

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

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10157

Countries

Namibia

Project Name

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

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

4/15/2020

Review completed by PM

11/13/2020

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 23, 2020:

There is no change from the PIF and the project remains aligned with the CBIT strategy. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 23, 2020:

Partially. In table B the outputs of Component 2 are about quality control, activity data enhanced, training, guidelines, collection of data regarding support. It is unclear how these outputs will allow to achieve the expected outcome which includes obtaining GHG inventories enhanced. Please clarify how concretely the expected result of this component is obtained.

July 2nd, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, June 07, 2020:

In Component 2 there are two outcomes: 2.1 Enhancement of greenhouse gas inventories as per gaps and needs previously identified and 2.2 Building MRV capacities of support. Within outcome 2.1, there are three outputs which are related to quality control and enhancement of documentation management (2.1.1), enhancement of activity data (2.1.2) and training on GHG emission inventories (2.1.3). Output 2.1.1 will result in the implementation of a quality assurance and quality control (QA/QC) system. QA/QC systems allow to verify systematically that the data used, methodologies applied, and results obtained in the inventory are in line with IPCC guidelines, and are a requirement of 2006 IPCC Guidelines for ascertaining the quality of the inventories. This QA/QC system is now missing in Namibia, so the implementation of a QA/QC system will improve the overall quality of the inventory. Output 2.1.2 will result in the improvement of the data used by the inventory. The improvement of the data used by the inventory will enable to improve the estimations made (the quality of the data is an essential element for the quality of the calculation results of the inventory) and thence the inventory will be improved/enhanced. The areas of improvement for the activity data were identified by the United Nations Framework Convention of Climate Change (UNFCCC) in a quality assurance exercise performed in the Namibia inventory in July 2018. Output 2.1.3 will result in an improved capacity of the experts involved in the GHG emission inventory in Namibia. An improved capacity will allow national experts to estimate the GHG emission inventory in a sustainable manner, not relying in external support and improving the quality of the inventory in the long term.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 23, 2020:

Yes. \$50,000 in-kind co-financing from The Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism and \$10,000 as grant co-financing from UNDP have been confirmed. Nevertheless, we note that in the project description under section 1.a.5 on incremental cost reasoning, the text says "In-kind co-financing now totals USD 1,160,000". Please correct and ensure consistency throughout all the information provided.

July 2nd, 2020:

Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, June 07, 2020:

Noted. This text has been changed under section 1.a6 in the CEO Endorsement request, page 25. The text now reads as follows:

(...) The incremental cost reasoning of the project has not changed from the PIF stage. The project is financed through a GEF grant of USD 1,100,000, USD 10,000 in cash co-financing to be administered by UNDP and USD 50,000 in other co-financing. Section VIII of the accompanying UNDP project document provides a summary of project co-financing by donor.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 23, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 23, 2020:

Yes. Out of \$50,000, \$19,374 have been spent and the rest is committed. Nevertheless, the Annex doesn't provide any information regarding the kind of expenditure. Please indicate in the table provided the main kind of expenditure and their associated cost.

July 2nd, 2020:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, June 07, 2020:

Updated information is provided in Annex C of the CEO endorsement request, as follows:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: US\$ 50,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted amount</i>	<i>Amount spent to date</i>	<i>Amount committed</i>
Conducting Technical Review (Design technical components, as well as financial and administrative components of the project)	24,500.00	15,200.00	9,300.00
Finalising Institutional Arrangements and Financial Planning	13,000.00	10,951.00	2,049.00
Stakeholder Consultation and Validation Workshop	12,500.00	787.00	11,713.00
Total	50,000.00	26,938.00	23,062.00

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/ adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 23, 2020:

There are no change from the PIF. Cleared.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/ adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 23, 2020:

There is no explanation of the problems, root causes and drivers specifically related to the implementation of the expected transparency framework (such as capacity, institutional arrangements, coordination, available data...) in order to justify the activities considered in the project. Please elaborate clearly, in the Portal under the appropriate section 1.a.a, about the existing issues the project needs to address.

July 2nd, 2020:

Thank you for the additional information. Nevertheless, we don't find the expected information on the problems, root causes and drivers specifically related to the implementation of the transparency framework under the right section 1.a.1. We do find it, but under the baseline scenario (section 1.a.2). Please place this information under the right section 1.a.1.

September 30, 2020:

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, September 29, 2020

Thanks for your comment. We have moved this information from 1.a.2 to 1.a.1. The text is highlighted in blue color for easy reference

UNDP, June 07, 2020:

Further information is provided in Part II Project justification of the CEO endorsement request (see pages 5-18) under 1.a.1 on the problems, root causes and drivers specifically related to the implementation of the transparency framework; and under 1.a.2. on the baseline scenario, in order to justify the activities considered in the project. This information was also provided in sections II and III of the ProDoc which is sent enclosed to the CEO Endorsement request.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 23, 2020:

The proposal refers to PIF arguing that the baseline scenario has not changed significantly during the project preparation period. In the PIF, we find a sentence like "The Fourth National Communication, to be submitted in December 2019, will provide a GHG inventory...". Has it been submitted now? Please provide in this section the requested and updated information focusing only on the information needed to explain the existing arrangements, initiatives, current relevant works and capacities the project will build on. There is no need to copy-paste here parts of other documents such as the NDC if the information doesn't clearly contribute to understand the rationale of the proposed activities (such as the tables 3, 4 and 5 in the PIF).

July 2nd, 2020:

Thank you for the updated information. Nevertheless, the section 1.a.2 is a copy-paste of the prodoc which includes also information related to the identified problems, root causes and drivers that should be included in the section 1.a.1. Please provide in this section the necessary information focusing only on the information needed to explain the existing arrangements, initiatives, current relevant works and capacities the project will build on.

September 30, 2020:

Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, September 29, 2020:

Thanks for your comment. We have moved the information on identified problems, root causes and drivers from 1.a.2 to 1.a.1. The information within 1.a.2 is now limited to existing arrangements, initiatives, current relevant works and capacities the project will build on..

UNDP, June 07, 2020:

The fourth NC has been just submitted to the UNFCCC and is available at <https://unfccc.int/documents/210615>

The CEO endorsement request includes now updated information under section 1.a.2 within Part II Project justification (page 11 of the CEO endorsement request), as follows:

The UNDP-GEF Namibia's Fourth National Communication (NC4) Project, built from BUR3 and other previous NCs, in terms of further strengthening the institutional arrangements for NCs and BURs. The project enabled Namibia to update its national GHG inventory dating back to 1991, as per the recommendations from the ICA process, and to the recent year of 2015. Unlike BURs, NC4 also undertook a vulnerability and adaptation assessment. The assessment took a human centered approach, by combining three variables: exposure, vulnerability and adaptive capacity, to produce a vulnerability hotspot map for Namibia. NC4 was submitted on 19th March 2020. Gender equality considerations have been included in previous NCs and BURs only in a cursory manner. It is critical that gender equality considerations are firmly integrated in the development of future reports in order to better reflect the situation of women and identify gender-responsive mitigation and adaptation actions.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 24, 2020:

The component 2 doesn't clearly include all the sectors of the NDC such as energy and IPPU. Please explain how these sectors will be taken into account.

July 2nd, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, June 07, 2020:

NDC is specifically included in component 3. Component 2, in its outcome 2.1 is about the GHG emission inventory. The GHG emission inventory is addressed as a whole for all IPCC sectors (Energy, IPPU, Waste and AFOLU) in outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.3. The activities of these two outputs are cross-cutting, affecting all sectors of the inventory. That is why IPCC sectors are not mentioned specifically in these two outputs. Please note that it is not in line with IPCC guidelines to talk about a QA/QC system for the energy or IPPU sector; these elements need to cover all IPCC sectors to be in line with 2006 IPCC good practices. The only reference to IPCC sectors related to the inventory is made in Output 2.1.2, where the main improvements areas identified in the QA activity performed by the UNFCCC in July 2018 are detailed. No major specific improvements areas were identified for the energy and IPPU sectors in the QA activity. Nevertheless, please note that the review and enhancement of the activity data of the inventory will start with the analysis of the whole inventory and the identification of gaps. If further gaps are identified in these two IPCC sectors (Energy and IPPU), they will be addressed. Please check the activities described within Output 2.1.2:

- Analyse the completeness of the inventory based on the latest GHG emission inventory available and the latest improvements carried out. Identify activities which occur in the country but are not currently estimated by the inventory.
- Based on the identification of gaps in the inventory, develop a roadmap for filling these gaps using national and international data sources.
- Identify proxies available at national and international level to fill gaps in existent databases, if applicable.
- Carry out estimations using the splicing techniques described in 2006 IPCC Guidelines for filling gaps in existent databases, if applicable.
- Improving the current emission estimates made in the inventory by (this are the main areas of improvement identified in the QA exercise):
 - o Improving the activity data for the AFOLU sector through production of new maps to generate land use changes activity data, carbon stocks change and emission factors, possibly using remote sensing images for confirming the assumptions and data used.
 - o Develop the digestible energy (DE) factor for livestock as country-specific data is better than the default IPCC value to address this key category fully at Tier 2;
 - o Refine data collection for determining country-specific (CS) weights for dairy cows, other cattle, sheep and goats;

New text has been added in the CEO endorsement request, page 23, specifying that The QA exercise held in July 2018 (as mentioned in the development challenge), which identified major improvements areas in the AFOLU, waste and product use sectors, will guide the prioritization of activity data enhancements. Furthermore, please note that the enhancement of the GHG emission inventory will build from the latest developments carried out in the country. Specifically, the project will consider the ongoing developments under the Climate Promise initiative, which is supporting the improvement of the inventory for NDC tracking. The climate Promise initiative has been added under section 6 Institutional Arrangement and Coordination, page 48 of CEO endorsement request.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 24, 2020:

The text only says the project is fully aligned with the Programming Directions for the CBIT but doesn't explain how. Please elaborate further (in a concise way) how the proposed activities and expected results are aligned with each of the 3 CBIT objectives as per paragraph 85 of the COP decision adopting the Paris Agreement.

July 2nd, 2020:

Thank you for the additional information. cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, June 07, 2020:

Updated information is provided in the CEO endorsement request on the alignment of the project with Programming Directions for the CBIT (see pages 25-26 of the CEO), as follows:

a) strengthening national institutions for transparency-related activities in line with national priorities;

The CBIT project includes numerous capacity building activities for national institutions on the main climate change transparency areas. The capacity of the institutions will be significantly strengthened and ready for meeting the transparency provisions of the Paris Agreement. The following is the list of capacity building activities defined in the CBIT:

- Within output 1.1.1: Capacity building activities to enhance technical knowledge on the key components of the MRV and the enhanced transparency framework international requirements. Specifically, the capacity building will cover 2006 IPCC guidelines, assessment of the impact of climate change policies and measures and information requirements under the enhanced transparency framework.
- Within output 1.1.3: Training for stakeholder in the use of the MRV system
- Within output 1.1.4: Provide training and ongoing capacity strengthening for data providers and project experts on gender considerations in data collection and analysis.

- Output 2.1.3. is entirely dedicated to capacity building on GHG inventories and on the use of the IPCC 2006 guidelines and its software.
- Within Output 2.2.3: A training programme will be developed on the tracking of climate change expenditure and support received for implementing climate change activities.
- Within Output 3.1.2: Capacity building will be provided on the use of the methodology to keep track of progress in the implementation of the NDC. The methodology will use the MRV system in place, so this capacity building will be aligned with the development of output 1.1.3. for the development of an integrated MRV system (hardware and software).

b) providing relevant tools, training, and assistance for meeting the provisions stipulated in Article 13 of the Agreement;

The CBIT project will support the implementation of an MRV system that will facilitate the continuous elaboration of national reports meeting the information provisions stipulated in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement. The implementation of the MRV system is specifically addressed under output 1.1.3 of the CBIT and complemented in other outputs of the project (such as output 2.2.1 for the support component of the MRV and output 3.1.2 for the development of a progress tracking tool of the NDC).

Furthermore, the CBIT project will extensively provide capacity training in all the components of the enhanced transparency framework (see previous bullet).

c) assisting the improvement of transparency over time.

The main objective of the MRV system that will be implemented through the CBIT is to facilitate the collection and generation of information following international best practices and IPCC Guidelines for ensuring the sustainable preparation of national reports, thus enhancing the transparency of the climate change efforts of the country. The MRV system will provide Namibia with the institutional structure, the templates and tools to transparently report on all the elements covered in article 13 of the Paris Agreement.

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 24, 2020:

The incremental reasoning is unclear and should refer to the baseline. Please explain how the activities proposed in the project build on and articulate with the existing baseline to achieve the expected outcomes.

July 2nd, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, June 07, 2020:

A detailed description of the incremental reasoning of the project is provided in section III of the ProDoc document. The CEO endorsement request (page 26) has been updated to clearly reflect the incremental reasoning referring to the baseline, as follows:

Namibia has been making progress in implementing its reporting commitments under the UNFCCC, including the improvement of its GHG Inventory in terms of both completeness and accuracy, and in developing GHG emission projections for submitting its NDC. This progress has been possible due to ad hoc support for capacity building activities under each National Communication. However, the country still lacks the necessary institutional arrangements to formalize the process of continuous monitoring and reporting on climate change. Without an official, ongoing process for climate change MRV, it will not be possible to improve data availability and quality, nor will it be possible to generate the information necessary to inform climate-resilient policies and decision-making in Namibia. In the absence of this project, the government would be able to make limited improvements in narrow areas of its GHG inventory, and it would have a set of stand-alone national reports on climate change action on which to base its decisions. However, it would lack the formal arrangements necessary to establish a transparency framework, and its organizations and experts would not have sufficient tools and training to gather a holistic picture of mitigation and adaptation activities. Finally, it would be limited in the amount of information it could exchange with other parties to the Paris agreement, including tracking its progress towards its NDC, and it would not be able to adopt international good practice quickly. In summary, the country would not be able to participate meaningfully in the implementation of the Paris Agreement.

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 24, 2020:

Please indicate in addition that the project will benefit to 200 relevant stakeholders contributing indirectly, through the enhancement of the national climate transparency framework, to climate mitigation and adaptation benefits.

July 2nd, 2020:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, June 07, 2020:

Section 1.a.6) of the CEO endorsement request (page 26) now describes that the project will benefit to 200 relevant stakeholders contributing indirectly, through the enhancement of the national climate transparency framework, to climate mitigation and adaptation benefits.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 24, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

DS, April 19, 2019:

Project is proposed to take place at the national level, therefore including the entire country.

PM, April 24, 2020: The project is at country level. Cleared.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 24, 2020:

1. We don't understand why this section includes an "Annex 7", a "table 7" while there is no table 6 and which is the same table as the one presented at the beginning of the section and the long template called "Combined Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) and Project Validation Meeting for the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency and Monitoring, Reporting & Verification (CBIT-MRV) Project". Please adjust accordingly and summarize the outcomes of the validation meeting.

2. There is no information under the paragraph requesting to "provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement". Please complete accordingly.

3. Regarding the role civil society will play in the project, the box "co-financier" is tagged. Nevertheless there is no co-financing identified in the budget from civil society. Please explain.

July 2nd, 2020:

1. We acknowledge the new and relevant paragraph but we don't understand the rest of the response as the Annex 7, the table 7, the table 9 and the long and useless template called "Combined Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) and Project Validation Meeting for the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency and Monitoring, Reporting & Verification (CBIT-MRV) Project" are still in the CEO endorsement approval. In addition, the table 7 is repeated. Please address this comment.

2. We don't see in the CEO endorsement approval any added text as stated in the response. Please address this comment.

3. The "co-financier" is still tagged for civil society in the CEO endorsement approval. Please address this comment.

September 30, 2020:

The table 9 and the LPAC template are still in the CEO Endorsement request. Please remove them.

October 13, 2020:

Thank you for the modification. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, October 2, 2020

Table 9 and the LPAC template were removed

UNDP, September 29, 2020:

1. 1. Annex 7 has been reviewed, deleting the LPAC template. No table 7 is now present in the CEO endorsement.
2. 2. Language summarizing the stakeholder consultation is present now in the CEO endorsement
3. 3. This has been untagged.

UNDP, June 07, 2020:

Bullet 1. The numbering of the table has been changed (as annexes should be numbered independently from the ProDoc main text); The numbering of the table is now 1. A new paragraph has been added before the LPAC minutes (page 104 of ProDoc) as a summary, as follows:

“A combined Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) and Project Validation Meeting for the Capacity Building Initiative Transparency and Monitoring, Reporting & Verification (CBIT-MRV) Project was held on Thursday, 13 February 2020 TIME: 08:00 – 15:00.

The project was validated by stakeholders in this workshop, which counted with a very high representation, evidencing the high commitment of stakeholders with the project. The minutes of the workshop and the list of participants is provided in the following”

Bullet 2. New text has been added to the CEO endorsement request, sub-section stakeholders in page 29, as follows:

The stakeholder engagement arrangements for the project are as follows. The project manager will be responsible for monitoring and supporting ongoing stakeholder involvement during project implementation. The MRV system will serve as the main platform for stakeholder coordination in the future climate changes activities in the country. Until the MRV platform is developed (under outcome 1.1.3 of the CBIT project) the exchange of information with stakeholders will be performed using a dedicated electronic platform (such as Dropbox or SharePoint) and through e-mail. The project will track participation in the working groups (V&A, mitigation and GHG emissions working groups), and participation in project events on an ongoing basis in order to monitor stakeholder participation.

Similar information has been added in section IV of the ProDoc, page 41.

Bullet 3. This was a mistake in the preparation of the CeO endorsement request. "co-financier" has been un-tagged for civil society.

Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities?
If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 24, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 24, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 24, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 12 November 2020

Response to the GEF comment from 13 October 2020:

Additional language and risk analysis and beneficiaries against possible future pandemics was added in both CEO Endorsement and PRODOC.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 24, 2020:

Yes. But there is a typo with the national executing partner cited as "MoEP" (also mentioned as "MET" in the stakeholder section). Please correct writing the name entirely here and be consistent throughout the document.

July 2nd, 2020:

The institutional arrangement and coordination for the project implementation remains vague in the CEO endorsement approval. Please provide in this section a clear summary of the section VII of the prodoc, presenting the main functions of the implementing and executing partners and demonstrating the implementing agency will not undertake any executing functions as defined in the GEF policy.

September 30, 2020:

We don't see the additional language in the CEO Endorsement Request as stated in the response and the description says "the project will be managed by UNDP and the MEFT..." which indicates possible executing functions handled by the Implementing Agency. Please address this comment made in the previous review.

October 13, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, October 2, 2020

The additional language is now available at the beginning of the section.

UNDP, September 29, 2020:

Additional language has been added in the CEO endorsement.

UNDP, June 07, 2020:

Thank you for this. Please note that the name of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism has changed to Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism. The name and its acronym have been changed throughout the documents (CEO endorsement and ProDoc).

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 24, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
April 24, 2020:

The knowledge management approach is unclear. Please elaborate further with a timeline and a set of deliverables.

July 2nd, 2020:

Thank you for the information provided. Nevertheless, some deliverables are planned for the year 4 while the project duration is 3 years, which is not possible. Please adjust accordingly.

September 30, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response
UNDP, September 29, 2020:

Thanks for your comment. The project has a duration of 3 years (36 months); however, it is implemented during 4 years (starting in November 2020, and finalizing in year 2023. Years 2020 and 2023 are not full years).

UNDP, June 07, 2020:

Virtual platforms

New text, a timeline and a set of deliverables have been added to the CEO endorsement request, under section 8, page 49, as follows:

The core focus of transparency is the exchange of climate change-related information and knowledge. At the country level, this includes enhanced coordination among existing databases of ministries, agencies, and individual projects, collect and manage climate change data. Within Namibia, this project adopts three core knowledge management approaches.

First, under Output 1.1.3, the project will establish an IT system for climate change MRV stakeholders in Namibia. This IT system, that will be built from existent systems and managed by NSA, would serve as a coordination medium between data providers, data aggregators, and the policy makers. It will also act as a back-end archiving system maintaining disaggregated wealth of country level information. Provision of training for all stakeholders involved in the national climate MRV will ensure that a cadre of trained experts will manage the knowledge sharing process and sustain this in the future as well. Lead experts will come up with meaningful insights from the shared information, including learnings from several initiatives and associated evaluation.

NSA will demonstrate complete transparency by placing relevant information in the public domain for further scrutiny and use by civil society organisations. The entire process will be based on a consultative approach to minimise any oversights.

Second, under output 1.1.5, the project will promote a knowledge-sharing culture through information dissemination activities and through sharing lessons learned at the regional and international level. In this output there is a specific activity in which the development of the national MRV system will be documented by a national researcher, in collaboration with the academia. The whole process of development of the national MRV will be documented to share good practices with third countries implementing climate change MRV systems. This documentation will lead to a publication in a peer reviewed journal, to ensure the quality of the process.

Finally, the project will undertake systematic documentation of project guidance, approaches, technical documentation, curricula, and other knowledge products.

There will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other GEF-funded projects (locally and globally). The project will provide information on a regular basis to GEF-funded global initiatives, such as the Global Support Programme for National Communications and Biennial Update Reports and the CBIT Global Coordination Platform and subsequent initiatives in these areas. The project will also identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned.

The table below provides an overview of key knowledge products by project component, including the timeline for their delivery.

Key Knowledge Products and Timeline for Delivery

<i>Key Knowledge Products</i>		<i>Timeline</i>
<i>Project Component 1</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Documentation of formalized institutional arrangements for transparency · MRV IT system, including system documentation · Documentation on the process of development of the national MRV 	Documentation: Y2 MRV-IT system: Y3 Documentation of development of national MRV: Y4
<i>Project Component 2</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · QA/QC plan and QA/QC system · Guidelines and data collection templates to track support 	<i>QA/QC plan and QA/QC system: Y2-3</i> Guidelines and data collection templates: Y2-3
<i>Project Component 3</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Methodologies and documentation of tool to track NDC 	<i>Documentation and methodologies: Y3</i>
<i>Project component 4: M&E</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Inception report, Project Implementation Reports, terminal evaluation · Reports on training participation by gender and gender mainstreaming in other activities, including website usage. 	<i>M&E reports: see Section 9 of the CEO endorsement request and Annex 3 of the accompanying UNDP ProDoc</i>
<i>Project Management</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Final Report, summary of achievements 	<i>Report/summary:Y4</i>

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 2nd, 2020:

The ESS screening is uploaded in the Portal (Annex 4). Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP 23 November 2020

Response to the comment from 19 November 2020:

The text in SESP annex was revised as per the GEFSec comment. It is now in line with GEF and UNDP policy for ESS screening.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 23, 2020:

Yes, it is the 4th Component of the project. Cleared.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBS or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 24, 2020:

As mentioned above, please indicate in addition that the project will benefit to 200 relevant stakeholders contributing indirectly, through the enhancement of the national climate transparency framework, to climate mitigation and adaptation benefits.

July 2nd, 2020:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, June 07, 2020:

Addressed

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 23, 2020:

In the Annex C, there is no mention of the PPG activities and their respective funding (as already indicated above under box 6. on the status and utilization of the PPG). Please complete.

July 2nd, 2020:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, June 07, 2020:

Addressed

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 23, 2020:

The project results framework is provided in Annex A. The relevant CBIT indicators have been included in the results framework. Cleared.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 23, 2020:

Out of \$50,000, \$19,374 have been spent and the rest is committed. Cleared.

Agency Response

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 23, 2020:

Project is expected to take place at the national level, therefore including the entire country. Cleared.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 24, 2020:

Thank you for this submission. The CEO approval is not yet recommended. Please address the comments raised above.

In addition, please make sure to say what the acronyms stand for at least the first time they appear in the project description of the Portal as they are in the Prodoc (for instance "EDA").

July 2nd, 2020:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments. Some comments are not addressed at all. It might be a Portal issue. Please make sure all the comments are correctly addressed before resubmitting.

September 30, 2020:

Not Yet. Please address the remaining comments.

October 13, 2020:

Thank you for addressing the remaining comments. Nevertheless, the continuous evolution of the COVID-19 pandemic and its already observed and potential consequences on project design and implementation unfortunately obliges us now to consider this important risk too. Some risk and opportunity analysis needs to be undertaken at this stage. Please add a the risk analysis and consider eventual opportunities this project could provide to enhance the resilience of the beneficiaries against possible future pandemics (it can be a specific note after the risk table under the risk section of the CEO endorsement request). For further clarification and possible guidance, we advice to refer to the note "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" shared by GEF Secretariat with the GEF Agencies on September 14.

November 19, 2020:

Thank you for addressing the comments. Nevertheless, we see the uploaded SESP states “As a GEF-funded [NC, BUR, NDC, CBIT or CCCD] project, this project is exempt from the SESP requirement, and therefore the SESP pre-screening is not required.” This statement seems to imply that GEF policy or guidelines exempt CBIT projects in terms of ESS screening, which is not the case. Please remove this statement from the SESP.

November 23, 2020:

Thank you for amending the SESP document as requested. The CEO Endorsement is now recommended.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/24/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/2/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/30/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/13/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/23/2020	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Context

As a Party to the UNFCCC, Namibia is required to periodically communicate relevant information on the Convention implementation. Accordingly, Namibia submitted to the UNFCCC its Initial National Communication (INC) in 2002, its Second National Communication (SNC) in 2011, First Biennial Update Report (BUR1) in 2014, the Third National Communication (TNC) in 2015, its National Determined Contributions (NDC) in 2015, the Second Biennial Update Report (BUR2) in 2016, the Third Biennial Update Report (BUR3) in 2019, and the Fourth National Communication (NC4) in 2020. However, most of these reports were elaborated ad-hoc on a project basis.

Since 2015, Namibia is making efforts to build national capacity and establish the institutional arrangements needed to produce the reports and inform its policies in a sustainable way. Nevertheless, important barriers remain, such as in particular the limited capacity of the institutions to collect and process the required data, inadequate technical capacity for GHG inventory exercise and related lack of data, inadequate framework for provision and management of financial resources including at local level and lack of toll to track the support received and progresses made to achieve the NDC.

Project:

This project will contribute to consolidate the efforts made so far by the country and enhance national capacity to meet the requirements of Namibia as a Party of the UNFCCC and as a signatory to the Paris Agreement.

To address these challenges, the project will be executed by the Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism and contribute to: i) strengthening the institutional arrangements in place for the establishment of a national transparency MRV system ; ii) enhancing the current GHG emission inventory as well as the national capacities on MRV; and iii) developing a tracking tool to enable reporting on progress of NDC implementation. Complementary, this project will aim at enhancing the national capacity on all the MRV elements and increasing the gender balance and mainstreaming in transparency activities. The project also includes a specific component for monitoring and Evaluation.

The scope of the Transparency Framework enhancement will be economy-wide and cover the IPCC key sectors identified in the country: Energy, Industrial Processes and Product Use (IPPU), Agriculture Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) and Waste.

The project is expected to benefit to 200 stakeholders (50% male and female).

Co-financing:

The additional co-financing of \$60,000 is provided in-kind by the Government of Namibia (\$50,000) and as grant by UNDP (\$10,000).