ASSESSMENT OF THE ENABLING ENVIRONMENT FOR ROAD SAFETY CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS IN THREE SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES

Final Report
June 2023

THE WORLD BANK
IBRD • IDA | WORLD BANK GROUP

UKaid
from the British people

GRSF
Global Road Safety Facility

Global Alliance of
NGOs for Road Safety

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
Alliance	Global Alliance of NGOs for Road Safety
COVID	Coronavirus Disease
CPDE	Civil Society Partnership for Development Effectiveness
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CSP	Charities and Societies Proclamation
DALYs	Disability-Adjusted Life-Years
EE	Enabling Environment
EEI	Enabling Environment Index
EENA	Enabling Environment National Assessment
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GO	Government Organization
GWU	George Washington University
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
ICNL	International Center for Non-profit Law
IDIs	In-depth interviews
IRB	Institutional Review Board
IUFR	Interim Unaudited Financial Report
LMICs	Low- and Middle-Income Countries
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NVivo	Non-numerical Data Analysis (N) Software (VIVO)
SD	Standard Deviation
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABOUT THIS REPORT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Road traffic crashes pose a significant global problem, resulting in over 1.35 million deaths and 20–50 million injuries annually. Over 93% occur in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) despite their lower motorization rates. Compared to high-income countries, low-income countries face more than three times higher fatality risk.[1] African low-income countries face various road safety challenges, including rapid urbanization, poor safety standards, inadequate enforcement, and insufficient use of safety equipment.[2] However, African LMICs have the opportunity to learn from past mistakes made in other regions and implement effective road safety measures.[3]

The World Bank recognizes that community driven development approaches and actions are important elements of an effective poverty-reduction and sustainable development strategy.[4] In pursuit of SDG targets 3.6 and 11.2, civil society organizations (CSOs) / non-governmental organizations (NGOs) play a pivotal role in influencing governments' decision-making in road safety[5] but they are not always able to meaningfully participate in this process to contribute to a reduction in deaths, injuries and related consequences.[6] In order for NGOs/CSOs to positively influence road safety decision-making, they need an environment that enables them to exist and effectively operate.

This project aimed to generate research-based guidance on the Enabling Environment (EE) of road safety NGOs/CSOs in three sub-Saharan low-income countries[7] (Ethiopia, Uganda, and Zambia), thus contributing to the development of global, regional, and country capacity to support the sustainable reduction in LMICs.

The research project was led by the Alliance in partnership with local universities in the study countries (Addis Ababa University School of Public Health, Makerere University School of Public Health, and Harvest University) and George Washington University (GWU). The current EE of road safety NGOs in the three study countries was assessed through an online survey and in-depth interviews (IDIs). Desk review in combination with the survey and IDI results were used to develop a framework for the EE for road safety NGOs. The practical implementation of the framework was considered through a workshop between NGOs and governments in the respective countries.

Key findings

- Most government officials in all three countries had a positive view of NGOs/CSOs and recognized their usefulness in their work such as reaching remote areas and bringing attention to issues overlooked by the government and bridging the gap between the government and the public.
- Government officials reported the primary way government worked with NGOs/CSOs was through receiving funding or equipment from foreign donors or the private sector.

[1] World Health Organization. (2018). *Global status report on road safety 2018*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
[2] Brondum, L. (2016). *Road safety made personal, local and real: The global alliance of NGOs for road safety - an umbrella for nongovernmental organisations*. Journal of the Australasian College of Road Safety, 27(3), 48–50.
[3] Brondum, L. (2016). *Road safety made personal, local and real: The global alliance of NGOs for road safety - an umbrella for nongovernmental organisations*. Journal of the Australasian College of Road Safety, 27(3), 48–50.
[4] World Bank. (2023). *Community-Driven Development. Retrieved from* https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/communitydrivendevelopment
[5] Brondum, L., Sakashita, C., Man, L., & Motta, V. (2022). *New deal in road safety: Why we need NGOs*. Journal of Road Safety, 33(1), 64–70.
[6] The Global Alliance of NGOs for Road Safety [The Alliance]. (2021). *Good Practice Guide: Meaningful NGO Participation*.
[7] World Bank. (2023). *World Bank Country and Lending Groups.* Retrieved from https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups

- 66% of NGO/CSO members in all three countries agreed that there were policies to support their involvement in policymaking and 75% in road safety program implementation.
- However, fewer than half of government officials felt there were policies or EE frameworks in place to support NGO/CSO-government relationships. A formal way of collaboration mentioned by the government officials was through the signing of a memorandum of understanding or terms of reference, especially in Ethiopia.
- 47% of NGO/CSO members in all three countries felt that government sometimes implemented their organization's proposals and 48% considered their concerns about policy and implementation. However, 46% felt that their organization never influenced government's funding in road safety.
- Fewer NGOs/CSOs in Ethiopia, compared to Uganda and Zambia, reported not being able to access information about government policies (57% vs 92% and 83%), policy decisions (43% vs 92% and 100%), and government budgets (86% vs 83% and 67.%).
- 67% of NGO/CSO members from Uganda and 83% from Zambia agreed that they were free to make statements that were openly critical of government policy and actions whereas only 14% from Ethiopia did. However, government officials in all countries felt that NGOs/CSOs were free to critique the government and hold meetings and protests.
- 20% of NGO/CSO members in Ethiopia, 17% in Uganda, and 0% in Zambia reported threats to close the organization. 60% of NGO/CSO members in Ethiopia reported physical threats against their work but 0% in Uganda and Zambia. In Freedom House's ranking of access to political rights and civil liberties, Ethiopia and Uganda were classified as "not free" while Zambia was classified as "partially free."[8] The report notes that in Uganda, civil society suffers from legal and extralegal harassment and state violence.
- However, most government officials believed that road safety NGOs/CSOs faced no restrictions on their work.
- In Ethiopia, some government officials reported that NGOs/CSOs worked in isolation from the government and failed to comply with government regulations. In Uganda, concerns were raised about the need for clarity on roles, a lack of appropriate expertise, misunderstanding about resource levels, and fears about sharing information with foreign donors. In Zambia, conflicts over policy and inaccurate data were mentioned as challenges when working with NGOs/CSOs.

Given the assessment of the enabling environment of road safety NGOs/CSOs is relatively new, a simple EE Framework and steps to implement it were proposed (Table 12). They are designed to initiate discussion between NGOs/CSOs and government working in road safety on key indicators of effective NGO/CSO functioning and NGO-government engagement and to identify and analyze issues for both parties to address in collaboration, thereby putting into practice an enabling environment and continually improving it.

Recommendations for governments and NGOs

- To implement the EE Framework (Table 12) as a way to establish a regular dialogue between government and NGOs/CSOs on ways to improve government-NGO working relationships for improved road safety outcomes, using the suggested steps:

    - Identify key stakeholders: key government officials involved in road safety from agencies with authority to make decisions and commitments and members of road safety NGOs/CSOs who are knowledgeable about road safety and have experience working with government on road safety. Both government and NGO/CSO stakeholders may provide a list. The list already developed for the study countries may be used for Ethiopia, Uganda and Zambia.

---

[8] Freedom House. (2022). *Freedom in the World 2022*. Washington, DC: Freedom House. Freedom House.

- ○ Apply the EE Framework: one or two participants from each party (government and NGOs) may be selected to lead the application of the EE Framework. These leaders may decide on logistics for a meeting to work together to answer the monitoring indicator questions candidly. This may be an opportunity for the government to establish a formal platform of communications between the government and NGOs/CSOs if none exists in the jurisdiction.
- ○ Analyze the issues identified toward solutions: discuss ways to improve the EE based on the answers to the monitoring indicator questions from both groups. It may be necessary to assemble a team of both government officials and NGO/CSO members (working group) to focus on each indicator and work toward a solution. Once appropriate changes have been agreed on, the group may work toward their adoption.
- ○ Re-apply the EE Framework at least annually: government officials and NGO/CSO members convene annually to re-apply the EE Framework, assess progress and continually improve the EE in collaboration.

Recommendations for future projects

- To replicate the online survey and in-depth interviews in other African countries and other regions to gain a better understanding of the existing EE of road safety NGOs in different countries and to improve the newly designed EE Framework for road safety.
- To develop an index based on the applications of the newly designed EE Framework for road safety.

CHAPTER ONE

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 Background

Road traffic crashes pose a significant global problem, resulting in over 1.35 million deaths and 20–50 million injuries annually. Over 93% occur in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) despite their lower motorization rates. Compared to high-income countries, low-income countries face more than three times higher fatality risk.[9] Pedestrians, cyclists, and motorcyclists, account for 50% of global road crash fatalities.[10] Additionally, road injuries are the leading cause of Disability-Adjusted Life-Years (DALYs) for individuals aged 10–49, while causing substantial economic losses, amounting to approximately 3% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) for most countries.[11]

Within the global context, Africa experiences the highest risk of road traffic injuries, deaths, and DALYs lost.[12] In 2016, the African region had the highest road traffic death rate of 27.64 per 100,000 population, with the lowest motorization rate (6,920 per 100,000 population) compared to Europe and Central Asia with a death rate of 12.53 (25,428.5 motorizations per 100,000 population) and South Asia with 14.55 (12,800.3 motorizations per 100,000 population).[13] African low-income countries face various road safety challenges, including rapid urbanization, poor safety standards, inadequate enforcement, and insufficient use of safety equipment.[14] However, African LMICs have the opportunity to learn from past mistakes made in other regions and implement effective road safety measures.[15]

Road safety is part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and is specifically captured in Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 3.6[16] and 11.2.[17] In response to the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) Resolution 74/299 "Improving global road safety",[18] the Global Plan for the Decade of Action for Road Safety 2021–2030 calls on governments around the world to set targets and develop and implement national and local action plans for the new decade involving other stakeholders who can

---

[9] World Health Organization. (2018). *Global status report on road safety 2018*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

[10] World Bank. (2019). *Guide for Road Safety Opportunities and Challenges: Low- and Middle-Income Countries Country Profiles*.

[11] GBD 2019 Diseases and Injuries Collaborators. (2020). *Global burden of 369 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019*. The Lancet, 396(10258), 1204–1222. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30925-9

[12] GBD 2019 Diseases and Injuries Collaborators. (2020). *Global burden of 369 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019.* The Lancet, 396(10258), 1204–1222. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30925-9

[13] World Bank. (2019). *Guide for Road Safety Opportunities and Challenges: Low- and Middle-Income Countries Country Profiles*.

[14] Brondum, L. (2016). *Road safety made personal, local and real: The global alliance of NGOs for road safety - an umbrella for nongovernmental organisations.* Journal of the Australasian College of Road Safety, 27(3), 48–50.

[15] Brondum, L. (2016). *Road safety made personal, local and real: The global alliance of NGOs for road safety - an umbrella for nongovernmental organisations.* Journal of the Australasian College of Road Safety, 27(3), 48–50.

[16] Target 3.6. (2020). *By 2020, halve the number of global deaths and injuries from road traffic accidents.*

[17] Target 11.2. (2030). *By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons.*

[18] UNGA Seventy-fourth session. (2020). *Agenda item 12: Improving global road safety.* 74/299 Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 31 August 2020.

influence road safety including civil society, academia, the private sector, donors, community and youth leaders.[19] The Global Plan further highlights the roles of civil society to:

- Help amplify the voice of academia by being an advocate and acting as an independent voice to influence social change.
- Support the development of policies by augmenting the evidence base as well as bringing the perspectives of communities impacted by those policies to the table.
- Help ensure government accountability by empowering communities on road safety issues and ensuring good governance.
- Keep road safety on the government agenda and unite stakeholders with a common goal.
- Be an important source of road safety information for the community and governments.

The World Bank recognizes that community driven development approaches and actions are important elements of an effective poverty-reduction and sustainable development strategy.[20] In pursuit of SDG targets 3.6 and 11.2, civil society organizations (CSOs) / non-governmental organizations (NGOs) play a pivotal role in influencing governments' decision-making in road safety[21] but they are not always able to meaningfully participate in this process to contribute to a reduction in deaths, injuries and related consequences.[22] In the official position paper for the 2017 High-Level Political Forum, the NGO Major Group called on the United Nations and its Member States to increase the engagement of civil society by soliciting more extensive inputs from the Major Group and other stakeholders and allowing ample time for meaningful engagement of civil society in the SDG implementation.[23] In order for NGOs/CSOs to positively influence road safety decision-making, they need an environment that enables them to exist and effectively operate.

This project aimed to generate research-based guidance on the Enabling Environment (EE) of road safety NGOs/CSOs in three sub-Saharan low-income countries[24] (Ethiopia, Uganda, and Zambia), thus contributing to the development of global, regional, and country capacity to support the sustainable reduction in LMICs.

1.1.2 Meaning of Civil Society Organizations and Non-Governmental Organizations

Although aid actors and governments in developing countries refer to 'NGOs' in international aid and development cooperation, 'NGOs' have been subsumed within a broader category of 'CSOs'.[25] According to the UN Guiding Principles Reporting Framework, CSOs are non-State, not-for-profit entities formed by people in the social sphere that are separate from the State and the market and do not include businesses or for-profit associations.[26] CSOs represent a wide range of interests and ties and can include community-based organizations as well as NGOs.[27] The World Bank defines NGOs as organizations that

[19] Global Plan for the Decade of Action for Road Safety 2021-2030. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/global-plan-for-the-decade-of-action-for-road-safety-2021-2030

[20] World Bank. (2023). *Community-Driven Development.* Retrieved from https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/communitydrivendevelopment

[21] Brondum, L., Sakashita, C., Man, L., & Motta, V. (2022). *New deal in road safety: Why we need NGOs*. Journal of Road Safety, 33(1), 64–70.

[22] The Global Alliance of NGOs for Road Safety [The Alliance]. (2021). *Good Practice Guide: Meaningful NGO Participation.*

[23] Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) Major Group. (2017). *Official Position Paper for the 2017 High-Level Political Forum.* Retrieved from https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/15002NGO.pdf

[24] World Bank. (2023). *World Bank Country and Lending Groups*. Retrieved from https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups

[25] UNDP Annexes (NGOs AND CSOs: A Note on Terminology). (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/migration/cn/UNDP-CH03-Annexes.pdf

[26] Shift Mazars. (n.d.). *Civil Society Organizations (CSOS).* Retrieved from https://www.ungpreporting.org/glossary/civil-society-organizations-csos/

[27] Shift Mazars. (n.d.). *Civil Society Organizations (CSOS).* Retrieved from https://www.ungpreporting.org/glossary/civil-society-organizations-csos/

pursue activities to relieve suffering, promote the interests of the poor, protect the environment, provide basic social services, or undertake community development.[28]According to the United Nation Civil Society Unit, a CSO or an NGO is any non-profit, voluntary citizens' group which is organized on a local, national or international level.[29]

The terms CSOs and NGOs are therefore used interchangeably and road safety NGOs/CSOs are defined in this study as "any not-for-profit non-State organizations that pursue activities to improve road safety outcomes".

1.1.3 Meaning of "Enabling Environment"

The literature describes an EE as:

- a rich and varied space where risks are minimized and well managed.[30]
- the conditions within which civil society operates and the forces that shape and influence the size, extent and functioning of civil society.[31]
- the recognition and implementation of rights and freedoms affecting CSOs, defining the legal and regulatory environment as well as spaces for dialogue and policy influencing and including access to information and donor–CSO relationships.[32]
- institutionalized processes and spaces for civil society-government and peer-to-peer engagement at the High-Level Political Forum and at the domestic level.[33]
- a space that encourages CSOs to implement practices that strengthen their accountability and their contribution to development effectiveness.[34]
- an environment that enables CSOs to exercise their roles as independent development actors and contribute to development, consistent with agreed international rights.[35]
- the respect in policy and practice for the freedoms of assembly, association and expression which are underpinned by the state's duty to protect civil society and which allow people to influence the political, economic and social structures around them.[36]

This study therefore employed the following working definition of EE for NGOs/CSOs: "Institutionalized processes and spaces that enable NGOs/CSOs to function and exercise their roles as independent contributors to development and improved societal outcomes, consistent with agreed international rights."

---

[28] World Bank. (n.d.). *Working with NGOs*. Retrieved from https://www.gdrc.org/ngo/wb-ngos.html

[29] United Nations Civil Society Unit. (n.d.). *Who We Are*. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/en/civil-society/page/about-us

[30] Early Years Alliance. (n.d.). *What makes an Enabling Environment*. Retrieved from https://www.eyalliance.org.uk/enabling-environments

[31] CIVICUS Monitor. (n.d.). *Enabling Environment.* https://www.civicus.org/index.php/what-we-do/defend/civicus-enabling-environment

[32] CPDE Working Group. (2013). *An Enabling Environment for Civil Society Organizations: A Synthesis of evidence of progress since Busan.* https://www.icnl.org/wp-content/uploads/2014_02_20_Synthesis_of_CSO_Evidence_-for_-Indicator_-2.pdf

[33] Working Group on Enabling and Protecting Civil Society. (2013). *The importance of ensuring an enabling environment for civil society as it relates to the Sustainable Development Goals*. https://community-democracies.org/app/uploads/2016/09/Study-Enabling-Environment-and-SDGs.pdf

[34] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2012). *Partnering with Civil Society. 12 Lessons Partnering with Civil Society*, p.7. https://www.oecd.org/dac/peer-reviews/12%20Lessons%20Partnering%20with%20Civil%20Society.pdf

[35]Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2012). *Partnering with Civil Society. 12 Lessons Partnering with Civil Society*, p.7. https://www.oecd.org/dac/peer-reviews/12%20Lessons%20Partnering%20with%20Civil%20Society.pdf

[36] CIVICUS Monitor. (n.d.). *Tracking Civic Space.* Retrieved from https://monitor.civicus.org/facts/

1.1.4 NGO/CSO Enabling Environment in Africa

Several indices and reports from international public and private entities suggest that spaces for civil society are closing. For example, the CIVICUS Monitor[37] which rates the EE for civil society around the world finds that only 3.1% of the world's population lives in countries where the space for civic activism is truly open (i.e. citizens and CSOs are able to organize, participate and communicate without hindrance) despite the international recognition of the rights to participation and freedom of expression, and their inclusion in most constitutions. The UN Human Rights refers to a concept of 'shrinking civic space' which is manifested by:

- Decreasing working environment;
- Denial/suppression of public freedoms and undue restrictions;
- Inability to express oneself without ridicule, disdain and condemnation;
- Silencing of voices and state capture;
- Limiting citizen engagement;
- Intimidation of human rights defenders.[38]

A historical overview of NGO-State relations in Africa suggests that policy formulation is heavily guarded as a highly political activity where the State does not allow for participation of NGOs and they are only invited to come in and pursue what the government outlines.[39] The CIVICUS Monitor 2022, which rates the EE for civil society around the world, rates the two regions 'Africa' and 'the Middle East and North Africa' as having the lowest number of countries with 'open' civic space (i.e. citizens and CSOs are able to organize, participate and communicate without hindrance).[40] The ratings are on a five-category scale: open, narrowed, obstructed, repressed, and closed on four dimensions (Freedom of association; Freedom of peaceful assembly; Freedom of expression; State duty to protect).[41]

In Ethiopia, CSOs working on sustainable development are reported to be disempowered by restrictive regulation, which not only harms CSOs but also hinders the achievement of sustainable development in a rapidly developing country.[42] Prior to the adoption of the Charities and Societies Proclamation (CSP) in 2009, Ethiopia had a young but active CSO sector, but a significant number of Federal States in Ethiopia have used legislative and other mechanisms to limit the autonomy and freedoms of CSOs through the use of propaganda and stigmatization, intentional misapplication of anti-terrorism and other legislation, and restrictions on funding.[43] However, it is also reported that parts of the government have made attempts to involve NGOs/CSOs in policy and programming.[44]

In Uganda, NGOs/CSOs relationships with government seem to vary significantly based on the issue and the level of government.[45] Some NGOs/CSOs that are considered pro-government or working on non-sensitive topics are reported to have useful relationships with government and involvement in policy

---

[37] CIVICUS Monitor. (n.d.). *Tracking Civic Space*. Retrieved from https://monitor.civicus.org/facts/

[38] OHCHR-East Africa Regional Office (EARO). (2017). *Civic Space and Effects of Shrinking Space on Women Human Rights Defenders in East Africa*, p.15.

[39] Hofisi, M., & Hofisi, C. (2013). *State-NGO Relations in Africa*, p.293, para. 1

[40] CIVICUS Monitor. (n.d.). *Tracking Civic Space*. Retrieved from https://monitor.civicus.org/facts/

[41] CIVICUS Monitor. (2021). *Methodology Paper*. https://findings2021.monitor.civicus.org/methodology.html

[42] African Journal of Legal Studies. (2021). *CSOs in Sustainable Development in Ethiopia: Past Practices and New Trajectories*, Volume 13, page 43-72.

[43] African Journal of Legal Studies. (2021). *CSOs in Sustainable Development in Ethiopia: Past Practices and New Trajectories*, Volume 13, page 54, para. 1.

[44] USAID, International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ICNL), & FHI360. (2021). *Civil Society Organization Sustainability Index for Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington, DC: USAID, ICNL, and FHI360

[45] Uganda National NGO Forum. (2014). *National Assessment of the Enabling Environment for Civil Society: Uganda*. Johannesburg, South Africa: CIVICUS.

processes.[46,47] While the government enacted the 1989 NGO Statute, and more recently, the 2010 National NGO Policy - Uganda Strengthening Partnerships for Development Registration (Amendment) Act 2006, the NGO regulatory landscape has not been without challenges. The key issues and challenges that this Policy seek to address include:[48]

- Lack of clarity of what constitutes an NGO in Uganda;
- Inadequacies in the existing legal and regulatory framework for the operations of NGOs;
- Inadequate clarity of the mutual roles and responsibilities, rights and obligations of key actors in the NGO sector, and the need to harmonize/facilitate the contribution of NGOs to national development;
- Inadequate capacity in Government and amongst NGO actors to propel sustainable NGO sector development;
- Donor dependency of the NGO sector, making foreign influence inevitable in Uganda governance processes;
- political (e.g., some NGOs have generally been involved in politics by taking sides) and unlawful activities of NGOs;
- Inadequate integrity, transparency, and accountability by some NGO actors for the public resources received;
- Lack of adequate and reliable data and information on the NGO sector.

In Zambia, a movement for a decentralized, community-driven Zambian aid sector has been advanced by the government and a range of international NGOs and local NGOs play a number of important roles within the Zambian civil society. Some international NGOs within Zambia have helped pave the way in implementing participatory approaches that involve community members' feedback and strengthen communities' capacities.[49] Certain local NGOs have also been promoting greater participation among community members impacted by development projects.[50] However, in many impoverished communities, low literacy levels, a lack of capacity to engage in project policy planning, implementation, and evaluation, and gender inequalities prevent the full participation of community members.[51] While some CSOs are doing advocacy in the health sector particularly in the HIV/AIDS sector, concerns are that most of these are government-owned CSOs and even then the government does not provide institutional support.[52] NGOs/CSOs in areas such as gender seem to be cooperating with government on policy development, but the level of mistrust between the two groups is also reported to be high.[53,54,55]

1.1.5 Key indicators of an enabling environment for NGOs/CSOs

In general, there are basic principles and legal and institutional standards that are crucial for CSOs to functionally exist and operate.[56] The literature suggests three key indicators of an EE for NGOs/CSOs:

---

[46] Howard, Bresnihan, Mavhinga, Chirwa, Mayaya & Winstanley. (2014). *Space for Civil Society - How to Protect and Expand an Enabling Environment*. Geneva, Switzerland: Act Alliance and CIDSE.

[47] Kansiime. (2019, August). *The State, Civil Society and Democracy in Uganda*. American Research Journal of Humanities & Social Science (ARJHSS), 2(8).

[48] Ministry of Internal Affairs. (2010). *The National NGO Policy: Strengthening Partnership for Development*. Ministry of Internal Affairs National NGO Policy.

[49] An Analysis of Zambian Development NGOs' Participatory Practices. (n.d.). Occasional paper series, p.8.

[50] An Analysis of Zambian Development NGOs' Participatory Practices. (n.d.). Occasional paper series, p.8, para. 1.

[51] An Analysis of Zambian Development NGOs' Participatory Practices. (n.d.). Occasional paper series, p.8, para. 2.

[52] Civil Society, Aid Effectiveness and Enabling Environment. (n.d.). p.10, para. 8.

[53] Brondum, L. (2016). *Road safety made personal, local and real: The global alliance of NGOs for road safety - an umbrella for nongovernmental organisations*. Journal of the Australasian College of Road Safety, 27(3), 48–50.

[54] Howard, Bresnihan, Mavhinga, Chirwa, Mayaya & Winstanley. (2014). *Space for Civil Society - How to Protect and Expand an Enabling Environment*. Geneva, Switzerland: Act Alliance and CIDSE.

[55] Munalula, Vincent & Haggai. (2018, November). *State Civil Society Relationship in Zambia.* International Journal of Humanities, Art and Social Studies (IJHAS), 3(4). doi: 10.5281/zenodo.2535485.

[56] International Environmental Law Research Centre. (n.d.). Strategies for good policy and practice, p.6-8.

1. Legal rights of independence and freedoms. Laws must provide NGOs/CSOs to have the independence and freedoms in accordance with international human rights law.[57]
2. Financial viability and sustainability. Laws and policy must allow NGOs/CSOs to generate local and independent revenue streams.[58]
3. Involvement in policy development. Institutional mechanisms must allow NGOs/CSOs to participate in policy development. [59]

In Ethiopia, Uganda, and Zambia, these elements do not seem to be fully adopted in legislation, policy or in practice. In Ethiopia, while the National Road Safety Framework mentions, "The private sector and civil society also have important roles to play",[60] it fails to highlight the importance of CSO involvement in *Promotion: promoting road traffic safety through forums, formal and non-formal education, public participation, and mass media promotion* (see page 15).

In Uganda, a Freedom House report classifies Uganda as 'not free' with regards to NGOs (Musila, 2019, p.15). In August and September 2019, the government required NGOs to submit information to the National Bureau for NGOs on their staffing, finances, and activities. In November 2019, the interior minister ordered some 12,000 NGOs to shut down for failing to renew their registration, though the Bureau said the groups would still have an opportunity to re-register if they met all the requirements. Only about 2,000 NGOs had successfully navigated the process. [61]

In 2009, Zambia enacted a new law to regulate NGOs.[62] The law restricts the independence of NGOs and subjects them to excessive controls. For example, the law requires NGOs to re-register every five years and annually report their activities, financiers, accounts, and the private wealth of their officials. If they fail to do so, the law prescribes penalties that range from suspension to revocation of their registration. The Bill also created an NGO Registration Board with an overreaching mandate, which is under the firm control of the Government.

---

[57] CIDSE and ACT Alliance. (n.d.). *SpaceForCivilSociety*, page 9, item 9.
[58] CIDSE and ACT Alliance. (n.d.). *SpaceForCivilSociety*, page 9, item 8.
[59] CIDSE and ACT Alliance. (n.d.). *SpaceForCivilSociety*, page 9, item 5.
[60] Small, M., Yimer, T., & Runji, J. (2018). *National Road Safety Management Framework*. 4. p. 10.
https://www.ssatp.org/sites/ssatp/files/road-safety/NRTSC Management Framework Finaljr.pdf
[61]Musila, G. (2019). *Freedoms Under Threat: The Spread of Anti-NGO Measures in Africa*, p.15.
[62] Library of Congress. (n.d.). *Zambia: New Law to Regulate NGOs.*

CHAPTER TWO

2.1 Methods

The research project was led by the Alliance in partnership with Milken Institute School of Public Health, George Washington University (GWU) and local universities in the study countries (Addis Ababa University School of Public Health, Makerere University School of Public Health, and Harvest University).

The current EE of road safety NGOs in the three study countries was assessed through an online survey and in-depth interviews (IDIs). Desk review in combination with the survey and IDI results were used to develop a Framework for the EE for road safety NGOs. The practical implementation of the EE Framework was considered through a workshop between NGOs and governments in the respective countries. These data collection methods are described below.

1) Desk Review

The desk research aimed to identify relevant literature on the EE for road safety CSOs. Documents were obtained from online sources using Google. The following criteria were applied to select relevant documents 1) Date: 2009 to date (First Global Ministerial Conference on Road Safety: Moscow Declaration); 2) Language: Documents in English language; 3) Subject matter: Documents on government policy on civil society including NGOs; Documents mentioning civil society / NGO roles in context of SDGs; 3) Geographical scope of the study: Documents relating to African context in general; Documents specific to Zambia, Uganda, and Ethiopia, and 4) Authenticity: Peer reviewed publications; Gray literature, technical reports, flagship reports, annual reports. Results of the desk review informed the development of the online survey and in-depth interview questions as well as the Framework for an EE of road safety NGOs.

2) Online Survey

The online survey targeted adults (18 years and above) who worked for road safety NGOs/CSOs in Ethiopia, Uganda, and Zambia. Potential participants identified by the Alliance and local universities (Addis Ababa University School of Public Health, Makerere University School of Public Health, and Harvest University) were contacted via email, informing about the study objectives, consent requirements and survey instructions including a link to the survey. The online survey was administered via Qualtrics® between 22 July and 4 November 2022. The survey, designed to take 20 minutes, consisted of five sections: 1) Operating environment including registration and reporting requirements; 2) Road safety activities in the past two years; 3) Restrictions placed on the organization's road safety activities in the past two years; 4) The organization's support for global road safety agenda; 5) Demographic information (Annex 1). Descriptive statistics and data analysis were performed using Excel© and Stata©. Open-ended responses were categorized, and Likert scale answers were converted to scores (very often=1, often=2, sometimes=3, rarely=4, never=5) to calculate the mean. Kruskal Wallis test was used to compare distributions by country.

3) In-Depth Interviews (IDIs)

The study population for the IDIs included adults (ages 18 years and above) of either gender who were currently government employees and involved in road safety policy making and/or program implementation at the national and/or sub-national levels in Ethiopia, Uganda, and Zambia. A potential list of government interviewees representing different government sectors was compiled with the

assistance of local road safety NGOs/CSOs and universities. They were invited in person and/or via phone, email, and postal mail to participate in the IDI informing them of the study goals and consent requirements. Experienced interviewers from local universities trained on the objectives of the study, procedures, and administration of informed consent, and conducted semi-structured interviews face-to-face, over the phone, or via video call between 5 September and 6 October 2022 using a standardized interview guide which detailed the questions and instructions to the participants (Annex 2). All interviewers followed similar procedures in each country to ensure the standardization and quality of the collected data and lasted between 60–90 minutes. The IDIs were conducted in English in Uganda and Zambia, and in Amharic in Ethiopia. The interviewers asked open-ended questions about the participants' knowledge and views on road safety NGOs/CSOs and the level of government support for road safety NGOs/CSOs, and existing cooperation between government and NGOs/CSOs in supporting the UN's Global Plan and the SDGs. All IDIs were recorded, transcribed, translated (if necessary) and de-identified. The transcripts were analyzed using inductive content analysis (codes are generated from the raw data rather than a prespecified hypothesis given there was little previous research on the topic) and data addressing the research questions were coded using NVivo©.

4) Development of the Enabling Environment Framework for road safety

An EE Framework was developed by analyzing the existing EE frameworks identified in the desk review as well as the survey and IDI findings. This EE Framework was further refined based on the feedback received through the in-country consultation workshops.

5) In-country Consultation Workshops

The local universities in each study country organized a workshop to present the survey, IDI findings and draft EE Framework, and facilitate a dialogue among NGO/CSO members and government officials working in road safety in Ethiopia, Uganda, and Zambia. The workshops were conducted following a standardized outline that defined the objectives and intended audience (Annex 3) to inform further development and implementation of the EE Framework for road safety.

2.2. Ethics

Ethical approval for the online survey was obtained from the GWU Institutional Review Board (IRB) prior to the start of data collection. The online survey was administered through Qualtrics©, which has specific features in place to ensure the security and confidentiality of data and no identifiable information was collected on participants.

Ethical approval for the IDIs was obtained from the GWU IRB, as well as the IRB in each country, prior to the start of data collection (Table 1).

Table 1. Ethical Approval Details

Country	University	Reference No.	Date
Ethiopia	Addis Ababa University, School of Public Health	EPHA/OG/938/22	3 August 2022
Uganda	Makerere University, School of Public Health	SPH-2022-296	22 July 2022
Zambia	Harvest Research Institutes, Harvest University	REF.No 2022-June 1222	28 June 2022
USA	Milken Institute School of Public Health, George Washington University (GWU)	IRB#NCR224250	12 July 2022

CHAPTER THREE

3.1 Milestones

The project started in September 2021 and was completed at the end of June 2023. In accordance with the objectives and methods stated above, the following milestones were achieved (Table 2).

Table 2. Major milestones

Major milestones	Completion date
Interim Unaudited Financial Report (IUFR) for the six-month period ending 30 June 2022	16 June 2022
Desk review	23 August 2022
In-depth interviews (IDIs)	6 October 2022
Online survey	4 November 2022
Interim Unaudited Financial Report (IUFR) for the six-month period ending 31 December 2022	16 December 2022
Implementation Progress Report	16 December 2022
Preliminary analysis of the results from online surveys and IDIs and draft Enabling Environment Framework	16 February 2023
In-country Consultation Workshops	12 May 2023
Final Enabling Environment Framework	31 May 2023
Interim Unaudited Financial Report (IUFR) for the six-month period ending 30 June 2023	13 June 2023
Draft Final report	21 June 2023

CHAPTER FOUR

4.1 Results

4.1.1 Online Survey

The online survey was completed by 37 people from the target countries: 9 from Ethiopia, 19 from Uganda, and 9 from Zambia. The distribution of respondents in each country was influenced by the number of NGOs/CSOs working in road safety. There was a larger number of road safety NGOs/CSOs in Uganda compared to the other two countries. Respondents were primarily 30–39 and male, although they were slightly older in Zambia (Table 3). Most organizations (52%) employed 6–10 people and had operated from 6–20 years (69%), although in Ethiopia there were fewer employees and fewer years in operation. Most organizations were operating at national-level and about half (56%) were members of the Global Alliance.

Table 3. Demographics of NGO/CSO survey respondents

	Ethiopia		Uganda		Zambia		Total	
What is your age?								
25–29	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	1	16.7%	2	8.7%
30–39	3	60.0%	5	41.7%	1	16.7%	9	39.1%
40–49	2	40.0%	1	8.3%	2	33.3%	5	21.7%
50+	0	0.0%	5	41.7%	2	33.3%	7	30.4%
What is your gender?								
Male	4	80.0%	9	75.0%	4	66.7%	17	73.9%
Female	1	20.0%	3	25.0%	2	33.3%	6	26.1%
How many people are employed by your organization (in your country)?								
1–5	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	3	13.0%
6–10	1	20.0%	8	66.7%	3	50.0%	12	52.2%
11–20	1	20.0%	2	16.7%	1	16.7%	4	17.4%
21–50	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	1	16.7%	2	8.7%
51+	1	20.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	2	8.7%
How many years has your organization been operating (in your country)?								
1–5	3	60.0%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	5	21.7%
6–10	2	40.0%	4	33.3%	2	33.3%	8	34.8%
11–20	0	0.0%	5	41.7%	3	50.0%	8	34.8%
21–50	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	1	4.3%
51+	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	1	4.3%
Organization level: City-level								
No	4	80.0%	10	83.3%	4	66.7%	18	78.3%
Yes	1	20.0%	2	16.7%	2	33.3%	5	21.7%
Organization level: Regional								
No	5	100.0%	8	66.7%	5	83.3%	18	78.3%

	Ethiopia		Uganda		Zambia		Total	
Yes	0	0.0%	4	33.3%	1	16.7%	5	21.7%
Organization level: National								
No	1	20.0%	2	16.7%	1	16.7%	4	17.4%
Yes	4	80.0%	10	83.3%	5	83.3%	19	82.6%
Organization level: International								
No	5	100.0%	11	91.7%	5	83.3%	21	91.3%
Yes	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	1	16.7%	2	8.7%
Is your NGO/CSO a member of the Global Alliance of NGOs for Road Safety?								
Yes	3	60.0%	6	50.0%	4	66.7%	13	56.5%
No	2	40.0%	5	41.7%	1	16.7%	8	34.8%
Don't know	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	1	16.7%	2	8.7%

The most popular sources of funding were philanthropy, NGOs, and the private sector (Table 4). Overall, most respondents stated that their organizations were free to accept funding from a variety of sources, domestic and foreign. In Ethiopia, 50% of respondents reported not being able to accept money from philanthropic foundations and multilateral development banks.

Table 4. NGO/CSO budget and funding sources

	Ethiopia		Uganda		Zambia		Total	
What is the yearly operating budget of your organization (in US dollars)?								
0–$5,000	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.5%
$5,001–$10,000	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	1	4.5%
$10,001–$50,000	3	60.0%	4	36.4%	0	0.0%	7	31.8%
$50,001–$100,000	0	0.0%	4	36.4%	3	50.0%	7	31.8%
$100,001–$500,000	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	1	16.7%	2	9.1%
$500,001–$1,000,000	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	2	9.1%
$1,000,001+	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	1	16.7%	2	9.1%
Source: Government								
No	3	60.0%	11	91.7%	6	100.0%	20	87.0%
Yes	2	40.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	3	13.0%
Source: Philanthropy								
No	3	60.0%	5	41.7%	3	50.0%	11	47.8%
Yes	2	40.0%	7	58.3%	3	50.0%	12	52.2%
Source: Development banks								
No	3	60.0%	12	100.0%	5	83.3%	20	87.0%
Yes	2	40.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	3	13.0%
Source: Non-governmental organization								
No	1	20.0%	5	41.7%	2	33.3%	8	34.8%
Yes	4	80.0%	7	58.3%	4	66.7%	15	65.2%
Source: UN agency								
No	3	60.0%	9	75.0%	4	66.7%	16	69.6%
Yes	2	40.0%	3	25.0%	2	33.3%	7	30.4%
Source: Private sector								

No	1	20.0%	6	50.0%	4	66.7%	11	47.8%
Yes	4	80.0%	6	50.0%	2	33.3%	12	52.2%
Source: Other								
No	5	100.0%	8	66.7%	4	66.7%	17	73.9%
Yes	0	0.0%	4	33.3%	2	33.3%	6	26.1%
Free to accept: National government sources								
No	2	25.0%	3	17.6%	2	22.2%	7	20.6%
Yes	6	75.0%	14	82.4%	7	77.8%	27	79.4%
Free to accept: Foreign government sources								
No	3	37.5%	3	17.6%	2	22.2%	8	23.5%
Yes	5	62.5%	14	82.4%	7	77.8%	26	76.5%
Free to accept: International NGO sources								
No	2	25.0%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	3	8.8%
Yes	6	75.0%	16	94.1%	9	100.0%	31	91.2%
Free to accept: Domestic NGO sources								
No	3	37.5%	2	11.8%	1	11.1%	6	17.6%
Yes	5	62.5%	15	88.2%	8	88.9%	28	82.4%
Free to accept: Domestic private industry sources								
No	2	25.0%	2	11.8%	2	22.2%	6	17.6%
Yes	6	75.0%	15	88.2%	7	77.8%	28	82.4%
Free to accept: Foreign private industry sources								
No	3	37.5%	4	23.5%	3	33.3%	10	29.4%
Yes	5	62.5%	13	76.5%	6	66.7%	24	70.6%
Free to accept: Philanthropic foundations								
No	4	50.0%	5	29.4%	1	11.1%	10	29.4%
Yes	4	50.0%	12	70.6%	8	88.9%	24	70.6%
Free to accept: Multilateral development banks								
No	4	50.0%	6	35.3%	2	22.2%	12	35.3%
Yes	4	50.0%	11	64.7%	7	77.8%	22	64.7%
Free to accept: United Nations agencies								
No	3	37.5%	2	11.8%	0	0.0%	5	14.7%
Yes	5	62.5%	15	88.2%	9	100.0%	29	85.3%
Free to accept: Individual donors								
No	3	37.5%	1	5.9%	1	11.1%	5	14.7%
Yes	5	62.5%	16	94.1%	8	88.9%	29	85.3%
Free to accept: Other								
No	7	87.5%	17	100.0%	8	88.9%	32	94.1%
Yes	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	2	5.9%

Almost all respondents said there was a formal NGO registration process (97%) and reporting requirements (91%) (Table 5). 85% of respondents reported that the government could dissolve NGOs/CSOs; the rest were unsure. Only a small percentage (3%) reported never cooperating with other NGOs/CSOs and the reason was due to finances. Respondents in Ethiopia reported cooperating less

frequently than those in Uganda. The majority of respondents (75%) felt that there were not laws restricting their organization's road safety activities. A few people (13%) said that their organization had been threatened with closure (Ethiopia and Uganda). A similar percentage (13%) reported that members of their organization had been physically threatened in relation to their work (from Ethiopia). Responses were split about whether corruption was a problem.

Table 5. NGO/CSO freedom of operation/activities

	Ethiopia		Uganda		Zambia		Total	
Is there a formal registration process for NGOs/CSOs in your country?								
Yes	9	100.0%	18	94.7%	9	100.0%	36	97.3%
No	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Don't know	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	0	0.0%	1	2.7%
Are there government reporting requirements for NGOs/CSOs?								
Yes	8	100.0%	17	94.4%	7	77.8%	32	91.4%
No	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Don't know	0	0.0%	1	5.6%	2	22.2%	3	8.6%
Does the government have the right to dissolve NGOs/CSOs in your country?								
Yes	7	87.5%	16	94.1%	6	66.7%	29	85.3%
No	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Don't know	1	12.5%	1	5.9%	3	33.3%	5	14.7%
How often has your organization cooperated with other NGOs/CSOs in the past two years?								
Mean, SD*	2.6	1.2	1.4	0.7	2.0	1.1	1.8	0.2
Very often	1	12.5%	13	76.5%	4	44.4%	18	52.9%
Often	3	37.5%	2	11.8%	2	22.2%	7	20.6%
Sometimes	3	37.5%	2	11.8%	2	22.2%	7	20.6%
Rarely	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	11.1%	1	2.9%
Never	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	2.9%
In the past two years, have there been laws restricting your organization's road safety activities?								
Yes	1	16.7%	3	25.0%	0	0.0%	4	16.7%
No	3	50.0%	9	75.0%	6	100.0%	18	75.0%
Don't know	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	8.3%
In the past two years, has your organization been threatened with closure?								
Yes	1	20.0%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	3	13.0%
No	4	80.0%	10	83.3%	6	100.0%	20	87.0%
In the past two years, have members of your organization been threatened physically in relation to your work?								
Yes	3	60.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	13.0%
No	2	40.0%	12	100.0%	6	100.0%	20	87.0%
In the past two years, has government corruption been a problem in the work of your organization?								
Yes	3	60.0%	6	50.0%	2	33.3%	11	47.8%

No	2	40.0%	5	41.7%	4	66.7%	11	47.8%
Don't know	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	1	4.3%

* Country values are significantly different

Most respondents felt that they had been free to access information about proposed policies (76%) and policy decisions (84%), however those in Ethiopia agreed less frequently (Table 6). The majority of respondents in Uganda (83%) and Zambia (67%) reported that they had been free to access information about government budgets, whereas 86% of respondents in Ethiopia said they had not been able to do so. There was a similar pattern of responses for whether their organization had been free to make statements that are openly critical of government policy and actions. Most respondents (80%) said they had been free to organize public meetings, but 71% said they could not organize peaceful demonstrations (however this may be due to COVID). About 83% of respondents were able to engage with the media, although it was only 50% in Ethiopia. They primarily engaged with media by inviting media to an event (80%) or being interviewed for a story (80%).

Table 6. NGO/CSO access to information and freedom of speech

	Ethiopia		Uganda		Zambia		Total	
In the past two years, has your organization been free to access information about proposed government policies?								
Yes	3	42.9%	11	91.7%	5	83.3%	19	76.0%
No	4	57.1%	1	8.3%	1	16.7%	6	24.0%
In the past two years, has your organization been free to access information about policy decisions?								
Yes	4	57.1%	11	91.7%	6	100.0%	21	84.0%
No	3	42.9%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	4	16.0%
In the past two years, has your organization been free to access information about government budgets?								
Yes	0	0.0%	10	83.3%	4	66.7%	14	56.0%
No	6	85.7%	2	16.7%	1	16.7%	9	36.0%
Don't know	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	2	8.0%
In the past two years, has your organization been free to make statements that are openly critical of government policy and/or actions?								
Yes	1	14.3%	8	66.7%	5	83.3%	14	56.0%
No	5	71.4%	4	33.3%	1	16.7%	10	40.0%
Don't know	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.0%
In the past two years, has your organization been free to hold public meetings?								
Yes	4	57.1%	10	83.3%	6	100.0%	20	80.0%
No	3	42.9%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	5	20.0%
In the past two years, has your organization been free to organize peaceful demonstrations?								
Yes	1	16.7%	1	8.3%	1	16.7%	3	12.5%
No	4	66.7%	10	83.3%	3	50.0%	17	70.8%
Don't know	1	16.7%	1	8.3%	2	33.3%	4	16.7%
In the past two years, has your organization been free to engage with the media?								
Yes	3	50.0%	11	91.7%	6	100.0%	20	83.3%
No	3	50.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	4	16.7%
How does your organization engage with the media: Suggested a story								
No	3	100.0%	6	54.5%	3	50.0%	12	60.0%

Yes	0	0.0%	5	45.5%	3	50.0%	8	40.0%

How does your organization engage with the media: Interviewed for a story							
No	1	33.3%	3	27.3%	0	0.0%	4	20.0%
Yes	2	66.7%	8	72.7%	6	100.0%	16	80.0%

How does your organization engage with the media: Held a news conference							
No	1	33.3%	4	36.4%	3	50.0%	8	40.0%
Yes	2	66.7%	7	63.6%	3	50.0%	12	60.0%

How does your organization engage with the media: Invited media to an event							
No	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	1	16.7%	4	20.0%
Yes	3	100.0%	8	72.7%	5	83.3%	16	80.0%

How does your organization engage with the media: Issued a press release							
No	1	33.3%	7	63.6%	0	0.0%	8	40.0%
Yes	2	66.7%	4	36.4%	6	100.0%	12	60.0%

How does your organization engage with the media: Other							
No	3	100.0%	9	81.8%	6	100.0%	18	90.0%
Yes	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%	2	10.0%

Cooperating with the government was very common, with only 9% reporting it rarely or never. Respondents in Ethiopia reported cooperating with the government more frequently than those in Uganda (Table 7). Most (59%) respondents felt the government was supportive of NGOs/CSOs working in road safety; in Ethiopia, opinions were more varied, but the difference did not reach statistical significance. Most respondents felt there were government policies supporting NGO/CSO involvement in road safety policy-making, decision-making, and program implementation. About 70% of respondents reported being free to meet with ministers and senior government officials, although more respondents answered in the negative from Ethiopia and Uganda compared to Zambia. Most respondents were also free to participate in official government discussions and working groups (81%). 84% of respondents felt there were no internal governance structures that affect their ability to cooperate with the government.

Table 7. NGO/CSO relationship and activities with government

	Ethiopia		Uganda		Zambia		Total	
How often has your organization cooperated with government in the past two years?								
Mean, SD*	2.4	1.1	1.5	0.8	2.2	1.1	1.9	0.2
Very often	2	25.0%	11	64.7%	3	33.3%	16	47.1%
Often	2	25.0%	5	29.4%	2	22.2%	9	26.5%
Sometimes	3	37.5%	0	0.0%	3	33.3%	6	17.6%
Rarely	1	12.5%	1	5.9%	1	11.1%	3	8.8%
Never	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Is the government in general supportive of NGOs/CSOs working on road safety?								
Mean, SD	3.4	1.4	3.8	0.9	4.0	0.7	3.8	0.2
Very unsupportive	1	12.5%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	2	6.3%
Unsupportive	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.1%
Neither supportive nor unsupportive	2	25.0%	1	6.7%	2	22.2%	5	15.6%
Supportive	2	25.0%	12	80.0%	5	55.6%	19	59.4%
Very supportive	2	25.0%	1	6.7%	2	22.2%	5	15.6%

Are there government policies supporting NGO/CSO involvement in road safety policy-making and/or decision-making?								
Yes	5	62.5%	11	73.3%	5	55.6%	21	65.6%
No	2	25.0%	2	13.3%	1	11.1%	5	15.6%
Don't know	1	12.5%	2	13.3%	3	33.3%	6	18.8%
Are there government policies supporting NGO/CSO involvement in road safety program implementation?								
Yes	6	75.0%	11	73.3%	7	77.8%	24	75.0%
No	1	12.5%	2	13.3%	0	0.0%	3	9.4%
Don't know	1	12.5%	2	13.3%	2	22.2%	5	15.6%
In the past two years, has your organization been free to meet with ministers and/or senior government officials?								
Yes	4	50.0%	10	66.7%	8	88.9%	22	68.8%
No	4	50.0%	4	26.7%	1	11.1%	9	28.1%
Don't know	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	1	3.1%
In the past two years, has your organization been free to participate in official government discussions and/or working groups?								
Yes	6	75.0%	12	80.0%	8	88.9%	26	81.3%
No	1	12.5%	3	20.0%	1	11.1%	5	15.6%
Don't know	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	3.1%
Are there internal governance structures in your organization that affect your ability to cooperate with government?								
Yes	1	14.3%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	2	8.0%
No	6	85.7%	9	75.0%	6	100.0%	21	84.0%
Don't know	0	0.0%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	2	8.0%

* Country values are significantly different

The majority (72%) felt they were able to influence policy and implementation, although again more respondents answered negatively from Ethiopia and Uganda (Table 8). Several respondents mentioned 30 km/h speed zones as an example of their work. Most respondents (47%) felt that the government sometimes implemented their organization's proposals (as opposed to often, very often, rarely, or never). Where the government had not done so, respondents felt there was a lack of interest and financial issues. 48% also felt that the government sometimes considered their organization's concerns when policy and implementation decisions were made. Again, lack of interest by government and finances were cited as reasons. There were no significant differences by country on these questions. Most respondents (46%) felt that their organization never influenced government's funding in road safety; in Zambia, the most common response was sometimes, although the difference was not statistically significant. Lack of government budget was a reason cited by several people.

Table 8. NGO/CSO influence

	Ethiopia		Uganda		Zambia		Total	
In the past two years, has your organization been able to influence policy and/or implementation?								
Yes	4	50.0%	11	73.3%	8	88.9%	23	71.9%
No	4	50.0%	2	13.3%	1	11.1%	7	21.9%

	Ethiopia		Uganda		Zambia		Total	
Don't know	0	0.0%	2	13.3%	0	0.0%	2	6.3%
In the past two years, how often has your organization's proposals been implemented by the government?								
Mean, SD	3.6	1.1	3.1	1.1	3.3	1.0	3.3	0.2
Very often	0	0.0%	1	7.1%	0	0.0%	1	3.3%
Often	1	12.5%	2	14.3%	2	25.0%	5	16.7%
Sometimes	3	37.5%	8	57.1%	3	37.5%	14	46.7%
Rarely	2	25.0%	1	7.1%	2	25.0%	5	16.7%
Never	2	25.0%	2	14.3%	1	12.5%	5	16.7%
In the past two years, how often has your organization's concerns been considered when policy and/or implementation decisions are made?								
Mean, SD	3.3	1.1	3.0	0.9	3.1	0.6	3.1	0.2
Very often	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Often	2	28.6%	4	28.6%	1	12.5%	7	24.1%
Sometimes	2	28.6%	7	50.0%	5	62.5%	14	48.3%
Rarely	2	28.6%	2	14.3%	2	25.0%	6	20.7%
Never	1	14.3%	1	7.1%	0	0.0%	2	6.9%
In the past two years, how often has your organization influenced government's funding in road safety?								
Mean, SD	4.7	0.5	4.0	1.0	3.9	0.9	4.2	0.2
Very often	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Often	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	1	3.8%
Sometimes	0	0.0%	3	25.0%	3	42.9%	6	23.1%
Rarely	2	28.6%	3	25.0%	2	28.6%	7	26.9%
Never	5	71.4%	5	41.7%	2	28.6%	12	46.2%

Almost 100% of respondents said that their organization was supporting the goals of the UN Global Plan for the Decade of Action for Road Safety 2021–2030 (Global Plan) and the SDG 11.2 (Table 9). Most frequent actions they are taking include: lobbying the government, raising public awareness and demand, partnering with other organizations, and promoting evidence-based interventions.

Table 9. NGO/CSO support of Global Plan and SDGs for road safety

	Ethiopia		Uganda		Zambia		Total	
Is your organization supporting the goals of the Second Decade of Action for Road Safety?								
Yes	5	100.0%	12	100.0%	6	100.0%	23	100.0%
No								
If Yes: in what way(s), is your organization supporting this?								
A) Lobbying the government								
No	2	40.0%	2	16.7%	2	33.3%	6	26.1%
Yes	3	60.0%	10	83.3%	4	66.7%	17	73.9%
B) Raising public awareness and demand								
No	1	20.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	2	8.7%

Yes	4	80.0%	11	91.7%	6	100.0%	21	91.3%

C) Partnering with other organizations								
No	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	2	8.7%
Yes	4	80.0%	12	100.0%	5	83.3%	21	91.3%
D) Promoting evidence-based interventions								
No	1	20.0%	3	25.0%	0	0.0%	4	17.4%
Yes	4	80.0%	9	75.0%	6	100.0%	19	82.6%
E) Tracking/monitoring government actions								
No	2	40.0%	5	41.7%	2	33.3%	9	39.1%
Yes	3	60.0%	7	58.3%	4	66.7%	14	60.9%
F) Conducting research								
No	3	60.0%	3	25.0%	3	50.0%	9	39.1%
Yes	2	40.0%	9	75.0%	3	50.0%	14	60.9%
G) Other								
No	4	80.0%	11	91.7%	6	100.0%	21	91.3%
Yes	1	20.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	2	8.7%
Is your organization supporting the SDG 11.2 goal?								
Yes	5	100.0%	11	91.7%	6	100.0%	22	95.7%
No								
Don't know	0	0.0%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	1	4.3%
If Yes: in what way(s), is your organization supporting this?								
A) Lobbying the government								
No	1	20.0%	1	9.1%	2	33.3%	4	18.2%
Yes	4	80.0%	10	90.9%	4	66.7%	18	81.8%
B) Raising public awareness and demand								
No	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Yes	5	100.0%	11	100.0%	6	100.0%	22	100.0%
C) Partnering with other organizations								
No	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	4.5%
Yes	4	80.0%	11	100.0%	6	100.0%	21	95.5%
D) Promoting evidence-based interventions								
No	1	20.0%	3	27.3%	1	16.7%	5	22.7%
Yes	4	80.0%	8	72.7%	5	83.3%	17	77.3%
E) Tracking/monitoring government actions								
No	2	40.0%	4	36.4%	0	0.0%	6	27.3%
Yes	3	60.0%	7	63.6%	6	100.0%	16	72.7%
F) Conducting research								
No	3	60.0%	3	27.3%	4	66.7%	10	45.5%
Yes	2	40.0%	8	72.7%	2	33.3%	12	54.5%
G) Other								
No	5	100.0%	11	100.0%	6	100.0%	22	100.0%
Yes	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

4.1.2 In-Depth Interviews (IDIs)

A total of 35 IDIs were completed with 12 from Ethiopia, 11 from Uganda, and 12 from Zambia. Not all provided demographic information but, based on the data available, the IDI respondents seemed primarily ages 30–39 years (43%), male (40%), with less than 10 years at their current job (60%) and 10–19 years of experience in government (31%) (Table 10).

Table 10. Demographics of interviewed government officials

	Ethiopia (N=12)		Uganda (N=11)		Zambia (N=12)		Total (N=35)	
Age range	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
18–24	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
25–29	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
30–39	9	75.0%	4	36.4%	2	16.7%	15	42.9%
40–49	2	16.7%	2	18.2%	4	33.3%	8	22.9%
50+	0	0.0%	3	27.3%	2	16.7%	5	14.3%
Missing	1	8.3%	2	18.2%	4	33.3%	7	20.0%
Gender								
Female	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	2	16.7%	4	11.4%
Male	9	75.0%	0	0.0%	5	41.7%	14	40.0%
Missing	1	8.3%	11	100.0%	5	41.7%	17	48.6%
Years at current job								
1–9	10	83.3%	9	81.8%	2	16.7%	21	60.0%
10–19	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	3	25.0%	5	14.3%
20–29	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	25.0%	3	8.6%
30+	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Missing	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	4	33.3%	6	17.1%
Years in government								
1–9	4	33.3%	1	9.1%	1	8.3%	6	17.1%
10–19	4	33.3%	6	54.5%	1	8.3%	11	31.4%
20–29	2	16.7%	2	18.2%	3	25.0%	7	20.0%
30+	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Missing	2	16.7%	2	18.2%	7	58.3%	11	31.4%

The themes identified through the IDIs are summarized below. Participant quotes are shown in italics.

Views of NGOs/CSOs

Most of the respondents in all three countries had a positive view of NGOs/CSOs and found them useful in their work. NGOs/CSOs were considered important because they are seen as bringing a previously unknown problem to the attention of government, closer to the public and able to mobilize them.

I think they are helpful. They help areas that the government hasn't reached yet. They intervene in remote areas and they are so helpful. (Ethiopia)

They have a big role since they are NGOs and are on [the] ground. They have identified many areas where government has turned a deaf ear or a blind eye. (Uganda)

They are quite very helpful, because they help us bridge the gap between us who are in the government and them who are on the side of the community...so they give the perspective on the reality on the ground based on what they experienced.... (Zambia)

Other less positive views were varied. In Ethiopia, respondents reported NGOs/CSOs working in isolation from government and a failure to obey government regulations. In Uganda, respondents mentioned a need for clarity on roles, a lack of appropriate expertise, misunderstandings about level of resources, and fears about sharing information with foreign donors. Respondents in Zambia mentioned conflicts over policy and inaccurate data as problems working with NGOs/CSOs. Negative views of NGOs/CSOs in Ethiopia and Uganda also centered on those that became "political." In this context, being political seemed to mean becoming involved with a political party or campaigning for political office.

CSOs can participate in any issues that are legal and that cannot contradict with the moral of the community. They shouldn't participate in issues supporting a specific political party or by being partisan. (Ethiopia)

The other challenge is that sometimes, they want to politicize whatever they do and sometimes when you take a political direction, it creates division within communities and people begin to attach activities of some of those organizations to opposition and yet they are supposed to complement efforts of the government. (Uganda)

Roles of NGOs/CSOs

The most frequently mentioned way that respondents were working with NGOs/CSOs in all three countries was by receiving funding or equipment like radar guns. NGOs/CSOs were seen as capable of securing funding from foreign donors or the private sector.

They also sometimes support us on buying controlling devices like Alcohol Taster and Radar. (Ethiopia)

Resource mobilization is key...Like this morning I was talking to a CSO which has mobilized some money, it is little money, but probably I wouldn't have got it. They have got it and now we can do something. (Uganda)

CSOs do play a big role, remember when you are non-governmental you tend to do things outside the box and to me that is important, they do offer their services whether it is in funding or in kind when we implement road safety. (Zambia)

Another role that NGOs/CSOs play quite frequently is advising the government on road safety policies and regulations in the three countries. They are seen as having useful technical expertise that they can share and can represent the public point of view.

There is a Road Safety Strategy at national level. It is launched this year. They [NGOs] are involved on consulting works of this strategy from drafting to implementing stages. (Ethiopia)

So when we are making government policies, we invite them...through their consultation, they should give their views, they should come and guide the government on areas to put in policy, for instance how to curb accidents. (Uganda)

So, when the planning is being done the stakeholders are engaged and civil society are part of the stakeholders...they also come up with proposed interventions which they think would help out and those are

the things which are brought forward to the relevant authorities and they can be passed on to government budget. (Zambia)

The other activity that NGOs/CSOs and government are cooperating on is awareness raising about road safety issues. This was mentioned in all three countries, although to a lesser extent in Zambia. Several respondents in Ethiopia and Uganda mentioned specific public events, like a road safety week, that they partnered to support.

We expect a lot from them in terms of awareness creation as they can reach out more than the government can. The people also listen to them as they are working closely to them. (Ethiopia)

They help to create awareness, both in the public and even reminding us about our role. (Uganda)

Well one of the benefits we see is that where government is not able to reach, civil society organizations are able to reach there...you discover that they surpass what government institutions can be able to do as far as awareness and sensitization campaigns are concerned. (Zambia)

Restrictions on Activity

The majority of respondents felt there were no restrictions on the work of road safety NGOs/CSOs in any of the countries.

There is no restriction. They can freely express their views. I mean, that is one of the rights that is given by the improved decree. CSOs can participate in any issues that are legal and that cannot contradict with the moral of the community. (Ethiopia)

Yes, as much as I know, they have that freedom to air out their views and as I said earlier, they are very welcome to air out any issues of road safety to us, as well as any other issues they find on the roads. They are free to point out any issues to us. (Uganda)

Like in terms of freedom, they've got the freedom of speech, freedom of expression. They are able to criticize the government of the day or even the previous governments without any interference. They are very free to talk against the government. (Zambia)

In Ethiopia and Uganda, respondents mentioned that they would not work with NGOs/CSOs that espouse political causes and that political NGOs/CSOs were not free to operate without restrictions on their work. The main reason NGOs/CSOs had freedom to operate is because they were seen as being apart from political concerns.

They shouldn't participate in issues supporting a specific political party or by being partisan. (Ethiopia)

I think they are 100% free because the road safety NGO is very easy to sell to everyone...No one is talking to NGOs that say they come to improve governance, democracy, police brutality NGOs. Those ones are not free but if you want to champion road safety, you are free. (Uganda)

Ways of Working Together

Less than half of respondents in the three countries felt there was a policy or framework that specified how their department or agency should work with NGOs/CSOs.

There is a general framework...there is a statement that says to work in collaboration with stakeholders. We collaborate on projects. In accordance with that, there is a detailed framework for collaboration with NGOs, GOs, and all stakeholders, to carry out the strategic planning. (Ethiopia)

And in our policy we state directly that we shall play an active role in working with civil societal organizations and we have also a desk in [agency] under the department of my sectorial coordination where all CSOs, NGOs and others will work together. (Uganda)

There's a strategy that the agency has developed. So, it includes things like procedures that the faith-based organizations or NGOs are supposed to follow; there are procedures that are laid down in the agency, they are there, yes. (Zambia)

One formal way that NGOs/CSOs and government were reported to work together is through signing a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or terms of reference (TOR). This mechanism was mentioned by about half of the respondents in Ethiopia and just a few respondents in Uganda and Zambia.

The same thing with other CSOs; we will sign [an] MOU. We work according to the MOU agreement, there is a detailed responsibility and deadlines. With this, we can work effectively. (Ethiopia)

As a ministry, there is an MOU on how [NGOs/CSOs] operate and collaborate with the ministry. The MOU shows how the ministry or the program should deal with them. We have these laws and regulations on how they should operate. (Uganda)

Nowadays as I said it's partnerships, so you need to ensure that you are working with all the key stakeholders. If it's things to do with road safety, then there's engagement process. Of course, how you work with them, they get introduced then you create an MOU. (Zambia)

Steps to Improvement

To improve the relationship between NGOs/CSOs and government, respondents in all countries noted that more communication and regular engagement between the two groups was needed.

Then we have to work closer through result focused meetings and genuine discussion, planning and evaluating together. (Ethiopia)

Engagement. Collaboration is key in road safety. You do not want to be working in silos and waste resources while working in silos. The more you engage, the better the relationship becomes. (Uganda)

And then, of course through communication, let them be having monthly meetings where they just sit together like government and these stakeholders and look at their objectives, they look at government policies and see how they can work in tandem or see how they become in tandem in terms of operations. (Zambia)

Several respondents from Ethiopia and Uganda stated that they were not currently working with any NGOs/CSOs, suggesting there is a sizable gap that NGOs/CSOs could turn to their advantage.

To tell the truth we don't know the established CSOs and there is no way to find out that. (Ethiopia)

Civil societies have not done what it takes to approach the government, they work in isolation. (Uganda)

4.1.3 In-Country Consultation Workshops

NGO/CSO members and government officials actively involved in road safety in each study country were brought together to participate in a consultation workshop in each of the study countries (Table 11). Each local university who hosted the workshop provided a summary report. The discussions varied between countries such as reflecting on research findings, evaluating the EE Framework's factors, identifying areas for improvement, determining sector involvement and leadership, proposing advocacy targets, addressing challenges, and considering the role of international partners and donors.

Table 11. In-Country Consultation Workshops of NGOs/CSOs and government

Country	Date	Venue	No. of Participants
Ethiopia	20 April 2023	Capital Hotel and Spa, Addis Ababa	17
Uganda	17 March 2023	Hotel Africana, Kampala	27
Zambia	12 May 2023	Mumbuluma House 43/56 Aluko	25

In Ethiopia, workshop participants confirmed that the online survey and IDI findings reflected realities on the ground. They also indicated that the implementation of the EE Framework would be a multi-sectoral activity and requested clear guidelines on how to implement it. Both government and NGOs/CSOs agreed it was important for both parties to work together in implementing the EE Framework. Government representatives encouraged NGOs to actively initiate the engagement, especially taking the time to identify roles, responsibilities and actions of different agencies and being open to provide technical support when the government needs help. Government representatives also expressed the need to map out the different road safety NGOs to better understand the players and committed to creating a platform for dialogue.

In Uganda, workshop participants applied the draft EE Framework and identified challenges with the registration process for NGOs/CSOs and potential restriction of NGO/CSO activities when promoting government accountability and transparency. Participants also indicated NGO/CSO influencing of road safety budget and monitoring of the spending are limited. However, an official from the Ministry of Works and Transport mentioned that since the 2020 revision of the Traffic and Road Safety Act of 1998, there has been a new push for NGOs/CSOs and government to work together and that the government was building a database of road safety stakeholders to facilitate cooperation and would hold trainings for NGOs/CSOs on how to work with government on road safety. Moreover, the importance of government allowing stakeholders to engage in open dialogues and question government work was also noted. A few specific areas of NGO/CSO-government engagement were suggested such as promoting public transport and assessing the overall costs over benefits of boda bodas (two-wheeler motorcycles) in Kampala.

In Zambia, workshop participants reflected that the research results demonstrate the relationship between government officials and NGOs/CSOs working in road safety and call for more engagement, possibly by creating a platform of sustained dialogue and dissent regarding road safety program performance in Zambia. An existing example of NGO/CSO and government engagement was the inclusion of NGOs/CSOs in district transportation and road safety committees. Participants noted that NGOs sometimes became political during election season and activities then can be restricted by election rules. NGOs/CSOs have no problems accepting money from foreign donors but are required to account for their operations through financial reporting which are assessed for validity, morality, and overall compliance with the registration rules. Participants also suggested that it is important to consider the role of international partners/donors in financing NGOs/CSOs as well as the implementation of the EE Framework.

CHAPTER FIVE

5.1 Enabling Environment Framework

5.1.1 Previous examples of Enabling Environment Framework

The desk review identified three examples of EE frameworks which illustrate what an EE framework may constitute. They tend to cover a set of interrelated conditions — such as legal, bureaucratic, fiscal, informational, political, and cultural — that impact on the capacity of CSOs to engage in development processes in a sustained and effective manner.[63]

1. Civil Society Partnership for Development Effectiveness (CPDE) Framework

The CPDE framework consists of three areas: 1) Universally accepted human rights and freedoms affecting CSOs; 2) Spaces for dialogue and policy influencing including open budget and access to information; and 3) Donor – CSO relationships in relation to CSO funding mechanisms that are reliable, transparent, and easy to understand.

2. The Enabling Environment National Assessment (EENA)

CIVICUS has taken efforts in the measurement of the EE of civil society.[64] Given the limited data available on the legal and regulatory environment for civil society, the Enabling Environment National Assessment (EENA) is an attempt by CIVICUS and International Center for Non-profit Law (ICNL) to develop a more in-depth national level monitoring framework that complements the Enabling Environment Index (EEI).[65] The EEI examines and attempts to measure the long-term environments in which civil society members have the capacity to participate freely and fully in the activities, organizations, and movements that seek to better their lives and improve their societies.[66] Using secondary statistical data, the EEI ranks three dimensions: governance, socio-cultural and socio-economic environments[67] for civil society in 109 countries.

3. The monitoring matrix on EE for civil society development and toolkit

The monitoring matrix on EE for civil society development and toolkit presents the main principles and standards that have been identified as crucial for CSOs to exist.[68] The matrix provides EE issues that the experts have found to be most important for the countries which they operate in: Basic Legal Guarantees of Freedoms; framework for CSOs' Financial Viability and Sustainability; Government – CSO Relationship.[69] In each area, the toolkit defines the standards and identifies legislation indicators and practice indicators. For example, the first standard states that "All individuals and legal entities

---

[63] Brinkerhoff, D. W. (2007). *The Enabling Environment for Implementing the Millennium Development Goals: Government Actions to Support NGOs.* RTI International | RTI International · International Development Group. ResearchGate.

[64] CIVICUS. (n.d.). *About CIVICUS*. Retrieved from https://www.civicus.org/index.php/who-we-are/about-civicus

[65] CIVICUS. (n.d.). *Enabling environment.* Retrieved from https://www.civicus.org/index.php/what-we-do/defend/civicus-enabling-environment

[66] CIVICUS. (2013). *The EEI: Enabling Environment Index 2013*, A CIVICUS Initiative. Retrieved from https://www.civicus.org/eei/

[67] CIVICUS. (n.d.). *Dimensions and Indicators for the CIVICUS Civil Society Enabling Environment Index*.

[68] European Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ECNL). (2013). *Monitoring matrix on enabling environment for civil society development: The tool-kit.* Retrieved from https://ecnl.org/sites/default/files/2020-09/438_MonitoringMatrix%20on%20Enabling%20Environment%20and%20Toolkit.pdf

[69] European Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ECNL). (2013). *Monitoring matrix on enabling environment for civil society development: The tool-kit,* p.7, para. 4. 4

can freely establish, join, and participate in informal and/or registered organizations offline and online."[70] This standard is then defined by legislative indicators as follows:

> i) There is a legal framework according to which any person can establish associations, foundations, and other types of non-profit, non-governmental entities (e.g., non-profit company) for any purpose.
> ii) The legal framework allows both individual and legal persons to exercise this right without discrimination (age, nationality, legal capacity, gender etc.).
> iii) Registration is not mandatory, and in cases when organizations decide to register, the registration rules are clearly prescribed and allow for an easy, timely, and inexpensive registration and appeal process.
> iv) The law allows for networking among organizations in the countries and abroad without prior notification.

Corresponding to the above legislative indicators, the following Practice indicators are defined:[71]

> i) Every individual or legal entity in practice can form associations, foundations, or other non-profit NGOs offline or online.
> ii) Individuals and legal entities are not sanctioned for not registering their organizations.
> iii) Registration is truly accessible within the legally prescribed deadlines; authorities decide on cases in a non-subjective and apolitical manner.
> iv) Individuals and CSOs can form and participate in networks and coalitions, within and outside their home countries.

5.1.2 Enabling Environment Framework for road safety

Desk review did not identify any EE frameworks specifically for NGOs/CSOs in the field of road safety. Given assessment of the enabling environment of road safety NGOs/CSOs is relatively new, a simple EE Framework is proposed. It aims to initiate discussion between NGOs/CSOs and government working in road safety on key indicators of effective NGO/CSO functioning and NGO-government engagement and provide an opportunity to identify and analyze issues for both parties to address in collaboration. These indicators are organized by three key domains based on the combined results of desk review, online survey and IDIs.

a) Legal and Regulatory Environment

As suggested by existing EE frameworks, an enabling legal and regulatory environment is an important element. Law and regulation must recognize the rights and freedoms of NGOs/CSOs and not restrict but allow road safety NGOs/CSOs to emerge, raise resources, access information (e.g., budget, policy, data) and function freely. For example, a law must not restrict road safety NGOs/CSOs to accept money from foreign donors or engage with the media. NGO/CSO funding is fundamental for effective functioning and their freedom to raise funds is vital. Road safety NGOs/CSOs also cannot fully engage with government if they are afraid of negative legal consequences such as closure when making critical statements or proposing alternative policies. An enabling legal and regulatory environment would be characterized by freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of information.

b) Political and Governance Environment

---

[70] European Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ECNL). (n.d.). *Monitoring matrix on enabling environment for civil society development: The tool-kit*, p.10. Retrieved from https://ecnl.org/sites/default/files/2020-09/438_MonitoringMatrix%20on%20Enabling%20Environment%20and%20Toolkit.pdf

[71] European Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ECNL). (n.d.). *Monitoring matrix on enabling environment for civil society development: The tool-kit,* p.10. Retrieved from https://ecnl.org/sites/default/files/2020-09/438_MonitoringMatrix%20on%20Enabling%20Environment%20and%20Toolkit.pdf

A political and governance environment is also influential on whether, and the extent to which, road safety NGOs/CSOs engage with the government. The present research results suggest that government may not be willing to work with NGOs/CSOs that work on politically sensitive topics or when NGOs/CSOs monitor government accountability. The willingness of government to listen and respond to road safety NGO/CSO concerns would be influenced by the government governance structure with more democratic governments being more responsive to civil society.

c) Policy Environment

Government policies can provide formal mechanisms to actively provide opportunities for government and road safety NGOs/CSOs to cooperate and to support road safety NGO/CSO participation in decision-making and NGO/CSO influence in policy, implementation, and budgets. This could mean a policy that directs government to include road safety NGOs/CSOs as part of a committee working on road safety or to consider proposals by road safety NGOs/CSOs when determining road safety policies and budgets. For example, in Tunisia, NGOs/CSOs are able to submit bills to parliamentary committees and in Nepal, there are CSO desks in many government agencies.[72]

The proposed EE Framework provides monitoring indicator questions under each domain for both government and NGOs/CSOs to consider in their assessment of the current environment (Table 12). Example answers that indicate a positive vs negative environment are also shown in Table 12. This EE Framework reflects the in-country consultation workshop results.

Table 12. Enabling Environment Framework for road safety

Domains	Monitoring indicators	Desirable examples	Non-desirable examples
Legal and regulatory environment	How difficult is the registration process for road safety NGOs/CSOs?	The registration process is straightforward and transparent	The registration process is costly and takes multiple steps over months
	How restricted are road safety NGO/CSO activities including freedom of speech and freedom of assembly?	NGOs/CSOs are free to engage with media and are not threatened with closure	NGOs/CSOs are unable to re-register due to making openly critical statements of government policy
	How accessible is government road safety information (proposals, budgets, policy, progress, and outcome data) for road safety NGOs/CSOs?	NGOs/CSOs can freely access road safety information from government in a timely manner	NGO/CSO access to road safety information requires a lengthy approval process
	How free are road safety NGOs/CSOs to raise resources for NGO/CSO operations?	NGOs/CSOs are free to accept money from multiple sources including foreign donors	NGOs/CSOs are restricted to a few revenue streams

[72] The Global Alliance of NGOs for Road Safety. (2021). *Good Practice Guide: Meaningful NGO Participation.* Copenhagen, Denmark: The Global Alliance of NGOs for Road Safety. Available at https://www.roadsafetyngos.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Meaningful-Participation-Guide-July-2022-English.pdf

Political and governance environment	How does the government listen to road safety NGO/CSO concerns?	A government agency readily opens communication channels to receive NGO/CSO recommendations on all road safety issues	A government agency does not respond to meeting requests by NGO/CSO
	How does the government respond to road safety NGO/CSO concerns?	A government committee addresses in a timely manner NGO/CSO proposals to place traffic calming measures	A government committee does not address an issue raised by NGO/CSO if it does not seem favorable to them
	What influence are road safety NGOs/CSOs making in government policy, implementation, and budgets for road safety?	NGO/CSO proposal for more speeding enforcement appears in the next budget	NGO/CSO proposals never appear in government budget or policy decisions
Policy environment	What policies exist to allow road safety NGOs/CSOs to participate in decision-making?	A government agency adopts a policy that NGOs/CSOs must be included in road construction and maintenance discussions	No policy exists for NGOs/CSOs to propose alternative policies
	What platforms are provided for road safety NGOs/CSOs to cooperate with government?	Road safety NGOs/CSOs are able to comment on policy proposals by being part of the road safety advisory committee	Road safety advisory committee exists but NGOs/CSOs are not represented
	How does the government recognize the rights and freedoms of road safety NGOs/CSOs?	A government official issues a permit for an NGO/CSO rally in support of increasing pedestrian facilities	Government refuses to issue a permit without providing clear reasons

5.1.3 Implementation of the Enabling Environment Framework for road safety

An improved EE for effective NGO/CSO functioning and NGO-government engagement can help governments to reach the Global Plan of Action target of 50% reduction in road traffic injuries and deaths by 2030. Based on the in-country consultation workshop results, the following steps are suggested to implement the EE Framework and help both governments and NGOs/CSOs to put into practice an enabling environment and continually improve it in collaboration.

Identify key stakeholders

First, key government officials involved in road safety from agencies with authority to make decisions and commitments, as well as members of road safety NGOs/CSOs, need to be identified. In order to effectively improve the EE through the EE Framework, it is desirable that NGO/CSO members are

knowledgeable about road safety and have experience working with government on road safety. Both government and NGO/CSO stakeholders may provide a list.

Apply the EE Framework

Once the key stakeholders are identified, one or two participants from each party (government and NGOs) may be selected to lead the application of the EE Framework. These leaders may decide on logistics for the meeting to work together to answer the monitoring indicator questions candidly.

Analyze the issues identified toward solutions

Once all the monitoring indicator questions are answered, it would be important to discuss ways to improve the EE based on the answers from both groups. It may be necessary to assemble a team of both government officials and NGO/CSO members to focus on each indicator and work toward a solution. For instance, if the registration process for road safety NGOs/CSOs is found to be very difficult, then a working group on registration process reform could be formed to discuss changes to the regulations. Once appropriate changes have been agreed on, the group may work toward their adoption.

Re-apply the EE Framework at least annually

It is recommended that government officials and NGO/CSO members convene annually to re-apply the EE Framework, assess progress, and continually improve the EE.

CHAPTER SIX

6.1 Summary of Findings

This mixed-methods research study suggested a mixed picture of the enabling environment in the three study countries:

- Most government officials in all three countries had a positive view of NGOs/CSOs and recognized their usefulness in their work such as reaching remote areas and bringing attention to issues overlooked by the government and bridging the gap between the government and the public.
- 59% of road safety NGO/CSO members in all three countries felt that government was supportive of their work on road safety.
- 70% of road safety NGO/CSO members in all three countries reported being able to meet with government officials and 81% to participate in official government discussions and/or working groups.
- Government officials reported the primary way government worked with NGOs/CSOs was through receiving funding or equipment from foreign donors or the private sector.
- 66% of NGO/CSO members in all three countries agreed that there were policies to support their involvement in policymaking and 75% in road safety program implementation.
- However, fewer than half of government officials felt there were policies or frameworks in place to support NGO/CSO-government relationships. A formal way of collaboration mentioned by the government officials was through the signing of a memorandum of understanding or terms of reference, especially in Ethiopia.
- 47% of NGO/CSO members in all three countries felt that government sometimes implemented their organization's proposals and 48% considered their concerns about policy and implementation. However, 46% felt that their organization never influenced government's funding in road safety.
- Fewer NGOs/CSOs in Ethiopia, compared to Uganda and Zambia, reported not being able to access information about government policies (57% vs 92% and 83%), policy decisions (43% vs 92% and 100%), and government budgets (86% vs 83% and 67%).
- While COVID-19 precautions may have had an influence, 71% of NGO/CSO members in all three countries reported not being free to hold peaceful demonstrations. Nonetheless, the CIVICUS report on the CSO EE reports that approval is needed from the Police for CSO meetings in Uganda and the Police can impose limitations on CSO protests in Zambia.[73]
- 67% of NGO/CSO members from Uganda and 83% from Zambia agreed that they were free to make statements that were openly critical of government policy and actions, whereas only 14% from Ethiopia did. However, government officials in all countries felt that NGOs/CSOs were free to critique the government and hold meetings and protests.
- 92% of NGO/CSO members in Uganda and 100% in Zambia reported they were able to engage with the media, but it was only 50% in Ethiopia.
- 20% of NGO/CSO members in Ethiopia, 17% in Uganda, and 0% in Zambia reported threats to close the organization. 60% of NGO/CSO members in Ethiopia reported physical threats against their work but 0% in Uganda and Zambia. In Freedom House's ranking of access to political rights and civil liberties, Ethiopia and Uganda were classified as "not free" while Zambia was classified as "partially free."[74] The report notes that in Uganda, civil society suffers from legal and extralegal harassment and state violence.

---

[73] Brondum, L. (2016). *Road safety made personal, local and real: The global alliance of NGOs for road safety - an umbrella for nongovernmental organisations*. Journal of the Australasian College of Road Safety, 27(3), 48–50.
[74] Freedom House. (2022). *Freedom in the World 2022*. Washington, DC: Freedom House. Freedom House.

- However, most government officials believed that road safety NGOs/CSOs faced no restrictions on their work.
- Most government officials in all three countries felt that road safety NGOs/CSOs were useful collaborators and not threatening to the government. However, in Ethiopia and Uganda, government officials also reported not wanting to work with politically involved NGOs/CSOs (involvement with political parties or campaigning for political office). This was not a concern in Zambia.
- In Ethiopia, some government officials reported that NGOs/CSOs worked in isolation from the government and failed to comply with government regulations. In Uganda, concerns were raised about the need for clarity on roles, a lack of appropriate expertise, misunderstandings about resource levels, and fears about sharing information with foreign donors. In Zambia, conflicts over policy and inaccurate data were mentioned as challenges when working with NGOs/CSOs.

The results suggest there is room to improve the enabling environment for road safety NGOs/CSOs in Ethiopia, Uganda, and Zambia. The EE Framework that has been developed based on the present research findings can assist NGOs/CSOs to have a better understanding of the current environment, monitor it with government, and structure a dialogue between NGOs/CSOs and government to improve the enabling environment for more positive road safety outcomes.

Given the assessment of the enabling environment of road safety NGOs/CSOs is relatively new, a simple EE Framework and steps to implement it were proposed. It aims to initiate discussion between NGOs/CSOs and government on key indicators of effective NGO/CSO functioning and NGO-government engagement and identify and analyze issues for both parties to address in collaboration, thereby putting into practice an enabling environment and continually improving it.

6.2 Recommendations

Based on the present findings the following recommendations are made.

Recommendations for governments and NGOs

- To implement the EE Framework (Table 12) as a way to establish a regular dialogue between government and NGOs/CSOs on ways to improve government-NGO working relationships for improved road safety outcomes, using the suggested steps:

  - Identify key stakeholders: key government officials involved in road safety from agencies with authority to make decisions and commitments and members of road safety NGOs/CSOs who are knowledgeable about road safety and have experience working with government on road safety. Both government and NGO/CSO stakeholders may provide a list. The list already developed for the study countries may be used for Ethiopia, Uganda and Zambia.

  - Apply the EE Framework: one or two participants from each party (government and NGOs) may be selected to lead the application of the EE Framework. These leaders may decide on logistics for a meeting to work together to answer the monitoring indicator questions candidly. This may be an opportunity for the government to establish a formal platform of communications between the government and NGOs/CSOs if none exists in the jurisdiction.

  - Analyze the issues identified toward solutions: discuss ways to improve the EE based on the answers to the monitoring indicator questions from both groups. It may be necessary to assemble a team of both government officials and NGO/CSO members (working group) to focus on each indicator and work toward a solution. Once

appropriate changes have been agreed on, the group may work toward their adoption.

- ○ Re-apply the EE Framework at least annually: government officials and NGO/CSO members convene annually to re-apply the EE Framework, assess progress, and continually improve the EE in collaboration.

Recommendations for future projects

- To replicate the online survey and IDIs in other African countries and other regions to gain a better understanding of the existing EE of road safety NGOs in different countries and to improve the newly designed EE Framework for road safety.
- To develop an index based on the applications of the newly designed EE Framework for road safety.

APPENDIX

Annex 1: Online Survey

Assessing the Enabling Environment of Road Safety Civil Society Organizations

Online Survey of NGOs

Introduction/consent form

Dear colleague,

You are invited to participate in a research study "Assessment of the enabling environment for road safety civil society organizations in three African countries" funded by the World Bank's Global Road Safety Facility through UK Aid and led by Ms. Lotte Brondum and Dr. Chika Sakashita of the Global Alliance of NGOs for Road Safety and Dr. Nino Paichadze of the Department of Global Health at the Milken Institute School of Public Health, the George Washington University. The main goal of the study is to assess the enabling environment for road safety civil society organizations (CSOs) in Ethiopia, Uganda, and Zambia. The study will evaluate the role of road safety CSOs in these countries, their engagement with the public, their work with the media, and government-CSO relationships. This information will help us understand ways to strengthen the enabling environment for road safety CSOs so that they can advance the global road safety agenda.

As an employee of a road safety CSO, the information you would provide about your organization's operating environment; activities you conduct with the public, government, and media; possible restrictions you face; and support for the global road safety agenda would be beneficial for understanding the environment that road safety CSOs operate in and what can be done to improve that environment.

Aside from giving up your time and the potential loss of confidentiality, we do not expect that there will be any risks or costs associated with taking part in this survey.

Taking part in this research is completely voluntary. If you choose to take part in this study, you will be asked to complete an online survey. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes of your time. You may refuse to answer any of the questions and you may stop your participation in the study at any time. There is no right or wrong answer to any question. Please answer all questions to the best of your knowledge. When you answer the questions, think about your current work experiences and answer on behalf of the CSO you work for, not your personal opinions. If you don't know the answer to a question, say that you don't know. The data collected through this survey will be processed by the researchers; the results of the study will be confidential and will be processed into a study report and scientific manuscript.

Every effort will be made to keep your information confidential. The online survey will be administered through Qualtrics that has specific features in place to ensure the security and confidentiality of data. We will not collect any identifiable information. All responses will be de-identified before sharing with the broader research team. If results of this research study are published in journals or at scientific meetings, the people who participated in this study will not be named or identified and all results will be reported in aggregate.

The Office of Human Research of George Washington University, at telephone number +1 202-994-2715,

can provide further information about your rights as a research participant.

If would like further information regarding this study, please contact Dr. Chika Sakashita (chika.sakashita@roadsafetyngos.org) or Dr. Nino Paichadze (npaichadze1@gwu.edu).

Your willingness to participate in this research study is implied if you proceed.

☐   I agree to participate in the survey

Online Survey

What country is your organization based in?
> Ethiopia
> Uganda
> Zambia
> Other (please specify)_____

Section 1: Operating Environment
First, we'd like to ask some questions about the operating environment for NGOs/CSOs in your country. A CSO is any non-profit, voluntary citizen's group which is organized around a commonissue on a local, national or international level. The term non-governmental organization (NGO) is another name for a CSO and will be used interchangeably in this survey.

1. Is there a formal registration process for NGOs/CSOs in your country?
> Yes
> No
> Don't know

If Yes:
2. Is the registration process for NGOs/CSOs difficult?
> Very difficult
> Difficult
> Fair
> Easy
> Very Easy

3. Is your organization formally registered as an NGO/CSO in your country?
> Yes
> No
> Don't know

4. Are there government reporting requirements for NGOs/CSOs?
   Yes
   No
   Don't know

If Yes:
5. Are these government reporting requirements difficult to comply with?
   Very Difficult
   Difficult
   Fair
   Easy
   Very Easy

6. Do NGOs/CSOs receive tax advantages in your country?
   Yes
   No
   Don't know

7. Do those who fund NGOs/CSOs receive tax advantages in your country?
   Yes
   No
   Don't know

8. Does the government have the right to dissolve NGOs/CSOs in your country?
   Yes
   No
   Don't know

9. How often has your organization cooperated with other NGOs/CSOs in the past two years?
   Very often
   Often
   Sometimes
   Rarely
   Never

If Never:
10. Why not?
   Internal organizational issues
   Issues external to my organization
   Other (please specify)
   Don't know

11. How often has your organization cooperated with government in the past two years?
    Very often
    Often
    Sometimes
    Rarely
    Never

If Never:
12. Why not?
    Internal organizational issues
    Issues external to my organization
    Other (please specify)
    Don't know

13. Is your organization free to express their views and concerns about road safety publicly?
    Yes
    No
    Don't know

14. If your organization were to seek funding, are you free to receive funds from any of these sources? (select all that apply)
    National government sources
    Foreign government sources
    International NGO sources
    Domestic NGO sources
    Domestic private industry sources
    Foreign private industry sources
    Philanthropic foundations
    Multilateral development banks (e.g. World Bank, African Development Bank, EBRD and etc.)
    United Nations agencies (e.g. WHO, UNRSF and etc.)
    Individual donors
    Other (please specify)

If National government sources is selected:
15. Is your organization still free to make critical comments in public about government'sroad safety policies and programs?
    Yes
    No
    Don't know

16. Does your organization receive non-financial support from the government?
    Yes
    No
    Don't know

17. If yes, is your organization still free to make critical comments in public about government's road safety policies and programs?

> Yes
> No
> Don't know

18. Is the government in general supportive of NGOs/CSOs working on road safety?

> Very unsupportive
> Unsupportive
> Neither supportive nor unsupportive
> Supportive
> Very supportive

19. Are there government policies supporting NGO/CSO involvement in road safety policy making and/or decision making?

> Yes
> No
> Don't know

20. Are there government policies supporting NGO/CSO involvement in road safety program implementation?

> Yes
> No
> Don't know

Section 2: Road Safety Activities in the Past Two Years
Now we'd like to ask some questions about your organization's road safety activities. For these questions, please think back over the past two years.

21. In the past 2 years, has your organization been free to meet with ministers and/or senior government officials?

> Yes
> No
> Don't know

If Yes:
22. Have these meetings been formal or informal?

> Formal
> Informal
> Both

If No:
23. Why not?

> _____

24. In the past two years, has your organization been free to participate in official government discussions and/or working groups?

> Yes
> No
> Don't know

If Yes:

25. Have these meetings been sporadic or permanently established?

> Sporadic
> Permanent
> Both

If No:

26. Why not?

> _____

27. In the past two years, has your organization been able to influence policy and/or implementation?

> Yes
> No
> Don't know

If Yes:

28. Please give specific example(s)

> _____

If No:

29. Why not?

> _____

30. In the past two years, how often has your organization's proposals been implemented by the government?

> Very often
> Often
> Sometimes
> Rarely
> Never

If very often, often, sometimes,

31. Please give specific example(s)

> _____

If Rarely or Never:

32. Why not?

> _____

33. In the past two years, how often has your organization's concerns been considered when policy and/or implementation decisions are made?

      Very often

      Often

      Sometimes

      Rarely

      Never

If Very often, often, sometimes,

34. Please give specific example(s)

      _____

If Rarely or Never:

35. Why not?

      _____

36. In the past two years, how often has your organization influenced government's funding in road safety?

      Very often

      Often

      Sometimes

      Rarely

      Never

If Very often, often, sometimes

37. Please give specific example(s)

      _____

If Rarely or Never:

38. Why not?

      _____

39. Are there specific road safety topics/issues that government is not willing to discuss with your organization?

      Yes

      No

      Don't know

If Yes:

40. Please give specific example(s).

      _____

41. Are there internal governance structures in your organization that affect your ability to cooperate with government?

      Yes

      No

      Don't know

If Yes:

42. Please give specific example(s).

      _____

43. In the past two years, has your organization been free to access information about proposed government policies?

      Yes

      No

      Don't know

44. In the past two years, has your organization been free to access information about policy decisions?

      Yes

      No

      Don't know

45. In the past two years, has your organization been free to access information about government budgets?

      Yes

      No

      Don't know

46. In the past two years, has your organization been free to access information that allows you to monitor government progress in their road safety commitments and/or delivery?

      Yes

      No

      Don't know

47. In the past two years, has your organization been free to access information about the outcomes of government road safety programs (e.g. road traffic mortality, morbidity and etc.)?

      Yes

      No

      Don't know

48. In the past two years, has your organization been free to make statements that are openly critical of government policy and/or actions?

      Yes

      No

      Don't know

49. In the past two years, has your organization been free to hold public meetings?
    Yes
    No
    Don't know

If Yes:
50. Do you need to notify the government or obtain permission for these meetings?
    Yes
    No
    Don't know

51. In the past two years, has your organization been free to organize peaceful demonstrations?
    Yes
    No
    Don't know

If Yes:
52. Do you need to notify the government or obtain permission for these demonstrations?
    Yes
    No
    Don't know

53. In the past two years, has your organization been free to engage with the media?
    Yes
    No
    Don't know

If Yes:
54. Which form(s) of media does your organization engage with? Select all that apply.
    Radio
    Newspapers and magazines
    TV
    Social media (internet)
    Other (please specify)

If Yes:
55. How does your organization engage with the media? Select all that apply.
    Suggested a story
    Interviewed for a story
    Held a news conference
    Invited media to an event
    Issued a press release
    Other (please specify)___

If No:

56. Why not?

    _____

<u>Section 3: Restrictions on Road Safety Activities</u>

In the next section, we'd like to ask questions about any restrictions placed on your organization's road safety activities. For these questions, please think back over the past two years.

57. In the past two years, have there been laws restricting your organization's road safety activities?
    Yes
    No
    Don't know

If Yes:

58. Please give specific example(s).

    _____

59. In the past two years, has your organization been under pressure to stop certain activities?
    Yes
    No
    Don't know

If yes:

60. Please give specific example(s).

    _____

61. In the past two years, has your organization been threatened with closure?
    Yes
    No
    Don't know

62. In the past two years, have members of your organization been threatened physically in relation to your work?
    Yes
    No
    Don't know

63. In the past two years, have members of your organization been physically detained in relation to their work?
    Yes
    No
    Don't know

64.   In the past two years, have members of your organization been harassed or discriminated against in relation to their work?

>   Yes
>   No
>   Don't know

65.   In the past two years, has government corruption been a problem in the work of your organization?

>   Yes
>   No
>   Don't know

Section 4: Global Plan and SDGs
In the next section, we'd like to ask some questions about your organization's support for the global road safety agenda.

66.   The goal of the United Nation's Second Decade of Action for Road Safety 2021-2030 is to reduce road traffic deaths and injuries by at least half. Is your organization supporting this goal?

>   Yes
>   No
>   Don't know

If Yes:
67.   In what way(s), is your organization supporting this goal? Select all that apply.

>   Lobbying the government
>   Raising public awareness and demand
>   Partnering with other organizations
>   Promoting evidence-based interventions
>   Tracking/monitoring government actions (e.g. against commitments and targets)
>   Conducting research
>   Other (please specify)___

68.   Target 11.2 of the United Nation's Sustainable Development Goals states that: "By 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all, improving road safety, notably by expanding public transport, with special attention to the needs of those in vulnerable situations, women, children, persons with disabilities and older persons." Is your organization supporting this goal?

>   Yes
>   No
>   Don't know

If Yes:

69. In what way(s), is your organization supporting this goal? Select all that apply.
    Lobbying the government
    Raising public awareness and demand
    Partnering with other organizations
    Promoting evidence-based interventions
    Tracking/monitoring government actions (e.g. against commitments and targets)
    Conducting research
    Other (please specify)___

Section 5: Demographics

70. What is your age?
    18-24
    25-29
    30-39
    40-49
    50+

71. What is your gender?
    Male
    Female

72. How many people are employed by your organization (in your country)?
    1-5
    6-10
    11-20
    21-50
    51+

73. How many years has your organization been operating (in your country)?
    0-5
    6-10
    11-20
    21-50
    51+

74. What is the yearly operating budget of your organization (in US dollars)?
    0-$5,000
    $5,001-$10,000
    $10,001-$50,000
    $50,001-$100,000
    $100,001-$500,000
    $500,001-$1,000,000
    $1,000,001+

75. What is your funding source? (check all that apply)
    Government
    Philanthropy
    Development banks
    Non-governmental organization
    UN agency
    Private sector (company)
    Other (please specify)＿＿

76. Is your organization city-level, regional, national, or international (check all that apply)?
    City-level
    Regional
    National
    International

77. Is your NGO/CSO a member of the Global Alliance of NGOs for Road Safety?
    Yes
    No
    Don't know

Thank you for your time and participation.

Annex 2: In-depth interviews (IDIs) tools

Assessment of the Enabling Environment for Road Safety Civil Society Organizations in Three Countries

Protocol for In-depth Interviews

I. Background

In the last two decades, civil society has played an increasingly influential role in policy development and service delivery worldwide. However, in some low-income countries (LICs), non-governmental organizations' (NGOs) face difficult operating environments and restrictions on their activities.[75]. Action on road safety is hampered by three main problems: 1) Failure to implement proven interventions; 2) Lack of financing to take interventions to scale; and 3) Lack of political motivation to take responsibility.[76] In a recent member survey, the Global Alliance of NGOs for Road Safety found that, while NGOs are well placed to assist in the design of local responses, they are often not consulted.[77]

African countries face the highest risk of road traffic injuries, death and disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) lost.[78] Globally, death rates in LICs are 3 times higher than in high-income countries.[79] LICs face widely-understood road safety issues: rapid urbanization, poor safety standards, lack of enforcement, and a failure to use safety equipment. There is an opportunity for African LICs to avoid the costly mistakes made in the past in other regions. Road safety NGOs play a vital role in social dialog, in creating modern urban spaces, in capacity building, drawing attention to lessons already learned, and highlighting good practice in all road safety areas. Multidisciplinary partnerships for road safety with strong leadership and active representation of civil society can help countries to integrate best practices that will save lives.[80]

II. Study goal and objectives

The primary goal of *Assessment of the Enabling Environment for Road Safety Civil Society Organizations in Three Countries* is to develop a clear understanding of the environment for road safety civil society organizations (CSOs) in a set of LMICs.

Specific objectives of this work include:

- To develop a questionnaire for in-depth interviews with relevant government officials;
- To determine a sample of participants for the interviews from our population of interest;
- To conduct in-depth interviews with selected participants;
- To analyze the data and summarize the results

III. Methods

Design and Setting

---

[75] Cordaid. (n.d.). *How to protect and expand an enabling environment - Space for Civil Society.* Netherlands: Cordaid.

[76] Brondum, L., Sakashita, C., Man, L., & Motta, V. (2022). *New deal in road safety: Why we need NGOs.* Journal of Road Safety, 33(1), 64–70.

[77] Global Alliance of NGOs for Road Safety. (2018). *Urgent Call to Action for Africa; Prioritize Road Safety Now*, presented at the 1st African Road Safety Forum, November 2018.

[78] GBD 2019 Diseases and Injuries Collaborators. (2020). *Global burden of 369 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019.* Lancet, 396(10258), 1204-1222.

[79] World Health Organization. (2018). *Global status report on road safety 2018.* Geneva: World Health Organization.

[80] Brondum, L. (2016). *Road safety made personal, local and real: The global alliance of NGOs for road safety - an umbrella for nongovernmental organisations.* Journal of the Australasian College of Road Safety, 27(3), 48–50.

In-depth interviews will be conducted with government officials in three countries: Ethiopia, Uganda, and Zambia. Ethiopia and Uganda are classified as low-income countries by the World Bank, whereas Zambia is classified as a lower-middle-income country.[81]

Participants and Recruitment

The study population includes adults (ages 18 years and above) of either gender who are currently government employees and are involved in road safety policy making and/or program implementation at the national and/or sub-national levels. We will aim to have representation from different sectors of the government.

With the help of the local road safety NGOs and academic institutions, we identified a potential list of government officials who work on road safety for each country. Potential participants from these lists will be contacted via phone and advised of the study goals and all consent requirements. We aim to interview 8-12 participants in each country depending on the size of the overall pool.

Data collection procedures

Semi-structured interviews will be conducted by trained facilitators using a standardized Interview Guide. All interviewers will follow the same procedures in each country to ensure the standardization and quality of the collected data. The Interview Guide will be pretested in each country with two government officials who work on road safety at the local city government level and therefore are not eligible for the study. Interviews will be conducted face-to-face in a private space or by phone or video call wherever in-person interview is not possible. After obtaining informed consent, the interviewer will first collect some demographics and details on the participant's government position. Then a series of open-ended questions will explore their knowledge and views on road safety NGOs/CSOs, the level of government support for road safety NGOs/CSOs, and existing cooperation between government and road safety NGOs/CSOs. Interviews will last between 60-90 minutes. Interviews will be conducted in English in Uganda and Zambia and in Amharic in Ethiopia. All interviews will be recorded.

Ethics

Ethical approval will be obtained from the IRB in each country prior to the start of data collection. Appropriate ethical clearance will also be obtained from the George Washington University Institutional Review Board.

IV. Data Analysis

All interviews will be transcribed, translated (if necessary), and de-identified. Transcripts will be managed using word processing software and coding conducted using NVivo. We will analyze the transcripts using inductive content analysis, a technique where codes are generated from the raw data rather than a prespecified hypothesis.[82] This approach is appropriate when there is little previous research on a topic as is the case with the subject of enabling environment and government-NGO/CSO relationships in the three countries.[83] Analysis will be conducted separately for each country to allow unique themes to develop. Once the qualitative analysis is completed, the results will be summarized into a report for each country and a peer-reviewed publication covering all three countries.

[81] World Bank. (2020). *World Bank Country and Lending Groups*. World Bank. Retrieved from https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups. Cited on 2022 April 12.

[82] Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). *Three approaches to qualitative content analysis.* Qual Health Res, 15, 1277–1288.

[83] Thomas, D. R. (2006). *A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data.* Am J Eval, 27, 237–246.

Assessment of the Enabling Environment for Road Safety Civil Society Organizations

Government Officials In-depth Interview

The purpose of this interview is to develop a clear understanding of the operating environment for road safety civil society organizations (CSOs). A CSO is any non-profit, voluntary citizen's group which is organized around a common issue on a local, national or international level. The term non-governmental organization (NGO) is another name for a CSO.

Please answer all questions to the best of your knowledge. When you answer the questions, think about your current work experiences and answer on behalf of the governmental agency or department you work for, not your personal opinions. If you don't know the answer to a question, say that you don't know.

First, we want to find out your knowledge and views on road safety NGOs/CSOs.

Government knowledge and views on NGOs/CSOs in road safety
1. Which NGOs/CSOs do you work with on road safety issues, if any? (if none) What are your reasons for not working with NGOs/CSOs? (if they work with at least one NGO/CSO) How do you work with them?
2. What are your views of NGOs/CSOs working in road safety? (probe: are they helpful, interfering, something else? – please tell us based on any experience you may have working with NGOs/CSOs or observation you made about NGOs/CSOs); Why?
3. What benefits do you see, if any, for governments to work with NGOs/CSOs on road safety? (probe: do you see any value-adding by working with NGOs/CSOs?)
4. What disadvantages do you see, if any, for governments to work with NGOs/CSOs on road safety? (probe: do you see any unfavorable process/outcome working with NGOs/CSOs?)
5. How free are NGOs/CSOs to operate in your country specifically in the field of road safety? (probe: are NGOs/CSOs able to freely express their views, critique government in/actions, hold peaceful protests, and etc.?) If any restrictions, please give examples. Are these restrictions supported by specific laws/regulations?
6. Can you tell us about the registration process, if any, for NGOs/CSOs in road safety in your country?

Next, we have some questions to learn about how your government department or agency supports road safety NGOs/CSOs.

Government commitment to NGO/CSO support
7. How supportive is your agency/department of NGOs/CSOs working on road safety? Please give examples.
8. Does your agency/department have specific policies or framework on how you should work with NGOs/CSOs in road safety? (if yes) Please tell us about it. (if no) Why not?
9. Does your agency/department have any specific restrictions on how NGOs/CSOs work with you on road safety? (if yes) Please tell us about it. (if no) Why not?
10. What role, if any, do NGOs/CSOs play in government policymaking on road safety? Can you give an example?
11. What role, if any, do NGOs/CSOs play in government funding and implementation of road safety interventions? Can you give an example?

We also want to understand cooperation between government and road safety NGOs/CSOs to reach targets such as those set by the Global Plan of Action for Road Safety. The Global Plan is the

implementation plan for the UN's Decade of Action for Road Safety (more detail to be provided as needed).

Government and NGO/CSO cooperation
12. How can NGOs/CSOs help government meet the Global Plan targets (at least halve road traffic deaths and injuries by 2030)?
13. In what ways can NGOs/CSOs in road safety support the government?
14. How can NGO/CSO-government relationships be improved?

Before we finish the interview, I have some general questions for you.

Demographics
15. What is your age?
    a. 18-24
    b. 25-29
    c. 30-39
    d. 40-49
    e. 50+
16. What is your gender?
17. What department or agency do you work for?
18. How long have you worked there?
19. How long have you been working in government?

Thank you for your time and participation.

When we have completed all the interviews and conducted a survey of NGOs/CSOs, we will be putting together a framework to understand the NGO/CSO enabling environment. We will present our findings in a workshop designed to improve the NGO/CSO enabling environment and we hope you will participate

Assessment of the Enabling Environment for Road Safety Civil Society Organizations in Three Countries

Recruitment Script for IDIs

Introduce yourself.

Explain the objectives of the overall study: to develop a clear understanding of the operating environment for road safety civil service organizations (CSOs).

Explain the meaning of CSO: a CSO is any non-profit, voluntary citizens' group which is organized around a common issue on a local, national or international level. The term non-governmental organization (NGO) is another name for a CSO.

Explain the objective of the interview: 1) to find out your knowledge and views on road safety NGOs/CSOs; 2) to learn how your government department or agency supports road safety NGOs/CSOs; and 3) to understand cooperation between government and road safety NGOs/CSOs.

Explain how the interview will proceed: they will be asked a series of questions. The interview will take 60-90 minutes. The interview will be recorded to ensure that we accurately capture their answers.

Ask if they would be willing to participate. If yes, arrange a date and time for the interview.

Whether or not they agree to participate, thank them for their time.

Title of Research Study: Assessment of the enabling environment for road safety civil society organizations in [country name]
Principal Investigator(s): [name, degrees, affiliation]

Key information

You are being asked to take part in a study about the enabling environment for road safety civil society organizations (CSOs)/non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in [country name]. This form provides key information to help you decide whether or not you want to participate in this study. More information can be found on the next pages. Feel free to ask the research team questions during the consent process and to use the contact information on this form to ask questions later.

What is the purpose, procedures, and duration of this study?
By conducting this study, we hope to learn about the enabling environment for road safety NGOs/CSOs in [country name]. Your participation in this study will consist of an interview on your knowledge and views on road safety NGOs/CSOs, government support for road safety CSOs, and cooperation between government and road safety NGOs/CSOs. This interview will take 60-90 minutes of your time.

What are the reasons you might choose to volunteer for this study?
By participating in this study, the information that you will provide will be used to understand the enabling environment for road safety NGOs/CSOs in [country name] and develop recommendations for strengthening that environment so that NGOs/CSOs can more effectively support the government in advancing the national and the global road safety agenda.

Do you have to take part in this study?
You do not have to take part in this study. It is your choice whether or not you want to take part. You can agree to take part and later change your mind. If you choose not to take part or choose to stop taking part at any time, there will be no penalty to you.

What if you have questions or concerns?
The people in charge of this study in [country name] are Dr. [first name, last name]. If you have questions, suggestion, or concerns regarding this study or you want to withdraw from the study, their contact information is:

E-mail: _____ Phone: _____

This research is overseen by an Institutional Review Board ("IRB") of the [name of the institution issuing the IRB approval]. You may talk to them at [phone number] or via e-mail at [e-mail address].

Detailed Consent Form

Why am I being invited to take part in a study?
We invite you to take part in this research study because you are a resident of [country name], are 18 years old or older and have been identified as a government official working on road safety.

Why is this study being done?
African countries face the highest risk of road traffic injuries, death and disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) lost. Globally, death rates from road traffic injuries in low-income countries are 3 times higher than in high-income countries. Road safety NGOs/CSOs can play a vital role in social dialog, in creating modern urban spaces, in capacity building, drawing attention to lessons already learned, and highlighting

good practice in all road safety areas. However, in low-income countries, CSOs'/NGOs' operations are often limited or not consistent with international standards due to the environment that they operate in. By participating in this study, the information that you will provide will be used to help us understand that operating environment and identify the important factors which enable NGOs/CSOs to thrive.

How long will I be in the study?
Your participation in this study will last about 60-90 minutes and will consist of an interview on your knowledge and views on road safety NGOs/CSOs, government support for road safety CSOs, and cooperation between government and road safety NGOs/CSOs.

How many people will take part in this study?
We expect about 8-12 people will take part in this study in [country name].

What happens if I agree to be in this study?
If you agree to be in this study, your participation in this study will last about 60-90 minutes and will consist of an interview on your knowledge and views on road safety NGOs/CSOs, government support for road safety NGOs/CSOs, and cooperation between government and road safety NGOs/CSOs. If at any point you feel uncomfortable or do not want to answer a question, you may skip the question or withdraw from the study at any time. In any analysis or presentation of data from this study, your name or any other information that may identify you, will never appear.

What happens if I agree to participate in this study, but later change my mind?
You may refuse to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty. Please inform us if you want to leave the study and if you want your data to be deleted.

Is there any way being in this study could be bad for me?
The risks and discomforts from taking part in this study are not expected to be greater than those that you face in daily life. There is potential for:
● Privacy or confidentiality risks: the risks related to your participation in this study may include an invasion to your privacy by sharing confidential information with others. The procedures mentioned below attempt to reduce these risks.

Will being in this study help me in any way?
We cannot promise any benefits to you or others taking part in this study. However, your participation and the information you would provide could help understand the enabling environment for road safety NGOs/CSOs in [country name]. This information could be used to develop programs and policies which will improve the health and well-being of [country nationality].

What happens to my information collected for the study?
To the extent allowed by law, we limit your personal information to people who have to review it. We cannot promise complete secrecy. The IRB and other representative of this organization may inspect or copy your information.

Are there any costs for participating in this study?
There are no costs for participating in this study.

Will I be paid for my participation in this study?
There will be no payments or other types of incentives for participating in this study.

Signature Block for Adult
By signing below, you agree that the above information has been explained to you and you have had the opportunity to ask questions. You understand that you may ask questions about any aspect of this

research during the course of the study and in the future. Your signature documents your permission to take part in this research.

_____

Printed name of participant

_____   _____

Signature of participant   Date

Thank you for your valuable time!

Annex 3: In-country Consultation Workshop Outline

Assessment of the Enabling Environment for Road Safety Civil Society Organizations in Three Countries

In-country Consultation Workshop

Outline

The goal of the In-Country Consultation Workshop is to initiate a dialogue on implementing the Enabling Environment Framework with NGO/CSO members and government officials working in road safety in Ethiopia, Uganda, and Zambia and collect feedback on its practical implications for multisectoral cooperation.

The objectives of this workshop include:

- To present the research results of the assessment of the enabling environment and introduce the Enabling Environment Framework
- To gather feedback on the framework and understand how it can contribute to government-NGO engagement in road safety in Ethiopia, Uganda, and Zambia
- To explore the necessary steps in implementing the framework in Ethiopia, Uganda, and Zambia
- To build connections between NGO/CSO members and government officials in Ethiopia, Uganda, and Zambia

The intended audience of this workshop includes road safety NGO/CSO members and government officials working on road safety in Ethiopia, Uganda, and Zambia.

To achieve the above objectives, the following questions for discussion are suggested:

- Do the research results reflect your own experiences or are they different?
- How well do the three factors of the framework capture government-NGO engagement in road safety in your country? Is anything missing from the framework?
- What factor needs the most improvement in your country?
- Which sectors should be involved in implementing the framework? Who should lead the implementation?
- What steps could NGOs/CSOs take to implement the framework? What targets for advocacy are suggested by the framework?
- What steps could government take to implement the framework? What targets for policy change are suggested by the framework?
- What are the potential challenges in implementing the framework?
- How can international partners and donors contribute to implementing the framework?

The main deliverable of the workshop is a summary report on the consultation workshop, including a practical discussion of implementing the framework.

The anticipated outcomes are an increased feeling of community and trust between government officials and NGO/CSO members working in road safety and a growing shared commitment to improving the enabling environment for government-NGO engagement in road safety.