



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/B.32/9  
11 September 2018

---

Adaptation Fund Board  
Thirty-second meeting  
Bonn, Germany, 11-12 October 2018

Agenda item 9a

**NEW FUNDING WINDOW FOR NATIONAL  
IMPLEMENTING ENTITIES (NIEs) TO ACCESS LEARNING  
GRANTS**

## Background

1. The Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat (the secretariat), at the request of the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board), and under the supervision and guidance of the medium-term strategy task force had prepared a first draft for a medium-term strategy (MTS) during the intersessional period between the twenty-ninth and the thirtieth meetings of the Board. As requested by the Board through decision B.29/39, the first draft was then published on the Fund's website for public consultation purposes and was also circulated to the Adaptation Fund NGO Network and other stakeholders together with a questionnaire designed to gather and organize feedback.

2. At its thirtieth meeting, the Adaptation Fund Board discussed the draft medium-term strategy, and members of the Board proposed amendments to the document. The secretariat then presented a revised draft, in document AFB/B.31/5/Rev.1. Having considered that document, the Board decided:

- a) *To adopt the medium-term strategy as amended by the Board, as contained in the Annex 1 of the document AFB/B.30/5/Rev.1 (the MTS); and*
- b) *To request the secretariat:*
  - (i) *To broadly disseminate the MTS and work with key stakeholders to build understanding and support;*
  - (ii) *To prepare, under the supervision of the MTS task force, a draft implementation plan for operationalizing the MTS, containing a draft budget and addressing key assumptions and risks, including but not limited to funding and political risks, for consideration by the Board at its thirty-first meeting; and*
  - (iii) *To draft, as part of the implementation plan, the updates/modifications to the operational policies and guidelines of the Adaptation Fund needed to facilitate implementation of the MTS, for consideration by the Board at its thirty-first meeting.*  
(Decision B.30/42)

3. Pursuant to decision B.30/42, subparagraph b (ii), the secretariat had prepared a draft implementation plan for the MTS, which was shared with the MTS task force for comments. The draft implementation plan included a general budget for the additional administrative costs expected to be incurred as a result of implementing the plan and suggestions for specific funding windows that could be opened under the MTS in complement of the Fund's existing funding windows for single-country and regional adaptation projects and readiness support projects.

4. At its thirty-first meeting, having considered the draft implementation plan, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) *To approve the implementation plan for the medium-term strategy for the Fund for 2018–2022 contained in the Annex I to document AFB/B.31/5/Rev.1 (the plan);*
- (b) *To request the secretariat:*
  - (i) *To facilitate the implementation of the plan during the period 2018–2022;*

[...]

- (iii) *To prepare, for each proposed new type of grant and funding window, a specific document containing objectives, review criteria, expected grant sizes, implementation modalities, review process and other relevant features and submit it to the Board for its consideration in accordance with the tentative timeline contained in Annex I to document AFB/B.31/5/Rev.1, with input from the Board's committees;*

[...]

(Decision B.31/32)

## **Learning and Sharing pillar**

5. The Fund's Medium-term Strategy places emphasis on the quality of concrete activities and long-term capacity strengthening for effective adaptation. The MTS is expected to be implemented under three strategic foci: Action; Innovation; and Learning. As outlined in document AFB/B.31/5/Rev.1, the third strategic focus – learning and sharing, has a focus to enhance its own processes and activities, as well as those of others. It builds on the Fund's recently revised Knowledge Management Framework and Action Plan (2016) that has an objective to continuously:

- (a) Improve Fund policies and performance through effective, "whole-of-organization" learning and sharing and;
- (b) Support collaborative learning and sharing across adaptation communities of practice

6. The learning and sharing pillar of the MTS has three expected results (ERs). Each of the ERs have presented outputs and activities that will be implemented under the MTS.

### *Expected results:*

- *ER1 – Lessons learnt and shared. Practical lessons from Fund processes and projects/programmes captured and effectively communicated to adaptation actors around the world;*
- *ER2 – Knowledge and guidance developed. Under this practical knowledge gained, and guidance provided vis-à-vis select themes (e.g. improving the durability of adaptation actions; integrating traditional knowledge, the knowledge of indigenous peoples and local knowledge systems into adaptation actions; and the role of adaptive management in project implementation) and;*
- *ER3 – Analytical capacity strengthened. Long-term analytical/learning capacity strengthened in developing country Parties.*

7. Pursuant to Decision B.31/32 to approve the implementation plan, the focus of this document is to present to the Adaptation Fund Board, the proposal for the Adaptation Fund new funding window for National Implementing Entities (NIEs) to access learning grants.

## **Overview of Learning Grants**

8. The main objectives of learning grants are:
- (a) Transferring knowledge from one NIE to another;

- (b) Transferring knowledge form NIEs to the wider climate finance adaptation community and;
- (c) Developing knowledge and guidelines through partnerships.

9. The goal of learning grants is to help encourage a culture of learning across institutions and help build NIE capacities. They represent a window of opportunity to capture, study and disseminate practical lessons from adaptation interventions that are additional to KM activities already financed under Adaptation Fund approved projects/ programmes. They may be utilized to complement collaborative knowledge and sharing efforts with respect to partnerships with diverse stakeholders on the ground.

10. At the project level, learning grants may be accessed by NIEs with experience in formulating and implementing at least one AF project, defining learning objectives, collecting lessons learnt, and generating and disseminating knowledge gained. In this respect learning grants can serve as a valuable resource to study successful climate change adaptation actions (thematic or sectoral) and disseminate knowledge gained to enable robust interventions. They may help in the development of reference guides on how to estimate and minimize incremental costs in planning investments to adapt to climate change. Additionally, resources can be used to share knowledge gained at the institutional level with the climate change adaptation community/ networks at the national, regional and international level.

11. Learning grants may enable the production of baseline studies that could be leveraged for replication and up-scaling purposes. Studies, publications and research material produced in collaboration with various executing partners as well as with national level universities, research institutions and civil society organizations can serve as an important feedback loop to guide future interventions.

12. Learning grants can play an enabling role by encouraging effective capturing and disseminating and communicating project knowledge to a diverse set of adaptation actors locally and globally. They may help leverage South-South learning by providing a platform for NIEs to exchange knowledge and best practices and find solutions to shared challenges. Such knowledge exchanges may then serve as valuable resources to the wider climate change adaptation community.

13. Learning grants represent an opportunity for implementing entities to develop knowledge products as well as setting up a knowledge management system for effective management and dissemination of learning material.

### **Eligibility criteria**

14. To be eligible to receive learning grants to share or transfer knowledge to other NIEs or the wider climate adaptation community or to develop knowledge or guidelines through partnerships, the organization applying must meet the following conditions:

- a. Be a national implementing entity (NIE) to the Adaptation Fund and have an accreditation status of “Accredited”;

- b. Have an Adaptation Fund funded project that has reached the mid-point<sup>1</sup> in implementation or where a Mid-Term Review or Evaluation (MTR/MTE) has been submitted
- c. Submit together with the application form, a letter endorsed by the Designated Authority to the Adaptation Fund in support of the learning grant application

15. The learning grants are available for each accredited entity meeting the above conditions up to a maximum of US\$150,000 per grant and can be accessed by submitting a request to the Board through the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat. The projected total amount of grant funding per year is US\$ 400,000.

### Proposed guiding principles

16. It is good practice in organizations evaluating knowledge and learning from projects/programmes and other processes to screen proposals against a substantive criterion which helps operationalize the proposed concepts. In line with this, the following proposed guiding principles would be used to help make the above learning grants operational. All potential learning activities will be assessed against these principles, which should be met to a satisfactory extent. While it will often not be feasible or necessary for any one learning activity to meet all these principles, they serve as a useful guidance for strategic alignment and screening for quality assurance.

#### 17. Guiding Principles for Learning

- a. **Evidence based:** Activities planned reflect the knowledge gaps identified by the users, addressing issues with strong potential for evidence-based learning.
- b. **Country owned:** Learning methods and approaches are driven by users and respond to learning needs identified in-country.
- c. **Learning-reoriented:** Learning activities proposed built on established best practices for project/programme learning.
- d. **Collaborative:** Collaborative partnerships should be pursued to facilitate relevant learning using shared resources and knowledge.
- e. **Inclusive and gender-responsive:** Learning activities should address gender considerations and include concerns of the most vulnerable groups and communities.
- f. **Innovative:** Learning activities should emphasize innovative, effective solutions and practices to adaptation that have demonstrated viability on the ground.
- g. **Supports local or traditional knowledge:** Learning activities to include expertise and knowledge of local stakeholders, whenever possible.

---

<sup>1</sup> For projects that have a duration of less than 4 years, at least one Project Performance Report (PPR) should have been submitted.

## Scoping study

18. To make the learning grants relevant for the countries and to ensure the activities funded by these reflect the accredited implementing entities' learning needs, the secretariat took a participatory approach in seeking out input from the NIEs on the knowledge management systems currently in place and the types of learning activities that could be funded under this new funding window, which should be above and beyond learning activities that have been mandatorily planned as part of the KM and learning component of the AF project they are implementing.

19. In order to kick-start the conversation, the knowledge management team of the secretariat took the opportunity to contact a few accredited implementing entities to seek input on a few questions related to the current practices in place to capture and disseminate knowledge, the challenges faced in this process and the types of knowledge activities related to climate adaptation projects to be captured and shared in the future to other accredited entities and to the wider climate adaptation community.

20. Furthermore, as part of the Fifth Climate Finance Readiness seminar held between August 28-31, 2018 in Washington, D.C., the secretariat organized an informative session announcing the upcoming learning grants and gave the participating accredited entities the opportunity to share ideas and suggestions among themselves and with the secretariat on the types of learning activities to be funded through the new learning grants.

## Eligible activities

21. It is expected that the entity's commitment to capturing and sharing knowledge and learning with other implementing entities and the wider climate adaptation community would be clearly articulated in the submitted application for learning grants and that tangible benefits to the intended users are also clearly outlined.

22. The types of activities to be funded by the learning grants should fall under the three categories of activities stated in the implementation plan of the MTS, namely: 1) transferring knowledge from one NIE to another, 2) transferring knowledge from NIE to the wider climate adaptation community and 3) developing knowledge and guidelines through partnerships. They can be very diverse and be based on the specific needs of the countries/implementing entities proposing them. Below is a non-exhaustive list of activities that could be funded by the learning grants. For more descriptive details related to these specific activities, please refer to Annex I of the current document.

- (i) Lessons learnt
- (ii) Studies and publications
- (iii) Technical guidance briefs
- (iv) Partnerships
- (v) Knowledge platforms
- (vi) Adaptation financing workshops
- (vii) Resource centers
- (viii) Knowledge sharing events
- (ix) Country exchanges
- (x) Learning courses

23. It is proposed that implementing entities submit a proposal with detailed information on the proposed activities to the Board following a launch of the learning grants by the secretariat. The proposed grant application template is included in Annex II of the current document.

### **Implementation arrangements**

24. It is proposed that the accredited NIEs would be responsible for managing the grant and implementation of the project, including management of all aspects of procurement as well as financial and non-financial reporting. However, with due consideration of avoiding additional administrative and financial burden on NIEs to report, and in keeping the reporting burden at a minimum, it is proposed that the reporting requirements be kept simple and straightforward relative to the small size of the grants involved. The NIEs would therefore be expected to submit project monitoring and completion reports as well as financial reports similar in structure and simplicity to current reporting requirements for grants under the readiness programme, which were approved by the Board through decision B.29/42. And will be adapted to fit the needs for learning grants.

25. The secretariat could assess fulfillment of the requirements to access the learning grants using the review criteria outlined in Annex III and undertake a technical assessment of the submitted proposals using the project review template in Annex IV to the current document. Following the technical review, the secretariat would submit the project proposal to the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) for their review and recommendation to the Board for decision by the Board.

### **Results monitoring and assessment of grant effectiveness**

26. The Board, through the secretariat, could measure performance of the learning grants annually, and evaluate results mid-way and at the end of the MTS implementation period (2022). To enable this process, it is proposed that a simple results framework is developed for learning grants, providing clear outcomes and indicators of measurement. This approach would be aligned to the Adaptation Fund approach to implementing results-based management (RBM) and signifies an extension of the Fund RBM system to encompass the impact of the learning grants on the MTS and consequently, Fund level goal and objectives.

27. The results framework for learning grants could include outcomes such as: (i) number of modalities (internet, knowledge platforms, email lists, etc.) of sharing knowledge from one NIE to another or to the wider climate adaptation community; (ii) number of evaluation surveys used to collect information on who received the knowledge products produced and (iii) number of partnerships and collaborations to share produce and share knowledge and guidelines established. The secretariat could report annually to the Board on performance of the results framework indicators through the annual performance report (APR).

### **Recommendation**

28. The Board may want to consider the proposed approach, application process, review criteria and features of the learning grants contained in document AFB/B.32, and decide:

- a) To make available learning grants for national implementing entities between financial year 2019 and 2022 up to a maximum of US\$ 400,000 per year as direct transfers from the resources of the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund;

- b) To approve:
  - (i) The features, and implementation arrangements of the learning grants as contained in document AFB/B.32/9;
  - (ii) The application form, review criteria and review template for the learning grants as contained in Annexes II, III and IV of document AFB/B.32/9;
- c) To request the secretariat to issue a call for proposals in accordance with the tentative timeline contained in the Annex I to document AFB/B.31/5/Rev.1 and budget pursuant to (a) above;
- d) To request the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) of the Adaptation Fund to review learning grant proposals and make recommendations to the Board in line with other grant approval procedures approved by the Board;
- e) To request the secretariat to develop and present to the Board at its 33rd meeting;
  - (i) a standard legal agreement for learning grants
  - (ii) notification template for project start and project completion
  - (iii) monitoring and evaluation reporting templates.
  - (iv) A Result framework for learning grants
- f) To request the secretariat to report to the Board annually on implementation progress for learning grants through the annual performance report (APR).



## ANNEX I

Activities that could be supported by the learning grants are illustrated below:

- i. Lessons learnt: knowledge extracted from a specific project or process to enhance future project or process performance. Emphasis should be focused on capturing knowledge that is useful to success. Lessons learnt could be derived from a single project but can be applied to work on many projects. Examples may include:
  - a) lessons learnt from the project implementation process, organized by theme (e.g. Integration of AF environmental, social and gender policies in project design and implementation, etc.) or sector (e.g. use of innovative adaptation practices or technologies, incorporation of traditional knowledge in project activities, use of risk management tools such as index insurance in agriculture, etc.);
  - b) lessons learnt from application of technical assistance grants for project formulation;
  - c) lessons learnt about successful and negative practices
- ii. Studies/publications: examples may include:
  - a) Studies on cross-sectoral approaches
  - b) Baseline studies integrated with different sectors
  - c) Research and development studies on innovative adaptation practices, indigenous knowledge systems as a tool for stakeholder buy-in
  - d) Studies on integrated approaches to adaptation,
  - e) Studies to finance identified adaptation gaps and scaling up opportunities using other sources of adaptation funding (i.e. bilateral funding, private sector, etc.)
- iii. Technical guidance briefs: notes summarizing evidence, best practices and programmatic guidance on a variety of topics related to climate change adaptation in different sectors.
- iv. Partnerships: building collaborative learning partnerships with national research institutes, knowledge institutions and universities to facilitate dynamic and responsive research and learning within and across institutions, projects and portfolios
- v. Knowledge platforms: creation of web-based platforms which enables an organization to manage formal learning related to projects/programmes or processes and share informal knowledge in a specific location.
- vi. Adaptation financing workshops: a series of workshops and trainings aimed at sharing knowledge and experiences between accredited entities or with other stakeholders (i.e. executing entities, beneficiaries) on different topics related to climate adaptation. The development of the workshops and training content could be done in partnership with other organizations with knowledge in the field.

- vii. Resource centers: setting up learning centers for collection and dissemination of documentation. This activity may include the creation of multimedia to capture successful project stories, to design creative knowledge dissemination mediums to explain adaptation concepts to communities (including translation in native languages), to....
- viii. Knowledge Sharing Events: the aim of this activity is to facilitate interactions among different stakeholders on climate change adaptation best practices. Such platforms help enhance decisive actions to adaptation to climate change, strategies to avoid maladaptation and increase community resilience. They may include:
- a) Seminars for climate change adaptation project level learning
  - b) Regional knowledge exchange networks
  - c) Multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms to disseminate the project results.
  - d) Regional fora for adaptation best practices
  - e) Peer to peer exchange for identification of technical gaps
  - f) Meetings of Task Forces
    - Regional Task Force (e.g. Asia-Pacific, Latin America and Caribbean or Eastern Europe)
    - Sector specific task force (e.g. Urban Resilience, Ecosystem Based Management, Water Management best practices, Indigenous knowledge for climate change adaptation sectors)
    - Gender Responsive climate change adaptation best practices
- ix. Country exchanges: Country exchanges might be in-country or cross-country. In-country exchanges might include a system established to facilitate periodic sharing of experiences between national implementing entities, executing entities and project beneficiaries. In-country exchanges might be between diverse actors such as - municipal staff from leading communities, along with regional and provincial government staff, non-governmental organizations, private consultants and in-country scholars to explore how communities are seizing opportunities and overcoming constraints to fulfill climate change adaptation objectives. Cross-country exchanges maybe between countries implementing projects with shared priority sectors. While this is not an exhaustive list, sub-activities may include:
- a) In-country field visits
    - Between regional executing entities working on complementary sectors;
    - Among key national stakeholders and technical assistance. This will allow them to improve their capacity in planning investments on technologies or infrastructure adapted to climate variability by integrating and minimizing costs for adaptation.
  - b) Cross-country exchanges
    - Holding innovative Peer Learning Exchanges, bringing national climate leaders and champions together to exchange information about the drivers of climate action and innovation;

- Sharing shared challenges in dissemination of knowledge as well as finding solutions to address challenges.
- x. E-learning courses: focus on developing on-line learning platforms to provide knowledge related to climate change adaptation best practices, to build capacity of various stakeholders and encourage exchanges via the e-learning platform.

**ANNEX II****Application for a Grant to facilitate learning and knowledge sharing**

Submission Date:

Adaptation Fund Grant ID:

Country/ies:

National Implementing Entity:

**A. Timeframe of Activity**

Expected start date	
Completion date	

**B. Proposed learning activities**

Describe the activities to be undertaken to share knowledge with other NIEs or the wider climate adaptation community or to develop knowledge/guidelines through partnerships

Proposed Learning Activities	Description of activities	Expected Output of the Activities	Country/Institution to share/transfer knowledge with/to or to develop guidelines for, including NIE(s)	Requested budget (USD)	Tentative timeline (Completion date)
<b>Total Grant Requested (USD)</b>					

**C. Implementing Entity**

This request has been prepared in accordance with the Adaptation Fund Board's procedures

Head of Implementing Entity	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Implementing Entity Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address

**D. Record of endorsement on behalf of government**

Provide the name and position of the government official, Designated Authority (DA) of the Adaptation Fund, and indicate date of endorsement. The DA endorsement letter must be attached as an annex to the request.

<i>(Enter Name, Position, Ministry)</i>	Date: <i>(Month, day, year)</i>
---	---------------------------------

**ANNEX III****Screening review sheet for Learning Grants applications**

<b>Review criteria</b>	<b>Screening Questions</b>	<b>Description of rating</b>
<b>Country eligibility</b>	Has this application been submitted by a national implementing entity from a country Party to the Kyoto Protocol?	As per paragraph 24 of the Fund's Operational Policies and Guidelines, main text document, "The Fund shall finance concrete adaptation projects and programmes in developing country Parties to the Kyoto Protocol that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change".
<b>Eligibility of implementing entity</b>	Has this application been submitted through an accredited national implementing entity?	As per Annex 1 of document AFB/B.31/4 approved by the Board through decision B.31/1, only implementing entities that have accreditation status of "Accredited" may receive project funding from the Adaptation Fund. Implementing Entities that have the accreditation status of "In Re-accreditation Process" and "Not Accredited" are not eligible for funding.
	Has the accredited NIE submitting the project proposal have experience implementing an AF funded project? If so, has this project/programme reached the mid-point in implementation and has a Mid-term Review or Evaluation (MTR/MTE) been submitted?	<p>At midterm, during implementation (in project performance reports) and project completion, the lessons learned from <i>climate resilience measures, concrete adaptation interventions</i>, community and national impact are expected to be summarized.</p> <p>The Adaptation Fund requires projects and programmes that have <b>more than four years of implementation</b> to conduct a mid-term evaluation (MTE) after reaching the project/programme mid-point. The mid-term evaluations are expected to be prepared no later than six months after the midpoint of the project and the mid-term report (MTR) should be sent to the AF secretariat.</p> <p>As part of the Fund's reporting requirements, implementing entities are required to submit a Project Performance Report (PPR) on an annual basis to the secretariat beginning from one year after the start of project implementation, (date of inception workshop) and the last such report should be submitted six months after project completion. For projects that are less than 4 years in duration and therefore not required to submit MTRs, the implementing entity should have submitted at least one project performance report (PPR).</p>
<b>Project eligibility</b>	Has this application been endorsed by the Designated Authority (DA) of the country?	Endorsement means that a signed letter on an official letterhead by the DA addressed to the Adaptation Fund Board approving the application was submitted.

	<p>Are the proposed learning activities to transfer knowledge from one NIE to another, or to the wider climate adaptation community or to develop knowledge and guidelines through partnerships adequate?</p>	<p>Adequacy will depend on the level of detail provided under the description of each activity and the logic flow of the overall activities identified under the chosen type of learning activity requested by the NIE.</p> <p>Generally adequate activities would describe in minor detail and offer clarity and understanding of the learning purpose in relation to the learning needs of other NIEs or wider community. Learning activities should be meaningful and understandable which will enable the user to receive, understand, retain and apply the knowledge gained in the future. Descriptions should offer clarity on the type of sub-activities envisaged, including duration and expected costs under each type of support activity requested.</p> <p>The expected outputs from each type of support activity requested would also be clear and conform to the overall purpose of the learning grants as outlined in the call for learning grant applications.</p>
<p><b>Resource availability</b></p>	<p>Based on the proposed activities, is the requested budget reasonable?</p>	<p>A reasonable budget is described as one that falls within the USD150,000 cap and gives an overview picture of how the sub-budgets identified will be spent to amount the total requested budget.</p> <p>Implementing entities may request an implementing entity management fee at or below 8.5 per cent of the total project budget before the fee.</p> <p>While it is not expected that implementing entities would have executing entities working on the learning grants, implementing entities may request execution costs at or below 1.5 per cent of the total project budget (including the fee)</p>
<p><b>Duplication with AF project(s)/programme(s)' learning activities</b></p>	<p>Do the proposed activities duplicate with the project/programme's learning activities as approved by the Board or do they duplicate activities financed from other sources of funding?</p>	<p>The Adaptation Fund has included knowledge management as part of its Results-Based Management Framework at the Fund level and therefore requires that activities related to knowledge management (KM) and dissemination of lessons learned have to be included in full-developed proposal. They can be grouped in a single component or part of a larger component.</p> <p>For a fully developed proposal, the KM and dissemination of lessons learned component must be explained in detail. Project/programme proponents are expected to therefore systematically keep track of experiences gained from their project and analyze them periodically to accelerate understanding about what kinds of interventions work.</p> <p>Learning grant proposals may not duplicate or be a substitute for the mandatory KM requirement in concrete projects and programmes.</p>

<b>Implementation arrangements</b>	Is the timeframe of activity adequate?	<p>While the duration of each specific activity and overall time period over which learning support is rendered will vary per project, applicants are encouraged to give as much information as possible, including expected number of days for workshops, training events, preparation and write up of guideline/policy documents/studies or days for preparation of an e-learning or a knowledge platform, etc. Applicants are encouraged to show what sub-activities are included under each requested learning activity including the number of days or weeks.</p> <p>It is generally expected that financial support for all activities available to applicants can take between six and twelve months.</p>
	Is a detailed budget including budget notes included?	The implementing entity should submit a detailed budget with budget notes indicating the break-down of costs at the activity level as well as any Implementing Entity management fee and execution costs requested.
	Is a budget on the Implementing Entity Management Fee use included?	The implementing entity should also provide a budget indicating how the management fee will be used.
	Is a budget for execution costs included?	The implementing entity should provide an explanation and a breakdown of the execution costs.



**ADAPTATION FUND BOARD SECRETARIAT TECHNICAL REVIEW  
OF PROJECT PROPOSAL FOR LEARNING GRANTS**

PROJECT CATEGORY: **LEARNING GRANTS**

Country:

Implementing Entity:

Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars):

Reviewer and contact person:

Implementing Entity Contact Person:

Co-reviewer(s):

<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Country Eligibility	1. Is the country that has an accredited entity Party to the Kyoto Protocol?	
Eligibility of IE	1. Is the project submitted through an Implementing Entity accredited by the Board?	
	2. Is the Implementing Entity already implementing a project/programme funded by the Adaptation Fund? If so, has this project/programme reached the mid-point in implementation and has a Mid-term Review or Evaluation (MTR/MTE) been submitted?	
Project Eligibility	1. Has the designated government authority for the Adaptation Fund endorsed the project?	

	<p>2. Are the proposed activities to support learning adequate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do they reflect knowledge gaps and learning needs identified by the users?</li> <li>• Do they build on established “best practices” for project/programme learning? Are they based on shared resources and knowledge?</li> <li>• Do they address gender considerations and include concerns of the most vulnerable groups and communities?</li> <li>• Are they generated in an inclusive way?</li> <li>• Do they emphasize innovative, effective solutions and practices to adaptation that are viable on the ground?</li> <li>• Do they include expertise and knowledge of local stakeholders, whenever possible?</li> </ul>	
Resource Availability	1. Is the requested project funding within the cap for Learning Grants set by the Board?	
	2. If the implementing entity has requested, is the Implementing Entity Management Fee at or below 8.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget before the fee?	
Duplication with AF project(s)/programme(s)'s learning activities	1. Do the proposed activities duplicate with the project/programme's learning activities as approved by the Board or do they duplicate activities financed from other sources of funding?	
Implementation Arrangements	2. Is the timeframe for the proposed activities adequate?	
	3. Is a summary breakdown of the budget for the proposed activities included? Is the proposed budget adequate and reasonable?	
Secretariat's Overall Comment		
Date:		