## United Nations Development Programme



Regional Bureau for Africa GEF/GCF Checklist Clearance Slip							
Subject:	GEF Clerance Checklist – UNDP Namibia Country Office						
Reviewed by:	Gloria Witherspoon, Country Programme Analyst Country desk	<u>Signature</u> Cloria Witherspoon <u>Signature</u> Owen Shuml	Date: 17 March 2021				
Cleared by:	Owen Shumba, Regional Advisor, ESA Cluster	Signature Owen Shuml	Date: 19-Mar-2021 И				
Cleared by:	Awa Dabo, Chief Chief of COT	<u>Signature</u> IWA Daho	22-Mar-2021 Date: 22-Mar-2021				
Approved By:	Noura Hamladji, Deputy Regional Director	Signature	/ Date:				
Remarks:		<u> </u>					

UNDP Check list to be used for projects when submitted to the GEF for CEO endorsement/approval

**Project Name:** Integrated approach to proactive management of human-wildlife conflict and wildlife crime in hotspot landscapes in Namibia (GEF ID: 10244 and GEF Agency Project ID: 6303)

## Background:

Reference is made to the OAI Audit report in relation to UNDP's management of GEF-supported projects (issued on 1 December 2020). Any actions undertaken in relation to the project shall require strict adherence to <u>all</u> recommendations and associated management actions plans set out in the OAI report. Pursuant to the decisions of the GEF Council during the 59th GEF Council meeting, UNDP is required by GEF Council, at the time of seeking CEO Endorsement/approval, to demonstrate that this project design meets all of the 2020 OAI audit recommendations as a prerequisite for further consideration and review by the GEF Secretariat. The project proposal will also be subject to 2<sup>nd</sup> review and approval by Council as a condition for CEO endorsement/approval. Consequently (and contrary to earlier practices), please note that funding is not assured unless and until these preconditions have been met and duly confirmed and submitted to the GEF Secretariat.

## Checklist:

Project address all concerns raised			ns raised	l	JNDP Assessment	
in the OAI report, based on below			on below	YES	NO	
ass	sessment.				X	check
		Υ	Ν	Additiona	information	
		es	0	(please inclu	de a page reference in the PROL	DOC and/or a link to supporting documents)
Int	ernal Control	Fram	newo	ork (ICF)		
1.	Please			Date of IC	F review by RBA: February	y 2021
	indicate					
	when the			Future dat	e of ICF review: January 2	2022
	Internal					
	Control					
	Framewor					
	k of your					
	Country					
	Office has					
	been					
	validated					
	by the					
	Regional					
	Bureau.					
	Indicate					
	when this					
	will be					
	reviewed					
	again.					
Со	untry Office (	CO) (	apa	cities		
2.	Please	Х		The Namib	bia Country Office (CO) is e	equipped to provide oversight functions

clarify if the CO is equipped to provide proper implement ation support and financial manageme nt of the project in line with UNDP rules and regulations and GEF policies?	<ul> <li>that are consistent with those described in the GEF Programme and Project Cycle Management Guidelines for GEF Agencies, and other relevant policies. These oversight functions will be carried out as part of the Country Office's Country Programme Document (CPD) 2019-2023 Sustainable Environmental Management and Enhancing Resilience (SEMER) Programme Portfolio, in line with the highest standards of UNDP accountability and transparency, and in alignment with the Delegation of Authority (DOA) letter which will be signed between the UNDP CO Resident Representative and the Executive Director of UNDP's BPPS-NCE Environmental Finance unit.</li> <li>The CO has an established track record of providing effective oversight to the implementation of projects under (National Implementation (NIM) conditions, including, but not limited to the GEF-financed portfolio. Currently, the CO oversees 7 GEF projects/programmes at various stages as follows:</li> <li>i) 1 Concept/PIF under development (UNDP PIMS 6589/NC5/BUR5<sup>1</sup>); 2 Hard Pipeline projects (UNDPPIMS / GEF ID 6303/10244 HWC- WC<sup>2</sup> for which this Audit Checklist is being prepared), and TDA/SAP/ CUVECOM<sup>3</sup> 4756/10565); and 4 projects under Implementation (PIMS 6378/10224 BUR4<sup>4</sup>, PIMS 6337/10157 CBIT<sup>5</sup>, PIMS 6540/9426 NILALEG<sup>6</sup>, and PIMS 5313/5753 BCLME III<sup>7</sup>, with midterm review completed).</li> <li>ii) Some of the past projects which were successfully overseen by the CO included: BUR1-3 (PIMS 6084/5521, 5555/9036, 5234/9838); NC4-NCA3 (PIMS 4626/4832); PASS (PIMS 4623/4729), CSP(PIMS 4334/4163); NEEP (PIMS 4110/3793); and CPP (PIMS 3889/3356 &amp; 3886/3355)</li> </ul>
l	<b>\$</b> 5

<sup>1</sup> Namibia's Fifth National Communication (NC5) and Fifth Biennial Update Reports (BUR5) to the UNFCCC; no GEF ID available yet

<sup>2</sup> Integrated approach to proactive management of human-wildlife conflict and wildlife crime in hotspot landscapes in Namibia

<sup>3</sup> Enhanced Water Security and Community Resilience in the Adjacent Cuvelai and Kunene Transboundary River Basins

<sup>4</sup> Namibia's Fourth Biennial Update Report (BUR4) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)

<sup>5</sup> Enhancing Namibia's capacity to establish a comprehensive Transparency Framework for Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) of climate actions and reporting on NDC implementation under the Paris Agreement

<sup>6</sup> Namibia Integrated Landscape Approach for enhancing Livelihoods and Environmental Governance to eradicate poverty

<sup>7</sup> Improving Ocean Governance and Integrated Management in the BCLME

	The proposed project (PIMS6303, GEF ID 10244) will be executed by the designated IP under UNDP's full national implementation modality (NIM), according to the <i>Standard Basic Assistance Agreement</i> (SBAA, 22 March 1990) between UNDP and the Government of Namibia and the <i>UNDP Country Programme Document</i> (CPD) for Namibia (2019-2023) - see <i>Prodoc,page 52.</i>
	The Implementing Partner (UNDP term to describe the Executing Agency), i.e. Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism (MEFT) will assume full responsibility and accountability for the effective use of GEF resources channelled through UNDP, and the delivery of outputs, as set forth in the Prodoc document <i>Refer to Prodoc para 144,page 52</i> . The Implementing Partner will be responsible for appointing a Project Management Unit which will be responsible for day-to-day management and decision making to ensure that the project produces the intended results, as specified in the Prodoc, to the required standard and within the specified time and budget. The project management team, who will be paid directly through the project budget, will report to the Implementing Partner, not the UNDP.
	Note that there is no request for the CO to provide Execution Support to NIM; thus, the UNDP role in this project will be strictly oversight (as GEF IA) with a clear segregation between project implementation/execution (by the MEFT) and oversight services (by UNDP at CO, RSCA and HQ levels).
3. Please provide evidence of CO capacities including the list of subject matter experts to	UNDP Namibia is equipped to provide programmatic and technical oversight support and to manage disbursements to the Executing Entity and oversee their financial management to ensure compliance with all relevant fiduciary standards. This first line of oversight carried out by the Country Office is backed up by a second line of oversight carried out by (i) the Regional Bureau for Africa, to ensure compliance with UNDP Regulations and Rules, and (ii) by the BPPS Nature, Climate and Energy Unit through its regional technical experts (RTA), global principal technical advisors (PTA), regional team leads (RTL) and HQ based Directorate to ensure technical support and compliance with GEF fiduciary standards.
support oversight and provide execution	Names of CO staff who will provide the first line of programmatic and technical oversight, with costs covered through the GEF Agency Fee, are: - Martha Talamondjila Naanda - Programme Specialist/Environmental
support/pr ocurement (when the latter has been	<ul> <li>Focal Point;</li> <li>Megan Van Turah - Operations Manager;</li> <li>Helena Ganes-Gowases – Programme Finance;</li> <li>Mekondjo Hitila - Programme Associate;</li> </ul>

approved by GEF)	Staff who will support oversight functions, with costs covered by non- GEF fees are:
	- Alka Bhatia -Resident Representative;
	- Armstrong Alexis -Deputy Resident Representative;
	- Maano Shimanda - Young Professional/M&E/SC;
	<ul> <li>Herta Josef -Finance Analyst/FT; and</li> </ul>
	- Raili Hasheela - Programme Analyst/SC
	Programming/Oversight Reporting Line: (which is separate from the 'Operational reporting line')
	<ul> <li>DRR directly reports to the RR on both programmatic and operational matters.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Both the Programme Specialist/EFP/Head of Portfolio (programmatic) and Operations Manager (operations) directly report to the DRR who is responsible for both Programme and Operations at the CO.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>The Programme Finance Manager will be reporting to the DRR while the Finance Analyst reports to the Operations Manager.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>The Programme Analyst, M&amp;E and Programme Associate reports to the Programme Specialist</li> </ul>
	No execution support services have been requested.
4. Has the CO put in place the necessary protocols to conduct annual field missions for project oversight support?	The CO has put in place protocols to conduct annual field missions, in line with UNDP corporate requirements to oversee and monitor implementation of the project and to ensure that the GEF resources are being used for the purposes intended. These protocols are outlined in the CO Annual M&E Plan. The CO will conduct one annual field visit for this project, starting, in 2021 and Output Verification and Monitoring visits, one in each quarter. The output verification template will be used and uploaded in the document tab in Atlas and the result is also recorded under the output monitoring tab. These field visits have been appropriately budgeted with costs covered by the GEF Agency Fee.
5. Please indicate	Date last OAI audit : 11-27 August 2020 – report dated 3 November 2020
when the latest internal OAI audit of the	<ul> <li>Qualification: Partially Satisfactory/some improvement needed. This rating was mainly given due to the financial sustainability of the Office being at risk.</li> <li>List outstanding audit recommendations:</li> <li>1.Strengthen project management – (PSC meetings to be held regularly as stipulated in project documents and programme monitoring schedule to be</li> </ul>
Country Office took place?	maintained) - March 2021 2.Improve management of low value grants – February 2021
What was	

0-S

		r	
qualificatio			
n and are			
there any			
outstandin			
g			
-			
	v		
	^		
-			Yes - See SECTION VII, page 52
ities of			
UNDP			
Country			
•			
-			
•			
-			
project			
Has Prodoc	Х		
properly			Yes. See SECTION VII, Page 55.
outlined			
roles and			
responsibil			
	n ove	-	
		X	Not applicable. Execution support services have not been requested by the
			National Implementing Partner; thus, they have not been agreed by the GEF
support			nor has there been any need to sign the LOA with the Government to provid
services			CO support. For this reason, there is no signed LOA attached/annexed to the
have been			Prodoc.
agreed			
-			
with the			
Governme			
nt to			
	there any outstandin g recommen dations? Has Prodoc clearly outlined roles and responsibil ities of UNDP Country Offices and implement ing partners for the oversight of this project Has Prodoc properly outlined roles and responsibil ities of the project boards? <b>Ewall betwee</b> Where execution support services have been agreed with GEF Secretariat , Specify if the LOA	qualification and aren and arethere anyoutstandingrecommendations?Has ProdocClearlyoutlinedroles andresponsibilities ofUNDPCountryOffices andimplementingpartnersfor theoversightof thisprojectHas ProdocXproperlyoutlinedresponsibilities of theprojectHas ProdocXproperlyoutlinedresponsibilities of theprojectboards?wall betweenserviceshave beenagreedwith GEFSecretariat, Specify ifthe LOA	qualificatio n and are here any outstandin g recommen dations? Has ProdocXclearly outlined roles and responsibil ities of UNDP Country Offices and implement ing partners for the oversight of this projectXProperly outlined ities of the project Has ProdocXproperly outlined responsibil ities of the project boards? where services have been agreed with GEF Secretariat , Specify if the LOA

pg. 2

<b></b>		
has been		
duly		
completed		
, cleared		
by BPPS,		
and signed		
by the		
relevant		
parties and		
included as		
Annex to		
the UNDP-		
GEF		
project		
document		
before		
signature		
by the		
Implement		
ing		
Partner,		
Governme		
nt		
Coordinati		
ng Agency		
and UNDP.		
Please		
provide		
the link to		
the LOA.		
9.What		Programmatic, operational and fiduciary oversight and technical quality
Governance		assurance of the project will be ensured at three levels: Country Office,
		Regional UNDP units (both through the Regional Bureau for Africa and the
structures,		
staffing and/or		regional hub of the BPPS-NCE team); and UNDP BPPS-NCE HQ, with oversight
operational		roles and responsibilities defined as per the UNDP RACI Matrix.
measures have		
been put in		At the CO level: the UNDP RR assumes full responsibility and accountability to
place in this		ensure timely implementation of the project as approved (in the Prodoc/CEO
specific project		ER), and to ensure that the project complies with the GEF and UNDP policy
to ensure		frameworks; the DRR approves quarterly financial advances to the NIM
proper		Partner (i.e. MEFT), and ensures that the project's financial management
oversight of		complies with relevant fiduciary standards; the Programme Specialist
this project		provides technical oversight and quality assurance of tasks undertaken by
		the Implementing Partner, ensures completion of the APR/PIR;, conducts
		Output verification, attends the PSC on behalf of the CO, and oversees the
		SEMER portfolio under which this project falls.
		-
		At the RBA (UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa) level: The RBA assumes full
	<u>AC</u>	
	0-S	

		responsibility and accountability to ensure that the CO implements the project in compliance with all UNDP rules and regulations (as per the Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP). The roles and responsibilities of the RBA Director, RBA Deputy Director, the RBA COST Desk Officer in respect of oversight are clearly detailed in UNDPs RACI Matrix. The Desk Officer will be informed and/or consulted at all relevant points and the RBA M&E Coordinator will provide additional monitoring oversight of key M&E milestones - including the MTR and TE. At the BPPS/NCE Regional level: The NCE Regional Team Leader, the assigned Regional Technical Advisor for Ecosystems and Biodiversity, the Regional Programme Associates and the Regional MPSA will fulfil technical quality assurance and fiduciary oversight roles, oversee the ÇOs risk management, and compliance with UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards Policy. BPPS/NCE HQ (New York): The Executive Coordinator remains accountable to the GEF for ensuring that the resources are spent for the intended purpose and in compliance with GEF and UNDP policies and procedures. The Principal Technical Advisor for Ecosystems and Biodiversity shall be responsible for overall technical quality assurance and oversight of risk management. Staff of UNDP's Results-Based Management Team will assist with oversight of M&E and safeguards quality assurance and verification and reporting to the GEF Sec and GEF Trustee at closure.
10. When execution support has been requested by the Government and approved by the GEF, please indicate what provisions have been taken to ensure that a proper firewall between staff providing oversight of	x	Not Applicable - the government of Namibia, i.e. Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism (MEFT) has not requested execution support.

O-S

the	
Implementing	
Partner	
executing the	
project and	
execution on	
behalf of the	
Implementing	
Partner is in	
place at the CO	
level	
Implementing P	
11. Please	PCAT: year undertaken and risk rating - 2019, moderate
indicate the	Will the PCAT be updated at mid-term review of this project? Yes.
risk rating	
outlined in the	HACT: The HACT was completed in 2019 with a moderate risk rating, largely
Partner	linked to a number of HACT findings regarding (i) the Government's use of
Capacity	the Integrated Financial Management System, which is centralized at the
Assessment	Ministry of Finance, to process its accounting transactions and produce its
Tool (PCAT)	financial statements, as well as (ii) the required application and monitoring o
and HACT/	the Governments procurement policies and processes. Risks identified in the
micro	HACT report will be monitored by the CO and other UNDP staff responsible
assessments.	for fiduciary oversight, and will be updated at midterm, based on the
Indicate the	outcomes of the annual monitoring.
year the HACT	
assessment	
was	
undertaken.	
undertaken.	
12. Please	HACT audit date: April 2020
indicate the	The Programme Management Unit and UNDP agree on actions to be taken to
date of the	implement action plan. PMU confirms action taken and verified during
most recent	programme visits, spot checks and audits. In line with the HACT Audit
HACT/NIM	schedules for 2020 expenses, 3 of the 4 projects currently under audit are
audits have	
	GEF projects.
been	https://cards.undp.org/ngonim_reports_view_observations_2019.cfm?org_i
conducted of	d_c=NAM&audit_report_id=694
the selected	
Implementing	
Partner. What	https://intranet-
measures have	apps.undp.org/undp.hq.apps.hact/Pages/search.aspx?Office=NAM
been put in	
place to	
respond to the	
audit findings?	
When	
available,	
avaliable.	

L		
provide a link		
to the		
management		
response		
13. Are there any outstanding HACT/NIM recommendati ons that haven't been addressed? What is the Net Financial Misstatement?		As of now, there are 3 HACT recommendations related to two projects executed by the Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism (MEFT) namely Third Biennial Updated Report (BUR3) and Sustainable Management of Namibia's Forested Lands (NAFOLA). For the BUR3, the MEFT PMU is recommended to stamp all invoices as paid to prevent accidental duplications of payment. For the NAFOLA, it is recommended that the VAT should not be reported as an expense on the FACE form; and it is further recommended that the MEFT PMU should request signed FACE forms to be returned from the UNDP. Lastly, it is recommended that the MEFT PMU to have a form of a computerized fixed asset system. These are all due for implementation verification by the current 2020 HACT Audit. There is no Net Financial Misstatement
		Audit. There is no net Financial Misstatement
14. Please specify what capacities the office has in place to conduct		In 2020, due to the pandemic and its restrictions, exceptional approval was given to the CO by Mr. John Rutere for spot checks to be conducted by an appropriately qualified staff member. Usually, as per the UNDP POPP, spot checks are conducted by a third party. Assurance activities are budgeted for and costs will be covered by the GEF Agency Fee.
periodic spot		
checks and		
monitoring of		
the IP's		
capacities		
Procurement	•	
	x	Yes. Please see Prodoc Annex 18.
procurement plan been elaborated and validated in coordination with the operation team/procure ment unit? Please include the minutes of the validation		
meeting.		At CO loval management and programment staff are required to argue the
16.How does		At CO level, management and procurement staff are required to annually
your office		complete Financial Disclosure forms. The Contracts, Procurement and Assets
identify and	1	Committee and the Technical Evaluation Committees members are required

O-S

manage		to sign Declaration of Impartiality and Confidentiality forms.
conflict of		
interest in		The micro assessment assesses the capacity of the IP, including the
general, and		procurement processes it has in place. The IP undertakes procurement
more		according to government rules and regulations. The ministry has an
specifically		established Procurement Committee/ Economizing Committee which
those arising in		comprises of the requesting Departmental Head, other heads of the ministry
procurement		departments which is inclusive of only senior management. The Head of
decision-		Finance sits on the committee to observe and advise. The procurement
making		committee is headed by a Director in the ministry for any specific
processes at		Directorate.
project level?		
project leven		Where procurements are initiated by the CO, POPP rules and regulations are
		followed. The assurance function performed by UNDP CO reviews processes
		followed by IP.
		At project level, the Project Steering Committee/Board is responsible for
		ensuring that all decisions, including around procurement, are made in
		accordance with standards that ensure best value for money, fairness,
		integrity, transparency, and effective international competition. The Board
		will be responsible for avoiding any real or perceived conflicts of interest, and
		for addressing any project level grievances, in accordance with the project's
		Grievance Redress Mechanism (which will form part of the project's
		safeguards architecture, to be put in place during the first 6 months of
		implementation, in line with requirements of the UNDP SESP - See Prodoc
		Annex 4).
In Risk Manager	1 1	
17. Has the CO	Х	As part of the PPG process we conducted a series of inter-linked risk
conducted a		assessments, including: (i) an assessment of social and environmental
proper risk		safeguard risks the project may trigger, as required by the UNDP Social and
analysis based		Environmental Standards (SES) Policy - ref. SESP Report, Prodoc Annex 4; (ii)
on the project		a UNDP Risks Assessment, to assess risks to successful implementation of the
document?		project (ref Prodoc Annex 5);(iii) a COVID-19 risk-opportunity analysis, and
Does the risk		Action Plan - (ref Prodoc Annex 14); (iv) a Climate Risk Assessment
register fully		conducted in accordance with the GEF-STAP Guidelines on Climate Risk
		conducted in decordance with the GEF STAT Guidennes on emilate hisk
align with the		Assessment ( <i>ref. Prodoc Annex 15</i> ).
align with the risks outlined		Assessment ( <i>ref. Prodoc Annex 15</i> ).
align with the risks outlined in the project		Assessment ( <i>ref. Prodoc Annex 15</i> ). As part of the safeguards risk analysis, a Social and Environmental Screening
align with the risks outlined		Assessment ( <i>ref. Prodoc Annex 15</i> ). As part of the safeguards risk analysis, a Social and Environmental Screening Report (SESP) and Environmental and Social and Management Framework
align with the risks outlined in the project		Assessment ( <i>ref. Prodoc Annex 15</i> ). As part of the safeguards risk analysis, a Social and Environmental Screening Report (SESP) and Environmental and Social and Management Framework (ESMF) was developed (including an Indigenous People's Planning
align with the risks outlined in the project		Assessment ( <i>ref. Prodoc Annex 15</i> ). As part of the safeguards risk analysis, a Social and Environmental Screening Report (SESP) and Environmental and Social and Management Framework (ESMF) was developed (including an Indigenous People's Planning Framework) - Ref Prodoc Annex 8), and these were publicly disclosed on the
align with the risks outlined in the project		Assessment ( <i>ref. Prodoc Annex 15</i> ). As part of the safeguards risk analysis, a Social and Environmental Screening Report (SESP) and Environmental and Social and Management Framework (ESMF) was developed (including an Indigenous People's Planning Framework) - Ref Prodoc Annex 8), and these were publicly disclosed on the UNDP website for a period of 120 days - the executive summary of the ESMF
align with the risks outlined in the project		Assessment ( <i>ref. Prodoc Annex 15</i> ). As part of the safeguards risk analysis, a Social and Environmental Screening Report (SESP) and Environmental and Social and Management Framework (ESMF) was developed (including an Indigenous People's Planning Framework) - Ref Prodoc Annex 8), and these were publicly disclosed on the UNDP website for a period of 120 days - the executive summary of the ESMF was translated into six local languages to maximize accessibility to local
align with the risks outlined in the project		Assessment ( <i>ref. Prodoc Annex 15</i> ). As part of the safeguards risk analysis, a Social and Environmental Screening Report (SESP) and Environmental and Social and Management Framework (ESMF) was developed (including an Indigenous People's Planning Framework) - Ref Prodoc Annex 8), and these were publicly disclosed on the UNDP website for a period of 120 days - the executive summary of the ESMF
align with the risks outlined in the project		Assessment ( <i>ref. Prodoc Annex 15</i> ). As part of the safeguards risk analysis, a Social and Environmental Screening Report (SESP) and Environmental and Social and Management Framework (ESMF) was developed (including an Indigenous People's Planning Framework) - Ref Prodoc Annex 8), and these were publicly disclosed on the UNDP website for a period of 120 days - the executive summary of the ESMF was translated into six local languages to maximize accessibility to local communities.
align with the risks outlined in the project		<ul> <li>Assessment (<i>ref. Prodoc Annex 15</i>).</li> <li>As part of the safeguards risk analysis, a Social and Environmental Screening Report (SESP) and Environmental and Social and Management Framework (ESMF) was developed (including an Indigenous People's Planning Framework) - Ref Prodoc Annex 8), and these were publicly disclosed on the UNDP website for a period of 120 days - the executive summary of the ESMF was translated into six local languages to maximize accessibility to local communities.</li> <li>The Project's Risk Register (Annex 5) will be uploaded into the UNDP ATLAS</li> </ul>
align with the risks outlined in the project	ØS	Assessment ( <i>ref. Prodoc Annex 15</i> ). As part of the safeguards risk analysis, a Social and Environmental Screening Report (SESP) and Environmental and Social and Management Framework (ESMF) was developed (including an Indigenous People's Planning Framework) - Ref Prodoc Annex 8), and these were publicly disclosed on the UNDP website for a period of 120 days - the executive summary of the ESMF was translated into six local languages to maximize accessibility to local communities.

		Risk Management is also discussed in the Prodoc on pages71 - 73. Table 3 provides a summary of the overall risks to project implementation (page 34 - 37)
17. List the frequency the risks will be monitored, and by whom. Explain how risks are monitored by the CO.	x	Risks will be monitored following UNDP standards for risk management as follows: at PSC meetings, where they will be reported by the s Project Manager (still to be hired), the UNDP CO EFP (Martha Naanda,) and the National Project Director (Bennett Kahuure, from the MEFT); , as part of the GEF APR/PIR (By the PM, EFP and RTA); in ATLAS as part of the enterprise risk management by EFP (Martha Naanda), and in the CO Integrated Work Plan (IWP) as part of the annual 2021-2026 IWPs, escalated at appropriate levels with risk owners including Alka Bhatia (Resident Representative), Armstrong Alexis (Deputy Resident Representative), Martha Naanda- Programme Specialist and Head of Portfolio aka EFP)and specifically in response to the SES) <i>ref. Prodoc Risk Management page 70-71</i> . During the Project Board/PSC meeting risks will be reviewed and updated; in the ATLAS systems risks will be monitored quarterly; and the SESP risks ( <i>ref. Prodoc Annex 4: Social and</i> <i>Environmental Screening Procedure</i> ) will be reviewed and updated during the inception phase, annually as part of the PIR, and at mid-term review, and TE
18. Has risk assessment and	x	A Risk Management Strategy is presented in the Prodoc - paragraphs 110 - 199, and Annexes 4, 5, 15 and 15. Table 3 in the Prodoc provides a summary of the overall risks (pages 34 -37). Also see answer to Q.17 of this checklist.
management been done		
with identified mitigating		
measures documented in		
the Prodoc? Cofinance		
19. Please	X	The CO will monitor and report back on the UNDP co-financing (USD 100,000)
indicate how		annually during the PIR ( <i>ref Table 7 Prodoc page 49 and page 57</i> ). For the
the CO will		Nationally Implemented projects, when significant co-financing is realized in
monitor and		a quarter it will be reported using the Quarterly Standard Progress Report
report back on		and captured during the Output Verification Monitoring visits. The MEFT and
the realization		KfW co-financing (USD 11,715,629) will be tracked and monitored by the
of co-financing		Project Manager who will be based at the MEFT, to which the co-financing by
included in the		KfW was pledged ( <i>ref. to Prodoc Page 57</i> ). This co-finance data will be
UNDP GEF		collated annually and reported as part of the PIR.
Project Document		
Time tracking		
20. Please	x	Project Oversight. Staff of the CO (PS, DRR, RR, OM, etc.) comply with the
specify if you		GEF Time sheet which is completed annually ( <i>ref. Table 7 Prodoc page 49</i> ).
currently have		Further, the CO conducts workload surveys (last one conducted in December
	<u>A</u> C	

a system in	2020) to capture staff time dedicated to UNDP development effectiveness
place to trace	and time related to development services. The UNDP RTA/and other regional
time dedicated	support staff track time spent on oversight activities in the PIMS+ Time
to providing	Module system.
oversight of	
this project	
and separately	
execution	
support.	

OS

Alka Bhatia

Date: 16 March 2021

Signature/Clearance:

Alka Bhatia

UNDP Namibia Resident Representative

V. 'dy.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

22-Mar-2021

Signature/Clearance:

Noura Hamladji

Regional Bureau for Africa, Deputy Regional Director

Pradeep kunukulasuniya

Signature/Clearance:

Pradeep Kurukulasuriya

UNDP BPPS-NCE Executive Coordinator

23-маг-2021 Date:\_\_\_\_\_