Readiness and Preparatory Support

Direct Access Proposal Template

DAE Support Window

Proposal title

CIIP Readiness Support for Institutional Strengthening and Programming Capacity Development in Tajikistan (37100)

Direct Access Entity

Center for Implementation of Investment Projects within the Committee for Environmental Protection under the government of the Republic of Tajikistan

* The full proposal, including the financial proposal and annexes, is available on the GCF Partner Platform.

Version Update: 15 Sep 2025 | Initial: 22 Sep 2024
Aligned with the Revised Readiness Results Management Framework

How to complete this template?

This proposal template is designed for Direct Access by Direct Access Entities (DAEs) for the DAE Support Window.

To assist with completing this proposal template, the GCF provides the following guiding documents available on the GCF website:

- **Guide for Direct Access Entities to Access Readiness Support**
- **Guide for Direct Access Entities on Strategic Planning of Readiness Support**

If the DAE opts for the Direct Access option under the DAE window[1], there is no need to complete the FMCA questionnaire, as accreditation already verifies the entity's financial capacity.

While this template allows DAEs to prepare the direct access proposal offline, please note that all information must be entered and officially submitted through the online submission platform in the **GCF Partner Portal**.

How to get support to complete this template?

If you are not sure how to complete the proposal, or require support, please send an email to the relevant GCF regional team. Please refer to the GCF website to identify the relevant GCF regional team.

[1] Within the DAE window, funding is provided to assist accredited DAEs as well as candidate DAEs in the advanced stages of the accreditation process. For candidate DAEs, this refers to the stage of resolving outstanding accreditation conditions subsequent to the Board's approval of accreditation.

Proposal Details

Title of the Direct Access Proposal

CIIP Readiness Support for Institutional Strengthening and Programming Capacity Development in Tajikistan

Total Approved Amount (in USD)

$408,047

Implementation Period (in months)

30 months

Country Information

☐ Single DAE

☐ Multi-DAE

Lead DAE

Center for Implementation of Investment Projects within the Committee for Environmental Protection under the government of the Republic of Tajikistan

Contact person

Junaidzoda Muhibullo

Position

Director of CIIP

Email

muhibullojunaidov@gmail.com

Additional email addresses that need to be copied in correspondences

angez.avzalshoeva@gmail.com

Type of Access

● Direct Access by DAE

Participating DAE Information

If the proposal involves multiple DAEs (multi-DAE)– please list each one below, adding as many rows as necessary. The entry listed above serves as the lead for the multi-DAE proposal.

Participating DAE	Name of contact person	Contact person's position	Contact person's email	Budget

1. Summary of the proposal

The proposed Readiness and Preparatory Support, "CIIP Readiness Support for Institutional Strengthening and Programming Capacity Development in Tajikistan," aims to strengthen the capacity of the Center for Implementation of Investment Projects (CIIP) as a newly accredited Direct Access Entity (DAE) to effectively develop and manage GCF-funded projects and programmes in Tajikistan.
Tajikistan faces increasing climate risks, including impacts from glacial melt, floods, and droughts. Strengthening CIIP's systems and staff capacities is therefore critical to improve access to climate finance and support implementation of national climate priorities, including the NDC, NAP and LTS.
The proposal is aligned with the GCF 2024–2027 Readiness Strategy and the Revised RRMF, with three complementary objectives:

- Objective 1 – Institutional strengthening: strengthen CIIP's institutional capacity to meet and maintain GCF accreditation standards and strengthen programming capacity (Outcome 1.3; Output Indicator 1.3.1.1).
- Objective 3 – Knowledge-sharing and learning: promote peer learning and South–South collaboration, including CIIP's engagement in the Community of Practice for DAEs (CPDAE/CBDAE) through annual meetings and thematic exchanges (Outcome 3.2; Output Indicator 3.2.1.1).

Expected results include strengthened institutional tools and staff capacities, improved readiness systems for implementation and reporting, and stronger peer learning and collaboration—enabling CIIP to operate as a fully functional DAE capable of preparing strong submissions and supporting climate-resilient and low-emission development outcomes in Tajikistan.

2. DAE Context

Guidance

This section provides an overview o– the DAE context, including institutional capacity and accreditation status, priority areas for funding by the GCF and programming capacity. It also highlights the DAE’s key challenges, pipeline as well as readiness needs and stakeholder engagement.

2.1 Institutional Context and Accreditation Track

Project/programme size

- Small

Environmental & social risk category

- Category B

Financing modalities

- Project Management

Accreditation Scope and Scale
The Center for Implementation of Investment Projects (CIIP) is accredited to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) with a small-size project scope (USD 10–50 million) and environmental and social risk categories B/I-2 and C/I-3. The accreditation covers project management and grant financing modalities. CIIP is authorized to implement climate change mitigation and adaptation projects in Tajikistan, focusing on sustainable infrastructure, water resources, and energy efficiency.
Institutional Context
CIIP is a state entity established within the Government of Tajikistan by Decree No. 357 dated 2 September 2021. Operating under the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP), CIIP is responsible for coordinating, implementing, and managing investment and climate-related projects at the national level. The institution serves as Tajikistan’s Direct Access Entity to the GCF, ensuring alignment of national priorities with international climate finance mechanisms. CIIP has structured departments for finance, procurement, environmental and social safeguards, and monitoring and evaluation, ensuring compliance with both national and international fiduciary and environmental standards.

Accreditation stage

- Negotiation Finalized

Accreditation Status
The Center for Implementation of Investment Projects (CIIP) was accredited as a Direct Access Entity (DAE) to the Green Climate Fund on 17 July 2024, pursuant to GCF Board Decision B.39. The Accreditation Master Agreement (AMA) between the Green Climate Fund and CIIP has been signed and made effective, granting CIIP access to GCF readiness resources under the DAE window.
CIIP has acknowledged the accreditation conditions outlined by the Accreditation Panel and has initiated actions to address them within the prescribed timelines. The six accreditation conditions and their current implementation status are:

- Adoption and implementation of the Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorism Financing (AML/CFT) policy (Fulfilled and closed; the AML/CFT policy has been incorporated within the framework of prohibited practices);
- Publication of investigation guidelines and procedures on prohibited practices (Partially fulfilled; guidelines have been developed within the prohibited practices framework and are being formalised for publication and dissemination);
- Submission of audited financial statements for 2024 and 2025 (In progress; audits are scheduled in line with statutory audit cycles and CIIP is preparing the required documentation for submission);
- Establishment of an internal audit committee and internal audit function (Partially fulfilled; internal audit procedures have been drafted, and quality assurance provisions and Board designation are being finalised);
- Preparation of an independent Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) report following the first approved GCF-funded project (In progress; to be commissioned following approval and implementation of the first GCF-funded activity);
- Operationalization of the AML/CFT policy (development and roll-out of counterparty due diligence (KYC/UBO) and sanctions/PEP/adverse media screening SOPs, including onboarding and ongoing monitoring).

CIIP is actively progressing the accreditation conditions within the prescribed timelines, including the remaining documentary and operational requirements. The submission of audited financial statements for 2024 and 2025 is expected to be finalised and submitted in early 2026, in line with applicable audit cycles.
All actions are integrated into CIIP's institutional development plan and are being implemented in accordance with the GCF's approved timeframes. The forthcoming Readiness and Preparatory Support grant will further strengthen CIIP's capacity to evidence and sustain full compliance through effective and practical implementation.

2.2 Entity Climate Priorities and Programming Capacity

Tajikistan’s climate priorities on GCF emphasize adaptation—resilient agriculture/livelihoods in mountain regions, hydromet upgrades, water security, and climate-proofing of hydropower—while keeping space for mitigation via renewables/efficiency and nature-based measures as laid out in the 2024 Country Programme and active projects (FP067, FP075, FP040, FP233). CIIP, newly accredited (Jul 2024) as the country’s Direct Access Entity, has a broad programming remit across environment and climate themes according to the above described national priorities; it has developed core policies/procedures (ESMS, gender, fiduciary, procurement, audit, M&E, GRM, risk, governance, stakeholder engagement) and a capacity-building plan, indicating operational readiness to originate and implement GCF-aligned programmes—while country-level materials flag that continued strengthening of monitoring/tracking capacities will further support CIIP’s programming effectiveness.

2.3 Past and Ongoing Readiness Grants (GCF and non-GCF) and PPF support

Please list past and current GCF readiness grants, and relevant capacity-building initiatives funded by other agencies and funds

GCF Readiness and PPF Activities

Title & Reference Number	Start and End Dates	Amount Approved	Status	Objectives	Key Outcomes & Results	Complementarity with the readiness proposal
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Other Capacity-Building Initiatives Funded or Commissioned by Parties Other Than GCF

Title	Start and End Dates	Status	Funding Agency	Main objectives	Complementarity with the readiness proposal

2.4 Past and Ongoing Funded Activity Implementation and Project Pipeline

Please briefly describe GCF-funded proposals/projects or programmes that the DAE has implemented, is currently implementing, and is in the process of conceptualising and preparing

GCF Funded Activities

Project Title	Status	Amount	Details	Complementarity with the readiness proposal
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

2.5 Challenges, Gaps, and Barriers

Snapshot of CIIP's situation
CIIP is a newly accredited national DAE (small-size, B/C risk), hosted within the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP), with a broad mandate across adaptation and mitigation priorities. While this accreditation enables stronger access to climate finance, it also requires rapid operationalization of systems and consistent application of policies in real project cycles. CIIP has developed and published key policies and procedures; the near-term challenge is institutionalization through staff training, compliance monitoring, and evidence of effective implementation.

Challenges, gaps, and barriers

- Institutional and coordination Cross-sector coordination (water, agriculture, energy, regions) can be challenging without structured inter-ministerial arrangements, clear roles, and predictable decision gates.
- Regulatory interfaces and permitting Environmental permitting and review processes (including State Environmental Expertise and other agencies) can create sequencing and timeline risks unless critical paths and responsibilities are clearly mapped.
- Fiduciary, procurement, and the broader PFM environment Even with internal procedures in place, the broader operating environment can affect timely procurement, value-for-money, competition, and robust audit trails—requiring strong planning, documentation discipline, and oversight.
- Systems maturity (from "on paper" to "in practice") The key gap is consistent application: staff onboarding/training, compliance monitoring, supplier outreach, internal assurance, and systematic documentation of lessons learned from early procurements and project cycles. This also includes operationalizing counterparty due diligence (KYC/UBO and sanctions/PEP/adverse media screening) across all counterparties.
- Monitoring, evaluation, MRV, and results CIIP will need consistent indicator frameworks, reliable data flows, and verification arrangements aligned with GCF RBM requirements and national reporting needs (including ETF/BTR-related data where relevant).
- Pipeline development and co-financing Translating national adaptation priorities into a bankable and sequenced pipeline remains a challenge, particularly where pre-feasibility work, partner alignment, and co-financing discussions are required early.
- Geographic and operational constraints Mountainous terrain and dispersed communities increase logistics costs and seasonal access constraints, which can affect implementation scheduling and O&M sustainability for field-based activities.
- Social inclusion and gender Ensuring meaningful consultations, gender-responsive design, functioning grievance channels, and appropriate SEA/SH risk management at community level requires practical systems beyond policy statements.

What this means for CIIP
Priority actions include: strengthening cross-government coordination through clear roles and gates; stress-testing fiduciary/procurement procedures and documentation; implementing indicator "passports," data ownership and verification plans; planning for last-mile logistics and seasonality; and ensuring inclusive stakeholder engagement and grievance handling operate effectively in practice.

2.6 Stakeholder Engagement

Government & public bodies: Engagement is structurally high because CIIP sits within the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP), which leads national climate processes (NDC/NAP). Recent NDC-update workshops convened ministries and partners under CEP leadership—an ecosystem CIIP operates within for programming and coordination.
Local communities & affected people: CIIP has disclosed a Stakeholder Engagement & Communication Strategy and ESMS/ESS materials indicating that a project-level Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) and a Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) will be applied to ensure continuous and meaningful engagement. The GRM is intended to be accessible to project stakeholders and the public (including anonymous channels), and should be implemented in practice through timely disclosure, consultations, feedback loops, and clear response timelines. Given CIIP's recent accreditation, project-level evidence will grow as the first CIIP-led proposals and activities progress.
Civil society/NGOs & private sector: CIIP's policy set references outreach and communications with non-state actors. In practice, the key implementation need is to translate these commitments into regular, documented consultations with CSOs and businesses for each proposal (e.g., meeting records, participant lists, feedback integration), taking into account capacity constraints and ensuring predictable engagement windows.
Indigenous peoples / vulnerable groups: While distinct groups meeting "Indigenous Peoples" criteria (ESS7) may not be present in many Tajik contexts, national minorities and vulnerable rural/mountain communities require tailored engagement (language accessibility, remoteness, seasonality, and differentiated impacts). CIIP's SEP/GRM should operationalize this in field implementation, including measures for inclusion and safe reporting (including SEA/SH-sensitive pathways where relevant).
Bottom line: CIIP has disclosed the core engagement architecture (SEP, GRM, ESMS, communications strategy) and operates inside CEP-led national platforms—so institutionally, engagement is well positioned. The near-term test is consistent implementation: timely multilingual consultations, transparent GRM handling and reporting, and publicly available records of engagement per project as CIIP-led proposals move forward.

2.7 Specific Readiness Needs

Programming capacity & proposal quality. Hands-on support to strengthen CIIP's ability to prepare high-quality, GCF-aligned submissions and project documentation, including practical templates/tools, and "shoulder-to-shoulder" mentoring to apply these tools in real work.

Institutionalization of core policies. CIIP has disclosed key manuals (ESMS, Gender, Procurement, Internal Audit, M&E, GRM, Risk, Stakeholder Engagement). Priority now is operationalizing them—staff training, compliance checks, supplier outreach, and independent assurance during early cycles of application.

Fiduciary & procurement practice (incl. integrity screening). Move from manuals to procedural fluency (planning, competitive tendering, contract management, audit trails) in Tajikistan's PFM context. This includes counterparty due diligence for all counterparties (vendors, consultants, service providers, etc.)—KYC/UBO plus sanctions/PEP/adverse media screening at onboarding and on an ongoing basis—alongside annual external audits and results reporting systems from Day 1.

Stakeholder engagement & GRM in practice. Ensure multilingual, timely consultations and visible, well-understood grievance channels at community level, including anonymous reporting options and safe pathways for sensitive cases (where relevant). Tajik project experience shows GRMs often exist on paper but are poorly disseminated—a known execution risk to pre-empt.

Coordination across government. CIIP sits within the CEP/NDA ecosystem; it needs clear RACI and predictable coordination with sector ministries (water, energy, agriculture) to avoid processing bottlenecks and maintain alignment with national priorities.

Private-sector stakeholder engagement. Strengthen practical approaches to engaging private-sector stakeholders (where relevant) through predictable consultation formats and documented feedback integration, consistent with CIIP's stakeholder engagement framework.

Legal/implementation enablers. Leverage the Privileges & Immunities agreement (signed 5 Aug 2024) by aligning project documentation and counterpart arrangements to reduce legal/friction costs during implementation.

Knowledge-sharing & South-South (CPDAE/CBDAE). Formalize a peer-learning program (at least 3 exchanges + practical follow-ups), including CPDAE/CBDAE engagement, focused on first-mile issues: safeguards disclosure, procurement packaging, GRM reporting, and audit preparation.

Communications & dissemination. Produce localized (TJ/RU) guidance and short video tutorials, and strengthen transparency through clear public information on engagement and grievance channels.

Geography & operational realism. Plan for mountain logistics, seasonal access and practical delivery constraints to ensure capacity-building and advisory support remains implementable across regions.

Why these now?

CIIP is a newly accredited national DAE with a broad mandate; getting from policy on paper to performance in projects is the critical near-term step.

Publicly posted policies show a strong foundation; the 2024 Country Programme and the P&I agreement create a favorable enabling environment—if CIIP rapidly builds execution muscle via training, mentoring, and first-project "dry runs."

3. Statement of Objectives

Guidance

This section aims to clearly define the objectives and scope of readiness support being sought. It outlines: (1) the anticipated impact of readiness support to establish and advance DAEs' capacities to effectively programme, implement and report on GCF-funded activities, as well as broader climate finance, and (2) specific areas of readiness support required, addressing capacity gaps and aligning with the objectives and outcomes of the 2024-2027 readiness strategy.

3.1 Objectives of the Readiness Support

This proposal is structured around two objectives that collectively contribute to three RRMF outcomes that are most relevant for a newly accredited DAE. The intervention is organised into five linked activities (A1-A5) to ensure that readiness support translates into practical, repeatable programming capability.

Objective-to-RRMF alignment (outcomes and indicators):

- Objective 1 – Institutional capacity / accreditation compliance (RRMF Outcome 1.3; Output Indicator 1.3.1.1).
- Objective 3 – Coordination & country programming through knowledge-sharing and collaboration (RRMF Outcome 3.2; Output Indicator 3.2.1.1).

Objective 2 – Quality pipeline (RRMF Outcomes 2.2 and 2.3) is not included in this readiness request; pipeline strengthening is expected as an indirect co-benefit through improved programming routines and knowledge products, and can be proposed as a follow-on readiness request if needed.Under Objective 1 (Outcome 1.3), Activities A1-A3 form a single institutionalisation pathway. They are designed to

- Standardise how national climate priorities are translated into climate finance aligned project documentation and decision-making

- Strengthen stakeholder engagement practice as a core requirement for credible project preparation and implementation, and
- Embed day to day application of CIIP's systems through applied support.

The expected outcome is that CIIP demonstrates strengthened programming capacity and consistent application of accreditation compliant systems in practice, supported by evidence of use and follow-up actions.

Objective (1)

Contributes to RRMF Outcome 1.3 (DAE accreditation/reaccreditation compliance and strengthened programming capacity) and is measured through Output Indicator 1.3.1.1: "Number of direct access applicants and accredited entities (DAEs) with capacity, systems, policies and tools that are compliant with GCF accreditation/reaccreditation requirements."

(a) Development of a Climate Strategy Integration Manual: A comprehensive manual outlining methodologies for integrating national climate strategies (NDCs, NAPs, LTS) into project documents. The manual will include step-by-step guidance, practical templates/tools, and case studies, and will be completed and adopted by CIIP with an approval record.. (RRMF Outcome 1.3; Output Indicator 1.3.1.1).

(b) Training on stakeholder engagement frameworks and methodologies: 8 workshops on stakeholder engagement best practices, focusing on methods to effectively involve local communities and private sector stakeholders in climate resilience projects. Deliverables include training completion reports with attendance records, participant feedback, and a post-training evaluation showing an increase in knowledge and application of stakeholder engagement methodologies. (RRMF Outcome 1.3; Output Indicator 1.3.1.1).

(c) Shoulder-to-Shoulder Consulting: Support by international experts (on-site and online) to build capacities in project management and financial planning. At least 24 support sessions will be delivered and 3 accreditation-condition work products completed, with the goal of 80% of CIIP staff demonstrating improved competencies in project management and GCF proposal preparation. The three work products will be selected to directly address CIIP's pending accreditation conditions. Evidence for the sessions and work products will be session logs, the final work products, and a conditions-to-work-products mapping table. (RRMF Outcome 1.3; Output Indicator 1.3.1.1).

Under Objective 3 (Outcomes 3.2), Activities A4-A5 establish a structured learning and collaboration mechanism that reinforces Objective 1. These activities are intended to convert peer experience into actionable improvements in CIIP's routines and tools, while also creating reusable learning assets that strengthen knowledge retention and standardisation. The expected outcome is that CIIP both produces and uses inclusive knowledge products and platforms, and strengthens South-South or peer collaboration through CPDAE and CBDAE engagement with documented follow-up actions that can be adopted internally.

Objective (3)

Outcome 3.2 (enhanced regional/South-South collaboration), including CIIP's engagement in the Community of Practice for DAEs (CPDAE/CBDAE) through annual meetings and thematic exchanges. It is measured through:

Output Indicator 3.2.1.1: "Number of regional or South-South partnerships, programmes, policies, MOUs and/or collaboration mechanisms established."

(a) Peer-to-Peer Learning Sessions: Delivery 10 peer-to-peer learning sessions with other regional DAEs and IAEs (including through CPDAE/CBDAE platforms) to share best practices in climate finance, project management, and sustainable tourism development. Deliverables include session agendas, participant lists, and materials for 10 sessions, and 1 peer-learning synthesis note and 1 action tracker produced with a validation record (meeting minutes or email confirmation. RRMF Outcomes 3.2; Output Indicators 3.2.1.1).

Objective 1. Capacity-building for climate finance coordination and setting up the enabling environment for integrated climate investment

☐ 1.1. Developing countries, through NDAs or focal points, have enhanced capacity to fulfil their roles, responsibilities and policy requirements, including coordination mechanisms to engage relevant stakeholders to develop, advance, and implement NDCs, NAPs and LTSs.

☐ 1.2. Developing countries design and implement strategic frameworks (including NDC/NAP/LTS), policies and instruments, including climate investment plans, to create enabling environments for integrated climate investments.

☒ 1.3. Direct access applicants and accredited entities (DAEs) have met and maintained the accreditation standards of the GCF and strengthened their programming capacities, as evidenced by the development of GCF-funded activities.

Objective 2. Paradigm-shifting GCF pipeline development and implementation for adaptation and mitigation, based on country needs and guided by USP-2

☐ 2.1. Developing countries have developed or updated their country programmes to guide GCF investment.

☐ 2.2. Developing countries have developed high-quality concept notes linked to approved GCF proposals for adaptation and mitigation that are aligned with the USP-2 results, including through DAEs, that build on readiness support and country programmes.

☐ 2.3. NDAs and DAEs have enhanced processes and systems to effectively oversee the implementation, financial management, monitoring and reporting of climate programmes and projects.

Objective 3. Knowledge-sharing and learning to enhance national and regional cooperation on climate programming and financing

☐ 3.1. Developing countries, through NDAs or focal points, have made use of knowledge products to address policy gaps and integrated climate investment programming and implementation.

☒ 3.2. Enhanced collaboration among developing countries on climate change issues, evidenced by transboundary and regional cooperations/South-South cooperation.

3.2 Anticipated Impact on Direct Access Entity Climate Programming and Implementation Capacity

This readiness support will strengthen CIIP’s ability to programme, implement and report on GCF funded activities by reinforcing two areas. Under Objective 1 (Institutional strengthening), it strengthens accreditation compliance and standards compliant programming capacity in practice, aligned with RRMF Outcome 1.3 and measured through Output Indicator 1.3.1.1. Under Objective 3 (Knowledge sharing and learning), it strengthens learning and collaboration through inclusive knowledge products and South South exchange, aligned with RRMF Outcomes 3.2 and measured through Output Indicator 3.2.1.1

Structured contribution of the proposed outcomes:

- Accreditation requirements: strengthening and demonstrating standards-compliant systems in practice (Objective 1; RRMF Outcome 1.3; Output Indicator 1.3.1.1).
- Pipeline development: improved quality and readiness of future concept notes/proposals through standardised strategy-to-project translation and inclusive design (indirect co-benefit).
- Overall programming needs: stronger implementation, monitoring/reporting routines and peer collaboration/learning (Objective 3; RRMF Outcomes 3.2; Output Indicators 3.2.1.1).

A) Impact on climate programming

Stronger proposal quality and alignment (Objective 1, Outcome 1.3, Indicator 1.3.1.1). A Climate Strategy Integration Manual (CSIM) (including step by step methods, templates, and case studies) will embed NDC, NAP and LTS priorities into project documentation and proposal drafts. This will improve consistency with GCF standards, national goals, and the quality of climate rationale, theory of change and results frameworks.

Better designed, more inclusive projects (Objective 1, Outcome 1.3, Indicator 1.3.1.1). Eight stakeholder engagement workshops, with documented learning results, will strengthen consultation quality with government bodies, the private sector, and communities. This will improve the integration of stakeholder feedback into design, reduce implementation risks linked to weak consultation, and strengthen sustainability and social acceptance.

Faster institutional learning and standardisation (Objective 3, Outcomes 3.2, Indicators 3.2.1.1). 10 Peer to peer exchanges, including through CPDAE and CBDAE platforms . The exchanges will also help CIIP benchmark practical workflows against more experienced DAEs and IAEs and translate lessons into internal tools and routines.

Country level coherence (Objective 1 and Objective 3, Outcome 1.3 and Outcome 3.2). CIIP operates within CEP led national platforms. Strengthened internal tools under Objective 1 and structured peer learning under Objective 3 will support more consistent coordination, documentation, and stakeholder facing practice as CIIP led programming advances.

B) Impact on direct access (CIIP as DAE)

Programming capacity proven in practice (Objective 1, Outcome 1.3, Indicator 1.3.1.1). Shoulder to shoulder consulting (at least 24 sessions) will strengthen day to day competencies in project management, financial planning and GCF proposal preparation. Success will be tracked through staff competency gains, with a target of at least 80% of relevant CIIP staff demonstrating improved competencies.

Accreditation standards maintained while scaling (Objective 1 supported by Objective 3, Outcome 1.3 supported by Outcomes 3.2). Strengthened fiduciary, environmental and social, gender, risk and stakeholder systems, supported by peer learning and mentoring through CPDAE and CBDAE, will help CIIP sustain GCF standards as its portfolio grows and as early project cycles test systems in practice.

Assurance and credibility (Objective 1, Outcome 1.3). Annual independent financial audits and an independent final evaluation or impact study will strengthen transparency and generate lessons to improve future readiness cycles and CIIP's operating model, supporting continuous improvement in accreditation related systems and programming practice.

C) How impact will be evidenced (selected KPIs and verification)

The readiness package is designed to translate CIIP's accreditation into delivery by standardising how climate priorities flow into CIIP documentation and practice **(Objective 1, Outcome 1.3)**, strengthening stakeholder engagement and fiduciary and safeguards culture in implementation **(Objective 1, Outcome 1.3)**, and embedding sustained learning through CPDAE and CBDAE exchange and knowledge products (**Objective 3, Outcomes 3.2).** Evidence will include use of the CSIM in live drafting, documented training outcomes from eight stakeholder engagement workshops, and competency improvement results from consulting sessions (target at least 80% of relevant CIIP staff improved). It will also include peer learning outputs (at least 10 exchanges, including CPDAE and CBDAE engagement). Annual progress reporting and audited financial statements, plus completion reporting with results and lessons, will be supported by an independent final evaluation or impact study.

4. Approach, Methodology, and Implementation Activities

Guidance

Please describe technical approach, methodology, and implementation plan to address the country needs and gaps, through the Direct Access modality.

4.1 Theory of Change

The first step in articulating the programme's objectives as well as the logic behind the delivery of its intended results is the formulation of a TOC. Please provide a TOC which highlights key challenges being addressed, as well as the step-by-step pathways to achieving the expected results. Key steps to designing a TOC are outlined in the **RRMF Handbook**.

CIIP is a newly accredited DAE and now needs to operationalise standards compliant programming practice while maintaining accreditation requirements. The TOC addresses five linked barriers. First, national climate priorities are not yet consistently translated into GCF aligned project documentation and results frameworks. Second, stakeholder engagement practice and documentation can be uneven, which weakens inclusion and increases implementation risk. Third, CIIP has limited day to day experience applying accreditation aligned procedures and tools across the full project cycle, including planning, budgeting, documentation, and quality assurance. Fourth, structured peer learning is limited, which slows the uptake of tested approaches and standardisation of practice. Fifth, reusable knowledge assets and institutional memory are limited, which can weaken continuity and slow onboarding.
To address these barriers, the readiness support delivers five linked activity streams that produce practical outputs. Development of the CSIM provides step by step guidance, templates, and case studies that embed NDC, NAP and LTS priorities into project documentation and proposal drafts. Eight stakeholder engagement workshops strengthen consultation quality with government bodies, the private sector, and communities, and document learning outcomes to support consistent practice. At least 24 shoulder to shoulder consulting sessions strengthen applied competencies in proposal preparation, project management and financial planning, and generate session logs and follow up action notes that reinforce adoption in live workflows. At least 10 peer learning exchanges through CPDAE and CBDAE platforms provide structured learning from experienced entities and translate lessons into CIIP routines through documented summaries and follow up actions.
These outputs contribute to the expected RRMF outcomes through two pathways. Under Objective 1, the manual, workshops and on the job consulting strengthen CIIP’s institutional practice and its ability to apply accreditation related systems and procedures consistently, contributing to Outcome 1.3 and measured through Output Indicator 1.3.1.1. Under Objective 3, peer exchanges, strengthen collaboration through CPDAE and CBDAE engagement and follow up actions, contributing to Outcomes 3.2 and measured through Output Indicators 3.2.1.1.
Key assumptions are that CIIP staff and relevant stakeholders participate consistently in workshops, coaching and exchanges, and that CIIP leadership supports adoption of the tools and routines produced. Main risks include scheduling constraints for peer exchanges, staff turnover, and uneven uptake of tools after delivery. These risks are mitigated through early planning of exchanges, the production of reusable learning assets, and the use of coaching sessions and documented follow up actions to reinforce application in practice.
THEREFORE, CIIP is better positioned to maintain its accreditation standards in practice while strengthening GCF-aligned climate programming and collaboration.

Assumptions

Output 1.3.1 / Outcome 1.3

- CIIP leadership supports adoption of CSIM/templates and applied coaching in live work
- Staff availability is sustained
- CEP/NDA can convene key counterparts for approvals and engagement.

Output 3.2.1 / Outcome 3.2

- Peer entities are available
- Exchanges can be scheduled (CPDAE/CBDAE)
- CIIP can implement follow-up actions from exchanges.

Risks and Mitigation Actions
Output 1.3.1 / Outcome 1.3
Risk: Slow approvals, procurement cycle overruns, and missed critical gates.
Mitigation: Critical-path Gantt; weekly tracker; pre-cleared ToR/templates; framework agreements; escalation pathway where needed.
Risk: Low participation by line ministries/regions and unclear roles leading to coordination gaps.
Mitigation: RACI with named focal points + alternates; monthly joint reviews; action logs; co-branded outputs to incentivise engagement.
Output 3.2.1 / Outcome 3.2
Risk: Peer exchanges (CPDAE/CBDAE) are delayed or remain information-sharing only, with weak follow-through on agreed actions.
Mitigation: Confirm exchange calendar early; ensure each exchange ends with documented follow-up actions; track follow-up actions through internal check-ins and subsequent sessions.

4.2 Implementation Activities

Please list all proposed activities under their corresponding outputs. For each activity:

- Assign a unique identifier using the format aligned with the output (e.g., activities under Output 1.2.1 should be labelled as 1.2.1a, 1.2.1b, 1.2.1c, etc.).
- Ensure these activity labels match those referenced in the Financial Proposal to maintain consistency and traceability.
- Provide a clear and detailed description of each activity, specifying the exact actions that will be undertaken.

Objective 1. Capacity-building for climate finance coordination and setting up the enabling environment for integrated climate investment

☒ Outcome 1.3. Direct access applicants and accredited entities (DAEs) have met and maintained the accreditation standards of the GCF and strengthened their programming capacities, as evidenced by the development of GCF-funded activities.

☒ Output 1.3.1. Institutional gaps of direct access applicants and accredited entities (DAEs) are addressed to obtain and/or maintain accreditation.

Activities

1-3-1.a. (a) Activity 1.3.1 a Development of a Climate Strategy Integration Manual: A comprehensive manual outlining methodologies for integrating national climate strategies (NDCs, NAPs, LTS) into project documents. The manual will include step-by-step guidance, practical templates, and case studies to support CIIP staff in aligning project proposals with GCF standards. Implementation Approach Scoping and outline: confirm how CIIP currently prepares concept notes and proposals, and identify where national priorities and GCF requirements need to be translated into consistent templates and drafting steps. Draft development: produce step-by-step guidance covering the core workflow from national strategy priorities to project narrative, results logic, and supporting documentation; prepare practical templates and checklists that staff can apply in live drafting. Case examples: include short case studies or worked examples showing how priorities are translated into project components and documentation. Internal application and refinement: apply the draft CSIM in live drafting/review settings and adjust it based on practical usability feedback, ensuring the final version supports routine use. Deliverables and evidence Final CSIM package (manual + templates/checklists + case examples), and documented evidence of internal application/refinement (version control and feedback notes).
1-3-1.b. (b) Training on stakeholder engagement frameworks and methodologies: 8 workshops on stakeholder engagement best practices, focusing on methods to effectively involve local communities and private sector stakeholders in climate resilience projects. Implementation approach and steps Design of workshop materials: tailor workshop content to CIIP's operating context and the types of projects it intends to develop, including practical tools for planning, facilitation, and documenting engagement outcomes. Delivery of workshops: deliver eight workshops using applied exercises, examples, and scenario-based practice to strengthen staff capability to plan and run consultations and to capture results clearly. Documentation and learning capture: ensure each workshop generates the required evidence trail (attendance, agenda, materials used) and captures participant feedback. Post-training follow-up: conduct a post-training evaluation focused on knowledge gained and practical application in CIIP's work, with lessons fed back into internal routines and templates where relevant. Deliverables and evidence Training completion reports (including attendance records), participant feedback summaries, and a post-training evaluation demonstrating increased knowledge and application of stakeholder engagement methodologies.
1-3-1.c. (c) Shoulder-to-Shoulder Consulting: Ongoing support by international experts (on-site and online) to build capacities in project management and financial planning. At least 24 consulting sessions will be delivered, with the goal of 80% of CIIP staff demonstrating improved competencies in project management and GCF proposal preparation. Implementation approach and steps Workplan and sequencing: agree an engagement plan that aligns sessions to CIIP's internal workflow and live tasks (proposal preparation steps, project planning routines, and financial planning requirements). Applied support delivery: deliver sessions in a practical "work alongside" format, focusing on CIIP staff applying procedures and tools in real work products, not simulations. Action notes and follow-up: each session produces documented action notes, with follow-up items tracked so improvements are embedded and demonstrated over time. Competency assessment: track competency improvement through a structured assessment approach consistent with the proposal's target for improved staff competencies. Deliverables and evidence Consulting session logs and action notes, follow-up tracking, and evidence of competency improvement consistent with the proposal's stated target.

Objective 3. Knowledge-sharing and learning to enhance national and regional cooperation on climate programming and financing

☒ Outcome 3.2. Enhanced collaboration among developing countries on climate change issues, evidenced by transboundary and regional cooperations/South-South cooperation.

☒ Output 3.2.1. Regional or South-South partnerships, programmes, policies, MOUs and/or collaboration mechanisms established among developing countries, including through their DAEs.

Activities

3-2-1.a. (a) Peer-to-Peer Learning Sessions: Organize exchange sessions with other regional DAEs and IAEs (CPDAE/CBDAE) to share best practices in climate finance, project management, and sustainable tourism development. Implementation approach and steps Partner identification and agenda setting: confirm peer entities and agree thematic focus areas aligned to CIIP's needs (climate finance practice, project management approaches, and relevant sector application such as sustainable tourism development). Session delivery: run the exchange sessions in a structured format oriented toward practical approaches, tools, and lessons learned. Documentation: document each exchange with a concise summary capturing key insights and practical takeaways. Follow-up plan: produce and maintain a follow-up plan to implement learned practices within CIIP, with actions defined clearly enough to be tracked. Deliverables and evidence Documented session summaries (including key insights gained and actionable strategies developed) and a follow-up plan for implementing learned practices.

4.3 Stakeholder Engagement Strategy

A) How relevant stakeholders were consulted to identify gaps, challenges, barriers, and solutions

- Structured needs assessment + training needs analysis (TNA). The inception approach will draw on a TNA across relevant ministries, NGOs/CSOs, civil society and other stakeholders to identify priority capacity gaps related to DAE institutional strengthening (fiduciary/procurement integrity, E&S/gender, stakeholder engagement and grievance handling, and internal procedures aligned with GCF standards).
- Mixed-methods baseline with government & non-state actors. The inception design uses key-informant interviews (KII), focus groups (FGD), and surveys across CEP/NDA, line ministries, regions, NGOs/associations, academia and (where relevant) private sector—explicitly to map bottlenecks, practical constraints, and realistic fixes.
- Stakeholder engagement training to co-create solutions. CIIP's readiness activities include two stakeholder-engagement workshops (with post-tests) to jointly define workable consultation, disclosure, inclusion and feedback practices (including for rural communities and SMEs).
- Policy & systems review with users. Tasks include developing localized guidance (TJ/RU), templates and SOPs, tested with target users and then disseminated (print + online) to ensure usability and uptake.
- Open complaint/feedback channels (public). CIIP's public-facing mechanisms (GRM/complaints channel, Whistleblower channels, and the Compliance Review Mechanism/CRM) accept third-party and anonymous inputs on wrongdoing, policy non-compliance, or project-related harms—providing an additional channel for identifying gaps and improving practice.

B) How stakeholders will be engaged during implementation—and how feedback/concerns will be addressed

Who is engaged and where

- Government & public bodies: CEP/NDA and relevant agencies engaged through trainings and working sessions linked to grant deliverables.
- Local communities & CSOs: consulted through project-level SEPs/meetings, FGDs and feedback tools; materials localized in Tajik/Russian for accessibility.
- Private sector/SMEs: engaged through stakeholder-engagement modules and targeted consultations where relevant.
- Peer DAEs/IAEs: engaged through CPDAE/CBDAE exchanges and peer support/mentoring arrangements.

Engagement activities

- Two stakeholder-engagement workshops; ≥24 shoulder-to-shoulder consulting sessions; ≥8 peer exchanges (including through CPDAE/CBDAE); and dissemination of localized guidance and learning products. Each event captures attendance, feedback, and learning gains (where applicable).
- Ongoing consultations are embedded in the monitoring approach (scheduled and logged KIIs/FGDs/field missions as relevant).

Dissemination

- Digital + print dissemination of guidance and learning products, with formal reporting milestones (inception, annual progress reporting and completion reporting) and public-facing materials where appropriate.

How feedback/concerns are handled (mechanisms)

- Institutional & project-level GRM: multiple intake channels (web, email, phone, postal, in-person), option for anonymous submissions, grievance logging and response timelines.
- Whistleblower Protection Program: confidential/anonymous reporting channels with protections from retaliation for allegations of misconduct/prohibited practices.
- Compliance Review Mechanism (CRM): enables third parties/groups to request a compliance review where there is reason to believe CIIP has not adhered to internal policies/procedures.
- Results & learning loops: annual progress and audited financial reporting, completion reporting and an independent final evaluation/impact study capturing lessons and stakeholder feedback for course correction.
- Event-level feedback: each training/consultation produces participant lists, basic evidence (photos/minutes), feedback analysis, and recommendations that feed the next iteration of materials and support.
- GCF external avenues: affected people may elevate issues to the GCF's IRM/IIU per GCF guidance; the Readiness RRMF Handbook codifies stakeholder engagement expectations across the grant lifecycle.

Ownership and inclusion safeguards

- Localization and access: all user-facing materials localized (TJ/RU); formats adapted to literacy and seasonality.
- Ethics & SEAH protections: informed consent and privacy protocols applied; safe pathways for sensitive cases are communicated through the GRM/whistleblowing channels.

Bottom line: Stakeholders were—and will be—engaged through a nested system of needs assessments, mixed-method consultations, structured trainings and CPDAE/CBDAE peer learning, transparent dissemination, and formal GRM/CRM + reporting/evaluation feedback loops—supporting co-design and continuous improvement in an auditable way.

4.4 Risk Assessment and Mitigation measures

Please describe potential risks and risk monitoring plan, as follows:

- Please list the key identified and potential risks as well as the mitigation measures proposed. The potential risks could include, for example, delays, disruptions, cost and market risks, inadequate coordination/participation, lack of political support, money-laundering/terrorist financing, and prohibited practices.
- Please indicate the probability of occurrence (low/medium/high) and impact level (low/medium/high) for each potential risk.
- If managed remotely, please describe the measures (mechanisms and controls) to be taken to identify, assess, monitor and mitigate any risk of money-laundering, terrorist financing or prohibited practices.
- Please describe the measures (mechanisms and controls) to be taken for activities within the proposal to identify, assess, monitor and mitigate any risk of money-laundering, terrorist financing, prohibited practices and other integrity matters.

Risk Category	Specific risk(s) / Risk(s) description	Probability of occurrence	Impact level	Mitigation action(s)	Entity(ies) responsible to manage the risk(s)
Operational	Slow approvals; procurement cycle overruns; missed critical gates	Medium	High	Critical-path Gantt; weekly tracker; pre-cleared ToR/templates; framework agreements; escalation ladder (PM → CEP/NDA Steering)	CIIP PMU (Project Manager), CEP/NDA Steering Committee
Regulatory	Coordination Low participation by line ministries/regions; unclear roles	Medium	High	RACI with named focal points + alternates; monthly joint reviews; action logs; co-branded outputs to incentivize engagemen	CIIP PMU, Line-Ministry Focal Points, CEP/NDA
Financial	Fraud, collusion, bid-rigging, kickbacks, conflicts of interest. ML/TF: sactions/PEP/adversemedia	Medium	High	CoI declarations; segregation of duties; dual approvals; red-flag analytics; spot audits; whistleblower protections; mandatory counterparty due diligence for ALL counterparties (vendors, consultants, service providers, implementing partners/subcontractors): KYC/UBO + sanctions/PEP/adverse media screening (e.g., Dow Jones Risk Center) prior to contracting and prior to payments; ongoing re-screening quarterly and event-based (triggered by changes in sanctions lists/adverse media); hits escalated for compliance review and cleared before engagement/payment.	CIIP Integrity/Compliance FP, Internal Audit

5. Logical Framework (output)

Guidance

Please complete the logical framework in the separate document.

Objective: Capacity-building for climate-finance coordination and setting up the enabling environment for integrated climate investment.

Outcome: Direct access applicants and accredited entities (DAEs) have met and maintained the accreditation standards of the GCF and strengthened their programming capacities, as evidenced by the development of GCF-funded activities.

Output: Institutional gaps of direct access applicants and accredited entities (DAEs) are addressed to obtain and/or maintain accreditation.

Indicator: Number of direct access applicants and accredited entities (DAEs) with capacity, systems, policies and tools that are compliant with GCF accreditation requirements.

Please provide the number of entities benefitted from the country window or DAE window
Unit: No. of Entities

Accreditation Support	Baseline	Target
Post-Accreditation Support	0	1

Expected Deliverables

☒ Status report on capacity building of direct access applicants and accredited entities to meet GCF accreditation requirements.

Objective: Paradigm-shifting GCF pipeline development and implementation for adaptation and mitigation, based on country needs and guided by USP-2 programming targets.

Outcome: Developing countries have developed high-quality concept notes linked to approved GCF proposals for adaptation and mitigation that are aligned with the USP-2 results, including through DAEs, that build on readiness support and country programmes.

Expected Deliverables

☐ Concept Note and studies, assessment, reports, etc. to support the development of investment-grade Concept Notes.

☐ Funding Proposal and studies, assessment, reports, etc. to support the development of investment-grade Funding Proposals.

Outcome: NDAs and DAEs have enhanced processes and systems to effectively oversee the implementation, financial management, monitoring and reporting of climate programmes and projects.

Expected Deliverables

☐ Status report on capacity building of NDA and DAEs in the Country/Region in project/ program design, implementation and oversight.

Objective: Knowledge-sharing and learning to enhance national and regional cooperation on climate programming and financing.

Outcome: Enhanced collaboration among developing countries on climate change issues, evidenced by transboundary and regional cooperations/South-South cooperation.

Output: Regional or South-South partnerships, programmes, policies, MOUs and/or collaboration mechanisms established among developing countries, including through their DAEs.

Indicator: Number of regional or South-South partnerships, programmes, policies, MOUs and/or collaboration mechanisms established.

Please provide the number of regional, multi-regional, South-South partnerships established or strengthened
Unit: No. of Regional Partnerships

Effectiveness Status	Baseline	Target
Establish	0	1

Expected Deliverables

☒ Status report on the regional or South-South partnerships, programmes, policies, MOUs and/or collaboration mechanisms promoted by the Country or Region.

6. Implementation Arrangements

6.1.1 Partnering under Direct Access

N/A

6.1.2 Framework Agreements

CIIP will implement this Direct Access Readiness grant directly as the accredited DAE, assuming full responsibility for programme delivery, fiduciary and procurement management, safeguards/gender compliance, monitoring and evaluation, and results and financial reporting in line with the GCF Readiness Programme and the Revised Readiness Results Management Framework (RRMF). CIIP will use its in-country systems and staff in Dushanbe for day-to-day oversight, with Steering/PMC governance and annual audits, and will report to the GCF Secretariat using the standard readiness templates and timelines (annual progress/financial reports, completion report). CIIP's implementation will follow GCF integrity policies—including the Policy on Prohibited Practices and AML/CFT standards—with GRM/whistleblowing and a Compliance Review Mechanism (CRM) accessible to stakeholders, and with cashless controls embedded in its procedures. CIIP will conduct counterparty due diligence for all counterparties (including vendors, consultants and service providers), including KYC/UBO and sanctions/PEP/adverse media screening (e.g., via Dow Jones Risk Center) at onboarding and on an ongoing basis, with any potential matches reviewed and cleared prior to engagement and payment. Where specialized services are needed, CIIP will competitively contract local firms or experts under CIIP's due-diligence and results-based contracting arrangements and apply RRMF-aligned reporting to ensure quality and accountability, while integrating tools and SOPs into CIIP's institutional framework for sustainability.

6.2 Organisation and Staffing

In this chapter, propose the structure and composition of your team. Consider including a visual depiction of the programme team through an organisational chart, depicting reporting responsibilities. List the main disciplines, key experts responsible, and technical and support staff, including their relevant past experience, using the form below.

Please also include any details on any other relevant group of stakeholders, such as steering committees, technical teams, tasks force, coordination mechanisms, PMC structure, etc.

For these groups, describe their composition, decision-making processes, operational procedures, terms of reference (if any) and how the DAE will manage or oversee these units to ensure fulfillment of its obligations.

Name of staff	Organization	Area of Expertise	Position Assigned	Task Assigned	Base Country During Assignment
CIIP Director	CIIP	Strategic leadership, governance	Director (Final decisions)	Final approvals; chair/represent CIIP at Steering Committee; escalation resolution	Tajikistan
Project Manager (PM)	CIIP	Project management, budgeting, risk	Manager (Daily decisions)	Day-to-day delivery; milestone plan; budget control; coordination across A1–A5; reporting	Tajikistan

- A 1.3.1.1 (CSIM Manual) → Activity A1 Leads deliver the manual and piloting.
- A 1.3.1.2 (Stakeholder workshops) → Activity A2 Leads deliver 8 workshops (with pre/post tests, localized materials).

- A 1.3.1.3 (S2S Consulting) → Activity A3 Leads deliver ≥24 sessions focused on proposal/PM/structuring.
- A 3.2.1.1 (Peer exchanges) → Activity A4 Leads deliver ≥8 sessions + follow-ups.
- Cross-cutting: Gender/SEAH reviews A2/A3 outputs; Safeguards/GRM ensures consultations are inclusive and that a functioning GRM (incl. anonymous channels) exists and is reported; M&E compiles the annual results report per RRMF; Finance/Procurement ensures compliant tenders/payments and AML/CFT controls as per your financial template.

6.3 Fund flow arrangements

1) Designated USD Account (receipt/holding)
- Account name: CIIP – Readiness Designated Account (USD) at a reputable commercial bank (or Central Bank) in Tajikistan.
- Purpose: Exclusive receipt of GCF grant tranches; temporary holding of USD balances.
- Controls: Dual sign-off (PM + Finance Lead / CIIP Director), maker–checker in e-banking, KYC/UBO on all counterparties, sanctions/PEP screening, monthly bank reconciliations, quarterly balance confirmations from bank.

2) Project Account in local currency (if applicable)
- Account name: CIIP – Readiness Project Account (TJS) at the same banking group for smooth internal transfers.
- Purpose: Routine operational payments in local currency (venue, printing, travel, local consultants, taxes).
- Transfer rule: Cashless USD→TJS transfers on-need basis, guided by the approved quarterly cash-flow plan and payment calendar.

3) Transfers and payment modes
- Donor → CIIP: GCF disburses USD tranches into the Designated USD Account upon milestone acceptance and cash forecast.
- USD retention vs. conversion:
    - USD retained for high-value foreign obligations (e.g., international experts, software/SaaS) with direct USD payments from the USD account.
    - USD→TJS conversion for local obligations, executed only when due to limit FX exposure.
- Payments: 100% cashless (no cash, if possible), to named, verified accounts; invoice ↔ contract ↔ goods-receipt/deliverable tri-match; dual approvals; payment runs 1–2 weekly.

4) Exchange-rate risk management
- On-need conversion policy: Convert USD to TJS close to payment dates to minimize holding risks.

- If available: Multi-quote rule: Obtain ≥3 FX quotes (bank/platform) for each sizable conversion; record time-stamped evidence.
- FX buffer: Maintain a 3–5% contingency line in the budget for FX variance.
- USD-denominated obligations: Keep contracts naturally hedged in USD where feasible (international experts, cloud tools), reducing conversion needs.
- Reforecasting: Quarterly FX/price re-baselining against actuals; adjust workplans to keep within grant ceilings.
- Accounting policy: Document treatment of exchange gains/losses in line with IPSAS/IFRS and donor rules; disclose in quarterly and annual reports.

5) Integrity and compliance controls (across all flows)

- Segregation of duties: Requestor ≠ Approver ≠ Payer; system audit trails.
- Sanctions/PEP & KYC/UBO: Screening of all vendors/consultants at onboarding and quarterly; verified bank accounts; out-of-band callbacks for any bank-detail change.
- Procurement discipline: Competitive methods by default; value-for-money; framework agreements where efficient.
- Whistleblowing/GRM: Anonymous channels open to staff and third parties; 48-hour acknowledgement, 15-business-day target resolution; escalation to GCF IIU/IRM where relevant.
- Audit and oversight: Monthly reconciliations; quarterly internal spot checks; annual independent audit; Steering Committee receives a quarterly finance dashboard.

One-glance diagram (what the PPTX shows)

GCF/Donor (USD) → CIIP Designated USD Account → (a) USD Direct Payments to foreign suppliers; (b) FX Conversion (multi-quote) → Project Account (TJS) → Vendors/Consultants/Taxes (cashless, dual approvals).
Footer highlights controls: KYC/UBO, sanctions/PEP, dual approvals, reconciliations, FX reserve 3–5%, quarterly reforecast, annual audit.

7. Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting

Guidance

The RRMF has been revised to align with the objectives and outcomes outlined in the 2024-2027 readiness strategy, with the view to (1) simplify and streamline monitoring and reporting procedures; (ii) appropriately capture and reflect the systemic approach and strategic, programme-based methodology for planning and implementing readiness support; and (iii) establish a clear connection between readiness support and the enhanced programming capacities of developing countries and DAEs to effectively access and utilise climate finance.

Please note that there are as per the Revised RRMF, there are two levels of monitoring and reporting. The first is at the programme/project level, and the second is at the Country level. Outlined below are the monitoring and reporting requirements and responsible parties.

7.1 Programme Monitoring and Reporting (Output-Level)

Responsibility & Tasks:

- In the case of direct access, the DAE or a Framework Agreement (FWA) holder is responsible for monitoring the programme/project's implementation and preparing relevant reports that detail the progress of output-level results and deliverables as articulated in the programme/project logframe.

Financial Reporting:

- Regular financial reporting is the principal reporting mechanism under Readiness. Reports should provide an overview of funds received and expended and a comparison of planned versus actual expenditure with rationale for any variances. All financial reports must be presented in USD, in line with the approved programme budget. The detailed reporting requirements, including content and format, will be specified in the implementation-related templates.

Reporting Frequency:

- Annual progress reports, including financial reporting, are to be submitted to the GCF Secretariat by 31 March of each year, unless otherwise agreed to in the respective legal agreements. Upon project closure, a completion report must be submitted within three months of the completion of the activities

☒ By checking this box, I acknowledge awareness of reporting tasks, including frequency and content

7.2 Financial Audits

Responsibility:

- Independent, third-party auditor commissioned by [choose appropriate] the DAE or FWA holder in case of direct access, or by the delivery partner if chosen from the GCF pre-qualified pool through mini-tenders.

Task:

- Regular financial audits to ensure responsible and transparent fund management, preventing misuse or mismanagement and ensuring compliance with GCF and national requirements.

Reporting Frequency:

- Annual financial audit reports must be submitted to the GCF Secretariat by 31 March of each calendar year, unless an alternative frequency and deadline is agreed upon at the conclusion of the legal agreement. The completion financial audit report to be submitted to the GCF Secretariat within three months of completing the activities.

Please confirm which type of auditor will be selected and provide any details

○ Private sector auditor Auditor

(If Public Auditor (such as Country Supreme Audit Institution (SAI) or other)):

N/A
N/A

☒ By checking this box, I acknowledge awareness of financial audit responsibilities, including frequency

7.3 Mid-Term Review (if the programme is four years)

This will align with the Year 2 annual progress report; a separate mid-term report is not required. Instead, a specific section in the Year 2 annual progress report will focus on the assessment of the adequacy of the initial design of the four-year programmes, the evaluation of the progress made towards achieving project objectives, and the review of the effectiveness of the delivery partner (if selected from the GCF pre-qualified pool). It will also identify any challenges encountered. The findings from this review will be used to make necessary adjustments to the project implementation plan in Years 3-4.

☒ By checking this box, I acknowledge awareness of reporting tasks, including frequency and content

7.4 Final Evaluation

Responsibility:
- An independent evaluator will be commissioned by the DAE, or a FWA holder, in case of direct access

Task:
- Upon completion of the project implementation period, an independent evaluation will be conducted to assess the overall impact of the readiness activities. This evaluation will measure the contribution of these activities to the country's objectives and GCF outcomes, guided by the GCF Evaluation Policy and Standards. It will include an impact assessment and document lessons learned to inform future project planning and readiness support. If the country selects two programmes, the GCF Secretariat and the country may consult to explore the rationale and feasibility of conducting a single evaluation for both programmes.

Reporting Frequency:
- The final evaluation report will be submitted to the GCF Secretariat within three months of completing the Readiness activities.

☒ By checking this box, I acknowledge awareness of reporting tasks, including frequency and content

7.5 Sanctions and Restrictive Measures

Confirmation (yes/no): No. There are no country-specific United Nations Security Council (UNSC) restrictive measures currently in force in the beneficiary country (Tajikistan). main.un.org
Compliance approach (scope of UNSC sanctions regimes):
Notwithstanding the above, UNSC sanctions regimes include targeted restrictive measures applicable globally to designated individuals and entities (UNSC Consolidated List). CIIP will ensure compliance by conducting comprehensive due diligence screening for all entities and individuals associated with the proposal (including vendors, consultants, service providers, and any partners/subcontractors) using the Dow Jones Risk Center platform. Screening will cover applicable international sanctions regimes (including the UNSC Consolidated List and other recognized lists), adverse media searches, and Politically Exposed Persons (PEP) checks (e.g., relevant government officials and CIIP senior executives in line with their roles). Screening will be performed prior to onboarding/contracting and prior to any payments, and repeated on an ongoing basis (e.g., periodic re-screening

for longer engagements and event-based screening when lists/material adverse media are updated). Any potential matches (sanctions/adverse media/PEP) will be reviewed and must be cleared prior to engagement and disbursement; otherwise CIIP will not proceed.
Screening results (proposal-associated parties):
Screening identified no material issues. Mr. Sheralizoda Bahodur was identified as a Politically Exposed Person (PEP) in his official role as Chairman of the State Committee for Environmental Protection. This PEP match was reviewed in accordance with CIIP's expected institutional roles and responsibilities for this readiness proposal and cleared with no concerns.

7.6 Grievance Redress Mechanisms

Confirmation (yes/no)
Yes. CIIP maintains (and will continue to maintain) both a Whistleblower Protection Program and a Compliance Review Mechanism (CRM) that are accessible to staff, partners, and external stakeholders, including third parties/the general public, with the option for anonymous submissions.
Applicable whistleblowing & compliance mechanisms (what exists and how they're used)
1) Whistleblower Protection Program (misconduct / corruption / prohibited practices)
CIIP's Whistleblower Protection arrangements are designed to:

- Protect reporters from retaliation and ensure confidential handling of reports.
- Provide multiple confidential reporting channels, including (as listed on CIIP's whistleblower page): web form, email, phone/fax, in-person reporting, and postal submissions.
- Allow anonymous reporting and explicitly state confidentiality/anonymity protections. (tajciip.com)

This mechanism is used for reporting allegations such as fraud, corruption, collusion, coercion, misconduct, and (where applicable) E&S / gender / SEAH-related wrongdoing.
2) Compliance Review Mechanism (CRM) / public-facing complaint mechanism (policy/procedure adherence)
In addition to whistleblowing, CIIP maintains a Compliance Review Mechanism (CRM)—i.e., a formal pathway that enables third parties or groups to request a compliance review when there is reason to believe CIIP has not adhered to its internal policies or procedures.
Operationally, CIIP's existing public-facing Complaint Mechanism / GRM covers "employees, partners, project stakeholders and members of the public," and is used to:

- Receive and resolve grievances related to CIIP operations and supported activities.
- Escalate issues into a compliance review when the concern is about non-compliance with CIIP's internal rules/standards (not only about a service complaint). (tajciip.com)

Project-level GRM guidelines further ensure community-level intake and resolution for project-related harms, including environmental, social, gender/SEAH issues, consistent with CIIP's policy set. *(tajciip.com)*
Note (to reflect the reviewer's wording): The CRM is the "policy compliance" route (did CIIP follow its own policies/procedures?), while the GRM/complaint channels also handle operational grievances and project-level impacts.
External avenues (GCF-level), complementing CIIP mechanisms
For GCF-funded activities, CIIP's internal mechanisms are complemented by:

- GCF Independent Redress Mechanism (IRM) — an independent channel for people/communities affected (or potentially affected) by GCF projects/programmes. (irm.greenclimate.fund)
- (Optional but useful to keep in the narrative) GCF Independent Integrity Unit (IIU) — for allegations of fraud/corruption/prohibited practices; also accepts anonymous reports. (iiu.greenclimate.fund)

Bottom line
CIIP has two core mechanisms that are accessible to staff, partners, and external stakeholders:

- a Whistleblower Protection Program (anti-retaliation + multiple confidential channels), and

- a Compliance Review Mechanism (CRM) for third parties/groups to request review where CIIP may not have followed its internal policies/procedures.

Both allow anonymous submissions and are complemented by the GCF IRM (and IIU for integrity cases), ensuring multiple pathways for reporting and redress.

8. Budget

8.1 Budget
The DAE (for the DAE Support Window) is required to prepare and submit the Budget for the proposal period. Please complete the Budget using the specified Excel template. As necessary, provide an accompanying narrative (text) explanation in this section of the proposal. If not necessary, please indicate “Refer to the Excel file”. The Budget must include a disbursement schedule linked to deliverables and aligned with the Implementation Plan. Use the Budget narrative to explain and justify the figures as needed. Download template
Budget plan (please complete in the separate document) While developing the budget, please consider the ineligible costs as per page 13 of the Initial Guide for Countries to Access Readiness Support

9. Other relevant information

9.1 Exit and Sustainability Strategy
1) Capacity Building and Institutionalization **Targeted training programmes — DAE Support Window** **Audience:** CIIP (DAE) core team + line-ministry focal points + selected local partners. • A. Programming & GCF standards (2× workshops + clinics): end-to-end CN/FP preparation, theory of change, budgets, risk & results, fiduciary alignment, safeguards/gender integration, disclosure & no-objection flow. • B.Fiduciary & procurement practice (1× workshop + desk-side coaching): planning, competitive methods, KYC/UBO, sanctions/PEP screening, dual approvals, audit trail, contract management, price reasonableness. • C. MRV/ETF & RBM (1× workshop + on-the-job labs): indicator selection, indicator passports, data ownership & verification, QA/QC, dashboards, alignment with ETF/BTR and annual results reporting. • D. Stakeholder engagement & GRM (2× workshops): SEP design, inclusive facilitation, GRM intake/triage, SEAH survivor-centred protocol, referral pathways, community evidence & disclosure records. • E. Private-sector engagement (1× clinic): market sounding, basic structuring for co-financing (even under grants), utility/SME engagement, risk-sharing options. • F. “Shoulder-to-shoulder” consulting (≥24 sessions): embedded coaching on live deliverables (CN/FP drafts, procurement packages, GRM set-up, data pipelines). • G. Peer exchanges (≥3): structured sessions with seasoned DAEs/IAEs on procurement packaging, safeguards disclosure, audit readiness, and M&E. **Verification:** pre/post tests (≥20% learning gain), task-based assessments (quality of draft CN/FP, completeness of procurement files), and competency self-ratings. **Tools, templates and instruments (to be institutionalized)** • Programming: Climate Strategy Integration Manual (CSIM); project documentation templates; risk & assumptions library; budget/costing workbook; disclosure checklists. • Fiduciary & procurement: procurement plan template; RfP/RfQ packs; bid evaluation forms; contract & variation orders; vendor KYC/UBO forms; sanctions/PEP checklist; payment tri-match (PO–contract–invoice) SOP. • MRV/ETF & RBM: indicator passports (definition, formula, source, owner, verification), data-flow maps, QA/QC checklist, results dashboard layout, annual results report template aligned to GCF. • Safeguards/gender/SEAH: ESMS screening form; ESMP outline; Gender Action Plan template; SEAH protocol; disclosure plan; field visit checklist. • Stakeholder and GRM: SEP toolkit (agenda, sign-in, notes, consent forms), GRM SOP (including anonymous channels), GRM case log with SLA fields, communications posters (TJ/RU). • All tools are version-controlled, assigned to named owners, and added to CIIP’s internal handbook. **Local adaptation for relevance and ownership** • Localization: all user-facing materials in Tajik/Russian; plain-language edits; examples from Tajik projects. • Co-design: pre-training TNA; pilots of tools with CIIP units and 1–2 line ministries; feedback loops built into clinics. • Operational realism: seasonal calendars, mountain logistics constraints, public-finance and permitting sequences; alignment with CEP/NDA processes.

- Accessibility: mixed delivery (in-person + remote), regional sessions when needed; inclusive formats for communities and SMEs.

2) Integration into National Systems
Enhancing policies and frameworks
Embed tools into SOPs: CSIM, procurement packs, documentation/reporting artifacts, and GRM/SEAH procedures are adopted as official CIIP SOP annexes referenced in ToR and contracts.
No-objection and disclosure flow: map roles/timelines with NDA/CEP; add gate reviews to key disclosure/engagement and deliverable milestones; publish disclosure calendars (where applicable).
Institutional roles and practices inside the entity/country framework
RACI and accountability: each SOP/tool has an Owner (responsible) and Approver (accountable); reflected in job descriptions/performance plans.
Steering/PMC cadence: monthly Steering Committee and weekly PMC are codified in a short Governance Note (agenda, quorum, minutes, action tracking).
Procurement & finance governance: maker–checker in e-banking, sanctions/PEP/adverse media re-screening at least quarterly (and event-based upon list updates/material adverse media), and prior to payments where applicable, cashless payments only, monthly bank reconciliations; all anchored in CIIP's Financial Procedures.
Institutional roles and practices inside the entity/country framework

- RACI an accountability: each indicator and SOP has an Owner (responsible) and Approver (accountable); these are inserted into job descriptions/performance plans.
- Steering/PMC cadence: monthly Steering Committee and weekly PMC are codified in a short Governance Note (agenda, quorum, minutes, action tracking).
- Procurement and finance governance: maker–checker in e-banking, sanctions/PEP/adverse media re-screening at least quarterly (and event-based upon list updates/material adverse media), and prior to payments where applicable, cashless payments only, monthly bank reconciliations; all anchored in CIIP's Financial Procedures.

3) Sustainability Mechanisms
Continuous learning and knowledge sharing
Knowledge base: SharePoint/Drive library with all SOPs, forms, single source of truth with version control.
Community of Practice (CoP): bi-monthly 60-min knowledge huddles (show-and-tell on procurement lessons, GRM cases, compliance/documentation fixes).
After-action reviews: brief AARs after each procurement, consultation, training cycle, or major deliverable; distilled "Do/Don't" notes added to the handbook.
Peer network: maintain the peer-DAE/IAE channel (via CPDAE/CBDAE where applicable) for Q&A for 6–12 months post-grant.
Results and institutionalization KPIs
Adoption: ≥80% of new procurements use the official RfP pack; 100% CN/FP drafts use CSIM + checklists.
Capability: ≥80% targeted staff show post-test improvement; ≥70% pass task-based assessment (file quality).
MRV/RBM: 100% indicators have passports & named owners; ≥90% data submissions pass QA/QC on first review.
Engagement & GRM: 100% activities have documented SEP/GRM evidence; ≥90% GRM cases resolved within SLA.
Sustainability: CIIP meets bi-monthly for 12 months.

9.2 Readiness Programme Closure

Asset Transfer Plan (sustainability post-readiness)
The project will implement a structured Asset Transfer Plan to ensure the effective transition and long-term sustainability of all tangible and intangible assets created or procured under the readiness grant. The Plan will cover: (i) tangible assets (e.g., ICT/equipment, if any), and (ii) intangible assets (manuals, SOPs, templates, training materials, datasets with metadata, system configurations, and any project accounts/access credentials). The designated beneficiaries will be clearly identified upfront—CIIP as the primary beneficiary and custodian (DAE Support Window), and, where relevant for country-programming outputs, CEP/NDA and nominated line-ministry focal points as secondary beneficiaries for specific materials/products. The transfer process will be documented, agreed, and signed-off by the relevant parties to ensure beneficiaries are fully prepared to take ownership and responsibility for the assets.
Key elements of the Asset Transfer Plan include:

- Inventory and classification: a Master Asset Register listing each asset, description, location (if tangible), format/version (if intangible), associated documentation, and intended beneficiary/custodian.
- Ownership and licensing: clear assignment of intellectual property (IP) to CIIP (as applicable) and defined licensing for shareable materials (e.g., open licensing such as CC BY 4.0 where appropriate).
- Data protection: all datasets will be anonymized (as applicable) and transferred with metadata, data dictionaries, and agreed access rules.
- Access & credential transfer: accounts/configurations will be transferred under dual control with MFA enabled, and all consultant access will be revoked upon handover.
- Acceptance criteria and documentation: each asset cluster will have a named Custodian, minimum O&M arrangements (including budget responsibility where relevant), and acceptance criteria. Transfer will be evidenced through signed Handover Forms and a Final Acceptance Certificate approved by the CIIP Director (and endorsed by the Steering/oversight body where applicable).