



**GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND**

Meeting of the Board
17 – 20 July 2022
Incheon, Republic of Korea
Provisional agenda item 14

GCF/B.33/04/Add.01

24 June 2022

Guidance on the approach and scope for providing support to adaptation activities – Addendum I

Comments and responses matrix

I. Consultations and technical engagements prior to B.31

1. Previous versions of a guidance document on the approach and scope for providing support to adaptation have been published at the twenty-first, twenty-third, twenty-sixth and thirtieth meetings of the Board. On all occasions, the agenda item was not opened.
2. Prior to each of these Board meetings, the document underwent consultation with members of the Board and accredited entities through different means including webinars, technical briefings, informal discussions, and requests for inputs through email.
3. As per guidance received from the Co-Chairs in 2020, the document has been under review by the Investment Committee since B.26.
4. The table below summarizes major comments and feedback received from the Board and Investment Committee members that have been incorporated and reflected in the current document.
5. Comments and responses following B.31 are summarised in a subsequent table and explanatory text.

BM	Comments and feedback	Action taken and proposal
B.21	<p>An information document was published for Board consideration including a comparative analysis of the GCF adaptation portfolio, existing approaches to adaptation activities by multilateral funds and accredited entities (AEs), and GCF means of supporting adaptation activities through different modalities and processes (document GCF/B.21/Inf.03).</p> <p>Some key comments by the Board members were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For national adaptation plans (NAPs), explore monitoring and evaluation of projects and what sort of monitoring countries are doing to link more strongly in project design and make sure it is incorporated in proposals. - Clarification on how the adaptation approach is really translated into actionable items. 	<p>The paper included summaries of the technical expert workshop on climate adaptation finance conducted in March 2018, the session on GCF's approach to adaptation in Adaptation Futures in June 2018, and the study prepared by the WRI on the GCF's approach to adaptation.</p> <p>The document also iterated next steps for the Secretariat to take that included general approaches and actions that can further strengthen GCF support to adaptation activities.</p> <p>The general approaches referred to continued promotion of country ownership and local planning while enabling flexibility throughout the project cycle to consider local contexts; wider range of stakeholder engagement including national and subnational stakeholders, private sector, and partners in development; strategic alignment of project activities and the larger policy framework.</p> <p>The actions identified are related policy items and Board mandates that consider, or may consider, the findings of the document. This includes the annual update on complementarity and coherence, steps to enhance climate rationale, incremental and full cost methodologies, accreditation framework, recommendations from the Private Sector Advisory Group (PSAG), and the further development of the performance measurement frameworks and update to the results management framework.</p>



<p>B.23</p>	<p>Prior to B.23, the Secretariat prepared a revised draft of the document based on guidance received from the Board. An initial draft was consulted with the Board members which included recommendations from and steps to enhance climate rationale as annexes. However, the annex on climate rationale was later removed in response to guidance provided by the Co-Chairs that this will be taken up in the Board's discussion of enhancing climate rationale.</p> <p>Some key comments received from Board consultation were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On adaptation planning and country programming – how GCF can better improve the link between adaptation planning and project design, making sure it feeds into country programmes and project pipelines. - On nationally determined contributions (NDCs) – how these can be turned into GCF investment plans. - On NAPs and national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs) – how these could be the basis for climate rationale. - On sequencing of adaptation investments – how this will be done based on type, timing and economics to address issues related to project origination and demonstrate the added-value of GCF. - On climate rationale – how this is assessed and whether the use of robust attribution can be used as a form of conditionality. - On climate information in proposals – how baseline data should be strengthened as a key consideration for the assessment of funding proposals. - On additionality and costing approaches – how this will be calculated while ensuring that data and capacity gaps are considered in the approach and that flexibility is retained. - On funding gaps in particular sectors – such as health, oceans and biodiversity and how GCF intends to mobilize funding for these overlooked sectors. - On private sector engagement – how the PSAG recommendations are valuable but also ensure that an insurance programme is developed in a way that it not only 	<p>The final document published for Board consideration comprised of a summary of the previous document, follow up actions and implementation plan for the Secretariat, and the PSAG recommendations on opportunities to engage private sector in adaptation</p> <p>Linking planning to investments is addressed in the support we provide through our different modalities, including the Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme, adaptation planning and NAPs, and country programmes. Climate rationale and climate information in proposals are supported through the Project Preparation Facility as well as other engagements with organizations such as the World Meteorological Organization.</p> <p>In addition, funding gaps in particular sectors, private sector engagement and contribution to poverty reduction are addressed through the strategic adaptation ambitions of the GCF as well as the sectoral guidance, both of which are the subject of ongoing work. Costing approaches are addressed in another policy proposal on incremental cost and full cost calculation methodologies.</p>
-------------	--	--



	<p>transfers risks, but also leads to increased resilience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On the most vulnerable and poor – how GCF intends to target this population and contribute to poverty reduction. 	
B.26	<p>In preparation for B.26, the Co-Chairs agreed that the paper shall be reviewed by the Investment Committee (IC) members prior to wider Board consultation. Key questions and comments received from the IC include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarification on how the recommendation of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) on transformational adaptation projects are addressed. - Have the PSAG recommendations been noted and are they currently being addressed/pursued? How can this paper be of more use to those who are looking to invest through private sector and looking at financial instruments? - Any updates to the climate rationale? - [Reference to IEU forward-looking performance review] Clarity in the background but also reflect the IEU recommendations throughout the document and where they are touched upon. - [Private sector adaptation] Possibility of strengthening through PSAG? 	<p>In addressing the comments to the IC review, the Secretariat made further updates to the document.</p> <p>First, the discussion of the IEU in the forward-looking performance review on transformational change associated this with certain attributes linked but not limited to country ownership, results management and paradigm shift. Country ownership is ensured through readiness support, adaptation planning and country programmes. Results management is being addressed through the update of the results management framework into the integrated results management framework (IRMF), which has been consulted on with the Board previously and is part of the Board Workplan for 2020. Paradigm-shifting projects will be covered by the sectoral guidance. The current proposal has tried to remove controversial points that did not attract consensus in the past including steps to enhance climate rationale, which is being addressed in a separate paper pursuant to the Updated Strategic Plan for 2020-23, and anything related to project-level guidance.</p> <p>Lastly, the Board decided in decision B.24/04 that it would consider the PSAG recommendations under the Updated Strategic Plan. The section has been enhanced by providing additional inputs from the IEU and PSAG recommendations that are currently being addressed by the Private Sector Facility (PSF).</p>
B.30	<p>Prior to B.30, the Secretariat prepared a revised draft of the document and received the following key comments. Responses to these comments and the location of corresponding text in the present version are given in the next column.</p> <p>6. Several Board members requested that the paper include further strategic guidance on areas where the GCF should focus on improving, based on its comparative advantage and current working modalities, via additions to the draft decision text, included in annex I, specifically identifying strategic areas for the GCF to enhance adaptation support.</p>	<p>1. As suggested, an extended decision text has been proposed (annex I to this document) that explicitly addresses this comment and adds specific text regarding the enhanced role of the PSF, scaled up capacity building activities, and clear guidance for the development and assessment of adaptation proposals (which is addressed in draft “Steps</p>

	<p>7. Several suggestions recommended that the paper elaborate on and provide responses to evaluations from the IEU. It was suggested to refer to and incorporate the findings and recommendations from the recent IEU evaluation of the adaptation portfolio and approach of the GCF.</p> <p>8. Many comments explicitly encouraged further description and scaling up of the role of the PSF in adaptation programming.</p> <p>9. Several comments requested that there be an information session on the ongoing innovative GCF private sector adaptation projects to provide good practice examples of private sector involvement in adaptation and inspiration to prospective GCF project proponents.</p> <p>10. Other comments highlighted that the document could provide better guidance to help AEs and other stakeholders fully understand the GCF mandate to enhance adaptation. One of the key challenges around adaptation is the difficulty in distinguishing between climate change adaptation projects and general development projects, and this is not well addressed in the document.</p>	<p>to enhance the climate rationale of GCF-supported activities”).</p> <p>2. Additions and modifications to the text have been included, which summarizes the key recommendations from the IEU evaluation “Independent Evaluation of the Adaptation Portfolio and Approach of the GCF”, and the Secretariat responses.</p> <p>3. The revised paper places a greater focus on the comparative advantage of the GCF with renewed emphasis on the role of the PSF. The role of the Private Sector Strategy in boosting adaptation action is also reflected in the decision text in annex I of this document.</p> <p>4. The Secretariat notes the suggestion and will raise the issue of information sessions during the further dialogue to agree the content of a final draft. Scaled-up capacity building is reflected in the decision text in annex I of this document.</p> <p>5. Additions and modifications to the text now more clearly articulate future ambition and strategy for adaptation (section IV, Support for developing the adaptation portfolio). The issue of the intertwined nature of adaptation and development is addressed completely in the companion paper, “Steps to enhance the climate rationale of GCF-supported activities”.</p>
--	---	--

II. Technical engagements prior to B.31

5. To inform the guidance on the GCF support to adaptation activities, the Secretariat undertook a number of activities to collect information, insights, experience and good practices from stakeholders. Firstly, in order to identify adaptation financing gaps and priorities in the global climate adaptation finance landscape, the Secretariat commissioned the WRI to conduct a preliminary study to analyse the portfolio balance and investment priorities of the GCF to support adaptation activities. This included a comparative analysis of GCF and other climate funds, good practices establishing climate rationale and costing approaches for adaptation projects. The study also examined the role of accredited entities and private sector engagement in adaptation. The findings can be found in document GCF/B.21/Inf.03/Add.01.

6. Additionally, the Secretariat organized a two-day technical expert workshop to collect expert views on climate adaptation practices and approaches to adaptation finance. A total of 42 experts attended from different regions and varying institutions, including government, research and funding institutions, and civil society organizations, including the nominated experts from the Adaptation Committee, the Least Developed Countries Expert Group and the Standing Committee on Finance of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

7. During this workshop, a discussion on identifying transformative adaptation activities was undertaken. The converging opinion of the participants was that a set of principles and clearer guidance are needed to carry this issue forward, yet it should be contextualized locally and should not be an indicative list of activities. Given that adaptation is a response to specific climate risks and impacts, which are often local in nature and variable over time, it is important for the principles and guidance to remain flexible but harmonized with the UNFCCC and other existing frameworks and guidance for ease of implementation. The participants noted that shifting towards a more systematic approach to designing adaptation actions is necessary. It was also recognized that it is critical to build on better practices that consider forecasting, timescales, financial innovations, policy and regulatory frameworks as well as human and institutional capacity as part of an iterative adaptation planning process. Support for creating an enabling environment was strongly emphasized as a focus area that could lead to transformational adaptation actions and that it would be important to identify and invest in enablers for adaptation actions as they are often not the first tier of actions. It was also emphasized that investment decisions are affected by policy and regulatory barriers, and by lack of information and capacity to measure and translate known climate risks into businesses. Needs with regard to overcoming policy and regulatory barriers, including those identified in document GCF/B.17/03 titled “Analysis of barriers to crowding-in and maximizing the engagement of the private sector, including PSAG recommendations” were shared and reiterated by many participants.

8. The Secretariat also organized a session at Adaptation Futures 2018, held on 18–21 June, in Cape Town, South Africa, at which around 50 stakeholders engaged in the discussion, including direct access entities and national designated authorities. Furthermore, the Secretariat organized a Thematic Expert Meeting on Adaptation as part of the UNFCCC NAP Expo 2019 and Korea Global Adaptation Week 2019 in Songdo, Korea, in April 2019. Participants were introduced to best available approaches for developing and utilizing robust climate science and data for project preparation and took part in sectoral dialogues within various adaptation sectors. The first GCF Working Paper, which highlights some of the key issues in adaptation, was launched at the event.

9. The Secretariat has continued to respond to the key findings and insights from these engagements not only through the development of this guidance on the GCF approach and scope to support adaptation, but also through strengthening and improving our processes and practices throughout the different GCF modalities.

III. Technical engagements subsequent to B.31

At B.31 the Board agreed to urgently clarify the GCF's role in and vision for climate adaptation, inter alia, by requesting the Secretariat to update the draft paper on 'Guidance on the approach and scope for providing support to adaptation activities' for consideration by the Board at B.32, by incorporating the findings and recommendations of the evaluation and the views expressed by Board and alternate members at B.31. The briefing note circulated to the co-chairs prior to B.32 is reproduced here:

Briefing Note for Co-Chairs and Co-facilitators on GCF/B.32/07 "Guidance on the approach and scope for providing support to adaptation activities": how Board member views to the adaptation evaluation were taken into account in the B.32 adaptation paper, and how the paper responds to the B.31 decision

1. Annex IV of the updated paper (GCF/B.32/07) summarizes all prior consultations and technical engagements on the paper since the original decision requesting the Secretariat develop guidance on the approach and scope for providing support to adaptation activities (B.17/10).
2. At B.31, under agenda item 16(c), the Co-Chairs invited representatives from the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) to introduce document GCF/B.30/13 titled "Independent evaluation of the adaptation portfolio and approach of the Green Climate Fund". The IEU evaluation made recommendations in six key areas: positioning; capacity; private sector; access and business model; results and impact measurement; and innovation and risk. In response to these specific recommendations, Table 2 of the updated paper summarizes the actions being taken by the Secretariat or planned to be undertaken as part of the Updated Strategic Plan for 2020-23.
3. The Board discussion that ensued is reported in full in the report of the thirty-first meeting of the Board (GCF/B.31/15/Drf.01) under agenda item 16(c). A concise summary is given here. Following the IEU presentation, a Board member delivered a statement on behalf of the African Group of Board members. That statement noted that whilst some progress has been made by the Fund since the evaluation was published, the GCF has not yet identified or defined a specific approach or vision for adaptation programming, drawing particular attention to (a) the relatively small scale of adaptation projects compared to mitigation projects; and (b) the length of time required to complete the approval process (109 days more than mitigation projects on average). The statement concurred with the evaluation on two further specific points: (c) that interaction and coherence between GCF proposals, other climate funds, multilateral partners and the private sector is not systematically identified and pursued; and (d) that the GCF should clarify its role beyond adaptation finance. The statement concluded that the GCF should advance a coherent vision for its role in addressing the adaptation finance gap, and proposed that that the Board move forward with a decision on GCF support for adaptation. The full statement can be found in Annex XI of document GCF/B.31/15/Drf.01 (p. 206-207).
4. Following the statement, the same Board member noted that in the context of adaptation the private sector is not sufficiently incentivized. Other Board members commented on the vital role of the private sector strategy, on an expanded role for the GCF in adaptation finance, and on the GCF playing a critical role in finding ways to mobilize private sector finance in adaptation. A Board member called for a holistic approach to adaptation challenges and an enhanced role for the GCF in providing adaptation support to developing countries. Annex III in the updated paper elucidates a forward-looking strategic approach to accelerate adaptation support with a distinct focus on the role of the private sector.

5. The Co-Chairs reopened the agenda sub-item, following a suspension, and proposed a decision text to the Board. The Board discussed the semantics of the proposed decision text, recognizing that the decision was a correct enactment of the Evaluation Policy that allows the Board to take a decision on adaptation matters as early as B.32. The decision, B.31/13, was adopted and is now included in the compendium of decisions from B.31 and will be inserted in the report of the thirty-first meeting of the Board (GCF/B.31/15/Drf.01). During discussions of the decision text the Co-Chairs told the Board that the clarification of the role and vision of the GCF for climate adaptation would be translated into the updated paper to be submitted to B.32.
6. Decision B.31/13 reads as follows: The Board, have considered the Independent Evaluation Units adaptation portfolio and approach of the Green Climate Fund undertaken, as well as relevant elements of the Independent Evaluations:
 - (a) *Takes note* of the independent evaluation of the adaptation portfolio and approach of the Green Climate Fund undertaken by the Independent Evaluation Unit, completed in accordance with the Board approved work plan of the IEU;
 - (b) *Also notes* the Secretariat's management response to the Evaluation as presented in document GCF/B.30/13/Add.01;
 - (c) *Requests* the IEU to present a management action report to the Board no later than one-year following the adoption of this decision;
 - (d) *Agrees* to urgently clarify the GCF's role in and vision for climate adaptation, inter alia, by requesting the Secretariat to update the draft paper on 'Guidance on the approach and scope for providing support to adaptation activities' for consideration by the Board at B.32, by incorporating the findings and recommendations of the evaluation and the views expressed by Board and alternate members at B.31.
7. In response to B.31/13 (d), the updated paper responds to the comments made during B.31 and the request of the Board by describing new strategic approaches to adaptation programming, noting that adaptation programming will evolve as part of strategic programming for the second replenishment of the GCF (GCF-2).

In May 2022, the paper was presented at B.32 (GCF/B.32/07). Since there had been insufficient time for written consultations with Board Members, the Co-Chairs opened the floor for comments but took no decision on the agenda item. Those comments have been incorporated into this latest draft and were summarized for the co-chairs in the following briefing note:

Briefing Note: Further consultation with Board Members on "Guidance on the approach and scope for providing support to adaptation activities"

I. Introduction and proposed approach to further consultations

1. This briefing note is designed to support further consultations with Board Members on the Guidance on the approach and scope for providing support to adaptation activities, following B.32. It provides the Secretariat's summary of: (1) outstanding issues of a potentially political nature, on which divergent views were expressed by Board members at B.32 (Section C); and (2) technical amendments to the paper requested at B.32 (Section D).
2. Given the limited time available between B.32 and B.33 for producing multiple new iterations of the draft, the Secretariat proposes to consult Board members on the basis of this note, with a particular focus on determining if a suitable way forward can be found on the issues identified in Section C. The Secretariat will then take the Board's comments from

B.32, and the further feedback provided in consultations on this note into account, in producing a revised draft. At the conclusion of Secretariat consultations, the Secretariat will brief the Co-Chairs on outstanding matters that may need to be taken up in Co-Chair consultations. This proposed way forward has been developed in consultation with the Co-Chairs.

II. Recent history of Board consideration and Board/AE/Co-Chairs consultations

3. The Co-Chairs held a consultation on the B.32 published draft on Tuesday 10 May. Because of the limited time between B.31 and B.32, the Secretariat did not conduct a written consultation prior to B.32. The last written consultation, on an earlier version, was over July-August 2021. The item was opened and discussed by the Board at B.32.

III. Key outstanding political issues

4. Based on B.32 discussions, the following represent the Secretariat's assessment of issues of a potentially political nature on which diverging views were expressed, including those related to the mandate for and purpose of the paper:

- (a) The intent of and audience for the paper, including where to take up practical guidance on preparation of quality adaptation proposals. Based on discussions at B.32, there seemed to be broad support for the paper elaborating strategic directions on adaptation programming. There was general (though not unanimous) comfort with the descriptive content on the approach and scope for supporting adaptation activities, though some members queried the purpose and value of this section. There were divergent views on whether this paper should also provide more detailed practical guidance to stakeholders on the elaboration of quality adaptation proposals, or whether this should be taken up in paper on steps to enhance climate rationale;
- (b) Addressing issues behind the original mandate linked to eligibility of adaptation activities. Some members raised questions around whether the paper addressed underlying issues related to the original mandate, in particular related to providing clear policy direction on the scope of adaptation proposals and their relevance to climate change. Others requested the paper be more specific in defining the relationship and distinctions between adaptation and development. Others considered that these matters could be dealt with through the steps to enhance climate rationale; however the countervailing view was that the paper on climate rationale was guidance-based, not prescriptive, and so could not speak to eligibility. The Secretariat notes that an explicit resolution of this issue had proved politically contentious in much earlier versions of the paper;
- (c) How to further evolve an adaptation programming strategy: While there was relatively widespread support for the paper elaborating strategic directions on adaptation programming, there were differing views expressed as to whether this should dovetail into strategic programming for GCF-2, or be a distinct long-term adaptation strategy. There were also differing perspective expressed on whether the focus of a strategy should be establishing a long-term vision/approach for adaptation programming, focusing more immediately on an action plan to move the GCF-1 portfolio to 50:50 balance, or both;
- (d) How and where to take up broader dimensions of the IEU evaluation: There were questions raised on how and where IEU evaluation findings and recommendations

not directly related to an adaptation strategy (e.g. related to potential changes to other policies, processes etc) would be taken up.

IV. Issues of a technical nature

5. The Secretariat also identified from the B.32 discussion a number of requests for more technical additions to or amendments of the paper, which could be readily integrated into a revised draft. The issues mentioned include:

- Further integrate gender considerations
- Clarify GCF’s unique position on adaptation, including comparative advantage through its high-risk appetite
- Clearer explanation of role of partners and complementarity/coherence with other funds
- Stronger focus on locally led climate action and particularly vulnerable countries and groups, behavioural as well as technological change – in the context of Annex III
- Stronger focus on nature-based solutions
- Stronger focus on diversification of financial instruments for adaptation
- Further integrate new areas of adaptation, disaster risk financing, loss and damage, and CIEWS
- Emphasise improved coordination between NDAs, AEs, local stakeholders, private sector
- Elaborate on the strategic approach for translating NDCs/NAPs into implementation
- Recognize regional aspects to adaptation and the role of single and multi-country programmes
- Emphasise development and sharing of a set of best practices from stakeholders

6. The Secretariat also notes that some pieces of additional analysis requested by Board members, for example better understanding barriers to good adaptation proposals, mapping of GCF support for adaptation planning, and an assessment of developing countries’ adaptation priorities as expressed through NDCs/NAPs/RPSP are being worked on in parallel in the context of preparing for GCF-2 strategic programming and could be ready for presentation to the Board for its informal discussions from B.33.

7. Following discussions at B.32 the Secretariat and Board held a technical session on 13 June 2022 where it was proposed to redraft the document, incorporating all comments from B.32 and inviting further comments from Board Members until 21 June for publication of the revised draft on 24 June 2022.

8. The table below summarizes the comments received during B.32 as well as one further written comment from a Board Member. All comments have been addressed in the revised draft.

Outstanding issue discussed at B.32, and again at the 13 June technical session	Secretariat response and proposed revision to address the issue
The intent of and audience for the paper, including where to take up practical guidance on preparation of quality adaptation proposals	Based on broad support for both elaborating strategic direction and a description of the approach for adaptation support from concept to implementation, the proposal is for a single integrated annex that presents: (1) The GCF mandate and vision for promoting climate

	<p>adaptation action; (2) The GCF strategic approach to adaptation programming; and (3) The scope and modalities for providing support to adaptation activities</p> <p>The revised draft will explain that practical guidance on proposal development will be taken up in parallel paper ‘Steps to enhance the climate rationale...’</p>
Addressing issues behind the original mandate linked to eligibility of adaptation activities	<p>Include decision text that addresses this issue directly, recalling Decision B.05/05 (“resources will be allocated based on the ability of a proposed activity to demonstrate its potential to adapt to the impacts of climate change in the context of promoting sustainable development”) and proposing that in order to demonstrate such potential, adaptation proposals should include evidence-based analysis to show that the proposed activity is likely to be an effective adaptive response to the risk or impact of a specific climate change hazard</p>
How to further evolve adaptation strategy?	<p>Integrated annex as proposed above and noting that this vision dovetails into the GCF-2 strategic programming</p>
Broader issues from IEU evaluation	<p>The revised draft will summarize key actions being taken by the Secretariat, consistent with the IEU recommendations. Responses will also be taken up in the context of relevant programming/ policy frameworks (e.g. RPSP work programme, accreditation strategy, programmatic approach , etc.)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further integrate gender considerations • Clarify GCF’s unique position on adaptation, including comparative advantage through its high-risk appetite • Clearer explanation of role of partners and complementarity/coherence with other funds • Stronger focus on locally led climate action and particularly vulnerable countries and groups, behavioural as well as technological change – in the context of Annex III • Stronger focus on nature-based solutions • Stronger focus on diversification of financial instruments for adaptation • Further integrate new areas of adaptation, disaster risk financing, loss and damage, and CIEWS • Emphasise improved coordination between NDAs, AEs, local stakeholders, private sector 	<p>All these recommendations have been adopted in the revised draft document</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Elaborate on the strategic approach for translating NDCs/NAPs into implementation• Recognize regional aspects to adaptation and the role of single and multi-country programmes• Emphasise development and sharing of a set of best practices from stakeholders	
<p>The documents “Guidance on the approach and scope for providing support to adaptation activities” and “Steps to enhance the climate rationale” should be both discussed and adopted at B33, as they complement each other, and in order to: i) avoid overlapping of objectives and double work by the Secretariat, Accredited Entities, iTAP and the Board; ii) avoid confusion when elaborating and reviewing funding proposals; and iii) provide a better critical assessment of whether the documents are effective or should be further improved.</p>	<p>The Secretariat notes this comment and agrees that considering these two papers together satisfies multiple objectives and avoids confusion and duplication of effort.</p>
<p>On the coordination with local stakeholders: we would suggest proposing an explicit mention of CSOs explaining why they are relevant for adaptation</p>	<p>The Secretariat agrees with this suggestion and has included text in the revised draft to reflect the recommendation</p>
