



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.38/10/Add.1
10 September 2026

Adaptation Fund Board
Project and Programme Review Committee
Thirty eighth Meeting
Bonn, Germany, 19-23 October 2026

Agenda Item 4 (g)

PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR BURUNDI

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.38/10 “Proposal for Burundi” includes a request for a Project Formulation Grant, requesting a budget of US\$ 150,000, which was received by the secretariat along with the concept for the AF00000430 “Strengthening resilience to extreme weather events - drought and flooding - for smallholder farmers in the rural regions of Burundi”. This proposal was submitted by Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS), which is a Regional Implementing Entity of the Adaptation Fund, in time for consideration by the Adaptation Fund Board at its forty-seventh 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 technical feasibility and design studies, institutional and partnership assessment, economic and financial analysis, comprehensive consultation process; vulnerability assessment and safeguards and full proposal development.

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



Project Title	Strengthening resilience to extreme weather events - drought and flooding - for smallholder farmers in the rural regions of Burundi
----------------------	---

AF00000430

Regular size project (over \$1 million)

Single country project

Concept

Burundi

OSS

USD 10,000,000.00

Lystra Fletcher-Paul Fletcher-Paul

Co-reviewer(s)

IE Contact Person

Khaoua JAOUI, Nabil Benkhatra, Steve MUHANJI

Secretariat's Overall Comment

The project “Strengthening resilience to extreme weather events - drought and flooding - for smallholder farmers in the rural regions of Burundi” aims to enhance the adaptive capacity and resilience of rural communities in Burundi, particularly small-scale farmers in "last-mile communities," in response to the negative impacts of climate change and land degradation.

The proposal includes a PFG request of 150,000 USD.

The initial technical review highlighted several issues, such as the need to amend the financing overview, estimation of the environmental benefits, sustainability of initiative, full cost of adaptation reasoning and findings of the initial gender assessment as discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.

This second technical review finds that some of the issues raised in the initial review were not thoroughly addresses such as project/programme cost-effectiveness, alignment with results framework of the adaptation fund, ESS issues in particular clarity on gender assessment and incorporation of discussion with indigenous people and clarifying the EE for the PFG as reflected in the remaining Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) included in the review.

This third technical review still finds key issues such as the feasibility of the proposed solutions and Results Framework as reflected in the remaining Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) included in the review.

This fourth technical review still finds key issues such as the Theory of Change, Adaptation Rationale, the feasibility of the proposed solutions, and Results Framework as reflected in the remaining Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) included in the review.

The fifth technical review still finds that a few issues such as inconsistencies in the Activities and Output totals, and the Results Framework as reflected in the remaining Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) included in the review.

The sixth technical review still finds that only the IE signature is missing as reflected in the remaining Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) included in the review.

The final technical review finds that the previous comments raised have been fully addressed

Country Eligibility

Is the country party to the Kyoto Protocol, or the Paris Agreement?

Response: Yes

Secretariat: April 24, 2025

Project Eligibility

Does the length of the proposal amount to no more than Fifty pages for the project/programme concept, including its annexes?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR2: Not Cleared.

While the proposal is ambitious, the Theory of Change lacks a cohesive narrative, and the Adaptation Rationale remains fundamentally disconnected from the proposed activities. Rather than a unified strategy, the project appears to be a fragmented collection of "digital products" that may not directly translate into climate resilience for smallholder farmers. The current structure is as follows:

Component 1: High-tech infrastructure including a Blockchain-Based Traceability System for livestock, a National Warehouse Receipt System for commodity storage, and an Online E-commerce Platform for market access (USD 2.2M).

Component 2: On-the-ground interventions in beekeeping and syntropic agroforestry practices (USD 3.95M)

Component 3: Extensive "soft" interventions such as capacity building, digital literacy training, and institutional strengthening (USD 1.65M)

Component 4: Knowledge management and dissemination of lessons learned (USD 700K)

While the proposed tools are innovative, there is a concern that the design may currently emphasize "Market Development" over "Climate Adaptation." It would be beneficial to consolidate these diverse initiatives into a more focused strategy that clearly demonstrates how each component directly contributes to reducing climate vulnerability. Please provide a strengthened Adaptation Rationale that ensures the project remains practical and impactful within the specific context of Burundi.

CR11 (New):

1. Component 2 represents a significant portion of the total budget (46% / USD 3.95M), with USD 3M specifically allocated to Output 2.2.1. Given the scale of this investment, further granular detail regarding the specific activities and their breakdown cost is required. Please also clarify how these interventions directly translate into concrete climate adaptation outcomes for the target beneficiaries.
2. Please update the latest date of the submission on the cover page at the stage of submission of the proposal.
3. Please update the project calendar to update the start of implementation of the project since the current proposal stage is concept note.
4. At the components financing table please remove the decimal points in the figures associated with component 2.

May 8, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR2: Cleared

The concept note has been revised to strengthen the adaptation rationale and present the project as an integrated climate adaptation system. Para 30(c), 32, 33, have been amended to clarify that the proposed interventions are designed and implemented as a single integrated climate adaptation system. Para 46–51, 59, have been revised to strengthen the adaptation rationale and to better articulate the causal link between Burundi's climate vulnerabilities including drought, flooding, land degradation, ecosystem degradation, and livelihood insecurity and the proposed project interventions. The revised text now clarifies that Comp. 2 provides the core ecosystem-based adaptation measures aimed at reducing physical climate vulnerability; Comp.1 supports climate-risk management and helps protect adaptation gains from climate-related shocks; Comp 3 strengthens livelihood resilience and supports the sustainability of adaptation investments; and Comp 4 reinforces the knowledge, governance, and institutional systems required for longer-term resilience and replication.

In addition, the ToC in Annex 3 has been adjusted to reflect this integrated logic more clearly, so that the project is presented as a coherent adaptation pathway rather than as a set of stand-alone innovations or market-oriented products.

CR11(New):

1. Not cleared: The concept note has been revised to provide greater detail on Comp 2 and to clarify how these investments will generate concrete adaptation benefits for target beneficiaries. Paras 78, 79, 80, and 81 have been updated to further disaggregate Outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 2.2.1, including the main sub-activities and associated cost breakdowns. The revised text now clarifies how these activities will support ecosystem restoration, soil and water conservation, adaptive capacity-building, and climate-resilient livelihood diversification for vulnerable smallholder farmers. However, for Activities 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2 the totals of the sub-activities do not coincide with the Activity amount. (e.g. Activity 2.2.1.1, the sum of allocations for the subactivities are: $170,000 + 450,000 + 180,000 + 200,000 = 1,000,000$ not 900,000. Similarly for Activity 2.2.1.2 the total of $220,000 + 260,000 + 400,000 + 120,000 = 1,000,000$ not 900,000). Please revise the allocations for these sub-activities to ensure that their totals coincide with the allocation for the Activity.

In addition, although the Project Components table has been updated to improve the presentation, the total amount for Output 2.2.1 in the Project Component table (page 20) does not coincide with the total of the Activities for that output as described in paragraph 81. (i.e: Activities $2.2.1.1 + 2.2.1.2 + 2.2.1.3 + 2.2.1.4 = 900,000 + 900,000 + 700,000 + 600,000 = 3,100,000$ not 3,000,000 as is stated in the Project Components Table (pages 20). Please revise the figures to ensure that they coincide

2. Cleared: The cover page has been updated with the latest submission date,

3. Not Cleared: The project calendar has been revised to reflect the concept note stage of the proposal. However, the proposed date of the Mid-term review does not fall mid-way between the start and end dates of the project (i.e. from 2028/10/01 to 30/01/01 is 15 months but from 2030/01/01 to 2031/12/01 is approximately 23 months.

4. Cleared: The decimal points in the figures associated with component 2 in the Project Components Table (page 20)

June 22, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR11: Cleared

1. The allocations under Output 2.2.1 have been revised to address the identified inconsistencies. The sub-activity allocations under Activities 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.1.2 have been adjusted to ensure that they each total USD 900,000. The allocation for Activity 2.2.1.3 has also been revised to USD 600,000, ensuring that the total

allocation for Output 2.2.1 amounts to USD 3,000,000. The corresponding figures have been updated for consistency across the concept note.

3. The Projected Calendar has been revised to place the Mid-Term Review on 1 May 2030, approximately halfway between the proposed project implementation start date of 1 October 2028 and the project closing date of 1 December 2031.

Aug 11, 2026

Does the project / programme support concrete adaptation actions to assist the country in addressing adaptive capacity to the adverse effects of climate change and build in climate resilience?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

The goal of the project is to enhance the adaptive capacity and resilience of rural communities in Burundi, particularly small-scale farmers in "last-mile communities," in response to the negative impacts of climate change and land degradation. Adaptation actions include 1) national parametric insurance scheme for resilience in the agriculture sector, 2) building adaptive capacity of farmers through training in use of climate information and risk management, and 3) establishing cooperatives and supporting opportunities for income diversification through value added products. Syntrophic agroforestry practices are also embedded to support agriculture and address land degradation issues.

These activities support two of the AF strategic objectives: action and innovation (e.g. parametric insurance for farmers).

CR3: Component 4 appears to be a mixture of policy or strategy development and knowledge management. Please clarify if an adaptation strategy be developed or will these processes under this component only inform adaptation strategies or environmental policies that will be developed external to the project?

CAR1: Please clarify how the project will address the "current paradigm" specifically related to changing attitudes and practices of the communities as none of the activities seem to specifically address this and can impact the sustainability of the project outcomes.

April 24, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR3: Cleared as per information in paragraph 84. Outcome 4.1 clearly indicates the development of enabling policies.

CAR1: Cleared as per information in paragraphs 83, 87- 88. The concept elaborates on activities to influence the current paradigm.

June 17, 2025

Does the project / programme provide economic, social and environmental benefits, particularly to vulnerable communities, including gender considerations, while avoiding or mitigating negative impacts, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR2: Not Cleared.

Initial Gender Assessment was completed (p.53 and Annex 4). The comprehensive Gender Analysis and Action Plan will be developed using the PFG. However, the PFG application form was not submitted with the proposal

neither is it indicated on the cover page of the proposal that a PFG is being sought.

Please include the PFG Application Form with the revised proposals.

- Request for Project Formulation Grant (PFG) (57 kB, DOC)
- PFG Amount Calculator (EXCEL)

May 8, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR2: Cleared

The revised submission now includes the Revised PFG Application Form. In addition, the cover page of the concept note has been updated to indicate that a PFG is being sought, and the requested PFG amount is now reflected accordingly. The PFG-related information has also been aligned across the revised proposal package to ensure consistency between the concept note and the accompanying PFG documentation.

CR1 (NEW):

1. Please verify if the PFG will be implemented by OSS or by Africa Apiculture Consortium (AAC) and Office Burundais pour la Protection de l'Environnement (OBPE). If OSS will be executing the PFG please update the PFG form to reflect this.
2. Please remove the details for the IE fee breakdown in the PFG as this is not required.

June 22, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR1: Cleared

The revised PFG form confirms the PFG activities will be executed by AAC as the lead Executing Entity in partnership with OBPE. The detailed breakdown of the Implementing Entity fee has also been removed from the PFG form, as requested.

Aug 11, 2026

Is the project / programme cost effective?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR4: Not Cleared.

While the additional details in paragraphs 158–164 are appreciated, this blockchain-based livestock traceability system represent a first-of-its-kind technology. To ensure feasibility, please provide information on any pilot testing (past or planned) and elaborate on the lessons learned, particularly regarding its practical application within the specific context of Burundi.

CR5: Not Cleared.

The additional details in paragraphs 64–66 are noted. The proposed Warehouse Receipt System includes various user fees (e.g., storage fees, quality testing charges, transaction commissions, insurance service fee).

1. Please provide evidence that the proposed fee structure will not create a barrier to entry for marginalized and vulnerable farmers.

2. Additionally, please provide a stronger climate adaptation rationale to justify how this system constitutes a concrete adaptation measure rather than a general agricultural development or market-access tool.

CR6: Not Cleared.

The additional details in paragraphs 87-89 and table 5 are noted.

While the proposal explains the digital marketplace's ownership structure, two critical concerns remain unaddressed:

1) Alignment of Incentives and Commercial Viability: As previously mentioned, the successful models cited (e.g., Twiga Foods) were driven by market-led agility and venture capital. In contrast, this project is primarily grant-funded and governed by a multi-stakeholder board (19% government and 51% cooperatives). The proposal does not yet sufficiently explain how this institutional structure will replicate the commercial efficiency and performance-based incentives necessary to sustain the platform. Please provide a detailed "exit strategy" and clarify how the platform will remain competitive, adapt to shifting market demands, and achieve financial self-sufficiency once the grant support concludes.

2) Physical Logistics and Supply Chain Integration: A digital platform is only a partial solution to market access. The proposal lacks a concrete logistics and infrastructure plan for the actual physical movement of goods.

Specifically, please clarify:

1. Who will be operationally responsible for "last-mile" collection and transportation?
2. How will the integrity of the dry/cold chain be maintained during extreme weather events (floods/heatwaves) to ensure adaptation benefits?
3. What budgetary provisions are made for the maintenance of physical assets (trucks, collection centers)?

Without a viable strategy for physical delivery, the platform risks becoming a "passive listing site" rather than an active, resilient market connector.

May 8, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR4: Cleared

The concept note has been revised to further clarify the feasibility of the proposed blockchain-based livestock traceability system in the Burundi context. Paras 158, 159, 162, and 164 have been amended to explain that, at concept note stage, no stand-alone pilot has yet been completed under the project in Burundi and that the system will therefore be introduced through a phased pilot approach in selected target areas before wider roll-out. The revised text also reflects lessons from comparable livestock traceability initiatives, including the importance of phased introduction, stakeholder sensitization, simple and visible identification systems, and offline-capable/mobile-based data collection adapted to low-connectivity rural settings. In addition, the revised paragraphs clarify that the pilot phase will be used to assess uptake, data quality, functionality, and operational costs, and that any scale-up will be informed by the results and lessons generated through this feasibility phase.

CR5: Cleared

The concept note has been revised in paras 61, 64, 65, 66, and 68 to clarify that the proposed Warehouse Receipt System (WRS) is designed as a climate adaptation measure that reduces climate-related post-harvest losses, protects harvest quality under increasingly erratic rainfall and humidity conditions, improves farmers' ability to avoid distress sales after droughts and floods, and strengthens seasonal income stability for vulnerable rural households in Burundi. The revised text also clarifies that the proposed fee structure will not create an entry barrier for marginalized farmers because participation will be organized primarily through marketing groups/cooperatives, with broader warehouse volumes helping reduce unit costs, and with low or deferred charges rather than burdensome upfront payments; this is further reflected in the revisions to the operational and financial sustainability text under para 66.

African WRS experience showing that group participation improves accessibility and sustainability, while evidence from Ghana indicates that community-based models can operate with storage charges as low as USD 0.35 per 100 kg bag, considered affordable for smallholders because they avoid high collateral-management overhead. Overall, the revised paragraphs strengthen the rationale that the WRS is not merely a market-access tool, but part of the project's climate-risk management architecture for protecting harvests, reducing losses, and improving resilience to drought and flooding.

References

- World Bank Blog — Can warehouse receipts unlock farmer finance?
- FarmFit Insights Hub — Warehouse Receipt Systems

- The role of Warehouse Receipt Systems in Africa
- Athens Journals of Business & Economics — Structuring African Warehouse Receipt Systems to Succeed

CR6: Cleared

The concept note has been revised in paras 86–89 and 94 and a new figure depicting the operational logistics and exit strategy framework, has also been included in the revised concept note to visually present the logistics flow, resilience measures, and transition to self-sustaining service delivery. (Para 89).

The revised text now explains the platform’s exit strategy, including the separation between strategic oversight and day-to-day commercial management, and clarifies how the platform will transition from grant-supported establishment to a commercially self-sustaining model through transaction-based revenues and logistics service margins. It also specifies the physical logistics arrangement, including the role of commune-level cooperative aggregation centers and aggregation agents in first-mile collection and dispatch preparation, and the use of private transport and buyer logistics partners for onward delivery under performance-based contracts.

CR (NEW): Please explain what is meant by the term “logistic service margins”

Last-mile collection will be organized through commune-level cooperative aggregation points, where producer groups and designated aggregation agents will consolidate produce, complete first-level quality checks, and prepare lots for dispatch.

To maintain the integrity of the dry chain during floods and heatwaves, the platform will prioritize sealed packaging, pallets, tarpaulins, ventilated temporary storage, moisture control, and weather-informed dispatch planning based on climate alerts; any more temperature-sensitive products will only be traded where insulated handling or hired refrigerated capacity is commercially justified.

With respect to budgetary provisions for the maintenance of physical assets, as well as the financing arrangements for the maintenance of collection and handling assets, the concept note states that maintenance will be provided by private sector partners under service agreements. Financial sustainability is hoped to be achieved through transaction fees, subscription fees from agribusinesses, and premium services for market analytics and quality certification.

June 22, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR: Cleared

The term, Logistics service margins refers to the difference between the consolidated collection-and-delivery fee charged by the platform to buyers and off-takers and the lower bulk rates paid to contracted transport and logistics partners under framework agreements. This margin will support dispatch coordination and the continued provision of logistics services and, together with cooperative maintenance reserves, contribute to the maintenance of project-supported collection and handling assets. (see para 87)

Aug 11, 2026

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?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: N/A

Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR2(NEW): At table 7 please indicate how the project will be responsive to the regulations identified.

June 22, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR2: Cleared

Table 7 has been revised to specify how the project will comply with each identified regulation.

Aug 11, 2026

Is there duplication of project / programme with other funding sources?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR9: Cleared (Page 21)

The proposal clarifies the status of formal data access agreements and the integration of blockchain with existing infrastructure (paras. 55–56).

May 8, 2026

Does the project / programme have a learning and knowledge management component to capture and feedback lessons?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR10: Not Cleared

The results framework alignment table is revised (pages 159-160); however,

1. it still lacks target figures for the listed indicators.
2. Output 3.1: Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities is selected in the bottom part of the table, however the outcome associated with it is not selected in the top part of the table. Please note that the top and bottom part of the table are complementary. Please address.

May 8, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR10: Not Cleared

Although the Alignment table in Part III has been corrected and budget figures have been updated. There are still some areas which need to be adjusted. :

1. Cleared: Target figures for all listed indicators have been included;
2. Not Cleared. The AF Outcome indicators in the top part of the table do not complement the AF Output indicators in the lower part of the table. E.g. Output associated with outcome 1 is not identified in the bottom part of the table. Please ensure that the top and bottom parts of the table are complementary.
3. At Part II A, insert a para after para 108 that the project is aligned with AF outcomes 1,2,3,5,6,and 7.

June 22, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR10: Cleared

The Adaptation Fund alignment table in Part III has been revised to ensure complementarity between the outcomes in the upper section and the outputs and indicators in the lower section as per the guidance in OPG: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/04/Alignment-with-AF-Results-Framework-Template-and-guidance-Dec2025.docx> .

Para 109 has been inserted after paragraph 108 confirming alignment with AF Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7.
Aug 11, 2026

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?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR 11: (re-opened):

At table 9:

1. Please provide the dates for the consultation events.
2. Please present summary outcomes of the discussions and indicate how these were incorporated in the concept note development.

May 8, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR11: Cleared

Table 9 pg. 54-55 has been revised to:

- (i) include the dates of all consultation events, based on the records presented in Annex 2;
- (ii) summarize the main outcomes of the discussions, including issues raised by national stakeholders, community members, and indigenous and ethnic minority groups; and
- (iii) show how these inputs were reflected in the concept note, including adjustments to the adaptation rationale, component design, beneficiary targeting, governance arrangements, and inclusion measures.

June 22, 2026

Is the requested financing justified on the basis of full cost of adaptation reasoning?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: At section Part II section I:

1. At table under para 157 please change additionality to “with AF project/intervention”.
2. In the section please indicate that the proposal will be able to effectively deliver on it proposed objectives with AF resources.

June 22, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: The heading “Additionality” in the table under paragraph 157 has been changed to “With AF Project/Intervention.” The introductory text has also been revised to clarify the added value delivered through each component and to confirm that, with the requested Adaptation Fund resources, the proposal will be able to effectively deliver its proposed objectives.

Aug 11, 2026

Is the project / program aligned with AF's results framework?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR12: Not Relevant

Please refer to CAR10.

May 8, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR 12: Not cleared:

Please refer to CAR 10 response in response to CAR12.

June 22, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR 12: Cleared

This is noted. Please refer to the response provided under CAR10, where the AF alignment table was revised to ensure complementarity between the Adaptation Fund Outcome and Output indicators, and the project's alignment with AF Outcomes 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 was further clarified.

Aug 11, 2026

Has the sustainability of the project/programme outcomes been taken into account when designing the project?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: N/A

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?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: N/A

Resource Availability

Is the requested project / programme funding within the cap of the country?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: N/A

Is the Implementing Entity Management Fee at or below 8.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget before the fee?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: N/A

Are the Project/Programme Execution Costs at or below 9.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget (including the fee)?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: N/A

Eligibility of IE

Is the project/programme submitted through an eligible Implementing Entity that has been accredited by the Board?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes.

As per decision B.46/9.

May 8, 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR1(NEW): Project proposal should be signed in the Implementing Entity certification section by the IE coordinator in our records: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/apply-funding/implementing-entities/>

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR1(NEW): Cleared as per IE signature in the clean version of the proposal and the PFG



Revised PFG Submission Form¹

Project Formulation Grant (PFG)

Submission Date: 1 June, 2026

Adaptation Fund Project ID:

Country/ies: Burundi

Title of Project/Programme: Strengthening resilience to extreme weather events - drought and flooding - for smallholder farmers in the rural regions of Burundi

Type of IE (NIE/RIE/MIE): Regional Implementing Entity

Implementing Entity: Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS)

Executing Entity/ies: Africa Apiculture Consortium (AAC); Office Burundais pour la Protection de l'Environnement (OBPE)

A. Project Preparation Timeframe

Start date of PFG	November, 2026
Completion date of PFG	June 2027

B. Proposed Project Preparation Activities (\$)

Table B1. Detailed budget notes by activity — USD 150,000

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note
1. Technical Feasibility and Design Studies	Technical feasibility and design package completed, including climate risk analysis, GIS-based targeting, agroforestry/apiculture design parameters, and technical feasibility assessment for blockchain traceability and warehouse receipt system architecture.	28,000	Covers specialist inputs, field verification, climate/weather and hydrological analysis, GIS/spatial mapping, technical design options, and integration of technical findings into full proposal preparation.
2. Environmental and Social Safeguards	Environmental and Social Screening Report, Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), mitigation measures, and	21,000	Covers safeguards specialist inputs, site screening, biodiversity and land-use risk review, social-risk analysis, consultation/disclosure

¹ As presented in AFB/PPRC.33/40 Annex 1.

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note
	safeguards monitoring framework prepared in accordance with Adaptation Fund requirements.		support, and drafting/finalization of the ESMP and safeguards package.
3. Gender mainstreaming operationalization and GAAP integration	Operationalize and integrate the completed Gender Analysis and Action Plan (GAAP) into the full proposal, including refinement of gender-responsive indicators, targets, budget provisions, implementation measures, and limited validation consultations to confirm final design and inclusion arrangements in target areas.	18,000	Covers gender/social inclusion specialist inputs, community consultations and FGDs, data collection and analysis, preparation of gender-responsive implementation measures, and validation/finalization.
4. Institutional and Partnership Assessment	Institutional capacity assessment, stakeholder mapping, implementation roles matrix, partnership roadmap, and partner engagement strategy completed.	9,500	Covers assessment of implementing/executing arrangements, stakeholder and institutional mapping, partnership consultations, governance and coordination analysis, and preparation of the institutional assessment note. Assess capacities of executing entities (OBPE, AAC).
5. Economic and Financial Analysis	Cost-effectiveness analysis, economic and financial appraisal, sustainability assessment, and detailed activity-based budget for the full proposal completed.	16,000	Covers financial/economic specialist inputs, cost-benefit and sustainability analysis, market/value-chain review, costing assumptions, and consolidation of the detailed full proposal budget.
6. Stakeholder Consultations and Validation	Stakeholder consultation report, validated design inputs, consultation records, and strengthened engagement framework for the full proposal completed.	22,000	Covers national and subnational consultations, community meetings, facilitation, travel and logistics, translation/materials where needed, consultation documentation, and integration of results into proposal design.

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note
7. Full Proposal Development and Quality Assurance	Full Adaptation Fund proposal package prepared, including narrative, results framework, implementation arrangements, workplan, M&E structure, annexes, and validation-ready final draft.	25,000	Covers proposal drafting, technical consolidation, results framework and M&E preparation, validation/review process, editing/formatting, annex integration, and final quality assurance prior to submission.
8. Implementing Entity Management Fee	Technical backstopping, quality control, fiduciary/administrative oversight, coordination, and final submission support provided by the Implementing Entity.	10,500	Covers project cycle management services by the IE, including technical review, quality assurance, financial oversight, coordination with partners, and submission/reporting support. A separate IE management fee use table should be included.
	Total	150,000	

Table B2. Implementing Entity management fee use — USD 10,500

IE management fee use category	Description of services covered	Amount (US\$)
Technical backstopping and strategic review	Technical guidance to ensure that all PFG outputs are coherent, aligned with Adaptation Fund requirements, and integrated into a single high-quality full proposal package.	3,200
Quality assurance and compliance oversight	Review of deliverables for quality, consistency, safeguards, gender responsiveness, fiduciary soundness, and proposal completeness prior to final submission.	2,500
Financial oversight and grant administration	Internal oversight of grant use, budget control, disbursement review, and administrative/fiduciary management of the PFG process.	2,200
Coordination, reporting, and submission support	Coordination with executing entities and national counterparts, consolidation of PFG outputs, and preparation/review of the final submission package and reporting.	2,600
Total IE management fee		10,500

Total Project Formulation Grant: \$150,000

Detailed Description and Justification of PFG Activities

1. Technical Feasibility and Design Studies

This activity will focus on conducting essential technical assessments to validate the project's innovative approaches and ensure successful implementation. The team will undertake comprehensive crop vulnerability assessments across the 12 target communes to identify the most climate-resilient varieties and determine appropriate insurance parameters for the parametric products. Food insecurity mapping will be conducted using GIS technology and household surveys to understand baseline conditions and target the most vulnerable communities effectively. The blockchain technology assessment will evaluate existing platforms, infrastructure requirements, and integration possibilities with local systems, ensuring the traceability system is technically feasible and culturally appropriate. Weather pattern analysis will examine 20-year historical climate data and future projections to inform both the insurance product design and agroforestry planning. Technical consultants with expertise in agricultural systems, climate science, and blockchain technology will conduct field assessments and develop detailed technical specifications for all innovative components. Its justification is to ensure interventions are context-appropriate, technically sound, and cost-effective, tailored feasibility studies are essential. These studies will guide the selection of technologies, assess scalability, and identify potential limitations, reducing implementation risk and enhancing long-term sustainability. The expected output will include:

1. Feasibility reports
2. Climate vulnerability and risk maps
3. Design options and technical specifications

2. Environmental and Social Safeguards

This critical activity ensures full compliance with the Adaptation Fund's Environmental and Social Policy given the project's Category B classification. Environmental and social specialists will conduct comprehensive impact assessments across all 12 target communes, examining potential risks and developing appropriate mitigation measures. The Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) will address identified risks including land use changes, biodiversity impacts, and social dynamics related to new technology adoption. Documentation will include detailed risk assessments, mitigation strategies, monitoring protocols, and grievance mechanisms to ensure environmental and social safeguards are effectively implemented throughout the project lifecycle. Its justification is to have early identification of potential negative impacts ensures that appropriate mitigation and monitoring measures are integrated into the full proposal. This is crucial for compliance, community acceptance, and sustainability of the project. The expected outputs will include:

1. Environmental and Social Screening Report
2. ESMP with mitigation and monitoring plans

3. Gender Mainstreaming Operationalization and GAAP Integration

This activity will operationalize and integrate the completed Gender Analysis and Action Plan (GAAP) into the full proposal and implementation arrangements. Rather than conducting a new stand-alone gender analysis, the activity will translate the findings of the completed GAAP into project-specific design features, implementation measures, institutional responsibilities, gender-responsive indicators, targets, and budget provisions. Limited targeted consultations will be undertaken only where necessary to validate final implementation arrangements, confirm inclusion measures in the target areas, and ensure that the full proposal adequately reflects the practical needs and priorities of women, youth, and vulnerable groups. Particular attention will continue to be given to indigenous peoples' rights and to ensuring that the final proposal reflects appropriate safeguards and inclusion measures for Twa communities. A detailed Gender Analysis and Action Plan has already been conducted during concept note development. The PFG allocation is therefore not intended to duplicate that work, but to ensure that its findings are fully operationalized in the full proposal, including integration into component design, implementation arrangements, safeguards, monitoring systems, and budgeting. This is essential to ensure that the final proposal is fully aligned with the Adaptation Fund's Gender Policy and Action Plan and that gender-responsive measures are practical, costed, and implementation-ready.

The expected outputs will include:

1. Completed GAAP fully integrated into the full proposal
2. Finalized gender-responsive indicators, targets, and implementation measures

3. Gender-responsive budget provisions and monitoring arrangements
4. Validated inclusion measures for women, youth, and vulnerable groups in the target areas

4. Institutional and Partnership Assessment

This activity will strengthen the institutional and partnership arrangements necessary for successful project implementation while maintaining AAC and OBPE as the Executing Entities. The assessment will review the implementation roles, technical capacities, and operational readiness of AAC and OBPE, identifying any specific capacity support needs required for full proposal implementation. It will also clarify coordination arrangements between OSS, AAC, and OBPE and define how additional technical or private-sector partnerships may support implementation without changing the established executing-entity structure. Partnership discussions with technical service providers, market actors, and other relevant stakeholders will therefore be framed as complementary arrangements to support delivery by AAC and OBPE, rather than as substitutes for their execution role. A strong institutional framework is vital for effective execution and sustainability. This assessment will clarify implementation roles, confirm coordination arrangements, identify capacity needs, and support the preparation of implementation modalities while maintaining AAC and OBPE as the project's Executing Entities. This assessment will clarify roles, highlight capacity needs, and establish the basis for collaboration through Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) or Letters of Agreement. The expected outputs will include:

1. Institutional capacity assessment report
2. Stakeholder mapping
3. Partnership strategy or implementation arrangements and framework

5. Economic and Financial Analysis

This activity will develop a comprehensive financial framework ensuring project sustainability and demonstrating value for money. Financial analysts will conduct detailed cost-benefit analyses with 20-year projections, examining the economic returns of different project components including blockchain traceability, parametric insurance, and agroforestry systems. Economic modeling will assess the potential income increases for farmers through improved market access and reduced climate risks. Market research will examine demand for certified organic bee and agroforestry products, identifying price premiums and market opportunities. The financial sustainability framework will design mechanisms for continuing the insurance scheme and technology platforms beyond the project period, including cost-recovery models and partnership arrangements. Budget development will create detailed financial plans with activity-based costing, procurement schedules, and cash flow projections. The analysis will demonstrate how the \$10 million investment will generate sustainable economic benefits for 24,000 farmers while enhancing climate resilience across 3,617 km² of land as well as demonstrating value for money and inform prioritization of activities. The analysis will strengthen the proposal by providing a rationale for chosen interventions and co-financing strategies (if any). The expected outputs will include:

1. Cost-effectiveness analysis
2. Financial sustainability assessment
3. Justification for investment decisions

6. Stakeholder consultations

This activity will involve undertaking stakeholder mapping and preparing a stakeholder engagement plan to establish protocols for meaningful participation of all groups, especially women, youth, and marginalized communities. The consultations will engage a broad range of actors, including community members, indigenous populations, local authorities, government agencies, civil society organizations (CSOs), women's groups, youth associations, technical experts, and private sector actors, to inform the detailed design of the full proposal. Particular attention will be paid to indigenous peoples' rights, ensuring proper Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) processes for Twa communities, where applicable. Community consultations will be conducted in local languages with culturally appropriate methods to ensure genuine participation. Stakeholder consultations are essential to ensure that the project design is inclusive, context-specific, and aligned with the priorities of those most affected by climate change. Engaging diverse actors, particularly vulnerable groups such as women, youth, and smallholder farmers, enables the identification and validation of local adaptation needs, knowledge, and capacities. These consultations promote community ownership, validate proposed interventions, and reduce implementation risks by addressing social, environmental, and cultural concerns early in the process. They also strengthen coordination among partners,

support compliance with the Adaptation Fund's Gender and Environmental and Social Policies, and contribute to the refinement of sustainable, locally led adaptation solutions.

The expected outputs will include:

1. Stakeholder consultation report with summary of participants, locations, and feedback
2. Community-defined adaptation priorities and risks
3. Inputs to the ESMP and to the operationalization of the completed GAAP
4. FPIC documentation where applicable

7. Full Proposal Development

This activity will synthesize all previous assessments and studies into a comprehensive Full Proposal document that meets all Adaptation Fund requirements. Project design specialists will integrate technical, environmental, social, gender, institutional, and financial assessments into a cohesive implementation strategy. The complete Full Proposal will include detailed component descriptions, implementation timelines, risk management frameworks, and monitoring protocols. The implementation plan will establish clear timelines with critical path analysis, procurement schedules, and coordination mechanisms between executing entities. The results framework will define measurable indicators aligned with the Adaptation Fund's results framework, establishing targets and monitoring protocols. The monitoring and evaluation plan will design systems for tracking progress, measuring impact, and ensuring adaptive management throughout implementation. Quality assurance processes will ensure the Full Proposal meets all AF standards and guidelines while maintaining consistency with the approved concept note objectives and outcomes.

The expected outputs will include:

1. Complete draft and final full proposal
2. All required annexes, including budget, ESMP, and integration of the completed GAAP
3. Submission-ready documentation

8. IE Management Fee

The Implementing Entity management fee supports OSS oversight and quality control throughout the PFG implementation period. This includes technical backstopping from OSS climate and development experts who will provide guidance on project design and ensure alignment with best practices in climate adaptation. Quality control measures will ensure all PFG deliverables meet international standards and Adaptation Fund requirements. Regular supervision and monitoring will track PFG progress, identify potential issues, and provide solutions to ensure timely completion. Technical support will include access to OSS networks and expertise in climate finance, technology transfer, and regional development. The management fee also covers reporting requirements to the Adaptation Fund Secretariat, financial management oversight, and coordination with national authorities. OSS will leverage its regional presence and experience implementing similar projects to ensure the PFG produces a high-quality Full Proposal that maximizes the project's potential for climate adaptation impact in Burundi. The expected outputs will include:

1. Timely execution and reporting of PFG activities
2. Compliance with fiduciary and operational standards
3. Coordination across partners and stakeholders

9. Expected Timeline

The eight-month PFG implementation period will follow an efficient timeline designed to maximize synergies between activities. It will be implemented by executing entities AAC (laed) and OBPE (partner). **Months 1–3** will focus on technical feasibility studies and environmental and social safeguards work, establishing the foundation for detailed design. **Months 4–5** will emphasize institutional assessments, partnership development, and stakeholder engagement, while continuing any targeted validation work needed to finalize implementation arrangements. **Months 6–8** will concentrate on economic and financial analysis, integration of all technical inputs, and development of the Full Proposal, ensuring that all components are consolidated into a coherent implementation strategy. This timeline leverages the preliminary work already undertaken during concept note development, including the completed GAAP, while allowing sufficient time to translate existing analytical work into a robust, submission-ready full proposal.

C. Implementing Entity

This request has been prepared in accordance with the Adaptation Fund Board's procedures and meets the Adaptation Fund's criteria for project identification and formulation

Implementing Entity Coordinator, IE Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Mr. Nabil BENKHATRA		06/01/2026	Ms. Khaoula JAOUI	(+216) 71 206 633	khaoula.jaoui@oss.org.tn



Annex 1: Endorsement LetterGitega, January, the 29th/01/2026

REPUBLIQUE DU BURUNDI

**MINISTRE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT,
DE L'AGRICULTURE ET DE L'ELEVAGE****Office Burundais pour la Protection de
l'Environnement**

To: The Adaptation Fund Board
C/O Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat
Email: Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org
Fax: 202 522 3240/5

Subject: Endorsement for Strengthening Resilience to Extreme Weather Events – Drought and Flooding –
for Smallholder Farmers in the Rural Regions of Burundi

In my capacity as the General Director of the national designated entity for the Adaptation Fund in Burundi, I confirm that the above national 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 Burundi.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above project proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by **Observatoire du Sahara et du Sahel (OSS)** and executed by **Office Burundais pour la Protection de l'Environnement (OBPE)**.

Sincerely,

HATUNGIMANA Berchmans**GENERAL DIRECTOR OF OBPE**

B.P. 56 Gitega • Tél. (257) 22403031 • TéléFax: (257) 22403032
B.P. 2757 Bujumbura • Tél. (257) 22254255 •
Email: obpe_burundi@obpe.bi