



ADAPTATION FUND

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

PROJECT/PROGRAMME CATEGORY: Regular Size Full Proposal

**Country/Region:** United Republic of Tanzania

**Project Title:** Karatu Climate Resilience and Adaptation project for Hadzabe and Datoga communities- KARAHADA

**Thematic Focal Area:** Multisector

**Implementing Entity:** National Environmental Management Council (NEMC)

**Executing Entities:** Hakikazi Catalyst & Karatu District Council

**AF Project ID:** AF00000255

**IE Project ID:**

**Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars):** 2,500,000

**Reviewer and contact person:** Dirk Lamberts

**Co-reviewer(s):**

**IE Contact Person:** Ally Mdangaya

### Technical Summary

The project “Karatu Climate Resilience and Adaptation project for Hadzabe and Datoga communities- KARAHADA” aims to enable climate resilient livelihoods in climate change affected areas by building capacity of Hadzabe (hunter-gatherers) and Datoga (blacksmiths) communities in undertaking practical and innovative smart solutions. This will be done through the five components below:

Component 1: Enhancing integrated climate change resilient livelihood diversification system in the selected sites in the wards of Baray, Endamaghan and Mang’ola in Karatu District (USD 508,055);

Component 2: Enhancing climate resilient rural water infrastructure and supply system in vulnerable Hadzabe and Datoga communities at Baray, Mang’ola and Endamaghany Wards in Karatu District (USD 918,102);

Component 3: Improving climate change resilience of ecosystems and non-timber products for selected villages of the three wards of Baray, Endamaghan and Mang’ola in Karatu District (USD 128,569);

Component 4: Undertaking studies on climate risks and vulnerability with a particular focus on most vulnerable sectors including water, agriculture, nutrition in three wards of Baray, Endamaghan and Mang’ola in Karatu District (USD 129,734);

|       |  |
|-------|--|
|       | <p><u>Component 5</u>: Enhancing capacity of Karatu District Council and Communities in three wards of Baray, Endamaghan and Mang'ola to design and implement climate change adaptation interventions and improve level of understanding of climate change related issues (USD 434,186).</p> <p><u>Requested financing overview</u>:<br/> Project/Programme Execution Cost: USD 201,271<br/> Total Project/Programme Cost<sup>1</sup>: USD 2,118,645<br/> Implementing Fee: USD 180,084<br/> Financing Requested: USD 2,500,000</p> <p>The initial technical review raises several issues, such as the use of USPs, compliance with ESP and GP, budget errors, and unclear indicators, as is discussed in the Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.</p> |
| Date: | 24 January 2022.   |

---

<sup>1</sup> As stated in the proposal. This amount does not correspond to the sum of the allocations for the components.

**KARAHADA REVIEW RESPONSES FEB 2022**

| <b>Review Criteria</b> | <b>Questions</b>  | <b>Comments</b>   | <b>Responses to comments</b> |
|------------------------|---|---|------------------------------|
| Country Eligibility    | 1. Is the country party to the Kyoto Protocol?  | <b>Yes.</b>   | <b>Noted with thanks</b>     |
|                        | 2. Is the country a developing country particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change?                            | <b>Yes.</b> Changes in rainfall trends and patterns have especially significant impacts on the availability of food and water for vulnerable communities. | <b>Noted with thanks</b>     |
| Project Eligibility    | 1. Has the designated government authority for the Adaptation Fund endorsed the project/programme?                                  | <b>Yes.</b> As per the endorsement letter dated 9 August 2021.  | <b>Noted with thanks</b>     |
|                        | 2. Does the length of the proposal amount to no more than One hundred (100) pages for the fully-developed project document, and one | <b>Yes.</b> The fully-developed proposal document consists of 89 pages, with 92 pages annexes.  | <b>Noted with thanks</b>     |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | hundred (100) pages for its annexes?  |  |  |
|  | 3. 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? | <p><b>Mostly yes.</b> Output 1.5 includes identification and production of suitable traditional and modern crops for selected villages but does not specify the target group(s). It is also unclear if the 8 target villages have already been identified.</p> <p><b>CR 1:</b> Please clarify the target villages for activity 1.5. as well as the intended beneficiaries.</p> <p>The activities under component 2 include the drilling of 10 boreholes to access groundwater for drinking water and for irrigating crops and watering livestock. Establishing Water User Associations with trained members will create management for these water sources but there is no information suggesting that 1) the volumes of water extracted will be sustainable, taking into account the potential of the groundwater sources, and 2) the WUA will know the limits of the volumes of water that can safely be extracted. The relevant knowledge should be established and integrated in the training activities for WUAs.</p> | <p><b>Response to CR 1</b></p> <p>The 8 target villages that have been identified for the project are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Qangnded</li> <li>2. Mbuga nyekundu</li> <li>3. Endamaghang</li> <li>4. Ndumbechand</li> <li>5. Mikocheni</li> <li>6. Endesh</li> <li>7. Jobaj</li> <li>8. Matala</li> </ol> <p>For more information on the selected villages see section 1.6 on the Scope of the project on page 8 of the track changed revised proposal.</p> <p>The target beneficiaries for output 1.5 are women, girls and boys as indicated on Part II on project justification specifically IIA on component 1, output 5 on page 17 of the revised proposal.</p> <p><b>Response to CR 2</b></p> <p>Clarification on how extraction of ground water will be sustainable and not risking depleting the ground water is provided Part II on Project justification,</p> |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p><b>CR 2:</b> Please clarify how the extraction of groundwater will be sustainable and not risk depleting the groundwater reserves.</p> <p>The activities of component 3 are unidentified sub-projects (USPs). Whilst the process of identifying appropriate restoration and management interventions appears justified, the proposal should provide details on the selected villages and the criteria by which they were selected.</p> <p><b>CR 3:</b> Please clarify the target villages under component 3.</p> <p>Component 4 is a new component and aims to determine climate change vulnerabilities at district level and develop a comprehensive action plan in climate-sensitive sectors. While the new component is very relevant in an adaptation project, its role in this project is unclear. The other 4 components of the project will address already identified and prioritised climate change adaptation issues, so it is unclear how this study will align with those, and why this is still justified?</p> | <p>specifically section IIA, component 2 output 1 on page 19 of the track changed revised proposal.</p> <p>Established WUAs will be trained on relevant knowledge about water use efficiency. For more information please see output 2.3 and 2.3 On Project justification section on page 20 of the track changed revised proposal.</p> <p><b>Response to CR 3</b><br/>The target villages are the same as indicated in <b>Response to CR 1</b></p> |
|--|--|---|

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p><b>CR 4:</b> Please clarify the added value of component 4.</p> <p>Like the activities of component 3 and output 5.4 – the construction and establishment of climate-smart community resource centres - constitutes USPs.</p> <p><b>CAR 1:</b> Please strengthen the justification why these activities cannot be identified yet, as well as the argument of the particular benefits of this approach. In addition, please include an adequate ESMP (please see for guidance <a href="https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AFB.B.32-33.7_Combpliance-with-ESP_Update-of-PPR_and_Guidance-for-USPs.pdf">https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AFB.B.32-33.7_Combpliance-with-ESP_Update-of-PPR_and_Guidance-for-USPs.pdf</a>).</p> | <p><b>Response to CR 4</b></p> <p>Component 4 has been revised to address the inadequacy of gendered climate smart policies for enforcing resilience measures for Karatu district. More information on the revised component please see project outcomes on page 8. Project objectives on page 9 and project components and financing-Component 4 on pages 12-13 of the track changed revised proposal. The changes have effected throughout the proposal.</p> <p><b>Response to CAR 1</b></p> <p>The activities of Component 3 have been fully identified, and the statement on an ESMP to be developed during inception has been amended to justify the activities</p> |
|--|--|---|--|

|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | <p>4. 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 and Gender Policy of the Fund?</p> | <p><b>Mostly yes.</b> The expected economic, social and environmental benefits are described and in line with the proposed activities and outputs. They also include gender considerations.</p> <p>The project activities are aligned to beneficiary groups that are identified by their main occupation as a proxy for ethnicity. Whilst there are practical grounds that may justify this approach, there is also a risk that it may sustain or exacerbate issues related to this categorisation.</p> <p><b>CR 5:</b> Please clarify why the main occupation approach is justified and how there is no risk of it sustaining or exacerbating related ethnicity issues.</p> | <p><b>Response to CR 5</b><br/>Project beneficiaries are identified by their main occupation of hunting gathering and blacksmith. More information about what the project intends to solve is presented in section 1.1 on page 2 of the track changed revised proposal.</p> |
|  | <p>5. Is the project / programme cost effective?</p>  | <p><b>Possibly.</b></p>  |   |

|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
|  |  | <p>The section describing the cost effectiveness of the proposal claims cost-effectiveness for the project based on 'enhanced direct access implementation', i.e. use of the 'Force Account Modality', without much further explanation of these concepts that are not mentioned in the description of the activities.</p> <p><b>CR 6:</b> Please clarify how these approaches are different from regular contracting of service providers and contribute to cost-effectiveness.</p> <p>Part of the justification of the cost-effectiveness is demonstrated by referring to activities not included in the description of the project components (e.g. establishment of 4 tree nurseries, planting of 1.5 million trees etc.). These activities also occur elsewhere in the proposal.</p> | <p><b>Response to CR 6</b></p> <p>Enhanced Direct Access modality and Force account modality have been proposed to be the main approaches of undertaking the project which is cost effective. More information about these approaches if provided on Section IIB. on Cost effectiveness from a technical perspective on pages 29-30 of the track changed revised proposal</p> |
|--|--|---|---|

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p><b>CAR 2:</b> Please ensure consistency in the contents of the proposal when describing and using project activities to demonstrate the qualities of the proposal.</p> <p>Overall, the cost effectiveness is not supported by specific numbers, and sustainability considerations are largely lacking. The proposal does not include a clear description of alternative options for comparison.</p> <p><b>CR 7:</b> Please clarify the cost-effectiveness of the project addressing the above-mentioned issues.</p> | <p><b>Response to CAR 2</b></p> <p>The project activities have been described consistently throughout the proposal please see table 11 and 12 for more evidence of consistency.</p> <p><b>Response to CR 7</b></p> <p>The cost effectiveness of the project based on project benefits and indicators is presented on the last paragraph on page 29</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | 6. 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? | <b>Yes.</b> The project is aligned with the country's NDC and NAPA.  |  |
|  | 7. Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund?  | <b>Partially.</b> Standards on e.g. water quality are included, but others are still missing, including on food quality.<br><br><b>CAR 3:</b> Please identify and list in the proposal all the national technical standards that are relevant, as well as how the project will meet those. | <b>Response to CAR 3</b><br><br>Clarification on national technical standards is provided on section II E on national technical standards and a table for relevant national technical standards have been presented. For more information see pages 34-37of the track changed revised proposal |
|  | 8. Is there duplication of project / programme with other funding sources?   | <b>No.</b> There is no duplication. The proposal has identified relevant programs which can complement this project.   | <b>Noted with thanks</b>   |

|  |  |  |                          |
|--|--|--|--------------------------|
|  | 9. Does the project / programme have a learning and knowledge management component to capture and feedback lessons?  | <b>Yes.</b> Component 5 has a clear learning and knowledge management focus.   | <b>Noted with thanks</b> |
|  | 10. Has a consultative process taken place, and has it involved all key stakeholders, and vulnerable groups, including gender considerations in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund? | <b>Yes.</b> The consultation process that took place is described, and outcomes of the consultations and how those were addressed have been included. The consultation seems to have taken a gender-sensitive approach.  | <b>Noted with thanks</b> |
|  | 11. Is the requested financing justified on the basis of full cost of adaptation reasoning?  | <b>Yes.</b> The project activities are relevant in addressing its adaptation objectives and capable of helping to achieve these objectives without additional funding from other donors. It is likely that the support provided will cover the full cost of that adaptation aspect for those involved. There are no provisions for co-financing. | <b>Noted with thanks</b> |
|  | 12. Is the project / program aligned with AF's results framework?  | <b>Yes.</b> However, the project indicators listed in the relevant section are not used as project indicators elsewhere in the proposal (e.g., "Number and   | <b>Response to CAR</b>   |

|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  |   | <p>type of ecosystems maintained and improved to enhance their functions and services under climate change and Variability- induced stress".)</p> <p><b>CAR 4:</b> Please ensure consistency in project indicators.</p>  | <p>Project indicators have been maintained consistently please see <b>CAR 2</b></p>   |
|  | <p>13. Has the sustainability of the project/programme outcomes been taken into account when designing the project?</p>   | <p><b>Yes.</b> The participatory and community-ownership aspect of the project activities, as well as their alignment with government policy are mentioned as sources of sustainability.</p>   | <p><b>Noted with thanks</b></p>   |
|  | <p>14. Does the project / programme provide an overview of environmental and social impacts / risks identified, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?</p> | <p><b>Partially.</b> The activities of component 3 and output 5.4 are unidentified sub-projects (USPs) and need to be considered as such. This implies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the proposal needs to explain and justify why it is not possible or opportune to identify these activities prior to submission of the proposal;</li> </ul> | <p><b>Response to CAR 5</b></p> <p>The activities for component 3 have already been revised and have been fully identified. Based on the just ending Karatu Strategic Plan and discussions made with KDC staff during proposal preparation. For output 5.4 the activities have been fully identified. Please see page ...</p> |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>- the environmental and social risks associated with these activities cannot be determined at this stage, and that needs to be done during implementation, for which the proposal needs to include anadequate Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP).</p> <p><b>CAR 5:</b> Please address the USPs, either by providing the required justification and ESMP, or by fully identifying the activities, carrying out required ESP and GP compliance measures, and updating the proposal accordingly.</p> <p>The identification of risks presented in section II.K of the proposal is not clearly presented and includes implementation and management arrangements. There are inconsistencies with the information provided in section III.C. In addition, there are issues for a number of ESP principles with the way risks</p> | <p>table... for justification for component 3 on page 21and for output 5.4 on page 26 of the track changed revised proposal.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p>have been interpreted, or how risks identification and impact assessments are deferred to the implementation period of the project.</p> <p><b>CAR 6:</b> Please list environmental and social risks in line with the ESP, providing substantiating information on the findings, and ensuring consistency with other parts of the proposal.</p> <p>The project is categorized C (p. 38) and B (p. 63) according to the ESP.</p> <p><b>CR 8:</b> Please clarify the project ESP category.</p> | <p><b>Response to CAR 6</b></p> <p>The list of environmental and social risks in line with the ESP has been presented including implementation management arrangements. This is consistent with information provided in Section IIIC. For more information. See Section IIK</p> |
|--|--|--|---|

|                       |  |   |  |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
|                       |  |   | <p>table 6 on pages 48-51. and section III C table 9 of the track changed revised proposal</p> <p><b>Response for CR 8</b></p> <p>The project has been categorised C</p> |
| Resource Availability | 1. Is the requested project / programme funding within the cap of the country?   | <b>Yes.</b>   | <b>Noted with thanks</b>   |
|                       | 2. Is the Implementing Entity Management Fee at or below 8.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget before the fee?      | <b>Yes.</b> the Implementing Entity Management Fee is at 7.8 per cent of the total project/programme budget before the fee.   | <b>Noted with thanks</b>   |
|                       | 3. Are the Project/Programme Execution Costs at or below 9.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget (including the fee)? | <b>Yes.</b> The Project Execution Costs are at 8.7 per cent of the total projectbudget (including the fee). The IE is not involved in the execution of the project. | <b>Noted with thanks</b>   |
| Eligibility of IE     | 1. Is the project/programme submitted through an eligible Implementing Entity that has been accredited by the Board?             | <b>Yes.</b> The National Environment Management Council was first accredited on 13 October 2017. Its  | <b>Noted with thanks</b>   |

|                             |  |   |  |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--|
|                             |  | accreditation expires on 12 October 2022.   |  |
| Implementation Arrangements | 1. Is there adequate arrangement for project / programme management, in compliance with the Gender Policy of the Fund? | <p><b>Yes.</b>The project management arrangements have the potential to be adequate, and include gender considerations, but there are some uncertainties. This section would be strengthened by the addition of a detailed overview of the roles of the IE in the project, as well as a chart outlining the different management entities and their respective relations.</p> <p><b>CR 9:</b> Please clarify the project management arrangements accordingly.</p> | <p><b>Response for CR 9</b></p> <p>The roles of IE have been stipulated in the project management arrangements to clearly show the different management entities and their relations. Please see Part III on implementation arrangements, section IIIA on the role of NIE on track changed revised proposal.</p> |
|                             | 2. Are there measures for financial and project/programme risk management?   | <p><b>Yes.</b>A general reference to GAAP is provided, but the project will benefit from specific mechanisms to avoid any corruption or mismanagement of the funds.</p>   | <p><b>Response for CR 10</b></p> <p>Fraud or corruption in procurement and disbursement is controlled using existing mechanisms. For more information please see</p>   |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <b>CR 10:</b> Please elaborate how any fraud or corruption in procurement or disbursement will be controlled under the project.  | Mechanisms to avoid any corruption or mismanagement of funds on page 70 of the track changed revised   |
|  | 3. Are there measures in place for the management of for environmental and social risks, in line with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund? | <p><b>No.</b> The proposal identified a number of environmental and social risks, and their management needs to be integrated in an ESMP. In addition, component 3 and output 5.4 of the proposal contain USPs, also requiring the project to have an ESMP to ensure that any environmental and social risks associated with the USPs are identified as and when that becomes possible, and that management measures are identified accordingly. The proposal states that an ESMP will be developed during the inception phase of the project but that is too late. All projects with ESP risks, and a fortiori those with USPs, require a comprehensive ESMP at the time of submission of the proposal.</p> <p><b>CAR 7:</b> Please include an adequate ESMP.</p> | <p><b>Response for CAR 7</b><br/>An adequate ESMP has been developed to identify environment and social risks and their management. For more information see Annex 7</p> <p><b>Response to CAR 8</b></p> |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>The proposal includes a description in section III.C of the grievance mechanism. The project will utilize the existing grievance mechanism in the United Republic of Tanzania, and the role of the project management is limited to informing stakeholders about the existence of the system. The description of the grievance mechanism in the proposal lacks clarity and seems to involve a multitude of committees and administrative levels, rendering the mechanism convoluted and unlikely to provide a functional and transparent process. The IE is accountable for negative impacts but its role in the process is very limited, and it is unclear how it will supervise the functioning of the grievance mechanism. It is recommended that the IE develops a bespoke, clear and lean grievance mechanism for the project that will allow it to carry out its supervision function effectively.</p> <p><b>CAR 8:</b> Please revise the grievance mechanism.</p> | <p>The grievance mechanism has been revised to show how the process is transparent and functional. The supervision function of IE is also clearly stated. For more information please see page 69-70 of the track changed revised proposal</p> |
|--|--|---|--|

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  | 4. Is a budget on the Implementing Entity Management Fee use included?   | <b>Yes.</b> Table 16 includes a breakdown of the IE Management Fee.   | <b>Noted with thanks</b>   |
|  | 5. Is an explanation and a breakdown of the execution costs included?  | <b>Yes.</b> Table 15 includes a breakdown of the execution costs.   | <b>Noted with thanks</b>   |
|  | 6. Is a detailed budget including budget notes included?   | <b>Yes.</b> A detailed budget and extensive budget notes are included. However, there is an error in the Total Project Cost calculation, which persists in the other sections of the proposal (the total of the project costs should be 2,118,645 according to the budget table. \$2,118,634 is being used in the proposal. The number is also inconsistent with the one in the disbursement schedule).<br><br><b>CAR 9:</b> Please correct all the budget tables in the proposal, as well as other references to the Total Project Cost. | <b>Response to CAR 9</b><br>All budget tables have been corrected to be consistence.   |
|  | 7. Are arrangements for monitoring and evaluation clearly defined, including budgeted M&E plans and sex-disaggregated data, targets and indicators, in | <b>Partially.</b> The proposal includes a budgeted M&E plan, including provisions for a terminal evaluation. However, it does not address management of environmental or social risks. Apart from the activities specifically aiming at a gender  | <b>Response to CAR 10</b><br>Gender disaggregated data; target and indicators in the proposal have been included in a comprehensive and consistence manner. For more information refer to table 11 and |

|  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
|  | <p>compliance with the Gender Policy of the Fund?</p>   | <p>group, there is little or no consideration of gender or gender-disaggregation in the monitoring and evaluation arrangements. The proposal includes very few quantified indicators or targets, and baseline figures are generally lacking.</p> <p><b>CAR 10:</b> Please include gender-disaggregated data, targets and indicators in the proposal in a comprehensive and consistent manner.</p> | <p>12 of the track changed revised proposal.</p> <p>Management of environmental and social risks has been considered in the M&amp;E plan and Budget. Please see table 9a and 9b</p>         |
|  | <p>8. Does the M&amp;E Framework include a break-down of how implementing entity IE fees will be utilized in the supervision of the M&amp;E function?</p> | <p><b>Yes.</b> The Project M&amp;E work plan and budget is included but contains an error.</p> <p><b>CR 11:</b> Please clarify the M&amp;E Plan budget with the breakdown of IE fees for supervision of the M&amp;E function.</p>   | <p><b>Response to CR 11</b></p> <p>The error on the Project M&amp; E has been corrected. Please see table 10 on page 66 of the track changed revised proposal</p>                           |
|  | <p>9. Does the project/programme's results framework align with the AF's results framework? Does it include at least one core</p>                         | <p><b>No.</b>The results framework (Table 11) includes gaps and indicators that are not mentioned elsewhere, some rather significant. The expected results lack quantification and are generally not gender-</p>  | <p><b>Response to CAR 11</b></p> <p>The result framework has been revised to fill the gaps and ensure consistence throughout the proposal. Core impact indicator has been included. For</p> |

|  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
|  | <p>outcome indicator from the Fund's results framework?</p> | <p>disaggregated. Several milestones have not been determined. e.g., under Outcome 1, one of the two indicators listed is "Number of trees planted", and the target is set at 1,500,000. The description of Output 1 elsewhere in the proposal does not mention any such targets.</p> <p><b>CAR 11:</b> Please revise the results framework to fill the gaps and ensure consistency throughout the proposal, and to comply with the GP.</p> <p>The project result framework does not include the core impact indicator "Number of beneficiaries including estimations for direct and indirect beneficiaries". A second core indicator is also lacking.</p> <p><b>CAR 12:</b> Please ensure that the project results framework aligns with the AF results framework and that core outcome indicators are included as required. Please refers to the revised AF's result framework available here <a href="https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-">https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-</a></p> | <p>more information please see table 11, 12 and 13 on pages 77-86 of the track changed revised proposal</p> <p><b>Response for CAR12</b></p> <p>The project result framework has been revised to align with core AF outcome indicators Please see CAR 11 for more information</p> |
|  |   |   |   |

|  |   |   |                          |
|--|---|---|--------------------------|
|  |   | <a href="content/uploads/2019/10/Adaptation-Fund-Strategic-Results-Framework-Amended-in-March-2019-2.pdf">content/uploads/2019/10/Adaptation-Fund-Strategic-Results-Framework-Amended-in-March-2019-2.pdf</a> |                          |
|  | 10. Is a disbursement schedule with time-bound milestones included? | <b>Yes.</b><br>Please <b>see CAR9.</b>  | <b>Noted with thanks</b> |