



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.33-34/3
19 July 2024

Adaptation Fund Board
Project and Programme Review Committee

**READINESS PACKAGE GRANT PROPOSAL TO SUPPORT
NATIONAL IMPLEMENTING ENTITY ACCREDITATION FOR
TAJIKISTAN**

Background

1. At its twenty-second meeting, the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat (the secretariat) had prepared document AFB/B.22/6 which outlined the possible elements and options for a phased programme to support readiness for direct access to climate finance for national and regional implementing entities and presented a framework and budget for a first phase of the programme. Following a discussion of the document, the Board decided to:

- a) *Approve Phase I of the Readiness Programme as detailed in document AFB/B.22/6, on the basis that it would follow performance-based funding principles;*
- b) *Take note of the options provided by the secretariat on a programme to support readiness for direct access to climate finance for national and regional implementing entities;*
- c) *Request the secretariat to submit to the Board intersessionally between the twenty-second and twenty-third meetings, execution arrangements, criteria/eligibility criteria to allocate the funds to the accredited implementing entities for specific activities, as well as a timeline of activities, with a view to start implementing the programme before the twenty-third Board meeting; and*
- d) *Approve an increase in the Administrative Budget of the Board, secretariat and trustee for FY2014 of US\$ 467,000 for the programme described in AFB/B.22/6, and authorize the trustee to transfer such amount to the secretariat and request the trustee to set aside the balance amount of US\$ 503,000 from the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund resources for subsequent commitment and transfer at the instruction of the Board.*

(Decision B.22/24)

2. At its twenty-third meeting, the Board had decided through decision B.23/26 to approve the execution arrangements and eligibility criteria to allocate the funds to the accredited implementing entities for specific activities, contained in document AFB/B.23/5, which included grants for technical assistance and South-South Cooperation (SSC).

3. Based on the Board Decision B.23/26, the first call for readiness project proposals was issued in May 2014 and eligible countries were given the opportunity to submit applications for a readiness grant.

4. At the tenth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 10), the Parties recognized the Readiness Programme of the Adaptation Fund and decided to:

Invite further support for the readiness programme of the Adaptation Fund Board for direct access to climate finance in accordance with decision 2/CMP.10, paragraph 5;

Decision 1/CMP.10

and also decided to:

Request the Adaptation Fund Board to consider, under its readiness programme, the following options for enhancing the access modalities of the Adaptation Fund:

- a) Targeted institutional strengthening strategies to assist developing countries, in particular the least developed countries, to accredit more national or regional implementing entities to the Adaptation Fund;*
- b) Ensuring that accredited national implementing entities have increased and facilitated access to the Adaptation Fund, including for small-sized projects and programmes;*

Decision 2/CMP.10

5. Upon completion of Phase I of the Readiness Programme, the secretariat had prepared document AFB/B.25/5 which outlined the progress made in Phase I and proposed Phase II of the Readiness Programme, taking into account the results from Phase I of the programme and integrating decision 2/CMP10. Following a discussion of the document, the Board decided to:

Approve Phase II of the Readiness Programme, as outlined in document AFB/B.25/5, with a total funding of US\$ 965,000, including funding of US\$ 565,000 to be transferred to the secretariat's budget and funding of US\$ 400,000 to be set aside for small grants to National Implementing Entities from resources of the Adaptation Fund trust fund.

(Decision B.25/27)

6. At its twenty-seventh meeting, the Board decided to integrate the Readiness Programme into the Adaptation Fund (the Fund) work plan and budget and set aside funding for small grants to be directly transferred from the resources of the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund. At this meeting, the Board decided to:

- a) Take note of the progress report for phase II of the Readiness Programme;*
- b) Integrate the Readiness Programme into the Adaptation Fund work plan and budget; and*
- c) Approve the proposal for the Readiness Programme for the fiscal year 2017 (FY17), comprising its work programme for FY17 with the funding of US\$ 616,500 to be transferred to the secretariat budget and US\$ 590,000 for direct transfers from the resources of the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund for allocation as small grants.*

(Decision B.27/38)

7. At the twenty-eighth meeting of the Board, the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) had recommended to the Board to establish a standing rule on the intersessional project review cycle for grants under the Readiness Programme to allow for continued review and approval of readiness grants intersessionally each year. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Board decided to:

- a) Request the secretariat to continue to review readiness grant proposals annually, during an intersessional period of less than 24 weeks between two consecutive Board meetings;*

AFB/PPRC.33-34/3

- b) *Notwithstanding the request in paragraph (a) above, recognize that any readiness grant proposal can be submitted to regular meetings of the Board;*
- c) *Request the PPRC to consider intersessionally the technical review of such readiness grant proposals as prepared by the secretariat and to make intersessional recommendations to the Board;*
- d) *Consider such intersessionally reviewed proposals for intersessional approval in accordance with the Rules of Procedure; and*
- e) *Request the secretariat to present, in the twentieth meeting of the PPRC, and annually following each intersessional review cycle, an analysis of the intersessional review cycle.*

(Decision B.28/30)

8. At the thirty-sixth meeting of the Board, the PPRC had discussed the review cycle for readiness grants and recommended to the Board for readiness proposals to be submitted for review and consideration by the Board during both intersessional periods between the regular meetings of the Board. Having considered the recommendations of the PPRC, the Board decided:

- a) *To request the secretariat to review readiness grant proposals during all intersessional periods between Board meetings while recognizing that such grants may also be reviewed at regular meetings of the Board;*
- b) *To request the PPRC to consider intersessionally the technical review of such readiness grant proposals as prepared by the secretariat and to make intersessional recommendations to the Board;*
- c) *To consider such intersessionally reviewed proposals for intersessional approval in accordance with the Rules of Procedure;*
- d) *To also request the secretariat to send a notification to implementing entities and other stakeholders informing them about the new arrangement;*
- e) *To further request the secretariat to present, at the twenty-eighth meeting of the PPRC, and at subsequent PPRC meetings following each intersessional review cycle for readiness grants, an analysis of the intersessional review cycle.*

(Decision B.36/26)

9. At the thirty-sixth meeting of the Board, following completion of the pilot phase for the readiness package grant, the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) had recommended to the Board to approve the readiness package grant as a standing grant to support accreditation to the Fund. The readiness package grant would replace South-South cooperation grants and continue to facilitate peer-peer support for accreditation through South-South cooperation using a more enhanced and comprehensive approach. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the PPRC, the Board decided:

- a) *To approve the Readiness Package Grant as a standing window and replacement to*

South-South Cooperation Grants under the Readiness Programme to provide support for the accreditation of a National Implementing Entity (NIE) of the Fund;

- b) That the Readiness Package Grant shall be available for accreditation of NIEs only, up to a maximum of US\$ 150,000 per country;*
- c) That Implementing Entities submitting proposals for the Readiness Package Grant should do so using the application form in Annex I of document AFB/PPRC.27/29 and that such proposals should be reviewed using the review sheet in Annex II of document AFB/PPRC.27/29;*
- d) That the review cycle and approval of Readiness Package Grants shall follow the review and approval process as well as reporting requirements for readiness grants under the Fund;*
- e) That already approved South-South Cooperation grants should continue implementation and fulfil all reporting requirements until completion;*
- f) To request the secretariat to prepare an analysis for opening the Readiness Package Grant to non-NIE intermediaries that are accredited implementing entities of the Fund;*
- g) To also request the secretariat to notify all accredited implementing entities of this decision by the Board on the Readiness Package Grant and South-South Cooperation Grants.*

(Decision B.36/25)

10. During the intersessional period between the thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth meetings of the Board, the PPRC had considered proposals submitted under the readiness package grant and recommended to the Board to make readiness grants available per NIE following decision B.36/42 to allow up to two NIEs to be accredited per country. The PPRC also recommended to the Board to update the readiness package grant application form and review template to facilitate provision of more comprehensive information by entities to enable the secretariat to adequately conduct a technical review of the submitted readiness package grant proposals. Having considered the recommendations of the PPRC, the Board decided to:

- a) Request the secretariat to amend the language of decision B.36/25 to allow the Readiness Package Grant to be made available for accreditation of NIEs only, up to a maximum of US\$ 150,000 per NIE, to ensure that entities going through the accreditation process are adequately supported;*
- b) Request the secretariat to update the application form and technical review sheet for Readiness Package grant proposals, and present them for consideration by the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) at its twenty-ninth meeting;*

[...]

(Decision B.37-38/14)

11. At its fortieth meeting, the Board, through decision B.42/44, approved the readiness workplan for FY25 as contained in the secretariat work schedule and work plan, document AFB/EFC.33/4. Following decision B.42/44 by the Board, the secretariat launched a call for readiness project proposals intersessionally between the forty-second and forty-third meetings of the Board and eligible countries were given the opportunity to submit applications for a readiness package grant to receive peer support for accreditation through an intermediary. The size of the readiness package grant would be up to a maximum of US\$ 150,000 per NIE as per decision B.37-38/14 by the Board.

12. At the Fortieth meeting of the Board, following the assessment for opening the Readiness Package Grants to non-NIE intermediaries that are accredited implementing entities of the Fund, the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) had recommended to the Board to extend the role of intermediary to all accredited IEs of the Fund, which include the multilateral implementing entities (MIEs) and regional implementing entities (RIEs) that are accredited to the Fund. The eligibility criteria for an IE to access the RPG and deliver support for accreditation would remain unchanged and would apply uniformly to all IEs. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the PPRC, the Board decided to:

- a) *To extend the role of intermediary in the delivery of support for the accreditation of an NIE via the readiness package grant to all accredited implementing entities of the Fund;*
- b) *To require that all accredited implementing entities of the Fund that wish to deliver support for accreditation of a national implementing entity via the readiness package grant meet the following eligibility requirements:*
 - (i) Have an “active accreditation” status with the Adaptation Fund;*
 - (ii) Have experience advising or organizing relevant accreditation or capacity building support for institutions, organizations or other entities in developing countries at the national, subnational or local level to receive climate finance for adaptation projects and programmes;*
 - (iii) Have experience implementing an Adaptation Fund project or programme and have submitted at least one project performance report, thereby demonstrating its commitment to adhering to the Fund’s fiduciary standards and operational policies and guidelines.*
- c) *To request the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat to update the website and notify all accredited implementing entities of the above decision by the Board.*

(Decision B.40/60)

13. Peer support for accreditation provided by the intermediary could involve a combination of activities that include (i) support to the designated authority (DA) to nominate a suitable NIE candidate (ii) In-country support by the intermediary to an NIE candidate (iii) technical support through experts (iv) organization of local, national or regional consultations/workshops, and (v) continuous support during the accreditation application process to address and respond to feedback provided by the accreditation panel (AP) during assessment of the NIE candidate application for accreditation.

14. It is expected that the peer-peer support would effectively help build national capacity and sustainability and that readiness package grants will enhance South-South cooperation for

accreditation to the Fund, through a more comprehensive suite of tools to help institutions in countries seeking direct access to the Fund's resources, to prepare and submit their applications for accreditation.

15. In response to the call for readiness grant proposals launched by the secretariat intersessionally between the forty-second and forty-third meetings of the Board, the secretariat received three grant proposals for readiness package grants for three countries to receive peer support for accreditation from three intermediary NIEs.

16. The present document introduces the readiness package project proposal submitted by the Environmental Project Implementation Unit (EPIU) of Armenia on behalf of the government of Tajikistan. It includes a request for funding of US\$ 130,200 outlining the activities to be undertaken by EPIU to support the accreditation process in Tajikistan.

17. The secretariat carried out a technical review of the project proposal and completed a review sheet.

18. In accordance with a request to the secretariat made by the Board in its 10th meeting, the secretariat shared this review sheet with EPIU and offered them the opportunity to provide responses before the review sheet was sent to the PPRC.

19. The secretariat is submitting to the PPRC pursuant to decision B.17/15, the final technical review of the project, both prepared by the secretariat, along with the final submission of the proposal in the following section. In accordance with decision B.25/15, the proposal is submitted with changes between the initial submission and the revised version.



ADAPTATION FUND

ADAPTATION FUND BOARD SECRETARIAT TECHNICAL REVIEW OF PROJECT/PROGRAMME PROPOSAL

PROJECT/PROGRAMME CATEGORY Readiness Package Grant

Readiness Package support recipient Country: **Tajikistan**

Accredited Implementing Entity (Intermediary) delivering support: **Environmental Project Implementation Unit (EPIU), Armenia**

Nominated National Implementing Entity (NIE) Candidate: **Center for Implementation of the Investment Projects (CIIP)**

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

Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars): **\$130,200**

AF Project ID: **AFRDG00077**

Reviewer and contact person: **Farayi Madziwa**

Co-reviewer(s): **Ishani Debnath**

IE Contact Person: **Milena Kiramijyan**

Technical Summary	<p>The project to support NIE accreditation in Tajikistan will be done through the five components below:</p> <p><u>Component 1:</u> Gap analysis (USD 12,000).</p> <p><u>Component 2:</u> Supporting design of missing documents and advancing existing ones (USD 43,000)</p> <p><u>Component 3:</u> Strengthening the capacities of CIIP in attracting and implementing climate finance through country visits and exchange (USD 45,000)</p> <p><u>Component 4:</u> Submission of the accreditation application to the Adaptation Fund (USD 10,000)</p> <p><u>Component 5:</u> Addressing comments from AF (USD 10,000)</p> <p><u>Requested financing overview:</u> Total Project/Programme Cost: USD 120,000 Implementing Entity Fee: USD 10,200 Financing Requested: USD 130,200</p> <p>The initial technical review raises some issues, such as clarifying the link between the initial institutional assessment conducted by the intermediary and the gap assessment to be conducted under component 1, justifying</p>
--------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>project activities based on each identified gap/challenge and individually describing each missing policy, manual and institutional structure and describing the gaps in existing ones, providing clarity in some elements of the proposed budget and engaging more proactively with the AF secretariat, as is discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) raised in the review.</p> <p>The final technical review finds that the revised proposal has sufficiently addressed the clarification requests (CRs) and corrective action requests (CARs) made in the initial technical review.</p>
Date:	1 July 2024

Review Criteria	Questions	Comments 6 June 2024	Comments 1 July 2024
Country Eligibility	1. Is the country that does not yet have an accredited NIE a Party to the Kyoto Protocol?	Yes	
Eligibility of IE (Intermediary)	1. Is the project submitted through an Implementing Entity with an "accredited" status with the Fund?	Yes	
	2. Does the Implementing Entity have an approved project by the Adaptation Fund Board and has submitted at least one project performance report (PPR)?	Yes. EPIU has submitted 3 PPRs and a Mid-term evaluation report for the project: Strengthening land-based adaptation capacity in communities adjacent to protected areas in Armenia, and 3 PPRs for the project: Artik city closed stonepit wastes and flood management pilot.	

	<p>3. Has the Implementing Entity demonstrated adequate experience providing capacity building support to NIE candidates and other national/sub-national entities for access to climate change adaptation finance?</p>	<p>Not cleared. EPIU supported two institutions to obtain accreditation with the GCF. The outcome of that support is stated as “Advanced fiduciary standards” for both institutions. However, this is vague and does not provide clarity on the nature of the support provided.</p> <p>CR1: Please provide more clarity on the outcome of the support e.g., what policies if any, were developed, or what specific capacities were enhanced, if any. In addition, please put the correct name of the candidate NIE in the first section of the proposal template under the heading “Institution to navigate accreditation process, if already identified.”</p> <p>In addition, please provide further clarification on the projects reflected in the application that were implemented before 2021. Were they implemented under a different organization name, and if that organization was then restructured to CIIP?</p> <p>CIIP should be prepared to provide information on the restructuring at the time they upload supporting documentation to the workflow e.g., by uploading the document when</p>	<p>Cleared. The intermediary (EPIU) provided technical support for the refinement of ArmSwissBank policies such as the policy on prohibited practices, grievance and redress mechanism, protection of whistleblowers and gender policy. EPIU also provided technical support for policy refinement and training to R2E2.</p> <p>The experience of CIIP prior to its renaming has been clarified on pages 5 and 6 of the proposal.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		and where the restructuring was announced.	
Eligibility of nominated NIE candidate	1. Has the nominated NIE candidate taken the AF online course on accreditation and demonstrated adequate results during the self-assessment to meet accreditation criteria of the Fund?	Cleared. Completed certificates for the CIIP Director, Chief Specialist and a Specialist have been submitted. The course helped these CIIP staff to contribute to the institutional capacity assessment conducted by the intermediary and to shape the Readiness Package Grant proposal.	

	<p>2. Is the suitability of the candidate NIE to meet the accreditation criteria justified considering its experience managing project finance, its institutional capacity and experience implementing and managing the full climate change or development finance project life cycle, and its competency for transparency, self-investigative powers and anti-corruption measures?</p>	<p>Not cleared.</p> <p>Whilst relatively new, having been established in 2021, as per the institutional capacity report undertaken by the intermediary, the NIE candidate has legal personality and legal capacity to enter into contracts and receive funds. It has experience implementing projects financed by the GCF and World Bank. It also has experience reporting on funds from those international sources. According to the submitted proposal, the NIE candidate has inherent capacities, policies and procedures that are much more advanced compared to other suitable entities in the countries.</p> <p>However, there is no indication of any exchange with the DA for Tajikistan in the proposal although as per the institutional capacity assessment report by the intermediary, there are several gaps that the NIE candidate needs to address.</p> <p>CR2: Please clarify whether there was any communication between EPIU and the DA for Tajikistan and explain when, and what the outcome of such communication was and how it is incorporated into</p>	<p>Cleared. The EPIU director had an initial meeting with the DA for Tajikistan on the margins of the Climate Finance Forum, which was held in Dushanbe during 3-7 July 2023. This meeting discussed the suitability of the NIE candidate to meet the accreditation criteria of the Adaptation Fund. Please see pages 31-33.</p> <p>Receipt of the log in credentials by CIIP contact persons has been confirmed in the responses to the initial technical review.</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>the readiness package grant proposal.</p> <p>In addition, CIIP has not yet acknowledged receipt of the credentials sent by the AF secretariat to access the accreditation workflow. Please reconfirm the name and contact details of the CIIP representative who should receive the log-in credentials. Further it is encouraged for CIIP to be more proactive and responsive in engaging with the secretariat</p>	
Project Eligibility	1. Has the designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in the country seeking accreditation endorsed the project?	Cleared. Endorsement letter signed on 18 September 2023.	

	<p>2. Has the intermediary undertaken an assessment or had dialogue on the NIE candidate gaps/challenges and ability of the candidate NIE to meet the requirements stipulated in the AF accreditation application form?</p>	<p>Cleared.</p> <p>The directors from the intermediary and NIE candidate met and had an initial discussion during the Climate Finance Forum, which was held from 3-7 July 2023 in Dushanbe. Subsequently, EPIU held several consultations with CIIP staff and conducted an institutional capacity assessment of CIIP which revealed that there is a need to update several of CIIP's policies and guidance documents, a need to organize trainings/seminars for CIIP respective staff members on the introduction and implementation of updated policies and procedures, and a need to establish an official website for CIIP for added transparency and communication.</p>	
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>3. Have accreditation gaps/challenges been clearly identified and the approaches to address them clearly outlined?</p>	<p>Cleared.</p> <p>The intermediary conducted an institutional capacity assessment of the NIE candidate and determined that the following gap areas need to be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improving the wording about organization's core business in the entity's charter.• Addressing the entity's capacity to prevent and deal with financial mismanagement.• Establishing a policy on anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing.• Establishing experience and protocol for project/programme development and appraisal.• Updating the operational manual and policies related to competency to manage or oversee the execution of the project/programme, competency to undertake monitoring and evaluation, including monitoring of measures for the management of environmental and social risks.• Updating the policy and mechanism to monitor and	
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>address complaints about environmental or social harms caused by projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Establishing an institution level policy and procedures for self-investigation.• Updating the gender policy and operational manual to enable the entity to comply with the AF gender policy. <p>The process to deliver support up to the point of submitting an application for accreditation is clear. However, further clarity needs to be provided regarding the nature and budget for components 1 and 3. Please see CR3.</p>	
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

	<p>4. Are the proposed activities to address identified gaps/challenges for the NIE candidate to obtain accreditation with the Fund justified?</p>	<p>Not cleared.</p> <p>Component 1 should draw from the initial institutional capacity assessment already undertaken by EPIU. The description of the component should therefore make it clear that it will dive deeper into the identified gaps and further tailor the support to be provided based on the already completed initial assessment.</p> <p>Based the initial institutional capacity assessment the contents of the table under Section D should be more precise and refer to specific policies, manuals, procedures and processes that have been identified as requiring attention. The table should make it clear whether such policy, manual or procedure already exists within CIIP or whether a new one would need to be developed. It should state what action would be taken to address the specific gap, e.g, whether the policy exists but needs an implementation record, or whether an update is needed, or whether a new policy is needed. The timeframe for actioning the identified course of action to address the gap should be clearly articulated in the table.</p>	<p>Cleared. The link between the initial institutional capacity assessment undertaken by EPIU with the proposed activities to support CIIP accreditation have been made in component 1 of the project.</p> <p>Further information on specific policies, manuals or processes that will be addressed is provided in Section D of the proposal. The type of consultants to been more clearly articulated in the budget breakdown on pages 9-11.</p> <p>The training referenced under component 3 as “on-job trainings” has been revised to focus on project development and navigating the AF project life cycle.</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>In the budget notes, only a fiduciary expert is specifically identified for the required scope of work. The notes should be more specific regarding the other types of experts and consultants (both international and local) that are required to address the specific policy areas or procedural gaps identified in the institutional assessment.</p> <p>CR3: Please provide more specific detail and explanation of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Please provide clarification that links the activities under component 1 with the initial institutional capacity assessment conducted by EPIU.• Please provide more specific information on specific policies, manuals or processes that will be addressed based on the 8 gaps already identified in the initial institutional capacity assessment, their status quo, the actions to be taken for each, and the timeline for addressing each. These should be listed individually including the type of experts needed to address the gap in these as relevant.• Please provide more specific information on what type of experts and consultants would	
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>be hired to address the identified policy, manual, process gaps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please clarify component 3 in terms of how the “on-job trainings for responsible staff” will work and how they are different from the “Implementation of training and capacity-building workshops in the country providing the support” 	
Resource Availability	1. Is the requested project funding within the cap for the Readiness Package grants set by the Board?	Cleared	
	2. Is the Implementing Entity Management Fee at or below 8.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget before the fee?	Cleared. The fee is 8.5%	
	3. Is there budget set aside to continue support post submission of a complete application for accreditation to the AF secretariat?	Cleared. A budget to provide an estimated 1 month of post submission support is provided.	
Implementation Arrangements	1. Has adequate time been provided to respond to and address comments and feedback that may be made by the Accreditation Panel?	Cleared. The given timeframe of 1 month is a reasonable timeframe to address comments by the AP.	
	2. Is a detailed budget including budget notes included?	Cleared. However, please see CR3.	



ADAPTATION FUND

ADAPTATION FUND BOARD SECRETARIAT TECHNICAL REVIEW OF PROJECT/PROGRAMME PROPOSAL

PROJECT/PROGRAMME CATEGORY Readiness Package Grant

Readiness Package support recipient Country: **Tajikistan**
 Accredited Implementing Entity (Intermediary) delivering support: **Environmental Project Implementation Unit (EPIU), Armenia**
 Nominated National Implementing Entity (NIE) Candidate: **Center for Implementation of the Investment Projects (CIIP)**
 Type of Intermediary (NIE/RIE/MIE): **NIE**
 Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars): **\$124,775**
 AF Project ID: **AFRDG00077**
 Reviewer and contact person: **Farayi Madziwa** Co-reviewer(s): **Ishani Debnath**
 IE Contact Person: **Milena Kiramijyan**

<p>Technical Summary</p>	<p>The project to support NIE accreditation in Tajikistan will be done through the five components below:</p> <p><u>Component 1:</u> Gap analysis (USD 20,000).</p> <p><u>Component 2:</u> Supporting design of missing documents and advancing existing ones (USD 30,000)</p> <p><u>Component 3:</u> Strengthening the capacities of CIIP in attracting and implementing climate finance through country visits and exchange (USD 45,000)</p> <p><u>Component 4:</u> Submission of the accreditation application to the Adaptation Fund (USD 10,000)</p> <p><u>Component 5:</u> Addressing comments from AF (USD 10,000)</p> <p><u>Requested financing overview:</u> Total Project/Programme Cost: USD 115,000 Implementing Entity Fee: USD 9,775 Financing Requested: USD 124,775.00</p>
---------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	The initial technical review raises some issues, such as clarifying the link between the initial institutional assessment conducted by the intermediary and the gap assessment to be conducted under component 1, justifying project activities based on each identified gap/challenge and individually describing each missing policy, manual and institutional structure and describing the gaps in existing ones, providing clarity in some elements of the proposed budget and engaging more proactively with the AF secretariat, as is discussed in the number of Clarification Requests (CRs) raised in the review.
Date:	6 June 2024

Review Criteria	Questions	Comments
Country Eligibility	2. Is the country that does not yet have an accredited NIE a Party to the Kyoto Protocol?	Yes
Eligibility of IE (Intermediary)	4. Is the project submitted through an Implementing Entity with an “accredited” status with the Fund?	Yes
	5. Does the Implementing Entity have an approved project by the Adaptation Fund Board and has submitted at least one project performance report (PPR)?	Yes. EPIU has submitted 3 PPRs and a Mid-term evaluation report for the project: Strengthening land-based adaptation capacity in communities adjacent to protected areas in Armenia, and 3 PPRs for the project: Artik city closed stonepit wastes and flood management pilot.

	<p>6. Has the Implementing Entity demonstrated adequate experience providing capacity building support to NIE candidates and other national/sub-national entities for access to climate change adaptation finance?</p>	<p>Not cleared. EPIU supported two institutions to obtain accreditation with the GCF. The outcome of that support is stated as “Advanced fiduciary standards” for both institutions. However, this is vague and does not provide clarity on the nature of the support provided.</p> <p>CR1: Please provide more clarity on the outcome of the support e.g., what policies if any, were developed, or what specific capacities were enhanced, if any. In addition, please put the correct name of the candidate NIE in the first section of the proposal template under the heading “Institution to navigate accreditation process, if already identified.”</p> <p>In addition, please provide further clarification on the projects reflected in the application that were implemented before 2021. Were they implemented under a different organization name, and if that organization was then restructured to CIIP?</p> <p>CIIP should be prepared to provide information on the restructuring at the time they upload supporting documentation to the workflow e.g., by uploading the document when and where the restructuring was announced.</p> <p>Reply: The requested amendment regarding the support provided by intermediary is performed. The name of the candidate NIE is corrected as well.</p> <p>Before 2021 4 projects had been implemented by the candidate NIE, but under the name of “Project Implementation Unit” of the Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan. The track record of CIIP is reflected under</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		Section C question (III).The recommendation on uploading the documents is well noted.
Eligibility of nominated NIE candidate	3. Has the nominated NIE candidate taken the AF online course on accreditation and demonstrated adequate results during the self-assessment to meet accreditation criteria of the Fund?	Cleared. Completed certificates for the CIIP Director, Chief Specialist and a Specialist have been submitted. The course helped these CIIP staff to contribute to the institutional capacity assessment conducted by the intermediary and to shape the Readiness Package Grant proposal.

	<p>4. Is the suitability of the candidate NIE to meet the accreditation criteria justified considering its experience managing project finance, its institutional capacity and experience implementing and managing the full climate change or development finance project life cycle, and its competency for transparency, self-investigative powers and anti-corruption measures?</p>	<p>Not cleared.</p> <p>Whilst relatively new, having been established in 2021, as per the institutional capacity report undertaken by the intermediary, the NIE candidate has legal personality and legal capacity to enter into contracts and receive funds. It has experience implementing projects financed by the GCF and World Bank. It also has experience reporting on funds from those international sources. According to the submitted proposal, the NIE candidate has inherent capacities, policies and procedures that are much more advanced compared to other suitable entities in the countries.</p> <p>However, there is no indication of any exchange with the DA for Tajikistan in the proposal although as per the institutional capacity assessment report by the intermediary, there are several gaps that the NIE candidate needs to address.</p> <p>CR2: Please clarify whether there was any communication between EPIU and the DA for Tajikistan and explain when, and what the outcome of such communication was and how it is incorporated into the readiness package grant proposal.</p> <p>In addition, CIIP has not yet acknowledged receipt of the credentials sent by the AF secretariat to access the accreditation workflow. Please reconfirm the name and contact details of the CIIP representative who should receive the log-in credentials. Further it is encouraged for CIIP to be more proactive and responsive in engaging with the secretariat</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>Reply: Wording describing the communication between EPIU and the DA of Tajikistan is incorporated into the proposal.</p> <p>Regarding the accreditation workflow arrangements, CIIP confirms that Mr. Muhibullo Junaidzoda and Mr. Karomatullo Samiev have been provided with access to the workflow by Nasya Huja and do have respective accounts.</p>
<p>Project Eligibility</p>	<p>5. Has the designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in the country seeking accreditation endorsed the project?</p>	<p>Cleared. Endorsement letter signed on 18 September 2023.</p>
	<p>6. Has the intermediary undertaken an assessment or had dialogue on the NIE candidate gaps/challenges and ability of the candidate NIE to meet the requirements stipulated in the AF accreditation application form?</p>	<p>Cleared.</p> <p>The directors from the intermediary and NIE candidate met and had an initial discussion during the Climate Finance Forum, which was held from 3-7 July 2023 in Dushanbe. Subsequently, EPIU held several consultations with CIIP staff and conducted an institutional capacity assessment of CIIP which revealed that there is a need to update several of CIIP's policies and guidance documents, a need to organize trainings/seminars for CIIP respective staff members on the introduction and implementation of updated policies and procedures, and a need to establish an official website for CIIP for added transparency and communication.</p>

	<p>7. Have accreditation gaps/challenges been clearly identified and the approaches to address them clearly outlined?</p>	<p>Cleared.</p> <p>The intermediary conducted an institutional capacity assessment of the NIE candidate and determined that the following gap areas need to be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improving the wording about organization's core business in the entity's charter.• Addressing the entity's capacity to prevent and deal with financial mismanagement.• Establishing a policy on anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing.• Establishing experience and protocol for project/programme development and appraisal.• Updating the operational manual and policies related to competency to manage or oversee the execution of the project/programme, competency to undertake monitoring and evaluation, including monitoring of measures for the management of environmental and social risks.• Updating the policy and mechanism to monitor and address complaints about environmental or social harms caused by projects.• Establishing an institution level policy and procedures for self-investigation.• Updating the gender policy and operational manual to enable the entity to comply with the AF gender policy. <p>The process to deliver support up to the point of submitting an application for accreditation is clear. However, further clarity needs to be provided regarding the nature and budget for components 1 and 3. Please see CR3.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>8. Are the proposed activities to address identified gaps/challenges for the NIE candidate to obtain accreditation with the Fund justified?</p>	<p>Not cleared.</p> <p>Component 1 should draw from the initial institutional capacity assessment already undertaken by EPIU. The description of the component should therefore make it clear that it will dive deeper into the identified gaps and further tailor the support to be provided based on the already completed initial assessment.</p> <p>Based the initial institutional capacity assessment the contents of the table under Section D should be more precise and refer to specific policies, manuals, procedures and processes that have been identified as requiring attention. The table should make it clear whether such policy, manual or procedure already exists within CIIP or whether a new one would need to be developed. It should state what action would be taken to address the specific gap, e.g. whether the policy exists but needs an implementation record, or whether an update is needed, or whether a new policy is needed. The timeframe for actioning the identified course of action to address the gap should be clearly articulated in the table.</p> <p>In the budget notes, only a fiduciary expert is specifically identified for the required scope of work. The notes should be more specific regarding the other types of experts and consultants (both international and local) that are required to address the specific policy areas or procedural gaps identified in the institutional assessment.</p> <p>CR3: Please provide more specific detail and explanation of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Please provide clarification that links the activities under component 1 with the initial institutional capacity assessment conducted by EPIU.
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Please provide more specific information on specific policies, manuals or processes that will be addressed based on the 8 gaps already identified in the initial institutional capacity assessment, their status quo, the actions to be taken for each, and the timeline for addressing each. These should be listed individually including the type of experts needed to address the gap in these as relevant.• Please provide more specific information on what type of experts and consultants would be hired to address the identified policy, manual, process gaps.• Please clarify component 3 in terms of how the “on-job trainings for responsible staff” will work and how they are different from the “Implementation of training and capacity-building workshops in the country providing the support” <p>Reply: The proposal was revised accordingly. More specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some wording was added to clarify the linkages. The hired expert will review the initial capacity assessment performed by EPIU to dive deeper into the preliminarily identified gap and develop a respective workplan to address those in order to ensure compliance of the candidate NIE to the accreditation standards of the AF.• The table under the section D was revised and currently represents all the requested information.• The requested details regarding the consultancy services are provided under the table “Budget breakdown per components”.• As presented under C(IV), Component 3 provides for on-job trainings to capacitate the CIIP staff members on the revised or newly established policies, manuals, procedures, etc. under the project. For this purpose, experts will be hired (preferably same experts who will
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		provide services for the revision/development of those documents) and their travel to Tajikistan will be arranged to organize the training. Tajikistan was decided to host the training so that the capacitation of the largest possible number of CIIP staff, as well as DA representatives is ensured. The component also provides for organization of workshops to build capacities of the CIIP staff on the processes starting from the project ideation to CN development, project implementation, M&E, reporting, stakeholder engagement and project closure. Armenia was decided to host the training so that meetings with EPIU specialist with various background are arranged; field visits to AF-funded project sites are organized; interaction with stakeholders is witnessed; etc.
Resource Availability	4. Is the requested project funding within the cap for the Readiness Package grants set by the Board?	Cleared
	5. Is the Implementing Entity Management Fee at or below 8.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget before the fee?	Cleared. The fee is 8.5%
	6. Is there budget set aside to continue support post submission of a complete application for accreditation to the AF secretariat?	Cleared. A budget to provide an estimated 1 month of post submission support is provided.
Implementation Arrangements	3. Has adequate time been provided to respond to and address comments and feedback that may be made by the Accreditation Panel?	Cleared. The given timeframe of 1 month is a reasonable timeframe to address comments by the AP.
	4. Is a detailed budget including budget notes included?	Cleared. However, please see CR3.

APPLICATION FORM/PROPOSAL TEMPLATE FOR READINESS PACKAGE GRANTS



ADAPTATION FUND

READINESS PACKAGE GRANT APPLICATION FORM TEMPLATE

Application for a Grant to support NIE accreditation through the readiness package

Submission Date: **05 April, 2024**

Adaptation Fund Grant ID:

Country receiving support:

Tajikistan

Institution to navigate accreditation process, if already identified:

“Environmental Project Implementation Unit” State Agency under the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Armenia

Name of Implementing Entity delivering support:

“Center for Implementation of the Investment Projects” (CIIP) of the Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan

Type of Implementing Entity delivering support (NIE/RIE/MIE):

NIE

A. Timeframe of Activity

Expected start date of support	<i>01 September 2024</i>
Completion date of support	<i>01 September 2025</i>

B. Experience participating in, organizing support to, or advising other NIE candidates

- (i) Describe the support provided for accreditation through readiness grants from the Adaptation Fund to developing countries and/or entities seeking to use the Fund’s Direct Access modality (*please list only up to five of the most recent and add any others as an annex to this template*).

Year support started	Year support ended	Climate Fund (source of grant)	Type of support provided	Outcome of the support	Country/institution supported
-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-

-	-	-	-	-	-
---	---	---	---	---	---

- (ii) Describe any other type of support provided outside the grants from the Adaptation Fund to other national, sub-national and/or local entities relevant to the AF accreditation process.

Year	Type of Support	Outcome of the Support	Country/Institution Supported
2021-2022	Support in advancement of the fiduciary standards for accreditation with the Green Climate Fund during the process of responding to the GCF reviewers' comments on the submitted accreditation package.	<p><u>Initial submission from Armswissbank received a number of comments with regard to the fiduciary standards, environmental and social guidelines and gender policy. Despite the availability of the most policies and procedures, some of them lacked alignment with the GCF requirements.</u></p> <p><u>EPIU has been instrumental in providing guidance to the team of ArmSwissBank in responding to these comments, refining the documents and incorporating them into the workflow of the organization.</u></p> <p><u>Specific attention has been paid to the policy on prohibited practices, grievance and redress mechanism, protection of whistleblowers and gender policy.</u></p> <p><u>The support from EPIU has been channeled not only in the form of technical expertise during the review process, but also guidance/mentorship of the responsible team</u></p>	ARMSWISSBANK CJSC, Republic of Armenia

		<u>members from Armswissbank. Advanced fiduciary standards</u>	
2020	Support in advancement of the fiduciary standards for accreditation with the Green Climate Fund, more precisely for reviewing <u>Environmental and Social Policies, Standards and Procedures (including Gender Policy).</u>	<u>EPIU has provided guidance to the R2E2 in reviewing these policies and identification of respective gaps (compliance with GCF requirements), designing comprehensive and responsive TORs for the consultants and review and acceptance of the final deliverables provided by letters. Also, EPIU has participated to the capacity building activities for the R2E2 responsible staff members (including support in designing training materials) and shared its experience with the review (at pre-accession stage) and application (at post-accession stage) of the respective policies and standards. Advanced fiduciary standards</u>	<i>Armenia Renewable Resources and Energy Efficiency Fund,</i> Republic of Armenia

C. Proposed activities to support NIE accreditation

- (i) Describe the initial exchange that took place with the candidate entity and with the DA e.g., state with who (director, committee, DA etc.). Also state when the discussion took place and state what conclusions were arrived at. e.g., briefly state what issues the identified candidate NIE(s) is likely to face considering its experience managing project finance, its institutional capacity and experience implementing and managing the full climate change or development finance project life cycle, and its competency for transparency, self-investigative powers and anti-corruption measures.

Initial exchange of ideas on the potential support from “Environmental Project Implementation Unit” State Agency under the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Armenia (EPIU) to the accreditation of the “Center for Implementation of the Investment Projects” (CIIP) of the

Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan (CEP, the DA) to the Adaptation Fund took place between the directors of two organizations on the margins of the Climate Finance Forum, which was held in Dushanbe during 3-7 July 2023. Moreover, the representatives of EPIU took the advantage to meet with the representatives of the Designated Authority of Tajikistan to ensure the endorsement of the candidacy of CIIP as a potential entity to be nominated for accreditation with the Adaptation Fund.

The engagement with CIIP identified its ~~Sspecifically, CIIP was~~ interested in benefiting from EPIU's experience in accreditation process and necessary competences to advance the following fiduciary standards, taking into account similarities in legal and regulatory frameworks of the countries, as well as respective practices:

- Project appraise, management, monitoring and evaluation, as well as impact assessment;
- Procurement procedures and financial management system;
- Stakeholders' engagement and consultative framework;
- Policy on prohibited practices and mechanisms to combat them (including grievance redress mechanism).

Also, EPIU's experience in collaboration with climate financiers in designing response and stakeholder driven projects has been prioritized. Thus, CIIP expressed interest in benefiting from EPIU's experience and expertise through implementation of the Readiness Package Grant.

Starting from Autumn 2023 the EPIU team started to consult with the CIIP colleagues on the current capacities to meet AF's accreditation criteria, existing gaps, opportunities and modalities for addressing the latter, the institutional capacity assessment to be conducted by EPIU, the need and modalities to take the AF's online courses of accreditation, etc. This was conducted through sequential correspondence and organization of online meetings, including with the participation of respective AF colleagues.

- (ii) Describe results of the self-assessment done by the candidate NIE or assessment done by intermediary on suitability of the candidate/nominated NIE to meet the accreditation criteria. Confirm whether any candidate NIE staff took the AF online course on accreditation and explain how the learning outcome from taking this course has been incorporated into the proposal. (The AF accreditation course can be found [here](#)).

Candidate entity (CIIP) has conducted no self-assessment due to lack of necessary knowledge and expertise. However, several rounds of preliminary consultations with the engagement of experts accompanying director of EPIU to the Climate Finance Forum has revealed the need to re-engineer number of policies and procedures (procurement and financial management, project management), as well as to introduce missing ones (entire set of regulations on the policies of prohibited practices).

Following the agreements reached in the backstage of the Climate Finance Forum, the EPIU team conducted an institutional capacity assessment of CIIP. Despite the fact that the conclusion of the excersize was the determination of sufficient institutional capacities of CIIP to meet the accreditation requirements of the Adaptation Fund, the assessment as well uncovered several gaps and areas of improvement, namely:

- The need to update guiding documents at the disposal of CIIP to fill in the identified gaps, to align with donors' potentially amended policies and procedures and with project implementation derived best practices and lessons learned.
- The need to organize trainings/seminars for CIIP respective staff members on the introduction and implementation of updated policies and procedures.
- The need to develop, if feasible, an official website for CIIP to ensure the transparency and communication of the updated guiding documents to a wide range of stakeholders starting from donor organizations and operational partners to the local beneficiaries of CIIP's projects.

The conclusions of the institutional capacity assessment were cleared with the representatives of CIIP during the call from March 29, 2024 (participants: Milena Kiramijyan, Leading Specialist of Cooperation with Donors Department, from EPIU's side and Mr. Muhibullo Junaidzoda, Director, Mr. Karomatullo Samiev, Chief Specialist, and Mr. Manuchehr Murodov, Specialist, from CIIP's side). Moreover, as a result of the online meeting an agreement was reached on indirect communication of the capacity assessment conclusions and the RPG proposal interventions derived from them with the Designated Authority. The DA communicated its endorsement of project proposal through CIIP.

CIIP has participated in the capacity building activities (number of trainings) organized within the framework of GCF Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme implemented by FAO and aimed at the advancement of Tajikistan engagement with GCF through building national programming framework and identification/advancement of the potential accredited entities.

Moreover, CIIP staff members of different managerial levels - Mr. Muhibullo Junaidzoda, Director of the Center for Implementation of Investment Projects, Mr. Karomatullo Samiev, Chief Specialist of the Center for Implementation of Investment Projects, Mr. Manuchehr Murodov, Specialist of the Center for Implementation of Investment Projects - has taken the AF online course on accreditation, which helped them to formulate a better understanding of the accreditation process, contribute to the identification of gaps and needs in the frameworks of the capacity assessment initiated by the EPIU team and proactively participate the programming of the Readiness Package Grant proposal.

(iii) Briefly justify why the nominated NIE candidate is best suited to meet the accreditation criteria.

CIIP has been identified by the DA of the Republic of Tajikistan for accreditation with Adaptation fund due number of factors:

- It is an operational arm of the Government's Committee for Environmental Protection (DA) in attracting climate finance, as well as initiation and implementation of the respective projects;
- Its policies and procedures are much more advanced in comparison with other entities;
- There are significant internal professional capacities that can be advanced and empowered to serve the proposed role.

CIIP was established in accordance with the decision No. 357 of the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan "On the Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan" dated September 2, 2021. It is a legal entity mandated to

Formatted: Armenian

coordinate and implement projects financed by international financial organizations and institutions within the Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan. It has rich climate-related track record that goes back even before 2021 when it was functioning under the name of "Project Implementation Unit" of the Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan.

CIIP track record:

<u>Project Name:</u>	<u>Country of Implementation:</u>	<u>Funding Source:</u>	<u>Project Value:</u>	<u>Dates of Performance:</u>
<u>Water Resources Management in the Pyanj River Basin (additional financing) GCF grant</u>	<u>Tajikistan</u>	<u>GCF</u>	<u>6,5 mln USD</u>	<u>2019-2024</u>
<u>Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation in the Aral Sea Basin (CAMP4ASB)" (Additional financing) GCF grant: through World Bank 2022-2024</u>	<u>Tajikistan</u>	<u>GCF</u>	<u>9 mln USD</u>	<u>2022-2024</u>
<u>Water Resources Management in the Pyanj River Basin (additional financing) GCF grant, 2019-2024</u>	<u>Tajikistan</u>	<u>ADB</u>	<u>11.5 mln USD</u>	<u>2019-2024</u>
<u>Tajikistan Resilient Landscape Restoration Project, Grant of World Bank 2022-2027</u>	<u>Tajikistan</u>	<u>WB</u>	<u>45 mln USD</u>	<u>2022-2027</u>
<u>Community-based Agricultural Support Project Plus</u>	<u>Tajikistan</u>	<u>IFAD</u>	<u>45 mln USD</u>	<u>2023-2029</u>

Formatted: Armenian

(iv) Provide a list in chronological order of occurrence, of the main components/steps that would be implemented to address the NIE candidate gaps/challenges, the activities to be undertaken, and the requested budget to support accreditation of the NIE candidate. An example is provided within the table in italics.

Component	Proposed support activities to address Gap/Challenge	Expected Output of the Activities	Tentative completion date	Requested budget for component in
------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------------------

				USD
<p>Component 1. – Gap analysis</p>	<p>Under this component, the review of existing policies, procedures and methodologies against AF accreditation questionnaire will be carried out to identify the key gaps. This will include the following key elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Legal status and capacities; ➤ Financial management capacity; ➤ Internal control framework; ➤ Project appraisal, preparation, implementation, M&E and impact assessment (including ESS, gender and stakeholder engagement); ➤ Procurement procedures and capacities; ➤ Policies on prohibited practices; ➤ Grievance mechanism. <p><u>Since an initial institutional capacity assessment exercise was carried out by EPIU the proposed activity would focus on diving deeper into the identified gaps and further tailor support to be provided.</u> Comprehensive gap assessment report will be designed and presented to the entity along with proposed</p>	<p>Gap Assessment Report <i>(that also includes proposed timelines and necessary inputs)</i></p>	<p>End of December 2024</p>	<p><u>1220,000</u></p>

	workplan (with necessary inputs from the entity).			
Component 2. – Supporting design of missing documents and advancing existing ones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Design of the missing policies, procedures and methodologies and advancement of existing (that requires certain improvements); ➤ <u>Translation of the updated/existing/newly developed documents to be mandatorily provided for AP's consideration in English.</u> ➤ Development of an official website for CIIP to ensure the transparency and communication of the updated guiding documents to a wide range of stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Introduced (new) and advanced (existing) policies, procedures and manuals; ➤ <u>Documents translated into English as per the AF requirements;</u> ➤ Functional official website that showcases the up to date policies and procedures of CIIP. 	End of April 2025	3430,000
Component 3. – Strengthening the capacities of CIIP in attracting and implementing climate finance through country visits and exchange	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Implementation of the on-job trainings for responsible staff in the country receiving the support on how to implement new regulatory framework developed under the project; ➤ Implementation of training and capacity-building workshops in the country providing the support on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mapping of adaptation financiers, their priorities; ○ Implementation of the national consultations to identify needs to be incorporated into 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Enhanced capacities of the potential NIE in attracting and implementing climate finance through enhanced and cognisant engagement with Adaptation Fund; ➤ Reports on the trainings/workshops conducted (including curricula, materials, outcomes, and performance assessment). 	End of June 2025	45,000

	the potential projects' portfolio; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Design of project idea notes and proposals; o Implementation of climate projects, adaptive management practices, M&E. 			
Component 4. – Submission of the accreditation application to the Adaptation Fund	Mentorship/guidance on properly structuring accreditation application and necessary annexes.	Accreditation application is submitted	End of July 2025	10,000
Component 5. – Addressing comments from AF	Addressing comments from AF Accreditation panel	Accreditation application is resubmitted	End of August 2025	10,000
Total Project Cost				115,120,000
Project/Programme Cycle Management Fee charged by the Implementing Entity (Maximum of 8.5%)				9,200,775
Total Grant Requested (USD)*				124,775,130,200

Budget breakdown per components:

Component	Activities under the Component	Budget (in USD)	Budget narrative
Component 1. – Gap analysis	Enhanced gap assessment of the potential accredited entity <u>guided by the results of the initial institutional capacity assessment</u> using accreditation questionnaire of the Adaptation Fund, <u>development of the respective workplan.</u>	457,000	Gap assessment services of individual international consultant (500 USD per day * 20-9 days) and national consultant/s (250 USD per day * 120 man days)
	Stakeholder consultations and	5,000	Travel of international

	<p>engagement. (Gap assessment should capture recent advancement of the framework and identify points requiring further advancement).</p>		<p>consultant to Dushanbe (3,000 USD for air ticket, DSA) and rent of premises for organization of the consultations</p>
<p>Component 2. – Supporting design of missing documents and advancing existing ones</p>	<p>Design of the missing regulations/procedures/policies, support with embedding into the overall operational framework and capacity enhancement.</p> <p>(Final scope is subject to the screening under the component 1 of the gap assessment carried out within the framework of the GCF Readiness project. Preliminary list of documents is provided in Section D).</p> <p><u>Translation of the updated/existing/newly developed documents to be mandatorily provided for AP's consideration in English.</u></p> <p><u>Development of an official website for CIIP to ensure the transparency and communication of the updated guiding documents to a wide range of stakeholders.</u></p>	<p>2028,000</p> <p>5,000</p> <p>10,000</p>	<p>The following consultancy services will be required for the implementation of this activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ International expert/s on (but not limited to) fiduciary standards, financial management, project development – 4018,000 USD (500 USD per day * 20-36 days); ➤ Local expert/s on (but not limited to) fiduciary standards M&E, ESS, gender – 10,000 USD (250 USD per day * 40-man days). <p><u>Translation services will be required for the implementation of this activity – 5000 USD (50 USD per day * 100 days).</u></p> <p>The following non-consultancy services will be required for the implementation of this activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> h) ➤ IT specialist/s on development of the

Formatted: Armenian

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.03", Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

			<p>website – 6,000 USD (20 USD per hour * 300 hours);</p> <p>➤ IT company on maintenance of the website – 4,000 USD for 1-2 years).</p>
<p>Component 3. – Strengthening the capacities of CIIP in attracting and implementing climate finance through country visits and exchange</p>	<p>Implementation of the on-job trainings for responsible staff in the country receiving the support on how to implement new regulatory framework developed under the project.</p>	<p>22,250</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ International expert on (but not limited to) fiduciary standards, <u>financial management</u>, <u>project development</u> – 2,500 USD (500 USD per day * 5 days); ➤ 3 local experts on (but not limited to) <u>M&E</u>, <u>ESS</u>, <u>gender</u> <u>fiduciary standards</u> – 3,750 USD (250 USD per day * 5 days * 3 experts); ➤ Travel of 4 experts –

	Implementation of training and capacity-building workshops on process starting from project ideation to project implementation in the country providing the support.	22,750	<p>12,000 (3,000 USD for air ticket and DSA of 3 experts for 5 days);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Implementation of 5-day long consultative workshops – 4,000 USD (venue, catering, equipment, printing, interpretation). ➤ 2 experts (preferably experienced in project development and implementation) on the elaboration of workshop topics – 2,500 USD (250 USD per day * 5 days * 2 experts); ➤ Travel of 4 CIIP staff members – 12,000 (3,000 USD for air ticket and DSA of 3 2 experts for 5 days); ➤ Implementation of 5-day long consultative workshops accompanied with a site visit – 8,250 USD (venue, catering, equipment, interpretation, printing, transportation).
Component 4. – Submission of the accreditation application to the Adaptation Fund	Distant mentorship and final peer review of the documents and necessary evidence to be submitted to the Adaptation Fund.	10,000	International Consultant on Fiduciary standards Accreditation (500 USD per day * 20 days)
Component 5. – Addressing comments from AF	Distant mentorship for responding to the comments from Adaptation Fund and implementation of the final round of the capacity building activities.	10,000	International Consultant on Fiduciary standards Accreditation (500 USD per day * 20 days)

Budget breakdown for project management fees:

Line Item	Cost in USD
Project Coordinator	5,000,400
Final Evaluation	2,000
External Audit	2,775,800
TOTAL	9,775,10,200

D. Justification of project activities

Provide a description of each identified NIE candidate gap/challenge and explain the status core, current processes and procedures within the NIE candidate regarding the identified gap/challenge and explain how the activities to be undertaken would address the identified gaps/challenges to advance accreditation of the NIE candidate. For new policies, procedures and institutional structures that need to be newly established, also provide a timeframe for demonstrating their effective operation and submission of evidence to the Accreditation Panel (AP), including responding to feedback from the AP. *(for missing policies, manuals and institutional structures, please list and explain each one individually)*

Policies, manuals procedures	Status	Relevance	Timeline for embedding and collecting evidence
<u>Charter of the organization</u>	<u>The existing document requires advancement - improving the wording about CIIP's core business in the entity's charter.</u>	Alignment of the operational framework, practices and capacities of CIIP with the requirements established for the National Implementing Entities to the Adaptation Fund.	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Financial management capacity Procedures Manual</u>	<u>The existing document requires Requires advancement - addressing CIIP's capacity to prevent and deal with financial mismanagement.</u>		<u>-1 month</u>

Formatted: Font: Not Bold
 Formatted: Justified
 Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Internal control -Control Framework	The existing document requires Requires advancement - <u>establishing an institution level policy and procedures for self-investigation</u>		<u>1 month-</u>
Operational Manual Project appraisal, preparation, implementation, M&E and impact assessment (including ESS, gender and stakeholder engagement)	The existing document requires Requires advancement - <u>updating the document and policies (including but not limited to procurement) related to competency to manage or oversee the execution of the project/programme, competency to undertake monitoring and evaluation, including monitoring of measures for the management of environmental and social risks.</u>		<u>-1 month</u>
Protocol on Project/programme Development/appraisal	A new document to be developed - <u>establishing experience and protocol for project/programme development and appraisal.</u>		<u>2 months</u>
Procurement	The existing		<u>-1 month</u>

<u>procedures and capacities Gender Policy</u>	<u>document requires Requires advancement - updating the gender policy and operational manual to enable the entity to comply with the AF gender policy.</u>		
<u>Policies on Prohibited Practices</u>	<u>A New document to be developed - establishing a policy on anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing.</u>		<u>23 months</u>
<u>Grievance Mechanism</u>	<u>The existing document requires Requires advancement - updating the policy and mechanism to monitor and address complaints about environmental or social harms caused by projects.</u>		<u>-1 month</u>

The table above is drawn on the basis of the institutional capacity assessment conduct by the EPIU team prior to the proposal development. It can be amended based on the gap assessment exercise provided for under the Component 1 of the project proposal.

E. Implementing Entity

This request has been prepared in accordance with the Adaptation Fund Board's procedures.

Head of	Signatu	Date	Implement	Telephone	Email Address
---------	---------	------	-----------	-----------	---------------

Implementing Entity	re	(Month, day, year)	ing Entity Contact		
Mr. Armen Yesoyan, Acting Director of EPIU SA		April 5, 2024	Ms. Milena Kiramijyan, Leading Specialist of the Cooperation with Donors Department	+374 651631	10 Info@cep.am milena.kiramijyan@epiu.am , milena.kiramijyan@gmail.com

F. Record of request of support on behalf of the government

Provide the name and position of the government official who is the Designated Authority of the Adaptation Fund in the NIE candidate country and indicate date of endorsement. The letter of endorsement from the Designated Authority should be attached as an annex to the application.

<i>Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan</i>	Date: 18 September, 2023
<i>Mr. Sheralizoda Bahodur Chairman</i>	

КУМИТАИ
ҶИФЗИ МУҶИТИ ЗИСТИ
НАЗДИ ҲУКУМАТИ
ҶУМҲУРИИ ТОҶИКИСТОН
734003, шаҳри Душанбе, кӯчаи Шамсӣ 5/1
Тел./факс: (992 37) 236-40-59, 236-13-53
Веб-сайт: www.tajnature.tj
Почтаи электронӣ: info@tajnature.tj



КОМИТЕТ ПО
ОХРАНЕ ОКРУЖАЮЩЕЙ СРЕДЫ
ПРИ ПРАВИТЕЛЬСТВЕ
РЕСПУБЛИКИ ТАДЖИКИСТАН
734003, город Душанбе, улица Шамси 5/1
Тел./факс: (992 37) 236-40-59, 236-13-53
Веб-сайт: www.tajnature.tj
Электронная почта: info@tajnature.tj

**COMMITTEE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
UNDER THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF TAJIKISTAN**
5/1 Shamsi str., 734003, Dushanbe city, tel./fax: (992 37)236-40-59, 236-13-53 web-site: www.tajnature.tj, e-mail: info@tajnature.tj

№ 1/17-03-2377 from «18» 09 2023

To _____ from « » 2023

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

Subject: Letter of Endorsement for “Application for a grant to support NIE accreditation through readiness package”

In my capacity as designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in Republic of Tajikistan, I confirm that the above national grant proposal is in accordance with the government’s national priorities in implementing adaptation activities to reduce adverse impacts of, and risks, posed by climate change in the Republic of Tajikistan.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above grant proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by “Environmental Project Implementation Unit” State Agency under the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Armenia and executed by the “Environmental Project Implementation Unit” State Agency under the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Armenia.

Sincerely,

Mr. Bahodur Sheralizoda

Chairman of the Committee for Environmental Protection
under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan
AF Operational and Political Focal Point





