REQUEST FOR: CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: SCCF

For more information about GEF, visit The GEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Scaling up community resilience to climate variability and climate change in Northern Namibia, with a special focus on women and children.			
Country(ies):	Namibia	GEF Project ID:[1]	5343
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4711
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF), Regional Councils (RC), non-government entities, Traditional Authorities	Submission Date: Resubmission Date: Resubmission Date:	25 July 2014 24 Sept 2014 12 Jan 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change	Project Duration(Months)	60 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➢ For SFM/REDD+ ☒ ➢ For SGP ☐	n/a	Agency Fee ($):	289,750

A. **FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK**[2]

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount ($)	Indicative Co-financing ($)
Objective CCA -1: Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level	Outcome 1.1: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas	Output 1.1.1: Adaptation measures and necessary budget allocations included in relevant frameworks	SCCF	2,400,000	19,038,263
Objective CCA-3 : Promote transfer and adoption of adaptation technology	Outcome 3.1 Successful demonstration, deployment, and transfer of relevant adaptation technology in targeted areas	Output 3.1.1 Relevant adaptation technology transferred to targeted groups	SCCF	505,000	659,000
Subtotal				2,905,000	19,697,263
Project management cost				145,000	320,000
Total Project Cost				3,050,000	20,017,263

[1] Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.
[2] Refer to the Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework when completing Table A.

B. Project Framework

Project Objective: **To strengthen the adaptive capacity to reduce vulnerability of rural communities in responding to droughts and floods in Northern Namibia, with a special focus on women and children.**						
Project Component	Grant type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	SCCF	Indicative Grant Amount ($)	Indicative co-financing (cash & in-kind) ($)
Scaling up climate resilient livelihoods	TA INV	Outcome 1: Strengthened capacity of Smallholder farms to implement climate resilient agricultural practices.	1.1 Smallholder advisory and mentorship programme that delivers drought resilient land management and crop production practices established to scale up good practice for 4000 small-holder farmers, 80% of whom are female-headed. 1.2 Community self-help groups formed to promote implementation and replication of climate-smart methods. 1.3 At least 300 trained farmers' field school leaders and coordinators in drought resilient land management practices serving 4,000 households *(Approx cost: US$ 650,000)*	SCCF	1,900, 000	15,246,542
	INV		1.4 4,000 smallholders plant their land in time to catch the first rains 1.5 Fresh vegetables' production through soil improvement and micro-drip irrigation practiced by 2,000 households, including 35% orphan-led households 1.6: Crop diversification away from traditional crop production for 75% of households 1.7: Savings and loan schemes are tested among smallholder farmers to promote replication and the scale up of adaptive practices and technologies *(Approx cost: USD: $1,200,000)*			
	TA		1.8: Market linkages established for dryland products working with the private sector 1.9. Documentation of best practices (*Approx cost: US$ 50,000)*			
Community level flood and drought management	INV	Outcome 2: Small scale agricultural infrastructure introducing to reduce vulnerability to floods and droughts e.g. through restoration of wells and harvesting of floodwater for food security.	2.1 Flood and drought control measures provided to smallholder farmers in flood-prone areas 2.2: Climate-smart Irrigation practiced *(Approx cost: USD: $455,000)*	SCCF	505,000	3,791,721
	TA		Output 2.3: Climate-smart fish farming practiced. *(Approx cost: USD 50,000)*			

Climate Change mainstreaming into agricultural strategy	TA	Outcome 3: Mainstream climate change into national agricultural strategy/sector policy, including adjustments to budgets for replication and up-scaling.	3.1 Impact assessment carried out 3.2 Results-based management plan for climate smart agriculture monitored by main stakeholder groups, led by the Regional Councils. 3.3 NNFU advocacy messages developed and delivered in policy to promote scale-up of climate-smart agricultural methods. 3.4 Regional Councils, line ministries and other partners (Regional platforms - RIPs or their equivalents - led by RCs) include climate-smart agricultural methods, water harvesting, storage and other relevant climate resilience building practices, approaches, techniques and technologies in their annual plans and budgets 3.5 Policy recommendations and a replication plan are developed for continuation of good practice, presented at the project closure workshop and integrated into cross-sectoral and national development planning	SCCF	500, 000	659,000
					2,905,000	19,697,263
PROJECT MANAGEMENT COST					145, 000	320,000
TOTAL PROJECT COST					3,050,000	20,017,263

A. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME ($)

Please include letters confirming co financing for the project with this form

SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING	NAME OF CO-FINANCIER	TYPE OF CO-FINANCING	AMOUNT ($)
NATIONAL GOVERNMENT	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, WATER & FORESTRY	*CASH*	18,757,263
NATIONAL GOVERNMENT	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND TOURISM	IN KIND	400,000
MULTI-LATERAL AGENCY	UNDP	CASH	500,000
MULTI-LATERAL AGENCY	UNDP	IN KIND	360,000
TOTAL CO-FINANCING			**20,017,263**

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES ($) REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY[1]

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	Grant Amount ($) (a)	Agency Fee ($) (b)[2]	Total ($) c=a+b
UNDP	SCCF	CCA	NAMIBIA	3,050,000	289,750	3,339,750
Total Grant Resources						**3,339,750**

[1] In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.
[2] Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS

Component	Grant Amount ($)	Cofinancing ($)	Project Total ($)
International Consultants	250,000	0	250,000
National/Local Consultants*	900,000	120,000	1,020,000

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF[3]

Since PIF, the baseline and co-financing arrangements have changed, and the confirmed key baseline initiatives for this GEF project are:

(1) **The MAWF Dryland Crop Production Programme (DCPP) is the key baseline project**. Components of this programme are co-financing the SCORE project (USD 13,608,247).
(2) The **MAWF Green Scheme** is a MAWF-financed project and it counts for N$3,500,000,000 – equivalent to USD389 million. The full co-financing amount that was foreseen at PIF stage was found to be unsuitable during the PPG phase, however US$ 82,474 for activities realted to small holder faremrs and in/ or near to the project intervention areas have been identified as baseline co-financing..
(3) The MAWF has recently developed (April 2014) the **Comprehensive Conservation Agriculture Programme (CCAP) for Namibia** which is included in the project design as strategic co-financing (US$ 5,066,542). All farmers in the SCORE zones fall in the beneficiary regions. A clear strategy for collaboration will be developed during the inception phase of the SCORE project and once the CCAP is moving into its implementation phase.
(4) The **Integrated Initiative in support of Urban and Peri-Urban Horticulture in Namibia (UPH)** is considered a prospective baseline investment, however, at PPG phase no specific baseline co-financing as identified. The in the PIF identified **MRLGHRD and RCs Food for Work/Cash for Work Programme** will likely continue beyond 2014, however at PPG the new successor programme was not readily identified to serve as project baseline. No co-financing letter was secured.

In terms of design minimal changes were made to the outcomes, mostly to clarify language. Outputs were partially reformulated and shifted between outcomes.

[3] For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter "NA" after the respective question

Outcome 1 was "Smallholder farmer adaptive capacity for implementation of climate resilient agricultural production practices strengthened" and has been changed to "Strengthened capacity of Smallholder farms to implement climate resilient agricultural practices."
Outcome 2 was "Reduced vulnerability to droughts and floods through restoration of wells and harvesting of floodwater for food security." And has been changed to "Small scale agricultural infrastructure introducing to reduce vulnerability to floods and droughts e.g. through restoration of wells and harvesting of floodwater for food security."
These changes were made for the sake of language and outcome clarity.

a) Component 1 an additional output was added *1.9 " Research conducted on best practices***"**
b) Component 2 expected outputs: In the PIF the expected outputs for component 2 were, **Output 2.1** Restoration of 8000 traditional wells and enhancement of inland ephemeral floodwater pools for 4000 hh through established 'Food for Work' programme and **Output 2.2** Communities trained on managing and maintaining harvested water resources and to use water for multipurpose such as for livestock, irrigation and inland aquaculture. The outputs were revised to ***Output 2.1****: Flood control measures provided smallholder farmers in flood-prone areas,* ***Output 2.2****: Climate-smart Irrigation practiced,* ***Output 2.3****: Climate-smart fish farming practiced* based on the inputs from the national stakeholder consultations held in February 2014.

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable.

The national strategies, plans, reports or assessments presented in the original PIF included:

Policies
National Development Plan 4 (2012/13 – 2016/17).
National Climate Change Policy (2011)
National Disaster Risk Management Policy (2009)
National Agricultural Policy (1995)
National water supply and sanitation policy (2008)
Decentralisation policy (1997)
Draft Rural Development Policy (2011)
National gender policy (2010-2020)
United Nations Partnership Assistance Framework (UNPAF 2013/4 -2017/8)

In the project document the following additional national strategies, plans, reports and assessments are cited:
- National Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan (2013)

Justification for the change: During the PPG phase, the Namibian Government launched the National Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan (2013). The project objectives had to be aligned with the national priorities presented in National Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan. The Namibia Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan addresses three aspects of climate change; adaptation, mitigation and crosscutting issues. Adaptation is to be addressed through four themes namely food security and sustainable resource base, sustainable water resources base, human health and well being and infrastructure.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

This project fully reflects the priority measures identified by Namibia's draft National Climate Change Action Plan, and will contribute to the country's development and achievement of critical national and international development goals.

Based on previous GEF investments, a SPA project (2007 to 2010) and a SGP/CBA project (2009-2011) in the target regions, experiences and lessons learnt about building climate change resilience amongst smallholder farmers in northern Namibia will be up scaled and further improved with new adaptation learning. The Agriculture sector in Namibia *per se* is only just realising that increased actions and investments into climate smart agricultural development are needed to assist Namibia's small holder farmers to build more sustainable futures. This specific project will work

closely with a well-established NGO, Creative Entrepreneur Solutions (CES), to work closely with the local and regional government and relevant extension services and support organisations in advancing adaptation learning, knowledge and overall capacities to deal with climate change challenges in the future – including on the local implementation level.

The project was prepared through a participatory planning process, with a suite of stakeholder workshops and community consultations in the regions, and reflects local needs and views in its design. See table below from the project document on the meetings and consultations that took place during the PPG phase.

Table 1 Meetings and consultations during the PPG phase

Event	Detail	Outcomes	Documentation available from UNDP CO
Inception workshop 19-20Aug 2013	Involve the stakeholders through direct consultation on the draft Project Identification Form (PIF) and incorporation of comments and amendments to this document.	Feedback on PPG planning and PIF content, especially identifying collaboration partners for the project and setting realistic and feasible outcomes.	Workshop report (in English)
Technical stakeholders and Regional Councilors workshop report held in Oshakati	Both consultations were aimed at elaborating the project design and Implementation arrangements as well as stakeholder involvement plans from both the Technical stakeholders as well as the Regional Councilors from the regions and validating on how this would suit the needs of this project.	Guidance for project design and implementation arrangements.	Workshop report (in English)
Consultations in the five project zone regions	Detailed consultations took place with communities in selected villages within different constituencies of the project zone regions. Data collection and interviews covered the relationship between the communities, agriculture and livelihoods, specifically, those who depend on crop farming. The following analysis was carried out; a) The analysis of the vulnerability of community activities to climate change; b) The social acceptability of the project.	Site selections Guidance for project design.	Field consultations report(in English)
Regional National stakeholder workshop May 2014	This meeting served to validate the baseline, project design with the key line ministries (MAWF and MET) and agree on the implementation arrangements as well as sourcing of the co financing letters.	Discussion point and agreement on the Project Implementation Arrangements	
Validation workshop	To obtain final inputs needed for the submission and finalisation of the CEO Endorsement Request and Project Document	The E-PAC workshop for the project was aimed at validating the project design and Implementation Arrangements with the stakeholders.	Validation of the project design

The United Nations Family in Namibia has also prioritised climate change resilience building as well as agricultural development, through the UNPAF.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

UNDP has historically been the largest GEF implementing agency in terms of assisting countries in undertaking climate change adaptation activities, having assisted more than 25 adaptation projects in over 80 countries worth over US$700 million excluding co-financing. The Government of Namibia has requested UNDP assistance in designing and implementing this project, due to UNDP's track record in Africa. UNDP currently supports the development and implementation of GEF projects in numerous other countries throughout Southern Africa (e.g., Angola, Botswana, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Mozambique, and South Africa, among others).

UNDP's comparative advantage in designing and supporting this SCCF project is particularly strong because of the project's capacity building focus. UNDP has strong mandates and capacities to develop national capacities for integrating

climate change risks/opportunities into social equity, economic growth and environmental protection issues at all levels of development decision making. Integrating climate change risks into sustainable management of environment and natural resources and into key national development frameworks and sector strategies is the key business of UNDP in Namibia.

UNDP has led previous related adaptation projects in Namibia, and has specifically worked with MAWF on climate change issues in the past.

UNDP Namibia has an established national office in Windhoek with well-developed working relationships with the key stakeholders of the project. The Office counts on support, operational and senior level staffs, which ensure programmes, are well run. The UNDP Country Office has finalized the development of new UN Partnership Framework in Namibia (UNPAF) for 2014- 2018.

The project will also benefit from the technical support of a UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor and Principal/Senior Technical Advisor dedicated to Climate Change Adaptation. Fiduciary oversight support will also be provided through UNDP-GEF staff at the regional and HQ level in addition to staff at the country office level. UNDP also has extensive experience in integrated policy development, human resources development, institutional strengthening, and non-governmental and community participation.

UNDP and its partners has been in the forefront of developing climate fiscal frameworks, particularly in Asia, based on country case studies and regional dialogues involving Indonesia, Bangladesh, Lao PDR, Nepal, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam. UNDP continues to develop and nurture this work area drawing its technical skills in climate finance, democratic governance and capacity development in Namibia as well.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The DLCPP baseline project invests into improved agricultural production especially of vulnerable groups under highly variable climatic conditions – which are considered normal in Namibia. However, the investment is not building in long-term multi-dimensional impacts including those related to climatic changes. It is recognized that the agricultural sectors, including governmental but also private sector investment, is ignoring climate change threats, and continues, for example, investing into irrigation through the Green Scheme although Namibia already suffers water scarcity – a problem that will be further impaired by climatic changes.

The principal problem to be addressed by this SCCF project is that increasing climate variability is worsening the problem of livelihood diversification and food insecurity among rural households in the north central and north eastern regions of Namibia. Future climate change is set to worsen these problems, with women, children and other vulnerable groups in the northern regions of the country being the most vulnerable. This problem has not changed from the original PIF. However, the baseline projects have undergone some changes.

The changes to the original PIF in terms of baseline are described in section A 1, above. In detail, the confirmed key baseline initiatives for this GEF project are described in the following section. :

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The baseline and adaptation alternative rationale is as follows:

Outcome 1: Strengthened capacity of Smallholder farms to implement climate resilient agricultural practices.

Baseline Component 1, Without SCCF Intervention

The MAWF is implementing several agricultural support programmes for smallholder farmers in northern Namibia. This includes: Oshana, Oshikoto, Omusati, Ohangwenaregions. The programmes are supporting methods for agricultural conservation as well as post-harvest techniques. Overall MAWF's work entails the provision of inputs such as seeds, fertilizers, land preparation, planting services and methods on how to combat weeds. Other government and non-government support projects, such as those through the GIZ and CLUSA international for smallholder farmers, include research into improved dryland cropping and livelihood diversification through the commercialisation of indigenous non timber products, etc.

The MAWF Dryland Crop Production Programme (DCPP): The DCPP is the key baseline project. It is funded by the Namibian Government and active since 2008, the project has been implemented in the crop growing regions: Kavango, Caprivi, Oshikoto, Oshana, Ohangwena, Omusati and Kunene North Region. The project targets rural households who are primarily engaged in dryland crop production and provides them with production inputs (improved seeds and fertilizers), weeding, ripping, planting, fertilizer application and ploughing services through the DEES. There is a registration process and selected beneficiaries pay about N$ 200 for the services they receive. Specific attention is paid to the elderly, single parents and children-led households. Components of this programme are co-financing the SCORE project (USD 13,608,247). Co-financing relates to activities under component 1.

The **MAWF Green Scheme** is a MAWF-financed project and it counts for N$3,500,000,000 – equivalent to USD389 million, allocated on a rolling annual and three budget periods. Operating at both national and sub-national levels, the project aims to encourage the development of agronomic production and enhance the contribution of agriculture to GDP, stimulate private sector investment, combat poverty and achieve social development of communities within suitable irrigation areas. The Scheme aims to add some 27,000 ha of irrigated land to the current areas covering ~ 10 000 ha. 22 000 ha (81%) of the new proposed schemes lies west along the Kavango river, with the remainder spread throughout the country. The Green Scheme is focused on large-scale agricultural investments, with only a nominal extension of the programme to benefit small-scale farmers. A co-financing portion is allocated through MAWF to this GEF project (US$ 82,474), establishing linkages to the project in/ close to the GEF project interventions areas and focusing on small holder farmers. It was clearly established during the PPG phase that the GEF project will have limited convening powers of influencing the Green Scheme to become more climate resilient[4].

Integrated Initiative in support of Urban and Peri-Urban Horticulture in Namibia (UPH): MAWF and FAO launched this joint programme in 2006 with the aim of supporting food security. This has been so far achieved by improving the household access to high-quality fresh horticultural produce throughout the year and promoting the employment of the less endowed populations in the urban and peri-urban environments. Several stakeholders have been involved in the project, from both the government and non-government sectors (e.g. MRLGHRD, MYNSSC, MGECW, AGRA and Pupkewitz). The targeted beneficiaries are urban slum dwellers, landless and marginal land farmers, previously disadvantaged group members, resource poor families, unemployed and underemployed, and the weak and old[5]. This project has a direct link to Outcome 1, output 1.6 and has already been implemented in one of the SCCF project zone: Rundu of the East Kavango. Such initiatives can be used to draw lessons. However, at PPG no specific baseline co-financing as identified as at MAWF the future of the programme was not clear. It was suggested to revisit the baseline potential at project inception. No specific co-financing is included in the co-financing letter of MAWF at this point.

There are other MAWF investments for the support of smallholder farmers in the communal areas of Namibia. The overall investment is around USD 30 Million. None of these interventions are currently addressing climate resilience. Similarly, investments of the Regional Councils do not address climate resilience in any format at this stage. Regional Councils have budgets for specific "development projects" that would for example be invested into agriculture

[4] Notably the STAP and Council reviews made special reference to this aspect. The detailed comments on the reviews are included in the Annex of the CEO Endorsement. Outcome 3 of the project design focuses on influencing upstream policies and especially output 3.5 includes opportunities for a gradual change of understanding and behaviour at relevant institutions as well as of related policies.

[5] Available at : **uphnamibia**.com/AgriNews%20March%2006_b.pdf

development on a decentralised level. However, in reality climate change is not specifically addressed. These investments are counted as 1 Mio US$ per Regional Council annually.

NNFU supports farmers through several of its programmes and projects as amongst which: the institutional strengthening and capacity building programme. This project assists its core members, local farmers associations and regional farmers unions in efforts that are related to: annual action planning, leadership training and mentoring during action plan implementation. The business advisory and trade links unit assists farmers in their effort to organise as small-scale farmers for collective commercialisation in order to enhance their bargaining power, critically analyse factors that influence the commodities market and also understand factors that influence price[6].

In terms of support to the agricultural sector, the contribution of the above listed interventions is significant. These programmes are dealing with issues of capacity at the systemic and institutional levels. They provide a useful baseline for component 1 and a two-way interaction with the SCCF project is foreseen.

Adaptation Alternative Component 1, With SCCF Intervention

The above described baseline indicates a significant investment into the agriculture sector in northern Namibia. However, it is clear that not all of the described baseline activities explicitly address future climate risks into their rationale and design. In fact it is likely that the made investments may be lost due to climate change impacts in the future. Additionally maladaptive practices may be currently promoted through short term investments, consequently undermining resilience building efforts and leaving small holder farmers more vulnerable to future climate challenges.

This SCCF project is furthering the scope of MAWFs ongoing baseline projects in terms of building climate resilience in several ways. Special community mobilization approaches are set up and used to develop an upscaling approach that are cost-effective and functional. It is not feasible for the Government of Namibia to establish public sector programmes that are solely funded from central coffers expected to reach out to the majority of needy farmers. The project pursued peer learning approaches provide an effective alternative to traditional government centralised extension services. Meaningful local level engagement and motivation are catalysed to unlock possibilities for micro-finance solutions that can support resilience building. A focus on women-led households and other vulnerable groups provides a further addition to building meaningful adaptive capacities amongst smallholder farming communities.
Meaningful local level engagement and motivation are catalysed to unlock possibilities for micro-finance solutions that can support resilience building. A focus on women-led households and other vulnerable groups provides a further addition to building meaningful adaptive capacities amongst smallholder farming communities.

The MAWF recently (April 2014) developed the **Comprehensive Conservation Agriculture Programme (CCAP)** for Namibia and is included in the project design as strategic co-financing. The programme seeks to holistically address important aspects of CA in order to encourage farmers to take up CA and profit from it. The objective of the programme is to counter and reverse land degradation and adapt to climate change through CA adaptation as a basis for sustainable crop production and improved food security at national and farm level[7].The programme aims to 1) increase awareness and knowledge on CA among stakeholders, 2)increase knowledge and skill among farmers and extensions, 3) conduct farmer focused research to develop appropriate technologies and packages for the farming systems, 4) establish institutional arrangements for harmonized and coordinated implementation of the CA programme, 5) ensure farmer sustained access to CA equipment, inputs, markets and services and 6) develop standards, monitoring and evaluation. The programme targets all crop producers in Namibia and aims to provide assistance to, in the form of subsidy, communal farmers, where farmers in the SCORE project zone regions all fall in the beneficiary regions. A clear strategy for strategic collaboration will be developed during the inception phase of the SCORE project and once the CCAP is moving into its implementation phase.

[6]Available at http://www.nnfu.org.na/
[7] MAWF (April 2014) .Comprehensive Conservation Agriculture Programme for Namibia Draft report

Aside a strong focus on agriculture and food security related policies, this project aims to engage with i.e. the micro-finance sector to explore possibilities to unlock the financial sector more effectively in support of resilience building of smallholder farmers and especially women and other vulnerable groups. Whilst Outcome 1 is piloting such approaches on the micro-level, Outcome 3 will include activities that further such work on the macro-level. Significant climate change adaptation additionality will be generated through such activities. Tied closely to the Green Scheme and CCAP programme of the MAWF.

The CCAP for Namibia will further be strengthened by the SCCF project, by providing a flexible and responsive learning platform that can enhance the performance of the large-scale government investment to build lasting community resilience. This is pertinent for Outcome 1 to strengthen the national seed suppliers, promote up scaling of smallholder horticulture production through soil improvement and micro-drip irrigation in the six project zones, and Outcome 3 to ensure that institutional gaps and capacities for CA adoption are dealt with adequately.

Aside a strong focus on agriculture and food security related policies, this project aims to engage with i.e. the micro-finance sector to explore possibilities to unlock the financial sector more effectively in support of resilience building of smallholder farmers and especially women and other vulnerable groups. Whilst Outcome 1 is piloting such approaches on the micro-level, Outcome 3 will include activities that further such work on the macro-level. Significant climate change adaptation additionality will be generated through such activities. Tied closely to the Green Scheme and CCAP programme of the MAWF.

The SCCF project builds on lessons learnt from previous CBA and SPA adaptation projects/programmes (see Annex 9) and specifically invests into the development and implementation of dedicated and targeted community engagement and ownership building. In Namibia it is recognised that local level impacts can only be reached when working directly and dedicatedly with communities and small holder farmers. The IPCC ARWG5 report specifically stresses the importance of working with local people and applying community engagement approaches that truly empower the farmers on the ground to learn about climate change adaptation and build their own adaptive capacities. The CBA programme and other work of the CES have demonstrated that setting up and working with voluntary Self-help Groups (SHGs) can be a successful way of mobilizing motivated community members. SHG community coordinators (volunteers) can become special change agents and be engaged in an advisory and mentorship programme, so that they can act as community mobilizers and advisors in the future.

Working closely in mobilizing and sensitising existing support and extension organisations and services, both from the public and private sector, is a critical part in the SCCF project. Therefore, an advisory and mentorship programme will be established to deliver an integrated package of support services to the project beneficiaries. Women-headed organizations will be given special consideration, given the predominance of women-headed households in the northern regions. Experts in the field estimate that the cost of a mentorship programme could be in the region of N$500 per hectare, which is lower than the demonstrated returns of climate-smart agriculture in Namibia. The mentorship programme will take place in the first year of the project. Dedicated training materials and a mentoring approach will be designed and applied to ensure the most effective knowledge exchange and transfers through this programme. The programme will produce about 200 mentors in the six project zones.

In the previously implemented CBA projects, SHGs have developed into informal Farmer Field Schools (FFS) which are in the driving seat of project implementation with support from the CBA project management team. The Farmer Field Schools act as the driving force for farmer mobilizations into SHGs where trainings on climate change impacts and adaptation, low-tillage agriculture, conservation agriculture and multipurpose crops, farm planning and management, nutrition and crop diversification, poultry and livestock health, and silage fodder production is done by the most experienced SHG farmer member. This approach will be further upscaled and it is envisaged that these Farmers Field Schools will turn smallholder farms into learning hubs for the rest of the farming community creating a sustainable method of learning and passing on best practices related to climate change resilience building. Critical aspects of work

with communities, such as overcoming barriers and resistance to absorption of new farming techniques, technologies, and approaches will specifically be addressed by such an approach, and the power of peer learning will be harnessed.

The SCCF project investments into developing and implementing the best community engagement approaches is seen to be a critical success factor for this intervention, and is specific adaptation additionality to the baselines described above. It is asserted that lasting adaptive capacities can be build through a focus on individual and institutional capacity development.

Three key technical adaptation interventions are being pursued through this SCCF project, following up on key needs identified through the community consultations carried out during the PPG phase as well as previous experiences with the implementation of SPA and CBA projects in northern Namibia. It is asserted that by addressing (a) smallholder farmers' challenges to plant fields in time for the onset of the first rains through reliable weather data, (b) improving nutrition and household incomes by focusing production on fresh vegetables, supported by soil improvement, micro-drip and other appropriate production enhancing techniques, and (c) helping farmers to move away from mono-cropping and applying a more diversified cropping systems, climate resilience of local communities and smallholder farmers will be greatly increased.

One of the key technical barriers to producing a good harvest is the shortage of draught power leading to crops being planted later than the recommended time in November/December. This is leaving little chance of reaching maturity for the crops, or is resulting in lower yields due to the crop not receiving sufficient rain to reach maturity, especially in seasons which end earlier than usual. Further, early rains make nutrients available and if the crop is planted some weeks later, much of this nutrition is leached away or becomes unavailable before it can be used by crop plants. Good management practices will be employed that ensures critical growth stages are less impacted by harsh climatic conditions such as mid-season droughts or temperature peaks, by modifying the length of the growing period, changing planting and harvesting dates. The project will invest into overcoming this barrier through targeted interventions such as conservation agriculture, and will additionally invest into systems that will ensure that appropriate and sufficient seeds are available for small-scale farmers at the time they are needed. Current seed supply bottlenecks severely hamper the ability of local farmers to plant in good time.

Investing more specifically into fresh vegetable production using CA principles is considered a valuable adaptation strategy for multiple-reasons. Firstly, productivity and yields can be enhanced through soil improvement and micro-drip irrigation. Applying CA creates a more "stable" micro-climate through enhancing water holding capacities of soils and lowering evapotranspiration and the drying out of soils. The provision of new implements and reliable agricultural extension services further will lead to enhanced and more reliable agricultural production. Secondly, malnutrition is often caused by an absence of nutrients critical to human health because fresh vegetables are lacking in our diets. Access to fresh vegetables will greatly enhance health, an important aspect of adaptive capacity and resilience. Thirdly, there is a good potential to establish fresh vegetable gardens as a business line for smallholder farmers in Namibia. Markets are available, and this project will overcome the barriers to connect the farmers with these.

In terms of implementing a project approach that focuses on vulnerable groups, the establishment of fresh vegetables, amongst others, can be a special opportunity. For example, the project proposes to also work through schools. The CBA programme shows that communities are successfully implementing the improved farming methods that their children have learned in school. Young people, especially girls, pick the skills up quickly. The project has been so successful that it has grabbed the attention of schools outside the pilot area. Some of the proceeds from the sale of vegetables and crops are used to purchase school uniforms for orphans so that they can attend school. Such a focus will be furthered through this SCCF project, in line with its special effort to build resilience amongst the most vulnerable.

The SCCF project will focus on these key technical intervention areas, working with the established institutional arrangements. It is clear that certain enabling conditions must be created to support the successful technical community outreach and support system. Key barriers identified relate to issues such as a need for market access and access to

micro-finance options to sustain the SCCF project interventions in the long-term and to allow for upscaling the demonstrations.

Lack of access to finances has been voiced as one key barrier to achieving climate resilient smallholder agriculture. Microfinance institutions can potentially support and unlock financial opportunities. The CBA projects implemented by CES have found that smallholder farmers can make good returns on their plots by practicing low tillage land preparation and other climate-smart conservation agricultural practices, and even the very poor smallholder farmers are able to make a savings monthly. Using the SHGs as voluntary groupings, a good foundation of successful savings programmes is in place. Additionally there is evidence that using mobile collateral (e.g. livestock) to secure loans can be a successful approach, and the Namibia Meat Board has piloted such an approach with small livestock in northern Namibia. However, during the PPG phase it was found that establishing a strong microfinance component is important in this project beyond the locally pointed pilots established by CES and requires more dedicated research and engagement of expertise. There have been recent movements in the micro-finance sector in Namibia, i.e. the selling of the only development microfinance institution FIDES Bank operating in northern Namibia to TRUSCO, a government close Namibian outfit. It is intended to establish a SME bank through this take-over, which, however, might be government and not commercial sector governed. An initial expert review of the intended project output 1.8 is included in Annex 8. A more explorative approach is suggested that will provide adaptation learning lessons that can then be integrated more systematically into output 3.5 on a macro-level.

Creating market access is partially related to marketing expertise, as well as to dedicated value-chain development of newly emerging products. This is a key barrier to many local level diversification efforts, and this project will specifically focus on overcoming such barriers through dedicated investments on the pilot level. To support local level diversification, the support of marketing organizations in the area of dryland product will be sought through the Advisory and Mentorship Programme to promote sustainability of smallholder livelihood diversification. Organisations currently working in this field are the NGO, Centre for Research Information Action in Africa Southern African Development and Consulting (CRIIA SADC) that supports rural communities, particularly the poorest members of society, to benefit from sustainably produced indigenous natural products and smallholder crops. The MCA programme in Namibia has dedicated a significant support to further developing value-chains for such products, but it is apparent that this takes a long time and requires dedicated support. The Small Grants Programme (SGP) already has had one success in enabling the cowpeas (omakunde) to become a commercial option. More traditional diversified crops and vegetables have the potential to reach market value and the Agro-Economic Board, the Agro-Marketing and Trade Agency (AMTA) and the National Chamber of Commerce and Industry (NCCI) are supporting smallholder farmers in reaching relevant markets. Macro-level interventions are needed to create the enabling environment for further upscaling the diversification efforts, and this project adds this as a specific adaptation alternative to its activity portfolio.

Outcome 2: Small scale agricultural infrastructure introducing to reduce vulnerability to floods and droughts e.g. through restoration of wells and harvesting of floodwater for food security.

Baseline Component 2, Without SCCF Intervention

Rural subsistence communities in the northern parts of the country are facing climate variability and changes like more frequent and severe floods from water flowing in from northern neighbouring countries, droughts, increased temperatures and unpredictable rainfall patterns. Floodplains in the Caprivi and oshanas (ephemeral rivers and pans formed in the shallow depressions of the Cuvelai system in the north) remain particularly vulnerable, as smaller areas will be inundated, and because they may dry out more rapidly due to increased evaporation. Rural subsistence communities in the northern parts of the country are facing climate variability and changes like more frequent and severe floods from water flowing in from northern neighbouring countries, droughts, increased temperatures and unpredictable rainfall patterns. Floodplains in the Caprivi and oshanas (ephemeral rivers and pans formed in the shallow depressions of the Cuvelai system in the north) remain particularly vulnerable, as smaller areas will be inundated, and because they may dry out more rapidly due to increased evaporation.

In 2011, 60,000 people had to be relocated during the flood season and all in all more than 260,000 people were severely affected, causing the President to declare a state of emergency – the second in the last three years. The 2011 floods adversely affected the communal farmers with an estimated 25,000 animals being killed. Roads, permanent buildings and bridges were destroyed to and resulted in damages equivalent to US$ 140, 000,000. Yield prospects were reduced by 40% and the cultivation area cut by 50% leaving up to 600,000 households vulnerable to little or no food availability and thus dependent on government flood relief.

About 50% of the rural population who live in the northern regions derive their food, income and informal employment from inland fish resources. Inland freshwater fisheries are dominant in the less arid areas such as the Caprivi, Kavango, Omusati and Oshana regions. Inland aquaculture includes inland facilities and utilisation of ponds, tanks and enclosures that are dependent upon the culturists for maintenance of water quality, food supply and waste removal[8]. The Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR) is coordinating aquaculture projects throughout the country and provide fingerlings (small finger-like potatoes) to the farmers/projects.

One specific project to mention is the Omahenene Inland Aquaculture which is providing fingerlings and training farmers on fish farming with MFMR. Although aquaculture has the potential to uplift the livelihoods through diversification of the diet and income for many rural households in the project zones. A suggestion for fish ranching as an alternative to conventional fish farming is made. This concept is being trialed in the Zambezi region with KAZA support by the NNF and other partners, and some of the social and environmental advantages includes limited infrastructure to set the seasonal water bodies up and the possible disease control as the fish eats the mosquito larvae.

The MAWFs Drylands Crop Production Programme (DLCPP) aims to prepare farmers for severe climatic conditions, although not specifically for long-term climate trends, and specifically invests into promoting suitable dryland crops, alternative production systems and well as water conservation practices. The Green Scheme of the MAWF, although mostly focusing on commercial irrigation production systems, invests into the development of dryland adapted irrigation systems that will allow for better drought preparedness. Although most activities of these two programmes are considered as baseline, certain activities that are implemented through MAWF in the pilot regions and relevant to the project sites are designed as co-financing to this project, specifically.

Disaster Risk Management falls under the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM). A National Disaster Risk Plan is in place, including an Early Warning System for drought and impending food shortages, in cooperation with the FAO global early warning system. A global early warning system can be reliable only when there is a strong local capacity to gather reliable information, for this reason the Government has established an Early Warning Unit within the MAWF. The OPM has a number of functions as well, and coordinates national and regional disaster Risk management units and responses[9].There is a need to strengthen disaster risk reduction activities, linked to the OPM's Disaster Management Policy. This project has the potential to identify these activities based on Output 2.1, Activity 2.1.1, and the ongoing OPM investment is counted as baseline investment.

Several flood and drought responses spring up on short notice in years of disaster, usually in the form of emergency response. Some baseline activities with a longer-term focus are the work of the Red Cross in north-central Namibia, focusing on linking floods and drought management to health, especially amongst vulnerable groups. The Namibia Nature Foundation, a local NGO, is implementing the "Every River has its People" programme along the Kavango river for some years, and this programme has floods and drought management component, including piloting seasonal "fish ranching" in the Kavango but also in the Zambezi regions. This project also relates to work the Ministry of Fisheries and Marie Resources (MFMR) is implementing in terms of aquaculture development, however, none of these projects is specifically geared to addressing climate change additionality. The Country Pilot Partnership for Sustainable Integrated Land Management, which was partially supported by GEF, implemented relevant pilot approaches, which are being

[8]http://209.88.21.36/opencms/opencms/grnnet/MFMR/Aquaculture/Type_Aquaculture.html
[9]OPM (1998).Republic of Namibia National Disaster Plan. Available at: www.opm.gov.na

implemented by Government and local partners in certain areas of the north-central regions and Kavango, adding to the project baseline. Interventions included, water harvesting, including the rehabilitation of traditional wells, improved cattle farming practices, dryland horticulture development, piloting aquaculture ponds, to name just a few.

Adaptation Alternative Component 2, With SCCF Intervention

The project will scale up the successful water harvesting pilots tested in the CCP/CCA and CBA programme. It is recognised that the suggested water harvesting techniques would be useful in northern Namibia in any event, but is more critical with the projected climate change impacts for the area. Namibia is classified as a water scarce or water constrained country, even under current climatic conditions. It is clear that the water situation in Namibia is becoming even harder under the available climate change projections, especially in the SCORE project target areas. This SCCF project aims to enhance water use and availability, clearly recognising that more drastic development options must be explored by the Government of Namibia in the long-term.

The communities who participated in the CBA programme revived a century old but now neglected practice: water harvesting. This used to be common practice in northern Namibia before the introduction of piped water 20 years ago and even earlier, before men were moved to the southern parts of the country for mining work by the colonial apartheid administration. The wells were either placed in or at the edges of the shallow rain and flood water fed ephemeral lakes ('oshanas') or dug on higher ground in areas where the ground water level was high (identified by the grass being green there even during the dry season). Wells could also be found at the edges of crop fields, placed there in order to prevent flooding coming from a specific direction and destroying crop.

In most areas in north central Namibia neglected traditional water harvesting wells can be found. They are now very shallow, having been filled by sludge or material from collapsing walls. The restoration of traditional water harvesting wells and the establishment of new wells for varying uses is an affordable, locally appropriate and effective community water harvesting method that would go far to complement the construction of large high-cost earth dams in the flood and drought prone areas of northern Namibia.

The CBA SHGs pilot revivals of flood and rain water harvesting in traditional wells, or the digging of new earth ponds as an adaptive measure proved an effective and welcomed method by rural dwellers due to the increasing negative impacts of floods on livelihoods. Rainwater is generally collected from roofs or non-permeable surfaces on the ground and stored in tanks made of different materials. It helps to bridge water shortages during the dry season and buffers fluctuations in rainfall even during the rainy season.

Major challenges of using the Oshana water are the high evaporation rates and quick degradation of the water stored. The technology of floodwater harvesting aims to avoid these problems by storing the water in artificial, closed reservoirs made of different materials. The Oshana water is therefore pumped with pedal pumps into the storage reservoirs at the height of the dry season when the water quality is best.

The SCCF project aims to mainstream rainfall harvesting and flood-water harvesting into the DLCPP, and Green Scheme, whilst – at the same time – implementing relevant activities in those project communities that are situated in the Oshanas or are otherwise threatened by flood and drought risks. Overall, the learning from the SCORE project is geared towards informing MAWF and partners on the urgency of mainstreaming long-term climate resilience building into their programmes and planning. The DLCPP and Green Scheme are committing co-financing for such activities at overlapping project sites. Productive activities will be implemented with the help of the technical services package implemented in Outcome 1.

The possibilities to establish sustainable aquaculture investments, especially where water harvesting is successfully undertaken, will be scoped and pursued as possible adaptation options. Aquaculture development can supplement subsistence food supplies but also lead to the establishment of functional commercial outfits. Relevant environmental standards will have to be developed and applied to ensure such investments would not cause negative environmental

impacts. Where community projects are being set-up relevant social impacts must also be addressed. Using SHGs and related social structures should provide feasible entry points for a manageable model of introducing food and livelihood alternatives.

To build better resilience to persistent droughts, dryland irrigation systems i.e. drip irrigation, coupled with the systematic application of Conservation Agriculture practices will be implemented at the pilot zones. Building on the various baseline projects of the MAWF, such technologies and techniques will be implemented with the SHGs, FFSs and supported through the Mentorship and Advisory programme. A comprehensive local level monitoring and farmers actions research component will be added so that a good understanding of which practices can indeed provide suitable adaptation options for upscaling will be derived. Such a research component will be conducted in close collaboration with the MAWF Directorate of Agricultural Research and Training (DART).

Outcome 3: Mainstream climate change into national agricultural strategy/sector policy, including adjustments to budgets for replication and up-scaling

Baseline Component 3, Without SCCF Intervention

The problem in Namibia is not the lack of policies, or even the fact that they may be disabling of climate smart agriculture – in fact the policy content is impressively good. It is the lack of implementation of those policies. Annex 2 of this report sets out the numerous policies that exist, with principles and objectives that support climate-smart agriculture. Capacity to implement is lacking, such as:

-Insufficient results-based management as a way to guide planning and budgetary allocations;
-Unclear roles and responsibilities;
-Limited performance management;
-Ineffective inter-agency cooperation and coordination in the areas of agriculture, irrigation and water development, sustainable natural resource management, rural and regional development, rural infrastructure, food security and nutrition and drought and disaster management;
-Inappropriate transfer of resources from Central Government to the Regions, to enable locally driven and prioritised development plans.

The above is being addressed through various donors/government funded projects in the country – more so, special focus has been placed on raising awareness of climate change in the rural areas because they are the most affected and vulnerable to the projected impacts. This is already demonstrated through the lack of ability for these communities to cope with the natural phenomenon such as floods and droughts. Policy mainstreaming can thus empower the communities to respond more effectively to these impacts.

The MET is Namibia's designated institution for Climate Change. As such the Ministry has an established Climate Change Division, headed by a Deputy Director for Climate Change. The Ministry chairs the National Climate Change Committee (NCCC), and coordinates the mainstreaming of climate change interventions throughout other sectors. MET is the lead institution tasked with the coordination of the implementation of Namibia's National Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan (NCCSAP). The NCCSAP is in the beginning stages of implementation. Although the SCORE programme is tightly embedded within the strategy and plan, the NCCSAP can be seen as baseline for this outcome. Currently SCORE is the only dedicated programme that will link to the land and inland water based elements of food security components of the NCCSAP. This also the only project with a specific focus on vulnerable groups to date. Without the SCORE project, these critical components of Namibia's NCCSAP will not be realized.

A specific Climate Finance Readiness initiative is being implemented under the leadership of MET with the National Planning Commission (NPC) and the Ministry of Finance, supported through the German Government through the GIZ. The project is laying the foundation for starting discussions on the need of mobilizing national financing sources for long-

term climate change resilience building action in all sectors of Namibia's economy. Although this project is running over a short time frame, it builds a useful baseline for the SCORE project interventions.

The **Namibia National Farmers' Union (NNFU)** is a national federation of regional farmers unions, established in June 1992, to represent the Namibian communal and emerging farmers. It aims to increase food production for household security, enhance marketing of farming products to increase household income, increase participation and recognition of woman in farming, contribute to environmental protection and sustainable utilization of natural resources. In recent years, it has strengthened the implementation of its mandate by providing services, as well providing an advocacy function. It has three programmes:

- *Policy Education and Advocacy,* which promotes active participation of the small scale farmers in the design and drafting of conducive and enabling policy environment related to agriculture, water, land, credit, among other; implementation of national policies, acts and legislations, projects and schemes; and serves as a conveyor belt between farming communities countrywide and service delivery institutions.
- *Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Building,* which works via local farmers associations and regional farmers unions on planning and leadership.
- *Business Advisory and Trade links unit* assist farmers to organise small-scale farmers for collective marketing purposes in order to enhance their bargaining powers, critically analyse factors that influence the commodity market chain, and understand factors that influence price structures in the market place.

Adaptation Alternative Component 3, With SCCF Intervention

The design of this SCCF project entails a strong focus on adaptation learning that will be integrated into relevant policy processes and implementation actions. By setting up a dedicated impact assessment that will be carried out alongside the project implementation and be linked to the various local level monitoring and research components, valuable information on which approaches, practices, techniques and technologies effectively contribute to climate-smart agriculture and finally climate resilience building in local communities will be generated. The design of the impact assessment will be geared towards generating policy relevant information that can be used directly for policy influencing strategies, not only in the agriculture sector, but also for disaster risk management and preparedness and other. This impact assessment will be conducted by the University of Namibia's Multidisciplinary Research Center.

Building on existing policy development processes e.g. in MAWF but also on the regional and national development planning level, knowledge generated and lessons learnt from the SCCF project will be injected into sector reviews, programme development and the Regional and National Development Plan 5 (NDP 5; 2017/18-2021/22) at relevant times. For example, a detailed mid-term evaluation can identify best practices emerging from the SCORE project just in time for the NDP4 review and following the NDP5 preparation. The mid-term evaluation would be due during 2017, a window of opportunity could be used to integrate resilience building e.g. in the agriculture sector at that time. MAWF has a practice to request lessons learnt from all projects implemented under it to be screened for best practices which should be upscaled. Based on such analyses the Ministry formulates follow-up national programmes that will allow for a systemic absorption of such best practices. This project can develop strategies that will strengthen the policy implementation on climate resilience building mainstreaming opportunities are systematically followed-up on especially those activities in the climate change strategy and action plan.

By specifically working with regional governance structures, i.e. with Regional Councils, and through setting up regional platforms for support organisations and extension services, this SCCF project is establishing critical linkages between deconcentrated central government/line ministry functions and decentralised governance structures in place. Moving away from a focus on sectoral ministries only, this project will provide specific institutional lessons that will be invaluable to implementing climate change resilience building activities more broadly in Namibia. Although it is clear that there are numerous capacity bottlenecks and short-comings at the RCs, it is also clear that meaningful service delivery to the broader population cannot be achieved by the relatively small agricultural extension teams only. Investing into upscaling and improving collaborative structures that were already set up e.g. under the Country Pilot Partnership for Integrated

Sustainable Land Management (CPP for ISLM) is a strategy that this project pursues in the light of piloting effective governance for resilience building.

A few things are needed to improve locally-driven development that builds up adaptive capacity:

-Agreement between politicians, government officials and the communities about what works and what does not work in terms of climate smart agriculture;
-Trust-building needed between communities and government;
-Sufficient resources for Regional Councils to be able to respond to local community needs and priorities;
-A results-based management plan for climate-smart (conservation) agriculture that is agreed to by all parties and which gets monitored by the relevant authorities, to feed into the planning and budgetary cycle.

This SCCF project will act on all these levels, particularly responding to key priorities set out in Namibia's NCCSAP. Through component 1 and 2 critical on the ground learning will be facilitated and component 3 of the project ensures that such learning will find its way into policy development. It will create and document relevant understanding of the interface of institutional and systemic level for broader scale climate change resilience building in Namibia. A strategic interlinkage between on the ground piloting of adaptation and climate resilience building approaches, their ongoing impact assessment and evaluation, and eventual integration into key policies is built into the project design.

It is recognised that public awareness has to be built to ensure that climate change adaptation best practices will be applied more broadly. To address this the SCCF project entails a small but important additional communication focus, working with the NNFU in developing relevant advocacy messages to promote the up-scaling of climate smart agricultural methods. A specific budget will be availed to NNFU to disseminate relevant messages through their network of influence. It is important to note that this will not only mean the development of brochures, but of meaningful strategies for behavioural change amongst local farmers. A dedicated research component will be attached to this specific output, as we still know relatively little of the values that especially differentiate our vulnerable groups and will help us to more effectively gear campaigns to assist such groups.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

Table 2 presents a summary of the key risks identified and mitigation strategies proposed

RISK	RATING(H/M/L)	RISK MITIGATION MEASURE
Environmental	Medium	The project will mitigate the risk of droughts and floods by harvesting flood waters using the natural depressions of the Cuvelai Basin (Oshanas), for productive use by households. The project will prepare households for dry years by implementing early land preparation and planting, and the planting of early maturing crops in drier than normal years. The project will need to make use of existing weather and seasonal forecasting information from the MET Service.
Organisational	Low	Low and variable organisational capacities for implementation will be addressed by delegating roles to the NGO and private sector, thus leveraging capacity and resources into the project. An adequate budget will be provisioned for capacity development and project management.
Social and cultural	Low	Only willing smallholder farmers will be included as project beneficiaries, the selection of the beneficiaries will be done with the inputs from the Regional Councils in the six project zone to avoid an unbiased or conflicts regarding the chosen beneficiaries.
Social and cultural: Low participation of	Medium	Women, youth and orphans participation will be targeted as direct beneficiaries. A gender assessment will be carried out in the PPG phase to mitigate against the risk. Experience shows that women are willing to participate in many developmental projects.

women, youth and orphans.		
Political	Low	Roles and responsibilities will be clearly defined through a consultative process. All key stakeholders such as MAWF will be involved in the project.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:

1) The project will draw on lessons from previous GEF financed initiatives in the targeted project areas as described below:

Lessons and coordination from the Sustainability of Protected Areas/ CBA project (PIMS 4623) that focused on soil conservation, water harvesting and hand made wells, and good practice for climate change adaptation will be taken on board this project. The two projects address similar priorities in the NAPA but have different (complementary) approaches and geographical focal areas in order to expand the range of evidence to the government of Namibia for implementing adaptation in subsistence agriculture and into development planning (For more information please refer to the lessons learnt box page 117 in the prodoc). This initiative focuses on strengthening the adaptive capacity to reduce vulnerability of rural communities in responding to droughts and floods in Northern Namibia, with a special focus on women and children, and in demonstrating the importance of strengthening the involvement of the local level in adaptation planning through strengthening vertical channels (in keeping with Namibia's commitment to decentralisation). There will thus be no overlap of activities on the ground. At the same time, there are a number of synergies. The UNDP and National Climate Change Steering Committee will oversee both the projects, through the National Climate Change Technical Committee. This will ensure effective exchange of materials, experiences and lessons. In addition to the creation of adaptation plans and the improvement of adaptation options for rural communities in northern Namibia, the outputs of each project will complement each other in informing scaling up by the government of Namibia. Tangible adaptation activities as implemented in this project will provide the basis for additional districts and line ministries adopting the adaptation opportunities that it also develops.

As UNDP is implementing the other GEF funded projects it will also play a coordination role between the various projects. Systems in place, such as the Project Steering Committee provide a platform for improved coordination between projects and functions in line with Govt coordination bodies for climate change. Strong coordination with other relevant GEF initiatives implemented by other agencies of the UN family will therefore also take place and ensure that effective convergence and synergies are captured and built upon.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

The Stakeholders identified during project preparation will continue to be implicated in project implementation. A stakeholder involvement plan has been created to provide a framework to guide interaction between implementing partners and the key stakeholders, particularly end-users to validate project progress. All stakeholders involved in the baseline self-capacity assessment will be addressed again in order to track the efficacy of stakeholder capacity building both operationally and technically. CES will act as the lead implementing unit at the local level as they are currently well established within the project zone regions with regards to climate smart agriculture as well as other community projects.

Table 3 Shows the stakeholder engagement plan

Outcomes	Outputs	Stakeholders
Outcome 1: Smallholder farmer adaptive capacity for implementation of climate resilient agricultural production practices strengthened	Output 1.1: Smallholder advisory and mentorship programme that promotes drought resilient land management and crop production practices established to scale up good practice for 4000 smallholder farmers.	Min of Environment &Tourism Min of Agriculture, Water &Forestry Relevant line Ministries such as MRLGHRD Representatives of RCs (CDC/VDCs) CES,CBOs, End-users at regional and local levels in six pilot zones

	Output 1.2: Community self help groups formed to promote implementation and replication of climate-smart methods.	CES, Min of Environment &Tourism Min of Agriculture, Water &Forestry Relevant line Ministries such as MRLGHRD, Representatives of RCs (CDC/VDCs) CBOs End-users at regional and local levels in six pilot zones
	Output 1.3: 200 trained farmer field school leaders and coordinators in drought resilient land management practices serving 4000 households.	CES, Min of Environment &Tourism Min of Agriculture, Water &Forestry Relevant line Ministries such as MRLGHRD, Representatives of RCs (CDC/VDCs) CBOs End-users at regional and local levels in six pilot zones
	Output 1.4: 4000 smallholder farmer land planted in time to catch first rains.	CES, Min of Environment &Tourism Min of Agriculture, Water &Forestry Relevant line Ministries such as MRLGHRD Representatives of RCs (CDC/VDCs) CBOs End-users at regional and local levels in six pilot zones
	Output 1.5: Fresh vegetable production through soil improvement and micro-drip irrigation practiced by 2000 households.	CES, Min of Environment &Tourism Min of Agriculture, Water &Forestry Relevant line Ministries such as MRLGHRD, Representatives of RCs (CDC/VDCs) CBOs End-users at regional and local levels in six pilot zones
	Output 1.6: Livelihood diversified away from traditional crop production for 75% of households.	CES, Min of Environment &Tourism Min of Agriculture, Water &Forestry Relevant line Ministries such as MRLGHRD, Representatives of RCs (CDC/VDCs) CBOs End-users at regional and local levels in six pilot zones
	Output 1.7: Savings and loan scheme tested among smallholder farmers to promote replication and up-scaling of adaptive practices and technologies.	Agribank, Fides, Kongalend, Min of Environment &Tourism, Min of Agriculture, Water &Forestry End-users at regional and local levels in six pilot zone
	Output 1.8: Market linkages established for dryland products working with the private sector.	AMTA ,Min of Agriculture, Water &Forestry
Outcome 2: Reduced vulnerability to droughts and floods through restoration of wells and harvesting of floodwater for food security	Output 2.1: Flood control measures provided smallholder farmers in flood-prone areas.	MAWF, CES, other NGO's such as red cross, NNFU Academic institutions e.g. PoN and UNAM, OPM
	Output 2.2: Climate-smart irrigation practiced.	MAWF, CES, End-users at regional and local levels in six pilot zones
	Output 2.3: Climate-smart fish Farming practiced.	MFMR, End-users at regional and local levels in six pilot zones, CES
Outcome 3: Mainstream climate change into national agricultural strategy/sector policy,	Output 3.1: Impact Assessment carried out.	Min of Environment &Tourism, Representatives of Regional Councils, Relevant line Ministries such as MRLGHRD, MAWF, MLR

including adjustments to budgets for replication and up scaling	Output 3.2: Results-based management plan for climate smart agriculture monitored by main stakeholder groups, to be led by the Regional Councils	Representatives of Regional Councils, Min of Environment &Tourism, Relevant line Ministries such as MRLGHRD, MAWF, MLR
	Output 3.3: NNFU advocacy messages developed and delivered in policy fora to promote scale-up of climate-smart agricultural methods.	National Planning Commission, Min of Environment &Tourism, Relevant line Ministries such as MRLGHRD, MAWF, MLR
	Output 3.4: Regional Councils, line ministries and other partners include climate-smart agricultural methods and water harvesting and storage in their annual plans and budgets.	Min of Finance, Representatives of Regional Councils, Min of Environment &Tourism, Relevant line Ministries such as MRLGHRD, MAWF
	Output 3.5: Policy recommendations and replication plan developed for continuation of good practice and presented at final project closure workshop.	National Planning Commission, Min of Environment &Tourism, Relevant line Ministries such as MRLGHRD, MAWF, MLR, Min of Finance, Representatives of Regional Councils

The project's design incorporates activities and mechanisms to ensure on-going and effective stakeholder participation in project implementation:

- Project inception workshop to enable stakeholder awareness at the start of project implementation: the project will be launched by a multi-stakeholder workshop. This workshop will provide an opportunity to provide all stakeholders with the most updated information on the project and the project work plan. It will also establish a basis for further consultation as the project's implementation commences.
- Project Steering Committee will ensure representation of stakeholder interests in project: a Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be constituted to ensure broad representation of all key interests throughout the project's implementation. The representation, and broad terms of reference, of the PSC are further described in Section II, Part V (Management Arrangements) of the Project Document.
- Project communications to facilitate on-going awareness of project: The project will develop, implement and maintain a communications strategy to ensure that all stakeholders are informed on an on-going basis about the project's objectives and activities; overall project progress; and the opportunities for involvement in various aspects of the project's implementation.
- Capacity building: Project activities are focused on building the capacity – at the systemic, institutional and individual levels – of the institutions, NGOs, and other stakeholders to ensure the sustainability of initial project investments.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

Overall, this project will contribute towards reduction in the vulnerability of about 4000 households in vulnerable areas of the northern regions of Namibia to impacts of climate change, including variability. The benefits will be at different levels as described in the sub-sections that follow:

Macro level: This SCCF project will contribute towards the implementation of the thematic area on food security of Namibia's Draft National Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan (draft November 2013). By reducing the vulnerability of communities and food-production systems to changes in mean climatic conditions and climatic variability, and enhancing the ability of individuals, communities and institutions to plan for and respond to the impacts of climate change. The project will further strengthen the activities under the Disaster Risk Management Policy by improving

disaster risk identification through the vulnerability assessment in Component 2, Output 2.1, similarly linked to Output 3.1. The project will also contribute significantly towards NDP 4's priorities on enhancing household food security, Namibia's capacity to produce food and promoting conservation agriculture and MDG 1 for Namibia's dryland communities.

Micro level: At individual farmer level, 4000 households will derive benefits having secure access to livelihood assets and adaptive capacity building activities such as the upscaling of climate smart agricultural practices from pilot programmes and livelihood diversification options, access to finance and markets, early warning systems and improved understanding of climate change risks, vulnerabilities and management options. Reduced economic losses associated with climate variability and change and consequently improved rural livelihoods is expected due to better climate risk management.

Benefits will derive from:

- Increase in income of smallholder farmers and vulnerable groups from improved agricultural production and increase in value added of agricultural produce;
- Inclusion of smallholder farmers in local market system;
- Stimulation of local economy;
- Reduced economic losses from extreme climate/weather events and increased income of the rural poor in the targeted northern communal regions;
- Mainstream adaptation plans into policy making.

Through the project management's M&E benefits will be tracked as well as the climate baseline to attribute the benefits identified to the project.

Environmental Benefits: Environmental benefits from this SCCF project will derive from: Decrease in land degradation and soil erosion for the 4000 households from the adoption of sustainable climate smart agricultural practices leading to overall environmental sustainability. This will be tracked through Output 1.9 through experiments by checking the land condition before and after the adoption of conservation agriculture by the DART of MAWF and looking at various ways of cropping and its effect on the land condition. Additionally, the DART will have to establish major disease and pest free crops, fertilizer requirement etc.

Social Benefits: Social benefits from this SCCF project will derive from:

- Improvements in human capacity, especially women, children and other vulnerable groups;
- Local adaptive capacity strengthened by smallholder farmers' improved access to agricultural technologies specific to local farming needs;
- Increase in human capital of farmers due to improved access to technical support;
- Increase in institutional capacity to mainstream climate change adaptation concerns in national and district level development planning processes and spending plans will improve the resilience of local communities to climate impacts in the long-term.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

A number of design options were considered for the project before the final design was proposed. The project design clearly identifies activities that were piloted/demonstrated through previous projects such as the CBA and CCA: CPP-SLM approach, amongst other. An emphasis is placed on implementing a rigorous approach to community mobilization and engagement that will generate long-term replication activities amongst the local population. Such an approach will aid the Government in the long-term to implement cost-effective extension work throughout the country, with a climate change focus. An underlying rationale of the design is that successful approaches and lessons learnt will be applied in the North Central and Kavango regions in Namibia. The SCORE project links with Government, NGO, private sector and community initiatives and programmes that work towards combating climate change and assisting communities to cope with drought and floods such as the CLUSA USAID's three year (2013-

2015) Namibia Conservation Agriculture programme (NCAP) and the KONGALEND's micro finance initiative for smallholder farmers to acquire agricultural equipments and inputs. The project will build on existing structures by adding and/or enhancing a climate change adaptation component to already existing initiatives. The emphasis on capacity development (technical analyses, development of indicator frameworks, training) and the plans for District management of this project and the direct beneficiaries is highly cost-effective due to the partnering with the relevant government staff, whose time and efforts are not charged to the project

The SCCF project builds on baseline rural CA programs in northern Namibia inclusive of the Oshana, Oshikoto, Ohangwena, Omusati and Kavango West and Kavango East regions through the NCASP which directly targets 10,800 smallholder farmers for training in Namibia specific conservation tillage (NSCT) techniques. Such training concentrates on land preparation, ripping techniques, planting, weeding, harvesting and post harvesting activities as well as the basic business skills required to sustainably manage income generating agri-business. These baseline initiatives have already collected some baseline data that could be used by the SCORE project. The NCASP is estimated to tranfer indirect skills to 43,200 fellow smallholder farmers as indirect beneficiaries[10].

During the PPG phase, the cost effectiveness of similar interventions was reviewed and revealed. See Table 4 of the project document for a detailed additional cost analysis.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

Given that the project is very innovative in approach, its monitoring and evaluation deserve special attention and consideration. While the main approach to building adaptive capacities is focused on vulnerable groups, particularly women and children (i.e. IPCC WGIIAR5), there is limited evidence to guide users in the selection of the most appropriate options for its context. Consequently, while the evidence base is developed, it is vital that a learning-by-doing approach is adopted. This approach advocates for constant reflection to inform change of course both during project implementation and also to continue to collect lessons post implementation that will facilitate longer-term adaptive management.

The project will be monitored through the detailed M&E activities set out in section 5 of the prodoc, summarized in Table 4. The M&E budget is provided in the table below. The M&E framework set out in the Project Results Framework (Part 3 of the project document) is aligned with the AMAT and UNDP's M&E frameworks.

Table 4 Project Monitoring and Evaluation workplan and budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US$ Excluding project team staff time	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	Project Manager PIU (Project Implementation Unit) UNDP CO, UNDP GEF	Indicative cost: 10,000	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results	UNDP GEF RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members PIU, esp. M&E expert	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on output and implementation	Oversight by Project Manager PIU, esp. M&E expert Implementation teams	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans

[10] www.kongeland.na

		Indicative cost is inclusive in the budget under the UNAM impact assessment[11]	
ARR/PIR	Project manager PIU UNDP CO UNDP RTA UNDP EEG	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	Project manager and team	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Review	Project manager PIU UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost: 30,000	At the mid-point of project implementation
Terminal Evaluation	Project manager PIU UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost : 40,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Audit	UNDP CO Project manager PIU	Indicative cost per year: 3,000 (15,000 total)	Yearly
Visits to field sites	UNDP CO UNDP RCU (as appropriate) Government representatives	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly for UNDP CO, as required by UNDP RCU
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US$ 95,000 (+/- % of total GEF budget)	

[11]This will be linked to the UNAM Impact assessment – thus it not budgeted for under this M & E workplan

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):): (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this form. For SGP, use this OFP endorsement letter).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE *(MM/DD/YYYY)*
TEOFILUS MUTANGENI NGHITILA	GEF EFP, ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSIONER	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND TOURISM/DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS	19 MARCH 2013

B. GEF AGENCY (IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date *(Month, day, year)*	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, Executive, UNDP/GEF		Jan 12, 2015	Benjamin Larroquette, RTA, Addis Ababa		Benjamin.larroquette@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP:

Outcome 12: By 2018, institutional frameworks and policies needed to implement the Environmental Management Act (2007); National Climate Change Policy (2011); Tourism Bill and Strategy; and Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Bill; and International Conventions, are in place and are being implemented effectively.
Outcome indicator: Number of environmental institutions fully equipped with standards, guidelines and specialized skills.

Country Programme Outcome Indicator:

Outcome 2: Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance. **Output 2.5** Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conservations and national legislation.

Primary Applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one): Promote climate change adaptation

Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:
Objective CCA-1: Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level

Objective CCA-3: Promote transfer and adoption of adaptation technology

Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:
Outcome 1.1: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks in targeted vulnerable areas
Outcome 1.2: Reduced vulnerability in development sectors
Outcome 1.3.: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas
Outcome 2.1: Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced risks in targeted vulnerable areas
Outcome 2.2: Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses

Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:

- Indicator 1.1.1:Adaptation action implemented in national/sub-regional development framework
- Indicator 1.1.1.2: Sectoral strategies that include specific budgets for adaptation actions
- Indicator 1.2.8 80 % change in projected food production in targeted area given existing and projected climate change
- Indicator 1.2.11: % of populations with access to improved flood and drought management

	Indicator (AMAT)	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions

Project Objective[12] To strengthen the adaptive capacity to reduce vulnerability of rural communities in responding to droughts and floods in Northern Namibia, with a special focus on women and children.	Vulnerability and risk perception index (Score) - Disaggregated by gender	Initial survey conducted during PPG. Score = 1. Extreme Vulnerability (men and women in all sites/six regions)	Target Scores = 3. Medium Vulnerability (both men and women in all sites / six project intervention regions) At least 4000 hh, of which 80% are women and children beneficiaries,targeted under this objective to reduce vulnerability to floods and drought	- Vulnerability Assessment carried out by UNAM and OPM - Baseline data of targeted communities established, household surveys done yearly	**Assumption**: The Implementing partner and communities are willing and efficiently implement the project. Risks of floods and droughts sufficiently mitigated in project zones
Outcome 1: Strengthened capacity of Smallholder farms to implement climate resilient agricultural practices.	Climate resilient agricultural practices introduced to promote food security and diversified livelihoods. % of households that have more secure access to livelihood assets (5 point score) – Disaggregated by gender	Farmers (women and men) currently constrained by limited access to CCA knowledge and resilient agricultural practices 10 % of households hold assets that can be used to buffer pressure during periods of climate shocks.	By the end of the project 4000 hh of smallholders farmers, 80% (3200 hh) of which are women and children have been trained and are applying climate resilient agricultural production practices. 4000 households have more secured assets and livelihoods diversified away from traditional crop production, promoting food security	Gender disaggregated community survey; community level vulnerability reduction assessment Household survey conducted annually CCA capacity assessment, evidence of training and demonstration of knowledge transfers	**Assumption:** - 4000 beneficiaries are willing to participate in the project - Farmers field schools and SHG are formed and fully functioning for implementation of activities - Govt is functioning and project implementation efficient and well-coordinated **Risks** - Support services such as land preparation, seed availability, etc, on a timely basis - Low and variable organisational capacities for the implementation of the activities

Outcome 2: Small scale agricultural infrastructure introducing to reduce vulnerability to floods and droughts e.g. through restoration of wells and harvesting of floodwater for food security.	Percentage of area covered by flood and drought infrastructure. population with access to improved flood and drought management (disaggregated by gender) Percentage of the population receiving relevant climate risk management information	Currently less than 10% of the targeted land area is covered by effective flood management infrastructure. Climate risk information (1 day through to seasonal forecasts) does not currently reach local populations	80% of targeted land area is covered by efficient flood management infrastructure By the end of the project beneficiaries receive adequate climate risk information and early warning for floods and droughts.	- Impact assessment survey report produced	**Assumptions:** - Adequate equipment and support services are available - The implementing partner is capable of delivering the project activities **Risk** - Maladaptive practices e.g. traditional wells are not properly restored and maintained and farmers harvesting fingerlings before maturity
Outcome 3: Mainstream climate change into national agricultural strategy/sector policy, including adjustments to budgets for replication and up-scaling.	Number of comprehensive adaptation actions - policies, programmes and budgets – included in development frameworks to support climate resilient agricultural practices	Within the agriculture sector climate change adaptation is, to varying degrees, hinted at but not explicitly or comprehensively addressed, and nor are effective budgets allocated	sector strategies for agriculture are integrating and budgeting adaptation measures such as: -Conservation agriculture -Contingency plans for DRM at regional levels?	Result based management plan for climate smart agriculture developed and monitored	**Assumptions:** - The Govt is willing and internal political complexities allow for the inclusion of CCA in planning and budgeting of development frameworks. **Risks** - Lack of political will to mainstream climate change into budgets

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Review comment	UNDP response
COUNCIL: Germany	
1. We do however share the observations and support the suggestions made by the STAP and recommend taking these into account in the final project document. In particular, we recommend clarifying how the baseline activities will be modified as a result of the SCCF contribution (STAP review, points 2 and 3).	See STAP responses below.
2. Considering the natural resources variability and the difference in agricultural systems, we recommend specifying the project sites. Especially in rained agriculture the difference between the O-Regions and Kavango is significant. In the latter region the ecosystems (various stages of degradation) surrounding the agricultural plots make an important contribution to food security and should be included in a resilience strategy.	See STAP response and PON study undertaken during PPG. The final confirmation of "sites"/ farmers will be through a farmers centered and Self-Help Group (SHG) approach (specified especially in *Adaptation Alternative Component 1, With SCCF Intervention*, para 1*25 ff.* and outputs 1.1.to 1.3)
3. For outcome 2 it would be important to state the role of the recently created water point committees in relation to well improvement and to analyze from a hydrogeological point of view the aggregated impact of well use and the additional wells being drilled in the region in relation to the aquifer. This could take the form of a Strategic Environmental Assessment.	Where such water point committees are functional they will be integrated into the local and site specific set up. An SEA is not specific part of this project, but it was discussed with the regional representatives of the MAWF to take this up with the RIPs.
4. Regarding potential synergies with relevant ongoing initiatives, we highly recommend coordination with German Development Cooperation. The "*Biodiversity Management and Climate Change*" project, the implementation of which is supported by GIZ on behalf of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), is starting pilot initiatives in Kavango/eastern Ohangwena with regards to ecosystem vulnerability assessments and ecosystem-based adaptation, including diversifying income from biotrade products which could help to increase resilience beyond agriculture. In the region the relationship to community-based natural resource management initiatives should be clarified in order to avoid promoting conflicting landuses.	Yes, met with Dr. Konrad Uebelhoer at several occasions and reviewed work ongoing under the water sector support project led by Martin Neumann. Had overlap with mission on BMZ/GIZ planned work with MAWF on CCA).
COUNCIL: USA	
1. Clarify how project results will be delivered by a series of partnerships between the government and non-government sectors in areas such as agricultural service delivery, financial services and marketing as mentioned on page 10. Are these pre-existing partnerships that will take on new areas of work as part of project implementation? Or, will these partnerships be established as part of project implementation? As government and non-government stakeholders often have different objectives, we urge UNDP to develop these partnerships in a way that ensures active participation from all parties in order to deliver results.	It is a main goal of this project to convene multi-institutional partnerships and service delivery. Building on previous best practices of such a platform in Omusati (with reach into the other three of the "4 Os" regions) piloted by the SPA project and latter being integrated into the CPP for ISLM, so called RIPs – Regional Implementation Platforms are foreseen to engage in service delivery in the six pilot regions. One RIP will be established for two regions together, as direct project support through regional project officers is limited to financing 3 staff. The Regional Councils will execute their convening powers and mandates, as foreseen under Namibia's Decentralisation Policy. This is an integral design approach of this project.

2. Provide more information on how the adaptation alternative described on page 16 under Outcome 2 will take into account the issue of flooding described in the baseline paragraphs also found on page 16. For example, will the restoration of 8,000 traditional wells proposed under Output 2.1 on page 17 take into consideration the build back better approach in order to increase the resilience of new irrigation infrastructure in the event of future flooding?	This is not specifically included in the project design at this stage, but will be brought to the attention of the implementing teams during project inception.
3. Clarify how it will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.	At the community / farmers level the establishment of farmers' field schools and a farmers' centred approach are critical for information flows (multi-directional); similarly, on the regional level the RIPs will serve the purpose of communication and multi-directional information flows. On the national level a policy influencing strategy will be specifically developed early on during project implementation, which will include a communication plan (see output 3.5). The Namibia's National Farmers Union (NNFU) is a project partner for output 3.3. with a clear communication outreach to farmer's. Output 3.1 will generate "unequivocal" information through a dedicated Impact Assessment that will be undertaken by the University of Namibia as part of the project design.
4. Clarify how it will facilitate coordination and information and knowledge exchange between the project activities and relevant ongoing initiatives in Namibia, including coordination with development partners such as FAO that work very closely on issues related to drought and improving resiliency of farmers in Namibia	The three RIPs and the national Steering Committee provide room for such exchanges, in additional to the specific communication objectives and targets set out under outcome 3. FAO is now a project partner, providing co-financing through MAWF through the Comprehensive Conservation Agriculture Programme (CCAP), which was prepared and approved in early 2014. It's implementation will run in parallel to the GEF project
5. Expand on how it will ensure the sustainability of climate change adaptation education, such as the training mentioned under Output 2.2	The farmers' centred approach set out under outputs 1.1. to 1.3 will build such education impacts on the small holder farmers level. Rips serve a similar purpose on the regional level for governmental and non-governmental organisations and service provider. Additionally component 2/ outcome 3 are fully dedicated to generating lasting CCA education, learning – and behaviour change.
STAP	
1. STAP believes it would be helpful to have a more detailed characterization of the range of future climate change outcomes for the region of interest. Some relevant information from the Second National Communication (2011) is provided, but in addition to precipitation, variables such as soil moisture and projected stream flows in the border rivers are also relevant.	See section 1.2 p. 9 ff in prodoc, and detailed Annex 11
2. This is a typical multi-stressor situation, where climate (change or variability) is only one of the risks that the vulnerable populations face. Coping with climate risks may not be sufficient to address the underlying economic difficulties of small-holder agriculture. Therefore, STAP recommends a greater emphasis on understanding, and addressing the linkages between different sources of risk for longer-term resilience / adaptation.	The approach taken to the implementation of outcomes 1 and 2 through farmers groups will help address a multi-stressor situation that will be discussed by the project beneficiaries. At RIP level, the integration and collaboration amongst representatives from a diversity of sectors will create a platform for such discussion. On the national level outcome 3 focuses on CC learning and sharing of lessons, in a multi-sectoral manner, which will also allow for addressing the multi-stressor context on the up-stream level.

3. The Green Scheme, the Rain-fed Crop Production programme and the Food/Cash for work programme are the main baseline activities that the project seeks to make more climate-resilient. Unfortunately, the project does not clearly indicate how it proposes to modify or enhance these baseline activities. Rather, the PIF talks about scaling up pilot interventions from the SPA and CBA projects.	The baseline has been modified during the PPG. Whilst elements of the Green Scheme, the DLCP and UHP remain as baseline activities, it was clearly identified during the PPG that an influencing of i.e. the Green Scheme to become more climate resilient cannot be a primary outcome of this project. The Green Scheme is a large commercial oriented agriculture investment, and an attitude change, including amongst MAWF staff, will be hard to effect. However, outcome 3 of the project design aims to influence upstream policy decision-making, be it at the regional as well as national levels. Output 3.5. foresees the strategic analysis of policy influencing entry points – which would possibly include a more intricate analysis of what policy and behavioural changes would be needed to effect a change of action including at the Green Scheme. The newly solicited co-financing through the CCAP provides a useful basis for mutual learning by the GEF project and the CCAP on Conservation Agriculture practices in Namibia. Specific activities with the new baseline projects and feedback loops that will lead to a sharing of lessons learnt within MAWF and other relevant institutions is created (outcome 3). Undertaking a dedicated Impact Assessment will generate comprehensive learning that will be internalised within the key institutions. The project uses a variety of multi-institutional information exchange platforms on the regional and national level (e.g. RIPS, and a national SC that was already operationalised during the Country Pilot Partnership for Integrated Sustainable Land Management (CPP-ISLM). Critical institutions such as the Namibia National Farmers Union (NNFU) are involved in the communication and information sharing activities under outcome 3, which will lead to the broader sharing of lessons. It is noted that influencing the climate resilience building and learning would be very beneficial for i.e. the Green Scheme, but it is also realised and for articulated by MAWF during the PPG phase, that this will be a very difficult task that would have to come out of the more organics learning under outcome 3.
4. It would be desirable to further consider questions of sustainability, viability and replicability with regard to the proposed interventions. As mentioned earlier, it is not clear how the proposed project would lead to changes in the baseline activities (or would be mainstreamed within them). Market creation for dryland agriculture products is important, but is a challenging prospect.	The sustainability, viability and replicability with regard to the proposed interventions has been specifically considered during design. A farmers focused community engagement approach has been developed, based on lessons learnt from working with "Self-Help Groups" (SHGs), piloted by local NGOs in the five project regions with good demonstration successes. See the *Adaptation Alternative Component 1, With SCCF Intervention*, para 1*25 ff.* It is noted that the baseline projects have changed, see response to STAP comment 1, above,, which further contextualises the approach. The market creation aspect is addressed in an integrated approach with other already existing institutions, notably AMTA, and will be pursued in a broader institutional context beyond the GEF project itself. As the micro-finance component also has proven to be challenging and expert review was undertaken as part of the PPG phase and is included in Annex 8.
5. Box 2 of the PIF lists some innovations from the GEF SGP and SPA projects. The viability and suitability of	Noted, and a further expansion of the review is included on Annexes 9 and 11.

these innovations in the context of future climate change needs to be carefully assessed. In the case of cash crops, market volatility can be an additional source of risk for small farmers.	
6. In the project overview (section A), STAP recommends defining the project sites. Currently, these do not appear to be defined explicitly in the proposal. Furthermore, STAP suggests including climate variability, or projection, data that may be available for the targeted regions. One possible source of information for this data include â€“ http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm and UNDP's climate change country profiles â€“ http://www.geog.ox.ac.uk/research/climate/projects/undp-cp/ Likewise, it would be valuable to include socio-economic data for the targeted regions, if available. This information will help characterize further why the targeted population is vulnerable to climate change, and why their dependence on agriculture (including livestock) is vital to their livelihoods; thereby, to reducing their vulnerability to climate change.	Detailed desk and field studies and consultations took place during the PPG phase (see Annexes 7 and 11). Relevant expanded descriptions and reviews are included in section 2.7.1 – where specific climate change adaptation profiles were developed, based on detailed site level assessments carried out by the Polytechnic of Namibia (see Annex 7 for synopsis of their study). Further Annex 11 provides a detailed review context of the environmental and socio-economic context of the target regions of the project.
7. Similarly, it would be valuable to provide further information on farmers' knowledge on adaptive capacity in the project region. For example, farmers appear to rely on their agro-ecological knowledge in parts of north-central Namibia to help them decide what crops to plant and where, and what grazing preferences to follow amidst climate variability and risks such as drought and floods. The project developers may wish to rely on the following paper to address this STAP suggestion â€“ Newsham, A. and Thomas, D. "Knowing, farming and climate change adaptation in north-central Namibia". Global Environmental Change 21 (2011) 761-770.	Dedicated field studies were conducted by the Polytechnic of Namibia. Newsham's research formed part of the resource material provide to the PoN team. Notably, during project implementation, the approach to continue to probe and value the understanding of farmers' knowledge on adaptive capacity is part of the overall project philosophy and approach under component 1 – SHGs, farmers' field schools and mentorship programmes are set out to engage in conversations, dialogues and mutual understanding and learning. See *Adaptation Alternative Component 1, With SCCF Intervention*, para 1*25 ff.* and outputs 1.1.to 1.3.
8. While the associated baseline projects and the proposed adaptation activities provide a good basis for the additional cost reasoning, STAP wishes to see further specificity on the adaptation measures and how these will contribute to adaptation benefits in Outcome 1. For example, STAP suggests specifying further the climate-resilient land management practices the project will strengthen, and scale-up. In this regard, it would be useful to specify how these practices will build-upon farmers' agro-ecological knowledge and adaptive capacity to climate change risks, such as drought and floods. How will the climate-resilient land management practices contribute to decreasing farmers' vulnerability to climate risks characterized by droughts and floods? This information may assist in defining more explicitly the adaptation benefit(s) associated with these interventions.	A small-holder farmer's centred approach is designed and specified in *Adaptation Alternative Component 1, With SCCF Intervention*, para 1*25 ff.* and outputs 1.1.to 1.3. Specific land management/adaptation activities and technologies are specified throughout outcome 1 and 2, based on the local level consultations undertaken during the PPG and stakeholder consultations, including Government and NGOs active in the six pilot regions. It is noted that the current project design proposes some very specific investment areas, and that during the farmers' field schools additional or different measures may be identified. The project has a certain degree of flexibility built into the design to allow for the joint identification of priorities with the local beneficiaries during project implementation. Most proposed adaptation activities are based on previous demonstrations from the SPA and CBA supported projects.
9. STAP notes the proposal will build-on the outcomes from other initiatives on water harvesting detailed in outcome 2. Similar to outcome 1, STAP suggest detailing further the rationale for this intervention and outcomes based the population's socioeconomic characteristics (including water harvesting needs) as well as	As above. Firstly detailed assessments with the beneficiary groups were undertaken during the PPG, but also the farmer's centred approach taken to the implementation of outcome 1 and 2 will help tailor the final interventions to the specific contexts. The proposed initiatives on water harvesting have been tested previously and the need was identified from the

on climate vulnerability, or projection, data. For example, it would be valuable to detail further the interventions (restoration of wells and establishing new wells), and its rationale based on the water harvesting needs, or adaptive capacity needs of the population at risk. This will help to specify the adaptation benefit(s) affiliated with this intervention and its expected outcome(s).	local government and local NGO partners already during the PIF stage, and verified during the PPG phase.
10. STAP is pleased the proposal intends to use a quasi-experimental design methodology. STAP supports this approach, particularly as it will achieve an impact evaluation and eliminate rival explanations for the observed data; thereby, attributing confidently effects to the project. STAP wishes to recommends its publication to the project developers on "Experimental project designs in the global environmental facility â€“ designing projects to create evidence and catalyze investments to secure global environmental benefits" (P.Ferraro. 2012) for the purpose of designing the methodology. The paper can be found at â€“ http://stapgef.org/multi-focal-area	Noted. The University of Namibia has developed an initial methodology/ proposal for the Impact Assessment (Annex 10), which will be further refined during project inception.
11. It is good to see that the project seeks to reinstate and replicate traditional knowledge (Box 3 of the PIF) for water resource management.	Noted.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS[13]

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

N/A

B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: **$150,000**			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	***GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount ($)***		
	Budgeted Amount	***Amount Spent To date***	***Amount Committed***
Activity 1: Stakeholder Analysis and Project Beneficiary Assessment, including project site specific verifications, resulting in final stakeholder engagement and participation plan; site profiles and beneficiaries profiles	35,000.00	31,489.00	3,511.00
Activity 2: Preparation of the full Project Scope and Strategy elaboration of the PIF information, with recent and current information and data, including finalisation of the CEO endorsement request, and accompanying annexes, log frame, CCA tracking tool, stakeholder plans, environmental and social screening, and the GRN/UNDP Full Project documentation prepared	30,000.00	30,000.00	-
Activity 3. Stakeholder Institutional capacity and Governance frameworks Assessments, resulting in the development of proposed mainstreaming options of different agencies	25,000.00	25,000.00	-
Activity 4: Development of a project M&E, an interactive community participatory M&E approach	30,000.00	30,000.00	0
Activity 5: CCA resilience and adaptive capacity research –based output: methodology and assessment designed and tested during the PPG to serve as either a	30,000.00	7,401.00	22,599.00

[13] If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

scientific publication /contribution to the field of CCA field level activities			
Total	150,000.00	**123,890.00**	26,110.00

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used**)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)
N/A