



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.38/16/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 (m)

PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR MALDIVES

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.38/16 “Proposal for Maldives” includes a request for a Project Formulation Grant, requesting a budget of US\$ 141,050, which was received by the secretariat along with the concept for the project AF00000514 “Secure Futures: Enhancing Climate and Socio-Economic Resilience integrating Nature-Based Solutions for Island Communities in the Maldives”. This proposal was submitted by United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT), which is a 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; engineering and design pre-feasibility for climate-resilient infrastructure; baseline analysis ; and vulnerability assessment studies.

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
"SECURE FUTURES: ENHANCING CLIMATE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC RESILIENCE
INTEGRATING NATURE-BASED SOLUTIONS FOR ISLAND COMMUNITIES IN THE
MALDIVES"

Project Title Secure Futures: Enhancing Climate and Socio-Economic Resilience
integrating Nature-Based Solutions for Island Communities in the
Maldives

Project ID AF00000514

Category Regular size project (over \$1 million)

Type Single country project

Stage Concept

Country Maldives

Implementing Entity UNHAB

Financing Requested USD 20,000,000.00

Reviewer Lystra Fletcher-Paul Fletcher-Paul

Co-reviewer(s)

IE Contact Person

Cerin Kizhakkethottam, Harshini Halangode, M.S.M. Aleem, Odicea Angelo Barrios, Roi Chiti, Tameez Bohoran

Secretariat's Overall Comment

The project “Secure Futures: Enhancing Climate and Socio-Economic Resilience integrating Nature-Based Solutions for Island Communities in the Maldives” aims to enhance adaptation and resilience of coastal urban communities in the Maldives to the impacts of climate-induced flooding, extreme heat, coastal erosion, and water scarcity.

The first technical review raised several issues, such as providing more details of the project activities, possible USPs; quantifying project benefits; providing initial gender assessment; clarifying the knowledge management and learning aspects; revising AF RF alignment table; revising the EC considering the involvement of the IE as an EE; among others as indicated in the Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.

The second technical review raised several issues, such as strengthening the Theory of Change, explaining how beneficiaries were calculated, the steps needed to comply with each standard; among others, as indicated in the Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.

The third technical review raises several issues, such as strengthening the initial gender analysis, including a sound justification to demonstrate no duplication with other related projects, and providing a proper comparison of the cost-effectiveness of the proposed project; among others, as indicated in the Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.

The fourth technical review finds that all issues raised in the third review have been addressed with the exception of the sustainability of the replication and scaling up of the project interventions and clarifying EEs for the PFG as indicated in the Corrective Action Request (CAR) raised in the review.

The fifth technical review finds that all issues raised in the fourth review have been addressed with the exception of the PFG submission date, and update of the proposal cover page as indicated in the Corrective Action Request (CAR) raised in the review.

The final technical review finds that all issues raised in the fifth review have been fully addressed.

Country Eligibility

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

Response: Yes

Secretariat: Yes.

The country has ratified both the Kyoto Protocol (30 December 1998) and the Paris Agreement (22 April 2016).
March 4, 2026

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

Response: Yes

Secretariat: Yes.

The Republic of Maldives is highly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, especially sea-level rise, extreme weather events, increased flooding frequency/ intensity, cyclones, coastal erosion, saltwater intrusion, droughts, among others.

March 4, 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 29 January 2026.

March 4, 2026

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, some amendments are required.

The total number of pages, including Annexes, is 32.

CAR1: Revise address the following:

1. On the cover page, please check the box for PFG.
2. Please use paragraph numbering to facilitate easier referencing and review.
3. Spell out abbreviations when first used and refer to figures, tables, annexes at related discussions.
4. Conduct a thorough round of editing/proofreading to the document.

March 4, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR1: Not cleared.

While the check box for PFG has been checked on the cover page; paragraphs and tables have been numbered; and abbreviations are spelled out in full when first used. However, please address:

1. Remove the check from the box of "This is the first submission ever of the concept proposal". Instead check the box in the sentence "This concept has been submitted before" and include the date.
2. Conduct a thorough round of editing/proofreading to the document.
3. Revise and amend the page numbers.
4. Please revise and amend the margins. For example, paragraph 22 is outside the borders.

May 11, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR1:

1. Cleared.

As per cover page. Check from the indicated box has been removed.

2. Not cleared.

Conduct a thorough round of editing/proofreading to the document.

3. Cleared.

Page numbering has been revised and corrected

4. Not cleared.

While paragraph 22 has been amended, please revise all the document and amend the margins accordingly. For example, paragraph 47 is outside the borders. Same with Table 5.

CAR1(NEW): the current submission is 60 pages long please reduce to 50 pages.

June 22, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR1:

2. Document has been edited

4. Margins have been adjusted

CAR1(NEW) : Cleared - the revised document is now 50 pages long

July 27, 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.

However, additional information is required.

Part II.A, pp. 13-15. Concrete actions include climate-resilient infrastructure upgrades (flood-resistant drainage & road systems; urban passive cooling through integrating vegetation corridors, urban gardens/ public spaces, tree canopies and living walls (climate smart vertical farming/ agroforestry practices); coastal green buffers via vegetation restoration actions against sea swells, sea erosion and saltwater intrusion; among others. However, more details are needed to substantiate the concrete actions, among other issues.

CR1: Please revise the project's objectives and amend as follows:

1. The overall objective statement to read "to enhance adaptation and resilience of coastal urban communities in the Maldives to the impacts of climate-induced flooding, extreme heat, coastal erosion, and water scarcity".
2. The third specific objective statement to read: "Strengthen national and local policies, climate resilient design

codes and regulatory frameworks for critical infrastructure and private sector adaptive development and build institutional and community capacities across the vulnerable Maldivian islands”.

CAR2: Please ensure the following:

1. Revise components description layout to include component, outcome under each component, outputs under each outcome, and activities under each output. Please note that activities are the actions to achieve an output. Current activities seem to be outputs.
2. Provide more details on the activities to demonstrate the amount/size of work and substantiate allocated budgets.
3. .
4. UN Habitat is one of the executing entities. In the component’s description, please indicate which components/outputs will be executed by the listed executing entities, particularly UN-Habitat. In this respect, please note that as per the AF policies the execution cost ceiling for UN-Habitat, being an IE, is 1.5% of the costs of activities executed by it, subject to the provision of reasonable justification.

CAR3:

1. Please clearly/identify the USPs, clarify if any of them would be identified at full proposal stage, and briefly discuss how they will be managed to meet AF requirements. Refer to this link for guidance.
2. Please include a sound justification for the use of USPs, if applicable, according to this guidance.

CR2: Kindly include a Theory of Change to describe the vertical logic of the proposed project. Please include the following elements:

- (i) the main problem.
- (ii) the overall objective.
- (iii) outcomes, outputs, and activities.
- (iv) components.
- (v) assumptions and risks, as transversal elements across all the above.

In addition, please include a Theory of Change Diagram after the explanation.

CR3: Please revise all outcomes and outputs, considering that outcomes are the expected results (e.g., strengthened institutional capacity) while outputs are the direct, tangible products (e.g., trainings held). Please include a target for each output.

CR4: Please provide numbers and percentages to understand the scale of the problem and the contribution of the proposed project to it.

March 4, 2026

Response:

Pending

Secretariat: CR1:

1. Cleared.

As per information on page 12. The overall objective statement has been amended to: "to enhance adaptation and resilience of coastal urban communities in the Maldives to the impacts of climate-induced flooding, extreme heat, coastal erosion, and water scarcity".

2. Cleared.

As per information on page 12. The third specific objective statement has been amended to: “Strengthen national and local policies, climate resilient design codes and regulatory frameworks for critical infrastructure and private sector adaptive development and build institutional and community capacities across the vulnerable Maldivian islands”.

CAR2:

1. Cleared.

As per information on pages 16-21. Components are described, including outcomes, outputs and activities.

2. Not cleared.

While the structure of Part II.B improved and now considers outcomes, outputs and activities. Please revise and

amend all activities for all components. For example, the activities under output 4.1.2, should be rephrased as the actions taken to create the systems, for example: “Design and develop community-led monitoring and reporting systems with youth-led initiatives and WDC.”

3. Cleared.

As per information on the cover page. UN Habitat has been removed as one of the executing entities.

CAR3: Cleared.

As per information on the answer sheet. While not stated in the CN, the answer sheet establishes that no USPs is part of the proposed project.

CR2: Not cleared.

While a Theory of Change diagram and narrative have been included, please ensure that the main problem is included in the diagram.

CR3: Cleared.

As per information on the Theory of Change diagram and Table 2. All outcomes and outputs have been revised and amended. In addition, targets have been included for outcomes and outputs for each component.

CR4: Cleared.

As per information on the section “Project/Programme Background and Context”. This information includes figures for population, sea-level rise, rainwater floodings, among others.

May 11, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR2:

2. Cleared.

As per revised Part II.B. Activities have been amended as indicated for all components of the proposal.

CR2: Cleared.

As per revised Theory of Change diagram. The main problem has been included in the diagram.

June 22, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: N/A

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, pp. 14-15. The CN provides broad narrative and logic of the project’s economic, social and environmental benefits. However, there is no information related to quantification and equitable distribution among vulnerable groups/beneficiaries including gender consideration are needed.

CAR4:

1. Please substantiate the project economic, social and environmental benefits with supporting quantification based on its planned interventions. If exact figures are unavailable, include estimation proxies.

Please outline how the benefits will be equitably distributed.

CAR5: Please ensure explicitly that the project interventions do not raise concerns of negative development/ maladaptation that would increase vulnerability of beneficiaries/non-beneficiaries or reduce their capacity to

adapt to climate change.

CAR6: Please provide an Initial Gender Assessment that outlines the distinct needs, capacities, roles, and knowledge resources of women and men, and/or identify how changing gender dynamics might drive lasting change. Include this assessment under a dedicated heading in Part I or attach as an annex.

CAR7: Please include the overall project beneficiaries (direct and indirect), gender disaggregated, and identify the specific vulnerable groups (e.g., women, indigenous peoples) that will benefit from the project.

March 4, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR4: Not cleared.

While figures have been included for each benefit dimension, however, please include:

1. references for the figures, and specifically, how beneficiaries were calculated.
2. how the benefits will be equitably distributed.

CAR5: Cleared.

As per information on paragraph 64. The proposal states that maladaptation is avoided by conducting pre-feasibility assessments alongside other criteria.

CAR6: Not cleared.

While an Initial Gender Assessment is provided in paragraph 23, the information is broad. Please include the distinct needs, capacities, roles, and knowledge resources of women and men, as well as other legal and contextual related information and statistics.

CAR7: Not cleared.

The proposal includes the overall project beneficiaries (direct and indirect), disaggregated by gender in Part II.B. However, it is not clear how the figures were calculated nor the figures per component/outcome.

May, 11, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR4: Not cleared.

While references for the figures and number of beneficiaries have been included, please specify the following:

1. How will benefits be equitably distributed? The CN indicates that “targets were cross-referenced to ensure equitable benefit distribution across highly dependent subgroups.” However, it is not clear how benefits will be equitably distributed, nor which benefits will be specifically allocated to vulnerable groups (women and others).

CAR6: Not cleared.

While the Initial Gender Assessment in paragraphs 22-25 has been strengthened, the information is broad and does not include references or enough figures. Please include numbers to understand the gender gap in each of the dimensions (work, education, etc).

CAR7: Cleared.

As shown in Table 4, this includes information on the beneficiary calculation summary for each outcome.

CAR20(NEW): Please clarify how it is expected to ensure that all interventions achieve 40–50% female participation.

June 22, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR4: Cleared

1. Section has been strengthened to address the issues of how beneficiaries were calculated and how the benefits will be equitably distributed by adding a new subsection (para 59-63) and new column to table 4 to address equitable distribution of benefits

CAR6: Cleared

Initial gender assessment has been further strengthened as recommended (see para 22 - 28)

CAR20(NEW): Cleared

A new column entitled Equitable distribution mechanism and means of verification has been added to Table 4 to explain how it will be ensured that all interventions achieve 40–50% female participation.

July 27, 2026

Is the project / programme cost effective?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, additional information is required.

Part II.C, pp. 15-18. The proposal explains that cost-effectiveness will be achieved “through integrating components, road and drainage infrastructure, water supply, natural coastal buffers and capacity building, leveraging synergies and avoiding duplication. Community-led maintenance and local materials will further enhance long-term cost efficiency”. A table comparing the selected approach with alternative actions is provided. However, further substantiation of the cost-effectiveness is recommended.

CR5: Please revise Table 4 to:

(i) Include/provide estimated dollar figures of the losses avoided/gains obtained based on the project planned interventions.

(ii) Provide a logic narrative to demonstrate the cost effectiveness per component of the proposed project.

(iii) Additionally, please highlight the sustainability point of view of the proposed interventions.

Note: Please strengthen the cost effectiveness analysis to include project specific information based on the project outputs and activities including quantitative comparison of the cost-effectiveness of the proposed measures with alternative adaptation measures is needed in the fully developed proposal.

March 4, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR5: Not cleared.

A broad explanation has been included in paragraph 6. Table 4 has been amended to include: (i) estimated losses avoided/gains obtained in USD, and (ii) sustainability perspective.

However, please strengthen the logic narrative to demonstrate the cost effectiveness per component of the proposed project.

Note: Please strengthen the cost effectiveness analysis to include project specific information based on the project outputs and activities including quantitative comparison of the cost-effectiveness of the proposed measures with alternative adaptation measures that are needed in the fully developed proposal.

May 11, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR5: Not cleared.

While Table 5 has been amended and paragraphs 68 and 69 have been included, please ensure to include:

(i) Initial estimated losses avoided/gains obtained in USD.

(ii) sustainability perspective.

(iii) strengthen the logic narrative to demonstrate the cost effectiveness per component.

Note: Please strengthen the cost effectiveness analysis to include project specific information based on the

project outputs and activities including quantitative comparison of the cost-effectiveness of the proposed measures with alternative adaptation measures that are needed in the fully developed proposal.

June 22, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR5: Cleared

Table 5 has been revised to include suggested changes and the narrative strengthened.

Moreover, it is stated that the estimated avoided losses and economic gains will be further validated during full proposal preparation through detailed engineering assessments, lifecycle costing, climate risk modelling and a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis.

July 27, 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: Pending

Secretariat: Unsure.

Further information is required.

Part II.D, pp. 18-19. The proposal provides broad information about national strategies relevant to the proposed project such as the National Adaptation Plan. However, it would be recommended to double check the relevance of additional national/ subnational plans.

CAR8: Please double the relevance of additional national/ subnational plans/ strategies (e.g.: sustainable development plans, poverty reduction strategies, SDGs, etc), if any, and include as appropriate in Part II.D.

Please ensure that the table listing is comprehensive and includes all relevant plans and strategies related to adaptation, as well as sectoral plans (such as those related to biodiversity, water and food security if they exist).

CR6: Kindly provide the details of the identified plans and strategies in a table format, including:

(i) Specific name of the plan/strategy and years of implementation,

(ii) Main objective(s),

(iii) Explain the relevance to the proposed project, including its alignment with the existing plan or strategy. A suggested structure could be: 'The proposed project is aligned with [Plan XX], under [Specific Action XX], contributing to [Outcome XX].'

March 4, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR8: Cleared.

As per information provided in Part II.D and Table 5. The list includes the NDC 3.0, The National Adaptation Plan, The Maldives Climate Change Framework, among others.

CR6: Cleared.

As per information provided in Table 5.

The proposal includes Table 5 that provides a list of 10 plans and strategies, including: (i) name of the plan/strategy and years of implementation, (ii) specific clauses, and (iii) the relevance to the proposed project.

May 11, 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.

Further information is required.

Part II.E, p. 19. The proposal provides broad information about compliance with national standards and AF principles. However, a comprehensive list of specific standards applicable to the proposed project is not provided.

CR7: Please include a tabulated list of the relevant national technical standards (with dates), indicate to which project interventions/ activities they apply, and explain how related compliance will be realized. In the case that compliance is required, please include the steps needed to comply with it.

CAR9: Please ensure that the table listing is comprehensive. Applicable standards may include building codes, water quality regulations, environmental requirements, and any other sector-specific related regulations relevant to the project interventions.

March 4, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR7: Not cleared.

Regarding the information in Part II.E and Table 6, the list should be based on the standards (one row per standard). In this context, when compliance is required, please include the steps needed to comply with each standard.

CAR9: Cleared.

As per information provided in Table 6.

The list includes applicable standards for building, water regulations, environmental requirements, and capacity building.

May 11, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR7: Not cleared.

While Table 7 now includes information based on the standards, please ensure that the list is comprehensive.

Given the proposed interventions, it should also include standards related to energy, energy efficiency, agriculture, gender, among others.

June 22, 2016

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR7: Cleared

Additional standards related to energy, gender and plant protection have been included

July 27, 2026

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: No.

Further information is required.

Part II.F, p. 20 (Table 5). The CN provides information about five projects in Maldives that are related to this proposed project. It states their name, thematic area, budget and donor, and status. However, more details are needed as well as a sound justification for non-duplication.

CR8: Please revise Table 5 to indicate the listed projects in a table listing format for easier visualization and review. Also, identify other related ongoing or completed projects and include them in the table. For each, please include:

- (i) Project title, Timeline and specific Location within the country,
- (ii) Main project interventions, and Target population,
- (iii) Implementing entity,
- (iv) Lessons learned, how they are considered/ reflected in the proposed project design,
- (v) Overlaps and synergies with the proposed project.

CR9: The no duplication statement should be clearly justified (e.g. by indicating the distinct geographic locations and/or types of i120: Please revise section Part II.F title to read "Duplication with other Funding Sources".

March 4, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR8: Cleared.

As per information provided in Table 7.

The indicate table now includes the following columns: (i) Project title, Timeline and Location; (ii) Main project interventions; (iii) Implementing entity; (iv) Lessons learned; and (v) Overlaps and synergies with the proposed project.

CR9: Not cleared.

Please include a no-duplication statement for each project identified related to the proposal.

May 11, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR9: Not cleared.

Please include a sound justification for no-duplication for each project identified related to the proposal.

June 22, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR9: Cleared

Justification for no duplication added to Table 8 (pp 36 - 39)

July 27, 2026

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: No.

Further information is required.

Part II.G, pp. 20-21. The discussion in Part II.G indicates that all the project components include awareness, knowledge and capacity building activities. However, this statement has to be further substantiated by identifying these activities. Also, means and tools of disseminating the project knowledge products among the project stakeholder/beneficiaries and the wider concerned audience need to be discussed.

CAR10: Please briefly highlight the learning and knowledge management aspects/activities of the project

components and the means/tools for disseminating the project knowledge products among the project stakeholders/ beneficiaries and the wider concerned audience.

Kindly include the following details:

1. More details of the Learning and Knowledge Management activities, including institutions involved, specific activities, and main goals.
2. who will be responsible for tracking the experiences gained, how this will be done, and when the tracking will take place.
3. how the knowledge generated will be sustained after the project concludes and what arrangements are needed to support these actions.
4. What feedback measures are put in place to evaluate and refine the training materials and capacity building activities to ensure that they are more effective and impactful.

CR11: Please consider including an exclusive component dedicated to Learning and Knowledge Management activities.

March 4, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR10: Cleared.

As per information provided in Table 8. It includes, for different expected outputs, information on the related knowledge products, the institutions involved, and the feedback measures and knowledge-tracking mechanisms.

CR11: Cleared.

As per information provided in Part II.G, paragraph 76. The proposal now includes Component 4, a dedicated component to Learning and Knowledge Management activities.

May 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: Yes.

Further information is required.

Part II.H, pp. 21-24 (Table 6). The proposal provides a table listing with 10 consultations, including date, attendees, and reflect consultations with key public stakeholders and one private entity. However, the information provided is broad, and it seems that no consultations with local communities/vulnerable groups are indicated, among other issues.

CAR11: Please include a summary table of the consultations conducted, including with key stakeholders and local communities. The table should include:

- (i) date of consultation,
- (ii) consulted entity/ group,
- (iii) number of participants disaggregated by gender,
- (iv) topics discussed and how they were considered in project design.
- (v) background information to verify whether marginalized and vulnerable groups have been consulted
- (vi) Moreover, please indicate if further future consultations will be conducted.

CAR12: Please clarify whether any consultations with local communities/vulnerable groups and stakeholders with a gender remit were conducted and included in the table. Justify such consultations were not conducted at this stage, if it is the case, as they are required in compliance with AF ESP/GP.

CAR13: Please include an Initial Gender Analysis in the CN. It should contain qualitative and quantitative data, to

clarify the opportunities and challenges/risks for men and women. The information provided should inform and guide the identification of women's specific needs.

The information provided should inform and guide the identification of women's specific needs.

March 4, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR11: Cleared.

As per information provided in paragraph 77 and Table 9. The table now includes, for each consultation, the name of the stakeholder, the meeting date, the participants (disaggregated by sex), and the key points of discussion. In addition, it states that further consultations will be conducted in the future.

CAR12: Not cleared.

While additional information has been included in Table 9 and consultations included female participation in all sessions, no other vulnerable groups or stakeholders with a gender remit were identified. Please justify why such consultations were not conducted at this stage, if applicable, as they are required to comply with the AF ESP/GP.

CAR13: Not cleared.

While an Initial Gender Assessment is provided in paragraph 23, the information is broad. Please include the distinct needs, capacities, roles, and knowledge resources of women and men, as well as other legal and contextual related information and statistics. This should include quantitative data when possible.

May 11, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR12: Not cleared.

Please clarify under Part II.H whether any other vulnerable groups, besides women, have been consulted.

CAR13: Not cleared.

Please see CAR6.

June 22, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR12: Cleared

This has been addressed in Part II.H. vulnerable groups such as elderly and youth have been consulted through community information and needs assessment surveys. (See Table 10, entry for 08.03.2026- Community evaluation survey)

CAR13:Cleared

Narrative has been strengthened (See response for CAR6).

July 27, 2026

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Unsure.

Further information is required.

Part II.I, pp. 24-25. The CN outlines broad narrative to sustain the cost of adaptation reasoning. It does not include a Business-as-usual and AF Project scenarios for each of the components to provide the full cost of adaptation reasoning. In addition, the proposal does not provide clear information on additional funding

sources.

CAR14: Please revise the discussion to further demonstrate how the project design (components/outcomes/outputs/activities) would achieve its objectives solely based on the requested AF funds, and irrespective of additional funding/ co-financing from other donors/ sources.

CR12: Please provide a detailed logical narrative on how the proposed project's objective will be achieved in terms of adaptation. Additionally, include information on the costs of the proposed activities, with reference to alternative options.

March 4, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR14: Not cleared.

Please revise the discussion to further demonstrate, with evidence from international literature or results from similar projects, how the project design will achieve its objectives. In addition, please clarify whether the outcomes will be achieved solely through AF funding.

CR12: Not cleared.

Please strengthen the logical narrative explaining how the proposed project's objective will be achieved in terms of adaptation, and include more detailed cost estimates, where possible, in relation to the BAU scenario.

May 11, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR14: Cleared.

As per revised Part II.I. The proposal confirms that AF funding is the sole source of funding for the proposed project (paragraph 85). In addition, it now includes references to international experiences (paragraphs 92 and 93).

CR12: Cleared.

As per revised Part II.I Paragraph 91 has been included to strengthen the logical narrative on how the proposed project's objectives will be achieved in terms of adaptation, in comparison with the BAU scenario

June 22, 2026

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, additional information is required.

Part IIIA, pp. 29-31. The alignment of the project with the Adaptation Fund Results Framework is presented, considering outcomes and outputs for each component. However, some amendments are required.

CAR15: Please revise the alignment table to address the following and to align with AF requirement as per template and example provided at Results Framework Alignment Table (Nov 2025).

CR13: Please ensure that all project's outputs and outcomes indicators are SMART.

March 4, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR15: Not Cleared.

As per information provided in Table 12. Numbering and wording of AF indicators is consistent with the Results Framework Alignment Table.

1. However, please present the grant amount for each output indicator.

2. The table does not fully comply with the template for example there is no total row at the end of the top part neither at the bottom of the table as required.

CR13: Cleared.

As per information provided in Table 12. The project's outputs and outcomes indicators are SMART.

May 11, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR15: Cleared.

As per revised Table 12.

CAR2(NEW): At Part II section B, please insert a sentence indicating how the proposal is aligned to strategic outcome areas of the fund ,2,3,4,5 and 7 as supported by Part IIIA.

June 22, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR2(NEW): Cleared

Alignment with fund outcomes added as recommended (paragraph 64)

July 27, 2026

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, additional information is required.

Part II.J, pp. 25-26. The proposed project provides broad information on its sustainability from the institutional, social, economic, financial and environmental perspectives. However, more specific information is needed.

CAR16: Please revise the discussion under Part II.J to:

1. Clearly explain the arrangements through which sustainability under each area (i.e., economic, environmental, social, etc.) would be achieved, taking into account the sustainability of operation and maintenance (O&M) of infrastructures/ installations to be developed.
2. Briefly discuss the potential replication/ upscaling of the project adaptation benefits/outcomes achieved by project with other funds after its completion/end.

March 4, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR16: Not cleared.

While additional information has been provided on the arrangements required to ensure sustainability, please address the following points:

1. How is a sense of ownership that endures over time expected to be created? Please support your response with evidence.
2. Are there any pre-arrangements in place with local authorities and the state-owned utility provider?
3. How will the potential replication and/or upscaling of the project's adaptation benefits and outcomes be ensured after project completion?

May 11, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR16: Not cleared.

While additional information has been provided, it is still too broad. Please address the following:

1. Are there any pre-arrangements in place with the authorities (besides the willingness)?
2. How will the potential replication and/or upscaling of the project's adaptation benefits and outcomes be ensured after project completion? (include this in a specific paragraph).

June 22, 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR16:

1. Cleared, The narrative has been strengthened to outline the pre-arrangements
2. Not Cleared:

While paragraph 110 explains the mechanisms for obtaining replication and upscaling, but it does not yet fully explain how replication and upscaling will be ensured after project completion. It lists several plausible enablers, but it does not clearly show the post-completion ownership, funding, maintenance, monitoring, and accountability arrangements that make scale-up actually happen.

Please revise the final sentence, stating that replication and upscaling will be ensured through formal institutional handover, integration into national and local planning and regulatory systems, sustained data management and knowledge transfer, and a post-project monitoring framework supported by the responsible authorities. That would move the paragraph from describing potential scale-up to showing a credible post-completion pathway for it.

July 37, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR16 (2): Cleared, the proposal has integrated additional comments to strengthen the narrative on Replicability and Scalability of Interventions (page 42)

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.

Further information is required.

Part II.K, pp. 26-27 (Table 7). The CN provides broad information about environmental and social risks through the risks identified against the 15 AF ESP principles. However, no mitigation measures are described, the project screening classification has not been included, and several amendments are required.

CR14: Please provide: (i) a brief discussion to highlight the potential project risks, and (ii) specify the project overall AF risk category (Category A, B or C) based on the initial E&S screening.

CR15:

1. Refer to the Initial Gender Assessment and USPs, if any, as appropriate at relevant E&S principles.

CAR17: Please revise Table 7 to:

1. Describe all potential impacts (direct, indirect, transboundary and cumulative) and risks that could result from the project.
2. Revise the magnitude of the risks and impacts (low, moderate, high). Risks should describe as: "There is a risk

....” and should be accompanied by mitigation plans as: “Mitigation measures are” or “To mitigate this risk, the project”

3. Kindly leave a check mark in the second column ‘No further assessment required for compliance’ if no further assessment is needed and leave blank if an assessment is to be conducted. No text should be included in the second column.

4. If no risk is identified for a given principle, a sound justification must be provided.

5. Please note that AF Principles 1, 4 and 6 always apply. For more information, please visit: AF’s ESP guidance and Environmental and Social Policy . If USPs will be part of the project, please address in a brief explanation under Part II.K.

March 4, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR14: Cleared.

As per information provided in paragraph 94. The project overall AF risk category is C based on the initial E&S screening.

CR15: Not cleared.

See CAR 13 above.

CAR17: Not cleared.

Please ensure that Table 11:

1. Describe all potential impacts (direct, indirect, transboundary and cumulative) and risks that could result from the project.

2. Risks should describe as: “There is a risk” and should be accompanied by mitigation plans as: “Mitigation measures are” or “To mitigate this risk, the project”

3. If no risk is identified for a given principle, a sound justification must be provided.

4. Please note that AF Principles 1, 4 and 6 always apply. For more information, please visit: AF’s ESP guidance and Environmental and Social Policy .

May 11, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR14(re-opened):

Please explain the reason behind the change in the overall AF risk category from C to B2.

CR15: Not cleared.

Please see CAR6.

CAR17: Not cleared.

While some amendments have been included, please ensure in Table 12 the following:

1. Expand the description of the potential impacts (direct, indirect, and cumulative) and risks, as they are currently too broad and do not make it easy to understand the actual risk associated with each principle.

June 22, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR14 : Cleared

The overall AF risk category was revised from C to B2 upon recommendation of the UN-Habitat ESSS Officer during a further review, following detailed screening of the project's physical interventions (climate-resilient infrastructure, drainage, IWRM, and ecosystem-based interventions). This screening confirmed medium-level environmental and social risks, manageable through an ESMP and monitored via an E&S Monitoring Plan, with no involuntary resettlement, impacts on critical/protected habitats, indigenous peoples, or cultural heritage

sites, and no environmental license required. The concept note (Part II) has been revised accordingly to reflect Category B2. This has been justified in narrative under section K (para 111).

CR15 : Cleared

Addressed see CAR6

CAR17 : Cleared

Table 12 has been updated accordingly

July 27, 2026

Resource Availability

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

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes.

May 4, 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: No.

Some amendments are needed.

All figures are rounded to whole numbers, and totals are consistent throughout the CN. The PFG request is correct in amount (USD 141,050). UN-Habitat is serving as both the Implementing Entity and the Executing Entity. However, the submission is not accompanied by a PFG form; therefore, it is not possible to state whether a PFG fee for the Implementing Entity's management is included. In addition, the IE fees exceed the 8.5% cap.

CR16: Please amend the IE fees to a maximum of 8.5% of the total project/programme budget. For further information: (i) definitions <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/generic/costs-and-fees/> and (ii) IE and EE Fees Calculator <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/ie-and-ee-fees-calculator/>.

CAR18: Please include the PFG form with the resubmission. The form is available at Request for Project Formulation Grant (PFG) (57 kB, DOC)

Please keep in mind the PFG fee of a maximum of 8.5% of the total PFG as IE fee only, and provide a detailed description of the outputs to be financed by the PFG.

March 4, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR16: Cleared.

The IE fees are 8.5% of the total project/programme budget (USD 1,566,820).

CR17 (NEW): Please confirm if Ministry of Environment and Tourism and Ministry of Construction, Housing and Infrastructure will also execute the PFG. If not please remove the PFG form.

CAR18: Not Cleared.

PFG includes a fee of 8.5% of the total, equivalent to USD11,050. However, please insert it in the table as the Total PFG amount includes the IE fee.

May 11, 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR17(NEW): Cleared.

According to the answer sheet, both ministries will be the executing Entities for the PFG.

CAR18: Cleared.

The PFG fee is included in the table as requested.

CR18(NEW):

1. Please strengthen the description in the "Budget Note" column of the PFG form. Please include details such as how many topographic surveys will be financed, how many field visits are being considered, and how many project team members are included for travel and meetings, among other details.
2. Please update the start and end date for the PFG.

June 22 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR18(NEW): Cleared

1. Budget note has been strengthened as recommended in the PFG
2. Dates have been updated accordingly in the PFG

July 27, 2026

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, some amendments are needed.

All figures are rounded to whole numbers, and totals are consistent throughout the CN. UN-Habitat serves as both the Implementing Entity and the Executing Entity, and as such, the limit for execution is 1.5%. In addition, the role of UN-Habitat serving as both Executing and Implementing Entity should be justified, as this arrangement is considered exceptional.

CAR19: Please clarify whether UN-HABITAT will act as the Executing Entity. If so, please include a sound justification for these arrangements, as they are considered exceptional.

March 4, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR19: Cleared.

Un-Habitat will serve solely as the Implementing Entity.

May 11, 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR19 (NEW):

1. Please clarify if UN-Habitat will execute the PFG if so please amend the EEs listed in the PFG.
2. Please include a submission date for the PFG.
3. Please update the dates on the cover page of the proposal document

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR19 (NEW): Cleared as per revisions on the cover pages of the proposal and PFG

Eligibility of IE

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: No.

United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) is in Re-accreditation Process.

Last accreditation expired on 01 October 2025.

Please be advised that the findings of the AFB Secretariat's review of the funding proposal(s) do not reflect, indicate, or prejudice the outcome of the reaccreditation process currently underway. The Implementing Entity (IE) shall acknowledge that the funding proposal will not be approved by the Board if the IE's accreditation has expired, and reaccreditation has not been achieved at the time of the Board's decision. Notwithstanding this potential risk, the IE has elected to proceed with the development of the funding proposal.

March 4, 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes.

As per decision B.46/9.

May 11, 2026



Revised PFG Submission Form¹ (additions in red)

Project Formulation Grant (PFG)

Submission Date:

Adaptation Fund Project ID:

Country/ies: Maldives

Title of Project/Programme: Enhancing Climate and Socio-Economic Resilience integrating Nature-Based Solutions for island Communities in the Maldives

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

Implementing Entity: UN-Habitat

Executing Entity/ies: ~~Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Ministry of Climate Change, Environment~~
and Energy

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 2.5"

~~Ministry of Construction, Housing and Infrastructure Ministry of~~
Infrastructure Housing and Urban Development

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 1.44"

Formatted: English (United Kingdom)

A. Project Preparation Timeframe

Start date of PFG	~~1st May 2026~~ 1 st December 2026
Completion date of PFG	~~30th November 2026~~ 31 st May 2027

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Superscript

B. Proposed Project Preparation Activities (\$)

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note ²
Climate risk profiles and design parameters for flood-, storm surge-, and pluvial-resilient infrastructure, including elevation benchmarks, drainage capacity ranges,	Climate and coastal risk profiles; flood, storm surge, and pluvial risk maps; design parameters and decision-support baseline for climate-	35,000	Engagement of climate/coastal resilience consultant <u>team</u> ; compilation and analysis of historical rainfall, tide, wave, and flood data; participatory hazard

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.

and safety margins for selected islands.	resilient infrastructure in selected islands		mapping; identification of critical risk zones and monitoring locations; development of design-relevant climate parameters for infrastructure planning. (2 field missions and 6 stakeholder consultation sessions to develop design-relevant climate parameters)
Engineering and design pre-feasibility for climate-resilient infrastructure (roads elevation, drainage, retrofitting public buildings and housing, integrated water management systems)	Conceptual and pre-feasibility engineering designs; cost ranges and technical options	20,000	two topographic surveys: one for island-wide baseline elevation and drainage mapping for planning purposes, and another for detailed site-specific engineering design in priority intervention areas. The surveys will support structural assessments, drainage analysis, and climate-adaptive design of roads, housing, public buildings, and water systems.s.2 Topographic surveys, preliminary structural assessments, drainage capacity checks, and climate-adaptive design options
Ecosystem restoration & Blue-Green corridor feasibility studies (urban greening and coastal green buffers)	Feasibility reports; site suitability analysis; baseline ecological data	20,000	2 Field surveys, sediment dynamics analysis, ecosystem condition assessment, and review of existing master plans
Data collection for baseline and analysis for each component	Collected data required to set up basis for argument formulation	5,000	3 Field visits, sample collection, data entry and preliminary

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

	and programme justification in the proposal		analysis across all project components
Travel and meetings required for data collection and consultation	Confirmation of assumptions and situation on the ground before programme document finalized	20,000	Travel, and DSA for 4 project team <u>members per mission with 4-5 field missions including consultations with government, councils, WDCs, communities, and private sector stakeholders, and stakeholders for fieldwork and consultation meetings</u>
Expert hiring for proposal development (technical + safeguards)	Use of collected baseline data to justify programme and enhance proposal with UN-Habitat support and ESSS assessment	20,000	Consultancy fees for technical lead and ESS/gender specialist to draft and finalize proposal
Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with Mult stakeholders	Stakeholder-validated Goal, Outcomes, Outputs, and implementation arrangements	10,000	4 FGDs with island councils, ministries, Women Development Councils, communities including youth groups, and private sector
Sub Total for Activities		130,000	
Management fee- 8.5%		11,050	
Total Project Formulation Grant		141,050	

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

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

For LLA Projects only:

If requesting additional funding for LLA projects to enable devolving decision making to the local level, please specify the activities that would directly serve to enable devolving decision making to the lowest

appropriate level and enable local actors to make informed decisions on how adaptation actions are defined, prioritized, designed, and implemented:

Please provide justifications for their need and for the amount of additional funding required:

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
Raf Tuts		05/02/2026	Odicea Angelo Barrios	(81-92) 724-7121	odicea.angelobarrios1@un.org

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ



Ministry of Tourism and Environment
Male', Republic of Maldives



Date: 1 April 2026

No: 88-CCD/PRIV/2026/479

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

Subject: Endorsement for “Enhancing Climate and Socio-Economic Resilience Integrating Nature-Based Solutions for Island Communities in the Maldives” Project

In my capacity as Designated Authority for the Adaptation Fund in Maldives, I confirm that the above national project/programme 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 Maldives.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above project/programme proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project/programme will be implemented by UN HABITAT and executed by Ministry of Tourism and Environment, and Ministry of Construction, Housing and Infrastructure.

Sincerely,

Amjad Abdulla,
Designated Authority for the Adaptation Fund