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1 Introduction


This report outlines the key issues that emerged during the inception phase of this evaluation, clarifies the scope of the evaluation, and updates the methodology described in the Terms of Reference (TOR) presented in Appendix I.

This Inception Report responds to the TOR for the assignment, and was developed with the input and guidance of consulted IDEV and AWF staff. The information provided in this reported is supported by a preliminary review of documents carried out by the Evaluation Team (see Appendix II for a list of consulted documents).

Once approved by IDEV, the final Inception Report will guide the evaluation and will serve as the key reference document for tracking progress of the evaluation assignment.

This document is organized as follows:

- Section 2 describes the overall context of the Evaluation
- Section 3 presents the Evaluation approach and Methodology
- Section 4 presents the Evaluation Work plan
- Appended to this inception report are: I) the evaluation TOR; II) a list of documents consulted by the evaluators; III) the interview protocols, and IV) the survey questionnaire
2 Context of the evaluation

2.1 The African Water Facility

The African Water Facility (AWF) is an initiative of the African Ministers’ Council on Water (AMCOW), and is hosted and managed by the African Development Bank (AfDB) at the request of AMCOW. Established in 2004, the Facility aims at boosting water sector investment in Africa, while at the same time strengthening capacity for water governance, and promoting water knowledge. The AWF received its first funding in 2005 and became operational in 2006, when it funded its first project: Support for the creation of the Volta River Basin Authority. The AWF is a multilateral trust fund that provides grants and technical assistance to enable governments, NGOs and private-public partnerships to address the increasing investment need for the development and management of water resources in Africa, towards meeting the goals and targets of the Africa Water Vision (AWV) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG).

The AWF is a demand-driven, African-led facility that is focused on Project Preparation, Water Knowledge and Water Governance, providing grants and technical assistance to ensure that projects are bankable, viable and future-proofed, with a clear opportunity for effective implementation. Projects can last from two to five years depending on the complexity and scope. Grants range from €50,000 to €5,000,000. Occasionally, the AWF also provides grants to fund the implementation of small-scale pilot projects.

The AWF supports a wide portfolio of water projects across a broad range of sectors: Agricultural water management, Drinking water, Environmental management, Flood and drought protection, Fisheries, Hydropower, Industry, Integrated water resources management, Sanitation and hygiene, Transport, Transboundary water resource management, Tourism. Committed to environmental and social sustainability and to promoting projects that are viable, the AWF ensures that its projects address climate change adaptation and mitigation, gender and social equity and environmental and social protection.

The Governing Council of the AWF decides the general policy and direction of the facility. It is made up of 13 members appointed by AMCOW, donors to the fund, the AfDB, the African Union and UN-Water/Africa. Since 2006 the AWF has mobilised €151.2 million from 15 bilateral, multilateral financial institutions, foundations and African government, namely: Algeria, Australia, Austria, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Burkina Faso, Canada, Denmark, the European Commission, France, the Nordic Development Fund, Norway, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the AfDB.

Since inception, the AWF operations are guided by a series of strategies and operational programmes, the focus of which has evolved over the years to provide sufficient room to address demands in the water sector. Since starting its operations, the AWF has developed a portfolio of grants covering national and multinational 118 projects in 52 countries.

After almost 15 years of implementation, an independent evaluation of the African Water Facility was commissioned by the African Development Bank (the Trustee of the AFW) and following a recommendation by its Board of Directors in 2018.
2.2 Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

In line with the Terms of Reference (ToRs), the purpose of the evaluation is threefold:

- To help the AfDB account for the performance of the AWF during the period 2005-2018 and disclose the results to the targeted audience of the evaluation (hereinafter referred to as the Audience) in a transparent manner.
- To help the AfDB extract learnings from the implementation of the AWF for the period covered by the evaluation (2005-2018)
- To help the AfDB identify gaps in the design and implementation of the AWF projects and propose practical remedial actions or recommendations for improvement of the Fund and of the grant management processes.

The evaluation has a dual objective of accountability (by looking at the organizational and development effectiveness of the AWF) and learning (by identifying the lessons on what has worked and what has not worked and why, and make actionable and relevant recommendations that will guide future operations of the AWF.

2.3 Scope of the evaluation

Drawing on the TOR, we have identified the following aspects which altogether define the scope of the evaluation of the African Water Facility.

- **Temporal scope**: the evaluation will cover AWF work since its first funding in 2005 until 2018 included. As such, the evaluation covers three strategic periods and foci, namely 2005-2011 (Operational Strategy of the AWF); 2012-2016 (AWF Strategic Plan); and 2017-2025 (Strategic Plan)
- **Programmatic scope**: During inception, the evaluation team conducted a preliminary review of the entire portfolio of grants under the strategic objectives during each of the periods. We will focus on the core areas of support: Project Preparation, Water Governance and Water Knowledge. As seven (7) projects of the total were terminated, it is proposed to address them under a section of the report addressing cancelled projects.

### Table 1: AWF strategies and areas of focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PERIOD</th>
<th>STRATEGY NAME</th>
<th>STRATEGY FOCUS AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2005-2011        | Operational Strategy of the AWF | Strategic objective 1: Strengthening water governance  
|                  |                           | Strategic objective 2: Investments to meet water needs                              |
|                  |                           | Strategic objective 3: Strengthening the financial base                              |
|                  |                           | Strategic objective 4: Improving water knowledge                                     |
| 2012-2016        | AWF Strategic Plan        | Strategic Priority 1: Prepare Investment Projects                                   |
|                  |                           | Strategic Priority 2: Enhance Water Governance                                      |
|                  |                           | Strategic Priority 3: Promote Water Knowledge                                         |
Geographic scope: since AWF operates all over Africa, and activities have been funded in 52 countries, the evaluation will also align with this scope. Notably, our sampling strategy will consider the five geographic regions of Africa to ensure a continental balance, namely:
- Western Africa
- Eastern Africa
- Southern Africa
- Central Africa
- Northern Africa

Analysis of Multinational Projects and Country operations combined: Multinational projects are by far the most recurrent projects financed by the AWF. Multinational projects include projects with sub-regional organizations (basin authorities, sub-regional economic cooperation mechanisms) as direct beneficiaries. A few multinational projects are continental (AU member states as direct beneficiaries). Our strategy includes association of work multinational projects with the countries involved in multinational projects (Details can be found in Table 2).

Table 2: Multinational and Country Project Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>INVOLVEMENT IN MULTINATIONAL PROJECTS</th>
<th>COUNTRY-SPECIFIC PROJECTS</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrafrique</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo CG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte D’Ivoire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem Rep Congo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eswatini</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4. Evaluation users

The TOR describe a wide range of users of the independent evaluation results, spanning from the AWFTF, the AWF’s Governing Council, Bank Board of Directors and AHWS Management, Donors (Governments of Canada, France, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Austria, Spain, UK, Algeria and the European Commission), potential donors to the Facility, the Regional Members Countries (RMCs), and many institutions (at continental and global level) with a mandate on water issues in Africa - such as the Regional Economic Commissions (RECs), AMCOW on behalf of the African Union (AU), River Basin Organizations (RBOs), the African Network for Basin Organizations (ANBO), water research institutions including the International and Water Management Institute (IWMI) and so on.
3 Evaluation Approach and Methodology

3.1 Overall Approach

3.1.1 Formative and Summative Approach

We are proposing to combine summative and formative approaches in line with the status of the AWF portfolio. According to our review of the portfolio, 118 projects have been approved since 2005 under three strategic phases. Out of the total portfolio, 32 are closed (with project completion report) 53 projects are completed, 26 are still ongoing, and 7 projects that were terminated. The evaluation will not review the terminated projects, reducing the total number of projects to 111 for the evaluation. In addition, the TOR also mentions that “Since the evaluation is covering all three strategic periods of AWF, deliberate efforts should be made to conduct a thorough analysis of the first two strategic periods focusing on its areas of focus, impacts and lessons. The evaluation covering the third strategic period should be more of process rather than performance since its still under implementation.”

In this light, a summative approach will be used to assess all project completed, especially those under the first two strategic periods so that long-term outcomes, impact and issues of sustainability can be better assessed. The summative approach will focus on learning and intends to draw conclusions about past performance that can inform current and future efforts at various levels: management, organisational, strategic and operational. For the projects under the third phase (since 2016), many of which are still ongoing, a formative approach will allow the evaluation team to determine the progress made by the AWF towards achieving its main objectives and expected outcomes. The formative approach is geared towards course-correction making recommendations to ensure ongoing projects can achieve their planned results and outcomes. As there are only 11 projects in the third phase (see Table 6), the sampling of projects for review will be much smaller than the first and second phases. The the formative component of the evaluation will move beyond learning from a few selected projects that have not been completed but also pay particular attention to process by examining the institutional dimensions of the AWF as a facility as well as the broader governance structures it operates.

3.1.2. Participatory and learning oriented approach

The proposed approach views the evaluation process itself as a learning opportunity for the primary users of the evaluation results, implying that sufficient space will be created for them to reflect on the results (together with the evaluation team), thus increasing ownership and likelihood of results use. Given the summative and formative nature, learning purpose and decision-making orientation of the assignment, the team suggests adopting a participatory approach oriented to favour learning and utility. Such an approach will allow the evaluation team to reach out to the widest possible representation of stakeholders (including beneficiaries). Ensuring the participation of stakeholders is not only a matter of ethics but also of utility as it fosters the appropriation and buy-in of findings, conclusions and recommendation among stakeholders. In so doing, this approach envisions the following steps:
Throughout the mandate, we will work closely with IDEV and the Reference Group to finalise the methodology and the workplan, including the sampling, case study approach, and deliverables.

The team will be regularly in touch with IDEV to provide progress updates and address any issue.

The team will conduct virtual and in-person interviews with a wide range of stakeholders to inform the evaluation, including end-users/beneficiaries of project outputs.

The team will engage with IDEV and the RG during the reporting phase to seek its feedback and ensure the quality is aligned with the expectations of the Governing Council.

The team will ensure presentation of preliminary findings upon completion of field work research during site visits to nine countries. This will allow the team to test the validity of initial findings with stakeholders and sift through inaccuracies or misjudgments.

All these measures will enable the evaluation team to come up with lessons learnt and recommendations that are grounded in the context, validated, and trustworthy.

3.1.3. **System based approach**

The proposed approach is system-based, implying that the evaluation will consider, on the one hand the progress made by the AWF towards achieving the results (and objectives) specified in its intervention logic(s) across the three strategic periods and, on the other hand, assess the internal and external conditions and factors (e.g., the context of implementation of the AWF supported projects, the assumptions made) that shape the observed results. The approach further entails a multi-level (i.e. global, regional, national, etc.) and bi-directional evaluation. In the latter case, the evaluation looks both backward to assess progress, and forward to provide inputs for the AWF improvement.

3.2 **Evaluation Framework**

3.2.1 **Evaluation Criteria**

The Terms of Reference for this evaluation emphasize that the evaluation should be based on the standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability as defined in the ECG good practices standards). The TOR also highlighted the need to consider cross-cutting issues (capacity development, gender mainstreaming, environmental sustainability, climate change and good governance) and perspectives for the future of AWF (forward looking aspects). In the light of these suggestions, the evaluation will assess six major areas that altogether will allow the Evaluation Team to build a compelling story on the performance of the African Water Facility and the way forward. The six areas are: AWF Global role and relevance, AWF Effectiveness (developmental and organisational), Sustainability of AWF results, AWF Efficiency, Cross-cutting issues, and Forward looking aspects.
3.2.2 Evaluation Questions

In line with the evaluation areas identified above, the evaluation will be focused on seven main evaluation questions (see Table 3). Each of these questions has been operationalised into evaluation sub-questions (see the Evaluation Matrix in section 3.2.3). The sub-questions draw largely on the questions provided in the TOR (see Appendix I, section 4), but they were rearranged, refined and or complemented with additional questions. We believe that this rearrangement of questions helps to structure the evaluation in more consistent way and in line with key dimensions that are of interest to the Bank and the AWF.

Table 3: Main evaluation questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS</th>
<th>EVALUATION CORE AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent is the African Water Facility a relevant instrument for supporting</td>
<td>AWF Global role and relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa to address water related challenges?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent and under what circumstances has the African Water Facility achieved</td>
<td>AWF Effectiveness (development and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>its strategic objectives: strengthening the financial base for water related</td>
<td>organisational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investments in Africa, meeting basic water needs, enhancing conducive water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governance, and promoting water knowledge?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To what extent and how have the African Water Facility institutional design and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management arrangements and processes supported the achievement of the Facility’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development objectives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent are the results achieved by the AWF likely to be sustained over time?</td>
<td>Sustainability of AWF results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent and how have AWF operations been optimal in achieving the Facility’s</td>
<td>AWF Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To what extent have the cross-cutting issues of capacity development, gender</td>
<td>Cross-cutting issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainstreaming, environmental sustainability, climate change and good governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been considered by the AWF?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What are the major areas of improvement needed to enable successful future</td>
<td>Forward looking aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operations of the African Water Facility?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 3.2.3. Evaluation Matrix

### Table 4: Evaluation matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS</th>
<th>SUB-QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>SOURCES OF DATA</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION TOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance (of the AWF)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent is the African Water Facility a relevant instrument for supporting Africa to address water-related challenges? (This question relates to the AWF global role and relevance dimension as per the TOR)</td>
<td>To what extent are AWF objectives valid and suited to the United Nations SDG 6, the African Water Vision, the Bank’s Ten Year Strategy and High 5 priorities? (Have the objectives and design of the AWF remained relevant throughout implementation?)</td>
<td>Degree to which activities of the AWF reflect United Nations SDG 6, African Water Vision, and AfDB high 5 water-related priorities.</td>
<td><strong>Primary sources</strong> - Semi structured interviews with AWF internal (core) and external stakeholders - Field visit (semi-structured) interviews or Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with AWF beneficiaries - Online stakeholder perception survey - Field visit workshop: with AWF beneficiaries and relevant partners at country level</td>
<td>Interview protocols (slightly adjusted) for each of the following stakeholders: Members of AWF Governing Council, AWF funding partners (available for interview), AWF Managers, and AWF beneficiaries visited in countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent are the activities carried out by the Facility consistent with the present (and future) water and sanitation needs and priorities of African countries (RMCs)?</td>
<td>Coherence between AWF activities and RMCs national water policies, strategies, priorities. Recipients’ perception of the extent to which AWF’s interventions’ focus is on</td>
<td><strong>Secondary sources</strong></td>
<td>Focus Group discussion protocol (Topics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey questionnaire targeted to all AWF funding partners (not available for interviews)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Depending on possibilities to convene AWF beneficiaries in one place, we might consider FGDs as a way of engaging with groups of different categories of beneficiaries (water service providers, NGOs and state officials) allowing the Evaluation Team to tease out some of the power relations dynamics.

2 The Governing Council consists of thirteen (13) members comprising five (5) persons appointed by AMCOW on a sub-regional basis, one (1) member appointed by the Bank, one (1) member appointed by the African Union under the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), one (1) member appointed by U.N.–Water Africa, five (5) members appointed by Donors to the Water Fund who are not otherwise represented in the membership of the Governing Council, and the Director of the Water Fund.

3 AWF funding partners include bilaterals, multinationals, philanthropic, Regional organizations, African governments, private sector organizations (source: AWF Strategy 2017-2025)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS</th>
<th>SUB-QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>SOURCES OF DATA</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION TOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>To what extent are the programmes and activities of the AWF competing with or complementing other programmes or entities that are providing similar support?</td>
<td>most pressing needs in the water sector.</td>
<td>Relevant documentation (including on AMCOW, AWF, African Water Vision, UN SDGs, sampled Regional Member Countries)</td>
<td>Workshop data capture Template, Desk review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>To what extent and how has the AWF allowed for adjustments of its governing principles (assumptions) to changing circumstances and new opportunities over the years (learning question – “double loop-learning”)?</td>
<td>Reviewed AWF intervention logic framework in light of (internal, mid-term) evaluations.</td>
<td>AWF programme level and project level documentation - A wider white and grey water-related literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Effectiveness (of the AWF)

2. To what extent and under what circumstances has the African Water Facility achieved its strategic objectives: strengthening the financial base for water-related investments in Africa, meeting basic water needs, enhancing conducive water governance, and promoting water

<p>| A.                        | What outcomes have been created by the AWF at programme level – and do they correspond to the goals and objectives specified in the results frameworks outlined in the different strategic (operational) plans? | Degree of achievements with respect to objectives set (at the fund, programme, and project levels). Evidence and nature of the results of the funded activities’ contribution to the achievement of AWF’s overall targets. Level of alignment of the AWF’s grants with its strategic orientation. | Primary sources | Interview protocols targeting the following stakeholders: AWF beneficiaries in visited countries, and AWF staff and managers |
| B.                        | To what extent has the AWF (performance) monitoring and evaluation system provided relevant evidence to assess whether the intended results were being achieved? | Extent to which AWF monitoring and evaluation system is used to | | Focus Group discussion protocol (Topics), Workshop data capture Template, Desk review |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS</th>
<th>SUB-QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>SOURCES OF DATA</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION TOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>knowledge? (This question relates to the development effectiveness dimension of the evaluation as per the ToR.)</td>
<td>C. What have been the outcomes of the AWF at the fund level (e.g. leveraging other funds through follow-on investments and co-financing, useful partnerships established)?</td>
<td>Systematically report on outputs and outcomes.</td>
<td>Examples of effective partnerships/cooperation between AWF and financiers, NGOs, regional institutions and governments. AWF leverage: number of EUR of additional grant funding pledged subsequent to approval of each EUR of AWF grant funding.</td>
<td>- AWF and relevant partners of AWF at country level. Field visit workshop: with AWF grantee organizations and relevant partners at country level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. To what extent and how have country or regional political and economic contexts, including the quality of a country governance, influenced the achievement or non-achievement of objectives and outcomes of the AFW at programme and project implementation levels?</td>
<td>Evidence of contributing / hindering factors during project implementation. Stakeholders’ perceptions of contributing / hindering factors to results achievement.</td>
<td>- AWF programme and project level documentation: including IDEV appraisals, donor annual reviews, midterm and final project evaluation reports, AWF manager reports, and so on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. To what extent and how have country or regional business and market environment affected AWF efforts to leverage private sector funding?</td>
<td>Private sector leverage: private sector funds generated as a result of each EUR of AWF grant funding (note: Leverage assessed at different levels: AWF as a whole, within each strategic objective area, and Africa sub-regional level over the 4 years of operation).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 The recipients of AWF fall under 4 different categories: (1) public institutions (such as Ministries, Agencies belonging to RMCs, Local Government Authorities, Water Basin Organizations and Commissions), (2) Trans-boundary Water Organizations, (3) Non-Governmental and Civil Society Organizations, and (4) Community-based Organizations (Source: AWF Guidelines and criteria for applicants, 2006)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS</th>
<th>SUB-QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>SOURCES OF DATA</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION TOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>What has the AWF learnt from past implementation mistakes/ errors (since launching in 2005) and how has it used the learnings to improve its implementation strategies (learning question – single loop learning)?</td>
<td>Existence of an effective monitoring and evaluation system that generates lessons learned and good practices. Extent to which, and processes through which lessons learned and good practices were disseminated internally and externally.</td>
<td>Primary sources - Online stakeholder perception survey - Semi structured interviews with AWF Managers - Field visit (semi-structured)</td>
<td>Survey questionnaire, targeted to AWF beneficiaries in all 52 countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Has the African Water Facility produced some unintended positive or negative outcomes?</td>
<td>Evidence of outcomes generated by the AWF and not initially intended. Stakeholders’ perceptions on any unexpected results, positive or negative that occurred/are occurring in countries following the AWF’s interventions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview protocols (slightly adjusted) for each of the following</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The AWF’s grant process involves the following stages: identification, preparation, appraisal, negotiation/approval/signature, implementation, project completion report (source: AWF operational manual, 2009)
## MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>SOURCES OF DATA</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION TOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>supported the achievement of the Facility’s development objectives? (This question relates to the Organizational effectiveness dimension of the evaluation as per the ToR.)</td>
<td>Stakeholders’ perceptions of the appropriateness of the grants management process in contributing to the achievement of results</td>
<td>interviews or Focus Group Discussions with AWF beneficiaries - Field visit workshop: with AWF beneficiaries and relevant partners at country level</td>
<td>stakeholders: Members of AWF Governing Council, AWF funding partners (available for interview), and AWF Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. To what extent have AWF’s application screening criteria and AfDB’s procurement procedures been appropriate in supporting the achievements of AWF’s objectives?</td>
<td>Evidence of clear and explicit guidelines for grants selection process and selection criteria. Stakeholders’ perceptions of the relevance of the grants selection process, selection criteria, and gaps, if any, in terms of interventions’ focus and prioritization.</td>
<td>- AWF programme and project level documentation: including IDEV appraisals, donor annual reviews, midterm and final project evaluation reports, AWF manager reports, and so on</td>
<td>Focus Group discussion protocol (Topics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. How effective has been the engagement of AWF (and or coordination between) and funding partners, as well as with other instruments and initiatives that support the water sector on the African continent level – and how has that affected the achievement of the Facility’s objectives?</td>
<td>Evidence of a clear partnership strategy in AWF strategic plans. Stakeholders’ perceptions on the role of AWF partners in contributing to the achievement of AWF’s objectives.</td>
<td>- Workshop data capture Template</td>
<td>Desk Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. To what degree were the AWF systems, processes and procedures improved to address findings of performance assessments (learning question – single loop learning)?</td>
<td>Evidence that AWF processes have improved as a result of learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Efficiency (of the AWF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. To what extent are AWF programmes and activities produced in a cost-effective and timely manner (e.g., the approval process of the AWF grants, fund disbursements, monitoring and evaluation activities, project completion)</th>
<th>Elapsed time between project proposal for funding by AWF, and approval/ rejection.</th>
<th>Primary sources</th>
<th>Interview protocols (slightly adjusted) for each of the following stakeholders: AWF Managers, AWF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent and how have AWF operations been optimal in achieving the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Primary sources</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS</th>
<th>SUB-QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>SOURCES OF DATA</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION TOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facility’s objectives? (This question relates to the efficiency dimension of the evaluation as per the ToR.)</td>
<td>(question assesses accountability and degree to which short-term results at output level were achieved timely and with planned budget)?</td>
<td>Elapsed time between project approval and first/final fund disbursement.</td>
<td>- Field visit (semi-structured) interviews or Focus Group Discussions with AWF beneficiaries</td>
<td>beneficiaries in visited countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. To what extent have any delays affected project execution, cost and effectiveness? To what degree are the delays justified (e.g., by unanticipated project complexities)?</td>
<td>% of projects completed on time; % of projects with extensions</td>
<td>- Field visit workshop: with AWF beneficiaries and relevant partners at country level</td>
<td>Workshop data capture Template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. To what extent were the AWF’s governance and management arrangements and delivery model (e.g., including the use of special accounts and partnerships) cost-effective in delivering the AWF projects and their results?</td>
<td>Stakeholders’ perceptions on the appropriateness of management arrangements for delivering results. Evidence that management arrangements are tailored toward delivering results.</td>
<td>- AWF programme and project level documentation: including IDEV appraisals, donor annual reviews, midterm and final project evaluation reports, AWF manager reports, and so on</td>
<td>Desk Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. To what extent has AWF had appropriate (and sufficient) human resources to carry out its operations across the three strategic periods? What organizational measures have been taken by the AfDB to ensure the Facility has the right human resources capacity throughout?</td>
<td>Calibre of members of AWF secretariat, and of the Grant Committee. Turnover rate of AWF staff. AWF’s staff perception on the appropriateness of human resources for delivering results.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. To what extent are the administrative costs of the AWF sufficiently covered by the AfDB?</td>
<td>Extent to which AWF’s administrative costs are covered by the AfDB. AWF and AfDB’s staff’s perception on the adequacy of AfDB’s contribution to AWF administrative costs.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS</td>
<td>SUB-QUESTIONS</td>
<td>INDICATORS</td>
<td>SOURCES OF DATA</td>
<td>DATA COLLECTION TOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability (of AWF and its outcomes)</strong></td>
<td>5. To what extent are the results achieved by the AWF likely to be sustained over time (this question relates to the sustainability dimension of the evaluation as per the ToR)</td>
<td>A. To what extent and how has the AWF ensured the achievement of sustainable outcomes (e.g., through the criteria used to select projects, due diligence, provision of capacity development services, etc.)?</td>
<td>Evidence of a clear sustainability strategy in AWF’s strategic plans.</td>
<td>Primary sources - Online stakeholder perception survey - Semi-structured interview with AWF staff/managers - Field visit (semi-structured) interviews or Focus Group Discussions with AWF beneficiaries, relevant partners of AWF at country level - Field visit workshop: with AWF beneficiaries and relevant partners at country level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. To what extent were AWF projects results sustained, or likely to be sustained, taking into account the institutional and human resource capacity of beneficiary countries/institutions?</td>
<td>Degree of country ownership associated with AWF projects as illustrated through financial commitment on taking AWF projects forward, or demonstration learning at domestic level actually leveraging change in performance.</td>
<td>Secondary sources - Survey questionnaire targeted to AWF beneficiaries in all 52 countries) - Interview protocols slightly adjusted for the following stakeholders: AWF beneficiaries in visited countries, AWF staff and managers - Focus Group discussion protocol (Topics) - Workshop data capture Template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Do the AWF-supported projects have clearly defined (exit) strategies to attract follow on investments – (e.g., to what degree AWF financing helps leverage local/domestic funds to follow on initiatives vs additional donor funds)?</td>
<td>Evidence of a clear sustainability strategy in project appraisal reports.</td>
<td>Desk Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. How do contextual factors (e.g., country institutional, political, economic, social realities) influence the sustainability of the outcomes created by the AWF?</td>
<td>Evidence of contributing / hindering factors to the sustainability of results. Stakeholders’ perceptions of contributing / hindering factors to the sustainability of results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cross-cutting issues

### 6. To what extent the cross-cutting issues of capacity development, gender mainstreaming, environmental sustainability, climate change and good governance have been considered by the AWF? (This question relates to the cross-cutting issues dimension of the evaluation as per the ToR.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS</th>
<th>SUB-QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>SOURCES OF DATA</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION TOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong> To what extent and how have issues of stakeholder participation and social inclusion (including participation of local communities, and disadvantaged groups) been addressed in AWF operations (throughout the Facility's project cycle)? (good governance)</td>
<td>Evidence of the existence of clear guidelines on the inclusion of social inclusion and stakeholder participation issues for project preparation. Evidence that social inclusion issues are considered as a criterion in the selection of water projects.</td>
<td><strong>Primary sources</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Online stakeholder perception survey&lt;br&gt;- Semi-structured interview&lt;br&gt;- with AWF staff and managers&lt;br&gt;- Field visit (semi-structured) interviews or Focus Group Discussions with AWF beneficiaries</td>
<td><strong>Secondary sources</strong>&lt;br&gt;- AWF programme and project level documentation: documentation: including IDEV appraisals, donor annual reviews, midterm and final project evaluation reports, AWF manager reports, and so on</td>
<td><strong>Survey questionnaire,</strong> targeted to AWF beneficiaries in all 52 countries**&lt;br&gt;<strong>Interview protocols</strong>&lt;br&gt;For each of the following stakeholders: AWF Managers, AWF beneficiaries visited in countries**&lt;br&gt;<strong>Focus Group discussion protocol (Topics)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Desk Review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.</strong> To what extent have AWF interventions strengthened the water sector capacity of RMCs (e.g., to mobilize and use financial resources, to actually implement developed IWRM policies and plans) at the individual, organizational and enabling environment levels? (capacity development)</td>
<td>Evidence of the existence of clear guidelines on the inclusion of governance issues for project preparation. Evidence that governance issues are considered as a criterion in the selection of water projects. Amount of AWF budget allocated to cross-cutting issues of governance, knowledge management, and capacity development. % of AWF supported projects that specifically address governance issues.</td>
<td><strong>Primary sources</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Online stakeholder perception survey&lt;br&gt;- Semi-structured interview&lt;br&gt;- with AWF staff and managers&lt;br&gt;- Field visit (semi-structured) interviews or Focus Group Discussions with AWF beneficiaries</td>
<td><strong>Secondary sources</strong>&lt;br&gt;- AWF programme and project level documentation: documentation: including IDEV appraisals, donor annual reviews, midterm and final project evaluation reports, AWF manager reports, and so on</td>
<td><strong>Survey questionnaire,</strong> targeted to AWF beneficiaries in all 52 countries**&lt;br&gt;<strong>Interview protocols</strong>&lt;br&gt;For each of the following stakeholders: AWF Managers, AWF beneficiaries visited in countries**&lt;br&gt;<strong>Focus Group discussion protocol (Topics)</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Desk Review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong> To what extent and how do the AWF supported interventions contribute to improving the resilience of RMCs countries to climate change (e.g., through designing and implementation of climate resilient water infrastructure, helping</td>
<td>Evidence of the existence of clear guidelines on the inclusion of climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS</td>
<td>SUB-QUESTIONS</td>
<td>INDICATORS</td>
<td>SOURCES OF DATA</td>
<td>DATA COLLECTION TOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMCs leverage financing to pursue water-related climate change adaptation and mitigation measures) (climate change)</td>
<td>resilience issues for project preparation. Evidence that climate resilience issues are considered as a criterion in the selection of water projects. Amount of AWF budget allocated to improving the resilience of RMCs countries to climate change. % of AWF supported projects that specifically address climate resilience issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. How adequately have the quality of environmental assets been considered by AWF operations? (Environmental sustainability)</td>
<td>Evidence of AWF guidelines on environmental assets. Evidence that environmental assets issues are considered as a criterion in the selection of water projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. To what extent are gender equity concerns (e.g., ensuring that both women and men participate in water decision-making processes, empowerment of women to actively participate in the management of water resources) considered in AWF operations? (gender mainstreaming)</td>
<td>Extent to which AWF support projects are gender informed. Evidence of the existence of clear guidelines on the inclusion of gender issues for project preparation. Evidence that gender issues are considered as a criterion in the selection of water projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Forward-looking aspects

#### 7. What are the major areas of improvement to enable successful future operations of the African Water Facility?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS</th>
<th>SUB-QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>SOURCES OF DATA</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION TOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. What are the specific role the Bank must play to increase the financial viability of the AWF?</td>
<td>Stakeholders’ perceptions on the role of AWF’s interventions in target countries.</td>
<td>% of AWF supported projects that specifically address gender issues.</td>
<td>Primary sources - Semi structured interviews with AWF internal (core) and external stakeholders</td>
<td>Interview protocols targeting different stakeholders: Members of AWF Governing Council, AWF funding partners (available for interview); AWF Managers and representatives of AfDB; and AWF beneficiaries visited in countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. What are the emerging strengths, weaknesses, constraints and opportunities as well as risks in managing and implementing the AWF and its projects?</td>
<td>Annual reports demonstrating AWF operational capacity Levels of project approvals Rates of successful project completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. What are the key risks, constraints and opportunities that the AWF will have to continue to deal with? What are the key options for improving AWF resources mobilization efforts to enable continued support to RMCs?</td>
<td>Levels of donor participation/ increases/ renewals in Trust Funds Level of collaboration from member states Resources allocated to maintain and operate AWF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. What are the key options for improving the implementation performance of the AWF and its projects?</td>
<td>Feedback/ Perceptions of stakeholders on implementation processes Project Completion Reports’ recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. To what extent and how has AWF appropriately positioned itself to adapt to the changing donor appetite in the global climate for leveraging financing in water resource management in Africa?</td>
<td>Donors’ perception of the relevance and value-added of the AWF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary sources - AWF programme and project level documentation: documentation: including IDEV appraisals, donor annual reviews, midterms and final project evaluation reports, AWF manager reports, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Desk Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS</td>
<td>SUB-QUESTIONS</td>
<td>INDICATORS</td>
<td>SOURCES OF DATA</td>
<td>DATA COLLECTION TOOLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Donors’ perception of the gaps, if any, between their expectations and the support that the AWF is providing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Methodology

3.3.1 Sampling

The portfolio of AWF financed interventions includes 118 projects, all of which fall under the scope of the evaluation. The projects can be categorized by their associated AWF strategies, operational programmes, relevant strategic priorities, objectives, or pillars; geographical location both in terms of countries and regions; their relevance to the AfDB’s High 5s; status; total project costs and AWF financed costs; and finally, projects can be categorized by the proportion of the total project costs financed by AWF. The following paragraph provides a brief overview of the distribution of AWF financed projects along these variables.

As seen in Table 5 below, AWF financed interventions have been implemented over the course of three strategies and operational programmes. While the first strategic period is more represented than other strategic periods in terms of number of projects, the second strategic period is more important in terms of the total amount the AWF invested.

Table 5: Distribution of AWF financed projects across strategic periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PERIODS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PROJECTS</th>
<th>TOTAL AWF FINANCED PROJECTS’ COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Programme 2005-2011</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>EUR 74,615,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan 2012-2016</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>EUR 81,149,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan 2017-2025</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EUR 7,627,033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each strategic period includes distinct set of strategic priorities, objectives, or pillars pursued by the AWF but that are related in content across all three periods. As seen in Table 6 below, while strengthening water governance was the most represented strategic objective during the Operational Programme of 2005-2009, project preparation is the most represented strategic priority since the 2012-2016 Strategic Plan. It is important to note that a single project can be relevant to more than one strategic priority and that, where possible, we have tried to identify these projects for deeper analysis during site visits so as to gain greater insight into how their results supported outcomes across various thematic areas.
Table 6: Distribution of projects per strategic objectives/priorities/pillars, and strategic periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES, PRIORITIES, AND PILLARS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Programme 2005-2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic objective 1: Strengthening water governance</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic objective 2: Investments to meet water needs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic objective 3: Strengthening the financial base</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic objective 4: Improving water knowledge</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan 2012-2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Priority 1: Prepare Investment Projects</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Priority 2: Enhance Water Governance</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Priority 3: Promote Water Knowledge</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan 2017-2025</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar 1: Project Preparation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar 2: Catalytic Investments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar 3: Investment Promotion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 25 percent of all project are multinational, while the remainder are country-specific interventions. Regarding projects’ status there are 53 projects completed, 26 ongoing, 32 closed, and seven projects are terminated.

In regard to the distribution of projects per region, Table 7 below shows that Western and Eastern Africa are the most represented regions, both in terms of the number of projects and AWF financed projects’ costs.

Table 7: Distribution of projects per regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PROJECTS</th>
<th>TOTAL AWF FINANCED PROJECTS’ COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Africa</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>EUR 38 305 687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Africa</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>EUR 43 628 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>EUR 37 304 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>EUR 15 140 546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Africa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>EUR 13 078 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects covering more than one region</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>EUR 15 934 355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, regarding the distribution of projects’ relevance to the AfDB’s high 5s (Table 8), “improve the quality of life for the people of Africa” is overwhelmingly represented in comparison to other AfDB’s priorities. Most projects under this priority are related to improving access to water and sanitation. The second most represented AfDB priority is “feed Africa”, with many projects aiming to increase the productivity of arable land and reducing poverty. Industrialize Africa is not represented in any of the 118 projects.

**Table 8: Distribution of sampled projects across AfDB’s High 5s.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFDB’S HIGH 5S</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SAMPLED PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light up and power Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed Africa</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrialize Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the quality of life for the people of Africa</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A Tiered Approach to Sampling**

A variegated/tiered sampling approach was applied to the population of 118 projects, to ensure that the evaluation could, with robust confidence, assess the portfolio of AWF financed projects taking ensuring a representative coverage of the variables described above.

This approach matches specific methods to specifically sampled sub-populations of projects and stakeholders (see Figure 1 for an overview).

- Tier 1 involves a deep dive into **27 projects**, three projects in each visited country (9). Details on these countries and associated projects can be found in Table 10.
- Tier 2 involves a survey sent to the stakeholders **84 projects**. These projects represent all projects excluding projects that are covered in country case studies and projects that have been terminated.
- Tier 3 involves a portfolio review of all **111 projects**.

---

6 Sampled projects can be relevant to more than one AfDB’s High 5s.
**Figure 1: Overview of Methodological Approach**

The overall sample of 27 projects that will be engaged with in Tier 1 covers nine countries. Table 9 outlines how each variable have been considered in selecting these 27 projects to be covered in nine case studies.

**Table 9: Sample Selection Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic periods</strong></td>
<td>The sample needed to be representative of projects’ distribution across the three AWF strategic periods. While the projects reviewed in the country case studies will cover all strategic periods, an emphasis is put on projects from the second strategic period, reflecting the fact that AWF’s investment is greater during that period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic objectives/priorities/pillars</strong></td>
<td>The sample of projects covered in the country case studies will be representative of the distribution of strategic priorities. However, more weight is given to projects related to project preparation resource mobilization, since both these objectives are still relevant to the current AWF Strategic Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic coverage and country-specific VS multinational projects</strong></td>
<td>While some regions are more represented than others in AWF financed projects, the sample of projects included the country case studies will cover all sub-region evenly to ensure that they are all represented. Additionally, the make-up of the three projects selected per country for review will consist of two country-specific and one multinational project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects’ status</strong></td>
<td>The sampling will select an adequate representation of each category. Preference is given (e.g. higher weighing) to those projects that present a degree of achievement that is more conducive to identifying long-term outcomes and lessons learned. Terminated projects are not included in the sample of projects informing the country case studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following section provides the distribution of projects covered in country case studies across strategic periods and priorities, geographical location both in terms of countries and regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AfDB’s High 5s</td>
<td>While the sample will cover all AfDB’s High 5s for tier 3, not all AfDB’s priorities will be represented in the sampling in tier 1 and 2. The sample for tier 1 and 2 will instead prioritize the weighting and representativeness of the other variables described above (strategic periods and priorities, and geographic coverage) and place greater emphasis in alignment to the Improving the Quality of Life and Feed Africa themes as these have the highest number of projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10: Distribution of selected projects by geographical location (countries and regions), AWF strategic periods and priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFRICA REGION</th>
<th>COUNTRIES</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>STRATEGIC PERIODS</th>
<th>STRATEGIC PRIORITIES</th>
<th>BASINS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Études de mobilisation et de valorisation des eaux pluviales</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>Strategic Priority 1: Prepare Investment Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Projet d’appui à la création d’un organisme de bassins transfrontaliers (Ogoué, Ntem, Nyanga, et Komo) et préparation de projets d’investissements (Pacobt-PPI)</td>
<td>2017-2025</td>
<td>Pillar 1: Project Preparation Pillar 3: Investment Promotion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>Côte D’Ivoire</td>
<td>AWF support to the Niger-Hycos project</td>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>Strategic objective 4: Improving water knowledge</td>
<td>Niger Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion de l’accès aux toilettes et aux emplois à Bouaké et Katiola à travers la réutilisation des boues et des urines</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>Strategic Priority 2: Enhance Water Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support to Volta basin authority on the Volta-Hycos project</td>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>Strategic objective 4: Improving water knowledge Strategic objective 1: Strengthening water governance</td>
<td>Volta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved Sanitation and Water Supply Service Delivery to the Urban Poor in Ghana through Tripartite Partnerships</td>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>Strategic objective 1: Strengthening water governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sogakope-Lome PPP transfert d’eau</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>Strategic Priority 1: Prepare Investment Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Amélioration de la gestion et de la valorisation des boues de vidange dans la ville de Ziguinchor</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>Strategic Priority 1: Prepare Investment Projects Strategic Priority 3: Promote Water Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direction de la Gestion et de la Planification des Ressources en Eau (DGPRE) / Ministère de l’Hydraulique</td>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>Strategic objective 1: Strengthening water governance Strategic objective 3: Strengthening the financial base Strategic objective 4: Improving water knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Projet de gestion intégrée des ressources en eau dans le bassin versant du fleuve Kayanga-Geba</td>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>Strategic objective 1: Strengthening water governance</td>
<td>Kayanga-Geba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>East African community Lake Victoria basin commission water and sanitation initiative prepration of investment plan for fifteen centres</td>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>Strategic objective 3: Strengthening the financial base</td>
<td>Lake Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated land and water management in the Kibuon and Tende river catchments</td>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>Strategic objective 1: Strengthening water governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRICA REGION</td>
<td>COUNTRIES</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>STRATEGIC PERIODS</td>
<td>STRATEGIC PRIORITIES</td>
<td>BASINS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Scaling up of integrated rainwater harvesting and management and complementary livelihood systems in semi-arid districts of Kenya</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>Strategic Priority 1: Prepare Investment Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Élaboration du programme régional de développement intégré de la plaine de Ruzizi (PREDIR)</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>Strategic Priority 1: Prepare Investment Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Projet pilote à l’introduction des techniques de collecte et d’utilisation des eaux de pluie à Bugesera</td>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>Strategic objective 2: Investments to meet water needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rwanda national water supply and sanitation masterplans</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>Pillar 1: Project Preparation Pillar 2: Catalytic Investments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Integrated water harvesting project</td>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>Strategic Priority 1: Prepare Investment Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange-Senqu River Basin: Preparation of Climate Resilient Water Resources Investment Strategy &amp; Plan and Multipurpose Project</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>Strategic Priority 1: Prepare Investment Projects Strategic Priority 2: Enhance Water Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social franchising operations &amp; maintenance of school sanitation</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>Strategic Priority 2: Enhance Water Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Community water management improvement project for traditional farmers in Mkushi, Masaiti, and Chingola districts</td>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>Strategic objective 3: Strengthening the financial base Strategic objective 4: Improving water knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support to SADC regional water supply and sanitation programme</td>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>Strategic objective 1: Strengthening water governance Strategic objective 2: Investments to meet water needs Strategic objective 3: Strengthening financial base Strategic objective 4: Improving water knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Africa</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>Élaboration de la Vision et de la Stratégie Eau 2050 de la Tunisie</td>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>Strategic Priority 2: Enhance Water Governance Strategic Priority 3: Promote Water Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MGDs monitoring and evaluation for water in North Africa</td>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>Strategic objective 4: Improving water knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Système d’information national sur l’eau (SINEAU)</td>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>Strategic objective 1: Strengthening water governance Strategic objective 4: Improving water knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Country-specific projects**

**Multinational projects**
The following paragraphs and tables describe the distribution of the sample of selected projects across AWF strategies and operational programmes and relevant strategic priorities, objectives, or pillars; geographical location both in terms of countries and regions; their relevance to the AfDB’s High 5s; and status.

As seen in table 11 below, the sample includes 27 projects distributed in nine countries, each country being represented by three projects. As per the population of all AWF-financed projects, national projects are more represented in the sample than multinational projects.

**Table 11: Distribution of Sampled projects across countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>MULTINATIONAL PROJECTS SAMPLED</th>
<th>COUNTRY-SPECIFIC PROJECTS SAMPLED</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECTS SAMPLED PER COUNTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte D’Ivoire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in table 12 below, all three AWF strategic periods are covered in the sample. While the distribution of sampled projects across strategic periods is not proportional to the distribution within the population of projects in terms of the number of projects, the sample is indeed proportional to the population of projects in terms of AWF investments across strategic periods.

**Table 12: Distribution of sampled projects across strategic periods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PERIODS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SAMPLED PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Programme 2005-2011</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan 2012-2016</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan 2017-2025</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all strategic objectives/priorities/pillars are represented in the sample. The second pillar of the 2017-2015 Strategic Plan is not represented since only one project from this strategic period is included in the sample. The distribution of sampled projects across strategic objectives/priorities/pillars is similar to the same distribution in the population of AWF-financed projects, with “Strategic objective 1: Strengthening water governance” and “Strategic objective 4: Improving water knowledge” being more represented during the first strategic period, and “Strategic Priority 1: Prepare Investment Projects” and
“Strategic Priority 2: Enhance Water Governance” being more represented in the second strategic period.

Table 13: Distribution of sampled projects per strategic objectives/priorities/pillars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES, PRIORITIES, AND PILLARS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SAMPLED PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operational Programme 2005-2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic objective 1: Strengthening water governance</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic objective 2: Investments to meet water needs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic objective 3: Strengthening the financial base</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic objective 4: Improving water knowledge</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan 2012-2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Priority 1: Prepare Investment Projects</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Priority 2: Enhance Water Governance</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Priority 3: Promote Water Knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan 2017-2025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar 1: Project Preparation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar 2: Catalytic Investments</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar 3: Investment Promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All regions within the continent are covered in the sample. To ensure that all regions are represented in the sample, the distribution of sampled projects across regions is not proportional to the distribution of all projects.

Table 14: Distribution of sampled projects per regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SAMPLED PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Africa</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Sampled projects can be relevant to more than one strategic objectives/priorities/pillars within the same strategic period.
The sample includes projects that are ongoing, closed, and completed. While the review of closed and completed projects is conducive to identifying long-term outcomes and lessons learned, the review on ongoing projects is expected to provide the evaluation team with more details on the current AWF and AfDB processes. Not a single terminated project was included in the sample to ensure sufficient data availability in each project reviewed.

**Table 15: Status of sampled projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT STATUS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SAMPLED PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminated</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, all relevant AfDB’s High 5s are represented in the sample. Their representation in the sample is similar to their representation in the population of AWF-financed projects, since “Improve the quality of life for the people of Africa” and “Feed Africa” are more represented than other High 5s.

**Table 16: Distribution of sampled projects across AfDB’s High 5s.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFDB’S HIGH 5S</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SAMPLED PROJECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light up and power Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed Africa</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrialize Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the quality of life for the people of Africa</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 Sampled projects can be relevant to more than one AfDB’s High 5s.
3.3.2 Portfolio Review

The portfolio review will be a desk-based exercise, which will begin as soon as the draft Inception Report is submitted.

The portfolio review will be informed by Project Appraisal Reports and Project Completion Reports. The focus of the portfolio review will be to assess the performance of all projects funded by the AWF under each strategic period. The main dimensions that will be explored through this task will be projects’ relevance, the Development Effectiveness of the AWF, as well as the outcomes and sustainability.

The team developed a review grid (using Excel) that reflects the evaluation matrix. Projects will be assessed against their stated objectives of the strategic period within which they were approved, but we also intend to obtain a larger perspective that cuts across strategic periods, especially if the team is able to capture strategic outcomes and sustainability of the portfolio.

The portfolio review will be split among team members, although the Water Sector Expert and the Socio-Economist will take the lead and do most of the review considering their thematic specialisation. The Portfolio Review Report will be prepared containing the main findings per evaluation criteria and areas of inquiry to further explore through the case studies. The exact number of projects reviewed as part of the portfolio review will be agreed upon with the AfDB.

3.3.3 Policy and Literature Review

The Policy and Literature Review will follow a similar approach as the portfolio review, although with a different scope. Here, the level of analysis moves up and shifts from a project perspective to a more regional, global, strategic and organisational inquiry. In this line, the main dimensions explored here are the AWF Global Role and Relevance, and Organisational Effectiveness.

Whereas the portfolio review is mostly desk-based and will be complemented with case studies, we anticipate conducting a series of key informant interviews to strengthen the policy and literature analysis, especially to assess the Organisational Effectiveness dimension (e.g. Governing Council, the Bank’s Board of Directors, AWF staff, AMCOW members, donors, partners, etc.) but also the Global Role and Relevance (African regional and national institutions). This task will be more qualitative than the portfolio review.

The portfolio review methodology that will be used will draw on some of the quantitative results across projects, tease out the outputs that will feed into analysis of outcomes that are supplemented with the policy and literature review as well as key informant interviews.

3.3.4 Case studies

Methodology

One of the key findings from the Synthesis Paper on the review of Thematic Areas of AWF operations, covering a scan of 89 projects (AWF 2015), was the notable absence of linking projects to the themes that are meant to guide how the AWF is performing against its strategic objectives. The sampling strategy is designed to address this historical challenge in assessing the bigger picture of the AWF’s achievements at a thematic level. It will do this through the three tiered sampling strategy outlined
above. The first tier will draw on analysis of outputs from portfolio reviews and analysis of policy documents to frame a causal chain for how various projects have contributed to the priority themes across all three strategic periods.

The design of the case studies is meant to be illustrative of importance of country contexts and the degree to which these have created an enabling environment for the various projects hosted within them. The design of the case studies will focus on the following four themes:

1. **Improved Water Governance**—In phase 1 the relevant areas are projects that focus on Transboundary Water Management, Agricultural Management, National Water Resource Management and IWRM. In phase 2 and 3, the objective is to create conducive environments for effective and sustainable investments.

2. **Greater Water Resources Leveraged**. This theme combines the two strategic outcome areas of “Water Needs Met” and Financial Base Strengthened” as outlined in the Operational Strategy in 2007 and continued in the 2012-2016 phase through the priority on preparing bankable projects and in the 2017-2025 phase through preparing project investments (strategic priority 1) and catalytic investments (strategic priority 2) and guarantee brokerage which is part of strategic priority 3.

3. **Improved Water Knowledge**—this is a consistent theme in phase and phase 2. In phase 3, this theme is refined as Strategic priority 3: Investment Promotion, which focuses on diagnostics for investment opportunities (research) and sharing and learning platforms.

4. **Organizational Support Provided**. This fourth category will not consist of evidence from projects reviewed during field missions but rather focus on the data from key informant interviews that can shed light on how partners have viewed the support provided by the AWF, how the AWF staff have viewed the support provided by the AFDB and how the AFDB has viewed the responsiveness from its Governing Council. These line functions will be reviewed to assess the efficiency dimension of the organizational governance of the AWF and how it engages with its partners. Stakeholder perspectives from key informant interviews, focus groups and surveys will be important sources of evidence.

**Analytical Framework**

The case studies will be explorative that helps generate a hypothesis for later investigation as to how the various case studies will be woven together into a synthesis that speaks to overall performance across the outlined outcome areas. The case studies will allow a zooming in to a single instance of unique interest that provides depth on an outcome story or illustrates a test of an assertion about program design or illustrates strategic intent. The case studies will illustrate evidence about program implementation outcomes through reviewing the operational dimensions of composite projects/outputs that have feed into these programmatic/strategic areas. The case studies will illustrate programme effects by looking at causal links between the program and observed effects. This will be done by testing different theories about what has produced the observed impacts.

The value of the case study approach focusing on the flesh that has made up the four strategic areas is that when looked at cumulatively across the 9 case studies, the synthesis will bring together findings that can answer the higher level evaluation questions. Finally, the comparison across case studies that
are looking at the same strategic themes will allow the evaluators to best and test hypotheses (Rogers, 2019).  

As indicated in Table 10 above, 9 country case studies will be undertaken in this evaluation. The countries to be visited are: West Africa: Ghana, Senegal and Ivory Cost; West Africa: Rwanda and Kenya; Southern Africa: South Africa and Zambia; Northern Africa: Tunisia; Central Africa: Cameroon.  

These countries were selected based on the following major criteria: representation of Africa 5 regions, reflection of AWF spending in various regions, participation in multinational projects, existence of country specific projects that target various AWF focus areas, participation in three strategic periods and, prior experience of the evaluation team of the African Water Supply Sector.  

### 3.3.5 Synthesis Report

This phase will gather the evidence collected through the previous deliverables (Portfolio, Policy and Literature, and Case Study Reports) and provide an overall response in the form of an evaluation synthesis. Answers to all questions will be structured according to the evaluation matrix. Data will be subjected to internal quality assurance procedures and consistency checks to eliminate any potential bias. The evaluation findings will be formulated based on the key evaluation questions under each of the evaluation criteria.  

These are the various data analysis techniques that will be applied, rooted in Universalia’s experience:

- **Contextual analysis** will provide important information that will situate the water sector and the AWF operations, its policies, strategies, approaches and projects in the context of the challenges and evolving needs. In particular, the Literature and Policy Review will contribute to the contextual framing of the assignment.

- **Descriptive analysis** will be used in multiple ways. At one level, it will be used to describe interventions themselves, identifying and situating actors, organizations, institutions, partners, governments, beneficiaries, and others. Descriptive analysis will also be used to articulate the functioning of Bank as a Trustee and AWF programming, management and oversight structures. This is an important step before moving on to more interpretative approaches.

- **Content analysis** will constitute the core of the qualitative analysis. Documents and interview notes will be analyzed to identify common trends, themes, and patterns. Content analysis will also be used to flag diverging views and opposite trends. Emerging issues and trends will constitute the raw material for crafting preliminary observations that will be subsequently refined to feed into the draft and final evaluation reports.

- **Quantitative/Statistical analysis** will be used to interpret quantitative data drawn from the results framework assessment of indicators and sub-indicators of the portfolio of projects.

- **Comparative analysis** will be used to examine findings across deliverables and within dimensions and evaluation criteria; and to identify best practices, innovative approaches, and lessons learned. Development of the narrative will follow the evaluation framework model developed,

---

with information organized according to hypotheses generated and data for each theme linked in two ways; to one another within each hypothesis, as well as across hypotheses.

- **Triangulation and synthesis**: once all data has been analysed, the team will triangulate each finding to ensure sufficient evidence from various sources supports the claim. Triangulation will allow the team to “filter” the analysis and focus on the most relevant and credible findings, before developing the conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.

- **Presentation of preliminary findings**: Once data has been triangulated and synthesized, the team will present the findings and preliminary recommendations to IDEV and the RG (by video-conference) in the form of a Power Point Presentation. This step is intended to clarify and assess the relevance, validity and usefulness of the findings identified with the goal of focusing on those that will provide actionable recommendations towards the new partnership structure.

- **Draft and Final Report**: The team will then submit a draft evaluation report to IDEV, and it will be presented to AWF RG, Governing Council and other relevant stakeholders to gather feedback. The team will then revise the comments and integrate them in the final report which will be accompanied by an Executive Summary.

### 3.3.6 Quality Assurance and IDEV Support

#### Quality Assurance on Reporting

Universalia is committed to quality control throughout each stage of the evaluation mandate – from proposal development to the final report. This section outlines the phases of the evaluation, associated activities, and the quality control measures that we employ to meet the norms, standards, and best practices of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and OECD DAC.

For this assignment, we will be working with a dedicated External Quality Assurance (QA) Advisor, Dr. Eric Abitbol, who has extensive evaluation experience in the water sector and with major development banks. The main task of the QA Advisor is to ensure that all deliverables meet the highest standards of quality, relevance, and usefulness, by applying the following questions and criteria:

- **Inception Report**:
  - Is the methodology sound, coherent, adapted, realistic, and aligned to the mandate requirements
  - Is the evaluation matrix appropriately built and robust
  - Are Indicators SMART
  - Are data collection tools well designed

- **Presentation of preliminary results and aide-mémoire (field mission pre-departure debriefing)**
  - Is the evidence collected sufficient and reliable
  - What are the main gaps and what needs to be addressed

- **Draft Evaluation Report**
  - Are findings based on triangulated evidence
  - Do findings appropriately lead to conclusions
  - Are lessons learned linked to specific findings and conclusions
– Do recommendations stem from the above and respond to the purpose of the assignment
– Are recommendations relevant, useful and actionable

- Final Evaluation Report
  – Are all comments and feedback been appropriately addressed

**IDEV Management and QA**

IDEV team will manage the evaluation and shall be responsible for the following:

(i) Overall guidance and approval of the evaluation process and outputs (inception report; draft and final evaluation reports);

(ii) Quality assurance process including the external peer review of the key evaluation products, and receiving comments from the AWTF/AHWS and Reference Group;

(iii) Establishing the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG), and organize forums for internal and external review, facilitate input and guidance required from the reference group;

(iv) Managing all data, evidence and materials that will be produced by the evaluation team;

(v) Communicating to the Bank's Management and Board of Directors, and the AWF Governing Council, and disseminating the evaluation results to the key stakeholders.

The AWF will provide necessary logistical support to the evaluation team especially in arranging stakeholder meetings, and facilitating access to relevant documents/reports and database, and arranging visits to AWTF project sites and grantees/beneficiaries. The AWTF/ AHWS will also review and provide comments on the evaluation process and products.

A group of external and internal peer reviewers will be identified to provide written comments on the evaluation outputs (Inception report, Portfolio review, Policy and strategy review report, Country case studies report, Technical report and summary Report).

The Evaluation Reference Group will be composed of selected Bank staff (IDEV, AWF/ AHWS and other bank departments). The reference group will review and comment on the AWF evaluation process and outputs (inception report; evaluation reports), and provide a sound platform for rapid feedback especially on the evaluation plan (including design and methods) and emerging evaluation findings.

### 3.3.7 Data collection tools

**Desk review**

The evaluation team will review a variety of relevant AWF materials partly provided by the AfDB and partly collected from the team’s own search efforts. Many of the documents were already provided by the AfDB and were used to prepare this Inception Report. Documents already consulted (or to be consulted) relate to AWF strategies and operations, programme and project documents, workplans, internal monitoring and evaluation products (operational and financial progress reports), and any other
relevant documentation. Secondary data will also be gathered through AMCOW water related strategic documents, reports, websites, archives, funding proposals submitted by AWF applicants, minutes of meetings, and so on. We will also consult a variety of relevant (global and or country specific) documents on water issues (e.g., country water development and management strategies, water policies, etc.). The overall approach of the evaluation team to the analysis of the documents will be as follows: first, it will be coded and then organised by criteria and evaluation questions using the evaluation matrix (Appendix V). This will facilitate the sorting, analysis and triangulation of data by criteria and key questions (outlined in the evaluation matrix) and/or other key foci that may emerge during the course of the evaluation) to inform report writing.

**Semi-structured Interviews**

Semi-structured interviews will be conducted with a variety of internal and external stakeholders of the African Water Facility. The interviews will be conducted either remotely (via Skype or telephone calls) or face-to-face. In the latter case, the Evaluation team will meet the interviewees at AWF Headquarters in Abidjan, during in-country visits, or at strategically selected international events (e.g., water related conference) where targeted stakeholders are expected to be present and can be interviewed. The following are the potential stakeholder groups that will be consulted by means of semi-structured interviews during the data collection phase: AWF beneficiaries, AWF and AfDB staff and managers, AWF donors, AMCOW, AWF Governing Council. The list of specific people under each category to be consulted by the evaluation team will be made with the support of the African Water Facility and African Development Bank. The interview protocols for each of these categories are included in Appendix VII.

**Online survey**

The online survey will be deployed to gather data on the overall relevance, effectiveness and value-added of the AWF and supported projects. While the case studies will allow the evaluation team to collect rich data and information on a sample of projects implemented in 9 countries, the survey will aim to reach out to the representatives of more projects (the grantees), thus helping gather additional evidence on the performance of the African Water Facility. The survey questionnaire is displayed in Appendix V); it consists mainly of closed questions, and respondents will be asked to give their answers by using rating scales with five values.

**Focus Group Discussion**

Focus Group Discussions (FDGs) will be used particularly to discuss specific topics of interest to the present evaluation. FDGs will be particularly held with AWF beneficiaries (in countries), depending on possibilities to convene them in one place, thus allowing the Evaluation team to engage with groups of different categories of beneficiaries (water service providers, with NGOs and state officials) allowing the Evaluation Team to tease out some of the power relations dynamics. Relevant partners of the African Water Facility at country level will be encouraged to participate in these discussions.

**3.3.8 Learning strategy during evaluation**

As indicated in section 3.1.2, the evaluation itself is conceived as a learning process. Thus, throughout the process, the evaluation team will implement a series of interrelated “learning oriented” activities,
ensuring that well informed lessons learnt and recommendations are drawn from the findings. The following activities will enable feedback loops to take place at different stages of the evaluation process, serving as opportunities for the AWF internal and external stakeholders (including the general public) to reflect on the evaluation results, and for the evaluation team to tease out learnings that will consolidate the final products.

**Field visits workshops**

The Evaluation Team plans to organise a workshop at the end of each country field mission, allowing the team to share preliminary findings (of the mission) with participating organisations – notably AWF beneficiaries and relevant partners – and gather their comments and feedback.

**Webinars**

The evaluation team plans to organize two webinars: one in French and one in English. These two events will be planned when the evaluation team has generated a sufficient amount of evidence and insights on the performance of the African Water Facility. These will then be shared, by means of webinars, with a wide audience of internal and external stakeholders – which will allow the team to inform these stakeholders about the evaluation findings while at the same time collecting their feedback and contributions. These reflective discussions will be used in the refining of the findings and finalising the evaluation deliverables.

**Final validation workshop**

The evaluation team will conduct a validation workshop with relevant stakeholders in Abidjan. The evaluation team will seek the participation of as many AWF internal and external stakeholders as possible: global, regional and country level partners. The aim of the workshop is to disseminate and validate the preliminary evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations. The discussion held during the workshop will be analysed and will be used to provide insights and triangulate findings that are presented in the mid-term evaluation report.

**Continuous dialogue between evaluation team members**

At the team level, a continuous dialogue between members of the evaluation team will be maintained throughout the entire evaluation process, ensuring that the evidence being collected and the ensuing analysis are used to answer the evaluation questions, drawing on the varied expertise available within the team. Notably, the portfolio analysis, policy and literature review, as well as country case studies (and the synthesis) will be drafted, then be subjected to an internal peer review process prior to producing the final reports. In that regard, the team has already created a shared database that will enable members to collaboratively contribute to each other’s assigned work and subsequent outputs.
### 3.3.9 Limitations and Mitigations Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIMITATIONS</th>
<th>MITIGATION STRATEGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some projects are quite old and institutional memory not available.</td>
<td>Work closely with AfDB IDEV to ensure as much information as possible is secured, and appropriate contacts identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data may be difficult to acquire, in particular with old projects, personnel may have changed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many projects selected are not located in large cities; some are remote areas.</td>
<td>Municipalities will have to be interviewed and brought from remote locations to facilitate interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover in the AfBD / AWF will limit available personnel for interviews.</td>
<td>AfDB/IDEV will need to identify both past and present personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential low response rates to survey.</td>
<td>Follow-up from AWF and IDEV to ensure response rates are adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays in visas slow travel.</td>
<td>Pre-plan travel well-ahead with support from IDEV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays in approval of draft reports.</td>
<td>Ensure presentation of documents on time and on schedule.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Evaluation Workplan

4.1. Schedule

The evaluation will be conducted in a phased approach with overlapping yet complementing activities implemented within six months from August 2019 to December 2019. Each Phase has a set of activities and key outputs delivered over a specific duration.

Table 17: Completion and Submissions of Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTS</th>
<th>DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DRAFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report</td>
<td>August 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Review Report</td>
<td>September 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and Literature Review Report</td>
<td>September 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Case Studies Reports (9)</td>
<td>October 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Case Study Synthesis Report</td>
<td>October 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Evaluation Report</td>
<td>November 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 1  Work Schedule and Planning for Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Deliverable #1: Inception Report | 1.1 Launch call with client  
1.2 Preliminary document review  
1.3 Virtual stakeholder consultation to inform the Inception Report  
1.4 Development of draft Inception Report and Work Plan  
1.5 Presentation of Inception Report to the RG (video-conference)  
1.6 Finalization of Inception Report and Work Plan |
| 2  | Deliverable #2: Portfolio Review Report | 2.1 Preparation of Final Database on AWF interventions (completed)  
2.2 Tabulation and Data Analysis  
2.3 Preparation of Portfolio Review Report |
| 3  | Deliverable #3: Policy and Literature Review Report | 3.1 Gathering Relevant Documents  
3.2 Document Analysis  
3.3 Preparation of note on policy and literature review report |
| 4  | Deliverable #4: Country Case Study Reports and Synthesis Report of Country Case Studies | 4.1 Desk review and field missions in 9 countries  
4.2 Preparation of country case study report  
4.3 Preparation of country case study report synthesis report |
| 5  | Deliverable #5: Final Evaluation Report | 5.1 Draft Evaluation Report  
5.2 Presentation of preliminary findings to the RG and Governing Council  
5.3 Final Evaluation Report |

- **Deliverables**
- **Turnaround time for IDEV/Reviewers to provide feedback on deliverables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.1.1. **Portfolio Review**

- **Duration:** 5 weeks
- **Start / End dates:** Mid-August / mid-September
- **Main activities:**
  - Preparation of Final Database on AWF interventions, focusing on the sample selected
  - Tabulation and Data Analysis
  - Preparation of Portfolio Review Report
- **Main deliverables:** Portfolio Review Report

4.1.2. **Policy and Literature Review**

- **Duration:** 5 weeks (conducted in parallel with the Portfolio Review)
- **Start / End dates:** Mid-August / mid-September
- **Main activities:**
  - Gathering Relevant Documents
  - Document Analysis
  - Preparation of note on policy and literature review report
- **Main deliverables:** Policy and Literature Review Report

4.1.3. **Country Case Studies**

- **Duration:** 10 weeks
- **Start / End dates:** Mid-August / Early-November
- **Main activities:**
  - Desk review, scheduling and field missions in 9 countries
  - Preparation of country case study report
  - Preparation of country case study report synthesis report
- **Main deliverables:** Country Case Study Reports (9) and Country Case Study Synthesis Report

4.1.4. **Evaluation Synthesis**

- **Duration:** 7 weeks (including 1 week of turnaround time to review the report)
- **Start / End dates:** Mid-October / Mid-December
Main activities:
- Draft Evaluation Report and presentation to the RG and Governing Council
- Final Evaluation Report

Main deliverables: Draft and Final Report, and Executive Summary

4.2. Deliverables

In line with the Terms of Reference, the Evaluation deliverables are as follows:

**D1: Inception Phase (August 7)**
- Documents review and stakeholders consultation with Abidjan
- Draft Inception Report
- Presentation and validation of the Draft Inception Report by the Reference Group
- Final Inception Report

**D2. Portfolio Review, Policy and Literature Review (September 15)**
- Preparation of Final Database on AWF interventions
- Tabulation and Data Analysis
- Preparation of the Portfolio Review Report
- Gathering relevant documents
- Documents Analysis
- Preparation of the Note on Policy and Literature Review Report

**D3. Country Case Studies (November 04)**
- Desk review and Field Mission in 10 Countries
- Preparation of Country Case Study Report (9) October 8
- Preparation of Country Case Study Synthesis Report November 4

- Preparation of the Evaluation Summary Report and Presentation of the Evaluation Findings to CODE and AWF Governing Council

**D5. Final Report (December 15)**
- Revisions and submission of Final Report

4.3. Roles and Responsibilities

All team members are specialists in M&E methods and approaches, including the use of quantitative, qualitative, participatory and mixed methods of data collection and analysis applied to field work and cases studies.
The core team will conduct all aspects of the work and be deployed on all country assignments.

- Dr. Laila Smith: Water Sector Expert and Team Leader
- Dr. Silas Mvulirwenande: Socio-Economist
- Hussein Amery: Institutional Expert and Project Manager

Universalia Quality assurance will be underpinned by Dr. Eric Abitbol, Senior Consultant, Environment, Security and Transformation.

The entire assignment will be supported by Luc Franche, Consultant, who will also be responsible for data management.
### Exhibit 2: Team Composition, Assignment and Key Experts’ Input

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>D-1</th>
<th>D-2</th>
<th>D-3</th>
<th>D-4</th>
<th>D-5</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Experts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-1</td>
<td>Laila Smith</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>Silas Mvulirwenande</td>
<td>Socio-Economist</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>Hussein Amery</td>
<td>Institutional Expert</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Key Experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-1</td>
<td>Eric Abitbol</td>
<td>Senior Advisor and Quality Assurance</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total time-input (in months):**

- **Sub-total:** 8.39
- **Sub-total:** 6.16
- **Total:** 8.61
Appendix I Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

EVALUATION OF AFRICA WATER FACILITY TRUST FUND,
2005- 2018

1. INTRODUCTION

The Independent Development Evaluation (IDEV) of the African Development Bank (“the Bank”) requires the services of a consulting firm with experience in evaluating complex development interventions to carry out an independent evaluation of the African Water Facility Trust Fund (AWTF). The terms of Reference, (TOR) sets out below the evaluation context, rationale and scope, and expected deliverables, timeline and management arrangements.

2. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

2.1 Background

The African Water Facility (AWF) was formulated as a response to the regional and international consensus on addressing the need for increased investment in the development and management of water resources in Africa. The AWF is an initiative led by the African Ministers’ Council on Water (AMCOW), which considers it an important instrument for achieving the objectives of the African Water Vision and Sustainable Development Goals on water and sanitation. AMCOW requested the African Development Bank (AfDB) host, administer and manage the resources of the Facility. The Bank welcomed this request and the Board of Governors approved its establishment as a Special Fund of the AfDB in May 2004. In pursuing its Trustee function, the AfDB created the AWF within its organizational structure in 2005, and started its core operational activities in January 2006.

The AWF has a Governing Council, responsible for guiding its operational activities and approves the operational focus and areas of interventions while the Board of Directors of the AfDB approves financing provided from the resources of the Facility. The AfDB maintains a Special Fund for financing project operations and administrative expenses of the AWF. Finance of the AWF Special Fund was received from the Governments of Canada, France, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Austria, Spain, UK, Algeria and the European Commission. As of the end of December 2018, the amount of
funds pledged by the various donors to the AWF amounted to Euro 178 million, of which 168 million has been committed.

Since inception, the AWF operations are guided by a series of strategies and operational programmes. The first one being the Operational Programme of 2005-2011, the 2012 - 2016 Strategic Plan, and finally the current 2017 - 2025 Strategy. All these strategies have fully aligned to the goals of the Africa Water Vision and Framework for Action as requested by the instrument establishing the AWF. The strategic focus of the three strategies have evolved over the years to provide sufficient room to address demands in the water sector. The table below highlights AWF strategic areas of focus per each period. Refer to Annex 2, 3, 4 for detailed strategy documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY NAME</th>
<th>STRATEGIC PERIOD</th>
<th>STRATEGY FOCUS AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Operational Strategy of the AWF    | 2005- 2011       | **Water Governance**: resulting in African countries and regional organizations having increased capacity to govern their water resources effectively based on Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) principles and transboundary cooperative arrangements that will foster regional cooperation and integration.  
**Investments to meet water needs**: resulting in advances made in meeting water needs through direct project investments and adoption of innovative technologies and approaches as well as preparing high impact investment projects.  
**Strengthening financial base**: resulting in African countries and regional organizations benefiting from increased financial resources due to an improved environment for sustainable financing and better availability and access to funds.  
**Improving water knowledge**: resulting in increased capacity for informed decision-making at all levels to guide water sector development planning and implementation for results. |
| AWF Strategic Plan                 | 2012- 2016       | i. Preparation of Investment Projects  
ii. Enhance Water Governance  
iii. Promote Water Knowledge |
| AWF Strategic Plan                 | 2017-2025        | **Project Preparation**: Primary strategic focus and involves the preparation of projects and programmes that optimise multipurpose water resources development and use. Core activities consists of supporting requisite material like feasibility studies and detailed designs that will validate and develop project concepts to an investment ready stage. |
Strengthening of water enabling environment or investments embedded within the preparation projects, including Water Governance, Institutional support and capacity building to manage and regulate water resources and Development of water information and knowledge base that guides water sector development planning and implementation.

**Catalytic Investments**: These are small strategic investments, or seed-funding, that provides grants or viability gap funding for innovative projects

**Investment Promotion**: A variety of marketing and investment promotion activities are undertaken by AWF in order to expand the number of investment opportunities and projects financed in the sector and, at the same time, contribute to speeding up the process from project identification to financial close.

The total number of projects approved since inception stands at 118 (amounting to € 155.03 million). Of these, seventy-five have been completed; thirty-five are on-going, of which eight are nearing completion.

The special nature of the AWF has necessitated undertaking a wide range of organizational activities that are essential to the effective operation of the Facility. These includes: establishing effective linkages with AMCOW; involvement in numerous activities to strengthen partnerships and create awareness; preparation of operational instruments and strategies; ensuring effective operational support to project executing agencies; mobilization of resources for implementing the AWF Operational Programme; and knowledge management. The Facility has devoted much time and internal resources on these non-lending activities to ensure that its operations flow smoothly.

### 2.2 Rationale of Evaluation

As part of recent recommendations in June 2018, the AfDB Board of Directors stipulated that an independent evaluation of the Facility’s operations should be undertaken. The purpose of this Evaluation exercise is as follows:

- To assess the performance of the AWFT over 2005 to 2018 against the OECD /DAC evaluation criteria.

- To assess the contribution of the AWTF in the implementation of the Bank’s Ten Year Strategy (TYS) 2013-2022 and High 5 priorities, and the Africa Water Vision

- Make actionable and relevant recommendations to guide future operations of the AWTF, taking into consideration the necessity to harmonize the AWTF activities with the other Bank’s water Trust funds.
In response to this recommendation, the Governing Council at its December 2018 meeting directed that this evaluation be conducted as soon as possible, given its importance to AWF operations.

This direction was made on the basis that the AWF has been operational for the past 14 years and has completed a substantial number of projects and a full evaluation of its operations as well as its impact is necessary. The assignment would focus on conducting an evaluation of AWF operations financed from 2005 to 2018, institutional issues related to its establishment and consolidation, and achievements relative to the objectives contained within its Instrument.

3. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND AUDIENCES

The evaluation combines two objectives as follows:

i. Accountability, through assessing the development and organizational effectiveness of the AWF
ii. Learning, by identifying the lessons on what has worked and what has not worked, and make actionable and relevant recommendations for the AWF’s project approach, selection, design, management, delivery and results, and stakeholder engagement.

The evaluation will also focus on the contribution of AWF as an instrument under AMCOW to accelerate and leverage the financing and implementation of water projects to attain the Africa Water Vision, Prior to this however, is the need to assess the performance of AWF projects.

3.1 Scope of the Evaluation

The scope of service will essentially involve a critical analysis of the operational and organisational activities undertaken, and a review of AWF institutional set-up, in order to determine the effectiveness of the institution in carrying out its mandate.

The evaluation will cover all AWF approved activities and all projects approved and cleared in principle, from 2005 to 2018. It will critically consider the grant operations portfolio and AWF governance structure, strategic directions, rules, procedures, and ways of working in practice.

Since the evaluation is covering all three strategic periods of AWF, deliberate efforts should be made to conduct a thorough analysis of the first two strategic periods focusing on its areas of focus, impacts and lessons. The evaluation covering the third strategic period should be more of process rather than performance since its still under implementation.

3.2 Targeted Audience of the Evaluation

The evaluation is of interest to the AWTF, the AWF’s Governing Council, Bank Board of Directors and AHWS Management, Donors (Governments of Canada, France, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Austria, Spain, UK, Algeria and the European Commission), potential donors to the Facility, and the Regional Members Countries (RMCs).
Other organisations to which the evaluation could be of interest are the Regional Economic Commissions (RECs), AMCOW on behalf of the African Union (AU), River Basin Organizations (RBOs), the African Network for Basin Organizations (ANBO), water research institutions including the International and Water Management Institute (IWMI), and other water-related institutions. Other stakeholders on the continent, as well as the global level with mandate on water issues in Africa would find this evaluation of interest.

4. EVALUATION FOCUS AND QUESTIONS

The evaluation will be based on the standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability as defined in the ECG good practices standards\(^\text{10}\), and also cross-cutting criteria including capacity building, gender mainstreaming, poverty reduction, environmental sustainability, climate change and good governance at project and AWF institutional level. The evaluation includes four main issues that relates to:

- AWF Global role and Relevance
- AWF Organisational Effectiveness
- AWF Development Effectiveness
- Assess the extent of the overall AWF project results (intended and unintended) and their sustainability and contribution to relevant long term and strategic development outcomes changes in the water sector.

The evaluation questions are framed around this evaluation criterion.

a.) **Relevance of AWF project objectives and designs** towards realizing the intended AWF strategic objectives consistent with Member states, RECs and the continents specific policies, strategies and plans.

Questions to be considered:

- To what extent are AWF’s projects’ objectives valid and suited to the African Water Vision, the Bank’s Ten Year Strategy and High 5 priorities? Establish the extent to which the objectives remained valid and relevant throughout implementation. Are the AWF governance and management arrangements, consistent with achieving the AWF strategic objectives?
- The extent to which the activities of the programs at the most appropriate level i.e. continental, regional or national, and outputs are consistent with the needs of beneficiaries, that is intended impacts and effects
- The extent to which the programs are competing with other programs or entities that are providing similar goods and services and recommend level of synergies to be established to maximize results delivery

\(^\text{10}\) [https://www.ecgnet.org/documents/4792/download](https://www.ecgnet.org/documents/4792/download)
• The extent to which the strategic approaches and the priority activities and outputs of the programs are appropriate for achieving their objectives.

b. **Effectiveness of AWF** in achieving targeted results under the three strategic periods.

*Questions to be considered:*
- The extent to which AWF programs achieved their objectives?
- What have been the outcomes of the intervention? e.g. leveraging other funds through follow-on investments and co-financing, governance, knowledge development, retention and transfer, partnerships?
- To what extent do the observed effects correspond to the objectives?
- What are the major factors that influenced the achievements or non-achievement of objectives?
- To what extent have AWF governance been effective to ensure successful execution of the projects?

c. **Efficiency** of AWF (fund) governance and management of AWF project implementation for delivering the intended results –how well the fund was governed and managed, and the projects implemented to lead to the intended results, and what were the driving factors?

*Questions to be considered:*
- To what extent were the AWF’s governance and management arrangements and delivery model (including the use of special accounts) cost-effective in delivering the AWF projects and their results compared to alternatives?
- How efficient were the AWF partnerships/collaboration with NGOs, CSOs, regional institutions and CB governments?
- The extent to which AWF programs’ activities and outputs are produced in a cost-effective way.
- To what extent were the objectives of AWF program activities achieved on time?

*Questions to be considered:*
- To what extent has AWF appropriate organisational and human resources capacity to carry out its operations;
- To what extent has AWF received adequate support on its operations from the AfDB?
- To what extent is AWF learning from experiences and adapt to changing demands?

d. **Sustainability** of AWF interventions results. The evaluation should assess the sustainability of the outcomes delivered through AWF projects.

*Questions to be considered:*
- To what extent has AWF contributed to strengthen institutional capacities - that will facilitate the continued flow of benefits associated with the project? (refer to PCR ratings)
- To what extent were AWF projects results sustained, and likely to be sustained, taking into account the institutional and human resource capacity of beneficiary countries/institutions?
- The extent to which the exit strategies of the programs are clearly defined in relation to continued resource mobilization initiatives by beneficiaries to attract follow on investments.
- What were the factors that affected the achievement or non-achievement of the sustainability of AWF activities?

e. **Forward Looking Aspects**

- What are the emerging strengths, weaknesses, constraints and opportunities in managing and implementing the AWF and its projects?
- What are the key risks, constraints and opportunities that the AWF will have to continue to deal with? What are the key options for improving AWF resources mobilization efforts to enable continued support to RMCs?
- What are the key options for improving the implementation performance of the AWF and its projects?
- What are the specific role the Bank must play to increase the financial viability of the AWF?

5. **METHOD AND PROCESS**

The evaluation approach will require a review of the supposed AWF theory of change across the three strategic periods i.e. 2006-2011, 2012-2016 and 2017-2025 and test its validity and alignment with the overall objective of AWF and give recommendations. The AWF theory will guide the refinement of the indicative evaluation questions, and the development of the evaluation methodological framework. Efforts should be made to critically analyse the results and lessons accrued from each strategic period. With regard to the third strategic period, focus will be on reviewing implementation status since its still under implementation.

The inception phase of the evaluation will clearly define and detail the most credible methodological framework and refining evaluation questions. The methodological approach will be of mixed designs and methods. The data sources, the basis for the evaluation streams of evidence, should include but not be limited to the following:

- **Desk review** of relevant documents/reports and databases including those of the AWF (including rules, procedures, Governance Council and Board of Directors documentation and minutes, progress report, website material etc.) and its projects, the Bank, and available literature.
- **Portfolio review** of AWF’s projects (i.e. grant operations approvals cleared by the Governance Council/Board of Directors and the President).
- **Review of policy and strategies** that provide the context of the functioning of the AWF. The evolving context, includes but is not limited; (i) Evolution of the African or Global
strategies and resolutions on Water (ii) (ii) findings of Africa infrastructure country diagnostic reports in relation to water investments and development (iv) the evolution of AfDB practices in regard to financing options; policies and strategies of national governments on water; AMCOW policy review documents on RMCs.

- **Substantive interviews and discussions** (face to face, teleconference, and focus group discussions or by other means) with key AWF stakeholders including the Governing Council, Bank’s Board of Directors and Management, donors, other development partners, AWF/AHWS staff, AMCOW and key African regional and national institutions.

- **Evidence-based case studies** of a sample of AWF projects; this will complement the evidence from the portfolio review. It will focus on generating evidence on the substantive AWF outputs and outcomes, and on the key success/limiting factors –where project performance was satisfactory/was not satisfactory.

**Sampling:** The evaluator shall develop a proper sampling procedure to determine a representative sample from the defined population of interest, subject to agreement with the Client.

Among others, the following key parameters must be considered when defining the population of interest among others: strategic area of focus (catalytic, project preparation, transboundary, integrated water resources management, water governance and knowledge), geographical location (to have a continental balance). Field visits shall be organised to visit some sampled project areas to collect data and develop at least 10 country specific case studies for different projects.

The evaluation process will include the following phases:

1. Inception phase to produce the inception report, which will include the full evaluation methodology (including sampling, evaluation matrix with refined evaluation questions, limitations, risks and mitigations, data collection and analysis tools/instruments, rating scale and standards), detailed work plan, evaluation team composition and responsibilities for each of the individual evaluation team members. This will involve inter-alia desk reviews and discussions with key stakeholders, rapid assessment of available data, and review of the supposed AWF theory of change/results chain and give recommendations, stakeholder mapping and preparation of the inception report. The draft inception report will be presented to the reference group for discussion and validation.

2. Portfolio review phase, which will overlap with the inception phase. Involving desk reviews and discussions around the sampled projects, the phase will report on the AWF project design and implementation, and results, and drivers of the portfolio performance, and issues for further assessment during the case studies.

3. Data collection and analyses for the generation of findings, and drawing of conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned: This phase will concern all the data sources, highlighted above. It will be the basis for the preparation of the background reports (portfolio performance review, organisational and management performance review (focusing on the quality of the AWF institutional arrangements, and coordination and partnership mechanisms) and evidence based case studies’ reports), and the evaluation
synthesis report. Emerging findings from fieldwork and country visits will be shared with in-country stakeholders for initial feedback.

iv. Synthesis, report writing and feedback leading to the draft evaluation synthesis report and its presentation to the AWF evaluation Reference Group (defined under the quality assurance section below), Governing Council and other stakeholders for feedback on the draft evaluation findings

v. Production and delivery of the final evaluation report in the appropriate format and languages (English) for dissemination and follow up

vi. Communication and dissemination of evaluation results

6. DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE

The evaluation will be carried out over a period of 6 months starting from 1 June 2019. The deliverables are presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Number of person-days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inception Phase</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documents’ review and stakeholders consultation mission in Abidjan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Draft Inception Report</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presentation and validation of the Draft Inception Report by the Reference Group</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Final Inception Report</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portfolio Review</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparation of Final Database on AWF interventions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tabulation and Data Analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparation of the Portfolio Review Report</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy and Literature Review</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gathering relevant documents</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documents Analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparation of the Note on Policy and Literature Review Report</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Case Studies</strong></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Desk review and Field Mission in 10 Countries</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparation of Country Case Study Report (10)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparation of Country Case Study Report Synthesis Report</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Number of person-days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWFTF Technical Evaluation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparation of the Evaluation Summary Report and Presentation of the Evaluation Findings to CODE and AWF Governing Council</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. PROFILE OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

A credible evaluation Consulting Firm with the appropriate qualifications, experiences and competencies will be required to undertake the evaluation work. The Firm is required to exercise diligence and professionalism, engage competent personnel, and adopt sound, and best-practice approaches in the execution of the assignment to deliver on the assignment.

- For the Water Sector Expert (Team leader), the candidate shall possess at least 15 years in Evaluation experience and an advanced degree in water resources management/development or related field of study. The consultant should have at least 10 years’ experience in water resources planning and management, including demonstrable experience in the links between water, sanitation, environment and economic development. S/he shall have experience working on the management of development programmes in water and sanitation and must possess good leadership skills, including teamwork, team coordination, and communication, team motivation, and proven experience in evaluations.

- For the Socio-Economist, the candidate shall have advanced degree in social science, including at least 10 years’ experience in the conception, design and management of development programmes targeted at poverty reduction in general; and specifically related to the water sector. The candidate shall demonstrate familiarity with economic, social and gender mainstreaming in water activities, social impact analysis, NGO/CSO collaboration, stakeholder participation.

- For the Institutional Expert, the candidate shall have at least a master’s degree, preferably in business/public administration, management, social sciences, development studies, or engineering. A minimum of 10 years of professional experience in Management Consulting covering institutional development, programme planning and management, governance programming, and monitoring and evaluation, at the national and international levels. Knowledge of results-based approaches is an asset. Specific experience in the water sector is essential.
All team members should have extensive and proven experience in monitoring and evaluating complex development programmes in water and other related natural resource systems and knowledge of development evaluation designs, and methods and techniques (qualitative and quantitative approaches incorporating poverty, gender and social aspects).

8. MANAGEMENT AND QUALITY ASSURANCE ARRANGEMENTS

IDEV team will manage the evaluation and shall be responsible for the following:

(vi) Overall guidance and approval of the evaluation process and outputs (inception report; draft and final evaluation reports);

(vii) Quality assurance process including the external peer review of the key evaluation products, and receiving comments from the AWTF/AHWS and Reference Group;

(viii) Recruiting the evaluation team and briefing the evaluation team, and hold technical meetings and discussions with the evaluation team;

(ix) Establishing the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG), and organize forums for internal and external review, facilitate input and guidance required from the reference group;

(x) Managing all data, evidence and materials that will be produced by the evaluation team;

(xi) Communicating to the Bank’s Management and Board of Directors, and the AWF Governing Council, and disseminating the evaluation results to the key stakeholders.

The AWTF will provide necessary logistical support to the evaluation team especially in arranging stakeholder meetings, and facilitating access to relevant documents/reports and database, and arranging visits to AWTF project sites and grantees/beneficiaries. The AWTF/AHWS will also review and provide comments on the evaluation process and products.

A group of external and internal peer reviewers will be identified to provide written comments on the evaluation outputs (Inception report, Portfolio review, Policy and strategy review report, Country case studies report, Technical report and summary Report).

The Evaluation Reference Group will be composed of selected Bank staff (IDEV, AWF/AHWS and other bank departments). The reference group will review and comment on the AWF evaluation process and outputs (inception report; evaluation reports), and provide a sound platform for rapid feedback especially on the evaluation plan (including design and methods) and emerging evaluation findings.

The Final Report must take into account comments on the draft Final Report from the Reference Group, the peer reviewers and IDEV.
9. EVALUATION BUDGET

The evaluation budget will comprise all expenses including fees, travel and taxes. The firm will provide a detailed budget with breakdown against activities and key milestones. All budget requirements will be paid by AWTF.
Appendix II List of consulted documents

AfDB. 2016. *Scaling up implementation of the ten years strategy: the High 5s Agenda.*
AWF. 2019. *AWF Governing Council Members*
AWF. No date. *Guidelines for preparation of the project completion report to be submitted by the recipient to the AWF.*
AWF. No date. *List of AWF donors.* PDF document shared by AWF to the evaluation team.
AWF. No date. *Projects stakeholders list.*
AWF. No date. *AWF Projects Database.* Excel document shared by AWF to the evaluation team.
FD Bougaire (Principle Water and Sanitation Engineer). *Towards Water for All by 2025, Strategic Plan 2012-2016.* (power point presentation, no date).


*Note: Numerous PADs, Appraisals and PCRs were also consulted for projects.*
Appendix III: Interview protocols

Interview protocol for AMCOW

Universalia, a management consulting firm based in Canada, was contracted by the African Development Bank to conduct an Evaluation of the African Water Facility. The evaluation covers all AWF approved activities and all projects approved and cleared in principle, from 2005 to 2018. It critically considers the project operations portfolio and AWF governance structure, strategic directions, rules, procedures, and ways of working in practice.

The evaluation combines two objectives: (1) Accountability, through assessing the development and organizational effectiveness of the AWF (2) Learning, by identifying the lessons on what has worked and what has not worked, and make actionable and relevant recommendations for the AWF’s project approach, selection, design, management, delivery and results, and stakeholder engagement.

The evaluation focus on assesses the performance of AWF projects and also focuses on the contribution of AWF as an instrument under AMCOW to accelerate and leverage the financing and implementation of water projects to attain the Africa Water Vision.

One important research and review methods being deployed is interviews aimed at gathering data on the overall relevance, effectiveness and value-added of the AWF projects. As such, we kindly request your participation in this review through participation in this interview.

Background and respondent profile

1. Name
2. Title / Organization
3. Please could you briefly describe your role?

Questions

1. Have you engaged with the AWF directly? If so, in what capacity?
2. When did this engagement begin?
3. How effective do you feel the AWF has been in meeting the Africa Vision 2025? (testing for relevance)
4. What do you feel have been its most substantial achievements since it was started in 2005? (testing for effectiveness)
5. Which of the Vison’s core priorities do you feel the AWF has been able to demonstrate progress on? (testing for relevance and effectiveness)

6. Which of the core thematic areas do you feel is gaining the most traction on the continent as a result of the AWF’s work 1) governance through transboundary water management 2) improved national water management through strengthened institutional capacity; 3) increased leveraging of funds for investments;

7. In the direction that the AWF has taken in its last strategy 2017-2025, do you feel that is priorities are still aligned with the Africa Vision 2025? (testing for relevance)

8. Do you feel that the manner in which the AWF is governed enables sufficient accountability to AMCOw? (testing for ownership)

9. If not, are there any suggestions you would make for improvements in the current governance arrangements? (testing for effectiveness)

10. How visible is the AWF’s programmatic work in AMCOW’s engagement at a regional/global scale? (testing for relevance)

11. Do you feel that the AWF has improved in its communicating the results of its work?

12. Do you think its knowledge management programming has been effective in raising awareness at the domestic level for increasing financing to the sector?

13. How effective do you think the AFDB has been in supporting the AWF in meeting the strategic interests as outlined by AMCOw? (testing for effectiveness)

14. Given that the Africa Vision 2025 was drafted in 2000, nearly 20 years ago, do you feel that this vision is still the appropriate guiding document for the AWF? (Testing for relevance)

15. If not, what needs to change in the vision to better reflect today’s realities? (testing for relevance)

16. On the operational side, where do you feel the AWF’s efficiencies could be improved?

17. If we had to start all over based on what we have learnt over the past 19 years, what would we do differently in the design of the AWF as a facility to mobilize resources on the continent?
Interview Protocol for AWF donors/funding partners

Universalia has been commissioned by the African development Bank to evaluate the African Water Facility for the period 2005-2018. The evaluation combines two objectives: (1) Accountability, through assessing the development and organizational effectiveness of the AWF (2) Learning, by identifying the lessons on what has worked and what has not worked, and make actionable and relevant recommendations for the AWF’s project approach, selection, design, management, delivery and results, and stakeholder engagement.

One important research and review methods being deployed is this evaluation is “interviewing” internal and external stakeholders of the AWF, to gather data on the overall relevance, effectiveness and value-added of the AWF projects and future directions of the Facility. As such, we kindly request your participation in this review as one of the funding partners of the AWF by granting the evaluation team an interview. Therefore, Universalia would like to get in touch with you at your earliest convenience to schedule a 30-45-minute phone or Skype call. The objective of this conversation is to get your views on the African Water Facility and to discuss future funding conditions.

Background and respondent profile

1. Name
2. Title / Organization
3. Please could you briefly describe your role?

Questions

4. What were the major reasons that led your organization to become a donor for the African Water Facility? When did this happen?

5. What do you consider the major achievements of African Water Trust Fund after more than 15 years of implementation? Have the results achieved by the Facility so far met your expectations as a donor? (testing effectiveness)

6. In your view as a donor, what are the priorities of the African Water Facility in the coming years that you align with the priorities of your organization? (Forward looking aspects)

7. What opportunities do you foresee for the AWF as a water Trust Fund?

8. What are your views on the sustainability of the African Water Facility? (sustainability)

9. Apart from sustainability challenges, what are the major risks facing the Facility? (Forward looking)
10. Do you think a Trust Fund has been a good modality for pooling donor resources for the African Water Sector? (Relevance)

11. Are there any other modalities you see emerging that might be better suited to deal with the funding challenges confronting the continent?

12. If you were to continue supporting AWF, what would be the key elements they would need to change in their performance? Where do you see the biggest room for improvement?

13. What would be the key conditions required to ensure alignment with your organization’s organizational and strategic requirements? (e.g., earmarking, regional expansion, targeted countries, etc.) (Relevance)

14. Above and beyond financial contributions to the AWF, what other roles do you think you could play in supporting the African Water Facility? Would you be willing to convince new donors in your network to support the Facility?

15. Is there anything else that you would like to share with us regarding your experience with the African Water Facility?

Thank you for your time and input!
Interview protocol for AfDB/AWF staff and managers

Universalia, a management consulting firm based in Canada, was contracted by The African Development Bank (AfDB) to conduct the Evaluation of the African Water Facility 2005-2018. The purpose of the evaluation is to help the AfDB with the following: (1) account for the performance of the AWF during the period 2005-2018 and disclose the results to the targeted audience of the evaluation (hereinafter referred to as the Audience) in a transparent manner, (2) extract learnings from the implementation of the AWF for the period covered by the evaluation (2005 -2018), and (3) identify gaps in the design and implementation of the AWF and propose practical remedial actions or recommendations for improvement of the Fund and of the grant management processes.

One important data collection instrument being deployed is the current evaluation is “interviewing” aimed at gathering data and information from a variety of AWF internal and external stakeholders on the overall performance, relevance and value-added of the African Water Facility. As such, we kindly request your participation in this independent review through this interview. The interview should take between 1-2 hours and will greatly help to inform the study. All information provided will be kept confidential. Findings will be presented in aggregate form and will not be attributed to individual respondents.

Background and respondent profile

1. Name
2. Title / Organization
3. Please could you briefly describe your role?

Questions

Relevance of the AWF

1. The African Development Bank has supported the African water sector through a variety of instruments over the past decades. What was the major reason for using a Trust Fund?
2. The African Water Facility intervention logic has been reviewed three times since the creation of the Facility, as evidenced by the logical frameworks and operational strategies developed for each of the three periods. Could you talk to us about the major shifts made in your intervention logics, and the rationale behind these shifts?

Development effectiveness (output and outcome levels)

3. How would you describe the level of achievement of the objectives set for the African Water (in terms of both outcomes and impact) – has it achieved the objectives, is it on track to achieve them or has it failed to do so? And Why?
4. Trust Funds, such as the AWF, are always based on a set of assumptions, but reality is sometimes different from expectations. Have there been unintended positive or negative results/impacts of the African Water facility so far? What evidence is there for this?

5. Support mechanisms such as Water Trust Funds often aspire to create systemic changes in the sector (market dynamics, policies, behaviours and attitudes). To what degree do you think the African Water Facility is contributing to systemic changes in the African water sector?

6. Have there been any shifts in the global environment (such as climate change or the aid environment) that have affected the African Water Facility’s outcomes and impact?

**Institutional effectiveness (grant process and management)**

7. So far, to what extent has the AFW “marketing” and “project selection” approaches enabled the Facility to attract higher quality applications?

8. Has the approaches changed or remained the same throughout the three strategic periods? If there were changes, what was the rationale for these changes?

9. What is the level of AfDB and AMCOW’s engagement in the selection process, if any? Does this level of engagement work for you as a Facility?

10. How well does the AWF grant payments system work?

11. How does the AWF engage with grantees to manage project level performance and risks? To what extent do you feel that this approach has been successful in supporting projects to deliver their intended outcomes?

12. How flexible are the AWF management arrangements and processes?

13. Does the AWF have an M&E framework strategy which enables you to track and aggregate grantee performance at programme level?

**Sustainability**

14. A key question facing all Trust Funds is what happens to grantees and their projects after the end of the life of the fund. To what extent is sustainability of supported projects considered at the outset/design of the African Water Facility?
15. What evidence is there that the projects supported through the African Water Facility have been / will be taken to the next level – e.g., actual implementation of developed IWRM plans?

16. To what extent do the projects supported by AWF trigger additional funding – from private sector, national governments? What systems are in place to track this?

Cross cutting issues

17. To what extent are each of the following cross-cutting issues (capacity development, environmental sustainability, good governance, gander equity, climate change) considered or addressed in AWF programme design (e.g., to a greater extent, to some extent, to a lesser extent)? Project design?

18. What weighting is given to the following cross-cutting issues (capacity development, environmental sustainability, good governance, gander equity, climate change) in the project selection process?

19. Does the AFDB and AWF have technical advisors on cross cutting areas on the selection panel?

To what degree are cross-cutting issues reflected in the results framework at project and programme level? What are the weak spots in relation to how cross-cutting issues are integrated into the design, implementation and performance management of the issues.

Forward looking

20. Having implemented the Facility for more than a decade now, how would you describe the future of this instrument?

21. What major risks do you foresee facing the AWF (e.g., regarding financial viability of the Fund itself and supported projects)?

22. What important opportunities do you foresee that the Facility should seize in order to achieve its objectives?

23. In your view, what are the specific roles the Bank must play to increase the financial viability of the AWF?
Interview protocol for Implementing Agents

Universalia, a management consulting firm based in Canada, was contracted by the African Development Bank to conduct an Evaluation of the African Water Facility. The evaluation covers all AWF approved activities and all projects approved and cleared in principle, from 2005 to 2018. It critically considers the project operations portfolio and AWF governance structure, strategic directions, rules, procedures, and ways of working in practice.

The evaluation combines two objectives: (1) Accountability, through assessing the development and organizational effectiveness of the AWF (2) Learning, by identifying the lessons on what has worked and what has not worked, and make actionable and relevant recommendations for the AWF’s project approach, selection, design, management, delivery and results, and stakeholder engagement.

The evaluation focuses on assessing the performance of AWF projects and also focuses on the contribution of AWF as an instrument under AMCOW to accelerate and leverage the financing and implementation of water projects to attain the Africa Water Vision.

One important research and review method being deployed is this survey aimed at gathering data on the overall relevance, effectiveness and value-added of the AWF projects. As such, we kindly request your participation in this review through participation in this interview.

Background and respondent profile

1. Name
2. Title / Organization
3. Please could you briefly describe your role?
4. How long have you been in this position/organization?

Questions

1. Please provide an overview of your work with the AWF

2. The AWF has been through three strategic phases with the broader aim of mobilizing investments into the water sector in Africa. This interview is relating to project xx in which your organization was engaged to implement. How has the AWF adapted to changing country contexts over the three strategic phases in which the facility has been active? Please provide specific examples?

RELEVANCE – CHANGING COUNTRY CONTEXTS
3. To what degree do you think the AWF is designed to be demand responsive to the needs of the domestic stakeholders it is engaging with at a country/multilateral level?

4. How were the priorities of the AWF determined in the country where you have been active in implementing the x project?

ToC

5. What is the link between the activities, such as the project(s) you have engaged in or with and what the AWF is trying to achieve? In other words, what is the theory of change of the AWF?

6. What do you see as some of the killer assumptions it has been operating with?

EFFECTIVENESS

7. Are you familiar with the AWF results framework that your project is supposed to feed into? If so, to what extent did the funded activities contribute to the achievement of the AWF outcomes as per the results framework?
   a. analytical products produced with resources from the AWF (feasibility studies, policy notes, survey work, reports) targeted at policymakers or for project preparation.
   b. technical assistance projects (project design, capacity building) that provide clear and practical recommendations for follow on financing.
   c. dialogue and knowledge sharing events (workshops, conferences, exchanges, leading to clear policy conclusions in focus areas.
   d. activities that have at least somewhat influenced policy at a domestic level?
   e. volume of funding leveraged by AWF activities for Bank operations and/or programs.
   f. capacity development (skills development, certification programs, training for capacity building, participation in events and workshops).

Efficiency

8. Does the grants selection process enable the AWF to pursue its operational objectives?

9. What kind of support is available to you when you reach a bottleneck in the project you are implementing that is financed by the AWF? How does this support work? How could it be improved?

10. Do you feel the vehicle is offering value for money in terms of the fast-tracking process for project approval?

COMMUNICATION

11. How effective are the current methods or tools used by the AWF to communicate its achieved results? ( – (prompt: annual reports, web site, steering committees, briefs. What else?)

RECOMMENDATIONS
12. If you were to do things differently, what recommendations would you have for the AWF (leveraging greater collaboration with other finance vehicles? How it selects projects? How it tries to leverage influence with domestic stakeholders? areas of focus, etc.)
Appendix IV Survey Questionnaire

Survey Questionnaire for African Water Facility Stakeholders

1. Purpose and conditions of the Survey

Universalia, a management consulting firm based in Canada, was contracted by the African Development Bank to conduct an Evaluation of the African Water Facility. The evaluation covers all AWF approved activities and all projects approved and cleared in principle, from 2005 to 2018. It critically considers the project operations portfolio and AWF governance structure, strategic directions, rules, procedures, and ways of working in practice.

The evaluation combines two objectives: (1) Accountability, through assessing the development and organizational effectiveness of the AWF (2) Learning, by identifying the lessons on what has worked and what has not worked, and make actionable and relevant recommendations for the AWF’s project approach, selection, design, management, delivery and results, and stakeholder engagement.

The evaluation focuses on assessing the performance of AWF projects and the contribution of AWF as an instrument under AMCOW to accelerate and leverage the financing and implementation of water projects to attain the Africa Water Vision.

One the evaluation methods being deployed is this survey aimed at gathering data on the overall relevance, effectiveness and value-added of the AWF projects. As such, we kindly request your participation in this review through the completion of this survey. The survey should take less than 15 minutes to complete and will greatly help to inform the study.

2. General instructions

- The questionnaire consists mainly of closed questions
- To indicate your answer, please tick the relevant box on the provided list of options
- If for any reason you cannot respond to a question, please select “Don’t know”.
- Please note that the survey is designed in a way that allows you to pick it up where you left off - if you are obliged to stop for some time
- All information provided will be kept confidential. Findings will be presented in aggregate form and will not be attributed to individual respondents.
Section I: Identification of respondent

1. Was your organization involved in a project funded by the AWF?
   a. No (stop survey here if answer is no)
   b. Yes
   c. Don't know (stop survey here if they say so)

2. Please chose the option that best describes your current employment
   a. I am an African Development Bank staff.
   b. I work at AMCOW
   c. I work in a United Nations Agency
   d. I work for an Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)
   e. I work for the Government of my country (central, regional, municipal)
   f. I work for a basin organization
   g. I work for a regional organization
   h. Other, please specify: ________________

3. Please indicate your position/job Title
   --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Section II: Identification of supported project

4. Please indicate the name of your project supported by AWF
   --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

5. When did your organization receive funding from the AWF?
   a. Between 2005 and 2011
   b. Between 2012 and 2016
   c. Between 2016 and 2018
   d. Don't know

6. Has the implementation period ended for the activities funded by the AWF?
   a. No
   b. Yes
   c. Don't know
7. Which of the following areas did your project address?
   a. Preparation of Investment Projects
   b. Direct catalytic project investments from AWF;
   c. Enhance / Improve Water Governance
   d. Promote / Improve Water Knowledge
   e. Investment Promotion
   f. Don't know

8. In which of the following ways have you been involved with the AWF project(s)? Please select all that apply
   a. Drafting and sending a proposal.
   b. Managed and executed project activities
   c. Monitored and/or evaluated project activities
   d. Other, please specify: __________________

Section III. Assessing AWF relevance

9. To what extent are the activities funded by the AWF relevant to your organization’s mandate?
   a. Minimally
   b. Partially
   c. Substantially
   d. Fully
   e. Don’t know/no opinion

10. To what extent are the activities funded by the AWF consistent with the water and sanitation needs and priorities of the country/municipality in which you work?
    a. Minimally
    b. Partially
    c. Substantially
    d. Fully
    e. Don’t know/no opinion

11. To what extent are the activities funded by the AWF relevant to the African Development Bank’s Ten Year Strategy and High 5 priorities?
    a. Minimally
    b. Partially
    c. Substantially
    d. Fully
    e. Don’t know/no opinion

12. To which of the African Water Vision 2025 actions, were the activities funded by the AWF project related to? Please select all that apply.
    a. Strengthening governance of water resources;
b. Improving water wisdom;
c. Meeting urgent water needs;
d. Strengthening the financial base for the desired water future
e. Don’t know

Section III. Assessing AWF effectiveness: developmental and institutional

13. To what extent have the implementation of activities and progress toward results under the project been monitored and reported?
   a. Minimally
   b. Partially
   c. Substantially
   d. Fully
   e. Don’t know/no opinion

14. To what extent the AWF-funded project’s activities have been implemented?
   a. Minimally
   b. Partially
   c. Substantially
   d. Fully
   e. Don’t know/no opinion
     i. Redirect to this question if responded a) or b) at question # 11, optional:
        what are the main factors explaining the low implementation rate of the planned activities? __________________

15. To what extent have the implementation of the activities funded by the AWF contributed to achieving expected results?
   a. Minimally
   b. Partially
   c. Substantially
   d. Fully
   e. Don’t know/no opinion
     i. what are the main factors explaining why the activities did or did not yield the expected results? ______________

16. Are/were the AWF funded activities supporting an already existing and ongoing program or project (supported by AfDB or another Agency)?
   a. No
   b. Yes
   c. Don’t know

17. (Only for people who answered b) at question # 16) To what extent are the activities funded by the AWF relevant and synergistic to the program to which they are attached?
18. (Only for people who answered b) at question # 16) To what extent has the implementation of the activities funded by the AWF contributed to achieving the objectives set in the program to which they are attached?
   a. Minimally
   b. Partially
   c. Substantially
   d. Fully
   e. Don’t know/no opinion
      i. optional: what are the main factors explaining why the activities did not contribute to achieving the objectives set in the program to which they are attached? ______________

19. Regarding the outputs of the activities funded by the AWF, have these activities (Please select all that apply):
   a. Resulted in having increased capacity to govern water resources effectively based on Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) principles and transboundary cooperative arrangements that will foster regional cooperation and integration.
   b. Resulted in advances made in meeting water needs through direct project investments and adoption of innovative technologies and approaches as well as preparing high impact investment projects.
   c. Resulted in African countries and regional organizations benefiting from increased financial resources due to an improved environment for sustainable financing and better availability and access to funds.
   d. Resulted in increased capacity for informed decision-making at all levels to guide water sector development planning and implementation for results.
   e. Resulted in feasibility studies and detailed designs that will validate and develop project concepts to an investment ready stage.
   f. Resulted in strengthening of water enabling environment or investments embedded within the preparation projects,
   g. Resulted in capacity building to manage and regulate water resources,
   h. Resulted in development of water information and knowledge base that guides water sector development planning and implementation.
   i. Supported the development of innovative projects
   j. Resulted in expanding the number of investment opportunities and projects financed in the sector
   k. None of the above
20. To what extent was the AWF’s application process effective and efficient (e.g., clarity of calls for proposals, ambiguity of criteria, support provided, time required to complete the process or to get feedback for AWF)?
   a. Minimally
   b. Partially
   c. Substantially
   d. Fully
   e. Don’t know/no opinion

21. How would assess the level of management and technical support you received from the AWF staff and managers?
   a. Enough for us
   b. Not enough for us
   c. Too much for us

22. Do you believe the AWF had the appropriate organisational and human resources capacity to support / carry out the projects?
   a. No
   b. Yes
   c. Don’t know

23. To what extent has AWF contributed to strengthening institutional capacities that may facilitate the continued flow of benefits associated with your project?
   a. Minimally
   b. Partially
   c. Substantially
   d. Fully
   e. Don’t know/no opinion

24. To what extent was AWF governance and management been effective to ensure successful execution of the projects?
   a. Minimally
   b. Partially
   c. Substantially
   d. Fully
   e. Don’t know/no opinion

25. Overall, how efficient was your collaboration with AWF?
   a. Fully efficient
   b. Substantially efficient
   c. Partially efficient
   d. Not efficient at all
   e. Don’t know
26. Are there any comments or recommendations you would like to make regarding the AWF in general?

27. Are there any comments or recommendations you would like to make regarding the AWF monitoring and reporting process?

Thank You for completing our survey