



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.37/18/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 JORDAN (1)

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.37/18 “Proposal for Jordan” 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 AF00000487 Resilient Ecosystem, Water and Rangelands Development (REWaRD)”. This proposal was submitted by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), which is a Multilateral 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; Gender and Environmental and Social risk analyses; policy & institutional gap analysis; economic and financial feasibility analysis and development of full proposal.

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: Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan
Project Title: Resilient Ecosystem, Water and Rangelands Development (REWaRD)
Thematic Focal Area: Climate smart livestock management, water management, rangelands management, ecosystem-based adaptation, food security
Implementing Entity: International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
Executing Entities: Ministry of Agriculture (MOA)
AF Project ID: AF00000487
IE Project ID: **Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars):** 9,998,356
Reviewer and contact person: Lystra Fletcher-Paul **Co-reviewer(s):**
IE Contact Person:

<p>Technical Summary</p>	<p>The project “Resilient Ecosystem, Water and Rangelands Development (REWaRD)” aims to contribute to increased climate resilience of rural smallholders engaged in the small-ruminant value chains in Jordan, specifically, to support climate resilience of small ruminants’ food systems through improved access to rangelands, fodder, feed, and water, and diversification of livelihoods of climate vulnerable households. This will be done through the three components below:</p> <p><u>Component 1:</u> Strengthening climate resilience of small ruminants’ food systems (USD 3,443,772);</p> <p><u>Component 2:</u> Enabling vulnerable groups to income diversification for climate change adaptation (USD 4,603,729);</p> <p><u>Component 3:</u> Supporting climate policy (USD 316,713).</p> <p><u>Requested financing overview:</u> Project/Programme Execution Cost: USD 850,862 Total Project/Programme Cost: USD 9,215,076 Implementing Fee: USD 783,280 Financing Requested: USD 9,998,356</p>
--------------------------	--

	<p>The proposal includes a request for a project formulation grant of USD 150,000.</p> <p>The initial technical review raised some issues, such as the inclusion of risks and assumptions in the Theory of Change, estimates of economic benefits and cost effectiveness, arrangements for economic, environmental and social sustainability and specifically the sustainability of the revolving fund and infrastructure, and the alignment with the Adaptation Fund Results framework to name a few, as is discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.</p> <p>The second technical review found that most of the issues raised in the first review have been addressed with the exception of the alignment with the Adaptation Fund Results Framework and amending the risk Table as discussed in the Corrective Action Request (CAR) raised in the review.</p> <p>The third technical review finds the pending CARs to be addressed.</p>
Date:	February 25, 2026

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
Country Eligibility	1. Is the country party to the Kyoto Protocol, and/or the Paris Agreement?	Yes. The country has ratified both the Kyoto Protocol (January 17, 2003) and the Paris Agreement (November 08, 2016).		-
	2. Is the country a developing country particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change?	Yes. Jordan is a developing country which is vulnerable to the impacts of climate change, particularly increased frequency and intensity of extreme weather events such as heat waves and diminishing water availability which lead to deteriorating water quality, thereby exacerbating livelihoods and health issues. The country ranked 74 out of 187 countries in the ND-GAIN index for 2023. It is the 138th most vulnerable country in the world.		-
Project Eligibility	1. Has the designated government authority for the Adaptation	Yes.		-

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
	Fund endorsed the project/programme?	As per the Endorsement letter dated 3 November 2025.		
	2. Does the length of the proposal amount to no more than Fifty pages for the project/programme concept, including its annexes?	Yes. The concept note is 47 in total, including annexes. CAR1: Please commence the proposal document with the AF proposal template cover page.	CAR1: Cleared The appropriate template cover page has been used	Editorial note: To improve the quality and clarity of the proposal document, please consider conducting a thorough round of editing/proofreading to the document before sending it to the secretariat .
	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?	Yes, but further information is required. In Part II.A, for each component, the aim is stated as well as how the project hopes to achieve the aim. It also explains each output, providing some background in terms of the climate vulnerability in the target areas, why the intervention is needed and it gives a broad description of the activities, showing how		

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
		<p>they lead to tangible outcomes and climate benefits. In addition, it provides a coherent Theory of Change (ToC) and states the alignment of the project with the AF Strategic Objectives. However, additional information for the targeted districts is required, as well as more details in the ToC.</p> <p>CR1: Please provide some more details (population disaggregated by gender, livelihoods, etc.) about the target districts.</p> <p>CR2: Please include in the ToC the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - activities as well as the outputs - risks and assumptions made 	<p>CR1 Cleared Details included about the target districts (para 5 to 8)</p> <p>CR2 Cleared ToC updated to include activities, risks and assumptions (See Figure 3 page 14)</p> <p>CR3 Cleared Outcomes included for each component (para 34, 38 and 42)</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
		CR3: Kindly include the outcomes for each component in Part II.A.		
	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?	Yes, but further information is required. Part II.B (para 40 to 45) provides information on the economic, social and environmental benefits of the project, including the number of expected beneficiaries and specifically women, youth and vulnerable groups. The target areas where the marginalized and vulnerable groups are located have been identified and the benefits to be provided by the project have been outlined. No mention has been made of negative development of maladaptation. However, there is no quantitative information on the dollar value of the economic benefits.		

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
		<p>An initial gender analysis has been conducted using information gained from lessons learned from IFAD's portfolio in Jordan as well as consultations with officials and non-official entities and community members including women, youth and vulnerable smallholder farmers. Funds have been requested for a detailed gender assessment and action plan through the Project Formulation Assistance Grant.</p> <p>CR4: Please include in the economic benefits the estimated dollar-value of beneficiaries' benefits for each of the target communities. If possible, kindly include overall figures of the estimated economic and social benefits.</p> <p>CR5: Please describe how benefits will be equitably</p>	<p>CR4: Cleared. Estimated dollar value added for some of the benefits (para 47 and table 6); additional data will be provided during project design</p> <p>CR5: Cleared Measures which will be taken to promote equitable benefits and integrate gender considerations have been included in para 46.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
		distributed, including how gender (and other vulnerable groups) considerations have been integrated.		
	5. Is the project / programme cost effective?	<p>Yes, but further information is required. Part II.C (para 46 to 48) describes the scope and approach to be taken by the full project. Table 6 also includes a preliminary comparison of averted losses and alternatives to the project for each of the components. However, more details are needed.</p> <p>CR6: Please provide quantitative data on the cost effectiveness of the proposed interventions where possible. Where possible, provide quantitative estimates through proxies or qualitative justifications to support the comparison.</p>	<p>CR 6: Cleared Quantitative data provided in paragraph 47 and Table 6); additional data will be provided during project design</p> <p>CR7: Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
		CR7: Kindly highlight the sustainability point of view of the proposed interventions.	Sustainability of proposed interventions included in Table 6 and Table 13.	
	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>Yes, but further information is required.</p> <p>Part II.D (para 49 to 55) mentions a list national and sub-national strategies relevant to the proposed project, including the National Strategy for Agricultural Development, the National Food Security Strategy, National climate Change Policy and updated Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). However, there is need to include more details as well as provide information on other sub-sectoral plans (if they exist) which may be of relevance to the project e.g. Water Sector and Health.</p> <p>CR8: Kindly provide the identified plans/strategies in a table-listing, including at least:</p>	<p>CR8: Cleared</p> <p>Revisions made to new Table 7</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
		<p>(i) Specific name of the plan/strategy and years of implementation,</p> <p>(ii) Main objective,</p> <p>(iii) Explain the relevance to the proposed project, including its alignment with the existing plan or strategy. A suggested structure could be: <i>'The proposed project is aligned with [Plan XX], under [Specific Action XX], contributing to [Outcome XX].'</i></p> <p>Please ensure that the table provides a comprehensive list.</p> <p>CR9: Please include any other sectoral plan/strategy related to the proposed project, including the ones related to water and health.</p>	<p>CR9: Cleared Water and Nutrition policies included in Table 7</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
	<p>7. Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund?</p>	<p>Yes, but further information is required. Part II.E (para 56) and Tables 7 and 8 provide a comprehensive list of the relevant legislation and standards. However, more details are needed for each standard identified.</p> <p>CAR2: Kindly include in Table 7, for each standard, the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) how it is related to the proposed project. (ii) the project's compliance status. <p>In the case that compliance is required, please include the steps needed to comply with it.</p>	<p>CAR2: Cleared (See Table 9)</p>	<p>CAR 2: Cleared at concept stage The proposal adequately identifies relevant national legislation and sectoral technical standards and clearly indicates the issuing institutions. However, the "Compliance" column in Table 9 remains largely declarative (e.g., "will take into account," "will comply," "will raise awareness") and does not clarify how adherence to these standards will be operationalized within project implementation.</p> <p>While this can be cleared at the concept stage, <u>at the fully-developed proposal stage</u>, institutional and procedural mechanisms that will ensure systematic compliance with key standards across project components are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether compliance with

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
				<p>specific standards will be mandatory conditions under the grant facility and MSME support schemes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How adherence will be verified (e.g., screening checklists, technical approval prior to disbursement, certification requirements, inspections); - How compliance will be ensured under the credit line, given that responsibility is stated to rely on borrowers; - The role of relevant ministries or agencies (MoA, MWI, MoH, JSMO, etc.) in oversight, validation, or technical backstopping

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
				during implementation.
	8. Is there duplication of project / programme with other funding sources?	<p>No, but further information is required.</p> <p>Table 9, in Part II.F, lists all the on-going or planned projects with similar objectives and geographic scope, providing the name, budget, duration and status of the project, including a summary of the objectives and geographic area covered by the project and the potential complementarity (including risk of duplication) with the current project proposal. However, all the projects listed are national in scope. There may also be regional projects of which Jordan is a beneficiary country which may also be relevant. In addition, a sound justification for no duplication projects is needed.</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
		<p>CR10: Please make a thorough review of regional projects of which Jordan is a beneficiary country and include them in Table 9.</p> <p>CR11: Kindly include in Table 9, for each project identified, the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Lessons learned (if applicable) (ii) Overlaps and synergies with the proposed project. <p>The no duplication statement should be clearly justified and specific (e.g. by indicating the distinct geographic locations and/or types of interventions) for each related project identified.</p>	<p>CR10: Cleared Table 11 provides the requested information on Regional Project, noting that a more accurate account will be done during design phase</p> <p>CR11: Cleared Lessons learned as well as overlaps and synergies have been included in Table 10 (pp 33 – 36).</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
	<p>9. Does the project / programme have a learning and knowledge management component to capture and feedback lessons?</p>	<p>Yes, but further information is required. Part III.G (para 58 to 61) describes the learning and knowledge component (component 3) of the project and specifies the project outputs which contribute to learning and knowledge. It includes the design of project-wide knowledge activities tailored to various audiences including policy roundtables, technical working groups, stakeholder workshops and co-publication with technical partners. However, more details are needed regarding the effectiveness and arrangements.</p> <p>CR12: Please include activities which analyse the effectiveness of the adaptation products and incorporate mechanisms for improvement.</p>	<p>CR12: Cleared Activities to analyse effectiveness included (Para 43 and Para 61-62)</p> <p>CR13: Cleared Information required has been included in Para 63-65.</p>	-

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
		<p>CR13: Kindly include details to respond to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More details of the specific activities, including the institutions involved, and main goals. For example, the policy briefs will be about what subject, or the demonstration sites will be focused on what matter. • who will be responsible for tracking the experiences gained, how this will be done, and when the tracking will take place (the arrangements needed). • how the knowledge generated will be sustained after the project concludes. 		

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
	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>Yes, but further information is required. Part II.H (para 62 to 65). An initial stakeholder consultation took place to provide information for the preparation of the concept note. This consultation included, inter alia, Government representatives (at central and local level), local communities and potential beneficiaries (including small herders and women), NGOs, Private sector and international organizations. Meetings were also complemented with field visits. The engagement and consultation process covered both national and regional levels. The list of stakeholders is presented in Annex 2. Gender considerations were included through an initial gender assessment (Para 9 and 10).</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
		<p>CAR3: Please include in the Annexes a report summarizing the findings from the stakeholder consultations and explain how these have been incorporated into the proposed project, including those related to gender and other vulnerable groups.</p>	<p>CAR3: Cleared. Findings from the stakeholder consultations and explanation of how they have been incorporated have been added to Annex 3</p>	
	<p>11. Is the requested financing justified on the basis of full cost of adaptation reasoning?</p>	<p>Yes. As per information provided in Part II.I (Para 66 to 69). Specifically, Table 10 shows how the activities of each component are relevant to addressing the adaptation objectives compared with the “business as usual” scenario.</p> <p>The project will also complement and support initiatives and approaches being piloted by IFAD and other donor funded projects, but it does not rely on co-financing or external support to generate adaptation</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
		benefits, rather it will build on the knowledge generated from these projects.		
	12. Is the project / program aligned with AF's results framework?	<p>Yes, but some adjustments are required.</p> <p>Part III.A, and specifically Table 13, shows the alignment of the proposed project with the AF Results Framework.</p> <p>However, there are some inconsistencies between the indicators in the table and the project indicators. Moreover, the Outcome indicators are not consistent with those of the AF Results Framework.</p> <p>For example, the indicator for Outcome 7 does not coincide with any of the indicators provided in the Strategic Results Framework.</p> <p>CAR4: 1. Please ensure consistency between</p>	<p>CAR4: Not cleared</p> <p>While the amended table (Table 15) is correctly completed in terms of the AF Outputs and Outcomes, the Project Objective and Outcome indicators in the upper and lower parts of the table should be expressed in measureable terms. Thus, for the Project Objective, instead of Households reporting adoption of environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient technologies and practices; it should be Number of households reporting.... Similarly for Project Outcome 1, instead of land brought under climate resilient practices, the Project Outcome Indicator should be: Acres of land or Number of parcels of land</p>	<p>CAR 4.1: Cleared (page 42)</p> <p>Table 13 (now Table 15) amended</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
		<p>the Expected Outcomes of the project and the Outcomes in the Adaptation Fund Strategic Results Framework as and utilize the updated template outlined in the Results Framework Alignment Table (Amended in November 2025) (77 kB, DOC)</p> <p>2. At Part 2 Section B, please indicate alignment of the proposal with the results framework of the fund by referencing the AF outcomes to which they are aligned.</p>	<p>brought under climate resilient practices.</p> <p>Also, the Total outcome and output level amounts are incorrect. In the lower part of the table, the total of the three Outcomes (USD 3,443,772 + 4,603,729 + 316,713) = USD8,364,214 not USD 9,999,989.</p> <p>Please amend Table 15 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change the Project Objective and Outcome Indicators to measureable terms. 2. Change the totals in the upper and lower sections of the table to the correct total of the three Outcomes – USD 8,364,214. 	
	13. Has the sustainability of the project/programme outcomes been taken	<p>Yes, but further information is required. Part II.J (Para 70 to 73) describes the project</p>	<p>CR14: Cleared Additional information provided in Paragraph 41 and Table 13</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
	into account when designing the project?	<p>sustainability, including beneficiary empowerment through awareness building, capacity building and cost-effective and environmentally friendly and long-lasting solutions. Table 11 also outlines some mitigation measures proposed to address Institutional, Governance and Financial Sustainability. However, it does not address environmental, economic and social sustainability, neither does it describe the measures which will be taken to maintain the infrastructure such as rainwater harvesting.</p> <p>The project also proposes to establish a revolving fund for small holders and vulnerable groups (women, youth, poor producers, etc.) in collaboration with the Agricultural Credit Corporation (ACC), providing reimbursable</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
		<p>grants to increase the resilience of small-sale and home-based producers of dairy and meat projects (See para 37). However, while the parameters for the sustainability of the fund have been mentioned, there is need for further details on how this fund will be sustained.</p> <p>CR14: Please include additional elements of sustainability such as: long term sustainability of the revolving fund, and engagement of private sector, environmental and social sustainability and measures which will be taken to ensure maintenance of infrastructure and equipment.</p>		
	14. Does the project / programme provide an overview of environmental and social impacts / risks	<p>Yes, but further information is required. Part II.K presents the findings of the risk screening, in which the</p>	<p>CAR5: Not Cleared Please delete the additional column added to indicate risk level and insert the following just</p>	<p>CAR 5: Cleared Third column included and anticipated impacts and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
	<p>identified, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?</p>	<p>potential environmental and social impacts and risks are identified against the 15 ESP principles. The concept note also indicates whether any further assessment is required for compliance and the potential impacts and risks, including further assessment and management required for compliance.</p> <p>The project is classified as Category B.</p> <p>Only two principles – Indigenous Peoples and Involuntary Resettlement have classified as not requiring further assessment for compliance.</p> <p>CAR5: Please include in the third column in Table 2, the risk level (low, medium or high) and anticipated impacts and mitigation measures for each principle. It should consider all potential</p>	<p>before the current paragraphs at each row in column 3.</p> <p>“Risk level: Low/Medium/High”. Please use whichever level is applicable.</p> <p>CAR 6: Cleared</p> <p>See Table 14 and Para (5-8). The updated table includes challenges, risks and mitigation measures. Further quantitative and quantitative data will be included in the design report.</p>	<p>mitigation measures revised. (Table 14)</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
		<p>direct, indirect, transboundary and cumulative impacts because of the project, as well as the mitigation measures associated with the risk described.</p> <p>CAR6: Please refer to the initial gender assessment, including qualitative and quantitative data for gender roles, activities, needs, and available opportunities and challenges or risks for men and women.</p>		
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?	<p>Yes. IE Management Fee is 8.5% of total budget. PFG of USD 150,000 is adequate for a single country project of this size.</p> <p>CAR7: Please confirm if MOA will also execute the PFG if not please amend</p>	CAR 7 Modified in the PFG that the EE is IFAD	

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
		the EE for in the PFG request form to IFAD.		
	3. Are the Project/Programme Execution Costs at or below 9.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget (including the fee)?	Yes. All figures add up and are consistent across the components table and the budget. The figures are rounded to a whole number, and the Project Execution cost is 9.2 % of the total budget.		-
Eligibility of IE	1. Is the project/programme submitted through an eligible Implementing Entity that has been accredited by the Board?	Yes. The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) is an accredited MIE. Accreditation Expiration Date: 21 December 2025		-
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		

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
	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?	n/a at concept stage		
	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		

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments December 17, 2025	Second Technical Review Comments 29 January 2026	Third Technical Review Comments February 25, 2026
	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 from the Fund's results framework?	n/a at concept stage		
	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

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:

Dr. Aiman A. Soleiman, Minister of Environment, Ministry of Environment	Date: November 3, 2025
--	------------------------

B. Implementing Entity certification

Provide the name and signature of the Implementing Entity Coordinator and the date of signature. Provide also the project/programme contact person's name, telephone number and email address

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 and subject to the approval by the Adaptation Fund Board, commit to implementing the project/programme in compliance with the Environmental and Social 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.	
Implementing Entity coordinator: Mr Pierre Guedez, Pierre Yves, Lead Climate and Environmental Funds, ECG division 	Email: p.guedez@ifad.org
Mr Juan Carlos Mendoza Casadiegos Director Environment, Climate, Gender and Social Inclusion Division	
Date: November 17 2025	Email: ecgmailbox@ifad.org
Project contact persons:	
Mr Walid Nasr Regional Lead Climate and Environment Specialist	Email: w.nasr@ifad.org
Mr Vrej Jijyan, Country Director	Email: v.jijyan@ifad.org

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Letter of endorsement of MoE



Ministry of Environment

Ref.No 2-7-6983
Date 3-11-2025

The Adaptation Fund Board
c/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat
Email: Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org
Fax: 202 522 3240/5

Subject: Endorsement for Resilient Ecosystem, Water and Rangelands Development (REWARD) Project

In my capacity as designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in Jordan, I confirm that the above national project concept note 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 Jordan.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above project concept note with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and executed by the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA).

Sincerely,

Minister of Environment

Dr. Aiman A. Soleiman



Revised PFG Submission Form¹ (additions in red)

Project Formulation Grant (PFG)

Submission Date:

Adaptation Fund Project ID:

Country/ies: Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan

Title of Project/Programme: Resilient Ecosystem, Water and Rangelands Development (REWaRD) project

Type of IE (NIE/RIE/MIE): Multilateral Implementing Entity

Implementing Entity: International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD)

Executing Entity/ies: International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD)

A. Project Preparation Timeframe

Start date of PFG	April 2026
Completion date of PFG	March 2027

B. Proposed Project Preparation Activities (\$)

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note²
Gender and Environmental and Social risk analyses and formulation of Environmental and Social Management Plan and Gender Action Plan. This document is required as part of the submission of the full proposal.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental and Social Management Plan and Gender Action Plan formulated. 	20,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultancy fees: 13,000 USD Logistics costs: 7,000 USD

¹ As presented in AFB/PPRC.33/40 Annex 1.

² The proposal should include a detailed budget with budget notes indicating the break-down of costs at the activity level. It should also include a budget on the Implementing Entity management fee use.

Consultancies on Rangeland ecological & degradation assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine selection criteria for site selection for the rangeland restoration • Assess the technical feasibility of the selected sites • Assess the rangeland management mechanism and its governance 	50,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultancy fees: 40,000 • Logistics: 10,000
Consultancies on policy & institutional gap analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy analysis report highlighting regulatory gaps and recommendations for improved rangeland and small-ruminant management 	10,000	Consultancy fees: 10,000
Consultancies on economic and financial feasibility analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost-benefit analysis for rangeland restoration, water harvesting, and livelihoods investments 	20,250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultancy fee: 13,250 • Logistics costs: 7,000 USD
Consultancies to develop project proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination documentation, financial reports, progress summaries, and submission packages 	37,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultancy fees: 30,000 • logistics costs: 7,000 USD
IE Fees (8.5% of total)		12,750	
Total Project Formulation Grant		150,000	

The PFG activities requested for REWARD project will support the formulation of the full proposal at different levels, ensuring that the Executing Entity will be provided with a complete package to fast-track implementation. The activities proposed are detailed below:

1.1 Gender and Environmental and Social risk analyses and formulation of Environmental and Social Management Plan and Gender Action Plan

The Adaptation Fund requires a robust and evidence-based gender and environmental and social risk analysis, based on the list of identified sites for project interventions. For the full proposal, IFAD and MoA would like to carry out thorough data collection and analysis for gender as well as for the assessment of environmental and social risks. The risk analysis will inform the formulation of a robust Environmental and Social Management Plan and Gender Action Plan. IFAD will hire one international consultant for this assignment, a gender specialist and an environmental specialist who will work jointly. The cost of 20,000 USD includes consultancy fees for 15 days as well as fieldwork costs (DSA, rental of vehicle) for one week.

1.2 Consultancy on Rangeland ecological & degradation assessment

The assessment study and related plan will address both technical aspects (water conservation techniques, seed types, fencing and other infrastructural works, grazing schedule, etc.) and governance aspects (ownership of land, land access especially by vulnerable groups, management modalities, roles and responsibilities, enforcement mechanisms and conflict resolution procedures, etc.). The study will develop criteria that will be used by the PMU for the selection of the 10 sites. IFAD will hire consultants/companies to conduct the needed study. The following activities are foreseen to be conducted by the consultants/companies:

- Vegetation baseline dataset and maps
- Remote-sensing-based degradation maps
- Current Carrying capacity and grazing pressure analysis
- Climate vulnerability and projections
- Assessment and recommendation of methodology for rangeland restoration
- Stakeholder engagement
- Selection criteria for prioritising of rangeland restoration sites
- Final assessment report with restoration priority zones

The overall cost would be 50,000 USD divided to 40,000 USD consultancy fees and 10,000 USD for travel costs.

1.3 Consultancy on policy & institutional gap analysis

IFAD will hire national consultant for conducting policy analysis gap for the small-ruminant sector. The analysis will also cover the rangeland management. The consultant will analyse all the relevant national laws and identify the gaps in the national law. The cost would be 10,000 USD covering consultancy fees. No travel costs will be required as the consultancies will focus on systematizing available information.

1.4 Consultancy on economic and financial feasibility analysis

The economic and financial feasibility analysis will assess the viability and cost-effectiveness of the proposed activities in the concept note. The analysis will also identify financial risks, potential revenue streams, and opportunities for scaling, ensuring that the proposed interventions deliver strong adaptation benefits and are financially feasible for herders, communities, and national institutions. The overall cost would be 20,250 USD divided to 13,250 USD consultancy fees and 7,000 USD for travel costs.

1.5 Consultancy and contracts to develop the project

IFAD is requesting funds for allocation for the design of Adaptation Fund projects. The fund will be used to address the issues the Adaptation Fund raised during the review of the project concept note and that revolve around hydrology and volume of groundwater, cost benefit analysis, knowledge management. IFAD would hire 3 consultants (national and international) to improve the quality of the full proposal. The overall cost would be 37,000 USD divided to 30,000 USD covering consultancy fees and 7,000 USD covering logistics. The consultancies would be completed in time for the submission of the full proposal.

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
Pierre Yves Guedez		11/20/2025	Walid Nasr		w.nasr@ifad.org