



## ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.37/19/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 (m)

### **PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR JORDAN (2)**

## 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.37/19 “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 AF00000460 “Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Change through Innovation and Entrepreneurship for Green Jobs in Jordan”. This proposal was submitted by United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), 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; vulnerability assessment studies; Environmental & Social Risk Assessment (ESS); Climate Risk & Impact Modelling; Institutional & Policy Alignment Review; Environmental sustainability & Financial Feasibility Analysis and Mapping and Data Analytics of project area.

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:

**Country/Region:** Jordan

**Project Title:** Building resilience and adaptation to climate change through agro-innovation and green jobs creation

**Thematic Focal Area:** Agriculture

**Implementing Entity:** United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

**Executing Entities:** Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), Jordan Valley Authority (JVA), and UNIDO

**AF Project ID:** AF00000460

**IE Project ID:**

**Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars):** 7,000,000

**Reviewer and contact person:** Ahmad Ghosn

**Co-reviewer(s):**

**IE Contact Person:**

### Technical Summary

The project “Building resilience and adaptation to climate change through agro-innovation and green jobs creation” aims to enhance the resilience and adaptive capacity of vulnerable communities facing climate-related stressors such as drought, heatwaves, and erratic rainfall that contribute to severe water scarcity, declining soil health, reduced agricultural productivity, increased postharvest losses, food insecurity, economic shocks, and displacement. This will be done through the three components below:

Component 1: Climate smart (CS) and water efficient urban farm system for resilience and adaptation to climate change (USD 1,400,000);

Component 2: Climate-resilient rural agriculture and livelihood diversification (USD 3,568,660);

Component 3: Strengthening Institutional Capacity to Drive National Agricultural Policy reform and facilitate the integration of climate adaptation strategies into national development planning. (USD 1,000,000).

Requested financing overview:

Project/Programme Execution Cost: USD 482,953

Total Project/Programme Cost: USD 6,451,613

Implementing Fee: USD 548,387

Financing Requested: USD 7,000,000

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

	<p>The first technical review raised several issues, such as: providing more details on project activities and identifying possible USPs; revising the discussion on benefits for more clarity; providing an initial gender assessment; specifying relevant national technical standards; adding completed projects to the list of related projects; providing a tabulated list of consultations, including those with concerned communities/ vulnerable groups; revising AF RF alignment table for consistency and alignment with related requirements; revising and restructuring the discussion on the sustainability of the project outcomes under dedicated subheadings (environmental, social, economic, financial, institutional, etc.) and highlighting the O&amp;M aspects; specifying the project overall risk category as AF requirements; clarifying the execution cost allocated to the IE; among others as is indicated in the Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.</p> <p>The second technical review finds that most of the CRs and CARs raised in the first review were addressed except for few CARs that warrant more clarification. These include providing totals at components level, inclusion of a summary table of the consultations, and revising the alignment with AF RF as per related AF requirements.</p> <p>The third technical review finds that a couple of pending CARs and CRs related to alignment table as well as updated stage of submission information mentioned in the second review are addressed.</p> <p>This fourth technical review finds that all outstanding CRs and CARs have been addressed.</p> <p><i>Please be advised that the findings of the AFB Secretariat's review of the funding proposal(s) do not reflect, indicate, or prejudge 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.</i></p>
Date:	<b>March 11, 2026</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	First Technical Review Comments 22 August 2025	Second Technical Review Comments January 13, 2026	Third Technical Review Comments March 2, 2026	Fourth Technical Review Comments March 11 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> Jordan is highly vulnerable to adverse climate change impacts including increased drought, rising temperatures and more frequent heatwaves, erratic rainfall, among others. These impacts are exacerbated by Jordan's scarce water resources and vulnerability to desertification.	-	-	-
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 13 July 2025.	-	-	-
	2. Does the length of the proposal amount to no more than Fifty pages for the project/programme concept, including its annexes?	<b>Yes.</b> <u>However</u> , addressing few issues under Part I is needed.  <b>CAR2:</b> Please revise the project title to align with that of the Endorsement letter: "Building resilience and adaptation to climate change through innovation and entrepreneurship for green jobs in Jordan".	<b>Note:</b> <u>Reference pages indicated are for TC version/ screen unless otherwise noted.</u>	<b>CAR1 NEW:</b> Please update the stage of submission section of the proposal to address the following: 1. Include the latest submission date. 2. Check the box to indicate that the proposal has been	<b>CAR1 NEW: Cleared.</b> Based on amendment to cover page of proposal addressing point 1 and 2.

		<p><b>CR1:</b> Under the heading "Geography, Social, Economic, and Environmental Context", p. 2, revise the discussion to clearly reflect the aspects mentioned in the "heading" under dedicated subheadings.</p> <p><b>CR2:</b> The overall objective statement (p.5) is lengthy and not consistent with that stated in Part IIIA table, p. 36. Kindly, revise for brevity and ensure consistency.</p> <p><b>CR3:</b> Add a brief paragraph to discuss/introduce the theory of change (TOC), and revise the TOC outcomes and outputs to align with those listed in the components financing table in Part I.</p> <p><b>CR4:</b> under objectives, p.5, add a brief paragraph to explicitly indicate the AF outcomes supported by the project. Based on the information provided</p>	<p><b>CAR2: Cleared.</b> See page 1.</p> <p><b>CR1: Cleared.</b> See pp. 5-6.</p> <p><b>CR2: Cleared.</b> See p. 7.</p> <p><b>CR3: Cleared.</b> See p.10.</p>	<p>submitted before since this is a third submission.</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

	<p>in Part IIIA, the supported AF outcomes include outcomes 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8.</p> <p><b>CR5:</b> In the components financing table, p.6, please also include amounts at output level.</p> <p><b>To improve the clarity, layout and quality, please address the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add table of contents and lists of acronyms, tables and figures.</li> <li>2. Add Tables numbers and heading to all tables (e.g.: components financing table, project schedule, AF E&amp;S checklist, AF alignment table in Part IIIA, etc.).</li> <li>3. Refer to tables, figures and annexes in related texts/ discussions.</li> <li>4. Under "Problem Statement", p. 2, revise the phrase "while per capita water availability remains critically low at just 100m<sup>3</sup>" to indicate that the per</li> </ol>	<p><b>CR4: Cleared.</b> See p.8.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> See <u>CAR13 below for related comments</u></p> <p><b>CR5: Not fully cleared.</b> See pp. 8-9. <u>Please include total of each component.</u></p> <p><b>Cleared.</b> See pp. 2-4; p.5; p. 12; etc.</p> <p><b>CAR1 (NEW):</b> Please amend stage of submission on page 1 (cover page of the proposal) to indicate that this is a re-submission and insert the last date of submission.</p>	<p>-</p> <p><b>CR5: Cleared.</b> See Table 1, pp. 9-10.</p> <p>-</p> <p><b>CAR1 (NEW): Cleared.</b> See p.1.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>capita of 100m<sup>3</sup> is annual.</p> <p>5. Define the “IoT” term mentioned on p. 9.</p> <p>6. Conduct a round of editing/ proofreading 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. 7-15. Concrete actions include: establishment of climate smart urban agriculture living lab, demonstration of aquaponic/ hydroponics and circular bioeconomy approaches, promotion of regenerative agriculture techniques and drought-resistant crops, installation of irrigation systems in clustered smallholder farms, strengthening smallholders and SMEs access to climate finance and insurance, enhancing livelihood diversification of vulnerable rural communities, building the capacity of key government institutions to revise, align, and enforce policy and relevant legal frameworks that support climate resilient and sustainable agricultural</p>			-

		<p>development. <b>However,</b> more details on the activities under each output and possible USPs is needed.</p> <p><b>CAR3:</b> In part IIA, please include the list of activities under each output along with a brief discussion on each activity to demonstrate the work involved and substantiate allocated budgets. (Note: the activities associated with each output can be extracted from the TOC Figure.5, p. 6. <b>Also, in the description of components in part IIA, enter the component outcome title before the discussion its related outputs</b> (apply for all components).</p> <p><b>CAR4:</b> Please confirm whether the project involves any USP and if any kindly review the CN to comply with AF ESP and requirements on USP.</p>	<p><b>CAR3: Cleared.</b> See pp. 12-18. <u>More details would need to be provided at full proposal stage.</u></p> <p>-</p> <p><b>CAR4: Cleared.</b> See pp. 37-38.</p> <p>-</p>	
	4. Does the project / programme provide economic, social and environmental benefits, particularly to vulnerable	<p><b>No.</b> See pp.15-16. The discussion provided is generic and not clearly presented. <u>Also,</u> despite highlighting the gender aspects under project</p>		

	<p>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>components and other pertinent sections, and Part IIK indication that such assessment has been prepared, <u>an initial gender assessment is not included.</u></p> <p><b>CAR5:</b> Please incorporate an initial gender analysis that outlines the distinct needs, capacities, roles, and knowledge resources of women and men, and/or highlights how evolving gender dynamics could contribute to sustainable transformative change. Attach the assessment as an annex. and refer to it at relevant sections of the proposal (e.g.: Parts IIB &amp; K).</p> <p><b>CR6:</b> Please revise the CN to include an initial estimate of project beneficiaries including gender disaggregated data as well as vulnerable groups, and briefly highlight the gender related aspects.</p> <p><b>CAR6:</b> Please revise the discussion on benefits to include information on</p>	<p><b>CAR5: Cleared.</b> <u>Sufficient for CN stage.</u> See Annex 3, p.45; p.31; p.20.</p> <p><u>Note: A more detailed gender assessment and action plan would be required at full proposal stage.</u></p> <p><b>CR6: Cleared.</b> See pp. 19-20. <u>More details need to be provided at full proposal stage.</u></p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p>	

		<p>expected beneficiaries with particular reference to equitable distribution of benefits to vulnerable communities, etc. Outline benefits in all three areas (economic, social and environmental) under dedicated headings along with supporting quantification/ statistics, where possible at this stage. Also, ensure that the project interventions do not raise concerns of any negative development/ maladaptation that would increase the vulnerability of beneficiaries or non-beneficiaries, or reduce their capacity to adapt to climate change.</p>	<p><b>CAR6: Cleared.</b> See CR6 above.</p>		
	<p>5. Is the project / programme cost effective?</p>	<p><b>Yes.</b> See p. 17. Acceptable for CN stage.</p> <p>The project is adopting a cost-effectiveness approach “driven by the integration of smart farming technologies, active community engagement, and efficient resource management. This cost-effectiveness is evaluated based on the</p>			-

		<p>anticipated outcomes of the project's interventions. <b>However,</b> there is little information on how the cost-effectiveness is insured for the proposed interventions including the proposed adaptative solutions.</p> <p><b>CAR7:</b> Kindly provide the justification for the cost-effectiveness selected measures, including alternative options to the proposed measures, and estimates of the evaluation where possible. <u>Consider</u> using a comparative table showing cost effectiveness of each measure compares to alternative option or BAU.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> <u>Section letter numbering should be "C". Revise and adjust the letter numbering of following sections.</u></p>	<p><b>CAR7: Cleared.</b> See pp. 20-22.</p>	-	
	6. Is the project / programme consistent with national or sub-national sustainable development strategies, national or	<p><b>Yes.</b> See pp. 17-19. <b>However,</b> please double check the relevance of other national plans and obligations under MEAs.</p>			-

	sub-national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, national communications and adaptation programs of action and other relevant instruments?	<b>CR7:</b> Please provide a tabulated list of the plans along with dates and areas of relevance. Also, include related national water management plans, sector plans (as indicated p.19) and national plans to meet obligations under MEAs (e.g.: UNCCD, etc.), if any.	<b>CR7: Cleared.</b> See p. 24.	-	
	7. Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund?	<b>Not clear.</b> See p. 19. National technical standards may include: building codes, water quality regulations, and any other sector-specific regulations.  <b>CAR8:</b> Please provide a tabulated list of relevant national technical standards form along with dates and project outputs/ activities they apply to.	<b>CAR8: Cleared.</b> See pp. 24-26.	-	-
	8. Is there duplication of project / programme with other funding sources?	<b>No.</b> See pp. 19-23. <b>However,</b> further clarification is needed. Listed projects do not include dates and status among other issues indicated in the below comment.  <b>CAR9:</b> Please revise Table 2 (pp. 21-23) to include completed	<b>CAR9: Cleared.</b> See pp. 27-28.	-	-

		<p>projects; project title and funding source; date (start and end dates) and status (ongoing, completed, etc.); synergy, lesson learned, and complimentary with the proposed project. (Note: add page numbering to the table pages).</p>			
	<p>9. Does the project / programme have a learning and knowledge management component to capture and feedback lessons?</p>	<p><b>Not clearly presented.</b> See p. 24. further clarification is needed.</p> <p><b>CAR10:</b> The first paragraph on p. 24 states “The project includes a dedicated learning and knowledge management component to ensure that insights, innovations, and lessons learned are systematically captured, documented, and disseminated. Building on the gaps identified in previous agricultural and rural development initiatives, this project emphasizes climate-smart agriculture, diversified livelihoods, and inclusive capacity-building through the deployment of innovative solutions such as the smart-farming system”. Please qualify the above</p>	<p><b>CAR10: Cleared.</b> See p. 18 and p.29. <u>More details on the MEL framework would be needed at full proposal stage.</u></p>	-	-

		<p><u>statement, as the listed project components do not include a dedicated component of learning and knowledge management.</u></p> <p>Also note that the paragraph on p. 16 “In addition, the project will develop a monitoring, evaluation, and learning framework to track and assess the effectiveness of adaptation interventions.....  ... Through these efforts, the project will ensure that its impacts extend beyond the immediate stakeholders, creating a foundation for systemic change and broad-based climate adaptation across the region.” <u>provide adequate information that is recommended to include the learning and knowledge section on p.24.</u></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</p>	<p>Yes. See pp. 24-26. <b>However,</b> further clarification is needed. Add a summary of the conducted consultations</p> <p><b>CAR11:</b> Please provide a summary table of the consultations, including those with concerned</p>		<p><b>CAR11: Cleared.</b> See Table 7, pp. 32-34.</p>	<p>-</p>

	Gender Policy of the Fund?	communities/ vulnerable groups (if any conducted at CN stage). The table should include consulted entity/ group and date, number of participants disaggregated by gender, topics discussed, outcomes along with a brief discussion how they were considered in project design.	<b>CAR11: Not Cleared.</b> Please include in Part IHH a consolidated summary table of the consultations mentioned in Annexes 2,3 & 4. The table should include consulted entity/group and date, number of participants disaggregated by gender, topics discussed, outcomes along with a brief discussion how they were considered in project design.		
	11. Is the requested financing justified on the basis of full cost of adaptation reasoning?	<b>Yes.</b> See pp. 26-27. <b>However,</b> clarification is needed.  <b>CAR12:</b> Add a brief statement to indicate that the project would be able to deliver its outcomes/ outputs solely based AF funds and irrespective of any additional co-financing.	<b>CAR12: Cleared.</b> See p. 32.	-	-
	12. Is the project / program aligned with AF's results framework?	<b>Yes.</b> See Part IIIA, pp. 36. <b>However,</b> further clarification is needed. The alignment table presented on p. 36 should utilize the correct AF template. More importantly please include the applicable AF outcomes and	<b>CAR13. Not cleared.</b> Alignment table is not consistent with AF requirements. Also, at the end of Part IC, it is	<b>CAR13: Not Cleared.</b>  Please utilize the template <a href="#">Results Framework Alignment</a>	<b>CAR13: Cleared.</b>  Based on <b>Table 9:</b> Project Alignment with AF results framework.

		<p>outcome indicators (upper part of the table and underneath the objective row) for projects outcomes 1, 2 and 3 as was done for the outputs section of the table. The grant amount per outcome indicator should also be included as was done for the output level. Based on current table in Part IIIA supported AF outcomes are: 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8.</p> <p><b>CAR13:</b> Revise Part IIIA alignment table to ensure consistency with AF table template and revise the supported AF outcomes (upper part of the table) to align with those associated with the output level (lower part of the table).</p>	<p>stated that the project aligns with AF outcomes 1,2,3, 6,7 &amp; 8, which is not consistently reflected in Part III AF alignment table. Moreover, please ensure consistency between upper part (outcome level) and lower part (output level) of the table, and ensure that the grant amounts are allocated at AF outcome and output levels (note: total at each level should be equal to the total of components cost (USD 5,968,660)). Please update the alignment table based on the updated guidance found at <a href="#">Results Framework Alignment Table</a> (Amended in November 2025) (77 kB, DOC).</p>	<p><a href="#">Table</a> (Amended in November 2025) (77 kB, DOC). What is currently presented in the proposal is a departure from the template. Noting the following the top of the table does not reflect the bottom of the table in terms. Not total for top portion and bottom of the table. <b>Please refer to the example presented in the document to ensure that the re-submission is aligned.</b></p>	
	<p>13. Has the sustainability of the project/programme outcomes been taken into account when designing the project?</p>	<p><b>Not clearly presented.</b> See p. 27. The CN details briefly the sustainability approach proposed for each of the proposed outcomes and components, as outlined under section H.</p> <p><b>CR9:</b> The proposal does not include any</p>	<p><b>CR9: Cleared.</b> See pp. 33-34. <a href="#">More details</a></p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>

		<p>information on how the services and infrastructure will be sustained beyond the project implementation. It highlights community-based approach but does not explain how this will translate into continuity of the project after its completion. Please strengthen this part and provide a sustainability mechanism including operations and maintenance (O&amp;M), scalability and replication, if any.</p> <p><b>CAR14:</b> Please restructure/ revise the discussion layout of the sustainability section to clearly demonstrate the sustainability aspects under dedicated subheadings (environmental, social, economic, financial, institutional, etc.) and explain arrangements through which this would be achieved. Also, discuss the sustainability aspects of the O&amp;M for established facilities (e.g.: labs) and other infrastructures/</p>	<p><u>would be needed at full proposal stage.</u></p> <p><b>CAR14: Cleared. See <u>CR9</u> above.</b></p>	-	
--	--	---	---	---	--

		installations established by the project.			
	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>Not fully.</b> See pp. 27-35. The category in which the screening process has classified the project (Category A, B or C) is not specified, among other issues indicated in the below comment.</p> <p><b>CAR15:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please provide a brief discussion on the expected project risks and explicitly mention the project overall risk category (A, B, or C) as per AF requirements.</li> <li>2. Make reference to the initial gender assessment at relevant AF principles of the check list, as well as USPs, if any.</li> <li>3. <i>Please amend the Risk table at section L in column 2 of the table, to uncheck all areas where further assessment is required. Please note that further assessments are always required for ESPs 1, 4 and 6.</i></li> </ol>	<b>CAR15: Cleared.</b> See pp. 34-38.	-	-

		4. <i>Please remove all text from column 2 and place any approach, risk management strategy etc., in column 3.</i>			
Resource Availability	1. Is the requested project / programme funding within the cap of the country?	<b>Yes.</b>	-	-	-
	2. Is the Implementing Entity Management Fee at or below 8.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget before the fee?	<p><b>Yes.</b> The Implementing Fee (USD 548,387) is 8.5% of the Total Project Cost (USD 6,451,613). However please address the following:</p> <p><b>CR10:</b></p> <p>1. In the PFG application form please ensure that the budget amount in column 3 associated with Baseline assessment, initial stakeholder Engagement &amp; Participatory Planning is aligned with the total presented in column 2. Currently column 3 total is \$15,000 while</p>	-	-	-

		<p>Column 2 total is 17,249.</p> <p>2. In the IE fee line please amend the amount rounding up to the nearest dollar and remove the decimal point and cents.</p>			
	<p>3. Are the Project/Programme Execution Costs at or below 9.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget (including the fee)?</p>	<p><b>Not fully.</b> The Execution Cost (USD 482,953) is 7.5% of the Total Project Cost (USD 6,451,613). <u>However</u>, it is not clear what portion of this goes to UNIDO (Note: <i>In case of Implementing Entity serving as the Executing Entity, the limit for execution is 1.5%. When the IE provides part of execution services for the project, to limit the execution costs of the IE to 1.5 per cent of the cost of the part of the project or programme executed by the implementing entity of the project/programme cost. In both cases, the justifications must be provided, as this arrangement can be approved only on an exceptional basis</i>). Also, more clarification is needed on the execution</p>		-	-

		<p>partners mentioned under Part IIA components description. Please note that at fully developed proposal stage clarity on the portion of the execution cost that is allocated to UNIDO will be required.</p> <p><b>CAR16:</b> Please provide the justification and the support letter from the DA for the execution services by UNIDO.</p> <p><b>CR10:</b> define the term “execution partner” as the AF only recognizes executing entities and clarify i) how their execution costs of these partners be allocated, ii) the executing entity listed on p. 1 responsible for their management/ supervision.</p>	<p><b>CAR16: Cleared.</b> See IE response and pp.40-41. <u>Support letter from NDA will be provided once received.</u></p> <p><b>CR10(CN): Cleared.</b> See p. 1 and IE response.</p> <p>Part III A indicates that UNIDO ‘may’ undertake execution of specific activities and that the PFG phase will further clarify or at inception. Please ensure that the <u>PFG stage clearly indicated which activities and that the FDP submitted reflects these activities so that the cost calculation apportionment can be properly assessed.</u></p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p>	
Eligibility of IE	1. Is the project/programme submitted through an eligible Implementing Entity that has been accredited by the Board?	<b>Yes.</b> UNIDO is an accredited MIE. <u>However,</u> Accreditation Expiration Date: 30 November 2025.	<b>No.</b>  <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</i>	<b>No.</b>  <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</i>	<b>No.</b>  <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</i>

			<p><i>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.</i></p>	<p><i>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.</i></p>	<p><i>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.</i></p>
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>4</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 as possible if a regional project/programme:

H.E. Dr. Aiman Abdalla Soleiman Minister of Environment Ministry of Environment	Date: <i>(Month, day, year)</i> December 9, 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 <u>certify that this proposal has</u> been prepared in accordance with guidelines provided by the Adaptation Fund Board, and prevailing National Development and Adaptation Plans (Economic Modernization Vision - 2033(EMV), National Adaptation Plan - 2021(NAP), National Climate Change Policy 2022–2050 (NCCP), Long-Term Strategy - 2050(LTS), the Updated Nationally Determined Contributions - 2021(NDCs), Health National Adaptation Plan (HNAP) 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	
<i>Name &amp; Signature/</i> Implementing Entity Coordinator:	
Ms. Ganna Onysko Senior GEF, GCF, AF Coordinator Division of Funding Partner Relations Directorate of Global Partnerships and External Relations United Nations Industrial Development Organization - UNIDO Implementing Entity Coordinator	
Date: <i>(Month, Day, Year)</i> : <del>6 February</del> <u>4 March</u> , 2026	Telephone: +43 1 26026 3708
Project Contact Person: Ms. Yvonne Lokko	
Email: Y.LOKKO@unido.org	

<sup>4</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.

## Annexes

### Annex 1: Government Endorsement Letter – Ministry of Environment



Ministry of Environment

Ref.No 7-2-3965  
Date 13-7-2025

Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat  
c/o Global Environment Facility  
Email: Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org  
Mail stop: N 7-700  
1818 H Street NW  
Washington DC 20433  
USA  
Fax +1 202 522 3240

**Subject:** Endorsement for “Building resilience and adaptation to climate change through innovation and entrepreneurship for green jobs in Jordan” by UNIDO

Dear Sir,

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

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above project/programme proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project/programme will be implemented by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture, the Jordan Valley Authority and partly executed by UNIDO.

**Please accept my high esteem and consideration,**

Sincerely,

Minister of Environment

  
Dr. Ahmad Al-Khalid Radwaneh



Ministry of Environment

Ref.No 7-2-7904  
Date 9-12-2025

**Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat**  
c/o Global Environment Facility  
Email: Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org  
Mail stop: N-700  
1818 H Street NW  
Washington DC 20433  
USA  
Fax +1 202 522 3240

**Subject: Endorsement for "Building resilience and adaptation to climate change through innovation and entrepreneurship for green jobs in Jordan" by UNIDO**

Dear Sir,

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

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above project/programme proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project/programme will be implemented by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture, the Jordan Valley Authority and partly executed by UNIDO.

Please accept my high esteem and consideration,

Sincerely,

**Minister of Environment**

**Dr. Aiman Abdalla Soleiman**



Ministry of Environment

Ref.No 7-2-653  
Date 27-1-2026

**To: 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: Letter of Support for UNIDO's execution role in Components 1, 2, and 3 in Jordan for "Building resilience and adaptation to climate change through innovation and entrepreneurship for green jobs in Jordan"**

With reference to the earlier Letter of Endorsement, and as the primary contact within the Designated Authority in Jordan for the Adaptation Fund, this is to convey the Government's agreement for the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) to serve as the Executing Entity for specialized activities in Component 1, 2, and 3 under the proposed project titled "Building resilience and adaptation to climate change through innovation and entrepreneurship for green jobs in Jordan"

UNIDO is requested to execute the above-mentioned components and related deliverables due to its proven track record and well-established technical expertise in sustainable value-/ supply-chains, climate-smart technologies and best practices, the promotion of climate-resilient agrifood systems, and institutional capacity-building through South-South Cooperation for the effective deployment, monitoring, and scaling up of adaptation solutions. In addition, UNIDO brings emerging climate solutions that support water user associations, small urban/ peri urban agro- and aqua-preneurs, and agri-service providers in adopting improved, climate-informed production practices and evidence-based decision-making systems.

It is important to emphasize that UNIDO's engagement is limited in scope and complementary in nature, while the project remains fully country-driven and firmly aligned with Jordan's national development and adaptation priorities.

**Sincerely,**

**Minister of Environment**

**Dr. Aiman A. Soleiman**



**Revised PFG Submission Form<sup>1</sup>**  
**Project Formulation Grant (PFG)**

**Submission Date:** 28 November 2025

**Adaptation Fund Project ID:**

**Country/ies:** Jordan

**Title of Project/ Programme:** Building resilience and adaptation to climate change through innovation and entrepreneurship for green jobs in Jordan

**Type of IE (NIE/RIE/MIE):** MIE  
**Implementing Entity:** United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO),  
**Executing Entity/ies:** UNIDO

**A. Project Preparation Timeframe**

<b>Start date of PFG</b>	June 2026
<b>Completion date of PFG</b>	December 2026

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

<b>List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities</b>	<b>Output of the PFG Activities</b>	<b>US\$ Amount</b>	<b>Budget note<sup>2</sup> (Based on Lead Organization)</b>
Baseline assessment, initial stakeholder Engagement & Participatory Planning	Comprehensive stakeholder consultation reports, inputs integrated into proposal design	17,249	Baseline assessment – UNIDO USD10,000 Community and stakeholders' organization and Stakeholders Consultation Workshop – MoA/JVA – USD 7,249
Gender and Vulnerability Analysis	Gender-sensitive vulnerability and needs assessment report	10,000	Conduct desk review and stakeholder mapping - MoA/JVA – USD3,000

<sup>1</sup> As presented in AFB/PPRC.33/40 Annex 1.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

			Identification of vulnerabilities and inequities, collect and analyze disaggregated data, develop recommendations and integrate findings, and validation and stakeholder engagement – UNIDO – USD7,000
Environmental & Social Risk Assessment (ESS)	ESS screening, risk mitigation framework, and compliance checklist	20,000	Site assessments, screen and categorize potential risks, develop mitigation measures and an Environmental & Social Management Plan (ESMP) – UNIDO USD12,000  Desk review and national E&S policy alignment and conduct stakeholder consultations – MoE – USD8,000
Climate Risk & Impact Modelling	Evidence-based climate risk profile for target areas and sectors	15,000	Climate data collection and analysis based on GeoAI methods, climate risk profiling, modeling/projection of climate impacts and ranking of vulnerability in different governorate in Jordan – UNIDO - USD10,000  Provides scientific justification for adaptation actions based on projected climate scenarios – MoE – 5,000
Institutional & Policy Alignment Review	Alignment report with NDC, NAP, EMV 2033, and sectoral plans	5,000	Aligning project interventions with national climate and agriculture related policies, and adaptation priorities and designing strategies for effective implementation – MoPIC – USD5,000
Mapping and Data Analytics for Project Areas and analysis of appropriate climate change adaptation solutions.	Set of detailed GIS-based maps identifying farms in target areas; Database of farmer profiles and agricultural statistics; defining location specific intervention recommendations for climate change adaptation; Monitoring framework and algorithm development for improved farm-level	33,000	Create spatial maps and visualize farms within the project area, assist in designing decision-support systems, collect farm-level data, and apply data science techniques to enhance feasibility analysis and improve algorithm performance; identifying climate resilient solutions through science-based approaches and mapping of best global practices; develop intervention-based mapping – UNIDO – 23,000

	analysis and impact tracking		Organizing field mission providing logistics services, and providing technical assistance during intervention-based land use and land resources mapping – MoA – USD10,000
Environmental sustainability & Financial Feasibility Analysis	Cost-effectiveness study, long-term sustainability and co-financing strategy	10,000	Undertake basic data collection, undertake environmental and economic analysis, demonstrates viability, scalability, and sustainability of proposed adaptation actions – UNIDO – USD10,000
Monitoring, evaluation & learning (MEL) Plan; Exit strategy, synergies, and sustainability planning	Adaptation-relevant indicators and MEL framework	10,000	Establishing MEL planning and evaluation frameworks and reporting mechanism, develop strategies to enhance local counterpart and stakeholders' ownership – UNIDO USD10,000
National stakeholder consultation and validation workshops (2)	Workshop reports, inputs for proposal refinement, Final validated project design by stakeholders, Secures national ownership and endorsement of the proposal.	18,000	Compilation of findings and finalizing the AF project proposal – UNIDO – USD 10,000  Organize high-level project proposal validation workshop (including travel cost of UNIDO's staff and Consultant from HQ)– UNIDO - USD8,000
Total Project Formulation Grant		138,249	
Implementing Entity management fee (Agency fee 8.5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IE admin and technical support for project development, monitoring and supervision.</li> <li>• Compliance assurance.</li> </ul>	11,751	
<b>Total Project Formulation Grant</b>		150,000	

Please describe below each of the PFG activities and provide justifications for their need and for funding required:

**For LLA Projects only:**

If requesting additional funding for LLA projects to enable devolving decision making to the local level, please specify the activities that would directly serve to enable devolving decision making to the lowest appropriate level and enable local actors to make informed decisions on how adaptation actions are defined, prioritized, designed, and implemented:

Please provide justifications for their need and for additional funding required:

### 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	Ms. Ganna Onysko Senior GEF, GCF, AF Coordinator Division of Funding Partner Relations Directorate of Global Partnerships and External Relations United Nations Industrial Development Organization - UNIDO Implementing Entity Coordinator Implementing Entity Coordinator		
Signature		Date (Month, day, year)	28 November 2025
Project Contact Person	Ms. Yvonne LOKKO Head IET/AGR/AIB Email: <a href="mailto:y.lokko@unido.org">y.lokko@unido.org</a> Work Phone: +43 1 26026 3737		
Telephone	Work Phone: +43 1 26026 3708		
Email Address	g.onysko@unido.org CC: gef@unido.org / glo@unido.org / f.haidara@unido.org		