

SustainableEnergy Management Response

to Evaluation Report for the ACE and PIPA projects

September 17th 2018

Aim: The Management Response, aims to comment on the utility of the evaluation report for the 2 projects *Accelerating the Implementation of Regional Policies on Clean Energy in West Africa (ACE)* and *Promoting Implementation of the Paris Agreement in East Africa with a focus on pro-poor low emission development (PIPA)* financed through CISU's Fund for Climate and Environment. The response expresses SustainableEnergy's position on the report and will contain the following sections:

1. **Overall response to the evaluation report:** In this section, the Management presents its general comments to the report and its conclusions.
2. **Response by recommendation:** In this section, SustainableEnergy addresses each recommendation, discussing them in the order presented in the report.

Overall response to the evaluation report by SustainableEnergy

SustainableEnergy appreciates the evaluation report which provides several relevant findings. The participatory approach of the evaluation team, where SustainableEnergy and the local partners were continuously involved in the assessment process, has provided valuable insights on both results as well as M&E methods. However, SustainableEnergy finds the report to be less clear on the following items:

The Score: The methodology for the scoring system is not clearly explained in the report. The scores for output indicators, objective indicators, and the score for outputs are merged rendering the usage of the scoring doubtful and comparison impossible.

Reference to the 92-group: SustainableEnergy disagrees with the stated link to the Danish 92-group in the report section 5.6. The PIPA partnerships are not related to some of the partners' historic cooperation with some 92-group members.

Assessment of assumptions: The second objective of the evaluation report was to assess the two projects' 4 commonalities including the underlying assumptions described in the ToR for the evaluation (ToR p. 4). These assumptions are briefly assessed in section 5.6, page 25 of the report. SE has requested the evaluation team for input on these assumptions. However, several of the critical underlying assumptions indicated in the ToR have been left out including:

- The first assumption is that reporting capacities exist from the outset of the project. The evaluation report does not assess this assumption.
- The fourth assumption is that meaningful relationships capable of engaging and sharing can be established among the partners within the first year of implementation. This assumption is not assessed in the evaluation report.
- The sixth assumption is that partners have the capability to measure impact of the campaigns and can find a relevant audience. This assumption is not assessed in the evaluation report.

Cost efficiency/cost effectiveness: It is not clear how the report distinguishes between (*cost*) *efficiency* and *cost effectiveness*. It appears to be more or less the same definition. It is used with the Logframe, however, it is not explained how the score has been calculated. The only place mentioning efficiency / effectiveness is section 5.5. p. 22 in relation to the final PIPA project meeting and conference. However, it is not clearly explained. The evaluation ToRs clearly define the concepts *Efficiency* and *Effectiveness* (p. 5) which is taken from OECD's

DAC definition. These definitions should have been used in the evaluation report to avoid confusion and improve on overall clarity.

Triangulation/support of findings: In section 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6, the evidence to back up the conclusions is lacking. It is not clear how the different triangulation methods have been applied to support findings and develop recommendations. It would have added more weight to the statements if the report had included an elaboration of the 3 external sources of where the information comes from (triangulation) as described at pages 9-10 in the inception report by the evaluation team.

Project	Recommendations by evaluation team	Management Response
ACE	<p>1. Given that the project ends in December 2018, it is urgent that the three country networks and ENDA embark on concrete advocacy activities, preferably focused on one specific advocacy goal at the regional level with ENDA in charge of the coordination and preparation of a policy brief, campaign materials, press kit, etc.</p>	<p>Among the project partners 2 themes were decided to work on in the regional advocacy. For reference, these are Taxation and social challenges in relation to big renewable energy power plans. Specific action plans are currently being developed for both themes including division of roles and development of campaign materials.</p>
ACE	<p>2. It is suggested to add a concrete work plan to the advocacy strategies within the three country networks, including specific targets to be reached by December 2018 and describing activities to be carried out by each of the 19-member organisations in Burkina Faso. The elaboration of such a work plan with targets is also relevant to the networks in Senegal and Mali.</p>	<p>The action plans and targets for 2018 will be reviewed to make sure that the activities planned including the national and regional policy briefs are consistent with the specific advocacy targets.</p>
PIPA	<p>3. SusWatch, TaTEDO, and SustainableEnergy are suggested to have more clear strategies for the development of a stable national CSO coalition in Kenya and Tanzania that can be the key force for influencing sustainable energy and mitigation issues at national and international levels – as is already the case with UCSD in Uganda.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is recommended that SustainableEnergy improve their contact and coordination with others international agencies supporting these issues in the same countries, e.g. WWF Denmark (WWF Kenya).</p>	<p>All 3 PIPA partners coordinated coalition meetings in June to discuss how best to scale up the project, share ideas, fundraising opportunities and way forward for stronger and active partnership. The 3 countries plan to continue working with the national coalitions on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support improved NDCs and LEDS and their implementation on national level → support coalitions • Promote implementation of SDGs → assist national coalitions • Work with regional institutions such as EAC when EAC is active on climate and sustainable development • Exchange of good practice in policies and practical solutions in East Africa and beyond, and experiences with climate financing • Fundraising for practical cooperation projects (as has been the case for PIPA) • Strengthen INFORSE-EA by reviewing the membership, develop a joint action plan, organize regional INFORSE meeting in relation to PIPA final conference, and develop a funding plan for the network.

<p>ACE & PIPA</p>	<p>4. The networks in West Africa could benefit from giving greater priority to their engagement and activities within the INFORSE West Africa network, which also needs more information in French.</p> <p>In the case of East Africa, it is recommended to continue to develop INFORSE-EA as a united force for sharing information, as well as for following and influencing the regional and international pro-poor climate change agenda.</p>	<p>The ACE project was designed to contribute to the revival and strengthening of INFORSE WA in terms of activities on the ground and not only in terms of information sharing. The membership form has been translated into French and circulated and it has been agreed that more information must be available in French. ENDA has prepared a presentation in French to be used by the national focal points. Moreover, a regional work programme is under development and at the final workshop in November 2018, one day will be allocated to organize the continued joint INFORSE WA activities. However, it is acknowledged that more facilitation of cooperation and joint advocacy activities could have been supported.</p> <p>In relation to the final PIPA project meeting in Nairobi, there was a meeting for INFORSE-EA members focusing on developing the work programme for East Africa.</p>
<p>PIPA</p>	<p>5.A: The three networks and SustainableEnergy should make an effort to enhance their advocacy, fleshing out their strategies in terms of (action) plans with specific key messages and targets (e.g. annual or six-monthly). Such plans should complement other advocacy instruments, not just lobbying but also public campaigns, involving coalition member organisations and mobilising constituencies.</p> <p>5.B: Furthermore, SustainableEnergy should improve its delivery of advisory and mentoring services regarding advocacy plans through various instruments.</p>	<p>The PIPA partners have included several other advocacy instruments than just lobbying in their national advocacy campaigns e.g. in Uganda, the coalition applied an event-based advocacy strategy heavily focusing on involving media and raising public awareness and support. Moreover, in Kenya there has been public campaigns.</p> <p>This second part of the recommendation (5.B) is related to the project partnership approach of having several partners. It is not clear however, which instruments the evaluation team has in mind. Scaling up advisory and mentoring services would require either an increase in resources or a decrease in the number of partners or ambitions. It would have been interesting with an elaboration on how the evaluation team assesses the prioritization of the level of advisory and mentoring services in comparison to the number of partners.</p>
<p>ACE & PIPA</p>	<p>6. The national focal points should strengthen the evaluation practice when carrying out training and capacity building activities, aiming at improving the pedagogical methods, facilitation and content of activities.</p>	<p>Recommendation accepted. It will be considered when developing new projects/interventions where training workshops are planned.</p>
<p>ACE & PIPA</p>	<p>7. The partner networks in the six countries should put high priority on fundraising for a continuation of the work in the networks. This includes resource mobilisation for each national network as well as elaboration of funding for the three networks collaboration in East and West Africa respectively.</p>	<p>There has been limited fundraising opportunities for the networks as the CISU fund for Climate and Environment was the main fund to support climate advocacy.</p> <p>Under the framework of INFORSE, regional activities have been identified to be applied for funding to.</p> <p>In Burkina Faso, CEAS has succeeded in fundraising for the national network's activities until the end of 2020.</p>

		<p>For East Africa, SE has succeeded in attracting a small amount of funding to continue parts of the network activities in Tanzania, Kenya, and Uganda through the new supplementary grant to the CISU supported programme in Kenya.</p>
<p>PIPA & ACE + SE general</p>	<p>8. The national focal points and SustainableEnergy should in their project planning pay more attention to the elaboration of indicators that are realistic and possible to verify.</p> <p>Furthermore, an annual status of the degree of implementation of the planned outcomes, outputs and indicators should be done, so LFA status beyond the reporting to the donor (CISU) can be seen as a tool for management in the focal points, coalitions and SustainableEnergy.</p>	<p>Recommendation accepted. SustainableEnergy has followed CISU indicators and CISU project logic, which is generally found to be sufficient.</p> <p>The practice is that each of the local partners reports on the logframe including indicators bi-annually. This is followed up on in emails, Skype calls, and physical meetings and visits. All the meetings and visits have included sessions on LFA status.</p>