



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.36-37/1
17 November 2025

Adaptation Fund Board
Project and Programme Review Committee

**REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON INITIAL
SCREENING/TECHNICAL REVIEW OF GRANT PROPOSALS
UNDER THE READINESS PROGRAMME**

Background

1. This document presents to the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) of the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) an overview of the readiness grant project proposals submitted by accredited Implementing Entities (IEs) for consideration during the intersessional period between the forty-fourth and forty-fifth meetings of the Adaptation Fund Board, and the process of screening and technical review undertaken by the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat (the Secretariat).

2. At its twenty-second meeting, the Board, through Decision B.22/24 allocated small grants under the Adaptation Fund Readiness Programme to help developing countries access the Fund through Direct Access by strengthening the capacities of potential national implementing entities (NIEs) to navigate accreditation and to comply with the Funds Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy. Support for accreditation was initially provided through South-South cooperation (SSC) grants, which, through Decision B.36/25.a, the Board replaced with the readiness package grant (RPG). RPGs facilitate peer-to-peer support for accreditation and strengthen SSC via intermediary implementing entities (IEs). Initially limited to accredited NIEs, the role of intermediary was expanded at the fortieth meeting (Decision B.40/60) to all accredited IEs with experience programming adaptation finance. Up to two NIEs can be accredited per country¹ and the RPG is available per NIE².

3. Through Decision B.36/26 by the Board at its thirty-sixth meeting, readiness grant proposals could be submitted and reviewed during all intersessional periods between the regular meetings of the Board. Further to the above, at its forty-first meeting, the Board, through Decision B.41/15, extended the readiness grant review cycle by giving IEs two weeks (an additional one week compared to the previous timeline) to respond to initial technical reviews, bringing the overall review cycle to 12 weeks:

4. Based on decision B.36/26 by the Board, the Secretariat launched a call for project proposals intersessionally between the forty-fourth and forty-fifth meetings of the Board for review by the Secretariat and consideration by the Board intersessionally between its forty-fifth and forty-sixth meetings. Accredited NIEs were given the opportunity to submit proposals for technical assistance (TA) grants whilst all accredited IEs were given the opportunity to submit proposals for RPGs on behalf of eligible³ countries.

Technical assistance grant proposals submitted by NIEs

5. In response to the call by the Secretariat, accredited NIEs of the Fund could submit project proposal documents for a technical assistance (TA) grant to enable them to source external expertise to help improve NIE capacity to assess and manage environmental, social and gender related issues and comply with the Fund's Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) and Gender Policy (GP). An NIE could submit a project proposal for one of two types of TA grants available, that is, a TA Grant for the ESP and GP (TA-ESGP) or a TA Grant for the Gender Policy (TA-GP). NIEs eligible to submit project proposals for the TA-ESGP would be those that had not previously received a grant for technical assistance and would be expected to build capacity on environmental and social safeguards and gender safeguards simultaneously. NIEs eligible to

¹ Decision B.36/42

² Decision B.37-38/14

³ All developing country Parties to the Kyoto Protocol and Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) that wish to have an NIE accredited with the Fund are eligible to receive the readiness package grant, including those that had previously accessed the SSC grant. The grant is available as a once off grant per NIE

submit project proposals for the (TA-GP) would be those that had previously not received a TA-ESGP that would like to integrate gender considerations into an existing robust ESP and environmental and social safeguards to align with the Fund's GP.

6. The Secretariat received three project proposals for a TA grant during the current review cycle. However, one proposal was not eligible as it was submitted by a non-accredited entity.

7. The two eligible TA grant proposals were submitted by the National Environment Trust Fund (NETFUND) of Kenya, and the Corporacion Nacional para el Desarrollo (CND) of Uruguay. Both were TA-ESGPs. Details of the fully reviewed grant proposals are contained in the separate PPRC working documents as follows:

Table 1: TA-ESGP proposals submitted to the intersessional period between the forty-fifth and forty-sixth meetings of the Board

Implementing Entity (IE)	Country	PPRC document number
NETFUND	Kenya	AFB/PPRC.36-37/2
CND	Uruguay	AFB/PPRC.36-37/3

8. The submitted TA grant proposals provide an explanation and a basic breakdown of the costs associated with the accredited NIEs building their capacity to assess and manage environmental, social and gender related issues and to comply with the Fund's ESP and GP. A summary of the proposals is provided in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Summary of financing requested for TA grant proposals submitted to the intersessional period between the forty-fifth and forty-sixth meetings of the Board

Country	IE	Initial Financing Requested (USD), (current period)	Final Financing Requested	IE Fee (USD)	IE Fee, %
Kenya	NETFUND	\$24,917	\$24,917	\$0	0%
Uruguay	CND	\$24,652	\$24,652	\$0	0%
Total		\$49,569	\$49,569	\$0	0%

Readiness package grant proposals submitted by IEs

9. In response to the call by the Secretariat, eligible accredited IEs that would like to support other countries that wish to access the Fund's resources through its Direct Access modality, can apply for RPGs as intermediaries on behalf of those countries. All intermediaries must meet the following eligibility requirements established by the Board⁴:

- (i) Have an "active accreditation" status with the Fund.
- (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.
- (iii) Have experience implementing an Adaptation Fund project or programme and have submitted at least one project performance report, thereby demonstrating its

⁴ See Decision B.40/60

commitment to adhering to the Fund's fiduciary standards and operational policies and guidelines.

10. The Secretariat received one RPG project proposal from one country seeking peer support for accreditation from a single intermediary NIE. However, following the initial technical review by the Secretariat, the proposal was withdrawn by the applicant with the intention of resubmitting it during the next intersessional review period.

The review process

11. In accordance with the operational policies and guidelines, following the receipt of the project proposal, the Secretariat screened and prepared technical reviews of the eligible grant proposals received.

12. In line with the Board request at its tenth meeting, the Secretariat shared the initial technical review findings with the IEs and solicited responses to specific items requiring clarification and/or corrective action. Responses were requested by e-mail, and the time allowed for the NIE to respond was two weeks. The IEs were offered the opportunity to discuss the initial review findings with the Secretariat via an online video conference call as per the usual practice.

13. Following the resubmission of the proposals, the Secretariat subsequently reviewed the IE responses to the clarification and/or corrective action requests in the initial technical review, and compiled comments and recommendations that are presented in the addendum to this document (AFB/PPRC.36-37/1/Add.1).

Issues identified during the review process

14. There were no issues identified during the current review cycle.