



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

ANNEXES – NAMIBIA

United Nations Development Programme
Independent Evaluation Office

Independent Country Programme Evaluation

Contents

Annex 1. EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE	2
Annex 2. LIST OF COUNTRY PROGRAMME PROJECTS.....	15
Annex 3. STATUS OF COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTCOME INDICATORS.....	33
Annex 4. PERSONS CONSULTED.....	17
Annex 5. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED.....	15

Annex 1. EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) conducts “Independent Country Programme Evaluations (ICPEs)”, formerly called “Assessments of Development Results”, to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP’s contributions to development results at the country level, as well as the effectiveness of UNDP’s strategy in facilitating and leveraging national efforts for achieving development results. The purpose of an ICPE is to:

- Support the development of the next UNDP Country Programme Document;
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to national stakeholders;
- Strengthen accountability of UNDP to the Executive Board.

ICPEs are independent evaluations carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy.¹ The IEO is independent of UNDP management and is headed by a Director who reports to the UNDP Executive Board. The responsibility of the IEO is two-fold: (a) provide the Executive Board with valid and credible information from evaluations for corporate accountability, decision-making and improvement; and (b) enhance the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function, and its coherence, harmonization and alignment in support of United Nations reform and national ownership.

An ICPE will be conducted in Namibia in 2017, as its country programme will end in 2018. This is the first country-level evaluation in Namibia and the results will feed into the development of the new country programme being prepared in 2017/2018. The ICPE will be conducted in close collaboration with the Government of the Republic of Namibia, UNDP Namibia country office and UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa (RBA).

2. NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT OF NAMIBIA

Governance: Namibia is one of the youngest countries in Africa, having won independence from South Africa in 1990. The country enjoys a stable political environment. It is a multi-party democracy with presidential elections being conducted every five years. The Constitution guarantees the separation of powers: executive power is exercised by both President and the Government; legislative power is exercised by the Government and the two chambers of the Parliament (National Assembly and National Council); and the judiciary is independent of the executive and the legislature.

Socio-economic: Namibia is a young country demographically also, with 35 percent of the population being under age 14. It is one of the least densely populated countries in the world with a population of 2.46 million (2015) and a land area of 824,000 square kilometres. Two thirds of the population live in rural areas. According to the national MDG report (2013), Namibia achieved or was on target to achieve most of the MDG targets, however, several key targets were off track. These included equitable

¹ See UNDP Evaluation Policy http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/policy/2016/Evaluation_policy_EN_2016.pdf. The ADRs, now called as ICPEs, are conducted in adherence to the Norms and the Standards and the ethical Code of Conduct set by the United Nations Evaluation Group (www.uneval.org).

distribution of income, eradication of hunger, reduction of child mortality, reduction of maternal mortality and reduction of HIV prevalence.²

The country's 2015 Human Development Index is 0.640, which is above the average of 0.631 for countries in the medium human development group and above the average of 0.523 for countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. However, when the value is discounted for inequality, the Index falls to 0.415, a loss of 35.2 percent due to inequality in the distribution of the HDI dimension indices.³ On the one hand the country is classified as an upper middle- income country. GDP per capita increased from \$2059 (current US\$) in 2000 to \$5920 in 2016. On the other, Namibia has one of the highest levels of inequalities in income distribution, standard of living, and quality of life.⁴ The GINI coefficient of Namibia is 0.572⁵ which indicates an extreme economic inequality in the society. The wealthiest ten percent of the households control more than half of the country's total income, whereas the poorest 10 percent only share 1 percent.⁶ The proportion of households living below the poverty threshold is about 27 percent,⁷ and about 14 percent are classified as severely poor.⁸

Namibia's GDP growth rate has been stable in recent years and reached 6.39 in 2016.⁹ The economy depends heavily on extraction and processing of minerals for export. Namibia is the fourth largest producer of uranium in the world, and it also produces gem-quality diamonds, gold, tin, marble, zinc, etc. In terms of agriculture, though arable land roughly accounts for 1 percent of the land area in Namibia, agriculture contributes to 7 percent of the country's GDP (2014),¹⁰ and is a critical sector as about half of the population depends on subsistence agriculture for its livelihood.¹¹ Tertiary industries, of which tourism is vital share 58 percent of the country's GDP.¹² Due to its extensive wildlife and diverse landscape, Namibia is one of the most visited countries in Africa. Tourism contributes about 15 percent of the country's GDP (2014), and created 102,500 jobs, which was 19 percent of total employment.¹³

However, economic growth in Namibia in recent years has not led to adequate job creation. The overall unemployment rate is 28 percent,¹⁴ which is alarmingly high. Gender, age and regional disparities are

² National Planning Commission, Republic of Namibia, 'Millennium Development Goals Interim Progress Report 2013.' <http://www.na.undp.org/content/namibia/en/home/library/mdg/mdgsrep2013.html>

³ UNDP, 'Human Development Report: Briefing note for countries on the 2016 Human Development Report – Namibia': http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/NAM.pdf

⁴ UNDP Namibia, 'Independent Evaluation of the UNDP Country Programme Document (2006-2010). Final Report,' October 2009.

⁵ Namibia Household Income and Expenditure Survey. 2015/16

⁶ UNDP Namibia, 'Understanding poverty data in Namibia,' <http://www.na.undp.org/content/namibia/en/home/ourwork/povertyreduction/successstories/undrstndngpovinNam.html>

⁷ National Planning Commission, Republic of Namibia, 'Poverty and Deprivation in Namibia 2015': <http://www.na.undp.org/content/namibia/en/home/library/poverty/nimdpovmao2015.html>

⁸ Ndumba J Kamwanyah, 'Namibia's Crisis of Income Inequality,' The Namibian: <http://www.namibian.com.na/index.php?id=128985&page=archive-read>

⁹ African Development Bank Socio Economic Database, 1960-2016. Extracted by Namibia Statistics Agency on January 2016: <http://namibia.opendataforafrica.org/hlwhvjf/afdb-socio-economic-database-1960-2016> (accessed May 2017)

¹⁰ Namibia Statistics Agency, Namibia Data Portal – Agriculture: <http://namibia.opendataforafrica.org/wsagxcf/agriculture> (accessed May 2017)

¹¹ Permanent Mission of the Republic of Namibia to the United Nations. Country Info: <https://www.un.int/namibia/namibia/country-info>

¹² Namibia Statistics Agency, Namibia Data Portal – Namibia National Accounts: <http://namibia.opendataforafrica.org/NANAR2017/namibia-national-accounts?> (accessed May 2017)

¹³ World Travel and Tourism Council, 'Travel & Tourism: Economic Impact 2015 – Namibia.' https://www.wttc.org/-/media/files/reports/economic_percent20impact_percent20research/countries_percent202015/namibia2015.pdf

¹⁴ Namibia Statistics Agency, 'The Namibia Labor Force Survey Report 2014,' 2015. <http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/--->

especially marked: the unemployment rate for women is about 32 percent, whereas male unemployment rate is 24 percent (2014).¹⁵ In addition, unemployment amongst women is higher in all regions and age groups under 60 compared to men. About 24 percent of the young people between age 15 – 34 years are not in employment, education, and training; and the number peaks at age 24.¹⁶ Unemployment is more prevalent in rural areas than in urban areas.¹⁷ According to the Ministry of Poverty Eradication and Social Welfare, small and medium enterprises (SMEs) play a crucial role in employment creation and income generation. However, it is recognized that most vulnerable population are not involved in business due to the lack of access to finance.¹⁸

Environment: The country faces major environmental challenges, including very limited natural fresh water resources, desertification, wildlife poaching, and land degradation which has led to few conservation areas.¹⁹ Namibia is one of the most water-deficit countries in the world with scarce and inconsistent rainfall. Due to the vast landscapes of desert, 92 percent of the land area is defined as hyper-arid, arid or semi-arid.²⁰ Land degradation and desertification, caused by several factors such as human population pressure (especially in the northern populous areas), poverty and over-dependence on natural resources, overgrazing, deforestation, and lack of secure tenure over natural resources is another critical issue for Namibia.²¹

Gender equality: Namibia has a supportive policy and legal environment for the advancement of gender equality. The Constitution guarantees the equal treatment of women. In addition, Namibia has enacted national gender laws and policies such as the Married Persons Equality Act, the Affirmative Action (Employment) Act and the Combating of Domestic Violence Act. The country is also signatory to the major international and regional instruments on gender, including the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the African Charter on Human and People's Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa. In 2016, 41 percent of the parliament seats in Namibia were held by women, and 22 percent of the managerial positions were held by women,²² ranking the country among the top African countries which have advanced women in decision-making structures. Namibia also scores well on the 2016 global gender gap index (0.765) and is ranked at 14 out of 144 countries. However, on UNDP's gender inequality index it is ranked 108 out of 159 countries in the 2015 index (with a score of 0.474).²³ The UNDP gender inequality index reflects gender-based inequalities in three dimensions: reproductive

africa/---ro-addis_ababa/---ilo-pretoria/documents/publication/wcms_368595.pdf

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ministry of Poverty Eradication and Social Welfare (Namibia), 'Blueprint on Wealth Redistribution and Poverty Eradication,' May 2016.

<https://info.undp.org/docs/pdc/Documents/NAM/Blue%20Print%20on%20Wealth%20Redistribution%20and%20Poverty%20Eradication%20PDF.pdf>

¹⁹ Permanent Mission of the Republic of Namibia to the United Nations. Country Info:

<https://www.un.int/namibia/namibia/country-info>

²⁰ Food and Agriculture Organization, 'Namibia Water Report 2005,'

http://www.fao.org/nr/water/aquastat/countries_regions/NAM/

²¹ Emilia Chioreso and Ben Begbie-Clench, 'Fact Sheet on Land Degradation: Implications for Food Security in Namibia,' October 2015, [https://www.enviro-awareness.org.na/common-files/files/%5BThink%20Namibia%20Factsheet%207%5D%20Land%20Degradation_final\(1\).pdf](https://www.enviro-awareness.org.na/common-files/files/%5BThink%20Namibia%20Factsheet%207%5D%20Land%20Degradation_final(1).pdf)

²² World Economic Forum, Global Gender Gap Report: Namibia country profile: <http://reports.weforum.org/global-gender-gap-report-2016/economies/#economy=NAM>

²³ UNDP, 'Human Development Report: Briefing note for countries on the 2016 Human Development Report – Namibia': http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/NAM.pdf

health, empowerment, and economic activity, whereas the global gender gap index seeks to measure the relative gaps between women and men across four key areas: health, education, economy and politics.

Despite this progress, poverty, gender based violence, HIV and AIDS and negative cultural practices are some of the factors that continue to hamper the achievement of gender equality in Namibia. A high proportion of households are female-headed (44 percent). Women's labour force participation is 56 percent, which is about 8 percent points lower than their male counterparts.²⁴ Women's employment rate is lower than men in most of the regions. In addition, as the Namibia Labour Force Survey for 2013 indicated, women's monthly mean wages are on average 16 percent less than that of men.²⁵

3. UNDP PROGRAMME STRATEGY IN NAMIBIA

The current Government of the Republic of Namibia–UNDP country programme was prepared in 2013. It was based on the lessons of the previous programme and details UNDP-specific support to an evolving national planning cycle as expressed through the 2014-18 United Nations Partnership Framework (UNPAF). The UNPAF provides the operational framework of the country programme, which was expected to contribute to three broad outcomes as illustrated in table 1.²⁶ It operates mainly at the policy level and is focussed on capacity development and policy-oriented research under the three programme components (democratic governance, poverty reduction, and environment and energy). The programme sought to address these issues in an integrated manner, while mainstreaming gender equality and HIV/AIDS into all programming components.

Under the governance programme UNDP envisioned to contribute towards improved democratic governance in Namibia by working in specific areas with the governance institutions that provide the best potential to improve oversight, human rights, accountability and participation.²⁷ Specifically UNDP sought to support the following institutions:

- Parliament to carry out oversight functions;
- Anti-Corruption Commission to develop and implement its strategy in line with the UN Convention against Corruption; the Ministry of Justice and Electoral Commission on the electoral law reform process;
- Office of the Ombudsman in promoting human rights through implementation of the UPR recommendations.²⁸

UNDP also planned to support the Ministry of Health and Social Services and the Office of the Prime Minister to fully mainstream HIV/AIDS in sectoral planning, budgeting and implementation processes, as

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Government of Namibia, 'Keynote Statement by Right Honourable Saara Kuugongelwa-Amadhila Prime Minister of the Republic of Namibia at the Commemoration of International Women's Day,' March 2016. <http://www.opm.gov.na/documents/108506/159888/International+Womens%2527+Day+Celebration+-+07-Mar-16.pdf/a678b369-5046-468e-80dd-44db0519536b?version=1.0>

²⁶ UNDP, Country Programme Document for Namibia, 2014-2018 (DP/DCP/NAM/2).

²⁷ UNDP, Country Programme Document for Namibia, 2014-2018.

²⁸ Ibid.

well as the Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare in the implementation of the national gender-based violence plan of action.²⁹

The poverty programme envisioned to support analytical, policy-oriented research and capacity-building efforts aimed at enhancing job creation and reducing poverty at national and sub-national levels. Economic analysis support was to be provided to the Economic Unit of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism to improve and enhance natural resource accounts. UNDP also planned to develop and implement targeted interventions that improve the livelihoods of the poor, especially women and youth, in rural and peri-urban areas. A pilot gender-responsive procurement initiative aligned to the women's economic empowerment component of the national Gender Plan of Action was also foreseen.³⁰

Under the environment programme which is the largest component, UNDP planned to contribute to building resilience by supporting technical and institutional capacity development for better management of environmental laws, policies and international multilateral agreements. The programme planned to address climate change adaptation and mitigation, environmental brown agenda issues and conservation of protected areas, landscapes and forests.³¹

Table 1. Planned outcome results of the country programme 2014–2018

By 2018, policies and legislative frameworks to ensure transparency, accountability, effective oversight and people's participation in the management of public affairs are in place and are being implemented.
By 2018, Namibia has adopted and is effectively implementing policies and strategies to reduce poverty and vulnerability which are informed by evidence on the root causes of poverty and vulnerability in a coordinated manner.
By 2018, institutional frameworks and policies needed to implement the Environmental Management Act (2007), National Climate Change Policy (2011) and international conventions are in place and being effectively implemented (including supportive gender equality strategies).

The Government executes or implements the majority (67 percent) of the projects of the country programme through national implementation modality (NIM). The National Planning Commission is the focal national agency for the coordination of the UNDP country programme.

The planned five-year budget of the country programme was \$12.8 million. However, total expenditures during the first three years (2014–2016) exceeded \$17 million (table 2). Environment and energy projects account for the largest share of expenditure as foreseen. Only 28 percent of the country programme resources are from UNDP core funding. The remainder has been mobilized from a variety of donors, with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) being the largest donor.

Table 2. Country programme budget, US\$

Programme component	Planned budget (CPD 2014-2018)	Expenditure* (2014–2016)
Governance	1,160,000	1,553,254

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

Poverty	800,000	2,356,206
Environment & energy	10,800,000	11,521,640
Total	12,760,000	15,431,100

*Source: UNDP Namibia, May 2017

UNDP Namibia underwent a change management process in 2016 following an internal audit in 2015 which covered the period January 2014 to September 2015. The UNDP Office of Audit and Investigations gave an overall score of unsatisfactory, noting that “internal controls, governance and risk management processes were either not established or not functioning well. The issues were such that the achievement of the overall objectives of the audited entity could be seriously compromised.” This rating was mainly due to revenue shortfall and non-implementation of Direct Project Costing policy, high programme management costs, lack of resource mobilization, and weaknesses in learning and performance management, procurement, and payments processing.

Following the change management exercise, the structure of the country programme has been revised from the initial design. It has been re-focused around two pillars: i.e. environmental management and poverty eradication. The third programme component – governance – was mainstreamed. Gender also remained as cross-cutting, while the HIV/AIDS interventions were moved into the UN joint programming.³²

The substantive content of the programme was also streamlined. Under environment, the new priority areas included energy and water. Under poverty, the focus was on two pillars: (i) policy and strategic planning support to the newly formed Ministry of Poverty Eradication and Social Welfare; and (ii) policy-oriented research and analysis on poverty and deprivation.³³

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

This is the first IEO-led independent country programme evaluation in Namibia. It will cover the ongoing country programme 2014-2018 while taking account of the longer-term activities that extend from the previous programme cycle. The evaluation will cover the formal UNDP country programme approved by the UNDP Executive Board and funded by all sources of finance, including core UNDP resources, government and donor funds. The scope of the evaluation includes the entirety of UNDP’s activities in the country and therefore, also covers initiatives from regional and global programmes. The roles and contributions of UNV and UNCDF in joint work with UNDP will also be captured by the evaluation.

The unit of analysis for the evaluation is the outcome as defined in the country programme document (CPD). The primary users of the evaluation are UNDP Namibia, RBA and UNDP Executive Board.

5. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology comprises two components: (i) assessment of UNDP’s contribution by programme area, and (ii) assessment of the quality of this contribution. The ICPE will present its findings

³² UNDP, Namibia Integrated Work Plan. 2017

³³ Ibid

and assessment according to the set criteria provided below,³⁴ in order to generate findings, broad conclusions and recommendations for future action.

- **UNDP's contribution through the country programme.** The ICPE will assess the effectiveness of UNDP in contributing to development results of Namibia through its programme activities. Specific attention will be paid to assess the contribution related to UNDP's overall vision of helping countries achieve poverty eradication and reduce inequalities and exclusion, and its contribution to furthering gender equality and women's empowerment.³⁵
- **The quality of UNDP's contribution.** The ICPE will also assess the quality of UNDP's contribution based on the following criteria:
 - Relevance of the design and approach of the country programme;
 - Efficiency of UNDP's interventions in terms of use of human and financial resources;
 - Sustainability of the results to which UNDP contributed.

UNDP's strategic positioning will be analyzed from the perspective of the organization's mandate and the agreed and emergent development needs and priorities in the country. This will entail analysis of UNDP's position within the national development and policy space, as well as strategies used by UNDP to maximize its contribution. The issues covered in the assessment will include, e.g. UNDP's response to emerging issues; its comparative strengths and use of partnerships in moving important national development discussions forward; UN-level coordination; and prioritization of programme focus areas. The ICPE will examine how managerial practices impacted achievement of programmatic goals.³⁶

The ICPE will also assess how specific factors explain UNDP's performance, namely the engagement principles and alignment parameters of the 2014-2017 UNDP Strategic Plan.³⁷ For example, in addition to assessing UNDP's contribution to gender equality and women's empowerment, the evaluation will assess gender mainstreaming as a factor of UNDP's performance for each country programme outcome.³⁸

Key questions the evaluation will answer include the following:

- To what extent is the country programme achieving anticipated results (outputs and outcomes)?
- To what extent is the country programme achieving its overarching goal in contributing to improved institutional capacities to design, budget, implement, monitor and evaluate national development programmes in the priority sectors of the country programme (poverty reduction, environment and energy, democratic governance, gender equality and HIV/AIDS)? To what extent and with which results did the UNDP programme contribute to policy changes and strengthened institutional capacities in the priority areas of democratic governance, poverty eradication, environmental sustainability, gender equality and HIV eradication?

³⁴ Further elaboration of the criteria can be found in ADR/ICPE Methodology Manual 2015.

³⁵ Using the UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN SWAP) to improve gender equality and the empowerment of women across the UN system.
www.unwomen.org/~media/Headquarters/Attachments/Sections/How%20We%20Work/UNSystemCoordination/UN-SWAP-Framework-Dec-2012.pdf

³⁶ This information is extracted from analysis of the goals inputted in the Enhanced RBM platform, the financial results in the Executive Snapshot, the results in the Global Staff Survey, and interviews with the management/ operations in the country office.

³⁷ The Strategic Plan 2014-2017 engagement principles include: national ownership and capacity; human rights-based approach; sustainable human development; gender equality and women's empowerment; voice and participation; South-South and triangular cooperation; active role as global citizens; and universality.

³⁸ Using inter alia the Gender Marker data and the Gender Seal parameters based on UNDP/UNEG methods.

- To what extent is the design and approach taken by the country programme appropriate in terms of the country context, existing capacities and available resources?
- To what extent is the country programme making efficient use of available resources (financial and human) to deliver outputs in a timely manner?
- To what extent are the results contributed to by the country programme sustainable?
- What are the enabling as well as the constraining factors that influence replication and sustainability?
- How well did the country programme establish partnerships to support achievement of anticipated results?
- What strategic adjustments, if any, are necessary to UNDP strategies and interventions to enhance UNDP's relevance and effectiveness in Namibia?

6. DATA COLLECTION

Assessment of data collection constraints and existing data. An assessment was carried for each outcome to ascertain available information, identify data constraints, and determine the data collection needs and methods. The assessment outlined the level of evaluable data that is available, indicating:

- **Institutional arrangements for monitoring and evaluation:** According to the CPD the monitoring and evaluation of the country programme will proceed within the framework of national institutional mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation of the National Development Plan (NDP4). There is adequate availability of national data and the primary sources of data will be from the Government. In addition, there is abundant research/analysis on Namibia in regard to its social and economic developments from government, international organizations and academia. UNDP also has good access to government partners. However, during the evaluation's preparatory/inception mission it was apparent that many staff in the UN/UNDP and Government are new to the job, indicating high staff turnover. This may affect availability of information/data. **Progress on the outcome level indicators** against the three planned outcome results are updated annually in the corporate Results Oriented Annual Reports (ROARs) by the country office. Most of these CPD indicators are better amenable to measuring outputs rather than outcome results as they are focused on measuring quantities of products/outputs produced rather than quality of services and changes in individual or institutional performance. This will make it difficult to systematically measure UNDP's contribution (input-output-outcome). Almost all the indicators have baseline data;
- **The country programme evaluation plan** lists some 12 evaluations to be conducted over the country programme period; eight of which are GEF project evaluations.³⁹ Seven evaluations have been completed as of mid-2017.⁴⁰ An end-of-cycle CPD evaluation is planned to be conducted mid-June 2018, however, this needs to be revisited given an ICPE is being conducted in Namibia in August 2017.
- **Availability of programme/project documentation:** With the support of the country office, available documents related to the country programme, e.g. project documents, results-oriented

³⁹ UNDP (DP/DCP/), Costed Evaluation Plan – Namibia CPD 2014-2018.

⁴⁰ UNDP, Evaluation Resource Center, accessed June 2017.

annual reports, etc. have been uploaded into the ICPE document platform (SharePoint). As mentioned above, the country office is affected by institutional memory loss due to staff changes.

Data collection methods. The evaluation will use qualitative approaches, including desk review, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions as appropriate. A multi-stakeholder approach will be followed and interviewees will include government representatives, civil-society organizations, private-sector representatives, UN agencies, donors, multilateral organizations and beneficiaries of the programme, both men and women. Field visits will also be undertaken to select project sites to observe the projects and activities first-hand.

A list of projects for in-depth reviews will be developed based on a purposive sampling. The criteria for selection includes programme coverage (a balanced selection of key focus areas/issues under each outcome), maturity, budgetary and geographical considerations. Attention will be paid to include both flagship projects of significance, outreach, and visibility, as well as those that experienced challenges.

The IEO and the country office have identified an initial list of background and programme-related documents which is posted on an IEO SharePoint website. The following secondary data will be reviewed: background documents on the national context, documents prepared by international partners during the period under review and documents prepared by UN system agencies; programme plans and frameworks; progress reports; monitoring self-assessments such as the yearly ROARs; and evaluations conducted by the country office and partners. The ICPE will contribute to, where possible and appropriate, the ongoing data collection endeavours being undertaken by UNDP projects for outcome monitoring.

Validation. The evaluation will triangulate and cross-verify information collected from multiple sources and/or by different methods to ensure validity.

Stakeholder involvement: Stakeholder analysis will be conducted to identify all relevant UNDP partners, as well as those who may not work with UNDP but play a key role in the outcomes to which UNDP contributes.

7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP: The UNDP IEO will conduct the ICPE in consultation with the UNDP Namibia country office, the Regional Bureau for Africa and the Government of the Republic of Namibia. The IEO lead evaluator will lead the evaluation and coordinate the evaluation team. The IEO will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ICPE.

Government of the Republic of Namibia: The National Planning Commission (NPC) and other key government counterparts of UNDP in Namibia will facilitate the conduct of ICPE by: providing necessary access to information sources within the government and safeguarding the independence of the evaluation. Additionally, the counterparts will be responsible within NPC for the use and dissemination of the final outputs of the evaluation process.

UNDP Country Office in Namibia: The country office will support the evaluation team to liaise with key partners and other stakeholders, make available to the team all necessary information regarding UNDP's programmes, projects and activities in the country, and provide factual verifications of the draft report on a timely basis. The country office will provide the evaluation team support in kind (e.g. arranging meetings with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries; and assistance for the project site visits). To ensure the

independence of the views expressed in interviews and meetings with stakeholders held for data collection purposes, country office staff will not participate. The country office will prepare a management response, in collaboration with the Regional Bureau, for inclusion in the final ICPE report. The country office will facilitate the organization of the stakeholders' debriefing workshop, facilitating government participation. The office will establish a national reference group which will review the draft terms of reference and the final draft report.

UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa: The UNDP Regional Bureau for Africa will support the evaluation through information sharing and will also participate in discussions on emerging conclusions and recommendations.

National Reference Group: A reference group will be established with support of the UNDP country office comprising representatives of the Government, development partners, civil society, and UNDP. The group is responsible for reviewing the key output documents of the evaluation, including terms of reference of and the draft evaluation report.

Evaluation Team: The IEO will constitute an evaluation team to undertake the ICPE. The IEO will ensure gender balance in the team which will include the following members:

- Lead Evaluator (LE): IEO evaluator with 20 years' experience in international development assistance/cooperation programme design, monitoring and evaluation. She is responsible for designing the evaluation; managing and conducting it; writing the evaluation report; and organizing the stakeholder workshop, as appropriate, with the country office.
- Associate Lead Evaluator (ALE): IEO evaluator with over 20 years of international development experience in leading and managing evidence-based policy, program, country and performance evaluations, research studies and impact assessments. He will support the LE in designing and conducting the evaluation and writing the report. Together with the LE, the ALE will also help backstop the work of other team members.
- Consultant: An external, independent consultant will be recruited to provide thematic expertise. The consultant is expected to have an advanced university degree in a relevant technical field combined with a minimum of seven years' work experience in international development, particularly in the environment and energy sector. He/she is also expected to have substantive experience in conducting development evaluations. Under the guidance of LE/ALE, he/she will conduct preliminary research, plan data collection activities, prepare outcome analysis papers and contributing to the drafting of the evaluation report.
- Research Assistant (RA): An IEO research assistant will provide background research and documentation.

Aside from the above core evaluation team members, other staff of the IEO, including the Directorate provide quality assurance by reviewing and clearing the evaluation report. The evaluation report is also externally reviewed by the International Evaluation Advisory Panel (IEAP). The IEAP is an independent advisory panel constituted by the IEO to advise IEO in keeping with its objective to produce high quality evaluations that help to enhance UNDP performance and contribution to development results. The data collection roles of the different members of the evaluation team can be summarised in Table 3.

Table 3. Data collection responsibilities by outcome/thematic area

Outcome/Area	Team Member
Poverty	LE/ALE
Environment	ALE/LE
Strategic positioning issues	LE/ALE
Operations and management issues	LE/ALE
Gender background paper	RA/LE

8. EVALUATION PROCESS

The ICPE will be conducted in accordance with the approved IEO process, as outlined in the ICPE/ADR Methodology Manual. Key elements of various phases in the evaluation are summarized below:

Phase 1: Preparation/inception phase. The IEO prepares the terms of reference and evaluation design, following a preparatory mission by the LE/RA to UNDP Namibia. The mission included the following objectives:

- i) to discuss with the country office and key national stakeholders the evaluation objectives, scope, key questions and overall approach and process, with the aim to enhance ownership;
- ii) to agree with the country office on an implementation plan outlining roles and responsibilities between the IEO and country office;
- iii) To conduct preliminary interviews with key stakeholders on their perspectives on the UNDP country programme to inform the next phases of the evaluation;
- iv) To explore opportunities for establishing a national reference group for the evaluation;
- v) To explore opportunities to use national evaluation capacities (e.g. national consultants, public policy institutions, etc.)

Following the preparation/inception phase, the external expert/team member will be recruited.

Phase 2: Data collection and analysis. The phase will commence in July 2017 with desk review of material, followed by field work in August 2017. The following steps will be undertaken:

- Pre-mission activities: Evaluation team members conduct desk reviews of background material, and prepare a summary of the context and other evaluative evidence, and identify the outcome theory of change, outcome-specific evaluation questions, gaps and issues that will require validation during the field-based phase of data collection. The evaluation matrix will be finalized to guide data collection.
- Data collection mission: The evaluation team will undertake a mission to the country to engage in data collection activities. The estimated duration of the mission is 2 weeks, 14 to 25 August. Data will be collected according to the approach and responsibilities outlined in Section 6 above.
- Analysis: The evaluation team members will prepare individual papers on respective assessment areas per agreed outline.

Phase 3: Synthesis, report writing and review. Once all outcome/thematic area reports are prepared, the LE/ALE will coordinate a synthesis process, with the participation of the external consultant. The first ICPE draft report will be prepared and subjected to the quality control process of the IEO entailing internal and external review by the IEAP. After incorporating feedback from internal and external reviewers and cleared by IEO Directorate, the report will be sent to the country office and the UNDP Regional Bureau for factual

corrections. The revised draft, which considers the corrections, feedback and comments, will be shared with national stakeholders for review.

At the stakeholders' debriefing workshop, results of the evaluation are presented to key national stakeholders and discussions on the way forward are held (including the presentation of a draft management response by the country office under the oversight of the Regional Bureau) as input to the preparation of the new country programme. The ICPE report will be finalized after the workshop, together with the country office's final management response to the ICPE.

Phase 4: Production, dissemination and follow-up. The ICPE report will be distributed in both hard and electronic versions. The report will be made available to UNDP Executive Board when the new CPD is submitted for approval (June 2018). The country office will ensure the dissemination of the report to national stakeholders. The report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website⁴¹ and uploaded on the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). The Regional Bureau will be responsible for monitoring the implementation of follow-up actions and reporting in the ERC.⁴²

9. TIMEFRAME FOR THE ICPE PROCESS

The overall timeframe is tentatively planned as follows:⁴³

Table 4. Tentative timeframe for the ICPE process		
Activity	Responsible party	Proposed timeframe
Phase 1: Preparation		
Preparatory mission	LE/RA	29 May – 2 June 2017
TOR – approval by the IEO	LE/ALE	June 2017
Phase 2: Data collection and analysis		
Preliminary analysis of programme data and context	All team members	July - Aug 2017
Data collection mission	LE/ALE	14 - 25 Aug 2017
Analysis and finalization of individual papers	All team members	September 2017
Phase 3: Synthesis and report writing		
Synthesis	All team members	October 2017
Zero draft report for clearance by IEO	LE	November 2017
First draft report for Country Office/Regional Bureau review	LE	Nov/Dec 2017

⁴¹ web.undp.org/evaluation

⁴² erc.undp.org

⁴³ The timeframe is indicative of the process and deadlines, and does not imply full-time engagement of the evaluation team during the period.

Second draft for Government review	LE	Dec 2017/Jan 2018
Draft management response	Country office/RBA	Jan 2018
Stakeholders' debriefing workshop (TBD)	IEO/Country office/ Regional Bureau	Feb 2018
Phase 4: Production and Follow-up		
Editing and formatting	LE/IEO Communications	March 2018
Final report	LE	April 2018
Dissemination of the final report	IEO Communications	April/May 2018

Annex 2. LIST OF COUNTRY PROGRAMME PROJECTS

Serial No.	Country programme projects	Projects for in-depth review
Poverty reduction		
1	Reduction of human poverty	X
2	Support to poverty eradication	X
3	Enhancing entrepreneurship development in Namibia (EMPRETEC)	X
Environment & Energy		
4	Namibia's second biennial update report (BUR 2)	
5	Namibia's third national communication to UNFCCC	
6	Realizing the inclusive and sustainable development	
7	Sustainable management of Namibia's forested lands (NAFOLA)	X
8	Strengthening protected area network (SPAN)	X
9	Namibia protected landscape conservation areas initiative (NAMPLACE)	X
10	Protected areas system strengthening (PASS)	X
11	Scaling up community resilience to climate variability (SCORE)	X
12	Namibia energy efficiency programme in buildings	X
13	Namibia renewable energy programme (NAMREP II)	X
14	Concentrated solar power technology transfer (CSP-TT)	X
15	Piloting climate change adaptation measures	
16	Building foundation for climate change adaptation	
17	Benguela current large marine ecosystem (BCLME) programme	X
18	Benguela current large marine ecosystem strategic action programme implementation (BCLME SAP)	X
19	BCLME III	X
20	Improving policy and practice civil society capacity building	X

21	Country pilot partnership for sustainable land management: adaptive management	X
22	Enhancing institutional and human resource capacity	
Democratic governance		
23	Support to gender equality	X
24	Curriculum development	
25	UNV capacity building support	

Annex 3. STATUS OF COUNTRY PROGRAMME OUTCOME INDICATORS

As reported by the Country Office in the Results Oriented Annual Reports

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress		
			2015	2016	2017
Outcome 19 By 2018, policies and legislative frameworks to ensure transparency, accountability, effective oversight and people’s participation in the management of public affairs are in place and are being implemented.					
Number of national strategies and action plans to fight corruption.	No Anti-Corruption Strategy and Action Plan in place.	Anti-Corruption Strategy and Action Plan developed and implemented in at least three sectors.	Some progress	Target reached or surpassed	Target reached or surpassed
			Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: The National Anti-Corruption Strategy and Action Plan is awaiting Cabinet approval.	Type: Quantitative Data: 1 Comment: The National ACC Strategy and Action Plan was finalized and approved ahead of the target year (2018).	Type: Quantitative Data: 1 Comment: The target was surpassed before the target year of 2018.
Number of offices/ministries/agencies (O/M/As) complying with human rights standards and norms.	No O/M/As complying with human rights standards and norms.	At least 50 per cent of O/M/As complying with human rights standards and norms.	Some progress		Significant progress
			Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: The National Human Rights Action Plan was approved and launched in December 2014. Implementation of the strategy started in 2015 and five ministries completed their implementation strategies.	No data	Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: There is not yet survey results to provide latest data on this indicator. In 2017 Office of the Commissioner of Human Rights and the Ministry of Justice conducted a training of trainers for various Offices, Ministries and Agencies on Treaty Body Reporting, in order for Namibia to comply with international

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress		
			2015	2016	2017
					Human Rights reporting and standards.
per cent of regions and stakeholders implementing GBV plan of action.	GBV plan of action not yet implemented.	100 per cent of regions and key stakeholders.	Some progress	Some progress	Some progress
			<p>Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: National Coordination Mechanisms (NCM was approved by Cabinet in May 2014 and the implementation started right after the approval. National stakeholder from all the 14 regions. in the country has been trained and placed in the different clusters under the NCM The mechanism involves overseeing the coordination of the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the National Gender Policy (NGP), the accompanying National Gender Plan of Action (NGPA) and the National Plan of Action on Gender Based Violence (NPAGBV)</p> <p>The Ministry made headway with the implementation of the National Gender Policy and</p>	<p>Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: There is ongoing implementation which will require monitoring to provide evidence of attainment.</p>	<p>Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: There is ongoing implementation which will require monitoring and data collection to obtain data to update the progress made in this specific indicator towards the target so far.</p>

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress		
			2015	2016	2017
			the National Plan of Gender Based Violence through the introduction of the Coordination Mechanisms that provides for the establishment of the Clusters consisting of various Key Stakeholders. These Clusters are: Gender Based Violence and Human Rights Poverty, Rural and Economic Development		
Per cent of National Strategic Framework for HIV/AIDS coordinating mechanisms functioning optimally at all levels.	40 per cent.	At least 90 per cent.	Some progress	No change	Significant progress
			Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: The National Strategic Framework (NSF) guiding the national coordination mechanism in the country was revised and finalized. Implementation is now underway with Regional AIDS Coordination Committee (RACOC) to ensure sub-regional structures are in place. 50% of the coordination structure is now operational although not functioning optimally. The Constituency AIDS	Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: This activity will be revised /updated taking into account the re-prioritization of strategic support at the CO. By 2016, the KYE and KYR report was launched in one of the 14 regions, i.e. Zambezi.	Type: Quantitative Data: 85 Comment: Majority of coordinating mechanisms are functioning at optimal level. Inclusive of the National Aids Executive Committee as the highest oversight HIV/AIDS coordinating body, the Gender Advisory Committee, as established by the National Gender Action Plan

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress		
			2015	2016	2017
			Coordinating Coordination (CACOC) have increased participation in the national response by increasing participation of constituency councilors in the response to HIV and AIDS.		
Per cent of national reports of the Auditor General scrutinized by the Public Accounts Committee (PAC).	Limited capacity of the PAC to oversee and scrutinize reports.	30 per cent increase in the number of reports scrutinized.	Some progress	No change	No change
			Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: Accountability Report: Committee Services 2013/14, indicates that the Committee on Public Accounts reviewed 31 reports from Offices, Ministries and Agencies at a retreat in Okahandja on 24-28 April 2014. In addition, the Committee also reviewed and examined 30 SOEs financial audited report for the years 2009-2012.	Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: Anecdotal evidence suggest that more cases are being scrutinized	Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: There is no survey results to update data for this indicator to date.
			Significant progress	No change	No change

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress		
			2015	2016	2017
Existence of revised electoral law.	Electoral law currently under review.	Electoral law improved and implemented.	Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: The electoral law was revised and is being implemented. Government Gazette Electoral Act 5 of 2014	No data	Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: There is no data results to provide latest data for this indicator.
Outcome 20: By 2018, Namibia has adopted and is effectively implementing policies and strategies to reduce poverty and vulnerability which are informed by evidence on the root causes of poverty and vulnerability in a coordinated manner					
Number of government institutions, private sector, CSOs, and academia utilizing research evidence to advocate for poverty and vulnerability reduction.	0	2	Some progress	Target reached or surpassed	Significant progress
			Type: Quantitative Data: 1 Comment: The University of Namibia was supported to organize the 7th Annual Research Conference on Poverty Eradication, Citizenship and Community Empowerment.	Type: Quantitative Data: 1 Comment: Following the 7th Annual Research Conference held in 2015; the University of Namibia partnered with the UNDP and organized the 8th Annual Research Conference focusing on the SDGs and its impacts on Poverty Eradication. The Theme was Directing Research Towards SDGs.	Type: Quantitative Data: 7 Comment: Although there is no survey results to provide data evidence for progress made towards the targeted number under this indicator, the utilization of specific reports such as National Poverty Mapping, National Index of Multiple Deprivation as reference for the development of the Blue Print for Wealth Redistribution and Poverty Eradication, and the NDP 5 could be used to estimate the number of institutions from Government. The data to verify the actual number of government institutions, private sector, CSOs, etc. is not available, thus we are using proxy indicators of

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress		
			2015	2016	2017
					documents citing these reports. Govt 1 = Ministry of Poverty Eradication and Social Welfare Govt 2 = National Planning Commission Govt 3 = Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare CSO 4 = Institute of Public Policy Research CSO 5 = Lifeline Child Line Namibia CSO 6 = Positive Vibes Trust Namibia CSO 7 = Out Right Namibia (ORN)
	2	4	Some progress	Significant progress	No change

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress		
			2015	2016	2017
Number of studies on poverty and vulnerability approved by the Research Council and conducted			<p>Type: Quantitative Data: 1 Comment: Support was given to provide capacity to National Development Advisors at National Planning Commission in the area of poverty and social impact analysis. This support directly contributed to the achievement of NDP4. Research areas that were covered included social policy, education, health, social welfare, labor market policies, and poverty and impact analysis. Through the training, National Development Advisors received capacity to become established policy researchers, able to undertake new policy research to advise the GRN</p>	<p>Type: Quantitative Data: 1 Comment: Following the capacity development provided in 2015, the NPC supported by the UNDP undertook a comprehensive study on the root causes of poverty in Namibia. This will inform the diagnostic information on drivers of incidences of poverty and spatial distribution of the poverty across the various constituencies in the country. Plans are at advanced stage to target future studies on critical sectors such as education, and health.</p>	<p>Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: Due to change in focus it is not possible to assess progress made on this indicator. The target was 4 by the Research Council, the activities implemented were targeting the National Planning Commission which is different from the Research Council, i.e. National Council of Scientific Research</p>
Number of multi-sectoral coordination	0	1	Some progress	Significant progress	Significant progress

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress		
			2015	2016	2017
mechanisms in place that ensure effective implementation of poverty and vulnerability policies and strategies			Type: Quantitative Data: 1 Comment: White Paper as a policy framework to detail policies and strategies on redistributing wealth and eradicating poverty was developed. The white paper also details coordination framework by the different ministries on poverty interventions.	Type: Quantitative Data: 1 Comment: UNDP provided technical and financial support to the Ministry of Poverty to developed the Blue Print on Wealth Redistribution and Poverty Eradication (and its subsequent implementation plan) for Namibia. The Blue Print was approved by Cabinet in August 2016.	Type: Quantitative Data: 2 Comment: 1. The Poverty Pillar Multi-Sectoral Coordination Mechanism that is co-chaired by the Ministry of Poverty Eradication and Social Welfare and UNDP is in place and functioning under the UNPAF Coordination Framework. 2. In addition the Zero Hunger Multisectoral Road map has been developed through a consultative process with civil, academia, public and private sector.
Existence SME database for enhanced coordination, monitoring and tracking income generation activities developed for coordination of business developed support and services	0	2	Some progress	Significant progress	Some progress
			Type: Quantitative Data: 1 Comment: The meeting for the Poverty, Rural and Economic Development Cluster was held to ensure implementation of National Gender Policy and National Gender Policy Action Plan in respective of poverty related issues and compliance with in National Development Plan, Millennium Development Goals, budgets and plans. The clusters are aimed at	Type: Quantitative Data: 1 Comment: One of the strategic pillars of the Blue Print on Wealth Redistribution and Poverty Eradication focused on employment creation, and generating a data base for all income generating activities supported by government and other stakeholders in the country.	Type: Quantitative Data: 1.5 Comment: Under the EMPRETEC programme, there is a 'mini' Small and Medium Enterprises database that is not yet completed capturing the details of SMEs (enterprises) to be coordinated under this programme along with the entrepreneurs, to be completed by end of 2017. A registry of income generating activities supported by government institutions has been compiled and the database

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress		
			2015	2016	2017
			ensuring the implementation of the activities around poverty reduction and gender inequalities and improve access to productive resources for women and girl.		for SMEs supported under the Empretec will be in place by 2018. A draft national MSME database is under development by the MITSMED
Outcome 21 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					
Number of smallholder field farmers (gender disaggregated) and schools employing drought resilient land management practices and serving the community.	The Scaling up Community Resilience for Climate Change Variability and Change (SCORE) project was endorsed by the MAWF and MET and approved by the Special Climate Change Fund through the GEF	200 trained farmer field school leaders and coordinators in drought-resilient land management practices serving 4,000 households, 60-80 per cent of which are female, youth and/or child-headed, with specifics to be agreed upon in the project formulation to facilitate local ownership, participation	Significant progress	Some progress	Significant progress
			Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: The seven northern regions of Namibia is targeted under this indicator given (a) this is the most populous part of the country where, (b) impacts of climate change are already observed/ felt and, (c) where rain-fed subsistence and commercial agriculture is the mainstay for food and income security. UNDP launched the "SCORE" Project (PIMS 4711) in July 2015 - baseline and target populations are being verified as part of inception	Type: Quantitative Data: 0 Comment: Developed criteria for the selection of self-help groups which are part of community garden groups who will be trained. 210 Lead Farmers were selected to be trained, these farmers will train an additional 30 farmers each. Thus, this mentorship training programme development is ongoing. A capacity needs assessment was also conducted in all 7 project areas; the assessment was to look at current training gaps to enable the	Type: Quantitative Data: 4759 Comment: a total of 4759 individuals (2658 females, 2101 males) have been reported as benefiting from the project interventions including drought resilient land mgt practices, micro drip, asset resilient building, etc.

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress		
			2015	2016	2017
		and full engagement in the preparation process.	<p>while an initial investment has been made to procure tractors and implements to initiate supporting 600 smallholder farmers. Of this target population, up 40% are expected to be women - to be confirmed as part of baseline verification. As the rainy season arrived late in historical context, the tractors and implements would enable farmers and their families to plant crops.</p> <p>Relevant policies, plans and programs include: the 2015 Comprehensive Conservation Agriculture Strategy, the National Climate Change Policy, Strategy and Action Plan; the National Disaster Risk Management Strategy, and relevant strategies and actions in the NBSAP and UNCCD NAP III.</p> <p>Institutions that UNDP supports with this activity include, Ministry of Environment and Tourism (custodian for Climate Change and Rio Conventions); Ministry of Agriculture, Water and</p>	development of the training materials. Based on the analysis conducted, an outline of the training was developed.	

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress		
			2015	2016	2017
			Forestry and, the Ministry of Urban and Rural Development. The outcomes and impact of the interventions would support the mandate and objectives of the newly established Ministry of Poverty Eradication and Social Welfare.		
Number of environmental	0	1	Some progress	Some progress	Target reached or surpassed

Indicator	Baseline	Target	Status/Progress		
			2015	2016	2017
institutions fully equipped with standards, guidelines and specialized skills.			<p>Type: Qualitative Data: Draft reports are in place for situation analysis and baselines for (a) public and occupational health in the extractives industry, (b) the status of social and environmental impacts in mining sites, (c) the status of labour issues and relations including the role of labour unions, (d) the status of public participation in mining EIA processes, (e) and the status of compliance with national laws, regional and international policy instruments. Awareness is planned for 2016 as part of a National Conference to devise a road map for the AMV while capacity strengthening will be done through the conference platform and consultations at regional level.</p>	<p>Type: Qualitative Data: Reports for situation analysis and baselines for (a) public and occupational health in the extractives industry, (b) the status of social and environmental impacts in mining sites, (c) the status of labour issues and relations including the role of labour unions, (d) the status of public participation in mining EIA processes, (e) and the status of compliance with national laws, regional and international policy instruments were finalised. Due to the postponement of the Extractive Industry Conference to the year 2017, institutional awareness and training activities will be undertaken in future.</p>	<p>Type: Qualitative Data: One environmental institution (Law Enforcement and Wildlife Centre) is established and fully equipped with standards (anti-poaching intelligence standards), guidelines (fire and poaching procedures) and specialized skills (anti-poaching detection, M&E,) Another departmental level institution (i.e. Anti-Poaching Unit) is to be established under the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, and three field patrol centers at strategic points have been initiated.</p>

Source: UNDP Corporate Planning System (2018)

Annex 4. PERSONS CONSULTED

Government of the Republic of Namibia

Ashipala, John, Deputy Chief, National Development Advice of National Development Advice, National Planning Commission

Elisa, Johanes, Constituency Councilor

Haikera, Olavi S., Personal Assistant to Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Industrialization, Trade & SME Development

Hailwa, Joseph, Director, Directorate of Forestry Services, Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry

Hamukuaya, Hashali, Executive Secretary, Benguela Current Commission

Hamukwaya, Pandu, Project Staff of SCORE, Ministry of Environment and Tourism

Hangula, Mary Tuyeni, Chief National Development Advisor, National Planning Commission

Hasholo, Elise, Agricultural Technician, Ministry of Agricultural, Fishery and Water

Heita, Jonas, National Project Manager of PASS, Ministry of Environment and Tourism

lipinge, Laurentius Makana, Regional Councilor, Omusati Regional Council

lipinge, Vicky, Senior Scientific Agricultural Officer, Ministry of Agricultural, Fishery and Water

Kaholongo, Mirjam Ndahafa, Regional Coordinator of SCORE, Ministry of Environment and Tourism

Kashuupulwa, Clemens H., Regional Governor, Oshana Region Office of the Governor

Kinyaga, Viviane, National Project Coordinator, Directorate of Forestry Services, Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry

Manghome, Frans, Energy Researcher, Ministry of Mines and Energy

Matali, Benson, Chief Development Planner, Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare

Mcebonenwa, Rosina, Deputy Director: Directorate of Gender Equality, Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare

Muhuura, Victoria N., Private Secretary to the Governor, Oshana Region Office of the Governor

Mupetami, Louisa, Deputy Permanent Secretary of Department of Natural Resources Management, Ministry of Environment and Tourism

Mwaetko, Charlie, Senior Scientific Officer, Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry

Nakata, Joyce, Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare

Nashandi, I-Ben N., Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Poverty Eradication and Social Welfare

Ndiili, Johanes, Ranger, Waterberg Plateau Park

Nengola, Namupa N., Chief: Public Education and Corruption Prevention, Anti-Corruption Commission

Nghitila, Teofilus, Environmental Commissioner, Ministry of Environment and Tourism

Shipoh, Victor, Director, Directorate of Gender Equality and International Affairs, Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare

Sibalatani, Michael, National Project Manager of NAMPLACE and SPAN, Ministry of Environment and Tourism

Sibeya, Ned, Deputy Chief: National Development Advice, National Planning Commission

Sikopo, Colgar, Director of Parks, Ministry of Environment and Tourism

Sinimbo, Gabriel P., Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Industrialization, Trade and SME Development

Snyders, Nico, Deputy Director of Energy, Ministry of Mines and Energy

Titus, John, Director, Directorate of Energy, Ministry of Mines and Energy

Uniras, Wilhencia, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare

UNDP

Adhikari, Basant, Programme Specialist (Parliament)

Gbeho, Anita, Resident Representative

Miwa, Chikako, Programme Analyst

Morota, Izumi, Deputy Resident Representative

Mubiana, Fabian, Poverty Reduction Advisor

Naanda, Martha, Programme Specialist

Ndimbira, Diana, Communications Associate

Paulo, Natende, Programme Finance Associate

Shaalukeni, Ndaedelao, Finance Assistant

Van Turah, Megan, Operations Manager

Van Wyk, Geraldine, Programme Associate

Willemse, Severiano, Finance Associate

Other United Nations Agencies

Adamu-Katjikonde, Yeshe, Programme Assistant, UNV

Barihuta, Tharcisse, Country Director, UNAIDS

Betts, Marcus, Deputy Representative, UNICEF

Faschina, Nadine, Project Leader, GIZ

Kamwi, Gloria, Programme Officer, WFP

Kanguatjivi, Eugene, Acting Director, FAO

Mutumba, Obert, Programme Officer, WFP

Nashoonga, Hafeni, Advocacy and Communication Officer, WHO

Negumbo, Beata, Programme Assistant, FAO

Odeke, Elvis, Programme Officer, WFP

Civil Society, Research Institutes, Private Sector

Goreseb, Jefta, Manager: Business Strategy, Development Bank of Namibia

Gxaba, Thandiwe, Deputy Executive Secretary, Benguela Current Commission

Hamukuaya, Hashali, Executive Secretary, Benguela Current Commission

Hopwood, Graham, Executive Director, Institute of Public Policy Research

Hutu, Zukile, Data and Information Manager, Benguela Current Commission

Inkumbi, Martin, CEO, Development Bank of Namibia

Kaoti, Jackson, Project Assistant, Benguela Current Commission

Kjelgaard, Tomas B., Managing Director, Merlus Seafood Processors PTY LTD

Madzwamuse, Masego, Economic and Social Justice Team Leader, Open Society Initiative of Southern Africa

Mbango, John S., Head: Lending, Development Bank of Namibia

Nepembe, Maano, Manager: Research and Product Development, Development Bank of Namibia

Shimbiis, Helen, Traditional Leader

Thomas, Monica, Manager: Capacity Development and Training, Benguela Current Commission

Country Programme Beneficiaries

Alweendo, Asser, Acting Principal, Onampira School (school garden using drip irrigation)

Andunge, Hedwig, Agriculture Teacher, Onampira School (school garden using drip irrigation)

Hafyenanye, Elizabeth, Beneficiary (home garden using drip irrigation)

Hengombe, Martha, Beneficiary (livestock farmer piloting animal feed consumption)

Hengombe, Ruckie, Beneficiary (livestock farmer piloting animal feed consumption)

Kalenga, Ruth, Beneficiary (conservation agriculture)

Kandiada, Abiud, Chairperson, African Wildlife Dog (de-bushing and animal feed production)

Katjeringo, Mathew, Vice Secretary, African Wildlife Dog (de-bushing and animal feed production)

Onesmus, Petrus, Beneficiary (home garden using drip irrigation)

Shatilwe, Naemi, Beneficiary (home garden using drip irrigation)

Tjaimi, Koviao, Chairperson, African Wildlife Dog (de-bushing and animal feed production)

In addition, a focus group was held with a group of male villagers benefitting from a rehabilitated well. One of the traditional leaders of this community was also interviewed separately.

International Partners/Donors

Unha-Kaprali, Johanna, Deputy Chief of Mission, Embassy of Finland

Valkonen, Suvi, Programme Coordinator, Embassy of Finland

Annex 5. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

In addition to the documents named below, the evaluation reviewed available programme/project documents, annual work plans, briefs, and other material related to the programmes/projects under review. Many related organizations' websites were also searched, including those of UN organizations, Namibia governmental departments, project management offices and others.

African Development Bank, Socio Economic Database, 1960-2016. Extracted by Namibia Statistics Agency on January 2016: <http://namibia.opendataforafrica.org/hlwhvjf/afdb-socio-economic-database-1960-2016>

Chioreso, Emilia & Begbie-Clench, Ben, 'Fact Sheet on Land Degradation: Implications for Food Security in Namibia,' 2015.

Food and Agriculture Organization, 'Namibia Water Report 2005':
http://www.fao.org/nr/water/aquastat/countries_regions/NAM/

Namibia Statistics Agency, Namibia Data Portal:
<http://namibia.opendataforafrica.org/NANAR2017/namibia-national-accounts?>

National Planning Commission, Republic of Namibia, 'Millennium Development Goals Interim Progress Report,' 2013

National Planning Commission, Republic of Namibia, 'Poverty and Deprivation in Namibia.' 2015:
<http://www.na.undp.org/content/namibia/en/home/library/poverty/nimdpovmao2015.html>

UN Women, 'UN system-wide action plan for implementation of the CEB United Nations system-wide policy on gender equality and the empowerment of women,' April 2012.
<http://www.unwomen.org/-/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/how%20we%20work/unsystemcoordination/un-swap/un-swap-framework-dec-2012.pdf?la=en&vs=3435>

UNDP Namibia, 'Understanding poverty data in Namibia.'
<http://www.na.undp.org/content/namibia/en/home/ourwork/povertyreduction/successstories/undrstndngpovinNam.html>

UNDP, 'Human Development Report: Briefing note for countries on the 2016 Human Development Report – Namibia,' 2017.

UNDP, 'Namibia Integrated Work Plan,' 2017.

World Bank, "World Development Indicators 2013." Data retrieved by UNDP Human Development Report Office in October 2013: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/income-gini-coefficient>

World Economic Forum, 'Global Gender Gap Report: Namibia country profile.' 2016