



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.38/27/Add.1
10 September 2026

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

Agenda Item 5 (f)

PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR BHUTAN, INDIA, NEPAL

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.38/27 “Proposal for Bhutan, India, Nepal” includes a request for a Project Formulation Grant, requesting a budget of US\$ 32,958, which was received by the secretariat along with the concept for the regional programme AF00000548 “Strengthening Adaptation and Flood and Landslide Early Warning for the HKH (SAFE NIB)”. This proposal was submitted by International Center for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD), which is a Regional Implementing Entity of the Adaptation Fund, in time for consideration by the Adaptation Fund Board at its forty-seventh Board meeting.

8. In accordance with Decision B.12/28, paragraph (b), the secretariat carried out an initial review of the PFG request and found that the document provided detailed information on the use of the requested funds. The proposed activities were aligned with the goal of the project and would support regional coordination of concept development; comprehensive consultation process and data compilation.

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



ADAPTATION FUND

ADAPTATION FUND BOARD SECRETARIAT
TECHNICAL REVIEW OF PROJECT PROPOSAL FOR
"STRENGTHENING ADAPTATION AND FLOOD AND LANDSLIDE EARLY WARNING FOR THE
HKH (SAFE NIB) "

Project Title	Strengthening Adaptation and Flood and Landslide Early Warning for the HKH (SAFE NIB)
Project ID	AF00000548
Category	Regular size project (over \$1 million)
Type	Regional project
Stage	Pre-concept
Country	Regional (Bhutan, India, Nepal)
Implementing Entity	ICIMOD
Financing Requested	USD 30,000,000.00
Reviewer	Estefania Jimenez Rodriguez

Co-reviewer(s)

IE Contact Person

Neha Rai, Prerana Dakhwa

Secretariat's Overall Comment

The project Strengthening Adaptation and Flood and Landslide Early Warning for the HKH (SAFE NIB) aims to enhance flood and landslide resilience in the Himalayas through innovative early warning systems, resilient infrastructure, inclusive governance, and regional collaboration, aligned with climate adaptation solutions.

The proposal includes a PFG request of USD 32,958.

The first technical review raises some issues, such as limited problem analysis, absence of a theory of change, missing output-level financing allocations, lack of details on stakeholder engagement to date, lack of clarity on implementation arrangements, and inconsistencies with the PFG budget etc. as discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Request (CAR) raised in the review.

The second technical review raises some issues, such as the need to strengthen the Theory of Change, provide output-level financing allocations, and address inconsistencies in the PFG budget, among others, as discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Request (CAR) raised in the review.

The third technical review finds that most of the outstanding issues have been addressed however some CRs and CARs remain concerning PFG execution entity clarification, proper template for project component & financing table as confirming the presence of USPs as raised in the few remaining CRs and CARs.

The fourth technical review finds one outstanding CR/CAR remains concerning the proper cover page.

the fifth technical review finds that all outstanding CRs and CARs have been addressed.

Country Eligibility

Are all of the participating countries party to the Kyoto Protocol, or the Paris Agreement?

Response: Yes

Secretariat: Yes.

Bhutan, India and Nepal are Parties to both the Kyoto Protocol and Paris Agreement.

Are all of the participating countries developing countries particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

Bhutan, India, and Nepal are all developing countries within the Hindu Kush Himalayan region, which is highly vulnerable to increasing risks from glacial melt, floods, landslides, and changing monsoon patterns.

The Hindu Kush Himalaya (HKH) region is highly vulnerable to multiple hazards driven by climate change, urbanisation, and socio-economic change. Nepal, India, and Bhutan face diverse but interconnected risks including Glacial Lake Outburst Floods (GLOFs), landslides, riverine flooding, and droughts. Rapid warming at more than double the global average rate is intensifying glacial melt, destabilising slopes, and shifting monsoon patterns. Heavy rainfall in upstream Nepal and Bhutan frequently leads to catastrophic flooding in India.

Project Eligibility

Have the designated government authorities for the Adaptation Fund from each of the participating countries endorsed the project/programme?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

As per the Bhutan Endorsement letter dated January 30, 2026.

As per the India Endorsement letter dated June 4, 2026.

As per the Nepal Endorsement letter dated January 25, 2026.

Has the pre-concept provided necessary information on the problem the proposed project/programme is aiming to solve, including both the regional and the country perspective?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes, but further information is required.

The proposed project provides regional and subnational information, as well as clear adaptation solutions to address the impacts of climate change in each country. It also highlights shared challenges and opportunities across countries, thereby supporting the rationale for a regional approach. However, more details are required.

CAR1: Please ensure that:

1. The full names of organizations, programs, and other terms are provided when first introducing an acronym.
2. Full numerical figures are used throughout the document (cover page, tables, etc.). For example, use "30,000,000" instead of "30 million" and "5,000,000" instead of "5".

3. Please remove all non-EEs from the proposal cover page.

CR1: Kindly provide clear linkage between the climate conditions affecting each country and the proposed solutions. These references should be specific to show this correlation and properly justify the proposed project. This may include information about environmental, economic and social impacts due to climate change.

CR2: Please clarify the main regional adaptation challenge that the proposed project seeks to address.

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: Yes, but further information is required.

The pre-concept provides a clear description of the problem from both the regional and country perspectives. It explains the shared climate risks across the Hindu Kush Himalayan (HKH) region and demonstrates why these risks require coordinated transboundary action. It summarizes the existing disaster risk reduction frameworks and capacities in Bhutan, India, and Nepal, while identifying common gaps. However, more details are needed.

CR3: The country-specific problem analysis is relatively brief and focuses more on existing institutions than on the specific vulnerabilities and adaptation gaps in each country. Please provide some additional discussion of how risks and needs differ among Bhutan, India, and Nepal.

CR4: Please integrate some quantitative data to better demonstrate the scale and urgency of the problem (e.g., historical losses, populations at risk, economic damages, trends in flood and landslide frequency).

CR5: Please provide additional details on why existing bilateral or regional initiatives have been insufficient and how the proposed project will address these remaining gaps without duplicating ongoing efforts.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR1: Cleared.

1. Full names of organizations, programs, and other terms have been revised and amended accordingly.
2. All figures throughout the PCN are presented as full numbers (e.g., "30,000,000").
3. All non-EEs have been removed from the proposal cover page.

CR1: Cleared.

As per revised Page 1. The proposal states that: "These hazards are also inherently transboundary: Heavy rainfall in upstream Nepal and Bhutan frequently leads to catastrophic flooding in India (e.g. Koshi 2008 and 2017; Manas 2004 and 2007; Ganges 1998 and 2004)- risk generated in one country routinely determines outcomes in another."

The solution will help to have cross-border coordination using the existing national early warning systems of each country.

CR2: Cleared.

As per revised Page 1. The proposal states that, while each country has early warning systems, these operate at the national level and do not support cross-border coordination. As a result, significant gaps remain that are inherently transboundary in nature, including limited information sharing and harmonised thresholds, gaps in impact-based forecasting, weak last-mile dissemination of warnings, and underutilised ecosystem-based solutions.

CR3: Cleared.

As per revised Page 2. The proposal provides information regarding the specific vulnerabilities and adaptation gaps in each country. Please provide some additional discussion of how risks and needs differ among Bhutan, India, and Nepal.

CR4: Cleared.

As per revised Page 2. Quantitative data has been included for each country to demonstrate the scale and urgency of the problem. The proposal states that: "The 2008 Koshi (Kushaha) embankment breach affected an estimated 4.3 million people and forced the evacuation of over 2 million across eight districts of Bihar, with more than 500 deaths and around 19,000 livestock lost; crop losses alone reached approximately US\$18.7 million, reducing Nepal's national GDP by an estimated 0.3%, and some 223,000 houses were damaged."

CR5: Cleared.

As per revised Page 3. The proposal provided additional details to ensure additionality through direct coordination with existing bilateral mechanisms in the project's regional governance structure. For details about duplication-avoidance mapping will be provided at the Full Proposal.

Have the project/programme objectives, components and financing been clearly explained?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes, but further clarification is needed.

The proposed project provides an outline of the objectives, components and financing. However, the description of components are not clearly defined.

CR6: Kindly provide brief yet clear explanations of what will be financed under each component.

CR7: Kindly revise the outcomes and outputs for each component to ensure they are properly defined. Please note that indicators must be SMART.

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: Yes, but further information is required.

The pre-concept clearly states the overall objective of enhancing flood and landslide resilience in the Hindu Kush Himalaya through improved early warning systems, resilient infrastructure, inclusive governance, and regional cooperation. It also presents five logical project components, with associated expected outcomes, outputs, participating countries, and indicative financing allocations. However, more details are needed.

CR8: Please provide an explicit description of the project's theory of change that demonstrates how the five components collectively contribute to the overall objective and reinforce one another.

CR9: Please provide proposed financing allocations at the output level. Also provide some discussion of how these budget allocations would be impactful and cost-effective.

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR6: Not cleared.

A brief description of what will be financed has been included for each component in Table of "Project/Programme Components and Financing":

However, please:

- number the specific objectives.
- make the title "What Will Be Financed" in Component 4 bold.

CR7: Not cleared.

Please rephrase outcome 3 in Component 5 as: "Communities in high-risk areas adopt improved DRR and preparedness practices" instead of "Awareness campaigns shift behaviour in high-risk areas".

CR8: Not cleared.

Please revise and strengthen the Theory of Change as follows:

- Explicitly identify the key assumptions underpinning the Theory of Change and describe the measures proposed to mitigate associated risks.
- Use this structure: "If (climate adaptation challenge being addressed) and if (key barriers/gaps preventing adaptation), then (describe the project's long-term objective). This will be achieved by: (i) (how Component 1 contributes to addressing the challenge); (ii) (how Component 2 contributes); (iii) (how Component 3 contributes); (iv) (how Component 4 contributes); and (v) (how Component 5 contributes). Together, these interventions will lead to (expected outputs and outcomes), resulting in (expected adaptation impact). Key assumptions include: (i) (assumption 1) and (ii) (assumption 2), with corresponding mitigation measures consisting of (describe mitigation measures)."

CR9: Not cleared.

The proposal already includes a brief discussion on the cost-effectiveness of the proposed project (page 7). However, please provide the proposed financing allocations at the output level in the Table of "Project/Programme Components and Financing".

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR6: Not cleared.

1. Please comply with the table template for the components financing table and separate out the output and components column.
2. Please provide the "What Will Be Financed" information below the table and not within the table.

CR7: Cleared.

As per amendment to component 5.

CR8: Cleared.

As per updated Theory of change.

CR9: Cleared.

Project/Program Components & Financing now included the cost at output level.

At part II, given the description of components 3 and 2 please confirm if the project will contain USPs as per <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Updated-guidance-on-USPs-.pdf>

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR6: Cleared.

Based on updated Components and Financing Table.

Has the project/programme been justified in terms of how: - it supports concrete adaptation actions? - it builds added value through the regional approach? - it promotes new and innovative solutions to climate change adaptation? - it is cost-effective? - it is consistent with applicable strategies and plans? - it incorporates learning and knowledge management? - it will be developed through a consultative process with particular reference to vulnerable groups, including gender considerations, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Adaptation Fund? - it will take into account sustainability?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes, but further information is required.

The document outlines concrete adaptation actions, explains the innovative approach behind the proposed solutions, demonstrates alignment with relevant strategies and plans, provides a cost-effectiveness rationale, states that an inclusive consultation process will be conducted during project preparation, and includes a learning and knowledge management component (Component 5). It also contributes to the thematic focal area of Disaster Risk Reduction and Early Warning Systems. However, the regional added value and the baseline information supporting the proposed approach could be strengthened.

CR10: Please ensure the following:

- (i) Adaptation actions are specific, clearly explained and well-defined. For example, clarify what is meant by "innovation" in Component 1 and "Inclusive" in Component 2.
- (ii) The added value of adopting a regional approach is clear for Nepal and Bhutan; but, please explain the specific benefits for India.
- (iii) A sustainability approach is included, and its integration into the project is clearly described.

CR11: Please include a statement that indicates how the project contributes to the "Disaster risk reduction and early warning systems" thematic focal area as specified on the cover page. Please consider whether the project also contributes to the "Transboundary water management" thematic focal area.

CR12: Please describe any stakeholder engagement to date as well as how the planned stakeholder consultations will be used to inform project design.

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR10:

- (i) Not cleared. Please ensure the following:

Adaptation actions are specific, clearly explained and well-defined. For example, clarify what is meant by "innovation" in Component 1 and "Inclusive" in Component 2.

- (ii) Cleared.

As per revised page 7. The proposal states that: "For India, the regional approach provides earlier access to upstream hydrological and glaciological data from Nepal and Bhutan, the only realistic source of additional lead

time for floods that materialise downstream in Bihar, Assam and West Bengal, since India's own monitoring networks cannot observe hazard formation occurring upstream of the border. "

(iii) Cleared.

As per revised page 8. A sustainability approach has been included. All technical systems will be part of existing government platforms, co-organised by the countries themselves rather than as ICIMOD-parallel systems, with recurrent operating costs progressively absorbed into national budgets.

CR11: Cleared.

As per revised page 7. A statement on the project's contribution to the "Disaster Risk Reduction and Early Warning Systems" thematic focal area has been included.

CR12: Not cleared.

Please briefly indicate whether consultations will be conducted during the concept stage, and how the planned stakeholder consultations will be used to inform the project design.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: For future submissions, the long narrative in the review sheet should be shortened, the necessary information should be placed in the proposal. The review sheet should point to where the information can be found in the proposal.

CR10: Cleared.

As per updated information on component 1 in Part II.

CR11: Cleared.

As per clarification in the review sheet.

The IE is advised to ensure that these linkage are strengthening and included in the concept note phase of the proposal

CR12: Cleared.

As per updated Consultative process and gender considerations section in Part II.

Does the pre-concept briefly explain which organizations would be involved in the proposed regional project/programme at the regional and national/sub-national level, and how coordination would be arranged? Does it explain how national institutions, and when possible, national implementing entities (NIEs) would be involved as partners in the project?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes, but further information is required.

Part III includes all required implementation arrangements. However, the information provided is not fully consistent with the cover page and requires further clarification.

CAR2: Please provide some details on the proposed governance and coordination structure for the project,

including decision-making arrangements, roles and responsibilities of the various partners, and mechanisms for coordinating implementation across countries. Additionally, please clarify the role of each entity and specify whether its responsibilities are at the regional, national, or subnational level.

CAR 3:

1. Please clarify if ICIMOD serving as an Implementing Entity (IE), an Executing Entity (EE), or both?
2. Please clarify which organizations are the Executing Entities: ADPC and NDMA, or ADPC and IFRC?
3. Please ensure consistency between the cover page and Part III regarding the Executing and Implementing Entities.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR2: Cleared.

As per revised Part III. An overview of the key roles and responsibilities of each entity has been included. However, please note that this information will need to be further detailed at the Full Proposal stage.

CAR 3:

1. Cleared.

ICIMOD serves as IE and EE.

2. Cleared.

EE are three: ICIMOD, ADPC and NDMA.

3. Cleared.

There is consistency between the cover page and Part III regarding the Executing and Implementing Entities.

Resource Availability

Is the requested project / programme funding within the funding windows of the programme for regional projects/programmes?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes.

The financing requested from the Adaptation Fund is USD 30,000,000.

Are the administrative costs (Implementing Entity Management Fee and Project/ Programme Execution Costs) at or below 10 per cent of the project/programme for implementing entity (IE) fees and at or below 10 per cent of the project/programme cost for the execution costs?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes, but some amendments are required.

All figures are not rounded to a whole number. Both the IE Management Fee and Project Execution costs are below 10% of the Project Total Cost and, therefore, are correct in size. It is not clear whether the IE is serving as EE as well. The PFG requested needs amendments.

CAR4: Kindly revise and amend the following:

1. Please update the PFG request from as well as the cover page of the proposal to reflect the appropriate amount for the pre-CN stage which is \$33,000.
2. Please remember to include the IE fee for the execution of the PFG as a specific budget 3. Please clarify if ICIMOD will self-execute the PFG. If yes, please update the PFG request from to reflect this.
4. Please update the start date of the PFG.
5. Please include AF project ID/FIF ID with resubmission.

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR4:

1. Not cleared.

Figures are rounded to whole numbers in the PCN, however, not in the PFG. Please amend accordingly. In addition, please ensure consistency of the amount of the PFG request in the cover page and the PFG form.

2. Cleared.

As per revised PFG form. The PFG includes a IE management fee of 8.5% of the total PFG.

3. Not cleared.

As per revised PFG form. ICIMOD will serve as both the IE and EE. However, please amend the EE entities listed in the PFG form to reflect their exact names (avoiding generic references such as "national disaster management authorities of the three countries"). Please ensure that the clean and the track version are the same.

4. Cleared.

As per revised PFG form. The start date of the PFG has been updated to November 2026.

5. Cleared.

As per revised PFG form.

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR4 (3):

1, The PFG form provides conflicting information on who is executing the PFG. It contains a note that the PFG will be executing by ICIMOD yet the header of the PFG form includes 3 other agencies. Please update the header of the PFG form in ICIMOD is also executing the PFG to show ICIMOD and delete the other named agencies on the PFG form.

2. Please delete in the PFG form the note under the table which addresses the amount of funds accessed now and what will be accessed later. Also no need for note on PFG execution below the table. see CAR4(3) 1 above.

3. Please ensure that the cover page only includes information related to PART I: PROJECT/PROGRAMME INFORMATION. Please commence part II on a separate page.

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR4 (3): Not Cleared.

PFG form has been updated. However the cover page should have as the last section the stage of submission. Please amend and re-submit.

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR4 (3): Not Cleared.

This has not been addressed.

The cover page should not contain Project/programme Background and Context information. That should commence on page 2 of the proposal. Please address and re-submit the package.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR4 (3): Cleared.

The cover page is now devoid of the project descriptive information.

Eligibility of IE

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes.

International Center for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) is a Regional Implementing Entity (RIE).

Accreditation status: Accredited (Special extension per Decision B.46/9)



Revised PFG Submission Form¹ (additions in red)

Project Formulation Grant (PFG)

Submission Date: ~~August 18~~ September 12, 2026 (Resubmission)

Adaptation Fund Project ID: AF00000548

Country/ies: Bhutan, India and Nepal

Title of Project/Programme: Strengthening Adaptation and Flood and Landslide Early Warning for the HKH (SAFE NIB)

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

Implementing Entity: International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD)

Executing Entity/ies: ICIMOD

A. Project Preparation Timeframe

Start date of PFG	Nov 2026
Completion date of PFG	Mar 2027

B. Proposed Project Preparation Activities (\$)

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note²
Technical leadership and regional coordination of concept development	Technically sound, regionally coherent draft concept reflecting DRR and early warning priorities across Bhutan, India and Nepal, with inputs coordinated across executing entities	USD 12,019	Staff time: Water and DRR Lead (10 days @ \$609/day = \$6,090); and Intervention Manager- DRR (11 days @ \$539/day = \$5929)
Strategic oversight, quality assurance, and AF compliance review	Institutional sign-off confirming alignment with ICIMOD's regional programme priorities and the Adaptation Fund's eligibility criteria prior submission	USD 4,770	Staff time: Head, Strategic Results, Partnerships and Business Development (SRPBD) (5 days @ \$954/day)

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.

Concept note drafting and proposal development	Draft AF compliant regional project concept note, including theory of change, preliminary results framework and indicative budget	USD 7,500	Consultant time: Proposal design and development consultant (15 days @500/day)
In-country coordination, secondary data compilation and stakeholder liaison	Compiled secondary data (national adaptation plans, DRR strategies, existing hazards/vulnerability assessments) and liaison with National Designated Authorities (NDAs) and line ministries to ground the concept in national priorities.	USD 6,087	Staff time: BDRM Officer (20 days @ \$133/day = \$2660); SRPBD Associate (12 days @ \$61/day = \$732), Country Focal Points (5 days @ \$539/day = \$2,695)
Total Project Formulation Grant		USD 30,376	
IE Management Fee (8.5%)		USD 2,582	
Total Project Formulation Grant		USD 32,958	

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

Activity 1: Technical Leadership and Regional Coordination of Concept Development
Proposed Budget: USD 12,019

Description: This activity covers the time of ICIMOD's Water and DRR Lead and Intervention Manager—DRR to provide technical direction to the concept development process, ensure the proposed early warning and adaptation approach is technically robust across the three countries' differing hydro-meteorological and landslide risk contexts, and coordinate inputs from the executing entities (IFRC, ADPC, NDMA, MOIT, DGM) into a single, consistent regional concept.

Justification: A three-country regional early warning project requires technical coherence across differing national systems and institutional mandates; without dedicated senior technical time, the concept risks being a loose compilation of country inputs rather than an integrated regional design. Given the reduced pre-concept budget, this technical function is delivered through existing ICIMOD staff time rather than external consultants, keeping cost to USD 12,019 for 21 combined staff-days.

Activity 2: Strategic Oversight, Quality Assurance and AF Compliance Review
Proposed Budget: USD 4,770

Description: This activity covers the time of the Head, Strategic Results, Partnerships and Business Development (SRPBD) to review the emerging concept against ICIMOD's institutional priorities and the Adaptation Fund's access modalities, eligibility criteria and quality standards, and to provide sign-off ahead of submission.

Justification: AF quality standards require institutional-level review before submission; this is a fixed, non-discretionary internal governance step. At USD 4,770 for 5 days, it is the minimum senior-level oversight needed to align institutional mandate and avoid rejection or resubmission delays at the Board review stage.

Activity 3: Concept Note Drafting and Proposal Development

Proposed Budget: USD 7,500

Description: This activity engages a Proposal Design and Development Consultant to draft the AF-compliant regional concept note, translating technical and country inputs into the required narrative, theory of change and indicative results framework.

Justification: Producing an AF template-compliant concept note is a specialized drafting task distinct from technical or coordination work. At this funding level, dedicated consultant drafting time (rather than committing already-stretched senior staff to full drafting) is the most cost-effective way to secure a submission-ready document within the available USD 33,000 ceiling.

Activity 4: In-Country Coordination, Secondary Data Compilation and Stakeholder Liaison

Proposed Budget: USD 6,087

Description: This activity covers the time of the BDRM Officer, SRPBD Associate and the three Country Focal Points to compile existing secondary data, national adaptation plans, DRR strategies, and prior hazard/vulnerability assessments already available for Bhutan, India and Nepal and to liaise with National Designated Authorities (NDAs) and line ministries so the concept reflects current national priorities.

Justification: At the pre-concept stage, funding is not available for new field consultations or primary data collection; this activity instead maximizes use of already-existing secondary sources and ICIMOD's established country-level relationships, ensuring the concept remains grounded in national realities at minimal cost (USD 6,087 for 37 combined staff-days across three focal points and two support staff).

For LLA Projects only:

If requesting additional funding for LLA projects to enable devolving decision making to the local level, please specify the activities that would directly serve to enable devolving decision making to the lowest appropriate level and enable local actors to make informed decisions on how adaptation actions are defined, prioritized, designed and implemented:

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

C. Implementing Entity

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

Implementing Entity Coordinator, IE Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Dr. Pema Gyamtsho, Director General, International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD)		17 July, 2026	Neha Rai Prerana Dhakwa	+977 1- 527-5222	Neha.ra@icimod.org prerana.dhakhwa@icimod.org



དངུལ་ཅིན་ལྷན་ཁག།

Department of Macro-fiscal and Development Finance
Ministry of Finance
Royal Government of Bhutan

MoF/DMD/DCDMD/AF_ICIMOD/2025-2026/1992

30th January, 2026

To: The Adaptation Fund Board
c/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat
1818 H Street NW
MSN N7-700
Washington, D.C., 20433
United States of America
Email: Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org
Fax: 202 522 3240/5

Subject: Endorsement for Strengthening Adaptation and Flood and Landslide Early Warning for the HKH (SAFE NIB) – a regional project proposal (Bhutan, Nepal and India).

In my capacity as designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in Bhutan, I confirm that the above 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 Bhutan.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above grant proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) and executed by ICIMOD, Ministry of Infrastructure and Transport, Ministry of Home Affairs, National Center for Hydrology and Meteorology, Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre (ADPC), International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and along with Disaster Risk Management Agencies of Bhutan, India and Nepal.

Thanking you.

Yours sincerely,

(Tshering Dorji)

Director General/ Designated Authority of Bhutan to the Adaptation Fund

Copy to:

1. Hon'ble Secretary, Ministry of Finance for kind information.
2. Director General, International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) for kind information and support.



དངུལ་ཅིན་ལྷན་ཁག།

Department of Macro-fiscal and Development Finance
Ministry of Finance
Royal Government of Bhutan

-
3. Director General, Department of Local Governance and Disaster Management, Ministry of Home Affairs for kind information.
 4. Director General, National Center for Hydrology and Meteorology for kind information.
 5. Director General, Department of Human Settlement, Ministry of Infrastructure and Transport for kind information.



राजश्री रे
RAJASREE RAY



सत्यमेव जयते



आर्थिक सलाहकार
पर्यावरण, वन एवं जलवायु परिवर्तन मंत्रालय
भारत सरकार
ECONOMIC ADVISER
MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, FOREST
AND CLIMATE CHANGE
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

No. 20/05/2024-CS-I

4th June 2026

To,

The Adaptation Fund Board
C/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat
Email: afbsec@adaptation-fund.org
Fax: 202 522 3240/5

Subject: Endorsement for Strengthening Adaptation and Flood and Landslide Early Warning for the HKH (SAFE NIB)

Dear Sir/Madam,

In my capacity as designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in India, I confirm that the above regional 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 India.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above project proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) and executed by ICIMOD, Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC) and National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA).

Yours sincerely,

(Rajasree Ray)



Government of Nepal
Ministry of Forests and Environment



P.O. Box No. 3987
Singh Durbar, Kathmandu

Ref. No. 241

Date: January 25, 2026

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

Subject: Endorsement for regional project pre-concept note "Strengthening Adaptation and Flood and Landslide Early Warning for the HKH (SAFE BaNIB)"

In my capacity as designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in Nepal, I confirm that the above regional project pre concept note is in accordance with the government's national priorities in implementing adaptation activities to reduce adverse impacts of, and risks, posed by climate change in the Nepal

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above project pre concept note with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development (ICIMOD) and executed jointly by Disaster Risk Management Agencies of Government of Nepal along with Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre (ADPC), International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS), and ICIMOD.

Sincerely,

Suman Subedi
Primary Contact Point, Adaptation Fund
Under Secretary, Adaptation Section
Ministry of Forests and Environment
Email: s_subedi2003@yahoo.com
Suman.subedi@nepal.gov.np