



## ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.37/37/Add.1  
April 7-8, 2026

---

Adaptation Fund Board  
Project and Programme Review Committee  
Thirty-seventh meeting  
Bonn, Germany

Agenda Item 7 f)

### **PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR LLA SINGLE COUNTRY PROPOSAL FOR SOUTH AFRICA**

## 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”.*

7. At its forty-second meeting the Board approved modifications to project formulation grants contained in document AFB/PPRC.33/40. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- a) *That project formulation grants (PFGs) be made available for projects submitted through national, regional and multilateral implementing entities;*
- b) *That the maximum size of the PFG for single country projects for all windows, inclusive of the management fee, be set as follows:*
  - (i) For projects below US\$ 2,000,000, the limit is set at US\$ 50,000;*
  - (ii) For projects at or above US\$ 2,000,000 and below US\$ 5,000,000, the limit is set at US\$ 100,000;*
  - (iii) For projects at or above US\$ 5,000,000, the limit is set at US\$ 150,000;*
- c) *That an additional PFG amount (inclusive of the management fee) can be provided on a case-by-case basis for locally-led adaptation projects up to a maximum of US\$ 100,000, and that such amount should be dedicated to support activities that enable decision-making by local actors over how adaptation actions are defined, prioritized, designed and implemented;*
- d) *That the maximum size of the PFG for all regional projects, inclusive of the management fee, is set as follows:*
  - (i) For regional projects of US\$ 5,000,000 and above, and with less than three countries, the limit is set at US\$ 150,000;*
  - (ii) That this limit increase by US\$ 15,000 for each additional country involved, up to a maximum of US\$ 250,000;*
- e) *That requests for a PFG should be made at the same time as the submission of a project concept or pre-concept to the secretariat using the revised PFG form in annex I to document AFB/PPRC.33/40;*

- f) *That, for a PFG at the pre-concept stage, up to 20 percent of the maximum amount of the PFG set in out in subparagraphs (b), (c) and (d) above could be granted;*
- g) *That only activities that support project preparation and formulation would be eligible for PFG funding, as per paragraph 32 of document AFB/PPRC.33/40.*

*(Decision B.42/37)*

## **II. The Project Formulation Grant Request**

8. This addendum to the document, AFB/PPRC.37/37 “LLA Single Country Proposal for South Africa” includes a request for a Project Formulation Grant (PFG), requesting a total budget of US\$ 248,568, comprising a PFG of US\$ 149,247 plus an additional PFG amount of US\$ 99,321, which was received by the secretariat along with the concept note proposal for the project AF00000489 “Upscaling and Enhancing the Locally-led Adaptation Small Grants Facility for South Africa Phase 1”. This proposal was submitted by South Africa National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI), which is a National Implementing Entity of the Adaptation Fund, in time for consideration by the Adaptation Fund Board at its forty-sixth Board meeting.

9. 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. The US\$ 149,247 Project Formulation Grant (PFG) will support core project formulation activities, including district climate risk and vulnerability assessment, safeguards screening aligned to the Adaptation Fund ESP, stakeholder consultations, capacity development, and project development services (including specialist inputs) to prepare a fully developed proposal, with targeted national consultations to support scalability. The additional US\$ 99,321 PFG amount will support supplementary locally led adaptation measures to enable devolution, including deeper community co-design and participation support, localisation of USP operations (including the USP Management Plan and community-level GRM/disclosure), piloting simplified access and proportionate fiduciary processes, and co-developing and training on community-led MEL tools, alongside related management oversight.

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



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

**Submission Date:** ~~TBC 27 January 2026~~ 24 February 2026

**Adaptation Fund Project ID:** TBC

**Country/ies:** South Africa

**Title of Project/Programme:** Upscaling and Enhancing the Locally-led Adaptation Small Grants Facility for South Africa Phase 1

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

**Implementing Entity:** South African National Biodiversity Institute

**Executing Entity/ies:** ~~SANBI~~ To be confirmed

**A. Project Preparation Timeframe**

<b>Start date of PFG</b>	TBC
<b>Completion date of PFG</b>	TBC

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

The requested PFG is split between core activities as part of the USD 150 000 cap (~~Table 1~~ Table 1) that establish the analytical, safeguards and participatory basis for the fully developed proposal, focusing on district vulnerability assessment, safeguards screening, structured stakeholder consultations, targeted capacity-building, project development services and limited national consultations to support scalability. The supplementary allocation under the additional USD 100 000 cap (~~Table 2~~ Table 2) is requested to enable devolution to the lowest appropriate level through deeper local engagement, localisation of USP operations, and co-development of community-led MEL tools. This split balances essential compliance and design parameters with incremental LLA measures that lower participation barriers and embed local decision-making and accountability. The detailed budget which includes the budget notes can be found here.: Detailed budget with budget notes . . .

**Table 1. Core PFG activities within the USD 150 000 cap**

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note <sup>2</sup>
1. District vulnerability assessment, safeguards screening and stakeholder consultations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1: Climate risk and vulnerability analysis and district risk profiles linking hazards to exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity, with quantitative mapping and qualitative insights</li> </ul>	68 020	A-E

<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.

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note <sup>2</sup>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.2: Cross-sectoral consultations with PDMs and stakeholders; policy/project mapping and synergy analysis</li> <li>• 1.3: Community consultations to assess receiving environment, socioeconomic context, gender-differentiated needs and indigenous knowledge; education/awareness materials co-developed</li> <li>• 1.4: Safeguards screening aligned to AF ESP at programme and anticipated USP levels; proportionate instruments and integration with disclosure/GRM</li> <li>• 1.5: Co-design of devolved governance and management arrangements clarifying local decision-making and risk management roles under Component 2</li> </ul>		
2. Capacity development and project development services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.1: Training workshops on ESP/ESS, gender, fiduciary, MEL and reporting for EE, DFFE, SANBI, PDMs and community representatives</li> <li>• 2.2: Co-development of small-grant application and evaluation templates, selection criteria and proportionate due diligence</li> <li>• 2.3: Technical services for FDP drafting and specialist advisory (gender analysis and GAP, ESS, MEL, economic efficiency)</li> </ul>	63 760	F-H
3. National grant facility consultations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.1: Stakeholder mapping and consultations with DFFE, National Treasury, National Adaptation Funds Advisory Board, Adaptation Network, private sector, philanthropies, donors and the Climate Change Response Fund</li> <li>• 3.2: Policy/legal landscape assessment and intergovernmental pathway scoping</li> <li>• 3.3: Roadmap for a national LLA facility framework</li> </ul>	5 775	I-K
<u>Sub-total</u>		<u>137 555</u>	
<u>IE Management fee (8.5%)</u>		<u>11 692</u>	
<b><u>Total</u></b>		<b><u>149 247</u></b>	

**Table 2. Supplementary PFG activities within the additional USD 100 000 cap**

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note <sup>3</sup>
1. Deeper local engagement and design support to enable devolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.1: Iterative community co-design rounds, site visits and feedback sessions with translation and accessible formats</li> <li>• 1.2: Participation support for inclusivity (childcare, transport stipends)</li> <li>• 1.3: Facilitation by local organisations; co-development of simplified USP eligibility and user support materials</li> <li>• 1.4: Localisation of USP Management Plan, community GRM channels and simplified access and fiduciary pilots</li> </ul>	32 650	L-N
2. Localisation of USP Management Plan, community GRM channels and simplified access and fiduciary pilots	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.1: Localisation of the USP Management Plan with guidance, templates and training modules for community applicants and district partners</li> <li>• 2.2: Establishment and communication of community-level grievance redress channels and disclosure mechanisms</li> <li>• 2.3: Pilot of simplified application, appraisal and disbursement processes with proportionate due diligence and procurement</li> <li>• 2.4: Documentation of streamlined fiduciary SOPs and training for district partners</li> <li>• 2.5: Community-led MEL tools and training</li> </ul>	36 800	O-R
3. Community-led MEL tools and training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.1: Co-development and piloting of community MEL tools (participatory scorecards, seasonal risk tracking, outcome journaling) aligned to AF SRF</li> <li>• 3.2: Training of community organisations and local government on data collection, quality assurance, use of MEL for decision-making and reporting</li> <li>• 3.3: Integration of community-generated data flows into the project MEL system, including safeguarding and GRM linkages</li> </ul>	22 090	S-U
<b>Sub-total</b>		<b>91 540</b>	
<b>IE Management fee (8.5%)</b>		<b>7 781</b>	

<sup>3</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.

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note <sup>3</sup>
<u>Total</u>		<u>99 321</u>	

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

**For LLA Projects only:**

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

**Activity description and justification**

The requested PFG budget for this LLA project allocates approximately USD ~~149 247 45049 000~~ to three core activities to secure the analytical, safeguards, and participatory foundations for the fully-developed proposal, with expenditure focused on: i) district vulnerability assessment; ii) safeguards screening; iii) structured stakeholder consultations; iv) capacity-building; v) project development services; and vi) targeted national consultations to support scalability. The rationale for the requested supplementary allocation of approximately USD ~~99 321 40099 000~~ through three supplementary activities is based on enabling devolution to the lowest appropriate level through deeper local processes, localisation of unidentified sub-projects (USP) operations, and the co-development of community-led monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) tools. The split reflects the importance of core analysis and compliance in shaping design parameters and the incremental nature of the LLA package, which directly reduces barriers to participation and strengthens local decision-making and accountability.

**Core LLA Activity 1: District vulnerability assessment, safeguards screening and stakeholder consultations**

This activity, with a total proposed cost of USD ~~68 0208 020~~ (budget notes A-E), will generate district-specific climate risk profiles, align design parameters with the Adaptation Fund Environmental and Social Policy, and co-design devolved governance with district institutions and communities. Using downscaled municipal climate factsheets as a starting point, the assessment will apply geospatial and participatory methods to map hazard exposure, vulnerability and risk, paying explicit attention to gender-differentiated impacts and disproportionately vulnerable groups. Parallel safeguards screening at programme and anticipated USP levels will inform eligibility/exclusion lists, proportions and siting constraints, and define proportionate instruments for a devolved small-grants modality. Sequenced cross-sectoral consultations with PDMs and focused community processes will mainstream climate information locally, identify complementary district policies and initiatives, capture lessons from ongoing work, and shape decision-making arrangements under Component 2.

Sub-activities include:

- 1.1: Climate risk and vulnerability analysis and district risk profiles linking hazards to exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity, with quantitative mapping and qualitative insights
- 1.2: Cross-sectoral consultations with PDMs and stakeholders; policy/project mapping and synergy analysis

- 1.3: Community consultations to assess receiving environment, socioeconomic context, gender-differentiated needs and indigenous knowledge; education/awareness materials co-developed
- 1.4: Safeguards screening aligned to AF ESP at programme and anticipated USP levels; proportionate instruments and integration with disclosure/GRM
- 1.5: Co-design of devolved governance and management arrangements clarifying local decision-making and risk management roles under Component 2

### **Core LLA Activity 2: Capacity development and project development services**

This activity, with a total proposed cost of USD 63 760 (budget notes F-H), will prepare the Executing Entity, DFFE, SANBI, PDMs and community representatives to meet AF standards and implement devolved small grants, while securing specialist inputs to complete the FDP and technical annexes. Training will focus on ESP/ESS, gender, fiduciary management, MEL and reporting. Project development services will deliver the full gender analysis and action plan, safeguards packages and a quantitative economic analysis to substantiate efficiency and cost-effectiveness.

Sub-activities include:

- 2.1: Training workshops on ESP/ESS, gender, fiduciary, MEL and reporting for EE, DFFE, SANBI, PDMs and community representatives
- 2.2: Co-development of small-grant application and evaluation templates, selection criteria and proportionate due diligence
- 2.3: Technical services for FDP drafting and specialist advisory (gender analysis and GAP, ESS, MEL, economic efficiency)

### **Core LLA Activity 3: National grant facility consultations**

This activity, with a total proposed cost of USD 5 775 (budget notes I-K), will catalyse the enabling environment for a future national LLA adaptation grant facility by engaging government and strategic partners on governance and policy requirements, legal pathways and intergovernmental processes. It will align district lessons with national systems and reduce set-up time during implementation of Component 3.

Sub-activities include:

- 3.1: Stakeholder mapping and consultations with DFFE, National Treasury, National Adaptation Funds Advisory Board, Adaptation Network, private sector, philanthropies, donors and the Climate Change Response Fund
- 3.2: Policy/legal landscape assessment and intergovernmental pathway scoping
- 3.3: Roadmap for a national LLA facility framework

### **Supplementary LLA Activity 1: Deeper local engagement and design support to enable devolution**

This activity, with a total proposed cost of USD 32 650 (budget notes L-N), will fund multiple iterative rounds of local engagement in each PDM, translation and accessible formats, and participation support (childcare and transport stipends), with facilitation by trusted local organisations. The intensified process will refine adaptation priorities, validate trade-offs, and co-develop simple, context-appropriate eligibility criteria and tailored application support for USPs, directly enabling decision-making at the lowest appropriate level and reducing barriers for vulnerable groups.

Sub-activities include:

- 1.1: Iterative community co-design rounds, site visits and feedback sessions with translation and accessible formats
- 1.2: Participation support for inclusivity (childcare, transport stipends)
- 1.3: Facilitation by local organisations; co-development of simplified USP eligibility and user support materials
- 1.4: Localisation of USP Management Plan, community GRM channels and simplified access and fiduciary pilots

### **Supplementary LLA Activity 2: Localisation of USP Management Plan, community GRM channels and simplified access and fiduciary pilots**

This activity, with a total proposed cost of USD ~~32 650 6 800~~ (budget notes O-R), will operationalise devolution by localising the USP Management Plan, establishing and socialising community-level grievance redress channels, and piloting simplified access modalities and proportionate fiduciary controls suitable for low-risk, small-scale grants. Outputs will include step-by-step guidance, templates and SOPs aligned with SANBI systems to reduce administrative burdens while maintaining control effectiveness.

Sub-activities include:

- 2.1: Localisation of the USP Management Plan with guidance, templates and training modules for community applicants and district partners
- 2.2: Establishment and communication of community-level grievance redress channels and disclosure mechanisms
- 2.3: Pilot of simplified application, appraisal and disbursement processes with proportionate due diligence and procurement
- 2.4: Documentation of streamlined fiduciary SOPs and training for district partners
- 2.5: Community-led MEL tools and training

### **Supplementary LLA Activity 3: Community-led MEL tools and training**

This activity, with a total proposed cost of USD 22 090 (budget notes S-U), will co-develop and pilot simple, low-cost community-led MEL instruments aligned to the AF Strategic Results Framework, and train community organisations and district counterparts to collect, use and report data. Integration of community-generated data will strengthen feedback loops, grievance linkages and adaptive management for devolved implementation.

Sub-activities include:

- 3.1: Co-development and piloting of community MEL tools (participatory scorecards, seasonal risk tracking, outcome journaling) aligned to AF SRF
- 3.2: Training of community organisations and local government on data collection, quality assurance, use of MEL for decision-making and reporting
- 3.3: Integration of community-generated data flows into the project MEL system, including safeguarding and GRM linkages

### **Implementing Entity Management Fee**

The NIE proposes to utilise the management fee ~~of USD 19 473 25 000~~ from core (USD ~~149 247 5049 000~~) and supplementary (USD ~~99 321 10099 000~~) LLA activities as follows:

- Overall project oversight and supervision

- Quality assurance and compliance
- Adaptation Fund fiduciary standards oversight
- Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) and Gender Policy oversight
- Reporting to the Adaptation Fund

### 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>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date (Month, day, year)</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
South African National Biodiversity Institute			Dr Mandy Barnett	+27 21 799 8895	m.barnett@sanbi.org.za



**cooperative  
governance**

Department:  
Cooperative Governance  
**REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

Private Bag X804, Pretoria, 0001 Tel: (012) 334 0600, Fax: (012) 334 0603  
cnr Hamilton and Johannes Ramokhoase Street, Arcadia, Pretoria

Reference: 15/3/1/2

**Ms Shakhira Parker**

National Designated Authority (NDA)  
Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment  
Private Bag X477  
**Pretoria**  
0001

Dear Ms Shakhira Parker

**ENDORSEMENT OF THE GREEN CLIMATE FUND (GCF) AND ADAPTATION FUND (AF) PROJECT PROPOSALS**

The Department of Cooperative Governance (DCOG) is pleased to formally endorse and express its full commitment to participating in the development of the key Green Climate Fund (GCF) and Adaptation Fund (AF) projects, led by the South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) in its capacity as a Direct Access Entity and National Implementing Entity for the country working with the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE) as the National Designated Authority.

This is to confirm that DCOG supports the development of the GCF and AF proposal pipeline for the following projects:

1. Eco-DRR Project: Scaling up Ecosystem-based Approaches to managing climate-intensified disaster risks in vulnerable regions in South Africa.
2. EbA-Farm Project: Ecosystem-based Approaches for transforming smallholder farming systems vulnerable to climate change impacts in South Africa.
3. EbA-Water Project: Ecosystem-based Adaptation for water security in South Africa.
4. Upscaling and Enhancing the Locally-led Adaptation Small Grants Facility for South Africa: Mainstreaming locally-led climate adaptation (LLA) response strategies into local practices in four targeted district municipalities.

Furthermore, as a key partner in representing and advocating for cooperative governance and strengthened institutional mechanisms at the sub-national and local government level, DCOG is fully committed to supporting these initiatives, which align with the efforts to enhance resilience at the local government level and transform municipal practices in addressing climate challenges.

**ENDORSEMENT OF THE GREEN CLIMATE FUND (GCF) AND ADAPTATION FUND (AF) PROJECT PROPOSALS**

Contact Senzi Malaza: Director: Infrastructure Planning on Tel: (012) 395-4661 or email: SenziM@cogta.gov.za for more information related to this matter.

Kind regards



**MR M TSHANGANA**  
**DIRECTOR-GENERAL: COOPERATIVE GOVERNANCE**  
**DATE: 23 APRIL 2025**