



## ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.37/27/Add.1  
16 March 2026

---

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

Agenda Item 6 (e)

### **PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR ETHIOPIA, TANZANIA**

## 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.37/27 “Proposal for Ethiopia, Tanzania” 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 regional programme AF00000442 “Enhancing the Bamboo Value Chain in Ethiopia and the United Republic of Tanzania to Leverage Bamboo as a Nature-based Solution for Climate Resilience and Adaptation”. This proposal was submitted by United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), which is a Multilateral 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: comprehensive consultation process; baseline analysis; HACT assessment and project MEL plan.

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



ADAPTATION FUND

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

PROJECT/PROGRAMME CATEGORY: Regional Project Concept

<b>Countries/Region:</b>	Ethiopia and the United Republic of Tanzania	
<b>Project Title:</b>	Enhancing the bamboo value chain in Ethiopia and the United Republic of Tanzania to leverage bamboo as a nature-based solution for climate resilience and adaptation	
<b>Thematic Focal Area:</b>	Innovation in adaptation finance	
<b>Implementing Entity:</b>	United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)	
<b>Executing Entities:</b>	United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), International Network for Bamboo and Rattan (INBAR)	
<b>AF Project ID:</b>	AF00000442	
<b>IE Project ID:</b>		<b>Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars):</b> 30,000,000
<b>Reviewer and contact person:</b>	Mahamat Assouyouiti	<b>Co-reviewer(s):</b>
<b>IE Contact Person:</b>		

<b>Technical Summary</b>	<p>The project “Enhancing the bamboo value chain in Ethiopia and the United Republic of Tanzania to leverage bamboo as a nature-based solution for climate resilience and adaptation” aims to strengthen the climate resilience and adaptive capacity of these vulnerable communities by promoting community-driven planning processes that scale nature-based solutions (NbS), and support sustainable alternative livelihoods that address the underlying barriers to adaptation and reduce vulnerability to climate shocks. This will be done through the three components below:</p> <p><u>Component 1:</u> Community-Based Planning for Locally Led Adaptation (USD 3,235,811).</p> <p><u>Component 2:</u> Bamboo-Based Climate-Resilient Livelihoods and Nature-based solutions (USD 14,000,000)</p> <p><u>Component 3:</u> Knowledge, Learning, and Policy Influence for Scalable Bamboo-Based Adaptation (USD 8,000,000).</p> <p><u>Requested financing overview:</u> Project/Programme Execution Cost: USD 2,036,917</p>
--------------------------	---

	<p>Total Project/Programme Cost: USD 27,272,728  Implementing Fee: USD 2,727,272  Financing Requested: USD 30,000,000</p> <p>The proposal includes a request for a project formulation grant and/or project formulation assistance grant of USD 150,000.</p> <p>The initial technical review raises some issues, such as the quantification of benefits, consistency between the narrative and the numbering of the Components, absence of results framework alignment table , additional information on environmental sustainability, the need to recalculation of the EE fees and (vi) ESP requirements such as risk categorization of project, absence of initial gender assessment etc. as discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Request (CAR) raised in the review.</p> <p>The second technical review notes most issues have been resolved; however, some remain. The remaining issues relate to lack of clear evidence of consultation with women/women associations in Annex 3 and misalignment between the Theory of Change and the Project Structure as discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Request (CAR) raised in the review.</p> <p>The third technical review notes some remaining issues relate the gender consultations, gender analysis, checklist of environmental and social impacts and risks, and EE costs, IE certification as well as USPs as discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Request (CAR) raised in the review.</p> <p>The fourth review highlights additional issues to be addressed including the project cost-effectiveness, the project EE cost calculation as well as the IE certification, results framework alignment and required signatures for endorsement as discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Request (CAR) raised in the review.</p> <p>The fifth and final review confirms that all CAR sand CRs have been addressed.</p> <p><i>Please be advised that the findings of the AFB Secretariat's review of the funding proposal(s) do not reflect, indicate, or prejudice the outcome of the reaccreditation process currently underway. The Implementing Entity (IE) shall acknowledge that the funding proposal will not be approved by the Board if the IE's accreditation has expired, and reaccreditation has not been achieved at the time of the Board's decision. Notwithstanding this potential risk, the IE has elected to proceed with the development of the funding proposal.</i></p>
Date	January 28, 2026

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments July 22, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments August 27, 2025	Third Technical Review Comments October 31, 2025	Fourth Technical Review comments December 16, 2025	Fifth Technical Review comments January 28, 2026
Country Eligibility	1. Are all of the participating countries party to the Kyoto Protocol and/or the Paris Agreement?	<b>Yes.</b>	-	-	-	-
	2. Are all of the participating countries developing countries particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change?	<b>Yes.</b> Both countries are vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, particularly prolonged droughts, erratic and declining rainfall, flooding, heatwaves, and sea-level rise. These impacts undermine agricultural productivity, degrading ecosystems, and intensify water scarcity, thereby posing acute risks to food security, health, and livelihoods, particularly in rural and climate-sensitive regions.	-	-	-	-

Project Eligibility	1. Have the designated government authorities for the Adaptation Fund from each of the participating countries endorsed the project/programme?	<b>Yes.</b> As per the Endorsement letters dated 9 October 2024 for Ethiopia and 15 October 2024 for Tanzania	-	-	<b>CAR1NEW:</b> Please ensure that the primary focal point Prof. Peter Lawrance Makenga Msoffe signs the LOE for resubmission since the second named focal point is not for signature but for being copied on correspondence etc.	<b>CAR1NEW:</b> <b>Cleared</b> as per revised LOE with correct name of focal point Prof. Peter Lawrance Makenga Msoffe.
	2. Does the length of the proposal amount to no more than fifty (50) pages for the project/programme concept, including its annexes?	<b>Yes.</b>	-	-	<b>CR1 (NEW)</b> On page 1 of the proposal please update the stage of submission and to indicate that this is a re-submission and the last date of submission.	<b>CR1 (NEW):</b> <b>Cleared</b> as per revised document with correct box ticked and submission date duly indicated on page 1.

	<p>3. Does the regional project / programme support concrete adaptation actions to assist the participating countries in addressing the adverse effects of climate change and build in climate resilience, and do so providing added value through the regional approach, compared to implementing similar activities in each country individually?</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p>However, amendments are required.</p> <p>The project aims to strengthen the climate resilience and adaptive capacity of selected vulnerable communities by promoting community-driven planning processes that scale nature-based solutions (NbS), and support sustainable alternative livelihoods that address the underlying barriers to adaptation and reduce vulnerability to climate shocks through its three components.</p> <p>The project's structure, activities and approaches address the each of the specific climate risks identified in Ethiopia and Tanzania. Its activities directly align with adaptation needs, promoting NbS and resilient livelihoods that are adaptive, participatory, systemic, and scalable—not simple extensions of existing development programs or static environmental protection projects (Pages 18 to 20)</p>		<p><b>CAR1(re-opened)</b></p> <p>Please strengthen the cost effectiveness analysis to include project specific information based on the project outputs and activities for concept note this stage.</p> <p><u>At fully developed proposal stage please ensure that quantitative comparison of the cost-effectiveness of the proposed measures with alternative adaptation measures is provided.</u></p>	<p><b>CAR 1: Not cleared</b></p> <p>Thank you for the revised section and addition information including figures to demonstrate the cost effectiveness. However, kindly revise the section and strengthen the cost-effectiveness of selected measures, including alternative options to the proposed measures, and estimates of the evaluation where possible.</p> <p><u>Consider using a comparative table showing cost effectiveness of each measure compare to</u></p>	<p><b>CAR 1: Cleared</b> as per revised Table 5 showing cost effectiveness of each measure compared to alternative options.</p>
--	---	---	--	---	---	---

		<p>The Theory of Change (Pages 19 to 20) clearly outlines how the project will bring about the desired outcomes, explaining the causal pathways between activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts as well as outlining the assumptions and risks.</p> <p>The regional approach maximizes synergies, accelerates learning, and enhances cost-effectiveness in addressing shared climate challenges.</p> <p>The activities support the AF Strategic Objectives of enhancing adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience, and reducing vulnerability and contribute to the thematic focal area of food security by providing farmers with an additional source of income so that they can afford and access food for their families.</p> <p>The concept includes a justification for selection of the target areas in both countries (Pages 20 to 23) and includes a description on how it will address maladaptation (Pages 33 and 46).</p>			<u>alternative option or BAU.</u>	
--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------	--

		<p>The concept also presents the findings of three surveys conducted in the project target districts to inform the project design and validate assumptions based on desk research (Pages 43 – 44). These surveys emphasized the inclusion of vulnerable groups – especially women farmers. The results of that survey have been integrated into sections of the concept document. The PFG also includes an allocation for a Gender Analysis and development of a Gender Action Plan.</p> <p>While the regional project supports concrete adaptation action to assist Ethiopia and Tanzania, there is need for consistency in some sections.</p> <p><b>CAR1:</b> Pages 19, 34 and 19 refer to Component 4, however only 3 Components are described in the project proposal. Please ensure that there is consistency in the sections on Project Structure, Cost Effectiveness of the project and the Table related to on-going and upcoming initiatives.</p>	<p><b>CAR1: Cleared</b> as references to Component 4 were removed.</p> <p><b>CAR2: Cleared</b> as per paragraph 52 which provides a justification for the inclusion of USPs in the proposal. For Outcomes 2, a competitive call for solutions will be issued, providing clear eligibility and exclusion criteria aligned with the ESP and Gender</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p><b>CAR2:</b> Based on the description of the Outcomes 1.2 and 2.2 the project may include Un-identified sub-projects. Please follow the guidance on USPs and amend Part II, Section A sub-section C1 to suit. USP guidance is available at <a href="#">Guidance Document for Project/Programme with Unidentified Sub-Projects</a></p>	<p>Action Plan. For Outcome 1.2 The PFG may also provide an opportunity to explore solutions with the communities.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>4. 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 of the Fund?</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p>Part C, Pages 31 to 33 describes the economic, social, and environmental benefits, providing a list of potential questions to provide additional information for the development of the final proposal. However, many of the questions are qualitative. Quantitative estimates would strengthen the narrative.</p> <p><b>CR1:</b> Where possible, please quantify the environmental, social and economic benefits and include questions which would provide quantitative estimates of the benefits.</p> <p><b>CR2:</b> At paragraph 75, please insert a statement that the ESP requirement of the fund will also be complied with.</p> <p><b>CAR3:</b> Please also transfer the questions to the Annex. A statement explaining the data to be collected will suffice, with reference to the Annex.</p> <p><b>CAR4:</b> Although the PFG request will allow for a full gender assessment to be done, an initial gender assessment should be provided at concept note</p>	<p><b>CR1: Cleared,</b> as per Section C1-C3 quantifies the economic, social and environmental benefits. It acknowledges that the figures will be validated during the design stage.</p> <p><b>CR2: Cleared,</b> as per first paragraph in Section C.</p> <p><b>CAR3: Cleared,</b> as per paragraph 76 and Annex 1.</p> <p><b>CAR4: Cleared.</b> A preliminary</p>	<p><b>CAR4(re-opened)</b> Please provide information specific to the vulnerable regions and segments identified in sections A12C and A1D.</p>	<p><b>CAR 4: Cleared</b> as per revised sections A1(c) "Identified Vulnerable Regions" and A1(d) "Identified Vulnerable Segments of the Population".</p>	
--	---	---	--	---	--	--

		<p>stage. Please include with the re-submission.</p> <p><b>CAR5:</b> It is noted that at full proposal development state that additional economic, social and environmental assessments and an ESMP will be developed. However at the CN stage please build on the information presented at Part II Section 8 and elaborate on the economic, social and environmental benefits of this project.</p>	<p>gender assessment was provided as per paragraphs 79-84.</p> <p><b>CAR5: Cleared</b> as per information provided at CR1</p>			
	<p>5. Is the project / programme cost-effective and does the regional approach support cost-effectiveness?</p>	<p><b>Yes. See Part D, Page 34</b></p> <p>The concept provides a logical explanation of the selected scope and approach as well as a comprehensive overview of the strategies which will be used to ensure cost-effectiveness.</p>	-	-	-	

	<p>6. 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? If applicable, it is also possible to refer to regional plans and strategies where they exist.</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p>Page 35 to 37 provide a list of the relevant national, regional and UNSDG frameworks, their respective dates and description of their area of focus and objectives and relevant strategic points an alignment with the project.</p>	-	-	-	
--	--	---	---	---	---	--

	7. Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund?	<p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p>Part F, Pages 37 to 39.</p> <p>The relevant national environmental regulations, technical and construction standards for both countries as well as the Bamboo standards for Ethiopia are provided. In addition, Draft Standards for Bamboo have been prepared by the Tanzania Bureau of Standards but they have not yet been published.</p>	-	-	-	
	8. Is there duplication of project / programme with other funding sources?	<p><b>No.</b></p> <p>See Part G, Pages 40 to 42</p>	-	-	-	

	<p>9. Does the project / programme have a learning and knowledge management component to capture and feedback lessons?</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p>See Section H, Pages 42 to 43</p> <p>Activities related to knowledge management, have been included in Component 3. Linkages are also planned to be established with other Global and Regional Platforms which have been listed in the Part H.</p> <p>However, the description of the project structure on Page 19 mentions Component 4 which does not exist in this project.</p> <p><b>CAR6:</b> Please change the title to Component 3 in Part C1.</p>	<p><b>CAR6: Cleared</b> as per page 18</p>	-	-	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

	<p>10. 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>Yes.</b> However, additional information is required.</p> <p>Part I, Pages 43 and 44)</p> <p>An initial consultative process took place with key project stakeholders, to inform them of the project design and to help to better understand the gaps, needs, vulnerabilities, interest in the project, and potential roles</p> <p>A multi-level consultation process is planned in the full proposal development phase in the target areas, building on initial engagements and deepening collaboration with a wide range of actors, including farmers, processors, financial institutions and local governments. During these consultations, particular attention will be given to gender- and youth-focused farmers and processors, ensuring inclusive participation, especially of vulnerable groups such as women, youth, marginalized populations, and indigenous peoples, whose insights will be essential to shaping context-responsive and</p>				
--	---	---	--	--	--	--

		<p>equitable project interventions.</p> <p>While the concept note acknowledges inclusive participation, please explicitly outline the specific challenges faced by women and youth and describe how these considerations have been integrated into the design of the concept.</p> <p><b>CR3:</b> Kindly provide evidence of these consultations in the Annex. Be sure such evidence is more detailed during the PFG process.</p> <p><u>Please ensure that in the preparation of the final proposal, the findings of the consultations are incorporated into the proposal.</u></p>	<p><b>CR3: Not cleared.</b> The concept note includes consultations in Annex 3. It is acknowledged that challenges suffered by marginalized groups have been identified in Table 1 and how the design of the project responds to these challenges as noted in paragraphs 63,65 and 71.</p> <p>However, evidence regarding consultation to discuss challenges faced by women is not clear. Consolidations of meetings may be prepared in a tabular format.</p>	<p><b>CR3: Cleared.</b> As per Annex 2, there are guiding questions to support the gender analysis at PFG stage. This process should be inclusive and include consultations with women associations and the country's national gender machinery/gender remit. Please ensure these consultations and the outcomes of these consultations are clearly reflected in the proposal developed.</p> <p>Consolidation of meetings are presented in a tabular format.</p>	-	
	11. Is the requested financing justified on the basis of	<b>Unsure.</b>	<b>Cleared.</b>	-	-	

	full cost of adaptation reasoning?	Information is presented at Part J, Page 45, however, this information is better associated with the cost-effectiveness of the proposed project and does not address the main is of how this proposed project, will deliver on its objectives with the resources provided by the Adaptation Fund. The section should further indicate if the proposed proposal contains any co-financing and explain if present that this co-financing will not adversely impact the ability of the AF funded component to deliver of its objectives.	As per Section J, paragraphs 106-110, The concept note also indicates there is no co-financing as all outcomes will be fully achieved using AF's resources. As the project includes USP, paragraph 109 provides justification for this. Please also include that there will be a competitive Call for Solutions.			
	12. Is the project / program aligned with AF's results framework?	<p><b>Unsure.</b></p> <p><b>CAR 7.</b> Please include the results framework alignment table as required in the concept note. Please also follow the template for the table: <a href="https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Results-framework-alignment-table-March-2019.doc">https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Results-framework-alignment-table-March-2019.doc</a> Kindly refer to link for guidance: <a href="https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Adaptation-Fund-Strategic-">https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Adaptation-Fund-Strategic-</a></p>	<p><b>CAR7: Not cleared.</b></p> <p>1. Although the Results Framework Alignment Table was completed as per Section J, paragraph 110. There is</p>	<p><b>CAR7: Not Cleared</b></p> <p>The Theory of Change has been revised to reflect 3 outcomes. In paragraph 109, the Table 8: Project alignment with Results Framework of Adaptation Fund was updated with</p>	<p><b>CAR7: Not Cleared</b></p> <p>1. At paragraph 36 please indicate that the proposal responds to strategic outcomes 2,3, 6, 7, and 8 as per the alignment table in Part III.</p> <p>2. Please situate the results</p>	<p><b>CAR7: Cleared</b> as per revised document, see below:</p> <p>1. Indication added at paragraph 29 that the proposal aligns with Adaptation Fund's outcomes 3, 6, 7 and 8 as</p>

		<a href="#">Results-Framework-Amended-in-March-2019.pdf</a>	<p>some misalignment. According to the Theory of Change, the project has four outcomes. Please align the Section D: Project Structure to the Theory of Change. Once completed, please update the Results Framework Alignment Table.</p> <p>2. Please ensure that the top part (outcomes) of the results framework</p>	<p>the appropriate outcome and outputs and their indicators. A sentence showing alignment with Adaptation Fund's Results Areas has been added under paragraph 50. However, please address the following:</p> <p>1. Please amend the alignment table to allow only the project objective in the first-row straddling columns 1- 4. in column 5 leave the grant amount total of 25, 235,</p>	<p>framework alignment table in the correct part of the proposal at Part III and not under Part II. It should not be under the justification of funding section.</p> <p>3. Also please use the updated template to guide appropriate completion of the alignment table.</p> <p><a href="#">Results Framework Alignment Table</a></p>	<p>illustrated in <i>Table 10</i>.</p> <p>2. <i>Table 10: Project alignment with the Results Framework of the Adaptation Fund</i> has been moved from Part II to Part III in its correct location.</p> <p>3. <i>Table 10: Project alignment with the Results Framework of the Adaptation Fund</i> has been revised to align with the new <a href="#">Results Framework Alignment Table</a>.</p>
--	--	---	---	--	--	---

			<p>alignment table corresponds with the bottom part (outputs). Currently only outcome 6 is selected for the top part of the table but the bottom part identifies outputs associated with outcomes 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7. Please amend.</p> <p>3. At Part II section B, please include a sentence on how the project is aligned with the results</p>	<p>811. in row 2 continue with outcome 2-8 each in their own row and represented in the same fashion as the outputs are presented in the lower part of the table.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

			areas of the Adaptation Fund.			
	13. Has the sustainability of the project/programme outcomes been taken into account when designing the project?	<p><b>Yes.</b> However, some additional information is required.</p> <p>Part K, Paragraph 110 provides a description of how the benefits will be sustained after the end of the project (community ownership, local institutional capacity, dynamic learning systems, market linkages, and scaling up, inter alia), the focus is on economic, social and institutional sustainability and not on environmental sustainability.</p> <p><b>CAR 8:</b> Please include information on how the environmental sustainability of the project will be achieved.</p>	<p><b>CAR8: Cleared.</b> As per Section K, paragraph 111, environmental sustainability is outlined. However please clarify here that non-invasive bamboo species will be used/prioritised.</p>	-	-	-
	14. Does the project / programme provide an overview of environmental and social impacts / risks identified, in compliance with	<p><b>Yes.</b> However, some additional information is required.</p> <p>Part L, Pages 46 to 47</p> <p>The concept identifies the potential environmental, and social impacts and risks and</p>				

	<p>the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?</p>	<p>elaborates on the gender-specific cultural and/or legal context in which the project/programme will operate. The checklist is completed and considers all potential direct, indirect, transboundary, and cumulative impacts and risks that could result from the proposed project/programme against the 15 ESP principles.</p> <p>However, the concept does not state the category in which the screening process is classified.</p> <p><b>CAR 9.</b> Please include the category in which the screening process is classified (i.e. Category A, B or C). In addition, please indicate in the third column of the table, the risk for the ESP (i.e. low, medium, or high)</p>	<p><b>CAR9: Not Cleared</b>  <b>The amendment</b> as per paragraph 112 which highlights that the project is classified as a Category B and the risk levels are well noted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. However, at column 2, please remove the text and only include an 'X' where no further assessm</li> </ol>	<p><b>CAR9: Not cleared.</b>  Under Table 8: Environmental and Social Impacts and Risks, an X was placed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> column instead of the 2<sup>nd</sup> column (Column 2). Under the second column labelled "No further assessment required for compliance", please remove the 'Yes' and 'No' and only placed an <u>X</u> where no further <u>further</u></p>	<p><b>CAR 9: Not cleared</b>  Thank you for the revised table for Environmental and Social Impacts and Risk including input on USPs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. However, please number the table as currently the table 8 is listed as foot note and not under the referred table.</li> <li>2. Please note that further assessment is required</li> </ol>	<p><b>CAR 9: Cleared</b> as per revised document with Table 9 corrected accordingly.</p>
--	---	--	---	---	--	--

			<p>ent is needed.</p> <p>2. At column 3 please ensure that – further assessment and management required for compliance is included for each area where further assessment is required.</p>	<p><u>assessment is required.</u></p> <p>Note that Principles 1,4, and 6 always apply. For example, for Compliance with the law, non-compliance is highly unlikely with government but could occur with service providers. Please therefore indicated how such issues could be avoided. Be sure to expound on this during the PFG too.</p> <p>Please remove the statements: “Further assessment and management will be required during implementation to ensure full compliance with this principle”. Please indicate how each risk</p>	<p>for ESPs 1, 4 and 6. Currently it indicates that no further assessment is required.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				will be addressed in Column 3 (i.e 3rd column labelled Potential impacts and risks)  Additionally, please insert a statement at paragraph L that USPs will be addressed through the ESMP.		
	15. Does the project promote new and innovative solutions to climate change adaptation, such as new approaches, technologies and mechanisms?	<b>Yes.</b>  See Part B, Pages 30 to 31. The project implements an innovative support framework combining performance-based grants, capacity-building, and ecosystem-wide coordination.	-	-	-	-
Resource Availability	1. Is the requested project / programme funding within the funding windows of the regional projects/programmes?	<b>Yes.</b>  The total value of the proposal is USD 30M.	-	-	-	-
	2. Are the administrative costs	<b>No.</b>		<b>CAR10: Not Cleared</b>	<b>CAR10: Not cleared</b>	<b>CAR10: Cleared as per revised</b>

	<p>(Implementing Entity Management Fee and Project/ Programme Execution Costs) at or below 10 per cent of the project/programme for implementing entity (IE) fees and at or below 10 per cent of the project/programme cost for the execution costs?</p>	<p>The proposal indicates that UNIDO is IE for the project and both INBAR and UNIDO will be the EEs.</p> <p><b>CAR10:</b> Since UNIDO is acting as IE and EE. Kindly review fee calculations in Section C, page 13, and use the IE and EE Fees Calculator to calculate the total program cost and the corresponding fees: <a href="https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/ie-and-ee-fees-calculator/">https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/ie-and-ee-fees-calculator/</a>. The EE fee for UNIDO should be 1.5% of the component which it is executing and the remaining 8.5 % to be allocated to INBAR.</p> <p><b>CAR11:</b> In the PFG request form, please also include the IE fee for the implementation of the PFG grant. Please also ensure that the fee is included in the USD 150K requested.</p> <p><b>CR4:</b> Please confirm if the intention is for the PFG to be implemented both by INBAR and UNIDO. If it is the case that the PFG will be implemented only by UNIDO, please amend the PFG form to reflect this.</p>	<p><b>CAR10: Not Cleared</b> The budget amendments are noted..</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. However please ensure that figures are adequately represented in the details of the proposal for effective review.</li> <li>2. Please ensure that the IE certification is signed.</li> </ol> <p><b>CAR11: Cleared</b> as the PFG request form has been updated.</p>	<p>The Execution Costs for the IE and the EE are clearly identified in the table on page 13. However, it is not entirely clear which component UNIDO is executing. Please state which component UNIDO is executing so that there can be an accurate calculation of UNIDOs 1.5% as this is of the components to be implemented by UNIDO as Per Decision B. 38/42</p> <p>Section C- Project Component and Financing on page 14 shows INBAR is allocated 10%. This reflects a total of 11.5% for EE costs.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please update the EE section of the Component s and Financing Table to reflect the total EE costs of only 10% and remove the separate line for UNIDO and IGBAR. <a href="#">IE and EE Fees Calculator ( EXCEL)</a></li> <li>2. Please update the figures in the table as necessary.</li> </ol> <p><u>Please note that at fully developed stage the breakdown of the EE costs and IE fees will be required. When this is being calculated</u></p>	<p>document, see references below :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. EE section of the Components and Financing Table has been amended to reflect exactly the figures of the IE-EE Fee Calculator.</li> <li>Separate lines for UNIDO and INBAR have been removed, and the table's presentation follows the exact format of the template for Regional Concept Notes.</li> <li>2. Figures have been updated in the table</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p><b>CR4: Cleared</b> as the PFG will be implemented by UNIDO and INBAR. The PFG form reflects this.</p>	<p>The EE fee for UNIDO should be 1.5% of the component which it is executing and the remaining 8.5 % to be allocated to INBAR.</p> <p>The IE certification has been signed as per page 46.</p>	<p><u>please ensure that the allocation for UNIDO falls within the 10% for regional proposals. The remaining from the 10% will be allocated to INBAR.</u></p>	<p>accordingly to comply with max 10% IE fee.</p>
<p>Eligibility of IE</p>	<p>1. Is the project/program me submitted through an eligible Multilateral or Regional Implementing Entity that has been accredited by the Board?</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> Accreditation expiration date for UNIDO is 30 November 2025.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p><b>CAR12 (NEW):</b> Please insert the authorized IE signature in the re-submitted documents.</p>	<p><b>CAR12: Not cleared</b> Please kindly note that the UNIDO focal point as per AF website is Ms Haidara and hence her signature is required. Kindly attach change of IE representative name letter if available.</p> <p><i>Please be advised that the findings of the AFB Secretariat's review of the</i></p>	<p><b>CAR12: Cleared</b> as per explanation provided</p> <p>As communicated to the AF Secretariat on 18 December 2025, UNIDO has provided the updated list of high-level and operational focal points and confirms that proposal submissions and signatures will</p>

					<p><i>funding proposal(s) do not reflect, indicate, or prejudge the outcome of the reaccreditation process currently underway. The Implementing Entity (IE) shall acknowledge that the funding proposal will not be approved by the Board if the IE's accreditation has expired, and reaccreditation has not been achieved at the time of the Board's decision. Notwithstanding this potential risk, the IE has elected to proceed with the development of the funding proposal.</i></p>	<p>be effectuated at the level of the UNIDO GEF, AF, and GCF Coordination Office.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Implementation Arrangements	1. Is there adequate arrangement for project / programme management at the regional and national level, including coordination arrangements within countries and among them? Has the potential to partner with national institutions, and when possible, national implementing entities (NIEs), been considered, and included in the management arrangements?	n/a at concept stage				
	2. Are there measures for financial and project/programme risk management?	n/a at concept stage				

	<p>3. Are there measures in place for the management of for environmental and social risks, in line with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund? Proponents are encouraged to refer to the Guidance document for Implementing Entities on compliance with the Adaptation Fund Environmental and Social Policy, for details.</p>	n/a at concept stage				
	<p>4. Is a budget on the Implementing Entity Management Fee use included?</p>	n/a at concept stage				
	<p>5. Is an explanation and a breakdown of the execution costs included?</p>	n/a at concept stage				
	<p>6. Is a detailed budget including budget notes included?</p>	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 breakdown 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				
--	---	----------------------	--	--	--	--

## PART IV: ENDORSEMENT BY GOVERNMENTS AND CERTIFICATION BY THE IMPLEMENTING ENTITY

### A. Record of endorsement on behalf of the government<sup>153</sup>

<b>Mr. Mohammed Andoshe Faynet</b> Director of Climate Change Planning, implementation & Coordination Directorate, Lead Negotiator of Climate Change Ministry of Planning and Development /Environmental Protection Authority Ethiopia	Date: 9 October 2024
<b>Prof. Peter Lawrance Makenga Msoffe</b> Permanent Secretary Vice President's Office Tanzania	Date: <del>15<sup>2</sup> August</del> December 2025

### B. Implementing Entity certification

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 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.	
<i>Name &amp; Signature</i> Implementing Entity Coordinator	
<b>Ms. Ganna Onysko</b> <b>Senior GEF, GCF, AF Coordinator</b> <b>Division of Funding Partner Relations</b> <b>Directorate of Global Partnerships and External Relations</b> <b>United Nations Industrial Development Organization -</b> <b>UNIDO Implementing Entity Coordinator</b>	
Date: <i>(Month, Day, Year)</i>  5-August-5 January 2026 <sup>5</sup>	Tel. and email:  +43 1 26026 3647; <a href="mailto:G.ONYSKO@unido.org">G.ONYSKO@unido.org</a>
Project Contact Person: <b>Caterina BIANCO</b> Email: <a href="mailto:C.Bianco@unido.org">C.Bianco@unido.org</a>	
(cc: Ms. Eleonora Gatti, Head of Climate Technology Innovation <a href="mailto:E.Gatti@unido.org">E.Gatti@unido.org</a> ; Mr. Alois Mhlanga, Director of Climate Innovation and Montreal Protocol <a href="mailto:a.mhlanga@unido.org">a.mhlanga@unido.org</a> )	

6. 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.



በኢትዮጵያ ፌዴራላዊ ዲሞክራሲያዊ ሪፐብሊክ  
**የፕላንና ልማት ሚኒስቴር**  
 FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ETHIOPIA  
 MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

ቁጥር./NO : 119/PPD/3/ሩ-3/219  
 ቀን/DATE : 02 FEB 2026

**To: The Adaptation Fund Board**  
 c/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat  
 Email: [Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org](mailto:Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org)  
 Fax: 202 522 3240/5

**Subject: Endorsement for the Project “Enhancing the Bamboo Value Chain in Ethiopia and the United Republic of Tanzania to Leverage Bamboo as a Nature Based Solution for Climate Resilience as a Nature Based Solution for Climate Resilience”**

In my capacity as designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in Ethiopia, I confirm that the above regional project 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 the country.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above project proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and executed by the Ethiopian Forestry Development, the International Network for Bamboo and Rattan (INBAR) and UNIDO in collaboration with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism of the United Republic of Tanzania.

Sincerely,

  
**Seyoum Mekonen Hailu**  
 State Minister



THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA  
**VICE PRESIDENT'S OFFICE**

Telegram: "MAKAMU", HQ  
Telephone No: +255 026 2329006  
Fax No: +255 026 2329007  
Barua Pepe:[ps@vpo.go.tz](mailto:ps@vpo.go.tz)



Government City,  
Mtumba Area,  
Vice President's Street,  
P.O. Box 2502,  
**40406 DODOMA.**

*In reply please quote:*

**Our Ref:** BA.90/201/01A/

15<sup>th</sup> December, 2025

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

**SUBJECT: ENDORSEMENT FOR "ENHANCING THE BAMBOO VALUE CHAIN IN ETHIOPIA AND THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA TO LEVERAGE BAMBOO AS A NATURE-BASED SOLUTION FOR CLIMATE RESILIENCE AND ADAPTATION"**

---

Refer to the subject captioned above.

2. The United Republic of Tanzania is collaborating with partners to develop a project proposal on "Enhancing the Bamboo Value Chain in Leverage Bamboo as a Nature-Based Solution for Climate Resilience and Adaptation."
3. The proposed regional project will be implemented in Ethiopia and the United Republic of Tanzania with the support of the Adaptation Fund.
4. Therefore, in my capacity as the Designated National Authority (DNA) for the Adaptation Fund in the United Republic of Tanzania, I confirm that the above regional project 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 the United Republic of Tanzania.
5. In view of this, I am pleased to endorse the above project proposal with the support of the Adaptation Fund.
6. If approved, the project will be implemented by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and executed by UNIDO and the International Bamboo and Rattan Organization (INBAR) in collaboration with the Ethiopian Forestry Development and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism of the United Republic of Tanzania.
7. Thank you for your continued support.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Peter Msoffe'.

Prof. Peter L.M. Msoffe

**NATIONAL DESIGNATED AUTHORITY  
DEPUTY PERMANENT SECRETARY-ENVIRONMENT**

**Copy:**

Dr. Kanizio Fredrick Manyika,  
National Focal Point for the Adaptation Fund Projects in Tanzania,  
Vice- President's Office,  
Mtumba Government City,  
Mtumba Area, Vice President's Street,  
P.O.Box 2502,  
40406 DODOMA,  
Mob: +255 713 426060,  
Email: [kanizio.manyika@vpo.go.tz](mailto:kanizio.manyika@vpo.go.tz).



**Revised PFG Submission Form<sup>1</sup> (additions in red)**  
**Project Formulation Grant (PFG)**

**Submission Date:** ~~6221 November-JanuaryDecember-20265~~

**Adaptation Fund Project ID:** N/A

**Country/ies:** Ethiopia and the United Republic of Tanzania

**Title of Project/Programme:** Enhancing the bamboo value chain in Ethiopia and the United Republic of Tanzania to leverage bamboo as a nature-based solution for climate resilience and adaptation

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

**Implementing Entity:** United Nations International Development Organization (UNIDO)

**Executing Entity/ies:** UNIDO

**A. Project Preparation Timeframe**

<b>Start date of PFG</b>	June 2026
<b>Completion date of PFG</b>	<del>October-March 20276</del>

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

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note <sup>2</sup>
<del>1. Baseline data collection</del>	<del>Baseline data is collected through desk-based research and in-country data collection, analysed and incorporated in the project document.</del>	<del>-15,000</del>	<del>In-country climate risk assessment at the district level is conducted to collect and analyse project baseline data on climate hazards, and climate vulnerability in Ethiopia and Tanzania, and to map and analyse the presence of bamboo, and assess its potential and opportunities for adaptation and</del>

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.24", Hanging: 0.01", No bullets or numbering

<sup>1</sup> As presented in AFB/PPRC.33/40 Annex 1.

<sup>2</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.

			resilience against the local needs and climate risks identified.
<p>2.1. Subcontract consultant/service provider to develop the full project proposal and annexes and including conduct baseline analysis, stakeholder engagement and consultations and community engagement; project indicators and project monitoring and evaluation plan and exist strategy; organization of the validation workshop.</p>	<p>Project full proposal is developed, including Gender and Environmental and Social risk analyses and formulation of Environmental and Social Management Plan and Gender Action Plan and other required annexes.</p> <p>Baseline data is collected through desk-based research and in-country data collection, analysed and incorporated in the project document.</p> <p>Consultations are carried out with project stakeholders to inform project design and assess interest of beneficiaries to participate in the project.</p> <p>Project logframe is developed against baseline indicators.</p> <p>Project monitoring and evaluation plan and exit strategy are developed.</p>	<p>105,000,000</p>	<p>The project full proposal will be drafted, including assessment of environmental and social risks, gender analysis and action plan and alignment with the AF's results framework and indicators.</p> <p>In-country climate risk assessment at the district level is conducted to collect and analyse project baseline data on climate hazards, and climate vulnerability in Ethiopia and Tanzania, and to map and analyse the presence of bamboo, and assess its potential and opportunities for adaptation and resilience against the local needs and climate risks identified.</p> <p>Stakeholder consultations are carried out with project stakeholders including vulnerable groups to ensure project relevance to local needs, inclusivity and ownership.</p> <p>Implementing arrangements will be further elaborated.</p>

<p><del>3.2. Subcontract consultant/service provider to develop the project concept</del></p>	<p><del>Project concept is developed, including Gender and Environmental and Social risk analyses and formulation of Environmental and Social Management Plan and Gender Action Plan.</del></p>	<p><del>65,000</del></p>	<p><del>The project full proposal will be drafted, including assessment of environmental and social risks, gender analysis and action plan and alignment with the AF's results framework and indicators. The project structure will be further refined and informed by the data collection and stakeholder consultations.</del></p>
<p><del>4.3. Subcontract consultant/service provider to identify project indicators and develop the project monitoring and evaluation plan and exist strategy.</del></p>	<p><del>Project logframe is developed against baseline indicators. Project monitoring and evaluation plan and exit strategy are developed.</del></p>	<p><del>10,000</del></p>	<p><del>A subcontractor/company will be hired to identify project indicators and targets against baseline to develop the logframe and develop a plan for monitoring and evaluation and for the exist strategy.</del></p>
<p><del>5.4. Travel for project validation workshops in 2 countries</del></p>	<p><del>2 project validation workshops are organized with project stakeholders.</del></p>	<p><del>150,000</del></p>	<p><del>Requested budget will cover the cost of logistical arrangements (venue, travel, communication materials) travel for the 2 project validation workshops</del></p>
<p><del>5.6. Hire a service provider to conduct HACT assessment of Project Executing Entity</del></p>	<p><del>PEE's' HACT assessments are conducted.</del></p>	<p><del>15,000</del></p>	<p><del>Requested budget will cover the costs of hiring a company to conduct HACT assessment of the PEEs to ensure execution is possible.</del></p>
<p><del>6.7. IE fee (10%)</del></p>	<p><del>IE admin and technical support for project development, monitoring and</del></p>	<p><del>15,000</del></p>	<p><del>Technical and admin support services</del></p>

**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"

**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Indent at: 0.25"

	supervision, compliance assurance		
<b>Total Project Formulation Grant</b>		150,000	

### 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
Ms. Ganna Onysko			Ms. Caterina Bianco	+43 1 26026 3481	c.bianco@unido.org
<b>Implementing Entity Coordinator, IE Name</b>	Ms. Ganna Onysko Senior GEF, GCF, AF Coordinator Division of Funding Partner Relations Directorate of Global Partnerships and External Relations United Nations Industrial Development Organization - UNIDO Implementing Entity Coordinator				
<b>Signature</b>			<b>Date:</b>		
			<del>6226 August December January 2026</del>		
<b>Project Contact Person</b>	Ms. Caterina Bianco +43 1 26026 3481 c.bianco@unido.org				
<b>Telephone</b>	+43 1 26026 3708				
<b>E-mail</b>	TO: <a href="mailto:g.onysko@unido.org">g.onysko@unido.org</a> CC: <a href="mailto:gef@unido.org">gef@unido.org</a> / <a href="mailto:glo@unido.org">glo@unido.org</a> / <a href="mailto:f.haidara@unido.org">f.haidara@unido.org</a>				