



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.38/19/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 (p)

PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR SRI LANKA

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.38/19 “Proposal for Sri Lanka” 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 AF00000507 “Integrating Community-Led Adaptation and Climate Risk Reduction for Resilience Building at Local Level in Sri Lanka”. This proposal was submitted by UN Development Programme (UNDP), 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; Gender and environmental and social risk analysis and formulation of Social and Environmental Management Plan and Gender Action Plan; 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
"INTEGRATING COMMUNITY-LED ADAPTATION AND CLIMATE RISK REDUCTION FOR
RESILIENCE BUILDING AT LOCAL LEVEL IN SRI LANKA "

Project Title	Integrating Community-Led Adaptation and Climate Risk Reduction for Resilience Building at Local Level in Sri Lanka
Project ID	AF00000507
Category	Regular size project (over \$1 million)
Type	Single country project
Stage	Concept
Country	Sri Lanka
Implementing Entity	UNDP
Financing Requested	USD 20,000,000.00
Reviewer	Francisca Saavedra

Co-reviewer(s)

IE Contact Person

Jiseon Park, Mariam Zafar, Missale Woldegiorgis, Nancy Bennet, Radhika Dave, Robin Merlier, Siriboon Ketphichai, Wirunpat Meebungprav

Secretariat's Overall Comment

The project “Integrating Community-Led Adaptation and Climate Risk Reduction for Resilience Building at Local Level in Sri Lanka” aims to strengthen the climate resilience and adaptive capacity of vulnerable communities engaged in Prajashakthi, the national poverty eradication programme, enabling them to sustainably manage climate risks and safeguard livelihoods under changing climatic conditions.

The proposal includes a request for a project formulation grant of USD 150,000.

The initial technical review raised several issues, such as the lack of clear assumptions in the Theory of Change, the lack of an Initial Gender Analysis, the lack of details of the consultation process, including discussions and perspectives included in the proposed project, and the lack of a clear explanation to support the cost-effectiveness of the proposed interventions, as is discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.

The second technical review raised several issues, such as the need for amendments to the Theory of Change figure, the lack of details of the Initial Gender Analysis, the lack of clear justifications for no duplication with other projects, the lack of clarity regarding the responsibility of each executing entity, among others, as is discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.

The third technical review found that all only two outstanding issues remain concerning gender action plan and properly addressing full cost of adaptation reasoning in the proposal.

The fourth technical review finds that all the issues raised in the third technical review were 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 (03 September 2002) and the Paris Agreement (21 September 2016).

(February 2, 2026)

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

Response: Yes

Secretariat: Yes.

Sri Lanka has experienced a growing incidence of climate-induced disasters, reflected in the increasing frequency and intensity of events such as drought, floods and landslides. Sri Lanka is experiencing clear and accelerating climate trends that are already affecting livelihoods, ecosystems, water security, and infrastructure (February 2, 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 09 January 2026.

(February 2, 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.

The total number of pages of the concept note is 47 pages including annexes.

CR1: Kindly ensure that every table is properly labelled to facilitate reference and review, in a sequential way.

(February 2, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR1: Cleared.

All tables have been properly labelled.

(May 11, 2026)

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, further information is required.

Part II.A and Theory of Change (ToC), pages 14 – 26.

The vertical logic presented leads to three substantive outcomes, together with their corresponding outputs and activities. The proposed programme aims to integrate climate change tools and criteria, among others, into the Prajashakthi Programme, the national poverty eradication programme. The proposal also includes a ToC diagram that identifies the Fund Outcomes targeted by the project (AF Outcomes 2, 3, and 5).

However, some clarifications and additional details are required.

CR2: Please amend the ToC figure as follows:

- (i) differentiate risks from assumptions,
- (ii) include the main development problem the proposed project is intended to address, and
- (iii) the main activities to achieve each outcome of the proposed project.

CR3: Please clarify the following: While four specific objectives are stated, only three components are described. It is unclear whether a fourth component is missing or which component encompasses the Knowledge and Learning Management activities.

In addition, please clarify which components/activities UNDP and UN Habitat's role as Executing Entities will be needed as this has budget implications (refer to CR29).

CAR1: Please include details for every activity such as the stakeholders involved and the number of beneficiaries, including gender-disaggregated data. Additionally, include specific targets for each output.

CR4: Please revise all Outputs to ensure they represent direct and tangible deliverables. For instance, "Output 3.3: Climate-resilient value chains developed and strengthened, integrating smallholder producers, processors, and market actors into inclusive and sustainable production and market systems", describes an outcome rather than an output as it represents a result in the medium term.

(February 2, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR2: Not cleared.

While risks are differentiated from assumptions, the main problem has been included as well as the main activities. Please amend the following:

1. Main problem should be the first line of the ToC figure. This problem should be a "development problem" regarding climate adaptation.
2. Right after the main problem, second line should be the general objective as this is "the opposite" of the main problem.
3. After that the causes should be listed alongside with the specific objectives.
4. Fund outcomes are not part of the ToC.

CR3: Not cleared.

The proposal now includes four specific objectives, with the fourth aimed to Knowledge and Learning Management activities. However:

1. The differentiation between components 1 and 2 is not clear. Kindly clarify or amend accordingly.
2. Please clarify in Table “Project/Programme Components and Financing” which components/activities the different Executing Entities will be in charge as this has budget implications (refer to CR29). While the management arrangements identify the Ministry of Rural Development, Social Security and Community Empowerment as the sole Executing Entity (EE), the cover page lists the Ministry of Rural Development, Social Security and Community Empowerment, UNDP, UN-Habitat, and FAO as EEs.

CAR1: Not cleared.

Details for each activity alongside the number of beneficiaries have been included. However, some adjustments are required:

1. Please include the targets and beneficiaries’ information at the output level.
2. In addition, please revise activities and outputs as some activities (for example, activity 1.1.2) are described as outputs. Please consider that activities are the “actions” to achieve an output.

CR4: Cleared.

As per information provided in Table Project/Programme Components and Financing. All outputs have been revised and amended to ensure they represent direct and tangible deliverables.

(May 11, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR2: Cleared.

The ToC figure has been updated according to the previous suggestions. Note that it is not necessary to include the phrase “Sri Lanka faces a development problem in climate adaptation” in the first line

CR3: Cleared.

1. The relationship between components 1 and 2 is now clarified.
2. The table has been updated to show which Executing Entities are involved in each component.

CR29: Cleared.

At the fully developed proposal stage, please ensure that the IE provides justification and request from the DA on UNDP, UN-Habitat and FAO serving as an EE since the current LOE only endorses Ministry of Rural Development, Social Security and Community Empowerment as the sole Executing Entity as EE.

CAR1: Cleared.

Information has been added on beneficiaries at the output level, and the relationship between activities and outputs is now clearer.

(June 11, 2026)

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, further information is required.

Part II.B, pages 26 – 28. The proposal outlines expected economic, social, and environmental benefits and describes potential risks and negative consequences. It presents the number of beneficiaries and quantifies the main results for the different components. With regard to gender, the social benefits section states that at least 50% of decision-making platforms will be represented by women.

However, the proposal does not clearly present sequential vertical logic explaining how the identified benefits will be achieved, nor does it explain how benefits will be equitably distributed or include an Initial Gender Analysis.

CAR2: Please expand the information on beneficiaries to include both direct and indirect beneficiaries for the economic, social, and environmental benefits, and explain how these benefits will be equitably distributed among women and other vulnerable groups, such as the elderly. In other words, beneficiaries should be disaggregated by these groups.

CR4: Please include in Part II.B a brief explanation of the methodology used to calculate the economic, social, and environmental benefits, as well as any other evidence used to support the quantifications provided.

CR5: Please outline the specific benefits that women, the elderly and other vulnerable groups will receive from the economic, social and environmental perspectives.

CAR3: Despite the PFG request considering a gender analysis and the construction of a Gender Action Plan, an Initial Gender Analysis should be provided at the CN stage.

Please provide an Initial Gender Analysis based on desktop research to address at least:

- (i) the distinct needs, capacities, roles, and knowledge resources of women and men at the national level and in the areas of intervention;
- (ii) to identify how evolving gender dynamics may influence potential changes.

(February 2, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR2: Not cleared.

Benefits are described for three dimensions: economic, social, and environmental. Direct and indirect benefits have been included and well as verification sources and the baseline for each dimension. However, please:

1. Include in Table 17 the indirect and direct beneficiaries for the economic, social, and environmental benefits, disaggregated by gender and other vulnerable groups (such as the elderly).
2. Explain how these benefits will be ensured to be equitably distributed among women and other vulnerable groups.

CR4: Not cleared.

Please include in Part II.B:

1. a brief explanation of the methodology used to calculate the economic, social, and environmental benefits.
2. other evidence used to support the quantifications provided.

CR5: Not cleared.

While the benefits for women, youth, and the elderly have been listed to some extent, the specific benefits for these groups are not clearly defined and instead appear to be part of the general benefits described for the entire project. Kindly outline the specific benefits for: (i) women, (ii) the elderly and (iii) the youth, according to each benefit dimension.

CAR3: Not cleared.

While an Initial Gender Analysis based on desk research has been included, the information presented remains too general and requires further clarification. Please clarify:

1. What it means that “81% of the population resides out”. Is it % of population in rural areas?
2. Activities of the program aimed at gender equality (Table 18) should be included in the description of the components under Part II.A, as this section constitutes baseline research.
3. the different needs, capacities, roles, and knowledge resources of women and men at the national level and in the areas of intervention. This comparison will provide a benchmark for the intervention areas.
4. Provide statistics where possible.

(May 11, 2026)

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR2: Cleared.

Beneficiary information is now included in Table 17. A clear explanation of the approach to equitable benefit distribution is included in the review response matrix.

CR4: Cleared.

At Part II, additional information has been provided to explain which benefits will be provided and how they have been calculated.

CR5: Cleared.

Information has been provided on specific benefits for each of these groups at Part II Section B.

CAR3: Not Cleared.

The Initial Gender Assessment has been improved with more specific information (including statistics) related to the project areas, and the results have been integrated into relevant component descriptions., however please clarify if the GAP is being developed through the PFG process including consultations why under the ‘Alignment with AF Gender Policy section in Part II, B that Gap will be endorsed ‘at inception’. Please clarify that the report will be validated and endorsed before the submission of the fully developed proposal package as a final output of the PFG process.

(June 11, 2026)

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR3: Cleared

Clarifies that Gender Action Plan to be developed and validated through stakeholder consultation during PFG process and endorsed before submission of full proposal (pg 23)

Is the project / programme cost effective?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Unsure.

Part II.C, page 28. The proposal provides a broad explanation of the expected results and products for each component; however, it does not include a logical explanation for the cost-effectiveness, nor does it clearly explain the sustainability perspective of the proposed interventions. The CN would also benefit from clearer articulation of alternative options compared to project approach to help determine cost-effectiveness.

CAR4: Please provide a logical and sequential explanation of the selected scope and approach for the cost-

effectiveness of the proposed interventions, including some quantifications when possible. Please expand on why this approach is better than others, and not only why it works.

CAR5: Please explain the logic by which the project's benefits will be sustained after the project ends, in order to demonstrate the sustainability perspective of the proposed project.

(February 2, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR4: Cleared.

As per information provided in Part II.C. The explanation for the selected approach has been included, together with some key quantifications, such as the estimate that crop interventions under this program will reduce costs by 40–50% compared to conventional interventions. Please note that further details will be required at the Full Proposal stage.

CAR5: Cleared.

As per information provided in Part II.C. It is explained that the Prajashakthi programme provides the sustainability perspective of the proposed project.

(May 11, 2026)

Is the project / programme consistent with national or sub-national sustainable development strategies, national or sub-national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, national communications and adaptation programs of action and other relevant instruments?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Unsure.

Part II.D, page 29. The proposal states that the proposed project will be consistent with national and subnational strategies and aligned with the National Policy Framework 2025–2029, Sri Lanka's National Adaptation Plan (NAP) 2016–2025, NDC 3.0 (2026–2035), the SDGs, among others.

However, a comprehensive list of the identified strategies and plans is not provided, nor is it clearly explained how the proposed project specifically aligns with them.

CAR6: 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].'

CR6: Please ensure that the table listing is comprehensive and includes all relevant plans and strategies related to adaptation, as well as sectoral plans

(February 2, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR6: Not cleared.

All information has been provided in Table 20, however, the alignment with the National Policy Framework 2025-

2029 seems incomplete. Please include the activities and outputs aligned to this policy.

CR6: Not cleared.

The proposed project includes in Table 20 a list with key relevant plans and strategies related to adaptation, as well as sectoral plans: (i) National Adaption Plan 2026-2035, (ii) Agriculture Strategy, NDC, (iii) NBSAP 2016-2022, and (iv) National Disaster Management Plan 2023-2030. However, please include strategies aimed at gender equality, development, and poverty, as well as strategies aimed at empowering or protecting other vulnerable groups.

(May 11, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR6: Cleared.

Information has been added on linkages to the National Policy Framework.

CR6: Cleared.

Additional plans and strategies have been discussed as requested

(June 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: No.

Part II.E, pages 29-30. The proposal states that the implementation of the proposed project will be fully compliant with Sri Lanka's technical, legal, and institutional frameworks, as well as with the Adaptation Fund's Environmental and Social Policy (AF ESP). However, it does not explain how compliance with relevant national and local technical standards and the AF ESP will be achieved.

CAR7: Please identify a comprehensive list of national and local technical standards and provide a clear, logical explanation of how the proposed project will comply with them. This information should be presented on a table.

For each identified standard, please include:

- (i) The scope and relevance in relation to the proposed project, i.e., the rationale for its selection.
 - (ii) How the standard relates to the proposed project, clearly identifying the outputs and activities that will require compliance with the standard.
 - (iii) The project's compliance status. Where compliance is required, please describe the specific steps that will be taken to achieve compliance. Please be sure to include the name of the competent authority for the standard.
- (February 2, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR7: Cleared.

As per information provided in Table 21. A table listing key national standards, along with their scope, links to the proposed project, compliance status and steps, and the competent authority, has been included. Please note that additional details will be required at the Full Proposal stage

(May 11, 2026)

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Unsure.

Part II.F, pages 30 – 32. The proposal indicates that no duplication is expected, as the proposed project is designed to be implemented through the Prajashakthi Project. In addition, it states that, in cases of potential duplication, implementation will target different geographic areas and sectoral focuses, and that all activities will be coordinated with executing entities and line ministries. The project therefore complements other funding sources by leveraging Prajashakthi to scale up climate resilient planning and investments at the national level. However, the proposal does not provide a comprehensive list of all relevant projects.

CR7: Kindly include a comprehensive table listing with all projects that are or have been implemented in Sri Lanka and are related to the proposed project.

Please ensure for each:

- (i) Project title, Timeline and specific Location within the country,
- (ii) Main project interventions, and Target population,
- (iii) Donors/Funding Agencies
- (iv) Implementing entity,
- (v) Lessons learned,
- (vi) Overlaps and synergies with the proposed project.

The no-duplication statement should be clearly justified for each related project identified, for example by specifying the distinct geographic areas and/or the different types of interventions involved.

CR8: Please consider other Adaptation Fund projects as there may be lessons learned from earlier initiatives that can support the project design. The lessons learned should be clearly identified and included in the table (See CR12).

(February 2, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR7: Not cleared.

Kindly include for each one of the projects that are or have been implemented in Sri Lanka and are related to the proposed project, the following:

- (i) Project title, Timeline and specific Location within the country,
- (ii) Main project interventions, and Target population,
- (iii) Donors/Funding Agencies
- (iv) Implementing entity,
- (v) Lessons learned,
- (vi) Overlaps and synergies with the proposed project.

The no-duplication statement should be clearly justified for each related project identified, for example by specifying the distinct geographic areas and/or the different types of interventions involved.

CR8: Not cleared.

Please consider other Adaptation Fund projects as there may be lessons learned from earlier initiatives that can support the project design. The lessons learned should be clearly identified (See CR12).

(May 11, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR7: Cleared.

Part II Section F now includes the information requested although not presented in a tabular format. Table 24 now includes all of the information requested clear no-duplication statements .

CR8: Cleared.

Part II Section F now includes the requested information on three existing AF-related projects.

(June 11, 2026)

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Unsure.

Part II.G, page 32. The proposal includes a broad explanation of: (i) the approach through which the proposed project will integrate with the Prajashakthi Project, (ii) operational learning, including the role of a Learning and Knowledge Management Officer, and (iii) knowledge products, such as technical briefs, manuals, among others which will be stored on a digital platform

However, no specific information is provided, and it remains unclear how KM and learning activities will be implemented and tracked. Linkages to regional knowledge platforms are not defined and may be useful for enriching knowledge beyond project beneficiaries.

CR9: Please clarify:

1. How will lessons learned be disseminated, among others, at the local and national levels?
2. Who will be responsible for tracking the experiences gained? Will the Knowledge Management Officer also be responsible for this along with synthesizing the data with support of MEL team and Learning and Knowledge Coordination Mechanism?
3. How will the knowledge generated be sustained after the project concludes and what institutional and budgetary arrangements are needed to support these actions?
4. Are there any prior agreements with the government and the team responsible for the Prajashakthi Project to ensure the integration of the proposed project?

CAR8: Kindly include:

1. Additional details on the Learning and Knowledge Management activities, including the institutions involved, specific activities, and main objectives.
2. Consider whether a dedicated component should be included for knowledge management and learning activities.

(February 2, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR9: Not cleared.

Please address the following questions under Part II.G. Answers must be specific:

1. How will lessons learned be disseminated, among others, at the local and national levels?
2. Who will be responsible for tracking the experiences gained? Will the Knowledge Management Officer also be responsible for this along with synthesizing the data with support of MEL team and Learning and Knowledge Coordination Mechanism?

3. How will the knowledge generated be sustained after the project concludes and what institutional and budgetary arrangements are needed to support these actions?
4. Are there any prior agreements with the government and the team responsible for the Prajashakthi Project to ensure the integration of the proposed project?

CAR8: Cleared.

As per information provided in Part II.A, description of component 4, dedicated to KM and learning activities.
(May 11, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR9: Cleared.

Additional detail has been provided to sufficiently address all these questions.
(June 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: Unsure.

Part II.H, pages 32 – 33. The proposal states that a consultation process was conducted at the national, subnational, and community levels, including timeframes for some of the consultations. In addition it refers to gender-responsive consultations.

However, no specific information on the consultations is provided.

CR10: Kindly ensure the following information in table format in Part II.H:

- (i) The list and total number of attendees of each consultation, disaggregated by sex, with background information to verify whether marginalized and vulnerable groups have been consulted. In addition, it would be helpful to clarify whether the Ministry responsible for gender was consulted during the project preparation, if not, whether engagement is planned during the PFG process.
- (ii) A summary of the subjects/issues discussed, and any agreements reached for each consultation. This should include specifically how the agreements were included in the proposed project.
- (iii) Timeframe in which these consultations took place.
- (iv) Indicate how the interests of women, the elderly and other vulnerable group considerations were addressed in the proposed project.

CR11: Please provide an Initial Gender Analysis that highlights gender dynamics and differentiated impacts between men and women from a national or sector-wide perspective. See CAR3.
(February 2, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR10: Not cleared.

While a table listing the consultations has been included, please ensure the following information is specifically address (please avoid general responses):

- (i) A summary of the subjects/issues discussed, and any agreements reached for each consultation. This should

include specifically how the agreements were included in the proposed project. For example, by stating and output or activity.

(ii) Indicate how the interests of women, the elderly and other vulnerable group considerations were addressed in the proposed project.

CR11: Not cleared.

While an Initial Gender Analysis based on desk research has been included, the information presented remains too general and requires further clarification. See CAR3.

(May 11, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR10: Cleared.

Part II.H and table 4 now includes additional detail on the different consultations and on how the interests of women, the elderly, and other vulnerable groups are being addressed.

CR11: Cleared.

The initial gender assessment has been improved with more specific information about the project areas and activities

(June 11, 2026)

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, further information is required.

Part II.I, pages 32 – 33. The proposal states for each component of the proposed project, a baseline scenario and an Adaptation Fund scenario, broadly explaining the cost of adaption reasoning for the proposed interventions. It does not explicitly state that AF along can deliver the adaptation outcomes.

However, more information is required.

CAR9: Kindly indicate whether the project requires co-financing. If no co-financing is required, this should be clearly stated in the Concept Note (CN), Part II.I.

CR12: Please provide further details on:

1. how the proposed project's objective will be achieved from an adaptation perspective.
2. The costs of the proposed activities, including a comparison with alternative options

(February 2, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR9: Cleared.

As per information provided under Part II.I. It is stated that no co-financing will be required.

CR12: Not cleared.

Please provide further details on:

1. how the proposed project's objective will be achieved from an adaptation perspective.
2. The costs of the proposed activities, including a comparison with alternative options

(May 11, 2026)

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR12: Not Cleared.

Part II.I now includes detailed information on full cost of adaptation as well as cost comparisons and a new subsection comparing the selected approach with alternative options (sector-specific programs and loan-based financing).

1. Please delete “and additionality” for the sub-heading “full cost of adaptation and additionality.
2. Please re-phrase the last sentence in the para to remove “incremental costs” from the financing as this is contrary to the AFs full cost of adaptation reasoning.

(June 11, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR12: Cleared.

Changes were incorporated: deleted "and additionality" and "incremental cost"

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, some amendments are required.

Part III.A, pages 38 – 40. The proposed project is aligned with the latest version of AF Results Framework, however, some amendments in the Table are required.

CR13: Please expand the narrative on the project's alignment with Strategic Results Framework outcomes at Part II B.

CR14: Please include in the “Project Objectives”, the information and the Grant Amount (USD) for each specific objective rather than the General Objective. To complete the Table, please follow the instructions and example in the updated AF Results Framework.

CR15: Please ensure the following information is included in the table at Part III.A:

1. All project's outputs and outcomes indicators are SMART.
2. Consistency between the AF outcome, outcome indicators, output and output indicators according to the Adaptation Fund Strategic Results Framework outlined in the updated AF Results Framework (nov 2025). For example, in the AF alignment table in the proposal, Outcome 2 is states as “Institutions with strengthened capacity to understand and better address climate risks and resilience [# of institutions, disaggregated by scale and sector]”, while in the AF Results Framework Outcome the precise wording is “Strengthened institutional capacity to reduce risks associated with climate-induced socioeconomic and environmental losses”. Wording and numbering must be precise.

(February 2, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR13: Not cleared.

Please expand the narrative on the project's alignment with Strategic Results Framework outcomes at Part II B.

CR14: Not Cleared.

As per information provided under Part III.A. The information and the Grant Amount (USD) for each specific objective have been included in Table under Part III.A.

1. However, as the template example this must be done for each AF output/outcome indicator. Please address as per updated AF Results Framework.
2. Please comply with the template including the summary total for the top part and the summary total for the bottom part of the table.

CR15: Cleared.

As per information provided under Part III.A. Consistency with the updated AF Results Framework is correct and indicators are SMART.

(May 11, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR13: Cleared.

This information was included in the TOC diagram. Please move to Part II Section B in a final sentence just before table 17.

CR14: Cleared.

Budget figures have been added for each specific output/outcome.

(June 11, 2026)

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, further information is required.

Part II.J, page 35. all key areas of sustainability (economic, social, environmental, and financial) are outlined. The sustainability of the proposed interventions is based on their integration into the Prajashakthi National Programme. From a financial perspective, the proposed project will rely on domestic financial flows, while governance is expected to be anchored in community development councils and other local structures. However, no details are provided on how operations, maintenance, and replacement costs will be financed, the long term institutional arrangements required, or whether any formal agreements have already been established. Additionally, the proposal does not explicitly state that areas such as operations and maintenance costs will be addressed at the full proposal stage.

CR16: Please ensure that the sustainability perspective of the proposed project goes beyond capacity building and the integration into the Prajashakthi National Programme. Please consider whether additional mechanisms will be put in place to ensure all the sustainability arrangements required.

CAR10: Kindly specify the arrangements required to ensure the project's sustainability and long-term maintenance, including financial, social, regulatory, institutional, economic, and environmental measures. This should also include the agreements required with the government, private institutions, and the Prajashakthi National Programme, as well as the corresponding timeframe. Additionally explicit reference to formal policy instruments such as circulars and cabinet decision can help lock in adoption.

CR17: Please address how the interventions are expected to scale up or replicate in other regions of Sri Lanka.
(February 2, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR16: Cleared.

As per information provided under Part II.J. Sustainability will be achieved, in addition to capacity building and integration into the Prajashakthi National Programme, through a cabinet paper for investments in rural development that is expected to become a parliamentary act in the near future.

CAR10: Not cleared.

Kindly specify the arrangements required including financial, social, regulatory, institutional, economic, and environmental measures. This should also include the agreements required with the government, private institutions, and the Prajashakthi National Programme, as well as the corresponding timeframe.

Please consider that arrangements refer to the formal mechanisms, roles, agreements, and measures put in place to ensure the project's sustainability and long term operation.

CR17: Not cleared.

Please explain specifically but briefly how the interventions are expected to scale up or replicate.
(May 11, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR10: Cleared.

Specific details are now provided on different sustainability considerations, including formal MOUs, handover agreements, and post-project financing approaches.

CR17: Cleared.

Part II.J now provides a clear and credible roadmap for scaling and replication.
(June 11, 2016)

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: Unsure.

Part II.K, pages 35 – 37. The proposal does not show clear compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Adaptation Fund. The checklist on environmental and social impacts is partially completed. Further information and amendments are required.

CAR11: Please include an Initial Gender Analysis following CAR3 and explain how the proposed project complies with the Gender Policy of the Adaptation Fund.

CAR12: Please include in Part II.K, the category in which the screening process has classified the proposed project (Category A, B or C).

CAR13: Please include in the Table in Part II.K:

1. Describe all potential impacts (direct, indirect, transboundary and cumulative) and risks that could result from the project.
2. Identify the magnitude of the risks and impacts ie. No risk, low risk, medium risk or high risk. Risk should describe as: “There is a risk”. If no risk is identified, please provide reasoning for this.
3. All identified risk should be accompanied by mitigation plans. Mitigation plans should be started by “The mitigation plan for this risk is” or “to mitigate this risk, the project will”
4. Kindly leave a check mark in the second column ‘No further assessment required for compliance’ if no further assessment and leave blank if an assessment is to be conducted. No text should be included in the second column.

CAR14: Please note for the checklist that Adaptation Fund Principles 1, 4 and 6 always apply. For more information, please visit: AF’s ESP guidance and Environmental and Social Policy .
(February 2, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR11: Not cleared.

While an Initial Gender Analysis based on desk research has been included, the information presented remains too general and requires further clarification. See CAR3. Compliance with the Gender Policy of the Adaptation Fund is included under Part II.A and Part II.E, through the inclusion of women and other vulnerable groups during the consultations and the gender differentiated interventions.

CAR12: Cleared.

As per information provided under Part II.J. The screening process has classified the proposed project under Category B.

CAR13: Cleared.

As per information provided in Table 24. Risks are described for each principle, including mitigation plans and risk levels. Where no risk is identified, an appropriate justification has been provided.

CAR14: Cleared.

As per information provided in Table 24. Adaptation Fund Principles 1, 4 and 6 are now included for compliance.
(May 11, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR11: Cleared.

The updated initial gender assessment moves now includes more specific and project-relevant findings from stakeholder consultations.
(June 11, 2026)

Resource Availability

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

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes
(February 2, 2026)

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, some amendments are needed.

Table “Project/Programme Components and Financing” and PFG Form. All figures are rounded to whole numbers, and the Implementing Entity Management Fee is 8.5% (USD 1,566,820). The figures add up across the tables alongside the CN. 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). However, there may be a minor discrepancy in the Total Project/Programme Cost.

CAR15: Please revise the Amount of Financing Request and amend accordingly. The total Program Cost as stated on page 20 is USD 18,433,180. However, the correct calculation should be stated as USD 18,433,179, summing a total of (Total Request) of USD 19,999,999.

(February 2, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR15: Cleared.

As per information provided in Table of Project/Programme Components and Financing.

CAR16 (NEW): Please present the budget in the components and financing table and the output level.

(May 11, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR16 (NEW): Cleared.

The budget now includes component and output-level figures.

(June 11, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: N/A

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

However, some amendments are required.

The figures are rounded to whole numbers and consistent throughout the CN. The Execution Costs are at the cap of 9.5% (USD 1,751,152). However, the Implementing Entity, UNDP, will act as Executing Entity as well.

CR18: Please clarify whether UNDP or UN-Habitat will act as the Executing Entity. Depending on this, the cap for execution costs will be determined.

CAR16: Please clarify if Ministry of Rural Development, Social Security, and Community Empowerment, UNDP, UN-Habitat, and FAO will also execute the PFG. If not please amend the PFG form in the event UNDP intends to execute the PFG.

(February 2, 2026)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR18: Not cleared.

While the management arrangements identify the Ministry of Rural Development, Social Security and Community Empowerment as the sole Executing Entity (EE), the cover page lists the Ministry of Rural Development, Social Security and Community Empowerment, UNDP, UN-Habitat, and FAO as EEs. Please clarify this to determine the cap for execution costs.

CAR16: Cleared.

As per information provided in the PFG. It is confirmed that the Ministry of Rural Development, Social Security, and Community Empowerment will be the sole Executing Entity of the PFG.

(May 11, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR18: Cleared.

The CN now identifies all four institutions as executing entities with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. However, at the next stage please ensure that the letter of endorsement also identifies all executing entities.

(June 11, 2026)

Eligibility of IE

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

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is an accredited Multilateral Implementing Entity (MIE).

The Implementing Entity's accreditation expiration date is 11 October 2029.

(February 2, 2026)

Implementation Arrangements

Is there adequate arrangement for project / programme management, in compliance with the Gender Policy of the Fund?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: n/a

Are there measures for financial and project/programme risk management?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: n/a

Are there measures in place for the management of for environmental and social risks, in line with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: n/a

Is a budget on the Implementing Entity Management Fee use included?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: n/a

Is an explanation and a breakdown of the execution costs included?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: n/a

Is a detailed budget including budget notes included?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: n/a

Are arrangements for monitoring and evaluation clearly defined, including budgeted M&E plans and sex-disaggregated data, targets and indicators, in compliance with the Gender Policy of the Fund?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: n/a

Does the M&E Framework include a break-down of how implementing entity IE fees will be utilized in the supervision of the M&E function?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: n/a

Does the project/programme's results framework align with the AF's results framework? Does it include at least one core outcome indicator from the Fund's results framework?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: n/a

Is a disbursement schedule with time-bound milestones included?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: n/a



Revised PFG Submission Form¹ (additions in red)

Project Formulation Grant (PFG)

Submission Date:

Adaptation Fund Project ID:

Country/ies: Sri Lanka

Title of Project/Programme: Integrating Community-Led Adaptation and Climate Risk Reduction for Resilience Building at Local Level in Sri Lanka

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

Implementing Entity: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Executing Entity/ies: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

A. Project Preparation Timeframe

Start date of PFG	April 2026
Completion date of PFG	April 2027

B. Proposed Project Preparation Activities (\$)

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note²
1. Cross-sectoral consultations with communities, provincial, district and divisional authorities, local governments and other stakeholders	- Consolidated stakeholder mapping report listing all consulted authorities, CSOs, private-sector and community institutions/actors per target district, with agreed roles and contact points. - Consultation summary reports capturing climate-risk priorities, institutional mandates, existing plans and confirmed entry points for CR-VDP integration. - Co-designed governance framework outlining decision-making structures, coordination mechanisms and risk-management arrangements for	45,000	Hiring of a consultancy firm for cross-sectoral consultations with communities, provincial, district and divisional authorities, local governments and other stakeholders

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.

	devolved project implementation at district/divisional and CDC level (through subnational structures of Prajashakthi). • Set of endorsed recommendations on integrating Adaptation Fund compliant climate-risk screening and safeguards into Prajashakthi planning, budgeting and approval workflows. • Community consultation tools (gender-responsive, inclusive sampling, safeguarding measures) approved and ready for use in project implementation. • Community co-design workshop reports with locally ranked adaptation options, implementation arrangements and agreed monitoring indicators.		for project development – (within 04 months)
2. Gender and environmental and social risk analysis and formulation of Social and Environmental Management Plan and Gender Action Plan	• Gender analysis report (quantitative + qualitative) with sex-disaggregated vulnerability profiles and entry points for each target landscape. • Environmental & Social Management Plan (SEMP) including risk register, mitigation measures and monitoring indicators for full-proposal interventions. • Stand-alone Gender Action Plan (GAP) with budgeted actions, targets, roles and alignment with AF Gender Policy.	10,000	Hiring a National Consultant on Gender and Social and Environment Safeguards- (USD 200/day for 50 days (within 40 weeks)
3. Location-specific climate risk and vulnerability assessments, baseline studies, and geospatial analysis	• District hazard–vulnerability–risk (HVR) profiles with maps and climate-change scenarios for each target landscape. • Prioritized list of location-specific adaptation/ climate risk-reduction options with preliminary cost–benefit and feasibility notes	16,250	Hiring of a consultancy firm to conduct a study on location-specific climate risk and vulnerability assessments,

	Baseline assessment report documenting socio-economic, environmental, and institutional conditions to inform project results frameworks and future impact measurement		baseline studies, and geospatial analysis – (within 04 months)
4. International consultant	High-quality project proposal which meets all AF guidelines	35,000	Hiring an International Consultant for Project Development (AF PPG Team Leader) (USD 700/day for 50 days (within 40 weeks))
5.)National Coordinator	All project annexes for the full project proposal	16,000	Hiring a National Team Coordinator for Project Development - (USD 200/day for 80 days (within 40 weeks))
6. Travel		~~14,000~~ 14,999	Cost of in-country travel to proposed project locations for site verification and stakeholder consultations related to the project document development process -
7. Micro Assessment for the Ministry of Rural Development, Social Security, and Community Empowerment		1,000	Conducting a HACT Micro Assessment to assess capacity of the executing partner, Ministry of

			Rural Development, Social Security, and Community Empowerment
Implementing Entity's Management Fee		~~12,750~~ 11,751	8.5% of total PFG budget
Total Project Formulation Grant		150,000	

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

Activity 01 - The objective of this activity is to generate robust, participatory, and geo-referenced socio-economic and institutional evidence to inform the design of a community-led Adaptation Fund proposal, ensuring strong sub-national ownership, coherent governance arrangements, and alignment with Prajashakthi planning systems; complementing but not duplicating the work of the Social, Environmental and Gender Safeguards Specialist.

The requested USD 45,000 covers specialist days, travel, workshops, transcription and rapid report production—costs not covered by routine government staff budgets—while generating the evidence base required for the full-proposal results framework and ensuring that the full proposal demonstrates clear sub-national/local institutional ownership, and readiness for effective implementation at scale.

UNDP will hire a company with the above expertise

Activity 02 – UNDP will engage a national Social, Gender and Environmental Screening Expert to support the project formulation process by: (i) conducting social and environmental screening in line with UNDP SESP and Adaptation Fund ESP requirements; (ii) identifying potential risks, impacts, and mitigation measures and supporting the preparation of relevant management frameworks, as required; and (iii) ensuring that gender equality and women's empowerment are meaningfully integrated into project design through a robust gender analysis and framework

The requested USD 10,000 covers the cost of 50 days of the consultant (USD 200 per day)

Activity 03 - This activity will generate robust, location-specific evidence on climate vulnerability and the feasibility of a landscape-based approach to inform the design, prioritization, and costing of adaptation interventions under the proposed Adaptation Fund project aligned with the Prajashakthi programme. This includes :

Vulnerability Assessment: Assess the location specific climate vulnerabilities of the six selected landscapes in six districts by analyzing exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacity of key socio-ecological systems and livelihood categories/groups, and identify, prioritize context-appropriate adaptation actions.

Feasibility and Stakeholder Buy-in Assessment: Assess the level of stakeholder buy-in and technical, institutional, socio-economic, environmental, and governance feasibility of applying a landscape based approach for rural and urban community development, and make recommendations to apply it within the proposed project and provide actionable recommendations for its operationalization.

The requested USD 20,000 will cover 83 working days over 4 months (three consultants – Vulnerability Expert (team lead), Climate Adaptation Expert, and GIS Expert). A company with above expertise is hired. Activity 04 – UNDP will hire a international consultant as the Adaptation Fund Project Preparation Grant (PPG) Team Leader. S/he will provide overall technical leadership, coordination, and quality assurance for the PPG process and will be responsible for the timely preparation, integration, and finalization of the UNDP-Adaptation Fund Project Document (ProDoc), including all mandatory and project-specific annexes. The Team Leader will ensure methodological rigor, technical coherence, policy compliance, and alignment across all PPG components, including technical studies, stakeholder consultations, environmental and social safeguards instruments, gender analysis, financial planning, and results frameworks. The PPG Team Leader will retain responsibility for: (1) Overall technical integrity and consistency of all PPG outputs; (2) Integration of inputs across consultants and components; and (3) Final technical validation of all deliverables prior to submission to UNDP and the Adaptation Fund Secretariat.

The estimated cost of USD 35,000 will cover 50 days of the consultant. (USD 700/day within 40 weeks)

Activity 05: UNDP will hire a local consultant to work with the international consultant on the project proposal development processes. S/he will support the preparation of the full Adaptation Fund project proposal by coordinating national-level inputs, consolidating technical and consultation outputs, and drafting designated sections of the UNDP-AF Project Document and annexes under the direction of the International PPG Team Leader. The consultant acts as the national focal point for information management and inter-consultant coordination, ensuring that inputs from stakeholder consultations, technical studies, safeguards and gender analyses are systematically integrated into the project design, results framework, and supporting documentation.

The estimated cost of USD 16,000 will cover 80 days of the consultant within 40 weeks(USD 200 per day)

Activity 06 : Estimated cost of USD 14,999 will cover the cost of in-country travel for local consultant and experts in the PPG team and CO staff related to project document development and related meetings and stakeholder consultations. This will include hiring of transportation services – USD 10,000 for 12 months, and DSA and other related payments of USD 4,999.

Activity 07: UNDP will carry out a Micro Assessment for the Ministry of Rural Development, Social Security, and Community Empowerment. The estimated cost is USD 1,000.

C. Implementing Entity

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

Implementing Entity Coordinator, IE Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Nancy Bennet <i>Director, Quality and Impact Hub and Executive Coordinator,</i>			Aishath Azza Regional Technical Specialist		aishath.azza@undp.org

<i>Vertical Funds</i>					
<i>Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (BPPS)</i>					
<i>United Nations Development Programme</i>					



පරිසර අමාත්‍යාංශය
சுற்றுடல் அமைச்சு
Ministry of Environment

"සොපාදම් පියා", අං. 416/ජී/1, රොබට් ගුනවර්ධන මාවත, බත්තරමුල්ල, ශ්‍රී ලංකාව.

"சொபாதம் பியா", இல. 416/ஜீ/1, ரொபர்ட் குணவர்தன மாவத்தை, பத்தரமுல்லை, இலங்கை.
"Sobadam Piyasa", No. 416/C/1, Robert Gunawardana Mawatha, Battaramulla, Sri Lanka.

Gen. Tel. +94-11-2034100

ලේකම්

செயலாளர்

Secretary

+94-11-2034121

ෆැක්ස්

தொலை நகல்

Fax

+94-11-2879944

මගේ අංකය
எனது இல
My No

Env/CC/04/04/02/01 - JP

ඔබේ අංකය
உமது இல
Your No

දිනය
திகதி
Date

09.01.2026

The Chairman
The Adaptation Fund Board
c/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat

Dear Sir,

Endorsement for Concept Note Proposal on “Integrating Community-Led Adaptation and Climate Risk Reduction for Resilience Building at Local Level in Sri Lanka”

In my capacity as designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in Sri Lanka, I confirm that the above Concept Note 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 Sri Lanka.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above project proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and executed by the Ministry of Rural Development, Social Security and Community Empowerment and Ministry of Environment of Sri Lanka.

Thank you

Yours sincerely

K. R. Uduwawala
Secretary