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PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT OF NAMIBIA'S FORESTED LAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country:</th>
<th>NAMIBIA</th>
<th>GEF Project ID:</th>
<th>4832</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEF Agency:</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>GEF Agency Project ID:</td>
<td>4626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Executing Partners:</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Water &amp; Forestry; DoF</td>
<td>Submission Date:</td>
<td>20 Nov 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF Focal Area:</td>
<td>LAND DEGRADATION</td>
<td>Project Duration(Months):</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Parent Program</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Agency Fee ($):</td>
<td>444,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Area Objectives</th>
<th>Expected FA Outcomes</th>
<th>Expected FA Outputs</th>
<th>Trust Fund</th>
<th>Grant Amount ($)</th>
<th>Co-financing ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD 3: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape</td>
<td>Outcome 3.1: Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management Indicator 3.1 Policies support integration of agriculture, rangeland, forest, and other land uses</td>
<td>Integrated land management plans developed and implemented</td>
<td>GEF TF</td>
<td>1,346,000</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities Indicator 3.2 Application of integrated natural resource management (INRM) practices in wider landscapes</td>
<td>INRM tools and methodologies developed and tested</td>
<td>GEF TF</td>
<td>3,100,000</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total project costs</td>
<td>4,446,000</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To reduce pressure on forest resources by facilitating policy & capacity enabling environment for the uptake of improved practices in agriculture, livestock and forestry management in the community forest areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Co-fin ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 1: Knowledge based land use planning and policy change hasten gazettement of eleven community forests (CFs) and mainstreaming of forest resources in productive policies</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>disrupting area under land use plans from 182,615 ha to 2,840,153ha (an increase of &gt;90%);</td>
<td>1.1: Eleven communities assisted to legalise their CFs</td>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>1,920,000</td>
<td>12,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase in compliance with land use plans from a current low of &lt;40% to more &gt; 60%</td>
<td>1.2: Three CFs supported to formulate &amp; implement integrated forest resources management plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Change in capacity score cards of technical staff of ministries, CF management committees/ Boards and community members</td>
<td>1.3: Strengthening Organisational Capacity for effective Community Forest Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Forest sector issues reflected in regional land use plans and regional programs of sectors such as agriculture, water, local development, environment and tourism</td>
<td>1.4: Policies harmonised, support local governance and reflect value of forests in national development programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.
2 Refer to the Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework when completing Table A.
Component 2: Implementation of SFM technologies in selected CF hotspots

**TA**
- Increase in agricultural productivity of main crops (pearl millet and sorghum) regions covering 300,000ha from current 200-600kg/ha to a range of 400-600kg/ha;
- Increased off-take of livestock in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjonzondjupa from 5% to at least 20%;
- Increased health, quality and type of livestock kept in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjonzondjupa regions covering 150,000ha measured by MEATCO records showing at least 20% of cattle upgrade to Grade B, fatness grade 2 or 3 and decrease in oxen and increase in number of heifers;
- Increased utilisation of fire management practices reduces total areas burned by 30% and severity reduced to mild in Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjonzondjupa regions (200,000ha);
- Reduction in bush densities by at least 20% and reduction in area covered by bush by at least 10% in 5 hotspots;
- Reduction in use of wood fuel by at least 20% and increase in use of alternative energy sources by 10%;
- Increase in financial returns from sustainable economic exploitation of forest resources in all hotspots increase by at least 25%, in line with land use plans;

2.1: Conservation Agriculture piloted in Kavango, Omusati, Otjonzondjupa, Kunene, Ohangwena and Omaheke;
2.2: Improved livestock practices piloted in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjonzondjupa hotspots;
2.3: Improved marketing of sustainably harvested forest and livestock products piloted in all hotspots;
2.4: Fire management strategy is piloted in Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjonzondjupa hotspots;
2.5: Bush-control program is piloted in Omundaungilo, Okongo, Ongandjera, Otjituu and Otjiku-Tjithilonde and provides financial incentives for controlled bush clearance;
2.6: Energy saving and alternative energy program implemented;
2.7: System for monitoring of forest and range condition and land productivity is in place lessons; lessons used in adaptive management and upscaling of experience in the rest of the wooded hotspots through a capacitated extension service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 2: Implementation of SFM technologies in selected CF hotspots</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**

| Subtotal | GEF | 4,246,000 | 18,500,000 |

Project management Cost (PMC)

| Project management Cost (PMC) | GEF | 200,000 | 1,500,000 |

**Total project costs**

| Total project costs | GEF | 4,446,000 | 20,000,000 |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Co-finance</th>
<th>Name of Co-financier (source)</th>
<th>Type of Co-fin</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>GRN; Ministry of Agriculture, Water &amp; Forestry</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral Aid Agency</td>
<td>German Ministry for International Development Cooperation (BMZ) through German Technical Cooperation (GIZ)</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Agency</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>In cash</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Agency</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>In kind</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Co-financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.
D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency, Focal Area and Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEF IA</th>
<th>Trust Fund</th>
<th>FA</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project amount</th>
<th>Agency Fee</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>GEFTF</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>4,446,000</td>
<td>444,600</td>
<td>4,890,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Consultants Working for Technical Assistance Components:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Grant Amount ($)</th>
<th>Co-Fin ($)</th>
<th>Project Total ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Consultants</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>222,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/Local Consultants</td>
<td>124,500</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>364,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>196,500</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>586,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Does the project include a “non-grant” instrument? NO

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. Describe Changes in Alignment with the Project Design of the Original PIF

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc. N/A

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

A.3. The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage: N/A

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

A.5. Incremental activities requested for GEF financing and the associated global environmental benefits to be delivered by the project

Incremental reasoning: The major change made during the PPG was that the threats, root causes and barrier analysis was improved substantially, leading to a more elaborate description of the interventions necessary to overcome the barriers and adoption of improved management techniques within the community forests. This, in turn, led to a refinement of the intervention strategy, to improve logic and clarity, with the following specific changes:

- **Goal and objectives:** The project objective and goal have been adjusted to enhance clarity with the project objective and goal being switched such that the **project goal** becomes: **To maintain current dry forests and the ecosystem goods and services they provide in 13 Community Forests to cover over 500,000 ha of forest lands, through wide scale adoption of SLM, SFM, Forest Certifications and other improved technologies.** The **project objective** becomes: **To reduce pressure on forest resources by facilitating the policy and capacity enabling environment for the uptake of improved practices within agriculture, livestock and forestry management in the community forest areas.** These changes were made in order to enhance clarity on the project’s intended interventions and enhance logic in the project strategy.

- **Components and outputs:** The wording of the Components has also undergone adjustment to enhance clarity: 
  - Component 1: Knowledge based land use planning and policy change becoming **Knowledge based land use planning and policy change hasten gazettement of eleven community forests (CFs) and mainstreaming of forest resources in productive policies and Component 2:** Adoption of improved production technologies and techniques reduce pressure on forest resources becoming: **Implementation of SFM technologies in selected CF hotspots.**

- **Distribution of budget between components:** The change in the placement of outputs and outcomes between Component 1 and 2 means that the 2 components have been delineated on the basis of implementation focus: Component 1 focuses on supporting the gazettement of the CFs (and the accompanying forest and integrated land use planning), and capacitation of strengthening organisational capacity for effective Community Forest Management (in

---

1 ToRs for these consultants are in the UNDP Prodoc budget notes 2, 9 and 10.
2 For questions A.1 – A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.
traditional, formal, local, regional and national institutions of governance and management); Component 2 focuses on local level application and of SFM/SLM technologies within the community forests production system. Consequently, Budget allocation has been adjusted: Component 1 is allocated 1,920,000 (originally 1,246,000) and Component 2 is allocated 2,326,000 (originally 3,000,000).

- **Number of community forests target:** The number of community forests to be supported by the project was reduced from 30 to 13. This was to focus project support to gazettement of 11 additional CFs, in order to enhance project impacts and their sustainability. Tackling 30 CFs with the current project budget and timeline would have spread the resources too thinly, risking non completion and disbursing impacts. Due to current devolution efforts by the Namibian government as well as government intention to develop community based forest management at a national level, the piloting of these 13 CF hotspots provides a strong piloting initiative. The government intends to learn lessons from the pilot sites and to implement them nationally. However the large size of project sites as well as the scale and extent of intended project interventions.

- **Length of the project:** The length of the project has been extended from 60 to 72 months. Both the government and UNDP consider that 72 months would be a more plausible timeline for the project to ensure completion and effective implementation of project interventions. This is because local level planning (for both Forest Management Plans and more detailed integrated land use plans) tend to be slow processes, particularly if communities are to be meaningfully involved (necessary for ownership and sustainability). This is particularly so in the communal forest areas of Namibia, because the land is expansive and public transport is very limited. The process of gazettement is also elaborate and complex. The project will also require the establishment and support of a strong management framework to ensure effective oversight and implementation of activities at the hotspot level. This is proposed in the management arrangement; and will include a National Level Project Director (the Director of the Directorate of Forestry) supported by a strong Project Coordination Unit to be based in the headquarters of one of the seven regions involved in the project (Groonfontein).

- **Elaboration of the threat, root cause and barriers as well as description of the intervention strategy:** Has been revised extensively, and is therefore produced below (see prodoc). Barriers to the SFM and SLM in the communal forests: Barrier 1: Weak institutional capacities to support CBNRM processes (planning, enforcement, research/knowledge, value addition): Barrier 2: Inadequate support to SFM/SLM technologies on the ground.

**PROJECT GOAL, OBJECTIVE, OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS/ACTIVITIES**

The project’s goal is to maintain current dry forests and the ecosystem goods and services they provide in 13 Community Forests covering over 500,000ha of forest lands, through wide scale adoption of SLM, SFM, and other improved technologies.

The project objective is to reduce pressure on forest resources by facilitating the gazettement of CFs, and increasing the capacity for the uptake of improved agriculture, livestock and forestry management practices in the community forest areas.

In order to achieve the above objective, and based on the barrier analysis (see Section I, Part I), which identified: (i) the problem being addressed by the project; (ii) its root causes; and (iii) the barriers that need to be overcome to actually address the problem and its root causes, the project’s intervention has been organised in two components (also in line with the concept presented at Project Identification Form, PIF, stage), under which 7 ‘outcomes’ are expected from the project.

**Component 1: Knowledge based land use planning and policy change hasten gazettement of eleven community forests (CFs) and mainstreaming of forest resources in productive policies**

The project will support the generation and use of knowledge for integrated land use planning and policy reform through the implementation of forest valuations; which will be used to inform local and national dialogue processes, aimed at influencing policy alignment in favour of forest resources. The outcome will ensure that knowledge based land use planning forms the basis for improving drylands sustainable economic development in eleven CFs to be gazetted. Production policies and plans will be aligned with SFM and SLM plans to enhance sustainable development and reduce the rate of deforestation and land degradation at the local level. Integrated land use plans will be formulated for three CFs, incorporating stakeholder interests, sustainable land use and forestry management practices. These plans will be disseminated to the local communities
for implementation and monitoring programs put in place to track their effectiveness. The knowledge generated to support the land use planning will support the total forest valuation exercise, which will be used to inform local and national dialogue process, aimed at influencing policy formulation in favour of forest resources.

This will lead to the following outcomes:

- Forest sector issues reflected in regional land use plans and regional programs of sectors such as agriculture, water, local development, environment and tourism.
- Regional and local dialogue initiated to disseminate land use and forestry issues and enhance awareness of SFM and SLM strategies and their integration into existing policies.

Stronger governance at Community Forest Level leads to general compliance with land use plans and increased returns from the forest resources.

**COMPONENT 2: IMPLEMENTATION OF SFM TECHNOLOGIES IN SELECTED CF HOTSPOTS.**

The implementation of SFM/SLM technologies will be in line with the management plans formulated under outputs 1.1 and 1.2, enriched by an assessment of CBFM best practices globally and regionally. Planning for the implementation will follow the principles of the Forum for Integrated Natural Resource Management (FIRM), the local resource management tool that was tested and refined by the CPP. This approach allows communities to take ownership and leadership of development priorities in their hands. They identify their own problems and propose solutions. The functionality of the FIRMs depends on ensuring that Integrated Work plans are supported and implemented with support from various organisations such as Regional Councils and Constituency Development Committees (CDCs), MEATCO, Namibia National Farmers’ Union, Directorate of Extension and Engineering Services, Directorate of Forestry and Directorate of Rural Water Supply.

Implementation of the technologies will also be guided by the gender strategy produced during the PPG. The strategy spells out the gender aspects in relation to forest resources management, harvesting, marketing, tree planting; and, identifies the likely ways these relations can affect effectiveness of the project (negatively or positively). It then provides recommendations on how the project can utilise the prevailing gender relations to improve its effectiveness and positive impacts on forestry resources management, and livelihoods (particularly bearing in mind the income generating aspects based on sustainable harvesting of NTFPs and the need for conservation). In addition, the strategy provides preliminary analysis of the forestry policy from gender perspectives and highlights recommendations for making it more gender responsive. It also provides a preliminary report on the capacity of the relevant institutions involved in project implementation to handle the gender aspects of the project; and recommendations for bridging the capacity gaps (to be tackled under output 1.3). Finally it provides specific gender indicators along with baseline and target values. This report will be used to refine targeting of project initiatives and activities to the relevant gender groups, to increase effectiveness and impacts.

This will result in the following outcomes:

- Application of SFM technologies and Land use being guided by integrated plans that balance environmental, ecological and economic development objectives in the wooded areas of Namibia covering over 500,000 ha;
- Capacitated institutions provide technical support to land and resource users to manage over 500,000ha of land under improved practices;
- Application of SLM technologies in the selected hotspots results in:
  - Improved crop production in degraded hotspots of Kavango, Omusati, Otjonzondjupa, Kunene, Ohangwena, and Omaheke regions covering 300,000 ha reduces deforestation/forest degradation while increasing productivity and food security;
  - Improved livestock management in overgrazed hotspots in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjonzondjupa regions covering 150,000 ha leads to simultaneous increase in livestock productivity and range/forest improvement;
  - Improved fire and bush control in hotspots spread across Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjonzondjupa regions (200,000) ha lead to improvement in range and forest conditions;
A program of alternative and efficient wood use reduces pressure on woody resources in 10 hotspots spread across the 7 wooded regions.

The UNDP Prodoc discusses the outputs in detail, summarised in the table below. The table shows only indicative actions needed to deliver the outputs, which will confirmed through the annual work plans.

Table showing outputs and preliminary actions needed to deliver them (to be confirmed via annual work plans):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 1: Knowledge based land use planning and policy change</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.1: Eleven communities assisted to legalise their CFs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1: Undertake an assessment of the stage of gazettement for the 11 CFs, and make workplan for completing gazettement process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2: Assist CFs to complete stage 1 of gazettement (Awareness, Registration of Interest and Initiating the Process and Community Organisation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3: Assist CFs to prepare Indicative Land-use and Resource Mapping, demarcation and to obtain Approval of Community Forest Boundaries:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4: Assist communities to under socio-economics and bio-physical assessments and use the information to prepare provisional CF management plans and bye-laws, and provisional CF level M&amp;E plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5: Assist CFs to Develop Benefit and Cost Sharing Arrangements and negotiate and Draft Community Forest Agreement: To submit applications for the Declaration of Community Forests and follow up the gazettement process to its logical conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.2: Three CFs supported to formulate &amp; implement integrated forest resources management plans:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1: Assist 3 CFs to undertake detailed integrated resource (Forests, range and agriculture) assessment studies to produce information for the land use planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2: Facilitate the use of information to formulate draft land use plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3: Disseminate the draft land use plans, solicit comments, finalise and publish plans, including registering them with the relevant authorities (and facilitate use of the use of the provision of the land use plans in outcome 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.3: Strengthening Organisational Capacity for effective Community Forest Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1: Refine the capacity needs assessment performed during PPG and draft a capacity building strategy (including training programs, develop training material, negotiate extra staff members from relevant authorities, etc.);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2: Facilitate delivery of training programs and other capacity development activities for the technical staff of relevant ministries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3: Facilitate delivery of training programs and other capacity development activities for the CFs (management committees and individual farmers/livestock keepers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3: Organise and facilitate learning missions, exchange visits (internal to Namibia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1.4: Policies harmonised, support local governance and reflect value of forests in national development programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1: Undertake an assessment of the effectiveness of the current national, regional and local forums/networks for facilitating dialogue on CBNRM, and in particular effectiveness of mainstreaming CPP policy recommendations into local resource management, and formulate a plan for making them effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.2: Facilitate local, regional and national dialogue on CBNRM, its potential for local and national economic development, and lessons of implementation, and use opportunities to mainstream SFM into productive sector policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.3: undertake total forest valuation (in conjunction with assessments under activity 1.2.1), disseminate information widely, finalise, publicise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 2: Adoption of improved production technologies reduces pressure on forest resources</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.1: Conservation agriculture piloted:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 Undertake an assessment of the current levels of adoption of CA in the 13 CFs, and lessons on CF from the country, the region and abroad, and develop CA implementation and management strategies (also taking the CF plans into account) to ensure enhanced agricultural productivity and minimise environmental impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Training courses for local communities &amp; farmers on the implementation of CA and agroforestry practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3 Support implementation of CA and agroforestry practices as well as incorporating suitable traditional practices to improve crop production and forest cover, by strengthening delivery of extension service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4 Using the FIRMs, increase supply of fertilisers and agricultural extension services to enhance CA efforts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5 Establishment of tree plantations and nurseries to provide source trees for agroforestry, including the identification of suitable crops and plantation trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Output 2.2 Improved livestock practices piloted in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjonzondjupa hotspots; | 2.2.1 Review of current pastoralist practices, livestock management plans and policies and identification of gaps and recommendations for the local communities.  
2.6.2 Development of integrated and holistic animal husbandry and livestock management strategies that enhance production and minimise environmental impacts.  
2.6.3 Awareness & training for livestock farmers on holistic livestock management practices  
2.6.4 Improved extension services provision in the local communities to improve community knowledge on animal health and productivity.  
2.6.5 Improved feed supply and veterinary services to enhance animal health and productivity. |
|---|---|
| Output 2.3 Improved marketing of sustainably harvested forest and livestock products piloted. | 2.3.1: Undertake a comprehensive assessment of marketable forest, non-forest and livestock tradable products (building on the PPG assessment), identify potential markets and undertake cost benefit analysis of the promising chains; develop marketing strategies for each potential proven worthwhile by the cost benefit analysis  
2.3.2: Disseminate market strategies and support the development of marketing capacity in the CFs (e.g. facilitate cooperatives; provide security for loans, link producers to high value markets  
2.3.3: Value addition of livestock products through establishment of abattoirs and livestock processing plants and storage facilities.  
2.3.4: Monitor uptake and effectiveness of marketing activities to sustainable forest management and local economic development, publish and share lessons |
| Output 2.4: Fire management strategy is piloted in Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjonzondjupa hotspots | 2.4.1 Identification & review of fire control strategies & fire management practices in selected hotspots.  
2.4.2 Development of appropriate fire control strategies incorporating SADC protocols and best practices; and dissemination of information to local communities.  
2.4.3 Provision of equipment and training to enhance local community capacity to deal with fires.  
2.4.4 Development of a fire monitoring system incorporating fire interval sequencing information to enhance management strategies and enhance fire control practices among local communities. |
| Output 2.5: Bush-control program is piloted in Omundaungilo, Okongo, Ongandjera, Otjituo and Otjikutjihlonde | 2.5.1 Development of appropriate bush control strategies for the selected hotspots based on best practices and recommendations from the Namibia rangelands and bush encroachment forum.  
2.5.2 Disseminate information to local communities & Implement bush clearing & bush management programs.  
2.5.3 Rehabilitation of rangelands through grass reseeding programs and rehabilitation of dense woodlands to improve tree-grass dynamics and perennial grasslands.  
2.5.4 Programs for the management and utilisation of Invader bush as an energy source. |
| Output 2.6 – Energy saving program implemented | 2.6.1 Assessment of wood consumption levels in the selected hotspots and review of gaps and recommendations as well as feasibility of alternative energy sources.  
2.6.2 Development of suitable alternative energy sources as well as exploring the use of bricks and brick-making as an alternative to using poles for construction to minimise wood consumption and enhance sustainability.  
2.6.3 Provision of equipment & training to enhance capacity in the utilisation of alternative energy sources and utilisation of alternative building & construction materials such as brick-making and brick-laying.  
2.6.4 Value addition of forest products based on recommendations of market assessments including establishment of processing plants |
| Output 2.7: M&E | 2.7.1 Development of a monitoring and evaluation program for SFM and SLM, harmonising the CF-level M&E plans.  
2.7.2: Data collection for M&E, including mid-term and final evaluations  
2.7.3: Data sharing, including publications and linkages to UNCCD PRAIS |

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

In addition to the risks identified at the PIF stage, several more have been identified, and the updated table of risks is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Risks</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slow process of policy</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>The project will mitigate this risk by using the information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Risks</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and legislation enactment may cause delays in mainstreaming of forest and woodlands considerations into productive sectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>generated by valorisation to promote the importance of the sector to sustainable development and adaptation; increasing organisational capacity and skills of the resource managers, forestry committees, regional governments and the Directorate of Forests will increase their ability to lead the policy review process, identify solutions for Namibia’s specific conditions and lobby for their adoption. The project will also link strongly to the structures and supportive capacity established through the CPP (GEF 3), which has already catalysed the process of policy review aimed at influencing the National Development Plan 4 (NDP 4), by mainstreaming sustainable land management principles in national development policies, programs and processes. A great deal of energy and support for improved environmental management has been generated through this and other programs, which forms a solid foundation for the proposed policy work. Further, the INRM working group established with the support of GEF under the CPP will provide a policy framework to advance any new policies, especially the CBNRM. The local and national dialogue platforms established by the project will also advance this advocacy role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing pressure on the forest resources will depend on i) successful intensification of crop yields to prevent further agriculture expansion into forest lands; ii) successful reduction of overstocking and overgrazing; iii) bush and fire control. These are all difficult issues to deal with and will reduce the success of the project if not adequately handled</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>The project recognises these three threats to forest resources and will tackle them through firstly formulation of an integrated land use plan that will clearly identify areas suitable for each production (or combinations thereof) but more importantly delineate areas that need specific protection or rehabilitation. More specifically, the SLM technologies (agroforestry and others) will tackle the issue of soil fertility and water harvesting to increase soil fertility, hence productivity; the introduction of livestock marketing and improved livestock management will tackle overgrazing, while the formulation of the bush and fire control programs will reduce the risks from fire and bush and increase rangeland productivity. The successful adoption of these technologies will be enhanced through provision of skills, guidelines and extension support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of sustainable charcoal and harvesting of wood resources as measures of bush control would depend on strict control of the sources of charcoal and such wood products to ensure that the programs do not become threats to forest resources</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>The project will increase organisational capacity (technical staff of line ministries, Regional Council, CF Management Committees) to increase the process of formalisation of the CFs; it will then support the process of land use planning and increase capacity for the effective use of SFM/SLM tools (such as permitting, controlling, etc.). Specifically, the adoption of sustainable charcoal and/or harvesting of woody resources will be informed by assessments and best practices, supported by EIAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful implementation of the Conservation agriculture may need to be supported by the application of pesticides that have a</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>The Conservation Agriculture program will be supported by the empowered extension service, and involves training of farmers. In addition, selection of pesticides will be informed by best practices world-wide and negative impacts would occur only where the science relating to pesticides is incomplete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Risks</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Likelihood</td>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>known negative effect on the environment or human health. Low levels of extension support may prevent the careful use of pesticides</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>The project will increase awareness of the CBNRM policies and the impacts on forest resources management (output 1.4). Combined with empowerment of the IPs via legalisation of the CFs and their Management Committees, the project will ensure that the impacts are largely positive. This is because formalising a CF bestows greater rights over natural resources to the community owning these resources. Formation of the Management Committees for the CFs also empowers communities, including IPs, to take on responsibilities and benefits of the community forests. The project will implement the strategy for re-confirming informed consent during the inception period. In addition, the project implementation will be guided by the draft gender strategy formulated during the PPG. The strategy highlights gender relations likely to affect, or be affected by the project activities, and suggestions of what the project needs to do to ensure that the project does not affect vulnerable groups (including IPs) negatively. It also recommends project approaches that indeed ensure equitable distribution of benefits and responsibilities across gender groups. This includes a strategy for re-confirming informed consent for the IPs to be part of the CFs, which has been agreed upon between the DoF and the IP leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project will involve zoning and formalising several CF, some under Indigenous Peoples. Inadequate awareness of the rights to forest resources – combined with the weak capacity of the Regional Councils to facilitate legalisation of CFs continues to put the indigenous people at risk of losing their forest resources</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Selection of the agroforestry species will be informed by science and best practices worldwide. The project will invest significantly in preventative and mitigation measures, including adequate assessments for the selection of indigenous tree species for agroforestry and strict monitoring of forestry and agroforestry activities to ensure minimisation of the introduction of exotic and indigenous species that could become invasive. SFM and SLM activities will aid in minimising land degradation so as to reduce opportunities for the establishment and spread of invasive species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The agroforestry interventions proposed by the project will involve the establishment of tree plantations on farms to increase productivity of the land, and reduce pressure on forest resources. Low levels of skills amongst the community members and inadequate capacity of technical line ministries, particularly the capacity gaps for extension services reported in table 14 prevents appropriate application of science and best practices to support selection of agroforestry species that would not turn out to be invasive</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Selection of the agroforestry species will be informed by science and best practices worldwide. The project will invest significantly in preventative and mitigation measures, including adequate assessments for the selection of indigenous tree species for agroforestry and strict monitoring of forestry and agroforestry activities to ensure minimisation of the introduction of exotic and indigenous species that could become invasive. SFM and SLM activities will aid in minimising land degradation so as to reduce opportunities for the establishment and spread of invasive species.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limestone mining | Medium | Low        | Low             | If limestone is confirmed after then in-depth cost benefit analysis |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Risks</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Risk Assessment</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>without adequate capacity for EIAs may lead to negative impacts on the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>upon which the income generating activities will be based, mining would be preceded by detailed environmental impact assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of climate change and capacity erosion through HIV/AIDS and other illnesses may derail the project effort, by reducing the effectiveness of the measures introduced by the project</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Climate change projections confirm that the growing conditions will change in project pilot areas; but the extent of the change and its effects on the ecosystem structure and composition is uncertain. Several studies however predict that these changes might be negative, leading to changes in species composition and reduction in primary productivity in the very long-term. Because of the uncertainty of the changes or the time line by which they will occur, the project will lay the foundation for adaptive capacity, which will be needed to monitor the changes and translate the technical monitoring information into management decisions. In addition, the SLM practices proposed by the project will lead to improvement in the ecosystem resilience, and, in turn, the resilience of the livelihoods dependent on the ecosystem. Many of the project initiatives will increase household incomes, further extending the capacity of households to adapt to the effects of climate change. The project will also link with other programs targeting mitigation against the impacts of HIV/AIDS, drawing on existing synergies and capacities. Preliminary assessment shows that there are several such initiatives in the targeted pilot sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large size of the CF hotspots and weak management support and oversight in the implementation of SFM and capacity development activities</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Due to the large sizes of the individual Community Forest hotspots selected for project intervention, management and oversight of SFM and capacity building activities will be difficult and result in inconsistent monitoring of site activities ultimately resulting in ineffective implementation and inconsistencies in meeting project targets. The project will mitigate this risk by increasing operational capacity of regional governments and the project management unit. The project will also link with government in procuring vehicles in order to enhance mobility and ensure consistent oversight and feedback on the effective implementation of project activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

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

The PPG phase included consultations with the Project’s key stakeholders at the national and local levels. Field trips were carried out in Northern regions of Namibia, where all project sites were visited. Local authorities and community organisations were presented to the project proposal. Two workshops at the national level were also held and the Project was thoroughly discussed. In addition, several bilateral meetings were held, mostly with donors and key stakeholders who could not attend the workshops. Generally, project design was a highly participatory process, in line with UNDP’s and GEF’s requirements. The stakeholders to have primary involvement in the Project are the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry, specifically the Directorate of Forestry. The stakeholders will play an important role in the Project through enabling and implementation of the Project, including the sustainable land management plans, the financing mechanisms
and the capacity development activities. Below is a list of the Project’s key stakeholders:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Relevant Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF) and Directorate of Forestry (DoF)           | • The main executing agency of the project.  
• Lead role in coordinating project implementation, in particular providing technical advice to the project planning and implementation process, build sustainability mechanisms to ensure that project initiatives and impacts continue after GEF funding.  
• Lead in ensuring that local and national policies are supportive to forestry issues, particularly the integration of forest values and management issues in the NDP4,  
• Support the national extension service to replicate the project successes to other regions.  
• Training and information dissemination on land and animal management, diseases and vaccinations, alternative livelihoods, crops and gardening projects  
• Management of Local Authorities and Regional Councils, implement decentralisation policy                                                                 |
| Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET)                                                       | • Resources institution especially on on-going biodiversity conservation initiative CF and Conservancies  
• Training and information dissemination on land and animal management, diseases and vaccinations, alternative livelihoods, crops and gardening projects  
• Ensure that the a good management of the environment in all CF  
• Ensure that any development within the CF comply with environmental management act  
• Provide critical support to the ministry of agriculture, water and forestry in the policy review to ensure that forestry sector issues are reflected in the other productive sectors,  
• Up scaling project initiatives to other regions;  
• Management of Local Authorities and Regional Councils, implement decentralisation policy                                                                 |
| Ministry of Lands and Resettlement (MLR)                                                        | • Supporting the Community Forestry Groups at the local level to enforce forest management in rural and urban development;  
• Formulation and implementation of the integrated land use plans and capacity development of the Community Forestry Committees.  
• Contribute to the up scaling of the project initiatives through collating and sharing lessons widely.  
• Training and information dissemination on land and animal management, diseases and vaccinations, alternative livelihoods, crops and gardening projects  
• Management of Local Authorities and Regional Councils, implement decentralisation policy                                                                 |
| Namibia Water Corporation (Namwater)                                                            | • National-scale water reticulation                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Namibian Association of Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) Support Organisations (NACSO) | • Disseminating lessons from the project, thereby promoting up scaling;  
• Support the communities, especially in conservancies’ areas with regard to biodiversity conservation and promote livelihoods.  
• Build the capacity of the communities in the CF such as those in the current conservancies                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF) Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN)                    | • Provide technical support in the land use planning formulation and implementation of the bush control program, sharing experiences with the bush to electricity program.  
• Sustainable development, especially land, water and energy sectors;  
• Community organisation, empowerment, capacity building;  
• Rangeland management interventions;  
• SLM approach in conservancies including diversified land and natural resource use activities that lead to improved conservation and improved livelihoods;  
• Build the capacity of the communities in the CFs such as those in the current conservancies e.g. in Kunene region, including holistic resource management.                                                                                                                                 |
| Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC)                                    | • Provide technical support in the land use planning formulation and implementation of the bush control program  
• Sustainable development, especially land, water and energy sectors;  
• Community organisation, empowerment, capacity building;  
• Rangeland management interventions;  
• SLM approach in conservancies including diversified land and natural resource use activities that lead to improved conservation and improved livelihoods;  
• Build the capacity of the communities in the CFs such as those in the current conservancies e.g. in Kunene region, including holistic resource management.                                                                                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Relevant Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Authorities</strong></td>
<td>• Liaise with central government agencies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohangwena, Omusati, Oshana, Oshikoto, Omaheke, Kunene, Otjozondjupa</td>
<td>• Facilitate and coordinate activities at lower council levels;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prepare budgeting, planning and service delivery systems which will be delegated and later decentralised;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supporting local development, land use planning and the community forest groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Host to the extension service at the regional level;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Entry point of project implementation (coordinated by the MAWF);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• They will work closely with traditional authorities and the Community Forest Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional Authorities</strong></td>
<td>• Supervise and ensure adherence to customary laws; uphold, promote and preserve traditional values of that traditional community;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Settle disputes between community members;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure that community members use natural resources at their disposal on a sustainable basis and in a manner that conserves the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and maintains the ecosystem for the benefit of all persons in Namibia;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensuring the security of land and resource tenure;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Involved in all aspects of project formulation and implementation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensuring coordination with other law enforcement institutions for the enforcement of local bye laws to ensure compliance with the land use plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Communities, Farmers, Pastoralists and CF groups</strong></td>
<td>• Implementation of the project initiatives and impact;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participation in training exercises and capacity development activities as provided within the scope of the project;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support in the Rangeland sustainable development activities within CFs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project will provide the following opportunities for long-term participation of all stakeholders, with a special emphasis on the active participation of local communities.

**Capacity-building:** At systemic, institutional and individual level – is one of the key strategic interventions of the project and will target all stakeholders that have the potential to be involved in brokering, implementing and/or monitoring management agreements related to activities in and around the reserves. The project will target especially organisations operating at the community level to enable them to actively participate in developing and implementing management agreements. Specifically the project will facilitate capacity building of key stakeholders in Sustainable Forest Management.

**Decision-making:** The establishment of the regional and national dialogue platforms and stakeholder groups will follow a participatory and transparent process involving the confirmation of all stakeholders; conducting one-to-one consultations with all stakeholders; development of Terms of Reference (ToR) and ground-rules; inception meeting to agree on the constitution, ToR and ground-rules for the mechanism and its active land use planning, ecological monitoring and community development units.

The project will be launched by a well-publicised multi-stakeholder inception workshop. This workshop will provide an opportunity to provide all stakeholders with updated information on the project as well as a basis for further consultation during the project’s implementation, and will refine and confirm the work plan. Based on the list of stakeholders a more specific stakeholder involvement strategy and plan can be developed at that inception stage.

**B.2 Socio economic benefits expected at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust)**

Securing sustainable management of forests will have significant socioeconomic benefits to the country at both national and local levels. Nationally, it will increase the sustainability of ecosystem services for Namibia, in particular of forest resources, covering an area of over 2.8 million hectares (covered in 13 Community Forests to be gazetted and who will formulate land use plans); and in 500,000 where additional capacity building will improve agricultural productivity, reduce overgrazing and deforestation from fires, overgrazing and bush encroachment. It will also prevent significant costs, both in terms of asset loss and human lives, of possible natural disasters as a result of land degradation, for over 55,000 people (men and women). On a local level, communities will be able to benefit from enhanced livelihoods based on sustainable use of forest resources.
Community members will participate in the landscape level management planning and implementation process, with agreed sustainable use regimes and monitoring mechanisms. In order to ensure socioeconomic benefits and their sustainability, local level activities will be carried out with the participation of local stakeholders, with full consideration given to gender dimensions. The development of a management strategy which incorporates stakeholder interests, participation capacity and potential conflicts and their mitigation measures will ensure community ownership and participation in the implementation of the project as well as ensuring their continued involvement in the established activities after the completion of the project. The establishment and formalisation of the community forests will secure land rights that will allow local communities to establish sustainable production initiatives and therefore provide direct benefits to the local communities.

The diversification of incomes through development of a wider range of forests products and improved agricultural production as well as establishment of alternative energy sources will result in financial sustainability. The project expects to increase incomes from sustainable exploitation of forest resources by at least 25% from a low average of Nam$ 37,500 per CF per year). Finally, following the UNDP and GEF gender policies and strategies, special attention will be placed on gender equity; in particular the Project will ensure participation of women in livelihood enhancement activities and in the landscape management planning processes. The role of women in conservation and development through the provision of training, access to resources and forums for women’s participation provides global benefits as the inclusion of women in economic activities will also boost local economies, household incomes and wealth creation. Increasing the adoption of SLM in the management of forested lands, the project will strengthen the foundation of the country’s economy, but more specifically, strengthening the foundation of those who depend on forests/woodlands ecosystems. Adoption of SLM techniques and increase in number of trees on the farms will lead to restoration of lost productive capacity in farm land, especially infertile degraded land, through the rehabilitation of agro ecosystem functions. In addition to reducing land and forest resource degradation, these benefits will boost adaptation to climate change and collectively lead to increased food security, reduction of malnutrition, hunger and ultimately poverty. Successful forestry based conservancies will create jobs at the local level, reducing the drivers of the rural-urban immigration.

B.3. Cost-effectiveness in the project design:

The project’s cost effectiveness is evident in the collaborative strategy it has employed, NAFOLA being one of the UNPAF, NDP 4 Outputs for the MAWF five year sector plan, will be a cost effective integration measure. By gazetting 11 CFs and building the capacity of the CF Management Committees of all 13 CFs in the hotspots, the project devolves the responsibility of ensuring sustainable management of forests from central government to local communities, greatly increasing the cost-effectiveness of forest management. This is further supported by building capacity of the DoF in the 7 Regional Offices and the 13 Community Areas, thereby devolving the responsibility of supervising community forest management from central to regional Councils and local governance structures, the cost effective measures postulated in the devolution policy and the Forestry Act.

The project will increase community forest benefits without undermining the economic viability of production systems. This has the added benefit of mitigating potential land degradation thereby avoiding potential rehabilitation costs. The inclusive and collaborative nature will lead to the development of a governance framework that incorporates stakeholder interests and enhances adaptive conservation management measures. The project thus enhances community ownership of management plans leading to effective implementation and reduced resistance to the management plans. This is unlike the ‘business-as-usual’ scenario in which policy and framework development is reactive and does not take into consideration interests of local communities.

The project is also considered cost effective as it builds on the best practices of other similar systems such as the CPP and PASS-Namibia, avoiding duplication of work, by ensuring timely sharing of information and resources and by avoiding landscape degrading and economically unsound investments which would require additional resource. In particular, the project will test the local level implementation of the policy reform proposed by the CPP, thereby generating useful lessons for the national roll out of the CPP-led policy reform. By utilising the national management platforms established by the CPP as the project steering committee, the project will ensure synergies and national-local level linkages, which are additional cost effective measures.
The enhancement of technical capacity that considers traditional knowledge and indigenous practices of the community will eventually reduce the government involvement to an advisory and facilitative role in the long run, thus making the project cost effective. This is unlike the business-as-usual scenario in which knowledge and technical capacity is limited to a few sector players. The project puts emphasis on the inclusion of women in the implementation of these economic activities to reduce vulnerability to environmental risk such as droughts, flood and fire.

C. THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

For monitoring and reporting, as per GEF guidelines, the project will also be using the LD Portfolio Monitoring and Assessment Tool (PMAT).

A Project Inception Workshop (IW) will be conducted with the full project team, relevant government counterparts, co-financing partners, the UNDP-CO and representation from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit. A fundamental objective of this Inception Workshop will be to assist the project team to understand and take ownership of the project’s goal and objective, as well as finalise preparation of the project’s first AWP. This will include reviewing the log-frame (indicators, means of verification, assumptions), imparting additional detail as needed, and on the basis of this exercise, finalising the AWP with precise and measurable performance indicators, and in a manner consistent with the expected outcomes for the project.

Additionally, the purpose and objective of the IW will be to: (i) introduce project staff with the UNDP-GEF team which will support the project during its implementation, namely the CO and responsible RCU staff; (ii) detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP-CO and RCU staff vis-à-vis the project team; (iii) provide a detailed overview of UNDP-GEF reporting M&E requirements, with particular emphasis on the Annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and related documentation, the Annual Review Report (ARR), as well as mid-term and final evaluations. Equally, the IW will provide an opportunity to inform the project team on UNDP project related budgetary planning, budget reviews, and mandatory budget re-phasing. The IW will also provide an opportunity for all parties to understand their roles and responsibilities within the project’s decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines.

A detailed schedule of project review meetings will be developed by project management, in consultation with project implementation partners and stakeholder representatives and incorporated in the PIR. Such a schedule will include: (i) tentative time frames for Project Steering Committee Meetings (PSCM) and (ii) project related M&E activities. Day-to-day monitoring of implementation progress will be the responsibility of the NPC based on the project’s AWP and agreed indicators. The NPC will inform the UNDP-CO of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely and remedial fashion. The NPC will also fine-tune the progress and performance/impact indicators of the project in consultation with the full project team at the Inception Workshop with support from UNDP-CO and assisted by the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit. Specific targets for the first year implementation progress indicators together with their means of verification will be developed at this Workshop. These will be used to assess whether implementation is proceeding at the intended pace and in the right direction and will form part of the AWP. Targets and indicators for subsequent years would be defined annually as part of the internal evaluation and planning processes undertaken by the project team.

Measurement of impact indicators related to global landscape benefits will occur according to the schedules defined in the Inception Workshop, using tracking tool scores, assessments of forest cover, land degradation and other means. Periodic monitoring of implementation progress will be undertaken by the UNDP-CO through quarterly meetings with the Implementing Partner, or more frequently as deemed necessary. This will allow parties to take stock and to troubleshoot any problems pertaining to the project in a timely fashion to ensure smooth implementation of project activities. Annual Monitoring will occur through the Project Steering Committee Meetings (PSCM). This is the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of a project. The project will be subject to PSCMs four times a year. The first such meeting will be held within the first six months of the start of full implementation.

A terminal PSCM will be held in the last month of project operations. The NPC is responsible for preparing the Terminal
Report and submitting it to UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU after close consultation with the PSCM. It shall be prepared in draft at least two months in advance of the terminal PSCM in order to allow review, and will serve as the basis for discussions in the PSCM. The terminal meeting considers the implementation of the project as a whole, paying particular attention to whether the project has achieved its objectives and contributed to the broader environmental objectives. It decides whether any actions are still necessary, particularly in relation to sustainability of project results, and acts as a vehicle through which lessons learnt can be captured to feed into other projects under implementation.

UNDP COs and UNDP-GEF RCU as appropriate, will conduct yearly visits to project sites based on an agreed upon schedule to be detailed in the project's PIR/AWP to assess first hand project progress. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP-GEF RCU and circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team, all PSC members, and UNDP-GEF.

**Project Reporting**

The core project management team (under the NPC) in conjunction with the UNDP-GEF extended team will be responsible for the preparation and submission of the following reports that form part of the monitoring process. The first six reports are mandatory and strictly related to monitoring, while the last two have a broader function and their focus will be defined during implementation.

A *Project Inception Report* will be prepared immediately following the Inception Workshop. It will include a detailed First Year Work Plan divided in quarterly time-frames detailing the activities and progress indicators that will guide implementation during the first year of the project. This Work Plan will include the dates of specific field visits, support missions from the UNDP-CO or the Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU) or consultants, as well as time-frames for meetings of the project’s decision making structures. The Report will also include the detailed project budget for the first full year of implementation, prepared on the basis of the AWP, and including any M&E requirements to effectively measure project performance during the targeted 12 months’ time-frame.

The PIR will include a more detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions and feedback mechanisms of project related partners. In addition, a section will be included on progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation. When finalised, the report will be circulated to project counterparts who will be given a period of one calendar month in which to respond with comments or queries. Prior to this circulation of the PIR, the UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF’s Regional Coordinating Unit will review the document.

The *Annual Project Report/ Project Implementation Review* must be completed once a year. *Annual Monitoring* will occur through the *Tripartite Review (TPR)*. The TPR will be composed of Government representatives, UNDP and the GEF. The project will be subject to TPR at least once every year. The first such meeting will be held within the first twelve months of implementation. The APR will be prepared and submitted to UNDP-CO and the UNDP-GEF Regional Office at least two weeks prior to the TPR for review and comments. The APR/ PIR is an essential management and monitoring tool for the GEF, UNDP, the Executing Agency and PCs and offers the main vehicle for extracting lessons from on-going projects at the portfolio level.

**Quarterly progress reports:** Short reports outlining main updates in project progress will be provided quarterly to the local UNDP CO and the UNDP-GEF RCU by the project team, using UNDP formats.

**UNDP ATLAS Monitoring Reports:** A Combined Delivery Report (CDR) summarising all project expenditures, is mandatory and should be issued quarterly. The NPC will send it to the PSC for review and the Executing Partner will certify it. The following logs should be prepared: (i) the Issues Log, used to capture and track the status of all project issues throughout the implementation of the project. It will be the responsibility of the NPC to track, capture and assign issues, and to ensure that all project issues are appropriately addressed; (ii) the Risk Log is maintained throughout the project to capture potential risks to the project and associated measures to manage risks. It will be the responsibility of the NPC to maintain and update the Risk Log, using Atlas; and (iii) the Lessons Learned Log is maintained throughout the project to capture insights and lessons based on the positive and negative outcomes of the project. It is the responsibility of the NPC
to maintain and update the Lessons Learned Log.

**Project Terminal Report:** During the last three months of the project the project team under the NPC will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarise all activities, achievements and outputs of the Project, lessons learnt, objectives met, or not achieved, structures and systems implemented, etc., and will be the definitive statement of the Project’s activities during its lifetime. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure the long term sustainability and the wide replicability of the Project’s outcomes.

**Periodic Thematic Reports:** As and when called for by UNDP, UNDP-GEF or the Implementing Partner, the project team will prepare Specific Thematic Reports, focusing on specific issues or areas of activity. The request for a Thematic Report will be provided to the project team in written form by UNDP and will clearly state the issue or activities that need to be reported on. These reports can be used as a form of lessons learnt exercise, specific oversight in key areas, or as troubleshooting exercises to evaluate and overcome obstacles and difficulties encountered.

**Technical Reports** are detailed documents covering specific areas of analysis or scientific specialisations within the overall project. As part of the PIR, the project team will prepare a draft Reports List, detailing the technical reports that are expected to be prepared on key areas of activity during the course of the Project, and tentative due dates. Where necessary this Reports List will be revised and updated, and included in subsequent APRs. Technical Reports may also be prepared by external consultants and should be comprehensive, specialised analyses of clearly defined areas of research within the framework of the project and its sites. These technical reports will represent, as appropriate, the project's substantive contribution to specific areas, and will be used in efforts to disseminate relevant information and best practices at local, national and international levels.

**Project Publications** will form a key method of crystallising and disseminating the results and achievements of the Project. These publications may be scientific or informational texts on the activities and achievements of the Project, in the form of journal articles, multimedia publications, etc. These publications can be based on Technical Reports, depending upon the relevance, scientific worth, etc. of these Reports, or may be summaries or compilations of a series of Technical Reports and other research. The project team, under the NPC, will determine if any of the Technical Reports merit formal publication, and will also (in consultation with UNDP, the government and other relevant stakeholder groups) plan and produce these Publications in a consistent and recognisable format. Project resources will need to be defined and allocated for these activities as appropriate and in a manner commensurate with the project's budget.

**Independent Evaluations**

The project will be subjected to at least two independent external evaluations as follows: An independent **Mid-Term Evaluation** will be undertaken at exactly the mid-point of the project lifetime. The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation. It will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project’s term. The organisation, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit.

An independent **Final Technical Evaluation** will take place three months prior to the terminal Project Steering Committee meeting, and will focus on the same issues as the mid-term evaluation. The final evaluation will also look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. The Final Technical Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of M&amp;E activity</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Budget USD Excluding project team Staff time</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Inception Workshop   | National Project Manager  
                       | UNDP CO  
<pre><code>                   | UNDP GEF | $10,000 | Within first two months of project start up |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of M&amp;E activity</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Budget USD Excluding project team Staff time</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report</td>
<td>Project Team&lt;br&gt;UNDP CO</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Immediately following Inception Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators</td>
<td>National Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members</td>
<td>To be finalised in Inception Phase.</td>
<td>Start, mid and end of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis)</td>
<td>Oversight by National Project Manager Monitoring and Evaluation Officer Project team</td>
<td>To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's None</td>
<td>Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARR and PIR</td>
<td>Project Team&lt;br&gt;UNDP-CO&lt;br&gt;UNDP-GEF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly progress reports</td>
<td>Project team&lt;br&gt;UNDP-GEF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDRs</td>
<td>National Project Manager</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues Log</td>
<td>National Project Manager&lt;br&gt;UNDP CO Program Staff</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks Log</td>
<td>National Project Manager&lt;br&gt;UNDP CO Program Staff</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons Learned Log</td>
<td>National Project Manager&lt;br&gt;UNDP CO Program Staff</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term Evaluation</td>
<td>Project team;&lt;br&gt;UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit;&lt;br&gt;External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>At the mid-point of project implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Evaluation</td>
<td>Project team;&lt;br&gt;UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit;&lt;br&gt;External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>At the end of project implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Report</td>
<td>Project team;&lt;br&gt;UNDP-CO local consultant</td>
<td>$10,000 - Funds are budgeted for local consultants to assist where needed</td>
<td>At least three month before the end of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learned</td>
<td>Project team&lt;br&gt;Monitoring and Evaluation Officer&lt;br&gt;UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit</td>
<td>$10,000 ($ 2,000 per year)</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>UNDP-CO&lt;br&gt;Project team</td>
<td>$15,000 ($3,000 per annum)</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to field sites</td>
<td>UNDP Country Office;&lt;br&gt;UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit;&lt;br&gt;Government representatives</td>
<td>Paid from IA fees and operational budget</td>
<td>Yearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<em>TOTAL indicative COST: <em>Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses</em></em></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USD 115,000</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning and Knowledge Sharing**

Results from the Project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention period through a number of existing information sharing networks and forums. In addition, the Project will participate, as relevant and appropriate, in UNDP/GEF sponsored networks, organised for Senior Personnel working on projects that share common characteristics. UNDP/GEF Regional Unit has established an electronic platform for sharing lessons between the project coordinators. The Project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The Project will identify, analyse, and share
lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Identify and analysing lessons learned is an on-going process, and the need to communicate such lessons as one of the Project's central contributions is a requirement to be delivered not less frequently than once every 12 months. UNDP/GEF shall provide a format and assist the project team in categorising, documenting and reporting on lessons learned.

**Branding and Visibility**

Full compliance is required with UNDP's Branding Guidelines and guidance on the use of the UNDP logo. These can be accessed at [http://web.undp.org/comtoolkit/reaching-the-outside-world/outside-world-core-concepts-visual.shtml](http://web.undp.org/comtoolkit/reaching-the-outside-world/outside-world-core-concepts-visual.shtml). Full compliance is also required with the GEF Branding Guidelines and guidance on the use of the GEF logo. These can be accessed at [http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo](http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo). The UNDP and GEF logos should be the same size. When both logs appear on a publication, the UNDP logo should be on the left top corner and the GEF logo on the right top corner. Further details are available from the UNDP-GEF team based in the region.

**Audit arrangement**

The Government will provide the Resident Representative with certified periodic financial statements, and with an annual audit of the financial statements relating to the status of UNDP (including GEF) funds according to the established procedures set out in the Programming and Finance manuals. The Audit will be conducted by a special and certified audit firm. UNDP will be responsible for making audit arrangements for the project in communication with the Project Implementing Partner. UNDP and the project Implementing Partner will provide audit management responses and the Project Manager and project support team will address audit recommendations. As a part of its oversight function, UNDP will conduct audit spot checks at least two times a year.

**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT & GEF AGENCY**

**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Ministry</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teo Nghitila</td>
<td>Director Environmental Affairs</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Tourism</td>
<td>04/15/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. GEF AGENCY CERTIFICATION**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Coordinator, Agency Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Project Contact Person</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adriana Dinu</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 Dec 2013</td>
<td>Veronica Muthui, RTA</td>
<td>+27123548124</td>
<td><a href="mailto:veronica.muthui@undp.org">veronica.muthui@undp.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX A: PART I: STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK, SRF (FORMERLY GEF LOGICAL FRAMEWORK) ANALYSIS

INDICATOR FRAMEWORK AS PART OF THE SRF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective/Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End of Project target</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Risks and assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective – To reduce pressure on forest resources by facilitating the policy and capacity enabling environment for the uptake of improved practices within agriculture, livestock and forestry management in the community forest areas.</td>
<td>Increased area of gazetted community forests within the CF hotspots in northern Namibia with legal management structures.</td>
<td>2 out of 13 CFs gazetted; some identified/established communal forests but without any systematic management regime or formalised authority.</td>
<td>11 CFs successfully gazetted and under a systematic and integrated land-use management framework.</td>
<td>Government registration/ formalisation documents Independent mid-term and final evaluations; Project reports Government Gazettes</td>
<td>Risk: - Incomplete submissions in the preparatory milestone for gazettement - Reducing pressure on the forest resources will depend on i) successful intensification of crop yields to prevent further agriculture expansion into forest lands; ii) successful reduction of overstocking and overgrazing; iii) bush and fire control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in area under effective land use management with vegetative cover maintained or increased as measured by %age area being managed under approved land use plans; %age change in woody cover for degraded areas, reduction in plant density in bush encroached areas and increase in desirable grass species in</td>
<td>Only 162,815ha out of 2,840,153ha (5.7%) being managed in line with approved land use plans; X hectares Woody cover average 30%; Bush densities range from 2,500-8,000/ha, decrease grasses dominate over 100,000ha of rangelands (all 3 will be fine-tuned for each community</td>
<td>2,840,153ha under approved land use plans; 500,000ha with woody cover in process of regeneration at an average &gt;50%; Reduction in bush densities by at least 20% and reduction in area covered by bush by at least 10%.</td>
<td>CF reports, project reports, DoF reports, Agricultural and Livestock production surveys and reports MAWF reports</td>
<td>Assumption: - Continued interest and support of government and staff in the implementation of policies and programs to mainstream forestry issues, land degradation and economic development in national planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective/Outcome</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>End of Project target</td>
<td>Source of Information</td>
<td>Risks and assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>overgrazed areas</td>
<td>forest as part of participatory monitoring;</td>
<td>Desirable perennial grasses dominant in at least 50% of degraded rangelands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 : Knowledge based land use planning and policy change hasten gazettement of eleven community forests (CFs) and mainstreaming of forest resources in productive policies</td>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Output 1.1 Eleven communities assisted to legalise their CFs: Output 1.2 Three CFs supported to formulate &amp; implement integrated forest resources management plans: Output 1.3 Strengthening Organisational Capacity for effective Community Forest Management Output 1.4 Policies harmonised, support local governance and reflect value of forests in national development programs</td>
<td>Increase in compliance with land use plans as measured by % of area complying with approved uses Only 5.7% of area under land use plans and compliance with land use plans currently &lt;40 % By year 4, eleven land use plans developed; end of project compliance &gt; 60%</td>
<td>CF reports, project reports, DoF reports, Agricultural and Livestock production surveys and reports MAWF reports</td>
<td>- Slow process of policy and legislation enactment may cause delays in mainstreaming of forest and woodlands consideration into productive sector - Complexity in sectoral coordination due to differing interests and wide range of stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest sector issues reflected in regional land use plans and regional programs of sectors such as agriculture, water, local development, environment and tourism.</td>
<td>No regional and national level production sector frameworks incorporating forestry issues At least 2 (Agriculture and Energy sectors incorporate forestry considerations)</td>
<td>Sectoral Framework Reports Management plans MAWF reports Government Policy Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of national, local and regional dialogue forums actively supporting policy implementation recommended by the CPP in local SFM and SLM processes.</td>
<td>1 (Ministerial Forum) At least 2 (One at Local and one at National level)</td>
<td>MAWF reports; Government registration/formalisation documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GEF5 CEO Endorsement – Namibia NAFOLA 2013**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective/Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End of Project target</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Risks and assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in capacity score cards of technical staff of ministries, CF management committees/Boards and community members</td>
<td>Technical institutions scored an average 64.9; CF institutions an average 30.9; community members capacity assessment during inception</td>
<td>Capacity score card increases to average of 80% for technical institutions, &gt;50% for CF institutions and community members</td>
<td>CF reports, project reports, DoF reports, Agricultural and Livestock production surveys and reports MAWF reports</td>
<td>- Effects of climate change and capacity erosion through HIV/AIDS and other illnesses may derail the project effort, by reducing the effectiveness of the measures introduced by the project. - Threat of continued degradation of the Community forests accompanied by fencing, deforestation, overgrazing, extension of agriculture and unplanned human development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Implementation of SFM technologies in selected CF hotspots</td>
<td>Outputs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 2.1 Conservation agriculture piloted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 2.2 Improved livestock practices piloted in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjonzondjupa hotspots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 2.3 Improved marketing of sustainably harvested forest and livestock products piloted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 2.4 Fire management strategy is piloted in Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjonzondjupa hotspots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 2.5 Bush control program is piloted in Omundaungilo, Okongo, Ongandjera, Otjituuo and Otjku-Tjithilonde and provides financial incentives for controlled bush clearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 2.6 Energy saving and alternative energy program implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Output 2.7 System for monitoring of forest and range condition and land productivity is in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in agricultural productivity of main crops (pearl millet and sorghum) in Kavango, Omusati, Otjonzondjupa, Kunene, Ohangwena and Omaheke regions covering 300,000ha</td>
<td>Current production of 200-600kg/ha</td>
<td>Production increase to 400-800kg/ha</td>
<td>Agricultural production surveys and reports MAWF reports Farmer Surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased health, quality and type of livestock kept in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjonzondjupa regions covering 150,000ha</td>
<td>70% of cattle at grade C, 60% with fatness grade 0 and 1 and 70% oxen.</td>
<td>At least 20% of cattle upgrade to Grade B, fatness grade 2 or 3 and decrease in oxen and increase in number of heifers.</td>
<td>MAWF reports MeatCo reports Farmer Surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased off-take of</td>
<td>Current livestock off-take</td>
<td>Off-take increased to</td>
<td>MAWF reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In table 13 of Prodoc*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective/Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>End of Project target</th>
<th>Source of Information</th>
<th>Risks and assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>livestock in Omaheke, Oshikoto and Otjonzondjupa</td>
<td>at 5-8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Livestock production and marketing reports Farmer Surveys</td>
<td>- Climate change affects ecosystem resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased utilisation of fire management practices reduces total areas burned and severity of fires in Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjonzondjupa regions (200,000ha)</td>
<td>15,405.3ha burned with 4 CFs suffering severe fires.</td>
<td>Reduction in area burned by at least 30% and at least 2CFs reduced to mild fire severity.</td>
<td>Fire Management Reports Community forest reports MAWF reports Satellite imagery data</td>
<td>- Participation by women in the project is limited by lack of awareness and cultural norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in bush encroachment in Omundaungilo, Okongo, Ongandjera, Ojituu and Otjku-Tjithlonde</td>
<td>Bush densities range from 2,500-8,000/ha. Baseline surveys to determine area covered by bush conducted at Inception.</td>
<td>Reduction in bush densities by at least 20% and reduction in area covered by bush by at least 10%.</td>
<td>MAWF reports Satellite imagery data Approved management guidelines</td>
<td>Assumptions: - Local communities welcome the improved technologies and there is sufficient uptake of the technologies resulting in reduced pressure on forest resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in utilisation of alternative energy sources and reduction in CF wood consumption for energy in the households in the CFs.</td>
<td>Current number of households: wood fuel 89.2%, electricity 7%, Gas 1.3%, Animal Dug 0.8%, Paraffin 0.4%, Solar 0.3%.</td>
<td>Reduction in use of wood fuel by at least 20% and increase in use of alternative energy sources by 10%</td>
<td>CF and DoF reports Satellite imagery data Approved energy development guidelines</td>
<td>- Increased awareness and capacity will lead to a change in behaviour with respect to the incorporation of SLM and SFM technologies and community participation in natural resource management and sustainable economic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in financial returns from sustainable economic exploitation of forest resources in line with land use plans</td>
<td>Data is incomplete but PPG assessment reported an annual total of Nam$ 487,500 (average of Nam$ 37,500 for 13 CFs)</td>
<td>Increased ability to capture data on incomes per CF; at least 25% increase in total incomes earned.</td>
<td>Community Forest reports, project and DoF/ MAWF reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>REFERENCE IN PROJECT DOCUMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjust the result framework strictly applying the GEF5 strategy formulation (outputs and indicators).</td>
<td>A comprehensive result framework has been developed that applies the GEF5 strategy format. Outcomes and Outputs have been adjusted for clarity and precision in project design. The revised project framework is provided above in Part I, B.</td>
<td>Please refer to Section II, Part I the Project Strategy section of the project document, under the Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/activities. Also refer to Section III, Part I the Strategic Results Framework Analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons from other similar initiatives in the region</td>
<td>Lessons from other similar initiatives have been included as part of the Baseline actions and under the SFM and SLM practices in the analysis of the Socioeconomic context. Reference to similar initiatives has been included in the Linkages to GEF Financed Projects.</td>
<td>Please refer to Section I, Part IA Situational Analysis, in the Socioeconomic Context – Sustainable Forest Management and SLM Practices. Also refer to Section I, Part IB under the Baseline course of Action and Section II, Part I in the Linkages with GEF Financed Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a comprehensive risk analysis</td>
<td>A comprehensive risk analysis has been developed, with each risk divided into political, financial, strategic and environmental categories as appropriate and given a rating based on a risk assessment guiding matrix which includes categories from ‘No determinable risk’ to ‘critical’, determined by the likelihood and potential impacts of each risk. For each risk a mitigation measure has been described.</td>
<td>Please refer to Section II, Part I the Project Strategy of the project document, under the Risks and Assumptions. Assumptions are listed while Risks and their corresponding mitigation measures are listed in the table on Elaboration of Risks, preceded by the risk assessment guiding matrix in Box 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include an analysis of the social and economic context in the pilot sites</td>
<td>A comprehensive analysis of the socioeconomic context of the Community forests targeted by the proposed project was conducted during PPG stage and includes analysis of economic activities and gender aspects in the selected CFs. The information gathered has been used extensively throughout (including in refining the threat, root cause, barrier analysis, and in refining the intervention strategy). A full gender analysis was conducted as part of the PPG and a draft gender strategy developed, which has also informed project formulation.</td>
<td>Please refer to Section I, Part IA Situational Analysis, in the Socioeconomic Context, under the Regional context of the Community Forests. Also refer to the Prodoc sections on threat, root cause, barrier analysis and the description of the project intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include gender aspects in the different steps of project document preparation; we also expect to find these elements included in the monitoring</td>
<td>Gender assessment was conducted during PPG and the information was included in the baseline assessment under the socioeconomic context of the community forests. Monitoring for gender aspects was also included in the Indicator framework with ‘Number of women participating in CF management’ being one of the project targets.</td>
<td>Please refer to Section I, Part IA Situational Analysis, in the Socioeconomic Context of Community Forests and under Production systems and technologies. Also refer to Section III, Part I the Strategic Results Framework Analysis, under the Indicator Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a robust monitoring plan</td>
<td>A comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan has been developed, including a corresponding budget. The plan entails an inception workshop, project reporting, independent evaluations, as well as learning and knowledge sharing.</td>
<td>Please refer to Section II, Part III of the project document: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget. The table provided details each component of the M&amp;E plan and its associated budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td>RESPONSES</td>
<td>REFERENCE IN PROJECT DOCUMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the implementation arrangements</td>
<td>A comprehensive plan for management and implementation has been developed, including details on execution and implementation modalities, project organisational structure, project coordination, landscape level project implementation, project components, project inception session, technical assistance, funds flow, public involvement plan and project reporting. It also details the legal context and audit requirements of the project.</td>
<td>Please refer to Section II, Part III the Management Arrangements of the project document. Included is a diagram of the project's organisational structure, refer to Figure 4 – Overview of Project Organisation Structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on the coordination with other initiatives and partners active on the FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010 same theme (German cooperation notably).</td>
<td>Reference to similar initiatives has been included in the Baseline Action section and under Linkages to GEF Financed Projects. The project will link to other initiatives through the uptake of technologies piloted in these projects such as the KfW Entwicklungsbank and CPP project.</td>
<td>Please refer to Section I, Part IB under the Baseline course of Action and Section I, Part II in the Linkages with GEF Financed Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responses to Comments from Council: Germany</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PIF mentions the plan to operationalise sustainable supply chains for 4 NTFPs. It is therefore suggested that those Community Forests with the same products be clustered to make the process simpler and more efficient.</td>
<td>The Community Forests were assessed for the primary NTFPs that were utilised and the different NTFPs for each region were noted; clustering for supply chain development will be conducted at Inception.</td>
<td>Please refer to Section IA in the Production Systems and Technologies section and in Table 5 and on the Forest resources utilised in the 13 CFs. Also refer to Table 18 in the Prodoc on list of potential NTFPs. Also refer to Section II, Part I the Strategic Results Framework Analysis, under the Indicator Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scope of work proposed in this PIF is in parts related to activities of the future GIZ Project on Biodiversity and Climate Change (operating in selected CBNRM areas in Kavango) and is identical to that of the next phase of the Community Forestry in Namibia Project funded by KfW, the difference between both interventions being geographical areas of operation. However, there is still an overlap in the areas of intervention. It is therefore suggested to agree as soon as possible on how to address the issue of overlapping areas and create synergies among these projects.</td>
<td>During the PPG stage, in-depth discussions were held with the KfW Teams; consequently, some hotspots were excluded from this project in agreement with KfW, which would include them in its areas (supported through the 3rd phase of the German government (KfW Entwicklungsbank), which is supporting community forest conservancies in Caprivi, Kavango and Otjozondjupa regions. This prevents overlap in areas of intervention. AT the same time, areas of synergies were identified; and the two projects will be closely coordinated, particularly in the forest valuations exercises, and exchange of lessons with the gazettement process.</td>
<td>Please refer to Section I, Part IA the Situational analysis, in the Regional context of Community Forests, specifically paragraph 23. Also refer to the description of the intervention, components 1 and 2, in the UNDP Prodoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise the result framework strictly applying the GEF5 strategy formulation (outputs and outcome indicators). Outcomes should clearly define the global environmental benefits of the project including indicators to measure and monitor these benefits relating to component 2.</td>
<td>A comprehensive result framework has been developed that applies the GEF5 strategy format. Outcomes and Outputs have been adjusted for clarity and precision in project design. The revised project framework is provided above in Part I, B.</td>
<td>Please refer to Section II, Part I the Project Strategy section of the project document, under the Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/activities. Also, refer to Section III, Part I the Strategic Results Framework Analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td>RESPONSES</td>
<td>REFERENCE IN PROJECT DOCUMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include lessons from other similar initiatives in the region especially relating to component 2 with regards to livestock management, adaptive capacity approach to managing climate risks in Namibia and the methodological challenges in measuring carbon in dry lands. Clarify which practices will be selected from similar initiatives for the pilot area and what criteria are used to determine the selection of the practices.</td>
<td>Lessons from other similar initiatives have been included under the SFM and SLM practices in the analysis of the Socioeconomic context. The practices to be implemented were selected from CPP and ICEMA-Namibia projects and discussed in the Situational Analysis section of the project document. The practices selected were considered to be the most viable and cost effective and shown to have relative success in the other initiatives studied.</td>
<td>Please refer to Section I, Part IA Situational Analysis, in the Socioeconomic Context – Sustainable Forest Management and SLM Practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify the methodology to be used for forest valuation and the criteria for selecting the specific methodology.</td>
<td>The specific methodology for conducting the forest valuations will be determined at Inception but will possibly include forest inventories and ecosystem services valuations.</td>
<td>Please refer to Section II, Part I the Project Strategy section of the project document, under the Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/activities. Also, refer to Section III, Part I the Strategic Results Framework Analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to Comments from STAP Review Agency

In the Project Framework, STAP is concerned that the majority of Expected Outputs appear to be project activities, rather than project deliverables. The Expected Outcomes read more like Outputs [Indeed, one of the Outcomes ‘application of SLM technologies’ is also a project activity and not even an output]. It is, therefore, impossible to identify what the ‘big picture’ is of this project and what contribution overall it will make to an improved global environment. There is, then, missing from the Framework the major changes to which the project will make a contribution. In part, the major changes are captured by the Objective of the project, but this objective statement needs disassembling into its component parts in order to construct realistic Outcomes. This is important because impact indicators for global environmental benefits (see below) need to be chosen, and this is impossible without a clearly and rationally structured Project Framework. Additionally, | A comprehensive result framework has been developed that applies the GEF5 strategy format. Outcomes and Outputs have been adjusted for clarity and precision in project design. The revised project framework is provided above in Part I, B. | Please refer to Section II, Part I the Project Strategy section of the project document. Also, refer to Section III, Part I the Strategic Results Framework Analysis, under the Indicator Framework. |
### COMMENTS | RESPONSES | REFERENCE IN PROJECT DOCUMENT
--- | --- | ---
STAP recommends that the output indicators of component 2 be redefined. At the moment, the output indicators are related to what is going to be achieved (e.g. at least 45% increase in crop farmers applying SLM technologies) instead of what is going to be measured, that is, the number of SLM technologies. Furthermore, STAP recommends delineating further the outcomes and outputs in the project framework. Currently, it is difficult to associate what outcome belongs to what outputs. | The practices to be implemented were selected from CPP and ICEMA-Namibia projects and discussed in the Situational Analysis section of the project document under the SFM and SLM practices. The practices selected were considered to be the most viable and cost effective and shown to have relative success in the other initiatives studied. | Please refer to Section I, Part IA Situational Analysis, in the Socioeconomic Context – Sustainable Forest Management and SLM Practices. |
It is unclear from the proposal whether all the SLM practices will be selected from the Country Partnership Program, and what criteria will determine the selection of these practices (e.g. cost effectiveness). STAP suggests, therefore, defining the source(s) and criteria during the project development. | | |
With regard to livestock management in Component 2, STAP urges the proponents to play close heed to the lessons already learnt in southern Africa for dealing with degradation on communal rangelands. A good starting point is the 1989 paper on Land degradation, stocking rates and conservation policies in the communal rangelands of Botswana and Zimbabwe, by N. O. J. Abel and P. M. Blaikie, published in Land Degradation and Development, volume 1, pages 101- 123. A more recent analysis of grazing policy is in Rhode, R.F. et al (2006) Dynamics of grazing policy and practice: environmental and social impacts in three communal areas of southern Africa. Environmental Science & Policy 9: 302- 306. | Lessons from other similar initiatives on livestock management have been included under the SFM and SLM practices in the analysis of the Socioeconomic context. | Please refer to Section I, Part IA Situational Analysis, in the Socioeconomic Context – Sustainable Forest Management and SLM Practices, specifically paragraph 72. |
STAP recommends defining explicitly the global environmental benefits mainly driven by component 2. This includes defining what | The global benefits of the proposed project are explicitly defined in the project document; specifically: increase forested areas under improved management by more than 90%, from a low of 162,815 ha to | Please refer to Section II, Part I the Project Strategy section of the project document, under the Incremental reasoning and expected global, national and local |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>REFERENCE IN PROJECT DOCUMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| indicators will be used to measure and monitor the expected global environmental benefits. STAP also recommends identifying the methodological challenges of measuring carbon in drylands (Stringer, L.C. et al. (2012): Challenges and opportunities in linking carbon sequestration, livelihoods and ecosystem service provision in drylands. Environmental Science & Policy 19-20:121-135). The GEF’s Carbon Benefit Project is developing a methodology for above and below-ground carbon that may address the knowledge and methodological gaps of measuring carbon in dryland areas. Therefore, the project developers may wish to inquire from the GEF Secretariat whether the methodology will be ready by the time of the project implementation. | 2,840,153ha in the 7 regions under the project. This will be achieved through the gazettlement of 11 additional Community Forests, and the formulation of land use plans (a requirement for gazettlement) and the legalization of the CFs management committees; supported by increased organisational capacity for supporting adoption of SFM/SLM technologies. This is expected to reduce pressure on forest resources and lead to:  
• Over 500,000 ha reporting improvement in vegetation cover of >25%;  
• Increased utilisation of fire management practices reduces total areas burned by 30% and severity reduced to mild in Omaheke, Oshikoto, Kunene and Otjonzondjupa regions (200,000ha);  
• Reduction in bush densities by at least 20% and reduction in area covered by bush by at least 10% in 5 hotspots;  
• Reduction in use of wood fuel by at least 20% and increase in use of alternative energy sources by 10%;  

The establishment and formalisation of the community forests will secure land rights that will allow local communities to establish sustainable production initiatives and therefore increase land and ecosystem productivity. The diversification of incomes through development of a wider range of forests products and improved agricultural production as well as establishment of alternative energy sources will result in financial sustainability. Adoption of SLM techniques and increase in number of trees on the farms will lead to restoration of lost productive capacity in farm land, especially infertile degraded land, through the rehabilitation of agro ecosystem functions. In addition to reducing land and forest resource degradation, these benefits will boost adaptation to climate change and collectively lead to increased food security, reduction of malnutrition, hunger and ultimately poverty. The indicators of these global benefits are included in the project result framework provided in Annex A above and the Indicator framework of the project document. | After reviewing the literature on the methodological challenges of measuring carbon in drylands (Stringer, L.C. et al. (2012): challenges and opportunities in linking carbon sequestration, livelihoods and ecosystem benefits; specifically paragraph 185. Also, refer to Section III, Part I the Strategic Results Framework Analysis, under the Indicator Framework. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>REFERENCE IN PROJECT DOCUMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>service provision in drylands (Environmental Science &amp; Policy 19-20;121-135.), and the GEF’s Carbon Benefit Project methodology for above and below-ground carbon, the government of Namibia decided NOT to take on the issue of carbon sequestered as a global benefit for now. This is largely because the PPG funds were inadequate to cater for baseline measurements. This decision will be revisited during the inception period and a final decision on the carbon made, and reported in the inception report.</td>
<td>The specific methodology for conducting the forest valuations will be determined at Inception but will possibly include forest inventories and ecosystem services valuations. The information from the forest valuations is intended to show the economic and ecological benefits of forests and provide an incentive for their sustainable utilisation and conservation.</td>
<td>Please refer to Section II, Part I the Project Strategy section of the project document, under the Project Goal, Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/activities. Also, refer to Section III, Part I the Strategic Results Framework Analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On forest valuation, STAP is unclear what methodology will be selected, and what criteria will be used to select the methodology. Furthermore, the proposal could be strengthened by citing how forest valuation has resulted in influencing decisions on forest resources at the national policy level and at the community forest management level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

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

N/A

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</th>
<th>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Assessment - Biophysical assessments (degradation hotspots, fire, bush encroachment, extent of land and forest degradation)</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Assessment - CBNRM/SLM/SFM governance and institutional capacity assessments (institutional mapping, institutional capacity assessment for CBNRM/SLM/SFM)</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and market assessment and Gender Analysis-Socio-economics assessments (NTFPs, Livestock marketing, energy profiles, Gender)</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project strategy, feasibility analysis and budget. (incl. stakeholder validation)</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$100,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

N/A

---

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