



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5343		
Country/Region:	Namibia		
Project Title:	Scaling Up Community Resilience to Climate Variability and Climate Change in Northern Namibia, with a Special Focus on Women and Children.		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4711 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$3,050,000
Co-financing:	\$40,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$43,700,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Jessica Troni

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	YES. Namibia is a non-Annex I country party to the UNFCCC and is eligible under the SCCF.	
Resource Availability	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated March 19, 2013, has been attached to the submission.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
Resource Availability	• the STAR allocation?		
Resource Availability	• the focal area allocation?		
Resource Availability	• the LDCF under the principle of		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	YES. The proposed grant (\$3,339,750) including Agency fee is available under the SCCF Adaptation Program (SCCF-A).	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1 and CCA-3.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	YES. The project is consistent with Namibia's National Development Plan 4 (NDP4). The PIF also lists several policies (pgs. 23-27), such as the National Climate Change Policy, National Disaster Risk Management Policy and National Gender Policy, that are in line with the proposed SCCF project objective.	
	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Overall, three government-led baseline projects, as described, are relevant for the proposed SCCF project: the Green Scheme, Dry Land Crop Production and Food for Work/Cash for Work programmes (pgs. 9-10).</p> <p>However, baseline investment amounts are not included in project descriptions on pg. 9, and it is therefore unclear how baseline investments relate to project</p>	

shown in Tables B and C.

Moreover, please indicate the timing of the investments proposed under the Green Scheme and Food for Work/Cash for Work.

Finally, the PIF does not specifically describe activities carried out under the Green Scheme within the regions (Kavango, Ohangwena, Oshana, Omusati and Oshikoto) in which the proposed SCCF project will be implemented.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify (1) how baseline projects relate to project components and the indicative co-financing, by including specific investment amounts with each baseline project description; (2) indicate the timing of investments proposed under the Green Scheme and Food for Work/Cash for Work; and (3) activities under the Green Scheme initiative within regions targeted by the proposed SCCF project.

04/11/2013 – NOT CLEAR. The Agency has responded to all recommendations, but the responses have yet to be fully incorporated into the PIF. In particular, the indicative co-financing associated with the baseline initiatives could be provided on pp. 9-10 of the re-submission. In the same section, the revised PIF could also provide information about the activities carried out under the Green Scheme within the regions targeted by the proposed SCCF project.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please

		<p>above recommendations (1) and (3) are incorporated into the revised PIF.</p> <p>04/12/2013 â€“ YES. The outstanding issues have been adequately addressed.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. First, please refer to sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>As the project aims to prioritize women, some "expected outputs" could be disaggregated by gender (as appropriate), therefore highlighting the number/percentage of women to be targeted. For example, this would be particularly useful for outputs 1.1, 1.3 and 1.6.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please (1) revise the project framework accordingly, and (2) consider disaggregating outputs 1.1, 1.3 and 1.6 by gender.</p> <p>04/11/2013 â€“ YES.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. First, please see section 6.</p> <p>The proposed SCCF project aims to implement climate-smart agricultural and livelihood diversification methods in smallholder farming communities in the North-Central region of Namibia. However, the PIF could further detail the criteria for selecting the targeted 4000 smallholder farmers/households, as described under outcome 1.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under section 6 above, please (1) revise the additional reasoning accordingly, as</p>	

		<p>smallholder farmers/households will be selected under component 1.</p> <p>04/11/2013 -- YES. The additional reasoning has been strengthened as recommended.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>YES. Public participation is adequately considered for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>YES. The PIF includes an analysis of environmental, organizational, social and political risks (pg.21); and provides sound mitigation measures for each.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>YES. The project is consistent several related initiatives, such as the US-Funded Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) Compact and the USAID-funded CULSA (pgs. 21-22). The project also aims to build on lessons learned from the GEF Small Grants Programme CBA pilot and SPA project in Namibia.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not why not 	<p>NOT CLEAR. The project includes a number of innovative aspects as noted on pg. 19 of the PIF. Notably, the project's focus on women does ensure overall project sustainability, as over 80% of the project beneficiary households in the North-Central region are headed by</p>	

	<p>for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>However, please address recommendations under sections 6 and 8, before the project's overall innovativeness and potential for scale-up can fully be assessed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please revisit the description of innovative aspects, sustainability and scaling up, as appropriate.</p> <p>04/11/2013 -- YES. The PIF identifies several innovative aspects, notably a very strong focus on women and youth; scaling up a self-help group methodology successfully piloted through the community-based adaptation program; a partnership with the Namibia National Farmers' Union; and the introduction of rainfall and floodwater harvesting through a social safety net program.</p> <p>Thanks to enhanced access to savings and credit schemes, a consistent focus on mainstreaming adaptation into rural development based on experiential evidence, and strong stakeholder-drivenness, the proposed project is well placed to generate sustainable adaptation benefits with considerable potential for scaling up.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-</p>		

	design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please see section 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please revisit the grant and co-financing figures per component, as appropriate.</p> <p>04/11/2013 -- YES. The indicative co-financing amounts per component have been adjusted as recommended.</p>	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Table C does not reflect UNDP co-financing.</p> <p>Also see section 6.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under section 6, please (1) include GEF Agency co-financing amount in Table C, and (2) adjust co-financing figures in Table B as appropriate.</p> <p>04/11/2013 -- YES. In line with its role, UNDP would bring \$500,000 in indicative co-financing towards the proposed project. The co-financing figures have been adjusted as recommended.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>NOT CLEAR. \$150,000 slightly exceeds 5% of the sub-total for components 1-3.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the SCCF funding level for project management does not exceed 5 per cent of the sub-total for project</p>	

		04/11/2013 “ YES. The Agency provides adequate justification for slightly exceeding the recommended SCCF funding level for project management.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	YES. A PPG of \$150,000 has been requested and will be recommended once the PIF is ready for clearance.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 13, 16 and 17. 04/11/2013 “ NOT YET. Please refer	

		04/12/2013 â€“ YES.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	April 04, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 11, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 2013	

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**