



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.36/17/Add.1
15 September 2025

Adaptation Fund Board
Project and Programme Review Committee
Thirty sixth Meeting
Bonn, Germany, 7-8 October 2025

Agenda Item 4(o)

PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR SURINAME

I. Background

1. The Board at its eleventh meeting discussed the document "Funding for Project Formulation Costs" (AFB/11/6) and agreed, in its Decision B.11/18, that:

- i. project formulation grants (PFG) should be given once a project concept has been approved
- ii. consideration should be given in terms of differentiating between NIEs and MIEs, since some NIEs might have financial difficulties in trying to formulate project or programme proposals;
- iii. a flat rate should be given for project formulation costs;
- iv. a list of eligible activities and items still needed to be prepared; v. the grant should be additional to the project cost; and
- v. the fate of funds if the final project document was rejected should be determined.

2. There was consensus that a three-tiered system should be considered for project formulation grants: endorse a project concept with a PFG amount, endorse a project concept without a PFG amount, or reject the project concept.

3. Following the discussion, the Board decided:

To request the secretariat to reformulate the document, to include a comparison of eligible activities provided by other funds for project formulation grants, to take into account guidance provided by the Board at the present meeting, and to submit the document to the Board at its twelfth meeting, through the EFC. The EFC should review and finalize the process and policy of the project formulation grant focusing, in particular, on: the issue of unspent project funds; the procedures followed by other funds in that regard; and the determination of a flat-rate.

4. A document was prepared by the secretariat in response to the above mandate and presented at the third EFC meeting, which made specific recommendations to the Board at its twelfth meeting. Having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Board, in its Decision B.12/28, decided that:

(a) Project Formulation Grants (PFGs) will only be made available for projects submitted through NIEs. The Board would continue reviewing the question of PFGs for projects submitted through MIEs and would solicit comments from members and alternate members by February 14, 2011; the views would be compiled by the secretariat for presentation to the Board at its March 2011 meeting;

(b) If a country required a project formulation grant, a request should be made at the same time as the submission of a project concept to the secretariat. The secretariat will review and forward it to the PPRC for a final recommendation to the Board. A PFG could only be awarded when a project concept was presented and endorsed;

(c) A PFG form, reproduced in Annex V, should be submitted;

- (d) Only activities related to country costs would be eligible for PFG funding;*
- (e) A flat rate of up to US\$30,000 shall be provided, inclusive of the management fee, which cannot exceed 8.5 per cent of the grant amount. The flat fee would be reviewed by the Board at its thirteenth and all subsequent meetings;*
- (f) If the final project document is rejected, any unused funds shall be returned to the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund;*
- (g) Once a project/programme formulation grant is disbursed, a fully developed project document should come to the Board for approval within 12 months. No additional grants for project preparation can be received by a country until the fully developed project/programme document has been submitted to the Board; and*
- (h) The Trustee was instructed to remove the set-aside of US\$100,000 for project preparation that had been decided at the June 2010 meeting, as project preparation would be approved on a project-by-project basis.*

5. In its twenty-fourth meeting, the Board had initiated steps to launch a pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, not to exceed US\$ 30 million and had requested the secretariat to prepare for the consideration of the Board a proposal for such a pilot programme (Decision B.24/30). In its twenty-fifth meeting, the secretariat submitted such document and the Board decided to:

- (a) Approve the pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, as contained in document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2;*
- (b) Set a cap of US\$ 30 million for the programme;*
- (c) Request the secretariat to issue a call for regional project and programme proposals for consideration by the Board in its twenty-sixth meeting; and*
- (d) Request the secretariat to continue discussions with the Climate Technology Center and Network (CTCN) towards operationalizing, during the implementation of the pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, the Synergy Option 2 on knowledge management proposed by CTCN and included in Annex III of the document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2.*

(Decision B.25/28)

6. The approved document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2 contained provisions for the approval of project formulated grants for regional project and programme proposals, at different development stages, as follows:

“It is proposed that the Board open a structured call for MIEs and RIEs to submit pre-concepts for regional projects and programmes. The optional pre-concepts would be very brief proposals of maximum 5 pages that would explain the proposed regional adaptation project/programme. The pre-concepts would be screened and technically reviewed by the

secretariat, and subsequently reviewed by the PPRC. Together with the pre-concept, the proponent could submit a Phase I PFG request, up to the maximum level of US\$ 20,000. While endorsing the pre-concept, the Board could also approve the Phase I PFG request. The endorsement of the pre-concept would not create an obligation for the Board for later funding. As the next step, the proponent would submit a concept, and with it the proponent could submit a Phase II PFG request. The maximum AFB/PPRC.18/25/Add.1 level of the Phase II PFG would be US\$ 80,000 for proposals that had been previously granted Phase I PFG, and US\$ 100,000 for proposals that bypassed the optional pre-concept stage. While endorsing the concept, the Board could also approve the Phase II PFG request. The endorsement of the concept would not create an obligation for the Board for later funding, as it is the case for the national projects. The final stage of the proposal process would be the submission of the fully-developed regional project document”.

II. The Project Formulation Grant Request

7. This addendum to the document, AFB/PPRC.36/17 “Proposal for Suriname” includes a request for a Project Formulation Grant, requesting a budget of US\$ 150,000, which was received by the secretariat along with the concept for the project AF00000424 “*Climate Resilient Food System Transformation in Suriname (CR-FST)*”. This proposal was submitted by Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC), which is a Regional Implementing Entity of the Adaptation Fund, in time for consideration by the Adaptation Fund Board at its forty-fifth Board meeting.

8. In accordance with Decision B.12/28, paragraph (b), the secretariat carried out an initial review of the PFG request and found that the document provided detailed information on the use of the requested funds. The proposed activities were aligned with the goal of the project and would support: feasibility studies; environmental and social assessment; and Gender and Social Inclusion assessment and action plan.

9. Therefore, the PPRC may want to consider and recommend to the Board to approve the PFG Request, provided that the related concept proposal is endorsed.



Revised PFG Submission Form¹ (additions in red)

Project Formulation Grant (PFG)

Submission Date: 7 February 2025

Adaptation Fund Project ID:

Country/ies: Suriname

Title of Project/Programme: Climate Resilient Food System Transformation in Suriname (CR-FST)

Type of IE (NIE/RIE/MIE): Regional Implementing Entity

Implementing Entity: Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC)

Executing Entity/ies: Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries (in Suriname)

A. Project Preparation Timeframe

Start date of PFG	April 2025
Completion date of PFG	January 2026

B. Proposed Project Preparation Activities (\$)

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note²
Feasibility study	Feasibility assessment report	44,000	Consultancy firm for the feasibility assessment at 55 days X US\$600/day. Logistical costs at 5 locations X US\$2200 per location
Environmental & Social Assessment	1. Environmental and Social Impact Assessment 2. Environmental and Social Management Plan 3. Indigenous Peoples Plan	57,000	Consultancy firm for Environmental & Social Assessment at 70 days X US\$600/day. Logistical costs at 5 locations X US\$3000 per location
Gender and Social Inclusion Assessment and Action Plan	1. Gender and Social Inclusion Assessment and Action Plan	37,000	Consultancy firm for the gender and social inclusion assessment and action plan at

¹ As presented in AFB/PPRC.33/40 Annex 1.

² The proposal should include a detailed budget with budget notes indicating the break-down of costs at the activity level. It should also include a budget on the Implementing Entity management fee use.

	2. Project Specific Grievance Redress Mechanism		45 days X US\$600/day. Logistical costs at 5 locations X US\$2000 per location
Implementing Entity Management Fee (8%)		12,000	Lumpsum for coordination of consultants, travel, consultations, etc.
Total Project Formulation Grant		150,000	

Please describe below each of the PFG activities and provide justifications for their need and for the amount of funding required:

All studies will address information gaps identified during the concept note formulation in terms of requirements by the Adaptation Fund, CCCCC and at national level. The exact scope of these studies might expand beyond what is described below, depending on e.g. desk studies, national requirements (incl. scoping phase of the Environmental and Social Assessment), etc.

Feasibility study

- Determination of exact project locations and identify partner organizations for each
- Baseline analysis of selected locations to:
 - Characterize existing practices within and extent of the agriculture supply chain
 - Characterize existing initiatives
 - Identify and describe stakeholders and beneficiaries
 - Assess vulnerabilities and capacities of beneficiary communities
 - Inventory and characterization of infrastructure, accessibility, amenities
- Analysis of location specific needs, required interventions and assess feasibility of interventions and alternatives per location

Output / deliverable: Feasibility assessment report

Environmental & Social Assessment

- Location specific assessment required to determine the extent of compliance with the relevant laws and regulations, identify the gaps and how they will be addressed. Identify all permits required before project implementation
- Characterize the labor situation in each of the beneficiary villages (communities collectively). What is the existing status of vulnerable category of works including children, migrant workers and workers engaged by third parties including workers in the supply chain, assess the prevalence of forced or child labor and status of working the environment
- The project is addressing risk and impacts specifically associated with indigenous and tribal peoples in compliance with the CCCCC PS-7 Indigenous Peoples
- Assessment required to characterize natural habits, their current status and how the project can assist to maintain their status in the ecosystem. Determine how the project will ensure protect natural habitats and assess what will be the risk and impacts for the communities. Identify appropriate mitigation measures that are cost effective and sustainable.
- Identification and assessment of valuable ecosystem within the participating communities that can be affected directly and indirectly by implementation of project activities and the impacts the communities can have on these ecosystems. Exploit opportunities to enhance and conserve and the sustainable use of the derivatives from the ecosystem. These should include protection status under

International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), World Heritage Sites, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, where they apply. Identify appropriate and cost-effective mitigation measures that are sustainable. The assessment should not be limited to legally protected ecosystems but also to areas that are considered critical to maintain connectivity to other protected areas. Make recommendations if the status of the areas identified should be changed or upgraded.

- Identification and assessment of nature and extent of land preparation within the participating communities. Determine the extent of the impacts from methodology utilized and how the project will reduce carbon emissions and contribute to the country's carbon reduction commitments.
- Identify, assess and describe the extent to which the regenerative agriculture practice is beneficial over the conventional agriculture system based on the prevailing environmental characteristics within each of the local areas. How will the risk and impacts be assessed (positive or negative) and measured and monitored during project implementation.
- Identify and evaluate the extent of risk and impacts to the specific participating villages and surrounding communities. The extent to when the increased production will impact road conditions and reduce the easy access to communities by emergency services and the necessity of an Emergency Preparedness Plan.
- Identify, describe and assess the specific risk posed to the communities located in or around each of the five areas, identified as direct beneficiaries of the project, that has the potential to threaten or damage physical and cultural resources including items of traditional and historical importance. How the impacts will be mitigated and how communities will ensure that access to the site(s) will not be prohibited.
- Describe the existing characteristics of land and soil specifically within the areas of the participating communities. Identify and assess the risk and impacts specific to the communities and how the project activities will contribute to soil conservation. Furthermore, assess and indicate the extent to which the traditional regenerative agricultural farming practices are advantageous and sustainable for the soil conditions within the specific communities. Since the regenerative agriculture practice is favorable, indicate the advantages and disadvantages for various soils identified and how the drawbacks will be overcome.
- Additional requirements which may arise from the screening and scoping phase as required by Suriname's Environmental Framework Law³

Output / deliverable:

1. Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
2. Environmental and Social Management Plan
3. Indigenous Peoples Plan

Gender and Social Inclusion Assessment and Action Plan

This assessment will include at least the following:

- Assess the extent of marginalized and vulnerable groups to social services at the community level in participating villages. The methodology that will be utilized to determine the direct beneficiaries and the extent of the services. How will the project ensure that marginalized or vulnerable groups will not be further excluded.
- Assess if human right issues directly or indirectly due to primary and residual risk and impacts as a result of implementation of project activities with the participating villages/communities. This includes added negative impacts such as pollution to air, land and water that can impede the lives and livelihood of all the residents within the communities.

³ Environment Framework Law [SB 2020 97.pdf \(dna.sr\)](#)

- Gender Assessment to ensure equitable distribution of benefits within identified communities, and to maximize benefits small scale women farmers and food processors.
- Formulate how the project will elevate the use of traditional knowledge in climate change adaptation. Knowledge management will need formal agreements to ensure that ITP traditional knowledge is available for their respective peoples but protected from misuse. There are existing practices at national level that can be used as examples.
- Formulate a project specific Grievance Redress Mechanism that builds on requirements of the Adaptation Fund and CCCCC, and takes into account the local context of beneficiary communities.

Output / deliverable:

1. Gender and Social Inclusion Assessment and Action Plan
2. Project Specific Grievance Redress Mechanism

C. Implementing Entity

This request has been prepared in accordance with the Adaptation Fund Board's procedures and meets the Adaptation Fund's criteria for project identification and formulation

Implementing Entity Coordinator, IE Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Mark Bynoe		2/7/2025	Chantal Landburg	(+501)6279139	clandburg@caribbeanclimate.org



ADAPTATION FUND

Letter of Endorsement by Government



**MINISTRY OF SPATIAL PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT
DIRECTORATE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT**

Prins Hendrikstraat 22, Paramaribo, Suriname

Tel: +597 522021

Email: secdir.milieu@rom.gov.sr



January 20, 2025

To: The Adaptation Fund Board
c/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat
Email: Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org
Fax: 202 522 3240/5

Our reference: KV/VD/03/25

**Subject: Endorsement for Climate Resilient Food System Transformation
in Suriname (CR-FST)**

In my capacity as the designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in Suriname, I confirm that the above-mentioned project proposal is in accordance with the government's National Adaptation Plan 2019-2029, Third National Communication (NC3) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change 2023, the Gender Vision Policy Document 2021-2035 and other national priorities focused on implementing adaptation activities to reduce adverse impacts of, and risks, posed by climate change in Suriname.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above-mentioned project proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project proposal will be implemented by the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC) and executed by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Ivette Pengel-Patterzon
Deputy Permanent Secretary Climate Change
NDA Adaptation Fund - Suriname