



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.38/13/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 (j)

PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR ALBANIA

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.38/13 “Proposal for Albania” includes a request for a Project Formulation Grant, requesting a budget of US\$ 150,000, which was received by the secretariat along with the concept for the project AF00000500 “Enhancing Drought Resilience through the Implementation of Albania’s National and Local Adaptation Plans”. This proposal was submitted by UN Development Programme (UNDP), which is Multilateral 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 comprehensive consultation process; validation workshops; Gender analysis and formulation of Gender Action Plan; Risk screening and analysis and formulation of Social and Environmental Management Framework; assessments and baseline studies and formulation of full proposal document.

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 PROPOSAL FOR
"ENHANCING DROUGHT RESILIENCE THROUGH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALBANIA'S
NATIONAL AND LOCAL ADAPTATION PLANS"

Project Title Enhancing Drought Resilience through the Implementation of Albania's National and Local Adaptation Plans

Project ID AF00000500

Category Regular size project (over \$1 million)

Type Single country project

Stage Concept

Country Albania

Implementing Entity UNDP

Financing Requested USD 10,003,592.00

Reviewer Estefania Jimenez Rodriguez

Co-reviewer(s)

IE Contact Person

Gulsah Isik, Jiseon Park, Mahlet Ambachew, Mariam Zafar, Missale Woldegiorgis, Nancy Bennet, Nataly Olofinskaya, Radhika Dave, Robin Merlier, Siriboon Ketphichai, Wirunpat Meebungprav

Secretariat's Overall Comment

The project Enhancing Drought Resilience through the Implementation of Albania's National and Local Adaptation Plans aims to strengthen Albania's preparedness and resilience to climate change-exacerbated drought.

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

The initial technical review raised several issues, such as, but not limited to: the title of the project on the Endorsement letter, details on the activities, the initial gender assessment, the compliance with the Fund's ESP and gender policy, the consultative process, technical standards, long term sustainability, justification and AF alignment, as was discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.

This second technical review found that there was an improvement in the Concept Note, as many of the issues raised in the first technical review were addressed. There were a few remaining CARs and CRs still to be addressed related to the project alignment with AF RF, particularly the AF Output Indicators; long term sustainability, and economic benefits; among others, as was discussed in Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CAR) raised in the review.

The third technical review raised a few issues such as discrepancies in Results Framework Alignment and quantitative estimates of benefits as was discussed in Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CAR) raised in the review.

The fourth technical review found that a few remaining issues, as discussed in CRs and CARs indicated below are still outstanding.

The fifth technical review found that two remaining issues, as discussed in CRs and CARs indicated below are still outstanding.

The sixth technical review found that all pending issues have been addressed.

Country Eligibility

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

Response: Yes

Secretariat: Yes.

(January 27, 2026)

Is the country a developing country particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change?

Response: Yes

Secretariat: Yes. Albania faces increasing drought risks due to climate change. Climate projections (Fourth National Communication to UNFCCC, the NAP process, and the Local Adaptation Plans) findings show that higher summer temperatures, increased evapotranspiration and shifting precipitation patterns will significantly increase the frequency, intensity, and length of dry periods, leading to increased incidence of meteorological, agricultural and hydrological drought.

(January 27, 2026)

Project Eligibility

Has the designated government authority for the Adaptation Fund endorsed the project/programme?

Response: Yes

Secretariat: Yes.

As per the endorsement letter dated 18 June 2025.

However, the title of the project on the endorsement letter (Enhancing Drought Resilience through the implementation of Albania's National and Local Adaptation Plans) is different from the title of the project on the proposal (Adaptation for Drought Resilience in Albania – ADRIA)

CAR1: Please ensure that the title of the project is consistent with that on the Endorsement letter.

CAR2: Please ensure the project document specify the thematic focal area.

(January 27, 2026)

Response: Yes

Secretariat: CAR1: Cleared

The project title "Enhancing Drought Resilience through the Implementation of Albania's National and Local Adaptation Plans" is now consistent across documents.

CAR2: Cleared

Thematic focal area included in the Revised Concept Note (CN).

(March 5, 2026)

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

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. The total length of the document is 48 pages.

CAR3: Please check the document formatting and add a title to all tables in the document.

(January 27, 2026)

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR3: Cleared

A title has been added to each table in the document, which has been formatted.

(March 5, 2026)

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat:

CR1(NEW): Please update the Last Submission date (on the first page of the concept note) to reflect the date of the previous submission.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR1(NEW): Cleared. Submission date was updated.

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

However, additional information is required

The project aims to strengthen Albania's preparedness and resilience to climate change-exacerbated drought through three components which address (i) the policy and institutional capacities for resilience, (ii) water and land resource management and (iii) community-based drought adaptation and drought resilient agriculture.

The Project Components and Financing (page 11) and Project Justification in Part II A (pages 13 to 26) provide details of the project components describing the Outcomes and Outputs with broad descriptions of the proposed activities. The activities, though not fully articulated, align with the project's overall goal and objectives, provide a good overview of the actions to be taken, are well suited to address the climate change

impacts identified and lead to tangible outcomes.

The Theory of Change is described on pages 12 – 13 and includes a diagram which shows the barriers, assumptions, focus areas, impacts, Outputs and Outcomes as well as the logic of the response to the threats identified in the Background and Context. However, it does not include the activities, neither does it outline the associated risks.

In addition, the background and context and the description of the components mention access to credit among the barriers faced by women and include financing and credit among in Outcomes 3.2.3, however, the proposal does not provide sufficient information on the modality for the provision of credit e.g. what institutions will manage it, criteria for assessing the farmers who will receive the credit, arrangements to ensure repayment and sustainability after the life of the project.

CR1: Please provide additional details of the activities to show the magnitude of the interventions and so justify the cost.

CAR4: Please include in the Theory of Change the activities associated with the respective Outputs as well as the risks that are likely to impact the attainment of the results.

CAR5: Please indicate the AF Strategic Objectives that are supported by the activities at Part II Section B.

CAR6: Please include additional information on the management of the credit facility to be provided to farmers.

CAR7: Kindly revise the document and further strengthen the adaptation measures in terms of range as per the proposed number of beneficiaries (direct and indirect) with gender disaggregated figures. Currently, there is no indicative figures for the targeted beneficiaries.

CAR8:

1. The Adaptation Fund's mandate is to support concrete adaptation action. At the moment a little over 50% of the components funds are being proposed for soft interventions like the development of plans assessments etc. Please review the activities to prioritize concrete adaptation actions and reduce the percentage of the policies and assessments etc. budget wise.
2. Please note that the Adaptation Fund only funds the implementation of NAPs not NAP development (or improvements). Please remove LAP development from the proposed activities as at 3.1.1.

As per AF policy PFG could be used for the following “Country, region, or site-specific risk assessments, including identifying hazards, vulnerabilities, development of scenarios and determining hazard mitigation options; Specific analyses in support of the proposed projects (policy analysis, data inventories and analyses, cost effectiveness, etc). Consider applying for PFG to support the project development as project funds should ideally be reserved for concrete adaptation action. Please consult PFG page at <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/readiness/readiness-grants/project-formulation-grants/>.

CAR9: The project includes number of outputs that can be merged for successful implementation and avoided duplication. Kindly consider revising each output and identify options for merging activity seeking a comprehensive assessment and implementation where they are would not contradict the points raised in CAR8 above.

CR2: Activities targeted under the output 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 with the use of National Drought Risk Assessment (small grants) seem to qualify for unidentified subprojects (USP) as per AF policy on ESP. Kindly clarify if this is

the case. If yes, please provide additional information where possible for the magnitude of the interventions at this stage of the concept note, in particular the location of the proposed beneficiaries of the small grants. If those are not yet defined, you might consider them under USP. Please refer to Guidance Document for Project/Programme with Unidentified Sub-Projects.

(January 27, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR1: Cleared

Additional details provided to show the magnitude of the interventions where possible.

CAR4: Cleared

The ToC has been adjusted to reflect the changes requested in the project structure, and now includes summarized activities and risks

CAR5: Cleared

See pages 38 – 40.

CAR6: Cleared

Credit facility removed from the project design. All funding for local projects will take place through small grants. Details provided in pages 35 – 36.

CAR7: Cleared

Number of beneficiaries for the hard interventions in Component 2 have been provided (pp 25 – 36), based on current information. However, this number will be refined in the full proposal preparation process, and further refined with the GIS-based identification of hotspots, one of the first activities to be implemented.

CAR8: Cleared

1. The activities have been revised and the budget has been rebalanced. Now, 70% of the budget is dedicated to hard intervention and 30% to soft interventions.

2. The design of new LAPs has been removed from the project, although local drought management plans have been proposed as complementary to existing LAPs in the area of focus and will use community and governance structures for adaptation set up for these existing LAPs. Most of the hard interventions on the ground will be based on the multicriteria analysis conducted for adaptation measures during the NAP elaboration process.

These are measures found to have high impact (benefits) /no regrets

CAR9: Cleared

Components, outcomes and outputs have been revised, merged where relevant, and harmonized

CR2: Cleared

It is confirmed that there will be USPs, all within the Vjosa River Basin. Details on the risk screening and management for the USPs will be elaborated in the ESMF to be developed with the full proposal. The selection of USPs through Small Grants will ensure compliance with AF guidance for USPs (ESMF and GP).

(March 5, 2026)

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: Yes. However, additional information is required.

Part II B (pages 28 – 29) provides a description of the economic, social and environmental benefits providing information on the expected beneficiaries, particular benefits to marginalized and vulnerable groups. There are, however, no quantitative estimates of the economic benefits.

No concerns of maladaptation risks or negative development were mentioned, neither was there a gender assessment conducted. However, initial consultations were conducted in preparing the concept note but these consultations do not indicate if a gender analysis was conducted.

CR3: The CN does not provide quantified benefits for economic, social and environmental benefits. Kindly revise the section and provide an estimated benefits with context specific figures for all 3 elements. Please strengthen the benefits with specific and quantifiable data where possible.

CAR10: Please provide details of any gender related consultation which was conducted.

CAR11: Please provide/ include an initial gender assessment relevant to the project scope. Attach it as an annex and refer to it at related sections, or include this under a dedicated subsection in part I.

CR4: Under outputs 3.2.1 and 3.2.2, kindly provide further data on the specific women led and targeted beneficiaries including selection criteria and monitoring. In addition, please specify whether other vulnerable groups beyond women will benefit from the project, in particular in relation to small grants.

CR5: Since the project involves locally led interventions through small grants, please consider describing how the locally led adaptation (LLA) approach will be used to select beneficiaries and the proposed USPs (see above).

cR6: Under outcome 3.2, the project will provide funding support to “Community-led drought adaptation projects through a small grant”. Kindly address the followings:

- 1- Will the project put in place a finance vehicle to manage the small grants and select beneficiaries? If yes, kindly present the structure and eligibility criteria for the identification of beneficiaries.
- 2- It is not clear how grant recipients will be identified and the proposals processed. Kindly briefly explain how the small grant facility if any will operate including the submission process, the endorsing authority and grant amount.
- 3- Also, please briefly clarify the disbursement process.

(January 27, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR3: Not cleared

Very few quantitative estimates were provided for some economic and environmental benefits. Even though it was mentioned that a Cost–Benefit Analysis conducted under the National Adaptation Plan showed a positive cost–benefit ratio and a positive net present value (NPV) under all tested scenarios, the actual values of the cost–

benefit ratio and net present value were not provided. Please provide the estimates of the cost-benefit ratio and net present value where the data are available.

CAR10: Cleared

See page 10. Approximately 90% of all participants to the consultations held for the preparation of this concept note were women. However, no specific gender-related consultations were undertaken. Nonetheless, the concept note draws information from the extensive consultative process very recently conducted for the NAP, including for NAP-related gender studies.

CAR11: Cleared

An initial gender assessment section has been added to the document, and can be found in the Project/Programme Background Context section (page 10). A full gender assessment and action plan will be elaborated for integration in the full proposal.

CR4: Cleared

Outputs 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 have been merged into Output 2.1.3. Specifically, the small grants process provides details in the eligibility, selection criteria, disbursement modality and grant amounts (See pp 35 – 36) after the narrative description of Output 2.1.3.

CR5: Not Cleared

While the description provided in the response gives a comprehensive description of how the LLA approach will be used to select beneficiaries and the proposed USP, this information is dispersed in different sections of the CN and not readily discernible. Please prepare a separate paragraph with the information provided in the response.

CR6: Cleared

A section on the Small Grants Process, including details in the eligibility, selection criteria, disbursement modality and grant amounts has been included after the narrative description of Output 2.1.3 (pp 35 – 36).

(March 5, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR3: Not cleared

As per Section B, pages 28-30), quantitative estimates of benefits remain uneven. Economic benefits are supported by Cost-Benefit Analysis. Please consider placing benefits in a tabular format:

- Column 1 – type of benefit (economic, social, environmental)
- Column 2 – current situation
- Column 3 – benefits after the project/programme (in bullet point format)

For environmental benefits, please consider scale indicators (e.g. hectares of land under improved drought-resilient land and water practices). Consider explicitly mentioning the number of direct and indirect beneficiaries. Please ensure all environmental, economic and social benefits are captured in the table.

CR5: Not cleared

As per Page 25, paragraph 3, a paragraph on the LLA approach is included. It refers to a Technical Committee which will lead selection process and will ensure inclusivity through allocation of 20% of grant resources to women's organisations and other vulnerable groups. To ensure that the paragraph is comprehensive, please indicate that these grants are USP, specify the types of eligible adaptation sub-projects/activities to be financed, proposed exclusion criteria. Kindly confirm what data will be used to families facing heightened climate

vulnerability. Consider indicating how this can be addressed during the PFG process.

(May 11, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR3: Cleared.

Table 1 (pp. 31-32) now includes benefits information, structured in a three-column table, as requested. Environmental scale indicators and estimated numbers of beneficiaries have been added.

CR5: Cleared.

The paragraph now specifies that the grants will be USPs and describes a screening process that will be developed during the PFG stage to identify vulnerable groups, adaptation options, and exclusion criteria.

(June 30, 2026)

Is the project / programme cost effective?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes, but further clarification is required.

Part II C describes how the project is cost-effective through preventive, governance-driven and nature-based strategies that avoid expensive reactive crisis responses. It shifts Albania toward anticipatory drought action via national assessments, plans, and monitoring systems, cutting fiscal losses from emergencies, water supplies, agriculture aid, and infrastructure damage.

The project demonstrates partly the long-term sustainability in cost-effectiveness by embedding preventive measures into enduring national and local systems, minimizing ongoing fiscal burdens, strengthening institutions and building capacity to ensure skills persist post-project, thereby reducing future external aid dependency. However, please address the followings :

CR7: In addition to information on page 35, please include a table which compares the proposed action against the alternative to show the cost effectiveness of the proposed interventions. This should be different from current table 1.

CR8: Please address the cost effectiveness in relation to section above when issues related to the financing facility (small grants).

CAR12: Kindly provide the specific plans for the financial sustainability post project in particular under the proposed small grants as well as the structure being proposed to be set up for interministerial coordination and the digital and in person knowledge hubs.

(January 27, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR7: Cleared

Table 3 has been included in the CN (See pp 42 – 43)

CR8: Cleared

Details are now provided in the cost effectiveness section (Part IIC, page 42).

CAR12: Cleared

See the subsection titled “Sustainability Plan” in Part II C which indicates that the interministerial coordination mechanism will be embedded within existing and funded national structures.

For financial sustainability of digital and in person knowledge hubs see the narrative description of Output 3.1.1.

For the Small Grants, the elements that have made the outputs of previous Small Grant sustainable over time are described. A sustainability strategy for the interventions funded through small grants will be presented in the full proposal.

CAR24(NEW): Under the cost effectiveness of the small grants program at page 31 (clean version) please also insert information that USPs will be guided by AF USP guidance.

(March 5, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR24(NEW): Cleared

As per Page 31, first paragraph, the sentence “The Unspecified Sub-Projects (USPs) will be guided by the AF USP guidance” was added.

(May 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: Yes. The information provided at this stage seems adequate.

Part II D shows the project’s alignment with Albania’s national development, environmental, climate change and disaster risk management policy, legal strategic and regulatory framework. For each of the documents cited, the proposal identifies the key areas of alignment and areas of relevance.

(January 27, 2026)

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: Unsure.

Part II E (page 34) only shows how the project adheres to the 15 principles of the AF's Environmental and Social Policy. The proposal also states that the regulations will be further detailed in the full proposal.

CAR13: Please delete the table provided in the section and replace it with a comprehensive list of the relevant technical standards as this is required for the Concept stage.

(January 27, 2026)

Response: **Cleared**

Secretariat: CAR13: Cleared

Table deleted, and replaced by narrative detailing the relevant standards. (pp 43 – 46)

(March 5, 2026)

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes, however additional information is required

Part IIF lists a number of on-going projects and initiatives showing how the project will complement them.

CAR14: Please summarize the information on the projects with other funding sources (including regional projects) by preparing a table which includes the title of the project, funding source, budget and areas of overlap or complementarity and where possible lessons learned.

(January 27, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR14: Cleared

A table has been added summarizing the information on ongoing relevant projects as suggested. (See Table 4, page 51)

CAR 25 (NEW): At page 41 (clean version) please amend the following sentence at paragraph 2 “Adaptation Fund support is therefore critical to cover the full incremental cost of adaptation” by deleting incremental. Although the project costs may be incremental in the context of the country’s overall adaptation needs, with respect the proposal before the AF, it funds the full costs of adaptation.

Note: Please ensure that this AF principle is adhered to in all UNDP submission.

(March 5, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR25(NEW): Cleared.

As per page 40, second paragraph, the word ‘incremental’ was removed.

(May 11, 2026)

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

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes, but further clarification is required.

Part II G (pages 35 – 36) describes the learning and knowledge management aspects of the project. It indicates that learning and knowledge management is embedded into all levels of implementation of the project – local, national and community levels. At the national level, post-drought evaluations and after-action reviews will be incorporated into the governance cycle to allow all thresholds, indicators and response protocols to be updated based on lessons learnt.

Component 3 also seeks to establish digital and in-person knowledge hubs to facilitate continuous exchange among farmers, municipal officials, women's groups and civil society. The digital platform will be linked with Albania's National Spatial Data infrastructure and relevant national information systems managed by the AMBU. By placing these knowledge management functions in permanent institutions, it is hoped that learning continuous as it will be embedded as part of the governance system.

CAR15: As indicative above, kindly consider revising the project structure to include a third (new or revised) component dedicated specifically to KM related activities along with replication and sustainability options.

(January 27, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR15: Cleared

The components, outcomes and outputs have been revised, and now Component 3 is dedicated to Knowledge Management and learning.

(March 5, 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: Yes, however additional information is required.

Part II H (pages 36-37), describes the consultative process. The consultations took place over two days and involved government agencies and ministries, local Adaptation Plan committees, the administration of the Vjosa Wild River National Park and representatives of on-going projects. Additional data and information which were used to prepare CN are also listed. However, there is no mention of consultations or focus group meetings with key stakeholders, marginalized and vulnerable groups, neither is there any indication that a gender assessment was conducted.

CAR16: Please include the following information:

- (i) The total number of attendees, disaggregated by sex, with background information to verify whether marginalized and vulnerable groups have been consulted.
- (ii) A summary of the subjects/issues discussed and any agreements reached.
- (iii) Indicate how their interests have been incorporated, including how gender and other vulnerable group considerations were addressed.

CR9: Please include in the Initial Gender Analysis information that highlights gender dynamics and differentiated impacts between men and women from a national or sector-wide perspective in areas such as education, employment, health, income, and political participation if available.

(January 27, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR16: Cleared

The Consultations section has been updated to include the information requested. (Part II H, pp 52 – 53)

CR9: Cleared

Based on existing information, these issues have been included in the initial gender assessment section added to the document under the Project/Programme Background Context (pp 10 – 11). However, to bridge information gaps and ensure gender responsiveness of the activities, a full gender assessment and action plan as part of the preparation of the full proposal.

(March 5, 2026)

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes, however additional information is required

Part II I (pages 37 – 38) provides the justification for the funding. It indicates that the funding is critical to cover the full incremental cost of adaptation and augment the Government's efforts to establish an enabling environment for adaptation planning and implementation in key socioeconomic sectors. By so doing it would shift from reactive, crisis-driven drought response to proactive, science-informed management.

Table 1 in that section also presents a comparison of the Business-as-usual scenario with the Adaptation Scenario for each dimension of the project – at the policy, national, local and community levels to show the relevance of the project activities and provide further justification for achieving adaptation goals of the project.

CAR17: Please explain how the project would be able to deliver its outcomes and outputs regardless of the success of other projects listed in Question 8 above.

(January 27, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR17: Cleared

All proposed interventions are fully deliverable within this project's scope and implementation period. The project's results do not depend on the timing or performance of other ongoing or planned external initiatives. During full proposal development, a further assessment will be conducted of the implementation risks and sustainability measures to strengthen long-term uptake of the interventions.

(March 5, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR17 (re-opened):

Please replace the word "additionality" in the last sentence that currently reads "To better illustrate the additionality of AF financing, the following table provides a comparison of the Business-as-Usual scenario and the adaptation scenario under the project." under part II Section I.

(June 30, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR17 (re-opened): Cleared.

The word "additionality" has been removed from that sentence (p. 42).

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes, but further clarification is required.

See Part III A. (pages 44 to 46). However, there are some disparities between the alignment table and the Project Components and Financing table on pages 11 to 12. For example, the total cost for the Outcome 3.1 in the Alignment Table is USD 800,000 but in the Component Financing Table it is USD 1,050,000 (the sum of Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2) are not consistent. Likewise for Outcome 3.2, the total cost in the AF Alignment table is USD 3,010,000 but in the Project Component financing table it is USD 2,760,000.

The upper part of the Alignment table should comprise only the relevant Fund Outcome indicators. Thus, for Outcome 2, the appropriate indicator is Outcome Indicator 2.1: (Capacity of staff to respond to and mitigate impacts of, climate related events (by gender), and not indicator 2.1.1 since Indicator 2.1.1 is an Output indicator.

Furthermore, the Fund Outputs listed in the lower section of the table should also be reflected in the upper section of the table. Thus, for Outcome 1.1, Outcomes 1 and 2 are listed for the for the Fund Outcomes but in the lower part of the table, Outputs 7 and 2.1 are listed for that Outcome.

CAR18:

1. Please ensure consistency between the AF outcome, outcome indicators, output and output indicators according to the Adaptation Fund Strategic Results Framework outlined in the Strategic Results Framework outlined in the updated AF Results Framework (nov 2025).
2. : Update and complete the table using the format provided in the Strategic Results Framework outlined in the updated AF Results Framework (nov 2025).
3. Please ensure that all Fund Outcomes associated with the Fund Outputs listed in the lower section are also reflected in the upper section of the table.

(January 27, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR18: Not cleared

Some of the AF Output indicators in Table (Outputs 4.1.1, 4.1.2 are 6.2.1) are not exactly the same as those in the updated AF Results Framework. Please use the exact AF indicators provided in the Results Framework (nov 2025). Results Framework Alignment Table (Amended in November 2025) (77 kB, DOC)

Also sum of the grant amounts in each row of the upper part of the table is not equal to the total (i.e. 1,700,000 + 1,700,000 + 5,870,000 + 5,870,000 + 5,870,000 + 850,000 ≠ 8,420,000). Please delete the grant amounts in the upper part of the table and only leave the total amount.

(March 5, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR18: Not cleared

As per Part III, Section A (pages 46-47), the Output indicators have been updated and are not aligned to the latest Results Framework Alignment Table. However:

1. The Outputs needs to be revised as well. Please ensure all Outcomes, Outcome Indicators and Output are in line with the same framework.
2. Please ensure that in the grant amount column that the cost of each indicator is provided at the outcome level and each output level separately. i.e. indicators 1; 2.1; 7; 4.1 etc.

(May 11, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR18: Cleared.

The Outcomes, Outputs, Outcome Indicators, and Output Indicators are now in line with the AF Results Framework. Costs are provided at the indicator level under both Outcomes and Outputs.

CAR25(NEW): At part II Section B add a sentence of two to the first paragraph indicating which of the AF strategic outcome areas that the proposal is aligned with. These should be the same AF outcome areas identified in Part II Section A.

(June 30, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR25(NEW): Cleared.

The requested sentence has been added (p. 28) and is consistent with the table in Part III.

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes, however, some additional information is required

Part IJJ (pages 38 – 49) explains that the project hopes to achieve long-term sustainability by institutionalizing drought resilience within Albania's policies, governance and communities, aligning with national strategies and EU accession standards; fostering ownership and building capacities. It further explains how long term sustainability will be ensured at the National, local and farm level and lays out a sustainability road map.

However, it does not include arrangements to operate and maintain infrastructure after the life of the project. The section could also be improved if the sustainability measures could be classified in terms of economic, financial, social and environmental and other relevant categories.

CR10: Ensure that all critical dimensions of sustainability are addressed, including economic, social,

environmental, institutional, and financial aspects.

CR11: Kindly indicate the arrangements, such as financial, social, regulatory, institutional, economic, and environmental measures required to guarantee the project's sustainability and long-term maintenance.

CAR19: Kindly revise the document and strengthen the sustainability of the proposed small grants facility beyond the AF funded project. Also note CAR12 above.

(January 27, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR10: Cleared

Critical dimensions addressed in new text in Part III

CR11: Not cleared

Although the text of Part III on sustainability has been redrafted in response to the comments received, it only presents arrangements for some critical sustainability dimensions. Sustainability for long term maintenance has not been addressed. Please list a few actions which will be taken to address this issue.

CAR19: Not Cleared.

The Small Grants section describes elements that have made outputs of previous UNDP-run Small Grants projects sustainable over time. However, it is hoped to present the sustainability strategy in the full proposal. For the CN please provide a brief narrative of how the proposed sustainability of the project will be ensured/pursued.

(March 5, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR11: Not Cleared

As per page 42, the concept links recurrent costs of operations and maintenance to municipal budgets. Please elaborate on maintenance responsibilities for the various measures and about the arrangements for sustaining knowledge products or indicate this will be addressed during the PFG stage.

CAR19: Not cleared

It is unclear how this was addressed in Section J related to sustainability. The sentence commencing "This integrated approach ensures that interventions are not only..." is board. Please elaborate on how this will be done.

(May 11, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR19: Cleared.

New language has been added on how the Small Grants Facility will be designed to support the sustainability of community-based initiatives (p. 33).

(June 30, 2026)

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: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

The proposal identifies potential environmental and social impacts, the checklist has been completed and the risks have been identified against each of the 15 ESP principles. However, the category in which the screening process has classified is not indicated.

No initial gender assessment has been included, however, the proposal states that the UNDP gender specialists will ensure the views, needs and interests of both women and men are analyzed and integrated into project implementation to reduce any potential gender bias. Compliance checks during implementation will also identify and address any potential gender inequality-related risks.

CAR20:

1. Please note for the checklist that Adaptation Fund Principles 1, 4 and 6 always apply. For more information, please visit: AF's ESP guidance and Environmental and Social Policy.
2. Please remove the text from Column 2 and replace with a check mark where no further assessment is needed.

CAR21: Please indicate the Category (A, B or C) in which the screening process has classified the project.

CAR22: Please include an initial gender assessment providing qualitative and quantitative data for gender roles, activities, needs, and available opportunities and challenges or risks for men and women . Please also refer to CAR11 and CR9.

(For support on assessing proposal compliance with ESP and GP, you may consider this – Technical Reviewers Tracking Sheet on ESP and GP Jan 2020)

CAR23: In relation to activities under the small grants, kindly clarify if those are considered USP and ensure its compliance with AF ESP and gender policy. Kindly provide an EISA framework for USP compliance with AF ESP and gender during project implementation.

(January 27, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR20: Cleared

The checklist has been updated as advised.

CAR21: Cleared

Risk category has been included under this section.

CAR22: Cleared

An initial gender assessment section has been added to the document under the Project/Programme Background Context. However, to bridge information gaps and ensure gender responsiveness of the activities, the team will undertake a full gender assessment and action plan as part of the preparation of the full proposal.

CAR23: Cleared

It is confirmed that the activities under the small grants will be considered as USP. Risk screening and assessment framework for USPs will be included in the ESMF to be included with the full proposal.

(March 5, 2026)

Resource Availability

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

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes.

Total amount requested is USD 10,003,592.

(January 27, 2026)

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

The figures are rounded to a whole number and add up and are consistent across all tables (components table and budget) and the fee is 8.5 % of the total budget before fee. No PFG is requested.

(January 27, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR24(NEW): The concept note includes a PFG valued at US\$150,000. The PFG is within threshold for projects valued over US\$5 million. However, please address the following:

1. Please include the miscellaneous charges under the IE fees and not as a separate line item.
2. Please update the PFG start date to a date post October 2026.

(May 11, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR24(NEW): Cleared.

The miscellaneous charges have been moved under the IE fees, and the start date has been moved to December 2026. However, in relation to "In country travel for national and international consultants \$2,500 flight tickets (\$1,250 x2) and \$3,500 per diem and in country per diem and vehicle reimbursement. Total \$6,000", this add up to \$8500 and not \$6000 included in the cost column associated with the notation. Please correct and update the PFG form as needed.

CAR25 (NEW): In the components and financing table output 1.1 has a grant amount of \$1.1500,000 in the clean version of the proposal. Based on the total of the activities it is assumed that this should be \$1,150,000. Please update the table and also ensure that a comma is used and not a decimal point after the first numeral.

(June 30, 2026)

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR24(NEW): Cleared.
Edits made to clarify travel cost totals

CAR25 (NEW): Cleared.
The table has been corrected as requested.

CAR26(NEW): The budget justification narrative mentions an Activity 6 that includes bank transaction fees and supplies. This does not appear in the budget table; however, it seems to be embedded in the \$5,799 total for the first item in the budget table. Please either make this a separate budget item in the table or remove the reference in the narrative.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR26(NEW): Cleared. PFG document was amended as requested.

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: Yes.

The figures are rounded to a whole number and they add up and match across all tables and the IE cost is 8.7 %.

(January 27, 2026)

Eligibility of IE

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

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes.

UNDP is an accredited Multilateral Implementing Entity. Its accreditation expires on 11 October 2029.

(January 27, 2026)



Revised PFG Submission Form¹
Project Formulation Grant (PFG)

Submission Date:

Adaptation Fund Project ID:

Country/ies: Albania

Title of Project/Programme: Enhancing Drought Resilience through the implementation of Albania's National and Local Adaptation Plans

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

Implementing Entity: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Executing Entity/ies: UNDP

A. Project Preparation Timeframe

Start date of PFG	December 2026
Completion date of PFG	December 2027

B. Proposed Project Preparation Activities (\$)

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note²
1. Cross-sectoral consultations with central and local government authorities, and other stakeholders	Consolidated stakeholder mapping report listing all consulted authorities, CSOs, private-sector and community institutions/actors per target area, with agreed roles and responsibilities and contacts.	5,799	Hiring of a local consultancy company for cross-sectoral consultations with central and local authorities, local communities, including vulnerable groups and other stakeholders for project development – (within 04 months)
2. Validation workshops	- Summary Consultation reports capturing drought-risk priorities, institutional mandates, existing plans and confirmed entry points. - Co-designed governance framework outlining decision-making structures, coordination	7,200	4 Workshops held out of which 2 at local level (1

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

² 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.

	mechanisms and risk-management arrangements for devolved project implementation at central and local level. • Set of endorsed recommendations on integrating Adaptation Fund compliant climate-risk screening and safeguards into Vjosa River Basin drought management planning, budgeting and approval workflows. • Community consultation tools (gender-responsive, inclusive sampling, safeguarding measures) approved and ready for use in project implementation. • Community engagement workshops	6,000	at the beginning of the process and 1 to present and consult the prodoc) and 2 at central level (1 at the beginning of the process and 1 to present and consult the prodoc) with rent of premises costs \$1,800/each Total \$7,200 In country travel for national and international consultants \$2,500 flight tickets for two travelers (\$1,250 x 2 people) and \$3,500 per diem and in country per diem and vehicle reimbursement for two travelers inclusive. Total \$6,000
2. Gender analysis and formulation of Gender Action Plan	• Gender analysis report (quantitative + qualitative) with sex-disaggregated vulnerability profiles and entry points for each target landscape. • Stand-alone Gender Action Plan (GAP) with budgeted actions, targets, roles and alignment with AF Gender Policy.	10,000	Hiring a National Consultant for Gender Assessment and Action Plan - (USD 200/day for 50 days (within 40 weeks)
3. Risk screening and analysis and formulation of Social and Environmental Management Framework	• Conduct social and environmental risk screening in line with UNDP SES and Adaptation Fund ESP requirements; (ii) identify potential risks, impacts, and mitigation measures and (iii) support preparation of relevant management frameworks, including ESMF, as required.	28,750 Incl.: 18,750 10,000	Hiring an International and a National Consultants on SES - (a) International consultant: USD 750/day for 25 days; (b) National consultant: USD 200/day for 50 days (within 40 weeks)
4. Location-specific assessments, and	• Location-specific assessments across the Vjosa River Basin will	33,000	Hiring of a consultancy company to conduct a

baseline studies for the interventions	be conducted to inform selection and costing of adaptation measures relevant to localized conditions. For each target area the activity will deliver: • Location profiles, maps and drought impact assessments. • Costed list of location-specific adaptation/ climate risk-reduction options with preliminary cost-benefit and feasibility notes • Baseline assessment report documenting socio-economic, environmental, and institutional conditions to inform project results frameworks and future impact measurement		study on location-specific assessments, baseline studies, and geospatial analysis – (within 04 months)
5. International and national consultants for baseline analysis, feasibility study and formulation of the project proposal	Leading the entire development process providing hands on and advisory expertise in all the components of the project resulting in a High-quality project proposal which meets all AF guidelines with all project annexes for the full project proposal	47,500 Incl: 37,500 10,000	(a)Hiring an International Consultant for Project Development (AF PPG Team Leader - USD 750/day for 50 days, within 40 weeks); (b) a National Consultant – Lead Baseline Analysis expert (USD 200/day for 50 days (within 40 weeks)
IE Fee (8.5%)		11,751	
Total Project Formulation Grant		150,000	

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

The proposed Project Formulation Grant (PFG) will enable Albania, with UNDP as Implementing Entity, to strengthen the country's preparedness and resilience to climate change-exacerbated drought. The project will adopt an integrated approach, with national, basin, and municipal-level interventions, including drought risk governance, climate information systems, nature-based solutions, and community-level investments, which are fully aligned with and support the implementation of the National Adaptation Plan and Local Adaptation Plans. At the subnational level, the project focuses on the Vjosa River Basin, an area at high risk of drought.

The proposed full project builds on national adaptation planning processes and requires robust technical design, safeguards compliance, gender-responsive programming, institutional arrangements, stakeholder ownership, safeguards and gender compliance, and cost-effective investment design.

The PFG will be used to support the preparation of the full proposal of the future project by strengthening its information, institutional, and operational foundations. It will ensure that the proposal is technically sound, environmentally and socially compliant, gender-responsive, cost-effective, and fully aligned with Adaptation Fund policies and Strategic Objectives.

Activity 1. The objective of this activity is to generate robust, participatory and inclusive consultative processes to inform the design of cross-sectoral and community-led actions to be supported with Adaptation Fund resources, ensuring strong national and local ownership, and coherent governance arrangements.

PFG resources requested for this activity (USD 18,200) cover facilitation expertise engagement \$ 5,000 and \$7,200 for 4 workshops logistics, 2 at central level and 2 at local level to feed in to the proposal development and validation process as well as in country travel for national and international staff \$ 2,500 flight tickets (\$1,250 x2) and \$3,500 per diem and in country per diem and vehicle reimbursement. Total \$6,000

Activity 2. This activity ensures that the full proposal complies with the Adaptation Fund Gender Policy and integrates gender considerations throughout project design. A gender analysis will be conducted to assess differentiated drought impacts, access to resources, and adaptive capacity among women, men, youth, and vulnerable groups in the target areas.

Based on the analysis, a budgeted Gender Action Plan (GAP) will be prepared, including objectives, targets, indicators, responsibilities, and monitoring arrangements aligned with the project results framework.

Use of the PFG for this activity strengthens equity, effectiveness, and policy compliance of the proposed AF investment and reduces social risk at implementation stage. The requested USD 10,000 covers the cost of 50 days of the consultant (USD 200 per day)

Activity 3. This activity supports compliance of the full proposal with the Adaptation Fund Environmental and Social Policy.

UNDP will engage one International and one National SESP expert to (i) conduct social and environmental screening in line with UNDP SESP and Adaptation Fund ESP requirements; (ii) identify potential risks, impacts, and mitigation measures and (iii) to support UNDP in the preparation of relevant management frameworks, as required.

PFG resources will be used to ensure that the proposed AF project is environmentally sound, socially inclusive, and implementation-ready in line with AF safeguards requirements. The requested amount of USD 28,750 covers 25 days of international consultant USD 750/day and 50 days of a national consultant USD 200/day

Activity 4. This activity generates the technical and analytical basis for the design of drought management measures on the ground.

Location-specific assessments across the Vjosa River Basin will be conducted to inform selection and costing of adaptation measures relevant to localized conditions. For each target area the activity will deliver:

- Climate risk analysis
- Location profiles, maps and drought impact assessments.
- Costed list of location-specific adaptation/ climate risk-reduction options with preliminary cost–benefit and feasibility notes
- Baseline assessment report documenting socio-economic, environmental, and institutional conditions to inform project results frameworks and future impact measurement

PFG resources (USD 33,000) will be used to engage a national entity to conduct the assessments under the guidance of the project technical lead. PFG resources will therefore ensure that the full proposal is grounded in evidence, measurable outcomes, and cost-effective design in line with Adaptation Fund standards.

Activity 5. This activity supports preparation of the full Adaptation Fund proposal through engagement of international and national consultants. These experts will coordinate technical inputs, consolidate analytical work, and draft the full proposal and annexes in accordance with AF policies and templates.

~~**Activity 6.** This activity covers under miscellaneous—Bank transaction fees~~

~~The cost of the activity, estimated at USD 799 related to payment of international bank transaction fees and supplies.~~

With PFG resources, UNDP will engage an international consultant PPG Team Leader, who will act as the main focal point for information management and inter-consultant coordination, and a local consultant to support the Team Leader in the various proposal development processes. The engagement of this team will ensure coherence across the safeguards, gender, technical design, institutional arrangements, and results-based management sections of the proposal.

The cost of this activity has been estimated at USD 47,500, including 50 days of professional services of the international consultant (USD 750/day) and 50 days of professional services of the national consultant (USD 200/day).

The use of PFG resources under this activity supports the delivery of a complete, high-quality submission for Board consideration.

The Project Formulation Grant will enable Albania to prepare a technically robust, safeguards-compliant, gender-responsive, and results-based Adaptation Fund proposal. By strengthening analytical foundations, stakeholder inputs, environmental and social management, and proposal development, the PFG reduces implementation risk and improves the quality and readiness of the proposed drought resilience investment for Adaptation Fund Board review.

C. Implementing Entity

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

Nancy Bennet, Director, Quality and Impact Hub, Executive Coordinator, Vertical Funds, Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (BPPS), UNDP			Nataly Olofinskaya		nataly.Olofinskaya@u ndp.org
--	--	--	-----------------------	--	---



REPUBLIC OF ALBANIA
MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND ENVIRONMENT

No. 4695 Prot.

Tirana, 18/6 2025

ADAPTATION FUND
Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat c/o Global Environment Facility
1818 H Street NW, Washington DC 20433, USA

Endorsement for Enhancing Drought Resilience through the Implementation of Albania's National and Local Adaptation Plans

In my capacity as the designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in Albania, I confirm that the above national grant proposal is in accordance with the Government of Albania's priorities for implementing adaptation activities to reduce the adverse impacts and risks posed by climate change. This project is fully aligned with Albania's National Adaptation Plan (NAP), Local Adaptation Plans (LAPs), and broader national strategies addressing Climate Change, drought resilience, sustainable land and water management, and energy.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above project concept note with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and executed by the Ministry of Tourism and Environment (MoTE).

Sincerely,

DEPUTY MINISTER

ADAPTATION FUND DESIGNATED AUTHORITY

SOFJAN JAUPAJ

