



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.38/20/Add.1
10 September 2026

Adaptation Fund Board
Project and Programme Review Committee
Thirty eighth Meeting
Bonn, Germany, 19-23 October 2026

Agenda Item 4(q)

PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR TAJIKISTAN

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.38/20 “Proposal for Tajikistan” 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 AF00000535 “Adaptation Measures for Agro-pastoral Livelihoods in Tajikistan (AMAL-Adapt)”. 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-seventh 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 Gender, environmental and social risk analyses and formulation of Environmental and Social Management Plan, Gender Action Plan, and USPs screening approach; comprehensive consultation process; vulnerability assessment studies, analysis and full proposal development.

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



ADAPTATION FUND

ADAPTATION FUND BOARD SECRETARIAT
TECHNICAL REVIEW OF PROJECT PROPOSAL FOR
"ACCESS TO MARKET AND ADAPTATION FOR LIVESTOCK – ADAPT (AMAL-ADAPT)"

Project Title Access to Market and Adaptation for Livestock – Adapt (AMAL-Adapt)

Project ID AF00000535

Category Regular size project (over \$1 million)

Type Single country project

Stage Concept

Country Tajikistan

Implementing Entity IFAD

Financing Requested USD 10,000,000.00

Reviewer Mauricio Leon

Co-reviewer(s)

IE Contact Person

Clarissa Conte,Fanny Grandval,Fanny Minjauw,Khafiz Atymtay,Pierre Yves Guedez,Renaud Colmant,Shaimaa Nasr,Walid Nasr,Wietse Michiels

Secretariat's Overall Comment

The project Adaptation Measures for Agro-pastoral Livelihoods in Tajikistan (AMAL-Adapt) aims to enhance climate-resilient and income security of vulnerable rural households in targeted areas by strengthening livestock-based production systems and promoting sustainable natural resources management.

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

The initial technical review raises several issues, such as the lack of a Theory of Change and quantitative data for the Economic benefits, the need for a clear Alignment with the AF Results Framework and screening of environmental and social impacts, among others, as is discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review.

The second technical review finds that most of the initial review CRs and CARs have been addressed. However, few others still warrant further clarifications including indicating last submission date among few other corrections/ edits; substantiating, as possible at this stage, the project cost effectiveness via providing estimated dollar value of the avoided losses and/ or accrued gains; indicating the duration of all listed related projects; Inclusion of the consultations summary in Part IIH; further revision of the alignment with AF RF table; among other issues/ notes indicated in the second review comments.

The third technical review finds that the proposal has addressed most of the CRs and CARs raised in the previous reviews. Further clarification is still required regarding indicative monetary values of avoided losses and/or accrued gains, the implementation period of one related project, and gender-disaggregated participant figures for four consultation sessions.

Country Eligibility

Is the country party to the Kyoto Protocol, or the Paris Agreement?

Response: Yes

Secretariat: Yes.

Is the country a developing country particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change?

Response: Yes

Secretariat: Yes. Tajikistan is highly vulnerable to climate change due to its mountainous geography, high dependence on climate-sensitive natural resources, and the strong reliance of rural livelihoods on agriculture and livestock. Climate change is already affecting temperature regimes, precipitation patterns, cryosphere dynamics, and the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events, with direct implications for pasture productivity, water availability, and the resilience of rural communities in upland and semi-arid areas.

TR1_ 10 Jun 2026

Project Eligibility

Has the designated government authority for the Adaptation Fund endorsed the project/programme?

Response: Yes

Secretariat: Yes. As per the Endorsement letter dated May 15, 2026.

TR1_ 10 Jun 2026

Does the length of the proposal amount to no more than Fifty pages for the project/programme concept, including its annexes?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: The CN is 49 pages including annexes.

CR1: Please include the following:

1. paragraph numbers for easier reference in the review process.
2. captions on each table of the CN.

(10 June 2026)

CR1: Cleared. Requested revisions are reflected across the document.

CR1 (New): Please address the following:

1. Update last submission date on p.1.
2. Paras 9 and 10 refer to annexes 2-F, 2-G, and 2-H which are not attached to the proposal. Please revise and instead, add footnotes to indicate the references for these annexes. Apply for similar cases in the document, if any.
3. In column 2 of Table 10, replace the term "Impact" with "Risk/ Impact"
4. Revise table of contents for Part II"1" entry. Also, include lists of tables, figures and abbreviation. refer to tables and figures at related discussions and spell out abbreviation when they are first used across the document. (Note: Table of contents, lists of table, figures and

abbreviations do not count towards the AF document length page limit).

5. Conduct a round of editing/ proofreading of the revised document after addressing the review the comments.
(22 July 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR1 (New):

1. Cleared. See p. 1.

2: Cleared. See paras. 9–10 and Annex 2. Minor editorial note: “Annex 2,0” in the reference to Figure A2.1, panel H, should read “Annex 2,”.

3. Cleared. See Table 10.

4. Cleared. See the revised Table of Contents and Lists of Tables, Figures and Abbreviations.

5. Cleared. A proofreading has been carried out on the revised document.

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?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. However, some amendments are needed. Gender Assessment (pages 11-15), Project Area and Targets groups (page 15-18), Project/programme Objectives (pages 18-20) and Part II.A (pages 20-25). The CN identifies specific climate risks (glacier retreat, drought, reduced biomass, increased flash floods, rising evapotranspiration) to which some of the adaptation actions respond directly (rotational grazing and reseeded; rainwater harvesting tanks, solar-powered water pumps, erosion control measures). The CN describes two components, four outcomes, and four outputs. It also includes an Initial Gender Assessment that covers the different needs of women and men in rural and urban areas, as well as aspects such as education, access to financial instruments, poverty, among other dimensions. However, some of the household-level activities (milk processing, greenhouses, livestock packages, gardens) are conventional development activities and not framed explicitly as adaptation. In addition, no Theory of Change (ToC) is presented.

CR2: Please revise the programme objectives as follows:

1. Review whether the current “objective” should instead be framed as the overall objective of the programme.
2. Include an overall objective instead of a goal.
3. Include specific objectives. These should be clearly defined, concise, and positioned as a second level under the overall objective. They should explain how the overall objective will be achieved, through which channels, and be results-oriented. Please consider including more than one specific objective.
4. The single specific objective (“to enhance productivity, sustainability, and climate resilience of livestock ecosystems and value chains through environmentally sustainable and inclusive practices”) covers too much ground and is not measurable as written. Please consider breaking up this objective into two or three distinct, outcome-oriented objectives.
5. Include a specific objective to englobe all learning and knowledge management activities.

CR3: Please revise the relevant sections of the project’s vertical logic to more explicitly address adaptation-specific goals, outcomes, and objectives, and to clarify how these differ from conventional development

activities.

CR4: Please add reference to specific activities that address market linkages, value chain strengthening, and/or market access, or change the title and objective. The CN references key climate trends (0.3–0.5°C warming per decade, 30%+ glacier loss) but does not translate these trends into projected impacts at the project level. This will help to understand how the proposed interventions are proportionate to the scale of the threat.

CR5: Please revise all Outputs and amend accordingly, considering that outputs are the direct, tangible products (e.g., trainings held). For example, Output 1.2 “Community governance strengthened (VOs/PUUs) and women and youth participation institutionalized; stakeholder engagement, grievance and screening procedures operationalized” corresponds to an outcome.

CR6:

1. Please include targets for all outcomes and outputs.
2. Please clarify what is meant by ‘grievance and screening procedures Operationalized’.

CR7: Please include a ToC (narrative and diagram) that covers the following elements:

- (i) the main problem.
- (ii) the overall objective.
- (iii) outcomes, outputs, and activities.
- (iv) Components as the solutions to contribute to the main problem.
- (v) assumptions and risks, as cross-cutting elements across all the above. These should be specific rather than generic.

This should clearly describe the vertical logic of the proposed programme toward adaptation.

CR8: Please revise the component description to clearly specify what will be financed, including the specific adaption considerations to be included in each one, the entities involved in the intervention, the target groups, and other relevant details. The current description outlines the rationale and intended outcomes but does not adequately detail what the component will fund.

CR9: Please clarify whether the activities under Component 2, that are not specifically identified, can be categorized as Unspecified Subprojects (USPs). As the use of USPs is intended for exceptional cases, it requires compliance with the AF requirements. Please refer this link for guidance and provide a clear justification for their use, ensuring full adherence to AF requirements.

CR10: Please clarify whether the trainings mentioned in Component 2 are related to the investments or are aimed at broader objectives related to learning and knowledge management activities.

(10 June 2026)

CR2: Cleared. See pp. 21-22 (TC document).

Note: reference is always made to TC document version unless otherwise specified.

CR3: Cleared. See Part IIA, 24-31, and Part II”I”, pp. 54-55.

CR4: Cleared. See revised Title, p.1, and revised overall objective and specific objectives, pp. 21-22, and Part IIA revised climate rationale, pp. 24-31.

CR5: Cleared. See Part IIA, pp. 24-31.

CR6: Cleared. Sufficient for CN stage, see Part IIA, pp. 24-31. The term “grievance and screening procedures operationalized” has been deleted from output 1.2 text (see pp. 22 and 27. Also, see Part IIB, last para on p.33.

CR7: Cleared. See p. 25.

CR8: Cleared. See Part IIA, pp. 24-31, and Part II”I”, pp. 54-55.

CR9: Cleared. Revisions have been made to clarify that Component 2 does not include fully unidentified/ open-ended subprojects. It consists of partially identified, framework-bound community adaptation investments. Geographic scope, eligible adaptation menu, exclusion criteria, climate-rationale and screening process are already defined. Final village/site selection specific combination of investments will be confirmed at full proposal stage. See Part IIA, p. 28.

CR10: Cleared. See Activity 2.2.2, p. 31.
(22 July 2026)

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?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. However, some amendments are needed. Part II.B (pages 25-26). The proposal highlights broad economic, social, and environmental benefits of the project. However, it offers no quantitative estimates of these benefits and does not explain how specific vulnerable groups (women, youth, others) will be targeted equitably. Also, the CN states that 20% of village investment budgets will be reserved for women-led priorities, but does not explain how this percentage was determined, how compliance will be monitored, or what recourse exists if the ring-fence is not honored. This needs to be operationalized more concretely.

CR11: Please provide some additional gender analysis to justify the planned activities, as well as further details on the proposed budget ring-fencing.

CR12: Please include quantitative data for the project economic, social and environmental benefits based on its planned interventions. If exact figures are not available, kindly include estimation proxies.

CR13: Please clarify whether the project interventions pose any risk of negative development or maladaptation that could increase the vulnerability of beneficiaries or non-beneficiaries or reduce their capacity to adapt to climate change.

CR14: Please outline how the benefits will be equitably distributed, considering the vulnerable groups included in the proposed interventions (women and youth).

CR15: Please revise and amend the budget allocation between the two components accordingly. Component 1 seems to have a low budget for participatory planning and capacity building across 55 villages in two regions. If these activities are not adequately resourced, this may reduce the effectiveness of the investments under

Component 2.

(10 June 2026)

CR11: Cleared. See pp. 32-33.

CR12: Cleared. Sufficient for CN stage. See Part IIB, pp. 31-33. More details to be provided at full proposal stage.

CR13: Cleared. See Part IIB, para 64, pp. 31-32.

CR14: Cleared. See Part IIB, para 66, pp. 32-33.

CR15: Cleared. Based on IE response, which justifies current budget allocations.

(22 July 2026)

Is the project / programme cost effective?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. However, more information is required. Part II.C (pages 26-27). The CN proposes several approaches to cost-effectiveness such as building on existing IFAD-supported Village Organizations and Pasture User Unions and investing in ecosystem-based adaptation. It considers alternative models in Table 5. However, all explanations are too broad and there is no attempt to quantify cost-effectiveness.

CR16: Please include quantitative estimates of cost-effectiveness. Otherwise, please include proxy estimates. This may be cost per beneficiary household, the value of avoided losses, or the expected return on ecosystem restoration investments.

CR17: Please strengthen the narrative logic to explain the cost-effectiveness of each component, as those included in Table 5 are too generic and do not clearly explain how they are more cost-effective than alternative options.

CR18: Please provide information on the cost-effectiveness from the sustainability point of view.

(10 June 2026)

CR16: Not fully cleared. In the last column of Table 6, pp. 35-36, please provide as possible at this stage the estimated dollar value of the avoided losses and/ or accrued gains.

CR17: Cleared. See pp. 34-35 of Part IIC.

CR18: Cleared. See para 72 of Part IIC, p. 35, and IE response.

(22 July 2026)

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR16: Cleared. See Table 6, pp. 26–27. The revised Table 6 substantially strengthens the cost-effectiveness analysis and provides cost proxies, FIRR, and B/C ratios.

For the Full Proposal stage, please provide, from the underlying AMAL EFA models, monetary values (USD) of accrued gains and/or avoided losses for relevant investment models, for example as per-unit estimates or ranges where supported by the available data.

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?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. However, more information is required. Part II.D (pages 27-29). The proposed programme is consistent with 11 national instruments, including the National Adaptation Plan 2023, the NDC 2021, State Programme on Climate Change Adaptation for 2019–2030 and National Water Strategy to 2040. However, further information is required.

CR19: Please include Tajikistan's national gender policy framework given the importance of gender considerations.

(10 June 2026)

CR19: Cleared. See Part IID, para 75, p. 37, and the Gender Assessment section, p. 13.

(22 July 2026)

Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. However, more information is required. Part II.E (pages 29-31). The proposal identifies four broad groups of legal frameworks aligned with the project, including the Constitution and environmental, land, and labour-related frameworks and 7 specific frameworks. However, the information provided should be further elaborated. In addition, given that Tajikistan is one of the most seismically active countries in Central Asia, it is important to clarify whether the planned investments require seismic design considerations and compliance with applicable standards.

CAR1: Please provide the list of standards in a table. This table should include:

- Specific title of the law or framework
- Objective of the standard
- The public entity in charge
- In the case that compliance is required, the main steps needed to comply with it (indicating how the project will ensure this).

CR20: Please ensure that the table listing is comprehensive. Applicable standards may include any other sector-specific related regulations relevant to the project interventions. For example, please include some consideration of seismic risks and the potential relevance of standards.

(10 June 2026)

CAR1: Cleared. See Part IIE, pp. 38-41.

CR20: Cleared. See a related dedicated para on p. 38 and Table 7 p.40.

(22 July 2026)

Is there duplication of project / programme with other funding sources?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: Unsure. More information is required. Part II.F (pages 31-33). A table with the identified projects is provided, including a summary and a justification for no duplication and potential synergies. However, the relationship with the parent AMAL project is not clear. The CAN states that AMAL-Adapt is "standalone" with its own budget and results framework, but the two projects share the same Implementing Entity (IFAD), Executing Entity (CEP), delivery structures (VOs, PUUs), and at least partially overlapping geographic areas.

CR21: Please include a narrative and/or figure that maps the boundaries between the two projects' activities, outputs, and beneficiaries.

CR22: Please clarify how AMAL-Adapt will be different from the original AMAL programme.

CR23: Please revise Table under Part II.F and identify other related ongoing or completed projects and include them in the table (for example, other relevant GCF and UNDP projects under implementation or development). For each identified project, please ensure to include:

- (i) Project title, Timeline and specific Location within the country,
- (ii) Main project interventions, and Target population,
- (iii) Implementing entity,
- (iv) Lessons learned, how they are considered/ reflected in the proposed project design,
- (v) Overlaps and synergies with the proposed project (specific rather than generic).

CR24: The no duplication statement should be clearly justified (e.g. by indicating the distinct geographic locations and/or types of interventions) for each related project identified.

(10 June 2026)

CR21: Cleared. See para 81 of Part IIF, p. 43.

CR22: Cleared. See para 80 of Part IIF, p. 43.

CR23: Not fully cleared. In Table 8 first column, some projects duration dates (i.e., start date and end dates) are

missing/ not clear. Please ensure the duration for all listed completed and ongoing project is included.

CR24: Cleared. See last column of Table 8, pp. 43-46.
(22 July 2026)

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CR23: Cleared. See Table 8, pp. 34–37. Table 8 provides implementation periods for almost all listed projects, and the treatment of projects with implementation periods not yet fixed is acceptable.

Does the project / programme have a learning and knowledge management component to capture and feedback lessons?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. However, more information is required. Part II.G (pages 33-34). The proposed project does not include dedicated budget or staffing associated with learning and knowledge management. In addition, the information provided is too broad, and it is not clear the arrangements to sustain them after the project concludes.

CR25: Please consider adding a dedicated component to operationalize Learning and Knowledge Management (LKM) activities.

CAR2: Kindly include the following:

- What LKM activities/products will be financed and included in the proposed project. This information should be specific.
- Which entities will be responsible for tracking the experiences gained, how this will be done, and when the tracking will take place.
- Explain how the knowledge generated will be maintained once the project concludes and describe the institutional or operational arrangements required to ensure its long term sustainability.
- Specify what feedback mechanisms are in place to assess and refine the training materials and capacity building activities, ensuring they become increasingly effective and impactful over time.

(10 June 2026)

CR25: Cleared. The CN has been revised to clarify that LKM will be operationalized through the broader AMAL programme M&E/KM system, supported by Project/Programme Execution costs, and through a dedicated activity under Output 1.2, is set for the purpose (Activity 1.2.3, p.28). Also, as per the IE response, IFAD&CEP will assess whether a dedicated component/ output need to be added at full proposal stage.

CAR2: Cleared. See Part IIG, pp. 49-50.
(22 July 2026)

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?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. However, more information is required. Part II.H (pages 34-35) and Annex I. At the national level, the consultations were limited. Only seven people were consulted in Dushanbe, representing the Ministry of Agriculture, CEP, Ministry of Finance, and Committee on Food Security. Several important stakeholders are absent, including the Agency on Hydrometeorology; the private sector; and national civil society. The CN reports that dedicated consultation sessions were held for women and that women's priorities directly influenced design features. A Gender Assessment is included. However, only 32% of overall participants in consultations were women and there is no gender-disaggregated data on consultation outcomes other than a reference to the ring-fencing idea coming from these consultations.

CAR3: Please include in the Table in Annex 1, the following:

- (i) consulted entity/ group, especially if they correspond to gender organizations. They should be specifically named.
- (ii) expand on the key issues raised and how they were considered in project design (name specific outputs and outcomes currently in the proposal).
- (iii) background information to verify whether marginalized and vulnerable groups have been consulted.
- (iv) A summary of the subjects/issues discussed and any agreements reached, for each session.
- (v) Indicate how the participants' interests have been incorporated in the proposed project, including how gender and other vulnerable group considerations were addressed.

CR26: Please indicate if further future consultations will be conducted.

(10 June 2026)

CAR3: Not fully cleared. Please include a summary table for consultations indicated in Annex 1. This summary table should include consulted entity/ community and date, number of participants disaggregated by gender, topics discussed, and outcomes and how they were considered in project design.

CR26: Cleared. See p. 52 of Part IIH.

(22 July 2026)

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: CAR3: Cleared. See Table A1.1, pp. 50–52. Table A1.1 substantially addresses the requested consultation information. However, session-level participant numbers, including gender-disaggregated figures, are missing for four village/WUA consultations: Jafr Kukhsori Ajam, Sharqiyon, WUA “Obi Oryo”, and WUA “Obi Surkhob”. Please provide at the full proposal stage the attendance figures for these sessions, disaggregated by gender, and clarify that they are included in the consolidated Lakhsh total to avoid double-counting.

Is the requested financing justified on the basis of full cost of adaptation reasoning?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. However, more information is required. Part II.I (pages 35-36). The project is structurally dependent on the broader AMAL program. AMAL provides the institutional architecture, community entry

points, trained facilitators, and community trust that AMAL-Adapt proposes to leverage. However, more information is required.

CR27: Please describe a contingency scenario for AMAL-Adapt's delivery if the AMAL program structures are not operational.

CR28: Provide some explanation of how these activities are justified in the context of achieving the adaptation goals of the project. As some of the household-level activities (milk processing, greenhouses, livestock packages, gardens) are conventional development activities and not framed explicitly as adaptation.

CR29: Please confirm whether the AF will be the sole source of funding. If not, please clearly indicate how the project, using only AF resources, will be able to effectively meet its objectives.

(10 June 2026)

CR27: Cleared. See pp. 54-55 of Part II "I".

CR28: Cleared. See Part IIA, pp. 24-31 and Part II.I, pp. 54-55. Also, see IE response.

CR29: Cleared. See para 89 of Part II "I", p. 54.

(22 July 2026)

Is the project / program aligned with AF's results framework?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. However, some adjustments are required. Part III.A (pages 42-44). The alignment of the project with the Adaptation Fund Results Framework is presented, considering outcomes and outputs for each component. However, some amendments are required.

CR30: Please consider adding linkages to AF Outcomes 1 and 3, which also seem relevant.

CAR4: Please revise Table 9 and amend according to the instructions provided in Results Framework Alignment Table (Nov 2025). Please ensure the following:

- Currently is presented 2 tables, it should be 1.
- Ensure consistency of all Fund Outcomes and Outputs (including indicators). For example, Output 2.1. is described as "Strengthened capacity of institutions to understand and better address climate risks", but it should be "Strengthened capacity of national and sub-national centres and networks to respond rapidly to extreme weather events".

CAR5: Please ensure that all project's outputs and outcomes indicators are SMART.

(10 June 2026)

CR30: Cleared. See revised Table 11, pp. 65-66.

CAR4: Not cleared. See Table 11, pp. 65-66. Please address the following:

1. Revise Table 11 title to read: "Alignment with AF Results Framework".
2. Please update table to comply with the updated SRF template for alignment table available at <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/document/alignment-with-adaptation-fund-results-framework-template-and-guidance-dec-2025/>

CAR5: Cleared. See column 2 of Table 11, pp. 65-66.
(22 July 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CAR4: Cleared. See Table 11, pp. 44–45. Table 11 follows the updated AF Results Framework Alignment Table, including the requested title, consolidated outcome/output structure, and corresponding Fund results and indicators.

Has the sustainability of the project/programme outcomes been taken into account when designing the project?

Response: Pending

Secretariat: CR: While the Concept Note briefly refers to community contributions, user-based cost-sharing and household responsibility on p. 39, it does not explain how recurrent O&M and asset-replacement costs will be financed and managed. Please clarify the level and frequency of beneficiary contributions, fund management arrangements, affordability and measures for vulnerable households.

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. However, more information is required. Part II.J (pages 36-38). The CN provides broad information about the sustainability of the programme from different dimensions such as technical view, financial and operational. The approach to sustainability relies heavily on the continued functioning of Village Organizations and Pasture User Unions. If these structures weaken or dissolve after the parent IFAD project closes, the institutional sustainability of AMAL-Adapt's investments is at risk.

CR31: Please describe what happens to maintenance arrangements in this scenario and consider any institutional capacity-building activities that would make the VOs and PUUs self-sustaining independently of IFAD support.

CR32: Please describe the arrangements needed to ensure the sustainability of the programme after its completion. For example, have any initial discussions been held with the Government of Tajikistan? Will this be addressed as part of the proposal development? Are there any pre-arrangements already signed or under preparation? What are the main responsible institutions involved?

CR33: Please include information on how the adaptation benefits would enable replication and scaling up after the project has ended.
(10 June 2026)

CR31: Not fully cleared. See para 94 of Part IIJ, pp. 56-57. Kindly note that while para 94, p. 39 (clean version) briefly refers to community contributions, user-based cost-sharing and household responsibility, it does not explain how recurrent O&M and asset-replacement costs will be financed and managed. Please clarify the level and frequency of beneficiary contributions, fund management arrangements, affordability and measures for vulnerable households.

CR32: Cleared. See para 97 of Part IIJ, p. 57.

CR33: Cleared. See para 97 of Part IIJ, p.57.

(22 July 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR31: Cleared. See Part II.J, paras. 94–95, pp. 39–40. The sustainability section provides indicative O&M costs, contribution frequency, fund management arrangements, and affordability measures for vulnerable households. Further details on asset-replacement cycles and related sinking-fund arrangements can be specified at the Full Proposal stage once final asset specifications and service lives are confirmed.

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?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. However, more information is required. Part II.K (pages 38-42). The CN provides an overview of the environmental and social impacts and risks in compliance with the AF ESP and Gender Policy. It lists the potential environmental and social risks, as well as the risk management instruments which will be prepared at the Full Project Stage. The project is classified as Category B. Risk have been identified against each of the 15 ESP principles. An Initial Gender Assessment is included (pages 11-15).

However, there is no discussion of potential indirect, transboundary, or cumulative impacts that could result from the proposed project/programme.

CR34: Please provide any available gender-disaggregated data on asset ownership or financial access; and discuss potential risks related to the legal constraints on women's land ownership.

CAR7: Please revise Table 8 to:

1. Describe all potential impacts (direct, indirect, transboundary and cumulative) and risks that could result from the project.
2. Revise the magnitude of the risks and impacts (low, moderate, high). Risks should describe as: "There is a risk" and should be accompanied by mitigation plans as: "Mitigation measures are" or "To mitigate this risk, the project"
3. Please remember that principles 1, 4 and 6 always apply.
4. If no risk is identified for a given principle, a sound justification must be provided.
5. Please strengthen the USPs justification under Part II.K as well as on how will be ensure the compliance according to the guidance.

(10 June 2026)

CR34: Cleared. See para 99 of Part IIK, p. 59.

CAR7: Cleared. See Part IIK, Table 10, pp. 60-64, para 101, p. 60, and para 102, p. 64.

Note: In column 2 of Table 10, replace the term “Impact” with “Risk/ Impact”.

(22 July 2026)

Resource Availability

Is the requested project / programme funding within the cap of the country?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes.

(10 June 2026)

Is the Implementing Entity Management Fee at or below 8.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget before the fee?

Response: Not Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. However, some amendments are needed. All figures are rounded to whole numbers, and the Implementing Entity Management Fee is 8.5%. The PFG request is correct in size (USD 150,000), including the PFG fee for the Implementing Entity's Management of 8.5% (USD 12,750).

CR35:

1. Please confirm whether IFAD will serve as the Implementing Entity (IE) and Executing Entity (EE) for the PFG activities.
2. Please ensure that the PFG received with the re-submission is signed.

(10 June 2026)

CR35: Not fully cleared. Please indicate the PFG Submission Date.

(22 July 2026)

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: CR35: Cleared. The revised PFG includes the requested submission date, Adaptation Fund Project ID, and IE signature.

Are the Project/Programme Execution Costs at or below 9.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget (including the fee)?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. As per information provided in Table of Project/Programme Components and Financing. All figures are rounded to whole numbers, and the Implementing Entity Management Fee is 9.5%.
(10 July 2026)

Eligibility of IE

Is the project/programme submitted through an eligible Implementing Entity that has been accredited by the Board?

Response: Cleared

Secretariat: Yes. International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD) is an accredited Multilateral Implementing Entity (MIE).
Accreditation Expiration Date: 05 February 2031.
(10 June 2026)



Revised PFG Submission Form¹ (additions in red)

Project Formulation Grant (PFG)

Submission Date: ~~TBC~~ 11 August 2026

Adaptation Fund Project ID: ~~TBC~~ AF00000535

Country/ies: Republic of Tajikistan

Title of Project/Programme: Access to Market and Adaptation for Livestock – Adapt (AMAL-Adapt)

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	December 2026
Completion date of PFG	December 2027

B. Proposed Project Preparation Activities (\$)

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PFG Activities	US\$ Amount	Budget note ²
Gender, environmental and social risk analyses and formulation of Environmental and Social Management Plan, Gender Action Plan, and USPs screening approach.	- Environmental and Social Management Plan formulated - Gender Action Plan formulated - GRM developed - USP screening approach developed	18,000	- Consultancy fees: US\$11,000 - Field consultations and logistics: US\$7,000
Integrated climate vulnerability, GIS and remote-sensing assessment to support geographic targeting, selection criteria and prioritization framework for village selection during implementation	- Vulnerability assessment completed - Selection criteria, indicators and prioritization framework for future village selection finalized - Screening-level spatial analysis prepared to support geographic targeting and full proposal design	25,000	- Consultancy fees: US\$20,000 - Field verifications and logistics: US\$5,000

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.

Economic and financial analysis, including community investment parameters and women-focused adaptation allocations	• Economic and financial analysis completed • Cost-effectiveness and adaptation rationale for priority investments refined • Proposed design parameters for community-level adaptation investments finalized	12,000	• Consultancy fees: US\$9,000 • Logistics costs: US\$3,000
Full proposal development, including international technical consultancies, local consultations and workshops, results framework, indicators and M&E plan, implementation arrangements, translation, knowledge management and submission package preparation	• Key technical sections of the full proposal refined and validated • Full proposal package prepared • Technical design inputs for priority adaptation investments strengthened • Consultation record, workshop outputs and design documentation completed • Updated results framework, project-level indicators and M&E plan finalized • Interpretation during the mission and translation of project materials completed	82,250	• Consultancy fees: US\$60,000 • Workshops, translation and logistics costs: US\$22,250
IE Fees (8.5% of total)		12,750	
Total Project Formulation Grant		150,000	

The PFG activities requested for the AMAL-Adapt project will support the preparation of the full proposal at different levels, ensuring that the Executing Entity will be provided with the analytical, safeguard, design and consultation inputs required to finalize a technically sound, socially inclusive and Adaptation Fund-compliant full proposal. The activities proposed are detailed below:

1. Gender, environmental and social risk analyses and formulation of Environmental and Social Management Plan, Gender Action Plan, and USPs screening approach

A comprehensive environmental and social risk analysis and gender assessment will be undertaken during project formulation to ensure that the full proposal is supported by robust safeguard and inclusion measures from the outset. This activity will finance the preparation of the Environmental and Social Management Plan and Gender Action Plan, together with the related consultations required to validate risks, mitigation measures and inclusion priorities. It will also support the development of an appropriate screening approach for any activities that remain unidentified at full proposal stage, so that the project design is fully prepared to meet Adaptation Fund requirements at submission and implementation stages.

2. Integrated climate vulnerability, GIS and remote-sensing assessment to support final village selection, selection criteria and prioritization during project design

A focused climate vulnerability and spatial assessment will be carried out during project formulation to support the final selection of target villages within the already defined target districts in DRS and Sughd when the implementation starts. This activity will finance the development of selection criteria, indicators and a prioritization methodology based on climate vulnerability, exposure to drought and pasture degradation, implementation feasibility, inclusion considerations, poverty, livestock dependence and remoteness. The work will draw on available geospatial,

administrative and socio-economic information, including GIS and remote-sensing analysis, and will provide the screening-level evidence needed to support the full proposal design.

3. Economic and financial analysis, including community investment parameters and women-focused adaptation allocations

Economic and financial analysis will be undertaken to strengthen the justification and design of the proposed investments under the full proposal. This activity will support the refinement of cost-effectiveness analysis, confirm the adaptation rationale of priority interventions, and develop the main design parameters for community-level adaptation investments, including women-focused allocations and household resilience measures. It will help ensure that proposed financing modalities are technically sound, economically justified and well aligned with the resilience objectives of the project.

4. Full proposal development, including international and national technical consultancies, local consultations and workshops, results framework, indicators and M&E plan, implementation arrangements, translation, knowledge management and submission package preparation

Full proposal preparation will be supported through a combination of recruitment of international and national technical consultants, local consultations and workshops, and consolidation of the project design package. This activity will finance the strengthening of the technical quality of the full proposal, including refinement of key technical sections, adaptation logic, eligible investments and priority interventions to be presented in the proposal. It will also support the preparation of the results framework, identification of project-level indicators, preparation of the monitoring and evaluation plan, clarification of implementation arrangements, and completion of the documentation required for submission. In addition, it will cover translation and interpretation needs during the design mission, consultation records, knowledge management inputs, and the final packaging of the proposal to ensure a complete, coherent and submission-ready document.

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		<u>08/11/2026</u>	Walid Nasr		w.nasr@ifad.org p.guedez@ifad.org

КУМИТАИ ҲИФЗИ МУҲИТИ ЗИСТИ НАЗДИ ҲУКУМАТИ ҶУМҲУРИИ ТОҶИКИСТОН 734034, шаҳри Душанбе, кӯчани С. Абдуллоев №77 Тел./факс: (992 37) 223-35-00 Сомона: https://egov.tj/site/nature-tj/lang-tg Почта электронӣ: info@tajnature.tj		КОМИТЕТ ПО ОХРАНЕ ОКРУЖАЮЩЕЙ СРЕДЫ ПРИ ПРАВИТЕЛЬСТВЕ РЕСПУБЛИКИ ТАДЖИКИСТАН 734034, город Душанбе, улица С. Абдуллоев №77 Тел./факс: (992 37) 223-35-00 Веб-сайт: https://egov.tj/site/nature-tj/lang-tg Электронная почта: info@tajnature.tj
COMMITTEE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION UNDER THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF TAJIKISTAN C. Abdulloev №77, 734034 Dushanbe city, tel./fax (992 37) 223-35-00 web-site: https://egov.tj/site/nature-tj/lang-tg e-mail: info@tajnature.tj		
№ <u>1/24-03-119</u> from « <u>15</u> » <u>05</u> 2026 To _____ from « _____ » _____ 2026		
To: The Adaptation Fund Board c/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat Email: Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org Fax: 202 522 3240/5		
Subject: Endorsement for the Access to Market and Adaptation for Livestock Adapt (AMAL-Adapt) Project		
In my capacity as designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in the Republic of Tajikistan, I confirm that the above national project 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 the country.		
Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above project proposal 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 Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of Tajikistan (CEP), through its Center for Implementation of Investment Projects (CEP-CIIP).		
Sincerely,  Sheraliyoda Bahodur, Chairman of the Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan, National Designated Authority for the Adaptation Fund		

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

КУМИТАИ
ҲИФЗИ МУҲИТИ ЗИСТИ
НАЗДИ ҲУКУМАТИ
ҶУМҲУРИИ ТОҶИКИСТОН



КОМИТЕТ ПО
ОХРАНЕ ОКРУЖАЮЩЕЙ СРЕДЫ
ПРИ ПРАВИТЕЛЬСТВЕ
РЕСПУБЛИКИ ТАДЖИКИСТАН

734034, шаҳри Душанбе, кӯчаи С. Абдуллоев №77
Тел./факс: (992 37) 223-35-00
Сомона: <https://egov.tj/site/nature-tjk?lang=tg>
Почтаи электронӣ: info@tajnature.tj

734034, город Душанбе, улица С. Абдуллоев №77
Тел./факс: (992 37) 223-35-00
Веб-сайт: <https://egov.tj/site/nature-tjk?lang=tg> Электронная
почта: info@tajnature.tj

COMMITTEE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
UNDER THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF TAJIKISTAN
С. Abdulloev №77, 734034 Dushanbe city, tel./fax (992 37) 223-35-00 web-site: <https://egov.tj/site/nature-tjk?lang=tg>, e-mail: info@tajnature.tj

№ 1/24-03-119 from « 15 » 05 2026

To _____ from « _____ » _____ 2026

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

Subject: Endorsement for the Access to Market and Adaptation for Livestock Adapt (AMAL-Adapt) Project

In my capacity as designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in the Republic of Tajikistan, I confirm that the above national project 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 the country.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above project proposal 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 Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of Tajikistan (CEP), through its Center for Implementation of Investment Projects (CEP-CIIP).

Sincerely,

Sheralizoda Bahodur,
Chairman of the Committee for Environmental Protection
under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan,
National Designated Authority for the Adaptation Fund