

**Joint SDG Fund**  
 Template for the Joint Programme  
 Evidence-based Final Narrative Report  
**SDG FINANCING PORTFOLIO – COMPONENT 1**

**Date of Report:** 31 / July / 2023

**Programme title and Country**

**Country:** Namibia  
**Joint Programme (JP) title:** Strengthening Namibia’s Financing Architecture for Enhanced Quality and Scale of Financing for SDGs and the Development Emergency Modality  
**MPTF Office Project Reference Number:** FC1 2020 NAM

**Programme Duration**

**Start date**<sup>2</sup> (day/month/year): 1<sup>st</sup> June 2020  
**Original End date**<sup>3</sup> (day/month/year): 1<sup>st</sup> June 2022  
**Actual End date**<sup>4</sup> (day/month/year): 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023  
**Have agencies operationally closed the Programme in its system:** No  
**Expected financial closure date**<sup>5</sup>: 31<sup>st</sup> December 2023

**Participating Organizations / Partners**

**RC** (name and email): Ms Hopolang Phororo, [hopolang.phororo@un.org](mailto:hopolang.phororo@un.org)  
**Government Focal Point:** Executive Director. National Planning Commission (NPC). Ms. Wilhencia Uiras, [wilhencia.uiras@npc.gov.na](mailto:wilhencia.uiras@npc.gov.na)  
**RCO Focal Point** (focal point name and email): Ms. Eunice, Ajambo, email: [ajambo@un.org](mailto:ajambo@un.org)  
**Lead PUNO** (focal point name and email): UNDP, Mr. Wilmot Reeve, email: [wilmot.reeves@undp.org](mailto:wilmot.reeves@undp.org)  
**Other PUNO Focal Points** (focal point names and emails):  
 ILO, Ms. Natalia Halweendo, email: [halweendo@ilo.org](mailto:halweendo@ilo.org)  
 UNFPA, Ms.Sofia Nambahu, email: [nambahu@gmail.com](mailto:nambahu@gmail.com)  
 UNDP, Mr. Wilmot Reeve, email: [wilmot.reeves@undp.org](mailto:wilmot.reeves@undp.org)  
 UNICEF, Mr. Jacob Nyamadzawo, email: [jnyamadzawo@unicef.org](mailto:jnyamadzawo@unicef.org)  
 WFP, Mr. Daison Ngirazi, email: [daison.ngirazi@wfp.org](mailto:daison.ngirazi@wfp.org) or Mr. Joab Seleya, email: [joab.seleya@wfp.org](mailto:joab.seleya@wfp.org)  
 FAO, Mr. Gift Kamupingene, email: [gift.kamupingene@fao.org](mailto:gift.kamupingene@fao.org)

**Programme Budget (US\$)**

**Total Budget** (as per Programme Document, without co-funding): **US\$ 1,000,000**  
**Agency/Other Contributions/Co-funding** (if applicable): **US\$ 169,000**

**Joint SDG Fund Contribution<sup>6</sup> and co-funding breakdown, by recipient organization:**

Agency/others	Joint SDG Fund contribution	Co-funding	Total
UNDP	399,755	318,000 <sup>7</sup>	717,755
UNICEF	389,055	50,000	439,055
ILO	105,595	15,000	120,595
UNFPA	105,595	29,000	134,595
WFP	250,000 <sup>8</sup>	80,000	330,000

FAO		236,000	236,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,250,000</b>	<b>728,000</b>	<b>1,978,000</b>

***External Consultant Details***

**Name:** Emmanuel Maliti  
**Title and organization** (if applicable): NA  
**Email:** [emmanuel.maliti@gmail.com](mailto:emmanuel.maliti@gmail.com)

## Table of contents

Abbreviations.....	5
Executive summary .....	7
1. Context .....	8
2. Joint Programme Results.....	9
2.1 Overview of Strategic Final Results.....	9
2.1.1 Overall assessment (max 100 words).....	9
2.1.2 Key results achieved (max 500 words) .....	9
2.1.3 Results achieved on Integrated National Financing Framework/SDG financing building blocks (max 2 pages).....	10
2.1.4 Contribution to SDG acceleration.....	12
2.1.5 Contribution to SDG financing flows (max 500 words) .....	12
2.1.6 Results achieved on contributing to UN Development System reform (max 500 words).....	13
2.1.7 Results achieved on cross-cutting issues (max 200 words) .....	14
2.1.8 Results achieved on COVID-19 recovery (max 200 words) .....	14
2.1.9 Strategic Partnerships (max 500 words).....	15
2.1.10 Additional financing mobilized (max 300 words) .....	16
2.2 Results by JP Outcome and Output.....	17
2.2.1 Results achieved by Fund’s global results (max 500 words).....	17
2.2.2 Results achieved by Joint Programme Outcome (max 500 words).....	17
2.2.3 Results achieved by Joint Programme Output (max 500 words).....	18
2.3 Challenges and Changes.....	20
2.3.1 Challenges faced by JP (max 300 words).....	20
2.3.2 Changes made to JP (if applicable) (max 200 words) .....	20
2.4 Sustainability and Country Ownership.....	21
2.4.1 Sustainability and country ownership (max 500 words).....	21
2.5 Communications .....	22
2.5.1 Communication products (max 300 words) .....	22
2.5.2 Events.....	22
2.6 Lessons and Best Practices.....	22
2.6.1 Key lessons learned, best practices, and recommendations on SDG financing (max 300 words).....	22

2.6.2 Key lessons learned and best practices, and recommendations on Joint Programming (max 300 words).....	23
Annex 1: Consolidated results framework.....	25
Annex 2: List of strategic documents .....	28
Annex 3. Communications materials.....	34
Annex 4: Stakeholder feedback.....	36

## Abbreviations

AfDB	–	African Development Bank
AI	–	Artificial Intelligence
ASP	–	Agriculture Subsidy Programme
ARDL	–	Autoregressive Distributed Lag
BoN	–	Bank of Namibia
CdR	–	Caisses de resilience
CPBN	–	Central Procurement Board of Namibia
CCA	–	Common Country Assessment
COVID-19	–	Corona Virus Disease - 19
CSOs	–	Civil Society Organizations
DAO	–	Deliver As One
DEM	–	Development Emergency Modality
DFA	–	Development Finance Assessment
DPs	–	Development Partners
DCPP	–	Dry Land Crop Production Programme
EPDN	–	Enhancing Participatory Democracy in Namibia
EU	–	European Union
E-voucher	–	Electronic Voucher
ECA	–	Export Credit Agency
EWS	–	Early Warning Systems
FAO	–	Food and Agriculture Organization
FDI	–	Foreign Direct Investment
GEWE	–	Gender Equality and Women Empowerment
GDP	–	Growth Domestic Product
GTG	–	Gender Theme Group
GIZ	–	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
GRN	–	Government of the Republic of Namibia
GRB	–	Gender Responsive Budgeting
HGSFP	–	Home-Grown School Feeding Programme
IEWS	–	Integrated Early Warning System
IFF	–	Illicit Financial Flows
ILO	–	International Labor Organization
IMF	–	International Monetary Fund
IDISFNS-WG	–	Integrated Data and Information Systems for Food and Nutrition Security Policy Working Group
IFMS	–	Integrated Financial Management System
IMIS	–	Integrated Management Information System
INFF	–	Integrated National Financing Framework
INFS	–	Integrated National Financing Strategy
IFIs	–	International Financial Institutions
IOAs	–	Investment Opportunity Areas
JP	–	Joint Programme
MAWLR	–	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform
MAPS	–	Methodology for Assessing Procurement System
MDG	–	Millennium Development Goals
MFPE	–	Ministry of Finance and Public Enterprises
MIT	–	Ministry of Industrialization and Trade
MSMEs	–	Micro Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises
MoHSS	–	Ministry of Health and Social Services
MoU	–	Memorandum of Understanding
MPs	–	Members of Parliament

MPTF	–	Multi-Partner Trust Fund
MTEF	–	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
MIGA	–	Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency
N\$	–	Namibian Dollars
NCCI	–	Namibia Chamber of Commerce and Industry
NIPDB	–	Namibian Investment Promotion and Development Board
NEP	–	National Employment Policy
NDC	–	Nationally Determined Contributions
NDP	–	National Development Plan
NPC	–	National Planning Commission
NSA	–	Namibia Statistics Agency
ODA	–	Official Development Assistance
OMAs	–	Offices, Ministries, and Agencies
OECD	–	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PER	–	Public Expenditure Review
PFM	–	Public Finance Management
PPU	–	Public Procurement Unit
PPP	–	Public-Private Partnerships
PUNO	–	Participating United Nations Organizations
RC	–	Resident Coordinator
RCO	–	Resident Coordinator Office
SACU	–	Southern African Customs Union
SADC	–	Southern African Development Community
SDG	–	Sustainable Development Goals
SERP	–	Socio-Economic Response Plan
SHFs	–	Small Holder Farmers
SEIAC-NAM	–	Socio-Economic Impact Assessment of COVID-19 in Namibia
SSA	–	Sub-Saharan Africa
SYSPRO ERP	–	supply chain management system
TA	–	Technical Assistance
UNCT	–	United Nations Country Team
UNCTAD	–	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDAF	–	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	–	United Nations Development Programme
UNECA	–	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNFPA	–	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	–	United Nations Children's Fund
UN	–	United Nations
UNSDCF	–	United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
UMIC	–	Upper Middle-Income Country
US\$	–	United States Dollars
USAID	–	United States Agency for International Development
VAM	–	Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping
WASH	–	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WFP	–	World Food Programme

## Executive summary

The United Nations (UN) system in Namibia implemented the SDG Fund Joint Programme (JP) through the six (6) Participating UN Organizations (PUNOs), namely UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, ILO, WFP, and FAO. The JP interventions were multidimensional and embedded complex priorities that resulted in a diverse list of interlinked deliverables ranging from the sector policies (social protection), strategies (Integrated National Financing Strategy (INFS)), technologies (Electronic Voucher (E-voucher), Integrated Early Warning System (IEW)), and tools (Gender and Employment Responsive Budgeting). Some of the deliverables were new to the Government of the Republic of Namibia (GRN). An example is the Integrated National Financing Framework (INFF), a financing architecture for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) that differs from the donor-dependent model for MDGs.

Implementation of the JP involved multiple institutions/organizations and brought an opportunity for the GRN, with the support of the United Nations Country Team (UNCT), to engage with International Financial Institutions (IFIs), the private sector, academia, regional UN agencies, regional hubs of respective PUNOs, and other Development Partners (DPs). Such collaborations bridge gaps in financing, expertise, and confidence. The extensive interagency and UN-GRN collaborations revealed the Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO)'s clear role on the programme, as a focal point for all engagements with the GRN. Such engagements were time-consuming, in terms of ensuring GRN's conceptualization of JP pioneering work and ownership. Ultimately, the GRN availability was a key in designing, validating, and implementing.

The JP implementation resulted in UNCT fulfilling the INFF's diagnostic and assessment domain by informing the drafting of the INFS through several diagnostic studies. The other INFF domains of Monitoring and Review (M&R) and Governance and Coordination (G&C) are elaborated in the draft INFS. Three JP's results stand out as transformative. First are the estimates of the Illicit Financial Flows (IFF) that prompted the GRN to establish an IFF unit under the Bank of Namibia (BoN). Second is health sector procurement reforms, which have improved compliance and efficiencies in public procurement. Third is the Agriculture Subsidy Programme (ASP), which has capacitated vulnerable Small-Holder Farmers (SHFs) to produce for the market and advanced in food and nutrition security. The 2-year period was, however, insufficient to carry forward the other JP initiatives, such as the INFS, to the implementation stage and deliver the transformative changes they were designed for.

The next stage therefore can focus on securing a catalytic fund for INFS implementation that offers Technical Assistance (TA) and leaves implementation to the GRN. The INFS will have to serve both as a reform and resource mobilization tool. The former responds to the "what" (private financing, debt for environmental/climate swaps, crowd financing, bonds, etc.) and the "how" (specific steps to tap such resources). On the reform side, the INFS can identify the most binding constraints among the multitude of constraints, each complemented by a theory of change that highlights political economy issues likely to facilitate or limit reforms for SDG financing.

At the administrative level, future JPs can review resources for programme coordination; consider assigning direct JP coordination to the RCO from individual agencies; shorten the chain of approvals and having common systems to share resources and easy procurement of services for JP implementation. At the UNCT level, the future JPs need to be considered as a strategic tool to contribute and benefit from interagency cohesion. Thus, UN agencies need to rely less on institutional visibility and high on sharing successes; move toward a systemic approach to development by leveraging expertise and deliverables from each other irrespective of the agencies producing the deliverables; and improve passion for sharing agencies' future priorities. Individual efforts on these matters are necessary and needs to be encouraged by the agencies' chains of command.

## 1. Context

Namibia is an Upper Middle-Income Country (UMIC) with a per capita income of US\$ 9,1379, the third in the Southern African Customs Union (SACU) region after Botswana<sup>10</sup> and South Africa<sup>11</sup> and more than twice the average for Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA).<sup>12</sup> Between 2000-2015, the economic growth in Namibia (SDG 8) averaged 4.8%, a rate that was similar to the average for SSA, higher than the global average (3.1%) and SACU region (3.5%), but lower than the average for UMIC (6.3%).

The relatively rapid economic growth (SDG 8) coupled with significant public investments in social sectors (SDGs 3, 4 and 6)<sup>13</sup> resulted into a sharp reduction in poverty from 27.6%<sup>14</sup> (2004) to 17.4%<sup>15</sup> (2016)<sup>16</sup> (SDGs 1, 3, 4 and 6). The rapid economic growth was followed by stagnation and recessions thereafter culminating in a significant decline in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) by 8% during 2020, the onset year of Coronavirus Disease-2019 (COVID-19). It was the most severe economic contraction since Namibia's Independence in 1990, and the second largest recession in the SACU region, after South Africa. Lacklustre growth, a deteriorating fiscal situation that risks resource availability for SDG financing, debt sustainability concerns, and vulnerability to external shocks pose significant challenges for Namibia to achieve inclusive, sustainable, and equitable growth. These challenges are compounded by Namibia's limited access to the Official Development Assistance (ODA) – mostly because of its status as an UMIC. That status alone necessitates Namibia to have a great ability to access development resources from the private sector and global initiatives, such as green climate financing. Despite the lack of specific data for Namibia, global analysis shows that many countries struggle to tap into large domestic and global resources viable for SDG financing. In 2020 alone, global financial assets were estimated to have grown to US\$ 469 trillion at the same time when the SDG financing gap in developing countries was US\$ 3.9 trillion – less than one (1) percent of the global financial assets.<sup>17</sup>

The macro-level challenges re-emerged at the micro-level. About 43% of the population remains multidimensionally poor, more so in rural areas (59%) than in urban areas (25%) (SDGs 1, 3, 4 and 6), with the country engulfed in prolonged food and nutrition insecurity. Starkly regional disparities in both economic opportunities and access to services persist. Poverty is highest in Kavango West (39%) and Kavango East (33%) and less severe in Karas (8%) and Erongo (6%) (SDG 10). Furthermore, the country remains relatively low-skilled, ranking 126<sup>th</sup> among 169 countries on the human capital index, and lagging well behind other UMICs in health, education, and access to basic services.

The rapid rural-to-urban migration and the slow growth of the industrial sector have failed to compensate for lost agricultural jobs, leading to an unemployment rate of 33% in 2018 (SDG 8), more so for women (34%) than men (33%). This is despite women surpassing men in educational attainment (SDGs 4 and 5). These challenges are worsened by inadequate financial and economic governance systems to accelerate effective resource mobilization, facilitate integrated and transparent financing architecture, including necessary tools for gender-inclusive and equitable allocation, and monitoring of resources towards the SDGs. The Sustainable Development Report 2023, for instance, ranks Namibia's performance towards achieving the SDGs at 109 out of 166 countries with a country score of 64.28, higher than the SSA average of 55.46<sup>18</sup>, South Africa (64.0) and Botswana (62.74), but lower than Cabo Verde (68.84) and the fellow UMIC of Mauritius (67.68).

The JP, therefore, sought to support the GRN in addressing some of these challenges by developing an INFF, for enhanced quality and scale of financing for the National Development Plan (NDP) and SDGs and to strengthen resilient food systems. To achieve these objectives, the JP invested in evidence generation for informed policymaking, institutional strengthening to facilitate scale, gender responsiveness and sustainability, technical capacity across a range of stakeholders and partnerships. These interventions were entirely aligned to the priorities outlined in the NDP5. Whereas each intervention matches one of the NDP5 priorities, it is worth stating that the JP's support to strengthen the inclusive financial and economic governance ecosystem will accelerate NDP5 and the emerging NDP6 implementation, in the form of increasing mobilization of resources.



## 2. Joint Programme Results

### 2.1 Overview of Strategic Final Results

#### 2.1.1 Overall assessment (max 100 words)

The JP's result frameworks consisted of two (2) outcomes and 13 outputs. While the two outcomes remain work in progress, several outputs were delivered. Overall, five (5) out of 13 outputs have been achieved (38%), four (4) outputs are work in progress (31%), two (2) outputs were postponed (15%), one (1) output is not achieved (8%), and one (1) output with missing information (8%). The performance rating is 'satisfactory'. Additional outputs that the JP delivered but not part to the results framework include facilitating the development of policies (social protection and the National Employment Policy (NEP) and reforming the health sector procurement regime.

- Above expectations (fully achieved expected JP results and made additional progress)
- In line with expectations (achieved expected JP results)
- Satisfactory (majority of expected JP results achieved, but with some limitations/adjustments)
- Not-satisfactory (majority of expected JP results not achieved due to unforeseen risks/challenges)

#### 2.1.2 Key results achieved (max 500 words)

##### Result 1:

##### **Strengthened the institutional, regulatory and policy framework for detecting and curbing of IFFs for increased fiscal space to finance development priorities including the SDGs.**

The IFFs estimates in Namibia have placed Namibia among the first countries in Africa to provide data points on IFF and ultimately responding to the SDGs Indicator 16.4.1.<sup>19</sup> Using the statistical method, the inward IFFs were estimated at US\$ 4.5 billion and the outward IFF at US\$ 34.1 billion.<sup>20</sup> This JP's result is transformative as the IFFs unit has been established under the BoN responsible for coordinating measures to eliminate IFFs and enhancing financial flows to SDG. The reform has strengthened the financial systems in Namibia, including the technical capacity to estimate IFFs. The reform also ensures that the GRN can detect and curb the diversion of funds earmarked for social development to tax and financial havens.

##### Result 2:

##### **Strengthened health procurement system for enhanced efficiencies and impact.**

The JP facilitated the reform of the health procurement regime that has advanced efficiency in procuring vaccines and essential medicines. This was achieved through direct technical support that introduced standard bidding documents, a pool procurement regime, and a model long-term procurement agreement. Through improved efficiency, the reforms are expected to generate significant annual savings of Namibian Dollars (N\$) 300 million, equivalent to 20% of the pharmaceutical and clinical budget.

The JP has delivered reforms across ministries and multiple disciplines (audit, administration and finance, IT functions, etc.), and therefore progressed coordination between the Public Procurement Unit (PPU), Ministry of Finance and Public Enterprises (MFPE), Ministry of Health and Social Services (MoHSS) and the Central Procurement Board of Namibia (CPBN). It has also been inspirational, by triggering further GRN reform initiatives including synchronizing

the Integrated Financial Management System (IFMS) with the supply chain management system (SYSPRO ERP).

**Result 3:**

**Agriculture Input Subsidy to vulnerable SHFs as part of the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform’s (MAWLR) Dry Land Crop Production Programme (DCPP)**

The JP partnered with the MAWLR in subsidizing agricultural inputs to the 280-climate change vulnerable small holder farmers (SHFs) in Kunene Region that could not afford the 20% of input cost from the GRN’s input subsidy programme. The intervention was transformative by ensuring ‘no one was left behind’ by the GRN’s input subsidy programme by covering 20% input cost; provided training and climate change resilient seeds that led to SHFs producing for the market.

A further transformative quality of the programme was its ability to demonstrate a compelling case to the GRN and other stakeholders that GRN programmes can leave no one behind. It has also demonstrated the case for scaling up the support to vulnerable SHFs in other regions and ultimately advancing national food and nutrition security.

**2.1.3 Results achieved on Integrated National Financing Framework/SDG financing building blocks (max 2 pages)**

Implementation stages	Planned (0%)	Emerging (1-49% progress)	Advancing (50-99% progress)	Complete (100% progress)	Previously completed	Not applicable
1. Inception phase	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Assessment & diagnostics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Financing strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Monitoring & review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Governance & coordination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**On the INFF’s inception phase:** The INFF road map was developed as part of the Development Finance Assessment (DFA) in 2019 and updated collaboratively with the NPC in 2021. The roadmap was adopted by the GRN through the Cabinet in the same year. It proposes a well-sequenced plan of action for the development of INFF over a timeline of 37 weeks.<sup>21</sup>

Four key recommendations emanating from the roadmap. First is the need to maintain an interactive process from diagnosis through implementation. Second, developing the INFS requires multiple steps, including consultations with various stakeholders. Third, aligning financing needs with financing options necessitates a mapping framework that ranks priority areas based on socioeconomic impact versus financial return/cost. Fourth, an integrated implementation plan should be delivered side-by-side by aligning development needs with financing.

**On the INFF’s assessment and diagnostic:** The JP fulfilled the INFF’s assessment and diagnostic domain by producing several diagnostic exercises. They included, DFA, SDG Investor Map, the IFF estimates, budget briefs, the SDG Audit of the national budget, and the Digital Finance Ecosystem Assessment and Strategy. Further assessments included the

Gender Responsive Budgeting Analysis and the employment Public Expenditure Review (PER). The DFA, budget briefs and the Public Expenditure Review (PER) form a package that highlights key areas necessary to strengthen the financing architecture in Namibia.

The assessments informed the development of an INFS; an action plan to improve budget transparency, the Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting Curriculum and the Pro-employment and gender-responsive budgeting toolkit. The assessment also presented the JP with an opportunity to collaborate with other DPs, including the IMF on SDG costing and UNCTAD and UNECA on the IFF.

**On the implementation of the INFS:** The draft INFS is under review and will be presented to the Technical Committee and the MFPE before being tabled to the Cabinet. The draft INFS has outlined 15 reforms under the domestic public finance domain, 37 reforms (domestic private finance), 14 reforms (international public finance), and 7 reforms (international private finance). It is worth mentioning that, even in the absence of a finalized INFS, the GRN has moved forward in meeting some of the recommendations from the strategy (the IFF Unit within BoN).

The final INFS needs to fulfil a dual function as a reform tool and a resource mobilization strategy. The former needs to offer insights on the "what" (potential private finance, debt for environmental/climate swaps, crowd financing, bonds, etc.) and the "how" (specific steps for GRN to tap such resources). Specific rather than broad recommendations will be of more value to the GRN. On the reform agenda, the INFS needs to identify the most binding constraints among the multitude of constraints with each proposed reform complemented by a theory of change that highlights key political economy issues that have the potential to facilitate, or limit proposed reforms.

The Digital Finance Ecosystem Assessment and Strategy preceded the draft INFS and went through a validation process in March 2022. The strategy maps the nation's digital finance landscape to define gaps and policy options and a roadmap to improve the digital finance ecosystem, especially for women and youth engaged in Micro, Small, and Medium-Sized Enterprises (MSMEs). Whereas the Digital Finance Strategy can be considered as a standalone strategy, it remains a key sub-sector and a specialized supplement to the INFS.

**On the INFF's Monitoring & Review domain:** The earlier idea of commissioning a feasibility study to establish the integrated financing dashboard was postponed awaiting further guidance from the INFS. However, other tools preceding the dashboard will assist the GRN in monitoring SDG financing. They include the IFF, the gender and employment-sensitive budgeting tools and the SDG diagnostic of the national budget. Containing IFF, for instance, will potentially expand fiscal space for SDG financing. The initial estimates from the IFF study show that the annual flows exceed the size of the GRN's expenditure on health and education, combined.

**On the INFF's Governance & Coordination domain:** In the absence of an active Steering Committee, the development of the INFF process was led by the Technical Committee, which maintained high-level engagement to facilitate the leadership and ownership of the GRN. The overall proposal for the Governance & Coordination framework for the implementation of the INFF, has been put forward under Section 8 of the draft INFS. It identifies solid political backing and broad-based country ownership as the prerequisites for an effective Governance & Coordination mechanism. The proposed INFF governance structures includes an Oversight group, Implementation group, Technical Secretariat, and Implementing Sectors/Pillar

Enabler Groups. Their roles and responsibilities, including composition for each structure, are also presented in the same section of the report.

## 2.1.4 Contribution to SDG acceleration

The JP document associates the programme with 10 SDGs and 48 indicators.<sup>22</sup> Eleven (11) out of the 48 indicators were presented with targets. Of the 11 indicators with targets, Namibia has achieved three (3) targets. Targets were missed for five (5) indicators. The remaining three (3) indicators have either targets and results reported in different units (number versus %), or the targets were incorrectly set up.

SDG indicator targets were met in areas such as systems in place to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women empowerment; primary government expenditures as a proportion of the original approved budget by sector; the presence of nationally determined contributions, long-term strategies, national adaptation plans and adaptation communications, as reported to the UNFCCC secretariat. Targets that were missed are associated with development assistance inflows. As a UMIC, Namibia is receiving declining inflows. Annex 6 reports on all 48 indicators, including the baselines, targets, results, and reasons for deviations from the targets.

## 2.1.5 Contribution to SDG financing flows (max 500 words)

It is too early to provide the impact of the INFS whose draft version is currently under review. The draft strategy presents challenges and associated reform options necessary to expand resource opportunities under the four main sources of finance as presented in the INFF model: domestic and international public finance, and domestic and international private finance.

As outlined in the draft INFS, the key challenges under domestic private investment range from the declining overall competitiveness ranking for Namibia<sup>23</sup> and limited export promotion measures to limited investment opportunities in the listed domestic assets. The draft INFS prioritizes improving the business and investment climate, strengthening and deepening financial markets, and accelerating the establishment of an Export Credit Agency (ECA).

Under the domestic public finance, Namibia's development efforts are hindered by a low tax base and tax arrears, income losses through IFF, and the absence of an extensive national asset register, limiting opportunities to bolster revenue and cut expenditures needed for maintaining the assets. Priority reforms include optimizing the tax schedule, increasing domestic resource mobilization, harnessing Public-Private Partnerships (PPP), enhancing public-domestic resource allocation, and optimizing the national development planning process.

The key challenge for Namibia in international public financing is its limited ability to tap international development resources relative to other UMICs. To address this challenge, the draft INFS calls for improving coordination between Namibia and the international and multilateral donors and partners, strengthening the role of export credit agencies, and exploring opportunities provided by the global and regional economic diplomacy, including from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the

Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA), as well as leveraging the potential of the African Continental Free Trade Area Agreement (AfCFTA).

Namibia has implemented a range of market-oriented policies, such as the Namibian Investment Promotion Act and the Namibian Competition Commission, that promote investment and create a level playing field for businesses. However, compared to the other UMICs in SSA, like Botswana, Mauritius, or South Africa, the FDI inflows to Namibia are comparatively low. Thus, under international private financing, the draft INFS advocates for more efforts in creating an enabling environment for international investments (e.g., reviewing regulatory hurdles) and strengthening debt management and risk mitigation (e.g., adopting gender-responsive budgeting practices for debt management).

### **2.1.6 Results achieved on contributing to UN Development System reform (max 500 words)**

The JP had both successes and challenges in contributing to the interagency coherence and UN-GRN collaborations. On the latter, the RCO in collaboration with the UNCT, under the technical leadership of UNDP, worked with MFPE in the strategic and operational coordination of the JP initiatives. The JP brought together relevant OMAs including the MFPE, NPC, BoN, Environmental Investment Fund, Ministry of Gender Equality, Poverty Eradication and Social Welfare, and Ministry of Labor, Industrial Relations, and Employment Creation, IFIs and UN entities to adopt a common strategy on the INFF, social protection; and in establishing new partnerships with both public and private sector partners and leveraging additional financing for the JP. At the beginning, the UN-GRN collaborations involved great investments in time from the UNCT side to advocate for translating Namibia's commitments to regional and global agendas into GRN ownership and leadership domestically. Increasing transaction costs was therefore inevitable, but in the end, the GRN's availability was designing, validating, bringing stakeholders together and facilitating implementation.

Similar to the UN-GRN interactions, the UN interagency coherence was a process rather than a rule. In the absence of a clear guidance from the UN Joint SDG Fund on how and to what extent the RCO or the lead UN entity should support its JPs, the UN interagency interactions involved a back-and-forth struggle at the beginning for individual agencies to conceptualise the JP structures– including understanding of each one's competencies.

Incidences of the JP's contribution to the UN coherence included support from the Regional Economic Commissions (UNECA and UNCTAD on the IFF study); the regional hubs of respective PUNOs, and the use of Gender Theme Group (GTG). The GTG was utilized by UN agencies to access expert advice. The highlight of JP's contribution to interagency coherence was the integration of Development Emergency Modality (DEM) programme into the JP. The merger facilitated the JP to position high on the agenda, the cross-cutting competencies (leaving no one behind, GEWE). Despite the merger, large parts of the work continued to be conducted independently, as each agency had pre-existing alliances with the respective ministries.

Other specific incidents of improved efficiencies included joint procurement for consultancies (drafting of the INFS, JP final review, budget briefs and workshop venues); joint field visits, and the UNFPA and ILO using one coordinator for their respective JP activities, whilst freeing resources towards activities. The incidents improved cross-agency understanding of each

other's work areas, broadened professional networking and some incidents of tapping into others' expertise.

Given the manhours spent pulling the agencies together, the net transaction costs remained unclear. The JP experience, however, exposed the limitations of inter-agency collaborations that are driven by the salient competition for space, visibility, and resource ownership. The future requires not only the individual efforts to loosen up attachment to institutional mandates but also the willingness of the agencies' chains of command to encourage staff to do so. Such steps are necessary to advance interagency coherence from incidents to systematic – and push the UNCT towards an efficiency frontier.

The other key UN reform agenda is for UNCT to focus on policy advice and integrated programmatic support and less on project support. The JP responded by engaging in policy reforms and advisory support. However, more could have been done on the integrated programmatic approach, by converging projects implemented by different agencies. Other JP's projects-based initiatives were outside the policy advice paradigm but remaining critical as pilots for generating lessons and compelling cases for technological adoption and informing future programmatic approaches.

In terms of contribution to UNDAF/UNCDF, the JP's macroeconomic modelling initiative was applied by the UN to undertake the socio-economic policy simulations as part of the Common Country Assessment (CCA), and to inform appropriate programming by the UN in the next United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDFC).

### **2.1.7 Results achieved on cross-cutting issues (max 200 words)**

JP interventions demonstrated visible cross-cutting principles. Examples of JP interventions that aligned to the principle of 'leaving no one behind' included the Agriculture Subsidy Programme (ASP); social protection policy; the digital finance ecosystem study; and E-voucher. The gender equality principle was met by the gender and employment budgeting PER and the draft INFS. The women's empowerment principle was exercised by the ASP and E-voucher initiatives.

Other initiatives such as the digital finance assessment included women, youth, and persons with disabilities, as specific segments for digital inclusiveness. Whereas the gender and employment budgeting PER is rich in gender-disaggregated indicators, the 2022 social protection policy strengthens social protection coverage for the poor, women, and children.

The cornerstone of the INFF, that is the INFS, has included the phrase "gender" in its title ("Gender-Responsive Integrated National FS") and proposed eight (8) reforms that specifically target Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE). Other assessments, the budget briefs, for instance, are rich in disaggregated data revealing, for example, spending inequalities along geographical lines among other data relevant to the cross-cutting issues. The funds spent on GEWE was 35.9% of the initial JP and 28.7% of the entire JP (initial and the top-up).

### **2.1.8 Results achieved on COVID-19 recovery (max 200 words)**

Generally, all the JP interventions were about the post-COVID recovery, in terms of resilience livelihood and the role of technology (E-voucher initiative, input subsidy), strategy for responding to the challenges of limited fiscal space (INFS, digital financing)



strengthening social protection coverage for the poor, women, and children (social protection policy) and the development of the employment policy.

The gender budget analysis, for example, presents a comparative view of pre-COVID-19 expenditure with that of three post-pandemic years (FY 2020/21 to FY 2022/23). The Autoregressive Distributed Lag (ARDL) macroeconomic modelling and training that was delivered to the GRN's Macroeconomic Working Group (MFPE, NPC, BoN and NSA) was also part of the support to the GRN's recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic. The modelling generated policy options and recommendations for long-term response and recovery, with the results of the simulation incorporated into the Socio-Economic Impact Assessment of COVID-19 in Namibia (SEIAC-NAM).

Results from macroeconomic simulations also informed the GRN and UN Socio-economic Response Plan (SERP) as per the UN framework for the immediate socio-economic response to COVID-19. The implementation of SERP helped Namibia recover and mitigated the impacts of COVID-19 on vulnerable households, women, and children.

### **2.1.9 Strategic Partnerships (max 500 words)**

Throughout its implementation, the JP was catalytic in coordinating with other agencies leading to a wide range of partnerships. The JP was an opportunity for the UNCT to engage with the IFIs, (the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank Group, and the African Development Bank (AfDB)) and project collaboration with non-residence UN agencies (UNCTAD and UNECA), revealing the clear role the RCO has on the INFF (interagency coordination, UN-GRN coordination).

Specific functional partnerships involved the UNCT consultations with IMF on SDG costing for health, education, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), electricity, and road infrastructure. Such an interaction was an advanced level of collaboration beyond the UN agencies' participation in the consultation with IMF Annual Article IV missions to Namibia.

Further functional partnerships came from collaboration with UNECA (macroeconomic modelling), UNCTAD, UNODC and UNECA (the IFFs study), European Union (EU)-funded Enhancing Participatory Democracy in Namibia (EPDN) (capacity development to Members of Parliament (MPs) and the GRN staff in budget transparency), and EU and ILO's Strengthen 2 (employment impact assessments). Regional hubs of respective PUNOs also played a critical role in providing technical backstopping support and in peer reviewing the various knowledge products produced by the JP.

Bilateral agencies were also actively engaged in the programme. The GIZ, for example, funded the DFA with the UN agencies providing technical guidance. All such partnerships with other development partners (DPs) assisted in bridging gaps in financing, expertise, and confidence.

For ownership and sustainability purposes, the partnership with different GRN entities was central to JP operations. A Technical Committee under the GRN leadership led the implementation of all interventions under the JP, thus helping to maintain a high level of engagement to facilitate the GRN leadership and ownership. The key challenges to the UN-GRN strategic partnership included translating the country's regional commitments into accelerated domestication, competing priorities – with GRN devoting its energy towards the fight against COVID-19 versus JP implementation; and getting the necessary conceptualization of JP pioneering work vis-à-vis timelines for implementation.

## 2.1.10 Additional financing mobilized (max 300 words)

The JP mobilized resources within individual UN agencies, as well as from partners outside PUNOs including GIZ and the Japan's private sector for the E-Voucher initiative. The JP also leveraged resources from the EU and IMF. Examples included the IMF's SDGs costing study; the EU-funded project EPDN in delivering training sessions to the MPs and GRN staff on budget transparency; and the STRENGTHEN 2, a joint initiative of the EU and the ILO in undertaking the employment impact assessments.

Some of the JP initiatives continued to receive complementary support from other DPs. The MFPE's PPU, for instance, has secured training support on the Methodology for Assessing Procurement System (MAPS) from the World Bank, an initiative that will contribute to the development of the PPU's 5-year strategic plan. Such complementary efforts are likely to magnify the expected outcomes from the JP interventions. The Table below presents additional resources mobilized and leveraged from different partners.

Source of funding	Yes	No	Type of co-funding/co-financing	Name of organization	Amount (US\$)	Comments
Government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Donors/IFIs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-funding	GIZ	Missing information	Feasibility study of for the Integrated Financing Dashboard through sponsoring the cost of an International Consultant.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Resource leveraging	IMF	Information N/A	SDG costing that involved consultations between IMF and the UNCT.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Missing information	EU	Missing information	EPDN training MPs and GRN officials on budget transparency.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-funding	EU and ILO	200,000	Facilitating employment impact assessments.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-financing	UNECA	2,500	DSA and tickets for 3 experts to support the Macroeconomic modelling to support the designing of macroeconomic policy and national budget.
Private sector	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-financing	Japan? E-voucher	XXXX	XXXX
PUNOs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Regular internal resources	UNICEF	50,000	UNICEF mobilized US\$50,000 from its internal regular resources to contribute towards the WASH cost of inaction study.
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-funding	ILO	XXXX	XXXX
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-funding	UNFPA	XXXX	XXXX
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-funding	WFP	XXXX	XXXX
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-funding	FAO	XXXX	XXXX
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-funding	UNDP	XXXX	XXXX
Other partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				



## 2.2 Results by JP Outcome and Output

### 2.2.1 Results achieved by Fund's global results (max 500 words)

- **Joint SDG Fund Global Outcome 2: Additional financing leveraged to accelerate SDG achievement.**

*Indicator 2.1: US\$ & Ratio of financing for integrated multi-sectoral solutions leveraged disaggregated in terms of public and private sector funds: (Baseline 0%; target 5%; results 0%)*

**Too early for an assessment.** The second draft INFS was produced in July 2023 and is currently undergoing review prior to GRN's approval. The impact will be evident only after the implementation of the reforms proposed by the strategy and resources mobilized for SDG financing.

- **Joint SDG Fund Global Output 4: Integrated financing strategies for accelerating SDG progress implemented.**

*Indicator 4.1: #of integrated financing strategies/instruments that were tested: (Baseline: 0; target: 1; results: 0)*

**Too early for an assessment:** The second draft INFS was produced in July 2023 and is currently undergoing review prior to GRN's approval. The take up of the reforms and testing of the proposed instruments is after the GRN's approval of the strategy.

*Indicator 4.2: # of integrated financing strategies that have been implemented with partners in lead: (Baseline: 0; target: 1; results: 0)*

**Too early for an assessment:** Same narrative as the preceding indicator.

*Indicator 4.3: # of functioning partnership frameworks for integrated financing strategies to accelerate SDG progress: (Baseline: 0; target: 1; results: 0)*

**Too early for an assessment:** Functional partnerships were established at the first stage of INFF's building block (diagnostic and assessment). The approval of the draft INFS will kick off potential functional partnerships in terms of facilitating the proposed reforms and financial mobilization.

### 2.2.2 Results achieved by Joint Programme Outcome (max 500 words)

- **Outcome 1: By Dec. 2022 Namibia has a strong national financing architecture for the enhancement of quality and scale of financing for SDGs.**

*Indicator 1: INFF (baseline: 0; target 2022: 1)*

**Work in progress:** The INFF building block of diagnostic, and assessment has been accomplished; and the draft INFS has outlined the structures for the Governance & Coordination and Monitoring & Review.

- **Outcome 2:** Namibia's food systems are supported to be resilient and responsive to the needs of the vulnerable people.

**Work in progress.** Important prerequisite efforts have been implemented as discussed under different sections of this report.

### 2.2.3 Results achieved by Joint Programme Output (max 500 words)

- **Output 1:** By December 2022, Namibia has developed a costed financing strategy for SDG financing.

*Indicator 1.1: Number of financing strategies (Baseline: 0; target: 1)*

**Work in progress:** The second draft of the INFS is undergoing a review. It will also be deliberated at the Technical Committee level and MFPE.

*Indicator 1.2: Number of costing studies: (Baseline: 0; target: 1)*

**Achieved:** SDG costing was carried out for the five (5) sectors<sup>24</sup> and the results are published in an online IMF report.<sup>25</sup>

*Indicator 1.3: Number of SDG and sector budget analysis conducted: (Baseline: 4; target: 12)*

**Achieved:** Twelve briefs were produced (seven (7) in 2022 and five (5) in 2023) (see the list in Annex 2).

*Indicator 1.4: INFF secretariat established and operationalised: (Baseline: 0; target: 1)*

**Postponed:** The Namibia INFF envisaged two stages 1) INFF development and 2) INFF implementation. The Technical Committee guided the former, whereas the operational and governance structure for the latter is elaborated in the INFS.

- **Output 2:** By Dec. 2022 a national Public-Private sector dialogue platform for SDG financing is established and operationalized.

*Output 2.1 indicator: Public-Private sector dialogue platform: (Baseline: 0; target: 1)*

**Work in progress:** There is an ongoing joint effort by the UNCT, the Ministry of Industrialization and Trade (MIT,) and the Namibian Investment Promotion and Development Board (NIPDB) to organize an engagement with the private sector in August 2023. The JP's SDG investor map will be utilized for further engagement with the private sector.<sup>26</sup>

*Indicator 2.2: National financing dashboard developed: (Baseline: 0; target: 1)*

**Postponed:** The earlier intention to develop a financing dashboard was postponed awaiting further guidance from the INFS.

- **Output 3: By Dec. 2022 Namibia has a more transparent, gender-responsive and SDG-aligned national budget.**

*Indicator 3.1: Decentralized fiscal framework developed and implemented: (Baseline: 0; target: 1)*

**Not achieved:** The activity was discontinued, due to delayed approval of initial conceptual framework, with the remaining time too short to pull the process out.

*Indicator 3.2: Employment and gender-responsive budget guidelines developed and implemented: (Baseline: 0; target: 1)*

**Achieved:** The package consisted of 1) Pro-Employment and Gender Responsive Budgeting Toolkit (PEGRB) 2) Gender Responsive Budgeting Analytical Report (including also sexual and reproductive health rights (SRHR) 3) SRHR Thematic Brief 4) Gender Equality Thematic Brief 5) gender-responsive planning and budgeting curriculum 6) employment-related public expenditures.

*Indicator 3.3: Namibia open budget score: (Baseline: 0; target: 1)*

**Achieved:** The JP facilitated the participation of Namibia in the OBS 2021<sup>27</sup>, helped to establish a Budget Transparency Technical Team, and assisted the GRN in developing a Budget Transparency Action Plan.

- **Output 4: Strengthen the design and implementation of real-time collection, analysis and dissemination of data.**

*Output 4.1: Conduct pre- and post-implementation rapid assessments.*

This output is yet to be fulfilled as implementation of the INFS is still underway.

*Output 4.2: Strengthen of VAM and Early Warning Systems (EWS).*

**Work in progress:** The interactive IEWS prototype has been developed and in the process of being deployed on GRN servers. In the future, the platform can adopt Artificial Intelligence (AI) to generate multidimensional information to inform strategic decisions, and the delivery of GRN services.

- **Output 5: Enhance livelihoods and strengthened sustainable food systems.**

*Output 5.1: Enhance productive capacity of SHFs and their linkage to sustainable markets.*

**Work in progress:** Some of the SHFs are now producing for the market. They have also acknowledged to have learned new production techniques.

*Output 5.2: Support sustainable livelihoods and production diversification through scaling-out of CdR approach in targeted communities.*

**Achieved:** The JP through a joint UNDP/FAO delivered the CdR approach and the tailor-made Farmer Field School (FFS) training to GRN and Regional Council staff.

## 2.3 Challenges and Changes

### 2.3.1 Challenges faced by JP (max 300 words)

The key challenges to the JP were mostly related to Namibia being a pioneering country for some of the JP's interventions, the magnitude of the interventions, and the associated level of collaborations required from the GRN. The 2-year period was insufficient to deliver to the implementation stage all JP's outputs and for outcomes to emerge as well.

As a pioneer in delivering the INFF, slow buy-in from stakeholders was inevitable, which in turn compelled extensive individual consultations internally (UNCT) and externally (UN-GRN). The latter led to establishing a Technical Committee whose members benefited from several capacity strengthening through Regional Meetings (Abuja), virtual webinars and peer-to-peer learning with countries such as Nigeria, which were ahead in terms of implementation.

Other challenges included UN financial systems and regulations that raise the costs of interagency resource transfers, difficulties in recruiting the right experts for different INFF components and the delayed GRN sharing of IEWS data. The data challenge was overcome by using the available documents to identify priority data. To get the right consultants, JP perused qualified institutional contractors, which by itself took some time. Other delays were overcome by signing the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) – an example being the MAWLR/KRC/WFP MoU that facilitated disbursement of funds to the Regional Council. Also, a Technical Committee was formed to steer the implementation of JP thus helping to maintain a high level of engagement to facilitate the leadership and ownership of the GRN for the JP.

The COVID-19 disruption also constrained smooth implementation of the JP, with the JP adopting virtual work arrangements where possible. The efforts by the GRN and the UN system to craft strategies to prevent the spread of COVID-19 and mitigate its socio-economic impacts inevitably diverted attention from the JP implementation. This slowed down the programme launch, constraining the time-space for extensive consultations internally and externally including extending training offerings by adding TA.

### 2.3.2 Changes made to JP (if applicable) (max 200 words)

The JP underwent four key changes. The first change occurred in 2022 with the DEM implemented by WFP, FAO, and UNDP topping up the JP. Whereas the original JP was entirely on strengthening the financial architecture in Namibia, the DEM focused on strengthening resilient food systems in Namibia. The second change came from the addition of the Health Procurement Reforms at the GRN request and the postponement of the support to the decentralized fiscal transfer framework due to the delays in its conceptualization.

The third change refers to the JP no-cost extension from 31 May 2022 to 31 March 2023. Reasons included the delayed launch of JP, disruptions from the COVID-19 pandemic, sensitivities of activities such as the IFF estimation; and challenges in recruiting the right experts to support INFF interventions (e.g., development of the INFS). The fourth change was the relocation of the INFF process from NPC to the MFPE, justified by the latter's mandate on fiduciary aspects in Namibia. Regarding the oversight structures, the Technical Committee was considered sufficient to drive and guide the process – particularly at the stage of developing the INFF. The structure is likely to evolve at the INFF implementation stage by considering a role for a secretariat and a Steering Committee.

## 2.4 Sustainability and Country Ownership

### 2.4.1 Sustainability and country ownership (max 500 words)

As discussed in the preceding sections, a number of the JP's supported financial and non-financial related reforms are underway (IFF, procurement reforms, IEWS, etc.). These reforms are likely to be sustained for several reasons. First, some of the JP interventions came at the time the GRN was prioritizing such reforms (health sector procurement reform, for example). Second, the technologies emerging from the reforms are to be embedded within the GRN structures (IEWS prototype, for example). Third, other DPs are complementing JP's reforms, a move that is likely to magnify the impact of the JP interventions.

The fourth reason to be optimistic about the sustainability of the JP results is the investment that went into developing capacities. The highlight of the capacity development efforts was the mobilization of all the PUNO members, under the JP umbrella, in designing and delivering a capacity development programme for Parliament. It was a departure from the previous silo approaches in engaging with partners and helped advance coherence and collaboration among PUNO. The training targeted diverse topics from the gender-responsive planning and budgeting curriculum (76 MPs) and the budget transparency and oversight (60 MPs). Other beneficiaries of the JP's training included 23 SHFs, six (6) officials from MAWLR and 24 agricultural scientists.

Fifth are the pre-existing GRN instruments, for example, the Cabinet directive<sup>28</sup> for OMA to implement GRB guidelines. Depending on the GRN enforcement motivations, this particular instrument is likely to contribute towards increasing application of the PEGRB. Sixth, other tools that JP assisted in their establishment (the GRN's led technical team on budget transparency; and the budget briefs) are also likely to advance JP agenda. The budget briefs, for instance, have set in motion the motivations for reforming the budgeting architecture for Namibia, paving the way for longer-term Public Financial Management (PFM) reforms.

There are also initial signs of scalability of the JP facilitated reforms. The health sector procurement reform has incentivized the GRN to reform the overall procurement regime with expected positive spillover effects to other sectors. A further example is the ASP which has delivered a compelling case for the GRN and other partners to scale up SHF's access to GRN programmes.

The speed to which the GRN conceptualized and internalized the JP varied across interventions. It depended on the extent to which the JP deliverables would alter the status quo (use of PEGRB, for example), and the overall SDG financing architecture that differs from the past 'donor dependent' financing model under the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It is however worth mentioning that overall, the GRN buy-in was evidenced when Namibia became among the pilot countries for the INFF. This was followed by the establishment of an Oversight Committee to oversee the development of the DFA. The Committee was co-chaired by the MFPE and NPC, with a technical team led by the GRN engaged in developing the INFS.

The next step is for the UNCT to strive for a catalytic fund to facilitate the finalization, validation, GRN endorsement and implementation of the INFS. This will demand delicate navigation between GRN's priorities, project objectives, institutional mandates, and best practices to minimize the risk of resistance, particularly to the new concepts that will threaten the status quo.

## 2.5 Communications

### 2.5.1 Communication products (max 300 words)

Instead of creating another structure (a communication policy), the JP exploited the existing UN Communication Group with programme activities featuring in the overall UNCT's country reports and standalone communique.

There are several examples. The passages from the *UN Country Annual Results Report for Namibia 2022* inform the public on the JP activities particularly the efforts to develop the INFF (pages 27 and 41 of the report<sup>29</sup>) coupled with an update on JP's support to vulnerability assessment and IEWS (pages 36 and 38). The JP interventions were also reported through the SDG JP secretariat website<sup>30</sup>, accompanied by two press releases on 'Sustainable Financing Instruments for an Inclusive Recovery in Namibia'<sup>31</sup> and on 'SDG Fund on Finance Launched in Namibia'.<sup>32</sup>

Individual UN agencies also released online communique. They included UNDP communique titled 'UN Namibia Launches Joint SDG Fund'<sup>33</sup> and UNFPA's 'UN Launches Joint SDG Financing Programme for Namibia'.<sup>34</sup> Other project-specific communiques are listed in Annex 3. All these efforts were aimed at ensuring that all stakeholders are informed on all the processes and stages of programme delivery of its objectives.

### 2.5.2 Events

Type of event (Additional events are presented under Annex 5)	Yes	No	Number of events	Brief description and any highlights
JP launch event (mandatory)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	High-level national launch of the JP took place in September 2021. The event was attended by MoFPE and NPC officials, the Resident Coordinator, Heads of PUNOs, EU, CSOs, private sector, media, and the AfDB. The event raised awareness of the JP and galvanize all stakeholders towards implementation. As part of peer-to-peer learning, the Advisor to the Nigeria Minister of Finance, provided lessons learnt from the Nigerian experience. <sup>35</sup>
Annual donors' event* (mandatory)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Partners' event ** *(optional)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

\* The Fund donor countries are Denmark, European Union, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland. Please note that this event can be held together with a launch event or partners' event.  
 \*\* Key advocacy outreach events with high level JP partners.

## 2.6 Lessons and Best Practices

### 2.6.1 Key lessons learned, best practices, and recommendations on SDG financing (max 300 words)

**Lesson 1:** A solid foundation for SDG financing is ensured when programme intervention priorities coincide with the GRN prioritization of similar reforms. The JP's support to the health sector procurement reforms and the ASP are some of the examples.

**Lesson 2:** The 2-year period was too short to make significant inroads into the implementation. Thus, a longer timeframe for SDG-financing-related programmes needs to be considered, as these interventions are constrained by Government planning cycles and extensive stakeholder consultations for buy-in and implementation.

**Lesson 3:** Continued support is necessary to motivate, through the use of TA, the resource mobilization and the reform agenda documented by an INFS. The absence of continued support and regular engagement for the upcoming INFF implementation phase has a reputational risk to the UNCT.

**Lesson 4:** Countries that pioneer new global initiatives, such as INFF, require more time as they do not have the luxury of learning from other countries' experiences. Such countries need to counter reservations about interventions that beneficiary stakeholders have never experienced. Time-consuming interactions and the involvement of high-level officials of the participating ministries are key to resolving these issues.

**Lesson 5:** To consolidate and sustain capacities, complementary capacity development efforts might be necessary for the implementing ministries coupled with TA.

## 2.6.2 Key lessons learned and best practices, and recommendations on Joint Programming (max 300 words)

**Lesson 1:** Integrated programmatic support needs to take advantage of deliverables that complement each other irrespective of the agency from which the deliverables emerged. The JP's deliverables offered an opportunity to be applied as a package and augment a systemic approach to development.

**Lesson 2:** The JP is a strategic tool to contribute and benefit from interagency cohesion. As a beneficiary, the JP requires agencies to restrain from the drive to be at the front and leverage each other's value proposition and expertise to deliver UNCT-GRN joint results. As a contributor to interagency cohesion, the JP's joint programming, funding proposal and implementation helped to foster Delivering as One (DaO) and to some extent overcome fragmentation by leveraging economies of scale.

**Lesson 3:** Joint programming helps to foster greater coordination between the GRN and the UN system as it creates clear pathways for communication through the RC as a focal point for all engagements with the GRN.

**Lesson 4:** The JP is an opportunity to bring together other ongoing operations (DEM into JP). In the case of future mergers, PUNOs can develop a single programme document as a reference point to all PUNO leads. A single document will also restrain agencies from communicating with the public using programme titles that prevail prior to a merger.

**Lesson 5:** All of the JP features (INFF and non-INFF) need to be part of the same monitoring and reporting tools. The final reporting template to which this report made use is exclusively serving the INFF – making it a challenging experience to respond to the guiding questions for projects outside the INFF thematic areas.

**Lesson 6:** It is too early for a JP that was operational a later over 2-years to respond to the outcome-based evaluation questions. In advance of commissioning an evaluation assignment,

an evaluability assessment is necessary to establish whether programmes are feasible to react to outcome enquiries.



## Annex 1: Consolidated results framework

### 1. JP contribution to global programmatic results (full programme duration)

Joint SDG Fund Global Outcome 2: Additional financing leveraged to accelerate SDG achievement (Complete table below)

Indicators	Baseline 2019	Target (end of JP)	Result (end of JP)	Notes
2.1: US\$ & Ratio of financing for integrated multi-sectoral solutions leveraged disaggregated in terms of public and private sector funds	0%	5%	0%	See sub-section 2.2.

Joint SDG Fund Global Output 4: Integrated financing strategies for accelerating SDG progress implemented (Complete table below and provide details as requested)

Indicators	Baseline 2019	Targets (end of JP)	Results (end of JP)	Notes
4.1: # of integrated financing strategies/instruments that were tested	0	1	0	See sub-section 2.2.
4.2: # of integrated financing strategies that have been implemented with partners in lead.	0	1	0	See sub-section 2.2.
4.3: # of functioning partnership frameworks for integrated financing strategies to accelerate SDG progress.	0	1	0	See sub-section 2.2.

## 2. Selected global operational effectiveness indicators (full programme duration)

2.1. Did your Joint Programme contribute to the improvement of the overall UNCT coherence?

- Yes, considerably contributed  
 Yes, contributed  
 No

Explain briefly: The JP contributed to improvement of UNCT coherence. Incidents of improved coherence are presented in sub-section 2.1.6. Challenges discussed in different sections of this report.

2.2. Did your Joint Programme contribute to avoiding duplication of efforts for the participating UN agencies in interaction with national/regional and local authorities and/or public entities?

- Yes,  
 No  
 N/A (if there are no other joint programmes in the country)

Explain briefly: Duplications were avoided as evidenced by several activities that were carried out either through collaborations, co-funding or leveraging resources and expertise within UNCT, UN regional bodies and IFIs.

### 3. Results as per JP Results Framework

- Present JP results in the following template

Result / Indicators	Baseline	Original 2021 Target (as per ProDoc)	Original 2022 Target (as per ProDoc)	Revised Target (if applicable)	Result (end of JP)	Reasons for variance from original target (if any)
<b>Outcome 1: By Dec. 2022 Namibia has a strong national financing architecture for the enhancement of quality and scale of financing for SDGs.</b>						
Outcome 1 indicator: INFF	0	0	1	NA	0	See sub-section 2.2.
<b>Output 1: By December 2022, Namibia has developed a costed FS for SDG financing</b>						
Output 1.1 indicator: No. of financing strategies	0	0	1	NA	2	See sub-section 2.2.
Output 1.2: Number of costing studies	0	1	1	NA	5	See sub-section 2.2.
Output 1.3: No. of SDG and sector budget analysis conducted.	4	5	5	NA	12	See sub-section 2.2.
Output 1.4: INFF secretariat established and operationalised.	0	1	1	NA	0	
<b>Output 2: By Dec. 2022 a national Public-Private sector dialogue platform for SDG financing is established and operationalized</b>						

Output 2.1 indicator: Public-Private sector dialogue platform.	0	1	1	NA	0	See sub-section 2.2.
Output 2.2 indicator: National financing dashboard developed.	0	0	1	NA	0	See sub-section 2.2.
<b>Output 3: By Dec. 2022 Namibia has a more transparent, gender-responsive and SDG-aligned national budget</b>						
Output 3.1 indicator: Decentralized fiscal framework developed and implemented.	0	0	1	NA	0	See sub-section 2.2.
Output 3.2 indicator: Employment and gender responsive budget guidelines developed and implemented.	0	1	1	NA	1	See sub-section 2.2.
Output 3.3 indicator: Namibia open budget score.	50%	51%	55%	NA	42% (2021)	See sub-section 2.2.
<b>Outcome 2: Namibia's food systems are supported to be resilient and responsive to the needs of the vulnerable people.</b>						
<b>Output 1: Strengthen the design and implementation of real-time collection, analysis and dissemination of data.</b>						
Output 1.1: Conduct pre- and post-implementation rapid assessments.						
Output 1.2: Strengthen of VAM and Early Warning Systems (EWS).						See sub-section 2.2.
<b>Output 2: Enhance livelihoods and strengthened sustainable food systems.</b>						
Output 2.1.: Enhance productive capacity of SHFs and their linkage to sustainable markets.						See sub-section 2.2.
Output 5.2: Support sustainable livelihoods and production diversification through scaling-out of CdR approach in targeted communities.						See sub-section 2.2.

## Annex 2: List of strategic documents

### 1. Strategic documents that were produced by the JP

Title of the document	Date (month; year) when finalized	Document type (policy/strategy, assessment, guidance, training material, methodology etc.)	Brief description of the document and the role of the JP in finalizing it
National Budget Brief for Namibia for 2022/23	June 2022	Assessment	<p><b>Description:</b> This budget analysis interrogates the budget assumptions and tracks revenue and expenditure trends including expenditure composition, execution rates and debt sustainability. This brief corresponds to output 1.3 of the JP. The JP provided technical and financial support.</p> <p><b>Key findings:</b> Whereas nominal revenue is projected to increase, the real revenue outturn is on a declining trend risking the GRN's capacity to meet the financing needs of its development priorities including the SDGs in the short to medium term. The social sectors take up a significant share of the budget (49.5%) a necessary move to address multidimensional poverty. Overall budget execution remains high, in line with the PEFA standards. Key challenges include high recurrent spending leaving a small budget share to development spending; declining spending in growth-enhancing capital investments; relatively low budget credibility of the development spending; and inequity allocation to LARCs. Fiscal consolidation remains necessary (including cutting back on costly subsidies to SOEs); strengthen spending efficiencies and reprioritize spending towards high-impact and people-centred interventions; diversifying revenue collection through tax reforms (innovative and digital financing products).</p>
Namibia Education Budget Brief for 2022/23	June 2022	Assessment	<p><b>Description:</b> The brief assesses the extent to which the 2022/23 National Budget addresses the education financing needs for children in Namibia. It focuses on the size, equity, credibility, and composition of the education budget. The analysis also benchmarks the budget against other countries. The brief corresponds to output 1.3 of the JP. The JP provided technical and financial support.</p> <p><b>Key findings:</b> The education sector takes up a significant share of the national budget (20.7%), which accounts for 7.8% of GDP and averages US\$1,190 per learner. This high spending needs to be sustained for Namibia to achieve SDG 4 and help recovery from pandemic-related learning losses. Key challenges include high learner repetition rates, relatively low allocation and execution of the development budget, inequalities in education sector outcomes along geographical, socio-economic and disability status. The need for spending efficiencies cannot be over-emphasized, given fiscal space constraints emanating from the COVID-19 pandemic and other emergencies.</p>

Namibia Health Budget Brief for 2022/23	June 2022	Assessment	<p><b>Description:</b> The brief assesses the extent to which the 2022/23 National Budget addresses the health financing needs of children in Namibia. It focuses on the size, equity, credibility, and composition of the health budget by programmes and diseases. The analysis also benchmarks the budget against other countries. This brief corresponds to output 1.3 of the JP. The JP provided technical and financial support.</p> <p><b>Key findings:</b> National health spending accounts for 16.6% of the national budget exceeding the AU member states commitment of 15%. Average per capita spending stands at US\$407 (N\$6,500.00), one of the highest in the Southern African Development Community (SADC) region. Key challenges are noted in the areas of spending inequalities along geographical lines, relatively low execution rates, and allocation to development spending, shortages of critical staff, including doctors and specialists.</p>
Assessing the cost of inaction on Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) in Namibia	June 2023	Study	<p><b>Description:</b> Estimate the cost (financial and economic) of inaction in the WASH sector that is, the socio-economic (health, nutritional status, lives lost/premature death, lost productivity, education, time costs, and an overall loss in GDP) and environmental costs of not investing in WASH. The study provides estimates of the financial (direct) and economic (opportunity) costs of inadequate WASH.</p> <p><b>Key findings:</b> Namibia loses an estimated N\$15.6 billion a year because of poor WASH services and behavior (based on 2023 prices). That equates to approximately 6.4% of the of the estimated GDP for 2023, with WASH sector urban area costs totaling 1.7% of GDP and rural areas 4.6% of GDP. The annual economic and financial contributions of inadequate WASH sector costs are estimated at N\$14.9 billion and N\$627.3 million, respectively. The annual average (across urban and rural) per capita cost of inadequate WASH is estimated at N\$5,976.</p>
Namibia Social Protection Budget Brief for 2022/23	June 2022	Assessment	<p><b>Description:</b> The brief analyzes the extent to which the 2022/23 National Budget responds to the social protection needs of children in Namibia. It discusses the evolution of social protection financing and composition and the disaggregation of spending between adults and children. This brief corresponds to output 1.3 of the JP. The JP provided technical and financial support.</p> <p><b>Key findings:</b> Namibia's investment in non-contributory social protection is relatively high (9.2% of the national budget and 3.3% of GDP). Key challenges include spending inefficiencies, limited deployment of the Integrated Management Information System (IMIS) for social protection, a weak link between social cash transfers and services, spending that is disproportionately skewed towards adults. Loss of value of child grant due to inflation, reducing its impact on child poverty.</p>
Namibia Development Finance Assessment Report	September 2019	Assessment	<p><b>Description:</b> The main objectives of the Development Finance Assessment exercise were twofold: first, to provide the GRN with an understanding of existing development finance flows and underlying policies and institutions, provide a framework for mobilizing domestic and international resources. The second objective was to develop recommendations that will guide the design of an INFF which encompasses these flows.</p> <p><b>Headline recommendations:</b> 1) Establish a holistic FS 2) Deepen domestic resource mobilization 3) Strengthen and promote private sector development 4) Strategic use of ODA and new sources of financing 5) Strengthen monitoring and evaluation 6) Improve accountability and enforcement mechanism 7) Making the existing dialogue architecture more inclusive.</p>

INFF Roadmap: INFF Development and Implementation	July 2021	Roadmap	<p><b>Description:</b> The roadmap was developed in 2019 together with the DFA and revised in 2021 and adopted by the GRN through the cabinet in the same year. The roadmap informs the remaining three INFF building blocks of financing strategy, the M&amp;R, and the governance and coordination, including proposed timelines. The JP provided technical and financial support.</p> <p><b>Key findings:</b> The roadmap's proposed timeline covers a period of 37 weeks for activities such as identification of financing needs, aligning needs and options, drafting of implementation plan; establishment of implementation bodies and establishing the monitoring and review bodies and processes.</p>
SDG Investor Map 2021 Report for Namibia	November 2021	Assessment	<p><b>Description:</b> The Map aims to document market-specific investment opportunities to deploy SDG-aligned capital.</p> <p><b>Key findings:</b> The Map has identified 13 impact-driven Investment Opportunity Areas (IOAs) across the five priority sectors of infrastructure, agriculture, services, education, and health. Other IOAs are listed as "marginal". They have either 1) strong impact and social return but negative return on capital, 2) lack of tangible feasibility data to estimated return profile; and or 3) current regulatory bottlenecks preventing scale in that sector. These marginal IOAs some of which require further feasibility studies include water and sanitation provision in low-income areas.</p>
Evaluating E-voucher End Users experiences and establishing a Cost Benefit Analysis for upscaling to implement Social Protection Programs in Namibia.	July 2023	Research	<p><b>Description:</b> The objectives of the study were to assess desirability, technical feasibility, and viability of using the tool by analysing the impact considering elements such as qualitative and quantitative data points such real time verification, generation of database, blending of financial resources, efficiencies, incentives for targeted beneficiaries and outlets partnerships; as well as end user experience.</p> <p><b>Key findings:</b> Strong evidence that E-voucher improves transparency and accountability. It has facilitated documentation of critical beneficiaries' data and was able to document the spending by each beneficiary card, including all expenditures per region and retailer. Such information enabled financial records keeping, clearly indicating balance of each card and balance per region during the project cycle. It has also facilitated financial reconciliation.</p>

2. Strategic documents to which the JP directly contributed to

Title of the document	Date (month; year) when finalized	Document type (policy/strategy, assessment, guidance, training material, methodology etc.)	Brief description of the document and the role of the JP in finalizing it
Audit of the Alignment of The Sustainable Development	June 2023	Assessment	<p><b>Description:</b> The main objective of the audit was to determine the level of financial support for the implementation of the 17 SDGs in Namibia, by undertaking both historical and forward-looking analyses of the national budget.</p>

Goals (SDG) in the Fiscal Framework (National Budget) of the GRN			<p><b>Key findings:</b> SDGs are not yet fully domesticated into the NDP 5, and into the national budget. There are no systematic SDG costing tools in place for more accurate SDG costing; significant financing gaps exist; national budget crowded out by recurrent spending and inadequate capital investments for SDGs. Key recommendations include training to ensure adequate resource allocations and tracking; substantial increases in domestic resource mobilization to meet SDG financing needs; review SDG alignment to the NDP5; develop and integrate SDG budget coding to track SDG expenditure; and establish formal SDG budget implementation and monitoring arrangements.</p>
Namibia Expenditure in 2030 to support the SDG (SDG Costing)	May 2023	Assessment	<p><b>Description:</b> An assessment of the spending in Namibia associated with making substantial progress along the SDGs for human and physical capital development.</p> <p><b>Key findings:</b> To make substantial progress in critical SDG sectors in Namibia would require additional annual spending of about 6.5% of GDP by 2030. Priority spending include expanding the supply of medical staff while ramping up efficiency (health); reprioritizing expenditures and making them more efficient (education); investing to end open defecation and improve sanitation (Water, sanitation, and hygiene); increasing domestic capacity to serve half the population without access (electricity); and gradually increasing rural access (roads).</p>
Namibia Social Protection Policy	March 2022	Policy	<p><b>Description:</b> The Policy aims to build a comprehensive social protection system that addresses risks and vulnerabilities throughout a person's life cycle, ensuring that no one is left behind. The JP provided financial and technical support towards the policy finalization.</p> <p><b>Key findings:</b> The Policy puts emphasis on ensuring the various vulnerabilities faced by people from childhood to old-age are addressed through many measures, among which are: strengthen, sustain and increase existing grants; improve the inclusion of marginalised communities and people with disabilities; create employment and empower women and youth; improve TVET and tertiary education financial assistance; and increase poor and vulnerable people's access to affordable housing.</p>
2021 Open Budget Survey (OBS)	May 2022	Assessment	<p><b>Description:</b> Global independent fact-based research instrument that uses internationally accepted criteria to assess public access and participation in GRN budget process, and the role of budget oversight institutions. The JP through UNICEF provided financial and technical support towards the survey and compilation of the report.</p> <p><b>Key findings:</b> Transparency score of 42 (out of 100) (2021) a decline from 51 (2019). The score ranks Namibia as 72 out of 120 countries, the score that is better than Botswana, Eswatini, Angola, Lesotho, Malawi, and Zambia, and worse than South Africa, Zimbabwe, and Mozambique. The declining trend was largely an outcome of failing to publish the Year-End Report online in a timely manner.</p>
Gender-Responsive Integrated National Financing Strategy (Draft)	May 2023	Strategy	<p><b>Description:</b> The main objective of the FS was to highlight potential areas of policy and regulatory reforms and business processes that are necessary for Namibia to tap financial resources necessary to accelerate SDGs implementation.</p>

			<p><b>Key findings:</b> In addition to the highlights of ongoing reforms, the draft INFS identifies a total of 45 measures under the domestic public finance quadrant, 37 measures under the domestic private finance quadrant, 14 measures under the international public finance quadrant, and 15 measures under the international private finance quadrant. The FS also presents proposals for the governance and coordination building block of the INFF (Including institutional roles and responsibilities)</p>
Digital Financing for Sustainable Development: An Ecosystem Assessment and Strategy for Namibia.	March 2022	Assessment and strategy	<p><b>Description:</b> The assessment mapped the digital finance landscape of Namibia to define gaps and provide policy options to improve the digital finance ecosystem of Namibia,</p> <p><b>Key findings:</b> The assessment advocates for advancing the digital finance infrastructure, innovate in DFS, implement catalytic projects and policy initiatives specifically those aligned with sustainable development. A roadmap is presented to address key reforms areas in digital finance infrastructure, policy and regulations, and innovative ecosystem. The role of JP in the assessment and strategy development include financing the work of the consultant and providing process and technical oversight, feedback.</p>
Counting the Cost: Defining, estimating, and disseminating statistics on illicit financial flows in Africa (ECA and UNCTAD).	September 2022	Research Report	<p><b>Description:</b> Namibia was included in the study together with other 10 African countries. The study defines, estimates, and disseminates statistics on IFF. This initiative also aimed at strengthening the statistical capacity of African countries and empowered them to develop more effective policies for measuring and tackling these flows.</p> <p><b>Key findings:</b> The IFF study estimates, for the period 2021-2022, the inward IFFs flows at US\$ 4.5 billion and US\$ 34.1 billion (statistical, and market price methods respectively) and US\$ 19.6 billion and US\$ 4.7 billion (statistical and market price methods respectively).<sup>36</sup> The JP through UNICEF provided technical and financial support for the analysis.</p>
Gender Responsive Budgeting Analyses: Analytical Report (draft)	March 2023	Research Report	<p><b>Description:</b> The exercise looked at the responsiveness of the budget on gender equality and SRHR from FY 2019/20 as a comparison with pre-COVID-19 situation till FY 2022/23).</p> <p><b>Key findings:</b> Policy commitments relevant to gender equality across different legislation, policies/frameworks and strategies have not been effectively translated into concrete actions; customary law continues to have predominance over statutory law especially in matters related to women's property rights; GRB guidelines d have yet to be integrated into the PFM reforms, and the MTEF; inadequate allocation of resources to the key ministries implementing programmes on GE and SRHR has restricted a broader reach of these activities.</p>
Thematic Brief: Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) (Draft)	March 2023	Research Report	<p><b>Key messages:</b> 3 out of 10 girls drop out of school due teenage pregnancy, which is 23.3% of all recorded dropout cases; 33% of married women aged 15-49 have experienced physical, sexual and/or emotional violence from their partner; gender-based violence and HIV are mutually reinforcing epidemics and of the 8.7% population living with HIV<sup>37</sup>, the prevalence rate among women is 15.7% as compared to 9.3% among men; Despite the significant impact of spending on sexual and reproductive health needs in the health sector budget, under and inadequate fundings are common.</p>



Thematic Brief: Gender Equality (GE) (draft)	March 2023	Research Report	<p><b>Key messages:</b> Gender norms and gender-specific roles are entrenched in discriminatory socio-cultural practices and traditions; They undermine women’s rights, financial independence and bodily autonomy and results in a high incidence of gender-based violence (GBV); as important milestones are being achieved for the promotion of gender equality, significant challenges remain (maternal mortality ratio is still high, there is a high incidence of teenage pregnancy and GBV, and under-representation of women in decision-making positions).</p>
PEGRB toolkit.	March 2023	Toolkit	<p><b>Description:</b> The toolkit intends to mainstream employment and gender strategies into national planning, budget programming, and monitoring and evaluation systems. The end goal is to ensure public expenditure is consistent with employment and gender strategies. The JP through ILO provided financial and towards the development of the toolkit.</p> <p><b>Key content:</b> The toolkit is organized around 7 modules. Module 1 (objectives); Module 2 (template linking budget programs to employment and gender outcomes); Module 3 (performance indicators); Module 4 (methodology); Module 5 (guidelines to conduct cost-benefit analysis of employment and gendered focused interventions); Module 6 (M&amp;E guidelines); Module 7 (templates for formulation and implementation of a PEGRB).</p>
Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting Curriculum for The Republic of Namibia	March 2022	Curriculum	<p><b>Description:</b> This curriculum intends to provide participants with knowledge and skills for implementing Cabinet Decision No. 2nd/11.03.14/007, where all OMAs ought to comply with GRB guidelines. The JP through ILO provided financial and towards the development of the curriculum.</p> <p><b>Key objectives:</b> 1) to increase the proportion of female civil servants with capacity to apply Gender Responsive Planning And Budgeting (GRPB) in sector planning and budgeting, 2) to attain an increase in the no. of central and local GRN agencies with gender responsive programmes and plans, 3) to achieve an increase in the no. of cabinet and parliamentary proceedings focusing on financing for gender laws, programmes and accountability for public resources, 4) to support NIPAM to become a centre of excellence on GRPB within the SADC region and beyond.</p>
Employment Sector Public Expenditure Review (PER)	December 2021	Assessment	<p><b>Description:</b> The PER assesses employment-related public expenditures from 2015-2021. It identified main funding gaps and issues related to resource allocation including implicit in relation to the 2<sup>nd</sup> National Employment Strategy (NES2) and allocative efficiency. The JP through ILO provided financial and towards the development of the PER.</p> <p><b>Key findings:</b> To achieve a modest reduction in unemployment rates by 2030, the country needs to grow at 7% per year, and mobilize more public and private investments. Labor productivity, particularly in agriculture, has to increase as well as an increase in employment-related sectoral and regional expenditures by some 3 percentage points of GDP. To improve the labor market opportunities, the country would need to increase expenditures in labor policies by 1 percentage point of GDP (including reforming and expanding the coverage of active labor market programs and setup a national public works program).</p>

## Annex 3. Communications materials

### 1. *Human interest story*

Loise Garosas from Rundu, Kavango East Region in Namibia is one of the beneficiaries of Namibia's first digital agriculture (E-Voucher) granting initiative.

**“I can say that this e-Voucher card has taken me from depression to success. I have been able to employ people to build three chicken coops in such a short time and also place an order for my chickens. I just had to take my card to the agricultural dealer outlets and used my e-voucher card to order what I need, and it was delivered here. Simple as that!”**

When Loise first thought about raising chickens, her goal was to improve the nutrition of her family. She felt that if she could at least provide her children with nutritious food through the chicken eggs, she would be contributing something to the well-being of her family.

**“I had lost all hope and I was seriously depressed. I did not have my job again and my small business was liquidating the little money our family was surviving from. My husband was the only one supporting me and our children and it was becoming too much for him.”**

Loise first started with seven (7) chickens in her backyard in Kaisosi, a neighborhood in Rundu. She found herself spending more time in her backyard coop, and as she spent more time with the chickens, she learned to understand their behaviors so that she could take better care of them. She learned to spot a sickly chicken in time to quickly isolate it from the others to prevent the sickness from spreading to the others.

**“It was tough at first even with just a few chickens, because I did not know much about raising chickens, but I persevered because it gave me something to put my mind into. At least I was doing something instead of feeling depressed and hopeless”**

Loise's dedication to her chickens paid off and she was able to start giving her children eggs for breakfast and even had a few to share with her neighbors. As she started to experience the benefits of raising chickens, her passion for poultry farming increased. However, without access to finance, which is one of the major barriers to increasing agricultural productivity for smallholder farmers in Namibia, Loise felt stuck.

**“I am so excited because I have finished building three chicken coops and I have transferred the chickens from my backyard into one. Tomorrow I am expecting to receive 100 broilers, 20 guinea fowls and 12 Geese.”**

Using the grant she received through the e-voucher card, Loise has been able to bring her dreams of becoming a poultry farmer to reality.

**“I made good profit from the little chicken I had before, so you can imagine what I will do with the additional that I was able to buy with my e-voucher card. I can also employ more people in my community to help me with the work. My sincere thank you goes to the people of Japan and UNDP Namibia; I can now call myself a poultry farmer!”**

2. *Communication products*

Title of the document	Date when finalized (MM/YY)	Brief description and hyperlink (if it exists)
2022 UN Country Annual Results Report for Namibia.	March 2022	Page 27, 36, 38 and 41 of the report. The report informs the public on the JP interventions to support the establishment of INFF, IEWS and the undertaking on vulnerability assessment. <a href="https://namibia.un.org/sites/default/files/2022-09/2021%20UN%20Country%20Annual%20Results%20Report%20Namibia.pdf">https://namibia.un.org/sites/default/files/2022-09/2021%20UN%20Country%20Annual%20Results%20Report%20Namibia.pdf</a>
UNDP Namibia’s press release: UN Namibia Launches Joint SDG Fund	September 2021	Announced the launch of the JP programme to a larger audience within and outside Namibia. <a href="https://www.undp.org/namibia/news/un-namibia-launches-joint-sdg-fund">https://www.undp.org/namibia/news/un-namibia-launches-joint-sdg-fund</a>
UNFPA Namibia’s press release: UN launches Joint SDG financing programme for Namibia	September 2021	Announced the launch of the JP programme to a larger audience within and outside Namibia. <a href="https://namibia.unfpa.org/en/news/un-launches-joint-sdg-financing-programme-namibia">https://namibia.unfpa.org/en/news/un-launches-joint-sdg-financing-programme-namibia</a>
Sustainable Financing Instruments for an Inclusive Recovery in Namibia	April 2022	Informing the audience on the UN training with the event mentioning on the SDG JP for Namibia. <a href="https://joinsdggfund.org/article/sustainable-financing-instruments-inclusive-recovery-namibia">https://joinsdggfund.org/article/sustainable-financing-instruments-inclusive-recovery-namibia</a>
SDG Fund on Finance Launched in Namibia	October 2021	Announced the launch of the JP programme to a larger audience within and outside Namibia. <a href="https://joinsdggfund.org/article/sdg-fund-finance-launched-namibia">https://joinsdggfund.org/article/sdg-fund-finance-launched-namibia</a>
First digital agriculture solution for improving distribution of quality agricultural inputs launched.	February 2022	<a href="https://economist.com.na/67922/community-and-culture/first-digital-agriculture-solution-for-improving-distribution-of-quality-agricultural-inputs-launched/">https://economist.com.na/67922/community-and-culture/first-digital-agriculture-solution-for-improving-distribution-of-quality-agricultural-inputs-launched/</a>
MAWLR and UNDP Namibia Introduce Innovative e-Voucher Agriculture and Food Granting Solution for Resilience and Food Security to Recover from COVID-19 and Related Shocks.	December 2021	<a href="https://www.undp.org/namibia/press-releases/mawlr-and-undp-namibia-introduce-innovative-e-voucher-agriculture-and-food-granting-solution-resilience-and-food-security">https://www.undp.org/namibia/press-releases/mawlr-and-undp-namibia-introduce-innovative-e-voucher-agriculture-and-food-granting-solution-resilience-and-food-security</a>
New Digital Solution Supports Smallholder Farmers to Access Finance	May 2022	<a href="https://www.undp.org/namibia/stories/new-digital-solution-supports-smallholder-farmers-access-finance">https://www.undp.org/namibia/stories/new-digital-solution-supports-smallholder-farmers-access-finance</a>

Hardap gets urban agri-grant e-vouchers	March 2022	<a href="https://www.namibian.com.na/hardap-gets-urban-agri-grant-e-vouchers-2/">https://www.namibian.com.na/hardap-gets-urban-agri-grant-e-vouchers-2/</a>
Local authorities receive N\$2 million for urban agriculture.	March 2022	<a href="https://neweralive.na/posts/local-authorities-receive-n2-million-for-urban-agriculture">https://neweralive.na/posts/local-authorities-receive-n2-million-for-urban-agriculture</a>

## Annex 4: Stakeholder feedback

No	Name of entity	Name of Representative	Title	Contact information	Role in the programme	Summary of feedback <sup>38</sup>
1.	MFPE - PPU	Mr. Francois Brand	Deputy Executive Director & Head	Francois.Brand@mfpe.gov.na	GRN counterpart in the JP support to the health sector procurement reforms.	
2.	UNICEF	Mr. Jacob Nyamadzawo	Social Policy Manager	jnyamadzawo@unicef.org	PUNO Focal Point - UNICEF	
3.	WFP	Mr. Ndaindila Haindongo	Head of Programme	ndaindila.haindongo@wfp.org	Food System Manager	
4.	ILO	Ms. Natalia Halweendo	National Program Coordinator	halweendo@ilo.org	PUNO Focal Point - ILO	
5.	Ministry of Agriculture, Water, and Land Reform	Mr. Ngujama Tjirora	Agricultural Scientific Officer	Ngujama.Tjirora@mawfr.gov.na	GRN Focal Point for the JP support to the ASP	
6.	UNDP	Ms. Irish Goroh	Programme Specialist	irish.goroh@undp.org	Programme Coordinator	
7.	WFP	Mr. Joab Selelya	Consultant Information Technology	Joab.selelya@wfp.org		
8.	UNDP	Mr. Wilmot A. Reeves	Economic Advisor	wilmot.reeves@undp.org	PUNO Focal Point - UNDP	
9.	FAO	Mr. Gift Kamupingene	National Project Coordinator	gift.Kamupingene@fao.org	PUNO Focal Point - FAO	
10.	RCO	Ms. Eunice Ajambo	Economist and Development Coordination Officer	ajambo@un.org	PUNO Focal Point - RCO	

11.	NPC	Ms. Lydia Mubita		LMubita@npc.gov.na	GRN counterpart in the JP's support to NPC	
12.	UNFPA	Ms. Sofia Nambahu	Development Finance Specialist	nambahu@unfpa.org	UNFPA	
13.	WFP	Mr. Michael Field	M&E Assistant	michael.field@wfp.org	WFP	
14.	NPC	Mr. Christof Kalumbu	Economist	CKalumbu@npc.gov.na	Macroeconomic Modelling training beneficiary	

## Annex 5: Events

Type of event	JP related deliverable	Date	Brief description
Workshop	Digital Finance Ecosystem Assessment and Strategy.	March 2022	Validation of the draft report
Training of smallholder farmers on good agricultural practices in Kunene Region	Capacity strengthening and resilience building	April 2023	In collaboration with the Kunene Regional Council, MAWLR conducted training for 25 SHF (16 women, 9 men) on good agricultural practices. The training workshop aimed at improving crop production knowledge and skills among SHF, especially women.
Training	Strengthening Budget Transparency and oversight	January & February 2022	Enhance the capacities of MPs on gender responsive and pro-employment budgeting.
Workshop	Develop easy to use guidelines implementation of employment centered and gender responsive budgets	January & March 2023	Validate the budget toolkit modules aiming at enhancing capacities amongst stakeholders.
Training	Capacity development on employment and gender responsive budgeting for MPs, national and regional stakeholders.	March 2022 & April 2023	Develop capacity and awareness of the NEP development process among key senior officials across GRN and social partners.

## Annex 6:

SDGs indicators	Baseline	Expected target (2022)	Actual results achieved/to be achieved in the near future	Reasons for deviation from targets if any
<b>Goal 1. No poverty:</b> 1.a Ensure significant mobilization of resources from a variety of sources (1.a.1; 1.a.2).				
1.a.1 Total official development assistance grants from all donors that focus on poverty reduction as a share of the recipient country's gross national income TIER III.	No baseline <sup>39</sup>	Targets not defined in the programme document	Not reported in the VNR 2021 nor in the UN SDG database	Targets not defined in the programme document
1.a.2 Proportion of total government spending on essential services (education, health, and social protection)	No baseline <sup>40</sup>	Targets not defined in the programme document	Education (20.7% <sup>41</sup> ); Health (16.6% <sup>42</sup> ); Social protection (9.2% <sup>43</sup> ); (FY 2022/23)	Targets not defined in the programme document
1.b Create sound policy frameworks at the national, regional, and international levels, to support accelerated investment in poverty eradication actions (1.b.1).				
1.b.1 Pro-poor public social spending.	Baseline not defined in the NPC (2021)	1	20.27% (2020) <sup>44</sup>	The target of '1' but reported as a % in NPC (2012).
<b>Goal 2. Zero hunger:</b> Increase investment to enhance agricultural productive capacity in developing countries <sup>45</sup> (2.a.1; 2.a.2:).				
2.a.1 The agriculture orientation index for government expenditures.	2.04% (2015) <sup>46</sup>	0.35	1.59% (2021) <sup>47</sup>	The target of 0.35 was incorrect below the baseline value.
2.a.2 Total official flows (official development assistance plus other official flows) to the agriculture sector.	18.76% (2015) <sup>48</sup>	17.0	16.84% (2021) <sup>49</sup>	Marginal decline. Namibia is UMIC with limited access to ODA
<b>Goal 5. Gender equality:</b> 5.c Adopt and strengthen policies and enforceable legislation for gender equality (5.c.1)				
5.c.1 Proportion of countries with systems to track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment.	Baseline not defined in the NPC (2021)	1 (Yes)	Yes (2020 <sup>50</sup> ). The indicator is listed in the NPC (2021) but not in the SDG Indicator Database	Target achieved.
<b>Goal 8. Decent Work and Economic Growth:</b> 8.5. By 2030, achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value (8.5.2).				
8.5.2 Unemployment rate, by sex, age and persons with disabilities.	Male (24.3%) Female (31.7%) <sup>51</sup>	24%	All (33.4%); Male (32.5%); Female (34.3%) <sup>52</sup> (2018)	Not achieved. Economic

SDGs indicators	Baseline	Expected target (2022)	Actual results achieved/to be achieved in the near future	Reasons for deviation from targets if any
	2016			contractions as discussed in section 1 of this report.
<b>Goal 9. Industry, innovation and infrastructure:</b> 9.a Facilitate sustainable and resilient infrastructure development in developing countries through enhanced financial, technological and technical support to African countries (9.a.1)				
9.a.1 Total official international support (official development assistance plus other official flows) to infrastructure.	US\$ 108.51 (2015) <sup>53</sup> US\$ 117.2 million (2015) <sup>54</sup>	US\$ 250.0 million	US\$ 67.3 million (2018) <sup>55</sup> US\$ 74.5 million (2021) <sup>56</sup>	Namibia is UMIC with limited access to ODA
<b>Goal 10. Reduced inequalities:</b> 10.b Encourage official development assistance and financial flows, including Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), to States where the need is greatest (10.b.1) o 10.c By 2030, reduce to less than 3 per cent the transaction costs of migrant remittances and eliminate remittance corridors with costs higher than 5 per.				
10.b.1 Total resource flows for development, by recipient and donor countries and type of flow (e.g., official development assistance, FDI and other flows).	US\$ 270.90 million (2015) <sup>57</sup>	US\$ 500 million	US\$ -38.77 million (2021) <sup>58</sup>	Namibia is UMIC with limited access to ODA
10.c.1: Average remittance costs of sending \$200 to a receiving country as a proportion of the amount remitted (%)	27.6 (2017) <sup>59</sup>	Targets not defined in the programme document.	NA	Targets not defined in the programme document.
10.c.1: Average remittance costs of sending \$200 in a corridor as a proportion of the amount remitted (%)	NA <sup>60</sup>	Targets not defined in the programme document.	NA	Targets not defined in the programme document.
10.c.1: SmaRT average remittance costs of sending \$200 in a corridor as a proportion of the amount remitted (%)	NA <sup>61</sup>	Targets not defined in the programme document.	NA	Targets not defined in the programme document.
Average remittance costs of sending \$200 for a sending country as a proportion of the amount remitted (%).	NA <sup>62</sup>	Targets not defined in the programme document.	NA	Targets not defined in the programme document.
<b>Goal 13. Climate action:</b> 13.2 Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning.				

<b>SDGs indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected target (2022)</b>	<b>Actual results achieved/to be achieved in the near future</b>	<b>Reasons for deviation from targets if any</b>
13.2.1 Number of countries with nationally determined contributions, long- term strategies, national adaptation plans and adaptation communications, as reported to the UNFCCC secretariat.	Yes (2015) <sup>63</sup>	Yes	Yes (2020) <sup>64</sup>	Target achieved.
<b>Goal 15. Life on land:</b> 15.a Mobilize and significantly increase financial resources from all sources to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity and ecosystems (15.a.1)				
15.a.1 (a) Official development assistance on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.	Indicator 15.a.1 (a) US\$ 17.64 million (2015) <sup>65</sup>	Target not defined in the programme document	Indicator 15.a.1 (a) US\$ 25.89 million (2021) <sup>66</sup>	Target not defined in the programme document
15.a.1 (b) Revenue generated and finance mobilized from biodiversity-relevant economic instruments.	NA	Target not defined in the programme document	NA	Target not defined in the programme document
<b>Goal 16. Peace, justice and strong institutions:</b> 16.4 By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime (16.5.1; 16.5.2).				
16.5.1 Proportion of persons who had at least one contact with a public official and who paid a bribe to a public official or were asked for a bribe by those public officials, during the previous 12 months.	81.2% for Govt officials and 69.5% for traditional leaders (2018) (16.5.1) <sup>67</sup>	Targets not defined in the programme document.	NA. The Afrobarometer SDG 16 scorecard for Namibia's Performance worsened by >3 percentage points between the surveys in 2014/2015 and 2019/2021.	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.5.2 Proportion of businesses that had at least one contact with a public official and that paid a bribe to a public official or were asked for a bribe by those public officials during the previous 12 months.	9.1% (2014) (16.5.2) <sup>68</sup>	Targets not defined in the programme document.	NA	Targets not defined in the programme document.
<b>16.6 Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels (16.6.1; 16.6.2)</b>				
16.6.1 Primary government expenditures as a proportion of original approved budget, by sector (or by budget codes or similar).	98.3% (2015) <sup>69</sup>	100%	99.9% <sup>70</sup> (2020).	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.6.2 Proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services.	NA	Target not defined in the programme document.	NA	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7 Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels (16.7.1 and 16.7.2)				



SDGs indicators	Baseline	Expected target (2022)	Actual results achieved/to be achieved in the near future	Reasons for deviation from targets if any
16.7.1 Number of chairs of permanent committees, by age sex and focus of the committee, Joint Committees	NA	The target was incorrectly set as 'Yes' instead of a number.	NA	The target was incorrectly set as 'Yes' instead of a number.
16.7.1 Ratio for female members of parliaments (Ratio of the proportion of women in parliament in the proportion of women in the national population with the age of eligibility as a lower bound boundary), Lower Chamber or Unicameral	0.8363 (2021)	Targets not defined in the programme document.	0.8343 (2023)	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7.1 Number of speakers in parliament, by age and sex, Lower Chamber or Unicameral	1 (2021)	Targets not defined in the programme document.	1 (2023)	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7.1 Number of chairs of permanent committees, by age sex and focus of the committee, Lower Chamber or Unicameral	Human rights (1) 2021 Foreign affairs and defence (1) 2021 Finance (1) 2021 Gender equality (1) 2021	Targets not defined in the programme document.	Human rights (1) 2023 Foreign affairs and defence (1) 2023 Finance (1) 2023 Gender equality (1) 2023	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7.1 Ratio for female members of parliaments (Ratio of the proportion of women in parliament in the proportion of women in the national population with the age of eligibility as a lower bound boundary), Upper Chamber	0.2701 (2021)	Targets not defined in the programme document.	0.2695 (2023)	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7.1 Number of speakers in parliament, by age and sex, Upper Chamber.	46+ Male: 1 (2021)	Targets not defined in the programme document.	1 (2023)	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7.1 Number of chairs of permanent committees, by age sex and focus of the committee, Upper Chamber.	Male: 1 (2021)	Targets not defined in the programme document.	1 (2023)	Targets not defined in the programme document.

<b>SDGs indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected target (2022)</b>	<b>Actual results achieved/to be achieved in the near future</b>	<b>Reasons for deviation from targets if any</b>
16.7.1 Ratio of young members in parliament (Ratio of the proportion of young members in parliament (age 45 or below) in the proportion of the national population (age 45 or below) with the age of eligibility as a lower bound boundary), Lower Chamber or Unicameral	NA	Targets not defined in the programme document.	0.4149 (2023)	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7.1 Proportion of youth in parliament (age 45 or below), Lower Chamber or Unicameral (%)	NA	Targets not defined in the programme document.	28.71 (2023)	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7.1 Number of youth in parliament (age 45 or below), Lower Chamber or Unicameral (Number)	NA	Targets not defined in the programme document.	29 (2023)	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7.1 Ratio of young members in parliament (Ratio of the proportion of young members in parliament (age 45 or below) in the proportion of the national population (age 45 or below) with the age of eligibility as a lower bound boundary), Upper Chamber	0.3237 (2021)	Targets not defined in the programme document.	0.3441 (2023)	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7.1 Proportion of youth in parliament (age 45 or below), Upper Chamber (%)	23.08 (2021)	Targets not defined in the programme document.	23.81 (2023)	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7.1 Number of youth in parliament (age 45 or below), Upper Chamber (Number)	6 (2021)	Targets not defined in the programme document.	10 (2023)	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7.1 Proportions of positions in the public service compared to national distributions (ratio)	Senior Government Officials (NA) Total national-level public service personnel (NA)	Targets not defined in the programme document.	Senior Government Officials (1.27: 2022) Total national-level public service personnel (1.26: 2022)	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7.1 Proportions of positions in the judiciary compared to national distributions (ratio)	Both sexes: Registrar (NA)	Targets not defined in the programme document.	Both sexes: Registrar (1.18: 2022) Female: Judges (0.7: 2022) Female: Registrar (1.66: 2022)	Targets not defined in the programme document.

<b>SDGs indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected target (2022)</b>	<b>Actual results achieved/to be achieved in the near future</b>	<b>Reasons for deviation from targets if any</b>
16.7.1 Proportions of positions in the judiciary compared to national distributions, Higher Courts (ratio)	Female: Judges (NA) Female: Registrar (NA)	Targets not defined in the programme document.	Both sexes: Registrar (1.2: 2022) Female: Judges (0.84: 2022) Female: Registrar (1.74: 2022)	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7.1 Proportions of positions in the judiciary compared to national distributions, Lower Courts (ratio)	Both sexes: Registrar (NA) Female: Judges (NA) Female: Registrar (NA)	Targets not defined in the programme document.	NA	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7.1 Proportions of positions in the judiciary compared to national distributions, Constitutional Court (ratio).	Both sexes: Registrar (NA) Female: Registrar (NA)	Targets not defined in the programme document.	Both sexes: Registrar (1: 2022) Female: Registrar (1: 2022)	Targets not defined in the programme document.
16.7.2: Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive (%)				
Proportion of population who believe decision-making is inclusive (%)	NA	The target was incorrectly set as 'Yes' instead of a number.	NA	The target was incorrectly set as 'Yes' instead of a number.
Proportion of population who believe decision-making is responsive (%)	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Goal 17. Partnerships for the goals:</b> 17.1 Strengthen domestic resource mobilization, including through international support to developing countries, to improve domestic capacity for tax and other revenue collection (17.1.1; 17.1.2).				
17.1.1 Total government revenue as a proportion of GDP, by source.	34.9% (2015/16) <sup>71</sup>	33%	29.4% (2021/22) <sup>72</sup>	Economic contraction and the resultant fiscal challenges as discussed under section 1 of this report.
17.1.2 Proportion of domestic budget funded by domestic taxes.	83.3% (2015) <sup>73</sup>	25%	69.70 (2021) <sup>74</sup>	Target set at a very low level and mostly

<b>SDGs indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected target (2022)</b>	<b>Actual results achieved/to be achieved in the near future</b>	<b>Reasons for deviation from targets if any</b>
				due to very low baseline. The baseline is adjusted in this report.
17.3 Mobilize additional financial resources for developing countries from multiple sources (17.3.1; 17.3.2).				
17.3.1 FDI inflows (millions of United States dollars)	FDI: US\$ 889.00 million (2015) <sup>75</sup>	Target not defined in the programme document.	FDI: US\$ 411.62 million (2021) <sup>76</sup>	Target not defined in the programme document.
17.3.1 Gross receipts by developing countries of official sustainable development grants.	US\$ 140.08 million (2019) <sup>77</sup>	Target not defined in the programme document.	US\$ 204.88 million (2021) <sup>78</sup>	Target not defined in the programme document.
17.3.1 Gross receipts by developing countries of official concessional sustainable development loans.	US\$ 47.58 million (2019) <sup>79</sup>	Target not defined in the programme document.	US\$ 29.57 million (2021) <sup>80</sup>	Target not defined in the programme document.
17.3.1 Gross receipts by developing countries of official non-concessional sustainable development loans.	US\$ 22.27 million (2019) <sup>81</sup>	Target not defined in the programme document.	US\$ 167.51 million (2021) <sup>82</sup>	Target not defined in the programme document.
17.3.1 Gross receipts by developing countries of mobilised private finance (MPF) - on an experimental basis.	US\$ 94.54 million (2017) <sup>83</sup>	Target not defined in the programme document.	US\$ 51.00 million (2021) <sup>84</sup>	Target not defined in the programme document.
17.3.1 Gross receipts by developing countries of private grants (millions of United States dollars)	US\$ 1.12 million (2016) <sup>85</sup>	Target not defined in the programme document.	US\$ 1.18 million (2021) <sup>86</sup>	Target not defined in the programme document.
17.3.2 Volume of remittances (in United States dollars) as a proportion of total GDP.	0.41 (2015)	0.45%	0.60 (2020) <sup>87</sup>	
17.17 Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships (17.17.1)				
17.17.1 Amount of United States dollars committed to public-private partnerships for infrastructure, million USD nominal	US\$ 51.37 million (2017)	Target not defined in the programme document.	US\$ 77.00 million (2018)	Target not defined in the programme document.

<b>SDGs indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Expected target (2022)</b>	<b>Actual results achieved/to be achieved in the near future</b>	<b>Reasons for deviation from targets if any</b>
17.17.1 Amount of United States dollars committed to public-private partnerships for infrastructure, million USD real	US\$ 53.58 million (2017)	Target not defined in the programme document.	US\$ 78.40 million (2018)	Target not defined in the programme document.

## Endnote

<sup>1</sup> The Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) Office Project Reference Number is the same number as the one on the Notification message. It is also referred to as “Project ID” on the project’s factsheet page on the MPTF Office GATEWAY.

<sup>2</sup> The start date is the date inserted in the original ProDoc submitted and approved by the Joint SDG Fund.

<sup>3</sup> As per approval of the original project document by the relevant decision-making body/Steering Committee.

<sup>4</sup> If there has been an extension, then the revised, approved end date should be reflected here. If there has been no extension approved, then the current end date is the same as the original end date. The end date is the same as the operational closure date which is when all activities for which a Participating Organization is responsible under an approved MPTF / JP have been completed. As per the MOU, agencies are to notify the MPTF Office when a programme completes its operational activities. Please see MPTF Office Closure Guidelines.

<sup>5</sup> Financial Closure requires the return of unspent balances and submission of the Certified Final Financial Statement and Report.

<sup>6</sup> Joint SDG Fund Contribution is the amount transferred to the Participating UN Organizations – see MPTF Office GATEWAY.

<sup>7</sup> It is the sum of US\$ 75,000 from the JP programme document and US\$ 243,000 from the DEM programme document.

<sup>8</sup> The DEM programme document states US\$ 250,000 as the UN Joint SDG Fund. The distribution of the amount between WFP and FAO was not stated.

<sup>9</sup> 2021 PPP (constant 2017 international \$) (World Bank, WDI 2023)

<sup>10</sup> US\$ 14,840

<sup>11</sup> US\$ 13,312

<sup>12</sup> US\$ 3,719

<sup>13</sup> e.g., investing about 21 of national budget and 8% of GDP to the education sector

<sup>14</sup> 13.8% severely poor

<sup>15</sup> 10.7% severely poor

<sup>16</sup> The latest MPI data

<sup>17</sup> Ibid

<sup>18</sup> Own computation

<sup>19</sup> “Total value of inward and outward IFFs”, and thus Namibia will be among a few countries with data to report on this indicator”.

<sup>20</sup> The market price method estimated inward IFF at US\$ 19.6 billion and the outward IFF at US\$ 4.7 billion (market price method).

<sup>21</sup> Covering activities such as identification of financing needs and options, aligning needs and options, drafting of an implementation plan to establish implementation bodies and thematic groups (coordination and governance) and establishing the monitoring and review bodies and processes.

<sup>22</sup> The JP document consists of 25 indicators. The 48 indicators emerge from the fact that a single SDG indicator can imply more than 1 indicator. For instance, the JP document associates the programme with indicator 16.7.1, which, from the UN SDG database, implies such an indicator has 18 sub-indicators.

<sup>23</sup> World Bank Group, 2020, Doing Business 2020. These two reports are no longer being published.

<sup>24</sup> Health, education, water, sanitation and hygiene, electricity, and roads.

<sup>25</sup> The report is titled ‘Namibia: Namibia Expenditure in 2030 to support the Sustainable Development Goals’

<sup>26</sup> A concept paper on the Public-Private Dialogue is in place.

<sup>27</sup> In collaboration with the MFPE and the Institute of Public Policy and Research (IPPR)

<sup>28</sup> No. 2nd/11.03.14/007

<sup>29</sup> The report is available online at <https://namibia.un.org/sites/default/files/2022-09/2021%20UN%20Country%20Annual%20Results%20Report%20Namibia.pdf>

<sup>30</sup> <https://jointsdgfund.org/where-we-work/namibia>

<sup>31</sup> <https://jointsdgfund.org/article/sustainable-financing-instruments-inclusive-recovery-namibia>

<sup>32</sup> <https://jointsdgfund.org/article/sdg-fund-finance-launched-namibia>

<sup>33</sup> <https://www.undp.org/namibia/news/un-namibia-launches-joint-sdg-fund><https://www.undp.org/namibia/news/un-namibia-launches-joint-sdg-fund>

<sup>34</sup> <https://namibia.unfpa.org/en/news/un-launches-joint-sdg-financing-programme-namibia>

<sup>35</sup> <https://www.undp.org/namibia/news/un-namibia-launches-joint-sdg-fund>

<sup>36</sup> Two different time period are presented for these statistics. The ECA/UNCTAD publication presents that the data are for the period 2021-2022 whereas the UNCTAD website states the time period between 2018 and 2020.

<sup>37</sup> Spectrum Model, 2021

- 
- <sup>38</sup> Stakeholder feedback has been integrated into the text of the report, without identification of specific individuals or organizations.
- <sup>39</sup> NPC (2021). Sustainable Development Goals and Fifth National Development Plan Indicator Framework Namibia.
- <sup>40</sup> NPC (2021). Sustainable Development Goals and Fifth National Development Plan Indicator Framework Namibia.
- <sup>41</sup> As reported by UNICEF (2022) Budget Briefs
- <sup>42</sup> As reported by UNICEF (2022) Budget Briefs
- <sup>43</sup> As reported by UNICEF (2022) Budget Briefs
- <sup>44</sup> NPC (2021).
- <sup>45</sup> The indicator is the “agriculture share of government expenditure”
- <sup>46</sup> UN SDG Indicator Database (2021)
- <sup>47</sup> UN SDG Indicator Database (2021)
- <sup>48</sup> UN SDG Indicator Database (2021)
- <sup>49</sup> UN SDG Indicator Database (2021)
- <sup>50</sup> Namibia’s 2021 VNR lists various legislations that promote non-discrimination on the basis of sex. The JP has contributed to the indicator by facilitating the development of 1) a PEGRB toolkit 2) Gender Responsive Planning and Budgeting Curriculum 3) Pro-Employment Budget Analysis 4) a Majority of the targeted SHFs that benefitted from the agriculture subsidy intervention were women.
- <sup>51</sup> NPC (2021).
- <sup>52</sup> NPC (2021).
- <sup>53</sup> NPC (2021).
- <sup>54</sup> SDG Indicator Database.
- <sup>55</sup> NPC (2021).
- <sup>56</sup> SDG Indicator Database.
- <sup>57</sup> SDG Indicator Database.
- <sup>58</sup> SDG Indicator Database.
- <sup>59</sup> JP programme document.
- <sup>60</sup> Only one target was set, and it is the one in the preceding indicator.
- <sup>61</sup> Only one target was set, and it is the one in the preceding indicator.
- <sup>62</sup> Only one target was set, and it is the one in the preceding indicator.
- <sup>63</sup> 1) National Policy on Climate Change (2011) 2) National Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan (2013) 3) Intended NDC (2015)
- <sup>64</sup> National Policy on Climate Change (2011) 2) National Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan (2013) 3) Intended National Determined Contribution (INDC) (2015)
- <sup>65</sup> SDG Indicator Database.
- <sup>66</sup> SDG Indicator Database.
- <sup>67</sup> National definition of SDG indicator 16.5.1 “Proportion of people that think a) Government officials b) traditional leaders have been involved in corruption” (NPC 2021)
- <sup>68</sup> National definition of SDG indicator 16.5.2 “Proportion of firms experiencing at least one bribe payment request” (NPC 2021).
- <sup>69</sup> NPC (2021).
- <sup>70</sup> NPC (2021).
- <sup>71</sup> Source: BoN (2017). Annual Report 2017. BoN. The baseline indicated in the JP document was 33% (2017)
- <sup>72</sup> Source: BoN (2022). Annual Report 2022. BoN.
- <sup>73</sup> SDG Indicator Database
- <sup>74</sup> SDG Indicator Database
- <sup>75</sup> SDG Indicator Database
- <sup>76</sup> SDG Indicator Database
- <sup>77</sup> SDG Indicator Database
- <sup>78</sup> SDG Indicator Database
- <sup>79</sup> SDG Indicator Database
- <sup>80</sup> SDG Indicator Database
- <sup>81</sup> SDG Indicator Database

- 
- <sup>82</sup> SDG Indicator Database
  - <sup>83</sup> SDG Indicator Database
  - <sup>84</sup> SDG Indicator Database
  - <sup>85</sup> SDG Indicator Database
  - <sup>86</sup> SDG Indicator Database
  - <sup>87</sup> SDG Indicator Database