

Annexure 1: UNPAF RESULTS

NDP 4 Desired Outcomes	High (National) Level Indicators	Means of Verification	UNPAF Outcomes	UNPAF Indicators, Baselines and Targets	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions	Partners and their roles
By 2017, Namibia is the most competitive economy in the SADC region, according to the standards set by the World Economic Forum	<p><u>HL Indicator 1</u> Ease of doing business rank <u>Baseline:</u> Global- 87 out of 185 (2013) <u>Target:</u> Global – Among top 25% out of countries surveyed.</p> <p><u>HL Indicator2</u> Corruption Perception Index. <u>Baseline:</u> (2012) 48/100 score on corruption perception index <u>Target:</u> Above 65/100 score on corruption perception index</p>	<p>Annual reports of Anti-Corruption Commission</p> <p>Transparency International Corruption Perception Index</p> <p>World Bank Doing Business Index Report</p>	<u>Outcome 1:</u> By 2018, policies and legislative frameworks to ensure transparency, accountability, effective oversight and people's participation in the management of public affairs are in place and are being implemented.	<p><u>Indicator1.1</u> % of cases of violation of HR reported to the Ombudsman which are resolved. <u>Baseline:</u> (2010) 74% <u>Target:</u> 95%</p> <p><u>Indicator 1.2</u> % of women's representation in key leadership and decision making bodies. <u>Baseline:</u> National Assembly 25%, National Council 27%, Regional Councils 8% (2012) <u>Target:</u> At least 30% women's representation.</p> <p><u>Indicator 1.3</u> Number of ministries having operational CSO coordinating offices/desks <u>Baseline:</u> 1 (NPC) <u>Target:</u> All line ministries</p>	<p>UPR Annual Reports of the Office of the Ombudsman</p> <p>National Gender Policy and Action Plan progress reports. IPU statistics</p> <p>NPC Annual Report</p>	<p><u>Risks:</u> Weak institutional capacity.</p> <p>Widespread gender stereotypes in the society.</p> <p><u>Assumptions:</u> Government continued commitment to support the drawing up and implementation of the National Anti-Corruption and Human Rights Strategy and Action Plans.</p> <p>Government continued promotion of CSO participation in the development process.</p> <p>Continued availability of adequate human and financial resources.</p>	<p><u>Government:</u> ACC, MoJ, Office of Ombudsman, ECN, LRDC, NPC, MTI and Parliament</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy formulation • Legislation • Implementation <p><u>Civil Society:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watch dogging • Advocacy • Supplement service delivery <p><u>Dev. Partners:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical support • Capacity Development • Advocacy • Catalytic funding
Driven by improved M&E mechanisms as well as improved accountability, supported by appropriate reward/sanction schemes and entrenched culture of performance management in the public sector, the execution rate of NDP 4 has improved significantly	<p><u>HL Indicator 3</u> NDP annual execution rate <u>Baseline</u> (tbc) <u>Target</u> (2018): (tbc)</p>	NDP Annual Review Reports	<u>Outcome 2:</u> By 2018, functional M&E and statistical analyses systems are in place to monitor and report on progress against objectives and targets of the NDP 4 and inform policy and decision-making.	<p><u>Indicator 2.1:</u> Existence of a functional M&E system <u>Baseline:</u> 2012 – M & E system not yet in place. <u>Target:</u> 1st functional version of system in place by end of 2013; improved version by end of 2015; credible core socio-economic statistical datasets that meet regional and international standards are available in a timely manner by 2016.</p> <p><u>Indicator 2.2:</u> Time between completion of survey field work and production of survey reports and micro-dataset. <u>Baseline:</u> NHIES -18 months; Census 2011- more than 24 months. <u>Target:</u> 12 months</p> <p><u>Indicator 2.3:</u> Number of analytical reports, with disaggregated data and statistics, produced from surveys undertaken. <u>Baseline:</u> tbc <u>Target:</u> tbc</p>	<p>Reports from the system Minutes of meetings of NPC on the M&E system.</p> <p>Survey Reports</p> <p>O/M/A/s websites Reports of discussion forums</p>	<p><u>Risks</u> Persistence of ad hoc, small-scale and fragmented approaches to M&E.</p> <p>Lack of retention of qualified staff to operate the M&E system.</p> <p>Slow pace and lack of clarity of treaty bodies reporting processes.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> GRN continued commitment to data transparency.</p> <p>Sustained GRN commitment to realization of human rights, people's participation and accountability at all levels.</p>	<p><u>Government:</u> NPC, NSA, and O/M/As</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership • Policy formulation • Planning • System development • Implementation <p><u>Civil Society:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy • Supplement implementation • Community mobilization <p><u>Dev. Partners:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical cooperation • Capacity Development • Advocacy • Catalytic financial support • Knowledge brokering • Linking to global best practices
	N/A	N/A	<u>Outcome 3:</u> By 2018, Namibia is able to comply with most of her international treaties' implementation and reporting obligations	<p><u>Indicator 3.1:</u> Number of reports to international treaty bodies submitted on time <u>Baseline:</u> CRC – Sept 2012; UPR – Jan 2011 <u>Target:</u> CRC – October 2017; UPR – 2014</p> <p><u>Indicator 3.2:</u> number of recommendations highlighted by treaty bodies in subsequent concluding observations. <u>Baseline:</u> tbc <u>Target:</u> tbc</p>	<p>International Treaty bodies registries and websites</p> <p>International Treaty bodies registries and websites. Government Reports to international treaty bodies</p>		
By 2017, Namibia is characterized by a high quality and internationally recognized education system that capacitates the population to meet current and future market demands for skills and innovation	<p><u>HL Indicator 4</u> Net Enrolment Rate (PPE, PE, SE) <u>Baseline</u> (2011): 31%, 99.8%, 57% respectively <u>Target</u> (2018): 40%, 100%, 70%, respectively</p> <p><u>HL Indicator 5</u> Literacy rate of 15-24 year olds <u>Baseline</u> (2009/2010): 96% <u>Target</u> (2018): 100%</p> <p><u>HL Indicator 6</u> Survival rate to grade 8 and 11 <u>Baseline</u> (2011): Grade 8: 81%; Grade 11: 46% <u>Target</u> (2018): Grade 8: 90%; Grade 11: 55%</p> <p><u>HL Indicator 7</u> % of national budget allocated</p>	<p>EMIS EFA and MDG Progress Reports</p> <p>NHIES</p> <p>EMIS</p>	<u>Outcome 4:</u> By 2018, the country has formulated and is implementing policies and practices that improve key learning outcomes at all levels.	<p><u>Indicator 4.1</u> % learners who score basic and above in Grade 5 & 7 national SAT <u>Baseline</u> (2011): English: 46%; Maths: 43% <u>Target:</u> English: 54%; Maths: 51%</p> <p><u>Indicator 4.2</u> % of Grade 6 learners who reach the minimum level on SACMEQ HIV-AIDS knowledge test. <u>Baseline</u> (2007): 36% <u>Target</u> (2018): 50%</p> <p><u>Indicator 4.3</u> % of learners aged 10-24 years, who demonstrate desired levels of knowledge of and reject major misconceptions about HIV and AIDS. <u>Baseline:</u> 0% <u>Target:</u> 20%</p> <p><u>Indicator 4.4</u> % of graduates from institutions of higher learning gainfully employed at the latest 6 months after graduation</p>	<p>National SAT SACMEQ (Regional)</p> <p>SACMEQ</p> <p>HIV sentinel surveillance</p>	<p><u>Risks</u> Inadequate commitment and collaboration among O/M/As.</p> <p>Lack of funding</p> <p>Non-functioning of accountability structures.</p> <p>Lack of capacity within CSOs.</p> <p>Failure to act on evaluation recommendations</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> Continued priority allocation to and effective utilization of funds in the education sector</p> <p>Continued timely availability of key personnel from O/M/As.</p>	<p><u>Government:</u> MoE, Institutions of Higher Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership • Policy formulation • Planning • M&E • Standard setting and regulation • Service Delivery <p><u>Civil Society:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy • Supplement service delivery <p><u>Dev. Partners:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical cooperation • Capacity Development • Advocacy • Catalytic financial support • Facilitation and promotion of multi-sectoral coordination • Knowledge brokering

NDP 4 Desired Outcomes	High (National) Level Indicators	Means of Verification	UNPAF Outcomes	UNPAF Indicators, Baselines and Targets	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions	Partners and their roles
	to R&D. Baseline (2011): 0.3% (for R&D) Target (2018): 1% (for R&D)					Synchronization of UNPAF activities with on-going education sector policy review processes.	
<p>By 2017, all Namibians have access to a quality health system in terms of prevention, cure and rehabilitation, and the country is characterized by an improvement in the 2011 baseline figure of 57 for a healthy adjusted life expectancy (HALE) to 59.</p>	<p><u>HL Indicator 8</u> % of mortality related to HIV Baseline: tbc Target (2018): tbc</p> <p><u>HL Indicator 9</u> HIV prevalence among pregnant women aged 15-24 years Baseline- 8.9% (2012) Target - 5%</p> <p><u>HL Indicator 10</u> Proportion of children under the age of five years who are stunted Baseline – 29% (2006/07) Target – Below 20%</p> <p><u>HL Indicator 11</u> % of population accessing HIV and AIDS prevention, treatment, care and support. Baseline – 77% (2010/11) Target – 95%</p>	<p>MoHSS annual reports</p> <p>ANC Sentinel Surveillance Report</p> <p>Special surveys</p> <p>Review of Universal Access Progress Report in Namibia</p> <p>NSF on HIV and AIDS reports.</p>	<p><u>Outcome 5:</u> By 2018, Namibia will have accountable and well-coordinated multi-sectoral mechanisms at all levels to prevent, control, eliminate and eradicate priority diseases and conditions and address socio-economic determinants of health.</p>	<p><u>Indicator 5.1</u> % of population with sustainable access to basic sanitation Baseline –24.4% Target – 50%</p> <p><u>Indicator 5.2</u> Percentage of eligible adults and children receiving antiretroviral therapy Baseline –84% (2011/12) Target – 95%</p> <p><u>Indicator 5.3</u> % of O/M/As that have mainstreamed HIV and AIDS interventions in their core functions. Baseline – 6 (2007) Target – All the 27 O/M/As.</p> <p><u>Indicator 5.4:</u> Percentage of adults aged 15–24 who had more than one sexual partner in the past 12 months who report the use of a condom during their last intercourse. Baseline: women 73.7 percent; men 82.2 percent. Targets women 80 percent; men 90 percent</p> <p><u>Indicator 5.5:</u> Percentage of women and men aged 15-24 who received an HIV test in the past 12 months and know their results. Baseline: women 23.2 percent; men 10.5 percent Targets: women 40 percent; men 25 percent.</p> <p><u>Indicator 5.6:</u> % of TB patients tested for HIV Baseline: 89% (2012) Target: 90%</p> <p><u>Indicator 5.7:</u> % of Tb patients known to be HIV positive started on ARVs Baseline: 71% (2012) Targets: 60%</p> <p><u>Indicator 6.8:</u> % of health facilities providing integrated HIV and Reproductive Health Services Baseline: 0% (2012) Targets: 50%</p>	<p>MoHSS annual reports</p> <p>WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Report</p> <p>OPM Bi-Annual Public Sector Impact Assessment Reports on HIV and AIDS; and NSF mid-term and end-term Programme Review Reports MOHSS Annual Reports</p> <p>MOHSS Annual Reports</p> <p>MoHSS Annual reports</p> <p>MoHSS Annual reports</p>	<p><u>Risks:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects of global financial crisis persist. • Human resources challenges are not adequately addressed • Natural or man-made disasters • Further reduction of external funding and technical assistance • Ineffective multi-sectoral coordination of stakeholders • Failure to implement the National Strategic Plan • Poverty and unemployment not adequately addressed <p><u>Assumptions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Namibia continues to enjoy peace and stability, economic growth and macroeconomic stability • Health remains a priority area both for Government, CSOs and other partners • Health Sector Strategic Plan developed by 2014 • Government and domestic partners continue to prioritise HIV • Decentralization agenda is advanced • Continued Government commitment to capacity strengthening, financial provisions and leadership of sustained response to HIV and AIDS 	<p><u>Government:</u> MOHSS and OPM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership • Policy formulation • Planning • M&E • Service Delivery • Funding of HIV and AIDS programmes of O/M/As <p><u>Civil Society:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy • Supplement service delivery <p><u>Dev. Partners:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical cooperation • Capacity Development • Advocacy • Catalytic financial support • Facilitation and promotion of multi-sectoral coordination • Knowledge brokering
<p>By 2017, the proportion of severely poor individuals has dropped from 15.8 % in 2009/10 to below 10%</p>	<p><u>HL Indicator 14</u> % of population, disaggregated by gender and area, classified as poor. Baseline: (2009/2010) General population - 28.7%, child poverty: 34%.</p>	<p>NHIES DHS, EMIS, Administrative data</p>	<p><u>Outcome 7:</u> By 2018, Namibia has adopted and is effectively implementing policies and strategies to reduce poverty and vulnerability which are</p>	<p><u>Indicator 7.1</u> Number of policy dialogue forums convened on the basis of published studies on the root causes of poverty and vulnerability Baseline: none Target: At least 2 policy dialogue forums convened.</p> <p><u>Indicator 7.2</u></p>	<p>Reports of policy advocacy dialogue forums</p>	<p><u>Risks</u> Impact of eurozone crisis could lead to decline in GDP and reduced fiscal space.</p> <p>Change in government priorities after 2014 elections could lead to change in</p>	<p><u>Government:</u> NPC, O/M/As</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership • Policy formulation • Planning • M&E • Implementation

NDP 4 Desired Outcomes	High (National) Level Indicators	Means of Verification	UNPAF Outcomes	UNPAF Indicators, Baselines and Targets	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions	Partners and their roles
	<p><u>Target:</u> General population - reduced below 20%; Child poverty reduced below 20%.</p> <p><u>HL Indicator 15</u> Proportion of disabled persons, pensioners and poor and vulnerable children receiving social grant. <u>Baseline:</u> 24.5%, 91% and 10.5%, respectively <u>Target:</u> 50% , 98% and 30%, respectively</p> <p><u>HL Indicator 16</u></p> <p>% of vulnerable children, disaggregated by gender, who benefit from the school feeding programme</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> 78% <u>Target:</u> 100%</p> <p><u>HL Indicator 17</u></p> <p>% of vulnerable people that have adequate access to food during emergencies</p> <p><u>Baseline:</u> 21% <u>Target:</u> At least 35%</p>	<p>MoLSW data base</p> <p>MGEW data base NHIES</p> <p>MoE EMIS and school feeding database and reports</p> <p>Annual NamVAC Reports</p> <p>MAWF Agricultural Inputs and Household Food Security Situation Report</p>	<p>informed by evidence on the causes of poverty and vulnerability in a coordinated manner</p> <p><u>Outcome 8</u> By 2018, the national social protection system is strengthened and expanded to poor and vulnerable households and individuals.</p>	<p>Inter-ministerial committee for reduction of poverty and vulnerability established <u>Baseline:</u> (2012) no inter-ministerial committee on poverty. <u>Target:</u> inter-ministerial committee for reduction of poverty and vulnerability established and operational</p> <p><u>Indicator 7.3</u> Index of multi-dimensional poverty disaggregated by regions and constituencies <u>Baseline:</u> (2012) no universally agreed multi-dimensional poverty measure in place. <u>Target:</u> multi-dimensional poverty measure is developed, standardized, adopted and being used for resource allocation.</p> <p><u>Indicator 8.1</u> % of children under five years who are accessing formal national documents and civil registration <u>Baseline:</u> Birth registration for children under 5: 67% <u>Target:</u> birth registration children under 5: 80%</p> <p><u>Indicator 8.2</u> Existence of standards and procedures for managing food-based programmes and hunger reduction efforts for populations affected by natural disasters. <u>Baseline:</u> 1 (2012): none in place. <u>Target:</u> 2 (2014, 2017): tbc</p> <p><u>Indicator 8.3</u> % of poor and vulnerable populations that have access to essential social protection services. <u>Baseline:</u> tbc <u>Target:</u> tbc</p>	<p>Minutes of inter-ministerial committee</p> <p>Annual (national and regional) budgets</p> <p>MoHAI data base</p> <p>Reports from WFP/OPM partnership</p>	<p>government priorities.</p> <p>Lack of reliable and up-to-date data could affect in-depth analysis of root causes of poverty.</p> <p>Lack of broad-based ownership of multidimensional measure could undermine it's acceptance and use for policy making</p> <p>Delay in development of new policies and strategies around general elections.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> Quality and comparable up-to-date NHIES data available</p> <p>Poverty reduction continues to be a priority of GRN</p> <p><u>Risks</u> Impending national elections may lead to shift in GRN priorities</p> <p>Data on access to formal and informal social protection is fragmented and insufficient</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> Government continues to show commitment to the expansion of the social protection system</p> <p>M&E systems improved for tracking use of social grants and services by vulnerable groups.</p> <p>Proposed changes in eligibility for child welfare grants are adopted and implemented.</p> <p>Barriers in accessing civil registration continue to be addressed.</p>	<p><u>Civil Society:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy • Supplement service delivery <p><u>Dev. Partners:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical cooperation • Capacity Development • Advocacy • Catalytic funding • Facilitation and promotion of multi-sectoral coordination • Knowledge brokering <p><u>Government:</u> OPM, NPC, MGEW, MHAI and MVA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership • Policy formulation • Planning • M&E • Implementation <p><u>Civil Society:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy • Supplement service delivery <p><u>Dev. Partners:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical cooperation • Capacity Development • Advocacy • Catalytic financial support • Facilitation and promotion of multi-sectoral coordination • Knowledge brokering
<p>Agriculture experiences average real growth rate of 4 percent over the NDP 4 period</p>	<p><u>HL Indicator 18</u> % of population classified as food insecure. <u>Baseline:</u> 30% <u>Target:</u> At most 15%</p> <p><u>HL Indicator 19</u> % share of poor and vulnerable populations having access to and control over productive resources and services <u>Baseline:</u> 29% - 2006/07 <u>Target:</u> At least 35%</p>	<p>DHS</p>	<p><u>Outcome 9</u> By 2018, Namibia has adopted and is implementing policies and strategies which ensure that severely poor and vulnerable households are accessing and utilising productive resources and services for food and nutrition security and sustainable income generation.</p>	<p><u>Indicator 91</u> Number of food and nutrition policies and strategies which incorporate the twin track approach <u>Baseline:</u> tbc <u>Target:</u> tbc</p>		<p><u>Risks</u> lack of funding</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> Fully functional SME bank in place</p> <p>Poor and vulnerable household have information and are knowledgeable about how to access resources from SME banks or related institutions.</p>	<p><u>Government:</u> MAWF, MTI, NPC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership • Policy formulation • Planning • M&E • Service Delivery <p><u>Civil Society:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy • Supplement service delivery <p><u>Private Sector</u> (SME Bank)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding • Capacity development <p><u>Dev. Partners:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical cooperation • Capacity Development • Advocacy • Catalytic financial support • Facilitation and promotion of multi-sectoral coordination • Knowledge brokering
<p>Namibia is the most competitive tourist destination in Africa by 2017, as measured by the World Economic Forum</p>	<p>tbc</p>	<p>tbc</p>	<p><u>Outcome 10:</u> By 2018, institutional frameworks and policies needed to implement the</p>	<p><u>Indicator 10.1:</u> Number of environmental institutions fully equipped with relevant standards, guidelines and specialised skills <u>Baseline:</u> (2012): Environmental Commission established in 2011</p>	<p>MET reports</p>	<p><u>Risks:</u> Lack of staff with appropriate or pivotal competencies.</p> <p>Lack of data collection and reporting</p>	<p><u>Government:</u> MET, MAWF, UNAM, NABA, MOE, MME, NAMPOWER, REEELPON MWT, LA, RC, OPM, NPC, and MLGHRD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership

NDP 4 Desired Outcomes	High (National) Level Indicators	Means of Verification	UNPAF Outcomes	UNPAF Indicators, Baselines and Targets	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions	Partners and their roles
<p>Travel and Tourism Competitiveness Index. Namibia ranking has increased from being third in SSA with an overall ranking of 3.84 out of 7.0 (2011/12) to being first, with ranking of at least 4.40 out of 7.0</p>			<p>Environmental Management Act (2007), National Climate Change Policy (2011) and international conventions are in place and are being effectively implemented.</p>	<p>Target: At least 3 Institutions including, the Environmental Commission, establish and operationalize standards, procedures and guidelines for implementing the Environmental Management Act (2007).</p> <p>Indicator 10.2: Number and timeliness of reports to international environmental treaty bodies Baseline: NBSAP 1 reviewed; SNC to the UNFCCC submitted Target: (2014 and 2017) Namibia's NBSAP 2 prepared and submitted to the UNCBD and is implemented in Namibia; Namibia's BUR and TNC prepared and submitted to UNFCCC.</p> <p>Indicator 10.3 Number of buildings (commercial and residential) using RE and EE technologies. Baseline: 2012 -Lack of EE technologies, appliances and practices in buildings Target: (2014, 2017): GBCNA registered and is operational; at least 20% of new buildings using RE and EE technologies</p> <p>Indicator 10.4 Number of line ministries, RCs, communities, and partners implementing the national policy and strategy on climate change Baseline: (2012): Strategy and Action Plan on climate change in place Target: (2014, 2017): National Strategy and Action Plan on climate change in place; and two (2) specific sector operational plans prepared</p> <p>Indicator 10.5 Number of line ministries, communities, and partners implementing the National DRM Policy and Strategy. Baseline: (2012): National DRM Bill in place Target: (2014, 2017): At least six (6) ministries, 12 communities and six (6) partners adopt and actively utilise DRM management and operational guidelines and procedures.</p>	<p>UNFCCC and UNCBD websites</p> <p>WGBC Website and Data Pool</p> <p>Reports from MET, MAWF, REEEI and MME</p> <p>Reports from WFP/OPM partnership</p> <p>Reports from MET, MAWF, MLR and MFMR</p>	<p>capacity within national institutions</p> <p>Lack of cooperation and coordination between stakeholders</p> <p>Namibia's vulnerability to climate change and variability (floods and drought)</p> <p>Lack of donor partner's support and domestic resources from Government</p> <p>Possible change in national priorities following impending changes in Government after the 2014 elections</p> <p>Assumptions Cost of energy from conventional sources continue to increase forcing owners of buildings to acquire RETs and adopt EE measures.</p> <p>The NSI will adopt and make the recommended standards and practices compulsory.</p> <p>DRM remains a priority, and receives budgetary support, for Government and other stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy formulation • Planning • M&E • Standard Setting • Implementation <p>Civil Society: DRFN, NNF, CES, OSISA, NRCS other CCCM sector members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy • Watch dogging • Knowledge management <p>Universities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • research and technology development <p>Private Sector Implementation, Investment</p> <p>Dev. Partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical cooperation & technology transfer • Capacity development • Advocacy • Catalytic funding • Facilitation and promotion of multi-sectoral coordination • Knowledge brokering