



## ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.37/10/Add.1  
16 March 2026

---

Adaptation Fund Board  
Project and Programme Review Committee  
Thirty seventh Meeting  
Bonn, Germany, 7-8 April 2026

Agenda Item 5 (e)

### **PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR BELIZE**

## 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.37/10 “Proposal for Belize” 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 AF00000465 “Strengthening Disaster Preparedness, Early Warning Systems, and Climate Resilient Housing”. This proposal was submitted by Protected Area Conservation Trust (PACT), which is a National Implementing Entity of the Adaptation Fund, in time for consideration by the Adaptation Fund Board at its forty-sixth 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: stakeholder consultations, risk & vulnerability assessment, feasibility study & technical design, environmental & social safeguards and gender analysis, economic & financial analysis, institutional & policy alignment review and full proposal development.

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.



ADAPTATION FUND

## ADAPTATION FUND BOARD SECRETARIAT TECHNICAL REVIEW OF PROJECT/PROGRAMME PROPOSAL

PROJECT/PROGRAMME CATEGORY: CONCEPT NOTE

**Country/Region:** Belize

**Project Title:** Strengthening Disaster Preparedness, Early Warning Systems, and Climate Resilient Housing

**Thematic Focal Area:** Disaster Risk Reduction or Urban Development

**Implementing Entity:** Protected Area Conservation Trust (PACT)

**Executing Entities:** Protected Area Conservation Trust (PACT)

**AF Project ID:** AF00000465

**IE Project ID:**

**Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars):** 25,000,000

**Reviewer and contact person:** UnaMay Gordon **Co-reviewer(s):**

**IE Contact Person:**

### Technical Summary

The project “Strengthening Disaster Preparedness, Early Warning Systems, and Climate Resilient Housing” aims to strengthen national disaster preparedness and response capacities, improving hurricane monitoring and early warning systems, and promoting climate-resilient housing and infrastructure through an innovative financing mechanism. This will be done through the three components below:

Component 1: Enhance the Capacity of Belize’s National Emergency Management Organization (USD 2,000,000);

Component 2: Support to the National Meteorological Service for Enhanced Hurricane Monitoring and Tracking (USD 2,000,000);

Component 3: Climate-Resilient Housing and Critical Infrastructure through Innovative Finance for Vulnerable Communities in Belize (USD 18,000,000).

Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation (USD 800,000).

Requested financing overview:

Project/Programme Execution Cost: USD 342,000

Total Project/Programme Cost: USD 23,142,000

Implementing Fee: USD 1,858,000

	<p>Financing Requested: USD 25,000,000</p> <p>The proposal includes a request for a project formulation grant of USD 150,000.</p> <p>The initial technical review raises several issues, such as the need for strengthening the adaptation rationale of the various components, the identification of potential risks and impacts of the project, the lack of information about potential overlapping projects, the absence of initial gender assessment and the project's cost-effectiveness, as is discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.</p> <p>The second technical review raises several issues such as, the need to complete the IE certification, improving on the component description, alignment with results framework and environmental and social principles of the Adaptation Fund, addressing USPs; PFG amendments etc. As indicate in the various CRs and CARs below.</p> <p>The third technical review continue to raise several issues such as the compliance with the environmental and social principles of the Adaptation Fund, addressing USPs, alignment with results framework, the project full cost of adaptation reasoning, as indicated in the various CRs and CARs below.</p> <p>The fourth technical review continue to raise issues such as not clearly articulating or addressing sustainability, full costs of adaptation reasoning and documenting stakeholder consultations, as indicated in the various CRs and CARs below.</p> <p>The fifth technical review finds that all outstanding CRs and CARs have been addressed.</p>
Date:	February 18, 2026

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments September 2, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments November 10, 2025	Third Technical Review Comments January 5, 2026	Fourth Technical Review February 13, 2026	Fifth Technical Review February 18, 2026
Country Eligibility	1. Is the country party to the Kyoto Protocol, and/or the Paris Agreement?	<b>Yes.</b>	-	-	-	-
	2. Is the country a developing country particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change?	<b>Yes.</b> In Belize, climate change has intensified hydro-meteorological hazards, increasing both the immediate and medium-term vulnerability of the population. These changes are accompanied by significant inter- and intra-annual climate variability. As a result, the country is experiencing more frequent and intense meteorological droughts, floods, storms, and hurricanes which exacerbate the country's vulnerability	-	-	-	-

		to climate change and limits its development.				
Project Eligibility	1. Has the designated government authority for the Adaptation Fund endorsed the project/programme?	<b>Yes.</b> As per the Endorsement letter dated August 5 <sup>th</sup> , 2025. However, please see address the following: <b>CAR1:</b> Please complete the IE certification at IV section B.	<b>CAR1: Not Cleared.</b> Please complete the IE certification at IV section B including the requisite signature.	<b>CAR1: Cleared</b> As per revised section IV-B.	-	-
	2. Does the length of the proposal amount to no more than Fifty pages for the project/programme concept, including its annexes?	<b>No</b> The concept note exceeds 50 pages including its annexes. <b>CAR2:</b> Please reduce the total pages within the required 50 pages	<b>CAR2: Cleared.</b>  <b>CR1NEW:</b> 1. Please amend page 1 to change the submission stage and uncheck 1 <sup>st</sup> submission. 2. Please add page numbers to the proposal.	-  <b>CR1: Cleared</b> As per revised document with page numbers added.	-	-
	3. Does the project / programme support concrete adaptation actions to	<b>Yes.</b> <b>However additional information is required.</b> The concept note provides overall information about the				

	<p>assist the country in addressing adaptive capacity to the adverse effects of climate change and build in climate resilience?</p>	<p>components and activities aiming at addressing the vulnerability of homes and households to more frequent and severe climate hazards. However, there are few elements to be addressed:</p> <p><b>CR1:</b> Beyond the overall description of the vulnerability and challenges caused by natural hazard on Belize housing sector, there is little information of how the proposed new resilient housing will address the impacts of climate hazards including increasing rain, sea rise, hurricane and others. Please explain how the newly proposed infrastructures will address the adaptive capacity of people, in particular if there are any specific building standards (national</p>	<p><b>CR1: Not cleared.</b></p> <p>1. Thank you for the clarification and additional information. However, in addition to information provided under paragraph 77, please strengthen the section with climate data on recent and past climate hazards as well as climate projections, i.e floods, and how the proposed solution be aligned with resilient building. Even a very brief data analysis is sufficient at this stage, to inform the validity of the proposed options to building resilience based</p>	<p><b>CR1.1: Not cleared</b></p> <p>The responses added in the review sheet seem to address another CAR related to building standards and code. Please revise the document and share the reference addressing CR1.1</p> <p><b>CR1.2: Cleared</b> as per revised paragraph 78.</p>		
--	---	--	--	---	--	--

		<p>or international) or technology that help strengthen the infrastructure and prevent negative impacts.</p> <p><b>CR2:</b> Although the CN states that “as of September 2024, approximately 89,874 people across 20,562 households were living in multidimensional poverty, representing over 22.1% of the population”, it is not clear how the proposed activities under component 3 and in particular the investment of 1,000 homes will address the overall vulnerability of populations exceeding the number of homes to be built or</p>	<p>on past data benchmark.</p> <p>2. Considering the frequency of category 4 and 5 Hurricanes impacting the Caribbean, please clarify why the resilience efforts in limited to category 3. Example see para 77.</p> <p><b>CR2: Not Cleared.</b> Thank you for the rationale behind the proposed number of houses and long-term approach proposed which is welcomed as presented at paragraph, 119, 128. At the fully developed proposal stage please ensure that any clarification on policy reforms or incentives that will be facilitate the dissemination of the</p>	<p><b>CR2: Not cleared.</b> Thank you for the explanation which is well noted. However, please include in the main document the comments and rationale provided in the review sheet. The clarification on the number of beneficiaries is well noted and included in paragraph 142 of the CN.</p> <p><b>CR3: Cleared</b> as per revised document</p>	<p><b>CR2: Cleared</b> as per paragraph 147. The direct beneficiaries (5000) will benefit from targeted adaptation interventions while 350,000 (the entire population of Belize) will benefit from increased institutional capacity for disaster risk response.</p>	-
--	--	---	---	---	---	---

		<p>rehabilitated. Please clarify how the proposed investment will build resilience in transformative and long-term manner.</p> <p><b>CR3:</b> While the CN states that “While this project will examine the vulnerability of the housing stock throughout the entire country, special emphasis will be given to those residing in high-risk, coastal communities”, there is no clear approach to implement the project to avoid creating inequity and exacerbate the vulnerability among population taking onto account existing social dimension.</p>	<p>new approach are articulated.</p> <p>1. For the CN please indicate how the proposal will address the overall vulnerability of populations exceeding the number of homes to be built or rehabilitated. Additionally, please clarify how the proposed number of 350,000 beneficiaries across the country has been identified as this represents nearly 85% of entire Belize population.</p> <p><b>CR3: Not cleared.</b> The risk and vulnerability activity in the PFG valued at US\$25,000 is noted. However, the proposal will be supported by providing the explanation provided in the</p>	<p>(parag. 142 and 143) and explanation provided.</p>		
--	--	--	---	---	--	--

		<p>Please clarify the project approach to target vulnerable communities without creating additional social issues. Please elaborate how the beneficiaries will be selected taking into account existing vulnerability factors.</p> <p><b>CAR3:</b> Beyond the number of 1,000 houses to be built or rehabilitated, the CN doesn't provide an indicative number of beneficiaries. Please indicate the estimated number of beneficiaries (direct and indirect) which will be supported.</p>	<p>review sheet within the proposal document itself. 1. Please include the response in the review sheet on CR3 in the proposal document and indicate the paragraph and page number in the next review sheet.</p> <p>2. It is important to briefly describe the approach to avoid exacerbating vulnerabilities and maladaptation. Considering the nature of the proposed intervention which involves infrastructure and considering the increasing and existing vulnerability, please elaborate further the beneficiary's identification including inclusion of some of the selection criteria described in the review sheet</p>	<p><b>CAR3: Cleared</b> as per revised document (parag. 142).</p> <p><b>CAR4: Not cleared</b> The revised parag. 127 nearly describes how the new construction will lead to increased resilience. It provides a very broad and limited reference to revised policies (not sure if the same as referred to in parag. 176 which was not amended). Please consider expanding the parag. 127 and provide additional information on how the proposed building code will help address the</p>	<p><b>CAR4: Not cleared.</b> Please clarify or be more specific regarding the standards or (planned) resilience provisions within the building code that would make the homes more climate-resilient i.e. addressing the vulnerability of homes due to increasing climate-induced risks. For example, does it include installing shutters or are there other designs that are/will be now considered mandatory? Please elaborate.</p>	<p><b>CAR4: Cleared.</b> Based on new information presented at paragraph 131.</p>
--	--	---	---	---	---	---

		<p><b>CAR4:</b> Despite the fact that project focuses on climate-resilient housing, the CN does not specify a clear definitions and standard of the proposed “Climate-Resilient Housing and Infrastructure”. Please explain and comment in the CN how the proposed “climate resilient housing” will build resilience in the context of Belize?</p> <p><b>CAR5:</b> Please elaborate on the new standards to be established taking onto account the climate change model for Belize and reference to the national disaster preparedness</p>	<p>responses. There is currently very limited information on beneficiary eligibility criteria.</p> <p><b>CAR3: Not cleared</b> Thank you for the additional clarification. However, please clarify how the proposed number of 350,000 beneficiaries across the country as indicated at paragraph 140, has been identified as this represents nearly 85% of entire Belize population.</p> <p><b>CAR4: Not Cleared</b> We believe you refer to paragraph 125 which provide very generic information and references the national building code. Please strengthen the CN at para 174 and provide even</p>	<p>vulnerability issues related to housing.</p> <p><b>CAR 5: Not cleared</b> Please refer to CAR4 and revise parag. 127.</p> <p><b>CR4: Cleared</b> as per revised Part 2, section A</p> <p>-</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

		<p>baseline assessment (Annex 2).</p> <p><b>CR4:</b> Kindly provide more details for each project activity, for example: clarify stakeholders to be involved), and which specific actions will be taken to ensure successful implementation of proposed climate resilient housing, and the locations (even tentative) where the constructions (housing and public buildings) will be done if already known at this stage.</p> <p><b>CR5:</b> Under Component 1, Output 1.3 “Critical infrastructure for hurricane response and recovery retrofitted to with flood protection, solar power, and water purification systems to ensure reliable hurricane response and recovery</p>	<p>indicative data on <b>how</b> the new construction will lead to increased resilience and be in compliance of the standards. Should they be new standards or techniques adopted, please describe it. Also refer to CR1 (2) above.</p> <p><b>CAR5: Not cleared</b> The paragraph 126 has not changed and new paragraph 125 does not address this issue. Please clarify.</p> <p><b>CR4: Not cleared.</b> The information and clarification provided on stakeholder’s consultation is welcome. However, please amend the CN and include in the document the</p>	<p><b>CR6: Cleared</b> as per revised parag. 102 and 113.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

		<p>operations”, please clarify what is meant by critical infrastructures and list them if already known. If not, please consider USP approach in line with AF OPG guidelines.</p> <p><b>CR6:</b> Under Component 1, Output 1.4 “Local disaster preparedness and response capacity is enhanced through strengthened data analysis, network administration, and disaster mitigation planning and policies” and component 2, Output 2.2 “Enhanced capacities in hurricane modelling and forecasting tools”, there seem to be potential to strengthen the proposed approach for new “resilience housing” for long term sustainability and resilient of the infrastructures.</p>	<p>additional information included in the review sheet.</p> <p><b>CR5: Cleared</b> As per clarification provided and updated CN, paragraphs 95-98.</p> <p><b>CR6: Not cleared.</b> No narrative under output 1.4 is included under the component description. The description goes up to 1.3 and goes to</p>	<p>-</p> <p><b>CAR7: Not cleared</b> Please specify where the “Memo re Climate Resilient Housing Product Design and Revolving Fund Framework” is included. Please note that it has to be within the main document or its annexes but not in separate file.</p>	<p><b>CAR7: Cleared</b> While there is no mention of a “Memo re Climate Resilient Housing Product Design and Revolving Fund Framework”, the approach is articulated in paragraph 121.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	---	--

		<p>Please clarify how the activities mentioned above will contribute to build a new “resilient housing” beyond the hard infrastructure component of the housing.</p> <p><b>CAR6:</b> Under Component 2, the output 3.1 “Legal, financial, and institutional frameworks to ensure sustainable management and governance of the revolving fund for climate-resilient housing and infrastructure established” seems to be executed by a third-party entity named “Development Finance Corporation”. However, the CN states on its cover note that PACT will execute the entire project. Please clarify the execution approach under the</p>	<p>Component 2. Please update the CN and refer to and align with the new policies under development with the information currently available. Also include a notation that alignment and compliance will be further strengthened at fully-developed proposal stage.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Answers only in the review sheet does not constitute a response to the comments. The changes /clarification <b>must</b> be reflected in the proposal document for the comment to be cleared.</p> <p><b>CAR6: Cleared.</b> As per clarification provided under paragraph 202.</p>	<p><b>CAR8: Cleared</b></p>	<p>As per paragraph 120, beneficiary selection is noted as a two-tiered process: (i) vulnerability prioritisation and (ii) affordability/repayment screening.</p> <p><u><i>In the fully developed proposal please ensure that the following is addressed.</i></u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have considerations been made as to if this approach could systematically exclude the most vulnerable due to their inability to repay?</li> <li>2. Will the vulnerability of indigenous people be assessed different?</li> <li>3. What safeguards will be in place?</li> </ol>	
--	--	--	--	-----------------------------	--	--

		<p>revolving fund and revise the CN accordingly.</p> <p><b>CAR7:</b> Under Component 3, Output 3.2 “At least 1000 homes in vulnerable communities are retrofitted, upgraded, or relocated to climate-resilient standards”, although the CN mentions that “The selection and implementation process will be guided by a thorough Environmental and Social Risk Screening to ensure that interventions minimize negative impacts and promote sustainability”, please provide at this stage some indicative selection criteria which can be further developed during FP stage.</p> <p><b>CR7:</b> Under Component 4, mostly all funds are</p>	<p><b>CAR7: Not cleared.</b> The indicative selection criteria are well noted. However, please include the proposed criteria and additional information in the CN document. In addition, please clarify if there are separate selection criteria of beneficiaries’ selection in addition to those for the revolving fund and if yes please detail them.</p>	<p>1: As per revised paragraph 143</p> <p>2: As per revised table on Part 3.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p>allocated to monitoring and evaluation and there is no other outputs and activities aiming at support concrete adaptation actions to assist the country in addressing adaptive capacity to the adverse effects of climate change and build in climate resilience. Please note that as per AF OPG and new evaluation policy, evaluation costs are included in the project implementation fees. Please revise the component 4 and including activities and outputs in accordance with AF OPG.</p> <p><b>CAR8:</b> As required by AF, please add explicitly the alignment with the Adaptation Fund Results Framework in Part II section B.</p>	<p><b>CR7: Cleared.</b> As per revised paragraphs 132-134.</p> <p><b>CAR8: Not cleared.</b> 1. At paragraph 141 under Part II Section B, please include a sentence which indicates how the proposal is aligned with the AFs results</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>framework. You may list the relevant outcomes to which the proposal is aligned.</p> <p>2.For the Demonstrate how the project/programme aligns with the Results Framework of the Adaptation Fund table at Part III A please amend the table to comply with the guidance and template as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Results Framework Alignment Table</a> (Amended in November 2025) (77 kB, DOC)</li></ul>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>3. Does the project / programme provide economic, social and environmental benefits, particularly to vulnerable communities, including gender considerations, while avoiding or mitigating negative impacts, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?</p>	<p>Unsure.</p> <p>The concept note briefly outlines some project's economic, social, and environmental benefits; however, the explanation is too general and with no estimated benefits. The document does not provide information on the expected total number of beneficiaries of the project and the specific vulnerable groups targeted. The concept note does not include an Initial Gender Assessment.</p> <p><b>CR8:</b> Please include in the economic benefits section, how many people will benefit in each community and what is the dollar-value of the economic benefit to them for each of the target communities. It would also be useful to present overall</p>	<p><b>CR8: Cleared.</b> As per information in initial gender assessment.</p> <p><b>CR9: Cleared.</b> As per information in initial gender assessment.</p>	-	-	-
--	---	---	---	---	---	---

		<p>figures for economic and social benefits.</p> <p><b>CR9:</b> Please strengthen the social, and environmental benefits with specific and quantifiable data where possible.</p> <p><b>CAR9:</b> Please include an initial gender assessment which is required at the concept note stage.</p> <p><b>CAR10:</b> Kindly provide specific information on the expected beneficiaries, disaggregated by gender and age, where possible. Also, whether marginalized and vulnerable groups and indigenous communities have been identified in the project area and if so, to specify how the project benefits those groups.</p>	<p><b>CAR9: Cleared.</b> An initial gender assessment was provided with the re-submission.</p> <p><b>CAR10: Cleared.</b> Thanks for providing the estimated number of direct and indirect beneficiaries at paragraph 140. However, to be compliant with the Gender Policy please provide the information disaggregated by gender at the fully-developed proposal stage. This information can draw on already existing gender studies or sectoral or country reports to provide some indicative information. Please consult <a href="#">Gender Guidance Document for Implementing Entities on Compliance with the Adaptation Fund</a></p>	<p>-</p> <p><b>CR10: Cleared</b> as per CR3 and revised paragraph 127.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<a href="#">Gender Policy (Updated in 2022).</a>  <b>CR10: Not cleared.</b> This CR has not been addressed, also please refer to CR3 above.			
	4. Is the project / programme cost effective?	<b>CR10:</b> As raised in CR3, kindly explain how the project will ensure the equitable distribution of benefits.  <b>Unsure.</b> The concept note provides a broad explanation of the project cost-effectiveness including a comparative table on pages 44-48 (BAU vs proposed interventions). However, the document lacks details on cost-effectiveness approach with alternative options and measures beyond the BAU scenario. For now, it is not possible to	<b>CAR11: Not cleared</b>	<b>CAR11: Cleared</b> as per revised document (parag. 155).		-

		<p>demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of the selected measures.</p> <p><b>CAR11:</b> Kindly provide a sound justification for the cost-effectiveness of the project and selected measures, including scope, approach, alternative options to the proposed measures, and estimates of the evaluation where possible. Please consider update the table in pages 44-48 to include tentative cost figures for benchmark and alternative solutions of the proposed infrastructures and solutions.</p>	<p>1. The response provided in the review sheet suggests that the review within MET/PACT is not yet finished. Please revise the CN based on available information on cost-effectiveness and update pages 44-48 accordingly.</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

	<p>5. Is the project / programme consistent with national or sub-national sustainable development strategies, national or sub-national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, national communications and adaptation programs of action and other relevant instruments?</p>	<p><b>Yes. But further information is needed.</b>  The project identifies relevant adaptation-related plans and strategies for Belize as well as sectoral country's policy and strategies including losses and damages. However, the document lacks reference to SDGs and other development indicators.</p> <p><b>CAR12:</b> Kindly provide specific linkage about how the project supports the implementation of the SDGs.</p>	<p><b>CAR12: Cleared.</b>  As per revised Section E, paragraph 175-182</p>	-		
	<p>6. Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable, in compliance</p>	<p><b>Yes. But further clarification is needed.</b>  The concept identifies several national regulations relevant to the project as described in Section D and E, Part II, including the</p>				

	<p>with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund?</p>	<p>Environmental Protection Act Chapter 328 of the Substantive Laws of Belize Revised Edition 2020, Belize Building Act Chapter 131 and the National Land Use Policy for Belize (2025-2035).</p> <p><b>CAR13:</b> However, considering the newly proposed “resilience housing and infrastructure”, please clarify and elaborate in the CN if the existing standards are sufficient or a need for new approach and standards for climate-proofed infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>CAR13: Cleared</b> As per revised CN paragraph 78 and 174.</p>	-		
	<p>7. Is there duplication of project / programme with other funding sources?</p>	<p><b>Yes. However additional information is required.</b></p> <p>Although relevant information is described to the minimum extent in Section F, Part II, all potentially</p>				

		<p>overlapping projects are not clearly identified in the concept note.</p> <p><b>CR11:</b> Kindly conduct more analysis and include a comprehensive list of projects that are or have been implemented in Belize and the selected area. Please consider using a table format to demonstrate the complementarity and non-duplication if any.</p>	<p><b>CR11: Cleared</b> As per revised CN with new table under paragraph 180.</p>	-		
	<p>8. Does the project / programme have a learning and knowledge management component to capture and feedback lessons?</p>	<p><b>Yes. However, amendment is required.</b> Although the information provided on section G, Part II describes the project learning and knowledge approach, there is no dedicated component or activity in the project funding table associated with KM.</p>	<p><b>CAR14: Not cleared.</b> We believe you refer to paragraph 186 and not 190.</p>	<p><b>CAR14: Not Cleared</b> Thank you for the revised Paragraph 183 – 194. However, please reflect those activities</p>	<p><b>CAR14: Not cleared.</b> The outputs under 4.1 and 4.2 in the Table of section Project/Programme</p>	<p><b>CAR14: Cleared.</b> Based on insertions to paragraphs 139, 140, 141 and 142 of the proposal document.</p>

		<p><b>CAR14:</b> Please strengthen the project KM part beyond the section G. Please consider revising the project component 4 and including the knowledge and dissemination-related activities which are currently spread among the 3 other components.</p>	<p>There is still very generic and brief sentence about KM dissemination. Please revise and strengthen this section in line with previous comment under CAR14.</p>	<p>and input in the project budget.</p>	<p>Components and Financing have been revised to reflect knowledge sharing and lessons learned. However, component 4 titled “Enabling environment for climate actions in Belize enhanced”, should more clearly and explicitly reflect a component with a dedicated knowledge management function.</p> <p>In addition, please ensure all tables are clearly labelled with the appropriate caption/numbering to aid the review process. Additionally please follow the template for the Table of section Project/Programme Components and Financing: Project/Programme Components- Expected Outcomes – Expected Concrete Outputs – Amounts (USD). Once these are adjusted this CAR can be cleared.</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--	--

					<p><b>CAR14.1 (new):</b> Section G indicates that different institutions will have the role of tracking the experiences gained. Please clarify in Section G of the proposal how often tracking will be conducted and whether these entities have a focal point to facilitate this?</p>	<p><b>CAR14.1 (new): Cleared.</b> Based on paragraphs 190-192.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Official Use

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Official Use

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Official Use

	<p>9. Has a consultative process taken place, and has it involved all key stakeholders, and vulnerable groups, including gender considerations in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?</p>	<p><b>Unsure.</b> The CN indicates that initial consultations were conducted through focus groups and one-on-one interviews. The consultative process has included local authorities, government entities, and communities. However, there is no annex or mention of the persons who have been consulted nor the locations.</p> <p><b>CAR15:</b> Kindly indicate whether any physical consultation has taken place and include the list of stakeholders in Annex, including if possible one or two images.</p> <p><b>CAR16:</b> Considering the important role of</p>	<p><b>CAR15: Not cleared</b> Since there has been consultations on the ground, please include in Annex the list of stakeholders consulted.</p> <p><b>CAR16:</b> At this point, the CN development has consulted with their</p>	<p><b>CAR15: Not cleared</b> As per AF OPG and gender policies, a minimum consultation with beneficiaries and stakeholders is required, even virtually or indicative which can be further strengthen at full development stage.</p> <p><b>CAR16 (reopened): Not cleared.</b> Please refer to CAR15</p>	<p><b>CAR15: Not cleared</b> Thank you for sharing the list of participants consulted. To aid the review process of Section I, please use a table that provides a comprehensive list of the stakeholder consultations convened. The table should include:</p> <p>i. The total number of attendees, disaggregated by sex, with</p>	<p><b>CAR15: Cleared.</b></p> <p>Based on information presented at tables 10 and 11 as well as paragraphs 198-199 as well as the link provided with additional consultation information.</p>

		vulnerable groups including women and youth, kindly explain how these groups been involved during consultation workshops.	relevant umbrella organization and ministries representing these groups.		<p>background information to verify whether marginalized and vulnerable groups have been consulted. Please ensure the names of the stakeholders are also highlighted.</p> <p>ii. A summary of the subjects/issues discussed and any agreements reached.</p> <p>iii. Indicate how their interests have been incorporated in the project, including how gender and other vulnerable group considerations were addressed.</p> <p>Clearly state clearly the Section H, that stakeholders with gender remit were consulted – these may be women’s associations or Ministry</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	---	--

					responsible for gender affairs.	
	10. Is the requested financing justified on the basis of full cost of adaptation reasoning?	<p><b>Unsure.</b> The concept note provides general arguments for the funding of the project and its impact on Belize and selected areas. However, the demonstration of how the project will address solely its adaptation objective is not fully clear with the resources provided is not clear.</p> <p><b>CR12:</b> Please present information to indicate how this project will meet its objectives solely with the resources of the adaptation fund.</p> <p><b>CR13:</b> Kindly clarify whether the project requires co-financing or not. If co-financing is being considered, please clearly indicate how the</p>	<p><b>CR12: Cleared</b> As per paragraph 202</p> <p><b>CR13: Cleared</b> As per confirmation that there is no co-financing, ref. Paragraph 202</p>	-		
				<b>CAR 17: Not cleared.</b>	<b>CAR17: Cleared.</b>	

		<p>project with the AF resources only, will be able to effectively meet its objectives.</p> <p><b>CAR17:</b> Considering that most of the proposed activities under component 2 (infrastructures) are to be designed or identified (standards for resilient housing), kindly confirm if this project will be implemented through an approach of unidentified sub-project (USP).</p> <p><b>CR14:</b> Given that the project will establish a</p>	<p><b>CAR17: Not cleared.</b></p> <p>The current proposal reads like a proposal with USPs Fully unidentified USPs within a fixed framework. Please consult the AF USP guidance below and make the necessary amendments. Please note that if USPs are present, be it explicit or de facto, the project fully-developed proposal must include an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) that includes a detailed, budgeted process to apply the ESP and the GP to each USP as and when it is being identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Guidance Document for Project/Programme with Unidentified Sub-Projects</a></li> </ul>	<p>While the CN confirms that activities will be implemented using USP approach, there is no reference on its compliance with AF ESP and gender. Please consider adding a paragraph outlining that at full development stage a full ESMP be completed for each USPs under parag. 143 or elsewhere.</p> <p><b>CR14: Not cleared</b></p> <p>The new sentence added under parag. 117 does not address the full cost of adaptation reasoning of the project</p>	<p>The CN confirms that during the full proposal development, the feasibility study and environmental and social assessment will help to identify the beneficiaries and areas of relocation, ensuring USP compliance with the ESP and GP.</p> <p><b>CR14: Not cleared</b></p> <p>Please strengthen the full costs of adaptation by clarifying in Section I, (i) how grant resources will be limited to</p>	<p><b>CR14: Cleared.</b></p> <p>(i) As per paragraph 203.</p>
--	--	---	--	---	--	---

		<p>“revolving housing finance facility, which will provide low-interest loans to working poor households”, please clarify how the AF funding will meet its full cost of adaptation reasoning with a grant-based instrument. Please clarify how the low-interest loans return will be aligned with AF requirements for full cost of adaptation reasoning.</p>	<p><b>CR14: Not cleared.</b> We are not able to find a revised text under paragraphs 126-182 that addresses this CR14. Please provide a clear reference.</p>	<p>under its revolving fund. It rather describes a sustainability approach. Please revise and strengthen.</p>	<p>financing the full cost of community-level assets and not used to subsidise or capitalise private household credit; (ii) explain how loan repayments from household beneficiaries will be managed such that payment do not generate financial returns on grant resources. This may have been explained in another section of the proposal but ideally it should be included in Section I.  In doing this also explain how the revolving loan mechanism will be separate from the grant funded adaptation investments.</p>	<p>(ii) Aps per paragraph 207.</p>
	<p>11. Is the project / program aligned with AF's results framework?</p>	<p><b>Yes, however amendment is required.</b> Although the CN includes information under section A, Part III on the results</p>				

		<p>framework, the document doesn't not fully demonstrate the project alignment with AF's results framework.</p> <p><b>CAR18:</b> Please add at least one Project objective indicators to the project results framework, allowing the project to track progress towards the achievement of the project objective. This may be one or several core impact indicators.</p> <p><b>CAR19:</b> Several indicators of the project results framework are measured using "number or % of communities" as a unit. In line with the methodologies for reporting on indicators, all data should be reported in terms of number of people or another unit that can be easily</p>	<p><b>CAR 18: Not cleared</b> Please refer to CAR8 (2).</p> <p><b>CAR 19 and 20: Not Cleared.</b> Please refer to CAR8 (2).</p>	<p><b>CAR 18: Cleared</b> as per revised Part 3.</p> <p><b>CAR19 and 20: Not cleared</b> Please update using the reference of both CAR 19 and 20. Please also use our new guideline under Part 3: <a href="https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/Alignment-with-Adaptation-Fund-Results-Framework-Template-and-guidance-Nov-2025.docx">https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/Alignment-with-Adaptation-Fund-Results-Framework-Template-and-guidance-Nov-2025.docx</a></p>	<p><b>CAR19: Not cleared.</b> Many of the project indicators are people based and few focus on assets. Output 4.1.2 (asset-based) conflicts with Outcome 3.1.1 (people-based). Note also data should be reported as number of people only where relevant.</p> <p><b>CAR19.1(new):</b> As per the new guidance - <a href="https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/Alignment-with-Adaptation-Fund-Results-Framework-Template-and-">https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/Alignment-with-Adaptation-Fund-Results-Framework-Template-and-</a></p>	<p><b>CAR19: Cleared.</b> Based on updated table 13.</p> <p><b>CAR19.1 (new): Cleared.</b> Based on updated table 13.</p>

		<p>tracked. Please review and revise all relevant indicators and associated targets in the project results framework to ensure consistency with AF guidelines, specifically ensuring that all data are expressed in number of people. Remove any reference to households where applicable. Please be guided by the template available at</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Results Framework Alignment Table</a> (Amended in March 2019) (77 kB, DOC)</li> </ul> <p><b>CAR20:</b> Please ensure a consistent use of "Number" or "#" throughout the project results framework.</p>			<p><a href="#">guidance-Nov-2025.docx</a>, please include "Total objective level grant amount" and "Total outcome level grant amount". This should not include IE fees and EE cost</p> <p><b>CAR20: Cleared</b> as there is consistent use of number rather than "#" in the project results framework.</p>	
	12. Has the sustainability of the project/programme	<b>Yes. However additional information is required.</b>				

	<p>outcomes been taken into account when designing the project?</p>	<p>The project seeks to sustain its benefits mainly through a key sustainability mechanism with the establishment of a revolving housing finance facility. It is not clear how the involvement of national and local stakeholders will be done to fostering community ownership, and building capacity for end users.</p> <p><b>CR15:</b> Kindly identify the sustainability approach and mechanism beyond the revolving fund. Please explain how the adaptation benefits will be sustained after this project ends and explain if this can be replicated and/or scale up.</p>	<p><b>CR15: Not cleared</b> As stated in the CR15, the sustainability approach should be for entire project and not only the revolving fund. Kindly revise the proposed approach and extend it to entire project.</p> <p><b>CAR21: Not cleared</b> Thank you for the clarification and the</p>	<p><b>CR15: Not cleared</b> The newly added parag. 82 <i>“The interlinked components will focus on building national resilience through investments in strengthening institutional structures, data driven decision-making, sustainable financing for climate response for the most vulnerable and enhanced national coordination for climate action”</i> does not address the sustainability approach. The CN should concisely address the key areas of sustainability, including but not limited to</p>	<p><b>CR15: Not cleared.</b> Matters related to sustainability should be included in the appropriate section (Section J). Apart from financial sustainability, all key areas of sustainability (economic, social, environmental, and financial) must adequately articulated. Note that sustainability must be beyond training people.</p> <p>Please move paragraph 84 to Section J. The narrative is high-level and does not provide the specificity the mechanisms, actors,</p>	<p><b>CR 15: Cleared.</b> Based on information shifted to paragraphs 208 and 209.</p>
--	---	--	--	---	--	---

		<p><b>CAR21:</b> considering that the proposed resilient housing will be newly introduced to Belize, please identify the O&amp;M mechanism and implementation modality to ensure project sustainability.</p>	<p>adoption of a collaborative and inclusive approach. However, please provide at least details of an indicative O&amp;M mechanism.</p>	<p>economic, social, environmental, institutional, and financial.</p> <p><b>CAR21: Not cleared</b> The answer provided in the review sheet does not address the issue. Please revise the CN and provide at least some details on the proposed O&amp;M mechanism and provide its reference in the CN.</p>	<p>etc required. For example, describe the arrangements required to ensure the sustainability of the project's benefits beyond its completion. Consider the question, how will sustainability function in practice.</p> <p><b>CAR21: Not cleared.</b> As per CR15, please ensure, matters of sustainability are in the relevant section (Section J). Please move paragraph 122 to Section J. Apart from beneficiaries, will anyone else be trained to support maintenance? Will manuals be provided for those trained?</p>	<p><b>CAR21: Cleared.</b> As per paragraph 212.</p>
	<p>13. Does the project / programme provide an overview of environmental and social impacts / risks identified, in</p>	<p><b>Yes. However, further information is required.</b>  The concept note does not state the project classification (A, B or C) from the</p>				

	<p>compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?</p>	<p>screening. The proposal has not identified all potential risks and impacts but rather provides some general information about some of the environmental and social principles from the checklist. For the concept note, the ESP overview should start by identifying potential risks, even if the project aims not to affect issues related to the principles.</p> <p><b>CAR22:</b> Please kindly state the project classification from the screening in Section K, Part II.</p> <p><b>CAR23:</b> Please review Table in page 68 and assess all the principles that may apply to the project, and state and describe all potential impacts and risks in particular regarding the unidentified subprojects if any</p>	<p><b>CAR 22: Cleared.</b> As per project category B reflected on section K Part II</p> <p><b>CAR 23: Not Cleared.</b> Thank you for revised table under Section K Part II has been revised. However, please refer to CAR17 and ensure compliance with AF ESP and gender policy.</p>	<p>-</p> <p><b>CAR 23: Not cleared</b> Please refer to CAR17. Also, the “No further assessment required for compliance” column should only be ticked for those principles for which impacts/risks were not identified. Delete the word ‘No’, these should be left blank or have an ‘X’ instead. Please consult guidance document <a href="#">Guidance document for Environment and Social Policy</a>.</p>	<p><b>CAR23: Not cleared.</b> Please note for the checklist that Adaptation Fund Principles 1, 4 and 6 always apply. For more information, please visit: <a href="#">AF’s ESP guidance</a> and <a href="#">Environmental and Social Policy</a> . Therefore, please remove the ‘X’ from column 2 related to these three principles.</p> <p><b>CAR23.1 (new):</b> Please include the statement that the project will be aligned to AF policy.</p>	<p><b>CAR23: Cleared.</b> As per amendment to Section K at table 12 of the proposal.</p> <p><b>CAR23.1 (new): Cleared.</b></p>
--	---	---	--	---	---	--

		<p>(resilient housing and public infrastructures). Please refrain from using “n/a” as the project has to be screened against all principles. Please note that ESPs 1, 4 and 6 will always require further assessment.</p> <p><b>CAR24:</b> Please include an initial gender assessment.</p> <p><b>CR16:</b> Please confirm if the project includes USP in particular for activities involving construction (housing and public infrastructures) and refer to AF policy of USP for compliance.</p>	<p><b>CAR 24: Cleared</b> As per the initial gender assessment included</p> <p><b>CAR 16: Not cleared.</b> Please see above CAR17 related to USPs.</p>	<p>-</p> <p><b>CAR 16: Not cleared</b> Refer to CAR17</p>	<p><b>CAR16: Cleared</b> While the reference to paragraph 147 is unclear. Paragraph 49 notes that the project includes USPs and the beneficiaries and locations will be identified during the full proposal stage (PFG).</p> <p><b>CAR16.1(new):</b> Please ensure the ESMP being developed at 5.1.1 of the PFG will also address the USP approach, ensuring compliance with AF policy.</p>	<p>As per amendment to paragraph 216.</p> <p><b>CAR16.1 (new): Cleared.</b> As per amendment to paragraph 216 as well as information contained in PFG application.</p>
Resource Availability	1. Is the requested project / programme funding within	<p><b>Yes. But further clarification is needed</b> <b>CAR25:</b> Please attach the request for</p>	<p><b>CAR25: Cleared</b> A PFG request has been added</p>	-		-

	<p>the cap of the country?</p>	<p>PFG of \$150,000 as announced in the CN document.</p> <p><b>CAR26:</b> The funding requested on the cover of the proposal is US\$25M, which does not correspond with the amount in the project financing and components section. Please correct and align all figures throughout the document.</p>	<p><b>CAR 26: Cleared.</b> The funding table is now aligned with the \$25M request.</p>	-		
	<p>2. Is the Implementing Entity Management Fee at or below 8.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget before the fee?</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> However, amendment is required in regard to overall project financing breakdown. EE cost seem to be wrong.</p> <p><b>CAR27:</b> Ref to CAR28 below</p> <p>For further clarification on the costs and fees please refer to More information, please visit: <a href="https://www.adaptation-">https://www.adaptation-</a></p>	<p><b>CAR 27: Cleared</b> See below CAR28</p>	-		-

		<a href="http://fund.org/generic/costs-and-fees/">fund.org/generic/costs-and-fees/</a> .				
	3. Are the Project/Programme Execution Costs at or below 9.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget (including the fee)?	<p><b>No.</b></p> <p><b>CAR28:</b> Since PACT is acting as both IE and EE, please only 1.5% of the EC costs can be allocated to PACT. The cover page only lists PACT as the EE however; the endorsement letter indicates that Both PACT and DFC will execute the project.</p> <p>1. Please update the cover page to reflect this or provide an updated endorsement letter.</p>	<b>CAR 28: Cleared</b> As per revised cover page.	-		-

		<p>2. Please note that justification for the IE to serve as the EE is required and should be provided with the re-submission.</p>				
Eligibility of IE	<p>1. Is the project/programme submitted through an eligible Implementing Entity that has been accredited by the Board?</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> PACT accreditation is active until April 2030.</p>	<p><b>CAR29 (NEW):</b>  1. Please amend para 203 since PACT is the IE to remove the statement on the DA implementing.  2. Please revise start date of PFG to after AFB46. IN PFG form item 2 column 3 total should be \$20,000 not \$15,000.  Item 5- please ensure that the FDP</p>	<p><b>CAR 29: Cleared</b> as per paragraph 205 <b>and PFG form</b></p>	-	-

			has no ESMP and this line item includes its development if needed.			
Implementation Arrangements	1. Is there adequate arrangement for project / programme management, in compliance with the Gender Policy of the Fund?	n/a at concept stage				
	2. Are there measures for financial and project/programme risk management?	n/a at concept stage				
	3. Are there measures in place for the management of environmental and social risks, in line with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?	n/a at concept stage				

	4. Is a budget on the Implementing Entity Management Fee use included?	n/a at concept stage				
	5. Is an explanation and a breakdown of the execution costs included?	n/a at concept stage				
	6. Is a detailed budget including budget notes included?	n/a at concept stage				
	7. Are arrangements for monitoring and evaluation clearly defined, including budgeted M&E plans and sex-disaggregated data, targets and indicators, in compliance with the Gender Policy of the Fund?	n/a at concept stage				

	8. Does the M&E Framework include a break-down of how implementing entity IE fees will be utilized in the supervision of the M&E function?	n/a at concept stage				
	9. Does the project/programme's results framework align with the AF's results framework? Does it include at least one core outcome indicator from the Fund's results framework?	n/a at concept stage				
	10. Is a disbursement schedule with time-bound milestones included?	n/a at concept stage				

Total output level grant amount

\$22,800,000

Formatted Table

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Annex 1: DFC Loans Program

Annex 2: Initial Gender Analysis

**PART IV: ENDORSEMENT BY GOVERNMENT AND CERTIFICATION BY THE IMPLEMENTING ENTITY**

**A. Record of endorsement on behalf of the government?** Provide the name and position of the government official and indicate date of endorsement. If this is a regional project/programme, list the endorsing officials all the participating countries. The endorsement letter(s) should be attached as an annex to the project/programme proposal. Please attach the endorsement letter(s) with this template, add as many participating governments if a regional project/programme:

Carlos Poi Chief Executive Officer Ministry of Economic Transformation and DA to AF (Enter Name, Position, Ministry)	Date: 27/11/2025 
--	---

**B. Implementing Entity certification** Provide the name and signature of the Implementing Entity Coordinator and the date of signature. Provide also the project/programme contact person's name, telephone number and email address

I certify that this proposal has been prepared in accordance with guidelines provided by the Adaptation Fund Board, and prevailing National Development and Adaptation Plans and subject to the approval by the Adaptation Fund Board, <u>commit to implementing the project/programme in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and the Gender Policy of the Adaptation Fund</u> and on the understanding that the Implementing Entity will be fully (legally and financially) responsible for the implementation of this project/programme.
--

\* Each Party shall designate and communicate to the secretariat the authority that will endorse on behalf of the national government the projects and programmes proposed by the implementing entities.

Abil Castañeda Executive Direct Protected Areas Conservation Trust/NIE Belize		
Date: 27/11/25	Tel. and email: <a href="mailto:ed@pacbelize.org">ed@pacbelize.org</a> / +501-822-3637	
Project Contact Person: Eli Romero		
Tel. And Email: <a href="mailto:cfmanager@pacbelize.org">cfmanager@pacbelize.org</a> / +501-822-3637		



ADAPTATION FUND

**Letter of Endorsement by Government**



**GOVERNMENT OF BELIZE**

Ministry of Finance, Investment, **Economic Transformation**,  
Civil Aviation & E-Governance

*P.O. Box 42  
Ground Floor, Sir Edney Cain Building  
Belmopan City  
Belize, Central America*

*Tel: (501) 880-2526  
(501) 880-2527  
Email: econdev@met.gov.bz*

20<sup>th</sup> September 2025

Ref: IA/AF/1/25 (24)

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

**Subject: Endorsement for Strengthening Disaster Preparedness, Early Warning Systems,  
and Climate Resilient Housing**

In my capacity as designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in Belize, I confirm that the above national grant proposal is in accordance with the government's national priorities in implementing adaptation activities to reduce adverse impacts of, and risks, posed by climate change in Belize.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above grant proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented and executing by Protected Area Conservation Trust (PACT) as the National Implementing Entity (NIE) to the Adaptation Fund, in collaboration with key national partners that will support with their respective project

component(s). These national partners include the National Meteorological Service, the National Hydrological Service, the National Emergency Management Organization and the Development Finance Cooperation

Sincerely,



Mr. Carlos Pol  
Chief Executive Officer  
Ministry of Economic Transformation & Designated Authority of Belize to the Adaptation Fund

CC: Ms. Milagro Matus, Chief Executive Officer, Ministry of Sustainable Development, Climate Change & Solid Waste Management  
Mr. Victor Espat, Chief Executive Officer, Ministry of Infrastructure Development & Housing  
Mr. Rolando Zetina, Chief Executive Officer, Ministry of Public Service, Governance & Disaster Risk Management  
Mr. Abil Castañeda, Executive Director, Protected Areas Conservation Trust  
Mr. Henry Anderson, Chief Executive Officer, Development Finance Corporation  
Mr. Leroy Martinez, Acting Director, Climate Finance Officer, Ministry of Economic Transformation  
Mr. Jason Middleton, Senior Project Officer, Climate Finance Unit, Ministry of Economic Transformation  
Ms. Hunter Hales, Project Development Officer, Climate Finance Unit



**Revised PFG Submission Form**  
**Project Formulation Grant (PFG)**

**Submission Date:** February 17, 2026

**Adaptation Fund Project ID:**

**Country/ies:** Belize

**Title of Project/Programme:** Strengthening Disaster Preparedness, Early Warning Systems, and Climate Resilient Housing

**Type of IE (NIE/RIE/MIE):** NIE

**Implementing Entity:** Protected Areas Conservation Trust

**Executing Entity/ies:** Protected Areas Conservation Trust

**A. Project Preparation Timeframe**

<b>Start date of PFG</b>	May 1, 2026 (pending approval of CN)
<b>Completion date of PFG</b>	12 months after approval

**B. Proposed Project Preparation Activities (\$)**

<b>List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities</b>	<b>Output of the PFG Activities</b>	<b>US\$ Amount</b>	<b>Budget note<sup>1</sup></b>
1. Development of Project Proposal	1.1 Project proposal in alignment with AF criteria	\$25,000	1.1.1 Lead proposal development, consultant/firm: <b>\$20,000</b> 1.1.2 Validation workshop for draft proposal with stakeholders: <b>\$5,000</b>  Budget Note: To develop a comprehensive full project proposal including all annexes, log frame, and detailed budget.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<p>2. Stakeholder Consultations</p>	<p>2.1 Stakeholder Consultation Technical Report: Documented consultation process across coastal/urban vulnerable communities.</p>	<p>\$20,000</p>	<p>2.1.1 Community workshop (venues, materials, facilitation): <b>\$8,000</b></p> <p>2.1.2 Travel &amp; accommodation for outreach in coastal and rural areas: <b>\$5,000</b></p> <p>2.1.3 Consultation facilitation team: <b>\$7,000</b></p> <p>Budget Note: To ensure inclusion of vulnerable groups in project design, following AF's and Gender Policy.</p>
<p>3. Risk &amp; Vulnerability Assessment</p>	<p>3.1 Comprehensive baseline study on disaster risk, early warning system gaps and climate resilient housing needs (inclusive of gender and social vulnerability analysis)</p>	<p>\$25,000</p>	<p>3.1.1 Consultant fees &amp; report preparation &amp; dissemination (Climate/Disaster Specialist): <b>\$14,000</b></p> <p>3.1.2 Field data collection: <b>\$6,000</b></p> <p>3.1.3 GIS mapping: <b>\$5,000</b></p> <p>Budget Note: To conduct baseline assessments of climate and disaster risk, including gender and social vulnerability dimensions to guide project design.</p>
<p>4. Feasibility study and Technical Design</p>		<p>\$30,000</p>	<p>4.1.1 Engineering/ Architectural consultant/firm for resilient housing design standards: <b>\$14,000</b></p> <p>4.1.2 Technical study on early warning</p>

			<p>system needs and integration and documentation:  <b>\$11,000</b></p> <p>4.1.3 Workshops with relevant entities:  <b>\$5,000</b></p> <p>Budget Note: To assess technical, environmental and infrastructural feasibility of proposed interventions, ensuring sustainability and scalability.</p>
5. Environmental & Social Safeguards & Gender Analysis	5.1 Environmental and Social Risk Assessment, Gender Analysis and Gender action Plan	\$20,000	<p>5.1.1 Environmental &amp; Social Impact Specialist and preparation of ESMF inclusive of the associated ESMP report. The risks associated project, as well as the USPs under this project will be assessed through the ESMP of the proposal aligned with AF ESS Policy. : <b>\$10,000</b></p> <p>5.1.2 Gender Specialist &amp; Action Plan preparation: <b>\$6,000</b></p> <p>5.1.3 Field assessments for data collection: <b>\$4,000</b></p> <p>Budget Note: To ensure project compliance with AF's ESP and Gender Policy.</p>
6. Economic & Financial Analysis	6.1 Cost-benefit analysis of proposed interventions	\$15,000	<p>6.1.1 Economist/ Financial Analyst Consultant &amp;</p>

			<p>report preparation: <b>\$12,000</b></p> <p>6.1.2 Cost-benefit analysis: <b>\$3,000</b></p> <p>Budget Note: To demonstrate cost-effectiveness and long term value of project interventions.</p>
7. Institutional & Policy Alignment Review	7.1 Report mapping the project with national frameworks	\$10,000	<p>7.1.1 Policy/legal consultant and report preparation &amp; validation: <b>\$7,000</b></p> <p>7.1.2 Workshops: <b>\$3,000</b></p> <p>Budget Note: To map and align the project with Belize's national priorities</p>
8. Management Fee	8.1 Fiduciary and financial management oversight	\$7,500	8.1.1 PACT fiduciary and financial management oversight: <b>\$7,500</b>
<b>Total Project Formulation Grant</b>		<b>\$150,000</b>	

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

1. Full Project Proposal Development: \$25,000
  - A lead consultant or firm will be hired to consolidate all assessments, stakeholder inputs, and technical studies into the AF's full project proposal template. The proposal must be comprehensive, aligned with AF's technical standards and include annexes. The allocation reflects the workload for high-quality drafting, editing and facilitation of a validation workshop.
2. Stakeholder Consultations & Community Engagement: \$15,000
  - Stakeholder consultations will be conducted with coastal communities inclusive of marginalized and vulnerable populations to ensure that local priorities and knowledge are reflected in the proposal. To ensure that the proposal is tailored to specific needs and given Belize's geographic spread and makeup, multiple in-person consultations are required. The budget will cover workshop logistics, community stipends, facilitations, and translation services (if needed) to guarantee inclusive participation.
3. Risk & Vulnerability Assessment: \$25,000
  - This activity will establish the baseline conditions of climate vulnerability, disaster exposure and social sensitivity in targeted communities. It will include GIS mapping of hazard-prone

areas, collection of socio-economic data and analysis of gender and social vulnerabilities. The development of project proposal requires robust evidence of who and what is most at risk. Given the focus of the project, such assessments are essential to prioritize interventions. The allocation covers consultancy fees for specialists, data field collection and mapping tools.

4. Feasibility Studies and Technical Design: \$30,000

- This activity will include technical assessment for climate-resilient housing designs, building standards, and the integration of early warning systems at the community level. The studies will identify practical options for resilient construction and appropriate technology for disaster preparedness. Feasibility studies will ensure interventions are sound, cost-effective and scalable. Engineering/Architectural and disaster risk specialists are needed, along with workshops to validate findings. The allocation reflects the complexity of multi-sector technical analysis and peer review.

5. Environmental & Social Safeguards & Gender Analysis: \$20,000

- An Environmental & Social Safeguard, risk screening in line with AF's ESP and a Gender Analysis will inform the preparation of a Gender Action Plan. The funding is necessary for hiring gender specialists, conducting field assessments and preparing safeguard documentation and development of a gender action plan.

6. Economic & Financial Analysis: \$15,000

- This activity will develop a cost-benefit analysis of proposed interventions to ensure economic justification. Being able to demonstrate cost-effectiveness is mandatory and will finance an economist/financial analyst to model intervention costs and benefits supported by data collection and reporting.

7. Institutional & Policy Alignment Review: \$10,000

- This activity will ensure the project is fully aligned with Belize's national and sectoral priorities. Ensuring strong alignment increases country ownership and sustainability. The financing will secure the services of a policy expert to conduct reviews and facilitate targeted workshops with relevant government agencies and policy units.

8. Management Fee: \$7,500

- PACT's Climate Finance Unit will provide fiduciary oversight, financial reporting and administrative support required to coordinate the execution of PFG activities. The 5% fee complies with AF norms and ensures adequate institutional support for transparent and accountable management of the grant.

**For LLA Projects only:**

If requesting additional funding for LLA projects to enable devolving decision making to the local level, please specify the activities that would directly serve to enable devolving decision making to the lowest appropriate level and enable local actors to make informed decisions on how adaptation actions are defined, prioritized, designed, and implemented:

Please provide justifications for their need and for the amount of additional funding required:

**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
Mr. Abil Castañeda			Mr. Eli Romero	(501) 822-3637	cfmanager@pactbelize.org

Annex 5 to OPG Amended in October 2017

---