

Combined Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) and Project Validation Meeting for the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency and Monitoring, Reporting & Verification (CBIT-MRV) Project

For CBIT Project

Date of the LPAC	Start time	End time	Held at
13 February 2020	08:00	14:00	NIPAM, Windhoek

Name of LPAC Chairperson:	Petrus Muteyauli
Functional Title:	Deputy Director
Institution:	Multilateral Environmental Agreements Division- Department of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET),
Signature:	

Name of LPAC Co-Chair:	Armstrong Alexis
Functional Title:	Deputy Resident Representative
Institution:	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Signature:	

Have all LPAC participants received the PRODOC for appraisal prior to the meeting and in a timely manner?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Remarks:	In addition, LPAC participants were given due date of the 20 February 2020 as final date to provide additional comments and/or further inputs in the project document.

Country:	Namibia		
Project Title (full):	Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency and Monitoring, Reporting & Verification (CBIT-MRV)		
Date of submission to the GEF	06 April 2020	Date of approval by the GEF:	06 August 2020
Name and contact of Environment Focal Point at the UNDP Office:	Martha Talamondjila Naanda (martha.naanda@undp.org)		

UNDAF Outcome(s):	By 2023, vulnerable populations in disaster-prone and biodiversity-sensitive areas are resilient to shocks and climate change effects, and benefit from natural resources management.
Expected SP Outcome(s):	
Expected CPD Output (s):	Country Programme Document Output 2.2: Scaled up integrated and innovative action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across priority sectors which is funded and implemented.

Programme Period:	2020 - 2023	Total resources required (total project funds)	\$ 1,160,000
Atlas Award ID:	00121666	Total allocated resources (UNDP managed funds)	\$ 1,110,000
Project ID:	10157	Regular (UNDP TRAC)	\$ 10,000
PIMS #	6337	GEF	\$ 1,100,000
Project Start date:	01 September 2020	Parallel co-financing	
Project expected End Date:	30 September 2023	o Government	\$ 50,000
Proposed Management Arrangements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NIM <input type="checkbox"/> DIM	o Other [Private Sector, Academic institutions, NGOs]	\$ 0
		o UNDP (Climate Promise)	\$ 200,000

Implementing Partner		Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET)
1) Decisions of the LPAC <input type="checkbox"/> [tick the applicable boxes, if these have been endorsed by the LPAC]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	General endorsement of the Project's strategy:
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	- Objective, Outputs and Activities (see PRODOC)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	- Log-frame indicators (see PRODOC PRF, Annex 3)
	<input type="checkbox"/>	- Management Arrangements (see PRODOC)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Specific</u> endorsement of the project's budget (see PRODOC)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>Specific</u> endorsement of the proposed project staff complement (and the project's organogram (see PRODOC Management Arrangements)
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Endorsement of the TOR for key project staff
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Endorsement of the proposed strategy for stakeholder engagement
Remarks on the above	LPAC endorsed key responsibilities of project staff and technical specialists as contained in prodoc section VII. LPAC endorsed the PMU arrangements proposed the same PMU for BUR 4 complemented by technical specialists.	

2) Engagement of Implementing Entity/Responsible Partners		
Will the project engage entities other than the Executing Entity/Implementing Partner?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If YES, which and for what purpose?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government department <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academia / centre of excellence <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Academia to serve in the NCCC committee as well as various Working Groups (WG) to be constituted and support knowledge management (codification of the MRV System and contributions to regional and global learning platforms)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Government department <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/> Academia / centre of excellence <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Community Trusts)	As members of the NCCC and various WG and in line with the Stakeholder Engagement Plan
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government department <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/> Academia / centre of excellence <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Local Authority)	As data provides and lead of the WGs
	<input type="checkbox"/> Government department <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/> Academia / centre of excellence <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Private Sector)	As data providers and members of the WGs, and in line with the Stakeholder Engagement Plan
Is the pre-selection of these partners in line with UNDP procedures and has this been fully endorsed by the LPAC?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Remarks	A detailed stakeholder engagement plan was developed during the project design, tabled and endorsed at the LPAC with minor adjustments (addition of key role players such DBN).	

3) General and Specific Recommendations of the LPAC
Session 1: Project Validation and Appraisal Objectives Project definition and objectives were noted. Specific discussions on the project design and implementation arrangements were as follows:
Session 2: Tabling of CBIT-MRV Project Document: strategy, components, outcomes, outputs and indicative activities The project design and three components, four outcomes and 13 outputs were validated and endorsed without major adjustments. The implementation arrangements for the project were noted, with the Ministry of Environment and Tourism as the Implementing Partner, the MET to communicate any changes on the arrangements to UNDP before 20 February 2020, specifically the designated CBIT National Project Director.
Session 2: Component 1: outcome, outputs and indicative activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome 1.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Output 1.1.1 ○ Output 1.1.2 ○ Output 1.1.3 ○ Output 1.1.4 ○ Output 1.1.5

Session 2, Component 2: outcome, outputs and indicative activities

- **Outcome 2.1**
 - **Output 1.1.1**
 - **Output 1.1.2**
 - **Output 1.1.3**

- **Outcome 2.2**
 - **Output 2.2.1**
 - **Output 2.2.2**
 - **Output 2.2.3**

Session 2: Component 3:

- **Outcome 3.1**
 - **Output 3.1.1**
 - **Output 3.1.2**

Session 3: Project Risks

No additional Project risks were added during the LPAC, and those presented from the draft Prodoc were noted.

Session 4: Iterative Discussions during the Tabling of the CBIT

Session 5: CBIT Project Quality Assurance

Project ratings in terms of QA was presented to the team, budget well elaborated, the use of existing ministries pointed out, project effectiveness rated, gender action plan is in place and the project is rated well to be responding to the needs and timely.

Session 6: Gender Action Plan and Stakeholder Engagement plan

UNAM stated that the background provided on Namibia clearly shows that more gender analytical work has been done in rural settings/contexts and there is a need for more research in urban and peri-urban settings.

A suggestion was given that the matter of women urgency (ability to take action) needs to be emphasised. This is due to the fact that women aspirations are completely different from the focus for interventions – unlike for men. Furthermore, the urgency for action between men and women is different. Most importantly, the issue of cultures, some women have more voice than others – important in view of women empowerment.

Session 7: Project management arrangements / PMU & TOR

Structure:

The proposed project management structure was noted. Based on the proposed structure, there will be no new PMU constituted to implement the project. The current manager for the national communications and BURs will be responsible for the management of the CBIT project.

Proposed change in the structure: Instead of having an international consultant doing computation, it is good to rather have one doing capacity building.

A suggestion on the fugitive emissions that it (i.e. from mining and transportation) should fall under the energy sector that is being led by MME.

The coloured structure represents highly specialised institutions.

It was shared that NSA is developing a system for recording statistics. The proposed CBIT implementation structure should be included in that strategy, as it is useful for certification (NSA Status on the structure)

The response was that there is a need to find out as to which institution is suited for which function etc. (in the structure). This needs to be discussed further.

Session 8: Final endorsement of the project strategy, budgets and implementation arrangements

Project was adopted with adjustments made today (13 February 2020) and comments expected to be sent by the partners by the 20th February 2020.

Session 9: Recommendations, Adoption and Way forward

Project was adopted with adjustments made today (13 February 2020) and comments expected to be sent by the partners by the 20th February 2020

General Comments:

It is a requirement by the UNFCCC that QA/QC for GHGs inventories should be conducted. An indication was made that MET should be involved in the QA/QC for the GHG inventories prepared under the CBIT Project. To carry out the QA/QC for the GHG inventories, it is essential that, a QA/QC plan needs to be developed, and implemented. Based on the 2006 IPCC guidelines, the plan should include the QA/QC activities and the institutional arrangements. The workshop recommended that the QA/QC plan should be implemented by an independent institution that is not involved in the project implementation, preferably NSA.

A suggestion was given by the consultant that since there are other countries currently doing QA/QC on GHGs inventories (e.g. Senegal) could be approached for possible advice. They have their QA and QC plans, which could be adopted.

A concern was raised by **NUST** as to whether it is possible to develop gender markers to be used for various aspects of reporting, including research e.g. towards national communication.

Response was that UNDP and other UN entities have developed gender markers, clearly defining the level of gender mainstreaming to be considered by the project; and these could be good entry points for the country to consider.

Action: Information on gender markers to be shared by presenter.

MET indicated that Climate change has a huge impact on men. For example, when they lose livestock during drought periods, they get into depression.

Response: Such an impact has been noted...research has revealed that men and women are impacted differently.

MET further pointed that Gender seems to be a sensitive issue in some areas. For example, in some areas owing to different hindering factors women may not speak up easily, unlike in others. It is therefore good to have a strategy for women empowerment.

Response/comment given was that, Gender is an issue that is influenced by various aspects, including culture. It is therefore advisable to ensure political involvement in influencing women participation/empowerment. In addition to addressing the many gender imbalances, the project has developed a gender action plan that can help to change some of these issues during the implementation of the project, and beyond.

NUST pointed out that on components: More focus on the MRV is on mitigation.

The response was that the idea is to have a system that addresses the climate change through mitigation and adaptation actions

SASCAL added that even though the proposed implementation structure has included NSA as one of the role players in project implementation. However, it is essential that its mandate is clearly spelled out in the structure.

Response: The roles and responsibilities are not clear, therefore need to be worked out.

NPC requested that training needs be extended to people providing data especially in line ministries.

Response given was that the relevant entities need to be identified (that should be targeted for capacity building)

MET stressed that most of the budgets have historically been dedicated towards consultancies. And gave a proposal to say; consultants should invest in capacity building for local peers.

Response given was that it is a priority to transfer knowledge from international to local consultants. It is however essential that the ToR for the consultancies should clearly include a component of knowledge transfer.

MME indicated that it is essential that national consultants should also be reduced, instead of only seeking to transfer knowledge from international to local consultants.

Response given was that, in essence, consultants should transfer knowledge to staff for the institutions that have appointed them.

MET further indicated that consultants need to share their secrets e.g. how they do calculations for GHGs, share tool kits etc.

Response from the room was that, the issue of dealing with consultants is what is being moved away from, which is the reason that the CBIT would like to bring in academia – for capacity building purpose and skills redevelopment.

NUST raised a question to find out whether there is a possibility for building an element of synergy for reporting requirements/data sharing.

Response was that the focus of the project is climate change, which should look into the guidelines for reporting requirements. Also, to look at the linkages will help a lot.

MET added that wastewater falls under MAWF

The room took the point for consideration

MAWF suggested that It will be good if projects are designed in such a way that at the time of design the consultant should have counterparts within the institution of focus. To work closely with personnel from the institutions that have appointed them.

Response from the room was the Point was taken

MET questioned if the data needed was based on estimation? Or tangible data?

Response given was that the aim is to provide tools for estimating data, although it is not available. That is basically the idea behind using the IPCC guidelines for updating the GHG inventories.

UNIDO stated a point that Climate change projects often leave out private sector and finance sector despite their potential valuable contribution. They have huge potential to make valuable monetary contribution or to provide the necessary data upon request.

Request was that action needs to be taken at the national level and COP.

Youth Custodian (Deon) reckoned that Collection of GHG data may involve the collection of energy data. What other data needs to be collected? Is there a possibility of involving youth in the project?

Response given was that at this point youth involvement is beyond project scope, however, it can possibly be included in future projects. Suggestions are welcome.

A concern was raised by **NPC** whether the issue of food security could possibly be incorporated into the project.

Response was that the CBIT Project intends to develop an MRV system to help Namibia to address the impacts of climate change. Such a system will strengthen institutions to be in a position to provide climate change related information based on the IPCC guidelines. It is not seeking to address the climate impacts directly.

Action Items:

- Participants to send additional comments and inputs to Martha Naanda martha.naanda@undp.org by 20 February 2020.

4) List of participants in the LPAC

NO.	NAME	ORGANISATION	EMAIL	Attendance
-----	------	--------------	-------	------------

NO.	NAME	ORGANISATION	EMAIL	Attendance
1.	Petrus Muteyauli	MET	pmuteyauli@yahoo.co.uk	YES
2.	Jonas Nghishidi	MET	Jnghishidi@gmail.com	YES
3.	Sallotte Hanghome	MET	Asallotte@yahoo.com	YES
4.	Frans Nghifilemona Nekuma	MITSMED	fnekuma@gmail.com	YES
5.	Mr. Mitchelle Mubuyaeta	MGECCW	Mitchell.Mubuyaeta@mgeccw.gov.na	YES
6.	Rosalia Nghikongwa	MGECCW	rosalia.nghikongwa@mgeccw.gov.na	YES
7.	Laina Mbongo	NPC	lbongo@npc.gov.na	YES
8.	Margaret Angula	UNAM	mangula@unam.na	YES
9.	Mwala Lubinda	NUST	mlubinda@nust.na	YES
11.	Hedwig Black	SASSCAL	hedwig.black@sasscal.org	YES
12.	Panduleni Hamukwaya	SASSCAL	panduleni.hamukwaya@sasscal.org	YES
13.	Eugene Kanguatjivi	FAO	eugene.kanguatjivi@fao.org	YES
14.	Nico Willemse	UNIDO	n.willemse@unido.org	YES
15.	Deon Shekuza	NYCC	dshekuza@gmail.com	YES
16.	Theo Uvanga	DBN	TUvanga@dbn.com.na	YES
17.	Desmond Cloete	Meat Board of Namibia	desmond@nammic.com.na	YES
18.	Venaune Hepute	Namibian AGR Board	Venaune.Hepute@nab.com.na	YES
19.	Hedwig Black	SASSCAL	Hewig.black@sasscal.org	YES
20.	Susan Tise	MME	Susan.Tise@mme.gov.na	YES
21.	Alex Mudabeti	NSA	Amudabeti@nsa.org.na	YES
22.	Alfeus Shekunyenge	MET/GIZ	Alfeus.shekunyenge@giz.de	YES
23.	Sirkka tshiningayamue	IUM	S.tshiningayamue@ium.edu.na	YES
24.	Sakeus Shilomnoleni	EIF	SShilomnoleni@EIF.org.na	YES

NO.	NAME	ORGANISATION	EMAIL	Attendance
25.	Saara Niitenge	NSA	sniitenge@nsa.org.na	YES
26.	Salmo Djuulume	MET	Salmo.djuulume@met.gov.na	YES
27.	Rikka Shikongo	MET	Nikka.shikongo@met.gov.na	YES
28.	Nelao Haimbili	MET	Nelao.haimbili@met.gov.na	YES
29.	Deon Shekaza	Youth Custodian	dshekaza@gmail.com	YES
30.	Inkeri Von Hase		inkerivonhase@gmail.com	YES
31.	Juan L. Martin – Ortega		ilm@gauss-int.com	YES
32.	Martha Naanda	UNDP	martha.naanda@undp.org	YES
33.	Armstrong Alexis	UNDP	armstrong.alexis@undp.org	YES
34.	Margretha Kampulu	UNDP	margretha.kampulu@undp.org	YES
35.	Irish Goroh	UNDP	irish.goroh@undp.org	YES
36.	Maano Shimanda	UNDP	maano.shimanda@undp.org	YES
37.	Nashilongo Amutenya	UNDP	nashilongo.amutenya@und.org	YES