

1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	2915
IA/EA Project ID	3598
Focal Area	Climate Change
Project Name	CPP Namibia: Adapting to Climate Change through the Improvement of Traditional Crops and Livestock Farming (SPA)
Country/Countries	Namibia
Geographic Scope	National
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	UNDP
Executing Agencies involved	Namibian Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF)
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Among the executing agencies
Involvement of Private Sector	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	Climate Change - SPA (Strategic Priority for Adaptation)
TER Prepared by	Sandra Romboli
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Negi
Author of TE	G.L. Jonas Capôco - Asca Investment (Pty) Ltd, Namibia
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	21/08/2007
Project Implementation Start Date	01/10/2007
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	31/12/2011
Actual Date of Project Completion	31/12/2011
TE Completion Date	01/03/2012
IA Review Date	N/A
TE Submission Date	11/12/2012

2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	0.04	0.04
Co-financing for Project Preparation		
Total Project Prep Financing	0.04	0.04
GEF Financing	0.96	0.96
IA/EA own		
Government		4.29
Other*	5.80	1.59
Total Project Financing	6.76	6.84
Total Financing including Prep	6.80	6.88

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

3. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF Evaluation Office TE Review
Project Outcomes	S	HS	S	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	HS	MU	ML
Monitoring and Evaluation	N/A	S	S	MS
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	S	N/A	S
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS

4. Project Objectives

4.1. Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

GEO: To assist the Republic of Namibia to devise and implement adaptation strategies to cope with predicted effects of climate change in the north-central regions, thus improving livelihoods and food security among the most vulnerable communities. There was no change in objective (as per TE and ProDoc).

4.2. Development Objectives of the project:

Objective: To develop and pilot a range of effective coping mechanisms that assist subsistence farmers in Namibia's North-Central regions to better manage and cope with climate change, including variability such as droughts. There was no change in objective (as per TE and ProDoc). Coping mechanisms include rainwater harvesting, drip irrigation, conservation agriculture, livestock, improved seeds, buffalo grass and aquaculture.

4.3. Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:

Criteria	Change?	Reason for Change
Global Environmental Objectives	No	
Development Objectives	No	
Project Components	Yes	Any other (specify to the right)
Other activities		

5. GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

5.1. Relevance – *Satisfactory*

This project was relevant to national priorities. The TE reports that: The project concept is in line with development priorities and plans of the country. This includes national priorities that are identified as part of Namibia's long-term development strategy, Vision 2030, its underpinning National Development Plans and the National Poverty Reduction Programme. The CCA project was instrumental to the formation of Namibia's Policy on Climate Change and the project input and contribution to the formation of Namibia's Policy on CC (TE page 31). The project was also relevant from the perspective of the GEF under CC SPA - "Sustained adaptation

to climate change is inherently linked to the country's sustainable development. In line with the GEF goal to establish pilot projects to demonstrate how adaptation planning and assessment can be practically translated into projects that will provide real, immediate and visual benefits and be integrated into national policy, this project focuses on piloting a practical adaptation approach" (ProDoc page 7).

5.2. Effectiveness – **Moderately Satisfactory**

Overall most of the set targets were achieved. Under outcome 1 (CC adaptation measures in agricultural production piloted and tested): The targets set were achieved. The CCA Project developed and piloted a range of coping mechanisms for reducing vulnerability of farmers and pastoralist to climate change including droughts and changes in rainfall patterns the project intervention enabled those beneficiaries to engage in small scale horticulture production, animal farming and aquaculture. Under outcome 2 (Improved information flow on CC variability): Not all targets were achieved (no uptake and utilization of weather forecasts and related decision making support). The main output was the climate information toolkit to disseminate information on climate change and adaptation responses in the Omusati region. The toolkit has subsequently been replicated in five other regions. Under outcome 3 (CC issues integrated into planning processes): This target has not been achieved at local level but is achieved at national level whereby CCA project was instrumental to the formation of Namibia's Policy on Climate Change. The strategy and action plan took into account some of the adaptation measures that were piloted and tested. Further details on project achievements from UNDP PIR 2011: More than 3 500 households (HHs) in Omusati Region have adopted improved seeds (Pearl Millet: Okashana no. 2 and Kangara, Sorghum-Macia). A 100 demo plots of 30m x 40m were set up in 100 households whereby such farmers are practicing Conservation Agriculture (CA) by means of ripper furrow with the application of Mono Ammonium Phosphate (MAP) fertilizers and manure onto the pearl millet crops, e.g. Okashana no. 2, Egypt and Kangara. The project has continued to carry out monitoring activities on the 100 fish farms (individual HHs members, cooperatives and community groups) that were supported with 35 650kg of fish feeds to supplement their foods in Omusati, Oshana, Ohangwena and Oshikoto Regions.

By end of 2010, 212 commercial Boer goat rams were distributed to the same numbers of farmers in the 12 constituencies of Omusati region. The total distribution is above the target, which is 200 HHs/ farmers at the end of the project. This intervention is aimed at reducing the vulnerability of farmers from the impacts of climate change. Due to the positive impacts of this intervention, the CPP Management Committee members have advised the project invest more resources on this intervention. In this regard, the PMU intend to procure another 69 commercial Boer goat rams before the end of the project.

The project has supported the installation of 70 water tanks for rainwater harvesting i.e. 40 water tanks of 5000ℓ at public places (clinics, schools and community water stand pipes) and 30 water tanks of 2500ℓ installed in individual households with the average of 6 people per HH.

Out of the 40 water tanks installed at public places - 35 were installed at schools which cater for about 4000 pupils and teachers, 2 were installed at clinics in two constituencies which have a population of over 38 000 and 3 were installed at community stand pipes with the population of 300 inhabitants. Moreover, one earth dam (water storage facility) of 6000 m³ was excavated in Otshipya village in Elim Constituency benefiting about 100 households. The earth dam is used for multipurpose, mainly for livestock, domestic use (washing, gardening and occasionally for drinking purposes). It is the only source of water in the area during the drier seasons of the year. Depending on the rainfall intensity, the availability of water will reduce distance of fetching water in harsh temperatures, also a source of drinking water to livestock. Some HHS have planted fruit trees for income generation. Drip irrigation system was advanced to 35 small-holder farmers along the Etaka Canal that engage into horticulture production. In total there are about 65 small-holder farmers that are engaged into horticulture. The support includes drip lines, fertilizers, water pumps, seeds and germination trays as well as mobilizing trainings in food processing and horticulture production. About 3500 people are exposed to produce from drip irrigation practice.

Twenty-one farmers were trained at the University of Namibia northern campus (Ogongo) in promoting the blue buffalo grass (a highly palatable grass species with more forage). The intervention aims to re-introduce perennial grass species and restore plant cover in the selected plots. Farmers would then harvest the grass to feed their animals during the drier seasons of the year.

5.3. *Efficiency – Moderately Satisfactory*

This project experienced some difficulty in its implementation which led to delays, however the project closed as expected with no project extension required. The TE reports that the severe flooding did prevent the project from achieving its objectives and the effectiveness of the project suffered as a result in the early years of project implementation. The TE reports on the reasons for delays as follows:

- Environmental: during the rainy season which occurs in February to April each year. Between, 2008 and 2011, severe flooding negatively impacted the pace of the project. This meant that some activities had to be delayed or postponed as some areas could not be accessed by the project team. To reduce this risk, the MAWF team which was supported by the PMU contributed to the flood response activities for the region (short-term flood assistance) through regional contingency as proposed under the National Disaster Risk Management Policy.
- Operational: the project underwent unanticipated change of management within the PMU's national project manager levels / Project Coordinator three times for the duration of the project which caused delays in project progress and at mid-point of progress implementation (TE page 24).

In view that all outputs were delivered and whereas, as of 30 June 2011, 93.7% of the project resources have been spent and the remaining resources were to consolidate project activities in the remainder of 2011 including undertaking the project's final evaluation, the TE determined that the project financial controls was adhered to, including reporting and planning that allowed the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time and that allowed for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables. However, TE points out that there are no financial audits for CCA project presented to reflect on due diligence in the management of funds.

5.4. Sustainability – **Medium/Significant Risks**

The TE deems the sustainability of the project to be satisfactory. The executing agency Min of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF) is committed to continually allocate annual increased budget to the project as part of its regional development programme. At community level, beneficiaries have demonstrated a sense of ownership and buy-in in the project. Other signs of sustainability is the small scale replication and scaling up of the projects results and also the fact that this project is "not a standalone but it is a project which is fully integrated into the ministry's agricultural processes". However the recurrence of severe flooding in the north and central regions poses a threat to the results and continued work of the project (TE). The project has been ingrained into Namibia's development planning process to ensure country ownership and sustainability through the involvement of MAWF. Other key stakeholders such as the National Planning Commission and MET are part of key stakeholders. The project has played a key supportive role in the development of Namibia's Policy on Climate Change. The involvement of regional councilors under MRLGHRD reduces institutional risks associated with acceptability of the project thus affecting its sustainability (TE page 58).

6. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

6.1. Co-financing

6.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

The co-financing provided by the Government of Namibia was 4 times that of the GEF, and as such the project would not have been able to achieve its results without it (the co-financing was spread out amongst the three outcomes). The TE includes a table on how the co-financing was divided up between components and also describes that the co-financing lead to a high level of by-in and ownership by the Government and by the communities which could lead higher levels of sustainability of projects outcomes (co-financing by the community/beneficiaries for this project totals USD 80,000).(TE page 34).

6.1.2.If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect

project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

There was no significant difference in expected vs. actual co-financing in this project.

6.2. Delays

6.2.1. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

This project experienced some difficulty in its implementation which led to delays, however the project closed as expected with no project extension required. The TE reports that the severe flooding did prevent the project from achieving its objectives and the effectiveness of the project suffered as a result in the early years of project implementation. The effectiveness was rated in the PIRs as marginally satisfactory in 2009 due to the flooding. The TE reports on the reasons for delays as follows:

- Environmental: during the rainy season which occurs in February to April each year. Between, 2008 and 2011, severe flooding negatively impacted the pace of the project. This meant that some activities had to be delayed or postponed as some areas could not be accessed by the project team. To reduce this risk, the MAWF team which was supported by the PMU contributed to the flood response activities for the region (short-term flood assistance) through regional contingency as proposed under the National Disaster Risk Management Policy.
- Operational: the project underwent unanticipated change of management within the PMU's national project manager levels / Project Coordinator three times for the duration of the project which caused delays in project progress and at mid-point of progress implementation (TE page 24).

6.3. Country ownership

6.3.1. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE reports that the "the CCA project was fully owned and driven by Namibian Government, stakeholders and beneficiaries" (page 46). The project is well embedded in the national institutions (five ministries were involved in the design of the project) and civil society organizations were fully involved in project implementation. The project design and formulation was incorporated into the five year Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) to ensure environmental sustainability under the NDP 3. (TE page 23). The executing agency Min of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF) is committed to continually allocate annual increased budget to the project as part of its regional development programme and the TE outlines that this is "not a standalone but it is a project which is fully integrated into the ministry's

agricultural processes". At community level, beneficiaries have demonstrated a sense of ownership and buy-in in the project examples of this is the reported 90% of farmers now using improved seed crops, whereas 45% of farmers are practicing Conservation Agriculture in order to boost up their production under dry land farming (UNDP PIR 2011). Other signs of sustainability is the small scale replication and scaling up of the projects results: The TE notes that (page 49) that skills learned in the project have been used for scaling up and replication (small scale) for example the commercial Boer goat rams and plastic granaries piloted in Omusati Region were replicated in Ohangwena Region in the constituencies of Okongo, Epembe, Endola and Ondobe and also, the project information toolkit on climate change adaptation that was developed with farmers in the Omusati Region has been scaled up to other regions with five toolkits for the whole of Namibia.

7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

7.1. M&E design at entry – Satisfactory

The ProDoc includes a plan for M&E, which includes costs/budget, timeframe and responsible party for each of the activities. The logframe in the ProDoc contains indicators that aim to measure outcome level results and specifies targets for achievements, such as: "Soil erosion rates in the project site reduced by at least 10%" and "Increase in farm output in yields per/ha by at least 25%" and similar. These indicators were not included in the TE results framework/logframe - the TE does mention that the logframe was revised following the project inception workshop.

7.2. M&E implementation- Satisfactory

The TE deems the M&E at design and at implementation as highly satisfactory, with overall quality of M&E as Satisfactory. As per the TE (page 34-35) The project was monitored through several mechanisms including annual project reviews, quarterly progress reports, evaluation reports and field visits. Also, the M&E plan included the measurement of means and verification of project progress and project results. In the process, these evaluation results were used to modify project activities for long-term monitoring of project impacts, development of strategy for information collection from farmers and analyzed. The project strategy and objectives, outcomes and outputs, implementation structure, work plans and emerging issues were regularly reviewed and evaluated annually by PMU, UNDP-CO and UNDP-RTA. Periodic Status Reports were prepared at Project Coordinator level for presentation at key meetings associated with the project. As mentions previously in this section, the indicators put in place during the project implementation aimed more at measuring results at output rather than outcome. For example "number of people trained" or "total number of people exposed to coping mechanisms" rather than the possible change these activities lead to. The targets in the results framework and logframe lists e.g. how many improved seeds and how many livestock that were distributed, but not for example HH income increase, yield increase or similar. However the TE presents an "impact analysis" in which percentage yield increase and HH

income increase are presented but with no real assessment on environmental or socioeconomic change this may lead to.

8. Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution

8.1. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution –Satisfactory

8.2. Overall Quality of Implementation- Satisfactory

Limited information is available. The TE reports that "the combination of Implementing Agency (UNDP) and Execution Agency (MAWF) proved effective as they focused on results and deliverables as realized. However, due to one or other reason, the project was not able to retain a Project Coordinator for over 1.5 years" (TE page 53). It further reads: "It is evidenced that a strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allowed the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time and that allowed for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables was maintained by the Implementing Agency and adjudged Highly Satisfactory".

8.3. Overall Quality of Execution – Satisfactory

Limited information is available. According to the UNDP PIR 2011: "The project steering committee and the Management Committee of the entire CPP Programme have proved to be effective mechanisms to provide guidance to the implementation of the project. The project was implemented in a reasonably effective and efficient manner, largely in accordance with work plan, schedule and budget". The TE reports on the Executing agency as follows: The National Government through the MAWF followed through on their pledges through the allocation of annual budget for all the 3 project outcomes over the past four years hence Highly Satisfactory (TE page 53).

9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

Criteria	Rating	GEF EO Comments
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Moderately Satisfactory	The evaluation is not fully satisfactory in the assessment of the project in that it does not attempt to measure change as a result of the project activities. There are many basic evaluation areas that are not addressed sufficiently; for example for Relevance the TE reports "The objectives of the intervention are deemed appropriate now and in the future because climate change is here thus Highly Satisfactory" and for Effectiveness "The region was undated with floods throughout its implementation which than hampered and even prevented project progress. Much could have been achieved if not because of recurrent floods and thus, the delivery of project inputs is rated Marginally Satisfactory". (TE page 54).
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Moderately Satisfactory	There are some sections that are missing in the TE, e.g. an assessment of the implementing and executing agencies. Also, some information that was found in the UNDP PIR 2011, had not been included in the TE, e.g. the outreach and dissemination activities.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Satisfactory	Sustainability is addressed in the TE, however it is unclear to what extent the coping mechanisms established by the project would withstand a severe drought/flood (which did occur during the project and largely immobilized project activities).
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Moderately Satisfactory	Some of the lessons / recommendations seem obvious (e.g. it is important to have a strong PMU), but on the whole the recommendations were relevant, useful and comprehensive.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Satisfactory	Yes, this is included in table 9-11 (page 32-33 in the TE).
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Moderately Satisfactory	The TE section on M&E is not sufficiently addressed. The fact that most of the indicators remained at output level in the results assessment is however partly mitigated by the impact analysis in the TE. The M&E arrangements are not described in detail in the TE for example there is no mention of impact monitoring or what monitoring arrangements that are put in place to function after the project finishes.

Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved?

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance?

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?

WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised?

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

Some awareness raising activities took place for example: 3 radio talks aimed at raising the profile on climate change issues and about project's activities were conducted and a documentary on the impacts of the project was produced and was aired on the National TV (NBC Green Horizon Programme) (UNDP PIR 2011). Also, the TE reports that " The capacity building and training component had 75 AETs in the North Central Regions (NCRs) trained on climate change adaptation measures, seasonal rainfall outlook and community toolkit. Out of the 75 technicians trained, 25 are based in the project Omusati Region, the project pilot area. The trained technicians have since been engaged rolling out the coping mechanisms to farmers at constituency level to ensure that key resource users (farmers) make informed decisions when farming in varying climate. The training of AETs and other officers were also aimed at integrating climate change issues into regional development planning" (TE page 45). Furthermore, " a community information toolkit on adaptation (component 2) that focused strongly on farming issues and on the basis that the livelihoods of the community are more affected by climate change. The information toolkit developed with farmers in Omusati region has been tested and applied since then throughout Namibia including Erongo, Hardap, Karas and Khomas regions" (TE page 45-46). The project also raised awareness on a small scale in the villages where it operated with regards to conservation agriculture and demonstration sites e.g. improved seeds, drip irrigation aqua culture, rainwater harvesting etc. The TE reports that "a total of 112 goat rams were introduced to the entire 12 Constituencies for improving livestock breeding and production. The intervention benefitted 2,000 household from the variety of crop breeds such as 12 tones Okashana #2, Kangara, Sorghum and conservation agriculture which was practiced in 100 demonstration sites. Drip irrigation system in horticulture production and a ripper furrower implement for conservation agriculture was acquired by the project and made available for the farmers to use in land cultivation in Omusati region through the MAWF" (TE page 44).

Was any **positive** change in behavior reported as a result of these activities?

UA

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

The TE does not include information on behavioral change, however it does report on small scale: HH income increases, Ha of land protected, farmers growing new crops, labor saved with new techniques, reduced local deforestation etc. which implies that farmers are applying the learned techniques, improved seeds and changing from traditional farming etc. The UNDP PIR 2011 further reports that: "farmers and natural resources managers were capacitated in dealing with climate change adaptation measures. To this end, the resilience of farmers to the impact of climate change and variability was enhanced" and that "various measures ranging from crops and livestock farming were piloted and tested in Omusati region with 90% of farmers are now using improved seed crops, whereas 45% of farmers are practicing Conservation Agriculture in order to boost up their production under dry land farming".

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/ environmental management skills?

Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO **TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS** BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

According to the TE: The capacity building and training component had 75 Agricultural Extension Technicians (AETs) in the North Central Regions (NCRs) trained on climate change adaptation measures, seasonal rainfall outlook and community toolkit. Out of the 75 technicians trained, 25 are based in the project Omusati Region, the project pilot area. The trained technicians have since been engaged rolling out the coping mechanisms to farmers at constituency level to ensure that key resource users (farmers) make informed decisions when farming in varying climate. The training of AETs and other officers were also aimed at integrating climate change issues into regional development planning (TE page 45).

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained?

Yes

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

The TE notes that (page 49) that skills learned in the project have been used for scaling up and replication (small scale) for example the commercial Boer goat rams and plastic granaries piloted in Omusati Region were replicated in Ohangwena Region in the constituencies of Okongo, Epembe, Endola and Ondobe and also, the project information toolkit on climate change adaptation that was developed with farmers in the Omusati Region has been scaled up to other regions with five toolkits for the whole of Namibia. Also the TE reports on small scale change in terms of HH income increases, Ha of land protected, farmers growing new crops, labor saved with new techniques, reduced local deforestation etc. which implies that farmers are applying the learned techniques, improved seeds etc. Furthermore, various measures ranging from crops and livestock farming were piloted and tested in Omusati region with 90% of farmers are now using improved seed crops, whereas 45% of farmers are practicing Conservation Agriculture in order to boost up their production under dry land farming.

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks?

Yes

Were these adopted?

Yes

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

Under outcome 3: Climate change issues integrated into planning processes, the TE reports that "the CCA project was instrumental to the formation of Namibia's Policy on Climate Change (page 31 and 58), which was officially approved by Cabinet in May 2011 (TE page 46).

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures?

Yes

Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures?

No

WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

The TE does not report on specific structures that were created because of the project, however the TE notes that the project is well integrated into the national Government structures in that "the project has been ingrained into Namibia's development planning process to ensure country ownership and sustainability through the involvement of MAWF. The involvement of regional councilors under Min of Regional and Local Government (MRLGHRD) as well as Community Development Centres (CDC) in each of the 12 Constituencies reduces institutional risks associated" (TE page 8). The TE further reports that "the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once GEF assistance ends do not pose any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of the project outcomes. This because the CCA project is not a standalone project, but fully integrated into the MAWF's agricultural processes (TE page 8).

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?

UA

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

UA

WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?

No

WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION?
WHAT RESULTED FROM THESE?

Did the project contribute to any of the following:

Technologies & Approaches Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	Yes
	No
Financial Mechanisms	Yes

Please specify what was contributed:

Some of the coping mechanisms were scaled up to 12 constituencies in Omusati Region and the project information toolkit on climate change adaptation that was developed with farmers in the Omusati Region has been scaled up to other regions with five toolkits for the whole of Namibia.
The project introduced alternatives to traditional farming activities (i.e. improved crops, water harvesting etc) which lead to small scale improvements in household income as a results of higher yields, selling of cash crops etc. The impact analysis in the TE reports on income per annum generated by the project intervention by HH (TE page 50-52).

Did **replication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place?

Yes

SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.

WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

The TE notes that (page 49) that skills learned in the project have been used for scaling up and replication (small scale) for example the commercial Boer goat rams and plastic granaries piloted in Omusati Region were replicated in Ohangwena Region in the constituencies of Okongo, Epembe, Endola and Ondobe and also, the project information toolkit on climate change adaptation that was developed with farmers in the Omusati Region has been scaled up to other regions with five toolkits for the whole of Namibia. There was no additional information in the TE on the results in the new areas.

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

Yes

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.

HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

The TE notes that (page 49) that skills learned in the project have been used for scaling up and replication (small scale) for example the commercial Boer goat rams and plastic granaries piloted in Omusati Region were replicated in Ohangwena Region in the constituencies of Okongo, Epembe, Endola and Ondobe and also, the project information toolkit on climate change adaptation that was developed with farmers in the Omusati Region has been scaled up to other regions with five toolkits for the whole of Namibia. Moreover, coping mechanisms were up-scaled in the 12 constituencies in Omusati Region namely: water harvesting, aquaculture, seeds, livestock, and conservation agriculture and drip irrigation) (UNDP PIR 2011). There was no additional information in the TE on the results in the new areas.

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

Yes

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Mainstreaming in terms of integrating climate change issues into planning processes at a national level took place - the TE reports that "the CCA project was instrumental to the formation of Namibia's Policy on Climate Change" (page 31 and 58), which was officially approved by Cabinet in May 2011 (TE page 46).

Did **removal of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place?

No

SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

<--dropdown menu

If "combination", then of which types?

& <--dropdown menu

*QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED** OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **STATUS HAS CHANGED** AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.*

Was stress reduction achieved?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local Intended (local) Unintended (local)

Systemic Intended (systemic) Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured Anecdotal

Was there a change in environmental status?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local Intended (local) Unintended (local)

Systemic Intended (systemic) Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured Anecdotal

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **local level**

Although no real stress reduction has been recorded in this project, the TE described how the project "has aimed to deliver GEBs in the GEF focal areas of climate change prevention of land degradation and to a limited extent, biodiversity conservation through community-based approaches. CPP Namibia has promoted grassroots actions to address global environmental concerns" (page 52). As an example: prevention of land degradation is addressed by "Plastic granaries - the intervention is estimated to have saved approximate 15 hectares of trees to be harvested over 5 years, reduces pressure on the resource base by substituting demand for wood and in the process; reduces deforestation, land degradation and stabilizes the environment".

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a **systemic level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a **systemic level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental

Socioeconomic

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

The TE does not contain any information on impact monitoring, however some of the indicators (especially those in the original logframe of the project) would measure environmental and socioeconomic change - but as the logframe changed in the project after its start the indicators became less focused on impact/change and more on output level results. The TE deems the general M&E at design and at implementation as highly satisfactory, with overall quality of M&E as Satisfactory. As per the TE (page 34-35) The project was monitored through several mechanisms including annual project reviews, quarterly progress reports, evaluation reports and field visits. Also, the M&E plan included the measurement of means and verification of project progress and project results. In the process, these evaluation results were used to modify project activities for long-term monitoring of project impacts, development of strategy for information collection from farmers and analyzed. The project strategy and objectives, outcomes and outputs, implementation structure, work plans and emerging issues were regularly reviewed and evaluated annually by PMU, UNDP-CO and UNDP-RTA. Periodic Status Reports were prepared at Project Coordinator level for presentation at key meetings associated with the project.

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

The indicators put in place aimed at measuring results at output rather than outcome level. For example "number of people trained" or "total number of people exposed to coping mechanisms" rather than the possible change these activities lead to. The targets in the results framework and logframe lists e.g. how many improved seeds and how many livestock that were distributed, but not for example HH income increase, yield increase or similar. However the TE presents an "impact analysis" in which % yield increase and HH income increase are presented but with no real assessment on environmental or socioeconomic change this may lead to.

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

UA

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

Unclear from the TE report.

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?

Unclear from the TE report

Has the monitoring data been used for management?

UA

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

Has the data been made accessible to the public?

UA

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

“SOCIOECONOMIC” REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE “BEFORE” AND “AFTER” NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.

Did the project contribute to **positive** socioeconomic impacts?

Yes

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local Intended (local) Unintended (local)

Systemic Intended (systemic) Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured Anecdotal

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts?

No

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local

Intended (local)

Unintended (local)

Systemic

Intended (systemic)

Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured

Anecdotal

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

At a very small scale there is some evidence of HH income increases for the target group of this project. The TE presents an "impact analysis" (page 49-52) for example, conservation agriculture through ripper furrower which was introduced at 100 demonstration sites (for 100 HH) has generated an annual income per HH of approx. 200 USD by increasing the agricultural yields by 53% by season. The UNDP PIR 2011 further describes more details on results i.e. "farmers and natural resources managers were capacitated in dealing with climate change adaptation measures. To this end, the resilience of farmers to the impact of climate change and variability was enhanced and that various measures ranging from crops and livestock farming were piloted and tested in Omusati region with 90% of farmers are now using improved seed crops, whereas 45% of farmers are practicing Conservation Agriculture in order to boost up their production under dry land farming".

Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report

The TE provides two lessons/actions (page 56-57) as follows: 1) A strong PMU is a prerequisite in similar projects to coordinate the project's strategic plans and daily activities. The PMU also acts as repository of information which will be handed over to the implementing partner. It is recommended that a robust and resourced PMU be established at the onset of any future project. 2) Climate change mitigation cannot be treated separately from adaptation. It is advised that adaptation projects consider incorporating lighter and simpler mitigation measures and activities such as solar energy, small devices like light and energy efficient stoves which are very handy at community level. Capacity building in these technologies will also help to ensure their appreciation and sustainable use.

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation:

A total of 11 recommendations are provided by the TE. Many of which bring up the issue of financing mechanisms necessary for the farmers to participate in the project scheme, as well as the future possibility of soft loans, sales and marketing channels and reduction of financial barriers. Some recommendations bring up the importance of climate variability and the importance of raising awareness of alternative adaptation. All recommendations are listed here below (from TE page 58-59).

1. The Commercial Boer goat ram was a very successful intervention by the project and it is recommended that the activities be scaled up for the benefit of vulnerable smallholder farmers in Omusati region through the MAWF

existing schemes. A financing scheme should be devised for vulnerable farmers that are unable to afford the upfront cost of purchasing the rams.

2. The study established that little has been done to develop sales and marketing channels for the various guinea fowl products and most CCA beneficiaries sold their eggs only to individual farmers or on informal markets. The sale of guinea fowl for meat and for breeding was not greatly explored, and there exists great potential to expand both of these activities.

CPP NAM: CCA Final Evaluation Report | CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS

LEARNED

3. The drip irrigation system proved suitable in Omusati region and in the long term, water is also more readily available from Etaka Canal and Olushandja Dam and relatively fertile soil. However, the start-up costs estimated at USD 11,000 for 1 – 2 hectare would be prohibitive for many smallholder farmers. Reform of existing financing scheme and identification of viable financing models would be required to accommodate emerging small holders' farmers in the region.

4. To reinforce the initiative of plastic granaries in the region and beyond, it is recommended that a subsidization mechanism (soft loan) should be introduced through the MAWF so that farmers can purchase the granaries on credit or at reduced rates, particularly for farmers operating in the vulnerable "Efundja" flood zone. It is anticipated that the scheme would reduce the financial barriers to the supply and purchase of plastic granaries including reduction (first cost reduction) of the price and ready availability of finance. In the circumstances, the scheme would reinforce trade, economy of scale and create a new trade dynamic in domestic economy.

5. One of the three Outcomes of the project was to establish policies and strategies at constituency level. Since this was put at abeyance to allow the development of Namibia's Climate Change Policy, it is recommended that the establishment of these sub-policies and strategies be revisited since Omusati Region is most prone to climate change variability.

6. The project has proved its relevance to the development priorities of the country and the Omusati Region on the basis that, through impact assessments, improved vegetation and crops among the affected communities have been noted. The lessons need to be tested in other regions which may offer different challenges.

7. Climate variability will be as much a feature of climate change as a trend towards drier conditions. Communities need to be prepared for climate variability, be it droughts or floods. Communities need to be ready to respond flexibly, and on the basis of good weather forecast information. An adaptation strategy that is good for droughts is not likely to be good for floods. Future efforts will need to look at how farmer-level adaptation strategies can be adjusted to prevent losses associated with floods as well as droughts, aided by weather forecast information.

8. Government effort to raising awareness of alternative adaptation options is not to be underestimated and should be adequately resourced.

9. The Meteorological office climate decision-support tools need to be demand focused, and respond to farmer's needs for short-term forecast tools.

10. It is noted that the water for the drip irrigation systems and aquaculture ponds are being extracted from the Etaka Canal and Olushandja Dam using fuel driven generator sets. It is recommended that solar powered water

pumping systems for irrigation purposes are employed at the site and future projects in order for the CCA activities in the Omusati region contributing to climate mitigation by reducing or avoiding CO2 emissions.

11. For future programmatic intervention, 5 year projects would be more effective in terms of allowing sufficient time to measure results.