



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.38/17/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 (n)

PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR MEXICO

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.38/17 “Proposal for Mexico” 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 AF00000527 “Program for the Resilience of Vulnerable Smallholder Coffee Producers in Mexico - Adaptcafé”. This proposal was submitted by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), 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 field studies and stakeholder consultations to validate the project design and inform full proposal development; Economic and financial analysis; gender assessment and social inclusion analysis, risk assessments and full proposal development.

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



ADAPTATION FUND

ADAPTATION FUND BOARD SECRETARIAT
TECHNICAL REVIEW OF PROJECT PROPOSAL FOR
" PROGRAM FOR THE RESILIENCE OF VULNERABLE SMALLHOLDER COFFEE PRODUCERS
IN MEXICO - ADAPTCAFÉ"

Project Title	PROGRAM FOR THE RESILIENCE OF VULNERABLE SMALLHOLDER COFFEE PRODUCERS IN MEXICO - ADAPTCAFÉ
Project ID	AF00000527
Category	Regular size project (over \$1 million)
Type	Single country project
Stage	Concept
Country	Mexico
Implementing Entity	IFAD
Financing Requested	USD 25,000,000.00
Reviewer	Francisca Saavedra

Co-reviewer(s)

IE Contact Person

Clarissa Conte,Fanny Minjauw,María-Mercedes Proaño Villalba,Pierre Yves Guedez,Wietse Michiels

Secretariat's Overall Comment

The project “Program for the Resilience of Vulnerable Smallholder Coffee Producers in Mexico - ADAPTCAFÉ” aims to strengthen the long-term climate resilience of vulnerable small-scale coffee producers, and of the ecosystems that sustain their livelihoods, in Mexico’s priority production landscapes by 2032.

The first technical review raised several issues, such as shortening the proposal document to AF limits; revising components financing table to include components totals, and project calendar to include month of the year; adding more details on the activities; clarifying possible USPs and related compliance with AF requirements; specifying the AF outcomes supported by the project; quantifying project benefits and confirming no concerns of any negative development/ maladaptation; further clarification of the project cost-effectiveness; double checking the relevance of UNCCD NAP; providing more information about related projects; providing information on applicable national technical standards; revising the discussion on the project outcomes sustainability; revising the alignment with AF RF as per the latest AF updated guidance; among other Clarification Requests (CRs), Corrective Action Requests (CARs), and notes raised in the review.

The second technical review found that while some of the CARs and CRs have been addressed, there are some CRs and CARs remaining related to indicative activities, quantification of losses averted or gains, O&M costs, as raised in the review.

The third technical review raised several issues, such as the need to strengthen the Theory of Change narrative, revise the structure of the project's objectives and outputs, and provide a clearer description of what will be financed under each component, among others, as is discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.

The fourth technical review raises a few issues; most CRs and CARs were addressed, and only a few outstanding issues remain on duplication of costs, IE serving as EE etc. as indicated in the CRs and CARs raised.

Country Eligibility

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

Response: Yes

Secretariat: Mexico ratified the Kyoto Protocol on 7 September 2000 and the Paris Agreement on 21 September 2016.

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

Response: Yes

Secretariat: Yes.

Mexico is vulnerable to climate change impacts including increased sea level and temperature, extreme weather events, erratic rainfall, droughts, floods, and reduced water precipitation among others.

10 May 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 2025.

10 May 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: No. Proposal length including annexes is 52 pages.

CAR1: Reduce proposal length including annexes to 50 pages and ensure it remains as such after addressing the review comments.

CAR2: In the "Project Components and Financing" Table 5, pp. 15-16, please include the total cost of each component (as a dedicated row). Also, remove the "\$" sign in front of the amounts listed (it is mentioned in the column heading) and separate million, thousand and hundred digits by commas.

CR1: In the project calendar, Table 7, p. 16, please add month of the year. Also, note that terminal evaluation should be scheduled within 9 months after project closing.

Editorial Comments: To improve the quality/ clarity of the proposal document, please consider the following:

1. Add Table of contents, and Lists of acronyms/ abbreviations, tables and figures (will not count toward proposal document length).
2. Spell out abbreviations when first used and refer to tables, figures and annexes at related discussions/ text.
3. Conduct another quick round of editing/ proofreading to the proposal document.

10 May 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR3(NEW): Please update the stage of submission section on the cover page.

CAR1: Cleared.

The total proposal has been shortened to 50 pages.

CAR2: Cleared.

As per page 20, the "Project Components and Financing" Table 5, has been updated to reflect the total cost of each component. The \$ has been removed and million, thousand and hundred digits are separated by commas.

CAR2 (NEW): Please note that '9.5% of total project costs' relates to the Project Execution Costs. Please remove '9.5% of total project costs' from the Table 5.

CR1: Cleared.

As per page 20, the month of the year has been added, and the terminal evaluation is scheduled 9 months after project closing.

Editorial comments addressed.

26 June 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR3(NEW): Cleared.

The stage of submission has been updated on the cover page to read: "This concept has been submitted before."

CAR2 (NEW): Cleared.

Table 5 now shows only "9.5%", and the phrase "of total project costs" has been removed.

However, please add paragraph numbering to facilitate the review process. Please include this editorial comment also in the Full Proposal.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Editorial note has been addressed.

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.

See Part IIA, pp. 19-28.

Concrete actions include: i) rehabilitating/ renovating 3000 ha of coffee productive units; complementing/ strengthening existing Nacional System for Phytosanitary Epidemiological Surveillance by operationalizing a community “last-mile” protocol/s; validating/ adopting climate-resilient post-harvest technologies; upgrading/ establishing 200 FFS to serve as platform for technology transfer and peer learning; providing in-kind support (equipment, material, inputs, etc.) for the renovation of old/ unproductive coffee trees/ on-farm small-scale processing; among other related technical, management and organizational capacity building actions as discussed in Part IIA. However, more details on the indicative activities are needed among other issues noted below.

CR2: Provide more details on the indicative activities (particularly under components 1 & 2 to further demonstrate the size of work to be undertaken (e.g., number of planned interventions, number of targeted beneficiaries, areas of rehabilitated lands, number of renovate/ established, training sessions and recipients, etc.) and substantiate allocated budgets.

CAR3: The generic description/ lack of details on the indicative activities (specific locations, number of interventions and targeted beneficiaries, selection of eligible recipients of in-kind resources/ support under output 2.1, etc.) may imply unidentified subprojects (USPs). Please, specify these USPs, if any, and indicate those that will be identified at full proposal stage and others that will be identified during project implementation and how these will be managed in compliance with related AF requirements. For guidance on USPs classification/ management please refer to: Guidance Document for Project/Programme with Unidentified Sub-Projects

Note: If the proposal will have USP, please ensure that the PFG adequately addresses the requirements according to the AF related guidance.

CAR4: Clarify in a dedicated brief paragraph at the end of Part I (after objectives) or as appropriate in Part IIA, the AF Strategic Objectives/ outcomes supported by the project (related information can be extracted from alignment with AF RF table in Part IIIA).

10 May 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR2: Not Cleared.

As per pages 24 – 33 further details were provided on the indicative activities and targets. However, details such as number of local institutions and beneficiaries are still missing from component 2.

For example, the activity “Carry out training at the farm group level and at the member level...”, should indicate how many farmer groups will be targeted and how many training sessions are expected to be held. On Page 30 ‘Provide technical assistance to Local Financial Institutions – the number of institutions should be referenced as noted in latter parts of the proposal.

CAR3: Cleared.

The IE notes there are no USPs. The locations of activities, e.g. Oaxaca, Chiapas, and Guerrero are identified at the municipality level. As per page 54 the exact project locations will be confirmed during the full proposal. Please ensure that the proposal explicitly states the project locations, interventions in the full proposal.

Note page 20, Output 1.3, Activity” Implement on-farm water harvesting and infiltration projects, a suite of

possibilities are provided. Though this implies USPs, please ensure the full proposal adequately identifies the measures being used on the precise intervention site.

CAR4: Not Cleared.

On page 18, the proposal notes the project is aligned to AF outcomes 1,2,3,5 and 6. However please also state the full name of AF Strategic Objectives/Outcomes.

26 June 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR2: Not Cleared.

- Please provide sufficient detail under each component so that the reader can clearly understand the specific activities and interventions that will be financed under the proposed project. For example, the activity "Carry out training at the farm group level and at the member level..." should indicate how many farmer groups will be targeted and how many training sessions are expected to be held. Also, the activity 'Provide technical assistance to Local Financial Institutions – the number of institutions should be referenced as noted in latter parts of the proposal.
- Please remove all contextual information from Part II.A and move it to the Context section.

CAR4: Cleared.

As per the revised page 15, the names of the AF outcomes have been included in full.

CR11(NEW): Please revise and restructure the project's goal and objectives as follows:

- The goal is overly detailed and combines development outcomes, means, and results. It should focus solely on the main long-term development change the project seeks to achieve, describing what will be achieved rather than how it will be achieved.
- The objectives currently mix objectives and targets, which are distinct concepts. Objectives should describe the change expected as a result of project implementation, while targets should be reflected in the indicators used to measure those changes. In addition, implementation means and activities should not be included in the objective statements.

CR12(NEW): Please revise the project's outputs and amend accordingly.

- outputs 1.1, 2.1, 2.2 and 3.2 seem to be formulated as outcomes rather than outputs.
- A. Output 1.1 describes a change in the production system. Consider reformulating it as: "Climate-resilient coffee varieties and ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) practices deployed in target coffee production systems."
- B. Output 2.1 uses the term "expanded," which refers to a change in beneficiaries' access and is typically considered an outcome. A possible alternative is: "Financing mechanisms tailored to small-scale coffee producers developed and made available."
- C. Output 2.2 uses "strengthened", which refers to a result. It needs to be at the output level.
- D. Output 3.2 refers to the establishment of commercial relationships, which is a result rather than a deliverable of the project and therefore appears to be an outcome.

CR13(NEW): Please revise Output 3.3 to include a verb. For example, would "Knowledge management and peer learning for climate-resilient coffee systems delivered" be appropriate?

Please note that outputs are tangible deliverables produced by the proposed project

CR14(NEW): Please restructure the Theory of Change into a single narrative paragraph for the entire project. The Theory of Change should not be organized around components, as components represent the proposed

solutions to the development problem identified. In addition, please revise the figure to remove the goal, as it currently reads more like the narrative of the Theory of Change. Instead, include the main problem to be addressed and the project's overall objective as the first two blocks. After that, the outcomes, outputs, barriers, assumptions, and risks appear to be well positioned.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR2: Cleared

Sufficient detail added to each of the components.

CR11(NEW): Cleared

- Goal of the project is well stated (pg 9, paragraph 39)
- Objectives well stated; they describe change expected

CR12(NEW): Cleared

Outputs 1.1, 2.1, 2.2 and 3.2 are worded as outputs as recommended (paragraph 45, 58, 61 and 69)

CR13(NEW): Cleared

Output 3.3 corrected; a verb was added (paragraph 70)

CR14(NEW): Cleared

Adjusted the ToC text and diagram as recommended. (paragraph 43 and page 14)

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: Not fully. See Part IIB, pp. 28-29.

CAR5: Please address the following:

1. In Table 7, pp. 28-29, please provide more quantification on the expected beneficiaries (disaggregated by gender) with particular reference to equitable distribution of benefits to the vulnerable communities, households, and individuals. Also, quantify as possible at this stage these benefits (e.g.: dollar estimates of the economic benefits, new job opportunities/ improved welfare under social benefits rehabilitated land/ coffee fields/ etc. under environmental benefits). Some related information can be extracted/ borrowed from Part IA.7, p. 13, and Table 9, p. 32.
2. In a dedicated paragraph, please confirm that the project will not imply any concerns of negative development/ maladaptation that would increase vulnerability of beneficiaries/ non-beneficiaries, or reduce their capacity to adapt to climate change.

CR3: Table 7, pp. 28-29, refers to the restoration of 2,500 ha of degraded land, while under the description of output 1.1, p. 19, reference is made to the renovation of approximately 3,000 ha of coffee productive units. Please clarify/ ensure consistency.

10 May 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR5: Not Cleared.

1. As per Table 7, pages 34-36, beneficiaries have been quantified. As per CR2, please ensure these are referenced in Part II, Section A as appropriate. Please indicate in Section B that quantification of benefits will be defined and included in the full proposal.
2. Page 36, includes a paragraph confirming the project will not have any concerns of negative development/ maladaptation that would increase vulnerability of beneficiaries/ non-beneficiaries.

CR3: Not Cleared.

Under Output 1.1, the proponent refers to

- renovation of approximately 3,000 ha of coffee productive units
- the application of EbA practices on at least 2,500 ha
- the restoration of 2,500 ha of degraded land

However, Table 7, page 35, now states “Restores 2,500 ha of degraded land and supports EbA practices across 3,000 ha”. Please confirm whether the intended EbA target is 2,500 ha or 3,000 ha and ensure that the figures are consistent throughout the proposal.

Please provide a clearer indicator formulation for clarity.

26 June 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR5:

1. Not Cleared.

The information presented is not clear. Please include a table only for beneficiaries (direct and indirect), disaggregated by gender and other vulnerable groups. Include footnote 33 in this table.

2. Not Cleared.

While the proposal includes a paragraph stating that the project is not expected to result in negative development impacts or maladaptation that could increase the vulnerability of beneficiaries or non-beneficiaries, please expand the narrative to explain why such risks are not anticipated. Currently, the section only includes a brief statement without supporting justification.

CR3: Cleared.

Table 7 has been amended to read: “Restores 2,500 ha of degraded land and supports EbA practices across 2,500 ha”.

CR15(NEW): Please include quantitative data for the project economic, social and environmental benefits based on its planned interventions. If exact figures are not available, kindly include estimation proxies. For example, in the case of component 1, how much are expected to reduce avoidable production? how much coffee quality will improve?

CR16(NEW): Please outline how the benefits will be equitably distributed, considering the vulnerable groups included in the proposed interventions (women and youth).

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR5: Cleared

1. Cleared

Table 7A has a list of direct and indirect beneficiaries disaggregated by gender, age, and indigenous peoples (page 24)

2. Cleared

Paragraph 75 explains how the project will avoid negative impacts.

CR15(NEW): Cleared

Table 7B includes quantitative data for economic, social and environmental benefits (page 25)

CR16(NEW): Cleared

Paragraph 74 explains how the plan is to make benefit sharing equitable. This explanation needs to be detailed and concrete for the full proposal.

Note 1: Table 7B has two labels. Suggest deleting "Table 7B summarises the economic, social and environmental benefits from the proposed interventions."

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Note 1: was addressed.

Is the project / programme cost effective?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

See Part IIC, pp. 30-32. Cost effectiveness is compared against "no action". Further quantitative support this comparison is recommended.

CR4: Please amend Table 8, pp. 30-31, to reflect quantification of the losses averted/ gains (e.g., \$ value where possible, rehabilitated land, etc.) to further support of the selected project interventions. A more detailed cost effectiveness analysis would be needed at full proposal stage.

10 May 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR4: Not Cleared.

The proposal does not address the quantified losses averted or gains, such as the monetary value of avoided production losses, increases in farmer income, hectares of land or watersheds rehabilitated, and reductions in post-harvest losses.

Please include a small number of quantified indicators. Assumptions can be preliminary but state a detailed cost-effective analysis will occur at full proposal stage.

26 June 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR4: Cleared.

The proposal now includes a subsection under Part II.C about "avoided loss and damage". This subsection includes major numbers to describe the problem and costs for this sector in México.

Please note that a detailed cost-effective analysis will occur at Full Proposal stage.

CR17(NEW): Please include quantitative cost-effectiveness estimates for each component, or appropriate proxy estimates where data are unavailable. Additionally, strengthen the rationale to explain why the proposed interventions are more cost-effective than alternative options.

CR18(NEW): Please provide information on the cost-effectiveness from the sustainability point of view.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR17(NEW): Cleared

Table 9 provides cost-effectiveness at output and component level (page 30). Additional explanation in Table 8, fourth column (page 27)

CR18(NEW): Cleared

Paragraph 77 explains cost-effectiveness from a sustainability point of view

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: Yes. See Part IID, pp. 32-34. However, the project involves restoration of degraded land, which would imply the relevance of the country's related UNCCD national action plan/ strategy, if any, among others.

CR5: Please double check the relevance of Mexico's UNCCD national action plan/ strategy, if any, and reflect as appropriate in Part IID discussion and table. Also, clarify if the country has any poverty reduction / development planning instruments and/or agriculture policy (if so, please include them).

CR6: Provide the missing dates of some listed plans/ strategies in Table 10, p. 34.

CR7: The country's National Adaptation Plan (NAP) is still in the process of development and is not formally finalised. Please highlight the status of the country's NAP/NAP process, including (if possible) how the project aligns with its priorities.

10 May 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR5: Not Cleared.

As per page 41, a paragraph has been included to reflect the status of a UNCCD National Action Programme. It notes that the country participates in a UNCCD Land Degradation Neutrality target setting process. However, it has not been clarified whether the country has any poverty reduction / development planning instruments and/or agriculture policy.

CR6: Cleared.

As per Table 10, pages 41-42, the dates for the plans/strategies have been incorporated.

CR7: Cleared.

As per page 40, a paragraph has been included to reflect the status and indicative priority areas of the NAP, as well as how the project aligns with its priorities.

26 June 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR5: Not Cleared.

Please ensure that the list of identified policies and strategies is comprehensive. In particular, please include gender-related policies and strategies in Table 10.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR5: Cleared

Table 10 (pages 32-33) includes gender policies and frameworks

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: Yes.

See Part IIE, pp. 34-35. However, more details are needed.

CR8: Please provide a summary table that lists the applicable standards. The table should include: the applicable standard, date and responsible authority, scope of the standard, the project activity/ies to which the standard applies, and how related requirements will be met. National technical standards may include environmental regulations, building codes, water quality regulations, sector-specific regulations, among others as pertinent to the project activities.

10 May 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR8: Not Cleared.

As per Table 11 page 43, the list of applicable technical standards have been updated. However, there is no reference to the competent authority/authorities that would ensure compliance and grant approval.

26 June 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR8: Cleared.

Table 11 has been updated to include a column indicating the authorizing office.

CR19(NEW): Please strengthen Table 11:

- In the case that compliance is required, the main steps needed to comply with it.
- Ensure that the table listing is comprehensive. Applicable standards may include any other sector-specific related regulations relevant to the project interventions. For example, related to labour or gender.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR19(NEW): Cleared

Table 10 is very comprehensive (pp. 33- 34); it includes steps to compliance and regulations/laws in a variety of sectors, including labor and gender

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

See Part IIF, pp. 35-36. However, more details are needed.

CAR6: Please address the following:

1. In Part IIF, please also provide information on related previous/ completed projects.
2. Revise Table 11, p. 36, to include project title and implementing entity/ funding source, dates and status (ongoing, completed, etc.), key focus areas/ objectives, complementarities/ lessons learned and how they are considered in the proposed project design.

10 May 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR6: Not Cleared.

As per Table 12, the list of projects has been updated.

Please be consistent and ensure the status of all projects is included. If project is on-going indicate 'Status: on-going'. Please provide details on project: TPS-Sustainable Productive Territories.

26 June 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR6: Cleared.

As per revised Table 12.

CR20(NEW): Please strengthen Table 12:

- Use a different column for Lessons learned, how they are considered/ reflected in the proposed project design (specific outputs).
- Use a different column for Overlaps and synergies with the proposed project (specific rather than generic).
- The no duplication statement should be clearly justified (e.g. by indicating the distinct geographic locations and/or types of interventions) for each related project identified.

CR21(NEW): Please clarify in Table 12 whether "agency" refers to the Implementing Entity.

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR20(NEW): Cleared

-Table 12 (pg 35-36) includes a column of lessons learned, columns of synergies (overlap), and a clear explanation of no duplication for each project in the synergy column.

CR21(NEW): Not cleared

Type of Agency is clarified for each project in column 1 of Table 12 (pg. 35-36).

However, some clarifications are still needed.

- Please clarify what "AE" stands for.
- Nuup project is missing information: Agency/status/Timeframe

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR21(NEW): Cleared as per updated table 12.

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

See Part IIA, output 3.3, pp. 27-28, and Part IIG, p. 37. However, some clarification is needed as noted below.

CR8: Kindly clarify which entity will be responsible for capturing, synthesizing and disseminating lessons learned, tracking the experiences gained, how this will be done, and reporting channels and the periodicity of the tracking. Will there be a dedicated person (e.g. Knowledge Management, M&E or Communications personnel) to support this work?

10 May 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR8: Cleared.

A per page 47, a Project Management Unit will oversee synthesising and disseminating lessons learning and tracking experience gained. This will be supported by a dedicated staff role, which combines knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation, and communications responsibilities.

26 June 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.

See Part IIH, pp. 38-39. However, some clarifications are recommended as indicated below.

CR9: Please address the following:

1. Please revise the introductory statement of Part IIH that refers to consultations “Between January and February 2026” to “During January 2026” , as all consultations listed in Table 12 were conducted in January 2006.
2. Under the column ‘Main issues identified’ please clarify how the stakeholders’ interests were addressed in the proposal.
3. At the end of Part IIH, please clarify in a brief paragraph if any future consultations will be conducted at full proposal stage or during project implementation.

10 May 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR9: Cleared.

As per page 48 the introductory sentence was corrected.

The column ‘Main issues identified’ links the issues to be addressed by the project output.

Page 49 includes a paragraph which states further consultations are expected during full proposal preparation, focusing on the targeted municipalities in the three states of Oaxaca, Chiapas, and Guerrero.

26 June 2026

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

See Part II”I”, pp. 40-41. However, it would be recommended to address the issues noted below.

CAR7: Please address the following:

1. Please elaborate on/clarify the project dependency on FIRA programme, which appears to be outside its control and may potentially impact it.
2. Although Table 13 second column heading indicates “No additional external funding”, it is recommended to include in Part II”I”, a brief statement to explicitly indicate that the project will achieve its objectives solely based on the requested AF funds.

10 May 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR7: Cleared.

Page 50 (Table 14) includes the sentence ‘Furthermore, the ADAPTCafe project will achieve its objective and expected results solely based on the requested AF funds.’

26 June 2026

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

See Part IIIA, Table 15, pp.45-47. However, amendments are required.

CAR8: Revise Table 15 to comply with the AF latest guidance found at: Results Framework Alignment Table (Amended in November 2025) (77 kB, DOC), to address the below issues, among others:

1. Allocate amounts at AF outcome level (table upper part) and AF output level (table lower part).
2. Ensure that each AF indicator has its own cost line in the grant amount column. Do not lump the AF indicator costs together.
3. Ensure that each of the totals (at AF outcome and output levels) add up to the total components cost (i.e., \$20,852,535).
4. Ensure the exact wording for AF Fund Outputs and Output Indicators, etc.

CR10: Delete Part IIIB “Implementation Arrangements” as it is not required at CN stage.

10 May 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR8: Cleared.

As per Table 16. ‘Alignment to AF

CR10: Cleared.

Part III, Section B “Implementation Arrangements” has been deleted.

26 June 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR8(re-opened): Please revise Table 16 and update it in accordance with the latest AF Results Framework:

https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/07/AF-Strategic-Results-Framework-Guidance-Document_Final.pdf

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR8: Cleared

Table 16 was updated according to the latest AF Result Framework. (pg 46-47)

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Unclear.

See Part IIJ, p. 41.

CAR9: Please revise the discussion in Part IIJ to address sustainability aspects under dedicated headings

(economic, social, environmental, institutional, and financial) with due consideration to the O&M of infrastructures/ installations to be developed, and potential replication/ scaling up of the project outcomes with other funds after its end.

10 May 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR9: Not Cleared.

As per Section J, pages 52-53, the section is organised under the required headings for sustainability. Preliminary O&M for post-harvest equipment. However, O&M should cover all infrastructure and installations developed by the project. Further information is needed on funding sources to support replication and scaling after project closure.

Please be more explicit regarding O&M for all infrastructure, equipment and system, including responsible entities, recurrent costs etc. Please clarify any mechanisms that will continue once the project ends.

26 June 2026

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR9: Not Cleared.

A section for the infrastructure sustainability has been included regarding Operation and Maintenance responsibilities. However, the information will benefit from more details.

- Please clarify the mechanisms to ensure the coverage of O&M for all infrastructure.

In addition, please clarify how the adaptation benefits will enable replication and scaling up after project completion. The proposal states that the knowledge management system under Output 3.3 will provide a foundation for replication and scaled-up investment in coffee-based climate adaptation after project closure; however, the mechanisms and causal linkages leading to these outcomes are not clearly explained.

- Please include a brief description/explanation of them.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR9: Cleared

Infrastructure sustainability is explained in detail (paragraph 113-115; page 42): a mechanism to cover O&M, including after project completion, and how knowledge management will ensure replication and scaling up.

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.

See Part IIK. Sufficient for CN stage. However, some clarification on possible USPs, if any, and how they will be managed, is recommended.

CAR10: Please refer to USPs. if any, relevant E&S principles and briefly highlight (in Table 14) and briefly discuss under a dedicated paragraph at the end of Part IIK on how they will be managed to comply with related AF requirements.

10 May 2026

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR10: Cleared

As per page 53, a paragraph has been included to reflect that all project locations will be identified during the full proposal stage.

26 June 2026

Resource Availability

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

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes.

The proposal is USD 25,000,000.

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 IE fee (USD 1,958,525) is at 8.5% of the total project cost (USD 23,041,475). Same applies to the PFG.

10 May 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes.

All figures are rounded to whole numbers, and the Implementing Entity Management Fee is 8.5%. The PFG request is correct in size (USD 150,000), including the PFG fee for the Implementing Entity's Management of 8.5% (USD 12,750).

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR23(NEW): Please review the calculation of execution cost. The total project cost is incorrect (activities + execution fee). This error trickles down to the calculation of the implementation fee (see CR22(NEW))

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR23(NEW): Cleared.

The project related costs and fees as presented in Table 5 are accurate

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.

The execution costs (USD 2,188,940) are at 9.5% of the total project cos (23,041,475).

10 May 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes.

As per information provided in Table of Project/Programme Components and Financing. All figures are rounded to whole numbers, and the Implementing Entity Management Fee is 9.5%.

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR10(New): What is the comparative advantage of having an MIE as EE as opposed to a national entity. Please include a justification also mentioning that the DA is aware of the requirement as per the needs of the country.

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR10(NEW): Not cleared. The response addressed IFAD serving as IE rather than FAO serving as EE. Please address the question posed.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR10:Cleared.

Based on clarification presented in the review sheet

Eligibility of IE

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR11: Not Cleared.

We note also that since the last review FAO has been re-accredited. However, please note that if IFAD will execute the PFG. The PFG form should be updated to reflect this. IF FAO will execute the PFG please confirm in the response.

Please ensure the PFG is signed and dated by the appropriate representative.

26 June 2026

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR11: Cleared.

The revised PFG form states that IFAD will serve as IE while FAO as EE. The PFG form has been signed by the appropriate representative.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR11 (re-opened): Please attach a clean version of the PFG form for the re-submission. Tracked change versions were submitted one labelled clean and one labelled tracked changed.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR11 (re-opened): Cleared.

The updated PFG has been submitted.



Revised PFG Submission Form¹
Project Formulation Grant (PFG)

Submission Date:

Adaptation Fund Project ID:

Country/ies: Mexico

Title of Project/Programme: Programme for the resilience of smallholder producers in Mexico – AdaptCafé

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

Implementing Entity: International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

Executing Entity/ies: [IFAD for the PFG and](#) Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) [for the project](#)

A. Project Preparation Timeframe

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

B. Proposed Project Preparation Activities (\$)

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note²
Activity 1. Field studies and stakeholder consultations to validate the project design and inform full proposal development	- Validated field-based evidence to inform the full proposal; - Refined project design and targeting approach; - Stakeholder consultation report - Stakeholder engagement plan for project design and implementation.	17,250	IFAD with support from relevant Government Agencies will conduct field visits to the project locations and potential beneficiaries and conduct design workshops with different stakeholders in Oaxaca, Chiapas, Guerrero.

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.

Activity 2. Detailed technical analysis of project components, outputs, activities, and implementation arrangements.	- Refined technical design for the project	20,000	Desk work with experts to assess the feasibility of proposed technologies and practices and define the project's components, outputs, and activities.
Activity 3. Development of the project's results framework, costing, and detailed budget	- Results framework - Detailed costing of project activities - Full project budget	10,000	Expert's work for the definition of the project log-frame, results framework, and budget.
Activity 4. Economic and financial analysis	- Economic and financial analysis	10,000	Economist to prepare the economic and Financial analysis.
Activity 5. Gender assessment and social inclusion analysis	- Gender Assessment - Gender Action Plan (GAP)	15,000	Gender expert for field activities and survey to produce the gender analysis for the project.
Activity 6. Environmental and social risk assessment, including screening of environmental impacts and mitigation measures	- Updated environmental and social screening/risk categorization - Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP)	15,000	ESS expert for field activities and survey for the final EIA reports.
Activity 7. Development of the FPIC process and engagement of Indigenous communities in project design and implementation	- Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) - Indigenous Peoples Plan	10,000	Indigenous Peoples expert to conduct consultation and develop the plan
Activity 8. Preparation of the full project proposal	- Full Project Proposal	40,000	Consolidate and finalize full project proposal for submission.
Sub-total		137,250	
Implementing Entity's Management Fee (8.5%)		12,750	
Total Project Formulation Grant		150,000	

Activity 1. Field studies and stakeholder consultations to validate the project design and inform full proposal development

Field studies and consultative workshops will be undertaken in the proposed project areas to validate the project design, refine targeting, and ensure that the full proposal reflects the actual climate, socio-economic, and institutional conditions faced by smallholder coffee producers. Field assessments will gather evidence on climate vulnerability, production constraints, landscape degradation, post-harvest practices, institutional capacity, and the status of existing support systems such as Farmer Field Schools, nurseries, and producer organisations. Consultative workshops at national, state, and local levels will engage key stakeholders—including producers, women’s and youth groups, Indigenous representatives, government agencies, technical institutions, and financial actors—to review the concept note, validate implementation arrangements, and identify priorities, barriers, and opportunities for scaling climate-resilient coffee systems.

This combined process will help ensure that the project is context-specific, technically feasible, inclusive, and aligned with local needs, institutional realities, and existing public programmes. Funding is required for technical field missions, stakeholder consultations and workshops, travel, facilitation, interpretation where needed, and documentation of findings for the full proposal. Outputs include:

- Validated field-based evidence to inform the full proposal;
- Refined project design and targeting approach;
- Stakeholder consultation report; and
- Stakeholder engagement plan for project design and implementation.

Activity 2. Detailed technical analysis of project components, outputs, activities, and implementation arrangements

A more detailed technical analysis will be necessary to further develop and substantiate the project’s components, outputs, and activities for the full proposal. This includes refining the adaptation logic of the intervention, confirming the suitability of the proposed technological packages, and defining how different project elements will interact across production resilience, climate services, post-harvest adaptation, inclusive finance, and market access. The analysis will also examine implementation arrangements, institutional roles, delivery mechanisms, and the operational feasibility of utilising existing structures such as Farmer Field Schools, producer organisations, public programmes, and financial intermediaries. This work is essential to ensure a coherent and feasible project design, with clear causal pathways between investments and adaptation outcomes. Funding is needed for specialised technical expertise, coordination among national and international experts, review of existing data and evidence, and the preparation of the technical design that will underpin the full proposal. Expected output:

- Refined technical design for the project, including validated components, outputs, activities, and intervention packages and Theory of Change.

Activity 3: Development of the project’s logical framework, results framework, costing, and detailed budget

The development of the full proposal will require a robust results architecture, including a logical framework, results framework, indicators, targets, means of verification, and assumptions. This process involves defining the hierarchy of results from outputs to outcomes and impact, ensuring alignment with both Adaptation Fund requirements and the project’s adaptation logic. It also requires costing activities and developing a detailed budget that accurately represents the scope and sequence of investments across the three components, which include technical assistance, infrastructure and equipment, training, field implementation, and knowledge management. Since the project integrates productive adaptation, post-harvest systems, inclusive finance, and market access, a meticulous costing exercise is vital to ensure realism, efficiency, and internal coherence among components. Expected outputs include:

- Complete logical framework and results framework for the full proposal, including indicators, baselines, targets, means of verification, and assumptions;
- Detailed costing of project activities across all components;
- Full project budget aligned with the results framework, implementation arrangements, and Adaptation Fund requirements.

Activity 4. Economic and financial analysis

Additional analysis will also be needed to assess the economic and financial justification of the project, including the rationale for blending grant support with financial inclusion measures and the expected benefits of stabilizing production, reducing losses, and improving access to differentiated markets. Funding is therefore needed to support climate risk analysis, vulnerability assessment, and economic/financial analysis, as well as to integrate these findings into the proposal narrative. Expected output:

- Economic and financial analysis demonstrating the justification, cost-effectiveness, and expected adaptation benefits of the proposed investments.

Activity 5. Gender assessment and social inclusion analysis

A dedicated gender assessment and social inclusion analysis will be carried out to ensure that the project design reflects the differentiated climate vulnerabilities, capacities, constraints, and opportunities of women, men, youth, and Indigenous Peoples in coffee-producing territories. Combining desk review, field consultations, and disaggregated data collection, the assessment will analyse roles, access to assets and services, participation in decision-making, and barriers to equitable participation in project benefits across coffee production, post-harvest activities, finance, extension, and markets. It will also identify risks of exclusion, unequal benefit sharing, and any context-specific concerns related to gender-based violence or harassment during implementation.

The findings will inform gender-responsive and socially inclusive project design measures, including participation targets, tailored outreach strategies, culturally appropriate approaches, and actions to strengthen the leadership of women, youth, and Indigenous producers. The assessment will also provide the basis for the project's Gender Action Plan and for integrating relevant indicators, targets, budget provisions, and monitoring arrangements into the results framework. Funding is required for specialized expertise, field data collection, consultations, analysis, and integration of the findings into the full project design. Outputs include:

- Gender Assessment with sex-disaggregated and socially inclusive baseline information to inform the results framework
- Gender Action Plan (GAP) with implementation actions, indicators, responsibilities, and budget provisions

Activity 6. Environmental and social risk assessment, including screening of environmental impacts and mitigation measures.

Given the nature of the proposed interventions, an environmental and social risk assessment will be undertaken to identify potential risks, determine the safeguard principles triggered by the project, and define the corresponding mitigation, management, and monitoring measures, in line with the Adaptation Fund's Environmental and Social Policy. Building on the preliminary concept-stage screening, the assessment will review risks related to land use, biodiversity, water resources, soil disturbance, waste and effluent management, occupational and community health and safety, labour conditions, equitable access to benefits, and possible impacts on vulnerable groups, including Indigenous Peoples.

The assessment will inform the preparation of the safeguard instruments required for the full proposal and define the mitigation actions, institutional responsibilities, monitoring requirements, capacity needs, and budget needed to manage risks during implementation. Outputs include:

- Updated environmental and social screening/risk categorization
- Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) proportionate to the project's risk profile

Activity 7. Development of the FPIC process and engagement of Indigenous communities in project design and implementation.

A dedicated process will be undertaken to ensure the meaningful and culturally appropriate engagement of Indigenous communities in project design and implementation and, where relevant, to comply with the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). This is necessary because the project will operate in coffee-producing territories where Indigenous Peoples are present and where activities may affect their livelihoods, natural resources, traditional practices, or access to benefits. The activity will include stakeholder mapping, consultation with Indigenous authorities and communities, assessment of FPIC requirements, and the design of culturally appropriate engagement processes using local languages and methods that respect community decision-making systems.

The process will help identify community priorities, potential risks, conditions for participation, and barriers to equitable inclusion, and will inform measures to ensure that the project design and implementation reflect Indigenous rights, knowledge, and development priorities. Funding is required for specialized expertise, field consultations, translation and interpretation where needed, and preparation of the relevant documentation for the full proposal. Expected outputs include:

- Documented FPIC and Indigenous engagement process
- Indigenous Peoples Plan with recommendations for integrating Indigenous considerations and equitable participation into the final project design, implementation arrangements, and monitoring framework.

Activity 8. Preparation of the full project proposal

The final PFG-supported activity will be the preparation of the full Adaptation Fund project proposal and all supporting documentation required for submission. This will involve consolidating the technical, financial, environmental, social, gender, and institutional analyses into a coherent proposal aligned with Adaptation Fund templates and review expectations. The proposal will need to clearly articulate the climate rationale, project design, implementation arrangements, results framework, budget, risk management measures, sustainability strategy, and monitoring approach. Expected output:

- Full project proposal

C. Implementing Entity

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

Implementing Entity Coordinator, IE Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
		07/14/2026	Mr. Daniel	(507) 62029372	ecgmailbox@ifad.org

Pierre Yves Guedez Senior Climate Finance Specialist ECG Division			Anavitarte, Mexico Country Director		p.guedez@ifad.org d.anavitarte@ifad.org
---	--	--	--	--	--

Annex 1 Letter of endorsement by the National Authority



Subsecretaría de Hacienda y Crédito Público
Unidad de Crédito Público y Asuntos
Internacionales de Hacienda
Dirección General de Organismos Financieros
Internacionales



Oficio No. 305.- E.-145/2026
Mexico City, august 20th, 2026

Letter of Endorsement by Government of Mexico

Ministry of Finance and Public Credit

To: The Adaptation Fund Board
c/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat
Email: Secretariat@Adaptation.Fund.org
Fax: 202522 3240/5

Subject: Endorsement for "PROGRAM FOR THE RESILIENCE OF VULNERABLE SMALL-HOLDER
COFFEE PRODUCERS IN MEXICO - ADAPTCAFÉ"

In my capacity as primary contact point (with signing authority) of Mexico's Designated Authority, the Ministry of Finance and Public Credit, before the Adaptation Fund, I confirm that the above project proposal is in accordance with the government's national priorities in implementing adaptation activities to reduce adverse impacts of, and risks, posed by climate change in Mexico.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above project/programme proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and executed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

Sincerely,

Raúl Fernando González Romero
Primary Contact Point (with signing authority),
General Director in charge of International
Financial Institutions in the Ministry of Finance
and Public Credit, Public Credit and
International Affairs Unit,
raul_gonzalez@hacienda.gob.mx
Ph. (+52) 55 3688 1704).



Insurgentes Sur 1971, Torre III, Piso 3, Col. Guadalupe Inn C.P. 01020, Álvaro Obregón, Ciudad de México
Tel: (55) 3688-1704, www.gob.mx/shcp



Hacienda

Secretaría de Hacienda y Crédito Público

Subsecretaría de Hacienda y Crédito Público
Unidad de Crédito Público y Asuntos
Internacionales de Hacienda
Dirección General de Organismos Financieros
Internacionales



ADAPTATION FUND

Oficio No. 305.- E.-145/2026

Mexico City, august 20th, 2026

Letter of Endorsement by Government of Mexico

Ministry of Finance and Public Credit

To: The Adaptation Fund Board
c/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat
Email: Secretariat@Adaptation.Fund.org
Fax: 202522 3240/5

Subject: Endorsement for **"PROGRAM FOR THE RESILIENCE OF VULNERABLE SMALL-HOLDER COFFEE PRODUCERS IN MEXICO - ADAPTCAFÉ"**

In my capacity as primary contact point (with signing authority) of Mexico's Designated Authority, the Ministry of Finance and Public Credit, before the Adaptation Fund, I confirm that the above project proposal is in accordance with the government's national priorities in implementing adaptation activities to reduce adverse impacts of, and risks, posed by climate change in Mexico.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above project/programme proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and executed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

Sincerely,

Raúl Fernando González Romero
Primary Contact Point (with signing authority),
General Director in charge of International
Financial Institutions in the Ministry of Finance
and Public Credit, Public Credit and
International Affairs Unit,
raul_gonzalez@hacienda.gob.mx
Ph. (+52) 55 3688 1704).



2026
año de
Margarita
Maza

Insurgentes Sur 1971, Torre III, Piso 3, Col. Guadalupe Inn C.P. 01020, Álvaro Obregón, Ciudad de México
Tel: (55) 3688-1704. www.gob.mx/shcp