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Peter Tarr (SAIEA)
Key challenges identified

- Formulating policies without defining clearly the problem to be addressed
- Inadequate review of literature
- Inadequate consultation
- Poor stakeholder analysis and mapping
- Poor coordination
- Lack of implementation action plan for policies
- Lack of monitoring and evaluation of policies programmes and projects
Built of commonly accepted stages in policy process

- Agenda setting
- Policy formulation
- Adoption (or decision making)
- Implementation and evaluation.
Recommendations

• Rewrite – to clarify text & add new elements

• Revise glossary of terms – tighten, sharpen, modify eg
  • *Agenda setting*: process not just a matter just for Cabinet but should enable issues raised, identified or experienced by any stakeholders to be taken into account;
  • *Problem identification*: should include any issues (not just those affecting society), including, environmental, social, economic, institutional

• Improve guidance as regards stakeholder engagement, reporting, transparency (all materials publicly available)
  • Draft policies, questionnaire surveys, workshop/meeting reports, resource folder, etc
Recommendations – Scoping and SWOT

- **[3.1] Identification of problems** - not just nationally-driven. Problems could be anything and could arise at all levels, e.g., hubs, regions (within Namibia), districts, etc.

- [3.1] Need clarity on the *ways/mechanisms for stakeholders to raise concerns* – relevant platform is rather loose

- [3.1] **Scoping study** – not just environmental. Should also cover social, economic and institutional dimensions.

- [3.1] But what is to be scoped?


- [3.1] Why is **SWOT** part of scoping? SWOT usually applied to response, not the problem

- [3.1] Could apply ‘**cluster SWOT**’ [all PPPs relevant to issue]
Too much focus on single policy

• Focusing on single policy can miss critical interactions, eg

• Coal-based economy in Botswana/NDP11 [Peter to flesh out]

• Bull-testing centre – Botswana [Peter to flesh out] – use map?
Recommendations – stakeholder engagement

• **[3.2.3]** Stakeholder events facilitated? By who? Who analyses outcomes?

• **[3.2.3]** Reports should be shared, *publicly available*. Website

• **[3.2.3]** *Encouraging participants to attend*. Need guidance on how to participate, advance notification, when, where (see DEA EIA guidelines)

• **[3.2.3.1]** Make IATC minutes publicly available (website)

• **[3.2.3.2]** Various stakeholders? Draft policy documents should be available to all and publicly (website)

• **[3.2.3.2]** Need several *stakeholder consultation workshops*

• **[3.2.3.3]** No. of *consultative meetings* required should not be at the discretion of the custodian O/M/A; Need minimum requirements

• **[3.2.3.4 and 3.2.3.5]** Need guidance on when *individual* should be interviewed.

• **[3.2.3.5 and 3.2.3.5]** *Focus groups* more robust

• **[3.2.3.4 and 3.2.3.5]** Need *standard format*, mode of conduct and reporting for consultative events
Recommendations – Implementation Action Plan

• [3.2.5] Need guidance on format/contents of Implementation Action Plan

• [3.5.1] Evaluation versus monitoring – need to clarify.
  • Evaluation every 5 yrs?
  • Monitoring is constant
  • Align/synchronise with the 3-yr rolling budget system?

• [3.5.3] Suggest independent element to M&E

• [3.5.1] Impact assessment – correct term? Could confuse with EIA

• [3.5.1] Evaluation should address environmental, social, economic and institutional aspects
Recommendations – M&E

• [3.5.1] *Evaluation* should address environmental, social, economic and institutional aspects

• [3.5.1] Need format/contents for an *evaluation report*

• [3.5.1] Who is the “*evaluator*”? independent individual or team?

• [3.5.1] “have *rewards and sanctions* systems to encourage implementers” – clarify

• Annex 1 – revise based on updated text
Recommendations - additions

- Need to *dovetail with new SEA Regulations* (SEA for all PPPs required under new EMA)

- Focus is on PPPs at a national level. Need to consider *hub/regional/district level PPPs*.

- Use of *linkage diagrams* to enable an understanding of intended and unintended consequences.
Linkage diagram for road, rail and port development in Bangladesh
Capacity Building Workshop on Policy Formulation and SDG Acceleration
Organized by the National Planning Commission, UN DESA and UN Namibia, with GIZ Namibia
27-28 April, Otjiwarongo
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• Update - synergise with Guidelines on Public Policy-making Process (August 2020)
• Indicate approx lengths for key sections
• Eliminate duplication, make succinct and clear
• Order of sections
• Executive summary – 2 pages max
• No need to discuss methodology [12] - standardise for all policies
• No need for roadmap [12] – table of contents is sufficient
• How does policy relate to other policies? [15] – overlaps/antagonisms, primacy, alignment table
• Objectives, goals and and mission are all same [17.2/17.3] – merge. But use ‘targets’ [18]
• Drop para on strategies [19] – over-complicates. This is role of IAP
• Implementation arrangements [20] – merge with IAP
• Legal and Regulatory Arrangements [20.2] – already addressed under ‘alignment’ [15].
• Monitoring and Evaluation framework and Reporting [20.4] - makes a statement but provides no guidance
• Advocacy and Dissemination (Communication Strategy) [20.5]
  • Website needed - common for all policies?
  • Standard GRN press release - invitation to public to comment
  • Revised EMA will require a policy SEA (common approach to public engagement needed?)
• Implementation Action Plan [21] - duplicates earlier section on implementation arrangements – merge
• Language [25] - local language versions of policy to improve understanding and communication
• Volume [26] – should be standardised for all policies
Implementation Action Plan

• Repeats/duplicates much of earlier text

• IAP should not have separate objectives to the policy

• Use targets – not objectives

• Remove para on strategies

• Activities/task = statement. Needs to be more ‘guiding’, ie “The IAP should …”
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