



**Interoffice Memorandum**

To: Mr. Simon Nhongo  
UN Resident Coordinator  
Namibia

Date: 19 June 2008

From:   
Assistant Administrator and Director, Partnerships Bureau  
UNDP New York

Extension: 6283

Subject: Namibia: Setting Things Right - Towards Gender Equality and  
Equity

File: MDGF 1710

**I. Approval Status**

On behalf of the MDG-F Steering Committee I am pleased to inform you that your Joint Programme "Setting Things Right - Towards Gender Equality and Equity" is hereby approved subject to a number of changes, hereby explained, to address those aspects that the Secretariat has considered as critical.

The Joint Programme is approved with an allocation of **USD\$ 8** million for three years. This figure includes 7% for indirect costs incurred by UN Participating Organizations. Please note the 1% AA fee will be reimbursed directly to the MDTF Office and need not be included in your allocation.

**II. JP design comments**

We have identified in section III below, those **changes we require to the design of your Joint Programme**. We also consider that an inception workshop must be organized and carried out in order to re-work the Results framework and the Annual Work Plan. We suggest that the funds required to carry out this workshop are advanced by the Country Team and subsequently charged to the Joint Programme budget. The Secretariat will support this process by sending a consultant to the workshop in order to facilitate it as well as to ensure that the recommendations are correctly addressed. Once these adjustments have been reflected in the document, you may proceed with signature of the Joint Programme document. In addition to the Government, the UN Resident Coordinator and Participating UN Organizations should each sign the Joint Programme document. We would encourage you to ensure some visibility for this event and for the launch of implementation.

The MDG-F Secretariat, in collaboration with various experts, has reviewed the draft Joint Programme resubmitted and considers it, up to a certain point, an extension of the approved concept note. We recognize that an effort has been made to address the recommendations of the Technical sub-committee and the Steering Committee, especially in respect to reducing the initial budget from \$11 to \$8 million. We appreciate the fact that the minutes of the national Steering Committee endorsed the resubmitted document and that they reflect a good discussion of the Joint Programme. However, we consider that further adjustments should be made to fully address the Secretariat's recommendations and to meet the UNDG standards.

**Relevance and external coherence**

We consider that this Joint Programme responds to the terms of reference of this thematic window and that includes an innovative component which explicitly links poverty, gender inequalities and HIV/AIDS. In



this sense, the Programme deals with aspects of the epidemic that have not been deeply explored so far as is the role of women and girls as care givers. We very much appreciate that you modified your original JP document targeting those groups that are in a situation of vulnerability due to gender based discrimination. We do agree that indigenous populations, San population in the case of Namibia, are usually more vulnerable due to discrimination. However, this thematic window will support actions addressing discrimination based on gender reasons. Please make sure that this focus is clearly reflected and kept during the implementation of the programme. An example of how this emphasis gets diluted in your JP is the description of the strategy where it says that the programme will target “other vulnerable categories and those whose rights are not being met” and where you should consider adding “due to gender based reasons” (page14). We would also recommend, instead of including specific outputs targeting san women and girls carrying out isolated interventions, consider the exclusion and needs they may face in respect to each of the outputs so that a multi cultural sensitivity is applied throughout the programme.

We also appreciate that a wide range of relevant stakeholders will be involved in the implementation. We see as positive –although rather ambitious- that the Joint Programme is geographically focused on 7 regions taking into account various dimensions of gender inequalities -including income of female headed households-. We recommend however that sex-disaggregated data on HIV prevalence in each of the selected areas could be included.

As far as the MDGs are concerned, we feel that the Joint Programme has the potential to advance the achievement of some of the Goals, especially number 1, 3 and 6. In regards to Paris Declaration, we really appreciate a strong national ownership and the involvement of the Government in all the phases of the design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the Joint Programme and the emphasis made on the need for the agencies to have a harmonized approach.

### **Internal coherence**

There seems to be a lack of consistency between the outcomes stated in page1, 5 and 16. You may want to check whether the first 8 pages of the Joint Programme Document are part of an older version of the document since this might be the reason for this inconsistency. We recommend amending this minor detail.

Overall, we think that the Programme’s internal logic requires revision focusing most specifically on the following aspects:

The identification and description of root causes and resulting problems, while referring to very relevant circumstances of the situation analysis, could be revisited and rearranged so that the logical linkage between them is clearer. We agree that the low status of women and girls in Namibia constitutes one of the root causes for violence and HIV/AIDS impact, especially in the case of indigenous women and girls. However it seems that food insecurity and income poverty of women headed households are also results of the low status of women and girls and that they should be examined at the same level as violence and HIV/AIDS impact. The relationship between this analysis and the proposed interventions should be reflected in the results framework in a more articulated way.



Generally speaking the formulation of outputs and activities is not very clear. Make sure your outputs do not look like indicators for instance “2 field trips conducted annually” or “training programme for cabinet ministries on gender issues”. Formulate the SMART outputs in such a way that they are specific, measurable, attainable, results oriented and time bound. Activities need to provide further detail on “what” and “how” the programme will reach those products. For instance, while supporting women and girls living with HIV activities under output 5 is positive, the JP fails to explain what exactly will be done for these women and girls and if this targeted population is the same as the one that will benefit from those income generating activities proposed under outcome 3.

Also make sure that agency outputs reflect the added value of the relevant agency. For instance, it is not clear the difference between the agency outputs “Journalism students trained on gender writing” carried out by UNDP and “journalism students at UNAM trained on gender...” carried out by UNICEF (output 1.1). We do not see complementarity in actions or justification to carry out the same activity in a separated manner. We do recommend revisiting your outputs to make sure that resources are being optimized, activities are not duplicated and that the agencies will perform in a truly joint fashion.

The cost of the intervention must be further justified defining (especially under outcome 1) the number of beneficiaries that will participate in each of the activities and which institutions will be targeted under outcome 2.

Also, please revise the following aspects in respect to each of the outcomes:

**Outcome 1:** The outputs under outcome 1, being interrelated, should show more clearly an internal logic between them. In this sense we recommend going back to the problems identified and to the root causes. The outcome aims at protecting rights of women and girls through different means, such as promoting the enforcement of laws (output 1), raising awareness (output 2), training service providers (output 3) and putting in place sex disaggregated data systems (output 4). Output 5 related to a national response to HIV/AIDS seems to be not sufficiently linked to the rest of the outputs since HIV/AIDS and its impact on women has been identified as one of the resulting causes of the low status of women, a cause and a consequence of violence against women and girls as well as being directly linked to sexual and reproductive rights. Therefore it could make more sense to strengthen the linkage between violence and HIV/AIDS (that is mentioned in some of the activities) along the different interventions proposed in the first 4 outputs while ensuring that both problems are dealt with from a gender perspective.

**Outcome 2:** The outputs should be revised so that there is logic between them; the way they are formulated right now output 1.1 seems to be an outcome. Agency outputs under output 1.1 are repetitive (see the first two carried out by UNFPA and UNDP) and vague in respect to “what” will be done and “with whom”, with some inconsistencies in numbers (SMART output 2 where the number of institutions changes from 5 to 7). We recommend grouping the agency outputs, targeting institutions you will work with and reconsidering budgets required for these interventions since some of them seem very limited for such ambitious products. Outputs and activities should address more systematically the main challenge identified that is the lack of enforcement of the laws.

**Outcome 3:** This outcome does not include any concrete strategy to ensure the sustainability of the interventions. We feel that the overall strategy will substantively benefit from the development of stronger links between interventions and beneficiaries targeted by outcome 1 and 3.



### **Sustainability, monitoring and evaluation**

A considerable amount of effort has been put to improve the aspect of the identification of the beneficiaries, in line with what was recommended by the Secretariat. However it could be further improved the aspect of the involvement of those groups in the implementation of the programme.

In terms of sustainability we consider that the document, under outcome 2, does not provide sufficient information to affirm that the programme will successfully address the challenges faced by the MGECW to implement a gender strategy (page 13). We also feel that sustainability of results under outcome 3 should be improved.

The Monitoring and Evaluation framework appears to be particularly weak given it is a fairly ambitious Programme. We would recommend that M&E and coordination cost are for the overall programme and not for each individual outcome. These issues should be extensively discussed and addressed in the inception workshop. Nevertheless, note that the Fund Secretariat plans to work with all approved programmes during the current year to address their M&E frameworks and to develop a small number of common indicators relating to the thematic windows, UN reform, Paris Declaration process and the Millennium Declaration.

### **III. JP re-design requirements and/or recommendations**

The Secretariat recommends that:

#### In regards to external coherence:

The focus on gender based discrimination and a multi cultural sensitivity are clearly reflected and kept in every component of the Programme.

Sex-disaggregated data on HIV prevalence in each of the selected areas is included.

Consistency between the outcomes stated in page1, 5 and 16 is ensured.

Food insecurity and income poverty of women headed households are included as results of the low status of women and girls and a result that reinforces both violence and HIV/AIDS impact.

#### In regards internal coherence:

Outputs are revised to ensure the agencies will perform in a truly joint fashion avoiding duplication of activities.

SMART outputs are formulated in a way they are specific, measurable, attainable, results oriented and time bound.

Activities provide further detail on “what” and “how” the programme will reach those products.

Outputs under outcome 1 show clearer an internal logic between them.



The linkage between violence and HIV/AIDS is strengthened along the different interventions proposed in the first 4 outputs while ensuring that both problems are dealt with from a gender perspective.

Agency outputs under output 1.1 are revised so that they are not repetitive and vague in respect to “what” will be done and “with whom” and inconsistent in numbers. We recommend grouping the agency outputs, targeting institutions you will work with and reconsidering budgets.

The main challenge identified under outcome 2, that is the lack of enforcement of the laws, is addressed more systematically.

In regards to sustainability, M&E:

Targeted groups are more involved through specific activities in the implementation of the programme.

More information is provided to affirm that the programme will successfully address the challenges faced by the MGECW to implement a gender strategy. We also feel that sustainability of results under outcome 3 should be improved.

M&E and coordination cost are for the overall programme and not for each individual outcome.

#### **IV. Management arrangements and delegation of authority**

On receipt of the report of the inception workshop and a copy of signed document, the Fund Secretariat will transfer the full three-year allocation to the custody of the Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) Office pending further instructions from you.

Please note the MDTF Office will pass-through funds to Participating Organizations on instruction from you as Resident Coordinator and Co-Chair of the National MDG-F Steering Committee.

As reflected in the Fund’s Framework Document (Section 9 ‘Formulation Process & Release of Funds) and the global MoU with Participating Organizations (Article I, 2-c) the MDTF Office will release resources on an annual, advance basis. For the first advance, these funds will be transferred on the basis of receipt of the first year Annual Workplan and the signed Joint Programme document. Subsequent annual advances will be released on instructions from you and on the basis of a) receipt of the next annual work-plan approved by the National Steering Committee; b) evidence that a formal review of the programme’s progress has been undertaken not more than three months earlier, either in the form of an annual progress report (if the timing coincides) or through the minutes of a National Steering Committee where this has been discussed; and c) only when combined commitments against the existing advance have exceeded 70%. Please review the initial year budget requests carefully with participating organizations in order to ensure realistic delivery targets in this regard. The annual agency apportionment projected in the final budget attached to the signed Joint Programme document should also be reviewed and can be revised up to the time of your first funds-advance request. This is important for the reasons outlined below.

In order to allow the implementation team some flexibility to adapt the strategy to unexpected challenges and opportunities (most particularly delivery issues), and to empower Resident Coordinators in their



oversight responsibilities, this memorandum also provides you with the authority over the three year duration of the programme in consultation with Participating Organizations and with the agreement of your National Steering Committee to (a) transfer up to \$1,000,000 or 20% of the total value of the project budget – whichever is lowest – *between Participating Organizations* identified in the original Joint Programme budget and (b) re-phase up to \$1,000,000 or 20% of the total value of the project budget – whichever is lowest - *between years*. The base-line against which these ceilings will be measured is the annual budget projection (by year and by participating organization) confirmed at the time of your first funds-advance request. The MDTF Office must be informed of any revisions of this kind, decided locally and is responsible for tracking these delegation ceilings for each programme. Any changes that fall outside these parameters will have to be referred back to the (Global) MDG-F Steering Committee for approval.

As you will appreciate, one of the MDG-F's express goals is to strengthen the role of Resident Coordinators as leaders of Country Teams. The success of the MDG-F activities will depend on your ongoing leadership and engagement. We count on you to exercise this leadership and to ensure this Joint Programme remains an ongoing, integrated effort by the UN system in support of national priorities. Please also use the National Steering Committee mechanism to help ensure national ownership by the Government in particular and involve it in important financial and programmatic oversight decisions.

The signed Joint Programme document and the completed Fund Release Form should be sent to the MDG-F Secretariat and MDTF Office within 30 days of the receipt of this memorandum. If this deadline is not possible, please inform the secretariat accordingly.

The Executive Coordinator of the MDTF Office, Bisrat Aklilu, will be in contact with any specific documentation requirements to ensure the programme meets compliance requirements for the Fund's pass-through arrangements.

With best wishes.

cc.

Mr. Bisrat Aklilu, Executive Coordinator, Multi-Donor Trust Fund Office  
Mr. Gilbert Houngbo, Assistant Administrator and Director Bureau for Africa, UNDP, New York  
H.E. Mr. D. Juan Antonio Yáñez-Barnuevo, Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations  
H. E. Mr. Kaire Munionganda Mbuende, Permanent Representative of Namibia to the United Nations  
Mr. Gabriel Ferrero y De Loma-Osorio, Deputy Director of Development Policy Planning and Evaluation, MFA Madrid  
Ms. Sally Fegan-Wyles, Director, Development Group Office  
MDG-F Secretariat