



## ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.37/28/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 (f)

### **PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR MALAYSIA, PHILIPPINES**

## 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.37/28 “Proposal for Malaysia, Philippines” includes a request for a Project Formulation Grant, requesting a budget of US \$130,000, which was received by the secretariat along with the concept for the regional programme AF00000354 “Strengthening Climate Resilience and Food Security through South-South Cooperation in Adaptive Rice Production in Malaysia and the Philippines”. 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 at national level; environmental and social assessment leading to an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP); in-depth gender analysis and produce a Gender Action Plan (GAP); and development of the full proposal.

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

---

**Countries/Region:** Malaysia and The Philippines  
**Project Title:** Strengthening Climate Resilience and food security through South-South Cooperation in adaptive rice production in Malaysia and the Philippines  
**Thematic Focal Area:** Food security  
**Implementing Entity:** United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)  
**Executing Entities:** UNIDO; Malaysian Bioeconomy Development Corporation, Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC)  
**AF Project ID:** AF00000354  
**IE Project ID:** **Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars): 13,651,000**  
**Reviewer and contact person:** Alexandra Munoz **Co-reviewer(s):**  
**IE Contact Person:**

<b>Technical Summary</b>	<p>The project “Strengthening Climate Resilience and food security through South-South Cooperation in adaptive rice production in Malaysia and the Philippines” aims to enhance the climate resilience and food security of smallholder rice farmers in Malaysia and the Philippines by strengthening adaptive capacity against specific climate hazards, such as floods, droughts, rising temperatures, and pest outbreaks, through innovative agricultural technologies, improved climate intelligence, and inclusive institutional frameworks. This will be done through the four components below:</p> <p><u>Component 1:</u> Medium and largescale climate-smart agriculture technologies and practices deployed through public-private partnerships to increase and diversify production, and to build the resilience of rice farming communities (USD 5,000,000);</p> <p><u>Component 2:</u> Strengthened integrated information &amp; climate intelligence for farmers and institutions (USD 3,500,000);</p> <p><u>Component 3:</u> Institutional capacity building for localized adaptation strategies to create enabling environment for investments in Agriculture Marketing Services (USD 2,500,000);</p> <p><u>Component 4:</u> Regional knowledge platform for South-South Cooperation (USD 500,000).</p> <p><u>Requested financing overview:</u>  Project/Programme Execution Cost: USD 910,000  Total Project/Programme Cost: USD 12,410,000  Implementing Fee: USD 1,241,000  Financing Requested: USD 13,651,000</p>
--------------------------	--

	<p>The proposal includes a request for a project formulation grant and/or project formulation assistance grant of USD 130,000.</p> <p>The initial technical review raised several issues, such as the clarity of concrete adaptation actions and beneficiaries; the Theory of Change alignment and coherence; and the level of detail in cost-effectiveness reasoning and national technical standards, as is discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Request (CAR) raised in the review.</p> <p>The second technical review raised several issues, such as how benefits will be equitably distributed (including gender considerations); how the innovative solutions outlined were successful in other countries; and to clarify how the program aligns with the Adaptation Fund Results Framework, as is discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Request (CAR) raised in the review.</p> <p>The third technical review raised some issues, such as the need for information to ensure the lack of duplication with other projects; and the need to ensure the Implementing Entity is accredited by the Board, as is discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Request (CAR) raised in the review.</p> <p>The fourth technical review raises some issues, such as the specific arguments to avoid duplication with other projects; and the need to ensure the Implementing Entity is accredited by the Board, as is discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Request (CAR) raised in the review.</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 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>
Date	February 13, 2027

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments July 21, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments August 29, 2025	Third Comments December 16, 2025	Fourth Comments January 28, 2026	Fifth Technical review Comments 13 February 2026
Country Eligibility	1. Are all of the participating countries party to the Kyoto Protocol and/or the Paris Agreement?	<b>Yes.</b> The country has signed and ratified the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement.	-	-	-	-
	2. Are all of the participating countries developing countries particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change?	<b>Yes.</b> The Climate Change Adaptation Framework for Water Sectors, 2023 acknowledges climate change as a fundamental threat in Malaysia. The Philippines is also highly vulnerable to its impact, including sea level rise, increased frequency of extreme weather events (typhoons and storm surges), rising temperatures, and extreme rainfall.	-	-	-	-
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 letter dated June 26 <sup>th</sup> , 2025, for The Philippines, and the Endorsement letter dated July 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2025, for Malaysia.	-	-	-	<b>CAR (NEW 1): 2. Cleared.</b>

	<p>3. Does the length of the proposal amount to no more than fifty (50) pages for the project/programme concept, including its annexes?</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> The concept note is 50 pages including its annexes.</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The concept note is 63 pages including its annexes.</p> <p><b>CAR (NEW1):</b> Kindly amend the concept note to a maximum of 50 pages, including the annexes.</p>	<p><b>CAR (NEW1): Not cleared.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kindly amend the concept note to a maximum of 50 pages, including the annexes.</li> <li>2. On page 1 please insert last date of re-submission.</li> </ol>	<p><b>CAR (NEW1):</b> <b>1. Cleared.</b> The CN has a total of 51 pages including the annexes. <b>2. Not Cleared.</b> While the last re-submission has been amended in the cover page, please adjust again to include the most recent date.</p>	
--	---	--	--	--	---	--

	<p>4. 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> However, additional information is required. The concept note outlines a relevant set of activities such as deployment of climate-resilient rice varieties and creation of climate intelligence platforms to address climate change impacts. The proposed project contributes to the thematic focal area of Food Security. However, how these activities translate into concrete and measurable adaptation benefits need more details. In addition, the value from the regional approach should be accompanied by sound justification.</p> <p><b>CR1:</b> Please clearly outline the specific adaptation actions that the project will lead to, including their tangible outcomes and measurable impact.</p> <p><b>CR2:</b> Kindly add a sound justification and explanation of the proposed South-South regional cooperation,</p>	<p><b>CR1: Cleared.</b> As per the information provided in Part II.B, table 5.</p> <p><b>CR2: Not Cleared.</b> Even though more information was provided to include a justification of the South-South cooperation, please refer to how regional cooperation adds value compared to national-level interventions. Please refer to any existing agreement, special agreements or plans between the countries, among other reasons, if possible. In</p>	<p><b>CR2: Not Cleared.</b> While paragraph 52 notes that the South-South cooperation aligns with the ASEAN Action Plan for Sustainable Agriculture, please also specify the particular objectives, and goals within the Action Plan that are related to the proposed project. This should be included explicitly in the body of the</p>	<p><b>CR2: Cleared.</b> As per information in paragraph 46. The CN explicitly indicates that the ASEN Action Plan aims to enhance the resilience of agri-food systems, which is aligned with this proposal's focus on rice.</p>	

		<p>including how it adds value compared to national-level interventions.</p> <p><b>CAR1:</b> Kindly indicate explicitly how the project supports one or more of the Adaptation Fund Strategic Results.</p> <p><b>CR3:</b> Please state what scenario in climate projections was considered for the proposed project's design.</p> <p><b>CAR2:</b> Please provide information on the specific locations in Malaysia and the Philippines which the project is targeting. This is important to determine whether there are any environment or social risks associated with the proposed project and for compliance with AF ESP. If the specific locations are yet to be determined, please follow guidance at <a href="#">Guidance Document for Project/Programme with Unidentified Sub-Projects</a> and amend the proposal accordingly.</p>	<p>the case that ASEAN policies are referred to, please outline clearly the specific policies/objectives/goals that are related to this proposed project.</p> <p><b>CAR1: Not Cleared.</b> Kindly indicate clearly how the program aligns with Outcome 4 (physical assets improved or constructed to withstand climate variability and change), Outcome 5 (Increased ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability induced stress). Please rephrase alignment with Outcome 8 to clarify the innovation in specific.</p> <p><b>CR3: Cleared.</b> As per information provided in Part I, paragraph 22.</p> <p><b>CAR2: Cleared.</b> As per information provided in Part I, tables 1 y 2.</p>	<p>document, and not as a link in a footnote.</p> <p><b>CAR1: Not cleared.</b> Information was provided in paragraph 23, Part II, and Table 11.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. However, while paragraph 23 indicates alignment with the 8 outcomes from the Results Framework of the Adaptation Fund, Table 11 only shows alignment with 2,3,4,6,7,8. Please ensure consistency.</li> <li>2. Since the last submission, the template has been updated. Please present in the following format. <a href="#">Results Framework Alignment Table</a> (Amended in November</li> </ol>	<p><b>CAR1: Cleared.</b></p> <p>As per information provided in Table 11 and paragraph 23. been addressed.</p>	
--	--	---	---	---	---	--

				2025) (77 kB, DOC)		
--	--	--	--	-----------------------	--	--

	<p>5. 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>Unsure.</b></p> <p>The proposal outlines expected benefits and refers to vulnerable populations and women. However, it lacks quantitative estimates of these benefits, and it does not clearly identify the specific vulnerable groups or demonstrate how benefits will be equitably distributed. The project also does not specify the location. As this element for economic, social and environmental benefits are context specific additional information is required in the proposal to make a determination.</p> <p>Please see <b>CAR2</b> above.</p> <p><b>CAR3:</b> Please identify the specific vulnerable groups (e.g., smallholder farmers, women, indigenous peoples) who will be benefit from the project.</p> <p><b>CAR4:</b> Kindly indicate the estimated number of direct and indirect beneficiaries by country and gender-disaggregated if possible.</p>	<p><b>CAR3: Cleared.</b> As per information provided in Part II. C, paragraph 70.</p> <p><b>CAR4: Cleared.</b> As per information provided in Part II. C, paragraph 71.</p> <p><b>CR4: Not Cleared.</b> Kindly include in the concept note an approximation of the expected economic, environmental, and social benefits of the proposed project, as overall for each dimension, whenever possible.</p> <p><b>CR5: Not Cleared.</b></p>	<p><b>CR4: Cleared.</b> As per information provided in Part II.C, paragraph 66 to 71.</p> <p><b>CR5: Cleared.</b></p>	-	
--	---	--	---	---	---	--

		<p><b>CR4:</b> Kindly quantify expected economic, environmental, and social benefits, whenever possible.</p> <p><b>CR5:</b> Please describe how benefits will be equitably distributed, including how gender considerations have been integrated.</p>	<p>Please describe explicitly how benefits will be equitably distributed, including how gender considerations have been integrated.</p>	<p>As per information provided in Part II.C, paragraph 70.</p>		
--	--	---	---	--	--	--

	<p>6. Is the project / programme cost-effective and does the regional approach support cost-effectiveness?</p>	<p><b>Unsure.</b> The concept note does not provide a comparison of cost-effective options or justification of the cost-efficiency of the chosen approach.</p> <p><b>CAR5:</b> Please provide a cost effectiveness analysis which includes project specific information based on the project outputs and activities including quantitative comparison of the cost-effectiveness of the proposed measures with alternative adaptation measures.</p> <p><b>CR6:</b> Kindly elaborate on how the regional approach reduces costs or increases the value of outputs compared to country-level interventions.</p>	<p><b>Cleared.</b> As per information provided according to the following CAR y CR.</p> <p><b>CAR5: Cleared.</b> As per the information provided in Part II.E, table 6.</p> <p><b>CR6: Cleared.</b> As per information provided in Part II.D, paragraph 78.</p>	-	-	
--	--	--	---	---	---	--

	<p>7. 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>  However, additional information is required.  The concept note aligns with key national strategies and plans in both countries, Malaysia and The Philippines. However, NDCs for both countries as well as The Philippines Adaptation Plan are not included.</p> <p><b>CR7:</b> Kindly review to include an exhaustive list to include NDCs for both countries and the Adaptation Plan for The Philippines.</p> <p><b>CR8:</b> Please also strengthen the alignment of the project to the regional level strategies, networks etc.</p> <p><b>CR9:</b> The project speaks to developing EWS, please clarify alignment with any national meteorological or disaster risk reduction early warning plans, systems and strategies.</p>	<p><b>Cleared.</b>  As per information provided according to the following CAR y CR.</p> <p><b>CR7: Cleared.</b>  As per information provided in Part II.F, table 7.</p> <p><b>CR8: Cleared.</b>  As per information provided in Part II.F, paragraphs 86-87.</p> <p><b>CR9: Cleared.</b>  As per information provided in Part II.A, paragraph 49.</p>	-	-	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

	<p>8. Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund?</p>	<p><b>Unsure.</b> The proposed project briefly mentions compliance with national technical standards but does not identify specific standards or outline a plan for compliance.</p> <p><b>CAR6:</b> Please specify all national technical standards applicable to the proposed project (e.g., EIA, water use regulations, agricultural input standards) and explain how it will comply with each one of these.</p>	<p><b>CAR6: Not Cleared.</b> Kindly refer to specific regulations instead of generic standards in the list. Please specify all national technical standards applicable to the proposed project (e.g., land use, water use regulations, agricultural input standards) and explain concise, but clear and specific, how it will comply with each one of them.</p>	<p><b>CAR6: Not Cleared.</b> While more information was provided, please include how the proposed project will comply with each one of the regulations.</p>	<p><b>CAR6: Cleared.</b> Additional broad information was provided in Table 8, indicating that the specific actions and steps to comply with the regulations will be developed in the Full Proposal.</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--	--

	<p>9. Is there duplication of project / programme with other funding sources?</p>	<p><b>Unsure.</b> The concept note does not provide a comprehensive list of the projects in the same sector and geography, and therefore, there is not a clear assessment of all possible overlaps with the proposed project.</p> <p><b>CAR7:</b> Please identify other relevant climate or agriculture-related initiatives in the project areas funded by other donors. This list should be comprehensive in the form of a table, outlining main project interventions, timeline, target population, and specific location within the country.</p> <p><b>CR10:</b> Within this table, kindly explain how duplication will be avoided, how the project is complementary to other projects, and what synergies will be built.</p>	<p><b>CAR7: Not Cleared.</b> Kindly provide the following information: (i) name of the project, (ii) description and main project interventions, (iii) timeline, (iv) target population, and (v) specific location within the country, for all relevant climate and agriculture-related initiatives placed in the project areas that are funded by other donors.</p> <p><b>CR10: Not Cleared.</b> Within this table, please explain how duplication will be avoided (for example, projects not related to rice, or implemented in different locations, among others sound justifications), and how the project is complementary to other projects, and what synergies will be built. The explanations should be concise but precise for each case.</p>	<p><b>CAR7: Cleared.</b> As per information in Table 9.</p> <p><b>CR10: Not Cleared.</b> Please include specifically for each programme/projects identified in Table 9, how duplication will be avoided.</p>	<p><b>CR10: Not cleared.</b> While actions to avoid duplication are included, all identified projects are already in the implementation phase. Therefore, the justification for avoiding duplication should be specific to each project. The arguments could be based on different locations or different types of interventions, for example.</p>	<p><b>CR10:Cleared as per amended table 9.</b></p>
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>10. Does the project / programme have a learning and knowledge management component to capture and feedback lessons?</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> However, additional information is required.</p> <p>The proposed project includes a dedicated Component 4 to support South-South cooperation and knowledge exchange through a Regional Knowledge Platform for South-South Cooperation and Farmer's Climate Field Living Labs. However, the project does not provide a MEL framework that will guide how experiences will be documented.</p> <p><b>CR11:</b> Kindly clarify how the proposed project will enable keeping track of the experiences shared on the platform, and how training lessons will be carried out.</p> <p><b>CR12:</b> Please clarify if any arrangements will be in place for addressing any possible barriers (related to costs or otherwise) of farmers accessing the information from the regional platform.</p>	<p><b>CR11: Not Cleared.</b> Kindly clarify how the proposed project will enable keeping track of the experiences on the platform overtime, and how training lessons will be carried out (ideally a brief of the flowchart for this task).</p> <p><b>CR12: Not Cleared.</b> Please briefly explain what arrangements are needed to address any potential barriers (such as costs, institutional limitations, or capacity-building needs) that may prevent farmers from accessing information from the regional platform.</p>	<p><b>CR11: Cleared.</b> While the Concept Note indicates that: <i>"To address potential barriers such as cost, connectivity, and capacity, the project will work through existing agricultural institutions. (...) The detailed design of the knowledge management and monitoring system, including how lessons will be tracked and updated on the Regional Platform, will be developed at the full proposal stage in consultation with national partners and stakeholders"</i>. <u>Please ensure that the information is included at the fully</u></p>	-	
--	---	---	--	--	---	--

				<p><u>developed proposal stage.</u></p> <p><b>CR12: Cleared.</b> As per information provided in Part II.H, paragraph 94.</p>		
	<p>11. 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. The proposal highlights an initial consultative process. Validation workshops were held in both countries. Annexes 1–3 provide summaries of consultations including with women and farmer groups. Part II.J also provides details on the consultation process.</p> <p><b>CR13:</b> While the proposal provides summaries of participants, kindly provide further explanation on gender considerations discussed and what interests were considered. Further indicated how the discussions have been incorporated into the development of the concept.</p>	<p><b>CR13: Not Cleared.</b> While the proposal provides summaries of participants, further explanations on gender considerations are required. Please provide in the concept note, under Part II.J, how these considerations were included in the preparation of the proposed project.</p>	<p><b>CR13: Cleared.</b> As per information provided in Part II.J, paragraph 99.</p>	-	

	12. Is the requested financing justified on the basis of full cost of adaptation reasoning?	<b>Yes.</b>	-	-		
	13. Is the project / program aligned with AF's results framework?	<p><b>Yes.</b> However, amendment is required.</p> <p><b>CAR8:</b> Please utilize the template and format of the template as presented at <a href="#">Results Framework Alignment Table</a> (Amended in March 2019) (77 kB, DOC).</p> <p><b>CR14:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To be consistent with the template, the first row of the alignment table should capture the project's overall objective only.</li> <li>2. The following rows should each contain the various project components. In the second column project outcome indicator should be included. Columns 3 and 4 should contain</li> </ol>	<p><b>Not Cleared.</b> Further information is required.</p> <p><b>CAR8: Not Cleared.</b> Please amend table 12 using the template <a href="#">Results Framework Alignment Table</a> and the example in the same link. For example, Grand amount should be provided per project's objective. Also, please clarify what project component is referring to the first row of table 12.</p> <p><b>CR14: Not Cleared.</b> Please consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) To align with the template, the first row of the alignment table should include only the project's general objective as a standalone statement. It should not be linked to any</li> </ol>	<p><b>CAR8: Cleared.</b> As per information provided in Table 12.</p> <p><b>CR14: Cleared.</b> As per information provided in Table 12.</p>	-	

		<p>AF outcomes and outcome indicators respectively and the final column should contain the grant amount associated with each Fund outcome indicate. The same format should be adopted for the outputs section-Second (bottom) part of the table. That way the top half and the bottom half corresponds, and the totals should be the totals of the project activities.</p> <p>3. Please ensure that the fund outcomes and fund outcome indicators are correctly numbered and worded.</p>	<p>specific outcome or output.</p> <p>(ii) The upper part is related to outcomes while the bottom is for outputs. Both section should correspond, and the total grant amount associated with each Fund Outcome should be the totals of the project activities.</p> <p>(iii) Please ensure that the Fund Outcomes and Fund Outcome Indicators are correctly numbered and worded.</p> <p>(iv) Please remove the breakdown by country e.g. Malaysia USD 1.5 million; the Philippines USD 2 million)" from the grant amount column.</p>			
	14. Has the sustainability of the project/programme	<b>Yes.</b>	<b>Not Cleared.</b>		-	

	<p>outcomes been taken into account when designing the project?</p>	<p>However, additional information is required.</p> <p>The concept note provides a discussion about the sustainability of the proposed project through institutional partnerships, capacity building and integration with national policies. However, there is no mention of regulations and resources specifically needed, and therefore, it is not clear how the project will be sustained in the long run, nor if replication and scaling up will be able to be achieved in either of the countries.</p> <p><b>CR15:</b> Kindly explain the arrangements (for example, financial, social, regulatory, institutional, economic, environmental) to be achieved on the sustainability and maintenance of the project.</p> <p><b>CR16:</b> Kindly identify the adaptation benefits that can be sustained after this project ends and explain if this can be</p>	<p>Further information is required.</p> <p><b>CR15: Not Cleared.</b></p> <p>Kindly describe the specific arrangements (e.g., financial, social, regulatory, institutional, economic, environmental) that will support the sustainability and long-term maintenance of the project. The arrangements should be concrete; for instance, instead of referring to “national agricultural programs” in general, please specify the exact agricultural program that could be leveraged for the project integration.</p> <p><b>CR16: Cleared.</b></p> <p>As per information provided in Part II.L, paragraph 110.</p>	<p><b>CR15: Cleared.</b></p> <p>As per information provided in Part II.K, paragraph 109.</p>		
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

		replicated and/or scale up.				
	15. Does the project / programme provide an overview of environmental and social impacts / risks identified, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?	<p><b>No.</b> The proposed project provides a checklist of risks in Table 4, including potential impacts and risk level. However, the project classification (A, B or C) from the screening is not stated, and more details are needed.</p> <p><b>CAR9:</b> Based on the assessments conducted with the PFG grant further assessment is required for most of the ESPs. Please review Table 4 accordingly. Also recall that further assessments are typically required for ESPs 1, 4 and 6.</p> <p><b>CR17:</b> Please include all potential direct, indirect, transboundary, and cumulative impacts and risks that could result from the proposed project based on the 15 Adaptation Fund ESP principles.</p> <p><b>CAR10:</b> Kindly provide, under Part II.M, an Initial</p>	<p>Further information is required. The proposed project provides a checklist of risks in Table 11, including potential impacts and risk level. However, more details are needed.</p> <p><b>CAR9: Not Cleared.</b> Kindly provide further assessments for all of the ESPs, and revise Table 11 accordingly. Risks should be written as "There is a risk ....". If no further assessment is selected, please provide a sound justification for this (it should be specific rather than generic) and leave the third column blank. Also recall that further assessments are always required for ESPs 1, 4 and 6.</p> <p><b>CR17: Not Cleared.</b> Please include at the concept note stage all potential direct, indirect, transboundary, and cumulative impacts and risks that could result from the proposed</p>	<p><b>CAR9: Cleared.</b> As per information provided in Table 10.</p> <p><b>CR17: Not Cleared.</b> Please include at the concept note stage all potential direct, indirect, transboundary, and cumulative impacts that could result from</p>	<p><b>CR17: Cleared.</b> As per information provided in Table 10. Direct, cumulative and transboundary risks have been</p>	

		<p>Gender Assessment, including details about gender-specific cultural and legal context in both countries.</p> <p><b>CAR11:</b> Kindly state in Part II.M the category of the project from the screening process (Category A, B or C).</p>	<p>project <u>for each of</u> the 15 Adaptation Fund ESP principles.</p> <p><b>CAR10: Not Cleared.</b> Although some gender context is provided for both countries, more information is needed to refer it as an assessment. Kindly provide, for each country, statistics on gender in general and, if possible, of gender in the sector. This is aimed at providing some guidance on the gender gap.</p> <p><b>CAR11: Cleared.</b> As per information provided in Part II.M, paragraph 111.</p>	<p>the proposed project <u>for each of</u> the 15 Adaptation Fund ESP principles.</p> <p><b>CAR10: Not Cleared.</b> Kindly provide, for each country, statistics on gender in general and, if possible, of gender in the sector.</p>	<p>identified for each of the corresponding AF ESP principles.</p> <p><b>CAR10: Cleared.</b> As per information in paragraphs 99 and 100. Broad information is included to understand the role of women in the sector as well as the main gaps for each country.</p>	
	<p>16. Does the project promote new and innovative solutions to climate change adaptation, such as new approaches, technologies and mechanisms?</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> However, more information is needed. At Part II.A, pages 22-23, the proposed project introduces Agriculture 4.0 tools (drones, remote sensing, precision farming, and digital farming platforms), climate-change resilient rice varieties and the implementation of</p>	<p><b>CR18: Not Cleared.</b></p>	<p><b>CR18: Not Cleared.</b></p>	<p><b>CR18: Cleared.</b> As per the information provided in paragraph 57, the CN has been revised and now includes examples of the innovative solutions in Myanmar and Bangladesh.</p>	

		<p>climate-smart cultivation techniques. The project contributes to: <i>“Rolling out innovative adaptation practices, tools and technologies that have demonstrated success in one country to new countries/regions”.</i></p> <p><b>CR18:</b> Kindly include how the innovative solutions outlined in the concept note were successful in another country/region.</p> <p><i>The aspect of innovation will be more thoroughly assessed in the next round of review.</i></p>	<p>Kindly include how the innovative solutions outlined in the concept note were successful in another country/region. <i>The aspect of innovation will be more thoroughly assessed in the next round of review.</i></p>	<p>Please include information on how the innovative solutions outlined in the concept note were successful in another country/region.</p>		
Resource Availability	1. Is the requested project / programme funding within the funding windows of the regional projects/programmes?	<b>Yes.</b>	-	-	-	
	2. Are the administrative costs (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><b>Yes.</b> However, amendments are required as per the CRs and CARs below.</p> <p><b>CAR12:</b> Kindly fix the fee calculations in Table 2, page 19, according to the definitions in <a href="https://www.adaptation-">https://www.adaptation-</a></p>	<p><b>Cleared.</b> As per information provided in table 2 and Support Letter from IE for components 1 and 3.</p> <p><b>CAR12: Cleared.</b> As per information provided in Table 2.</p> <p><b>CAR13: Cleared.</b></p>	<p><b>CAR15 (NEW):</b> Kindly delete the proposed AF ID number as it is incorrect. The AF ID number is AF00000354.</p>	<p><b>CAR15(NEW): Cleared.</b> The AF ID number has been adjusted to “AF00000354”.</p>	

		<p><a href="https://www.adaptation-fund.org/generic/costs-and-fees/">fund.org/generic/costs-and-fees/</a>.</p> <p><b>CAR13:</b> Please disaggregate the resources each EE will execute in component 4, in order to clarify the cap for the administrative costs. If the actual execution costs of the IE UNIDO exceed 1.5% cap of components for the budget for these components in the Philippines. Please 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>.  Please provide justification with supporting request from DA for UNIDO executing Components 1 and 3 in the Philippines.</p> <p><b>CR19:</b> Please clarify if it is intended that all three EEs for the project will be serving as EE for the PFG. If only UNIDO will execute the PFG please update the PFG request form to reflect this.</p>	<p>As per information provided in Table 2 and Support Letter from IE Execution for components 1 and 3.</p> <p><b>CR19: Cleared.</b>  As per information provided in PFG request indicating only UNIDO as the EE for the PFG.</p> <p><b>CAR14: Cleared.</b>  As per the insertion of IE fees line in PFG request form.</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

		<p><b>CAR14:</b> Please include the line item and amount of the IE fees for the PFG as required by the template.</p>				
<p>Eligibility of IE</p>	<p>1. Is the project/programme submitted through an eligible Multilateral or Regional Implementing Entity that has been accredited by the Board?</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> UNIDO is an accredited MIE. Accreditation Expiration Date: November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2025.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p><b>No.</b> United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) is a Multilateral Implementing Entity (MIE). Accreditation expiration date: 30 November 2025.</p> <p><b>CAR(NEW 16):</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 funding proposal(s) do not reflect, indicate, or prejudice the outcome of the</i></p>	<p><b>CAR16(NEW): Cleared.</b> UNIDO focal points have been updated.</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</i></p>	

				<p><i>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><i>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>	
Implementation Arrangements	<p>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?</p>	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 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.	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				

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

**A. Record of endorsement on behalf of the government<sup>51</sup>** Provide the name and position of the government official and indicate date of endorsement for each country participating in the proposed project/programme. Add more lines as necessary. The endorsement letters should be attached as an annex to the project/programme proposal. Please attach the endorsement letters with this template; add as many participating governments if a regional project/programme:

Mr. Datuk Nor Yahati Binti Awang Deputy Secretary General Environmental Sustainability Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Sustainability	Date: July 2 2025
Ms. Analiza Rebuelta-Teh Undersecretary Finance, Information Systems & Climate Change Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)	Date: June 26 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 (such as Malaysia's Climate Change Adaptation Framework for Water Sectors, 2021 and the Philippines Rice Industry Road Map, 2018 by DoA) 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.	
<b>Ms. Ganna Onysko</b> 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	
Date: 6 January 2026	Tel. and email:  +43 1 26026 3708  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>
Project Contact Person: Meryem SGHIR	
Tel. And Email: +43 1 26026 364743  <a href="mailto:M.SGHIR@unido.org">M.SGHIR@unido.org</a>	

<sup>51</sup>. 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.



NRES.700-7/1/3 (5) (S)

2 July 2025

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

Dear Sir,

**ENDORSEMENT FOR THE CONCEPT PROPOSAL “STRENGTHENING CLIMATE RESILIENCE AND FOOD SECURITY THROUGH SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION IN ADAPTIVE RICE PRODUCTION IN MALAYSIA AND THE PHILIPPINES”**

With reference to the above matter.

2. In my capacity as designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in Malaysia, 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 Malaysia.
3. 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 Bioeconomy Corporation and the Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC). UNIDO will also act as partial executing entity, in line with the request and agreement of the Government of the Philippines.
4. The project design will address climate change threat to food security by enhancing adaptation capacity and creating an enabling environment for investments in agriculture sector. The project aims to complement further development of National Adaptation Plan, as well as to build resilience of rice farming communities.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

**(DATUK NOR YAHATI BINTI AWANG)**  
Designated Authority to the Adaptation Fund  
Deputy Secretary General (Environmental Sustainability)  
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Sustainability  
Malaysia



DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES  
KAGAWARAN NG KAPALIGIRAN AT LIKAS NA YAMAN



JAN 09 2026

**MR. MIKKO OLLIKAINEN**

Head, The Adaptation Fund Board  
c/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat  
Washington, D.C., USA

Subject: Endorsement for “Strengthening Climate Resilience and Food Security Through South-South Cooperation in Adaptive Rice Production in Malaysia and the Philippines”

Dear Mr. Ollikainen:

In my capacity as designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in the Philippines, 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 Philippines.

In this regard, 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 Bioeconomy Corporation and the Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC). UNIDO will also act as partial executing entity, in line with the request and agreement of the Government of the Philippines

Thank you.

Very truly yours,



**RAPHAEL P.M. LOTILLA**  
Secretary  
and Primary Contact Point of the Philippines  
as National Designated Authority - Adaptation Fund



Visayas Avenue, Diliman, Quezon City 1100, Philippines  
[www.denr.gov.ph](http://www.denr.gov.ph)





ADAPTATION FUND

14 AUG 2025

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

Subject: Justification on UNIDO's Execution Role for Components 1 and 3 in the Philippines under the proposed regional project entitled "Strengthening Climate Resilience and Food Security through South-South Cooperation in Adaptive Rice Production in Malaysia and the Philippines"

Dear Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat:

In my capacity as Designated Authority for the Adaptation Fund in the Philippines, I am writing to provide formal justification on the role of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) as Executing Entity for Components 1 and 3 in the Philippines under the proposed regional project entitled *"Strengthening Climate Resilience and Food Security through South-South Cooperation in Adaptive Rice Production in Malaysia and the Philippines."*

In particular, Component 1 involves the deployment of medium- and large-scale climate-smart agriculture (CSA) technologies through public-private partnerships, while Component 3 supports institutional capacity building for localized adaptation strategies and investments in agricultural marketing services. UNIDO's role will support the effective execution of these components by providing technical and operational capacity, in close collaboration with Philippine institutions.

This execution arrangement follows a request from the Philippines' Department of Agriculture - Climate Resilient Agriculture Office (DA-CRAO) and reflects a shared understanding of the need for strong technical support to achieve the project's ambitious objectives. UNIDO brings global expertise in climate-resilient agriculture and institutional capacity building and has a strong country presence through its field office in the Philippines, which enables close coordination with national and local stakeholders.

We also confirm that the Department of Agriculture and its relevant agencies will continue to play a central role in implementation, coordination, and oversight. The project remains fully country-driven and aligns with national development and adaptation priorities. UNIDO's execution role is designed to complement national efforts and contribute to long-term institutional strengthening.

We hope this explanation provides the necessary clarifications. Please do not hesitate to reach out should further information be needed.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,



**ATTY. ANALIZA REBUELTA-TEH**

Undersecretary

Finance, Information Systems and Climate Change  
and National Designated Authority-Adaptation Fund



Revised PFG Submission Form<sup>1</sup> (additions in red)

Project Formulation Grant (PFG)

Submission Date:

Adaptation Fund Project ID: 230157

Country/ies: Malaysia, The Philippines

Title of Project/Programme: Strengthening Climate Resilience and food security through South-South Cooperation in adaptive rice production in Malaysia and the Philippines

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

Implementing Entity: UNIDO

Executing Entity/ies: UNIDO

A. Project Preparation Timeframe

Start date of PFG	JuneApril 2026
Completion date of PFG	-May 2027

Formatted: Indent: Left: -0.01", First line: 0"

B. Proposed Project Preparation Activities (\$)

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note <sup>2</sup>
<p>1. <del>Preparation of the full fledged</del> <del>full-fledge</del> project document and required annexes <del>by ADPC;</del></p> <p><del>To conduct a Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessment (CRVA)</del></p> <p>1.12. To prepare a baseline report against the interventions proposed and indicators/targets <del>aimed</del> <del>aimed</del>;</p>	<p>Output 1: Full Project Document Proposal</p> <p><del>CRVA assessment report</del></p> <p>- Baseline report</p> <p>- Stakeholders' consultation report</p> <p>- <del>ESIA and Environmental and Social Assessment, including preparation of an ESMP Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP)</del> and a UNIDO</p>	<p>60,000</p> <p>15,000</p> <p>10,000</p> <p>15,000</p> <p>17,000</p> <p>117,000</p>	<p>CRVA Analysis: \$35,000</p> <p>International Travel: \$5,000</p> <p>Stakeholder Consultations (incl. Local travel and Workshops): \$2507,000</p> <p>Local Travel: \$2000</p> <p>Preparation of Baseline Report: \$1000</p> <p>Environmental &amp; Social Management Plan (ESMP): \$30,000</p> <p>405045,000</p> <p>International &amp; national experts – Gender and Baseline <del>incl. light CRVA</del>: \$3015,000</p> <p>international and national technical experts</p> <p>Preparation of in Gender and</p>

Formatted Table

Formatted: Justified, Space After: 12.5 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.03 li

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Normal, Line spacing: single, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Justified, Space After: 12.5 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.03 li

Formatted: Normal, 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.

<p>- <u>1.2.</u> To carry out detailed stakeholders' consultations at local and national level, specifically on selected project sites, with local communities and indigenous populations;</p> <p>- <del>1.3</del> <u>To conduct specific analyses in support of the proposed projects</u>          . To conduct an <u>environmental and social assessment leading to an Environmental and Social Management Plan assessment (ESMP)</u></p> <p>- <u>1.4.</u> To carry out an <u>in-depth gender analysis and produce a Gender Action Plan (GAP)</u> in order to effectively mainstream gender issues into the design and formulation of the project.</p> <p>- <u>1.5.</u> To <u>identify</u> project or programme indicators and development of monitoring and evaluation plan.</p> <p>- <u>1.6.</u> To prepare the full-fledge project proposal as per the requirements of the Adaptation Fund</p> <p><u>1.7.</u> UNIDO direct support in facilitating local consultations, workshops to discuss the specific project and program ideas (including translation into local languages, preparation of background papers, etc.).</p>	<p>Environmental and Social (E&amp;S) Screening form</p> <p>- <u>Gender analysis report and Gender Action Plan developed</u><u>Plan of action for gender mainstreaming is developed,</u></p> <p>-Project document is gender</p> <p>-mainstreamed</p> <p>- and costs for implementation estimated</p> <p>- <u>Monitoring and evaluation plan</u></p> <p>- <u>Report on local and regional stakeholder consultations</u></p> <p>- <u>HACT assessments</u></p> <p>- <u>Mission reports</u></p> <p>-<u>Validation workshop reports</u></p> <p>-<u>Monitoring and evaluation plan:</u></p> <p>- <u>Report on <del>local</del> consultations, workshops supported</u></p> <p>- <u>HACT assessment Mission report</u></p> <p>- <u>Validation workshop report</u></p>		<p><u>baseline) assessments Report and GAP: \$112000</u></p> <p><u>Preparation of M&amp;E Plan and ESM Assessment: \$1000</u></p> <p><u>Project Proposal Formulation/Development: \$172500,000</u></p> <p><u>Workshop Cost: \$5000</u></p> <p><u>International and national travel: US\$ 10,000</u></p> <p><u>Local travel: 5,000</u></p> <p>Subcontracting an entity for HACT assessment based on UNIDO Long-term agreement (LTA) : 2 X US\$ 5,000 = \$-10,000</p> <p><u>Travel for Travel for pproject monitoring: International and national travel: \$10,000</u></p> <p><u>Technical report: International and national travel: US\$ 10,000</u></p> <p><u>Project manager time: US\$ 5,000</u></p> <p><u>Workshop expenses: US\$ 20,000</u></p>	<p>Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering</p> <p>Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering</p> <p>Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering</p> <p>Formatted: Left, Indent: Left: 0.05", Hanging: 0.13", Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at:</p> <p>Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering</p> <p>Formatted: List Paragraph, Line spacing: single</p> <p>Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering</p>
--	---	--	---	---

<p><u>1.8.</u> HACT assessment for the executing entities</p> <p><u>1.9.</u> To carry out a monitoring mission by the backstopping officer of UNIDO</p> <p><u>1.10.</u> To organize pre-validation workshops at local level, specifically on selected project sites, with local communities and indigenous populations and validation workshops at national level and regional level</p> <p>±</p>			
IE fee (support costs)	IE admin and technical support for project development, monitoring and supervision  Compliance assurance	13,000	Technical and admin support services.
<b>Total Project Formulation Grant</b>		<b>130,000</b>	

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Description of the required activity	Justification for the need and for the amount
To conduct a Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessment (CRVA):	The Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessment covers assessments of climate risks, climate exposure, sensitivity, and vulnerability and identification of adaptation measures for the target sector in the identified regions. Measuring the sector's vulnerability to climate change impacts is necessary to increase the sector's resilience. This assessment will be conducted by a national adaptation expert, with the support of a project assistant to facilitate related travel of the adaptation expert and coordination with various stakeholders
To conduct a baseline assessment	The baseline assessment will be conducted so that the data and information is provided to support the interventions proposed and indicators/targets aimed at. The methodology will be based on a participatory approach, collection primary data at the local, community level and secondary data.
To carry out detailed stakeholders' consultations at local and national level:	Stakeholder consultation serves as a fundamental mechanism for collecting information, perspectives, and feedback from individuals involved in a project. This activity will serve to ensure further alignment of an engagement plan with the needs, expectations, and concerns of all relevant stakeholders. The

	stakeholders' consultations will target specifically selected project sites, involving local communities and indigenous populations;
To conduct an Environmental and Social Management assessment :	This activity is an integral part of UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policy and Procedures, applicable to all UNIDO projects and programmes submitted to the AF. It requires that UNIDO projects and programmes undergo environmental and social risk (E&S) assessments which will help decide on the categorization of the project and identify environmental and social issues that should be addressed in its development and implementation. The ESM will provide guidance on how to mitigate the environmental and social risks during the project implementation phase. This activity will be conducted by a technical expert and will require local travel to the project sites.
To carry out an In-depth gender analysis in order to effectively mainstream gender issues into the design:	This activity will allow mainstreaming a gender perspective is the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making both women and men's concerns, experiences and aspirations an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that they benefit equally, and inequality is not perpetuated. This activity will be conducted by a national gender expert and will require travel to the project sites and consultations with various groups of beneficiaries.
Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) assessment for the executing entity	This Micro assessment dictates policies and procedures for capacity assessment, cash transfer modality, audit, assurance and monitoring. It is a requirement in order to make sure that the executing entity has the capacity to deliver project activities. This activity will be delivered via a subcontract of an audit company under a Long-Term Agreement (LTA) with UNIDO.
To carry out a monitoring mission by the backstopping officer of UNIDO	This travel is earmarked for the project manager of UNIDO who needs to contribute in terms of technical backstopping, supporting the mobilization of the endorsement letter and the stakeholders' consultations with key institutions and providing orientation on the project design, scope and budgeting. The fee of the project manager is covered by the support costs
To prepare the full-fledge project proposal as per the requirements of the Adaptation Fund	This activity will gather the results of all the assessments conducted during the preparation of the full fledge project proposal, following the template of the Adaptation fund and the requirements of UNIDO. The full-fledge proposal will be presented to all key stakeholders for validation during national and regional workshops. The drafting and compiling of the project proposal will be conducted by a national adaptation expert, supported by an internal expert in programming. The validation workshop will be organized with the support of the project support staff, with the participation of the national and international technical experts.
To organize a validation workshop	Given the wide scope of <del>the</del> target regions in both Malaysia and The Philippines, this activity will involve in person pre-validation workshops at the level of the target communities and indigenous populations in order to ensure their buy in of the proposed project interventions. This will be conducted during pre-validation workshops. Also validation workshops will be conducted virtually separately in Malaysia and The Philippines so that each country has an opportunity to focus on the proposed project intervention and provide validation. A final regional validation workshop will bring both countries together, presenting the final project document for the validation by both countries

### 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

<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>  21 November 2025
<b>Project Contact Person</b>	Meryem SGHIR +43 1 26026 364743 <a href="mailto:M.SGHIR@unido.org">M.SGHIR@unido.org</a>	
<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>	