



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.36/2/Rev.1

6 October 2025

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

Agenda item 3

**REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON INITIAL
SCREENING/TECHNICAL REVIEW
OF PROJECT AND PROGRAMME PROPOSALS**

Table of Contents

Background.....	3
Funding status: country cap	3
Funding status: MIE cap	3
Funding status: annually-determined funding provisions	4
Project/programme proposals submitted by implementing entities	5
Regular single-country proposals	5
Regional proposals.....	6
Regional Locally-Led Adaptation proposals	8
Global Locally-Led Adaptation Aggregator Programme	8
Large Innovation Projects.....	9
AFCIA Programme	10
Bundled learning-innovation grant proposals.....	10
Cofinancing in submitted proposals	11
Issues Identified during the review	11
Recommendations	12
ANNEX 1: Project Tables	13
ANNEX 2: Decisions of the Adaptation Fund Board Relevant to this report.....	25

Background

1. This document presents to the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) of the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) an overview of the project/programme proposals submitted by Implementing Entities (IEs) to the current meeting of the Board, and the process of screening and technical review undertaken by the secretariat. For the current meeting of the Board it covers the proposals submitted for funding under the following windows:
 - a. Single-country “Regular”
 - b. Regional “Regular”
 - c. Single-country Locally-led Adaptation (LLA)
 - d. Regional LLA
 - e. LLA Aggregator Programme
 - f. Large Innovation Projects
 - g. Adaptation Fund Climate Innovation Accelerator (AFCIA) Programme
 - h. Bundled Learning-Innovation Grants.
2. The analysis of the proposals mentioned above is contained in a separate addendum to this document.

Funding status: country cap

3. At the thirty-sixth meeting, having considered the analysis contained in document AFB/B.36/5, the Board decided to revise the country cap from US\$ 10 million to US\$ 20 million *all eligible developing country Parties*. It also decided *[t]o set a maximum level of US\$ 10 million for an individual funding request for single country concrete adaptation projects, provided that lower maximum levels could be set by the Board in specific circumstances* as captured in [Decision B.36/41](#).
4. At the forty-fourth meeting, having considered document AFB/B.44/9 the Adaptation Fund Board decided to revise the country cap from US\$ 20 million to US\$ 40 million, increase the single-country project/programme size to US\$25 million and increase the regional project/programme size to US\$30 million, with the provision that the Secretariat reviews the caps at the commencement of the next Medium-Term Strategy (MTS) period, with a view to supporting the mandate to triple the outflows as per the NCQG decision, paragraph 16, as captured in [Decision B.44/4](#).

Funding status: MIE cap

5. At the twelfth meeting, the Board instituted a cap of 50 per cent for project funds directed through Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs), as per [Decision B.12/9](#) and [Decision B.17/19](#).
6. According to the latest Financial Report prepared by the Trustee as of 31 June 2025, the cumulative funding decisions for all projects/programmes amounted to US\$ 1,396.30 billion and funds available to support AF Board funding decisions amounted to US\$ 563.81 million. The cumulative funding decisions for projects/programmes submitted by MIEs amounted to US\$ 861.96 million. The Board had instituted, through [Decision B.12/9](#), a cap of 50 per cent for projects/programmes submitted by MIEs. Some categories of proposals submitted by MIEs had been excluded from counting towards the 50 per cent, and the cumulative funding decisions for

MIE projects/programmes that counted towards it amounted to US\$ 852.78 million. Therefore, the funds available below the 50 per cent cap currently amount to US\$ 130.71 million.

Funding status: annually-determined funding provisions

7. Since its inception and until March 2017, the Adaptation Fund Board had only approved projects and programmes implemented in individual countries. The Adaptation Fund Board then decided on a regional project and programme pilot with a cap of US\$ 30 Million as per [Decision B.25/28](#).
8. In accordance with the [Decision B.25/28](#) and the document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2, the secretariat had issued, in 2015, an invitation to submit project and programme proposals for funding under the pilot programme. The invitation was sent to Designated Authorities (DAs) of the Adaptation Fund, and to Multilateral and Regional Implementing Entities (RIEs) accredited by the Board.
9. The Board decided, at its twenty-sixth meeting invited Multilateral Implementing Entities and Regional Implementing Entities to submit proposals under the Pilot programme for Regional Projects and Programmes in response to a call through [Decision B.26/3](#).
10. The Board considered the prioritization of regional project/programme proposals, the awarding of project formulation grants, and the establishment of a pipeline through [Decision B.28/1](#) at its twenty eighth meeting.
11. At the twenty-ninth meeting, having considered the comments and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) continued the allocation for regional project and programmes and PFG requests to support projects and programmes them based on the size of the proposals through [Decision B.29/4](#).
12. At its thirty-first meeting, the Board subsequently decided to merge the two pipelines for technically cleared regional proposals established in [Decision B.28/1](#) (b)(ii), from fiscal year 2019 commenced the provisional allocation for regional proposals without distinction between the two categories originally described in document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2, and that the funding of regional proposals would be established on a 'first come, first served' basis, along with other specification as indicated in [Decision B.31/3](#).
13. For the fiscal year 2020, the decision was taken by the Board to approve the same amounts as for the year 2019 [Decision B.31/12](#). The annual funding provision for the following windows was approved most recently at the forty-fourth meeting, and the funding remaining is in Table 1. There are no regional projects or programmes currently on the waitlist. Currently, no regional fully developed proposals are being presented for approval.

Table 1: Annual funding allocations with decision numbers

Window	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Regional	US\$ 59M B.33/12	US\$ 59 M B.36/1		US\$ 100 M B.40/56	US\$ 60 M B.42/33	US\$ 60 M B.44/41
PFG	US\$ 1 M B.33/12	US\$ 1M B.36/1				
EDA		US\$ 20.2 M B.36/2	US\$ 20 M B.38/39	US\$ 30.3 M B.40/56		
Large Innovation	\$30M B.35.b/8			US\$ 30.3 M B.40/56	US\$ 30.3 M B.42/33	US\$ 30 M B.44/41
AFCIA						US\$ 60 M B.44/41
Bundled (innovation & learning)	-	-	-	-	US\$750K B.43/22	US\$4M B44/41 *
Small Innovation				US\$ 1.5M B.40/56	US\$ 1.5 M B.42/33	US\$ 4 M B.44/41*
Learning grants	US\$ 400K B.31/32	US\$ 400K B.31/32	US\$ 400K B.31/32	US\$ 1M B.40/56	US\$ 1.5 M B.42/33	US\$ 4M B44.41*
Scale Up	US\$ 200K B.31/32	US\$ 200K B.31/32	US\$ 200K B.31/32	US\$ 1 M B.40/56	US\$ 1 M B.42/33	US\$ 4M 44.41*
LLA Single country					US\$ 26.5 M B.42/33	US\$ 26.5 M B.44/41
LLA regional						US\$ 30 M B.44/41
LLA Aggregator					US\$35 M B.42/33	

- Decision B44/41 groups small innovation grants, learning and project scale-up under US \$4M

Project/programme proposals submitted by implementing entities

14. The secretariat presents below the details of projects and programmes submitted for this cycle, following the details of the pilot rolling-basis process as described AFB/PPRC.31/60 and approved in [Decision B.40/59](#). This decision was confirmed by [Decision B.41/21](#).

Regular single-country proposals

15. Accredited Entities submitted 38 single country project proposals to the secretariat, of which all 38 were eligible and for which technical reviews were carried out. Of the 38 eligible single country project proposals, 21 project proposals submitted to the secretariat were technically cleared. All eligible proposals are presented in Annex 1, Table 2. The total amount of funding requested by the eligible single country proposals is US\$ 345,808,968 and includes US\$ 25,928,269 (7.5%) in IEs' management fees and US\$ 25,213,158 or (7.3 %) in execution costs. The total requested funding for PFGs is US\$ 2,451,675.

16. The proposals were submitted by the following National, Regional and Multilateral Implementing Entities of the Fund: Caribbean Community climate Change Center (CCCCC) Development Bank of Latin America (CAF); Honduras; Environmental Project Implementation Unit (EPIU), Armenia; the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); Mexican Institute of Water Technology (IMTA); The Interprofessional Fund for Agricultural Research (FIRCA); National Environment Fund Benin (FNEC); International Bank of Reconstruction and Development (IBRD); Partnership for Governance Reform of Indonesia (Kemitraan); Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (MOFECET); National Environment Management Authority (NEMA); Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS); the United Nations Human Settlement Programme (UN-Habitat), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP).

17. Of the 21 projects that were technically cleared, ten are fully developed project proposals and eleven are concept notes. The total requested funding of the fully developed proposals amounts to US\$ 76,561,444. The total requested funding for PFGs is US\$ 976,675.
18. All the technically cleared proposals are in compliance with Board [Decision B.11/16](#) to cap management fees at 8.5%. In accordance with the same [Decision B.11/16](#), all proponents of fully developed project documents provide a budget on fee use. All fully developed project/programme documents provide an explanation and a breakdown of their execution costs and other administrative costs, and are in compliance with [Decision B.12/17](#). All the technically cleared proposals are in compliance with Board Decision B.13/17 to cap execution costs at 9.5% of the project/programme budget.
19. All submissions for single countries request funding below the cap available to each country, as per decision B.13/23 and [Decision B.36/41](#) on the *Provision* of financial resources between single country and regional concrete adaptation project and programmes (country cap) - Annex 1, Table 2. One of the proposals is a small size proposal (under US\$ 1 million). One MIE submitted multiple proposals. The 19 proposals are for 18 different countries.
20. Details of the single-country proposals are contained in separate PPRC working documents. All eligible proposals are presented in Annex 1, Table 2. Details of the single-country proposals that are not technically cleared are presented to the Board as information documents.

Regional proposals

21. Accredited entities submitted 14 regional proposals to the secretariat. All 14 were eligible to undergo technical review and are presented in Annex 1, Table 2. The total amount of funding being requested by the eligible regional proposals is US\$ 291,067,655 and includes US\$ 25,984,651 (8.9%) in IEs' management fees and US\$ 21,033,380 or (7.3 %) in execution costs. The total requested funding for PFGs is US\$ 799,000 (including project formulation grants).
22. The proposals were submitted by the following Regional and Multilateral Implementing Entities of the Fund; European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD); the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO); World Health Organization (WHO); and World Meteorological Organization (WMO).
23. Of the 14 eligible regional proposals submitted to the secretariat, five proposals were technically cleared. The total requested funding of those proposals amounts to US\$ 106,558,000 (project formulation grants). None of the five proposals are fully developed projects, none are concept notes, and all five are pre-concepts.
24. Details of the regional proposals that are not technically cleared are presented to the Board as information documents.
25. The secretariat received 52 submissions for the AFB45 review cycle. All 52 submissions were found to be eligible and, in accordance with the operational policies and guidelines, the secretariat screened and prepared technical reviews for them.

26. The eligible submissions were posted online for public review, inviting comments within a specified time period. Public comments were received for three single-country fully developed proposals for Egypt, Kenya and Ethiopia. The comments were submitted to the IE and responses on the comments were submitted to the Secretariat by the IEs. These are annexed to the individual project documents.
27. In line with the details of the rolling-basis submission, the secretariat shared the technical review findings with the IEs that had submitted the proposals and solicited their responses to specific items requiring clarification. Responses were requested by e-mail, and IEs were given three weeks to respond to the comments of each round of the technical reviews. The IEs were offered the opportunity to discuss the review findings with the secretariat by telephone as is the usual practice and the secretariat organized 20 such calls. The secretariat received seven requests for extensions of the time available to resubmit a revised proposal to enable the IEs to address the requests received during the technical review.
28. The secretariat reviewed the IEs' responses to the clarification requests and undertook additional rounds of technical reviews as needed. As per the details of the rolling-basis submission process, the secretariat compiled comments and recommendations for technically cleared proposals or proposals that are recommended to be rejected. These are presented in the addendum to this document (AFB/PPRC.31/3/Add.1).

Single-country Locally-Led Adaptation proposals

29. Accredited entities submitted seven single-country Locally-Led Adaptation (LLA) proposals to the secretariat, of which all seven were eligible, and technical reviews were carried out and are presented in Table 4 below. The total amount of funding being requested by the eligible single country proposals is US\$ 34,936,237 and includes US\$ 2,779,940 (8.65%) in IEs' management fees and US\$ 2,992,870 or (9.31%) in execution costs.
30. The proposals were submitted by the following National, Regional and Multilateral Implementing Entities of the Fund: Fundecooperacion Para el Desarrollo Sostenible (Fundecooperacion), Environmental Management Agency (EMA), The Pacific Community (SPC), UN Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)
31. Of the seven eligible single country LLA proposals submitted to the secretariat, two proposals were technically cleared. The total requested funding of those proposals amounts to US\$ 9,999,420 (excluding project formulation grants). The two proposals are pre-concepts. All eligible proposals are presented in Annex 1, Table 2.
32. Details of the LLA single country proposals that are not technically cleared are presented to the Board as information documents.
33. The eligible submissions were posted online for public review, inviting comments within a specified time period. One public comment was received for a concept note for an LLA single country proposal for Costa Rica. The comments were submitted to the IE

34. In line with the details of the rolling-basis submission, the secretariat shared the technical review findings with the IEs that had submitted the proposals and solicited their responses to specific items requiring clarification. Responses were requested by e-mail, and IEs were given three weeks to respond to the comments of each round of the technical reviews. The IEs were offered the opportunity to discuss the review findings with the secretariat by telephone as is the usual practice. The secretariat received three requests for extensions of the time available to resubmit a revised proposal to enable the IEs to address the requests received during the technical review.
35. The secretariat reviewed the IEs' responses to the clarification requests and undertook additional rounds of technical reviews as needed. As per the details of the rolling-basis submission process, the secretariat compiled comments and recommendations for technically cleared proposals or proposals that are recommended to be rejected. These are presented in the addendum to this document (AFB/PPRC.36/2/Add.1).

Regional Locally-Led Adaptation proposals

36. Accredited entities submitted two regional locally-led adaptation (LLA) proposals to the secretariat, of which one was eligible and underwent a technical review. . The total amount of funding being requested by the eligible regional proposals is US\$ 24,860,496 and includes US\$ 1,947,594 (8.5%) in IEs' management fees and US\$ 1,987,875 or (8.6 %) in execution costs.
37. The proposal was submitted by the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB).
38. The proposal was submitted as a concept note along with a project formulation grant (PFG) and is not technically cleared. It is included in Annex 1, Table 3.
39. Details of the regional proposal that is not technically cleared is presented to the Board as an information document.
40. The eligible submission was posted online for public review, inviting comments within a specified time period. No public comments were received.
41. In line with the details of the rolling-basis submission, the secretariat shared the technical review findings with the IEs that had submitted the proposals and solicited their responses to specific items requiring clarification. The IEs were given three weeks to respond to the comments of each round of the technical reviews. The IEs were offered the opportunity to discuss the review findings with the secretariat as per the usual practice.

Global Locally-Led Adaptation Aggregator Programme

42. Accredited entities submitted three LLA Aggregator proposals to the secretariat, all three were eligible and technical reviews were carried out. The total amount of funding being requested by the eligible regional proposals is US\$ 37,000,000 and includes US\$ 3,072,727 (9.05%) in IEs' management fees and US\$ 1,854,364 or (5.4%) in execution costs.

43. The proposals were submitted by the following Regional and Multilateral Implementing Entities of the Fund; the Development Bank of Latin America (CAF), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO).
44. Of the three eligible LLA aggregator fully-developed proposals submitted to the secretariat, two proposals were technically cleared. The total requested funding of those proposals amounts to US\$ 22,000,000. The technically cleared proposals are included in Annex 1, Table 2. All eligible proposals are presented in Annex 1, Table 3 below.
45. Details of the proposal that is not technically cleared is presented to the Board as an information document.
46. The eligible submissions were posted online for public review, inviting comments within a specified time period. No public comments were received.
47. In line with the details of the rolling-basis submission, the secretariat shared the technical review findings with the IEs that had submitted the proposals and solicited their responses to specific items requiring clarification. IEs were given three weeks to respond to the comments of each round of the technical reviews and they were offered the opportunity to discuss the review findings with the secretariat by telephone as per the usual practice.

Large Innovation Projects

48. Accredited entities submitted eight large innovation project proposals to the secretariat, of which all eight were eligible and technical reviews were carried out and are presented in Annex 1, Table 3 below. The total amount of funding being requested by the eligible single country and regional proposals is US\$ 39,148,000 and includes US\$ 3,205,509 (8.95%) in IEs' management fees and US\$ 2,920,121 or (8.19%) in execution costs.
49. The proposals were submitted by the following National, Regional and Multilateral Implementing Entities of the Fund: Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and World Meteorological Organization (WMO).
50. Of the 8 eligible single country and regional proposals submitted to the secretariat, four proposals were technically cleared. The total requested funding of those proposals amounts to US\$ 19,998,000 (excluding project formulation grants). All four proposals are fully developed projects. (see Annex 1, Table 2).
51. Details of the proposals that are not technically cleared are presented to the Board as information documents.
52. The eligible submissions were posted online for public review, inviting comments within a specified time period. No public comments were received.
53. In line with the details of the rolling-basis submission, the secretariat shared the technical review findings with the IEs that had submitted the proposals and solicited their responses to specific items requiring clarification. The IEs were given three weeks to respond to the comments of each

round of the technical reviews, and were offered the opportunity to discuss the review findings with the secretariat by telephone as is the usual practice.

AFCIA Programme

54. Accredited entities submitted one regional proposal to the secretariat, the proposal was eligible, and technical reviews were carried out and are presented in Annex 1: Table 3 below. The total amount of funding being requested by the eligible regional proposal is US\$ 5,000,000 and includes US\$ 440,000 (9.65%) in IEs' management fees and US\$ 151,960 or (3.33%) in execution costs.
55. The proposal was submitted by the following Regional Implementing Entity of the Fund: The Pacific Community (SPC).
56. The proposal submitted by SPC is technically cleared.
57. The eligible submission was posted online for public review, inviting comments within a specified time period. No public comments were received.
58. In line with the details of the rolling-basis submission, the secretariat shared the technical review findings with the IEs that had submitted the proposals and solicited their responses to specific items requiring clarification. The IEs were given three weeks to respond to the comments of each round of the technical reviews and were offered the opportunity to discuss the review findings with the secretariat by telephone as is the usual practice.

Bundled learning-innovation grant proposals

59. Accredited entities submitted one bundled learning-innovation grant proposal to the secretariat, that was eligible and technical reviews were carried out and is presented in Annex 1: Table 3 below. The total amount of funding being requested by the eligible single country proposal is US\$ 750,000 and includes US\$ 60,000 (8%) in IEs' management fees and US\$ 47,000 or (6.8%) in execution costs.
60. The proposal was submitted by the following National Implementing Entity of the Fund: Fundecooperacion para el Desarrollo Sostenible of Costa Rica (Fundecooperacion).
61. The proposal was technically cleared. The total requested funding of the proposal amounts to US\$ 750,000.
62. In line with the details of the rolling-basis submission, the secretariat shared the technical review findings with the IE that had submitted the proposal and solicited their response to specific items requiring clarification. Responses were requested by e-mail, and the IE was given three weeks to respond to the comments of each round of the technical reviews. The IE was offered the opportunity to discuss the review findings with the secretariat by telephone as is the usual practice and the secretariat organized one such call.
63. The secretariat reviewed the IEs' responses to the clarification requests. As per the details of the rolling basis submission process, the secretariat compiled comments and recommendations

for technically cleared proposals that are presented in the addendum to this document (AFB/PPRC.36/2/Add.1).

Cofinancing in submitted proposals

64. During the review period, 3 proposals included information about cofinancing. Additional clarifications have been sought through the review process to confirm if the financing requested from the Adaptation Fund could be justified on the basis of full cost of adaptation reasoning, where this was not clearly presented in those proposals. The first proposal is a concept note by IBRD for Uzbekistan, IBRD and has only received one round of technical review and has not been technically cleared. The second proposal is a concept note by CCCCC for Suriname and the third proposal is regional pre-concept note by EBRD for Georgia, Moldova, Kyrgyz Republic and Uzbekistan. The previous two proposals were technically cleared.

Issues Identified during the review

Interpretation of policy concerning the first funding request on country cap

65. At the thirty-sixth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board Since, the country cap was raised to US\$ 20 million and, as per [Decision B.36/41\(a\)](#), “any Party could access a total of up to US\$ 20 million from the Adaptation Fund once it had accessed funding amounting to at least US\$ 8 million for regular single-country adaptation projects or programmes or once four years had passed since approval of the first concrete single-country adaptation project(s)/(programme(s) by the Board, whichever occurred earlier”. At that time, the maximum funding that could be accessed via a single project financed under the country cap was US\$ 10 million. At the forty-fourth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board the county cap was further raised to US\$ 40 million and the maximum project size for single-country projects was increased to US\$ 25 million through [Decision B.44/4](#).

66. Currently, there is no updated guidance for countries concerning Decision B.36/41(a). It is not clear, for example, how Decision B.36/41(a) should be interpreted for countries attempting to access funding for the first time, i.e. whether countries should have met the US\$ 8 million minimum or at least four years since approval threshold, and whether the PPRC wishes to retain the principle in light of the increase in the maximum project size. The Secretariat invites the Board to consider this matter and to provide guidance on the preferred approach.

Approach to project failing to address technical issues

67. The Secretariat noted that a Large Innovation Project proposal remains unsuitable for consideration as a fully developed large innovation project. Despite five rounds of technical reviews, fundamental issues persist, including a weak and unsubstantiated adaptation rationale, a poorly developed innovation justification, inconsistencies between activities, targets, results framework and budget, and gaps in safeguards, knowledge management and gender integration. The Secretariat had advised resubmission at concept stage to allow these issues to be addressed, but the IE has opted to proceed with a fully-developed proposal. The Secretariat invites the Board to consider this matter and provide guidance to the IE on the appropriate way forward.

Recommendations

Recalling Decision B.36/41, the PPRC may wish to consider recommending to the Board to:

- a) Request the secretariat to prepare options concerning access to funding under the country cap with a view to clarifying and/or updating Decision B.36/41(a), and present them to the PPRC at its thirty-seventh meeting.

ANNEX 1: Project Tables

Table 2: Proposals technically recommended for consideration at AFB 45

Country	IE	PPRC Document number	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Technical Recommendation	Funding set aside, USD
1. Full Proposals: Single-country							
NIE							
Armenia (1)	EPIU	AFB/PPRC.36/3	4,097,546			Approve	4,097,546
Armenia (2)	EPIU	AFB/PPRC.36/4	4,472,630			Approve	4,472,630
Ethiopia	MOFEC	AFB/PPRC.36/5	9,999,328			Approve	9,999,328
Indonesia (1)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.36/6	993,081			Approve	993,081
Indonesia (2)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.36/7	998,868			Approve	998,868
Kenya	NEMA	AFB/PPRC.36/8	20,000,000			Approve	20,000,000
Mexico	IMTA	AFB/PPRC.36/9	7,999,991			Approve	7,999,991
RIE							
Dominican Republic	CAF	AFB/PPRC.36/10		10,000,000		Approve	10,000,000
Egypt	OSS	AFB/PPRC.36/11		8,000,000		Approve	8,000,000
MIE							
Grenada	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/12			10,000,000	Approve	10,000,000
Sub-total, USD			48,561,444	18,000,000	10,000,000		76,561,444
2. Concepts: Single-country							
NIE							
Benin	FNEC	AFB/PPRC.36/13	4,011,561			Endorse	0
Côte d'Ivoire	FIRCA	AFB/PPRC.36/14	10,000,000			Endorse	0
RIE							
Barbados	CCCCC	AFB/PPRC.36/15		10,000,000		Endorse	0
Saint Lucia	CCCCC	AFB/PPRC.36/16		9,992,305		Endorse	0
Suriname	CCCCC	AFB/PPRC.36/17		9,998,839		Endorse	
MIE							

Country	IE	PPRC Document number	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Technical Recommendation	Funding set aside, USD
Botswana	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/18			10,000,000	Endorse	
Comoros	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/19			10,000,000	Endorse	
Djibouti	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/20			9,996,630	Endorse	
Morocco	UN Habitat	AFB/PPRC.36/21			9,171,939	Endorse	0
Philippines	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/22			10,000,000	Endorse	0
Venezuela	WFP	AFB/PPRC.36/23			10,000,000	Endorse	0
Sub-total, USD			14,011,561	29,991,144	59,168,569		-
3. Project Formulation Grants (PFG): Single-country concepts							
NIE							
Benin	FNEC	AFB/PPRC.36/13/Add.1	91,800			Approve	91,800
Côte d'Ivoire	FIRCA	AFB/PPRC.36/14/Add.1	150,000			Approve	150,000
RIE							
Barbados	CCCCC	AFB/PPRC.36/15/Add.1		149,250		Approve	149,250
Suriname	CCCCC	AFB/PPRC.36/17/Add.1		150,000		Approve	150,000
MIE							
Botswana	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/18/Add.1			150,000	Approve	150,000
Comoros	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/19/Add.1			150,000	Approve	150,000
Djibouti	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/20/Add.1			135,625	Approve	135,625
Philippines	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/22/Add.1			150,000	Approve	150,000
Sub-total, USD			241,800	299,250	585,625		1,126,675
4. Pre-concepts: Regional							
MIE							
Angola, Mozambique	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/24			30,000,000	Endorse	0
Georgia, Moldova, Kyrgyz Republic, Uzbekistan	EBRD	AFB/PPRC.36/25			30,000,000	Endorse	0
Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan,	WMO	AFB/PPRC.36/26			13,915,000	Endorse	0

Country	IE	PPRC Document number	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Technical Recommendation	Funding set aside, USD
Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan							
Malawi, Tanzania Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.36/27			13,999,000	Endorse	0
	WHO	AFB/PPRC.36/28			18,644,000	Endorse	0
Sub-total, USD			-	-	106,558,000		-
5. Project Formulation Grants (PFG) Pre-concepts: Regional MIE							
Angola, Mozambique Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/24/Add.1			30,000	Approve	30,000
	WMO	AFB/PPRC.36/26/Add.1			39,000	Approve	39,000
Malawi, Tanzania Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.36/27/Add.1			30,000	Approve	30,000
	WHO	AFB/PPRC.36/28/Add.1			20,000	Approve	20,000
Sub-total, USD			-	-	119,000		119,000
GRAND TOTAL (1+2+3+4+5)			62,814,805	48,290,394	176,431,194		77,807,119
6. Pre-Concept: Single Country LLA MIE							
Cambodia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.36/29			4,999,420	Endorse	
Lebanon	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.36/30			5,000,000	Endorse	0
Sub-total, USD			-	-	9,999,420		-
7. Project Formulation Grants (PFG) Pre-Concept: Single Country LLA MIE							
Cambodia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.36/29/Add.1			30,000	Approve	30,000
Lebanon	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.36/30/Add.1			50,000	Approve	50,000
Sub-total, USD			-	-	80,000		80,000
8. LLA Aggregator RIE							

<i>Country</i>	<i>IE</i>	<i>PPRC Document number</i>	<i>NIE funding, USD</i>	<i>RIE funding, USD</i>	<i>MIE funding, USD</i>	<i>Technical Recommendation</i>	<i>Funding set aside, USD</i>
MIE Regional [Latin America and Caribbean]	CAF	AFB/PPRC.36/31		12,000,000		Approve	12,000,000
Global	UNDP	AFB/PPRC.36/32			10,000,000	Approve	10,000,000
Sub-total, USD			-	12,000,000	10,000,000		22,000,000
GRAND TOTAL (6+7+8)			-	12,000,000	20,079,420		22,080,000
9. Full Proposals Single Country: Large Innovation Projects							
NIE							
Belize	PACT	AFB/PPRC.36/33	5,000,000			Approve	5,000,000
Sub-total, USD			5,000,000	-	-		5,000,000
10. Full Proposals Regional: Large Innovation Projects							
MIE							
Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia	UNDP	AFB/PPRC.36/34			5,000,000	Approve	5,000,000
Kenya, Uganda, The Gambia, Tanzania	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/35			5,000,000	Approve	5,000,000
	WMO	AFB/PPRC.36/36			4,998,000	Approve	4,998,000
Sub-total, USD			-	-	14,998,000		14,998,000
GRAND TOTAL (9+10)			5,000,000	-	14,998,000		19,998,000
11. AFCIA Grants							
RIE							
Cook Islands, Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu	SPC	AFB/PPRC.36/37		5,000,000		Approve	5,000,000
Sub-total, USD			-	5,000,000	-		5,000,000
12. Bundled Innovation-Learning grants							

<i>Country</i>	<i>IE</i>	<i>PPRC Document number</i>	<i>NIE funding, USD</i>	<i>RIE funding, USD</i>	<i>MIE funding, USD</i>	<i>Technical Recommendation</i>	<i>Funding set aside, USD</i>
RIE							
Costa Rica	FDSCR	AFB/PPRC.36/38	750,000			Approve	750,000
Sub-total, USD			750,000	-	-		750,000
GRAND TOTAL (1+2+3+4+5+6+7+8+9+10+11+12)			68,564,805	65,290,394	211,508,614		125,635,119

Table 3: Project proposals reviewed ahead of the forty-fifth Adaptation Fund Board meeting

Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Number of Technical Reviews	FIF Platform Document ID	Grant Size, USD
1. Full Proposals: Single-country					
NIE					
Armenia (1)	EPIU	AFB/PPRC.36/3	4	AF00000363	4,097,546
Armenia (2)	EPIU	AFB/PPRC.36/4	11	AF00000368	4,472,630
Ethiopia	MOFEC	AFB/PPRC.36/5	5	AF00000410	9,999,328
Indonesia (1)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.36/6	7	AF00000302	993,081
Indonesia (2)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.36/7	5	AF00000306	998,868
Indonesia (3)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.1	3	AF00000307	998,739
Kenya	NEMA	AFB/PPRC.36/8	5	AF00000431	20,000,000
Mexico	IMTA	AFB/PPRC.36/9	4	AF00000328	7,999,991
RIE					
Dominican Republic	CAF	AFB/PPRC.36/10	3	AF00000397	10,000,000
Egypt	OSS	AFB/PPRC.36/11	4	AF00000331	8,000,000
Kiribati	SPREP	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.2	2	AF00000158	10,000,000
Mauritania	OSS	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.3	1	AF00000332	10,000,000
Tonga	SPC	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.4	1	AF00000450	14,803,820
MIE					
Grenada	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/12	4	AF00000334	10,000,000
Zambia	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.5	5	AF00000280	12,655,103
Sub-total, USD					125,019,106
2. Concepts: Single-country					
NIE					
Belize	PACT	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.6	1	AF00000465	24,948,700
Benin	FNEC	AFB/PPRC.36/13	5	AF00000429	4,011,561
Côte d'Ivoire	FIRCA	AFB/PPRC.36/14	4	AF00000418	10,000,000
Morocco	ADA	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.7	1	AF00000432	9,981,000
Peru (1)	Profonanpe	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.8	2	AF00000451	10,000,000
Peru (2)	Profonanpe	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.9	2	AF00000452	10,000,000
Zimbabwe	EMA	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.10	1	AF00000453	7,225,000
RIE					
Barbados	CCCCC	AFB/PPRC.36/15	3	AF00000406	10,000,000
Burundi	OSS	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.11	3	AF00000430	10,000,000
Papua New Guinea	SPREP	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.12	6	AF00000396	3,469,288
Saint Lucia	CCCCC	AFB/PPRC.36/16	3	AF00000425	9,992,305
Suriname	CCCCC	AFB/PPRC.36/17	4	AF00000424	9,998,839
MIE					
Botswana	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/18	6	AF00000385	10,000,000
Comoros	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/19	7	AF00000403	10,000,000

Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Number of Technical Reviews	FIF Platform Document ID	Grant Size, USD
Djibouti	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/20	6	AF00000402	9,996,630
Ecuador	WFP	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.13	4	AF00000413	10,000,000
Jordan	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.14	1	AF00000460	7,000,000
Morocco	UN Habitat	AFB/PPRC.36/21	5	AF00000409	9,171,939
Philippines	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/22	3	AF00000437	10,000,000
Sri Lanka	WFP	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.15	3	AF00000435	9,994,600
Tuvalu	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.16	1	AF00000461	10,000,000
Uzbekistan	IBRD	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.17	1	AF00000462	5,000,000
Venezuela	WFP	AFB/PPRC.36/23	2	AF00000436	10,000,000

Sub-total, USD**220,789,862****3. Project Formulation Grants (PFG): Single-country****NIE**

Belize	PACT	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.6		AF00000465	150,000
Benin	FNEC	AFB/PPRC.36/13/Add.1		AF00000429	91,800
Côte d'Ivoire	FIRCA	AFB/PPRC.36/14/Add.1		AF00000418	150,000
Morocco	ADA	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.7		AF00000432	150,000
Peru (1)	Profonanpe	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.8		AF00000451	150,000
Peru (2)	Profonanpe	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.9		AF00000452	150,000
Zimbabwe	EMA	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.10		AF00000453	150,000

RIE

Barbados	CCCCC	AFB/PPRC.36/15/Add.1		AF00000406	149,250
Burundi	OSS	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.11		AF00000430	50,000
Papua New Guinea	SPREP	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.12		AF00000396	100,000
Suriname	CCCCC	AFB/PPRC.36/17/Add.1		AF00000424	150,000

MIE

Botswana	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/18/Add.1		AF00000385	150,000
Comoros	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/19/Add.1		AF00000403	150,000
Djibouti	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/20/Add.1		AF00000402	135,625
Ecuador	WFP	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.13		AF00000413	125,000

<i>Country</i>	<i>IE</i>	<i>PPRC Document number</i>	<i>Number of Technical Reviews</i>	<i>FIF Platform Document ID</i>	<i>Grant Size, USD</i>
Jordan	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.14		AF00000460	150,000
Philippines	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/22/Add.1		AF00000437	150,000
Tuvalu	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.16		AF00000461	150,000
<i>Sub-total, USD</i>					2,451,675
4. Full Proposals: Regional					
MIE					
Bangladesh, Nepal	WMO	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.18	2	AF00000337	12,090,000
<i>Sub-total, USD</i>					12,090,000
5. Concepts: Regional					
RIE					
Chad, Togo	OSS	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.19	1	AF00000463	24,895,000
MIE					
Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana	WMO	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.20	3	AF00000440	19,360,000
Costa Rica, Panama	WMO	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.21	1	AF00000398	22,859,155
Cuba, Dominican Republic	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.22	1	AF00000464	30,000,000
Ethiopia, Tanzania	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.23	2	AF00000442	30,000,000
Malaysia, Philippines	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.24	2	AF00000354	13,707,500
<i>Sub-total, USD</i>					140,821,655
6. Project Formulation Grants (PFG): Regional Concepts					
MIE					
Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana	WMO	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.20		AF00000440	100,000
Costa Rica, Panama	WMO	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.21		AF00000398	120,000
Cuba, Dominican Republic	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.22		AF00000464	150,000
Ethiopia, Tanzania	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.23		AF00000442	150,000
Malaysia, Philippines	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.24		AF00000354	130,000
<i>Sub-total, USD</i>					650,000
7. Pre-concepts: Regional					

	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Number of Technical Reviews	FIF Platform Document ID	Grant Size, USD
RIE						
	Niue, Tonga	SPREP	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.25	1	AF00000434	13,398,000
MIE						
	Angola, Mozambique	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/24	3	AF00000441	30,000,000
	Cabo Verde, Comoros, Seychelles	WHO	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.26	2	AF00000433	18,200,000
	Georgia, Moldova, Kyrgyz Republic, Uzbekistan	EBRD	AFB/PPRC.36/25	4	AF00000423	30,000,000
	Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan	WMO	AFB/PPRC.36/26	3	AF00000420	13,915,000
	Malawi, Tanzania	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.36/27	4	AF00000428	13,999,000
	Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe	WHO	AFB/PPRC.36/28	3	AF00000419	18,644,000
	Sub-total, USD					138,156,000
8. Project Formulation Grants (PFG) Pre-concepts: Regional						
MIE						
	Angola, Mozambique	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/24/Add.1		AF00000441	30,000
	Cabo Verde, Comoros, Seychelles	WHO	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.26		AF00000433	30,000
	Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan	WMO	AFB/PPRC.36/26/Add.1		AF00000420	39,000
	Malawi, Tanzania	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.36/27/Add.1		AF00000428	30,000
	Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe	WHO	AFB/PPRC.36/28/Add.1		AF00000419	20,000
	Sub-total, USD					149,000
GRAND TOTAL (1+2+3+4+5+6+7+8)						640,127,298
9.Full Proposal: Single Country LLA						
MIE						
	Rwanda	UNDP	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.27	1	AF00000438	4,937,397
	Sub-total, USD					4,937,397
10. Concept: Single Country LLA						
NIE						
	Costa Rica (1)	FDSCR	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.28	1	AF00000444	5,000,000
	Costa Rica (2)	FDSCR	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.29	1	AF00000445	4,999,420

	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Number of Technical Reviews	FIF Platform Document ID	Grant Size, USD
RIE	Zimbabwe	EMA	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.30	1	AF00000466	5,000,000
	Vanuatu	SPC	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.31	1	AF00000455	5,000,000
Sub-total, USD						19,999,420
11. Project Formulation Grants (PFG) Concept: Single Country LLA						
NIE						
	Costa Rica (1)	FDSCR	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.28		AF00000444	150,000
	Costa Rica (2)	FDSCR	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.29		AF00000445	149,996
RIE	Zimbabwe	EMA	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.30		AF00000466	120,000
	Vanuatu	SPC	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.31		AF00000455	150,000
Sub-total, USD						569,996
12. Pre-Concept: Single Country LLA						
MIE						
	Cambodia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.36/29	2	AF00000456	4,999,420
	Lebanon	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.36/30	2	AF00000446	5,000,000
Sub-total, USD						9,999,420
13. Project Formulation Grants (PFG) Pre-Concept: Single Country LLA						
MIE						
	Cambodia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.36/29/Add.1		AF00000456	30,000
	Lebanon	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.36/30/Add.1		AF00000446	50,000
Sub-total, USD						80,000
14. Concept: Regional LLA						
RIE						
	Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Grenada, Jamaica, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	CDB	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.32	1	AF00000458	24,860,469
Sub-total, USD						24,860,469
15. Project Formulation Grants (PFG) Concept: Regional LLA						
RIE						

Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Number of Technical Reviews	FIF Platform Document ID	Grant Size, USD
Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Grenada, Jamaica, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	CDB	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.32		AF00000458	179,385
Sub-total, USD					179,385
16. LLA Aggregator					
RIE					
Regional [Latin America and Caribbean]	CAF	AFB/PPRC.36/31	2	AF00000457	12,000,000
MIE					
Global	UNDP	AFB/PPRC.36/32	2	AF00000447	10,000,000
Global	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.33	2	AF00000439	15,000,000
Sub-total, USD					37,000,000
GRAND TOTAL (9+10+11+12+13+14+15+16)					97,626,087
17. Full Proposals Single Country: Large Innovation Projects					
NIE					
Belize	PACT	AFB/PPRC.36/33	4	AF00000272	5,000,000
Honduras	CASM	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.34	3	AF00000417	4,000,000
Uganda	MoWE	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.35	5	AF00000386	5,000,000
MIE					
Somalia	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.36	1	AF00000275	5,000,000
Sub-total, USD					19,000,000
18. Concept Single Country: Large Innovation Projects					
NIE					
Costa Rica	FDSCR	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.37	2	AF00000443	5,000,000
Sub-total, USD					5,000,000
19. Project Formulation Grants (PFG) Concept Single Country: Large Innovation Projects					
RIE					
Costa Rica	FDSCR	AFB/PPRC.36/Inf.37		AF00000443	150,000
Sub-total, USD					150,000
20. Full Proposals Regional: Large Innovation Projects					
MIE					

<i>Country</i>	<i>IE</i>	<i>PPRC Document number</i>	<i>Number of Technical Reviews</i>	<i>FIF Platform Document ID</i>	<i>Grant Size, USD</i>
Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia	UNDP	AFB/PPRC.36/34	1	AF00000448	5,000,000
Kenya, Uganda	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/35	4	AF00000276	5,000,000
The Gambia, Tanzania	WMO	AFB/PPRC.36/36	4	AF00000288	4,998,000
<i>Sub-total, USD</i>					14,998,000
GRAND TOTAL (17+18+19+20)					39,148,000
21. AFCIA Grants					
RIE					
Cook Islands, Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu	SPC	AFB/PPRC.36/37	1	AF00000449	5,000,000
<i>Sub-total, USD</i>					5,000,000
22. Bundled Innovation-Learning grants					
RIE					
Costa Rica	FDSCR	AFB/PPRC.36/38	1	AFRDG00082	750,000
<i>Sub-total, USD</i>					750,000
GRAND TOTAL (1+2+3+4+5+6+7+8+9+10+11+12+13+14+15+16+17+18+19+20+21+22)					782,651,385

ANNEX 2: Decisions of the Adaptation Fund Board Relevant to this report.

<p>Decision B.36/41</p>	<p>b) Provision of financial resources between single-country and regional concrete adaptation project and programmes (country cap)</p> <p>para 41. Having considered the analysis contained in document AFB/B.36/5, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) To revise the cap per country established by decision B.13/23 from US\$ 10 million to US\$ 20 million for all eligible developing country Parties, so that any Party could access a total of up to US\$ 20 million from the Adaptation Fund once it had accessed funding amounting to at least US\$ 8 million for concrete single-country adaptation projects or programmes or once four years had passed since approval of the first concrete single-country adaptation project(s)/(programme(s) by the Board, whichever occurred earlier; b) To set a maximum level of US\$ 10 million for an individual funding request for single country concrete adaptation projects, provided that lower maximum levels could be set by the Board in specific circumstances, such as in the case of national implementing entities accredited through the streamlined process; c) To maintain the processes already put in place for the allocation of funding for regional projects and programmes, i.e., the provision on an annual basis (fiscal year) of a specific amount for the funding of regional project and programme proposals and the pipeline established through decision B.31/3; d) To assess implications of decision B.36/41 three years after the thirty-sixth meeting of the Board, taking into consideration resource availability, equitable access to funds, accreditation progress and programmatic development of the Fund; e) To inform the designated authorities and accredited implementing entities of this decision.
<p>Decision B.44/4</p>	<p>Agenda item 14: Utilization of resource caps within the Adaptation Fund</p> <p>4. The Adaption Fund Board, having considered document AFB/B.44/9, refers to its decision B.43/33 requesting the Secretariat to undertake additional analysis and further elaborate options for caps and project and programme size, and decided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) To increase the country cap to US\$40 million; b) To increase the single-country project/programme size to US\$25 million; c) To increase the regional project/programme size to US\$30 million; d) To request the Secretariat, at the start of the next Medium-Term Strategy (MTS) period to review the caps, with a view to supporting the mandate to triple the outflows as per the NCQG decision, paragraph 16.
<p>Decision B.12/9</p>	<p>Para 45. Following a discussion, during which the Board considered a number of options to promote and facilitate the access by NIEs to the resources of the Adaptation Fund, including the need to both cap the amount of funding allocated to MIEs and the need to also cap the funds allocated to each MIE within a general cap on all MIEs, as well as the need to keep any such decision under regular review, the Board decided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) That the cumulative budget allocation for funding projects submitted by MIEs, should not exceed 50 per cent of the total funds available for funding decisions in the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund at the start of each session. That cumulative allocation would be subject to review by the Board on the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee at subsequent sessions; b) To request the Trustee to provide an update on the amount of funds that have been approved for projects implemented by NIEs and MIEs at each meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board; and c) To review the implementation of this decision at the fourteenth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board.

Decision B.17/19	<p>Para 75. Having considered the recommendation of the EFC the Board decided to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Maintain the 50 per cent cap on the funding of project/programmes implemented by MIEs established by decision B.12/9, and exclude project/programme concepts from the 50 per cent calculation; b) Establish a pipeline of fully developed projects/programmes that have been recommended by the PPRC for approval by the Board, but exceeding the 50 per cent cap; c) Prioritize the projects/programmes in the pipeline by sequentially applying the following criteria: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Their date of recommendation by the PPRC; ii. Their submission date; and iii. The lower “net” cost. d) Consider fully developed projects/programmes in the pipeline for approval, subject to availability of resources and respecting the 50 per cent cap; and e) Request that the EFC consider at its 9th meeting the suspension of project/programme submissions as the last measure and elaborate on a clear threshold that indicates when the measure should be applied (e.g. 60 per cent excess of the cap).
Decision B.25/28	<p>Para 28. The Adaptation Fund Board decided to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.26/3	<p>Para 3. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to request the secretariat to inform the Multilateral Implementing Entities and Regional Implementing Entities that the call for proposals under the Pilot programme for Regional Projects and Programmes is still open and to encourage them to submit proposals to the AFB at its 27th meeting, bearing in mind the cap established by</p>
Decision B.27/5	<p>Para 35. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Continue consideration of regional project and programme proposals under the pilot programme, while reminding the implementing entities that the amount set aside for the pilot programme is US\$ 30 million b) Request the secretariat to prepare for consideration by the Project and Programme Review Committee at its nineteenth meeting, a proposal for prioritization among regional project/programme proposals, including for awarding project formulation grants, and for establishment of a pipeline; and c) Consider the matter of the pilot programme for regional projects and programmes at its twenty-eighth meeting.
Decision B.28/1	<p>Para 31. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC), the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:</p> <p><i>(a) With regard to the pilot programme approved by decision B.25/28:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. <i>To prioritize the four projects and 10 project formulation grants as follows:</i> ii. <i>If the proposals recommended to be funded in a given meeting of the PPRC do not exceed the available slots under the pilot programme, all those proposals would be submitted to the Board for funding</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i>If the proposals recommended to be funded in a given meeting of the PPRC do exceed the available slots under the pilot programme, the proposals to be funded under the pilot programme would be prioritized so that the total number of projects and project formulation grants (PFGs) under the programme maximizes the total diversity of projects/PFGs. This would be done using a</i>

	<p><i>three-tier prioritization system: so that the proposals in relatively less funded sectors would be prioritized as the first level of prioritization. If there are more than one proposal in the same sector: the proposals in relatively less funded regions are prioritized as the second level of prioritization. If there are more than one proposal in the same region, the proposals submitted by relatively less represented implementing entity would be prioritized as the third level of prioritization;</i></p> <p><i>To request the secretariat to report on the progress and experiences of the pilot programme to the PPRC at its twenty-third meeting; and</i></p> <p><i>(b) With regards to financing regional proposals beyond the pilot programme referred to above:</i></p> <p><i>(i) To continue considering regional proposals for funding, within the two categories originally described in document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2: ones requesting up to US\$ 14 million, and others requesting up to US\$ 5 million, subject to review of the regional programme;</i></p> <p><i>(ii) To establish two pipelines for technically cleared regional proposals: one for proposals up to US\$ 14 million and the other for proposals up to US\$ 5 million, and place any technically cleared regional proposals, in those pipelines, in the order described in decision B.17/19 (their date of recommendation by the PPRC, their submission date, their lower “net” cost); and</i></p> <p><i>(iii) To fund projects from the two pipelines, using funds available for the respective types of implementing entities, so that the maximum number of or maximum total funding for projects and project formulation grants to be approved each fiscal year will be outlined at the time of approving the annual work plan of the Board.</i></p>
Decision B.29/4	<p>38. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:</p> <p><i>(a) To include in its work plan for fiscal year 2018 a program of work amounting to US\$ 30 million for the funding of regional project and programme proposals, as follows:</i></p> <p><i>(i) Up to three proposals requesting up to US\$ 5 million for funding;</i></p> <p><i>(ii) One proposal requesting up to US\$ 14 million of funding;</i></p> <p><i>(iii) Up to five project formulation grant (PFG) requests, of up to US\$ 100,000 each, for preparing project and programme concepts or fully developed project documents requesting up to US\$ 5 million of funding;</i></p> <p><i>(iv) Up to five project formulation grant (PFG) requests, of up to US\$ 100,000 each, for preparing project and programme concepts or fully developed project documents requesting up to US\$ 14 million of funding.</i></p>
Decision B.31/3	<p>Para 3. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:</p>

	<p>a) <i>To merge the two pipelines for technically cleared regional proposals established in decision B.28/1(b)(ii), so that starting in fiscal year 2019 the provisional amount of funding for regional proposals would be allocated without distinction between the two categories originally described in document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2, and that the funding of regional proposals would be established on a ‘first come, first served’ basis; and</i></p> <p>b) <i>To include in its work programme for fiscal year 2019 provision of an amount of US\$ 60 million for the funding of regional project and programme proposals, as follows:</i></p> <p>i. <i>Up to US\$ 59 million to be used for funding regional project and programme proposals in the two categories of regional projects and programmes: ones requesting up to US\$ 14 million, and others requesting up to US\$ 5 million; and</i></p> <p>ii. <i>Up to US\$ 1 million for funding project formulation grant requests for preparing regional project and programme concepts or fully developed project and programme documents.</i></p>
Decision B.40/59	<p>Para 60. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:</p> <p>a) To extend the role of intermediary in the delivery of support for the accreditation of an NIE via the readiness package grant to all accredited implementing entities of the Fund;</p> <p>b) To require that all accredited implementing entities of the Fund that wish to deliver support for accreditation of a national implementing entity via the readiness package grant meet the following eligibility requirements:</p> <p>i. Have an “active accreditation” status with the Adaptation Fund;</p> <p>ii. Have experience advising or organizing relevant accreditation or capacity building support for institutions, organizations or other entities in developing countries at the national, subnational or local level to receive climate finance for adaptation projects and programmes;</p> <p>iii. Have experience implementing an Adaptation Fund project or programme and have submitted at least one project performance report, thereby demonstrating its commitment to adhering to the Fund’s fiduciary standards and operational policies and guidelines.</p> <p>c) To request the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat to update the website and notify all accredited implementing entities of the above decision by the Board.</p>
Decision B.41/21	<p>Para 21. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided to:</p> <p>a) Maintain the piloting of the rolling-basis submissions process for all funding windows, as described in document AFB/PPRC.31/60 and approved by decision B.40/59;</p> <p>b) Request the secretariat to:</p> <p>i. Present to the PPRC at its thirty-third meeting a report on the implementation of the pilot with any recommendations for improvement, as appropriate, and including a table comparing the number of proposals submitted at each cycle;</p> <p>ii. Undertake a comprehensive revision of the Operational Policies and Guidelines to reflect all necessary changes due to the revision of the Fund’s policies to-date, and with a view of better accommodating future changes of the policies of the Fund; and</p> <p>iii. Present the proposed draft revisions under the paragraph (b)(ii) above for consideration by the Board in its forty-third meeting.</p>
Decision B.11/16	<p>Para 86. Following a discussion, and having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Board decided:</p> <p>a) To set a cap for a fee of 8.5 per cent for all projects/programmes funded by the Adaptation Fund;</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) That implementing entities should provide a budget on fee use in project or programme proposals, which would be considered during project and programme review; and c) That the fee policy could be reviewed and adjusted after three years, or more specifically at the meeting of the Board following the ninth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol.
Decision B.12/7	<p>Para 36. Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Projects and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) To request the secretariat to prepare a desk study on how other funding sources had considered the issue of execution costs and present that study to the Ethics and Finance Committee for its consideration; and b) To request to the implementing entities that the project document included an explanation and a breakdown of all administrative costs associated with the project, including the execution costs.
Decision B.36.41	<p>Para 41. Having considered the analysis contained in document AFB/B.36/5, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) (a) To revise the cap per country established by decision B.13/23 from US\$ 10 million to US\$ 20 million for all eligible developing country Parties, so that any Party could access a total of up to US\$ 20 million from the Adaptation Fund once it had accessed funding amounting to at least US\$ 8 million for concrete single-country adaptation projects or programmes or once four years had passed since approval of the first concrete single-country adaptation project(s)/(programme(s) by the Board, whichever occurred earlier; b) To set a maximum level of US\$ 10 million for an individual funding request for single country concrete adaptation projects, provided that lower maximum levels could be set by the Board in specific circumstances, such as in the case of national implementing entities accredited through the streamlined process; c) To maintain the processes already put in place for the allocation of funding for regional projects and programmes, i.e., the provision on an annual basis (fiscal year) of a specific amount for the funding of regional project and programme proposals and the pipeline established through decision B.31/3; d) To assess implications of decision B.36/41 three years after the thirty-sixth meeting of the Board, taking into consideration resource availability, equitable access to funds, accreditation progress and programmatic development of the Fund; e) To inform the designated authorities and accredited implementing entities of this decision.
Decision B.41/30	<p>Para 30. Having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Take note of the report on the review of budget implications and options for evaluation policy implementation as contained in document AFB/EFC.32/10; b) Request the implementing entities to set the overall evaluation budget for proposed projects and programmes at 1 to 5 per cent of the project or programme budget, to be counted towards the implementing entity fee, starting from the forty-second meeting of the Board; c) Invite the implementing entities to consider "Proposed new structure of project evaluation cost" referred to in paragraph 30 of document AFB/EFC.32/10 as a guidance for allocating funding for evaluation activities; d) Request the secretariat to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Update the "Instructions for Preparing a Request for Project Funding" contained in Annex 5 to the Operational Policies and Guidelines accordingly and submit it to the forty-second meeting of the Board for consideration and approval; ii. Communicate the present decision to the implementing entities and ensure compliance during project reviews and monitoring; and iii. Report on the implementation of the new budget allocation for project evaluation budget to the Ethics and Finance Committee at its thirty-fourth meeting