Template for Plan of Recommendations/Management Response

Project Title and Reference No.: 'Investing in Walking and Cycling Policies in African Cities (within least developed countries), 14AC0001; 20231'

Contact Person: Carly Gilbert Patrick (carly.koinange@un.org)
Janene Tuniz (Janene.tuniz@un.org)

Management Response to Recommendations:
If management rejects any of the recommendations, the reason should be stated and an alternative course of action proposed that addresses the challenge which led to the recommendation.

No.	Recommendation	Acceptance (Rationale if rejected)[1]	Priority[2]	Party Responsible	Action Description	Time frame	Status of Progress
1	**Align a project's Theory of Change and subsequent Results Framework and ensure that at least one outcome is to a greater extent within the project's sphere of influence or control.**	Accepted	Critical	SMU (Sustainable Mobility Unit)	The Sustainable Mobility Unit (SMU) project team has met with the UNEP Evaluation team to talk about, among other things, the structure of a theory of change and how it can impact project effectiveness and monitoring. It has been noted that outcomes should be more directly linked to elements that are within the project control in terms of timelines and processes. This has been reflected in the development of	July 2024 onwards	Ongoing.

---

[1] Accepted, partially accepted, or rejected.
[2] Select priority level from these three categories:

  Critical recommendation: address significant and/or pervasive deficiencies in governance, risk management or internal control processes, such that reasonable assurance cannot be provided regarding the achievement of programme objectives.
  Important recommendation: address reportable deficiencies or weaknesses in governance, risk management or internal control processes, such that reasonable assurance might be at risk regarding the achievement of programme objectives.
  Opportunity for improvement: comprise suggestions to improve performance that do not meet the criteria of either critical or important recommendations

No.	Recommendation	Acceptance (Rationale if rejected)[1]	Priority[2]	Party Responsible	Action Description	Time frame	Status of Progress
					a UNDA Tranch 17 application and will be applied in all future project design processes.		
2	**Develop structures, processes, and mechanisms to address under-recognized co-funding by stakeholders, and stakeholder fatigue (within civil society, vulnerable groups (including women and people with disability, and small local partners).** **This could involve, for example:** • **Developing guidance for working group structures and expectations. Working groups are challenging to start up and sustain without an institutional home, funding (travel and stipend), and a clear MoU with consistent management and follow-up. It is not always easy to meet guidance around equitable participation by government and civil society.**	Accepted	Important	SMU	The UNEP Share the Road Programme is anchored in understanding the needs of vulnerable groups. While the project did have a clear Stakeholder Engagement we recognise it could be improved. For future projects – in our stakeholder strategy - we will include mechanisms for recognising stakeholder co-financing and managing stakeholder fatigue, guidance for governance set up (including working groups), and building stakeholder relationships form the outset. SMU will also be developing a unit action plan which is complementary to the project document that guides the activities of the unit. Consideration of these factors will be incorporated.	January 2025 onwards	Not yet started.

No.	Recommendation	Acceptance (Rationale if rejected)[1]	Priority[2]	Party Responsible	Action Description	Time frame	Status of Progress
	• **Finding a way to address immediate needs of stakeholders, to build trust and encourage active participation. This might involve flexible funding for events, exposure trips, or conferences. Their limited resources often lead to initial resistance towards projects.** • **Allocating some measure of discretionary funding for partner disbursement to sub-contractors, particularly in the secondary cities that face greater financial limitations (such as to local universities or NGOs)**						
3	**Implement strategic, outward-facing or public communication throughout a project by:** • **Including a budget line item for communication** • **Providing TA to project partners in strategic communication including project branding/'boilerplates' and messaging)**	Accepted	Important	SMU	Future projects will have a clearer communication framework developed in partnership with the SMU communication focal points- incorporating all of the recommendations.	July 2024 onwards	Ongoing.

No.	Recommendation	Acceptance (Rationale if rejected)[1]	Priority[2]	Party Responsible	Action Description	Time frame	Status of Progress
	• **Providing TA to project partners in high-level monitoring for evidence of effect, reach, or otherwise for its engagement value** • **Developing a full suite of social media posts at different stages of the project for pre-approval by the different communications teams given that the project could not have a dedicated page on any social media platform** • **Developing a content calendar to ensure consistent**						
4	**Seek funding to develop and explore strategies to strengthen the capacity of local civil society organizations, especially at the city level. This could help sustain their involvement beyond project timelines and contribute to project sustainability (ToC drivers).**	Partially Accepted	Important	SMU	The Share the Road Programme priority stakeholder group is government and work is often aimed at building the capacity and knowledge of national and city government. However, it is recognized that a strong local civil society presence keeps governments accountable when projects end and are an important mechanism for bottom-up change. Where funding allows, we will incorporate capacity	July 2024 onwards	Ongoing

No.	Recommendation	Acceptance (Rationale if rejected)[1]	Priority[2]	Party Responsible	Action Description	Time frame	Status of Progress
					building of civil society in future projects.		
5	**Seek funding to develop a post-project framework for tracking of vulnerable group inputs and commitments, until implementation.**	Partially Accepted	Important	SMU	It is recognized that this is very important. We always aim to ensure vulnerable group involvement is embedded in policy and it's government role to follow through on the policy. Our funding is project driven so we do not have funds to continue tracking vulnerable group inputs after the project has ended. It is noted, however, that more could be done to include specific indicators or systematic feedback mechanisms in future work, and we will incorporate this into the new Pan African Action Plan for Active Mobility (PAAPAM) Fundraising to strengthen the link between governments and vulnerable groups will continue.	July 2024 Onwards	Ongoing. Incorporated into UNDA Tranche17 proposal.

The following is a summary of lessons learned from some of the project's experiences and based upon explicit findings of the review. They briefly describe the context from which the lessons are derived, and the potential for wider application:

Lesson Learned #1:	**Stakeholder groups representing people who walk and cycle do not need to have an explicit NMT or road safety advocacy focus.**

Context/comment:	While it is quite common for cycling groups to mobilize, groups focused on the needs of pedestrians are less common. Therefore, engaging with stakeholders that represent different types of users such as the elderly, children or people with disabilities creates an opportunity for these stakeholders, who may not be actively engaged in NMT decision making processes, to be more involved in how cities are shaped to ensure their unique accessibility needs are met.

Lesson Learned #2:	**Stakeholder engagement can be a slow, iterative, intuitive process, which can be at odds with project efficiency and project timeframe.**
Context/comment:	In this project, the initial structure was very systematic. Engaging with vulnerable groups on city and national level and then engaging with government counterparts to share the outcomes of the engagement. In reality, workshops and engagement activities were varied depending on the country and stakeholder group. The outcomes from engagement were therefore quite varied depending on the format (1-1 meetings, workshops, discussions, forums). In some cases, governments were very comfortable to have a blended approach while in others, they preferred more intimate conversations. Engagement, therefore, was indeed an ongoing and iterative process that was reactive to the unique needs identified during implementation. This insight has enabled the Share the Road team to factor more flexibility into the stakeholder engagement process in future.

Lesson Learned #3:	**NMT investment plans are more likely to be implemented when linked to timeframes and budgets. Developing such detailed plans is easier within a context where policy and strategy already exist, where project partners have existing relationships with relevant government and decision-makers and other stakeholders, and when the country's financial systems and potential other revenue sources are well understood.**
Context/comment:	The Share the Road programme uses strong relationships and existing interest in the walking and cycling agenda as a strong marker for interventions. As walking and cycling is often marginalized in the transport development sector, a lot of advocacy work and resource is needed to build momentum from scratch. While it is intended that the programme expand its reach and advocate on a larger scale, having a strong in country presence through trusted and well-connected partners is essential.

Lesson Learned #4:	**Staff turnover within an organization, as well as political official turnover, can have a negative impact on project outputs and outcomes as well as credibility.**
Context/comment:	One of the in-country project partners had a very high staff turnover and at times it was challenging to ensure that the project delivery stayed on track. However, having other consistent regional partners helped to ensure that there was a detailed monitoring of the activities and that new staff were brought up to speed on the needs of the project.