



## ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.37/14/Add.1  
16 March 2026

---

Adaptation Fund Board  
Project and Programme Review Committee  
Thirty seventh Meeting  
Bonn, Germany, 7-8 April 2026

Agenda Item 5 (i)

### **PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR TANZANIA (5)**

## I. Background

1. The Board at its eleventh meeting discussed the document "Funding for Project Formulation Costs" (AFB/11/6) and agreed, in its Decision B.11/18, that:

- i. project formulation grants (PFG) should be given once a project concept has been approved
- ii. consideration should be given in terms of differentiating between NIEs and MIEs, since some NIEs might have financial difficulties in trying to formulate project or programme proposals;
- iii. a flat rate should be given for project formulation costs;
- iv. a list of eligible activities and items still needed to be prepared; v. the grant should be additional to the project cost; and
- v. the fate of funds if the final project document was rejected should be determined.

2. There was consensus that a three-tiered system should be considered for project formulation grants: endorse a project concept with a PFG amount, endorse a project concept without a PFG amount, or reject the project concept.

3. Following the discussion, the Board decided:

To request the secretariat to reformulate the document, to include a comparison of eligible activities provided by other funds for project formulation grants, to take into account guidance provided by the Board at the present meeting, and to submit the document to the Board at its twelfth meeting, through the EFC. The EFC should review and finalize the process and policy of the project formulation grant focusing, in particular, on: the issue of unspent project funds; the procedures followed by other funds in that regard; and the determination of a flat-rate.

4. A document was prepared by the secretariat in response to the above mandate and presented at the third EFC meeting, which made specific recommendations to the Board at its twelfth meeting. Having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Board, in its Decision B.12/28, decided that:

*(a) Project Formulation Grants (PFGs) will only be made available for projects submitted through NIEs. The Board would continue reviewing the question of PFGs for projects submitted through MIEs and would solicit comments from members and alternate members by February 14, 2011; the views would be compiled by the secretariat for presentation to the Board at its March 2011 meeting;*

*(b) If a country required a project formulation grant, a request should be made at the same time as the submission of a project concept to the secretariat. The secretariat will review and forward it to the PPRC for a final recommendation to the Board. A PFG could only be awarded when a project concept was presented and endorsed;*

*(c) A PFG form, reproduced in Annex V, should be submitted;*

- (d) Only activities related to country costs would be eligible for PFG funding;*
- (e) A flat rate of up to US\$30,000 shall be provided, inclusive of the management fee, which cannot exceed 8.5 per cent of the grant amount. The flat fee would be reviewed by the Board at its thirteenth and all subsequent meetings;*
- (f) If the final project document is rejected, any unused funds shall be returned to the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund;*
- (g) Once a project/programme formulation grant is disbursed, a fully developed project document should come to the Board for approval within 12 months. No additional grants for project preparation can be received by a country until the fully developed project/programme document has been submitted to the Board; and*
- (h) The Trustee was instructed to remove the set-aside of US\$100,000 for project preparation that had been decided at the June 2010 meeting, as project preparation would be approved on a project-by-project basis.*

5. In its twenty-fourth meeting, the Board had initiated steps to launch a pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, not to exceed US\$ 30 million and had requested the secretariat to prepare for the consideration of the Board a proposal for such a pilot programme (Decision B.24/30). In its twenty-fifth meeting, the secretariat submitted such document and the Board decided to:

- (a) Approve the pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, as contained in document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2;*
- (b) Set a cap of US\$ 30 million for the programme;*
- (c) Request the secretariat to issue a call for regional project and programme proposals for consideration by the Board in its twenty-sixth meeting; and*
- (d) Request the secretariat to continue discussions with the Climate Technology Center and Network (CTCN) towards operationalizing, during the implementation of the pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, the Synergy Option 2 on knowledge management proposed by CTCN and included in Annex III of the document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2.*

*(Decision B.25/28)*

6. The approved document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2 contained provisions for the approval of project formulated grants for regional project and programme proposals, at different development stages, as follows:

*“It is proposed that the Board open a structured call for MIEs and RIEs to submit pre-concepts for regional projects and programmes. The optional pre-concepts would be very brief proposals of maximum 5 pages that would explain the proposed regional adaptation project/programme. The pre-concepts would be screened and technically reviewed by the*

*secretariat, and subsequently reviewed by the PPRC. Together with the pre-concept, the proponent could submit a Phase I PFG request, up to the maximum level of US\$ 20,000. While endorsing the pre-concept, the Board could also approve the Phase I PFG request. The endorsement of the pre-concept would not create an obligation for the Board for later funding. As the next step, the proponent would submit a concept, and with it the proponent could submit a Phase II PFG request. The maximum AFB/PPRC.18/25/Add.1 level of the Phase II PFG would be US\$ 80,000 for proposals that had been previously granted Phase I PFG, and US\$ 100,000 for proposals that bypassed the optional pre-concept stage. While endorsing the concept, the Board could also approve the Phase II PFG request. The endorsement of the concept would not create an obligation for the Board for later funding, as it is the case for the national projects. The final stage of the proposal process would be the submission of the fully-developed regional project document”.*

## **II. The Project Formulation Grant Request**

7. This addendum to the document AFB/PPRC.37/14 “Proposal for Tanzania” includes a request for a Project Formulation Grant, requesting a budget of US\$ 150,000, which was received by the secretariat along with the concept for the project AF00000473 “Scaling Up of Project Interventions and Lessons Learned from Strategic Water Harvesting Technologies for Enhancing Climate Change Adaptation for Argo-Pastoral Communities of Semi-arid Areas of Tanzania (SWAHAT)”. This proposal was submitted by National Environment Management Council (NEMC), which is a National Implementing Entity of the Adaptation Fund, in time for consideration by the Adaptation Fund Board at its forty-sixth Board meeting.

8. In accordance with Decision B.12/28, paragraph (b), the secretariat carried out an initial review of the PFG request and found that the document provided detailed information on the use of the requested funds. The proposed activities were aligned with the goal of the project and would support: comprehensive consultation process; Assessment of existing SWAHAT interventions; Technical design of water harvesting systems; and full proposal development.

9. Therefore, the PPRC may want to consider and recommend to the Board to approve the PFG Request, provided that the related concept proposal is endorsed.



ADAPTATION FUND

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

PROJECT/PROGRAMME CATEGORY: Regular-sized Project Concept

**Country/Region:** Tanzania

**Project Title:** Scaling Up of Project Interventions and Lessons Learned from Strategic Water Harvesting Technologies for Enhancing Climate Change Adaptation for Argo-Pastoral Communities of Semi-arid Areas of Tanzania (SWAHAT)

**Thematic Focal Area:** Water management, agriculture and forestry

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

**Executing Entities:** Technologies and Resilience for Agroecology, Climate Change & Environment (TRACE)

**AF Project ID:** AF00000473

**IE Project ID:**

**Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars):** 5,000,000

**Reviewer and contact person:** Ahmad Ghosn

**Co-reviewer(s):**

**IE Contact Person:**

<p>Technical Summary</p>	<p>The project “Scaling Up of Project Interventions and Lessons Learned from Strategic Water Harvesting Technologies for Enhancing Climate Change Adaptation for Argo-Pastoral Communities of Semi-arid Areas of Tanzania (SWAHAT)” aims to upscale the successful lessons learned from the Strategic water harvesting Technologies for Enhancing Resilience to Climate Change in Rural Pastoral Communities in Semi-Arid Areas of Tanzania (SWAHAT) project in Kondoa, Bahi and Nzega districts. This will be done through the four components below:</p> <p><u>Component 1:</u> Enhance climate resilient rural water supply system in vulnerable agro-pastoral communities of semi-arid areas (USD 2,587,381);</p> <p><u>Component 2:</u> Develop integrated climate resilient livelihoods diversification through improved climate smart technologies in agriculture, efficient utilization of natural ecosystem resource (USD 986,916);</p> <p><u>Component 3:</u> Engagement of local community in a participatory reforestation program through planting of locally adapted fruit and forest trees (USD 425,996).</p> <p><u>Component 4:</u> Learning and Knowledge Management to Strengthen local community capacity for effective adaptation strategies and reduce risks associated with climate change (USD 173,707)</p> <p><u>Requested financing overview:</u> Project/Programme Execution Cost: USD 436,000</p>
--------------------------	--

Total Project/Programme Cost: USD 4,610,000  
Implementing Fee: USD 390,000  
Financing Requested: USD 5,000,000

The proposal includes a request for a project formulation grant of USD 150,000.

The first technical review raises several issues, such as: aligning components financing table with AF template format and revising allocated amounts/ requested funding; providing overall project objective statement and indicating the AF objectives/ outcomes supported by the project; providing details on the activities and identifying USPs, if any; clarifying the project theory of change; adding more details on project benefits; providing initial gender assessment; clarifying project cost effectiveness; adding details on related national plans and inclusion of applicable national standards; revising related projects list; providing more details on the consultations, and knowledge management and sustainability aspects; aligning AF E&S checklist with AF requirement and specifying the project overall risk category; revising EC and IE fees to align with AF limits; revising AF alignment table; among others, as indicated in the Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.

The second technical review finds that most of the first review CARs, CRs and notes are adequately addressed. However, few others still need to be addressed/ further addressed including: providing initial gender assessment; quantifying project benefits, as available; adding more related national plans; clarifying the vulnerable groups involvement in consultations; aligning AF E&S checklist with AF requirement; revising AF RF alignment table; among other issues and notes indicated in the second review.

The third technical review finds that most of the pending CRs and CARs of the second review were addressed, except for the calculation of components costs in the components financing table, which if not adjusted/ revised, would require revising the requested financing and the AF RF alignment table. There is also need to amend the alignment table to conform with the template and the correct manner of completion.).

The fourth technical review finds that most of the pending CARs and CRs of the third review are addressed, except for review of the risk table a typo error in the date of last submission and an editorial note (revising table of content, page numbering and updating the project timeline).

The fifth technical review finds that all outstanding CRs and CARs have been addressed.

*Please be advised that the findings of the AFB Secretariat's review of the funding proposal(s) do not reflect, indicate, or prejudice the outcome of the reaccreditation process currently underway. The Implementing Entity (IE) shall acknowledge that the funding proposal will not be approved by the Board if the IE's accreditation has expired, and reaccreditation has not been achieved at the time of the Board's decision. Notwithstanding this potential risk, the IE has elected to proceed with the development of the funding proposal.*

Date:

**11 March 2026**

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments 12 November 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 17 December 2025	Third Technical Review Comments 27 January 2026	Forth Technical Review Comments 24 February 2026	Fifth Technical Review Comments 11 March 2026
Country Eligibility	1. Is the country party to the Kyoto Protocol, and/or the Paris Agreement?	<b>Yes.</b>	-	-	-	-
	2. Is the country a developing country particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change?	<b>Yes.</b> Tanzania is vulnerable to climate change risks including rising temperatures, more frequent/ intense floods and droughts, and sea-level rise. All of the above risks negatively impact agriculture-dependent livelihoods, food security, and water resources and natural ecosystems health, provisions and services.	-	-	-	-
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 08 August 2025.	-	-	-	-

	<p>2. Does the length of the proposal amount to no more than Fifty pages for the project/programme concept, including its annexes?</p>	<p><b>No.</b> The length of the CN including annexes is 52 pages.</p> <p><b>CAR1:</b> Please revise the CN document to ensure that its length after addressing remain within the 50 pages limit (excluding recommended table of contents, lists of acronyms, figures and tables).</p> <p><b>CAR2:</b> On p.1, Only list the <u>responsible Executing Entity/ies (to whom AF funds will be transferred)</u>. If TRACE is officially the sole responsible executing entity that utilizes the expertise of SUA, then list TRACE only; if both TRACE and SUA officially share the execution responsibilities, then list both and delete “in cooperation with”.</p> <p><b>CAR3:</b> On p. 1, the requested financing of USD 5,000,000 is higher</p>	<p><b>Note:</b> All reference pages refer to track change version – computer screen dashboard, unless otherwise specified.</p> <p><b>CAR1: Not Cleared.</b> Document length is 51 including table of contents, lists of acronyms, figures and tables). However, please update the stage of submission section on page 1 to include the re-submission date as well as to check the box that this proposal has been previously submitted.</p> <p><b>CAR2: Cleared.</b> See p. 1.</p> <p><b>CAR3: Cleared.</b> Components,</p>	<p><b>CAR1: Cleared.</b> See p. 1.</p> <p><b>CAR1 (NEW):</b> Please be sure to update stage of submission section on page 1 with the re-submission.</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>	<p>-</p> <p><b>CAR1 (NEW): Not fully cleared.</b> See p.1. <u>A typo error in resubmission date (year should be 2026).</u></p> <p><b>CAR2 (NEW):</b> Please revise the project implementation timeline at Figure 3 since the PFG will need to be executed before project implementation commences.</p> <p>-</p>	<p><b>CAR1: Cleared.</b> As per correction on page 1.</p> <p><b>CAR2 (NEW): Cleared.</b> As per amended project calendar - Table 3.</p>
--	--	--	---	---	---	---

		<p>than the total project cost and implementing fee compared with the figures indicated in the project components and financing table, pp. 9-14. Please revise the requested funding based on the revised figures of the project components and financing table (see related CAR3 below).</p> <p><b>CAR4:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On p.1, please revise the requested project formulation grant to be USD 150,000, instead of USD 5000,000.</li> <li>2. Please also amend the start and end dates of the PFG.</li> <li>3. Please confirm if TRACE and SUA will also execute the PFG, if not please amend the PFG request form.</li> <li>4. Please include a dedicated IE fee line item for the PFG. Please note that the other activity costs plus the IE fee should all add up of the \$150,000.</li> </ol> <p><b>CR1:</b> On p.3, it is stated that "The project will be</p>	<p>execution and IE costs are revised to maintain requested financing of USD 5,000,000. See Table 2, pp. 15-16.</p> <p><b>CAR4: Cleared.</b> See p. 1, and pp. 78-79.</p> <p><b>CR1: Cleared.</b> See p. 8. Singida District (Singida DC) has been added throughout the CN document where it is required</p>	-	-	-
--	--	--	--	---	---	---

		<p>implemented in drought and flood prone semi-arid regions of Tanzania particularly Dodoma, Singida, and Tabora. However, the districts where the project is implemented (Kondoa, Bahi and Nzega) are located in Dodoma and Tabora regions only. None is located Singida. Please revise the above statement.</p> <p><b>CR2:</b> Under ““Project Objectives”, p. 8, the overall project objective is not provided. Please include a statement of the overall objective, followed by the listed 4 main/ specific objectives. <u>A suggested overall objective statement is: "to upscale the successful lessons learned from the Strategic water harvesting Technologies for Enhancing Resilience to Climate Change in Rural Pastoral Communities in Semi-Arid Areas of Tanzania (SWAHAT) project in Kondoa, Bahi and Nzega districts.</u></p>	<p><b>CR2: Cleared.</b> See p. 12.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Revise section 1.2.2 to indicate specific objectives only (add “to” at the beginning of objectives 1&amp;3 statements or delete “to” from the beginning of objectives 2&amp;4 statements, and list components after as a dedicated subsection.</p> <p><b>CR3: Cleared.</b> See pp. 18-19.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> delete section numbering 2.1.2.2,</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p><b>Note: Cleared.</b> See p. 11.</p> <p>-</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p><b>CR3:</b> In the absence of SWAHAT project mid-term review or any other evaluation, it is not clear how the proposed scaleup is evidence-based and would lead to maximized adaptation impacts. Please, include in Part I, or beginning of Part IIA, a brief summary of the SWAHAT project (one page or less) to highlight the successful interventions to be replicated/ upscaled.</p> <p><b>CAR5:</b> Align the components and financing table, pp. 9-24, with the AF template format. No need to include activities and detailed execution costs. Provide amounts at component, outcome and output levels, the total of the execution costs, the total project cost , the total implementing fee and the total requested financing. the AF CN template can be accessed via the below link:  <a href="https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/template-for-concept-note-for-single-country-proposal/">https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/template-for-concept-note-for-single-country-proposal/</a></p>	<p>....., 2.5 or revise to A.1, A.2, ....., A.5.</p> <p><b>CAR5: Cleared.</b> See pp.15-17.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> no need to include the breakdown of execution costs and implementation fee in the table, just include the totals (i.e.: USD 436,000 for EC and USD 390,000 for IE fee).  <u>Aso, revise Table 2 title to “Project Components and Financing”.</u></p> <p><b>CAR6: Not Cleared.</b> See pp. 15-17.</p> <p>All revisions made to components costs, execution cost costs</p>	<p><b>Note: Cleared.</b> See pp, 17-20.</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p><b>CAR6:</b> Revise the calculations/ amounts in the project components and financing table.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Double check the total of component 2, as it should be USD 986,916.</li> <li>2. Include the total of component 4: USD 347,414</li> <li>3. Total of execution costs is not correct and is different from that mentioned at the bottom of the table (i.e.: USD 435,520 - used in this review).</li> <li>4. Revise the total project cost and requested funding based on the below:</li> </ol> <p>Project/programme activities cost = A (\$3,915,919)  Project/programme execution cost =B (\$435,520)  Total project/programme cost = A+B (\$4,351,439)  Implementing Entity Fee = C (\$384,654)  Total amount of funding requested, or the grant amount=A+B+C (\$4,736,093). A fees calculator is available at</p>	<p>and IE fee are noted. However, please remove the details inserted for the fees. At this is not required at the Concept stage and as presented do not accurately reflect the placement of costs and fees. Only the total EE costs and total IE fees are required.</p>	<p><b>CAR6: Not Cleared.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Component 3 outputs total as presented in the financing table adds up to \$371,996 not \$425,996 (difference of \$54,000). <u>Please adjust allocated costs for outputs 3.1&amp;3.2 to be the same as those indicated in the AF RF alignment Table 8 (i.e.: \$158,170 and \$267,826 respectively).</u></li> <li>2. Delete the three rows directly under component "Total component 4" as they are mentioned at the table bottom rows.</li> </ol>	<p><b>CAR6: Cleared.</b> See Table 2, pp. 13-14.</p>	
--	--	---	---	---	--	--

**Some editorial issues indicated**

		<p><a href="#">IE and EE Fees Calculator</a> (EXCEL)</p> <p><b>Please address the following editorial issues to improve the clarity/ quality of the CN document:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add table of contents</li> <li>2. Add tables numbers and headings for all tables across the document.</li> <li>3. Add lists of acronyms, figures and tables. Reflect these lists in the table of contents, spell out abbreviations when first used and refer to figures/ tables at related discussions.</li> <li>4. On p. 4, delete the title "Outline the economic social, development and environmental context in which the project would operate".</li> <li>5. Please add section letter numbering "F" for the "duplication of project/programme with other funding sources" section, pp.</li> </ol>	<p><b>below need to be addressed:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Some tables numbers and headings are not provided (e.g.: project calendar, AF E&amp;S Checklist in Part IIK, Alignment with AF results frame table in Part III, etc.).</li> <li>2. Revise Table 2 title to "Project Components and Financing".</li> <li>3. Delete the empty column (column 4) in Table 3.</li> <li>4. Include Endorsement letter in Part IV instead of Annex 1.</li> <li>5. Conduct a thorough round of editing/ proof reading for the CN document after revising it to ensure its quality.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Note:</b> Another quick round of editing/ proofreading is recommended.</p>	<p><b>Note:</b> Another quick round of editing/ proofreading is recommended (e.g., revising table of contents, adding page numbering).</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

		<p>25-26, and revise numbering of the sections that follow.</p> <p><b>6.</b> Conduct a thorough round of editing/ proof reading for the CN document</p>				
	<p>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>	<p><b>Yes.</b> See Part IIA, pp. 15-19. Concrete actions include drilling boreholes; installing solar water pumps; constructing water storage tanks, community water distribution points, cattle water troughs; reinforcement of water-harvesting dams; establishing drip irrigation schemes and pest management clinic;</p>				-

		<p>enhancing management options on emerging pests; establishing value chains options for income generation; capacity building; among others. <u>However</u>, adding more details on the activities would be recommended, including the identification of possible USPs, if any. <u>Also</u>, a brief discussion on the “Theory of Change” to reflect the suitability of activities to the climate change threats addressed by the project. <u>Moreover</u>, briefly indicate the AF objectives/ outcomes supported by the project.</p> <p><b>CR4:</b> Please provide more details on the activities including: locations (to avoid overlap with any current / ongoing projects), number of beneficiaries, selected villages in the districts, number of boreholes, number of governance structures (CBWSOs), number and topics of trainings and trainees, among other etc.</p>	<p><b>CR4: Cleared.</b> See Part IIA, pp. 19-23. Also see IE response.</p>	-	-	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

		<p><b>CAR7:</b> Activity 1.1.1 “Extensively survey and drill boreholes in drought prone and water scarce villages and install solar power-driven water pumps in selected eight villages of Kondoa, Bahi and Nzega districts” implies unidentified sub-projects (USPs). Please, clarify and provide a brief discussion on how these USPs, if it is the case, would be managed to meet related AF requirements.</p> <p><b>CR5:</b> Revise title of activity 2.3, p. 16, and provide pertinent details.</p> <p><b>CR6:</b> at the end Part I (after objectives), or at the beginning of Part IIA, please include a brief discussion of the project theory of change (TOC) and provide a schematic presentation of the same to illustrate how the proposed interventions will lead to the intended long-term change/ tangible outcomes, the assumptions made, potential constraints, required inputs and how they would link to project components and climate</p>	<p><b>CAR7: Cleared.</b> See p. 19.</p> <p><b>CR5: Cleared.</b> See p. 21.</p> <p><b>CR6: Cleared.</b> Sufficient for CN stage. See pp. 12-14. A clearer Schematic presentation of the TOC would be recommended at full proposal stage.</p>	-	-	-	-
--	--	--	---	---	---	---	---

		<p>change impacts addressed by the project.</p> <p><b>CAR8:</b> After objectives in Part I, or in Part IIA, please indicate the AF strategic objectives/ outcomes supported by the project (information can be extracted from Part IIIA AF RF Alignment table, pp. 35-47).</p>	<p><b>CAR8: Cleared.</b> See Part IIA-components description, pp. 19, 20, 22, 23,</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>Yes.</b> To a large extent. See Part IIB, pp. 19-20. <u>However</u>, providing quantitative supporting evidence of the stated benefits is recommended including beneficiaries, with particular reference to the equitable distribution of benefits taking into account vulnerable groups and gender aspects. <u>Also</u>, an initial gender assessment/ analysis (required at CN stage) is lacking (only scattered reference to gender issues is made).</p>				-

		<p><b>CR7:</b> Please quantify, where possible at this stage, the benefits in all three areas (economic, social and environmental), including benefits (can be extracted from activities details) and beneficiaries with particular with particular reference to vulnerable groups and gender aspects. A more detailed discussion on the benefits would be required at full proposal stage.</p> <p><b>CAR9:</b> Please provide an initial gender assessment and attach as an annex. Refer to this assessment, as relevant, at related sections of the proposal (e.g.: related activities in part IIA, Part IIB, Part IIK).</p>	<p><b>CR7: Not Cleared.</b> Please include <u>requested information in Part IIB</u> (e.g.: total number of beneficiaries extracted from table 5, and other economic, social and environmental benefits numbers/ quantities extracted from activity details in Part IIA).</p> <p><b>CAR9: Not Cleared.</b> Table 5 title indicated that the listed beneficiaries/ communities are consulted, but no substantiation of such consultation is provided (e.g.: date of consultations, venue/ method of consultation, etc.). The information provided seem to rather be relevant data that was collected on the intervention areas, which could be part of the initial assessment if amended by additional discussion</p>	<p><b>CR7: Cleared.</b> See pp. 20-21.</p> <p><b>CAR9: Cleared.</b> Sufficient for CN stage. A detailed gender assessment and action plan would be required at full proposal stage. See Part IIB, pp. 22-23, Table 6 pp. 35-36, and IE response.</p>	-	
--	--	--	---	--	---	--

			<p>on the gender issues associated the project scope (e.g.: challenges and opportunities faced/ available to men, woman, youth in the intervention areas). It is therefore recommended to combine table 5 and the above recommended discussion on gender issues mentioned above and present as an initial gender assessment (which could be attached as an annex and referred to at relevant discussions/ sections or presented under dedicated heading/ title in Part I (background and context).</p>			
	<p>5. Is the project / programme cost effective?</p>	<p><b>Unsure.</b> See Part IIC, p. 20. Only reference to NAPA priorities and SWAHAT for related cost effectiveness is provided.</p> <p><b>CAR10:</b> Please provide a brief discussion on the cost effectiveness of the planned project interventions against status quo and/ or other</p>	<p><b>CAR10. Cleared.</b> Sufficient for CN level. See pp. 25-26. <u>More detailed and focussed discussion should be provided at full proposal stage to</u></p>	-	-	-

		intervention options/ scenarios. A more detailed cost effectiveness analysis would be required at full proposal stage.	<u>compare the proposed project cost-effectives against “no action” and/ or other alternative intervention options.</u>			
	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?	<p><b>Yes, however additional information is required.</b> See Part IID, pp. 20-24. <u>However,</u> the discussion refers to “The water supply project in semi-arid areas” for related consistency and some listed plans/ strategies lack dates, among others.</p> <p><b>CAR11:</b> Reference should be made to the proposed upscaling project CN and dates of some related plans need to be added. Also, listed plans/ strategies <u>should logically include those applicable to SWAHAT project being upscaled.</u> Please revise Part IID discussion in line with the above.</p>	<p><b>CAR11: Not Cleared.</b> See pp. 27-30. While refence is made to the SWAHAT upscaling project to avoid confusion with the parent completed SWAHAT project, no additional plans/ strategies were added. <u>Please double check the parent/ completed SWAHAT project proposal document for more relevant plans/ strategies and include in Part IID.</u></p>	<p><b>CAR11: Cleared.</b> See pp. 24-28 and IE response.</p>	-	-
	7. Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable, in	<p><b>Yes, however additional information is required.</b> See Part IIE, pp. 24-25. <u>Relevant technical standards are</u></p>				-

	<p>compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund?</p>	<p><u>not listed</u>. These standards may include building codes, water quality regulations, sector-specific regulations, among others as relevant to the project intervention. (Note: these standards/ regulations/ etc. should logically include those of the SWAHAT project to be replicated).</p> <p><b>CAR12:</b> Please provide a list of relevant technical standards/ guidelines/ etc. along with dates and to which project interventions they would apply. Those mentioned in SWAHAT project could possibly be relevant, as the proposed project is closely related.</p>	<p><b>CAR12: Cleared.</b> See pp. 31-32.</p>	-	-	
	<p>8. Is there duplication of project / programme with other funding sources?</p>	<p><b>No.</b></p> <p>See Part IIF, pp. 25-26 (Please add Section letter numbering "F" and revise the letter numbering of the sections that follow). <u>However</u>, the information provided requires further clarification regarding the inclusion of SWAHAT project, and</p>				-

		<p>other possible related projects (ongoing and or completed), if any.</p> <p><b>CAR13:</b> Include SWAHAT as a related project, and double check for other possible ongoing/ completed projects including those mentioned in SWAHAT project proposal document. Also, revise the table on pp. 25-26 to include details on possible complementarity in addition to avoided duplication. Listed projects should indicate: (i) project title; (ii) main project interventions, (iii) timeline, (iv) target population, (v) implementing entity, (vi) specific location, and (vii) complementarity/ synergies with the proposed project. Evidence of no overlap should be clearly justified (e.g. by indicating distinct geographic locations and/or types of interventions) for each related project identified.</p>	<p><b>CAR13: Cleared.</b> See pp. 33-34. <u>More details would be needed at full proposal stage.</u></p>	-	-	
	<p>9. Does the project / programme have a learning and</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> See Part IIG, pp. 26-27. A dedicated component is devoted</p>				-

	<p>knowledge management component to capture and feedback lessons?</p>	<p>for the purpose. <u>However</u>, more details need to be provided in Part IIG.</p> <p><b>CR8:</b> Please include more details on the knowledge management aspects including those included under component 4. Also, clarify who will be responsible for tracking the experiences gained, how this will be done, and when the tracking will take place.</p>	<p><b>CR8: Cleared.</b> See p. 35. More details are needed at full proposal stage.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p><b>Unsure.</b> Part IIH, p.27, states that a consultative process with national authorities took place. <u>However</u>, no details are included in the concept note or annexes.</p> <p><b>CAR14:</b> Please provide details of the consultations conducted in tabulated form and highlight consultations with local communities/ vulnerable groups. The table should include date of consultations, stakeholders/ communities/ vulnerable groups consulted, number of participants disaggregated by</p>	<p><b>CAR14: Not cleared.</b> Table 4, pp. 37-38, provide requested details on the conducted consultations. However, a clarification on the involvement of vulnerable groups (women and youth), if any, is not provided. <u>Please, clarify in a dedicated paragraph</u></p>	<p><b>CAR14: Cleared.</b> See pp. 32-35/36.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>

		<p>gender, topics discussed and how outcomes are reflected in project design. Also, considering the important role of vulnerable groups (women and youth), kindly explain how these groups have been involved in consultation workshops, if any.</p>	<p><u>the involvement of these groups in the consultations for the CN (e.g.: as part of consultations listed in Table 4), if any, and indicate their involvement in future consultations at full proposal stage.</u></p> <p><u><i>More importantly, Table 5 does not read as/ imply consultations with vulnerable groups as it lacks substantiation (consultation dates, topics discussed and outcomes). The information provided rather reads as a survey of the populations/ beneficiaries in the intervention areas, and could be part of an initial gender assessment (See related CAR9). Please also revise Table 5 title to indicate that the information presented are gender data/ information (not consultation) of the beneficiaries of communities in the intervention areas.</i></u></p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p>11. Is the requested financing justified on the basis of full cost of adaptation reasoning?</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> See Part II”I”, pp. 27-31. <u>However</u>, there is no need to include the listed activities under the components discussion. Also, it is not clear whether or not co-financing is targeted/required.</p> <p><b>CR9:</b> In Part II”I”, pp. 27-31, delete the activities listed under the components. Also, delete the repeated title of Part II”I”, p. 27 (i.e.: “A. Provide justification for funding requested, focusing on the full cost of adaptation reasoning”).</p> <p><b>CR10:</b> Kindly clarify whether the project requires co-financing or not. Irrespective of any such co-financing, please confirm that the project will be able to effectively realize its objectives utilizing requested AF funds only.</p>	<p><b>CR9: Cleared.</b> See pp. 43-47.</p> <p><b>CR10: Cleared.</b> Based on IE response. no co-financing is required.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project / program aligned with AF’s results framework?</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> See Part IIIA, pp. 35-47. However, AF alignment table need to be revised to ensure consistency at AF outcome and output levels, among others.</p>	<p><b>CAR15: Not cleared.</b> See pp. 52-54.</p> <p>1. <u>Totals of grant amounts at AF outcome and at output levels should be included based on the</u></p>	<p><b>CAR15: Not Cleared.</b></p> <p>The table is still not complying with the template. The total line for top and bottom sections of</p>	<p><b>CAR15: Cleared.</b> See Table 8, pp. 42-43.</p>	<p>-</p>

		<p><b>CAR15:</b> Please update the results framework alignment table based on updated guidance found at <a href="#">Results Framework Alignment Table</a> (Amended in November 2025) (77 kB, DOC)</p>	<p><u>updated guidance of the AF RF alignment table.</u> (Note: totals at AF outcome level should be equal to components cost (USD 4,174,000);</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Same applies to the total at AF output level. The total at AF output level adds up to USD 4,120,000 only (should be USD 4,174,000).</li> <li>3. <u>Please double check allocated amounts at output level and revise to make it add up to USD 4,174,000.</u></li> <li>4. <u>At Part II Section B, in the preambular paragraph please indicate the strategic results framework outcomes to which the proposal is aligned. These should be the same as in the table at Part III A.</u></li> </ol>	<p>the table is missing. Please address.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please ensure that the outcome chosen at the top and the corresponding total for that outcome matches what is identified under the subordinate outputs in the bottom part of the table. Please address the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. For outcome 3 the top part has a total of 173,707 but in the bottom part of the table the totals assigned to output 3 is 236,106. Please correct.</li> <li>b. For Outcome 6 top 1,986,916 vs 145,086 on the bottom.</li> <li>c. For outcome 4 2,587,381 on the top vs 2,524,983 on the bottom.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>		
--	--	---	---	--	--	--

				<p>d. For outcome 5 on the top 425, 996 vs 267,826 on the bottom.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Please see CAR6 above regarding component 3 total cost.</p>		
	<p>13. Has the sustainability of the project/programme outcomes been taken into account when designing the project?</p>	<p><b>Yes, however additional information is required.</b> See Part IIJ, p. 32. Only a brief general discussion is provided.</p> <p><b>CAR16:</b> revise the discussion in Part II"1" to address the key sustainability areas (economic, social, environmental, institutional, financial, etc.), under dedicated subheadings, and refer to the related lessons learnt from SWAHAT project, if any. Briefly explain the arrangements through which sustainability would be achieved, taking into account O&amp;M operation of infrastructures/ installations to be developed, policies/ governance arrangements to be</p>	<p><b>CAR16: Cleared.</b> Sufficient for CN stage. See pp.47-48. More details are needed at full proposal stage.</p>	-	-	-

		developed/ implemented, capacity to be improved, etc.				
	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><b>Yes, however additional information is required.</b></p> <p>See Part IIK, pp. 32-34. Please revise Part IIK to address the below issues.</p> <p><b>CAR17:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the AF checklist, pp. 32-34, although the list indicates no further assessment would be required for all principles, related discussions on whether there is a risk or no risk should be indicated/ substantiated including level of risk/impact and it would be mitigated to ensure compliance with AF principles (should be included in the third column).</li> <li>2. Also, please note that the AF E&amp;S principles 1, 4 and 6 always apply. For more information, please visit: <a href="#">AF's ESP guidance</a>.</li> </ol>	<p><b>CAR17: Not cleared.</b> Further assessment is always required for AF E&amp;S principles 1, 4, and 6. Please revise column 2 to reflect this. Also, <u>specify the risk</u>, if any, <u>and indicate the risk/ impact level</u> in column 3 for all E&amp;S principles (e.g.: No risk, low risk, moderate risk, etc.).</p>	<p><b>CAR 17: Cleared.</b> See Table 7 pp. 40-42.</p>	<p><b>CAR7 (re-opened):</b> At Table 7 where "No further assessment is required" Please replace with the X all other rows under column 2 please leave blank.</p>	<p><b>CAR7 (re-opened): Cleared.</b> As per updated Table1: Environmental and social impacts and risks identified as being relevant to the project/programme.</p>

		<p><b>CAR18:</b> Please provide an overall discussion of the project risks and impacts and explicitly state the risk category in which the screening process has classified the project (Category A, B or C).</p> <p><b>CAR19:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is stated under the ES principle "Marginalized and Vulnerable Groups" that they will be consulted/involved in project design. Kindly, revise the statement to clarify whether they were consulted at CN stage, and will be further consulted at full proposal stage, etc. Since consultations are required at each stage of project development, please provide information on the dates,</li> </ol>	<p><b>CAR18. Cleared.</b> Sufficient for CN level. See p. 48. <u>Further details need to be provided at full proposal stage.</u></p> <p><b>CAR19: Cleared.</b> Based on the information provided in Table 4, pp. 37-38.</p>	-	-	-
--	--	--	---	---	---	---

		<p>topics, and participant information disaggregated by gender.</p> <p>2. Please indicate how these consultations have been integrated in the development of the Concept Note.</p> <p><b>CR11:</b> Under “Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment” principle, please refer to the initial gender assessment and women involvement in consultations at CN stage and those to be conducted at full proposal stage. Also, refer to relevant national policies that protect gender rights, if any.</p>	<p><b>CR11: Not Cleared.</b> Please refer in the table (column 3) to <u>the initial gender assessment which is an AF requirement at concept stage (to be provided as per CAR9 above)</u>. Also, refer to any related gender policies in the country, if any, for ensuring gender equality,</p>	<p><b>CR11: Cleared.</b> Sufficient for CN level. See Part IIB, p. 22-23 and IE response.</p>	-	
Resource Availability	1. Is the requested project / programme funding within the cap of the country?	<p><b>Yes.</b></p> <p>Tanzania’s remaining country Balance in approximately \$30M.</p>	-	-	-	-
	2. Is the Implementing Entity Management Fee at or below 8.5 per cent of the total project/programme	<p><b>No.</b> Implementing Entity Fee is at 8.8%. Please revise and see CAR3 for related notes.</p>				-

	budget before the fee?	<b>CAR20:</b> Revise IE fee to be 8.5% or less of the total project/ programme cost. Adjust requested funding accordingly.	<b>CAR20: Cleared.</b> Revised IE fees are 8.5% of total project cost. See p. 17.	-	-	
	3. Are the Project/Programme Execution Costs at or below 9.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget (including the fee)?	<b>No.</b> Execution costs are at 10% of the total project/ programme budget. See CAR3 for related notes.  <b>CAR21:</b> Revise Execution Costs to be 9.5% or less of the total project/ programme cost. Adjust requested funding accordingly.	<b>CAR21: Cleared:</b> Execution costs are 9.5% of total project cost. See p. 17.	-	-	-
Eligibility of IE	1. Is the project/programme submitted through an eligible Implementing Entity that has been accredited by the Board?	<b>No.</b> National Environment Management Council (NEMC), an accredited National Implementing Entity (NIE), is in the process of being re-accredited.  <i>Please be advised that the findings of the AFB Secretariat's review of the funding proposal(s) do not reflect, indicate, or prejudice the outcome of the reaccreditation process currently underway. The Implementing Entity (IE) shall acknowledge that the funding proposal will not be approved by the</i>	<b>No.</b> National Environment Management Council (NEMC), an accredited National Implementing Entity (NIE), is in the process of being re-accredited.  <i>Please be advised that the findings of the AFB Secretariat's review of the funding proposal(s) do not reflect, indicate, or prejudice the outcome of the reaccreditation process currently underway. The Implementing Entity (IE) shall acknowledge that the funding</i>	<b>No.</b> National Environment Management Council (NEMC), an accredited National Implementing Entity (NIE), is in the process of being re-accredited.  <i>Please be advised that the findings of the AFB Secretariat's review of the funding proposal(s) do not reflect, indicate, or prejudice the outcome of the reaccreditation process currently underway. The Implementing Entity (IE) shall acknowledge that the funding</i>	<b>No.</b> National Environment Management Council (NEMC), an accredited National Implementing Entity (NIE), is in the process of being re-accredited.  <i>Please be advised that the findings of the AFB Secretariat's review of the funding proposal(s) do not reflect, indicate, or prejudice the outcome of the reaccreditation process currently underway. The Implementing Entity (IE) shall acknowledge that the funding</i>	<b>No.</b> National Environment Management Council (NEMC), an accredited National Implementing Entity (NIE), is in the process of being re-accredited.  <i>Please be advised that the findings of the AFB Secretariat's review of the funding proposal(s) do not reflect, indicate, or prejudice the outcome of the reaccreditation process currently underway. The Implementing Entity (IE) shall acknowledge that the funding</i>

		<i>Board if the IE's accreditation has expired, and reaccreditation has not been achieved at the time of the Board's decision. Notwithstanding this potential risk, the IE has elected to proceed with the development of the funding proposal.</i>	<i>proposal will not be approved by the Board if the IE's accreditation has expired, and reaccreditation has not been achieved at the time of the Board's decision. Notwithstanding this potential risk, the IE has elected to proceed with the development of the funding proposal.</i>	<i>underway. The Implementing Entity (IE) shall acknowledge that the funding proposal will not be approved by the Board if the IE's accreditation has expired, and reaccreditation has not been achieved at the time of the Board's decision. Notwithstanding this potential risk, the IE has elected to proceed with the development of the funding proposal.</i>	<i>proposal will not be approved by the Board if the IE's accreditation has expired, and reaccreditation has not been achieved at the time of the Board's decision. Notwithstanding this potential risk, the IE has elected to proceed with the development of the funding proposal.</i>	<i>proposal will not be approved by the Board if the IE's accreditation has expired, and reaccreditation has not been achieved at the time of the Board's decision. Notwithstanding this potential risk, the IE has elected to proceed with the development of the funding proposal.</i>
Implementation Arrangements	1. Is there adequate arrangement for project / programme management, in compliance with the Gender Policy of the Fund?	n/a at concept stage				
	2. Are there measures for financial and project/programme risk management?	n/a at concept stage				
	3. Are there measures in place for the management of for environmental and social risks, in line with the Environmental and Social Policy and	n/a at concept stage				

	Gender Policy of the Fund?					
	4. Is a budget on the Implementing Entity Management Fee use included?	n/a at concept stage				
	5. Is an explanation and a breakdown of the execution costs included?	n/a at concept stage				
	6. Is a detailed budget including budget notes included?	n/a at concept stage				
	7. Are arrangements for monitoring and evaluation clearly defined, including budgeted M&E plans and sex-disaggregated data, targets and indicators, in compliance with the Gender Policy of the Fund?	n/a at concept stage				
	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?	n/a at concept stage				
	9. Does the project/programme's results framework align with the AF's results framework? Does it include at least one core outcome indicator	n/a at concept stage				

	from the Fund's results framework?					
	10. Is a disbursement schedule with time-bound milestones included?	n/a at concept stage				

**PART IV: ENDORSEMENT BY GOVERNMENT AND CERTIFICATION BY THE IMPLEMENTING ENTITY**

**A. Record of endorsement on behalf of the government<sup>2</sup>**

*Provide the name and position of the government official and indicate date of endorsement. If this is a regional project/programme, list the endorsing officials all the participating countries. The endorsement letter(s) should be attached as an annex to the project/programme proposal. Please attach the endorsement letter(s) with this template; add as many participating governments if a regional project/programme:*

<i>Prof. Peter Lawrance Makenga Msoffe, Deputy Permanent Secretary, Vice President's Office</i>	<i>Date: August, 8th, 2025</i>
---	--------------------------------

**A. Implementing Entity certification**

I certify that this proposal has been prepared in accordance with guidelines provided by the Adaptation Fund Board, and prevailing National Development and Adaptation Plans (National Environmental Policy (20210; National Climate Change Response Strategy (2021-2026); Nationally Determined Contributions (2021-2030); National Adaptation Program of Action (2007); National Environmental Master Plan for Strategic Interventions (2022-2032); Tanzania Development Vision 2025-2050) and subject to the approval by the Adaptation Fund Board, commit to implementing the project/programme in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and the Gender Policy of the Adaptation Fund and on the understanding that the Implementing Entity will be fully (legally and financially) responsible for the implementation of this project/programme.

<sup>6</sup> Each Party shall designate and communicate to the secretariat the authority that will endorse on behalf of the national government the projects and programmes proposed by the implementing entities.

<i>Fredrick F. Mulinda</i>	
	
Implementing Entity Coordinator	
Date: <i>August, 1st, 2025</i>	Tel. and email: +255 753 240 517 <a href="mailto:nieaf@nemoc.or.tz">nieaf@nemoc.or.tz</a> <a href="mailto:/kasigazi.koku@gmail.com">/kasigazi.koku@gmail.com</a>
Project Contact Person: Prof. Paul Mbogo Kusolwa	
Tel. +255 785 116 669 And Email: <a href="mailto:kusolwa@sua.ac.tz">kusolwa@sua.ac.tz</a> Or <a href="mailto:kusolwap@gmail.com">kusolwap@gmail.com</a>	

**Government Endorsement Letter**

JAMHURI YA MUUNGANO WA TANZANIA  
OFISI YA MAKAMU WA RAIS

Telegrams: "MAKAMU",  
Telephone : +255 26 2329006  
Fax : +255 26 2329007  
Email : [ps@vpo.go.tz](mailto:ps@vpo.go.tz)  
In reply, please quote:



Government City,  
Mtumba Area,  
Vice President Street,  
P.O. Box. 2502,  
**40406 DODOMA.**

Our Ref. No : **CBA. 78/90/03**

08<sup>th</sup> August, 2025

The Adaptation Fund Board  
c/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat  
Email: [Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org](mailto:Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org)  
Fax: 202 522 3240/5

**SUBJECT: ENDORSEMENT FOR SCALING UP OF PROJECT INTERVENTIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED FROM STRATEGIC WATER HARVESTING TECHNOLOGIES (SWAHAT) FOR ENHANCING CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION FOR AGRO-PASTORAL COMMUNITIES OF SEMI-ARID AREAS OF TANZANIA**

Please refer to the above subject.

2. In my capacity as the designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in Tanzania, I confirm that the above national grant proposal is in accordance with the government's national priorities in implementing adaptation activities to reduce adverse impacts of, and risks, posed by climate change in semi-arid areas of Tanzania.
3. Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above grant proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by National Environment Management Council (NEMC) and executed by Technologies and Resilience for Agroecology, Climate Change and Environment (TRACE).
4. Thank you for your continued support.

  
Prof. Peter L.M. Msolle  
NATIONAL DESIGNATED AUTHORITY- DEPUTY PERMANENT SECRETARY

## Annex 1: Project Formulation Grant



## Project Formulation Grant (PFG)

**Submission Date:** August 6, 2025

**Adaptation Fund Project ID:** [To be assigned]

**Country/ies:** Tanzania (United Republic of)

**Title of Project/Programme:** Scaling up of Project Interventions and Lessons Learned from Strategic Water Harvesting Technologies (SWAHAT) for Enhancing Climate Change Adaptation for Agro-Pastoral Communities of Semi-Arid Areas of Tanzania

**Type of IE (NIE/RIE/MIE):** NIE

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

**Executing Entity/ies:** Technologies and Resilience for Agroecology, Climate Change and Environment (TRACE)

## A. Project Preparation Timeframe

<b>Start date of PFG:</b>	<del>May</del> <sup>June</sup> 30 <sup>th</sup> , 2026
<b>Completion date of PFG:</b>	<del>November</del> <sup>June</sup> <del>December</del> 30 <sup>th</sup> , 202 <del>2</del> <sup>6</sup>

Formatted: Superscript

Formatted: Superscript

## B. Proposed Project Preparation Activities (\$)

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget Note
<b>Assessment of existing SWAHAT interventions</b>	Report on lessons learned and scalability potential	40,000	Costs for field visits, data analysis, and expert consultations
<b>Community consultations for scaling up</b>	Community-driven plans for expanded water harvesting	40,000	Logistics, facilitation, and materials for workshops and stakeholder engagement
<b>Technical design of water harvesting systems</b>	Blueprints for scalable water harvesting technologies	35,250	Engineering, technical expertise, and prototype development
<b>Drafting full project proposal</b>	Comprehensive proposal for country cap modality	22,000	Staff time, technical expertise, and stakeholder coordination for proposal development
<b>Implementing Entity fee for PFG (8.5%)</b>	IE coordination fee	12,750	IE staff time, technical expertise, and stakeholder coordination
<b>Total Project Formulation Grant</b>		<b>150,000</b>	

## Description and Justifications for PFG Activities:

- **Assessment of existing SWAHAT interventions (\$40,000):** Conducting in-depth evaluations of current water harvesting technologies, including field visits and expert analysis, to inform scaling-up strategies. This ensures the project builds on proven approaches with robust data.

Annex 5 to OPG Amended in October 2017

- **Community consultations for scaling up (\$40,000):** Engaging agro-pastoral communities through extensive workshops to co-design scaling-up plans, ensuring local relevance and sustainability. Costs cover logistics, facilitation, and materials for broad engagement.
- **Technical design of water harvesting systems (\$35,250)** Developing detailed blueprints and prototypes for scalable, climate-resilient water harvesting technologies tailored to semi-arid areas. This requires advanced engineering expertise.
- **Drafting full project proposal (\$22,000):** Preparing a comprehensive proposal that incorporates lessons learned, stakeholder inputs, and technical designs, meeting country cap modality requirements through iterative revisions.
- **Implementing Entity fee for PFG (8.5%) (\$12,750):** Coordination, monitoring, review and stakeholder coordination

**C. Implementing Entity**

This request has been prepared in accordance with the Adaptation Fund Board’s procedures and meets the Adaptation Fund’s criteria for project identification and formulation.

Implementing Entity Coordinator, IE Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Fredrick F. Mulinda		August 6, 2025	Prof. Paul Kusolwa	+255 785 116 669	kusolwa@sua.ac.tz