



## ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/B.36/9  
16 April 2021

---

### ADAPTATION FUND BOARD

Thirty-sixth Meeting

Bonn, Germany (held virtually), 6–8 April 2021

### DECISIONS OF THE THIRTY-SIXTH MEETING OF THE ADAPTATION FUND BOARD

#### **Agenda Item 8: Report of the twenty-seventh meeting of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC)**

*a) Report of the secretariat on initial screening/technical review of project and programme proposals*

#### **Issues identified during the review process**

##### *Regional project and programme funding provision for fiscal year 2022*

1. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to include in its work programme for fiscal year 2022 a provision for an amount of US\$ 60 million, to be provisionally set aside as follows:

- (a) Up to US\$ 59 million for the funding of regional project and programme proposals;
- (b) Up to US\$ 1 million for the funding of project formulation grant requests for preparing regional project and programme concept or fully-developed project documents.

(Decision B.36/1)

##### *Enhanced direct access funding provision for fiscal year 2022*

2. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to include in its work programme for fiscal year 2022 a provision for an amount of US\$ 20.2 million, to be provisionally set aside as follows:

- (a) Up to US\$ 20 million for the funding of Enhanced Direct Access projects;
- (b) Up to US\$ 200,000 for the funding of project formulation and project formulation assistance grant requests for preparing Enhanced Direct Access fully-developed project documents.

(Decision B.36/2)

Single-country project and programmes

**Fully-developed proposals**

*Proposals from National Implementing Entities (NIEs)*

*Small-sized proposals:*

Indonesia (1): Enhancing the Adaptation Capability of Coastal Community in Facing the Impacts of Climate Change in Negeri (Village) Asilulu, Ureng and Lima of Leihitu District Maluku Tengah Regency Maluku Province (Fully-developed project; Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan); IDN/NIE/CZM/2019/1; US\$ 963,456).

3. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To note the recommendation that the Board:
  - (i) Approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan) to the request made by the technical review;
  - (ii) Approve the funding of US\$ 963,456 for the implementation of the project, as requested by Kemitraan;
  - (iii) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with Kemitraan as the national implementing entity for the project;
- (b) To consider the recommendation under subparagraphs (a) (i)-(iii) above when Kemitraan has the status of “accredited” with the Fund, as defined in document AFB/B.34/5.

(Decision B.36/3)

Indonesia (2): EMBRACING THE SUN: Redefining Public Space as a Solution for the Effects of Global Climate Change in Indonesia's Urban Areas (Fully-developed project; Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan); IDN/NIE/Urban/2019/1; US\$ 824,835).

4. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To note the recommendation that the Board:
  - (i) Approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan) to the request made by the technical review;
  - (ii) Approve the funding of US\$ 824,835 for the implementation of the project, as requested by Kemitraan;
  - (iii) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with Kemitraan as the national implementing entity for the project. Prior to first disbursement, Kemitraan should submit a revised result framework of the project that includes the core impact indicator “Number of beneficiaries” including estimations for direct and indirect beneficiaries and a second core indicator related to “Assets produced, developed, improved, or strengthened”;
- (b) To consider the recommendation under subparagraphs (a) (i)-(iii) above when Kemitraan has the status of “accredited” with the Fund, as defined in document AFB/B.34/5.

(Decision B.36/4)

*Regular proposals:*

Belize: Enhancing the Resilience of Belize’s Coastal Communities to Climate Change Impacts (Fully-developed project; Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT); BLZ/NIE/CZM/2019/1; US\$ 4,000,000).

5. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) Not to approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that PACT reformulate the proposal taking into account the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision, as well as the following issues;
  - (i) The proposal should provide further formation on the cost-effectiveness of component 3, which relates to the possible beach stabilization measures to be selected;
  - (ii) The proponent should eliminate inconsistencies throughout the proposal in relation to the environmental impact assessments to be undertaken for the coastal protection measures being chosen;
  - (iii) The proposal needs to further document the full cost of adaptation regarding component 3 and clarify how the project objectives under this component will be achieved if the technical assessments to be undertaken cannot be finalized in the planned timeframe;

- (iv) The proposal needs to clarify the hard engineering measures which could be selected to guarantee beach stabilization, and to improve the environmental and social risk screening and risk mitigation measures;
- (c) To request PACT to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Belize.

(Decision B.36/5)

United Republic of Tanzania: Bunda Climate Resilience and Adaptation Project (Fully-developed project; National Environment Management Council (NEMC); TZA/NIE/Agric/2019/1; US\$ 1,400,000).

6. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (a) To approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the National Environment Management Council (NEMC) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To approve the funding of US\$ 1,400,000 for the implementation of the project, as requested by NEMC;
- (c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with NEMC as the national implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.36/6)

### *Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)*

#### *Regular proposals*

Djibouti: Integrated Water and Soil Resources Management Project (Projet de Gestion Intégrée des Ressources en Eau et des Sols PROGIRES) (Fully-developed project; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); AF00000249; US\$ 5,339,285).

7. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) Not to approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that IFAD reformulate the proposal taking into account the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
  - (i) The proposal should address how the "positive ratio" in component 2 is evaluated for the cost effectiveness of the project;
  - (ii) The proponent should provide more information with regard to how the project will avoid overlap with similar projects implemented in the same areas, and

further information on the synergies with the IFAD-funded COSOP/2019-2024 programme, should be provided;

- (iii) The proposal should include the list of names of the community representatives that took part in the consultative process;
  - (iv) The proponent should provide more information on the baseline scenario in relation to project component 1, improve the justification for the activities selected, and clarify what gaps remain to be addressed vis-à-vis other stakeholders included in the baseline;
  - (v) The proposal should include clearly-defined targets for indirect beneficiaries of the project and a breakdown of the costs for the monitoring and evaluation funding sources;
- (c) To request IFAD to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Djibouti.

(Decision B.36/7)

Syrian Arab Republic: Increasing the Climate Change Resilience of Communities in Eastern Ghouta in Rural Damascus to Water Scarcity Challenges through Integrated Natural Resource Management and Immediate Adaptation Interventions (Fully-developed project; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); SYR/MIE/Water/2019/1; US\$ 9,997,156).

8. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (a) To approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To approve the funding of US\$ 9,997,156 for the implementation of the project, as requested by UN-Habitat;
- (c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UN-Habitat as the multilateral implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.36/8)

Zimbabwe: Strengthening Local Communities' Adaptive Capacity and Resilience to Climate Change through Sustainable Groundwater Utilisation in Zimbabwe (Fully-developed project; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); ZWE/CIE/Water/2018/1; US\$ 5,000,000).

9. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (a) To approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to the request made by the technical review;

- (b) To approve the funding of US\$ 5,000,000 for the implementation of the project, as requested by UNESCO;
- (c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UNESCO as the multilateral implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.36/9)

## Concepts

### *Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)*

#### *Regular proposals:*

Lebanon: Enhancing Water Sector Resilience through Nature-based Adaptation Technologies in North-Lebanon (Concept note; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); AF00000254; US\$ 2,139,174).

10. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to notify FAO of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issue:
  - (i) The fully-developed proposal should consider opportunities to link project component 2 to protocols and standards already agreed by countries under the Barcelona Convention frameworks, which may provide a cost-effective way to elevate lessons learned to the regional level;
- (c) To request FAO to transmit the observation under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Lebanon;
- (d) To encourage the Government of Lebanon to submit, through FAO, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observation under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.36/10)

Viet Nam: Building Resilience and Improving Response to Drought and Flood in the North Central Region of Viet Nam to Reduce the Impacts of Climate Change: Inclusive Integrated Management of Drought and Flood (Concept note; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); AF00000252; US\$ 3,580,000).

11. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to notify FAO of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
  - (i) The fully-developed project proposal should enhance opportunities for knowledge exchange and the development of private sector synergies;
  - (ii) The fully-developed project proposal should provide more information on the community's capacity to undertake the management of the small-scale infrastructure to be installed;
  - (iii) The fully-developed project proposal should strengthen the environmental and social risk screening, including impact assessments for the principles for which risks have been identified, with adequate management measures;
- (c) To request FAO to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Viet Nam;
- (d) To encourage the Government of Viet Nam to submit, through FAO, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.36/11)

Yemen: Increase the Climate Change Resilience to Water Scarcity and Sea Level Rise-related Challenges in the Tuban Delta (Concept note; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); AF0000250; US\$ 10,000,000).

12. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) Not to endorse the concept note, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that UN-Habitat reformulate the proposal taking into account the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision;
- (c) To request UN-Habitat to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Yemen.

(Decision B.36/12)

*Review of regional project and programme proposals*

### **Fully-developed proposals**

*Proposals from Regional Implementing Entities (RIEs)*

Angola and Namibia: Resilience Building as Climate Change Adaptation in Drought Struck South Western African Communities (Fully-developed project; Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS); AFR/RIE/Rural/2019/PPC/1; US\$ 11,941,038).

13. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) Not to approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that OSS reformulate the proposal taking into account the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision;
- (c) To request OSS to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Angola and Namibia.

(Decision B.36/13)



*Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)*

Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana: Improved Resilience of Coastal Communities in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana (Fully-developed project; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); AFR/MIE/DRR/2017/1; US\$ 13,951,160).

14. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) Not to approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that UN-Habitat reformulate the proposal taking into account the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
  - (i) The proposal should focus on climate change adaptation, demonstrating the sustainability and innovative character of its activities while showing the added value of the chosen regional approach;
  - (ii) The proponent should demonstrate that the risk of maladaptation is avoided, as well as compliance with the Fund's Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy;
- (c) To request UN-Habitat to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana.

(Decision B.36/14)

**Concepts***Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)*

Azerbaijan, Islamic Republic of Iran: Urbanization and Climate Change Adaptation in the Caspian Sea Region (Concept note; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); ASI/MIE/Urban/2019/1; US\$ 14,000,000).

15. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To endorse the regional concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to notify UN-Habitat of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
  - (i) The fully-developed project proposal should ensure that complementary with other projects and programmes is clearly stated;

- (ii) The fully-developed project proposal should specify how much of the intended adaptation funds will be directed towards concrete measures, and their overall sustainability;
- (iii) The fully-developed project proposal should provide details on the project screening process and should include a full gender assessment;
- (iv) The fully-developed project proposal should incorporate additional consultations with vulnerable and marginalized communities, as required;
- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 80,000;
- (d) To request UN-Habitat to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b), above to the Governments of Azerbaijan and the Islamic Republic of Iran;
- (e) To encourage the Governments of Azerbaijan and the Islamic Republic of Iran to submit, through UN-Habitat, a fully-developed proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.36/15)

Chad, Sudan: Strengthening Resilience to Climate and Covid-19 Shocks through Integrated Water Management on the Sudan – Chad Border Area (SCCIWM) (Concept note; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); AF00000248; US\$ 14,000,000).

16. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to notify FAO of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as well as the following issues:
  - (i) The fully-developed project proposal should provide a more comprehensive analysis to demonstrate its compliance with the Fund's Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy;
  - (ii) The fully-developed project proposal should further develop its gender assessment;

- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 100,000;
- (d) To request FAO to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Chad and Sudan;
- (e) To encourage the Governments of Chad and Sudan to submit, through FAO, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.36/16)

## **Pre-concepts**

### *Proposals from Regional Implementing Entities (RIEs)*

Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal: Strengthening the Resilience of Climate-vulnerable Communities in the Senegal River Basin Using a Multi-hazard Early Warning System and Enhancing Adaptation Capacity (Pre-concept note; Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS); AF00000253; US\$ 14,000,000).

17. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To endorse the pre-concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to notify OSS of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
  - (i) The concept note should provide more detail on the specific climate issues and their impacts as well as a detailed approach to establishing early-warning systems and the multisectoral actions, both from the regional perspective and in the individual countries;
  - (ii) The concept note should provide indications of the budgeted amounts to be directly spent in the rural communities in each of the countries;
  - (iii) The concept note should outline options for involving national implementing entities in the project implementation;
  - (iv) Provide more information on complementarity and coherence on existing early warning interventions in the region and individual countries, including the Climate Risk and Early Warning System (CREWS) initiative;

- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 20,000;
- (d) To request OSS to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Guinea, Mali, Mauritania and Senegal;
- (e) To encourage the Governments of Guinea, Mali, Mauritania and Senegal to submit, through OSS, a concept note that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.36/17)

*Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)*

Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Niger, Nigeria: Integrated Water Resources Management and Early Warning System for Climate Change Resilience in the Lake Chad Basin (Pre-concept note; United Nations World Meteorological Organization (WMO); AF00000224; US\$ 10,620,000).

18. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To endorse the pre-concept note submitted by the United Nations World Meteorological Organization (WMO);
- (b) To request the secretariat to notify WMO of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the board's decision and well as the following issue:
  - (i) The proponent should strengthen the climate change rationale and elaborate on synergies with other projects;
- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 20,000;
- (d) To request WMO to transmit the observation under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Niger and Nigeria; and
- (e) To encourage the Governments of Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Niger, and Nigeria to submit, through WMO, a concept note that would also address the observation under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.36/18)

Costa Rica, Panama: Enhancing the Climate Resilience of Local Livelihoods through Nature-based Tourism in the Caribbean Communities of Limon, Costa Rica, and Bocas del Toro, Panama (Pre-concept note; United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); AF00000251; US\$ 10,693,000).

19. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) Not to endorse the pre-concept, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) Not to approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 20,000;
- (c) To suggest that UNEP reformulate the proposal taking into account the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision;
- (d) To request UNEP to transmit the observations under subparagraph (c) to the Governments of Costa Rica and Panama.

(Decision B.36/19)

*b) Report of the secretariat on initial screening/technical review of innovation small grant project proposals*

Bhutan: Building Adaptive Capacity through Innovative Management of Pests/Disease and Invasive Alien Species (IAS) in Bhutan to Enhance Sustainable Agro-Biodiversity and Livelihoods (Innovation Small Grant; Bhutan Trust Fund for Environmental Conservation (BTFEC); BTN/NIE/Agri/2021/1/Innovation; US\$ 250,000).

20. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) Not to approve the innovation small grant, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Bhutan Trust Fund for Environmental Conservation (BTFEC) to the requests made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that the BTFEC reformulate the proposal taking into account the observations in the technical review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, and the following issue:
  - (i) The proposal should provide more information on learning from the project and wider impacts of Giant African Land Snails eradication for a strategy to deal with invasive species in the agricultural sector in the climate change context;
- (c) To request BTFEC to transmit the observation under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Bhutan.

(Decision B.36/20)

Dominican Republic: Strengthening of a Replicable Micro Ecosystem for Accelerated Development of Technologies for Climate Change Adaptation of the Dominican Republic - Phase I - Disruptive Modular Dynamic Floating Breakwater Technology (Innovation Small Grant; Instituto Dominicano de Desarrollo Integral (IDDI); DOM/NIE/CZM/2021/1/Innovation; US\$ 248,734).

21. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) Not to approve the innovation small grant, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Instituto Dominicano de Desarrollo Integral (IDDI) to the requests made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that the IDDI reformulate the proposal taking into account the observations in the technical review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision;
- (c) To request IDDI to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of the Dominican Republic.

(Decision B.36/21)

Zimbabwe: Accelerating Climate Change Resilience through Climate Smart Agriculture and Landscape Management Project in Matobo District, Zimbabwe (Innovation Small Grant; Environmental Management Agency (EMA); ZWE/NIE/EBA/2021/1/Innovation; US\$ 249,970).

22. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) Not to approve the innovation small grant, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Environmental Management Agency (EMA) to the requests made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that the EMA reformulate the proposal taking into account the observations in the technical review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision;
- (c) To request EMA to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Zimbabwe.

(Decision B.36/22)

c) *Report of the secretariat on initial screening/technical review of learning grant proposal*

Kenya: Grant to Facilitate Learning and Knowledge Sharing (Learning grant; National Environment Management Authority (NEMA); Kenya/NIE/Multi/2021/Learning; US\$ 143,545).

23. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (a) To approve the project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To approve the funding of US\$ 143,545 for the implementation of the project, as requested by NEMA;
- (c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with NEMA as the national implementing entity for the project. Prior to signature, NEMA should provide clarification on alternative ways to conduct overseas exchanges in case of travel restrictions related to the coronavirus disease pandemic.

(Decision B.36/23)

d) *Innovation programme: large grant projects and programmes*

24. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To approve the Large Grant Project Proposal template, the Review Criteria template and the Instructions for Preparing a Proposal for Innovation Large Grants, as described in annexes II, III and IV to document AFB/PPRC.27/28;
- (b) To launch the request for proposals so that submissions of Innovation Large Grants proposals are invited to be considered as early as the thirty-seventh meeting of the Board.

(Decision B.36/24)

e) *Report on the Readiness Support Package Pilot*

25. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To approve the Readiness Package Grant as a standing window and replacement to South-South Cooperation Grants under the Readiness Programme to provide support for the accreditation of a National Implementing Entity (NIE) of the Fund;
- (b) That the Readiness Package Grant shall be available for accreditation of NIEs only, up to a maximum of US\$ 150,000 per country;
- (c) That Implementing Entities submitting proposals for the Readiness Package Grant should do so using the application form in Annex I of document AFB/PPRC.27/29 and that such proposals should be reviewed using the review sheet in Annex II of document AFB/PPRC.27/29;
- (d) That the review cycle and approval of Readiness Package Grants shall follow the review and approval process as well as reporting requirements for readiness grants under the Fund;
- (e) That already approved South-South Cooperation grants should continue implementation and fulfil all reporting requirements until completion;
- (f) To request the secretariat to prepare an analysis for opening the Readiness Package Grant to non-NIE intermediaries that are accredited implementing entities of the Fund;
- (g) To also request the secretariat to notify all accredited implementing entities of this decision by the Board on the Readiness Package Grant and South-South Cooperation Grants.

(Decision B.36/25)

*f) Report of the secretariat on the intersessional review cycle for readiness grants*

26. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC), the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To request the secretariat to review readiness grant proposals during all intersessional periods between Board meetings while recognizing that such grants may also be reviewed at regular meetings of the Board;
- (b) To request the PPRC to consider intersessionally the technical review of such readiness grant proposals as prepared by the secretariat and to make intersessional recommendations to the Board;
- (c) To consider such intersessionally reviewed proposals for intersessional approval in accordance with the Rules of Procedure;
- (d) To request the secretariat to send a notification to implementing entities and other stakeholders informing them about the new arrangement;



- (e) To request the secretariat to present, at the twenty-eighth meeting of the PPRC, and at subsequent PPRC meetings following each intersessional review cycle for readiness grants, an analysis of the intersessional review cycle.

(Decision B.36/26)

*g) Request for a change in project approval conditions*

Fiji: Increasing the Resilience of Informal Urban Settlements in Fiji that are Highly Vulnerable to Climate Change and Disaster Risks (United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); FJI/NIE/Urban/2016/1; US\$ 4,235,995) (Decision B.30/24).

27. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (a) To take note of the justification for the request for change in the approval conditions provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) for the project “Increasing the resilience of informal urban settlements in Fiji that are highly vulnerable to climate change and disaster risks (the Project),” as described in Annex 2 and Annex 6 of document AFB/PPRC.27/31;
- (b) To approve, on an exceptional basis, the change in project conditions as referred to in decision B.30/24, subparagraph (d), by replacing it in its entirety by the following: “UN-Habitat shall report to the Board through the annual Project Performance Reports (PPRs), following the guidance document on unidentified sub-projects (USPs) compliance (document AFB/B.32-33/7):
  - (i) The progress and performance in applying the Adaptation Fund’s Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) to the USPs and demonstrating compliance of all the project/programme activities with the ESP;
  - (ii) An updated Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) of the project that would cover all USPs it has identified during the relevant reporting period including a description of the fully formulated USPs, details on their characteristics and, the specific environmental and social setting in which the USPs will be implemented;
  - (iii) The updated ESMP which is to be prepared following the identification of USPs in compliance with the Fund’s ESP is to be attached to the annual PPR.”

(Decision B.36/27)

Solomon Islands: Enhancing Urban Resilience to Climate Change Impacts and Natural Disasters: Honiara (United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); SLB/MIE/Urban/2016/1; US\$ 4,395,877) (Decision B.30/26).

28. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (a) To take note of the justification for the request for change in the approval conditions provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) for the project “Enhancing urban resilience to climate change impacts and natural disasters: Honiara (the Project),” as described in Annex 2 and Annex 6 of document AFB/PPRC.27/32;
- (b) Approve, on an exceptional basis, the change in project conditions as referred to in decision B.30/26, subparagraph (d), by replacing it in its entirety by the following: “UN-Habitat shall report to the Board through the annual Project Performance Reports (PPRs), following the guidance document on unidentified sub-projects (USPs) compliance (document AFB/B.32-33/7):
  - (i) The progress and performance in applying the Adaptation Fund’s Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) to the USPs and demonstrating compliance of all the project/programme activities with the ESP;
  - (ii) An updated Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) of the project that would cover all USPs it has identified during the relevant reporting period including a description of the fully formulated USPs, details on their characteristics and, the specific environmental and social setting in which the USPs will be implemented;
  - (iii) The updated ESMP which is to be prepared following the identification of USPs in compliance with the Fund’s ESP is to be attached to the annual PPR.”

(Decision B.36/28)

*h) Full cost of adaptation reasoning*

29. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC), the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided to request the secretariat to develop a report including elements for defining the scope of application of the full cost of adaptation reasoning criterion, taking into consideration the programmatic developments of the Fund, and the views of the Fund’s relevant stakeholders and Board members, in a two-stage manner for consideration at the twenty-eight and twenty-ninth meetings of the PPRC.

(Decision B.36/29)

## **Agenda Item 9: Report of the twenty-seventh meeting of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC)**

### *a) Financial issues*

#### Work plan of the Board and secretariat for fiscal year 2022

30. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to approve the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat's proposed work plan for fiscal year 2022, as set out in annex I to document AFB/EFC.27/5.

(Decision B.36/30)

#### Administrative budget of the Board and secretariat and the trustee for fiscal year 2022, and of the AF-TERG and its secretariat for fiscal years 2022–2023

31. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To approve, from the resources available in the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund:
  - (i) The proposed budget of US\$ 6,678,575 to cover the costs of the operations of the Board and the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat over the period from 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022, comprising US\$ 5,313,075 for secretariat administrative services (the main secretariat budget), US\$ 608,550 for accreditation services and US\$ 756,950 for the Readiness Programme;
  - (ii) The proposed revised budget of US\$ 1,300,829 to cover the costs of the operations of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AF-TERG) and its secretariat for fiscal year 2022, from 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022, comprising US\$ 689,112 for the management component and US\$ 611,717 for the evaluation component. (The resulting increase of US\$ 113,758 over the originally approved AF-TERG budget for fiscal year 2022 consists of a carry-over of US\$ 52,739 from fiscal year 2021, and a net increase of US\$ 61,019 for fiscal year 2022 that requires an additional transfer from the Trust Fund.);
  - (iii) The proposed budget of US\$ 1,293,049 to cover the costs of the operations of the AF-TERG and its secretariat for fiscal year 2023, from 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023, comprising US\$ 689,705 for the management component and US\$ 603,344 for the evaluation component;
  - (iv) The proposed increase of US\$ 142,000 in the trustee budget for fiscal year 2021;
  - (v) The proposed budget of US\$ 861,000 for the trustee services to be provided to the Adaptation Fund during fiscal year 2022;

- (b) To authorize the trustee to transfer the amounts in subparagraphs (a) (i), (ii) and (iii) above to the respective secretariats and the amounts in subparagraphs (a) (iv) and (v) above to the trustee.

(Decision B.36/31)

*b) Report of the Chair of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group*

AF-TERG progress update on the review and revision of the evaluation framework

32. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC), the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To request the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AF-TERG), in consultation with the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat, to prepare a draft evaluation policy for the Adaptation Fund that would replace the current evaluation framework;
- (b) To request the AF-TERG to submit and present to the EFC, at its twenty-eighth meeting, the draft evaluation policy for the Board's consideration.

(Decision B.36/32)

AF-TERG synthesis of Adaptation Fund final evaluations

33. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To take note of the executive summary of the synthesis of Adaptation Fund final evaluations and five recommendations for the cohort of 17 evaluation reports analysed, as presented in document AFB/EFC.27/8;
- (b) To request the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat and the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AF-TERG) to consider the five recommendations when updating relevant frameworks/policies, templates and guidance and when planning and implementing evaluations;
- (c) To request the secretariat, in communication with the AF-TERG as necessary, to prepare a management response to the synthesis of Adaptation Fund final evaluations, for the consideration of the Board during the intersessional period between its thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh meetings.

(Decision B.36/33)

AF-TERG advisory groups

34. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To acknowledge and take note of the additional information provided by the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund, on objectives,

composition and membership of the advisory groups, roles and responsibilities, timeframe and time commitments, as presented in document AF/EFC.27/9/Rev.2, on Board participation in advisory groups;

- (b) To encourage any member wishing to participate in advisory groups, in an individual/non-representative capacity and on a voluntary basis, to consider the following in making their decision on participation: the required time commitment, their interest in the topic and any perceived or real conflict of interest.

(Decision B.36/34)

*c) Report on project inception delays and proposed options*

35. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To approve options 2 and 4, as described in document AFB/EFC.27/3, for addressing project and programme inception delays;
- (b) To grant a maximum extension of 12 months for the inception of projects and programmes, subject to their compliance with the requirements under option 2;
- (c) To require any implementing entity whose project or programme experiences, due to exceptional circumstances, a significant delay in inception (exceeding 12 months from the standard inception target of six months from the first cash transfer) to submit to the Board, through the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat, a “Request for revision of the project implementation schedule, including a revised inception date” for intersessional consideration;
- (d) To request the secretariat to communicate to implementing entities the monitoring requirement(s) under option 2.

(Decision B.36/35)

*d) Update on resource mobilization strategy and action plan*

36. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided to request the secretariat, in consultation with Resource Mobilization Task Force, to prepare a draft resource mobilization strategy for the period 2021– 2024 and a draft resource mobilization action plan and present them to the Board for its consideration at its thirty-seventh meeting.

(Decision B.36/36)

*e) Classification of implementing entity applicants as regional implementing entities*

37. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (a) To approve the review process for certified self-assessment for the determination of whether an implementing entity applicant is eligible to apply for accreditation as a regional implementing entity, as proposed in document AFB/EFC.27/11, and the certified self-assessment form set out in annex I to the document;
- (b) To endorse the proposed definition of regional implementing entity as presented in paragraph 15 of document AFB/EFC.27/11.

(Decision B.36/37)

*Other matters*

Fiduciary issues related to the United Nations Development Programme

38. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC), the Adaptation Fund Board decided to request the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat:

- (a) To coordinate with the secretariats of the Green Climate Fund and the Global Environment Facility regarding fiduciary issues associated with the projects implemented by the United Nations Development Programme;
- (b) To provide an update on any implications of the fiduciary issues referred to under subparagraph (a) above for the portfolio of the Adaptation Fund to the EFC at its twenty-eighth meeting:

(Decision B.36/38)

**Agenda Item 10: Further clarification of definition of innovation under the Adaptation Fund: analysis of relevant elements and guidance for review criteria**

39. Having considered the analysis contained in document AFB/B.36/8, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To take note of the information presented in document AFB/B.36/8 and its annex I;
- (b) To adopt the vision and definition for innovation contained in document AFB/B.36/8, as well as the innovation review criteria contained in annex I to document AFB/B.36/8;
- (c) To request the secretariat to develop, in line with decision B.35.b/9, under the continued guidance of the task force for innovation, an updated document that further refines the elements related to innovation and adaptation outlined in document AFB/B.36/8, which contains the elements below, and to present it to the Board for its consideration at its thirty-eighth meeting:
  - (i) Analysis of the global landscape of finance for innovation in climate adaptation, along with any gaps;

- (ii) Identification of potential types of risks related to innovation projects funded by the Adaptation Fund, with recommendations on the flexibility on acceptable levels specific to the type of risk;
- (iii) A proposal on the piloting of the establishment of an advisory body to support the Adaptation Fund's work on innovation on an ongoing basis.

(Decision B.36/39)

### **Agenda Item 11: Issues remaining from the second session of the thirty-fifth meeting**

#### *a) Strategic discussion on objectives and further steps of the Fund. Potential linkages between the Fund and the Green Climate Fund*

40. Having considered the ongoing efforts to enhance complementarity between the Adaptation Fund and the Green Climate Fund (GCF), as outlined in document AFB/B.36/6 and its annex I, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To take note of the report included in document AFB/B.36/6 which provides an update on the recent cooperation between the Adaptation Fund and the Green Climate Fund;
- (b) To request the Chair and Vice-Chair to continue their active engagement with the GCF Board, assisted by the secretariat, with a view to further exploring complementarity and coherence between the two funds and taking concrete steps to advance the options for fund-to-fund arrangements described in document GCF/B.22/09 and its appendix;
- (c) To request the secretariat to continue discussions with the GCF to advance the collaborative activities identified at the Annual Dialogue in November 2020 and progress in implementing the seven activities of the roadmap (annex I to document AFB/B.36/6);
- (d) To request the Chair and secretariat to provide the Board with:
  - (i) A report on the progress made in the activities described in subparagraph (c) above at its thirty-seventh meeting;
  - (ii) An update on the matter referred to in subparagraph (b) above once it has been considered by the GCF Board.

(Decision B.36/40)

#### *b) Provision of financial resources between single-country and regional concrete adaptation project and programmes (country cap)*

41. Having considered the analysis contained in document AFB/B.36/5, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To revise the cap per country established by decision B.13/23 from US\$ 10 million to US\$ 20 million for all eligible developing country Parties, so that any Party could access a total of up to US\$ 20 million from the Adaptation Fund once it had accessed funding amounting to at least US\$ 8 million for concrete single-country adaptation projects or programmes or once four years had passed since approval of the first concrete single-country adaptation project(s)/(programme(s) by the Board, whichever occurred earlier;
- (b) To set a maximum level of US\$ 10 million for an individual funding request for single-country concrete adaptation projects, provided that lower maximum levels could be set by the Board in specific circumstances, such as in the case of national implementing entities accredited through the streamlined process;
- (c) To maintain the processes already put in place for the allocation of funding for regional projects and programmes, i.e., the provision on an annual basis (fiscal year) of a specific amount for the funding of regional project and programme proposals and the pipeline established through decision B.31/3;
- (d) To assess implications of decision B.36/41 three years after the thirty-sixth meeting of the Board, taking into consideration resource availability, equitable access to funds, accreditation progress and programmatic development of the Fund;
- (e) To inform the designated authorities and accredited implementing entities of this decision.

(Decision B.36/41)

42. Having considered the analysis contained in document AFB/B.36/5, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To enable the accreditation of up to two National Implementing Entities (NIEs) per country for eligible developing-country Parties, and to request the secretariat to reflect that change in the Operational Policies and Guidelines (OPG) and to submit the revised OPG for consideration by the Board at its thirty-seventh meeting;
- (b) To strongly encourage countries to make use of the direct access modality of the Adaptation Fund in order to enhance national capacity and country ownership, including, whenever possible, through the accreditation of NIEs and the submission of projects through the same.

(Decision B.36/42)

c) *Application of the environmental and social policy by implementing agencies*

43. Having considered document AFB/B.36/9 and its annexes I and II, and document AFB/B.36/9/Add.1, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:



- (a) To maintain the status quo of the requirement of “top-level management statement communicating the entity’s commitment to abide by the Adaptation Fund’s environmental and social policy and gender policy” (TLMS) for accreditation and reaccreditation;
- (b) To request the secretariat to communicate the present decision to the implementing entities and applicants that have refused or failed to submit the TLMS as required.

(Decision B.36/43)

### **Agenda Item 12: Issues remaining from the earlier meetings**

#### *a) Options to further enhance civil society participation and engagement in the work of the Board*

44. Having considered the information contained in document AFB/B.36/7, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided to request the secretariat:

- (a) To resubmit the initial survey including the updated questions among the Board members and alternates, during the intersessional period between its thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh meetings, which reflect the Board’s discussions held at its thirty-sixth meeting, including on the need of defining civil society organizations;
- (b) To conduct a study on the need for a policy for civil society engagement with the Adaptation Fund, taking into account the practices and policies of other climate funds;
- (c) To present a document containing the outcome of the work as referred to in subparagraphs (a) and (b) above for the Board’s consideration at its thirty-seventh meeting.

(Decision B.36/44)

### **Agenda Item 15: Date and venue of meetings in 2021 and onward**

45. The Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To hold its thirty-seventh meeting:
  - (i) In Bonn, Germany, from 11–15 October 2021, if a physical meeting was possible, including the meetings of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) and the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) and the meeting of the Board;
  - (ii) Virtually, from 18–22 October 2021, if a physical meeting was not possible, preceded by virtual meetings of the PPRC and EFC from 11–15 October 2021;

- (b) To request the Chair of the Board, supported by the secretariat and informed by a survey among Board members and alternates, to determine whether a physical meeting is possible, considering the global situation of the COVID-19 pandemic and related implications on travel and gatherings, as well as the need for an equal opportunity of Board members to participate, and to circulate a decision in line with option (i) or (ii) in subparagraph (a) above to the Board for approval intersessionally;
- (c) To hold its thirty-eighth meeting in Bonn, Germany, from 14-18 March 2022;
- (d) To hold its thirty-ninth meeting in Bonn, Germany, from 10-14 October 2022.

(Decision B.36/45)

## ANNEX I

## AFB36: Summary of funding decisions for projects and programmes at the thirty-sixth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board

1. Full Proposals: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
NIE								
	Indonesia (1)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.27/5	963,456			Pending*	0
	Indonesia (2)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.27/6	824,835			Pending*	0
	Belize	PACT	AFB/PPRC.27/7	4,000,000			Not approve	0
	Tanzania (United Republic of)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC.27/8	1,400,000			Approve	1,400,000
MIE								
	Djibouti	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.27/9			5,339,285	Not approve	0
	Syrian Arab Republic	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.27/10			9,997,156	Approve	9,997,156
	Zimbabwe	UNESCO	AFB/PPRC.27/11			5,000,000	Approve	5,000,000
	<b>Sub-total, USD</b>			<b>5,400,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>20,336,441</b>		<b>16,397,156</b>
2. Concepts: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
MIE								
	Lebanon	FAO	AFB/PPRC.27/12			2,139,174	Endorse	-
	Viet Nam	FAO	AFB/PPRC.27/13			3,580,000	Endorse	-
	Yemen	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.27/14			10,000,000	Not endorse	-
	<b>Sub-total, USD</b>			<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>15,719,174</b>		<b>-</b>
3. Full Proposals: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
RIE								
	Angola, Namibia	OSS	AFB/PPRC.27/15		11,941,038		Not approve	0
MIE								
	Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.27/16			13,951,160	Not approve	0
	<b>Sub-total, USD</b>				<b>11,941,038</b>	<b>13,951,160</b>		<b>0</b>
4. Concepts: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
MIE								
	Azerbaijan, Iran (Islamic Republic of)	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.27/17			14,000,000	Endorse	-
	Chad, Sudan	FAO	AFB/PPRC.27/18			14,000,000	Endorse	-
	<b>Sub-total, USD</b>					<b>28,000,000</b>		<b>-</b>
5. Project Formulation Grants: Regional Concepts	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
MIE								
	Azerbaijan, Iran (Islamic Republic of)	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.27/17/Add.1			80,000	Approve	80,000
	Chad, Sudan	FAO	AFB/PPRC.27/18/Add.1			100,000	Approve	100,000
	<b>Sub-total, USD</b>					<b>180,000</b>		<b>180,000</b>
6. Pre-concepts: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
RIE								
	Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal	OSS	AFB/PPRC.27/19		14,000,000		Endorse	-
MIE								
	Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Niger, Nigeria	WMO	AFB/PPRC.27/20			10,620,000	Endorse	-
	Costa Rica, Panama	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.27/21			10,693,000	Not endorse	-
	<b>Sub-total, USD</b>				<b>14,000,000</b>	<b>21,313,000</b>		<b>-</b>
7. Project Formulation Grants: Regional pre-concepts	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
RIE								
	Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal	OSS	AFB/PPRC.27/19/Add.1		20,000		Approve	20,000
MIE								
	Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Niger, Nigeria	WMO	AFB/PPRC.27/20/Add.1			20,000	Approve	20,000
	Costa Rica, Panama	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.27/21/Add.1			20,000	Not approve	0
	<b>Sub-total, USD</b>				<b>20,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>		<b>40,000</b>
<b>TOTAL (1+2+3+4+5+6+7)</b>				<b>5,400,000</b>	<b>25,961,038</b>	<b>99,539,775</b>		<b>16,617,156</b>

8. Innovation Small Grants	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
NIE								
	Bhutan	BT FEC	AFB/PPRC.27/23	250,000			Not approve	0
	Dominican Republic	IDDJ	AFB/PPRC.27/24	248,734			Not approve	0
	Zimbabwe	EMA	AFB/PPRC.27/25	249,970			Not approve	0
	<i>Sub-total, USD</i>			<b>748,704</b>				-
9. Learning Grants	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
NIE								
	Kenya	NEMA	AFB/PPRC.27/27	143,545			Approve	143,545
	<i>Sub-total, USD</i>			<b>143,545</b>	-	-		<b>143,545</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b> (1+2+3+4+5+6+7+8+9)				<b>6,292,249</b>	<b>25,961,038</b>	<b>99,539,775</b>		<b>16,760,701</b>

\* In line with the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee to approve the project, the Board will consider the approval of the project, via the intersessional process, as soon as the status of the IE changes to "accredited".

## ANNEX II

**Approved FY21 and FY22 budget of the Board and Secretariat, and the Trustee, and Approved FY21, FY22 and FY23 budgets of the AF-TERG and its secretariat**

All amounts in US\$	<b>FY21</b> <b>Approved</b>	<b>FY21</b> <b>Estimate</b>	<b>FY22</b> <b>Approved</b>	
<b>BOARD AND SECRETARIAT</b>				
1 Personnel	3,247,224	3,131,130	4,111,220	
2 Travel	492,000	5,000	456,000	
3 General operations	479,700	390,000	508,875	
4 Meetings	247,362	70,000	236,980	
<b>Sub-total secretariat administrative services [a]</b>	<b>4,466,286</b>	<b>3,596,130</b>	<b>5,313,075</b>	
5 Accreditation [b]	548,250	441,300	608,550	
6 Readiness Programme [c]	652,960	100,100	756,950	
<b>Total Board and Secretariat [a] + [b] + [c]</b>	<b>5,667,496</b>	<b>4,137,530</b>	<b>6,678,575</b>	
All amounts in US\$	<b>FY21</b> <b>Approved</b>	<b>FY21</b> <b>Estimate</b>	<b>FY22</b> <b>Revised Approved</b>	<b>FY23</b> <b>Approved</b>
<b>AF-TERG AND ITS SECRETARIAT</b>				
1 Personnel	350,929	440,016	408,083	414,197
2 Travel	130,779	-	134,702	138,744
3 General operations	113,320	100,581	136,327	126,564
4 Meetings	10,000	-	10,000	10,200
<b>Sub-total management</b>	<b>605,028</b>	<b>540,597</b>	<b>689,112</b>	<b>689,705</b>
5 Evaluation	458,191	366,735	611,717	603,344
<b>Total AF-TERG and its secretariat</b>	<b>1,063,219</b>	<b>907,332</b>	<b>1,300,829</b>	<b>1,293,049</b>
All amounts in US\$	<b>FY21</b> <b>Approved</b>	<b>FY21</b> <b>Estimate</b>	<b>FY22</b> <b>Approved</b>	
<b>TRUSTEE</b>				
1 CER Monetization	180,000	170,000	180,000	
2 Financial and Program Management	227,000	320,000	320,000	
3 Investment Management	216,000	245,000	245,000	
4 Accounting and Reporting	40,000	60,000	60,000	
5 Legal Services	45,000	55,000	56,000	
<b>Total trustee</b>	<b>708,000</b>	<b>850,000</b>	<b>861,000</b>	
<b>GRAND TOTAL ALL COMPONENTS</b>	<b>7,438,715</b>	<b>5,894,862</b>	<b>8,840,404</b>	