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Abstract

Mott MacDonald, University of Cape Town and University of Birmingham commenced the establishment of a Centre for Sub-Saharan Transport Leadership (CSSTL) in February 2019. This Inception Report is the first deliverable and identifies updates to the methodology and information collated since the Kick-Off Meeting on 5th February 2019. The main task completed in this period is the initial shortlisting of two strong candidates as potential hosts for the CSSTL.

The Project Team generated a list of eight institutions (Universities of Namibia, Rwanda, Dar es Salaam (Tanzania), Addis Ababa (UoAA) (Ethiopia), Nairobi (Kenya), Ndejje (Uganda), Makerere (Uganda) and Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology [KNUST], Ghana)). A request for a Capability Statement was sent to each, with pre-defined questions to assist with converting the longlist to a shortlist of three (max.) for visits in April 2019.

The request to Makerere was delayed whilst awaiting contact details. Their Capability Statement was received on 6th March 2019. Following assessment of all the Capability Statements, a shortlist of two universities namely the University of Addis Ababa (Ethiopia) and KNUST (Ghana) is proposed.
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Research for Community Access Partnership (ReCAP)

Safe and sustainable transport for rural communities

ReCAP is a research programme, funded by UK Aid, with the aim of promoting safe and sustainable transport for rural communities in Africa and Asia. ReCAP comprises the Africa Community Access Partnership (AfCAP) and the Asia Community Access Partnership (AsCAP). These partnerships support knowledge sharing between participating countries in order to enhance the uptake of low cost, proven solutions for rural access that maximise the use of local resources. The ReCAP programme is managed by Cardno Emerging Markets (UK) Ltd.

www.research4cap.org
### Acronyms, Units and Currencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABET</td>
<td>Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABEEK</td>
<td>Accreditation Board for Engineering Education of Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEER</td>
<td>Association for Engineering Education of Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfCAP</td>
<td>Africa Community Access Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICTE</td>
<td>All India Council for Technical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASANRA</td>
<td>Association of Southern African National Road Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AsCAP</td>
<td>Asia Community Access Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCE</td>
<td>American Society of Civil Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEM</td>
<td>Board of Engineers Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCPE</td>
<td>Canadian Council of Professional Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIHT</td>
<td>Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Continuous Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIR</td>
<td>Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (Ghana &amp; South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSTL</td>
<td>Centre for Sub-Saharan Transport Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department of International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECSA</td>
<td>Engineering Council South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EngC</td>
<td>Engineering Council (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EngNZ</td>
<td>Engineering New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Gesellschaft fur Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKIE</td>
<td>Hong Kong Institution of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPE</td>
<td>High-Performance Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVT</td>
<td>High-Volume Transport (DFID-funded programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>Institution of Civil Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Computer Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEET</td>
<td>Institute of Engineering Education Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IES</td>
<td>Institution of Engineers Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRIM</td>
<td>Inter-regional Implementation Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JABEE</td>
<td>Japan Accreditation Board for Engineering Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBM</td>
<td>Joint Board of Moderators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNUST</td>
<td>Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (Ghana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>Mobility in African Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDB</td>
<td>Multilateral Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc</td>
<td>Master of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReCAP</td>
<td>Research for Community Access Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAICE</td>
<td>South African Institution of Civil Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSLDP</td>
<td>Transport Sector Leadership Development Programme (ReCAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UoAA</td>
<td>University of Addis Ababa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>University of Cape Town (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom (of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKAid</td>
<td>United Kingdom Aid (Department for International Development, UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UoB</td>
<td>University of Birmingham (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

The methodology outlined in the Technical Proposal was reviewed by ReCAP and clarification was provided by the project team about the options that were being proposed. The most important decision to note is that it has been decided the CSSTL will be based at a Host Institution in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) from the outset and not initiated in the UK or South Africa (SA) and later relocated to SSA. This is to ensure an SSA institution gains the full capacity building benefit from establishing this centre.

Host Institution Shortlisting

The assessment and shortlisting of candidate institutions has taken place during the Inception Phase rather than during the Interim Phase, as originally scheduled in the Terms of Reference. A selection of candidate institutions were asked to submit a Capability Statement to aid the Project Team in shortlisting up to three universities for a more detailed assessment.

The universities the team contacted include the Universities of Rwanda, Namibia, Dar es Salaam (Tanzania), Ndejje (Uganda), Nairobi (Kenya), Addis Ababa (Ethiopia) and Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (Ghana). On 26th February 2019 a request was also sent to Makerere University (Uganda) and a response was received on 6th March 2019.

In total six Capability Statements were received from these candidates, with no submissions received from Namibia or Nairobi. The Capability Statements were reviewed independently by the three education partners on the team (i.e. UCT, UOB and David Hughes of Queens University Belfast and Mott MacDonald) against a set of selection criteria. All three partners scored the Capability Statements slightly differently (see Appendix C), but all ranked the same universities in the top two positions. These are:

- Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana, and;
- University of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Whilst the intent was to shortlist up to three institutions, having reviewed all submissions, the team decided to proceed only with the strongest two candidates. This was due to a clear distinction between these two universities and the remaining competitors, in terms of their capability and links to other programmes and institutions that could benefit the CSSTL. It was not considered appropriate to ask another of the remaining universities to invest further time or expense in the process, or to raise expectations, when it was felt there is only negligible likelihood of them succeeding against the top two.

The shortlisted universities will be visited by members the Project Team and ReCAP in April 2019. This visit is to gain a better understanding of their suitability and enthusiasm to host the CSSTL. The team will interview key staff, understand their resource capacity (i.e. Management Staff availability) and assess the university infrastructure. Once this is complete, a decision on the preferred option will be taken collaboratively between the Project Team and ReCAP.

Once chosen, the formal engagement process will commence. The precise details of this engagement mechanism needs to be defined between the Project Team and ReCAP in the Interim Phase. This agreement is important to define roles and responsibilities and the mechanism through which the funding amounts allowed in the Terms of Reference for the Management Staff will be paid. This will be reported on in the Interim Report (and Draft Business Plan), which is scheduled for submission on 31st May 2019.

Engagement of the Host Institution is the foundation upon which progress through the remainder of the project is based. Therefore, it is important the Project Team, ReCAP and the chosen Host Institution work collaboratively to ensure it progresses smoothly, to avoid any delays to the programme.

CSSTL Working Group

A CSSTL Working Group is proposed to, among other requirements to be defined, keep the High-Volume Transport (HVT) programme informed of progress, as this project and the Project Team will be novated to the HVT programme at the end of ReCAP in June 2020. It is also to generate benefit from linkages to
professional institutions, such as Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (CIHT), who have indicated they may be able to provide someone to sit on the panel. It is proposed that this Working Group is established by ReCAP as soon as possible. The Project Team will support this effort as required.
1 Introduction

1.1 Project Background

Mott MacDonald, the University of Cape Town and University of Birmingham are working with ReCAP to implement the second phase of their Transport Sector Leadership Development Programme (TSLDP). The TSLDP project concept originated from the Association of Southern African Road Agencies (ASANRA), who identified a lack of technical and managerial leadership as a risk to the delivery of their highway transportation goals in the coming years. Whilst ReCAP generally focus on rural roads, they decided to take this broader transport-focused project forward and establish a capacity building programme that could help develop future generations of transport leaders in Africa.

Mott MacDonald and the University of Cape Town delivered Phase 1 of the TSLDP project in 2017. They identified that before any training is developed, a Centre of Excellence based in an appropriate sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) institution, responsible for owning and implementing this programme, was critical to secure its success in the long-term.

In Phase 2, Mott MacDonald, University of Cape Town and University of Birmingham are tasked with establishing this Centre of Excellence within a suitable institution in SSA. Their role is to identify this institution and work with it to establish the Centre of Excellence and technical and leadership training courses to be delivered. In selecting a suitable host, it must be demonstrable that the location can provide continuity and stability, has an excellent academic reputation and shows a long-term commitment to developing a sustainable CSSTL.

The projects goal is for the Host Institution to become the home of the CSSTL and the training courses. With our support over the next two years (and possibly up to four years), the aim is that the Host Institution can go on to operate the centre independently beyond the end of this project. To support this objective, the Project Team and Host Institution will be working together to develop links to other Universities, professional institutions and funding bodies who can support the Centre and the training programme in the long-term.

1.2 Purpose of this Report

This is the Inception Report and first deliverable for this phase of the project. The purpose of the report is to provide an updated approach and methodology for delivery, programme and update on other aspects raised during the Kick-Off Meeting, held at the University of Birmingham on 5th February 2019 (see Appendix A for minutes).
2 Refinement of Approach and Methodology

2.1 Phase 1: Inception Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Key Tasks</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Inception| Weeks 1-4| • Contract signature.  
          |          | • Kick-off meeting with ReCAP.  
          |          | • Team workshop.  
          |          | • Initial scoring and shortlisting of institutions.  
          |          | • Preparation of Inception Report and submission.                         | Inception Report  
          |          | Due: Week 4 (28/02/19)                                                    |                                                  |

At the Kick-Off Meeting it was agreed to shorten the Inception Period and submit this Inception Report on the 28th February 2019. This decision was agreed based on the significant amount of suitable content already contained within the Technical Proposal. This amendment is reflected in the updated programme provided in Section 4.

In line with discussions held during the Kick-Off Meeting, the task progression has been amended as shown in Figure 1 below. The Terms of Reference indicated the Inception Report should provide a refined approach and methodology and programme, refined criteria for selection of the CSSTL Host Institution and a preliminary shortlist of possible hosts. Furthermore, it states appropriate selection criteria for the CSSTL Management Staff and their Terms of Reference should be provided.

**Figure 1: Tasks during Phase 1 Inception for shortlisting of host institutions (circled below)**

More detail on the findings from the Host Institution assessments and the findings from the Capability Statements received, is provided in the sections below. This culminated in the selection of the final shortlist of up to three universities (see Section 2.1.1.5) which shall receive visits from members of the Project Team in the Interim Phase.

2.1.1 Selection of the Host Institution

2.1.1.1 Selection Process

An overview of the selection process is outlined in Figure 2 below. Further explanation is provided in the subsequent sections.

**Figure 2: Overview of the selection process**
2.1.1.2 Scoping Phase

A review of SSA countries and their institutions was conducted during the Scoping Phase of TSLDP in 2017, culminating in the list of potential Host Institutions shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Initial Options for Host Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSA Universities</th>
<th>UK and SA Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Addis Ababa (Ethiopia)</td>
<td>University of Birmingham (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNUST, Ghana</td>
<td>University of Leeds (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Namibia (Namibia)</td>
<td>University of Southampton (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ibadan (Nigeria)</td>
<td>University of Cape Town (South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Dar-es-Salaam (Tanzania)</td>
<td>University of Stellenbosch (South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardhi University (Tanzania)</td>
<td>University of Pretoria (South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndejje University (Uganda)</td>
<td>University of Kwa-Zulu Natal (South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nairobi (Kenya)</td>
<td>CSIR (South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National University of Rwanda (Rwanda)</td>
<td>CSIR (South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makerere University (Uganda)</td>
<td>CSIR (South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makerere University (Uganda)</td>
<td>CSIR (South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>CSIR (South Africa)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.1.3 Preliminary Shortlisting

The options in Table 1 were reduced to a Preliminary Shortlist of eight universities in a second screening exercise during the Inception Phase. The eight universities were issued with a request to submit a Capability Statement with a defined set of questions. A copy of this Capability Statement is provided in Appendix B. This was used to help the Project Team understand each candidate’s capability and commitment to host the CSSTL. Their responses were used as the major input in a multi-criteria analysis based on the selection criteria defined in Table 2.

Table 2: Criteria for Shortlisting and Selecting the Host Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criterion</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport offering</td>
<td>Currently delivering relevant transport courses</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire</td>
<td>Has the institution the interest and desire to run the CSSTL in the long-term</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course accreditation</td>
<td>Currently delivering courses accredited by internationally recognised professional institution</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Has the institution the physical infrastructure to run the centre</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>Strength of the institution’s reputation in the region and internationally</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to tertiary institutions</td>
<td>Has the institution got links to tertiary institutions (i.e. other universities, particularly internationally recognised)</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs)</td>
<td>Has the institution got links to MDBs</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to professional institutions</td>
<td>Has the institution got links to professional bodies, like ICE, CIHT, SAICE etc.</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>Has the institution two suitable management staff that could run the centre</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Is the centre location accessible and desirable to candidates from the region</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment between the CSSTL and university’s vision and objectives</td>
<td>Do the CSSL and the university share similar goals and objectives. How well is the CSSTL likely to fit within the university’s current operations and future plans.</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These institutions were screened based on existing knowledge of the institution, existing connections/partnerships and country security situation. Cognisance was also given to ReCAP’s preference that the institution is in a SSA country, so they gain the direct capacity building benefits of establishing the CSSTL, and not the UK or SA. An assessment of these institutions was concluded during the Inception
Phase. The final eight institutions selected based on this assessment are shown in Error! Reference source not found..

Table 3: Preliminary Shortlisting of Potential Host Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Institution Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kwame Nkrumah University Science and Technology (KNUST), Ghana</td>
<td>University of Rwanda, Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nairobi, Kenya</td>
<td>University of Namibia, Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia</td>
<td>University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndejje University, Uganda</td>
<td>University of Makerere, Uganda*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: Request for a Capability Statement sent to the University of Makerere on 26th February 2019 as contact details were being sourced. Contact was made at the 2019 ReCAP Inter-Regional Implementation Meeting (IRIM). Capability Statement response was received from Makerere on 6th March 2019.

2.1.1.4 Selection of Universities for Interview

The aim was to choose from the Preliminary Shortlist a maximum of three institutions that have the greatest potential to host the CSSTL. The three institutions will be visited by the Project Team during the Interim Phase of the project. This will involve interviews with key staff and site tours to understand their physical/infrastructural capabilities, before making a final decision on the preferred Host Institution. The other candidates and their capability statements will be kept on file at this stage as the outcome of negotiations with the preferred institution might force us to re-visit the options.

The institution that emerges from the selection process as the host, will be expected to meet certain criteria in line with ReCAP’s vision for the programme. The institution should be well situated, have a global appeal, and possess the necessary infrastructure to be, or quickly become, a centre of transport leadership activity in SSA. This means that the Host Institution needs to have adequate human resource in the form of highly qualified and competent academic and support staff, to oversee the programme successfully. In addition, well-equipped facilities such as lecture venues, libraries and IT facilities for off-site learning should be readily available at the institution.

The institution is also expected to maintain good industry and academic relations both nationally and internationally. Furthermore, the institution should be accessible physically and through information and computer technology (ICT) and be attractive for ReCAP, potential sponsors and students who will enrol on the programme. Equally important is that the host location (city, country), should have academic freedom and non-restrictive visa constraints on students and staff as intermittent movement to and from the host institution is expected.

It was intended that by asking pertinent questions in the capability statement, the potential hosts would provide a representative picture of their institution’s readiness and appetite to host the CSSTL. The areas of inquiry covered in the questionnaire and a brief explanation of how each question is relevant to the CSSTL is presented in Table 4.

Requests for Capability Statements were sent to the institutions listed in Error! Reference source not found. on the 13th February 2019. The request to the University of Makerere was delayed as contact details were pending. Contact was made at the ReCAP IRIM in Nepal on 26th February 2019. A request for a Capability Statement was sent to the University of Makerere on 26th February 2019, with a specified response deadline of 6th March 2019.

Table 4: Description of Capability Statement Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enquiry addresses</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available transportation programmes and departmental capability in terms of duration of programme’s existence, student enrolments and accreditation of the programme</td>
<td>This question was intended to get an understanding of the strength and quality of existing transportation related programmes available in the institution. This would help the team gauge if there are relevant modules that can be adapted for the CSSTL rather than build all modules for the programme from scratch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated academic staff strength and their core research interest in the overall transportation discipline.</td>
<td>This question gives insight if the institution has enough competent academic human resources to host and run the CSSTL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enquiry addresses</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of laboratories, access to online international library resources and other teaching and learning support facilities.</td>
<td>Gives insight into the institution’s available teaching aids and other resources that will facilitate qualitative teaching and learning both on campus and off site at the commencement of the CSSTL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing links with multilateral development banks, donor agencies and other relevant international funding bodies regarding the sponsorship of existing postgraduate programmes.</td>
<td>Explores the ability of the institution to sustain the programme with funds beyond the initial seed fund from ReCAP. This will help the team understand if the institution can potentially attract funding from existing partnerships and links to donor agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to the industry both locally and in sub-Saharan Africa.</td>
<td>Gives insight into the institutions links that will facilitate industry-based mentorship for the CSSTL participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How hosting CSSTL ties into the institution corporate strategic goal.</td>
<td>Gives insight into how the programme would fit into existing institutional and legal frameworks of the university to help the long-term vision of entrenching the premier transportation leadership programme in sub-Saharan Africa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1.1.5 Host Institutions: Final Shortlisting

Responses were received from six of the eight institutions contacted (KNUST, Ndejje, Rwanda, Addis Ababa, Makerere and Dar es Salaam). Unfortunately, the University of Nairobi was interested but could not provide a response within the allotted time due to other commitments, whilst no response was received from the University of Namibia. The response from the University of Makerere was received on 6th March 2019 following which the provisional shortlisting provided below was finalised.

It should be noted that the two universities shortlisted did not change as a result of the University of Makerere’s submission, as their Capability Statements strongly demonstrated the potential they hold as hosts for the CSSTL. The decision the Project Team made is that the Capability Statement submitted by the University of Makerere did not demonstrate sufficient capability to justify their inclusion as a third candidate on the shortlist.

The completed capability statements were scored against the criteria in Table 2. The table shows the scores and weights that were used to assess the potential Host Institutions. The weights were assigned based on the relative importance of the criteria. For instance, the availability of existing relevant transportation courses at the Host Institution, which directly affect how the programme’s modules will be delivered at its inception, is assigned a weight of 5. While course accreditation which is important but would not be a major issue until the programme is converted from a CPD format to a full degree in the future has been given a weight of 3.

The scoring was completed by the three educational partners (i.e. UCT, UoB and Dr David Hughes from Queens University Belfast) in the Project Team individually and independently. Once this process was completed, the entire scoring set was adjudicated by the project team to ensure consistent and fair application of the scoring criteria. A summary of their scoring is provided in Appendix C, with the two highest scoring, and therefore shortlisted candidates, being:

- University of Addis Ababa (UoAA), Ethiopia; and
- Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST), Ghana.

Each partner ranked the same institutions in the top two positions. Both the UoAA and KNUST strongly demonstrated their capability in addition to links they hold to other programmes and MDB’s, which could be of great benefit to the CSSTL.

The objective was to shortlist up to three institutions. Having completed the review, the Project Team decided to only shortlist UOAA and KNUST, as it was felt unlikely that the others, based on the significant difference between their scores and those of the leading two candidates, would have sufficient probability of success to merit them investing further in the process. This was reviewed again once the Capability Statement from University of Makerere was received.

The two shortlisted institutions will be engaged in further conversations and a visit from members of the Project Team and ReCAP in the Interim Phase before a preferred institution is selected. Identification of two strong candidates is a positive outcome at this early stage of the project and helps de-risk a concern raised at the proposal stage regarding the identification of a suitable institution.
2.2 Phase 2: Interim Phase

2.2.1 Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Key Tasks</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interim Phase</td>
<td>Week 5 - 20</td>
<td>• Assess shortlisted Host Institutions and select preferred option.</td>
<td>Interim Report&lt;br&gt;Due: Week 16 (31/05/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Define programme structure, course content and curricula.</td>
<td>Draft Business Plan&lt;br&gt;Due: Week 16 (31/05/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Define links to universities, institutions and MDBs.</td>
<td>Draft Business Plan&lt;br&gt;Due: Week 20 (28/06/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Define options for Asian TSLDP expansion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Team workshop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Interim Phase is scheduled to commence in March 2019 and finish at the end of June 2019. It incorporates the Interim Report, Draft Business Plan and Final Business Plan deliveries.

Figure 3: Tasks during Phase 2 Interim for selection of preferred host institution (circled below)

2.2.2 Host Institution Visits

Interviews with the shortlisted Host Institutions are proposed to take place in April 2019. This is subject to the proposed scheduling being agreeable to the Host Institutions, ReCAP Representative and the Project Team members who will join the visits.

The purpose of the visits is to provide them with greater detail on the TSLDP and CSSTL. From there it will be possible to gain greater understanding as to their capability and appetite to host the CSSTL.

An outline interview template will be drafted by the Project Team and shared with ReCAP in advance of these visits. This is to ensure agreement and consistency in approach with respect to the content to be covered.

2.2.3 Agreeing the Basis of CSSTL Operations

The following will be the basis for the establishment of the CSSTL and its operations. The CSSTL sits within an existing university in sub-Saharan Africa and forms part of its business for reasons borne out of practical necessity and value to the institution:

1. The Host Institution is responsible for the identification and fulfilment of any taxation or legal registration requirements resulting from hosting the centre. However, as the CSSTL is expected to form part of the hosts business-as-usual operations, it is not expected that these requirements are onerous.

2. If the CSSTL was setup as a separate business entity, it would become liable for any such taxation or legal registration regulations that apply in the host country. Compliance with these would add an additional cost to the annual CSSTL operations (e.g. filing of annual tax returns and associated accountancy costs).

3. The Host Institution must have a sense of ownership and investment in the CSSTL. This is vital for the institution to see itself as an Owner and Champion to achieve the sustainability objectives.
2.2.4 Selection of Preferred Host Institution

Once the interviews have been completed with the shortlisted institutions, a decision shall be made collaboratively between the Project Team and ReCAP regarding the Preferred Host. This decision shall be captured in the Interim Report due at the end of April 2019. The next phase of the project, covered in Section 2.3, involves the agreement that will need to be established between ReCAP and the Host Institution, defining the terms of the relationship and support the Host Institution will receive (i.e. funds allocated for Management Staff – see Section 2.2.5).

2.2.5 Identification of the Management Staff

A Terms of Reference / Job Specification for the Management Staff has been prepared during the Inception Phase and is provided in Appendix D. The Host Institution will be expected to propose two Management Staff who meet the criteria defined in this Terms of Reference. Provision of suitable Management Staff is a criterion in the selection of the preferred candidate institution.

2.2.6 Definition of Courses and Curricula

The definition of courses and curricula has been provided in the Technical Proposal under Section 3.10 and is not repeated here. The material provided in the Technical Proposal comes from the work undertaken by Mott MacDonald and the University of Cape Town in the Phase 1 Scoping Study for TSLDP in 2017. This content will undergo an additional review for suitability in the Interim Phase and undergo revision, if necessary. Further expansion of this content, in terms of converting the proposed curricula into course content and training materials for delivery, does not form part of this scope of works. It is expected that the selected Delivery Providers (i.e. supporting Universities or private sector companies, selected by the Host Institution, Service Provider and ReCAP) delivering the courses would develop the necessary materials required for the defined curricula. This would form part of their engagement as a supporting Delivery Provider for the TSLDP. However, the Education Management Specialist, Dr Mark Zuidgeest, will oversee the content and quality of these materials to ensure they are commensurate with the requirements of TSLDP.

Most potential Delivery Providers would be expected to have much of this content available from existing courses they deliver (e.g. existing transport/engineering MSc or existing leadership programmes etc.), which should be adaptable to the needs of the TSLDP.

Information on Mott MacDonald’s Emerging Leaders Programme is supplied in Appendix E. The team intend to explore the possibility of utilising this programme and/or its content to fast-track implementation of Leadership training on this project. This process has commenced and initial discussions have been held with Mott MacDonald’s Learning and Development Team. Further discussions will take place in the Interim Phase in addition to exploration of the possibility to utilise our relationship with the service provider who delivers Emerging Leaders for Mott MacDonald. In parallel with this, other suppliers and content delivery partners will also be researched.

2.2.7 Definition of Candidate Selection Criteria

Candidate selection criteria were developed during the Scoping Study undertaken in 2017. These remain valid now and are provided in Appendix F.

2.2.8 Establishing Links to Potential Funding Partners

Several links to Funding Partners were provided in our Technical Proposal. We are conscious ReCAP will also have links to these bodies. We are currently collating these contacts and intend to initiate communications with them early in the Interim Phase. It is important they are introduced into the process at an early stage, so any conditions they might place on the Project or Host Institution to secure their support, are known and managed from the outset.
The two shortlisted universities are operating programmes, courses or research centres that are partly funded by the World Bank. This was an important factor in the selection process, as these existing links could be explored for the benefit of the CSSTL. Having existing links and funding may mean that:

- Some funding may already exist to help support the establishment costs of the CSSTL;
- The Host Institution will have been through the MDB or Donor’s processes to secure funding, so will be familiar with what will be required. This should make navigating this process simpler.

In addition to MDB’s, UCT has close links with the Volvo Research and Educational Foundations and is hoping to start hosting the Mobility in African Cities (MAC) programme together with a number of partners in Sub-Sahara African cities in the years to come. This would enable ample opportunities for further fostering links with other transport initiatives on the continent.

2.2.9 Links to Professional Institutions

The Institution of Civil Engineering (ICE) in the United Kingdom and the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) in the USA, are two of the preeminent engineering professional institutions worldwide. They are responsible for the accreditation of University programmes, as well as the continuation of learning among members. In addition to ICE and ASCE, many African countries, are looking at the Engineering Council South Africa (ECSA), which regulates the quality of professionals and University programmes for all engineering disciplines in South Africa. ECSA maintains close links with ICE and ASCE.

A number of international accreditation organisations have agreed on the recognition of international degrees in Engineering and each other’s accreditation. This recognition was formalised in the Washington Accord. The purpose of the Washington Accord is recognition of the equivalence of Accredited Engineering Education Programmes leading to the Engineering Degree and is applicable only to Engineers. It is essentially a quality assurance process and is based on world best practice.

Signatories are: Australia (Engineers Australia), Canada (CCPE), Chinese Taipei (IEET), Hong Kong, China (HKIE), Ireland (Engineers Ireland), Japan (JABEE), Korea (ABEEK), New Zealand (ENZ), South Africa (ECSA), Singapore (IES), United Kingdom (EngC/ICE) and United States of America (ABET/ASCE). Provisional Members are: Germany (ASIIN), India (AICTE), Malaysia (BEM), Russia (RAEE) and Sri Lanka (Engineers Sri Lanka). As none of the identified African institutions are in countries with signatures to the Washington Accord, it can be concluded that they are not internationally accredited programmes.

The Project Team has links to the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation (CIHT), the Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE) in the United Kingdom and the South Africa Institution of Civil Engineers (SAICE) and Engineering Council South Africa (ECSA). These links were explored in Phase 1, with the CIHT and ICE in particular providing positive feedback on the possibility of support. These links will be re-engaged by the Project Team as this project progresses.

This process has commenced, with the team holding an initial meeting with CIHT on 22nd February 2019. The feedback from this meeting was positive, with CIHT indicating this is something they would be keen to explore supporting. They will aim to provide a point of contact to the Project Team whom we can communicate with regarding project progress and any items we require their advice and support with.

It was suggested in the Kick-Off Meeting that a Working Group may be setup to include key stakeholders, in particular the High-Volume Transport Programme (HVT). It will be worthwhile including the CIHT point of contact on this Working Group.

2.2.10 Options to Expand into Asia

To support expanding into Asia, we will build an understanding of the needs basis. Much of the high-level approach to the delivery mechanism and delivery content already identified for Africa can likely remain the same, albeit its regional context would change. We will undertake a desk review with a focus on understanding whether there is a need for TSLDP/CSSSTL there and who could support it in the region.

Given the Asian institutions are more developed than Africa, it is likely there will be more available options for hosting a centre like CSSTL and delivering TSLDP in Asia than were identified in Africa. The focus of the study will centre on the AsCAP countries initially and will be supplemented by a smaller review of other
institutions in other areas of Asia. The outcome of the study will be to make recommendations on the next steps to be taken. This may include a more detailed scoping study, similar to that undertaken in 2017 for this project, as such an extensive study in Asia is not feasible under this commission unless as an additionally funded task.

2.2.11 Draft Business Plan

An outline for the Draft Business Plan was provided in the Technical Proposal. This will be developed during the Interim Phase in collaboration with ReCAP. The Host Institution will also need to be involved in the development of the Business Plan. This involvement will be sought from the outset of their engagement on the project.

2.2.12 Draft Marketing Strategy

A marketing strategy will be developed in this Phase of the project, for implementation once the Host Institution is selected and the CSSTL established. The marketing strategy will identify the forms of communication and platforms to be adopted to distribute information about the CSSTL and upcoming training programme. It is important this is implemented as soon as reasonably practicable to garner enough interest from candidates to apply for the programme.

2.3 Phase 3: Establishment of CSSTL and Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Key Tasks</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment Phase</td>
<td>Week 21 – Contract End</td>
<td>• Agreement with the preferred Host Institution.</td>
<td>Progress Reports 1 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Engagement of the Management Staff.</td>
<td>Due: End of Weeks 28, 40 &amp; 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Finalise the Business Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Marketing the TSLDP and CSSTL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Engage implementation partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 3 of this project involves forming the agreement with the preferred candidate institution who will act as Host. Once this is decided, progress can continue with engaging the Management Staff they are expected to provide, finalisation of the Business Plan with their input and marketing the TSLDP and CSSTL to raise awareness amongst potential candidates.

Figure 4: Tasks during Phase 3 for Establishing the CSSTL and Training (circled below)

2.3.1 Agreement with Preferred Host Institution

The Project Team aim to establish an agreement with the Host Institution in the Interim Phase. However, this task may extend into Phase 3, depending on the efficiency with which the agreement can progress through the respective contract departments. This agreement should be between ReCAP and the Host Institution and this is discussed further in Section 3.1.1.

2.3.2 Engage the Management Staff

During the selection process, the candidate institutions had to identify the staff capability they possess to support the CSSTL. In the agreement with ReCAP, the Host Institution will be expected to identify the two
Management Staff that will be proposed to support the CSSTL implementation. Engagement of these staff will be subject to acceptance by the Service Provider and ReCAP, who will assess the candidates against the Terms of Reference/Job Specification provided in Appendix D.

2.3.3 Marketing

Marketing the CSSTL and TSLDP is critical to raise awareness of the impending training programmes and to attract candidates for the pilot programme. The pilot programme will be the initial delivery in the first year and will be used to test the structure, content and delivery of the training course. The marketing strategy developed in the Interim Phase will now be implemented, which will involve the distribution of marketing materials via a broad range of channels – e.g. via Regional bodies like ASANRA, regional professional institutions, presenting at regional conferences and social media platforms (e.g. ReCAP Twitter and LinkedIn).

2.3.4 Programme Setup and Progression

Discussions were held with Professor Ian Jefferson, who is the Deputy Head of School (Teaching) and Head of Education in the Department of Civil Engineering at the University of Birmingham. Professor Jefferson was supportive of the concept of developing teaching resources and modules for the CSSTL and in linking with this organisation, perhaps through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), when the Centre is established at a reputable University in sub-Sahara Africa.

In line with the project team’s initial thoughts, Professor Jefferson advised a staged approach to developing learning resources and a Transport Leadership qualification in sub-Sahara Africa. He thought accredited learning towards a qualification could initially be provided through short courses at the Host Institution leading to standalone CPD qualifications, eventually migrating to taught modules as elements of an MSc qualification. This staged approach would gauge interest in the programme and provide student output for future accreditation purposes.

These views on CPD to MSc progression are also held by the Project Teams Education Management Specialist, Professor Mark Zuidegeest, who is the Deputy Head of Department and Director of Undergraduate Studies in Civil Engineering at University of Cape Town (UCT). Similarly, UCT also expressed an interest in supporting the Host Institution and the CSSTL when the centre is established. Both links to UCT and University of Birmingham (UOB) will be explored further, in addition to support from other external universities, as this project progresses.

In line with this, it is the Project Teams opinion that goals need to be agreed in terms of what can be achieved before the end of ReCAP in 2020. The following is proposed:

- Baseline target: establish the CSSTL and the leadership development training (no technical training) before ReCAP ends in July 2020; and
- Stretch target: establish the CSSTL and the CPD programme of leadership and technical training before the end of ReCAP in 2020.

Establishing a bespoke degree programme will not be feasible within this initial two-year programme, although the development work for its establishment will be undertaken. It is more realistic that the development of the training programme into the degree would be a task to take place within the two-year extension period, through the planned Novation Agreement with the HVT programme. This will be confirmed later during project implementation.

There is benefit in this approach, as by this point, more information will be available on uptake and interest in the programme before committing extra resources to developing and accrediting a degree.
2.4 Phase 4: Pilot Implementation and Monitoring/Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase and Duration</th>
<th>Key Tasks</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot and Monitoring/ Evaluation</td>
<td>Week 45 – Contract End</td>
<td>Initiate pilot CPD programme;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor and evaluate the success of implementation and the training courses;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation and submission of the Final Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Project Team is aiming to have the pilot programme established by the second half of this year. This will likely be an independent leadership training programme or a collection of CPD courses. As explained earlier, this will be dependent on the speed with which the Host Institution and any external suppliers can be engaged.

Figure 5: Tasks during Phase 4 Pilot and Monitoring/Evaluation phase (circled below)

2.4.1 Management Staff Development

Management staff are likely to need substantial support in the early stages until they are developed to a level whereby they can confidently manage the CSSTL independently. This will be monitored by the project team as the project progresses. If additional support is required for the Management Staff, this will need to be discussed with ReCAP, or HVT/DFID, later in the project, as provisions for additional in-country support are not included in the project at this stage.

2.4.2 Monitoring and Evaluation of CSSTL Progress

Monitoring and evaluation criteria are provided in Table 5 below and will be used to assess performance of the CSSTL and monitor uptake and embedment moving forward. These will be assessed and updated as required based on the developments made in the next months of this project.
Table 5: Key Performance Indicators from Phase 1 Scoping Stage for the CSSTL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>KPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Courses Implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Training programmes successfully implemented (i.e. Intervention Levels 1-3). Should be tailored to suit specific goals of CSSTL once defined — i.e. what are the expectations after Year 1, Year 2, Year 3 etc., as this criterion will vary accordingly.</td>
<td>0 (Poor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (Fair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (Good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Links Developed to Other Institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) The number of links the centre has developed (in Year 1) and is maintaining (Year 1 onward) to external universities, technical and professional institutions across sub-Saharan Africa. Company name, address and key point of contact should be provided for each link.</td>
<td>&lt;15 (Poor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-20 (Fair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 – 25 (Good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;25 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) The number of links the centre has developed (in Year 1) and is maintaining (Year 1 onward) to external technical and professional institutions outside of sub-Saharan Africa. Company name, address and key point of contact should be provided for each link.</td>
<td>&lt;15 (Poor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-20 (Fair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 – 25 (Good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;25 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) The number of links the centre has developed (in Year 1) and is maintaining (Year 1 onward) to International Finance Institutions, IFI and other Donor Agencies. Agency/Bank name and key point of contact should be provided for each link. e.g. World Bank, African Development Bank, EU, Dept. for International Development (DFID), GIZ etc.</td>
<td>≤1 (Poor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2-3 (Fair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 – 5 (Good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≥6 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Funding secured for the TSLDP to cover running the course for the next...</td>
<td>0 Year (Poor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Year (Fair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Years (Good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3+ Years (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Funding secured for the CSSTL to cover running the centre for the next...</td>
<td>0 Year (Poor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Year (Fair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Years (Good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3+ Years (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Knowledge Transfer and Promotion of TSLDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Number of conference papers, journal articles and/or articles written and published in regional or internationally available magazines, journals or conferences annually by CSSTL staff.</td>
<td>≤2 (Poor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4 (Fair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-6 (Good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≥7 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Number of talks or presentations given at regional conferences, institutions or at the Leadership Centre (to external parties) regarding TSLDP and promotion of leadership skills development in transportation.</td>
<td>≤2 (Poor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4 (Fair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-6 (Good)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>≥7 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the centre, the programmes courses and content will also need to be monitored and evaluated. In Phase 1, an outline set of monitoring and evaluation criteria were provided and these will be used as the starting point for defining what is required under this next phase. The criteria are not repeated here, but the purpose of them is to:

- Ensure there is a good return on investment in terms of the benefits candidates will have on the industry in sub-Saharan Africa;
- Make sure we know what success looks like;
- Provide a mechanism to allow fact-based enhancements to the programme;
- Enable executives to understand programme dependencies;
- Create a rhythm of personal, departmental and organisational success that reinforces learning at every level.
The development of additional questionnaires and surveys will be required by the delivering institution(s) to address candidate feedback where required, particularly with regards post-programme assessments. This documentation shall be provided by the delivering institution and co-ordinated by the CSSTL Management Staff. The questionnaires should explore the following areas:

**Reaction:** Includes participants reactions to the learning and the overall participant experience. This ensures that the correct environment is in place to create and sustain a conducive learning environment. This is completed during and at the end of each module.

**Learning:** Key to assessing TSLDP. This can involve assessing knowledge gained through examinations and coursework etc. to post-programme questionnaires to determine whether attitudes have been changed. This should be completed throughout the programme.

**Behavioural Change:** Measures the extent to which participants have applied their learning back in the workplace. This should be completed through post-programme assessment in the months after the programme ends.

**Results:** Measures the impact of the programme on the industry and is likely to relate to specific business measures. This could be completed up to five years after the programme ends, particularly with a view toward assessing if candidates have progressed into leadership roles.
3 Operational Considerations for ReCAP

Below are tasks that ReCAP must be aware of in the implementation of this project. They are items that will need to be addressed as the project progresses. They sit parallel to the phasing shown in the previous section and addressing some of these (e.g. accreditation) will likely span multiple phases of the project.

3.1.1 Formal Agreement with Host Institution

3.1.1.1 Form of Agreement and Parties to the Agreement

It is important that a formal link between the Host Institution and ReCAP exists and this should be more substantial (and legally binding) than a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), as suggested in the Terms of Reference. The agreement should set out clear roles and responsibilities and the expectations of each party. It will also be needed to outline how the Host Institution will be supported financially, particularly with respect to the funding of the Management Staff positions it will be expected to provide. The form of this agreement will need to be developed in the Interim Phase of the project in collaboration with the Service Provider, ReCAP and the preferred Host Institution.

The original Terms of Reference for this project imply that the agreement should be between the Host Institution and Service Provider. The Service Provider does not consider itself as the appropriate party to this agreement given ReCAP are the ultimate owner of this project, at least until July 2020, at which time this responsibility should be transferred to HVT at a similar time to the Service Providers novation. The process for this transfer needs to be determined by ReCAP, the Host Institution and Service Provider in the coming months and will likely need to be initiated in April/May 2020, in advance of the July ReCAP end date.

There is an option for this project to be extended by a further two years beyond the end of this appointment. However, in the event this extension does not take place, then ownership of that link with the Host Institution should remain intact with HVT/DFID, independent of the Service Providers engagement.

3.1.1.2 Programming Implications

Establishing an agreement between the parties creates a possible risk to the programme that needs to be managed in the next phases of the project. Depending on how smoothly that process progresses, there is the possibility that management staff cannot be engaged or the CSSTL formally established until the agreement is in place.

This will need to be managed from early in the Interim Phase. Discussions will be held with the host institution regarding viable contracting mechanisms during the interview meetings. Also, exploratory work will need to be undertaken by the Project Team in advance of these interviews to understand what approaches would be acceptable to ReCAP and DfID.

3.1.2 Operating on a Cost-Recovery Basis

The team recognises the ambition for the CSSTL to operate on a cost-recovery basis. This means fees generated from the training programme will cover the cost of training delivery plus the running costs of the CSSTL (i.e. overheads). For example, depending on the agreement reached with the Host Institution, they may charge the CSSTL estate costs. These can be significant and could potentially double the cost of employing someone.

Operating on a cost-recovery basis is intrinsically linked to how many candidates the course can attract, the fees they can be charged versus the overall running costs. In the long-term this goal is potentially achievable, but it is unlikely to become a reality within the early years when ReCAP and HVT are managing this programme. This highlights the importance of securing alternative sources of funding, whether that is via the links to be explored with the MDB’s and Donors, existing funding support available to the Host Institution, or whether further funding will be available to support CSSTL operations from the HVT programme until 2025. These forms of support will be discussed with the potential Host Institutions during their interviews, to identify which options are most viable.
3.1.3 Accreditation Process

Professor Jefferson was content to lend his support to the project team in developing this Centre and to assist in progressing the Centre, as it evolves, through the process of recognition by the University of Birmingham and possible eventual accreditation by the Joint Board of Moderators (JBM) (Engineering Council). Similarly, from a UCT perspective, they will be willing to investigate options such as joint and double degrees with the Host Institution, UOB, and/or other suitable institutions.

The project team believes that if the Transport Leadership qualification is to be internationally recognised and widely sought after by future leaders in the sub-Saharan African transport sector (and funded and recognised by the World Bank and similar organisations) it should be accredited (recognised) by the Engineering Council in the UK and South Africa. This process is overseen by the JBM. Full details of the accreditation process can be found at [https://jbm.org.uk/Home](https://jbm.org.uk/Home) but it should be understood that this is a very onerous and rigorous process and few, if any, MSc courses in sub-Sahara Africa have achieved this level of recognition. The extract below taken from the JBM home page summarises how the JBM is constituted and its goal.

“The Institution of Civil Engineers, the Institution of Structural Engineers, the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation, and the Institute of Highway Engineers together represent some 100,000 of the world’s leading professional engineers. These four professional bodies have formed the Joint Board of Moderators (JBM) to work and strengthen links with universities and industry to ensure that formal educational programmes (e.g. degrees) and workplace programmes are in place to develop professional engineers that will continue to provide a global contribution to sustainable, economic growth and ethical standards. The JBM assesses and makes recommendations on the accreditation and approval of relevant educational programmes that it will accept as meeting the requirement to register as a professional engineer with the Engineering Council (EngC) - the body responsible for regulating the engineering profession within the UK.” ([www.jbm.org](http://www.jbm.org)

A flow chart illustrating the JBM accreditation process is shown in Figure 6. It should be noted that courses can only be accredited when the course has been in place and the learning resources, staff, facilities and institution can be assessed by the visiting JBM team. The JBM team need also to be able to examine student output which means the course must be running for a full year and a student cohort must have passed through the course before accreditation can be achieved.

Another avenue that will be explored is the Engineering Council of South Africa (ECSA), via our partner at UCT. ECSA currently accredits programmes in Namibia and Botswana and may be open to accreditations elsewhere. This will be investigated via UCT once the Host Institution is known.
Figure 6: JBM Accreditation Process

ICE, IStructE, IHIE and IHT establish JBM Terms of Reference and limits of authority for the accreditation of CEng courses.

Academic Institution makes application for Accreditation or is scheduled for re-Accreditation (5-year cycle).

Does the application fall within the remit of the JBM?

JBM Secretariat check degree course to confirm accreditation is/is not in date or is new course application. A letter is sent to Head of Department and suggested dates are given for accreditation visit.

Head of Department produces submission in accordance with JBM Guidelines. These are sent directly to the Moderating Team with a duplicate copy to JBM Secretariat for Audit purposes.

JBM select Visit Team to reflect course.

JBM Secretariat finalize visit dates and confirm programme with MOD.

Visit carried out in accordance with Guidelines.

Visit Report prepared and agreed by the Team and checked for factual correctness by the Department.

Team Leader presents the Report to the Full Board.

Does the JBM agree the recommendations of the Moderating Team?

Visit Team prepare additional Report.

Board requests additional information.

Institutions decision reported to the Board and Department informed.

Inform academic institution that the submission does not meet the required standard.

Do the Institutions approve the recommendations?

Yes

Recommended by JBM Secretariat.

The Head of Department are informed of the Board’s decision by JBM Secretariat and EC (UK) website updated and decision reported back to the Board.

Board advised of decision and clarification sought from Team Members.

Recommendations of Board Rejected.

No

Clarity requested on recommendations.

Yes

No

Referred to appropriate Committee of ICE, IStructE, IHIE and IHT for decision.

No
4 Programme

4.1 General

An updated programme has been provided in Figure 7 below. This is a live document which will be shared with ReCAP and the Working Group throughout the project.

It is readily recognisable that engagement of the Host Institution in Phases 2 and 3 is the foundation from which the remainder of the project progresses. This is a process the Project Team and ReCAP will have to manage collaboratively over the coming months to help ensure the project remains on schedule.

Also, the Project Team and ReCAP will need to consider the necessity for a ‘Plan B’ strategy should none of the potential Host Institutions be engaged or accepting of the challenge in establishing the CSSTL. Given the interest expressed thus far from the shortlisted universities, the probability of this occurring is considered low. However, it would be careless not to give due consideration to this possibility and its implications for the project.

Similar uncertainties may be faced later in the project when engaging external suppliers to deliver the training programme and will also require management by the Project Team and ReCAP. Options to mitigate these risks will be explored and may be mitigated through delivery of some existing UCT, UoB and/or Host Institution courses or modules, as these partners are already engaged in the project.

4.2 Proposed Delivery to June 2020

It is proposed to implement a leadership development programme and a CPD offering in the period up to June 2020 (i.e. contract end date with ReCAP). As explained earlier, this will be followed by the postgraduate programme, but this will be beyond the end of this first phase (i.e. to June 2020) and should be subject to enough interest being generated by the initial CPD offering.

As academic reputation of the Centre is crucial for the success of the postgraduate programme and its accreditation, it is proposed to start the academic programme in year 3, allowing the CSSTL (and Project Team, if still involved) to go through registration and accreditation procedures with evidenced delivery of the capacity building (CPD) courses in the earlier years of the project.
### Key Task List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Milestone or Submission Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1: Inception</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb-19 Mar-20 Apr-20 May-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: CSSTL Setup and Training Establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interim Period Nov-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4: Pilot &amp; M/E (Leadership/CPD Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interim Period Nov-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5: TSLDP Pilot and Monitoring (Phases 6 &amp; 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interim Period Nov-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 7: Project Programme (Live Document)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Milestone or Submission Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1: Preparation of Business Plan</td>
<td>Submission of Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2: Preparation of Business Plan</td>
<td>Submission of Interim Report &amp; Draft Business Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3: Preparation of Business Plan</td>
<td>Submission of Final Business Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4: Preparation of Business Plan</td>
<td>Submission of Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5: Preparation of Business Plan</td>
<td>Preparation of Quarterly Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Key Milestone or Submission Date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant Name/Organisation TBC</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Milestone or Submission Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Name/Organisation TBC</td>
<td>Task 1: Preparation of Business Plan</td>
<td>Submission of Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Name/Organisation TBC</td>
<td>Task 2: Preparation of Business Plan</td>
<td>Submission of Interim Report &amp; Draft Business Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Name/Organisation TBC</td>
<td>Task 3: Preparation of Business Plan</td>
<td>Submission of Final Business Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Name/Organisation TBC</td>
<td>Task 4: Preparation of Business Plan</td>
<td>Submission of Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Name/Organisation TBC</td>
<td>Task 5: Preparation of Business Plan</td>
<td>Preparation of Quarterly Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Project Implementation

5.1 Progress Meetings

At the Kick-Off Meeting it was proposed the Project Team and ReCAP hold a regular Progress Meeting. The purpose of this is to discuss project development, deliverable content and gain feedback from ReCAP in advance of submission and organise availability for the trips and meetings required by the project. The first meeting is scheduled for Monday 4th March, continuing fortnightly thereafter until project completion.

5.2 Establishing a Working Group

With ReCAP ending in 2020, the Project Team and ReCAP are conscious that the final months of this project will be completed under novation to another managing consultant. Indications at this stage are that this consultant will be IMC Worldwide who are managing the High-Volume Transport (HVT) programme for the Department for International Development (DFID).

It is important that the HVT programme remain informed as the project progresses. This will make the novation process simpler and enable the project to transition smoothly between both phases. During the Kick-Off Meeting it was suggested that a Working Group would be established to support this aim, with a member of the HVT programme present on the panel. The detailing of how the Working Group will operate shall be developed in the Interim Phase.

An initial list of proposed members is provided in Table 6 below. This is currently under review and subject to amendment in the Interim Phase.

Table 6: Draft List of Proposed Working Group Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nkululeko Leta</td>
<td>ReCAP Deputy Team Leader – Infrastructure</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>ReCAP Technical Panel</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Stephen Jones*</td>
<td>Project Team Leader</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mark Zuidegeest*</td>
<td>Project Education Management Specialist</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>CSSTL Host Institution</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>High-Volume Transport (HVT) Technical Panel</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>ASANRA</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Representative from Asian Institution</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>CIHT</td>
<td>Contact provided by CIHT. Awaiting confirmation regarding participation on Working Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>World Bank and/or African Development Bank</td>
<td>Contact initiated with a senior World Bank representative. Awaiting response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other project team members to participate as required.

5.3 Marketing

Current deliberations on the marketing strategy has identified opportunities to target regional conferences or major events to present the project. The purpose of this is to raise awareness amongst potential candidates, funding bodies and other supporting institutions (e.g. universities and professional bodies) and generate interest in the programme.

The ReCAP website identifies the following upcoming events:

- 9th Africa Transport Technology Transfer Conference, Maputo Mozambique from 28-30th August 2019;
- 12th Low-Volume Road Conference, Kalispell, Montana from 15 – 18th September 2019;
- 26th PIARC World Road Congress, Abu Dhabi from 6 – 10th October 2019.
Of the events listed above, of highest priority is the 9th Africa Transport Technology Conference in Mozambique. This is likely to have the most relevance in terms of regional target audience and the best timing in terms of generating interest from potential candidates in the impending training programme.

5.4 Milestone Optimisation

The scheduled Milestone Delivery has been refined as agreed at the Kick-Off Meeting to find optimisations that could benefit the delivery – i.e. avoid duplication of effort where deliverables overlap. This has been achieved by combining Quarterly Reports No. 1 and 5 with the Interim Report and Final Report deliverables respectively, as summarised in Table 7.

**Table 7: Schedule of Deliverables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone Deliverable</th>
<th>Due (Week) – see programme*</th>
<th>Due (Date)</th>
<th>Revision to Payment Schedule (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28th February 2019</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Report &amp; Draft Business Plan (also forms Quarterly Progress Report No. 1)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31st May 2019</td>
<td>31% (Interim Report 25%; plus, Quarterly Progress Report 6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Business Plan</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28th June 2019*</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Progress Report No. 2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30th August 2019</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Progress Report No. 3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29th November 2019</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Progress Report No. 4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28th February 2020</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report (also forms Quarterly Progress Report No. 5)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31st May 2020</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: Business Plan must have the input of the Host Institution. Its scheduled delivery date is linked to the Host Institution being formally engaged by this point.

+ Note: Programme starts from the project commencement date of 5th February when contract was signed and Kick-Off Meeting took place.

5.5 Novation Agreement

The form of novation agreement to be adopted by ReCAP has not yet been supplied to the Project Team. The Project Team are operating on the basis that this will be mutually agreed later.

5.6 Project Opportunities, Uncertainties and Risk Management

5.6.1 Opportunities

Several opportunities exist on this project through the linkages the Project Team, ReCAP and the Host Institution possess. These will be explored as the project progresses and exploited to benefit the successful implementation of the CSSTL. A summary of these opportunities is provided in Table 8.
**Table 8: Summary of Project Opportunities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Work</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Impact (H, M, L)</th>
<th>Opportunity Likelihood (H, M, L)</th>
<th>Opportunity Pre-Mitigation</th>
<th>Opportunity Post-Mitigation</th>
<th>Actions (indicate intention to 'Remove', 'Decrease', 'Transfer', or 'Manage', and then how to be achieved)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Delivery (Funding)</td>
<td>Potential Host Institutions already have links to MDB's, Donors and other sources of funding.</td>
<td>These links could be utilised for the benefit of the CSSTL - i.e. utilise existing links to WB and AfDB to benefit CSSTL funding.</td>
<td>H M Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Manage this opportunity through careful selection of the preferred institution. The preferred host institution should have strong existing links to MDB's like the World Bank and/or African Development Bank.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Delivery (links to Professional Bodies)</td>
<td>Potential Host Institutions already have links to Professional Institutions which may be of benefit for accreditation or recognition purposes.</td>
<td>These links could be utilised for the benefit of the CSSTL.</td>
<td>M M Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Manage this opportunity through careful selection of the preferred institution. The preferred host institution should have links to professional institutions in its host country. It should also be of reasonably academic standing such that international professional institutions (e.g. ECSA, ICE, CIHT) would consider accrediting courses run there.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM Leadership Development programme</td>
<td>MM operate their own internal Leadership Development Programme. Through this, links exist with third-party suppliers who could potentially support the CSSTL. Similarly, there is the potential that course content could be utilised for TSLDP.</td>
<td>Opportunity for quicker implementation of a Leadership Development Course using MM links and existing content. Other suppliers to also be researched in addition to MM's.</td>
<td>H M Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Manage the opportunity through MM's Learning and Development Team. Identify course content through them and opportunities to link up with MM's Third-Party Supplier to see if they could support the CSSTL training. Use MM's Learning and Development Team to also identify other suppliers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Work</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Consequence</td>
<td>Impact (H, M, L)</td>
<td>Opportunity Pre-Mitigation</td>
<td>Opportunity Post-Mitigation</td>
<td>Actions (indicate intention to 'Remove', 'Decrease', 'Transfer', or 'Manage', and then how to be achieved)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Delivery (Courses)</td>
<td>Potential Host Institutions may have existing courses that could be used to aid in training implementation and reduce costs of running courses from external partners.</td>
<td>Benefit to the CSSTL in terms of running costs. Benefit to the CSSTL in terms of buy-in and ownership of the host institution.</td>
<td>H M Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Manage this opportunity through careful selection of the CSSTL host institution. The host institution should ideally have some courses existing, or some which could be developed, and utilised for the TSLDP delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team + ReCAP (Links)</td>
<td>The project teams got existing links that can be utilised for the project. These includes links to professional institutions, MDB’s, Road Agencies, Regional Bodies (e.g. ASANRA) and other universities.</td>
<td>Opportunity to go directly to the decision makers within organisations to generate support and interest in the CSSTL.</td>
<td>H M Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Manage this opportunity throughout delivery. Initiate contact with these links during inception and interim phases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6.2 Uncertainties

The Project Team is conscious that the Technical Proposal raised several uncertainties and risks that will need to be managed throughout this project. They will not be raised in their entirety again here, however, the team acknowledges that ReCAP is aware of these and our intent to work as a collaborative team throughout the implementation period to manage these. The main risks identified at the proposal stage are given in Table 9 below, along with their mitigation measures and current status.
Table 9: Summary of Main Risks, Mitigation and Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Work</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Impact (H, M, L)</th>
<th>Likelihood (H, M, L)</th>
<th>Risk Pre-Mitigation</th>
<th>Risk Post-Mitigation</th>
<th>Actions (indicate intention to 'Remove', 'Decrease', 'Transfer', or 'Manage', and then how to be achieved)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project delivery (Host Institution Engagement)</td>
<td>Lack of an appropriate Host Institution for the CSSTL. Or preferred Host Institutions unwilling to be engaged.</td>
<td>Impacts viability of the project. Likely to result in project closure.</td>
<td>H L High Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage: generate interest early from potential Host Institutions. Inform them fully of the requirements and obligations. Make them aware they will be fully supported by the Project Team. Identify the opportunities for the Host Institution in the long-term - i.e. becoming a Centre of Excellence for leadership in Africa. Update: Risk reduced since Proposal Stage. Two strong host institutions shortlisted (KNUST in Ghana and UoAA in Ethiopia). Both institutions interested in hosting the CSSTL and will be visited in April 2019 by the Project Team and ReCAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating the CSSTL on a cost-recovery basis</td>
<td>Running on a cost-recovery basis unlikely, at least in short-term but also possibly long-term.</td>
<td>Impact on CSSTL viability in short to medium term.</td>
<td>H M High Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage Risk: need to open discussions with alternative funding sources. These include MDB’s, Donors, Road Agencies, regional bodies like ASANRA. Need to develop a funding mechanism through which the CSSTL is supported and candidate fees are either paid in full or part-sponsored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring of CSSTL Management Staff</td>
<td>Employment risks, legacy risks in terms of benefit entitlement, management/ performance risks</td>
<td>Impact on reputation, project performance</td>
<td>H M High Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove Risk: the Management Staff are to be engaged by the Host Institution. Ideally, they will already be their members of staff. This way they manage their employment and all legal obligations associated with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Work</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>Impact (H, M, L)</td>
<td>Likelihood (H, M, L)</td>
<td>Risk Pre-Mitigation</td>
<td>Risk Post-Mitigation</td>
<td>Actions (indicate intention to ‘Remove’, ‘Decrease’, ‘Transfer’, or ‘Manage’, and then how to be achieved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding the CSSTL to cover cost of Management Staff</td>
<td>Contractual risk, payment mechanism and contractual arrangement with the CSSTL unclear at this stage.</td>
<td>Risk to ReCAP. Payment to staff. Performance has to be monitored.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Reduce Risk: formal contract mechanism to be established between ReCAP and the Host Institution which outlines the terms of their support and the Host Institutions engagement. Gives ReCAP some comeback if performance of the Host Institution is not as expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and tax advisory around setting up the CSSTL (i.e. registration, taxation etc.)</td>
<td>Risk of high cost legal reviews required to understand the legal implications of setting up the centre.</td>
<td>Impact on funds available if money needs to be spent on these reviews.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Remove Risk: legal registration and tax implications should be avoided if the Centre becomes part of the Host Institutions operations. We do not want to establish a new business. Responsibility for registration/tax and advising on such will rest with the Host Institution, as they are best placed to advise on policy and regulations in their country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of students on the programmes /courses</td>
<td>Insufficient interest in the programme from target audience</td>
<td>Impacts the viability of TSLDP in the medium to long term (sustainability impact).</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Reduce Risk: competitively price tuition fees. Effective marketing strategy. Seek scholarships form key stakeholders. Ensure curriculum meets market need. Update: Risk reduced since Proposal Stage. Marketing Strategy document added to Interim Report delivery. Propose attendance at relevant regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Work</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>Impact (H, M, L)</td>
<td>Likelihood (H, M, L)</td>
<td>Risk Pre-Mitigation</td>
<td>Risk Post-Mitigation</td>
<td>Actions (indicate intention to 'Remove', 'Decrease', 'Transfer', or 'Manage', and then how to be achieved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>Internationally recognised Professional Institutions unwilling to accredit TSLDP</td>
<td>Impacts credibility and sustainability of TSLDP</td>
<td>H M High Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conferences (e.g. 9th T2 in Mozambique) to generate interest from the target audience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mott MacDonald’s risk management process was provided in the Technical Proposal and will be followed throughout the project. A risk register has been produced for the project and is included as Appendix G. This will remain live and can be discussed with ReCAP in the regular Progress Meetings.
### 6 Conclusions

#### 6.1 Updates to Methodology

The fundamental processes outlined in the Technical Proposal remain fundamentally intact from proposal stage – e.g. training content, establishing links with professional bodies, MDB’s etc. The most important decision to note is that it has been decided the CSSTL should be based at a Host Institution in SSA from the outset and not initiated in the UK or SA and later relocated to SSA. This is to ensure an SSA institution gains the full capacity building benefit from establishing this centre.

#### 6.2 Selection of Host Institution

The inception period was shortened to benefit the project implementation, based on the quantity of suitable information available from the Technical Proposal. A further efficiency saving is that an assessment and shortlisting of candidate institutions has taken place in the Inception Phase rather than during the Interim Phase, as originally scheduled in the Terms of Reference.

Following receipt of Capability Statements from an initial longlist of universities, these were reviewed against the defined selection criteria. This assessment identified two strong candidates, which will be taken forward to the next phase:

- Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST), Ghana, and;
- University of Addis Ababa (UoAA), Ethiopia.

A Capability Statement was sent to the University of Makerere on 26th February 2019 and returned on 6th March 2019. Following review a decision was made not to include the University of Makerere as a third candidate on the shortlist alongside UoAA and KNUST.

Shortlisted institutions will be visited by members of the Project Team in March/April 2019 to assess their suitability and capability to host the CSSTL. The team will interview key staff, understand their resource capacity (i.e. Management Staff availability) and assess the university infrastructure. Once this is complete, a decision on the preferred option will be taken collaboratively between the Project Team and ReCAP.

The proposed timeframe for visiting the shortlisted institutions is the week commencing 8th April 2019. This is subject to confirmation of availability with these institutions and ReCAP.

Once chosen, the formal engagement process will commence. The exact detailing of this engagement mechanism needs to be defined between the Project Team and ReCAP in the Interim Phase. This agreement is important to define roles and responsibilities and the mechanism through which the funding amounts allowed in the Terms of Reference for the Management Staff will be paid.

Engagement of the Host Institution is the foundation upon which progress through the remainder of the project is based. Therefore, it is important the Project Team, ReCAP and the chosen Host Institution work collaboratively to ensure it progresses smoothly, to avoid any delays to the programme.

#### 6.3 Programme and Milestone Updates

The programme has been updated in line with the new start date of 5th February 2019. During the Kick-Off Meeting it was agreed that the programme be revised and milestone delivery optimised where possible, to avoid duplication of effort if deliverable submissions overlapped.

This process has been completed and the revised milestone delivery is given in Table 7. Two Quarterly Progress Reports have been removed from the delivery as they overlap with the Interim Report and Final Report submissions.
6.4  Project Implementation Details

6.4.1  Progress Meetings
Fortnightly progress meetings are proposed between key members of the Project Team and ReCAP. These calls will commence on Friday 4\textsuperscript{th} March 2019 and continue until the end of the project.

6.4.2  CSSTL Working Group
A CSSTL Working Group is proposed to keep the HVT programme informed of progress given their future management role on this project and also to benefit from potential linkages to professional institutions, such as CIHT. It is proposed that this Working Group is established as soon as possible and its meetings linked to the contract deliverable schedule for the project. The details of how the Working Group will operate will be agreed during the Interim Phase.

6.4.3  Marketing Strategy
A marketing strategy document has been added to the Interim Report deliverable. This will identify the types of communications required and the timing they should be initiated. It is likely to include presentations at regional events, such as the 9\textsuperscript{th} Africa Transport Technology Transfer Conference in Mozambique from the 28-30\textsuperscript{th} August 2019.
Record of meeting/discussion

Project title: ReCAP Establishment of a Centre for Sub-Saharan Transport Leadership

Subject: Project Kick-Off Meeting

Location: University of Birmingham, Room F8, Dept. of Civil Engineering

Date/time of meeting: 05 February 2019 from 14:30 – 16:00

Project number: 400815 (MM) / RAF2147A (ReCAP)

Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Company/unit/division</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Runganaikaloo</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Cardno Emerging Markets</td>
<td>CEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkululeko Leta</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Cardno Emerging Markets</td>
<td>CEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Haule</td>
<td>JH</td>
<td>Cardno Emerging Markets</td>
<td>CEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Jones</td>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>Mott MacDonald</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hughes</td>
<td>DH</td>
<td>Mott MacDonald / Queens University Belfast</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Burrow</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
<td>UOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurmel Ghataora</td>
<td>GG</td>
<td>University of Birmingham</td>
<td>UOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kieran Kelly</td>
<td>KK</td>
<td>Mott MacDonald</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Zuidegeist (via telecon)</td>
<td>MZ</td>
<td>University of Cape Town</td>
<td>UCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obiora Nnene (via telecon)</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>University of Cape Town</td>
<td>UCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apologies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Vanderschuren</td>
<td>MV</td>
<td>University of Cape Town</td>
<td>UCT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recorded by: Kieran Kelly

Distribution: Attendees plus Marianne Vanderschuren

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Round table introductions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Update on CSSTL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Not too much progression in the months since Phase 1. NL had informal discussion with KNUST who expressed interest in supporting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Preference from ReCAP towards moving ahead with an identified smaller number of suitable institutions rather than extending the programme by visiting a large number of universities, many of which would be unlikely to be suitable. Initial selection can be based of screening carried out in Phase 1 and as described in MM’s technical proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Based on existing knowledge, there are a number of likely candidate host institutions such as University of Addis Ababa in Ethiopia, University of Nairobi in Kenya, KNUST in Ghana, Dar es Salaam in Tanzania, and Ndeje &amp; Makerere in Uganda. Others shall be reviewed during the Inception Phase also.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Project Team suggested a Capability Statement be prepared for issue to the initial list of universities within the Inception Phase. Final shortlisting to be provided in the Inception Report.</td>
<td>Project Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>NL identified that ReCAP do not have links with these universities. Dependent on Project Team contacts to these institutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>NL indicated RECAP may be able provide links to some donor/bank bodies (e.g. AfDB) and to Road Authorities. The Project Team will also bring the linkages they possess to these institutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Project Team identified that the CSSTL must have a Champion at the Host Institution to be successful in the long-term. This should be linked to the need for the two Management Staff to be employed or sourced from the Host Institution, at least one of whom should be this Champion, or where the Champion is the person leading and advising these staff within the institution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>MM discussed their Emerging Leaders programme which they use to develop carefully selected staff and equip them with the skills to perform better in Senior Management roles within the company. MM to explore how this could be utilised and/or lessons learned for the benefit of the CSSTL programmes. This will be outlined in the Inception Report. It is considered that a leadership programme such as Emerging Leaders could be a quick win, as it isn’t a formal qualification which would have the same accreditation requirements as a degree. The potential for this to be established as a ‘quick win’ in advance of the technical qualifications will be explored in the Inception and Interim Phases.</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Funding sources beyond ReCAP are critical. We need to look at alternative funding bodies. DR indicated DFID may be unlikely to support long-term as they are keen to see others support, given they have been doing so for over 10 years now.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Team will need to broaden our reach and proactively publicise the programme. May involve attending targeted events to market what we are doing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>ReCAP explained African Development Bank have a big transport programme which includes capacity building. This should be explored.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Briefing Note to be prepared for Michael Burrow so we can use it at the ReCAP IRIM in Nepal at the end of February 2019 to discuss our work with participants, particularly any Banks/Donors present as well as HVT personnel.</td>
<td>Project Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>JH made the point that in our Capability Statement we need to be sure it is the Senior Staff the Host Institutions promise that will be available and delivering the course. Experience has shown that often the universities put forward the best CV’s but these staff are not the ones who deliver the course. This is to be added to the questions. JH also noted that there is a need to ensure balance between the engineering and transport content to ensure it is a “transport leadership programme” and not an “engineering leadership programme”.</td>
<td>Project Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Query raised about course delivery language. Explained that initial delivery will be in English. Beyond this, if we find there is a demand for its delivery in other languages, then this can be reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>JH made the point that we should also look at the Road Agencies and the Road Funds, as they have the budgets to pay for staff to attend this programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.14 Consideration needs to be given to how best the course can be delivered. It needs to stand out from existing offerings from a marketing perspective. Things like 2 weeks in Cape Town, 2 weeks in Birmingham and rest through CSSTL, etc.? May increase costs, but GG explained that one of UOB's best subscribed courses is a Railway Masters that requires candidates to do overseas study tours. It's more expensive than other Master's, but highly subscribed – people often link cost and quality and value for money in terms of what you're getting. Linked to this how ever MZ noted it would be worth re-doing the calculations to show what is the optimum balance between delivering at CSSTL and at UCT/UOB – as flying lecturers to the CSSTL will not be cheap either but has the overriding advantage of anchoring the TSLDP in an African institution.

### 3.15 Project Team to let NL know the anticipated dates for visiting the shortlisted Host Institutions. Visits will not be undertaken in Inception Phase. However, contacts and desk-based assessments will commence during Inception. Aim is for physical visits to be undertaken in the Interim Phase, likely towards the end of March.

### 4 Discussion with Prof. Ian Jefferson, University of Birmingham

#### 4.1 Discussion with Ian Jefferson regarding the potential for linkages to be developed with UOB to deliver training programmes from the CSSTL in future. Ian J is the Head of Education for the School of Engineering and one of the people who would be involved in signing-off on any future link-up between UOB and the CSSTL.

#### 4.2 Ian J positive on the possibility of being able to work with the institutions identified in principle.

“Devil is in the detail” in terms of how it would be undertaken. This can be discussed at a later date when greater detail about the programme and Host Institution is available.

#### 4.3 Accreditation by a Professional Body (e.g. ICE) may be trickier but not something that is unfamiliar to the Joint Board of Moderators (JBM). They have accredited international/overseas courses.

The JBM would request to visit the Host Institution to inspect it and this would be at the Host Institution’s cost.

#### 4.4 Discussions with the JBM to understand what they would want to see to accredit the programme could be initiated once we have a plan for what the course(s) will look like. This could happen fairly soon, we don’t need to have the finished product in place.

#### 4.5 The JBM like to see output from the courses in question to accredit it. As this is a new course, there will be no output until 1-2 years down the line. This makes using existing modules at places like UCT or UOB appealing if we want an accredited programme setup quicker. This way we utilise modules with existing accreditations, as they will have been producing output for years.

#### 4.6 Initiating the programme as CPD is a good way to start and it avoids the accreditation issue. It also allows one to build up the programme, test the market and level of interest for it, and lay the foundations for the degree later on. Reduces the risk versus setting up a degree from the outset.

#### 4.7 Information on this accreditation process is to be added to the Inception Report

Project Team
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>CSSTL Setup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Discussion around the challenges setting up a centre – e.g. need to avoid setting up a new business, taxation and legal registration implications etc. Host Institution is best placed to advise on this and it will need to form part of the assessment. Aim is that the CSSTL is setup within an existing institution who take on the responsibility for running it, managing any tax requirements and legal requirements, the Host Institution providing the Management Staff as MM cannot hire sub-consultants for this etc. Host Institution providing the Management Staff also benefits the project given the need for a Champion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5.2 | We will need to agree how the centre is contracted due to the need to pay funds etc. Considered the most appropriate route for this by MM is a contract between ReCAP and the CSSTL/Host Institution. DR indicated the details of this can be agreed later once it is clearer what the operating modalities will be with the selected Host Institution. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.0</th>
<th>Project Housekeeping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Communications channels: the Project Team can contact the Universities directly. Any formal communiques should be passed to ReCAP first so they can review them. Any approaches to Donor Agencies or Banks, Regional Bodies or Road Authorities to be done via ReCAP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6.2 | Weekly Skype call to be setup with NL to appraise him of progress. |

| 6.3 | ReCAP to send the Project Team updated Report Templates for the delivery. MM will add their Disclaimer to this template. |

| 6.4 | A project working group will be established which will be composed of appropriate representation from the project team, the ReCAP PMU and the HVT PMU, respectively. |

| 6.5 | ReCAP will inform the HVT Programme that the project is now live and provide key documents for its reference: MM’s technical proposal and proposal clarifications letter, and the project TOR. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.0</th>
<th>Inception Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Submission date agreed as latest 28th February 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7.2 | Project Team expected to revisit the project milestones, see if any can be re-packed or combined to make the delivery more efficient and to update the programme and methodology for delivery. |
Appendix B: Exemplar Capability Statement
Request for Capability Statements from interested institutions in establishing a Centre for Sub-Saharan Transport Leadership (CSSTL)

13 February 2019

To whom it may concern,

The Research for Community Access Partnership (ReCAP) is a low-volume rural road research programme funded by UK Aid and managed by Cardno Emerging Markets (UK) Ltd. Mott MacDonald, the University of Cape Town and University of Birmingham are working with ReCAP to implement the second phase of their Transport Sector Leadership Development Programme (TSLDP).

The TSLDP project concept originated from the Association of Southern African Road Agencies (ASANRA), who identified the lack of technical and managerial leadership as a risk to the delivery of their highway transportation goals in the coming years. Whilst ReCAP generally focus on rural roads, they decided to take this broader transport-focused project forward and establish a capacity building programme that could help develop the next generations of transport leaders in Africa.

Mott MacDonald and the University of Cape Town delivered Phase 1 of the TSLDP project in 2017. They identified that before any training is developed, a Centre of Excellence based in an appropriate Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) institution [excluding South Africa], responsible for owning and implementing this programme, was critical to help secure its success in the long-term.

In Phase 2 we are now joined by the University of Birmingham and are tasked with establishing this Centre of Excellence within a suitable institution in SSA. Our role is to identify this institution and work with them to establish the Centre of Excellence and technical and leadership training courses to be delivered. In selecting a suitable host, we must be able to demonstrate the location can provide continuity and stability, has an excellent academic reputation and shows a long-term commitment to developing a sustainable CSSTL.

The project’s goal is for the host institution to become the home of the CSSTL and the training courses. With our support over the next 2 years (and possibly up to 4 years), the aim is that the Host Institution can go on to operate the centre independently beyond the end of this project. To aid in this, a supplementary task over the next two years will be to develop links to other Universities, professional institutions and funding bodies who can support the Centre and the training programme in the long-term.

As part of our initial shortlisting process, and in order to gauge interest in the programme, we would like you to outline the capability of your organisation and your level of interest in hosting this Centre of Excellence. If you are interested,
please kindly respond to this short questionnaire below. Your willingness to engage in the programme will be judged qualitatively by the earnestness of responses to the questionnaire. Please limit your responses to the number of words stated for each question.

Following the assessment, a number of institutions will be shortlisted and taken forward to the next stage. This next stage will involve visits to the institution from the Project Team and interviews with key staff/academics to determine the institutions suitability and enthusiasm to act as the host for the CSSTL.

We look forward to receiving your completed Capability Statements by **20th February 2019 at 17:00 UK time**. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to get in contact with us via either myself or our Education Management Specialist, Mark Zuidegeest, the contact details for whom is provided below.

Yours sincerely,

Stephen Jones
Project Team Leader (Mott MacDonald)
T +44 (0)23 8062 8833
stephen.jones@mottmac.com

Please return your completed Capability Statement by **20th February 2019 at 17:00 UK time** to:

Stephen Jones (Team Leader for ReCAP CSSTL)
Stephen.jones@mottmac.com

and

Mark Zuidegeest (Education Management Specialist for ReCAP CSSTL)
Mark.zuidegeest@uct.ac.uk

With a copy to:

Kieran Kelly (Project Coordinator for ReCAP CSSTL)
Kieran.kelly@mottmac.com
**Capability Statement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q 1.0 Describe your Civil/Transport/ Highway Engineering Department capabilities in terms of the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic and support staff numbers (separately)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Undergraduate and postgraduate courses your Department provides including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The name of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The associated numbers of students enrolled on the programmes over the last 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The approximate date when the programme was instigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Indicate which courses have Engineering Council accreditation or other national or international accreditation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q 2.0 Specifically, how many academic staff work in the discipline of Transport/Highway Engineering? Include 3-5 short CVs (one page only per member of staff) of these staff which summarise the modules they deliver and their research/consultancy interests.

Q 3.0 Give a brief description of the capability of your engineering laboratories, access to online international library resources and other facilities used to support teaching and learning (maximum of 100 words).
Q 4.0  Please describe any existing links with the Multilateral Development Banks, donor agencies or other relevant links with eternal international funding bodies for your postgraduate courses (maximum of 200 words)

Q 5.0  Describe any active research programmes in your department in the transport/highway engineering sector (e.g. the number of PhD students; active research grants etc.) (maximum of 200 words)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q 6.0</th>
<th>Describe any active links you have with the transport/highway engineering industry (e.g. active internships/vacation work placements, industry research etc.) (maximum of 100 words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q 7.0</th>
<th>Describe from your institution’s point of view how hosting the CSSTL would tie in with your University corporate strategy (up to a maximum of 300 words).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Appendix C: Capability Statement Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Weighted Average Score</th>
<th>Un-Weighted Average Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST)</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Strong submission and strong supplementary evidence. Existing link ups with internationally recognised universities and industry bodies. Ambition to setup other Centres of Excellence. Clear alignment between KNUST’s goals and the CSSTL. Clear to the reviewers the opportunities for how the CSSTL and KNUST could operate together. Existing experience and links to WB etc. benefits the long-term sustainability of the CSSTL project. Facilities and location also favoured their selection. Overall, the submission gave the reviewers a high degree of confidence in their suitability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of Addis Ababa / Addis Ababa Institute of Technology (AAIT)</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Strong submission from UoAA. Remaining link ups with internationally recognised universities and industry bodies. They have Masters level teaching capability in highways and railways. They are signatories to a WB MOU on transport research. Clear alignment between UoAA’s goals and the CSSTL. Existing experience and links to WB etc. benefits the long-term sustainability of the CSSTL project. Facilities and location also favoured their selection. Overall, the submission gave the reviewers a high degree of confidence in their suitability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Makerere University</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Good submission from Makerere. The main difference between the shortlisted universities (KNUST and UoAA) and Makerere was in terms of how well aligned it would be with the CSSTL goals, how the CSSTL would fit into its corporate strategy and where potential links with other universities, Donors/Banks etc. might be developed to support CSSTL operations. KNUST and UoAA stood out very clearly in this regard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>As for Makerere, this was a good submission and similar observations apply to Dar es Salaam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ndejje University</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Reasonable submission from Ndejje and the potential for a link with Makerere was noted. Unfortunately not considered strong enough and with the long-term sustainability of the centre in mind, was not considered suitable for shortlisting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Rwanda</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Reasonable submission, but similar to Ndejje, just not considered strong enough at this point in time to be a sustainable host for the CSSTL, with its long-term operations in mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of Nairobi</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>DNS</td>
<td>DNS</td>
<td>No submission received due to time constraints. Apologies from the university noted, as there was an initial desire to submit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>University of Namibia</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>DNS</td>
<td>DNS</td>
<td>No response received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DNS: did not submit

Shortlisted
## Capability Statement Scoring Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Addis Ababa / AAIT</th>
<th>KNUST</th>
<th>Dar es Salaam</th>
<th>Ndeje</th>
<th>Rwanda</th>
<th>Makerere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently delivering relevant transport courses</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the institution the interest and desire to run the CSSTL in the long-term</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently delivering courses accredited by internationally recognised professional institution</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the institution the physical infrastructure to run the centre</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of the institutions reputation in the region and internationally</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the institution got links to tertiary institutions (i.e. Universities)</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the institution got links to MDBs</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the institution got links to professional bodies, like ICE, CIHT, SAICE etc.</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the institution two suitable management staff that could run the centre</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the centre location accessible and desirable to candidates from the region</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the CSSTL align with the University’s current operations and future corporate vision</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weighted Score:
- Addis Ababa: 161
- KNUST: 163
- Dar es Salaam: 160
- Ndeje: 183
- Rwanda: 185
- Makerere: 187

### Unweighted Score:
- Addis Ababa: 41
- KNUST: 42
- Dar es Salaam: 41
- Ndeje: 48
- Rwanda: 48
- Makerere: 48

### Average Weighted Score:
- Addis Ababa: 161
- KNUST: 185
- Dar es Salaam: 122
- Ndeje: 94
- Rwanda: 89
- Makerere: 125

### Average Unweighted Score:
- Addis Ababa: 41
- KNUST: 48
- Dar es Salaam: 31
- Ndeje: 24
- Rwanda: 23
- Makerere: 32

### Ranking (Un-weighted):
- Addis Ababa: 2
- KNUST: 1
- Dar es Salaam: 4
- Ndeje: 5
- Rwanda: 6
- Makerere: 3

### Ranking (Weighted):
- Addis Ababa: 2
- KNUST: 1
- Dar es Salaam: 4
- Ndeje: 5
- Rwanda: 6
- Makerere: 3
Appendix D: Management Staff Job Specification

This section identifies the specific staff requirement to run and manage the CSSTL. It defines the terms of reference and the job specification for the staff that will champion the programme at the institutions. Ideally, the champions are expected to be staff of the institution as this will ensure stability in terms of their long-term availability. The management team will comprise of two staff; one a senior academic and a junior support staff.

**Purpose**

To define the required qualifications, skills and competencies for the staff that will manage and run the Centre for Sub-Saharan Transport Leadership at the Host Institution. The roles and responsibilities of the staff are also defined. The details of each position can be seen in Table 10 below.

**Staffing Requirements**

**Operations Manager**

The purpose of this position is to manage the general operations, human resource matters, marketing and financial expenditure control of the School. The intent is that this person would free the Education Manager from many of the management functions to enable them to concentrate on the academic and strategic leadership of the department.

**Education Manager**

The Education Manager is expected to be a seasoned senior academic. Preferably a Senior Lecturer or Professor who has managerial responsibility in their department. This person is to oversee the centre from a strategic viewpoint to ensure that the aims and its objectives are achieved. They will also be expected to provide oversight in terms of the academic leadership issues in the Centre.
Table 10: Job Specification for each Management Staff Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Academic qualification</th>
<th>Minimum Requirement</th>
<th>Activities / Objectives / Tasks</th>
<th>Results / Outcomes</th>
<th>Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) Operations Manager | A relevant tertiary qualification (preferably PhD) and proven equivalent experience equating to at least 7 years in a similar environment. A professorship would be an advantage. | This will include, but is not limited to activities where the incumbent will:  
- Manage the academic administration for all programmes at the Centre.  
- Act as the link between the CSSTL and the institution leadership.  
- Drafting the lecture schedule and assist with allocation of academic portfolios and drive the logistics side of this together with the co-ordinator.  
- Manage and co-ordinate the introduction of the new programme and new courses and modules.  
- Responsible for ensuring that matters relating to the examination process and procedures are adhered to.  
- Responsible for ensuring that external examiners are appointed and approved.  
- Ensure that all relevant and required systems needed for accreditation as well as possible joint degree purposes are adhered to.  
- Liaising with the business school if relevant. | - Liaise with Faculty on all academic administrative matters.  
- Managing the curriculum change process to ensure that forms are completed timeously and that changes are in keeping with the programme structure.  
- Ensuring that examination submission dates are lodged on the timetable. Managing the paper submissions of all theory exams. Managing the process of receiving examination results from lecturers and external examiners for timeous process in keeping with the University deadlines.  
- Ensuring that external lecturers adhere to the Departmental Examination policy. Appointing external examiners. | - Communication.  
- Decision-making & problem solving.  
- Building partnerships.  
- Knowledge of relevant policies, processes and systems.  
- Resource Management.  
- People Management.  
- Negotiation.  
- Building inter-personal relations.  
- Technical and professional knowledge of systems. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Academic qualification</th>
<th>Minimum Requirement</th>
<th>Activities / Objectives / Tasks</th>
<th>Results / Outcomes</th>
<th>Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2) Education Manager | A relevant tertiary qualification (at least Masters) and proven experience equivalent experience equating to at least 5 years in a similar environment. | - Administrative management experience at senior level will be an advantage.  
- Proven computer literacy at an intermediate/advance level specifically MS Excel, MS Word & MS PowerPoint.  
- Proven financial experience.  
- Report writing.  
- Effective time management skills and the ability to organise, prioritise and multi-tasks within a highly pressured environment.  
- Sound communication skills coupled with interpersonal skills. | This will include, but is not limited to activities where the incumbent will:  
- Develop, implement and manage appropriate administrative control systems, protocols & procedures.  
- Ensure that all policies and practices of the Centre adhere to institutional and statutory requirements.  
- Manage and allocate office space.  
- Representing the Department internally and externally, including serving on relevant faculty committees.  
- Scrutinise all documents before submission to the director.  
- Overseeing and managing travel and accommodation arrangements for the programme candidates, external lecturers and other Centre visitors.  
- Co-ordinating activities with the business school where relevant. | - Document administrative and operational processes.  
- Enhanced administrative functioning of the department.  
- Compliance to relevant departmental, faculty and university policies, protocols and procedures.  
- Accurate and signed off meeting minutes.  
- Easily accessible/electronic record/filing system.  
- Positive feedback.  
- Review documentation for the director regularly.  
- Liaise with stakeholders regarding travel arrangements. | - Technical/professional knowledge and skill.  
- Resource management.  
- People management including performance management.  
- Building interpersonal relationships.  
- Decision-making and problem solving.  
- Safety awareness.  
- Communication.  
- Client/student service.  
- Building partnerships.  
- Negotiation.  
- Facilitating change impact. |
Appendix E: Summary of Mott MacDonald’s “Emerging Leaders” Programme

General

One of the critical components of this project is the development of its leadership development training. As identified in Phase 1, these training programmes generally sit outside traditional engineering and transportation degrees. Often, they are delivered by business schools or independent suppliers. The challenge with TSLDP will be merging leadership training into a blended training programme which also includes a large proportion of technical transport/engineering content.

In recent years, Mott MacDonald identified similar leadership challenges to ASANRA in developing the future senior management pipeline within the company. To address this, they established two leadership development programmes:

1. “Emerging Leaders”, whose focus is to develop talented people and help them progress into senior leadership roles, and;
2. “Senior Leaders”, whose focus is on the continued development of the company’s current senior management.

The strategic objectives and content for the Emerging Leaders programme align very closely with the objectives of TSLDP. An overview of the Emerging Leaders programme is provided in the following section. In the next phases of this project, it is proposed that this is explored further to identify opportunities to utilise existing content, augment it from being Mott MacDonald-focused to sub-Saharan Africa-focused and reach out to our suppliers for the benefit of TSLDP.

Mott MacDonald’s Emerging Leader Programme

Emerging Leaders is an exciting global programme to enable talented people to develop and progress to more senior leadership roles. It is a career development programme for those people we believe have the potential to accelerate their leadership development towards senior leadership roles in the company. Focusing on long-term solutions to grow our pipeline of leaders and progress enthusiastic, driven and talented people is becoming increasingly important. It has been developed and delivered in collaboration with Lane4, a leading UK-based leadership and management development consultancy. Emerging Leaders is about much more than formal leadership development:

- It’s not just a single development experience. It’s an unforgettable journey that defines and develop the careers of those we believe have the potential and drive to become senior leaders.
- It’s a planned, purposeful and accelerated career development experience that builds leadership capability and credibility across different regions, units and roles.
- Emerging Leaders drive their own learning and development journey. We will provide them with the materials, learning opportunities and support to explore their own unique needs and interests.
- It is challenging, and we will frequently push individuals outside their comfort zone. This develops their potential, encourages fresh thinking and expands career horizons. The expectations placed on Emerging Leaders are high and their resilience is frequently tested.
- Emerging leaders have a support network and a community of experts who will educate, coach, mentor and facilitate their development journey.

To grow their potential, Emerging Leaders will need to find and embrace new ways of thinking about themselves, others and Mott MacDonald’s business. Only then will they start to see changes in their own journey, through stages of transition, towards the role of strategic leader.

Programme Structure

Emerging Leaders progress through the programme’s four stages as follows:
Launch Event – 4 days face-to-face

As part of a global cohort, Emerging Leaders come together for four days in the United Kingdom to complete core development modules, receive support from their learning coach and clarify their leadership development challenges going forward. Highlights include:

- Hear from leaders in the business and elite performers about their own journeys to success;
- Discover the capabilities, mindset and behaviours required to grow and develop into more senior leadership roles;
- Take part in a range of interactive challenges that will test participants and their leadership capability.

Online Accelerated Development – 18 months

After the launch event, further ‘virtual’ leadership modules are delivered to build on the face-to-face work using our on-line learning technology platform to deliver an immersive experience for the participants. These are run roughly every two months and have three elements to them. A prepare stage, where participants are expected to engage in the topic through research, suggested reading or video clips. The webinar itself, around 90 minutes of live delivery that introduces the latest thinking on a range of leadership topics delivered by a subject matter expert from Lane4 (our external partners) augmented by a Mott MacDonald practitioner. And finally, an apply stage where participants apply their learning and share experiences in an Action Learning Group. They are given access to additional self-directed learning materials to augment their core learning in leadership topics that are of particular interest. Modules reflect the content of most business school leadership programmes and include the following topics:

- Creating a high-performance environment;
- Honest conversations;
- Leading change;
- Collaboration;
- Leadership transitions;
- The bigger picture;
- High performing teams.

The section below contains further details of these modules and specifically the objectives for each one. Three additional modules are run which are very specific to Mott MacDonald’s specific leadership agenda and these have not been included below. They are Client Centricity, Wellbeing and Innovation.

During this 18-month period they are supported by an experienced Mott MacDonald leader trained as a career coach who will work with four coachees on a 1-1 and small group basis using an Action Learning model.

Creating a High-Performance Environment

- Introduction to the Lane4 High-Performance Environment (HPE) model;
- Understand the elements that contribute to a high performing environment;
- Explore the enablers to creating an environment where success is inevitable;
- Understand the four areas of focus that compete for an organisation’s attention and how these affect performance.

Honest Conversations

- Develop an enhanced mindset around having honest conversations and the ability to give effective motivational and developmental feedback;
- Raised understanding of how to deal with honest conversations and any uncovered issues and weaknesses;
- Introduction into courage and what it means for leadership communication;
- Understand the role of having crucial conversations in the development of others;
- Exploration of the skills and behaviours necessary to overcome risk or fear associated with honest conversations;
- Practise with a real-life example of an impending honest conversation and develop a plan for your communication challenges ahead.

**Leading Change**

- Develop the ability to engage your teams in change projects and manage people’s reactions to change;
- Raise awareness to the challenges associated with leading change and how to overcome them;
- Increase your ability to enable successful implementation of the Group Strategy, with a clearer understanding of the sources of change and expected benefits across your area of responsibility.

**Collaboration**

- Understand the importance of collaboration for Mott MacDonald;
- Explore ideas of how to be collaborative at Mott MacDonald and specifically the benefits of internal and external collaboration;
- Identify ways to foster greater collaboration for more productive working relationships and enhance intra team dynamics;
- Understand the need to seek diverse perspectives, challenge appropriately and collaborate to deliver results at pace.

**Leadership Transition**

- Understand the context in which transitions occur within Mott MacDonald, either from your own development or in response to the rapidly changing markets in which we operate;
- Building on the launch event, extend your understanding of Lane4’s leadership transitions framework and reconnect with the differences between a leader and a manager in Mott MacDonald;
- Explore how leaders transition from one role to another, the benefits of effectively managed transitions as well as how to deal with potential challenges/derailers;
- Understand the traits and behaviours underlying leader emergence and effectiveness and the positive and negative impact these can have;
- Identify transformational leadership behaviours that may help you effectively transition to leadership roles and overcome challenges.

**Bigger Picture**

- Provide greater clarity about what we mean by ‘the bigger picture’ and the role this requires of you;
- Explore your context (big and small), recognise what you need to take into account and what you need to leave behind;
- Develop a common language, structure and way of thinking about the bigger picture to enable you to feel more confident and skilful in your approach to navigating the business;
- Explore what’s behind the Mott MacDonald brand and specifically how it might relate to you and those you lead;
- Raise awareness of the dynamic nature of organisational culture and how changing culture is a continuous process requiring careful management by leaders.

**High Performing Teams**

- Introduction to Lane4’s HPT model as a way to explore the fundamental principles of how and why high performing teams function;
- Gain knowledge of how to build strong team behaviors and a common team language;
- Identify ways of working that will deliver high performance for your own teams;
- Building on the launch event, recap on resilience and explore the importance of this in a high performing team;
Reflect back on some of the key tools from previous webinars and understand how they connect to High Performing Teams.

Springboard Event – Two Days Face-to-Face

This two-day event to help Emerging Leaders take control of their future leadership career and plan the crucial development experiences that will build their capability and credibility as a future leader. This will be an opportunity for participants to:

- Reflect on the last 18 months;
- Celebrate their achievements;
- Jointly solve problems or challenges relating to their development;
- Plan for the continuation of the journey towards senior strategic leadership (a career development plan);
- Work with their support network and understand how to utilise it effectively.

A crucial part of this phase is for them to develop a network of mentors both internal to Mott MacDonald and external to support them on their career development journey. They also continue to work with the programme director who will help them develop a five-year career plan as a live and dynamic document that is fed back into the organisation – see below.

Career Development – On-going

An on-going process where participants focus on bringing the career plans to life, planning critical career moves that will provide ‘stepping stone’ experiences to shape them as credible senior leaders. They continue to have access to mentors, line managers, peers and the programme director. Senior Leaders will take a keen interest in their development through regular talent reviews and facilitate essential career development moves as appropriate.
Appendix F: Candidate Selection Criteria

The information below is taken from the Final Report completed in the Phase 1 Scoping Stage of TSLDP. These selection criteria will be adopted for this phase of the project and refined with the Host Institution as appropriate, once they have been selected.

Candidate Selection

Applications will need to be made to a processing body, which will likely be the managing agent or university that will run the programme. Part of the CSSTL role could be to take on the candidate selection / assessment processes involved in enrolling candidates. This could help mitigate some of the costs indicated in Table 11 below.

The assessment process begins with an initial categorisation and screening of candidates, where they will be sub-divided into Categories A, B or C based on the criteria in Table 12. This assesses the initial applications to eliminate any applicants who are clearly inapplicable and creates a longlist of candidates to be taken forward to the more in-depth selection criteria.

Table 11: Candidate Assessment Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category A (Primary Candidates)</th>
<th>Category B (Secondary Candidates)</th>
<th>Category C (Not Suitable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Relevant Bachelors or post-graduate degree in civil eng., transport, environmental sciences, or geography related field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ≥10 years relevant experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exceptions:</strong></td>
<td>• Relevant Bachelors or post-graduate degree in civil eng., transport, environmental sciences, or geography related field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5-10 years’ experience but demonstrable high-flier candidate – e.g. won awards, industry recognised etc.</td>
<td>• 5 -10 years relevant experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exceptions:</strong></td>
<td>• &lt;5 years’ experience but demonstrable ‘high-flier’ potential seen in CV or portfolio. Could be accepted depending on availability of places.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is followed by a number of assessment procedures, outlined below and culminating in a character profile and candidate score:

- A Scoring Matrix: a matrix will be used in this assessment to score candidates for various criteria that includes education and experiences, motivation for being involved in the programme.

- Background Checking: for this assessment, each candidate will have to provide a Police Clearance Certificate (PCC) from their country of origin and any other country they have resided in for over six months. Additionally, qualification and reference checks will be performed.

- All candidates who come through the categorisation, scoring matrix and background check will be required to attend an interview to confirm their suitability for the programme.

- A specific number of places, or a percentage of the spaces available, should be set aside for female candidates. The exact number or percentage should be defined in the next phases of the project and may vary annually depending on female applicant numbers – but should be broadly in line with the percentages shown in the Monitoring and Evaluation criteria.

Additional processes can be considered, as discussed in the Personnel Sub-Consultants Report, such as Activity-Based Assessment and Confirmation (ABAC) and Dominance, Influence, Steadiness and Compliance (DISC) profiling. These are additional assessments to establish the candidate’s competency and behavioural traits.
However, it is worth bearing in mind that the addition of these may make selection a more onerous task for the managing agency, as all of these processes will be time-consuming. They are not processes that are usually undertaken for post-graduate degree applications, but in this instance, it may be considered valuable by ReCAP to help ensure they are investing in the right candidates, particularly for the more expensive training options like CPD and post-graduate degrees.

### Table 12: Scoring Matrix for Candidate Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>Candidate Assessment</th>
<th>Candidate Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>Relevant degree ≥10 years relevant experience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Relevant Bachelor’s degree + ≥10 Years Relevant Experience.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant degree + 5-10 years relevant experience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lacks degree and Experience.</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>English Language Skills</td>
<td>IELTS score of 6.5 - 7.5.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>IELTS Score of 6.5 - 7.5.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IELTS score of 7.5 - 9.0.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IELTS score of less than 6.5.</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nomination Letter from Employer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes, shows future potential and employer agrees to provide study leave etc.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interview Scoring</td>
<td>Candidate demonstrates potential to be ‘high flier’ in industry - Exceptional Candidates Only.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Candidate demonstrates potential to be ‘high flier’ in Industry (Exceptional Candidates Only).</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate demonstrates some knowledge and ambition but does not differentiate themselves from other candidates.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate considered unsuitable for the programme. Valid reasons must be given.</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate is engaging and shows excellent knowledge and ambition in the transport area.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Motivation Letter</td>
<td>Excellent – clearly articulates tangible benefits to career in participating.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent - criteria TBC.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good – identifies that there may be benefit to their career and some interest in participating.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair – may be some benefit to the candidate in participating. Not made very clear what candidate wishes to gain.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor – has not demonstrated any benefits to them or their career in being part of the programme.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Excellent - wide range of technical content across TSLDP spectrum, excellent competence, well presented.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good - good range of technical content across TSLDP spectrum, good competence, good presentation.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair - fair range of technical content across TSLDP spectrum, fair competence, adequately presented.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good - good range of technical content across TSLDP spectrum, good competence, good presentation.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor - poor range of technical content across TSLDP spectrum, demonstrates poor competence, poorly presented.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Contract Agreement</td>
<td>Agrees to contract terms i.e. repayment of fees and / or repeat exams not being paid for.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Agrees to contract terms i.e. repayment of fees and / or repeat exams etc. not being paid for by ReCAP or other funding agency.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contract terms are not applicable i.e. if the candidate is self-funded.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Does not agree to contract terms i.e. repayment of fees and / or repeat exams etc. not being paid for by ReCAP or other funding agency.</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public Sector Employee.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Funding Agency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private Sector Employee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Sector Employee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Candidate Score**: 44
Feedback was received at the Stakeholder Workshop about delivery of TSLDP in languages other than English. It is considered that the first pilot of TSLDP should be delivered in English, however, once established, work should then take place to translate it to other languages where a needs basis may be identified – e.g. French. On this basis, English language skills should then be altered as needed to any other language in which TSLDP will be offered in future.

Costs of Candidate Selection

A costing summary is provided in Figure 8 below for the candidate assessment phase of the candidate selection, and where final candidate scoring would be carried out by a lead academic from the host institution(s). Full detail on the makeup of these costs is given in the Personnel Sub-Consultancy Report and in Figure 8, with regards to how candidate assessment was generated. With the specific nature of the course content and sectoral audience, the most efficient results will be gained through careful targeting of institutional stakeholders at the stage of accessing candidates.

![Figure 8: Basis for Maximum and Minimum costs of assessing candidates (assuming 100 applicants)](image)

It is worth noting that there are costs below that could be mitigated if the CSSTL was adopted – such as email circulars, social media, administration staff and recruitment agency fees. These tasks could be given to the administration and academic staff already employed by the Centre.

Furthermore, recruitment agencies are an option for undertaking this process, hence why they’re included in the costing below. However, in reality, the task is more likely to be undertaken by the managing agents (e.g. CSSTL) or the university that is developing any future degree course. Therefore, it may be possible to remove these recruitment agency fees from consideration.

Additionally, to provide some perspective from other institutions, anecdotal evidence suggests that budgets available to many universities in the UK for marketing etc. on new courses would not be substantial. They would tend to be in the tens of thousands in year 1 and unlikely to continue at this level beyond year 1, as it would be expected that candidates would simply keep applying once the course becomes well-known.
### Table 13: Indicative Costing for Candidate Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Do Min (Year 1)</th>
<th>Do Some (Year 1)</th>
<th>Do Max (Year 1)</th>
<th>Annual Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Branding Campaign</td>
<td>£6,300</td>
<td>£6,300</td>
<td>£6,300</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£5,050</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Marketing Video</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£10,700</td>
<td>£10,700</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>£11,350</td>
<td>£11,350</td>
<td>£11,350</td>
<td>£11,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Magazine Adverts</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td>£2,400</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Selection</td>
<td>Administration Staff</td>
<td>£600</td>
<td>£600</td>
<td>£600</td>
<td>£600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Selection</td>
<td>Recruitment Agency Fees</td>
<td>£ -</td>
<td>£21,000</td>
<td>£74,520</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£19,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>£51,450</strong></td>
<td><strong>£110,920</strong></td>
<td><strong>£13,450</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Project Risk Register
## Opportunities

### Project Delivery (Funding)

**Potential Host Institutions already have links to MDB's, Donors and other sources of funding.**

These links could be utilised for the benefit of the CSSTL - i.e. utilise existing links to WB and AfDB to benefit CSSTL funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Pre-mitigation</th>
<th>Post-mitigation</th>
<th>Risk Mitigation / Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Manage this opportunity through careful selection of the preferred institution. The preferred host institution should have existing links to MDB's etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>Action (by when)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Throughout Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Delivery (links to Professional Bodies)

**Potential Host Institutions already have links to Professional Institutions which may be of benefit for accreditation or recognition purposes.**

These links could be utilised for the benefit of the CSSTL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Pre-mitigation</th>
<th>Post-mitigation</th>
<th>Risk Mitigation / Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Manage this opportunity through careful selection of the preferred institution. The preferred host institution should have links to professional institutions in its host country. It should also be of reasonably academic standing such that international professional institutions (e.g. ECSA, ICE, CIHT) would consider accrediting courses run there.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>Action (by when)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Project Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Work</td>
<td>Threat / Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM Links to Leadership Development programme</td>
<td>MM operate their own internal Leadership Development Programme. Through this, links exist with current third party suppliers who could potentially support the CSSTL. Similarly, there is the potential that course content could be utilised for TSLDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Delivery (Courses)</td>
<td>Potential Host Institutions may have existing courses that could be used to aid in training implementation and reduce costs of running courses from external partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team + ReCAP (Links)</td>
<td>The project teams got existing links that can be utilised for the project. These includes links to professional institutions, MDB’s, Road Agencies, Regional Bodies (e.g. ASANRA) and other universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project delivery (Host Institution Engagement)</td>
<td>Lack of an appropriate Host Institution for the CSSTL. Or preferred Host Institutions unwilling to be engaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating the CSSTL on a cost-recovery basis</td>
<td>Running on a cost-recovery basis unlikely, at least in short-term but also possibly long-term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring of CSSTL Management Staff</td>
<td>Employment risks, legacy risks in terms of benefit entitlement, management/performance risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding the CSSTL to cover cost of Management Staff</td>
<td>Contractual risk, payment mechanism and contractual arrangement with the CSSTL unclear at this stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and tax advisory around setting up the CSSTL (i.e. registration, taxation etc.)</td>
<td>Risk of high cost legal reviews required to understand the legal implications of setting up the centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of students on the programmes/courses</td>
<td>Insufficient interest in the programme from target audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>Internationally recognised Professional institutions unwilling to accredit TSLDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness/disease</td>
<td>Disease risks, such as malaria, in SSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Security risks within SSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>Internal travel within the UK (Road and Rail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>International travel to (and within) Sub-Saharan African countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>