



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.



Project title: Namibia Integrated Landscape Approach for enhancing Livelihoods and Environmental Governance to eradicate poverty (NILALEG)

GEF Implementing Agency : United Nations Development Programme

Country: Republic of Namibia

Implementing Partner: Ministry of Environment and Tourism

Management Arrangements: National Implementation Modality (NIM)

UNDP-GEF PIMS ID number: 5640

GEF ID number: 9426

Annex K Design and Appraisal Stage Quality Assurance Report

Design & Appraisal Stage Quality Assurance Report

Overall Project Rating:

Decision:

Project Number: 00118575

Project Title:

This Multi focal areas project is an integrated landscape management approach that maximizes poverty reduction and achieves Namibia's national and global environmental commitments set out in the LDN Strategy (UNCCD), the INDC (UNFCCC) and the NBSAP (CBD)

Project Date:

01-Jun-2019

Strategic

Quality Rating:

1. Does the project's Theory of Change specify how it will contribute to higher level change? (Select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: *The project has a theory of change with explicit assumptions and clear change pathway describing how the project will contribute to outcome level change as specified in the programme/CPD, backed by credible evidence of what works effectively in this context. The project document clearly describes why the project's strategy is the best approach at this point in time.*
- 2: The project has a theory of change. It has an explicit change pathway that explains how the project intends to contribute to outcome-level change and why the project strategy is the best approach at this point in time, but is backed by limited evidence.
- 1: The project does not have a theory of change, but the project document may describe in generic terms how the project will contribute to development results, without specifying the key assumptions. It does not make an explicit link to the programme/CPD's theory of change.

Evidence

The project theory of change were explicitly developed around an analysis of the development challenges (P.6-7). Also, the ProDoc clearly describes that why the Project's strategy will lead to those changes (P.9).
Also, as per ANNEX M. Theory of Change

Management Response

2. Is the project aligned with the thematic focus of the UNDP Strategic Plan? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: *The project responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan; it addresses at least one of the proposed new and emerging areas; an issues-based analysis has been incorporated into the project design; and the project's RRF includes all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: While the project may respond to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan, it is based on a sectoral approach without addressing the complexity of the development issue. None of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF. This answer is also selected if the project does not respond to any of the three areas of development work in the Strategic Plan.

Evidence

Evidence
The Project responds to Strategic Plan, Output 1.3, (ProDoc, RRF, p.1)
Yes
The project is linked to Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Outcome 1. 3 (ProDoc, P1), UNPAF 2019-2023 Outcome 3.1(ProDoc, P1), and CPD 2019-2023 Outputs 2.1 (ProDoc, P9)

Relevant

Quality Rating:

3. Does the project have strategies to effectively identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of targeted groups/geographic areas with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project)

- 3: *The target groups/geographic areas are appropriately specified, prioritising the excluded and/or marginalised. Beneficiaries will be identified through a rigorous process based on evidence (if applicable.)The project has an explicit strategy to identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of specified target groups/geographic areas throughout the project, including through monitoring and decision-making (such as representation on the project board) (all must be true to select this option)*
- 2: The target groups/geographic areas are appropriately specified, prioritising the excluded and/or marginalised. The project document states how beneficiaries will be identified, engaged and how meaningful participation will be ensured throughout the project. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: The target groups/geographic areas are not specified, or do not prioritize excluded and/or marginalised populations. The project does not have a written strategy to identify or engage or ensure the meaningful participation of the target groups/geographic areas throughout the project.
- Not Applicable

Evidence

Per Annex F- Stakeholder Assessment and Engagement Plan, and Annex Q Socio Economic Profiles of Local Landscapes.

Management Response

4. Have knowledge, good practices, and past lessons learned of UNDP and others informed the project design? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project)

- 3: *Knowledge and lessons learned (gained e.g. through peer assist sessions) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, and monitoring have been explicitly used, with appropriate referencing, to develop the project's theory of change and justify the approach used by the project over alternatives.*
- 2: The project design mentions knowledge and lessons learned backed by evidence/sources, which inform the project's theory of change but have not been used/are not sufficient to justify the approach selected over alternatives.
- 1: There is only scant or no mention of knowledge and lessons learned informing the project design. Any references that are made are not backed by evidence.

Evidence

In page 10, The ProDoc shows that "the project approach builds on lessons learned through recent and current bilateral cooperation on environmental management between the Governments of Namibia and Germany, as well as the European Union and others, and recent experiences in the current portfolio of projects funded by the GEF and other multilateral agencies and financial institutions. (ProDoc, Section IV)
Also, as per ICPE and PASS Evaluation Reports.

Management Response

5. Does the project use gender analysis in the project design and does the project respond to this gender analysis with concrete measures to address gender inequities and empower women? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project)

- 3: *A participatory gender analysis on the project has been conducted. This analysis reflects on the different needs, roles and access to/control over resources of women and men, and it is fully integrated into the project document. The project establishes concrete priorities to address gender inequalities in its strategy. The results framework includes outputs and activities that specifically respond to this gender analysis, with indicators that measure and monitor results contributing to gender equality. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 2: A gender analysis on the project has been conducted. This analysis reflects on the different needs, roles and access to/control over resources of women and men. Gender concerns are integrated in the development challenge and strategy sections of the project document. The results framework includes outputs and activities that specifically respond to this gender analysis, with indicators that measure and monitor results contributing to gender equality. (all must be true to select this option)

- 1: The project design may or may not mention information and/or data on the differential impact of the project's development situation on gender relations, women and men, but the constraints have not been clearly identified and interventions have not been considered.

Evidence**Management Response**

Per Annex G of the Project Document, a gender assessment was done and an action plan developed.

6. Does UNDP have a clear advantage to engage in the role envisioned by the project vis-à-vis national partners, other development partners, and other actors? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project)

- 3: *An analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and credible evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and partners through the project. It is clear how results achieved by relevant partners will contribute to outcome level change complementing the project's intended results. If relevant, options for south-south and triangular cooperation have been considered, as appropriate. (all must be true to select this option)*

2: Some analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners where the project intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the proposed engagement of and division of labour between UNDP and partners through the project. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation may not have not been fully developed during project design, even if relevant opportunities have been identified.

1: No clear analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area that the project intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and partners through the project. There is risk that the project overlaps and/or does not coordinate with partners' interventions in this area. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have not been considered, despite its potential relevance.

Evidence**Management Response**

As indicated in the Project Document, (Under Section IV. Results and Partnerships, P.22) an analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners and credible evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and stakeholders. The project also involves south-south and triangular cooperation. UNDP will play an important role in providing technical assistance to Government on this area of work. (P.23)

Social & Environmental Standards**Quality Rating:**

7. Does the project seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights based approach? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

3: Credible evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights, upholding the relevant international and national laws and standards in the area of the project. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were rigorously identified and assessed as relevant, with appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true to select this option)

2: *Some evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights. Potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were identified and assessed as relevant, and appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into the project design and budget.*

1: No evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were considered.

Evidence**Management Response**

Per Annex E, UNDP Social and Environment and Social Screening Template (SESP). How the project mainstream the human-rights based approach is described in Part A.

The NILALEG Project will promote an integrated landscape management approach in key agricultural and forest landscapes, reducing poverty through sustainable nature-based

livelihoods, protecting biodiversity and restoring forests as carbon sinks, and promoting Land Degradation Neutrality. This will be done in five Focal Landscapes that are inhabited by local people (see Annex Q: Profiles of the Landscapes). Significantly, the Project will enable the duty bearers, such as the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Agriculture, Water and Forestry, and Academic institutions (remote sensing and GIS units) to provide tools, guidelines and monitoring platforms that can help the right-holders (local people/communities in the five landscapes) to demand and claim their economic, social and environmental benefits on a sustainable foundation. In the long-term, this project enables Namibia to meet its international environmental obligations.

On the whole, an integrated management approach will enable Namibia to a) ensure maximum Global Environmental Benefits as a result of the GEF-supported investments; b) apply lessons from implementation of past project experiences; c) promote stricter alignment with international and national targets through a strong thematic and geographical focus; and d) build upon firm foundations provided by key national baseline programmes, with co-finance from partners directly supporting the project outcomes.

Furthermore, value will be added to planned investments by the Government, private sector, and bilateral & multilateral donors by bringing about a new integrated approach to landscape management, creating multi-stakeholder platforms at national, regional and landscape levels. These platforms will address issues of human right of the local communities including the San and Ovahimba by building their capacity to deal with interconnected issues of biodiversity conservation, sustainable land and forest management, and climate change mitigation within the current system of Integrated Regional Land Use Plans (IRLUP). Local people working through the Community Based Organisations (CBOs) and Regional Councils will be assisted (capacities built) to ensure that IRLUPs are implemented.

The Project will thus enable these IRLUP Plans to be rolled out at landscape level to create mosaics of land use with specific management guidelines that maximise environmental sustainability and the extraction of value for livelihoods on lands that are used by local people (e.g. the San and the Ovahimba). Specifically, the local people's roles working through their CBOs -as right holders - will be: (a) enhanced to pilot new approaches to small business development, (b) access finances in rural areas, and (c) scaling up these throughout the country. Broadly, this will break the cycle of poverty and environmental degradation that limits the local people to meet their basic human rights' needs (access to food, water and land). This is achieved by a strategy which simultaneously improves the national and regional enabling environment for an integrated approach to planning and managing landscapes and monitoring spatial results (Component 1), and pilots the approach at a landscape level, generating sustainable livelihoods in rural communities (Component 2); with the Financial mechanisms to be put in place for scaling up nationally (Component 3).

Explicitly, the NILALEG Project design:

- Includes measures to assist the Namibian government to realize (respect, protect and fulfil) human rights under the three Rio Conventions and to implement human rights-related standards in line with national legislation, i.e. Environmental Management Act 07 of 2007.
- Enhances the availability, accessibility and quality of benefits and services for potentially marginalized individuals and groups (the San and Ovahimba), and to increase their inclusion in decision-making processes that may impact them (consistent with the non-discrimination and equality human rights principle) - see the Stakeholder Engagement Report (Annex F).
- Supports meaningful participation and inclusion of all stakeholders, in particular, marginalized individuals and groups

(the San, Himba and Ovaherero), in processes that may impact them including design, implementation and monitoring of the Project, especially in the five (Omaoipanga, Ruacana, Okongo, Nkulivere and Zambezi) Focal Landscapes.

- Provides or supports meaningful means (multi stakeholder platforms, access to Regional Councils and working with the Traditional Authorities) for local communities and affected populations to raise concerns and/or grievances including a redress processes for local communities when activities may adversely impact them (consistent with accountability and rule of law human rights principle) – per the Environmental Management Act and associated regulations

8. Did the project consider potential environmental opportunities and adverse impacts, applying a precautionary approach? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

3: *Credible evidence that opportunities to enhance environmental sustainability and integrate poverty-environment linkages were fully considered as relevant, and integrated in project strategy and design. Credible evidence that potential adverse environmental impacts have been identified and rigorously assessed with appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true to select this option).*

2: No evidence that opportunities to strengthen environmental sustainability and poverty-environment linkages were considered. Credible evidence that potential adverse environmental impacts have been identified and assessed, if relevant, and appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget.

1: No evidence that opportunities to strengthen environmental sustainability and poverty-environment linkages were considered. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse environmental impacts were adequately considered.

Evidence

Management Response

The NILALEG Project supports implementation of national environmental sustainability priorities identified in Namibia's Second National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2013-2022; Nationally Determined Contribution in terms of the Paris Agreement; and Namibia's Third National Report on the implementation of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification. Lessons and recommendations that emanated from the Namibia Country Pilot Partnership, National Programme to Combat Desertification, and Land Degradation Neutrality Report 2015, have been taken on board to ensure that the project mainstream environmental issues at appropriate levels (national, regional and local) and take cognisance of geographical zones (focal landscapes). Thus;

- Strengthens environmental management capacities of country partners through: Institutional coordination and governance mechanisms for integrated landscape management;
- Promotes collaboration by partnering with tertiary and research institutions for longitudinal studies on project impact; Knowledge sharing for replication of best practice locally, nationally and internationally; Public awareness, advocacy, communications and knowledge management for project activities.
- Addresses environment-development linkages by implementation of the integrated landscape management approach in target landscapes; implementation and upscaling of the integrated landscape management approach (providing financing to CBOs for the on-the-ground interventions) - thereby specifically addressing the poverty-environment nexus; and
- Applies a precautionary approach to natural resource conservation, as well Sustainable Development Goals, especially SDGs 1, 6, 7, 13, 14, and 15.

9. Has the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) been conducted to identify potential social and environmental impacts and risks? [If yes, upload the completed checklist as evidence. If SESP is not required, provide the reason(s) for the exemption in the evidence section. Exemptions include the following:

- Preparation and dissemination of reports, documents and communication materials
- Organization of an event, workshop, training
- Strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences
- Partnership coordination (including UN coordination) and management of networks
- Global/regional projects with no country level activities (e.g. knowledge management, inter-governmental processes)
- UNDP acting as Administrative Agent

- Yes
- No
- SESP not required

Evidence

Annex E of the Project Document, and supplementary Indigenous People Plan

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating:

10. Does the project have a strong results framework? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

3: *The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level and relate in a clear way to the project's theory of change. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure all of the key expected changes identified in the theory of change, each with credible data sources, and populated baselines and targets, including gender sensitive, sex-disaggregated indicators where appropriate. (all must be true to select this option)*

2: The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level, but may not cover all aspects of the project's theory of change. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators, but baselines, targets and data sources may not yet be fully specified. Some use of gender sensitive, sex-disaggregated indicators, as appropriate. (all must be true to select this option)

1: The results framework does not meet all of the conditions specified in selection "2" above. This includes: the project's selection of outputs and activities are not at an appropriate level and do not relate in a clear way to the project's theory of change; outputs are not accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the expected change, and have not been populated with baselines and targets; data sources are not specified, and/or no gender sensitive, sex-disaggregation of indicators.

Evidence

Per the Project Results Framework on pages 26-30, the PRF indicates selection of outputs at appropriate level and in a clear way to the TOC.

Management Response

11. Is there a comprehensive and costed M&E plan with specified data collection sources and methods to support evidence-based management, monitoring and evaluation of the project?

- Yes
- No

Evidence

Section VII of the Prodoc, there is a costed M&E Plan and it is attached.

12. Is the project's governance mechanism clearly defined in the project document, including planned composition of the project board? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

3: *The project's governance mechanism is fully defined in the project document. Individuals have been specified for each position in the governance mechanism (especially all members of the project board.) Project Board members have agreed on their roles and responsibilities as specified in the terms of reference. The ToR of the project board has been attached to the project document. (all must be true to select this option).*

- 2: The project's governance mechanism is defined in the project document; specific institutions are noted as holding key governance roles, but individuals may not have been specified yet. The prodoc lists the most important responsibilities of the project board, project director/manager and quality assurance roles. (all must be true to select this option)
- 1: The project's governance mechanism is loosely defined in the project document, only mentioning key roles that will need to be filled at a later date. No information on the responsibilities of key positions in the governance mechanism is provided.

Evidence**Management Response**

The project's governance mechanism is fully defined in the project document (on page 36). Individuals and technical Specialists have been specified for each position and roles in the section of the governance mechanism (especially all members of the project board.) Project Board members have agreed on their roles and responsibilities as specified in the terms of reference (ToR0. The ToR of the project board/PSC is part of the Project document and Annex C and Annex D clearly spell out the TORs for PSC and all positions.

13. Have the project risks been identified with clear plans stated to manage and mitigate each risks? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

- 3: *Project risks related to the achievement of results are fully described in the project risk log, based on comprehensive analysis drawing on the theory of change, Social and Environmental Standards and screening, situation analysis, capacity assessments and other analysis. Clear and complete plan in place to manage and mitigate each risk. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 2: Project risks related to the achievement of results identified in the initial project risk log with mitigation measures identified for each risk.
- 1: Some risks may be identified in the initial project risk log, but no evidence of analysis and no clear risk mitigation measures identified. This option is also selected if risks are not clearly identified and no initial risk log is included with the project document.

Evidence**Management Response****Efficient****Quality Rating:**

14. Have specific measures for ensuring cost-efficient use of resources been explicitly mentioned as part of the project design? This can include: i) using the theory of change analysis to explore different options of achieving the maximum results with the resources available; ii) using a portfolio management approach to improve cost effectiveness through synergies with other interventions; iii) through joint operations (e.g., monitoring or procurement) with other partners.

- Yes
- No

Evidence

Project Document (which includes TOC, M&E, Delivery with technical specialist, etc. Entire Prodoc is attached already in the Strategic part of the PQA and cannot be loaded twice.

15. Are explicit plans in place to ensure the project links up with other relevant on-going projects and initiatives, whether led by UNDP, national or other partners, to achieve more efficient results (including, for example, through sharing resources or coordinating delivery?)

- Yes
- No

Evidence

A Joint Advisory Forum serving GEF funded NILALEG and Green Climate Fund (GCF) funded EbA (i.e. Ecosystem-Based Adaptation) project is explicitly part of the project design. See page 38-39 of the Prodoc.

The NILALEG Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be kept small and streamlined, and will be complemented by a Joint Advisory Forum serving both NILALEG and the EIF-managed Ecosystem-Based Adaptation project. This forum will provide guidance to the PSC where necessary, and will also discuss topics of interest to forum members in relation to the projects, co-opting additional members whenever necessary for discussion of specialized topics

16. Is the budget justified and supported with valid estimates?

- 3: *The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, and is specified for the duration of the project period in a multi-year budget. Costs are supported with valid estimates using benchmarks from similar projects or activities. Cost implications from inflation and foreign exchange exposure have been estimated and incorporated in the budget.*
- 2: The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, when possible, and is specified for the duration of the project in a multi-year budget. Costs are supported with valid estimates based on prevailing rates.
- 1: The project's budget is not specified at the activity level, and/or may not be captured in a multi-year budget.

Evidence

Prodoc from page 40-51 provides a clear total budget and work plan over the full period of the Project. In addition, the project oversight costs will be provided as part of the GEF Implementing Agency fees.

17. Is the Country Office fully recovering the costs involved with project implementation?

- 3: *The budget fully covers all direct project costs that are directly attributable to the project, including programme management and development effectiveness services related to strategic country programme planning, quality assurance, pipeline development, policy advocacy services, finance, procurement, human resources, administration, issuance of contracts, security, travel, assets, general services, information and communications based on full costing in accordance with prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL.)*
- 2: The budget covers significant direct project costs that are directly attributable to the project based on prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL) as relevant.
- 1: The budget does not reimburse UNDP for direct project costs. UNDP is cross-subsidizing the project and the office should advocate for the inclusion of DPC in any project budget revisions.

Evidence

Prodoc from page 40-51 provides a clear total budget and work plan and budget notes over the full period of the Project. In addition, the project oversight costs will be provided as part of the GEF Implementing Agency fees.

Management Response

Effective

Quality Rating:

18. Is the chosen implementation modality most appropriate? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

- 3: *The required implementing partner assessments (capacity assessment, HACT micro assessment) have been conducted, and there is evidence that options for implementation modalities have been thoroughly considered. There is a strong justification for choosing the selected modality, based on the development context. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 2: The required implementing partner assessments (capacity assessment, HACT micro assessment) have been conducted and the implementation modality chosen is consistent with the results of the assessments.
- 1: The required assessments have not been conducted, but there may be evidence that options for implementation modalities have been considered.

Evidence

Management Response

19. Have targeted groups, prioritizing marginalized and excluded populations that will be affected by the project, been engaged in the design of the project in a way that addresses any underlying causes of exclusion and discrimination?

3: Credible evidence that all targeted groups, prioritising marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in or affected by the project, have been actively engaged in the design of the project. Their views, rights and any constraints have been analysed and incorporated into the root cause analysis of the theory of change which seeks to address any underlying causes of exclusion and discrimination and the selection of project interventions.

2: Some evidence that key targeted groups, prioritising marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in the project, have been engaged in the design of the project. Some evidence that their views, rights and any constraints have been analysed and incorporated into the root cause analysis of the theory of change and the selection of project interventions.

1: No evidence of engagement with marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in the project during project design. No evidence that the views, rights and constraints of populations have been incorporated into the project.

Not Applicable

Evidence

20. Does the project conduct regular monitoring activities, have explicit plans for evaluation, and include other lesson learning (e.g. through After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops), timed to inform course corrections if needed during project implementation?

Yes

No

Evidence

M&E Plan on Prodoc pages 34-35

21. The gender marker for all project outputs are scored at GEN2 or GEN3, indicating that gender has been fully mainstreamed into all project outputs at a minimum.

Yes

No

Evidence

GEN 2 and Gender Analysis and Action plan is attached to the PQA and is Annex G of the Prodoc

Management Response

22. Is there a realistic multi-year work plan and budget to ensure outputs are delivered on time and within allotted resources? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

3: The project has a realistic work plan & budget covering the duration of the project at the activity level to ensure outputs are delivered on time and within the allotted resources.

2: The project has a work plan & budget covering the duration of the project at the output level.

1: The project does not yet have a work plan & budget covering the duration of the project.

Evidence

The Total Budget and Work Plan and detailed budget notes is part of the Prodoc . Section X, from page 43.

Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating:

23. Have national partners led, or proactively engaged in, the design of the project?

- 3: *National partners have full ownership of the project and led the process of the development of the project jointly with UNDP.*
- 2: The project has been developed by UNDP in close consultation with national partners.
- 1: The project has been developed by UNDP with limited or no engagement with national partners.
- Not Applicable

Evidence

Yes, the project partners have led the formulation process, and project design phase. 1) A NILALEG Working Group comprised of the various sectors (i.e. environment, agriculture, urban and rural development, land reform, poverty and gender), parastatal partners (i.e. environment investment fund), and civil society (namibia nature foundation) was constituted to lead the process. F

The stakeholders' consultation process during the PPG was undertaken in four different phases namely: Phase 1: Initiation of the PPG Activities (July – August 2018), Phase 2: CoFinancing and Focal Landscapes Selection (September 2018), and Phase 3: Focal Landscape Level Stakeholders' Consultations (October 2018) and Phase 4: Presentation, Validation and Appraisal of the Project Document. Stakeholders' consultations activities were undertaken through official meetings with key government ministries (at national and regional levels), parastatals, civil society, international development organisations and regional councils; and through community meetings and focus-group discussions with communities' members in the project's proposed Focal Landscapes.

Since 2016 when the NILALEG's PIF process and document was completed and subsequently approved in 2017, new dynamics have come into play – new projects have been developed and new government initiatives have started, some of which were directly relate to the different components (especially at output level) of the NILALEG project. Therefore, consultations during Phase 1 largely focused on updating the key line ministries especially the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) and the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF) on the project design, deliberating on their respective roles and discussing on project focal landscapes as proposed in the PIF. These consultations were further instrumental as the PPG consultants were further updated by the key line ministries on activities and initiatives that are already being implemented, but were identified in the PIF to be part of the NILALEG project.

Consultations were also held with the project of Working/Advisory Group, a committee that comprises of multi-stakeholders from both government and non-governmental institutions working in the fields central to the NILALEG project. Further consultations were with other key institutions that may play the roles of Responsible Parties and with the related programme and projects ongoing that will be complementary to the NILALEG project and that will provide co-finance. During Phase 1, the PPG team also undertook a brief familiarisation visit to the proposed landscape areas for the NILALEG project, meeting mainly with key government institutions at regional level - the Regional Councils.

24. Are key institutions and systems identified, and is there a strategy for strengthening specific/ comprehensive capacities based on capacity assessments conducted? (select from options 0-4 that best reflects this project):

- 3: *The project has a comprehensive strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions based on a systematic and detailed capacity assessment that has been completed. This strategy includes an approach to regularly monitor national capacities using clear indicators and rigorous methods of data collection, and adjust the strategy to strengthen national capacities accordingly.*
- 2.5: A capacity assessment has been completed. The project document has identified activities that will be undertaken to strengthen capacity of national institutions, but these activities are not part of a comprehensive strategy to monitor and strengthen national capacities.
- 2: A capacity assessment is planned after the start of the project. There are plans to develop a strategy to strengthen specific capacities of national institutions based on the results of the capacity assessment.
- 1.5: There is mention in the project document of capacities of national institutions to be strengthened through the project, but no capacity assessments or specific strategy development are planned.

- 1: Capacity assessments have not been carried out and are not foreseen. There is no strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions.
- Not Applicable

Evidence

Annex X ILM Capacity Development Scorecard Framework
[https://www.dropbox.com/home/NILALEG%20Annexes%20\(for%20sharing\)?preview=Annex+X+5640+ILM+Capacity+Development+Scorecard+Framework.pdf](https://www.dropbox.com/home/NILALEG%20Annexes%20(for%20sharing)?preview=Annex+X+5640+ILM+Capacity+Development+Scorecard+Framework.pdf)

25. Is there is a clear strategy embedded in the project specifying how the project will use national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluations, etc..) to the extent possible?

- Yes
- No
- Not Applicable

Evidence

The proejct will be nationally implemented with a) the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) responsible for Component 1 and 4 of the NILALEG project and Environment Investment Fund (EIF) of Namibia responsible for Component 3 utilizing national systems. For component 2, to be implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF), owing from the PCAT results, it is expected that UNDP will provide services while building the capacities of the national systems to function. A draft Letter of Agreement (LOA) with the detailed estimated costs is attached to the Prodoc as Annex J (i).

26. Is there a clear transition arrangement/ phase-out plan developed with key stakeholders in order to sustain or scale up results (including resource mobilisation strategy)?

- Yes
- No

Evidence

Yes, a draft sustainability approach based on a clear TOC is part of the Project Strategy

Quality Assurance Summary/PAC Comments