



## ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.16/4  
28 March 2015

---

Adaptation Fund Board  
Project and Programme Review Committee  
Sixteenth Meeting  
Bonn, Germany, 7-8 April 2015

Agenda Item 7

### **OPTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE TRACKING OF CHANGES MADE BETWEEN DIFFERENT VERSIONS OF PROJECT/PROGRAMME PROPOSALS**

## **Background**

1. At the fifteenth meeting of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC), committee members discussed the ways to improve the tracking of changes made by the proponents to the project documents following the technical review of the secretariat. The issue was how to ensure that the PPRC was made aware of the changes that had taken place in the iterations of the proposals between the previous meetings of the Board and the present meeting. The options discussed included:

- (a) Highlight in colour the changes made to the document as a response to the clarification requests of the secretariat;
- (b) Use a colour coding to represent the different stages that the document had passed through such as the initial review of the final review;
- (c) Circulate to PPRC members copies of the versions of proposals with tracked changes, where they existed; or
- (d) Provide the committee with a simple statement explaining how the proponents had responded to the observations of the Board.

2. Until now, the usual practice has been that, once the final review had taken place the secretariat posted a clean version of the proposal on the website that did not indicate the changes that had been made to the text. Some of the challenges faced in tracking the changes included the fact that each resubmission was treated as a new proposal and that it was difficult to track all the changes in the project submissions as some went through several iterations and were substantially modified over time.

3. Following recommendation by the PPRC, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided to request the secretariat, in order to assist the committee in its review of the proposals, to present to the PPRC, at its sixteenth meeting, options for:

- (a) Improving the tracking of changes made between different versions of project/programme proposals; and
- (b) Providing the committee with an explanation on how the proponents had responded to the observations of the Board.

(Decision B. 24/20)

4. The present paper presents such options for the consideration of the committee. As first submissions of fully-developed proposals in a two-step approval process are considered as new submissions by the secretariat, the versions of proposals to be considered in this document do not include changes made between the concept stage and the fully-developed proposal stage, in order to avoid confusions. Since some sections of the proposal template are requested to be completed by the proponents at the fully-developed proposal stage only, it makes it irrelevant to compare the concept and fully-developed versions of a proposal. However, since at endorsement stage the Board usually makes some observations which the proponents are expected to take into account when developing the fully-developed proposal, the secretariat assesses how those observations have been taken into account when the fully-developed proposal is submitted for the first time after concept endorsement.

**Options for improving the tracking of changes and responses to the observations made between different versions of project/programme proposals**

5. To allow for better consideration of the proposed options, the review of an existing proposal, i.e. the proposal for Jordan which is submitted at the present meeting, will be taken as an example. This proposal is presented in document AFB/PPRC.16/11 submitted to the PPRC for its consideration.

*Tracking changes made during the same review cycle*

6. During the current review cycle, the review sheets provided at initial stage (see annex 1) and posted with the final PPRC document (annex 2) include clarification requests made by the secretariat along with a technical summary of the issues identified during the review cycle and details of how those issues have been addressed by the revised proposal. Under the current practice, the initial review of the secretariat is shared with the proponents only. The final review sheet (annex 2) presents at once the initial comments of the secretariat (Comments on 22 February 2015) and the final comments following the submission of a revised document in response to the initial review (Comments on 15 March 2015).

- **Option 1:** *The initial technical review could be circulated to the PPRC at the same time it is sent to the proponent. This could help the PPRC members follow the review of proposals at its initial stage.*

7. The revised proposal submitted following the initial review is usually posted on the AF website in its clean format, excluding tracked changes.

- **Option 2:** *The revised proposals submitted during the same review cycle could be posted with tracked changes or highlighted text.*

*Tracking changes between meetings*

8. In its current reporting structure, the changes made in submissions of a fully-developed proposal between meetings are reflected through the observations made at the previous submissions of the proposal. As an example, document AFB/PPRC.16/11 includes the observations made by the Board in its decision B.24/11 at its twenty-fourth meeting, as follows:

[A fully-developed programme document was submitted to the Board at its twenty-fourth meeting and the Board decided to:

- (a) *Not approve the fully-developed programme document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC) to the request made by the technical review;*
- (b) *Suggest that MOPIC reformulates 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) *As a general observation, the proposal should be more concise and structured; as an example among others, the section on consistency with the national*

*development strategies could be limited to strictly demonstrate consistency with national plans and strategies with the relevant information;*

- (ii) The demonstration of cost effectiveness should be improved through providing the costs of alternatives to the proposed programme activities, including but not limited to investment in large water retention/harvesting infrastructures, cost of fresh water for irrigation versus treated waste water, alternative water resources and alternatives to permaculture;*
  - (iii) Although a table on compliance with the environmental and social principles established by the Fund is provided, no potential impacts and risks or further assessment or mitigation measures were identified, including risks on public health and pollution as well as soil conservation. Also, several risks rated medium to very high were identified in other parts of the document, for which mitigation measures or procedures are not provided;*
  - (iv) The proposal should include an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), together with implementation arrangements and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) provisions, which will contain all the relevant elements. The ESMP is required for category B projects for which the proposed activities requiring environmental and social assessment do not represent a minor part of the project;*
  - (v) The programme budget needs to be organized in a way to allow for an assessment of the costs based on the programme's expected outputs. In addition the proposal should include budget notes;*
  - (vi) The proposal should justify the "development and preparation" budget under the implementing entity fees (US\$ 144,600), since a project Formulation Grant (PFG) was already provided to the NIE for programme preparation;*
  - (vii) The proposal should include a programme results framework which should include programme outcome and output indicators, baseline and targets which would help in the achievement of the programme's objectives, including sex disaggregated data and at least one Adaptation Fund core outcome indicator; and*
- (c) Request MOPIC to transmit the observations under item (b) to the Government of Jordan.*

*(Decision B.24/11)]*

9. Also, it should be noted that in many cases, including the case of the proposal for Jordan, the proponents had submitted, along with the proposal, a table explaining how the clarification requests (CRs) made in the previous technical review and the observations made by the Board during the previous meeting had been addressed in the current submission (see Annex 3).

10. Consequently, although it is not explicitly stated in the initial review presented in Annex 1, the review includes the analysis made by the secretariat on how the observations made during the previous meeting had been addressed.<sup>1</sup>

11. Since it is not mandatory for the proponent to provide a new submission of the document in tracked changes, the document posted on the AF website does not allow for a systematic tracking of the changes made between the two meetings.

12. Based on the points made above, the following four options could be considered altogether or alternatively to improve the tracking of changes made between different meetings and to explain how the proponents had responded to the observations of the Board made in previous meetings:

- **Option 1:** *Include in the PPRC document presenting the proposal the final technical review sheets prepared in the past meetings and the current one.*
- **Option 2:** *Make mandatory the practice of submitting a response table explaining how the observations made by the Board had been addressed when a proposal previously reviewed in a past meeting is submitted for consideration. A response sheet template could be prepared by the secretariat, to be used by all proponents. The said explanatory document could be posted on the website along with the proposal or as part of the PPRC document presenting the proposal<sup>2</sup> (e.g. document AFB/PPRC.16/11); and/or*
- **Option 3:** *Reflect in the initial technical review sheet, either in an additional column or in a separate text, an analysis of the changes made in the document in order to address the observations and clarification requests made in a past meeting; and/or*
- **Option 4:** *Request the proponent to submit the proposal document to be considered at a Board meeting with tracked changes (or highlighted text) reflecting the changes made to the proposal submitted at a past meeting to address the observations made by the Board at that meeting. Such document would be posted on the AF website.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Also, the secretariat had taken good note of the observations made by the PPRC members at the earlier meetings on avoiding adding new requests in the proposal when related requests made in previous versions of the document had already been addressed by the proponent.

<sup>2</sup> In case of inconsistency between the response sheet and the proposal, the information contained in the proposal would prevail (as is the secretariat's de facto practice).

**Annex 1: Initial technical review – Proposal for Jordan**



**ADAPTATION FUND BOARD SECRETARIAT TECHNICAL REVIEW  
OF PROJECT/PROGRAMME PROPOSAL**

PROJECT/PROGRAMME CATEGORY: Regular-sized Project

Country/Region: **Jordan**

Project/Programme Title: **Increasing the resilience of poor and vulnerable communities to climate change impacts in Jordan through implementing innovative projects in water and agriculture in support of adaptation to climate change**

AF Project ID: **JOR/NIE/Multi/2012/1**

NIE/MIE Project/Programme ID:

Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars): **9,226,000**

Regular Project/Programme Concept Approval Date: **Oct 2013**

Anticipated Submission of final RP document (if applicable): **n/a**

Reviewer and contact person: **Daouda Ndiaye**

Co-reviewer(s): **Mikko Ollikainen**

NIE/MIE Contact Person: **Hazar Badran**

Review Criteria	Questions	Comments
Country Eligibility	1. Is the country party to the Kyoto Protocol?	Yes.
	2. Is the country a developing country particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change?	Yes. Jordan is one of the ten driest countries in the world with demand for water exceeding the available resources, and this will be exacerbated by future climate change.
Project Eligibility	1. Has the designated government authority for the Adaptation Fund endorsed the project/programme?	No.
	2. Does the project / programme support concrete adaptation actions to assist the country in addressing adaptive capacity to the adverse effects of climate change and build in climate resilience?	This programme is very relevant for a country that clearly faces CC risks in addition to existing biophysical challenges, such as water scarcity and land degradation. The proposed approach includes concrete adaptation actions of major significance to two important sectors: water and agriculture sector. The proposed actions for water build on an existing effort by the government to increase water harvesting and the reuse of waste water for productive purposes, especially in regions where irrigation is critical.

	3. Does the project / programme provide economic, social and environmental benefits, particularly to vulnerable communities, including gender considerations, while avoiding or mitigating negative impacts, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund?	Yes, the project takes account of multiple benefits to be generated from the investment, including considerations of the critical role of women. The entire focus of the project is to address priority needs of vulnerable communities in geographies of crucial importance to the national economy. Hence the integrated approach to taking into account environment, economic and social needs is clearly articulated.
	4. Is the project / programme cost effective?	Yes, the proposed approach can be deemed cost-effective since it will build on existing and planned government commitments to the two targeted sectors, which will also ensure sustainability of the outcomes.
	5. Is the project / programme consistent with national or sub-national sustainable development strategies, national or sub-national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, national communications and adaptation programs of action and other relevant instruments?	Yes, consistency with the national development strategies is clearly articulated and justified. It is further strengthened by the fact the NIE is also the government entity responsible for the country's development planning.
	6. Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund??	Yes.
	7. Is there duplication of project / programme with other funding sources?	No.
	8. Does the project / programme have a learning and knowledge management component to capture and feedback lessons?	Yes, mainly under component 2.
	9. Has a consultative process taken place, and has it involved all key stakeholders, and vulnerable groups, including gender considerations?	Yes.

	10. Is the requested financing justified on the basis of full cost of adaptation reasoning?	Yes.
	11. Is the project / program aligned with AF's results framework?	Yes.
	12. Has the sustainability of the project/programme outcomes been taken into account when designing the project?	Yes.
	13. Does the project / programme provide an overview of environmental and social impacts / risks identified?	<p>Yes. The programme has identified a number of environmental and social risks in line with the ESP, and has done this overall well.</p> <p>Nonetheless, some important risks seem not to have been explicitly identified or identified at all:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Large influxes of refugees from Syria and Iraq are reported but it is unclear if and to what extent they are present in the project areas. They would be an important vulnerable group, and the risks to them as a group and as individuals resulting from project funding should be explicitly identified and assessed, as needed.</li> <li>b. <i>Gender equity and Women's Empowerment</i>: on p. 18, last item in 2<sup>nd</sup> column of Component 2 has job creation targets disaggregated by gender: 5,400 for women and 14,400 for men, which amounts to 19,800, not 18,000, but importantly, what are the grounds that justify this gender-differentiated job creation targeting?</li> <li>c. On the same principle, p. 19. the target of 240 families for outcome 1, component 1, states that the average family size is 6 - 2 females and 4 males. This should be explained.</li> <li>d. <i>Core Labour Rights</i>: the risks described on p. 107 do not mention child labour.</li> <li>e. <i>Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</i>: p. 25-26 mentions the building of a factory to produce dairy products. The major waste product of dairy processing plants is polluted water, either extracted from the milk or from cleaning the processing installation and equipment. The risk assessment on p. 109 for this principle should be changed to 'yes' accordingly.</li> <li>f. <i>Natural Habitats and Biodiversity</i>: the risks associated with the rainwater harvesting activities on habitats that will receive less rainwater as a consequence seem overall underestimated. The ecological value and importance of these temporary streams seems considerably under-appreciated (see also p. 130, paragraph before point D.). <b>CR1</b></li> </ul>



Resource Availability	1. Is the requested project / programme funding within the cap of the country?	Yes.
	2. Is the Implementing Entity Management Fee at or below 8.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget before the fee?	Yes. The requested Implementing Entity fees are set at 8.5 per cent of the total programme budget before the fees.
	3. Are the Project/Programme Execution Costs at or below 9.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget (including the fee)?	Yes. The requested execution costs are set at 8.27 per cent of the total programme budget.
Eligibility of NIE/MIE	4. Is the project/programme submitted through an eligible NIE/MIE that has been accredited by the Board?	Yes. MOPIC is an accredited NIE.
Implementation Arrangement	1. Is there adequate arrangement for project / programme management?	Yes.
	2. Are there measures for financial and project/programme risk management?	Yes.

	<p>3. Are there measures in place for the management of for environmental and social risks, in line with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund? <a href="#">Proponents are encouraged to refer to the draft Guidance document for Implementing Entities on compliance with the Adaptation Fund Environmental and Social Policy, for details.</a></p>	<p>Yes. The proposal contains an ESMP, which is justified given the risks present and the fact that some activities are not fully identified. The ESMP is currently at 43 pages quite long and contains very useful information. Specific Environmental monitoring and management plans (EMMPs) were developed following EIAs that were carried out for the wastewater treatment plants from which treated wastewater will be sourced for the programme. Table (41) is the Environmental and Social Risks Management and Monitoring Plan (ESMMP) which is part of the ESMP for the case of direct treated wastewater effluent reuse as in the case of Wadi Mousa WWTP project (1.1) and the rainwater harvesting through the construction of earthen dams project (1.5), whereas Table (42) is for the case of mixed water quality (TWW mixed with fresh water supplies) such as in the case of Jordan Valley where the effluent from WWTPs is mixed with fresh water supplies downstream of king Talal Reservoir for the case of Northern Jordan Valley (Irbid, Dougara and Shallalah), North Shouneh and Tal Mantah WWTPs. The ESMP should focus on the mechanism for risk assessment for the activities that have not been fully identified, on risk mitigation measures for those risks identified and in a way commensurate with the risks. Tables 41 and 42 provide information on the mitigation measures and institutions responsible for the implementation of those measures, for the risks identified. However the risks identified are not linked with the 15 principles of the ESP. The information in those tables is still useful, however the ESMP document should provide a framework for addressing the 15 principles for the programme as a whole, including all the risks identified in the individual projects, and linking them to the respective principles of the ESP and, lastly, outlining the responsibilities for monitoring and implementation of the identified mitigation measures for each risk. Such framework could build on the information provided in tables 39, 41, 42 and 43. <b>CR2.</b></p> <p>Also, it is unclear if the wastewater reuse master plan that is discussed on p. 127 was also included in the EIAs that were carried out for the wastewater treatment plants from which treated wastewater will be sourced for the project (p. 127). <b>CR3.</b></p> <p>Lastly, the ESP categorization applies to the programme as a whole, and it is not envisaged to be used for separate sub-projects or individual project activities (p. 59). The activity or sub-project with the highest degree of risk determines the risk level and hence the category for the whole programme. Therefore, the programme is considered a Category B programme.</p>
	<p>4. Is a budget on the Implementing Entity Management Fee use included?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

	5. Is an explanation and a breakdown of the execution costs included?	Yes.
	6. Is a detailed budget including budget notes included?	Yes. <b>CR4:</b> However, more detail is needed to better assess the budget, including on, but not limited to, the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The costs of technologies of water filtration systems</li> <li>ii. The operational costs incurred by the individual projects;</li> <li>iii. Details of the technical assistance budgets;</li> <li>iv. Permaculture pilots and capacity building activities under the permaculture project;</li> <li>v. JV regional grading, packing and cold storage facilities.</li> </ul>
	7. Are arrangements for monitoring and evaluation clearly defined, including budgeted M&E plans ?	Yes.
	8. Does the M&E Framework include a break-down of how implementing entity IE fees will be utilized in the supervision of the M&E function?	Yes.
	9. Does the project/programme's results framework align with the AF's results framework and include sex-disaggregated data, targets and indicators? Does it include at least one core outcome indicator from the Fund's results framework?	
	10. Is a disbursement schedule with time-bound milestones included?	Yes. However, schedule dates need to be revised. <b>CR5.</b>

<p>Technical Summary</p>	<p>Jordan is a country particularly vulnerable to drought, being one of the ten driest countries in the world with demand for water exceeding the available resources, which will be exacerbated by future climate change.</p> <p>The proposal seeks to adapt the agricultural sector in Jordan to climate change induced water shortages and stresses on food security through piloting innovative technology transfer, policy support linked to community livelihoods &amp; resilience. The programme presents eight projects divided under two main components, with component 1 presenting five projects related to concrete adaptation solutions to address water scarcity and agriculture in vulnerable regions in Jordan notably through reuse of treated waste water, and component 2 presenting three projects related to policy reforms, training and knowledge management.</p> <p>This objective will be achieved through the following two components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Component 1: Climate change adaptation of Agricultural &amp; water Sector through</u></li> </ul>
--------------------------	---

Technology Transfer (The use of Non-conventional water resources (Reuse of wastewater, rainwater harvesting & perma-culture),

- Component 2: Capacity Building at both the national and local/community levels respectively, knowledge Dissemination, policy and legislation mainstreaming.

This is the second submission of the proposal as a fully-developed programme document. It was submitted to the Board at its 24<sup>th</sup> meeting and the Board decided not to approve it. A few observations were made, mainly related the need for more concision and coherence of the projects within the programme and issues of compliance with the Fund E&S Policy, including the need to provide an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) for the whole programme.

The initial technical review finds that the revised document has much improved and is more concise. Results framework, budget and implementation arrangement for the whole programme are provided. A comprehensive ESMP is also provided.

However, the review has identified a few issues, mainly related to compliance with the ESP, which should be addressed before the proposal could be recommended for approval. The following clarification requests (CRs) are made:

**CR1:** The programme has identified a number of environmental and social risks in line with the ESP, and has done this overall well. Nonetheless, please address the following important risks that seem not to have been explicitly identified or identified at all:

- a. Large influxes of refugees from Syria and Iraq are reported but it is unclear if and to what extent they are present in the project areas. They would be an important vulnerable group, and the risks to them as a group and as individuals resulting from project funding should be explicitly identified and assessed, as needed.
- b. *Gender equity and Women’s Empowerment*: on p. 18, last item in 2<sup>nd</sup> column of Component 2 has job creation targets disaggregated by gender: 5,400 for women and 14,400 for men, which amounts to 19,800, not 18,000. Besides this discrepancy, please explain the grounds that justify this gender-differentiated job creation targeting;
- c. On the same principle, p. 19. the target of 240 families for outcome 1, component 1, states that the average family size is 6 - 2 females and 4 males. This should be explained.
- d. *Core Labour Rights*: the risks described on p. 107 do not mention child labour.
- e. *Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*: p. 25-26 mentions the building of a factory to produce dairy products. The major waste product of dairy processing plants is polluted water, either extracted from the milk or from cleaning the processing installation and equipment. The risk assessment on p. 109 for this principle should be changed to ‘yes’ accordingly.
- f. *Natural Habitats and Biodiversity*: the risks associated with the rainwater harvesting activities on habitats that will receive less rainwater as a consequence seem overall underestimated. The ecological value and importance of these temporary streams seems considerably under-appreciated (see also p. 130, paragraph before point D.).

**CR2:** Tables 39, 41 and 42 provide information on risks, mitigation measures and institutions responsible for the implementation of those measures. However the risks identified in tables 41 and 42 are not linked with the 15 principles of the ESP. Although those tables are still useful, the ESMP document should provide a single, comprehensive framework for addressing the 15 principles for the programme as a whole, including all the risks identified in the individual projects, and linking them to the respective principles of

	<p>the ESP and, lastly, outlining the responsibilities for monitoring and implementation of the identified mitigation measures for each risk. Such framework could build on the information provided in tables 39, 41, 42 and 43.</p> <p><b>CR3:</b> Please clarify if the wastewater reuse master plan that is discussed on p. 127 was also included in the EIAs that were carried out for the wastewater treatment plants from which treated wastewater will be sourced for the project (p. 127).</p> <p><b>CR4:</b> A detailed budget is provided. However, more detail is needed to better assess the budget, including on, but not limited to, the following items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>vi. The costs of technologies of water filtration systems</li><li>vii. The operational costs incurred by the individual projects;</li><li>viii. Details of the technical assistance budgets;</li><li>ix. Permaculture pilots and capacity building activities under the permaculture project;</li><li>x. JV regional grading, packing and cold storage facilities.</li></ul> <p><b>CR5:</b> A disbursement schedule is provided. However, schedule dates need to be revised.</p>
Date:	21 February 2015.

## Annex 2: Final technical review – Proposal for Jordan



ADAPTATION FUND

## ADAPTATION FUND BOARD SECRETARIAT TECHNICAL REVIEW OF PROJECT/PROGRAMME PROPOSAL

PROJECT/PROGRAMME CATEGORY: Regular-sized Project

Country/Region: **Jordan**Project/Programme Title: **Increasing the resilience of poor and vulnerable communities to climate change impacts in Jordan through Implementing Innovative projects in water and agriculture in support of adaptation to climate change**AF Project ID: **JOR/NIE/Multi/2012/1**

NIE/MIE Project/Programme ID:

Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars): **9,226,000**Regular Project/Programme Concept Approval Date: **Oct 2013**Anticipated Submission of final RP document (if applicable): **n/a**Reviewer and contact person: **Daouda Ndiaye**Co-reviewer(s): **Mikko Ollikainen**NIE/MIE Contact Person: **Hazar Badran**

Review Criteria	Questions	Comments on 22 February 2015	Comments on 15 March 2015
Country Eligibility	3. Is the country party to the Kyoto Protocol?	Yes.	
	4. Is the country a developing country particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change?	Yes. Jordan is one of the ten driest countries in the world with demand for water exceeding the available resources, and this will be exacerbated by future climate change.	
Project Eligibility	14. Has the designated government authority for the Adaptation Fund endorsed the project/programme?	No.	

	15. Does the project / programme support concrete adaptation actions to assist the country in addressing adaptive capacity to the adverse effects of climate change and build in climate resilience?	This programme is very relevant for a country that clearly faces CC risks in addition to existing biophysical challenges, such as water scarcity and land degradation. The proposed approach includes concrete adaptation actions of major significance to two important sectors: water and agriculture sector. The proposed actions for water build on an existing effort by the government to increase water harvesting and the reuse of waste water for productive purposes, especially in regions where irrigation is critical.	
	16. Does the project / programme provide economic, social and environmental benefits, particularly to vulnerable communities, including gender considerations, while avoiding or mitigating negative impacts, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund?	Yes, the project takes account of multiple benefits to be generated from the investment, including considerations of the critical role of women. The entire focus of the project is to address priority needs of vulnerable communities in geographies of crucial importance to the national economy. Hence the integrated approach to taking into account environment, economic and social needs is clearly articulated.	
	17. Is the project / programme cost effective?	Yes, the proposed approach can be deemed cost-effective since it will build on existing and planned government commitments to the two targeted sectors, which will also ensure sustainability of the outcomes.	
	18. Is the project / programme consistent with national or sub-national sustainable development strategies, national or sub-national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, national communications and adaptation programs of action and other relevant instruments?	Yes, consistency with the national development strategies is clearly articulated and justified. It is further strengthened by the fact the NIE is also the government entity responsible for the country's development planning.	
	19. Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund??	Yes.	
	20. Is there duplication of project / programme with other funding sources?	No.	

	<p>21. Does the project / programme have a learning and knowledge management component to capture and feedback lessons?</p>	<p>Yes, mainly under component 2.</p>	
	<p>22. Has a consultative process taken place, and has it involved all key stakeholders, and vulnerable groups, including gender considerations?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
	<p>23. Is the requested financing justified on the basis of full cost of adaptation reasoning?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
	<p>24. Is the project / program aligned with AF's results framework?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
	<p>25. Has the sustainability of the project/programme outcomes been taken into account when designing the project?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
	<p>26. Does the project / programme provide an overview of environmental and social impacts / risks identified?</p>	<p>Yes. The programme has identified a number of environmental and social risks in line with the ESP, and has done this overall well.</p> <p>Nonetheless, some important risks seem not to have been explicitly identified or identified at all:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>g. Large influxes of refugees from Syria and Iraq are reported but it is unclear if and to what extent they are present in the project areas. They would be an important vulnerable group, and the risks to them as a group and as individuals resulting from project funding should be explicitly identified and assessed, as needed.</li> <li>h. <i>Gender equity and Women's Empowerment</i>: on p. 18, last item in 2<sup>nd</sup> column of Component 2 has job creation targets disaggregated by gender: 5,400 for women and 14,400 for men, which amounts to 19,800, not 18,000, but importantly, what are the grounds that justify this gender-differentiated job creation targeting?</li> <li>i. On the same principle, p. 19. the target of 240 families for outcome 1, component 1, states that the average family size is 6 - 2 females and 4 males. This should be explained.</li> </ul>	



		<p>j. <i>Core Labour Rights</i>: the risks described on p. 107 do not mention child labour.</p> <p>k. <i>Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency</i>: p. 25-26 mentions the building of a factory to produce dairy products. The major waste product of dairy processing plants is polluted water, either extracted from the milk or from cleaning the processing installation and equipment. The risk assessment on p. 109 for this principle should be changed to 'yes' accordingly.</p> <p>l. <i>Natural Habitats and Biodiversity</i>: the risks associated with the rainwater harvesting activities on habitats that will receive less rainwater as a consequence seem overall underestimated. The ecological value and importance of these temporary streams seems considerably under-appreciated (see also p. 130, paragraph before point D.). <b>CR1</b></p>	<b>CR1</b> : Addressed.
Resource Availability	5. Is the requested project / programme funding within the cap of the country?	Yes.	
	6. Is the Implementing Entity Management Fee at or below 8.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget before the fee?	Yes. The requested Implementing Entity fees are set at 8.5 per cent of the total programme budget before the fees.	
	7. Are the Project/Programme Execution Costs at or below 9.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget (including the fee)?	Yes. The requested execution costs are set at 8.27 per cent of the total programme budget.	
Eligibility of NIE/MIE	8. Is the project/programme submitted through an eligible NIE/MIE that has been accredited by the Board?	Yes. MOPIC is an accredited NIE.	
Implementation Arrangement	11. Is there adequate arrangement for project / programme management?	Yes.	
	12. Are there measures for financial and project/programme risk management?	Yes.	

	<p>13. Are there measures in place for the management of for environmental and social risks, in line with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund? <a href="#">Proponents are encouraged to refer to the draft Guidance document for Implementing Entities on compliance with the Adaptation Fund Environmental and Social Policy, for details.</a></p>	<p>Yes. The proposal contains an ESMP, which is justified given the risks present and the fact that some activities are not fully identified. The ESMP is currently at 43 pages quite long and contains very useful information. Specific Environmental monitoring and management plans (EMMPs) were developed following EIAs that were carried out for the wastewater treatment plants from which treated wastewater will be sourced for the programme. Table (41) is the Environmental and Social Risks Management and Monitoring Plan (ESMMP) which is part of the ESMP for the case of direct treated wastewater effluent reuse as in the case of Wadi Mousa WWTP project (1.1) and the rainwater harvesting through the construction of earthen dams project (1.5), whereas Table (42) is for the case of mixed water quality (TWW mixed with fresh water supplies) such as in the case of Jordan Valley where the effluent from WWTPs is mixed with fresh water supplies downstream of king Talal Reservoir for the case of Northern Jordan Valley (Irbid, Dougara and Shallalah), North Shouneh and Tal Mantah WWTPs. The ESMP should focus on the mechanism for risk assessment for the activities that have not been fully identified, on risk mitigation measures for those risks identified and in a way commensurate with the risks. Tables 41 and 42 provide information on the mitigation measures and institutions responsible for the implementation of those measures, for the risks identified. However the risks identified are not linked with the 15 principles of the ESP. The information in those tables is still useful, however the ESMP document should provide a framework for addressing the 15 principles for the programme as a whole, including all the risks identified in the individual projects, and linking them to the respective principles of the ESP and, lastly, outlining the responsibilities for monitoring and implementation of the identified mitigation measures for each risk. Such framework could build on the information provided in tables 39, 41, 42 and 43. <b>CR2.</b></p> <p>Also, it is unclear if the wastewater reuse master plan that is discussed on p. 127 was also included in the EIAs that were carried out for the wastewater treatment plants from which treated wastewater will be sourced for the project (p. 127). <b>CR3.</b></p> <p>Lastly, the ESP categorization applies to the programme as a whole, and it is not envisaged to be used for separate sub-projects or individual project activities (p. 59). The activity or sub-project with the highest degree of risk determines the risk level and hence the category for the whole programme. Therefore, the programme is considered a Category B programme.</p>	<p><b>CR2:</b> Addressed.</p> <p><b>CR3:</b> Addressed. However, it is expected that during the implementation of programme activities, the wastewater reuse activities will be screened for potential environmental and social risks in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund, and that, in the case of identification of any significant risks, the relevant risks mitigation measures will be taken and included in the Environmental and Social Management Plan which will be updated accordingly and adequately reported annually through the programme performance reports</p>
--	---	--	--

	14. Is a budget on the Implementing Entity Management Fee use included?	Yes.	
	15. Is an explanation and a breakdown of the execution costs included?	Yes.	
	16. Is a detailed budget including budget notes included?	Yes. <b>CR4:</b> However, more detail is needed to better assess the budget, including on, but not limited to, the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The costs of technologies of water filtration systems</li> <li>ii. The operational costs incurred by the individual projects;</li> <li>iii. Details of the technical assistance budgets;</li> <li>iv. Permaculture pilots and capacity building activities under the permaculture project;</li> <li>v. JV regional grading, packing and cold storage facilities.</li> </ul>	<b>CR4:</b> Addressed.
	17. Are arrangements for monitoring and evaluation clearly defined, including budgeted M&E plans ?	Yes.	
	18. Does the M&E Framework include a break-down of how implementing entity IE fees will be utilized in the supervision of the M&E function?	Yes.	
	19. Does the project/programme's results framework align with the AF's results framework and include sex-disaggregated data, targets and indicators? Does it include at least one core outcome indicator from the Fund's results framework?		
	20. Is a disbursement schedule with time-bound milestones included?	Yes. However, schedule dates need to be revised. <b>CR5.</b>	<b>CR5:</b> Addressed.

Technical Summary	<p>Jordan is a country particularly vulnerable to drought, being one of the ten driest countries in the world with demand for water exceeding the available resources, which will be exacerbated by future climate change.</p> <p>The proposal seeks to adapt the agricultural sector in Jordan to climate change induced water shortages and stresses on food security through piloting innovative technology transfer, policy support linked to community livelihoods &amp; resilience. The programme presents eight projects divided under two main components, with component 1 presenting five projects related to concrete adaptation</p>
-------------------	---

	<p>solutions to address water scarcity and agriculture in vulnerable regions in Jordan notably through reuse of treated waste water, and component 2 presenting three projects related to policy reforms, training and knowledge management.</p> <p>This objective will be achieved through the following two components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- <u>Component 1</u>: Climate change adaptation of Agricultural &amp; water Sector through Technology Transfer (The use of Non-conventional water resources (Reuse of wastewater, rainwater harvesting &amp; perma-culture),</li><li>- <u>Component 2</u>: Capacity Building at both the national and local/community levels respectively, knowledge Dissemination, policy and legislation mainstreaming.</li></ul> <p>This is the second submission of the proposal as a fully-developed programme document. It was submitted to the Board at its 24<sup>th</sup> meeting and the Board decided not to approve it. A few observations were made, mainly related the need for more concision and coherence of the projects within the programme and issues of compliance with the Fund E&amp;S Policy, including the need to provide an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) for the whole programme.</p> <p>The initial technical review found that the revised document had much improved and was more concise. Results framework, budget and implementation arrangement for the whole programme are provided. A comprehensive ESMP is also provided. However, the review had identified a few issues, mainly related to compliance with the ESP, which should be addressed before the proposal could be recommended for approval. Therefore a few clarification requests (CRs) were made.</p> <p>The final review finds that all the observations made were addressed. However, it is expected that during the implementation of programme activities, the wastewater reuse activities will be screened for potential environmental and social risks in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund, and that, in the case of identification of any significant risks, the relevant risks mitigation measures will be taken and included in the Environmental and Social Management Plan which will be updated accordingly and adequately reported annually through the programme performance reports.</p>
Date:	15 March 2015.

**Annex 3: Response to the observations and clarification requests made by the Board and secretariat – Proposal for Jordan**



ADAPTATION FUND

## ADAPTATION FUND BOARD SECRETARIAT TECHNICAL REVIEW OF PROJECT/PROGRAMME PROPOSAL

PROJECT/PROGRAMME CATEGORY: Regular-sized Project

Country/Region: **Jordan**

Project/Programme Title: **Increasing the resilience of poor and vulnerable communities to climate change impacts in Jordan through Implementing Innovative projects in water and agriculture in support of adaptation to climate change**

AF Project ID: **JOR/NIE/Multi/2012/1**

NIE/MIE Project/Programme ID:

Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars): **9,226,000**

Regular Project/Programme Concept Approval Date: **September 2014**    Anticipated Submission of final RP document (if applicable): **n/a**

Reviewer and contact person: **Daouda Ndiaye**

Co-reviewer(s): **Mikko Ollikainen**

NIE/MIE Contact Person: **Hazar Badran**

Review Criteria	Questions	Comments on 21 August 2014	Comments on Sept 9, 2014	Response of MOPIC on Jan 2015
<b>Project Eligibility</b>	1. Has the designated government authority for the Adaptation Fund endorsed the project/programme ?	No	No	<b>Response:</b> Yes, the designated government authority for the Adaptation Fund endorsed the project/programme (Endorsement Letter attached).
	2. Does the project / programme support concrete adaptation actions to assist the country in addressing adaptive capacity	This programme is very relevant for a country that clearly faces CC risks in addition to existing biophysical challenges, such as water scarcity and land degradation. The proposed approach includes concrete adaptation actions of major	<b>CR1:</b> Addressed. However, having results frameworks for each project could be confusing for the reader. It would be best to develop a single RF for the programme, reflecting the outcomes and outputs presented under the	<b>Response: CR1</b> All individual Results frameworks (RF) for different projects were removed, and a single RF was developed for the program reflecting the outcomes and outputs as requested. Pls refer to page (19). For further detailed information

	<p>to the adverse effects of climate change and build in climate resilience?</p>	<p>significance to two important sectors: water and agriculture sector. The proposed actions for water build on an existing effort by the government to increase water harvesting and the reuse of waste water for productive purposes, especially in regions where irrigation is critical.</p> <p>However, the way the programme's activities are presented could be made more reader-friendly and organized. Although the projects 1 to 4 have different stakeholders and location, they could be presented as one sub-component, under component 1, for more clarity. Any information related to budget, results indicators, economic, social and environmental benefits or implementation arrangement should be removed from that section and presented in the relevant section, in a coherent way as subcomponents of the programme. The same would apply with the other projects, which could be presented in a more concise and coherent manner. The details of each project could be included as an Annex instead. <b>CR1</b></p>	<p>table on programme components and financing. <b>CR3:</b> Partially addressed. The original table's outputs were well presented. The request was to add specific targets to the "concrete outputs" column.</p> <p>More generally there seems to be confusion between the request for providing core indicator(s) for the whole programme and the definition of project-level outcomes, outputs and their relevant indicators.</p>	<p>on project-level outcomes, outputs and their relevant indicators/ baseline/ milestones &amp; targets, please refer to section III Part E in Table 28 (Results Framework) in Page (136).</p> <p><b>Response to CR3:</b> The Table on program components and financing (Pgs 17 &amp;18) was modified by adding specific "Targets" to the "Concrete Outputs" column as well as rephrasing many output sentences and linking those to the "Concrete Outcomes".</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>Please revise the table on programme components and financing (p. 16), to clearly present the expected outcomes and outputs, with the latter including clear targets, instead of indicators. <b>CR3.</b></p>		
	<p>3. Is the project / programme cost effective?</p>	<p>Yes, the proposed approach can be deemed cost-effective because it will build on existing and planned government commitments to the two targeted sectors, which will also ensure sustainability of the outcomes. However, the demonstration of cost effectiveness could be improved through providing the costs of alternatives to the proposed programme activities, i.e. investment in large water retention/harvesting infrastructures, cost of fresh water for irrigation vs treated waste water, alternative water resources, alternatives to permaculture, etc. <b>CR5.</b></p>	<p><b>CR5:</b> Not addressed. On one hand the proposal presents the economic benefits of the programme. On the other hand, no alternatives to the current options are presented, to compare and assess cost effectiveness of the programme.</p>	<p><b>Response to CR5:</b> Cost Alternatives to the current options are now presented to allow for comparison and assessment to cost effectiveness of the programme. Cost of alternatives derived from the Capital Investment Plan FY 2015 for investment in large water retention dams versus rain water harvesting infrastructures, cost of fresh water for irrigation vs irrigation with treated waste water, alternative water resources, and cost of monoculture vs permaculture. This comparison included the socio-economic cost benefit alternatives.</p>
	<p>4. Is the project / programme consistent with national or sub-national sustainable development strategies, national or sub-national</p>	<p>Yes, consistency with the national development strategies is clearly articulated and justified. It is further strengthened by the fact the NIE is also the government entity responsible for the country's development planning. However, the section could gain</p>	<p><b>CR6:</b> Partially addressed. The section could gain from more concision.</p>	<p><b>Response to CR6:</b> The whole section was revised and summarized to demonstrate consistency with relevant national plans and strategies as requested.</p>



	<p>development plans, poverty reduction strategies, national communications and adaptation programs of action and other relevant instruments?</p>	<p>from being more concise and strictly demonstrate consistency with national plans and strategies with the relevant information. <b>CR6.</b></p>		
	<p>5. Has a consultative process taken place, and has it involved all key stakeholders, and vulnerable groups, including gender considerations?</p>	<p>Yes. However, please justify the lack of consultation during the full programme preparation phase, for project 1.5. <b>CR9.</b></p>	<p><b>CR9:</b> not addressed. The information provided does not allow assessing the consultation process for project 1.5.</p>	<p>CR9: A WUAs consultation meeting was held at Fifa/Mazzrah/Khnaizereh/Haditha on June 20, 2014 to address all issues related to undertaking Project (1.5) – Rain Water Harvesting, refer to Annex 2D page (17) to view the list of participants. Requests for construction of earthen dams were one of the key demands/ needs of the WUAs in this region under the WB Institute led initiative of JVWF. Also this request came again under the ESMP consultation held on December 4, 2014. Refer to list of participants and their signatures under ESMP Annex 5 Part D Public Disclosure and Consultation Table 43. Their requests and concerns were documented and analyzed/ assessed under Table 40 Risk Evaluation &amp; Screening (Stakeholder concerns were during construction phase of</p>

				<p>earthen dams (Dust, noise, etc.) and potential for risks when building water retention system. Table 41 for Mitigations measures, roles and frequency. This was also elaborated in Part II K.</p>
	<p>6. Does the project / programme provide an overview of environmental and social impacts / risks identified?</p>	<p>No. <b>CAR1</b>. Please complete section K under the new AF proposal template including the table on compliance with the E&amp;S principles and taking into account the points raised below:</p> <p>In the absence of the ESP section (K), it is difficult to assess compliance, and this is exacerbated by the structure of the document. Although the proposal was developed taking principles of the ESP into account, there are a number of environmental and social risks that can be identified associated with the programme. The evident ones include indigenous/vulnerable groups (Beduins), public health, soils, gender, and possibly climate change.</p> <p>The risk on public health is the most compelling one. The reuse of treated wastewater carries a number of environmental and social risks. The risk related to</p>	<p><b>CAR1</b>: Partially addressed. Although a table on compliance with the E&amp;S principles is provided, no potential impacts and risks or further assessment or mitigation measures were identified, including risks on public health and pollution as well as soil conservation, all of which were identified in previous EIAs and mitigation presented (see example of EMMP p.170-184). Also, several risks rated medium to very high are identified under table p.185-190, for which mitigation measures or procedures are not provided. However a list of mitigation measures associated with wastewater reuse is provided in p.223 some of which could be used to address some of the concerns above. This emphasizes again the need to reorganize the document in a more structured and coherent manner.</p>	<p>Part II Section K was fully revised and an ESMP was developed in Annex 5 taking note of the Category of each proposed sub project especially those falling under Category B, where gender sensitive scoping sessions were held, risks identified and rated, mitigation measures were developed and the roles and responsibilities of related entities were identified as well as frequency of monitoring. TABLE 24 pg. 105 of the proposal was developed and has the Check List of Environmental and Social Principles as per the CC AF guidance as per Annex 3 of the CC AF ESP guidance approved in Nov 2013 and amended October 2014 and taking note of the AF-ESP suggested amendments in the “<b>Guidance Document for Implementing Entities on compliance with the Adaptation Fund Environmental and Social Policy</b>” Draft 9 January 2015 –</p>

		<p>public health through consumption/exposure to pathogenic micro-organisms is the greatest threat. Exposure to heavy metals, harmful organic substances (drugs, endocrine disruptors) is a lesser risk. There are a number of irrigation risks as well, such as soil salinisation and nutrients loading. In case the reuse of treated wastewater requires uphill pumping, greenhouse gas emissions may be significant. Building water retention dams in a watershed always carries.</p>		<p>Pending final edits .</p>
<p><b>Resource Availability</b></p>		<p><b>CR14:</b> Please include an ESMP, together with implementation arrangements and M&amp;E provisions, which will contain all the relevant elements. The ESMP is required for category B projects for which the proposed activities requiring environmental and social assessment do not represent a minor part of the project.</p>	<p><b>CR14:</b> Somewhat addressed, although there is a need to present the ESMP in a more structured manner.</p>	<p>An ESMP was developed as a stand - alone in Annex 5 for category B projects for which the proposed activities requiring environmental and social assessment do not represent a minor part of the project. This ESMP follows CC AF ESP Guideline document and aligned with the national EIA Regulation #37 FY 2005. The ESMP was per the CC AF guidance as per Annex 3 of the CC AF ESP guidance approved in Nov 2013 and amended October 2014 and taking note of the AF-ESP suggested amendments in the “<b>Guidance Document for Implementing Entities on compliance with the</b></p>

				<b>Adaptation Fund Environmental and Social Policy</b> “ Draft 9 January 2015 – Pending final edits .
	Is a budget on the Implementing Entity Management Fee use included?	Yes. However, such budget is not justified, given the lack of distinction between the implementation and execution roles of MOPIC. Also, the development and preparation budget under the NIE fees (144,600) is not justified given the PFG already provided to the NIE for programme preparation. <b>CR15.</b>	<b>CR15:</b> Partially addressed. The “Development and preparation” budget is not explained nor justified.	The Execution Entities (EE) Fees table, and National Implementation Entity (NIE) Fees table were revised to reflect detailed budget notes.  The \$144,600 set for “Development and Preparation” budget includes the \$29,000 for project formulation Grant already received by MOPIC Plus *\$28,900/Yr for (Annual work plans, quarterly and monthly report production) over four years through technical expertise subcontracts in support of project work plans preparation and implementation.
<b>Eligibility of NIE/MIE</b>	Is a detailed budget including budget notes included?	No. Although budget details are provided here and there within the document, under the projects narrative and annexes 1 and 2, it is not organized to allow for a proper review of the whole programme” budget. <b>CR17.</b>	<b>CR17:</b> Not addressed. The programme budget was not organized in a way to allow for an assessment of the costs based on the programme’s expected outputs. In addition the proposal does not provide budget notes.	The budget section was reorganized and budget notes were added. Kindly refer to Part III Section G pages (143 -148).
	Does the project/programme’s results framework align with the AF’s results framework and include sex-	Yes. An alignment table is provided. However, the results framework is very weak and does not allow for a proper measurement of the achievement of the	<b>CR19:</b> Not addressed.	<b>Response to CR19:</b> Pls refer to Section III Part F Table (29) Alignment of Project Objectives/Outcomes with Adaptation Fund Results Framework is provided. The table

	disaggregated data, targets and indicators? Does it include at least one core outcome indicator from the Fund's results framework?	programme's objectives. Also, it does not include sex disaggregated data nor an AF core outcome indicator. <b>CR19.</b>		was revised to include sex disaggregated data as well as clear targets. Additionally PIs refer to Table (30) to view the Alignment with Adaptation Fund Core Impact Indicators.
--	--	---	--	---

## Technical Summary

Jordan is a country particularly vulnerable to drought, being one of the ten driest countries in the world with demand for water exceeding the available resources, which will be exacerbated by future climate change. The proposal seeks to adapt the agricultural sector in Jordan to climate change induced water shortages and stresses on food security through piloting innovative technology transfer, policy support linked to community livelihoods & resilience. The programme presents eight projects divided under two main components, with component 1 presenting five projects related to concrete adaptation solutions to address water scarcity and agriculture in vulnerable regions in Jordan, and component 2 presenting three projects related to policy reforms, training and knowledge management.

The initial review found that although the proposed activities were very relevant to the challenges faced by Jordan in the water and agriculture sector, a number of issues were still to be clarified. These included the need for improving and simplifying the presentation of projects under the programme and to demonstrate coherence and complementarities among them; the need to further demonstrate the programme cost effectiveness; issues related to compliance with the E&S Policy of the Fund; weakness of the results framework and information gap on the consultation process.

Although the revised proposal has made some progress in addressing the requested corrective actions and clarifications made during the initial review, there remains key issues that are pending and for which the following observations are made:

- (i) As a general observation, the proposal could gain from more concision and structuring; as an example among others, the section on consistency with the national development strategies could be limited to strictly demonstrate consistency with national plans and strategies with the relevant information;  
**MOPIC Response: The proposal was revised to show more concession and has been restructured, to reflect the above note**
- (ii) The demonstration of cost effectiveness could be improved through providing the costs of alternatives to the proposed programme activities, including but not limited to investment in large water retention/harvesting infrastructures, cost of fresh water for irrigation vs treated waste water, alternative water resources and alternatives to permaculture;  
**MOPIC Response: The cost Effectiveness section was revised and detailed to reflect the above where cost of alternative options were highlighted as reflected in the Capital Investment Plans FY 2015.**
- (iii) Although a table on compliance with the E&S principles is provided, no potential impacts and risks or further assessment or mitigation measures were identified, including risks on public health and pollution as well as soil conservation. Also, several risks rated medium to very high were identified in other parts of the document, for which mitigation measures or procedures are not provided;  
**MOPIC Response: Part II Section K Overview of the environmental and social impacts and risks**

identified was fully revised to align with the ESP guidelines of the CC AF and National EIA Regulation, risks were identified and scoping sessions were held, mitigation measures were detailed and responsible entities were identified. TABLE 24 Pg 105 of the proposal was developed and has the Check List of Environmental and Social Principles as per the CC AF guidance.

- (iv) The proposal should include an ESMP, together with implementation arrangements and M&E provisions, which will contain all the relevant elements. The ESMP is required for category B projects for which the proposed activities requiring environmental and social assessment do not represent a minor part of the project.

**MOPIC Response: A detailed ESMP was developed following the CC AF ESP Guidance it includes implementation, and monitoring and evaluation provisions for all project activities including those of Category B projects. The ESMP is in Annex 5 with details on Scoping and Stakeholder consultations and feedback, and screening.**

- (v) The programme budget needs to be organized in a way to allow for an assessment of the costs based on the programme's expected outputs. In addition the proposal should include budget notes;

**MOPIC Response: Budget was re-organized to allow for assessment of costs with budget notes. The Kindly refer to Part III Section G Pages (143 -148).**

- (vi) The proposal should justify the development and preparation budget under the implementing entity fees (144,600), since a PFG was already provided to the NIE for programme preparation.

**MOPIC Response: The \$144,600 set for "Development and Preparation" budget includes the \$29,000 for Project Formulation Grant already received by MOPIC Plus \$28,900/Yr for (Annual work plans, quarterly and monthly report production) over four years through technical expertise subcontracts in support of project work plans preparation and implementation. Also the Execution Entities (EE) Fees table, and National Implementation Entity (NIE) Fees table were revised to reflect detailed budget notes.**

- (vii) The proposal should include a programme results framework which should include programme outcome and output indicators, baseline and targets which would help in the achievement of the programme's objectives, including sex disaggregated data and at least one AF core outcome indicator.

**MOPIC Response: Pls refer to Section III Part F Table (29) Alignment of Project Objectives/Outcomes with Adaptation Fund Results Framework is provided. The table was revised to include sex disaggregated data as well as clear targets. Additionally Pls refer to Table (30) to view the Alignment with Adaptation Fund Core Impact Indicators.**

Date: