



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.21/4
23 September 2017

Adaptation Fund Board
Project and Programme Review Committee
Twenty-First meeting
Bonn, Germany, 10-13 October 2017

Agenda Item 5

**REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON INITIAL
SCREENING/TECHNICAL REVIEW
OF PROJECT AND PROGRAMME PROPOSALS**

Background

1. This document presents to the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) of the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) an overview of the project/programme proposals submitted by Implementing Entities (IE) to the current meeting, and the process of screening and technical review undertaken by the secretariat.
2. The analysis of the proposals mentioned above is contained in a separate addendum to this document.

Funding status and situation of the pipeline

3. At the twelfth meeting, the Board instituted a cap of 50 per cent for project funds directed through Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs), having decided:

(a) That the cumulative budget allocation for funding projects submitted by MIEs, should not exceed 50 per cent of the total funds available for funding decisions in the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund at the start of each session. That cumulative allocation would be subject to review by the Board on the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee at subsequent sessions;

(b) To request the Trustee to provide an update on the amount of funds that have been approved for projects implemented by NIEs and MIEs at each meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board; and

(c) To review the implementation of this decision at the fourteenth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board.

(Decision B.12/9)

4. In its seventeenth meeting, having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC), the Board decided to:

(a) Maintain the 50 per cent cap on the funding of projects/programmes implemented by MIEs established by decision B.12/9, and exclude project/programme concepts from the 50 per cent calculation;

(b) Establish a pipeline of fully developed projects/programmes that have been recommended by the PPRC for approval by the Board, but exceeding the 50 per cent cap;

(c) Prioritize the projects/programmes in the pipeline by sequentially applying the following criteria:

(i) Their date of recommendation by the PPRC;

(ii) Their submission date; and

(iii) The lower “net” cost.

(d) Consider fully developed projects/programmes in the pipeline for approval, subject to availability of resources and respecting the 50 per cent cap; and

(e) Request that the EFC consider at its 9th meeting the suspension of project/programme submissions as the last measure and elaborate on a clear threshold that indicates when the measure should be applied (e.g. 60 per cent excess of the cap).

(Decision B.17/19)

5. At its nineteenth meeting, having considered the comments and recommendations of the PPRC, the Board decided *to define the submission date referred to in paragraph (b) of Decision B.17/19 as the date of the submission of the fully-developed project/programme document to the particular meeting in which it was recommended for approval by the Project and Programme Review Committee.*

(Decision B.19/5)

6. At the nineteenth meeting in December 2012, for the first time, the total funding request of MIE project and programme proposals recommended by the PPRC for approval by the Board exceeded the 50 per cent cap and a pipeline of MIE projects and programmes was established. At the nineteenth meeting, four projects and programmes, for which funding was not available at that meeting, were placed in the pipeline in the order of the above prioritization criteria. At the twentieth to twenty-third meetings, additional MIE proposals were placed in the pipeline. After the twenty-first meeting, new revenue received by the Fund allowed the Board to intersessionally approve pipeline proposals. The last proposal in the MIE project pipeline, proposed by the World Food Programme (WFP) for Indonesia, was approved intersessionally between the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth meetings (Decision B.25-26/4).

7. According to the latest Financial Report prepared by the Trustee as of 30 June 2017 (AFB/EFC.21/10), the cumulative funding decisions for projects/programmes submitted by MIEs amounted to US\$ 236.96 million, and the cumulative funding decisions for all projects/programmes amounted to US\$ 418.11 million. Funds available to support AF Board funding decisions amounted to US\$ 185.89 million. To recall, a cumulative set aside of US\$ 60 million was approved by the Board to fund regional projects and programmes. Following the intersessional review cycle, funding decisions for regional projects and programmes amounted to US\$ 26.3 million. In accordance with the Board decision B.12/9, the funds available for single-country projects submitted by MIEs below the 50% cap amounted to US\$ 35.04 million.

Funding window for Regional Projects and Programmes

8. Since its inception, the Adaptation Fund Board has only approved projects and programmes implemented in individual countries. At its twenty-fifth meeting, the Board considered a proposal for a pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, and 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; [...]

(Decision B.25/28)

9. In accordance with the decision B.25/28 and the document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2, the secretariat had issued, on 5 May 2015, an invitation to submit project and programme proposals for funding under the pilot programme. The invitation was sent to Designated Authorities for the Adaptation Fund, and to Multilateral and Regional Implementing Entities accredited by the Board. In accordance with document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2, the deadline for the first cycle of technical review was set to coincide with that of single-country proposals for the twenty-sixth meeting, i.e. 4 August 2015.

10. The Board considered, at its twenty-sixth meeting, seven pre-concepts for regional projects, and decided to endorse four of them, as well as approve project formulation grants for those four pre-concepts. The Board also decided, at its twenty-sixth meeting,

[...] to request the secretariat to inform the Multilateral Implementing Entities and Regional Implementing Entities that the call for proposals under the Pilot programme for Regional Projects and Programmes is still open and to encourage them to submit proposals to the AFB at its 27th meeting, bearing in mind the cap established by decision B.25/28.

(Decision B.26/3)

11. The Board considered, at its twenty-seventh meeting, two concepts and six pre-concepts for regional projects, and decided to endorse one concept and five pre-concepts, so that in total by the twenty-seventh meeting there was one regional proposal endorsed at the concept level and eight regional proposals endorsed at the pre-concept level. The Board also discussed, at its twenty-seventh meeting, issues related to the pilot programme on regional projects and programmes and decided to:

- (a) Continue consideration of regional project and programme proposals under the pilot programme, while reminding the implementing entities that the amount set aside for the pilot programme is US\$ 30 million;*
- (b) Request the secretariat to prepare for consideration by the Project and Programme Review Committee at its nineteenth meeting, a proposal for prioritization among regional project/programme proposals, including for awarding project formulation grants, and for establishment of a pipeline; and*
- (c) Consider the matter of the pilot programme for regional projects and programmes at its twenty-eighth meeting.*

(Decision B.27/5)

12. The proposal requested in (b) above was presented to the nineteenth meeting of the PPRC as document AFB/PPRC.19/5. The Board subsequently decided:

- a) With regard to the pilot programme approved by decision B.25/28:*
 - (i) To prioritize the four projects and 10 project formulation grants as follows:*
 - 1. If the proposals recommended to be funded in a given meeting of the PPRC do not exceed the available slots under the pilot programme, all those proposals would be submitted to the Board for funding;*

2. *If the proposals recommended to be funded in a given meeting of the PPRC do exceed the available slots under the pilot programme, the proposals to be funded under the pilot programme would be prioritized so that the total number of projects and project formulation grants (PFGs) under the programme maximizes the total diversity of projects/PFGs. This would be done using a three-tier prioritization system: so that the proposals in relatively less funded sectors would be prioritized as the first level of prioritization. If there are more than one proposal in the same sector: the proposals in relatively less funded regions are prioritized as the second level of prioritization. If there are more than one proposal in the same region, the proposals submitted by relatively less represented implementing entity would be prioritized as the third level of prioritization;*

(ii) To request the secretariat to report on the progress and experiences of the pilot programme to the PPRC at its twenty-third meeting; and

b) With regard to financing regional proposals beyond the pilot programme referred to above:

(i) To continue considering regional proposals for funding, within the two categories originally described in document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2: ones requesting up to US\$ 14 million, and others requesting up to US\$ 5 million, subject to review of the regional programme;

(ii) To establish two pipelines for technically cleared regional proposals: one for proposals up to US\$ 14 million and the other for proposals up to US\$ 5 million, and place any technically cleared regional proposals, in those pipelines, in the order described in decision B.17/19 (their date of recommendation by the PPRC, their submission date, their lower "net" cost); and

(iii) To fund projects from the two pipelines, using funds available for the respective types of implementing entities, so that the maximum number of or maximum total funding for projects and project formulation grants to be approved each fiscal year will be outlined at the time of approving the annual work plan of the Board.

(Decision B.28/1)

13. In relation with decision B.28/1 (iii), the Board at its twenty-ninth meeting decided:

a) To include in its work plan for fiscal year 2018 a program of work amounting to US\$ 30 million for the funding of regional project and programme proposals, as follows:

(i) Up to three proposals requesting up to US\$ 5 million for funding;

(ii) One proposal requesting up to US\$ 14 million of funding;

(iii) Up to five project formulation grant (PFG) requests, of up to US\$ 100,000 each, for preparing project and programme concepts or fully-developed project documents requesting up to US\$ 5 million of funding;

- (iv) *Up to five project formulation grant (PFG) requests, of up to US\$ 100,000 each, for preparing project and programme concepts or fully-developed project documents requesting up to US\$ 14 million of funding.*

(Decision B.29/4)

14. At the present meeting the secretariat again received proposals for regional projects and programmes as encouraged by Decision B.26/3, and as observed in Decision B.27/5, and reviewed them, as explained below.

Project/programme proposals submitted by implementing entities: single country proposals

15. Accredited IEs submitted 23 single-country proposals to the secretariat, with the total requested funding amounting to US\$ 97,409,640. Among the proposals were 13 project concepts, with a total requested funding of US\$ 42,341,838 and 10 fully developed proposals with a total requested funding of US\$ 55,067,802. Following the initial technical review carried out by the secretariat, budget requests from some proposals were altered. The final total requested funding of the 23 proposals amounted to US\$ 97,576,337, with US\$ 42,508,247 for the 13 concepts, and US\$ 55,068,090 for the 10 fully developed proposals. The proposals included US\$ 7,243,068 or 8%¹ in Implementing Entities management fees and US\$ 8,358,304 or 9.2%² in execution costs.

16. The National Implementing Entity (NIE) for Armenia, the Environmental Project Implementation Unit (EPIU), submitted two project concepts, and the NIE for Indonesia, the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (*Kemitraan*), submitted seven project concepts. One Regional Implementing Entity (RIE) submitted a project concept for Chad: the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS). Three concepts were received from two MIEs, the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), for Cambodia and Mongolia, and the African Development Bank (AfDB) for Côte d'Ivoire. Three NIEs submitted four fully developed project proposals: the NIE for Namibia, the Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN) submitted two fully-developed project documents, the NIE for Cook Islands, the Ministry of Finance and Economic Management (MFEM) and the NIE for the Federated States of Micronesia, the Micronesia Conservation Trust (MCT) each submitted one fully-developed project document. Two RIEs submitted three fully developed project proposals: *Banco de Desarrollo de America Latina* (CAF; Development Bank of Latin America) submitted one for Ecuador and the *Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement* (BOAD, West African Development Bank) submitted two for Guinea-Bissau and Togo. Also, two MIEs submitted three fully developed project proposals: UN-Habitat for Fiji and the Solomon Islands and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) for Iraq. Details of the single-country proposals are contained in the separate PPRC working documents, as follows:

AFB/PPRC.21/5 Proposal for Indonesia (1) (Kemitraan).

AFB/PPRC.21/5/Add.1 Project formulation grant for Indonesia (1) (Kemitraan).

AFB/PPRC.21/6 Proposal for Indonesia (2) (Kemitraan).

AFB/PPRC.21/6/Add.1 Project formulation grant for Indonesia (2) (Kemitraan).

AFB/PPRC.21/7 Proposal for Indonesia (3) (Kemitraan).

¹ The implementing entity management fee percentage is calculated compared to the project budget including the project activities and the execution costs, before the management fee.

² The execution costs percentage is calculated as a percentage of the project budget, including the project activities and the execution costs, before the implementing entity management fee.

- AFB/PPRC.21/7/Add.1 Project formulation grant for Indonesia (3) (Kemitraan).
- AFB/PPRC.21/8 Proposal for Indonesia (4) (Kemitraan).
- AFB/PPRC.21/8/Add.1 Project formulation grant for Indonesia (4) (Kemitraan).
- AFB/PPRC.21/9 Proposal for Indonesia (5) (Kemitraan).
- AFB/PPRC.21/9/Add.1 Project formulation grant for Indonesia (5) (Kemitraan).
- AFB/PPRC.21/10 Proposal for Indonesia (6) (Kemitraan).
- AFB/PPRC.21/10/Add.1 Project formulation grant for Indonesia (6) (Kemitraan).
- AFB/PPRC.21/11 Proposal for Armenia (1) (EPIU).
- AFB/PPRC.21/1/Add.1 Project formulation grant for Armenia (1) (EPIU).
- AFB/PPRC.21/12 Proposal for Armenia (2) (EPIU).
- AFB/PPRC.21/12/Add.1 Project formulation grant for Armenia (2) (EPIU).
- AFB/PPRC.21/13 Proposal for Indonesia (7) (Kemitraan).
- AFB/PPRC.21/13/Add.1 Project formulation grant for Indonesia (7) (Kemitraan).
- AFB/PPRC.21/14 Proposal for Chad (OSS).
- AFB/PPRC.21/15 Proposal for Cambodia (UN-Habitat).
- AFB/PPRC.21/16 Proposal for Côte d'Ivoire (AfDB).
- AFB/PPRC.21/17 Proposal for Mongolia (UN-Habitat).
- AFB/PPRC.21/18 Proposal for Federated States of Micronesia (MCT).
- AFB/PPRC.21/19 Proposal for Cook Islands (MFEM).
- AFB/PPRC.21/20 Proposal for Namibia (1) (DRFN).
- AFB/PPRC.21/21 Proposal for Namibia (2) (DRFN).
- AFB/PPRC.21/22 Proposal for Ecuador (CAF).
- AFB/PPRC.21/23 Proposal for Guinea-Bissau (BOAD).
- AFB/PPRC.21/24 Proposal for Togo (BOAD).
- AFB/PPRC.21/25 Proposal for Fiji (UN-Habitat).
- AFB/PPRC.21/26 Proposal for Iraq (IFAD).
- AFB/PPRC.21/27 Proposal for Solomon Islands (UN-Habitat).

17. Of the 23 proposal submissions, 16 are for regular projects and programmes, i.e. they request funding exceeding US\$ 1,000,000 and seven are small-size project proposals, i.e. a proposal requesting up to US\$ 1,000,000.

18. The average funding requested for the nine regular fully-developed proposals amounts to US\$ \$6,010,899, including management fees charged by the IEs. The average funding requested for the seven regular concept proposals amounts to US\$ 5,296,857, and for the six small-size concept proposals to US\$ 905,042, also including management fees charged by the IEs. The average implementing entity fee requested by the fully-developed project/programme documents

is US\$ 417,893. The execution costs in the fully-developed project/programme documents submitted to this meeting average of US\$ 417,867.

19. All proposals request funding below the cap of US \$10 million decided on a temporary basis, for each country, as per Decision B.13/23.

20. The funding requests of the fully-developed NIE project documents submitted to the current meeting amount to US\$ 13,968,185, including 8.5% in management fees. The project formulation grant (PFG) requests from NIEs amount to US\$ 267,000 and are in accordance with Board Decision B.12/28. The current cumulative funding allocation for projects/programmes and PFGs submitted by NIEs is US\$ 151.44 million, which represented 23.4% of the sum of cumulative project/programme funding decisions and funds available to support funding decisions, as at 30 June 2017. If the Board were to decide to approve all the fully-developed NIE proposals and the PFG requests submitted to the twenty-eighth meeting, the cumulative funding allocation for NIEs would increase to US\$ 165,67 million, which would represent 25.6% of total project/programme funds.

Table 1: Single-country project proposals submitted to the 30th Adaptation Fund Board meeting

Country	IE	Size, USD	Stage	PFG Request, USD	Total Funding requested, USD	IE Fee	IE Fee %	Execution cost	EC %
Concepts									
Concepts, NIE									
Armenia	EPIU	\$1,435,100	Project concept	\$27,000	\$1,462,100	\$112,400	8.50%	\$114,700	8.67%
Armenia	EPIU	\$2,528,000	Project concept	\$30,000	\$2,558,000	\$198,000	8.50%	\$200,000	8.58%
Indonesia	Kemitraan	\$4,169,993	Project concept	\$30,000	\$4,199,993	\$61,626	1.50%	\$390,290	9.50%
Indonesia	Kemitraan	\$998,878	Project concept	\$30,000	\$1,028,878	\$84,448	9.24%	\$97,524	10.67%
Indonesia	Kemitraan	\$905,109	Project concept	\$30,000	\$935,109	\$70,907	8.50%	\$69,644	8.35%
Indonesia	Kemitraan	\$946,287	Project concept	\$30,000	\$976,287	\$74,133	8.50%	\$75,492	8.66%
Indonesia	Kemitraan	\$990,000	Project concept	\$30,000	\$1,020,000	\$79,000	8.67%	\$690,000	75.74%
Indonesia	Kemitraan	\$589,975	Project concept	\$30,000	\$619,975	\$43,701	8.00%	\$39,511	7.23%
Indonesia	Kemitraan	\$1,000,000	Project concept	\$30,000	\$1,030,000	\$75,240	8.14%	\$76,760	8.30%
Concepts, RIE									

Chad	OSS	\$9,600,000	Project concept	-	\$9,600,000	\$750,000	8.47%	\$730,000	8.25%
Concepts, MIE									
Cambodia	UN-Habitat	\$5,000,000	Project concept		\$5,000,000	\$391,705	8.50%	\$437,788	9.50%
Cote d'Ivoire	AfDB	\$9,866,905	Project concept		\$9,866,905	\$772,983	8.50%	\$863,922	9.50%
Mongolia	UN-Habitat	\$4,500,000	Project concept		\$4,500,000	\$352,000	8.49%	\$394,000	9.50%
Full proposals									
Full proposals, NIE									
Cook Islands	MFEM	\$2,999,125	Fully-developed project document	-	\$2,999,125	\$234,330	8.48%	\$262,581	9.50%
Micronesia (F. S. of)	MCT	\$970,000	Fully-developed project document		\$970,000	\$76,461	8.56%	\$86,719	9.71%
Namibia	DRFN	\$4,999,386	Fully-developed project document		\$4,999,386	\$391,657	8.50%	\$437,734	9.50%
Namibia	DRFN	\$4,999,674	Fully-developed project document		\$4,999,674	\$391,680	8.50%	\$437,759	9.50%
Full proposals, RIE									
Ecuador	CAF	\$2,489,373	Fully-developed project document	-	\$2,489,373	\$119,373	5.04%	\$180,000	7.59%
Guinea Bissau	BOAD	\$9,979,000	Fully-developed project document	-	\$9,979,000	\$781,000	8.49%	\$798,000	8.68%
Togo	BOAD	\$10,000,000	Fully-developed project document		\$10,000,000	\$728,405	7.86%	\$804,380	8.68%

Full proposals, MIE									
Fiji	UN-Habitat	\$4,235,995	Fully-developed project document	-	\$4,235,995	\$331,852	8.50%	\$369,000	9.45%
Iraq	IFAD	\$9,999,660	Fully-developed project document		\$9,999,660	\$779,790	8.46%	\$418,000	4.53%
Solomon Islands	UN-Habitat	\$4,395,877	Fully-developed project document	-	\$4,395,877	\$344,377	8.50%	\$384,500	9.49%
Total		\$97,576,337		\$267,000	\$97,843,337	\$7,243,068	8.02%	\$8,358,304	9.25%

21. All of the fully-developed project/programme documents provide an explanation and a breakdown of their execution costs and other administrative costs, and are in compliance with the following Board Decision made in the twelfth meeting:

(b) To request to the implementing entities that the project document include an explanation and a breakdown of all administrative costs associated with the project, including the execution costs.

(Decision B.12/7)

Project/programme proposals submitted by implementing entities: regional proposals

22. Accredited MIEs and RIEs submitted to the secretariat 13 proposals for regional projects and programmes, for consideration by the Board. The total requested funding of those proposals amounted to US\$ 122,022,014. Among the proposals were six pre-concepts for regional projects, with a total requested funding of US\$ 67,699,997, three project concepts with a total requested funding of US\$ 16,969,367, and four fully-developed project proposals with a total requested funding of US\$ 37,352,650. Following the initial technical review carried out by the secretariat, two fully-developed project documents and one concept were withdrawn by their proponents. The final total requested funding amounted to US\$ 98,478,539 including US\$ 18,809,175 for the two remaining fully-developed project documents and US\$ 11,969,367 for the two remaining project concepts. They included US\$ 7,537,280 or 8.3%³ in Implementing Entities' management fees and US\$ 7,782,824 or 8.3%⁴ in execution costs.

23. Three of the six pre-concepts were submitted by RIEs, including two by OSS and one by CAF; the other three were submitted by the following MIEs: AfDB, UN-Habitat and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO). The two concepts were submitted by MIEs: the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). One

³ The implementing entity management fee percentage is calculated compared to the project budget including the project activities and the execution costs, before the management fee.

⁴ The execution costs percentage is calculated as a percentage of the project budget, including the project activities and the execution costs, before the implementing entity management fee.

of the fully-developed project documents was submitted by an RIE, CAF, and the one from MIES was submitted by UNESCO. Details of the regional proposals are contained in the separate PPRC working documents, as follows:

- AFB/PPRC.21/28 Proposal for Argentina and Uruguay (CAF).*
- AFB/PPRC.21/29 Proposal for Burkina and Mali (OSS).*
- AFB/PPRC.21/29/Add.1 Project formulation grant for Burkina and Mali (OSS).*
- AFB/PPRC.21/30 Proposal for Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda (OSS).*
- AFB/PPRC.21/30/Add.1 Project formulation grant for Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda (OSS).*
- AFB/PPRC.21/31 Proposal for Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana (UN-Habitat).*
- AFB/PPRC.21/31/Add.1 Project formulation grant for Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana (UN-Habitat).*
- AFB/PPRC.21/32 Proposal for Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea (AfDB).*
- AFB/PPRC.21/32/Add.1 Project formulation grant for Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea (AfDB).*
- AFB/PPRC.21/33 Proposal for Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali and Togo (WMO).*
- AFB/PPRC.21/33/Add.1 Project formulation grant for Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali and Togo (WMO).*
- AFB/PPRC.21/34 Proposal for Cuba, Dominican Republic and Jamaica (UNDP).*
- AFB/PPRC.21/34/Add.1 Project formulation grant for Cuba, Dominican Republic and Jamaica (UNDP).*
- AFB/PPRC.21/35 Proposal for Thailand and Vietnam (UNEP).*
- AFB/PPRC.21/36 Proposal for Chile and Ecuador (CAF).*
- AFB/PPRC.21/37 Proposal for Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand and Vietnam (UNESCO).*

24. Of the six pre-concepts, five target the funding window for larger projects, of up to US\$ 14 million, and the other one targets the funding window of up to US\$ 5,000,000. Of the two concepts, one targets the window for larger projects and the other one the window for smaller projects. The fully-developed project proposals include one targeting the window for larger projects and one targeting the window for smaller projects. These proposals do not request administration costs, including implementing entity management fee and execution costs, in excess of 20% and are thus in compliance with the pilot programme as described in document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2.

25. Four of the pre-concepts were submitted together with project formulation grant (PFG) requests, for US\$ 20,000 each, while two of the concepts were submitted with PFG requests at the level ranging from US\$ 75,000 to US\$ 80,000, and therefore in accordance with decisions B.25/28 and B.29/4. If the Board were to decide to approve all the PFG requests submitted to the thirtieth meeting with the regional proposals, totaling US\$ 235,000, this would correspond to 11.6% of the funding indicatively set aside for project formulation grants for regional projects and programmes, and raise the cumulative amount of PFG support in the programme to US\$ 500,000 or 25% of the funding indicatively set aside.

Table 2: Regional project proposals submitted to the 30th Adaptation Fund Board meeting

IE	Countries	Size	Size, USD	PFG Request, USD	IE Fee	IE Fee %	Execution cost	EC %
Pre-Concepts, RIE								
CAF	Argentina, Uruguay	Large	\$13,999,997	\$0	\$1,037,037	8.00%	\$500,000	3.86%
OSS	Burkina, Mali	Medium	\$4,790,000	\$20,000	\$285,000	6.33%	\$475,000	10.54%
OSS	Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan, Uganda	Large	\$12,990,000	\$20,000	\$1,000,000	8.34%	\$990,000	8.26%
Pre-Concepts, MIE								
AfDB	Cote d'Ivoire, Guinea	Large	\$14,000,000	\$20,000	\$1,096,774	8.50%	\$1,225,806	9.50%
UN-Habitat	Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana	Large	\$14,000,000	\$0	\$1,096,774	8.50%	\$1,225,806	9.50%
WMO	Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali, Togo	Large	\$7,920,000	\$20,000	\$670,000	9.24%	\$750,000	10.34%
Concepts, MIE								
UNDP	Cuba, Dominican Republic, Jamaica	Medium	\$4,969,367	\$80,000	\$431,132	9.50%	\$431,235	9.50%
UNEP	Thailand, Vietnam	Large	\$7,000,000	\$0	\$548,388	8.50%	\$612,903	9.50%
Full proposals, RIE								
CAF	Chile, Ecuador	Large	\$13,910,400	\$0	\$1,030,400	8.00%	\$965,074	7.49%
Full proposals, MIE								
UNESCO	Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand, Vietnam	Medium	\$4,898,775	\$0	\$341,775	7.50%	\$357,000	7.83%
Total			\$98,478,539	\$160,000	\$7,537,280	8.29%	\$7,782,824	8.28%

The review process

26. In accordance with the operational policies and guidelines, the secretariat screened and prepared technical reviews of the 23 single-country project and programme proposals, and the 10 regional project and programme proposals. In performing this review task, the dedicated team of officers of the secretariat was supported by members of the Global Environment Facility secretariat technical staff, particularly for proposals that had not been previously submitted by the implementing entities.

27. In line with the Board request at its tenth meeting, the secretariat shared the initial technical review findings with the Implementing Entities that had submitted the proposals and solicited their responses to specific items requiring clarification. Responses were requested by e-mail, and the time allowed for the Implementing Entities to respond was one week. In some cases though, the

process took longer. The Implementing Entities were offered the opportunity to discuss the initial review findings with the secretariat by telephone.

28. The secretariat subsequently reviewed the IEs' responses to the clarification requests, and compiled comments and recommendations that are presented in the addendum to this document (AFB/PPRC.21/4/Add.1).

Issues identified during the review process

29. There were no particular issues identified during this review process.