



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.38/8/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 (e)

PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR UGANDA

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.38/8 “Proposal for Uganda” includes a request for a Project Formulation Grant, requesting a budget of US\$ 126,864, which was received by the secretariat along with the concept for the project AF00000471 “Strengthening Resilience of Women to Climate Risks in Rural Communities of Uganda”. This proposal was submitted by Ministry of Water and Environment of Uganda (MWE), which is a National 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 stakeholder engagement, baseline assessment, and needs analysis; market research and value chain analysis; capacity assessment; and development of detailed project plan, budget, and ESMP safeguard framework.

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
"STRENGTHENING RESILIENCE OF WOMEN TO CLIMATE RISKS IN RURAL COMMUNITIES
OF UGANDA "

Project Title **Strengthening Resilience of Women to Climate Risks in Rural Communities of Uganda**

Project ID **AF00000471**

Category **Regular size project (over \$1 million)**

Type **Single country project**

Stage **Concept**

Country **Uganda**

Implementing Entity **MWE**

Financing Requested **USD 5,500,000.00**

Reviewer **Jonathan Cook**

Co-reviewer(s)

IE Contact Person

Francis Opolot, Joseph Lule, Mildred Martha Namwiira

Secretariat's Overall Comment

The project “Strengthening Resilience of Women to Climate Risks in Rural Communities of Uganda” aims to strengthen the resilience of rural women in Uganda to climate-related risks and impacts, enhancing their adaptive capacity, food security, and economic well-being.

The first technical review raised several issues, such as the lack of an Initial Gender Analysis, the need for more detailed information on the Initial Stakeholder Consultations, and stronger alignment with the Adaptation Fund Results Framework, as is discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.

The second technical review found that most of the CRs and CARs have been addressed. However, a few issues remain: adding some discussion of any considerations related to indigenous people; using a table format for the presentation of alignment with relevant plans/instruments/strategies; including additional information from previous stakeholder consultations; rechecking some indicators to ensure they are SMART; and providing some details on the expected link between different interventions and climate adaptation outcomes.

The third technical review found that most of the CRs and CARs have been addressed. However, a few issues remain, including using the correct templates and providing additional information for several tables.

The fourth technical review finds that most of the CARs have been addressed. A few CRs and CARs remain concerning value of component 2, and amending PFG budget note, total presented in alignment table and proper completion of components financing table.

The fifth technical review finds that all remaining CRs and CARs have been addressed.

Country Eligibility

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

Response: Yes

Secretariat: The country has ratified both the Kyoto Protocol (September 21, 2016) and the Paris Agreement (March 25, 2002).

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

Response: Yes

Secretariat: Climate disaster risks in Uganda are significant and multifaceted, involving various types of natural disasters exacerbated by climate change. These include flooding that have increased due to heavy rainfall that have increased the frequency and impact of floods. (November 11, 2025)

Project Eligibility

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

Response: Yes

Secretariat: As per the Endorsement letter dated August 25, 2025.

CAR1: Please check the letter of endorsement box on page 1-cover page.

(November 11, 2025)

Response: Yes

Secretariat: CAR1: Not Cleared.

Amendment to stage of submission section is needed. The box for 1st submission has not been checked.

(June 22, 2026)

Response: Yes

Secretariat: CAR1: Cleared.

The box on the first page has been checked.

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

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes.

The concept note is 35 pages, including its annexes.

CR1: On page 10 please review the project implementation timeline since MWE is going through re-accreditation and a PFG has been applied for which first has to be implemented before the full proposal.

CAR2: Page 1 indicates that a PFG in the amount of \$86,800 is being applied for however, a PFG request form was not attached. Please see template at Request for Project Formulation Grant (PFG) (57 kB, DOC).

(November 11, 2025)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: The revised concept note is 50 pages, including its annexes.

CR1: Cleared. The timeline has been adjusted to July 2026 – June 2031, and accreditation has been extended until 31 October 2027.

CAR2: Cleared. The PFG request form was attached, with a revised amount of \$95,000.

CAR1(NEW):

1. Please clarify if Climate Change Adaptation Innovation (CHAI) will execute the PFG if MWE intends to execute the PFG please updated.
2. Please ensure that the PFG form is signed.
3. Please updated the stage of submission section on the proposal to demonstrate that this proposal has been submitted before and include the latest re-submission date.
4. On the cover page, please change the value of the proposal form \$5.5M to 5,500,000.
5. Please include the budget information at the project components financing table at the output level.

(June 22, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR1(NEW): Cleared.

1. Revised PFG specifies that Climate Change Adaptation Innovation (CHAI) will execute the PFG.
2. PFG form is now signed.
3. Re-submission information, including new date of 30 June 2026, added to p. 1 of the proposal.
4. Total value of the proposal has been changed to \$5,500,000.
5. Budget information at the output level has been added to the project components table (pp. 6-8).

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR1 (NEW) reopened:

1. In the PFG form in the budget note column activity 4 needs to be amended from 20,000 to 30,000 to correspond to the amount presented in the total amount column.
2. In the project components and financing table please remove the text corresponding to the outputs in the grant amount column (column 4) only the US\$ values should be retained.
3. Please rationalize the value of component 2 as it is presented as US\$ 1,087,559 in the components financing table but presented as US\$ 1,129,335.37 on pages 19 and 31. Please also note that decimal points should not be used in figures in the proposal.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR1 (NEW) reopened: Cleared.

1. Cleared.

As per updated PFG form in the budget note column activity 4 is now amended to 30,000 to correspond to the amount presented in the total amount column.

2. Cleared.

As per updated project components and financing table.

3. Cleared.

As per updated value for component 2 as US\$ 1,087,559 on pages 19 and 31.

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: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes, but further information is needed.

The project activities aim to climate adaptation knowledge and agriculture related sector in Uganda. The proposed activities contribute to an integral perspective focus for rural women from 12 districts. While the outcome for each component is clear, more details are needed for the activities and outputs. In addition, no theory of change is presented, and it is not clear how these actions would lead to a substantial tangible outcome nor what AF strategic objectives are supported.

CR2: Kindly review the main project's outcomes and outputs to ensure they are clearly and appropriately articulated. Additionally, please define the tangible outputs and outcomes with measurable whenever corresponds. Please also remember to number each outcome, and number their associated outputs and activities.

CR3: Kindly include, under Part II.A, the Theory of Change (and its diagram) to clearly illustrate how the proposed interventions will lead to the intended long-term change, the assumptions being made, the potential constraints, the required inputs and how they link to the project components. Theory of Change use the form of "IF 'THEN'" statements. This would clearly state how the project activities would lead to substantial tangible outcomes.

CR4: Kindly indicate explicitly how the project supports one or more of the Adaptation Fund Strategic Objectives.

CR5: The baseline assessment and training needs assessment may be included in the PFG request.

(November 11, 2025)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR2: Cleared.

Project outcomes and outputs have been numbered and clearly articulated. Outputs are concrete and

measurable. The linkage between outputs and outcomes is clearer than before.

CR3: Cleared.

A Theory of Change (including a diagram) has been included, is structured using "If/Then" statements, and includes assumptions. Please consider adding some discussion of potential constraints.

CAR2(NEW): Please clarify how this is linked to the NAP.

CAR3(NEW): It is noted that community-based plans are being developed, however this would need to be linked with specific activities that that will be implemented through this AF project. Please clarify the adaptation activities that this project will finance supported by these plans.

CR4: Not cleared.

The Results Framework alignment table (Part III.A, pp. 44-45) now maps project objectives and outcomes to Adaptation Fund Strategic Outcomes as well as outputs and indicators. Please also add a narrative on alignment with the AF Strategic Framework in Part II.B, as required.

CR5: Cleared.

These assessments have been shifted to the PFG phase.

(June 22, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR2(NEW): Cleared.

Detailed information about NAP alignment now included under the Theory of Change section (pp. 10-12).

CAR3(NEW): Cleared.

A new section, "Operational Integration of Community-Based Adaptation Plans with Funded Activities" (pp. 14-15), describes proposed linkages between community-based plans and AF-funded activities.

CR4: Cleared.

A new section, "ALIGNMENT WITH THE STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK OF THE ADAPTATION FUND" (pp. 19-21), describes alignment between project components and the AF Strategic Framework. It complements the more detailed discussion of alignment at the objective, outcome, and output levels provided in Part III.

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: No.

The proposal presents a broad overview of the project's potential economic, social, and environmental benefits, including the identification of vulnerable groups and communities. The project's proposal states the negative impacts to be mitigated through an Environmental and social impact assessment, a gender-responsive approach in the project's structure, and a grievance redress mechanism.

However, it lacks both quantitative estimates to substantiate benefits and an initial gender analysis. Additionally, the concept note does not demonstrate how benefits will be equitably distributed.

CAR3: Please outline economic, social and environmental benefits quantification in Part II.B, whenever possible. When exact figures are not available, kindly include estimates or proxies to support the identified project's impact alongside a brief explanation of the method used for these calculations.

CAR4: Kindly include an Initial Gender Analysis in the concept note reflecting statistics that highlight differences and disparities between men, women, in areas such as education, employment, health, income, and political participation. This data is often broader and not necessarily tied to a specific project, focusing instead on national or sector-wide trends related to gender. A more in-depth analysis would be required in the proposal to highlight the different needs of women and men and/or identify how changing gender dynamics might drive changes.

CR6: Kindly estimate the number of direct and indirect beneficiaries (gender-disaggregated) for each outcome whenever possible. Also, please specify if indigenous people will benefit from the project, including a description on how benefits will be equitably distributed.

(November 11, 2025)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR3: Cleared.

Economic, social and environmental benefits are now quantified with specific estimates.

CAR4: Cleared.

A substantive Initial Gender Analysis has been included and is directly linked to project components (p. 23).

CR6: Not cleared.

Beneficiary estimates are now detailed and disaggregated by component (pp. 11-12). Please specify if indigenous people will benefit from the project, including a description of how benefits will be equitably distributed.

(June 22, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR6: Cleared.

A substantive new section has been added on "Inclusion and Equitable Benefit Distribution for Localized Ethnic

Is the project / programme cost effective?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Unsure.

The concept note outlines the cost-effectiveness of the proposed project, including potential indicators and identifying the focus to enhance the analysis. However, it does not include the selected scope and approach nor the sustainability point of view of cost-effectiveness.

CAR5: Kindly provide a sound justification for the project's cost-effectiveness. The justification should include the selected measures, alternative options to these measures and quantitative estimates whenever possible, all from a sustainability point of view.

(November 11, 2025)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR5: Cleared.

The revised concept includes a thorough justification of the project's cost-effectiveness including through comparison with alternative options (pp. 26-27), the use of quantitative estimates, and explicit attention to sustainability.

(June 22, 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: Yes, but further information is required.

The concept note outlines 13 national plans/instruments/strategies related to the proposed project, including NAP and NDC. However, broad information is provided for each. In addition, while the Uganda Agriculture National Adaptation Plan is included, it should be explored if any other sectoral plan/strategy should be also incorporated.

CR7: Kindly include the identified plans/instruments/strategies in a table listing. The table should include at least the following columns:

- (i) specific name of the plan/strategy,
- (ii) years of implementation,
- (iii) goals/objectives,
- (iv) relevance with the proposed project, and
- (v) project's compliance status.

CR8: Please include any other sectoral plan/strategy related to the proposed project.

(November 11, 2025)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR7: Not cleared.

The revised concept presents a detailed narrative alignment with national and sectoral frameworks. Please present this information in the form of a table as requested.

CR8: Cleared.

The revised concept adds several relevant sectoral and sub-national strategies.

(June 22, 2026)

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR7: Not cleared.

A table has been added in the "Strategic Alignment with National and Sectoral Frameworks" section (pp. 24-25). Please ensure that the table includes the following information, presented in separate columns, as requested previously:

- (i) specific name of the plan/strategy,
- (ii) years of implementation,
- (iii) goals/objectives,
- (iv) relevance with the proposed project, and
- (v) project's compliance status.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR7: Cleared.

The revised table (pp. 24-25) now includes all of the requested information.

Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Unsure.

The concept note broadly outlines national technical standards relevant to the proposed project as well as some specific measures for compliance. However, it is required to provide a comprehensive list of the specific regulations and standards to comply with.

CR9: Kindly provide a comprehensive table listing of all specific national technical standards applicable to the proposed project. These include agricultural codes/regulations, water quality standards, among others. The columns in the table should include:

- (i) specific name/number of the standard/regulation,
- (ii) goals/objectives, and
- (iii) how it is related to the proposed project and the project's compliance status.

(November 11, 2025)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR9: Cleared.

The revised concept includes a detailed "Comprehensive Technical Standards & Compliance Pathway" table (pp. 26-27) that includes the requested information about relevant standards and regulations.

(June 22, 2026)

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Unsure.

The concept note states no duplication of the proposed project with other funding sources, however, no other relevant information is included.

CAR6: Kindly include a comprehensive table listing of all projects that are or have been implemented in Uganda and are related or complementary to the proposed project. For each, please include the following details:

- (i) Project title, Donors/Funding Entity
- (ii) Main project interventions,
- (iii) Timeline and specific location within the country,
- (iv) Target population,
- (v) Implementing entity,
- (vi) Lessons learned (if applicable)
- (vii) Overlaps and synergies with the proposed project, including how proposed project will build upon an existing or previous project

The lack of overlap should be clearly justified (e.g. by indicating the distinct geographic locations and/or types of interventions) for each related project identified.

(November 11, 2025)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR6: Not cleared.

A "Complementary Projects and Strategic Demarcation Matrix" is now included (pp. 31-33) with information about related and complementary projects. Please add the requested information for each project about (iii)

timeline, (v) implementing entity, and (vi) lessons learned. Consider adding any additional relevant projects funded by bilateral donors.

(June 22, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR6: Cleared.

The revised table (now pp. 27-29) includes information about timeline, implementing entity, and lessons learned for each project.

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Unsure.

The proposal states that robust learning and knowledge management is crucial for lessons learned from the UWEP project. However, beyond the training activities, it remains unclear what specific actions will be carried out, under which project's component they will be implemented, and how the experiences will be monitored.

CAR7: Please ensure the project reflects a Knowledge Management and Learning component or sub-component which will have a clear budget line. Kindly clarify or include details to respond to the following:

- specific activities for Learning and Knowledge Management of the proposed project.
- who will be responsible for tracking the experiences gained, how this will be done, and when the tracking will take place.
- what type of information will be collected throughout this process and what and how will be disseminated.
- how the knowledge generated will be sustained after the project concludes.

(November 11, 2025)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR7: Cleared.

A dedicated Component 4 (Knowledge Management and Learning) has been added with a clear budget line. Specific activities, responsibilities, collection and dissemination of information, and post-project sustainability are discussed (Part II.G, pp. 33-34).

CAR5(NEW):

1. Since generally 4.1 should be captured under the GAP please clarify the intention of this here.
2. Since 4.3 is usually covered by the ESMP please clarify the intention of this here.

(June 22, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR5(New): Cleared.

The revised concept includes new text explaining the strategic justification for having 4.1 and 4.3 as dedicated sub-components (p. 16 and p. 17).

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR 7 (NEW):Outputs 1.6, 4.1 and 4.3 should not be included in the component costs as these should fall under IE and EE fees. Please address in re-submission.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR7(NEW): Cleared.

New language has been added (p. 18) that explains why these outputs are included and budgeted within Component 4 rather than the IE/EE costs (because they are direct project activities with direct links to beneficiaries).

Has a consultative process taken place, and has it involved all key stakeholders, and vulnerable groups, including gender considerations in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes, but further information is required.

As per Section H, pages 22-23, the proposed project states that initial consultations were conducted with government agencies, including Ministry responsible for gender, community groups, including the UWEP women groups, civil society, private sector, academia and development partners (including the Adaptation Fund) through focus groups, interviews and community workshops. However, no specific information is included in the concept note.

CR10: Kindly provide detailed information on the consultative process described in the proposal, covering at least the following elements:

- (i) the participants of each meeting, including the total number of attendees disaggregated by sex,
- (ii) date and location for each meeting,
- (iii) brief summary of the subjects discussed, and any agreements reached, where applicable,
- (iv) explanation of the gender considerations (and those related to other vulnerable groups) addressed during the process, including how their interests were reflected in the proposed project. Please also clarify whether this information has been documented elsewhere.
- (v) Please confirm that a representative from the national gender machinery was presented at the consultations, as well as the youth groups.

(November 11, 2025)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR10: Not cleared.

The revised concept includes a structured Chronological Stakeholder Consultation Matrix (Part II.H, pp. 34–36) covering national-level institutional engagement, regional hub-level focus groups, and grassroots community workshops. Please add the requested information on i) the participants; ii) the dates and locations; and (v) confirmation of participation by gender and youth group representatives.

(June 22, 2026)

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR10: Not cleared.

A new Annex 1 contains substantial information about stakeholder consultations, including participant lists, and it confirms participation by the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD), as well as youth groups. Please provide specific dates for each consultation as previously requested.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR10: Cleared.

Annex 1 has been revised and now includes dates for each consultation.

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Unsure.

The proposal mentions a breakdown of costs and how adaptation actions will contribute to mitigating the scale of the problem. However, it does not clearly separate adaptation-specific costs from baseline development activities nor clear information about additional funding and sustainability. A number of the suggested outputs in table on page 7 can be undertaken within the PFG allocation.

CR11: Please provide information about whether this project will meet its outcomes and outputs solely with the resources of the Adaptation Fund.

CR12: Kindly clarify the link between costs and climate adaptation outcomes, strengthening how each cost type (e.g., infrastructure, capacity building, sustainability costs) directly reduces climate vulnerabilities of rural women in Uganda and including examples to support the rationale (e.g., citing climate impact statistics on rural women or lessons from similar adaptation initiatives). This aims to explain how the proposed project's objective will be achieved in regards to adaptation.

(November 11, 2025)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR11: Cleared.

This is clarified on p. 38: “The project does not require or rely on additional external donor funding to deliver its stated outputs and outcomes.”

CR12: Not cleared.

The "Baseline vs. Adaptation Cost Delineation" section (pp. 37-38) provides clear and logical details on the additionality of AF funding for adaptation. Please add some details on the link between different cost types (e.g. categories of interventions) and expected climate adaptation outcomes, as requested.

(June 22, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR12: Cleared.

A new section ("Strategic Mapping of Cost Types to Expected Climate Adaptation Outcomes", pp. 37-38) provides an explicit discussion of how categories of project interventions are expected to deliver specific adaptation outcomes.

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Unsure.

The concept note includes a mapping of the proposed project's results and products to the Adaptation Fund Strategic Results Framework. However, revisions to the wording of the outcomes, outputs and indicators are required.

CAR8:

1. Please ensure that both project's outcome and output indicators are well presented and correspond to the ones presented in the Table: Project Components and Financing (pages 7-10). All indicators should be reviewed and amended, where necessary, to ensure that they are SMART.
2. In addition, kindly utilize the updated template and guidance for completing the Alignment with results framework table. Results Framework Alignment Table (Amended in November 2025) (77 kB, DOC)

(November 11, 2025)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR8: Not cleared.

The updated template has now been used. Please review to ensure that all indicators are sufficiently SMART. For example, consider a more measurable indicator for Outcome 4 than "Value of learning assets and operational channels functional."

(June 22, 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR8: Not Cleared.

1. Revised project indicators in both the Objective-Level and Outcome and Output-Level Alignment tables (pp. 39-41) are now SMART. However, the table does not conform to the template. Please utilize the template <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/alignment-with-adaptation-fund-results-framework-template-and-guidance-dec-2025/>.

2. Please remove all decimal points in the alignment table.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR8: Not Cleared.

The Project Outcome and Output-Level Alignment table (pp. 44-45) is now consistent with the AF template. The AF Outcomes, Outputs and indicators are written accurately.

Decimal points have been removed from budget figures in the Project Objective-Level Alignment table (p. 44). However,

1. Please ensure that the alignment table is 1 table as per the template available at <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/strategic-results-framework-guidance-2026/>

2. Total output and total outcome should be total of components which is US\$4, 587,559 not US\$4,629,337. Please address.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR8: Cleared

The results framework alignment table has been updated. Please note for the fully developed proposal stage, please ensure that the results framework alignment table utilized the outcomes and indicators of the Updated 2026 SRF.

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

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Yes, but further information is needed.

The concept note briefly outlines arrangements for sustainability and indicates Monitoring and Evaluation activities to be performed during the project implementation. It provides roles and responsibilities for the main institutions, relevant KPIs to be tracked, and specific activities. However, the arrangements for the project's benefits sustainability are not included and more details are needed.

CAR9: Kindly describe the arrangements required to ensure the sustainability of the project's benefits beyond its completion. This should include, but not be limited to, the regulatory, institutional, and financial resources needed to maintain outcomes.

CR13: Capacity building activities are often event-based and may not translate into systemic institutional change. It is not entirely clear what will prevent communities from reverting to unsustainable practices. For social sustainability, please confirm what will be done to ensure participation is not tokenistic. While revolving loans are a good initiative, please ensure the sustainability plan reflects how issues of poor loan repayment and non-compliance will be addressed as this can impact sustainability.

CR14: Please explain clearly how replication and scaling up of the proposed project activities and benefits will be achieved.

(November 11, 2025)

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CAR9: Cleared.

The concept note now includes a substantial discussion of sustainability that covers these different dimensions.

CR13: Cleared.

The concept note implies that communities will not revert to unsustainable practices because of asset ownership and UWEP groups. Provide a more explicit discussion of this issue.

CR14: Cleared.

The concept note now addresses replication and scaling through several mechanisms, including the annexation of community adaptation plans into DDPs.

(June 22, 2026)

Does the project / programme provide an overview of environmental and social impacts / risks identified, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: Unsure.

In Part II.K, pages 27-29, the concept note provides a list of environmental and social risks besides the table against the 15 Adaptation fund Environmental & Social Principles on page 30. However, the project classification (A, B or C) from the screening is not included as well as the compliance, risk level, and potential impacts for each assessed risk.

CAR10: Please review table in Part II.K and state and expand, all potential impacts (direct, indirect, transboundary and cumulative), state whether the risk is low, medium or high, and include how it is planned to mitigate and manage each risk. Such risks should be described in the third column along with the corresponding mitigation measures.

In addition, please take into account the following guidance:

i) In the third column, risks should be stated and properly write down for all relevant principles by starting the

statement as “There is a risk of ...”.

ii) If no risk is identified for a given principle, then state ‘no risk’ but a clear justification must be provided.

iii) Whether the second or third column is marked depends on whether further assessment for compliance is required.

Only one of the two columns should be marked. Column 2 should have a tick if no further assessment is required.

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

CAR11: Kindly state the category in which the screening process has classified the project (Category A, B or C) in Part II.K.

(November 11, 2025)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR10: Cleared.

The ESP screening table has been significantly revised. It covers all 15 principles and provides specific mitigation measures for each risk. Please ensure that no transboundary or cumulative risks are missing from the list.

(June 22, 2026)

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR10 (re-opened):

1. Please remove the current second column from the risk table and comply with the template. The column headings should be as follows:

1. Checklist of environmental and social principles
2. No further assessment required for compliance
3. Potential impacts and risks – further assessment and management required for compliance

2. Risk levels and mitigation measures should be incorporated in the template's column 3.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR10(re-opened): Cleared.

The ESP screening table (pp. 37-42, track changes version) has been revised. Column headings match the template. Risk levels and mitigation measures are included in column 3 when appropriate.

Resource Availability

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

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes.

Country cap Balance for Uganda is \$22,744,400.

(November 11, 2025)

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

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. As per information provided in Table “Project/Programme Components and Financing”, pages 7-10.

All figures in the concept note are rounded to a whole number and add up and match across the tables and components. The Implementing Entity Management Fee is correct in size (around 8.5% of the total Project Cost). There is a PFG request that is correct in size, with a total amount of 86,800 USD.

CAR14: Please ensure that the IE certification is completed before re-submission.

(November 11, 2025)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: The PFG request has been increased to 95,000 USD, which is still acceptable.

CAR14: Cleared.

In accordance with Adaptation Fund Board Decision B.46/9, the accreditation of all accredited Implementing Entities whose accreditation expires between 10 April 2026 and 31 October 2027, as well as those undergoing re-accreditation process has been extended until 31 October 2027.

(June 22, 2026)

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

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: Not cleared.

The Project Execution costs are below 9.5 percent of the total project budget (including the fee).

However, some of the allocations in the Project Objective-Level Alignment and Project Outcome and Output-Level Alignment tables still include cents and should be rounded.

CAR1(New): Please convert all budget figures to whole US dollars and ensure that those adjusted figures are

consistent with other references elsewhere in the concept note.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR1(New): Cleared.

All budget figures have been rounded to whole dollars and are consistent across the concept note.

The PFG request is now 126,864 USD, which is still acceptable.

Eligibility of IE

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

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. The Ministry of Water and Environment of Uganda is an accredited National Implementing Entity (NIE).

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR8 (NEW): Please ensure that the IE certification is signed by Joseph Lule who is the IE authorized signatory.

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR8(NEW): Cleared.

The IE certification (p. 43) is now signed by Joseph Lule.



Revised PFG Submission Form¹ (additions in red)

Project Formulation Grant (PFG)

Submission Date: 20TH MAY 2026

Adaptation Fund Project ID:

Country: UGANDA

Title of Project/Programme: STRENGTHENING RESILIENCE OF WOMEN TO CLIMATE RISKS IN RURAL COMMUNITIES OF UGANDA

Type of IE (NIE/RIE/MIE): NATIONAL IMPLEMENTING ENTITY

Implementing Entity: MINISTRY OF WATER AND ENVIRONMENT

Executing Entities: CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION INNOVATION (CHAI)

A. Project Preparation Timeframe

Start date of PFG	JULY 2026
Completion date of PFG	MAY 2027

B. Proposed Project Preparation Activities (\$)

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	USD Amount	Budget note²
Activity 1: Stakeholder Engagement, Baseline Assessment, and Needs Analysis.	Stakeholder Analysis Report and Baseline Assessment Report documenting localized vulnerability parameters.	20,000	Technical Consultant fee at a daily rate of \$500 for 40 workdays, covering field-level focus group discussions, data aggregation, and baseline report formulation.
Activity 2: Market Research and Value Chain Analysis for Alternative Livelihoods.	Market Research Report and Value Chain Analysis Report detailing regional demand trends and agro-processing opportunities.	18,000	Livelihood Consultant fee at a daily rate of \$400 for 45 workdays, covering market mapping, off-taker tracking, and

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.

			viable sub-county enterprise profiling.
Activity 3: Capacity Assessment of Target UWEP Women Groups.	Capacity Assessment Report detailing existing skills gaps, literacy levels, and custom capacity-building frameworks.	14,000	Institutional Consultant fee at a daily rate of \$400 for 35 workdays, covering field capacity auditing, training manual outlining, and digital literacy mapping.
Activity 4: Operational Design of the Climate Livelihood Revolving Fund.	Revolving Fund Mechanism Design Document establishing governance guidelines and credit recovery workflows.	14,000	Financial Specialist fee at a daily rate of \$400 for 35 workdays, covering multi-signature structural modelling, risk evaluation, and localized credit policy creation.
Activity 5: Development of the Detailed Project Plan, Budget, and ESMP Safeguard Framework.	Detailed Project Plan, Final Budget Document, and Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP).	30,925	Project Planning and Safeguards Specialist fee at \$500/day for 60 workdays (\$230,000) + \$925 allocated for localized printing, information sharing, and translation of safeguard checklists.
Development Accountability and a Grievance redress mechanism	Detailed Accountability and a Grievance redress mechanism	20,000	Technical Consultant fee at a daily rate of \$500 for 40 workdays, covering field-level focus group discussions, data aggregation, and baseline report formulation.
Implementing Entity Fee (8.5%)	Management and Fiduciary Oversight Fees.	9,939	National Implementing Entity management fee capped at exactly 8.5% of the total grant request.
Total Project Formulation Grant		126,864	

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

The Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) functions strictly as the National Implementing Entity (NIE) providing fiduciary oversight and compliance verification for the Project Formulation Grant (PFG). The operational management and technical execution of all five project preparation activities will be performed exclusively by Climate Change Adaptation Innovation (CHAI) as the sole Executing Entity (EE). This linear division of roles guarantees total continuity between the preparatory phase and the primary five-year project implementation timeline, avoiding parallel administrative channels or parallel institutional structures.

Activity 1: Stakeholder Engagement, Baseline Assessment, and Needs Analysis

The execution of a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement, Baseline Assessment, and Needs Analysis is essential to define the localized boundaries of the project across the 12 selected target

districts. This activity will fund systematic field visits and focus group discussions to collect gender-disaggregated baseline indicators regarding time poverty, household subsistence levels, and historical crop yield losses.

The resulting data-driven baseline report will ensure that the final proposal directly addresses the specific structural deficiencies highlighted in the NPHC 2024 dataset. The allocation of USD 20,000 covers technical consultant fees and multi-district engagement costs, allowing the project to establish a clear, non-overlapping operational perimeter that avoids duplication with existing rural development initiatives.

Activity 2: Market Research and Value Chain Analysis

To secure the long-term success of the alternative livelihood enterprises funded under Component 3, a specialized Market Research and Value Chain Analysis must be executed during the proposal formulation phase. This activity will identify high-demand, climate-resilient economic opportunities (such as commercial apiaries, mushroom cultivation, and eco-friendly biomass briquetting) that are decoupled from traditional weather risks.

The resulting technical report will profile 60 potential regional wholesale buyers and urban off-takers, establishing verified commercial channels before project inception. The requested USD 18,000 is required to fund 45 workdays of localized market mapping and supply-chain analysis to insulate female entrepreneurs from local supply gluts and price fluctuations.

Activity 3: Capacity Assessment

The Capacity Assessment is designed to audit the specific functional capabilities and training barriers of the target UWEP women's groups across the four administrative regions. This activity will investigate existing literacy gaps, local technical familiarity with solar-powered hardware, and mobile phone ownership trends to bypass the digital gender split.

The resulting Capacity Assessment Report will provide the foundational blueprint for the 120 early warning system training blocks and financial literacy courses executed under the main grant. Allocating USD 14,000 ensures an exhaustive field capacity audit, preventing technology abandonment by matching physical asset distribution with targeted, group-specific training modules.

Activity 4: Revolving Fund Mechanism Design

Designing a transparent, legally compliant revolving fund mechanism is a key technical requirement to operationalize the USD 1,000,000 economic allocation under Component 3. This activity will support a specialized financial modelling consultant to establish clear eligibility criteria, interest-free credit terms, and multi-signature bank protocols managed exclusively by elected female executives.

The resulting operational guidelines will utilize a social collateral model to safely bypass individual land-title barriers. The allocation of USD 14,000 covers financial structure formulation, default risk mitigation modelling, and full integration with the permanent digital registries of the supporting Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD).

Activity 5: Development of Detailed Project Plan, Budget, and ESMP Safeguard Framework

This central consolidation activity translates all field data, capacity indexes, and financial models into a fully synchronized full project proposal. Crucially, this funding will support the formulation of site-specific Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) and clear project screening briefs for submission to NEMA and the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE), in strict compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) of the Adaptation Fund.

The USD 20,925 allocation funds 40 workdays for a core planning specialist and provides USD 925 to handle localized material printing, translation into local dialects, and the public disclosure of safeguard tracking indicators at sub-county headquarters across the 12 districts, securing total community consensus prior to final submission.

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
Joseph Lule		29/05/2026	Winnie Masiko	+256772670044	wmasiko@gmail.com

Telephone : 256 41 4341305/230487
Fax : 256 41 4233524
Email : finance@finance.go.ug
Website : www.finance.go.ug
Plot No. 2-8 Apollo Kaggwa Road
In any correspondence on
This subject please quote No.DARC 158/550/04



Ministry of Finance,
Planning & Economic
Development,
P.O Box 8147
Kampala, Uganda

25th August, 2025

The Adaptation Fund Board,
C/O Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat,
Email: Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org,
Fax: 202 522 3240/5

**ENDORSEMENT LETTER FOR THE PROJECT TITLED
“STRENGTHENING RESILIENCE OF WOMEN TO CLIMATE RISKS
IN RURAL COMMUNITIES OF UGANDA”**

In my capacity as the National Designated Authority for the Adaptation Fund in Uganda, I confirm that the above regional project/ programme is in line with Uganda's priorities in implementing adaptation actions to reduce the adverse impacts of, and risks, posed by climate change in Uganda.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above national project/programme proposal to be supported by the Adaptation Fund.

If approved, the project/ programme will be implemented by Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) and executed by Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MoGLSD) in close coordination with Climate Change Adaptation Innovation (CHAI).

Ramathan Ggoobi

PERMANENT SECRETARY/SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY

Copy to: Hon. Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic
Development
Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Water and Environment
Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social
Development

Mission

"To formulate sound economic policies, maximize revenue mobilization, ensure efficient allocation and accountability for public resources so as to achieve the most rapid and sustainable economic growth and development"