An Evaluation Synthesis of Partnerships
Inception Report

April, 2018

Draft version
# Table of Contents

I. Background and Context ........................................................................................................................................ 3  
   A. Introduction .................................................................................................................................................. 3  
   B. Partnerships in development ...................................................................................................................... 3  
   C. Partnerships at the Bank .......................................................................................................................... 4  
      a. Long-term Strategy 2013-22 .................................................................................................................. 4  
      b. Partnership categories ........................................................................................................................ 5  
      c. Important Bank partnerships .............................................................................................................. 6  
   D. Partnership evaluations ............................................................................................................................ 6  
   E. Findings from the ESP scoping phase ....................................................................................................... 7  

II. Purpose and scope ........................................................................................................................................... 8  
   A. Evaluation synthesis goal and objectives ................................................................................................. 8  
   B. Evaluation synthesis questions ............................................................................................................... 9  

III. Proposed approach, methods and evaluability .......................................................................................... 11  
   A. Approach .................................................................................................................................................. 11  
   B. Main reports for review ........................................................................................................................ 11  
      a. IDEV and project evaluations .............................................................................................................. 11  
      b. Other Bank reports .......................................................................................................................... 12  
      c. External evaluations ......................................................................................................................... 12  
   C. Sampling .................................................................................................................................................. 12  
   D. Evaluability and limitations of the ESP ................................................................................................. 13  
   E. Principles ................................................................................................................................................ 14  
   F. Quality assurance .................................................................................................................................... 15  

IV. Work streams and timeline ....................................................................................................................... 16  
   A. Work streams for ESP phase II and III ................................................................................................. 16  
   B. Next steps and timeline ......................................................................................................................... 16  

V. ANNEXES ................................................................................................................................................... 18  
   Annex 1: Summary of the findings of the Scoping mission ........................................................................ 18  
   Annex 2: Terms of Reference ....................................................................................................................... 22  
   Annex 3: Trust Funds / Global Partnerships / Special Initiatives ............................................................ 26  
   Annex 5: Theory of Change of Partnerships: Case of the AfDB ............................................................. 32  
   Annex 6: Timeline of the evaluation .......................................................................................................... 33  
   Annex 7: List of Documents for Evaluation Synthesis of Partnerships .................................................. 34  
   Annex 7: Schedule of Scoping Mission / Persons met ............................................................................. 37
I. Background and Context

A. Introduction

The Independent Evaluation of Development (IDEV) of the African Development Bank (AFDB) is carrying out an Evaluation Synthesis of Partnerships (ESP). This inception report summarizes initial findings from the ESP scoping phase which included reviews of relevant documents and literature and interviews at the Bank’s headquarters. It describes the main objectives, scope, evaluation questions and approach for the ESP.

This Evaluation Synthesis precedes and provides background information for a full-scale evaluation of AfDB’s partnerships that is part of the IDEV 2016-18 work plan and scheduled to start in the second half of 2018. Its title is: “Bank’s partnerships: co-financing, syndication and coordination”.

Recent developments at the Bank and elsewhere merit a broad scope of evaluating the Bank’s partnerships. At the level of the Bank, finance and non-finance-oriented partnerships are prominent in its priority development areas such as the High 5s and the Bank’s resource mobilization objectives beyond the African Development Fund (ADF) and Trust Fund windows. Partnerships are also considered as having to play an important role in implementing the Bank’s new Delivery and Business Development Model (DBDM). At the global level, the importance of leveraging partnerships to accelerate the development in Africa is evident in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the European Initiative on Partnership with Africa (Compact with Africa) while partnerships are also high on the agenda of the Evaluation Coordination Group (ECG).

The ESP would be mainly based on a desk review of IDEV and Bank-wide evaluations, reviews, policies and operational guidelines and interviews at the Bank, as well as a review of external partnership evaluations by other International Financial Institutions (IFIs) and selected donors and relevant literature.

B. Partnerships in development

Partnerships for development are ubiquitous. In general terms, partnerships describe collaborative relationships toward mutually agreed objectives, with different degrees of intensity and formality. Accordingly, there are many definitions and ways to categorize and map partnerships.

The 2005 Paris Declaration put partnership principles for improved aid effectiveness at the center of the development agenda, including commitments to improve country ownership, donor harmonization and alignment. These principles were reaffirmed by the High Level Fora in Accra and Busan in 2008 and 2011 respectively. Various conferences and agreements on Climate Change and the
2015 SDGs further built the momentum towards using partnerships for development, while existing and emerging donors shifted the development agenda by using new forms of partnerships, such as PPPs, knowledge networks and platforms, and South-South support.

C. Partnerships at the Bank

The African Development Bank is well positioned to work in partnership with Governments, other donors, civil society and private sector through its High 5s agenda, its strong commitment to partnerships in the Bank’s Ten Year Strategy (TYS, 2013-2022), its network of country and other offices on the continent, and its large program of trust funds, co-finance and as a widely trusted high-level convening power in Africa. Partnerships are a cornerstone in the Bank’s goal to contribute to Africa’s economic and social development beyond its own lending programme. Partnership issues have been high on the Bank’s agenda since its Medium-Term Strategy 2008-2012. In recent years the AfDB also mainstreamed many partnership initiatives and funds and has commenced the decentralization of partnership decision-making and management across the Bank’s organizational complexes, operational sectors and regions. At the same time, efforts were made to be more selective and rational in engaging in partnerships and aligning them better with Bank priorities and resources.

a. Long-term Strategy 2013-22

According to the Bank’s long-term strategy 2013-22 (LTS) partnerships would become central to the Bank’s ability to serve clients, beyond the direct impact of the Bank’s lending and non-lending programme. The LTS set the corporate partnership aspiration for the Bank to become a partner of choice\(^1\) and to reposition the Bank as Africa’s premier finance institution\(^2\). To leverage its capacity, the Bank would emphasize collaboration, coordination, harmonization and information-sharing with other development actors, with a view to maximizing synergies and complementarities. The Bank would also promote increased co-financing and leveraging of the Bank’s scarce resources, for the Bank and for Africa.

In line with these aspirations the Bank set itself three specific corporate partnership goals, those of becoming:

1. A catalyst, convener and connector: The Bank would be a catalyst for development finance and solutions by leveraging its partnerships to convene and connect the right players. The Bank would be uniquely

---

\(^1\) Bank Long-term Strategy 2013-22, p. 26

\(^2\) Quoted also as Objective 1 on Bank web-site on AfDB Partnership Strategy [https://www.afdb.org/en/topics-and-sectors/topics/partnerships/](https://www.afdb.org/en/topics-and-sectors/topics/partnerships/)
positioned to catalyze regional cooperation and integration and public-private partnerships in Africa.

2. **A credible knowledge broker**: The Bank would develop its role as an honest and credible knowledge broker, connecting clients with African institutions such as the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UN-ECA), the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), and international knowledge centers, such as the United Nations and the World Bank Group, with the Bank acting as a knowledge hub on African development issues.

3. **A voice for development in Africa**: With national and regional leaders, the Bank would develop its voice for Africa on development issues, sharing its views and experience in multilateral forums and engaging in strategic partnerships, with greater capacity to disseminate knowledge and lead new policy initiatives.

   b. **Partnership categories**

The Bank makes a clear distinction between partnerships that involve financial commitments and related legal agreements, and those that do not, be it for lending or for non-lending purposes. This means that two broad partnership categories can be distinguished for the Bank, those of primarily finance-oriented (leverage function) and non-finance-oriented partnerships, such as for cooperation and coordination or knowledge and advisory services (convening function). These partnerships could be operating within or outside of specific investment programs or projects, be lending or non-lending oriented.

**In the first set of partnerships, the Bank leverages its own finance with that of partners**, sovereign and non-sovereign, to complement its own lending and non-lending programme and, more broadly, to help close Africa’s finance gaps for critical development investments. Such finance (or transactional) partnerships would commonly involve formal financial arrangements, in particular through co-financing, syndication, trust funds and other financial mechanisms, such as global development funds. **In the second set of partnerships, the Bank engages in complementary, primarily non-financial partnerships to support the Bank’s convening, brokering and voice-for-development goals.** Such partnerships may include a variety of coordination, cooperation and knowledge partnership activities as well as policy dialogue initiatives. They primarily promote broad-based cooperation and dialogue at country, regional and Africa wide levels in coordinating development approaches and acting as partners, in project and

---

3 Based on interview with FIRM during scoping mission
4 These two main partnership categories are also used by IDEV in the TOR template for partnership assessments in the Country Strategy Programme Evaluations carried out for the Comprehensive Evaluation of Development Results (CEDR) of 2016.
program design and implementation, analytical work and policy dialogue. They may consist of advisory services, alliances and networks that focus on generating and transferring knowledge and innovations. They may be part of the Bank’s non-lending programme and involve finance, but with a primary goal that is unrelated to leveraging funds.

As a matter of fact, there are usually overlaps between these two broad categories in specific Bank partnerships and partnership instruments. They are broadly synonymous with partnerships for lending and non-lending operations, but not always, as resources could for instance be mobilized for purposes beyond the Bank’s own lending or for promoting the Bank’s non-lending partnerships and knowledge.

c. Important Bank partnerships

Beyond the statutory windows of the Bank (ADB, ADF and NTF) the Bank has important non-statutory funding mechanisms and trust funds, including the long-running Enhanced Private Sector Assistance initiative with Japan, the Korea and China Fund, and a new framework arrangement for EU grants to be mixed with ADF (PAGODA). Also, the Bank is engaged in many special partnership initiatives, partly hosted by the Bank, and partly external. This includes a multitude of bilateral and multilateral trust funds, such as the Africa Trade Fund (ATF), the African Water Facility (AWF), the Sustainable Energy Fund or the Africa Growing Together Fund (AGTF) and the Power Africa Initiative to name just a few. Special initiatives also cover other joint funding mechanisms, such as Global Funds: the Climate Investment Funds and the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). A 2011 Review counted 56 such initiatives. In addition, the Bank is involved in many non-financial partnerships that involve coordination, cooperation and knowledge, such as the Programme for Infrastructure Development in Africa (PIDA) and the High-Level Panel on Fragile States.

Based on this existing knowledge on partnership, a theory of change has been designed to serve as a conceptual model of the Partnership contribution to the Bank’s long-term objectives (See Annex 6). The ToC will be further discussed in the evaluation report.

D. Partnership evaluations

The IDEV Comprehensive Evaluation of Development Results of October 2016 and related Country Strategy Programme Evaluations (CSPEs) drew a number of pertinent conclusions on partnerships at country level; and an earlier IDEV evaluation of Trust Funds in 2013 focused on overall management and implementation aspects of these particular partnerships. Questions related to partnerships are also mainstreamed in other independent evaluations, such as sector and thematic evaluations, and self-evaluations at the Bank.
Several other IFIs have addressed partnership performance in their evaluations in recent years. However, only the AsDB carried out a full-fledged partnership evaluation in 2016, focusing on its corporate and global partnerships and their effectiveness in co-financing, knowledge management, and coordination. IFAD just completed an evaluation synthesis review of partnerships in 2017, mainly based on the analysis of 36 country evaluations and a number of thematic evaluations and syntheses. Until 2015, the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) at the World Bank Group (WBG) had a strong program of evaluations of Global Partnerships, such as the Climate Investment Funds (CIF) or the Energy Sector Management Assistance Program (ESMAP). Since then, the IEG has moved to mainstream the evaluation of partnerships systematically as a cross-cutting theme in its evaluations and to strengthen its overall partnership evaluation methods and capacities. IEG has just started a thematic evaluation of the WB’s convening power and IEG agreed to share the approach paper with the ESP team. The GEF recently assessed its partnership in the context of an evaluation of GEF Programmatic Approaches (2017). These and other evaluations by international institutions form good reference points and benchmarks for this evaluation synthesis at the AfDB.

During the November 2017 meeting of the Evaluation Coordination Group (ECG) several methodological issues around partnership evaluations were brought up. Among others, abilities and limitations of current evaluation methods and indicators to adequately capture the contributions of different partners in partnerships were discussed, as well as methodological problems in evaluating some partnership outcomes and goals such as ‘convening power’ and the frequent crowding-out of partnership issues when they are mainstreamed in other evaluations.

E. Findings from the ESP scoping phase

Evaluations of partnerships in IFIs, and elsewhere, are notoriously difficult, as partnerships are a truly cross-cutting theme that can be applied to many aspects of Bank policies and operations and dealings with RMC governments and donors. Moreover, methods and indicators for evaluating partnerships are not well established, such as on value-addition and transaction costs.

The scope for this evaluation synthesis and major partnership issues were reviewed during phase 1 of this ESP. This included discussions during a scoping mission at Bank HQ in Abidjan. The ESP team met with CODE and various Bank and IDEV staff, including representatives from the Resource Mobilization and

---

5 From 4 to 12 February 2018 IDEV undertook a scoping mission for the Evaluation Synthesis of Bank Partnerships (ESP) at Bank HQ in Abidjan that included the ESP team leader Oswald M. Agbadome, lead consultant Detlev Puetz and IDEV consultant Eustace Uzor.
Partnerships Department; Quality Control, Performance Management and Results Department; and the Strategies and Operational Policies Department. Other critical partners were interviewed in the Regional Integration Coordination Office; Private Sector Development (FIST); Water and Sanitation; Agriculture and Agro-Industry; and Climate Change and Green Growth. Staff from the Chief Economist/VP for Economic Governance and Knowledge Management were contacted but were not available (see attached Interview Schedule for persons met, Annex 7).

In sum, the scoping phase suggested to (i) orient the evaluation questions clearly towards the High 5s and the TYS, (ii) to deal with resource mobilization and ongoing decentralization of this function, regional and sectoral responsibilities, and the continued role of trust funds viz-à-viz other forms of resource mobilization, and (iii) review the internal capacity, willingness and readiness of the Bank to enter into effective partnerships to achieve its corporate goals of convening, knowledge brokering and voice for development, taking account of the ongoing DBDM process.

II. Purpose and scope

A. Evaluation synthesis goal and objectives

The overarching goal of the IDEV evaluation synthesis of partnerships is to facilitate learning by identifying and capturing accumulated knowledge on the issues related to partnerships. The four objectives of the evaluation synthesis are as follows:\textsuperscript{6}:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1.] To provide a better understanding of the overall development effectiveness of partnerships with RMCs and non-RMCs, other development partners and the private sector; and of their relevance for achieving the Bank’s High 5s\textsuperscript{7};
  \item[2.] To generate an overall picture of which partnerships work, why, for whom, how and under which circumstances;
  \item[3.] To provide the Bank’s Management and the Board with recommendations related to improving the effectiveness of present and future partnerships;
  \item[4.] To inform the forthcoming evaluation of the Bank’s partnerships including co-financing, syndication and coordination.
\end{itemize}

The ESP would include sovereign and non-sovereign operations and partnerships. It would summarize key findings and conclusions on relevance, effectiveness and efficiency (value for money) of partnerships at the Bank and benchmark them.

\textsuperscript{6} TOR for the Evaluation Synthesis of Bank Partnerships, with slight modifications
\textsuperscript{7} Text in blue added to the original objectives
with relevant practices in other development institutions. It would also assess how the Bank conceptualizes and supports partnerships, map the most important partnerships and propose a theory of change for partnerships derived from Bank documents and interviews. In terms of evaluation, the ESP would review and benchmark the state of the art on measuring and evaluating partnerships.

The ESP would strive to provide an overall picture of effectiveness of partnerships, based on available independent and self-evaluations and other partnership results reports. As a matter of fact, effectiveness cannot be assessed in detail in this evaluation synthesis, given its general scope, timeframe and availability of underlying reports.

The ESP is expected to produce a free-standing report that would be submitted to the Committee on Operations and Development Effectiveness (CODE). The ESP would be peer reviewed and a small Bank-wide reference group would be created. Main stakeholders in this evaluation synthesis are IDEV, CODE, and AfDB management and operations, including the AfDB Resource and Partnership Department (FIRM), and equally Bank Complexes and Directorates engaged in partnering, such as those concerned with sector and regional operations, country programme management, public-private partnerships, knowledge management, and Global Programs.

B. Evaluation synthesis questions

Based on above reviews and preliminary assessments of AfDB partnerships the following set of evaluation questions is proposed. Four overarching questions refer to the larger picture, followed by more specific questions – in line with the main evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency and also covering monitoring and evaluation of partnerships, lessons learnt and recommendations. They are further elaborated in the evaluation matrix in Annex 4.

The four overarching evaluation questions are:

1. How can various partnerships help to implement the aspirational development agenda as laid out in the High 5s and the Bank’s long-term strategy?

2. How do partnerships work in mobilizing and leveraging resources, for the Bank and for Africa; for public, private and blended (PPP) operations – lending and grants – and non-operational activities (non-lending)?

3. How can partnerships help to strengthen the convening role of the Bank, in particular in countries and regions? How can partnerships for knowledge, cooperation and coordination support the Bank’s role in convening and policy (voice for development)?
4. How supportive are internal Bank structures, business processes and team work for establishing and maintaining partnerships? To what extent does the DBDM process and the intended strengthening of regional offices (General Directorates) guide and support various forms of partnerships?

More specific evaluation questions are as follows:

1. **Relevance**: What partnerships and partnership instruments are most relevant for AfDB long-term strategic partnership objectives and high-five goals?
   i. How are partnerships understood and defined at the AfDB? And how does this compare with how other IFIs and development partners understand and define partnerships?
   ii. How are the responsibilities for partnerships institutionally shared across the AfDB?
   iii. What are the most important AfDB partnerships, particularly in view of the High 5 agenda?

2. **Effectiveness**: To what extent have partnerships delivered on their intended outcomes and added value?
   i. What are the overall results and effectiveness of partnerships?
   ii. Which partnerships work, for whom, how and under which circumstances: Who benefits and why?
   iii. What is the value added of different partnerships?
   iv. What experience and lessons of partnership effectiveness have been gained at other IFIs and development partners?

3. **Efficiency and value for money**
   i. How selective and efficient are organizations in entering into partnerships?
   ii. How efficiently are partnerships organized?
   iii. Is Bank staff equipped and incentivized to manage partnerships?
   iv. To what extent do partnership benefits and value-addition justify their transaction costs? (value-for-money)?

4. **Measuring, reporting and evaluating partnerships**
   i. How are partnerships evaluated at the Bank?
   ii. How are partnerships evaluated by others, mainly IFIs and selected other donors?

5. **Lessons learnt and best practices on partnerships**
i. What are the main partnership lessons at the AfDB?

ii. What key lessons on partnerships have been identified by other development institutions?

iii. What partnership best practices as identified through the literature are most relevant for the AfDB?

6. **Recommendations**

   i. What are the major recommendations on improving effectiveness of present and future Bank partnerships?

   ii. What partnerships and partnership issues should be considered with priority in the main partnership **evaluation**?

**III. Proposed approach, methods and evaluability**

**C. Approach**

This evaluation synthesis uses a realist synthesis approach. It aims at synthesizing all relevant existing research in order to make evidence-based policy recommendations.

This synthesis will use a mixed methods approach, with desk analysis of documents, literature review, partnership mapping, and perceptions gathering through interviews – individual and group interviews as needed. Interviews will be carried out in Abidjan or via conference call with at least 2 AfDB regional directorates and 3 country offices.

The evaluation synthesis was designed with three phases and three deliverables:

1. A scoping phase that would lead to this inception report;
2. A data gathering and analysis phase that would be summarized in a draft technical report; and
3. A review, triangulation and learning phase that would include a workshop of emerging findings and end with the submission of a final synthesis report, including a two-page brief.

**D. Main reports for review**

a. IDEV and project evaluations

For IDEV, the main evaluation documents to be reviewed in the evaluation synthesis are 14 Country Strategy Programme Evaluations (CSPEs) used for the Comprehensive Evaluation of Development Results (CEDR), its technical reports and summaries, as well as the CEDR summary report. These 14 CSPEs had a common, coherent framework of data collection and analysis, that included several questions on partnerships.
The most important thematic IDEV reports for synthesis include evaluations of the Congo Basin Finance Facility (CBFF), agriculture value chains, rural electrification, transport and energy (draft), the water synthesis report, RISP and, to a lesser extent, PBOs. The 2013 IDEV Trust Fund evaluation would serve as an important reference document. In terms of project evaluations, it was suggested that the ESP should review some carefully selected PCRs, PRAs and PCR evaluation notes to assess partnership findings and approaches to partnership evaluations.

b. Other Bank reports

The ESP would review all relevant and available Bank policies, strategies, guidelines and results frameworks concerning partnerships, in particular those of FIRM (and preceding responsible departments/units) and those of major operational complexes and departments that mainstream partnerships for achieving the High 5s (for some details see Annex 7). It would also review available results and evaluation reports for partnership results, including annual reports, to assess the extent of partnership engagement, results and effectiveness for the High 5s and partnership results for major trust funds and other finance partnerships. Documents from partnership departments or divisions in charge of partnerships in their respective complexes (such as the Directorate of the Energy Partnership or Division specifically charged with Partnerships, such as in the Agriculture and Agro-Industries Department) are of particular interest.

c. External evaluations

In terms of external agencies, the evaluation synthesis would include reviews of partnerships evaluations of the WBG, the AsDB, IFAD, and GEF. Other bilateral donors and development partners would be included in the review, depending on availability of relevant partnership evaluations and other work, such as the EU, selected UN agencies, and bilateral donors for instance DfID, JICA, Germany, AFD, CIDA, Dutch and Swiss Aid.

E. Sampling

Due to the large number of certain partnerships (such as special initiatives and trust funds) and documents to be reviewed (such as project completion reports or trust fund results reports) and of difficulties in assembling necessary documents it would be useful to establish sample frames and sampling criteria and techniques for certain products and partnerships. All products and partnerships would be purposively selected, with the main reasons and criteria for their selection well described in the final report of the ESP. Sampling would lead to some major case studies, particularly of individual funds and initiatives.

The following is proposed:

---

8 No evaluation notes synthesis reports are available for recent years
- **For PCRs** the sample frame will include PCRs delivered between 2015 and 2017. Between 20 and 30 PCRs would be reviewed, covering all regions, the major sectors and High 5s. They would include an equal number of projects without co-financing, and projects with co-financing.

- **For Trust Fund, other Non-statutory Funds (AGTF, EPSA, Korea) and Global Funds (eg. GEF, CIF)** a maximum of 6 – 8 funds would be purposively selected for in-depth review, based on fund maturity, availability of more recent reports or evaluations, ease of access to documents, and covering sovereign and non-sovereign funds. It would be useful to include funds that worked well and one or two that did not.

- **For other special partnership initiatives**, a maximum of 8-10 initiatives would be purposively selected for in-depth review, covering the various categories of engagement as defined by the relevant Report on Bank Special Initiatives and Rationalization Guidelines of March 2011, also including some partnerships that may not include financial commitments or transactions.

- **Partnerships mentioned in the Long-term Strategy 2013-22** and with special relevance for the High 5s would receive particular attention.

**F. Evaluability and limitations of the ESP**

The evaluability of this Evaluation Synthesis of Partnerships in terms of justification, feasibility and usefulness is seen as high, despite several limitations and risks. The ESP is justified. There is high interest in the evaluation topic of partnerships at the AfDB, in a broad sense, and also in specific issues that would be covered as shown earlier. There is much valuable information and experience on partnerships available at the AfDB part of which is summarized in IDEV evaluations, and, above all, in Operations that can and should be synthesized. Although the topic is broad the scoping phase already identified a number of findings and points for further discussion and possible evaluation. The ESP learning phase III would provide an opportunity for broader learning and for putting AfDB experience on partnerships into the context of what other development institutions’ experience, partnership best practices and literature suggest.

The ESP is feasible. The Evaluation Synthesis would deliver an overview, synthesis and re-assessment of main findings and conclusions already available in reports and tacit knowledge. Similar work has been done elsewhere. Partnerships have been evaluated in other IFIs, either in the form of broad and full-scale evaluations (ADB), as evaluation syntheses (IFAD) or more thematically concentrated (WB and GEF). This evaluation synthesis would not go in-depth, but rely on available evaluations, partnership result reports and other documents, complemented by interviews with key informants.
But there are also clear limitations of what a Partnerships Evaluation Synthesis can achieve. There are basically three limitations and risks: First, the large number of potential partnership categories and types, their mainstreaming throughout operations and the large number of potential partnership activities, reports and counterparts in operations suggests that the ESP will be selective, and not necessarily representative. Secondly, the wide non-availability of readily accessible and digestible information on partnership outcomes and results is of major concern. The initial gathering of information and data already showed that good and reliable summative reports on partnerships, or even evaluations, are relatively rare. Even when available, they are often not in final or public form, and their circulation is limited. There is quite a bit of information on partnership strategies and intentions, but even this material is often somewhat dated, and its usefulness remains to be seen. Third, non-responsiveness of potential informants is a problem, given the wide range of actors involved.

All these risks suggest three conclusions: first, that it is important for this evaluation summary to focus on summary of information relatively readily available, and well sampled when necessary; secondly, that a part of the information coming out of this Evaluation Summary would be more based on case studies rather than representative material; and third, that lessons need to be learnt from this synthesis for how to enhance the availability and representativeness of information for the main evaluation of partnerships.

G. Principles

The following principles would be applied to the evaluation approach and methodologies:

- the approach would be evidence-based and apply OECD/DAC criteria and principles;
- it would seek to be participatory in the sense that relevant staff would be actively involved at Bank headquarters and in selected country offices;
- the approach would be context and theory based, relying on an analytical framework that combines key concepts and methods from realistic evaluation and theory of change;
- the evaluation synthesis would be demand-oriented to enhance its relevance and influence; and
- the approach would be learning oriented and propose ways for communicating findings with a larger audience within the Bank (in the inception report). Analysis and presentation methods would be used that are readily understandable and reduce complexity.
**H. Quality assurance**

A reference group has been set up to ensure the quality of the ESP. The reference group is constituted by designated focal points of all relevant departments of the Bank working on partnership issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strategic Department</strong></th>
<th><strong>Name of Focal Point</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery, Performance Management and Results (SNDR)</td>
<td>Dr. Victoria Chisala, Division Manager Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Committee Secretariat and Quality Assurance (SNOQ)</td>
<td>Dr. Awa BAMBA, OIC, SNOQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies and Operational Policies (SNSP)</td>
<td>Massamba Diene, Division Manager, SNSP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Integration Coordination Office (RDRI)</td>
<td>Soare Mamady, Manager Operation Office (RDRi0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, Human and Social Development (AHWS)</td>
<td>Jochen Rudolph, RWSSI Focal Person, AHWS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change and Green Growth (PECG)</td>
<td>Joseph Justus Kabyemera, Coordinator - ClimDev Africa Special Fund (CDSF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Fast Track Fund (AFT)</td>
<td>Njie, Modou Badara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndications and Client Solutions</td>
<td>Peter Ide, Chief Technical Assistance Officer, FIST1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Mobilization and Partnerships (FIRM)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The synthesis evaluation will also be peer reviewed by an IDEV internal peer reviewer.

Finally, an internal validation/capitalization workshop will be organized to discuss major findings and conclusions from the ESP.
IV. Work streams and timeline

A. Work streams for ESP phase II and III

Six inter-related work streams would be carried out in the second phase and two in the third phase of this evaluation synthesis:

1. **Mapping partnerships at the AfDB**, with a focus on the two partnership categories of finance and convening. Mapping criteria would take into account partnership sub-categories, the ToC, the earlier mapping of special initiatives, and the evaluation matrix. It would include partnership contributions to the High-5s and to the Bank’s overall partnership goals.

2. **Reviewing and summarizing available evidence on partnerships** in IDEV independent evaluations and of self-evaluations (PCRs and Country Strategy Programme reviews, to the extent available) that would correspond to the main evaluation questions and partnership categories.

3. **Reviewing the most recent policies, strategies with critical relevance for partnerships**, with particular reference to those with high relevance for the High 5s, taking into account the development and policy contexts in which AfDB carries out its partnerships.

4. **Summarizing how other IFIs and key donors have addressed partnership questions** and how the evaluation of partnerships has been methodologically approached by these organizations.

5. **Providing an overview and critical assessment of approaches and methods currently used by the development evaluation community for tracking and evaluating partnerships**.

6. **Summarizing key issues in the broader partnership literature** as they relate to critical partnership questions raised by this ESP for the AfDB.

7. **Synthesizing lessons and best practices on partnerships of the review** to support the evaluation’s learning objectives and carry out some benchmarking of key Bank partnership operations against established good practices. (Phase III)

8. **Identifying critical evaluation gaps in addressing partnerships at the AfDB** to inform priorities and scope for more in-depth work during the broader IDEV partnership evaluation planned for 2018/19. (Phase III)

In addition, gaps would be filled in documents and data and a decision would be made on what bilateral donors to include in the ESP review.

B. Next steps and timeline

The next steps would be to finalize this inception report and set up a Reference Group by early April, concurrently fill gaps in data and documents, assemble
and analyze partnership relevant information, and write up a first draft synthesis report for delivery in early May. A Bank internal workshop would be carried out during the week of May 21-25, 2018, to discuss major findings and conclusions from the ESP. A final synthesis report would be submitted in early June. The detailed timeline is in Annex 6.
V. ANNEXES

Annex 1: Summary of the findings of the Scoping mission

The scope for this evaluation synthesis and major partnership issues were reviewed during phase 1 of this ESP. This included discussions during a scoping mission at Bank HQ in Abidjan. The ESP team met with CODE and various Bank and IDEV staff, including representatives from the Resource Mobilization and Partnerships Department; Quality Control, Performance Management and Results Department; and the Strategies and Operational Policies Department. Other critical partners were interviewed in the Regional Integration Coordination Office; Private Sector Development (FIST); Water and Sanitation; Agriculture and Agro-Industry; and Climate Change and Green Growth. Staff from the Chief Economist/VP for Economic Governance and Knowledge Management were contacted but were not available (see attached Interview Schedule for persons met, Annex 7).

Interview questions ranged from perceptions on the most important AfDB partnerships, availability and relevance of partnership policies, strategies and guidelines to value-addition and outcomes of partnerships, issues and constraints, and partnerships monitoring and evaluation (M&E). The team also invited suggestions on issues that should be covered in the main IDEV partnership evaluation. Prior to the scoping mission the lead consultant had been in contact with various members of the international evaluation and research community (World Bank Group, IFAD, GEF, AsDB, IFPRI) to assess ongoing work and interests.

i. Overall findings

The scoping mission found keen interest for an evaluation of the Bank’s partnerships but also concerns about the scope of the ESP. In particular, it was noted that the main evaluation needs to be well defined to be useful. Also, an assessment of partnerships at the Bank should be clearly linked to the Bank’s High 5s and its partnership objectives highlighted in the 10-year strategy (LTS, 2013-2022).

In general, interview partners felt that the Bank is too transaction-oriented, focused on its own lending programme while not adequately fulfilling its overall partnerships, resource mobilization, convening and policy dialogue roles as envisioned in the Bank’s long-term strategy. A lack of resources for non-lending activities – financial and staff time – were frequently mentioned, but also the Bank’s staff incentive structure and undercainties about responsibilities and clear mandates for engaging in these activities.

9 From 4 to 12 February 2018 IDEV undertook a scoping mission for the Evaluation Synthesis of Bank Partnerships (ESP) at Bank HQ in Abidjan that included the ESP team leader Oswald M. Agbadome, lead consultant Detlev Puetz and IDEV consultant Eustace Uzor.
Few see the Bank in its current form as well set-up and positioned for brokerage and upstream enabling policy work to achieve the High 5’s. There was a general acknowledgment that the Bank needs stronger partnerships to complement in its own finance, knowledge and operational capacities in RMCs, and cover gaps where necessary.

According to the interviews, the Bank’s partnership instruments and mechanisms, motivation and support are not sufficiently clear. There is no specific partnership strategy, beyond the formulation of its basic partnership goals in the 10-year long-term strategy. A Bank-wide resource mobilization strategy has been under preparation and review for a while.

While FIRM is regarded as the main custodian with coordinating and advisory functions on partnerships at the Bank, many partnership decisions and initiatives are widely mainstreamed throughout the Bank’s complexes. Several Bank departments and divisions share the responsibility for partnerships, for policy and strategy and for operationalizing partnerships in lending and non-lending activities, such as SNSP (Directorate for Strategy and Operational Policies), SNDR (Directorate for Operationalization, Performance Management and Results) RDRI (Office for Coordination of Regional Integration), PENP (Directorate for Energy Partnerships), AHWS (Directorate for Water and Sanitation), PISD (Private Sector Development) and FIST (Directorate for Syndications and Client Solutions). Accordingly, partnerships and related engagements are mainstreamed in various regional, sectoral, policy and strategy documents.

A Standing Committee on Partnerships (SCP) is domiciled in the Vice-President’s complex and charged with reviewing and clearing all major transactional partnerships. FIRM has the responsibility of ensuring that all financial partnerships for lending and non-lending activities are approved by the SCP.

ii. CODE comments

Interviews with CODE members suggested a high priority for trust funds in the ESP and in the main evaluation: to learn more about how trust funds come into existence in the first place, their policy basis, their rationale, additionality and administrative implications for the Bank, including the legal capacity of the Bank to handle the agreements. CODE members also inquired about overall partnership efficiency, and whether the Bank had the capacity to engage in broader partnerships and policy dialogue with regional and non-regional member countries, given its legal implications. The ongoing delegation of authority under the DBDM process would be important to consider in this regard. CODE strongly

---

10 And in a few Presidential Directives to be further examined
11 There has been no opportunity to discuss its status with FIRM so far.
12 Governance of Trust Funds is based on the 2006 TF reform policy, complemented by TOR for the Standing Committee on Partnerships and some Presidential Directives.
advised IDEV to consult with the constituencies and partner countries, particular those with trust funds, and to consider what other multilaterals have done, such as the WBG.

iii. FIRM comments

Discussions with FIRM raised three main points: First, on scope: an evaluation (or an evaluation synthesis) on the structures, functions and delivery of partnerships Bank-wide needs to define its scope carefully. Covering all partnerships, including trust funds, would be far too broad, and therefore would ultimately be a question of width versus depth. Secondly, on attribution: many support systems and procedures for Trust Funds and other partnerships have changed over the past years. This means that an evaluation would find it difficult to make attributions and meaningful recommendations. And third, on relevance: a forward-looking evaluation would have to go beyond the current partnership structures, mandates and business processes and also consider suggested changes coming out of the DBDM. In this context, an evaluation would also have to look at respective responsibilities of sector and regional departments, and their corresponding authority.

FIRM also proposed that the evaluation should take the Bank’s long-term strategy 2013-22 as a starting point, given the Bank’s aspiration to become the partner of choice in Africa, with three corporate goals for the Bank to be: 1) a catalyst, convener, and connector; 2) a knowledge broker; and 3) a voice for development. Thus, the criteria and issues for a partnership evaluation could include key partners, instruments, associated processes, risks and their mitigation, results and lessons. Different partnership types should be looked at.

iv. Comments from others in the Bank

Interviews at the Departments for Strategy, for Results, OPSCOM and Climate Change pointed to limited formal strategic attention to partnerships in a broader sense at the Bank, mainly through mainstreamed partnership issues in sectoral and regional strategies (to the extent that they exist).

Country operations and demand should drive partnerships. But apparently there is lack of clarity in partnerships and staff may not be well trained and authorized to engage and to speak on behalf of the Bank. Also, there are few or no frameworks for engagement with non-traditional partners in particular Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), Private Philanthropies and the Private Sector.

There is no partnership related KPI in the Bank’s corporate Results Management Framework, and previous attempts to report on the Bank’s resource mobilization and co-financing proved very difficult. In many cases, interview partners view better internal partnering across complexes is seen as absolutely essential for successful external partnering to achieve the High-5s and other Bank objectives. For this reason, it would be critical for any evaluation to consider the ongoing
DBDM process and the consequent decentralization of decisions to regional general directorates.

Initial interviews with private sector staff at the Bank indicated very limited interest, motivation and policy/strategic guidance for resource syndication and co-financing of private sector deals at the Bank. This has worsened as private sector operations have apparently become more dispersed and diluted in recent years (except for a dedicated private sector department in the Complex for Private Sector, Infrastructure and Industrialisation (PIVP)), but without common leadership and guidance.

Trust Funds are still seen as relatively poorly governed, with limited integration in regular work programs and impeded by tied arrangements and arduous reporting requirements. According to one source there is “no strong initiative to turn it around”. There was a recognition that other funding arrangements may be more important for resource mobilization.

Interviews with trust fund managers for water (RWSSI and MWPP), agriculture (AFT) and private sector (FAPA) revealed many useful results from trust funds, their management and the Bank’s experience. Several common and familiar problems were highlighted during the interviews that could provide good case studies for the ESP or the main evaluation. While TF may be a ‘pittance’ compared with other fund-raising mechanisms at the Bank (as described by one staff) they still could provide many useful partnership lessons for the Bank’s operations.

The IDEV 2016 Comprehensive Evaluation of Development Results drew two main conclusions on partnerships, first, that co-financing is not sufficiently oriented towards mobilizing additional resources for the Bank and Africa, particularly from the private sector, and, secondly, that the Bank is not seen as a strong provider of knowledge and policy engagement, except in small and fragile states (the example of Liberia was provided).

In sum, the scoping phase suggested to (i) orient the evaluation questions clearly towards the High 5s and the TYS, (ii) to deal with resource mobilization and ongoing decentralization of this function, regional and sectoral responsibilities, and the continued role of trust funds viz-à-viz other forms of resource mobilization, and (iii) review the internal capacity, willingness and readiness of the Bank to enter into effective partnerships to achieve its corporate goals of convening, knowledge brokering and voice for development, taking account of the ongoing DBDM process.
Annex 2: Terms of Reference

African Development Bank

Independent Development Evaluation

Evaluation synthesis of Partnerships

Terms of Reference

The Independent Evaluation of Development (IDEV) of the African Development Bank’s (AfDB or Bank) is conducting an evaluation synthesis of partnerships and donors’ coordination activities. This document sets out the Terms of Reference for the recruitment of an individual consultant to assist IDEV in this undertaking.

Background

Partnerships do not hold only one definition. In the UN, “Partnerships are defined as voluntary and collaborative relationships between various parties, both State and non-State, in which all participants agree to work together to achieve a common purpose or undertake a specific task and to share risks and responsibilities, resources and benefits. “13 Multilateral Partnerships are financing arrangements whereby sovereign and non-sovereign donors share their resources with multilateral organizations to pursue their development policy objectives.

Over the years the number of these partnerships has increased steadily. A subdivision into five categories had been suggested14: (i) Influencing political and civil discourse (“advocacy”), (ii) Adopting international norms, regulations, and standards (“standard setting”), (iii) Mobilizing private and public finances (“financing”), (iv) Technical cooperation and service provision (“implementation”), (v) Coordinating state and non-state activities in a particular sector (“coordination”).

In the study "Building Partnerships," Jane Nelson identified five main potential advantages for partnerships15 (i) Resource mobilization to support development (in terms of added funding, skills, knowledge and technology that can help to increase operational effectiveness and efficiency in the delivery, greater support for organizational values and activities; (iii) Increased innovation at the

13 UN Doc. A/60/214, para. 8
organizational level and in terms of international cooperation in general; (iv) Shared learning, increased trust and mutual understanding (v) Better understanding of boundaries and expectations – opportunities to better define relative roles and responsibilities of different sectors and to prevent or resolve conflict across these boundaries;".

The African Development Bank sees partnerships as one of the central enablers to achieve its strategy. The Long-Term Strategy 2013-2022 of the Bank indicates that "To leverage its capacity, it will emphasize collaboration, coordination, harmonization, and information-sharing with other development actors, to maximizing synergies and complementarities. Partnerships will thus become central to the Bank’s ability to serve clients. The Bank will focus on developing more effective partnerships with its regional member countries, regional economic communities and African and international knowledge centers." To this extent, the Bank is actively engaged in an extensive number of partnership initiatives with bilateral, multilateral and private entities. The Bank currently manages 40 Funds with a total amount of approx. UA 926.5 million as of end September 2016. There has been a shift from Bilateral Trust Funds (BTFs) to Thematic Trust Funds (TTFs): 77% of resources mobilized are channeled to TTFs and 14 % to BTFs. Other types of funds, e.g., special funds, account for 9% of resources. The Bank also has various Cofinancing Agreements such as the Africa Growing Together Fund (USD 2 billion over ten years with China) and EPSA with Japan (USD 1.5 billion). Partnership initiatives have flourished and are to remain in the development landscape. Hence the issue of their effectiveness, efficiency and impact become a growing and relevant concern.

**Purpose, Objectives, and Scope of the synthesis**

The purpose of this synthesis is to facilitate learning by identifying and capturing accumulated knowledge on the issues related to partnerships. The objectives are to (i) provide a better understanding of the development effectiveness of partnerships, (ii) generate an overall picture of which partnerships work, for whom, how and under which circumstances, (iii) provide Bank’s Management and the Board with recommendations, and (iv) to inform the next AfDB’s partnerships and coordination evaluation. The evaluation synthesis will cover existing research, reviews and evaluation knowledge on the issue of partnerships at global, corporate or country/project level. It will include aspects related (but not limited) existing types and nature of partnerships, performance and outcomes, management, efficiency, resource mobilization, coordination, leverage, co-financing, knowledge work, technical assistance, and cooperation in regions/countries.

**Evaluation questions**

The synthesis will respond to the following main questions/

---

The above evaluation questions will be refined and complemented as necessary during the design of the evaluation.

**Approach and tasks of the Consultant**

The synthesis evaluation will identify and synthesize evidence from multiple studies, evaluation, and research. A full inception report will be designed to inform the synthesis work. The evaluation will build on OECD/DAC criteria and principles as well best practices in synthesizing credible evaluative knowledge.

As part of this approach, the following tasks will be undertaken by the Consultant

i. Design an **inception report** summarizing background information, methodology, and tools of the evaluation

ii. Collect data and set up of a **database of the relevant literature** to be included in the synthesis

iii. Review relevant documents and research on partnership evaluations, in particular of IFIs and other pertinent donors,

iv. Consult with key informants,

v. Prepare a draft evaluation synthesis report,

vi. Contribute to an emerging findings workshop,

vii. Revise and finalize draft report

**Deliverables**

The following deliverables are expected from the consultant

1. An inception report of the evaluation synthesis
2. A draft technical report
3. A final synthesis report containing a two-page policy brief

**Timeline**
The following table presents an indicative timetable that is subject to changes following the design of the evaluation. The Consultant’s work will start at by mid-December 2017 for a maximum duration of 6 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Design (incl Scoping mission &amp; consultations)</td>
<td>15/12/2017</td>
<td>16/02/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report submission</td>
<td></td>
<td>16/02/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and analysis (incl. literature review and interviews)</td>
<td>16/02/2018</td>
<td>30/03/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft technical report submission</td>
<td></td>
<td>30/03/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of draft report</td>
<td>30/03/2018</td>
<td>16/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging findings workshop</td>
<td>13/04/2018</td>
<td>27/04/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final synthesis report submission</td>
<td></td>
<td>25/05/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultant profile**

The consultant in charge of the synthesis evaluation must demonstrate the following qualifications:

- A master with a minimum of 10 years’ experience in the field of development, economics, and other related topics
- A proven background in evaluation of development assistance, country strategies, and projects
- A strong knowledge of multilateral development agencies context. Experience working for the AfDB will be an asset.
- Previous experience in evaluation of thematic issues such as partnership, trust funds, cooperation activities,

**Travel**

The consultant may travel to the Headquarters of AfDB at least twice during the assignment (one for scoping mission and one for an emerging finding workshop).
Annex 3: Trust Funds / Global Partnerships / Special Initiatives

Some information has been collected for the following Trust Funds:

1. Africa Climate Change Fund (ACCF)
2. Africa Trade Fund (ATF)
3. Africa Growing Together Fund (AGTF)
4. African Water Facility (AWF)
5. Agriculture Fast Track Fund
6. China AfDB
7. Korea Africa Economic Cooperation (KOAFEC)
8. ClimDec-Africa Special Fund
9. Fund for African Private Sector Assistance (FAPA)
10. MENA TF
11. Nigeria Technical Cooperation Fund (NTCF)
12. Pillar Assessed Grant or Delegation Agreement (PAGODA) (EU, relatively recent)
13. Portuguese Cooperation Fund (PTF)
15. Sustainable Energy Fund (SEFA)
16. Global Environment Facility (GEF)
17. Climate Investment Fund (CIF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
<th>Methods / Sampling</th>
<th>Notes / Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Relevance: What partnerships and partnership instruments are most relevant for AfDB long-term strategic partnership objectives and high-five goals?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are partnerships understood and defined at the AfDB?</td>
<td>1. What are the most important partnership categories, instruments and mechanisms at the Bank? 2. What policies, strategies and guidelines exist at the Bank – at Corporate and Bank Complex level - that allow to prioritize, manage and assess partnerships? What do policies and strategies say about partnerships? 3. What is the prevalent understanding of staff about the importance and limitations of partnerships? 4. How are partnerships understood in private sector operations, and how may this differ from public sector ones? 5. How does the Bank understanding of partnerships compare with that of other IFIs and major donors?</td>
<td>- Corporate and Complex partnership documents  - Interviews / meeting records  - IDEV CEDR/CSPEs  - Gray literature (partnership conferences etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mapping of policies  - Mapping of main partnerships according to partnership categories, mechanisms and relevance for high-5s  - Desk review  - Perceptions gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are the responsibilities for partnerships institutionally shared across the AfDB?</td>
<td>1. What is the role and mandate of FIRM? 2. What is the role of the Partnership Committee? 3. What are the roles and TOR of the partnership divisions in various complexes? 4. What roles do decentralized offices have in promoting partnerships viz-a-viz 5. What has changed since the 2013 IDEV Trust Fund evaluation? 6. To what extent is staff informed and empowered to develop partnerships?</td>
<td>- Corporate documents (FIRM and others)  - Interviews at HQ  - Interviews with decentralized staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Desk review  - Interviews  - Long-distance interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key questions</td>
<td>Sub-questions</td>
<td>Sources of information</td>
<td>Methods / Sampling</td>
<td>Notes / Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **What are the most important AfDB partnerships, particularly in view of the High 5 agenda?** | 1. What are the most important partnerships and who are the most important partners vis-à-vis the various specific partnership goals (long-term strategy)?  
2. What are the most important partnerships (finance and non-finance) for promoting the High-5s?  
3. How relevant are different partnership categories and mechanisms for the High-5s?  
4. How are the High-5 lead departments strategically and institutionally positioned to make use of partnerships for the High-5 agenda?  
5. What does decentralization mean for partnerships, at country and regional level? | - Interviews at HQ / meeting records  
- Document review  
- Strategies and results by AfDB complexes  
- Interviews with decentralized staff | - Desk review  
- Perceptions gathering  
- Mapping of most important partnerships by the Bank’s High-5s  
- PCRs to be sampled  
- Trust Funds and Special Initiatives to be sampled | |
| **2. Effectiveness: To what extent have partnerships delivered on their intended outcomes and added value?** | 1. What are the main overall results for different partnership categories and mechanisms, in particularly vis-à-vis the various partnership goals?  
2. To what extent has the management of partnerships been successful in achieving operational effectiveness?  
3. What are the main findings on partnerships at corporate, regional and country levels?  
4. How do partnerships affect regular investment project operations and non-lending activities?  
5. To what extent have co-financed projects changed delivery and outcomes of Bank projects?  
6. What are the results in selected trust-funded operations?  
7. How effective have private sector partnerships / syndication been?  
8. To what extent have trust funds and other strategic partnerships helped the Bank to facilitate the preparation of projects; knowledge sharing and technical assistance? | - IDEV CEDR and country evaluations  
- IDEV thematic evaluations  
- PCR and PRAs  
- Summarized information from FIRM documents  
- Results documents of specifically sampled trust funds etc.  
- Results documents from High 5s lead departments  
- Bank results | - Desk review  
- Interviews  
- Analysis of case studies  
- PCRs to be sampled  
- Trust Funds and Special Initiatives to be sampled | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
<th>Methods / Sampling</th>
<th>Notes / Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Which partnerships work, for whom, how and under which circumstances: Who benefits and why? | 1. What differences in results exist across partnership categories and mechanisms and why?  
2. What are the factors that are affecting the performance of partnerships?  
3. How do different partnerships affect benefits of different AfDB clients, countries (country categories?) and target groups?  
4. How does the experience of partnership results at the Bank compare with that of other IFIs and major donors? | - IDEV CEDR and country evaluations  
- IDEV thematic evaluations  
- PCRs and PRAs  
- Summarized information from FIRM documents  
- Results documents of specifically sampled trust funds etc.  
- Results documents from High 5s lead departments | - Desk review  
- Interviews  
- Analysis of case studies  
- Qualitative analysis |                                      |
| What is the value added of different partnership categories and instruments? | 1. To what extent have different partnership types and mechanisms achieved their intended outcomes? Has there been value-added?  
2. Have partnerships delivered more effectively than non-partnered activities would have done?  
3. How does the experience of partnership value-added at the Bank compare with that of other IFIs and major donors? | - See above interviews | - Analysis of case studies |                                      |

### 3. Efficiency and value for money

| How selective and efficient is the AfDB in entering into partnerships? | 1. What are the criteria of partnership selection? How do partnerships come about?  
2. Are selected partnerships the most appropriate ones in service of a particular partnership goal? | - FIRM documents  
- Interviews  
- Other document review | - Desk review  
- Perceptions gathering |                                      |
| How efficiently are partnerships organized? | Are the Bank Group’s internal organization and associated processes efficient?  
1. General support structures  
2. Partnership approval processes  
3. Administrative support systems  
4. Legal reviews  
5. Monitoring and Reporting | - IDEV evaluations  
- FIRM documents and interviews  
- Interviews with legal, M&R focal points | - Desk review and interviews |                                      |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>What to look for</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
<th>Methods / Sampling</th>
<th>Notes / Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Is Bank staff equipped and incentivized to manage partnerships?              |               | 1. Do Bank complexes support partnerships through adequate institutional structures and business processes? 2. To what extent does the DBDM process address and support selectivity and efficient management of partnerships? 3. Are decentralized offices and Bank staff well equipped to perform various partnership functions at the Bank? 4. To what extent is the pursuit of partnerships encouraged and rewarded? | - IDEV Evaluations  
- Interview and documents on DBDM process  
- Documents from and interviews with sectors  
- Interviews with decentralized staff | - Desk review and interviews                                                                                                                         |                                                         |
| To what extent do partnership benefits and value-addition justify their transaction costs? (value-for-money) |               | 1. Is there a process of balancing benefits/value-addition and costs when entering into partnerships? 2. Which costs occur most frequently and how do they affect the projects? 3. Which partnership risks are most prominent at the Bank and how are they mitigated? | - FIRM documents and interviews  
- Case study documents and interviews of specific trust funds | - Desk review and interviews                                                                                                                         |                                                         |

4. Measuring, reporting and evaluating partnerships

| How are partnerships evaluated at the Bank?                                  |               | 1. How and under which prisms are partnerships evaluated at the Bank, through independent and self-evaluations? 2. What evaluation criteria are being used? | - Bank Results measurement frameworks  
- Guidelines for M&E for self and independent | Desk review and interviews                                                                                                                          |                                                         |
| How are partnerships being evaluated by others, mainly IFIs and selected other donors? |               | 1. What partnerships aspects are other IFIs and donors particularly concerned about? 2. How do other IFIs track partnership results and indicators? | - Documents from and interviews with other IFIs | Desk review and interviews                                                                                                                         |                                                         |

5. Lessons learnt and best practices on partnerships, at AfDB and beyond

<p>| What are the main partnership lessons at the AfDB?                           |               | 1. What are the main lessons learnt and best practices from this review to improve partnership engagement and management at the AfDB? 2. What works in mobilizing and leveraging resources, for the Bank and for Africa? What works for being the partner of choice? | n/a                                                                 | Summary from generalizable findings under eval. qu. 14 |                                                         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key questions</th>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
<th>Methods / Sampling</th>
<th>Notes / Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What lessons on partnerships have been identified by other development institutions? | 1. What do major evaluations at other IFIs say about partnerships and best practices?  
2. What do major evaluations at selected other major donors (development partners) say about partnerships and best practices? | Document review from external agencies  
Interviews with external agencies | - Document review and interviews |            |
| What best practices could be useful for AfDB?                                 | 1. What partnership best practices as identified through the literature are most relevant for the AfDB? | Document and external literature review | |            |

6. Recommendations

| What recommendations are drawn from the ESP for the Bank's partnerships? | 1. Recommendations from the Evaluation Synthesis on improving effectiveness of present and future Bank partnerships | n/a | n/a |
| What partnerships and partnership issues should be considered with priority in the main partnership evaluation? | 1. What are the most critical evaluation gaps on partnerships?  
What could provide most value-addition for the Bank?  
2. Where could the main evaluation be (most) influential?  
3. In which areas should the main evaluation stay broad, and where should it go in-depth? What about field work? | n/a | n/a |
Annex 5: Theory of Change of Partnerships: Case of the AfDB

**AfDB Partnerships – Towards a Theory of Change**

**Enabling factors**
- **AfDB readiness to partner**
  Supportive business processes and organizational structure (DBDM). Strategic guidance and clarity. Staff awareness and incentives. Intra-Bank partnerships
- **RMC readiness to partner**
  RMC policy and partnership environment. Government preferences and capacities for partnerships.

**Partnership categories and instruments**
- **Finance partnerships**
  - co-financing
  - trust funds, special funds
  - syndication (private sector)
  - global partnerships
- **Non-finance partnerships**
  - policy and technical dialogue platforms
  - knowledge networks
  - Bank advisory services and capacity building
  - other coordination and cooperation mechanisms
  - in countries, regions and continent-wide

**Special partnership initiatives**
- Bank internal initiatives
- Partnerships managed/housed by the Bank
- External initiatives managed outside of the Bank
- External initiatives with minor Bank contributions

**Partnership outcomes**
- Leveraging the Bank’s own resources through sovereign and non-sovereign investments
- Convoking, building alliances, exploiting complementarities and synergies
- Delivering knowledge, innovation and advice influencing policy

**Bank Project outcomes**
- Lending
- Non-lending

**Transaction costs and risks**
- Coordination, time, consensus building, contracting, monitoring and enforcement, trust building.

**Partnership transaction costs**
- Coordination, time, consensus building, contracting, monitoring and enforcement, trust building.

**Partnership risks**
## Annex 6: Timeline of the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preliminary work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentation collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Scoping Mission &amp; Consultations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Draft of the Inception Report</td>
<td>7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Submission of the inception report</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Comments by IDEV team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Revision of the inception report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Submission of Final Inception Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Draft of Technical Report</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Submission of the draft report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Comments on the draft report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Revision of the Draft Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Emerging findings workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Integration of final comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Final Synthesis Report Submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 7: List of Documents for Evaluation Synthesis of Partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type / level</th>
<th>Main categories / themes</th>
<th>Notes / status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Evaluation of Development Results (CEDR)</td>
<td>0. Synthesis report</td>
<td>• Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. 14 CSPEs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 14 Context Factor Reviews (CFR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAs</td>
<td>3. IDEV Project Results Assessments PRA (n=169) – plus related PCRs</td>
<td>• Available; but need to get a list with some information on PCRs for drawing the sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• some PCRs will be in French only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic evaluations / syntheses</td>
<td>1. Trust Funds 2013</td>
<td>• Most reports are available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. CBFF evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Private sector synthesis 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Agriculture value chains 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Water synthesis / cluster evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Energy (draft)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. PBO approach paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. RISP evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Other Bank-wide self-evaluations, reviews and reports</td>
<td>Relevant documents: Self-evaluations (PCRs, country strategy etc.), reviews involving partnership issues, annual reports. Policies, strategies and guidelines concerning partnerships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level</td>
<td>1. Long-term partnership strategy (2013-22)</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. President’s vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. High-five strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type / level</td>
<td>Main categories / themes</td>
<td>Notes / status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Partnerships:** Corporate processes and structures | Special initiatives  
1. Trust funds  
2. Other partnership finance funds  
4. Global/regional partnership programs  
3. Other special initiatives | Trust Fund information available, but mostly pre-2013/14  
Some information on Global partnership programs available  
Requested from FIRM:  
4. FIRM Annual Reports or annual trust fund reports (summary reports), if available  
5. Resource Mobilization Strategy (draft);  
6. Terms of Reference (ToR) of the Standing Committee on Partnerships (SCPs);  
7. Internal Review of Memoranda of Understandings (MoUs);  
8. List of Trust Funds (TFs) - bilateral and thematic TFs;  
9. Documents AfDB/China Africa Growing Together Fund (AGTF) | DBDA process; OPSCOM  
To be followed up |
| | Private sector syndication | FIST  
EPSA partnership with Japan as a potential case study  
Priv. Sector Department (PISD) to be contacted |
| **Information on specific Trust Funds and Other Financing Mechanisms** | Africa Climate Change Fund (ACCF)  
Africa Trade Fund (ATF)  
Africa Growing Together Fund (AGTF)  
African Water Facility (AWF)  
Agriculture Fast Track Fund  
China AfDB (only a 1-page powerpoint available)  
Korea Africa Economic Cooperation (KOAFEC)  
ClimDec-Africa Special Fund  
Fund for African Private Sector Assistance (FAPA)  
MENA TF  
Nigeria Technical Cooperation Fund (NTCF)  
Pillar Assessed Grant or Delegation Agreement (PAGODA; EU, relatively recent)  
Portuguese Cooperation Fund (PTF)  
Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Initiative (RWSSI)  
Sustainable Energy Fund (SEFA)  
Global Environment Facility (GEF)  
Climate Investment Fund (CIF) | Miscellaneous information available from various individual trust funds (see separate list prepared by Eustace) |
| **Partnering for the High Five** | 1. Light-up  
Lead sector/complex: PEVP, Electricity, energy, climate and green growth | • **Strategy:** No consolidated strategy, but **identified areas for Bank resources and leverage available**  
• There is a Department for ‘Partnerships for energy’ (Astrid Manroth)  
• Climate and green growth are crosscutting. CIF/GEF could be a case study |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type / level</th>
<th>Main categories / themes</th>
<th>Notes / status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. Feed     | Lead sector/complex: AHVP, Agriculture development, human and social | • Strategy: Agric. strategy of 2010 outdated; refer to “Feed Africa” strategy  
• Division manager responsible for partnerships in agriculture is Ken Johm  
• Agriculture Fast Track TF could be a case study |
| 3. Industrialize | Lead sector/complex: PIVP, Private Sector Development Department and Industry Department; plus infrastructure | • Strategy: Does PIVP have a strategy? Is 2013 Private Sector Development Strategy still valid?  
• Information on syndication available, incl. 2008 guidelines |
| 4. Integrate | Lead sector/complex: RDVP, Regional integration, development and service delivery | • Strategy: Bank Group Regional Policy and Integration Strategy 2014 23 available |
| 5. Quality of life | Lead sector/complex: AHVP, Agriculture development, human and social Jobs, youth Education Water and Sanitation | • Strategy: New water policy being discussed – went recently back to SMCC  
• Information on Water and Sanitation available, RWSSI, AWF; could be a case study |

Measuring results of partnerships

Bank Results Measurement Framework

PCRs and CSP reviews

169 PCRs are with IDEV

3. External sources

Relevant documents: Corporate evaluations of partnerships. Evaluation of trust funds.

Other IFIs

1. World Bank Group  
2. AsDB  
3. IFAD  
4. GEF  
5. IADB

reports available (WB, AsDB, IADB, IFAD, GEF)

Bilaterals EU and UN

1. EU  
2. Key UN partners for AfDB (eg. UNICEF, UNDP, FAO)  
3. Bilaterals: DFID, JICA, Germany, AFD, Dutch, Swiss, Nordic  
4. Non-traditional donors (eg. Korea, China, India)

Candidate options to follow-up with priority
## Annex 7: Schedule of Scoping Mission (5-12 February 2018) / Persons met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Department / Activity</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, 5 February 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 10:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partnerships Team Meeting</td>
<td>Oswald Agbadome, Senior Evaluation Officer IDEV.2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:m.agbadome@afdb.org">m.agbadome@afdb.org</a>, <a href="mailto:e.uzor@afdb.org">e.uzor@afdb.org</a>, <a href="mailto:detlev26@gmail.com">detlev26@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eustace Uzor, Long-term Consultant IDEV2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detlev Puetz, External Lead Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30- 11.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Briefing with IDEV Team</td>
<td>Foday Turay, OIC, IDEV1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:f.turay@afdb.org">f.turay@afdb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madhusoodnan, Mampuzhasseril, OIC, IDEV2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:m.mampuzhasseril@afdb.org">m.mampuzhasseril@afdb.org</a>, <a href="mailto:m.agbadome@afdb.org">m.agbadome@afdb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oswald Agbadome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, 6 February 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15 - 12:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Syndications and Client Solutions</td>
<td>Xavier Rollat, Chief Co-Financing and Syndication Officer, FIST1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:x.rollat@afdb.org">x.rollat@afdb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:10 - 16:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery, Performance Management and Results (SNDR)</td>
<td>Dr. Victoria Chisala, Division Manager Results</td>
<td><a href="mailto:v.chisala@afdb.or">v.chisala@afdb.or</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, 7 February 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 - 11.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operations Committee Secretariat and Quality Assurance (SNOQ)</td>
<td>Dr. Awa BAMBA, OIC, SNOQ</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a.bamba@afdb.org">a.bamba@afdb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cohen Marc, Division Manager SNOQ2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:m.cohen@afdb.org">m.cohen@afdb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-100</td>
<td></td>
<td>IDEV</td>
<td>Girma Kumbi, Principal Evaluation Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:g.kumbi@AFDB.ORG">g.kumbi@AFDB.ORG</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-15:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies and Operational Policies (SNSP)</td>
<td>Kapil Kapoor, Director SNSP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:k.kapoor@afdb.org">k.kapoor@afdb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Massamba Diene, Division Manager, SNSP1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:m.diene@afdb.org">m.diene@afdb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, 8 February 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 9:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Integration Coordination Office (RDRI)</td>
<td>Soare Mamady, Manager Operation Office (RDRI0)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:m.souare@afdb.org">m.souare@afdb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 10.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Water, Human and Social Development (AHWS)</td>
<td>Mulen Oswald Chanda, IOC Director</td>
<td><a href="mailto:o.chanda@afdb.org">o.chanda@afdb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jochen Rudolph, RWSSI Focal Person, AHWS1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.rudolph@afdb.org">j.rudolph@afdb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 :30 - 12:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Climate Change and Green Growth(PECG)</td>
<td>Okon Anthony Nyong, Director PECG</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a.nyong@afdb.org">a.nyong@afdb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00- 14:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Climate Change and Green Growth(PECG)</td>
<td>Joseph Justus Kabyemera, Coordinator - ClimDev Africa Special Fund (CDSF)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.kabyemera@afdb.org">j.kabyemera@afdb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00- 14:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Development Evaluation (IDEV.1)</td>
<td>Penelope Jackson, Chief Evaluation Officer,</td>
<td><a href="mailto:p.jackson@afdb.org">p.jackson@afdb.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, 9 February 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 – 10:30</td>
<td>Agriculture and Agro-Industry</td>
<td>Chinedum Chiji Ojukwu, Director AHAI Jonas Chianu, Chief Agricultural Economist and Coordinator AFT (represented by Njie, Modou Badara)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:c.ojukwu@afdb.org">c.ojukwu@afdb.org</a> <a href="mailto:j.chianu@afdb.org">j.chianu@afdb.org</a> <a href="mailto:m.njie@afdb.org">m.njie@afdb.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:40 - 11:50</td>
<td>Syndications and Client Solutions</td>
<td>Peter Ide, Chief Technical Assistance Officer, FIST1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:p.ide@afdb.org">p.ide@afdb.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-12:45</td>
<td>Committee for Development Effectiveness (CODE)</td>
<td>ED Gaomab, Heinrich - Chair CODE ED Cudre-Mauroux, Catherine, Vice Chair CODE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 – 18:00</td>
<td>Independent Development Evaluation (IDEV.2)</td>
<td>Madhusoodnan, Mampuzhasseril, OIC, IDEV2 Oswald Agbadome, Senior Evaluation Officer IDEV.2 Eustace Uzor, Long-term Consultant IDEV2 Detlev Puetz, External Lead Consultant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:m.mampuzhasseril@afdb.org">m.mampuzhasseril@afdb.org</a> <a href="mailto:m.agbadome@afdb.org">m.agbadome@afdb.org</a> <a href="mailto:e.uzor@afdb.org">e.uzor@afdb.org</a> <a href="mailto:detlev26@gmail.com">detlev26@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, February 12, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 - 12:00</td>
<td>Resource Mobilization and Partnerships (FIRM)</td>
<td>Desiré Vencatchellum, Director Alex Mubiru, Division Manager FIRM1 Valerie Dabady, Division Manager, FIRM2 Jeruto Chesire Belinda, Principal Cooperation Officer, FIRM2 Principal Cooperation Officer, FIRM2</td>
<td><a href="mailto:d.vencatchellum@afdb.org">d.vencatchellum@afdb.org</a> <a href="mailto:a.mubiru@afdb.org">a.mubiru@afdb.org</a> <a href="mailto:v.dabady@afdb.org">v.dabady@afdb.org</a> <a href="mailto:b.chesire@afdb.org">b.chesire@afdb.org</a> <a href="mailto:c.manlan@afdb.org">c.manlan@afdb.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 - 2:30</td>
<td>IDEV.2</td>
<td>Joseph Mouanda</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.mouanda@afdb.org">j.mouanda@afdb.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40 - 3:20</td>
<td>IDEV.2</td>
<td>Foday Turay</td>
<td><a href="mailto:f.turay@afdb.org">f.turay@afdb.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>