

# Evaluation Management Response

**Purpose:** To guide the formal, mandatory management response to an evaluation in the IUCN standard format.

**Sign off:** Approving authority according to DoA with consultation by PM&E for HQ programmes and RPC for regional programmes.

**PGS instructions:** PGS Module 5, section 5.5.6.

Project identification data			
<b>Project title:</b>	SUSTAIN AFRICA		
<b>Date started:</b>	January 1, 2014	<b>Registration n°:</b>	P00927
<b>Date closed:</b>			
<b>Project manager:</b>	<b>Programme/office:</b>		
Mark Smith	Global Water Programme		

Management Response Summary Data	
<b>Name of evaluation or midterm review:</b> Mid-term evaluation of an IUCN initiative: Sustainability and Inclusion Strategy for Growth Corridors in Africa - SUSTAIN	<b>Unit/person responsible for managing/tracking follow-up:</b> Global Water Programme/Mark Smith & Isabelle Fauconnier
<b>Date received:</b> 13 June, 2017	
<b>Date Management Response approved:</b>	<b>Units/individuals requested to take action:</b> SUSTAIN global corridor and cluster level partners
<b>Last updated:</b>	

Recommendation	Management response	Intended Result	Actions planned (including timeframe)	Completed Actions (progress update)	Responsibility
<b>Bundle No. 1<sup>1</sup> Theory of Change and M&amp;E</b>					
<i>List each recommendation from the report, one per row.</i>	<i>e.g. Agree, partially disagree or disagree (explain as needed)</i>	<i>What is the intended result of the action you plan to take?</i>	<i>Actions should be SMART</i>		<i>Responsible unit/person and any other notes</i>
<b>Theory of Change (TOC)</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on first early markers of change in the field, reflect on sequencing and prioritizing of lower, intermediate outcomes in the TOC, arriving at a clear result (or outcome) hierarchy and adjust the TOC accordingly. That could best be done at the next learning event.</li> <li>Use the change suggestions as already formulated in the current TOA also as inputs in that reflection; and then merge TOA with TOC;</li> <li>The overall SUSTAIN TOC structure can remain as it is, but it will be enriched with more detailed level of changes;</li> <li>The discussion and reflection on the TOC must also include a critical analysis of all activities with regard to their relevance and added value, including the cost-dimension.</li> </ul>	Partners agree that the TOC can be enhanced to better reflect experience so far with how actions and outcomes are unfolding at different levels of the programme, and to be a more constant reference tool. Also agree that ToC and ToA can be merged into one to avoid confusion. At the same time, enhancements to the ToC must take into account potential programme design changes that might come into effect for SUSTAIN Phase 2.	Greater ease of use of and reference to the ToC by SUSTAIN partners to design and monitor activities and results.	1 <sup>st</sup> meeting of the partners to review and discuss ToC in relation to early outcomes (held on Jul.6); Follow-up work by M&E team to propose enhanced ToC; Follow up work by IPs to re-work cluster-level ToCs; Harmonisation of programme and cluster level ToCs; Agreement on this by next Global Partners' meeting (Dec 2017).	1 <sup>st</sup> meeting of the partners to review and discuss ToC in relation to early outcomes (done, Jul.6);	SUSTAIN M&E officers (HQ) shepherding, all partners involved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stimulate the development of more detailed, field based TOC per IP, based on their realities and context in the growth corridors; that will provide to them the basis for adaptive management.</li> </ul>	Agree	Improved cluster level ToCs that better reflect reality on the ground	IPs to re-work cluster-level ToCs, then work with partners to harmonise with programme-wide ToC	Work with implementing partners in Tanzania and Mozambique to revise their ToC	Implementing Partners in consultation with SUSTAIN M&E officers (HQ)

<sup>1</sup> The recommendations from the Mid-term review have been grouped into three bundles, to facilitate gathering inputs for the Management Response across the SUSTAIN partnership.

Recommendation	Management response	Intended Result	Actions planned (including timeframe)	Completed Actions (progress update)	Responsibility
<b>Bundle No. 1<sup>1</sup> Theory of Change and M&amp;E</b>				and relevant indicators ongoing.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss and agree on how the new nature based VC are also including the different key changes as described by the other SOs. This would then also respond to the key question whether these changes have a transformative character fitting with the SUSTAIN vision.</li> </ul>	Agree that a less silo'd representation and understanding of SOs would be beneficial across the partnership, including how nature based VC objectives integrate with the other SOs.	Improved understanding of SUSTAIN's objectives as part of integrated landscape approach for IGG	This is being addressed as part of the work on the ToC.	Same as TOC status above.	SUSTAIN M&E officers (HQ) shepherding, all partners involved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Mozambique: take time to reflect on and analyse the existing livelihood or subsistence sectors, including the lessons from other projects; thoroughly update the situational analysis</b></li> </ul>	Partially agree. SUSTAIN partners continue to believe that the Mozambique landscapes offer an opportunity to work on IGG from a different perspective, focusing on the inclusivity of small farmers and their transition to "beyond subsistence" livelihoods, thanks to improved productivity and market linkages through SUSTAIN.	IGG is demonstrated in an area that is initially characterised by livelihoods and subsistence activities, including to bring communicates and subsistence farmers out of poverty to partake in growth opportunities.	IPs, with support from K2I partners (including ESARO) will work on putting more emphasis on market linkage interventions in the Mozambique landscapes.	Ongoing work with implementing partners to draw out this emphasis.	Mozambique Programme Coordinator with Moz IPs, to ensure that ADPP/MICAIA are enabled to carry required focus
<b>M&amp;E</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Put working on the current M&amp;E indicators framework on a hold and first engage with the IPs, using their inputs by making explicit use of the first early markers of change to identify better, more suitable (outcome) indicators. That should also lead to shared understanding of the content of each indicator avoiding multiple interpretations;</li> <li>Focus on intermediate changes or outcomes first, because they are best markers of suitability of pathways of change SUSTAIN stands for towards final impact. A bigger focus on clearly defined intermediate outcomes may also be helpful to establish baseline values and targets</li> <li>Review and establish SUSTAIN indicators that can be easily found from its key stakeholders' reports and have the required quality</li> </ul>	Agree that indicator framework continues to need simplification and improved measurability.	Improved usability and usefulness of SUSTAIN indicators.	Indicator framework is under review with input from IPs. A set of results categories is being proposed, to which relevant and useful indicators will be mapped.	Work ongoing since April 2017.	SUSTAIN M&E officers (HQ) shepherding, in consultation with partnership
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More on the ground presence and practical M&amp;E support and learning by IUCN NC and HQ is crucial to revert the tendency of prescribing M&amp;E tools; that support would also include a closer collaboration with IP M&amp;E staff to make use of their skills, insights and experiences; that would also strengthen more informal and frequent learning on the ground.</li> </ul>	Agree that on the ground presence and support will be key. Disagree that M&E tools have been "prescribed" – until recently efforts focused on stabilising a final framework in consultation with partners before undertaking practical training on finalised tools.	Partners are more comfortable and have increased ownership in using the M&E framework.	Once above actions are completed, practical support to IPs can begin.	Two missions conducted to support IPs on M&E (August and October 2017).	SUSTAIN M&E officers (HQ) to lead on practical M&E training.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree on the best way to collect and analyse disaggregated data and information in order to assess the quality of inclusiveness; decide on the specific categories of persons to be distinguished.</li> </ul>	Agree that data collection and analysis methods need to be further harmonised and agreed for maximum effectiveness and usefulness, including disaggregation approaches aiming at measurement of inclusiveness results.	Improved measurement and monitoring of inclusiveness, and of data collections methods more generally	Team discussion and allocation of responsibilities to carry out this work	Not started	SUSTAIN M&E officers (HQ) to lead
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include M&amp;E on unexpected changes and context changes on a regular basis.</li> </ul>	Agree	Improved learning on unexpected changes and how they articulate (or not) with	Incorporation of question on unexpected changes in regular reporting.	Done (2017 semi-annual reporting template)	Global Water Programme

Recommendation	Management response	Intended Result	Actions planned (including timeframe)	Completed Actions (progress update)	Responsibility
<b>Bundle No. 1<sup>1</sup> Theory of Change and M&amp;E</b>		ToC			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use the stories from the field in a more systematic manner, selecting beneficiaries to share their feedback.</li> </ul>	<b>Agree.</b>	Stories from the field capture and illustrate achievements and policy lessons for IGG.	<i>See actions planned under learning category of recommendations.</i>	New stories writing in progress.	All partners.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IATI process which needs a clear result hierarchy, may be used to streamline the transition to a more simple and practical M&amp;E; the support that AKVO will provide for this IATI compliance, will also help the proper formulation of indicators (see recommendations above).</li> </ul>	<b>Partially agree.</b> The IATI process is designed to record machine readable, quantifiable indicators, and may not enable a full representation of changes and results under SUSTAIN. For this reason, the annual narrative reporting constitutes a useful complementary output to crystallise learning across the partnership.	IATI compliant reporting is online. IATI compliant reporting aids in streamlining overall reporting process.	Continued adaptation, with support from AKVO, to IATI compliant reporting, including streamlining of indicators.	Ongoing	SUSTAIN M&E officers (HQ) with Global Water Programme.
<b>OECD criteria</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirming that SUSTAIN is well on its way to meet OECD criteria, the relevant recommendation is to give more attention to the bottom-up process of M&amp;E and learning, reflect on the result hierarchy of TOC (and jointly review the Mozambique work packages at cluster level in relation to the selected landscapes.)</li> </ul>	<b>Agree.</b> Relevant responses and action outlined in sections above.				

Recommendation	Management response	Intended Result	Actions planned (including timeframe)	Completed Actions (progress update)	Responsibility
<b>Bundle No. 2<sup>2</sup> Articulation of Implementing Partner and Knowledge to Impact activities</b>					
<i>List each recommendation from the report, one per row.</i>	<i>e.g. Agree, partially disagree or disagree (explain as needed)</i>	<i>What is the intended result of the action you plan to take?</i>	<i>Actions should be SMART</i>		<i>Responsible unit/person and any other notes</i>
<b>Learning and Capacity building</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In general, give more attention to cluster level experiences and lessons as inputs into the support, coaching, capacity building activities.</li> <li>Learning must be further scaled down to the field (see also M&amp;E recommendations) to improve the learning inputs for the formal learning events. Joint partner meetings and learning events are the best opportunities to stimulate that approach and improve the facilitative management style of IUCN HQ.</li> <li>Make use of current insights on early markers of change by IPs, as inputs into 1) the M&amp;E framework and, parallel, to 2) give the broad SUSTAIN concepts a practical angle. Both steps will improve the local ownership, because direct</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree.</b> Cluster level experiences provide essential learning that should be used to inform and update coaching, support and capacity building activities. Cross learning between cluster/district level and landscape level provides opportunities for deeply relevant and feasible 'solutions.' This has been the intent and efforts will be sharpened in this direction going forward.</p> <p><b>Partially agree that learning must be further scaled down to the field.</b> Learning in SUSTAIN is already designed to collect inputs from field levels, but in practice this is only gaining momentum</p>	<p>Coaching and capacity building is more relevant for all audiences by drawing on current experience and recent learning from the field, and goes both ways between cluster teams and programme levels teams.</p> <p>Learning from the field is actively used across the programme and increases both effectiveness of</p>	<p>A more systematic process for capturing learning will be put in place, including e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continuous documenting of findings, best practices and lessons following interventions on the ground, in short form;</li> <li>- Regular feedback is sought from cluster stakeholders on the assessment/findings and lessons generated following interventions;</li> <li>- Cross-cluster mentorship is built into work plans and budgets with regular meetings/calls and products (e.g. lessons from the field);</li> <li>- Lessons, best practices and stories are expanded, deepened by Global learning team to inform CB, policy influencing and communications about the programme.</li> <li>- Production and dissemination of communication materials about lessons</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Landscape level and programme level stories are being documented</li> <li>- Land Use dialogues offer a space for feedback from stakeholders</li> <li>- Partners' meetings provide opportunities to share lessons from the field across clusters</li> <li>- Best practice compilation ongoing through work with FRI</li> </ul>	<p>Implementing partners continuously record lessons, best practices and stories, and feedback from stakeholders (at least in short form), and feed them to global learning team.</p> <p>Global learning team supports to flesh out the lessons, best practices and stories that will be used for CB, policy influencing and communications.</p> <p>National and Global Programme coordinators arrange for spaces and times for cross-cluster mentorship and programme wide learning</p>

<sup>2</sup> The recommendations from the Mid-term review have been grouped into three bundles, to facilitate gathering inputs for the Management Response across the SUSTAIN partnership.

Recommendation Bundle No. 2 <sup>2</sup> Articulation of Implementing Partner and Knowledge to Impact activities	Management response	Intended Result	Actions planned (including timeframe)	Completed Actions (progress update)	Responsibility
<p>use will be made of their experiences on the ground</p>	<p>now that early results are happening. More proactive collection of stories from the field is also underway.</p> <p><b>Agree</b> that Joint partner meetings and learning events are the best opportunities to stimulate that approach and the recommendation to use this moment to facilitate transition to more bottom up management.</p> <p><b>Agree</b> that actively building IP's insights on early markers of change on the ground will enhance the M&amp;E framework and improve local ownership.</p> <p>In addition, learning from landscape level work and on early markers of change at landscape and corridor level, when well used, communicated and promoted, will induce a virtuous circle of ownership and local emulation leading to scaling up.</p>	<p>communication and policy influencing, and local ownership for the programme interventions.</p>	<p>and best practices to diverse levels of cluster stakeholders</p> <p>We will also continue to put a large focus on field level (landscape level) learnings during the Global Partners' Meetings (GPMs) and will also find a mechanism for such learning to emerge from corridor level partners' meetings and to be broadly shared among the SUSTAIN partners in a timely way.</p>		<p>from demonstration landscapes.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity building of diverse stakeholders on the ground need to have a more tailor-made character, based on a shared view on what better performance of these actors implies</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree.</b> Capacity building activities must be both demand driven and strategically oriented to achieve programme goals. Achieving shared view on better performance for Inclusive Green Growth with Integrated Landscape management (IGG + ILM) is key and has been the object of many early and ongoing consultations with stakeholders in the programme. This in turn can drive demand for CB activities. Cluster level needs provide a guiding hand for the planning and design of support and CB activities from the K2I active partners and other sources. This has been emphasised from the outset at programmatic level but needs more concerted efforts in the last 18 months of phase 1.</p>	<p>Coaching and capacity building is more relevant for all audiences by drawing on current experience and recent learning from the field, and goes both ways between cluster teams and programme levels teams.</p>	<p>Partners and key stakeholders will collaborate more systematically to design CB events according to needs and specific, contextualised understanding of what IGG means locally. Specifically, this entails:</p> <p>Capacity building needs on the ground semi-annually assessed by Implementing Partners and National coordinators and fed back across SUSTAIN partnership teams.</p> <p>SUSTAIN CB coordination supports in designing tailored CB menus for different audiences and thematic foci, in keeping with SUSTAIN's IGG+ILM approach</p> <p>SUSTAIN CB coordination supports in matching needs (chosen menus) with training capacity and resources across the partnership and in-country.</p>	<p>CB activities and needs collected from all partners and CB matrix of concepts, skills and practices for IGG has been developed</p>	<p>Implementing Partners and National coordinators</p> <p>SUSTAIN CB coordination (ESARO + WP)</p> <p>SUSTAIN CB coordination (ESARO + WP)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>VCD capacity building will need a stronger market systems orientation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Partially agree.</b> There is a need to differentiate between SUSTAIN's two corridors, SAGCOT and Zambezi. In</p>	<p>Value Chain capacity building supported through SUSTAIN fully reflects Inclusive</p>	<p>In Zambezi corridor, build momentum on VCD activities and capacity building for market linkages.</p>	<p>Zambezi corridor and landscape workplans under revision to make these dimensions more salient.</p>	<p>Implementing partners in Zambezi corridor and landscapes, and in SAGCOT corridor and landscapes.</p>

Recommendation Bundle No. 2 <sup>2</sup> Articulation of Implementing Partner and Knowledge to Impact activities	Management response	Intended Result	Actions planned (including timeframe)	Completed Actions (progress update)	Responsibility
	<p>SAGCOT, there is already a clear and specific market systems orientation for each VC being supported. However, agree that this needs more attention in Zambezi.</p> <p>Also, note that we are aiming for transformative change towards Inclusive Green Growth (IGG), so current market constraints (e.g. externalities) are barriers to achieving our aims. Thus while being market oriented we are also aiming to be agents of change in those markets.</p>	<p>Green Growth objectives and Integrated Landscape Management approaches in its content relating to market linkages.</p>	<p>In both corridors, carefully select market partners who are aligned in vision of inclusive green growth. Focus policy interventions that enable those progressive market oriented players to have advantage.</p> <p>The partners will take stock of the type of training they have delivered on VCD and share experiences, successful approaches, particularly on the theme of market linkages and how that can be strengthened.</p>		<p>Support from National Coordinators and K2I partners on strategic direction and content of VCD training.</p>
<b>Facilitation role of IPs<sup>3</sup></b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Having agreed on the crucial dimensions and importance of this facilitation role for sustained results, discuss, agree and monitor the different specific components of this role;</b></li> <li>• <b>More attention is needed for guidance from IUCN HQ and learning about this facilitation role at least till end of current phase; that also includes the necessary facilitation skills and capacities the IPs;</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Partially Agree.</b></p> <p>The recommendation to discuss, agree and monitor the components of the facilitation role is valuable not only in terms of internal learning and performance improvement on the part of all partners, which is key, but also from the standpoint of “Who will take on the role of facilitating new partnerships for IGG &amp; ILM after the programme ends?” From that perspective, it will be important to prepare those actors for the role through CB activities, including learning by doing through participation in SUSTAIN activities.</p> <p>Disagree that guidance on</p>	<p>Facilitation in its different dimensions and functions is well understood by partners and stakeholders as a key component of fostering IGG, during and beyond the SUSTAIN programme.</p>	<p>Implementing partners at all levels of the programme discuss, and learn about the different components of this role, sharing experiences, tools and concepts (at next Global Partners’ Meeting December 2017).</p> <p>Ongoing monitoring and learning about this role is shared at semi-annual and annual partners’ meetings and cross-cluster field visits.</p>		<p>All partners. Global and National Coordinators shepherd.</p>

<sup>3</sup> The MTR noted the importance of the Implementing Partners’ facilitative role in the implementation of activities. According to the MTR, two most important aspects of this facilitation approach are:

- 1) The capacity to identify, access and mobilize specific technical expertise, required for proper implementation. The IPs do not need to have all technical expertise in their own team, but they need to know where to get the necessary expertise. This requires relation building with knowledge institutes, specialized services, etc. A good example has been AWF who accessed technical expertise on sugar cane from other sources instead of developing its own expertise.
- 2) The capacity to properly facilitate partnerships, availing of softer skills in order to foster relations whether in a VC context, or intra-government departments set-up, learning platform, community based organizations, etc. Apparently, SUSTAIN took this dimension already in consideration during IP identification: the project managers have these necessary skills, are accepted as neutral facilitator by other stakeholders, and are politically sensitive and knowledgeable.

<b>Recommendation</b> <b>Bundle No. 2<sup>2</sup> Articulation of Implementing Partner and Knowledge to Impact activities</b>	<b>Management response</b>	<b>Intended Result</b>	<b>Actions planned (including timeframe)</b>	<b>Completed Actions (progress update)</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
	facilitation skills comes only from IUCN HQ, as the IPs on the ground are actually developing the most in-depth experience and can teach others about their lessons learned. While Global units have a lot of experience they may share about facilitation in general, the kind of facilitation happening under SUSTAIN, in particular for new partnerships establishment towards IGG models, is in fact new and being pioneered by the IPs.				
<b>Partnerships establishment and policy influencing</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Continue working with key corridor agencies, but remain alert whether this type of stakeholders sufficiently assure inter-ministries collaboration as envisioned within the landscape approach, which may imply more direct collaboration with these ministries</b> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree.</b> Corridor agencies only address one part of the picture and it has always been understood in SUSTAIN and that cross sectoral convening, coordination and platform enabling remains essential in addition to working with those agencies. That cross sectoral work already happens at national, corridor and local level, from ministries to their local implementing agencies. It is essential to the landscape approach and it is highly contextualised.</p> <p>IPs use a participatory approach in partnership building and policy influencing. E.g., SNV in their yearly planning identify key partners based upon their level of influence, contribution and facilitation they are able to provide during the course of interventions. AWF has been putting a lot of effort already into connecting with ministries and government bodies, ensuring they are aware of and engaged in SAGCOT processes.</p>	Corridor agencies are better connected with ministries and government departments through SUSTAIN and there is greater synergy and buy-in between corridor efforts and land, forest, water and wildlife efforts, leading to a better enabling environment to foster IGG.	Yearly workplanning and budgeting for implementation of activities considers existing corridor level agencies and institutions that will aid successful implementation for results.  Multi-stakeholder platforms and forums, include representatives from across sectoral agencies.  Land use dialogue facilitate the cross linkages.	Examples: Signed MoUs for partnerships with corridor agencies such as 1) National Land use Planning Commission in the preparation of Village Land Use Plans in Sumbawnga and Kilombero clusters; 2) MoU with Tanzania Forest Services for the preparation of Kalambo Nature Reserve.	National coordinators and implementing partners in nested collaborative way at cluster, regional, and national levels.  In SAGCOT, Corridor coordinator shares insights/lessons through EFG & GRG.
<b>Linking landscape results to higher levels</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Use the landscape level results with the higher levels contacts as an input for policy influence</b> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree.</b> The SUSTAIN programme is designed to use demonstration work at landscape level to feed</p>	Influencing policy adjustment for IGG at local, national and	(As above, see response to 1 <sup>st</sup> recommendation under this bundle ) A more systematic process for capturing	- Landscape level and programme level stories are being documented	All partners. Global and national coordination shepherds. K2I partners

<b>Recommendation</b> <b>Bundle No. 2<sup>2</sup> Articulation of Implementing Partner and Knowledge to Impact activities</b>	<b>Management response</b>	<b>Intended Result</b>	<b>Actions planned (including timeframe)</b>	<b>Completed Actions (progress update)</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<p><b>and adjustments. The practical and behavioural responses from the diverse stakeholders it collaborates with, will inform SUSTAIN on the contacts with greatest potential and/or priority.</b></p>	<p>into policy influencing at higher levels. The programme's engagement with a wide set of stakeholders across sectors and levels indeed offers valuable information about key contacts for policy shaping. We can be more strategic and agile in identifying and engaging priority change agents for intentioned change.</p>	<p>regional levels , by contributing though our landscape level interventions best practices, business cases, and lessons.</p>	<p>and documenting learning for policy influencing will be put in place;</p> <p>Use multi-stakeholder platforms to disseminate learning in policy-friendly, action-oriented language</p> <p>Strategically identify key contacts/change agents for policy influencing, on a semi-annual basis during corridor and Global partners' Meetings.</p> <p>In addition: Resources permitting, SUSTAIN will work towards the collection of landscape level evidence through studies/surveys, and research on existing challenges, issues and successes. These will be geared towards generating working scenarios as well as for providing the entry point for influencing policy at high level.</p> <p><b>Relevant</b> policy areas include: Land use planning; agriculture and irrigation; IWRM and Joint forest management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land Use dialogues offer a space for information to policymakers</li> <li>- Best practice compilation ongoing through work with FRI</li> <li>- MoUs signed with key agencies in WRM, land use planning, and Forest management.</li> </ul>	<p>(including ESARO) play a key role in dissemination and access to higher level policy makers.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Pay specific attention to the private sector based contacts in VC development as strong cases for this result linkages and policy influencing</b></li> </ul>	<p>Agree that private sector contacts and dissemination of lessons and results among business are key to policy influencing: this is part of the programme design.</p> <p>However, we should also be aware of and address potential agendas that the PS bring to these policy discussions. For example, the sugar industry agenda on seed cane has their interest ahead of smallholders which influences how they will advocate...and not always in alignment with IGG.</p>	<p>SUSTAIN influences both public and private sector (business) policies and practice.</p>	<p>Continue to work with business interests both in partnership building and didactic mode to maximise opportunities for influencing both public and private sector (business) policy and practice.</p> <p>Strengthen business contacts and engagement across VC levels</p> <p>Include a specific focus in learning activities on the role of business in IGG</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• building business cases</li> <li>• establishing partnerships with businesses in the landscapes</li> <li>• round tables and trainings with business leaders</li> </ul>	<p>Implementing partners at landscape level National coordinators at national/corridor level BBP and other K2I units at programme level.</p>

Recommendation	Management response	Intended Result	Actions planned (including timeframe)	Completed Actions (progress update)	Responsibility
<b>Bundle No. 3<sup>4</sup> Programme Coordination and Management</b>					
<i>List each recommendation from the report, one per row.</i>	<i>e.g. Agree, partially disagree or disagree (explain as needed)</i>	<i>What is the intended result of the action you plan to take?</i>	<i>Actions should be SMART</i>		<i>Responsible unit/person and any other notes</i>
<b>Coordination and management</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Jointly review the position of IUCN NL in the coordination of the SUSTAIN programme and agree on the three expected results of the three components IUCN is responsible for.</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree.</b> Steps have already been taken between March and May 2017 with IUCN NL to clearly delineate their responsibilities and deliverables. They have confirmed their wish to participate in the PMG, which we have underlined is a key management instrument to ensure good information flow across units, joint strategic thinking and problem solving, adaptive management, etc.</p>	<p>IUCN NL delivery goals are clear and delivery is effective.</p>	<p>Continued strategic and technical support from WP and others to aid IUCN NL in its delivery,</p> <p>Close monitoring of IUCN NL delivery against these clear objectives.</p>	<p>Workplan revised</p> <p>Clear objectives defined</p> <p>Regular communication and monitoring in place.</p>	<p>IUCN NL</p> <p>Global Coordination team.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Assigning a bigger responsibility to IPs and their cluster level activities with a stronger support and coaching role of IUCN National Coordinators and Global units.</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Partially Agree.</b> IPs are meant to carry full responsibility for cluster level activities, as per their contractual arrangement, with support when needed and requested from NCs and global units. At the same time, Corridor coordinators have a mandate to oversee, guide and when needed, provide course correction to the Implementing Partners. The Global units provide technical and strategic guidance to the Regional Coordinator and NCs and when needed or requested, to the IPs directly.</p>	<p>Delivery of Cluster level activities is enhanced by IP ownership and accountability along with technical and strategic support from NC and K2I partners.</p>	<p>More proactive and systematic exchange with IPs regarding their support, training and coaching needs: through joint annual workplanning and joint adaptive management at least semi-annually.</p> <p>Clarification of the role of the National Coordinators, including clearer differentiation of the oversight functions of the IP performance; guidance and technical support functions; and essential functions in-country to build strategic partnerships and to influence policy makers at national levels.</p>	<p>Support needs identified at annual Global Partners' meeting and in semi-annual reporting exchanges.</p>	<p>Cluster-level Implementing Partners</p> <p>NC's and RC</p> <p>Global K2I units</p>
<b>Fundraising</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Can be best pursued as an explicit and broad resource mobilization approach, with a longer term perspective in mind. Consider this resource mobilization as one of the explicitly expected (and negotiated) behavioral changes;</b></li> <li><b>Fundraising 'targets' must be contextualized, taking into account the nature of all three clusters and the types of actors active in and around those clusters.</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Partially agree.</b> In SUSTAIN we distinguish between 1) investment into IGG oriented collaborative partnerships by stakeholders themselves; 2) funding of the enabling functions around those partnerships (what SUSTAIN is doing and will need to continue after SUSTAIN ends); 3) funding of SUSTAIN programme interventions themselves. Each of</p>	<p>Resource mobilisation into IGG oriented partnerships is sustainable beyond the life of the programme.</p>	<p>Help local authorities become comfortable in an IGG partnership enabling role; and</p> <p>Help devise a financial sustainability mechanism for that role, through self-sustaining cost- recovery</p>		<p>Implementing partners involve local authorities in brokering new IGG partnerships.</p> <p>K2I partners support IPs in devising financial sustainability mechanisms for that</p>

<sup>4</sup> The recommendations from the Mid-term review have been grouped into three bundles, to facilitate gathering inputs for the Management Response across the SUSTAIN partnership.



	<p>these areas receives attention.</p> <p><b>Agree</b> that resource mobilisation strategy for enabling IGG (i.e. category 2 above) must be long term (i.e. beyond project life) in order to ensure true sustainability of SUSTAIN's interventions, and that it must be contextualised. Currently, SUSTAIN facilitates the making of new collaborative agreements among diverse stakeholders, that are interest-based and embody the objectives of IGG in a given context. That external facilitation role may become less necessary as behaviours change to proactively seek such arrangements, but likely would continue to sit with local public entities working cross-sectorally to facilitate and ensure the IGG quality of such arrangements.</p>		mechanisms.		role.
<b>OECD Criteria; Mozambique landscape level work</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Confirming that SUSTAIN is well on its way to meet OECD criteria, the relevant recommendation is to (...) and jointly review the Mozambique work packages at cluster level in relation to the selected landscapes.</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree.</b> SUSTAIN will continue to work in the spirit of the OECD criteria.</p> <p><b>Agree</b> that IP in Mozambique landscapes will need more support with the VCD and market access aspects of their work.</p>	<p>SUSTAIN programme delivery meets OECD criteria.</p> <p>Results in Mozambican landscape are consistent with SUSTAIN strategic objectives around IGG.</p>	<p>Additional technical guidance and strategic support will be given to the Implementing partner (ADPP)</p> <p>ADPP to clearly articulate VCD and market linkage objectives and activities for end 2017 and for 2018</p>		<p>National coordinator Mozambique and global coordinating team.</p> <p>Implementing partner in Mozambique (ADPP).</p>