SUMMARY OF IDEV EVALUATIONS DELIVERED IN 2021

What did IDEV evaluate?
The AfDB undertakes self-evaluations of its sovereign operations through Project Completion Reports (PCRs) prepared by the appropriate operations departments. These PCRs are then validated by IDEV, which produces independent PCR evaluation notes (PCRENs) and a synthesis report on each year’s PCRENs. This 2019 synthesis report relates to the PCRENs of 65 PCRs selected from the 89 PCRs prepared in 2019, and summarizes: (i) the key results of the 2019 PCRENs, focusing on the PCR quality and the performance of the projects, Bank and Borrowers; and (ii) the key lessons for improving the quality of PCRs and project results performance.

What did IDEV find?
- Overall project performance was found satisfactory and progressed from an average score of 2.80 (out of 4) in 2018 to 3.04 in 2019. Although 98% of projects were found relevant, there is scope to improve the quality of the project results framework, timeliness, the realism of estimated project costs, and financial sustainability.
- The quality of the 2019 PCRs was found satisfactory overall, with an average score of 2.80, as in 2018 and 2016. About 77% of the PCRs were rated satisfactory or above, which is similar to 2018 (78%).
- The performance of the main stakeholders (Bank, Borrowers, and other development partners) contributed to project performance and was, on average, satisfactory but has shown no real trend over the 2016–2019 period.
- Areas for improvement include PCR ratings, PCR compliance with the Bank’s guidelines, M&E systems, as well as a distinction in formulating the lessons and recommendations.

What lessons did IDEV draw?
Project preparation and design:
- Building on previous lessons is essential to ensure high-quality project design.
- Projects are more likely to succeed if key performance indicators are established in a meaningful and measurable way during the design phase, rather than being left as an implementation task.
The design phase is critical in project success. Design weaknesses tend to result in cost increases and delays.

A project is more likely to succeed if the design phase is used to build commitment among stakeholders by involving them to the fullest extent possible.

Multi-country and multi-sectoral projects tend to be most challenging and require a clear early definition of roles and responsibilities.

**Implementation arrangements and performance:**

- Ensuring that the Project Management Team possesses the required technical expertise is crucial.
- If funding from all expected sources is made available in a timely fashion in accordance with project planning, then delays and cost overruns can be avoided.
- An effective M&E system, including the planning of supervision missions and project reviews, is an essential project management tool.
- Continuing the involvement of stakeholders identified in the design phase helps to ensure ownership of the project and its results.
- Appropriate financial planning is crucial in ensuring the sustainability of project outcomes.

**Evaluation Task Manager**

Clément Bansé, Chief Evaluation Officer

---

**Cluster Evaluation of AfDB Road and Port Projects (2012-2019)**

What did IDEV evaluate?

IDEV carried out a cluster evaluation of 18 AfDB transport projects in the road transport and ports/water & fluvial transport sub-sectors, comprising eight completed or close to completed projects (USD 805.5 million) and ten recently approved projects (USD 1.2 billion) over the 2012-2019 period. The evaluation aimed to draw lessons from the design and implementation of road and port projects in order to provide insights for future strategic and operational directions for the Bank’s assistance in the transport sector and to inform any revision to the AfDB Transport Policy (1993).

What did IDEV find?

- Project alignment with the Bank’s relevant strategies was found highly satisfactory due to the relevance of the transport sector in the Bank’s overall strategy.
- The reviewed projects supported African countries in their need to expand their transport network and services, which were identified as investment priorities by the countries themselves.
The appraisal reports of the recently approved transport projects were found to show a good understanding of the main issues that can negatively affect project implementation and sustainability, but did not display new approaches to address these problems.

Recent transport operations in the cluster have integrated High 5 objectives into their design.

The cross-cutting issues of gender, climate, and fragility were found to be better integrated into the design of the recent transport projects than the completed ones; however, the contribution of transport projects to green growth is not well defined.

Completed projects achieved substantial transport efficiency gains that benefited the local populations and businesses.

The outcomes of project socio-economic components were often insufficiently reported.

The evaluation found no evidence of projects’ effects on improving transport sector governance and regional integration.

Project outcomes on road safety are uncertain.

The planning of transport project timelines and budgets proved to be challenging.

The implementation of the main infrastructure works was found to have been well supervised while the ancillary components were not sufficiently followed up on.

The sustainability of the road transport projects remains questionable due to ongoing reforms to road funds and road agencies not being completed.

Private sector involvement improved efficiency, but the financial risks remain high.

What lessons did IDEV draw?

Project development outcomes

Greater development outcomes can be achieved through more thoughtful design and follow-up of project ancillary components, and exploiting synergies with other development projects.

The success of capacity-building activities in improving transport sector governance can only be measured if appropriate assessment frameworks are included in the design of a project’s monitoring systems.

Improving the analysis of transport projects' negative impacts on climate change could help the Bank better mitigate such impacts.

Project performance

The timely implementation of transport projects can be improved if binding constraints are removed.

Project sustainability

Embedding a revenue generating mechanism in transport projects can be an effective way to address the lack of funding and capacity for maintenance.

Data collection and monitoring

Activating project monitoring and evaluation systems in a timelier fashion can make more information available about the development outcomes of transport projects.

A more accurate traffic demand forecast could help improve project design and increase project sustainability.

Evaluation Task Manager

Clément Bansé, Chief Evaluation Officer
What did IDEV evaluate?

IDEV undertook an impact evaluation of Phase 1 of the Kenya Last Mile Connectivity Project (LMCP). The main objective of the project, which was approved in 2014 for a value of USD 131 million (UA 99.2 million), was to support the Government’s initiative of ensuring increased electricity access to Kenyans across all 47 counties, particularly the low-income groups. The evaluation aims to inform the mid-term review of the Bank Group’s 2016 – 2025 Strategy for the New Deal on Energy for Africa (NDEA), launched in 2016, by identifying lessons and potential areas for improvement. It provides credible evidence-based findings on the impact of the LMCP and recommendations for future energy operations.

What did IDEV find?

- The evaluation found positive results of the impact of the project on increasing access to and use of a reliable source of electricity for households.
- The evaluation found that the project significantly increased (by 85%) beneficiaries’ electricity connection to the national grid compared to the non-beneficiaries in the communities surveyed. It also increased the connection of household-owned businesses to the national grid by 7%.
- The impact of the project on some educational outcomes for children was found significant and positive. However, the project was not found to improve the respiratory health nor the self-reported well-being of beneficiaries, compared to non-beneficiaries.
- The project was found to have a significant positive impact on household consumption, while the reported impact on household income was positive but not statistically significant.
- The project was found to have a positive impact on the time women spent on leisure activities but no impact on women’s empowerment.
- The project increased the social capital of project beneficiaries in communities and increased awareness about current events.
- Despite good technical quality and strong partnerships with the Government and other development agencies, the sustainability of the development outcomes of the project was found to be highly unlikely in the near term.

What lessons did IDEV draw?

- A high cost of electricity relative to the household income of beneficiaries undermines access and the productive use of electricity.
- The financial sustainability of the electric utility company is a critical success factor for the quality and reliability of electricity provided to eligible households.
- An effective project communication strategy is key to increasing households’ participation in electrification projects.
- Lack of baseline data hampers the assessments of project outcomes and impacts after completion.
What did IDEV recommend?

- Ensure the sustainability of project benefits.
- Stimulate and manage households’ and businesses’ demand for the productive use of electricity.
- Improve future electrification projects’ design and implementation.

Evaluation Task Manager

Eustace Uzor, Evaluation Officer

Country Strategy and Program Evaluations


What did IDEV evaluate?

IDEV evaluated the Bank’s country strategies and programs in Gabon, covering the period 2011 - 2020. The evaluation covered an overall portfolio of UA 1,093.65 million. This evaluation aimed to: (i) analyze the performance of the Bank’s actions and the achievement of Gabon’s development results linked to them and (ii) draw lessons from the Bank’s experience in managing its programs in order to improve its subsequent strategies and programs in Gabon.

What did IDEV find?

- The relevance of the Bank’s strategies and programs over the period was deemed satisfactory.
- The effectiveness of the Bank’s support to Gabon was also deemed satisfactory overall.
- The efficiency of AfDB interventions in Gabon during the considered period is deemed unsatisfactory, mainly due to project implementation delays.
- The sustainability of Bank interventions in Gabon during the evaluation period was unsatisfactory.
- The Bank mainstreams gender in all its interventions but lacks a clear global approach to its priorities in the fight against gender inequality in Gabon. Therefore, this dimension is not sufficiently addressed at the project level.
- The Bank’s strategies in Gabon address the challenges of inclusion, while also showcasing its ambition to tackle them directly. However, despite initiatives in the agriculture and infrastructure sectors, these ambitions have not yet materialized at the operational level.
- Gabon does not have a standard framework for coordinating technical and financial partners, despite the establishment in April 2010 of a joint strategic orientation and consultation committee on external aid coordination split into several thematic groups.
- Through its CSPs, the Bank identified a list of relevant analytical work, most of which are logically in line with the diversification of the Gabonese economy.
- The AfDB made provision for a monitoring mechanism under the two CSPs, marked by midterm reviews and the preparation of completion reports.
What lessons did IDEV draw?

I Policy dialogue, driven by in-depth analysis of the country context, challenges and institutional machinery, helps to improve strategy and program design and delivery.

I The concentration of available resources in a limited number of sectors is crucial for the Bank to make a difference and strengthen the impact of its interventions on the country’s development.

I Frequent changes in strategic orientations or operational priorities following leadership changes in a partner country’s public administration constrains the implementation of the indicative lending program and the effectiveness of Bank interventions in the country.

I In the event of a fiscal crisis, PBOs with flexible conditions and rapid disbursements are a powerful instrument enabling the Bank to respond exceptionally to urgent needs and ensure the continuity of government operations.

I The deepening of comprehensive approaches to institution building through a participatory approach (involving all stakeholders), the ownership of a good governance, control and accountability culture, and the consolidation of monitoring and evaluation capacity are key to the effectiveness of the Bank’s technical assistance projects in Gabon.

I The ownership of stakeholders and the implementation of additional measures by the partner country are crucial to ensure the sustainability of project effects and the sustainability of infrastructure.

What did IDEV recommend?

I Deepen the analysis of the context and the specific challenges facing Gabon, especially those related to the country’s economic diversification and private sector development by establishing a conducive environment for promoting small- and medium-sized enterprises.

I Strengthen the selectivity of Bank interventions around key sectors with high potential for economic recovery and diversification.

I Strengthen the implementation of the Bank’s country program for Gabon.

I Support the promotion of PPPs particularly by modernizing Gabonese legislation and strengthening building national institutional capacity in PPP management and monitoring.

I Strengthen the sustainability of Bank interventions.

What did Management respond?

Management welcomes the outcome of the evaluation. Management agrees with the five main recommendations on deepening knowledge of the country context, strengthening the selectivity of interventions, reinforcing the implementation of the country program, promoting Public-Private Partnerships and improving the sustainability of Bank interventions.

Evaluation Task Manager
Samson K. Houetohossou, Principal Evaluation Officer


What did IDEV evaluate?

IDEV evaluated the AfDB’s country strategy and program for Rwanda for the period 2012-2021. The evaluation covered two program cycles, 2012-2016 and 2017-2021, during which 37 projects totaling UA 1.2 billion (USD 1.7 billion – October 2021 exchange rates) were approved. The purpose of the evaluation was to inform the design of the Bank’s next country strategy for Rwanda (2022-2026).
What did IDEV find?

The AfDB’s interventions in Rwanda were found highly relevant to the needs, development challenges and priorities of the country, where inadequate infrastructure, limited private sector development, high poverty rates, income inequality and high youth unemployment have remained key bottlenecks to broader socioeconomic development.

The evaluation found the Bank’s interventions to be coherent and well-coordinated internally, especially at the sector level.

The evaluation found that the Bank’s interventions in infrastructure development have achieved or are likely to achieve their objectives.

The Bank’s infrastructure interventions were found to be economically viable at appraisal.

Rwanda has sound institutional and governance structures, with strong technical capacities, that are likely to ensure continued flow of benefits associated with Bank supported projects after completion, particularly in the energy and transport sectors.

The evaluation found that project designs were gender sensitive and, in most cases, had gender disaggregated performance targets.

The design quality of the Bank’s two country strategies, CSP 2012-2016 and CSP 2017-2021, was found satisfactory.

What lessons did IDEV draw?

Rightly sequenced and coherent approaches can make critical contributions to sector development.

Adapting the country program to the prevailing situations of vulnerability to climatic and health shocks enabled the Bank to effectively respond to the country needs.

Deployment of sector experts in the Country Office with implementation support responsibilities can enhance the delivery of Bank support.

Careful targeting is essential for impactful lines of credit operations.

What did IDEV recommend?

The Bank should maintain the focus on key sectors while improving selectivity in its support to the country.

Sharpen the strategy and approach to private sector development by making it more coherent and comprehensive.

Ensure the sustainability of the long-term benefits of infrastructure projects.

Continue supporting the country to overcome the challenges of COVID-19 and facilitate post-pandemic economic recovery in collaboration with other development partners.

What did Management respond?

Management welcomes the evaluation and agrees with the evaluation’s lessons, conclusions, and recommendations, many of which are consistent with its findings from regular monitoring, follow-ups, and portfolio reviews. The evaluation findings and recommendations have been used as a basis for the design of the new CSP (2022-2026) as well as guiding the implementation of the ongoing operations and the design of future programs/projects.

Evaluation Task Manager

Girma Earo Kumbi, Chief Evaluation Officer

**What did IDEV evaluate?**
IDEV evaluated the Bank’s strategies and programs in Angola for the period 2011 - 2020. The evaluation covers two Country Strategy Papers (2011-2015 and 2017-2020) and a portfolio comprising two private sector and 23 public sector operations, amounting to USD 2.53 billion (UA 1.8 billion). The primary purposes of the evaluation were to assess the performance and results of the Bank's program and to provide useful lessons to inform decisions on future support in Angola.

**What did IDEV find?**
- The relevance of the Bank’s strategies and programs over the period under review is assessed as satisfactory. The Bank’s strategies were broadly relevant to Angola’s development challenges.
- The overall coherence of the Bank’s interventions in Angola is considered satisfactory. With regard to infrastructure support interventions in water and sanitation, and energy programs, its strategies were well coordinated and harmonized with other development partners.
- Effectiveness was assessed at output and outcome levels, based on results achieved in both the overall program and the projects, including non-lending activities. While the levels of achievement varied by sector, the overall effectiveness is assessed as satisfactory.
- The evaluation assessed efficiency as unsatisfactory overall, notably in terms of portfolio implementation quality, project returns to investment in some agriculture and energy operations, implementation progress, disbursement rates, and the level of monitoring and supervision over the period.
- The sustainability of the Bank’s interventions in Angola during the evaluation period is found to be partly unsatisfactory.
- The mainstreaming of crosscutting issues remained challenging. The evaluation found that the Bank’s program set ambitious and relevant objectives regarding crosscutting issues at the strategy level, but that it was unable to deliver on all of them.

**What lessons did IDEV draw?**
- Failure to systematically identify, adopt and monitor measures to mitigate sudden shocks in the country context can have a major adverse effect on public finance and, in turn, on the country’s ability to effectively use further external assistance.
- Efforts to improve the business enabling environment for private sector development and foster good governance may not have the desired supply response unless the adverse changes in the country context are adequately addressed by the Government. Solid investments in economic and social infrastructure, and in new skills and technical capacities, can yield good returns, given the pervasive infrastructure and skill gaps that continue to affect Angola.
- Enhancing support and investments in capacity-building activities can achieve sustained benefits when these are accompanied by relevant beneficiary institutional arrangements and legal framework support.
- Projects that are firmly aligned with national strategies, meet beneficiary expectations, and take into consideration institutional realities, stand the best chance of being implemented in a timely and effective manner.

**What did IDEV recommend?**
- Enhance dialogue between the Government and the Bank’s Project Management Units to address operational and implementation issues.
Explore options for strengthening the Bank’s support for private sector development in Angola.

Strengthen the Bank’s non-lending operations in Angola.

Take measures to help mitigate the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on program implementation and country engagement.

What did Management respond?
Management welcomes the evaluation and found it particularly timely to inform the development of the next cycle of the Angola CSP (2024-2028). Management broadly agrees with the findings of the evaluation, which will inform the dialogue with the authorities to help improve the effectiveness of on-going operations as well as the design of future programs and the new CSP.

Evaluation Task Manager
Akua Arthur-Kissi, Principal Evaluation Officer


What did IDEV evaluate?
IDEV evaluated the Country Strategy and Program of the AfDB Group in Uganda over the period 2011 - 2021. During this period, the Bank approved 37 projects for over USD 2 billion of financing, mainly in the sectors of transport, agriculture, power, and water supply and sanitation (WSS). The evaluation also assessed an additional 17 projects that were approved before 2011 but completed during the evaluation period, which had received USD 770 million of financing. The main purpose of the evaluation was to inform the design of the AfDB’s next Country Strategy Paper for Uganda (2022–2026).

What did IDEV find?
1. The evaluation rates the relevance of the AfDB’s support to Uganda across the two CSPs as satisfactory. The two pillars of the CSPs—infrastructure development for industrialization and the development of human capital (skills and capacity)—were found to align with Uganda’s Vision 2040 and Uganda’s two national development plans (NDP I and NDP II).

2. The evaluation rates the coherence of the Bank’s interventions as satisfactory overall. The evaluation found most of the Bank’s interventions to be internally coherent: linkages among the Bank’s projects were common and they generated synergy. Concerning external coherence, the Bank used the Local Group of Development Partners platform to coordinate its work with the work of other donors.

3. The evaluation rates the overall effectiveness of the Bank’s strategies and operations as partly unsatisfactory. The evaluation found that in infrastructure development, some results were achieved in terms of enhancing agricultural productivity and the marketing of agricultural produce, improving the generation and distribution of electricity, increasing access to water and sanitation in rural and urban areas, and improving the national road network; however, the results were below expectations. As for human capital development, the Bank was found to have produced positive results for CSP 2011–2016, under which it improved and expanded infrastructure in six universities and two hospitals in Kampala. But the expectations in the CSP 2017-2021 in terms of skills and entrepreneurship development were not met.

4. Sustainability is rated as partly unsatisfactory. Most projects were found to be technically sound, though the Bank’s success in reversing a power shortage has resulted in a power surplus so large that it threatens the sector’s financial viability.

5. The efficiency of the Bank’s projects over the evaluation period is rated as partly unsatisfactory. Data shows
that completed projects in agriculture and WSS produced positive economic returns, but in all sectors, cost overruns and delays in start-up and implementation were an issue. The COVID-19 pandemic hampered implementation further, particularly for infrastructure projects.

What lessons did IDEV draw?

- Larger projects generate greater impacts for more communities.
- Adequately assessing the government’s borrowing policy when formulating the country strategy would avoid re-orientating efforts midway.
- Close attention to quality at entry when planning and designing new operations would reduce implementation challenges and facilitate the timely completion of projects.
- Public-private partnerships in infrastructure development offer the opportunity to increase the share of private sector operations in the Bank’s portfolio.

What did IDEV recommend?

- Adapt the CSP priorities to the country context in the areas of skills development and private sector growth.
- Refocus support for the energy sector.
- Make Bank-supported benefits more sustainable.

Evaluation Task Manager

Girma Earo Kumbi, Chief Evaluation Officer

### Evaluation of the AfDB’s Transition Support Facility

What did IDEV evaluate?

IDEV evaluated the AfDB’s Transition Support Facility (TSF) over the 2014-2019 period to inform future Bank planning, programming, and strategic frameworks. Following on from IDEV’s 2020 Evaluation of the Bank’s Fragility Strategy (2014-2019), it evaluates the Facility more deeply, as a core instrument in the Bank’s toolbox for addressing fragility. In particular, it examines the relevance, responsiveness, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and coherence of the TSF instrument. The evaluation examined the synergies and interlinkages between TSF-funded operations across the three pillars (I: Supplemental support, II: Arrears clearance, III: Targeted support) and other interventions of the Bank, as well as the consistency of TSF-funded operations with the interventions of other actors in the same context.
What did IDEV find?

- The TSF was found to be highly relevant to the RMCs and regions in fragile situations. It was especially important for Transition States receiving limited funding from the Bank’s performance-based allocations.
- The performance on coherence was found to vary significantly by pillar and type of project. Overall, Pillar I and Pillar II operations scored well on coherence, whereas Pillar III operations did not.
- Overall, the available evidence on the effectiveness of TSF operations points to a mixed performance across the three pillars, with Pillar II operations being most effective after concluding arrears clearance operations in Somalia (2020) and Sudan (2021) and contributing to reduced vulnerability and increased resilience. The performance of Pillar I and Pillar III operations was mixed but generally poorer than that of non-TSF-funded projects.
- The findings indicate that while TSF projects were more efficient than non-TSF projects during the design and start-up phases, they experienced more delays in completion due to various difficulties of the implementation context in fragile situations.
- As an instrument, the TSF’s sustainability was found to be satisfactory, although there is room for improvement in terms of ownership and leverage of external funding. At the operational level the performance among the pillars is mixed.

What lessons did IDEV draw?

- The unique and multifaceted design of the TSF, which also embodies flexibility, has enabled the Bank to respond effectively to the multidimensional needs of Transition States.
- Success in reducing the structural drivers of fragility requires a continuous commitment over time and significant financial resources.
- Strong partnerships and collaboration among the Bank, RMCs and other multilateral and bilateral development partners are critical for the success of TSF operations.
- Greater flexibility of eligibility criteria would allow the TSF to address a wider range of drivers and pockets of fragility in non-Transition States, and to control against the risks of new countries or regions from falling into fragility.
- A robust monitoring, evaluation and reporting framework is critical, not only to enhance the Bank’s accountability and learning in its support to regions and countries in fragile situations, but also to ensure more effective implementation and to increase the likelihood of sustainability.

What did IDEV recommend?

- Enhance the quality of project design, implementation, monitoring, and the reporting of results of TSF operations, tailoring them better to the difficult implementation context of fragile situations.
- Increase the scale of funding for the TSF through greater leverage of external funding, as well as through the use of other Bank financial instruments.
- Review the eligibility criteria of the TSF and, if necessary, its pillar structure.
- Improve the efficiency and the sustainability of the Bank’s support for arrears clearance.

Evaluation Task Manager

Clement Banse, Chief Evaluation Officer
Evaluation of the AfDB's Additionality and Development Outcomes Assessment Framework 2.0

What did IDEV evaluate?
IDEV evaluated the Bank’s second Additionality and Development Outcomes Assessment (ADOA) Framework, approved in 2015. The ADOA Framework is a decision-making tool to guide the AfDB Board and Senior Management in selecting non-sovereign operations (NSOs) to fund. It assesses two dimensions of NSOs, namely: i) additionality, which measures the contribution from the Bank’s private sector interventions that markets do not currently supply, and ii) development outcomes. The objective of the evaluation was to take stock of the implementation of the ADOA 2.0 Framework and provide credible evidence on its relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency, to inform the forthcoming revision of the Framework.

What did IDEV find?
- The ADOA Framework is relevant for the Bank’s strategies, provides a sound basis for Bank Management and the Board of Directors to approve projects with high additionality, and makes a sound assessment of development outcomes. However, the evaluation found a misalignment between the ADOA indicators and those of project results frameworks.
- ADOA’s method of assessing additionality might inflate the Bank’s contribution and lower the hurdle for additionality, and claims of additionality were not always supported by robust evidence.
- The typology of projects used by ADOA in assessing development outcomes no longer matches the Bank’s sectors of intervention, and could be updated.
- Views on the efficiency of the ADOA process are mixed, with the evaluation suggesting that producing successive ADOA notes may not add much value.

What lessons did IDEV draw?
- Having a feedback loop is essential for learning purposes. The fact that the ADOA process stops at Board approval of the transaction and the absence of any meaningful monitoring means that there is no feedback loop for learning purposes.
- Monitoring systems should be designed with the use of monitoring data in mind, to provide the basis for adaptive management and to ensure that corrective actions are taken for projects at risk.
- Most clients were found not to comply with monitoring and reporting requirements for development outcomes. In the absence of a strong incentive for clients to comply, building monitoring systems around client reporting is ineffective.
- The provision by ADOA notes of discriminatory assessments is essential for decision-makers. Shortcomings in methodological soundness (such as in the development outcomes assessment methodology) should be addressed to ensure that ADOA assessments form a sound basis to inform decision-making.

What did IDEV recommend?
- Further improve the ADOA’s assessment of additionality.
- Strengthen the ADOA’s assessment of development outcomes.
- Ensure data availability for better project preparation, decision-making and monitoring.
What did Management respond?

Management welcomes IDEV’s evaluation, which provides relevant recommendations that will undoubtedly improve the relevance and effectiveness of ADOA as a screening and decision-making tool. It will serve as a critical input into the ongoing ADOA Framework Revision, which will result in ADOA 3.0 and is scheduled for completion by the end of 2021.

Evaluation Task Manager
Latefa Camara, Evaluation Officer

Corporate Evaluations

Evaluation of the AfDB Group Non-Concessional Debt Accumulation Policy

What did IDEV evaluate?
IDEV undertook an evaluation of the Bank’s Non-concessional debt accumulation policy (NCDAP), covering the period 2008–2020. The evaluation assessed the Bank’s performance in implementing the NCDAP since its approval for the dual purpose of accountability and identifying lessons and recommendations to inform the development of a new sustainable debt policy by the Bank. It examined all measures implemented as part of the Policy and presents its findings under the four criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, and efficiency.

What did IDEV find?
1. The relevance and coherence of the NCDAP were satisfactory, due to its alignment with other Bank policies, sister organizations’ policies, client countries’ priorities, as well as the Sustainable Development Goals, with a well-defined overall approach and clear pillars.
2. Given the limited influence of the Bank on countries’ borrowing behavior and with the worsening debt situation of African countries over the evaluation period, the Policy’s ultimate goal could have been more realistically stated and defined in a clearer way to avoid differing interpretations among stakeholders as well as lack of ownership.
3. Despite improved coordination with other MDBs, the effectiveness and efficiency of the Policy were found unsatisfactory, due to its limited implementation.
4. The evaluation found multiple challenges, among which weaknesses in internal coordination, monitoring, data recording and transparency, application of compliance measures to countries, and scattered engagement of the Bank in capacity-building actions linked to debt management in African countries.

What lessons did IDEV draw?
1. The accumulation of non-concessional debt is an important factor driving debt distress on the continent. The issue of debt has grown beyond the original policy coverage and should be considered as a major topic for the foreseeable future.
A lack of clear objectives weakens the basis for collaboration and coordination.

Clear political will and consensus on the application of a policy are key factors for success.

The absence of strong ownership of a policy by a "Champion" in the subject matter, and of a strong coordination mechanism, can undermine effective policy coordination and implementation.

A strong capacity-building component can contribute to the success of a policy.

Consistent monitoring and reporting are essential to ensure a policy remains relevant and pertinent.

What did IDEV recommend?

- Ensure a robust design for the new sustainable debt policy.
- Place increased focus on data and transparency.
- Ensure strong ownership of the policy and strengthen coordination within the Bank.
- Clarify the approach to debt management capacity building.

What did Management respond?

Management welcomes the evaluation and agrees with most of the evaluation's lessons, conclusions, and recommendations. These are timely as Management is developing a successor policy, the Bank Group Sustainable Borrowing Policy.

Evaluation Task Manager

Oswald Agbadome, Principal Evaluation Officer

Mid-Term Evaluation of the AfDB's Results Measurement Framework, 2016-2025

What did IDEV evaluate?

IDEV undertook a mid-term evaluation of the Bank's Results Measurement Framework (RMF) for the period 2016-2020 to facilitate understanding of the RMF's performance and to help improve its execution for the remaining period until 2025. The evaluation assessed the robustness of the RMF's design in supporting the Bank's development effectiveness, and the extent to which it has achieved its strategic objectives of being an accountability, decision-making, and learning tool for the Bank. It also assessed to what extent, and how, it has been optimal in achieving its strategic objectives.

What did IDEV find?

- The Bank's 2016–2025 RMF was found to be relevant in supporting the AfDB's development effectiveness, demonstrable through its strategic alignment with the Bank's corporate policies and strategies, as well as international goals such as the SDGs. However, the evaluation found room for improving the intervention logic and alignment between the Bank's RMF and its country, sector, and project-level results frameworks.

- The quality of the design of the RMF is assessed as good, albeit with some weaknesses in indicator selection, target setting, and stakeholders' consultation, and the RMF was also found to largely satisfy the characteristics of a good corporate results framework.

- The RMF was found to be an effective tool for accountability, and it has improved the communication of corporate performance. However, it has not been fully utilized for learning and decision-making.
The evaluation drew attention to the relatively large number of RMF indicators compared with other Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs), which has implications for cost efficiency. In addition, the RMF indicators mainly capture results that are measurable by quantitative metrics and thus fail to capture the "soft" elements of the Bank’s support, such as policy dialogue, knowledge management, and Economic and Sector Work.

The evaluation pointed out that the AfDB is the only MDB that has chosen to report exclusively on its own contribution and the results that can be attributed to it, and not on the aggregate project contribution, which includes co-financiers.

The AfDB’s corporate results reporting can be better complemented by proactive analysis and reporting on the regional/country and sector/High 5s results frameworks, to strengthen the effectiveness of Results-Based Management.

**What lessons did IDEV draw?**

- The robustness and credibility of the Bank’s self-evaluation system are critical for tracking RMF indicators.
- A sense of ownership among key stakeholders is essential for delivering the RMF.
- Stretching to maintain flexibility is vital.
- Finding the balance between realism and ambition is important.

**What did IDEV recommend?**

- Improve the design of the RMF.
- Improve its results reporting.
- Enable better results-based management and evidence-based decision-making.

**What did Management respond?**

Management is encouraged that IDEV’s evaluation found that the RMF was not only “relevant in supporting the Bank’s development effectiveness” and “aligned with the Ten-Year Strategy,” but also an “effective tool for accountability that has improved the communication of corporate performance.” The evaluation helpfully suggests areas where Management can further improve the RMF’s design and focus on results. These findings are timely as the Bank undertakes the mid-term review of the RMF.

**Evaluation Task Manager**

*Joseph Mouanda, Chief Evaluation Officer*