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1. Introduction

The present document is the inception report which marks the end of the initial stage of the evaluation of the African Development Bank's (AfDB) Kingdom of Eswatini’s Country Strategy and Program Evaluation (CSPE) over the period 2009-2018. It was prepared following the scoping mission undertaken in Eswatini and South Africa from 6th to 11th April 2018.

1.1 Scope and objectives

This country evaluation is based on three key objectives in a double-perspective approach:

- A retrospective dimension aiming at (i) assessing the AfDB assistance to the country through an analysis of the development results of its key interventions and of the reasons which underly such results;
- A prospective and learning dimension by (ii) learning from successes and challenges to provide lessons and recommendations, which will contribute to (iii) informing the design of the future country strategy (CSP).

Beyond the future CSP, the CSPE should also inform future programming - both strategic and operational - in other countries with similar programmes. It is therefore key to provide clear and traceable evidence on the development results of the AfDB's engagement as well as how this engagement was managed. This must enable to identify the factors that affect good or poor performance.

The evaluation scope covers a portfolio of 14 projects approved between 2009 and 2018 in seven high-level sectors: (i) agriculture; (ii) water supply and sanitation, (iii) transport (roads), (iv) finance; (v) power/energy; (vi) environment; (vii) multi-sector. These interventions, being completed or in course of implementation during the 2009-2018 period, are complemented by non-lending activities (analytical work, advisory services, policy dialogue, capacity development and aid coordination), and are framed by two Country Strategy Papers: CSP 2009-2013 and CSP 2014-2018. The evaluation will also consider, as far as possible, operations in pipeline during the evaluation period.

---

1 In this report, the name of the Kingdom of Swaziland has been changed to Kingdom of Eswatini, in accordance with the Declaration of Change of Swaziland Name Notice, which came into force on the 19th April 2018.

2 7 specific sectors are included in the bank portfolio, but the ToRs suggest to regroup them in 5 coherent sector
The outputs of the assignment are the following:

- Five sector reviews including an analysis of the portfolio of the 14 interventions and the sector specific ToC;
- A technical report including an overall analysis and synthesis of the Bank’s activities in Eswatini based on the sector reviews, and an examination of the overall Theory of Change and of specific strategic issues;
- A summary report of the technical report.

1.2 Evaluation process

The evaluation process is presented in ADE’s methodological offer. It is structured in three phases: inception phase, data collection and analysis phase, and reporting and quality assurance phase. The table below summarizes for each phase the tasks to be carried out in relation to the methodological approach, and the corresponding deliverables.
During the inception phase, the consultant team fine-tuned the evaluation questions, developed the evaluation design and the evaluation framework as well as prepared and tested data collection tools, identified required resources, and determined exact roles and responsibilities. In the data collection and analysis phase, the consultant team will implement the detailed evaluation plan through a complementary document review, field visits and key informant interviews. Subsequently, the sectoral reports, technical report and the summary report will be drafted during the reporting phase and refined based on comments from internal as well as external peer-reviewers. This report marks the end of the inception phase which enabled us to put the evaluation framework in place by implementing the following activities:

- Literature and documentary review (see bibliography in Annex 2);
- Context analysis and Theory of Change (ToC) elaboration;
- Portfolio review and analysis;
- Scoping mission;
- Evaluation framework elaboration;
- Inception report drafting.
The scoping mission took place from 6th to 11th April 2018. It was undertaken by M. Girma Kumbi from IDEV, M. Hubert Cathala, ADE Team leader, and M. Bheki Mamba, ADE Evaluation expert. The mission was supported by the AfDB Eswatini country team. The list of people and institutions met during the mission is presented in Annex 3.

1.3 Risks and limitations

Various risks and limitations were identified in the methodological proposal. They are summarised below along with the ways in which the evaluation team intends to mitigate them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The challenges of a country-level evaluation include the complexity of the exercise, which aims to provide results, conclusions and recommendations encompassing both strategic, sectoral, and operational considerations. This is made all the more complex by the fact that the analysis is based on a large number of interventions as well as non-financial support in a variety of sectors.</td>
<td>This exercise is well known to the Team Leader who has led and supervised similar exercises successfully, such as the Evaluation of the AfDB’s support to agricultural value chain development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sector level is a key level of analysis for this CSPE</td>
<td>The methodology for this evaluation capitalises on ADE and other companies’ best practices from recent successful CSPEs for IDEV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The methodological approach insists on the sector level analysis, but will provide globally useful lessons, conclusions and recommendations at strategic, sectoral, and operational levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A challenging political environment and poor governance</td>
<td>ADE has extensive experience in strategic evaluations in similar contexts. The proposed methodology takes into account the inherent limitations of an evaluation in countries with weak governance scores and proposes the following mitigation measures, consistent with our experience of evaluating strategies and programmes in the same contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The scoping mission made it possible to assess the degree of quality and availability of secondary data and to set up a strategy for the appropriate collection of missing data;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The evaluation team will systematically cross-reference sources to ensure data reliability and avoid the potential influence of political views in interviewee responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A profound evolution of the context during the evaluation period (2011 economic crisis),</td>
<td>The Bank’s assistance to Eswatini has undergone significant changes, given the 2011 economic crisis. The evaluation should consider the full evaluation period 2009-2018, and not focus only on the post-crisis period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The evaluation team will ensure during the interviews that the interviewees highlight their experiences during the different sub-periods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, the fact that Swaziland does not benefit from a proper local AfDB office and is largely managed from Johannesburg / Pretoria is a further difficulty in the sense that Bank personnel are less embedded in the country's issues and have less of a global vision of the AfDB's interventions in the country, the AfDB's role in coordination and in terms of political dialogue. Moreover, access to data and contacts with local officials and non-government stakeholders, and with development partners may be less than is the case in countries in which there is an active in-country bank presence. This situation is compounded by the fact that many of the AfDB personnel presently in charge of Swaziland have only recently assumed their responsibilities concerning the Swazi portfolio, meaning they have a limited historical vision of the programme over the last ten years. The evaluation team will give specific attention to this particular situation in order to properly understand the issues and constraints linked to it, in close collaboration with IDEV.

Finally, the scoping mission suffered some limitations due to communication challenges between the AfDB and Swazi Authorities. As a result, it was not possible to meet as many institutions as had been originally planned during the preparation phase.
2. Country context

The Kingdom of Eswatini is a small, landlocked country bordering Mozambique (to the east) and South Africa (to the north, west and south). With its 17,360 km² and a population of around 1.45 million (2016) it is one of the smallest countries in Africa. Though it classifies as a lower middle income economy, the Swazi Human Development Index (HDI) stood at 0.541 in 2015, ranking the country at 148 out of 188 countries. The average Swazi life expectancy at birth is 58 years (WHO, 2016), one of the lowest in the world. One of the major determinants of this situation is the extremely high 27.2% HIV/AIDS prevalence rate (2017) in the population, the highest in the world. The impact of so many AIDS-related deaths in Eswatini exacerbates existing poverty for families, resulting in a very youthful population. Around 38% of the population are aged under 15 and only 5% are aged 60 or over. (WHO Swaziland Profile 2016).

Its capital is Mbabane. Swazi and English, the official language, are spoken throughout most of the country.

2.1 Economic Context

With a gross national income (GNI) per capita of about US$ 2,960 (WB, 2016), Eswatini is classified as a lower-middle-income country. An open economy, it is very closely linked to South Africa on which it depends for about 85% of its imports (including most of its electricity) and about 60% of its exports. Eswatini’s currency -the Lilangeni- is pegged to the South African rand, effectively relinquishing its monetary policy to South Africa (inflation trends in Eswatini closely follow the trends in South Africa). Though the figure is down from 60% at the beginning of the decade, the government is dependent on customs duties from the Southern African Customs Union (SACU) for 49% of its revenue, meaning movements in SACU receipts have important implications for the fiscal balance and the health of the economy in general. Unemployment levels are extremely high, standing around 28% as per the African Economic outlook 2018. The employment-to-population ratios is 39%, one of the lowest in Africa (African Economic Outlook, 2018).

The agricultural sector which in the past was the main growth sector contributing about 36% to GDP in the 1980s, is now responsible for only 6% of GDP. With a combined contribution to GDP of 93%, manufacturing and government services have now emerged as the dominant sectors, while tourism is expected to offer economy diversification and growth opportunities in the future. To exploit the potential of this latter sector, government has taken a number of initiatives including the drafting of legislation to

---

3 World factbook 2016, CIA
4 However, over the last decade Eswatini has done well to curb its HIV epidemic. At 79%, they have one of the highest rates of antiretroviral treatment coverage in sub-Saharan Africa, and they have also increased their own investment and funding for the HIV response. The Swazi life expectancy at birth was 46 years in 2004 (UNDP).
5 UNDP Human Development Index 2016
6 World Bank, Country overview, April 2017
7 The Swazi lilangeni exchanges at parity with the rand which is also legal tender in the country
8 African Economic Outlook 2014
regulate the gaming industry and the development of regulations on tourism accommodation and establishments.

Although its resource base is small, Eswatini has not fully exploited its potential in the mining sector. Coal reserves, estimated at about 158 million tons, could attract private sector investments for the export market. The mining sector, however, has restrictions from a policy perspective and also suffers from institutional capacity constraints. Investors face equity restrictions and shorter periods for prospecting rights.

The tertiary sector has grown since 2000 from 38% to over half (51%) of GDP. The industrial sector is Eswatini’s second largest economical sector, contributing to 42% of GDP in 2014. Wages in Eswatini being relatively lower than in South Africa contribute to Swazi competitiveness but also to a brain drain. The main manufacturing activities consist of agriculture-based value-adding activities -commercial agro-processing of sugar (particularly Coca-Cola concentrate9), citrus fruit, canned fruit (pineapples), meat- forestry products (wood pulp) as well as clothing and textiles10. Most of Eswatini’s overseas trade comprises of i) sugar, ii) wood pulp, iii) textile and clothing, iv) canned fruit and v) soft drink concentrates.

Despite the fact that agriculture now represents only 6% of GDP, around 70% of Eswatini’s population is based in rural areas11, with their livelihoods predominantly dependent on subsistence agriculture. Besides, the agricultural sector provides essential inputs to the manufacturing sector.

The rise in the tertiary sector and reduction of the importance of the agricultural and secondary sectors has resulted in a reduced capacity to absorb unskilled labour. The increasing role of services, especially due to the growth of the telecommunications and financial sectors, has led to demand for higher skilled labour, and reduced the economy’s labor absorptive capacity. This has been compounded by low growth and a mismatch between skills supply and demand.

Eswatini has invested heavily in infrastructure in recent times and the country’s infrastructure can be considered to be in a better state than that of most other African countries. However, bottlenecks in all kinds of infrastructure, including those relating to transport, electricity, and telecommunications, all of which increase the cost of doing business, remain; and infrastructural facilities in rural areas are relatively poor. Moreover, the country is still confronted with the problem of maintenance, inadequate investment in the electricity sector and telecommunication services. The Global Competitiveness Index ranks Eswatini at 73 out of 144 countries in the quality of its infrastructure.

Structural constraints to growth include Eswatini’s myriad complex government regulations and processes, as reflected in its low rank in the Ease of Doing Business Index. Problems of property seizure, weak enforcement of property right, weak labor protections, and a high level of corruption adversely affect the business setting. This diminishes Eswatini’s

---

9 Eswatini hosts the principal Coca-Cola concentrate plant for Southern and Eastern Africa
10 African Economic Outlook 2016
11 CSP 2014-2018
attractiveness as an investment destination. Some of the country’s growth challenges can also be traced back to issues around access to land. The country’s Title Deed Land which accounts for the bulk of the country’s land in commercial and industrial use, and under high value crops (citrus, forestry and sugarcane), is characterized by high levels of investment, irrigation, and productivity but is becoming increasingly scarce. Meanwhile, much of Swazi Nation Land is under subsistence agriculture and provides employment to about 75% of the population but attracts little investment and suffers from low productivity. Moreover, the public sector is considered too large by many in Eswatini. The government’s wage bill is one of the highest in the region: 15.3 % of GDP in 2012/13 and 15.8 % in 2013/14.

Many consider that Eswatini’s fiscal problems and related economic problems are linked to its high wage bill (which peaked at 18% of GDP in 2010), fairly high capital spending, and low tax revenues (see IMF 2017 Staff Report). Revenues to GDP have fallen from 20% of GDP in 2009-2010 to 15% in 2017 as SACU transfers declined. Nonetheless, others argue that the Eswati economy is mainly consumption driven and that reducing the large public sector and increasing tax too abruptly would further deepen the economic crisis. Such arguments over how far economic growth should be demand driven appear to be one of the explanations to the fact that little has been done to address the causes of the 2011 economic crisis.

Despite the large public sector, the Swazi private sector is a primary generator of exports and provides about 70% of formal employment opportunities in the country. Indeed, small-scale enterprises create a significant number of jobs in the Swazi private sector underscoring the importance of government’s continued support for their growth and integration into the formal sector.

The 2011 economic crisis
During the 1980’s, Eswatini had one of the fastest growing economies in Africa. In the 1990’s, the dawn of South Africa’s majority rule, which ended her political and economic isolation, eroded some of Eswatini’s advantages as a destination for investment. As the inflows of foreign direct investment declined; real GDP growth fell to less than 2.5 % for the period 1993 to 2008. Indeed, the country’s real GDP growth rate has been below the SACU average since 2000 while real GDP per capita remains the lowest among SACU countries. Between 2009 and 2011 the economy grew at an average of less than 1.3 % as SACU revenues dropped thereby reducing government capacity to maintain high expenditures. In 2011, the country suffered its worst fiscal crisis since independence due to a 63% decline in SACU revenue, as a result of the slowdown of the South African economy and the unwinding of infrastructure spending associated with the 2010 FIFA World Cup. Economic activity stagnated, real GDP grew at 0.7 % in 2011 and then contracted by 0.3 % in 2012. With a fiscal deficit reaching 11.3 % of GDP in 2010/11, the country could not meet some of its payment obligations in time, resulting in the accumulation of domestic arrears of almost 5 % of GDP. The fiscal crisis spilled over to the rest of the economy as the accumulation of arrears by the Government created financial constraints on private businesses, which consequently reduced their activities.
(private investments declined from 16.7% of GDP in 2000 to 8% in 2015\textsuperscript{12}). Real GDP was estimated to have contracted by 0.3% in 2012.

The fiscal deficit remained high (-9.6%) in 2011/12, but in 2012/13, inflows from the common revenue pool more than doubled to E7.1 billion, compared to their level in 2011/12 resulting in a fiscal surplus of 3% of GDP. SACU inflows in 2013/14 were at the same level as in the previous year, enabling Government to clear all payments arrears to the private sector.

Eswatini’s economic growth has improved since the 2010–11 fiscal crisis, however economic growth remains limited mainly due to droughts that hurt agricultural production, a weaker mining sector and subdued prospects in South Africa, the major trading partner. Government estimates for 2016 and 2017 are of 1.9% for 2017 and 1.4% for 2016 (due to the draught which affected the primary sector). The country’s textile and apparel sector has had to contend with the loss of markets following the suspension of eligibility for benefits under AGOA in January 2015\textsuperscript{13} albeit with modest impact on Eswatini’s growth due to the relatively low share of the textile industry in GDP. Furthermore, Eswatini’s revenues from the Southern African Customs Union (SACU) have declined and are projected to continue declining in the coming years, raising concerns for fiscal and external sustainability. Indeed, such a decrease in revenue, combined with increased public spending, is generating higher fiscal deficits and a growing public debt\textsuperscript{14}. Eswatini thus needs to strengthen its resilience to shocks in anticipation of the expected SACU revenue fall.

South Africa and the European Union are the country’s main trading partners. Swaziland has traditionally exported agricultural and forestry products but food products, drinks processing and other manufacturing activities have increased their importance and currently account for over 35% of GDP. While capital investment in Swaziland slowed during the 1990s, significant expansion has occurred in existing industries such as refrigerator manufacturing, wood pulp production and sugar refining.

Swaziland has struggled to attract new foreign investors, who prefer to invest in South Africa, its neighbouring country. FDI flows decreased strongly under the effect of the global economic slowdown, and remain very low: in 2016 the flow was negative (-11 million USD), after reaching USD 32 million in 2015. The total FDI stock is estimated to be at USD 545 million (UNCTAD). The main sectors attracting foreign investment remain sugar, paper pulp and non-alcoholic beverage concentrates. The main investing countries are South Africa, the United Kingdom, Denmark and the Netherlands.

The 2017 IMF report declares that the country faces a number of serious macro-economic risks. It notes that “The main risk stems from further tightening in budget financing. Additional risks arise from deteriorating banks’ asset quality, lower SACU revenue and demand for key exports. With a fragile outlook, the materialization of risks could trigger abrupt fiscal adjustment”. (IMF 2017 Staff Report, p. 2)

\textsuperscript{12} IMF, September 2017, Selected Issues paper
\textsuperscript{13} AGOA has since been restored
\textsuperscript{14} World Bank, Country overview, April 2017
The Swazi private sector remains small and weak, with a low level of domestic entrepreneurship that reflects the reliance on foreign direct investment as the driver of growth.

Consistent with decreases in food and fuel prices, inflation has been trending downwards since 2009 with the country recording single-digit inflation figures over the last 9 years (inflation was estimated at 7% in 2017 according to the 2018 African Economic Outlook). The Swazi fiscal policy remains expansionary to boost economic activity and public debt has grown steadily to about 17 % of GDP in 2015 and 24% in 2018\textsuperscript{15}. The deficit is financed through domestic borrowing, including Central Bank financing, and accumulation of domestic arrears, which threatens banking sector stability and potentially crowds out the private sector. Nonetheless, public debt remains sustainable (2018 African Economic Outlook).

2.2 Social context

Despite its middle-income status, an estimated 63% of the Swazi population lives below the poverty line (42% lives in extreme poverty, on less than USD 1.90 (PPP) a day). Such poverty levels are amongst the lowest in the region. This is due to the fact that income distribution is highly unequal with the Eswatini Gini coefficient estimated at 49.5 (WB, 2018). Indeed, though this does not correspond to Gini coefficient ratings, Oxfam classifies Swaziland as the most inequitable country in the world. Freedom House remarks that the top 10% of the population control 40% of the nation’s wealth, and that the Tibiyo Taka Ngwane (a sovereign wealth fund) has garnered assets of close to $2 billion and is held in trust by the King.

Among the many causes of poverty in Eswatini, a lack of effective health care is one of the largest concerns. The nation holds the highest rate of HIV prevalence in the world (28.8% of the adult population) (Borgen Institute, 2017, Gender Inequality and Causes of Poverty in Swaziland). In addition, despite a high annual birth rate of 28.3 births per 1000 people, high mortality rates (52 per 1000 births, 73 per 1000 for under 5s and 7000 AIDS related deaths per year) limit the increase in population (UNDP, 2016).

Moreover, the Swazi population is extremely young. The median age is 20.5 years and about 40% of the population is under 15 years of age, resulting in a relatively high dependency ratio. Besides, 23% of the country’s population comprises of orphans and vulnerable children. Furthermore, this young population faces a high level of unemployment (53% of 15-24-year-olds are unemployed)\textsuperscript{16}.

In terms of geographic disparities, the East (Lubombo) and South (Shiselweni) are the driest and the poorest regions of the country, while the Centre-West (Manzini) and North (Hhohho) regions, which include the major urban centres of Mbabane and Manzini, have

\textsuperscript{15} World Bank, Country overview, April 2018. However, it must be noted that 2017 IMF Staff Report states that Swaziland has seen its ratio of public debt (gross) to GDP double over the last five years, from 15.3% of GDP in 2013 to 31.3% in 2017. WB and IMF figures are inconsistent.

\textsuperscript{16} UNDP Human Development Index 2016
the lowest poverty rates\(^{17}\). In general, the prevalence of poverty (and unemployment) is more pronounced in rural areas.

With respect to education, Eswatini has one of the highest enrollment and literacy rates on the continent but the quality of education and training remains poor despite government allocating the largest share of its budget to this sector. According to the IMF (2017), Eswatini has one of the highest skills mismatch index in the world, ranking 136\(^{th}\) out of 139 countries. One possible source of such mismatch can be found in lower educational attainments particularly at the secondary and tertiary level compared to other lower middle-income countries.

**Figure 3. A low supply of skilled labor force in Eswatini**

![Educational Level Enrollment, 2015](image)

*Source: Barro-Lee, Central Statistics Office, ILO, World Economic Forum, Penn World Tables, and IMF staff estimates*

Current curricula are identified as not being relevant enough to the needs of the labour market. In particular, vocational schools have not developed enough links with industries.

### 2.3 Food security

In Eswatini 26% of Swazi children under the age of five are stunted (WFP, 2018) and 18% of households are food insecure, according to a measure of per capita access to calories (FAO, 2009).

Eswatini has historically depended on imports for about 20% of its food requirements. Moreover, while population is growing the production is on decline with maize production decreasing between 2000 and 2012 at a rate of 30%, dropping from an average 100,000 tons of maize per year in 2000 to an average harvest of 70,000 tons in 2012. According to the World Food Programme (WFP), the outcome of the annual assessment by the Swaziland Vulnerability Assessment Committee (Swazi VAC) indicated that 116,000 people (10% of the population but down from 25% in 2006) faced a food deficit during the 2012/2013 lean season. This was a 30% increase on the 2011/12 figure of 89,000.

\(^{17}\) Swaziland Household and Expenditure Survey (SHIES), 2010-11
More recently, the season 2016/17 saw the worst ever recorded maize production (33,460.00 MT corresponding to a 60% decrease), mainly due to El Niño and the resulting crop failure. The Lubombo and Shiselweni regions recorded the highest numbers of vulnerable population as affected by the effects of the prolonged dry spells.

However, the 2017/2018 season was mainly characterised by normal to above normal rainfalls, resulting in maize production returning to normal at 84,344.00 MT. None the less, the current maize production is 30% less than the average national requirement. This can be met through imports; but the pressure on food prices remains high and results from the Rapid Nutrition and Health Assessment conducted in 2017 revealed that the prevalence of acute malnutrition had increased from 2% to 3% during the drought period (WFP, 2018).

Food security is threatened by a number of factors, especially unsustainable farming techniques, low rainfall and limited irrigable land. In addition, extension services required to lift agricultural productivity do not adequately cover smallholder farmers. Problems emanating from soil erosion, the haphazard location of non-agricultural activities, overgrazing, and policy conflict present additional challenges to food security.

Swazi authorities appear to consider food security mainly from a production point of view. An Irrigation Policy was formulated, in 2007, to address the problem of food security. Increasing irrigated land and organising farmers into cooperatives to facilitate the provision of extension services, thereby enhancing productivity, appear to be its main areas of activity in terms of addressing food security issues.

2.4 Gender inequalities

53% of the Swazi population are women. Though women have only been able to vote and stand for election since 1968, Eswatini has made progress in promoting gender equality by adopting the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women and a constitution that protects women’s rights in key areas such as land allocation, maternal rights and participation in political decision making. It has also ratified the African Charter on Human Rights and People’s Rights of Women in Africa and the SADC Protocol on Gender and Development.

However, the revision of the legal frameworks to enact the gender equality provisions of the constitution into laws has been slow. The Marriage Act, Deeds Registry Act and the Review of Administration of the Estate which were drafted with support from the UN Agencies took many years to be finalised. The Sexual Offences and Domestic Violence Bill, despite having been passed in Parliament in October 2017 has since been awaiting approval by the Senate where a debate over implications of various of its articles for cultural and marital practices persists.

In spite of the visible progress made in achieving gender parity and equality in rights guaranteed by the Constitution, important disparities still exist in the Swazi society. The Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Plan (PRSAP) acknowledges strong correlation between gender and poverty in the country; the prevalence of poverty is higher among
female-headed households (63%) than male headed ones (52%)\textsuperscript{18}. The gender development index (GDI) was 0.525 (or a ranking of 115 in the world) in 2012 according to the 2009-2013 CSP.

Moreover, despite progress in politically empowering women (22\% of seats in Parliament against a target of 30\%), the economic empowerment of women lags behind. Women's participation in formal employment is estimated at between 25\% and 30\% (33\% in the private sector and 43\% in the public sector)\textsuperscript{19}. Unemployment is also higher amongst women (70\% according to the 2009-2013 CSP).

Gender inequalities are more pronounced in access and control of productive resources, with inheritance, property rights and protection and security all being issues to address in this respect. Strong patriarchal traditions tend to maintain women in subordinate roles in almost all areas of social, cultural, economic and political activities. Married women cannot start a business, access credit and register property without the consent of their husbands for instance.

Specifically, in relation to agriculture, married women (even those whose husbands have migrated for work) are not in a position to make decisions on farm management. These challenges have led to the reduction of areas under cultivation and crop yield and caused changes in cropping patterns. To promote women's participation in commercial agriculture, the Ministry of Agriculture in collaboration with a private sector firm organizes the \textit{Women Farmer of the Year Competition} and awards good performing female farmers. Women's productivity in agriculture is also affected due to their lack security of land tenure.

In terms of gender related challenges, some of the major weaknesses include lack of supportive legal and policy frameworks as well as the limited institutional capacity to mainstream a gender perspective into development interventions. Although the country's constitution articulated women’s equal rights on key areas such as land allocation, maternal rights, participation in political decision making and other areas important for women’s equality, in practice women are still considered as minors.

The policy and institutional framework for promoting gender equality and empowerment of women remains weak. The countries National Gender Policy was only adopted in 2010 after several delays over the previous years. The Gender Unit (at the Ministry of Home Affairs) is mandated to mainstream a gender perspective into policy frameworks and programs. However, the Unit lacks the necessary human resources and budgetary provisions. There is the need to strengthen the capacity of the National Gender Machinery in order to enhance the mainstreaming of gender into policy formulation and development programming in key sectors. In particular, there is a recognised need to strengthen capacity of the Gender Unit to fulfill its mandate.

In addition to the Gender Unit, other structures on institutional strengthening arrangements for promoting gender equality include:

\textsuperscript{18} Swaziland Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Plan (PRSAP), 2006 - 2015

\textsuperscript{19} CSA 2009-2013 from "The AfDB: Labour Market Study of the Kingdom of Swaziland, July 2006"
The Sexual and Reproductive Health Unit of the Ministry of Health;

The National Emergency Response Council on HIV and AIDS (NERCHA) - with specific gender based initiatives relating to HIV and AIDS;

The SMME Unit of the Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry (women in business and entrepreneurship);

The Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs (pertaining to issues of rights, law and making judicial system accessible to women);

The Central Statistics Office - MEPD (ensuring gender/sex disaggregated data);

The Domestic Violence Child Protection & Sexual Offences Unit (D.C.S) of the Royal Swaziland Police

The Prevention of People Trafficking and People Smuggling Secretariat

There are also strong CSOs structures supporting gender equality. Besides, the Eswatini Parliament has also provided for the Parliamentary Women Caucus that also support promoting gender equality and women’s issues. Within the private sector, Business Women Forum Swaziland (BWFS) association with the Federation of Swaziland Employers and Chamber of Commerce (FSE&CC) has created space and voice for women entrepreneurs to engage and dialogue with key decision makers on issues affecting their businesses. A draft national strategy for the Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Trade regarding women has been prepared which includes cross border trade issues.

On the other hand, while the PRSAP identified strategies to promote gender equality and women empowerment, it had no clear targets, and timeframe for monitoring progress.

Customary laws and the Dutch Roman Common Law regard married women as minors and place them under the guardianship of their husbands. The dual nature of the legal framework creates a major challenge in protecting and securing women’s rights. Efforts to revise the legal frameworks to further interpret the gender equality provisions of the constitution into laws have been very slow. As previously mentioned, three key laws have been approved, namely (i) the Marriage Act, (ii) the Deeds Registry Act and (iii) the Review of Administration of the Estate, but this took considerable time. Moreover, the Sexual Offenses and Domestic Violence Bill which was drafted over 7 years ago to address the alarming level of Gender Based Violence in the Country, remains unapproved by the Senate despite having been voted in Parliament.

Regarding health, as the key driving factors of Eswatini’s HIV epidemic include low and inconsistent condom use, transactional sex, gender inequalities and gender based violence, it is clear that the cycle of poverty supported by this disease disproportionately affects women. With 120,000 of the 220,000 people living with HIV in Eswatini being women, studies reveal that 31% of all women within the country live with HIV, while only 20% of men are affected (Borgen Institute, 2017, Gender Inequality and Causes of Poverty in Swaziland).
2.5 Political Context

Eswatini is divided in 210 tribal areas, including 40 traditional communities (Clans). The capital is Mbabane and counts around 70000 inhabitants (2003). The country is divided into 4 regions: i) Hhohho, ii) Manzini, iii) Lubombo and iv) Shiselweni.

Map 1: Eswatini administrative map (source: CSP 2009-2013)

84.3% of the population are Swazi, 9.9% are Zulu, 3% Tonga and Shangaan with Indian (0.8%), Pakistani (0.8%) and Portuguese (0.2%) minorities (Source: Wikipedia)

The country has a dual -modern and traditional- political and governance system. A modern democratic parliamentary system modeled along the lines of the British system with 2 chambers (the House of Assembly and the Senate), coexists with a traditional monarchy based on chiefdoms. The 2005 Constitution provides for the separation of powers between the executive, the legislature and the judiciary. However, the King remains at the top of the constitutionally-created State and traditional systems and holds executive, legislative and judicial powers, although he no longer rules by decree despite being at the apex of both the constitutionally created state and traditional systems.

The NGO Human Right Watch mentions in its World Report 2017 that “Although the Swazi constitution provides for three separate organs of government—the executive, legislature, and judiciary—under Swaziland’s law and custom, all powers are vested in the king. Swaziland’s prime minister is supposed to exercise executive authority, but in reality, King Mswati holds supreme executive power and
controls the judiciary. The king appoints 20 members of the 30-member senate, 10 members of the house of assembly, and approves all legislation passed by parliament.”

Since 1973, political parties are illegal. However, political activities are allowed. As a result, informal political parties or networks such as the African United Democratic Party, Imbokodvo National Movement, Ngwane National Liberatory and People’s United Democratic Movement are known to exist.

Since 1978, a traditional electoral system (tinkhundla) has been introduced. Tinkhundla are Administrative sub-divisions (55 in total) based on a traditional governance system which underlies political organization and representation in Parliament. The House of Assembly has 65 seats corresponding to the fifty-five tinkhundla seats which are elected through the non-party political system and an additional 10 seats, directly appointed by the King. The King also directly appoints 20 of the 30 members of the senate as well as the Prime Minister. He also appoints the Cabinet, but upon recommendation of the Prime Minister.

The association of a bi-cameral constitution with a traditional monarchy is not without some level of political tension. In practice the separation of power is blurred, with ambiguities and overlaps in the policy and decision-making processes. There is also friction between a highly devolved tinkhundla system and a more Centralized government one. Balancing views on policy between the state and the traditional leaders is a delicate process that has to be managed by the executive. This complex political set-up has resulted in a challenging environment for policy formulation, approval and implementation.

2.6 Environmental context

Eswatini is divided into 3 distinct geographical regions known as the high, middle and low veld (plain), all approximately the same size. The Western region is mountainous with a central plateau and flatlands to the east.

The country is endowed with a wide range of forest resources. The total forest area is estimated at 32 % of total land area, including 7 % of planted forests. The cultivated plantations and natural woodlands are increasingly being degraded due to uncontrolled fires and extraction of forest products, agricultural development, and large livestock populations.

Eswatini is also prone to volatile weather conditions. The Climate Emergency Institute reports that, by 2050, Southern Africa’s temperatures and rainfall are expected to have risen by 2-4°C and to have fallen by 10-20 %, respectively, compared to the 1961-90 baselines.

Almost half of Eswatini’s land area of 17,364 km2 is vulnerable to desertification and degradation which have become a serious problem due to overgrazing and deforestation. Erosion is prevalent in all the agro-ecological zones particularly in communal grazing Swazi Nation Lands. Land degradation and ecosystems are projected to worsen, negatively

---

impacting productivity and possibilities for gaining a livelihood, especially in Eswatini’s low lying regions.

Wildlife was exterminated by European hunters in the first half of the 20th century and the remaining animals are being killed by poachers.

In the low-veld areas, water born infections result in high mortality rates.

The key institutions involved in the management of environmental impact assessments are the Swaziland Environment Authority (SEA), the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development (MoEP) and the municipalities. The SEA, created in 1992, is directed by a Board that sets policy priorities. SEA functions as an autonomous body operating outside of government, but still largely depends on government funding.

Eswatini also has institutions that handle climate change and green growth issues, such as the National Climate Change Committee and Designated National Authority. The 2010 Technology Needs Assessment, whose aim was to identify and evaluate climate change mitigation and adaptation technologies and measures consistent with Eswatini’s national development priorities established gaps in education, training and public awareness. All greenhouse gas emissions are currently estimated at 25.4 million tons of CO2 equivalent and are expected to increase to 33.4 million tons by the year 2030, as the country responds to poverty and food security challenges.

Proposed mitigation measures include a fuel switch from coal to sugarcane trash in the sugar industry, strengthening and promoting renewable energy sources, efficient energy system and ethanol blending. Implementation of these proposals is supported by the Swaziland Environment Act 1992 and the Environment Management Act 2002, which provide the legal framework for managing the environment that requires that all Government programs be subjected to environmental assessment. The UNDP is currently assisting in building national capacity in climate change issues.

In terms of climate change impact, vulnerability studies indicate a reduced precipitation, increased temperature, change in length of rainy season, increased incidences of drought and floods, increased vulnerability of infrastructure, lack of policies and finally a negative impact on the economy. In general Eswatini is considered as being very much vulnerable to impacts of climate change; though the exact form of such impacts is still debated, it is clear that water reserves have been affected by the period of drought suffered from 2013-2015. Such periods of water stress if they are repeated in the future could cause strong health and sanitation problems as well as impact negatively agricultural irrigation and hence agricultural production.

Eswatini participates in and has ratified a number of international environmental conventions including, the Montreal Protocol on substances that deplete the ozone layer, the convention on Biodiversity, the convention to combat desertification, and the framework convention on climate change.

In general, Eswatini has a well-established system of environmental policies, laws, regulations and guidelines. Among others legislation the Environmental Management Act,
2002 gives SEA power to take legal action where there is contravention with environmental requirements. SEA is also in charge of monitoring compliance with environmental plans it approved.

The Environmental Audit, Assessment and Review Regulations of 2000 arms the Authority with sanctionary measures with regards to non-compliance. Most of all, it is the only piece of legislation that provides for public participation in environmental matters, one of the most important components of the Rio 10 Principles.

Challenges include:
- Lack of national capacity to review Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) which has meant that major development projects with possible adverse impact on the environment have gone ahead without adequate assessment;
- Lack of enforcement of legislations;
- Insufficient planning of grazing, farming and habitats;
- Inadequate collaboration between the SEA and ministries concerned with water sanitation and health.

The finalization and implementation of the Swaziland Environment Action Plan (SEAP) would ensure integration of environmental concerns into the national development planning process in a coordinated manner.

### 2.7 The sub regional dimension

Swaziland’s economy is fairly diversified and its economy is very closely linked to South Africa, which accounts for about 85% of Swazi imports and about 60% of Swazi exports (WB, 2016). The sub region represents an important potential market for the country’s products. Eswatini’s membership of several regional organisations is therefore of great significance. Faced with gradual loss of trade preferences and reduction in guaranteed EU price for sugar, the country’s membership of various regional economic organisations provides it with an opportunity to expand and diversify its markets within the region. Eswatini’s ability to compete effectively on cost offers it a platform to penetrate regional markets. The major regional organisations, Eswatini is part of, are the following:

- The Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) is a free trade area with twenty member states. While Eswatini is a member of the COMESA, its neighbours (South Africa, Lesotho, Mozambique and Botswana) are not part of the organisation.
- The Southern African Development Community (SADC) aims to further socio-economic cooperation and integration as well as political and security cooperation between 16 Southern African states.
- Five of the SADC members (Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa and Eswatini) are also part of the Southern African Customs Union (SACU), which provides for a common external tariff and a common excise tariff. All customs and excise collected in the common customs area are paid into South Africa’s National Revenue Fund. The revenue is shared among members according to a revenue-
sharing formula as described in the agreement. Membership of SACU is a major driver of the Swazi economy.

- Moreover, Eswatini’s membership of the Common Monetary Area (CMA\textsuperscript{21}) is a further important driver of its economy. CMA membership allows for a free flow of funds between Eswatini and other member countries. The CMA arrangements limit the scope of Eswatini’s monetary and exchange rate policies, which are linked to South Africa’s inflation-targeting framework.

Besides, in relation to the energy sector, the South African Power Pool (SAPP) is one of the 4 Power Pools in Sub-Saharan Africa. It is affiliated to the African Electrotechnical Standardisation Commission (AFSEC) created in South Africa and which has a growing importance in relation to energy efficiency throughout Africa.

More generally, in relation to infrastructure, the Programme for Infrastructure Development in Africa (PIDA) is coordinated by NEPAD and guides infrastructure investments at the level of the continent and SADC in relation to all of energy, transport, telecommunication and water resources.

### 2.8 Challenges

According to the World Bank (2018), the primary development challenge for the Eswatini is to address the high rate of poverty and inequality in the country (an estimated 63% of the population lives below the poverty line). The HIV/AIDS prevalence (31% of the population), among the highest in the world, is another major challenge for the country, particularly as it largely accounts for the country’s particularly low life expectancy (58 years according to WHO). Access to food and water is also a priority need for Eswatini (as a consequence of severe drought, up to a quarter of the population remains food- and water-insecure). Moreover, Swaziland needs to reduce its vulnerability to fiscal shocks that can potentially undermine macroeconomic stability; as well as address weak governance which discourage private investment.

These challenges are compounded by the uncertainty of Eswatini’s status regarding the United States’ African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) eligibility since January 2015 (the act contributes to ensure a relatively strong demand for Eswatini’s major exports, including textile and soft drink concentrate). This is exacerbated by a recent weakening of the regional economic outlook with potentially adverse impacts on Eswatini’s trade (South Africa and the EU markets have shrunk and commodity prices, as evidenced by the mining sector, exacerbated the decline of exports) and financial channels and the related further reductions in SACU revenues. Eswatini thus needs: (i) to strengthen its resilience to shocks in preparation for the expected SACU revenue fall and (ii) to achieve higher and inclusive growth and meet social and development needs\textsuperscript{22}.

To harness new growth opportunities and attract FDI Eswatini needs to become more competitive, particularly within SACU, where it is lagging behind in Doing Business

\textsuperscript{21} CMA members include Namibia, Lesotho, Eswatini, and South Africa. SACU members include the CMA countries plus Botswana.

\textsuperscript{22} FINCORP project Appraisal Report (PAR), 2017
indicators. The ‘Doing Business Report’ (2016) ranks Eswatini 105 out of 189 countries in the overall ease of doing business. Despite the fact that several of the Doing Business indicators between 2006 and 2015 reflect some improvements over time, the overall pace of progress has been slower than other RMCs. High levels of corruption, government bureaucracy, and limited access to finance remain significant problematic factors in terms of doing business.

The Economic Diversification Study (EDS) identified an inefficient bureaucracy, corruption, and poor access to finance as the main challenges faced by businesses. In addition, foreign equity in mining is restricted to a maximum of 50%. Small enterprises operating on Swazi National Land do not have land title, and this has adverse implications for access to credit. Access to electricity is considered the third major challenge; according to the Southern Africa Trade Hub Swaziland has the highest electricity cost in SACU.

Moreover, growth will need to be supported by investments in human capital and an inclusive social safety net system to address the poverty challenge. Other necessary measures include efforts to reform public financial (and investment) management systems, and enhance domestic revenue collection. In order to realize inclusive growth and address social and economic challenges, enhanced economic diversification and competitiveness of the whole production structure is required, beyond agricultural production. Eswatini thus needs to fast-track policy efforts to promote export diversification (through private sector development), enhance access to financing, and improve the business climate (IMF, 2015). On the long run, new growth poles that can sustain and boost economic growth have to be found.

Also, Eswatini’s private sector is small and weak and must be developed. In the past, a reliance on FDI as the driver of growth led to domestic entrepreneurship being neglected. In addition, a large public sector leaves little space for the domestic private sector, which is poorly organized and lacks influence over Government decision making.

Eswatini also needs to address its infrastructural shortcomings, especially for the rapidly growing urban areas, and position itself as a competitive node for the region. This is in addition to creating conditions for expansion of local entrepreneurship, improving the environment for agribusinesses, targeting support to smallholder farmers, and exploiting the potential for developing commercial agriculture with strong links to value chains in South Africa.

Reducing dependence on the volatile SACU revenues remains a further major challenge. Collection of domestic revenue has improved since the establishment of the Swaziland Revenue Authority (SRA) in 2011 and the successful introduction of the value-added tax in April 2012. Indeed, domestic revenue improved by 8% during the first year of the establishment of the SRA. None the less, a narrow tax base and weak economic growth limit tax collections and there is need to reduce fiscal vulnerabilities through fiscal consolidation and better management of SACU revenue inflows.

Institutionally, it should be noted that the country has a weak statistical practice and has not put in place a national monitoring and evaluation system enabling to monitor development progress adequately. The capacity of the Ministry of Economic Planning
(MoEP) to monitor and evaluate implementation progress needs to be strengthened. Also, the capacity of the Central Statistics Office to produce and report on development indicators needs to be enhanced through the provision of adequate resources and implementation of institutional reforms.

### 2.9 National Strategies and policy framework

The Royal Government of Swaziland’s (RGoS) Development Agenda is spelt out in the National Development Strategy (NDS) 2009-2022 and the long-term vision 1997-2022 (“Vision 2022”). The NDS was recently revised to capture SDG priorities and renamed the Strategy for Sustainable Development and Inclusive Growth; it will be associated to an implementation plan. The RGoS has further developed a Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Plan (PRSAP) for the period 2006-2015, it sets the major targets for the country, aiming at reducing poverty in Eswatini by 30% by 2015 and eradicating it by 2022. It constitutes a key document for operationalising the NDS and Vision 2022. The strategy rests on six strategic pillars: (i) maintaining macroeconomic stability and accelerated economic growth based on broad participation; (ii) Empowering the poor to generate income and reduce inequalities; (iii) Fair distribution of the benefits of growth through fiscal policy; (iv) Human capital development; (v) improving the quality of life of the poor; and (vi) Improving governance and strengthening institutions.

The PRSAP is summarised in the following table:
Currently, Eswatini’s development agenda is also guided by the Programme for Action (2013-2018). The prevailing theme for the Programme of Action 2013-2018 is the drive to secure a huge expansion of foreign and domestic large-scale investment, substantially accelerated growth in small, medium and micro scale enterprises, giving rise to taxes and duties that help Government meet the service targets of 2022. It represents a detailed strategy and action plan that sets out the contribution that Government Ministries must make in eight Focal Areas, namely: economic prosperity, agriculture and environment sustainability, education, health, service delivery, infrastructure, governance and corruption.

Following the decline in SACU revenues in 2009, several donors including the Bank provided technical assistance to the RGoS to develop a Fiscal Adjustment Roadmap (updated in 2012) to address macroeconomic instability.

The Fiscal Adjustment Roadmap (FAR) is produced out of Government’s desire to implement decisive immediate measures and reforms over the medium-term to deal with the challenges of the global financial crisis, most notably, the sharp deterioration in the fiscal outlook elaborated in this year’s budget. One of the fundamentals of this document is to bring the fiscal position to sustainable levels through revenue enhancement and better expenditure control, particularly the relatively large wage bill, and create space for the Government’s commitment to increase spending in the health and education sectors. The roadmap also focuses on efforts to promote a robust private sector to complement the
envisaged more efficient public sector in mobilizing domestic and foreign investment, diversify the economy, and accelerate employment creation. It combined immediate fiscal measures with more long term structural reforms. In particular, on the revenue side, the Bank supported the establishment of the SRA, leading to the introduction of Value-Added Tax (VAT), and the setting up of a large taxpayers’ unit all of which have enhanced domestic revenue collection. Due to the involvement of different government departments in expenditure decisions and budget execution, it has had less success in dealing with expenditure limitation though the PFM Bill was expected to tackle it.

In addition to the FAR, the RGoS also developed its Economic Recovery Strategy (ERS) a multiyear plan aimed at achieving economic growth and job creation, reforms to encourage trade and investment. The overall objective of the ERS is to achieve a growth rate of 5% and create at least 30,000 jobs by 2014. The main thrust of the recovery program is to strengthen macroeconomic management, restore investor and consumer confidence, undertake structural reforms, infrastructure development (increasing pro-poor and pro-growth investment), invest in human capital and empower the poor to generate income. It identifies potential growth sectors within the economy; these include i) agriculture (particularly through infrastructure improvement (irrigation, dams...) aimed at increasing sugarcane production); ii) energy (particularly the enhancement of electricity production); iii) drinking water supply; iv) social sector development (primary education, health...). The Government was expected to design and implement appropriate fiscal policy as well as adopt relevant monetary policy instruments that provide an enabling environment for the private sector to thrive. It is unclear how far such expectations have been met.

The country development agenda may be summarized in the following figure:
Figure 4: Eswatini development agenda

- DBS: Direct Budget Support; SBS: Sector Budget Support

The national policy framework for each sector of intervention of the AfDB in Eswatini will be explored in depth during the study. The non-exhaustive list below gives a first brief overview of these thematic policies:

- **Agriculture**: Comprehensive Agriculture Sector Policy (CASP, 2005); National Irrigation Policy (2005); National Food Security Policy (2005); and the National Programme for Food Security (NPFS); Swaziland National Agricultural Investment Plan (SNAIP, 2015); Agricultural Research Policy (2012)


- **Transport**: Road Transportation Act No:5 (2007); National Transport Policy; Road Fund Act


- **Power/energy**: Final National Energy Policy (2018); National Energy Policy (2003); Action Plan for Sustainable Energy for All (2014); Swaziland Renewables
Readiness Assessment (2014); and possibly the Swaziland household energy access survey (if available); Energy Act (2007)

On a crosscutting environmental basis, the 2007 Environmental Policy and corresponding Action Plan (SEAP), the Environmental Monitoring Act (EMA, 2002) and the Environmental Audit Assessment and Review Regulations (2000) are main components of the environmental legislation.

Regarding gender, the National Gender Policy (2010) is the main reference document.

### 2.10 The various sectors of AfDB intervention

#### 2.10.1 Agriculture and environment

Despite Eswatini’s huge potential for agricultural production (both in terms of soil and climate), limited irrigation related infrastructure is holding back the sector’s growth and crop diversification. The majority of Swazi households grow rainfed maize and vegetables on land which is allocated to them by traditional chiefs. Cattle ownership is also high, with the ratio of cattle to land among the highest in Africa with 80% of the country’s cattle owned by smallholder farmers. Agriculturally the country is split between largely rain fed subsistence production smallholders, and cash cropping on large private estates. The smallholders constitute about 70% of the population and occupy 75% of the crop land but productivity is low, accounting for only 11% of total agricultural outputs. Poor availability of water for irrigation is a major constraint to smallholder production. As a result, harvests are largely dependent on amount of rainfall.

The main crops are sugarcane, pineapple, citrus fruits and rice (irrigated), cotton, maize corn (the basic foodstuff), sorghum and tobacco. Sugar is the dominant sector of the agricultural export economy. Wood and meat are also significant sectors of the rural economy.

Sugar is the largest single foreign exchange earner in Eswatini, exported via the rehabilitated port at Maputo to the EU and US, and regionally to Mozambique and South Africa. The irrigated sugar cane plantations at Simunye, Mhlume and Ubombo are major employers, second only to the government. However, the sugar sector has been in crisis for some years. In response, Eswatini has developed a National Adaptation Strategy (NAS) with the objective of restoring the profitability of smallholder sugar cane growers through the achievement of reduced investment and working capital costs.

According to the Central Bank of Swaziland Report, 2015 the agricultural sector remained volatile with GDP growth rates of -5.4%, 1.5% and 0% for the fiscal years 2012, 2013 and 2014 respectively. Developments in the agriculture and forestry subsector were mixed. Subsistence agriculture output (on Swazi Nation Land) rose by 15.7% in 2014 following a significant jump in maize production which reached 101,041 tons in the 2013/14 harvest season from 81,934 the previous season. Commercial agriculture in the (Individual Tenure
farms) contracted by 2.4% mainly due to a significant decline in citrus production. Citrus plantations were hard hit by storms in the last quarter of 2013 which destroyed the fruits for the 2014 harvest and resulted in citrus production shrinking by half. In addition, drought conditions in 2014 affected livestock output as it fell by 11.3% in the period under review. On the other hand, forestry output maintained its momentum recording a 17% increase in 2014 compared to 13% the previous year.

The main institutional actors concerned with this sector within the RGoS are the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) and the Swaziland Environment Agency (SEA), in addition to the Swaziland Water & Agricultural Development Enterprise Limited (SWADE).

From a strategic point of view, Eswatini has developed a Comprehensive Agricultural Sector Policy which includes livestock, food security, irrigation and fisheries, as well as agriculture strictly speaking. Moreover, it recently developed a 10 year (2015-2025) sub-sectoral strategy: the Swaziland National Agricultural Investment Plan (SNAIP). The SNAIP’s overall goal is to (i) increase the contribution of agriculture to economic development (ii) reduce poverty and (iii) improve food and nutrition security. The SNAIP overall objective would be achieved through programmes and projects that are aimed at (i) ensuring optimal use of the natural resources while ensuring their sustainability for future generation use (ii) improving market access through strengthening and improving stakeholder participation in commodity value chains (iii) commercialisation and diversification of agricultural production (iv) supporting the contribution of agricultural research and extension systems to increase agricultural productivity and (v) improving agricultural knowledge management and institutional strengthening to enhance planning, evidence-based decision making and policy implementation coordination. It should be noted that, by 2019, the RGoS wishes to update the SNAIP so as to align more closely to the Malabo Declaration and better recognise the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG).

In addition to the SNAIP, there are a number of policies in place addressing specific agricultural policy issues, which include: (i) a Comprehensive Agricultural Sector Policy (CASP); (ii) National Food Security Policy; (iii) Livestock Development Policy; (iv) Draft Land Policy; (v) National Forestry Policy; (vi) Resettlement Policy; (vii) Swaziland National Irrigation Policy, (viii) Agricultural Diversification Strategy, (ix) National Agricultural Research Policy, and (x) National Agriculture Investment Plan. There are also supportive legislations and regulations, which enforce these policies especially for animal health, plant health and water use and quality.

Moreover, the Bank’s Ten Year Strategy (TYS) 2013-2022, identifies agriculture related infrastructure development as a key factor in improving agricultural production, and agriculture and food security as areas of special emphasis.

Land tenure is a key aspect of the agriculture and environment sector. In Eswatini there are two systems of land ownership and use: (1) the Swazi Nation Land (SNL), and (2) the Individual Tenure Farms (ITF).

Swazi Nation Land (SNL) is vested in the Ingwenyama (the King) and represents 57% of the total available land in the Kingdom. The king governs the land through local chiefs, who act as the main administrators of the land tenure system. Chiefs allocate land to
individual households through the ‘kukhonta’ system. Under this system, an individual, seeking to own or use land, approaches the chief who, in conjunction with the community in the chiefdom, may decide to allocate land to the individual. Once the land is allocated, the individual allottee enjoys some degree of security of tenure which includes -but is not limited to- the right to pass land on to offspring. However, although this occurs quite infrequently, the chief can always reallocate the land or evict the household.

Production on SNL is primarily for subsistence and less than 10 per cent of total production is offered for sale. Maize, the staple food of Eswatini, is the principal crop grown on the SNL and occupies about 80 per cent of the total crop areas. Maize is quite frequently mix-cropped with cucurbits, legumes, sweet potatoes, and sorghum. In recent years, SNL farmers have appreciably increased production of some cash crops, such as cotton, tobacco, and vegetables, but this still represents a small proportion of the total SNL agricultural production. SNL has increased at a rate of approximately 2.8 per cent per annum over the past decade but this has not met the requirements of the population growing at a higher rate.

**Individual Tenure Farms (ITF)** cover about 750,000 hectares and average about 800 hectares each. About three-quarters of the freehold title holdings are held in equal proportions between Swazis, and expatriates, and the balance belongs to large companies such as the Commonwealth Development Corporation. The ITFs are predominantly cropland, livestock ranches, timber and fruit plantations, and mining concessions. However, a large proportion of this subsector consists of unused land, owned by absentee owners. Production techniques on most of the ITFs are modern and capital intensive, including use of full inputs and mechanization. The bulk of output produced in this subsector is intended for both domestic and foreign markets. Sugar and timber are the principal commodities and account for a sizeable proportion of total merchandise exports. About 60 per cent of the national agricultural production originates from the ITFs, and includes other important commercial crops such as cotton, citrus, pineapples, tobacco, and livestock. The annual growth of this subsector is estimated at 5 per cent.

The diagnostic analysis of the agricultural and rural sector in the 2014 Bank’s Swaziland Country Strategy Papers identifies some constraints which are likely to be addressed by this project among other are; (1) limited irrigation-related infrastructure is holding back agricultural sector's growth and crop diversification; (2) sources of some major rivers located outside the country which would necessitate the country to renegotiate its water rights with South Africa, and (3) Non diversification of exports receipts which substantially rely on sugar export and to a lesser extent on the textiles and clothing industry. Eswatini also needs to renegotiate its water rights with South Africa, where the sources of some of its rivers are found, to ensure greater access to water.

However, opportunities include proximity to South Africa and Mozambique. Indeed, despite its small market size, Eswatini is geographically well situated to supply a market of almost 80 million in SACU and Mozambique; (ii). Availability of good agricultural land which allows for greater diversification of agricultural production provided the requisite infrastructure is available and (iii) Better employer-labor relations and lower labor costs when compared with neighbouring countries.
Finally, it should be noticed that despite the importance of agriculture as the basis of the livelihoods of the majority of the population, over time, the role of agriculture as a key driver in the Swazi economy has declined due mainly to prolonged drought, forest fires and other natural factors which led to a shrinking of agricultural output, while manufacturing and government services have emerged as the dominant sectors.

### 2.10.2 Water and sanitation

Eswatini suffers from a shortage of drinking water. In particular, water supply and sanitation challenges in rapidly growing towns are reaching acute levels. The Government recognizes that provision of potable water and adequate sanitation is essential for improving the quality of life of its citizens and mitigate environmental and pollution management challenges. Maintenance of water and sanitation schemes remains a major challenge, with close to one third of the existing schemes in need of rehabilitation to ensure continued operation. Access to clean water supply is estimated at about 70% while access to sanitation is below 60%. The key challenges facing the sector are: (a) water scarcity, (b) low level of access to sanitation services, (c) aging infrastructure and (d) financial constraints as the share of government spending allocated to the sector is small. To improve the services in the sector in order to reach the national target by 2022 more funds are required.

### 2.10.3 Energy

Eswatini is an energy-deficit country - it imports about 80% of its electricity requirements from South Africa and some 10% originate in Mozambique. It also has the highest tariffs in the region, which increases the cost of doing business. Domestic electricity generation covers only 10% of the total demand. In view of the existing power deficits in South Africa, it is critical for Eswatini to start investing in renewable energy generation capacity, which is consistent with green growth objectives, to avoid potential future shortages. Indeed, the growing electricity shortage in the Southern African Power Pool (SAPP) is likely to have adverse implications for economic growth for Eswatini given the country’s dependence on South Africa and Mozambique for most of its electricity supply.

The initial energy policy developed in 2003 is outdated; a new energy policy has just been developed in 2018 (but may not have been adopted yet). An Energy Act was introduced in 2007; and an IPP Act was introduced in 2016.

With respect to the institutional situation, in Eswatini as in most African countries, the incumbent state-owned utility remains dominant. Nevertheless, the energy sector has been liberalised in Eswatini and hybrid markets are emerging and independent power producers are being introduced.
The future development of renewable energy sources (solar and wind) is planned by the RGoS, and supported by the AfDB, particularly solar energy; indeed, it represents one of the main possibilities for increasing the country’s energetical autonomy. The Swaziland Electricity Company (SEC), a parastatal company, has already developed a Power Generation Plan which incorporates renewable and conventional energy technologies. The IRENA Report (“Swaziland Renewables Readiness Assessment – 2014”) constitutes a major contribution to Eswatini’s energy policy.

Solar energy is perceived as having more potential than hydro electrical energy because water resources are limited and should be even more so in the future considering global warming.

2.10.4 Governance and public finance management

The political scene is relatively stable since the September 2013 parliament elections, but the Ibrahim Index of African Governance shows a sharp decline in the Participation and Human Rights indicator (notably in terms of social unrest) in Eswatini over the period 2006-2015. In terms of Accountability and Rule of Law, the country also registers a low ranking owing to corruption and limited judicial independence. In 2015 Eswatini was ranked 29th out of 54 African countries, and 9th out of 12 Southern African countries. In 2017 Eswatini still had the lowest scores in terms of political rights, civil liberties and freedom ratings as compared to its neighbours: South Africa, Namibia, Lesotho and Botswana (Table 3). Moreover, the country’s ranking in the Global Peace Index declined from 69 out of 153 in 2011 to 88 out of 158 in 2012. According to the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) of Transparency International, in 2014, Eswatini was ranked 69 out of 175 countries, with a score of 3.2 (out of 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Political rights and civil liberties in the region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggregate Score (0-100)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eswatini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A score of 0 represents the smallest degree of freedom and 100 the greatest degree of freedom

Source: Freedom House, 2017

23 African Economic Outlook 2016; and Ibrahim Index of African Governance – Swaziland Insights 2016

Concerning the business environment, a comparison across Doing Business indicators between 2009 and 2018 suggests that the country has made some absolute improvements in several indicators (trading across borders, investors’ protection, property registration), while other indicators have experienced significant decline (contracts, construction permits, insolvency) - see Figure below. Overall, the pace of progress has been slower than in Sub-Saharan Africa. Some of the challenges the country faces include technological readiness, its brain drain to neighbouring South Africa, and its relative paucity of business sophistication, higher education, and training.

Figure 6: Doing Business ranking, 2009-2018

Source: ADE; based on World Bank 2009 and 2018 ‘Doing Business’ reports

25 World Bank, Country overview, April 2017

The 2010 FinScope Survey revealed that only 9% of adults in Eswatini used banks or nonbank financial institutions to access credit and only 45% of the Swazi population had access to financial services.

The main institutional actors concerned with this sector within the RGoS are the Ministry of Finance (MoF) and the Prime Minister.

2.10.5 Transport

The country boasts of a relatively good road network in comparison to African countries at similar level of development.

The importance of the transport sector is underscored by the fact that the bulk of foreign trade is with South Africa, around 80%, and traded directly through the land routes between the two countries.

Much of the rest of the country’s external trade is with North America, the Far East and Europe. Given that the country is landlocked, its external trade is channeled through its two neighbours, South Africa and Mozambique. The principal exit ports are Maputo and Durban, with Richards Bay and Gauteng, South Africa’s industrial heartland, being further significant points of exit. The major transport corridors through which external trade is facilitated are; the Lomahasha to the east by road to Maputo, Goba by rail to Maputo, Luvumisa to the south by road to Richards Bay, Golela to Richards Bay and Durban, Mahamba to the southwest by road to Durban, and Ngwenya, to the northwest by road to Gauteng.

The main institutional actors concerned with this sector within the RGoS are the Ministry of Works and Construction (MOWC) and the Ministry of Transport and Communications (MOTC).

The road sub-sector policy and strategy as articulated in the National Transport Policy (NTP) of 2000 is on (i) strengthening the institutional capacity of the Ministry of Public Works and Transport (MPWT); (ii) reforming the institutional environment, and; (iii) establishing new financing mechanisms for road development.

Policy principles enunciated in the NTP include:

a. A government focus on policy-making, planning and regulatory affairs;

b. The need to justify comprehensively, government-funded investment on financial, economic, social and environmental grounds.

c. Enhancement of the participation of the private sector and skills development of Government agencies, thus placing services and infrastructure activities on a commercial footing through professionally-managed bodies with quasi-autonomous boards funded by user charges; and
d. Harmonisation of transport rules with neighbouring countries through participation in international groups such as SADC.

Based in the above, policy developments triggering sector reforms, particularly for the road sector include:

a. Public-Private Participation: A Privatisation Road Map for public-private participation (PPP) is considered to guide ministries in identifying and planning projects with PPP potential.

b. Road Sector Institutional Reform: The enactment of the Roads Agency (or Authority) and Road Fund Bill 2008 enabling (i) the transition of the current Road Department (RD) to a semi-autonomous Roads Agency and (ii) the establishment of the Road Fund dedicating funding for the management of the road infrastructure to replace reliance on parliamentary appropriations.

c. Institutional strengthening: Integrated in the above legislation is institutional strengthening of the sector which, among others, include (i) capacity in road maintenance contract (e.g. OPRC); (ii) establishment of road management system; (iii) strengthening of the Road Transport Department and regulations; and (iv) road safety.

d. Other measures include the deployment of the implementation of regional cross-border road user charges (SADC Project 188), deregulation of Transport Services to refocus on safety (driver, vehicle, load security) and quality of management (to ensure compliance with rules—safety, loading, international obligations, etc.).

The Road Reform Programme (RRP) consist of the following broad activities:

- Establishment of a Roads Agency or Authority, responsible for the management of the road network;
- Establishment of a dedicated Roads Fund within the Ministry of Finance, to which revenues from road user charges would be paid and from which disbursements for road management would be paid;
- Transformation of force account activities to private sector entities;
- Retention of training facilities in the MPW.

To make sure that a restructured road sector is financially sustainable, a road user charge approach has been proposed through the RUC model for Eswatini. The major instruments identified are the fuel levy, license fees, cross border charges and fines from overloading. It has been proposed that, initially, only the recurrent maintenance and traffic management costs are included while the capital expenditure on new links and capacity expansion can be phased in over time.

The Government, through its Second Economic and Social Reform Agenda (ESRA II) has also committed itself to the participation of private sector enterprises in road management, both at institutional and operational level. This includes the goal to complete the privatisation of routine maintenance of the road network in the near future.

The Bank started operations in Eswatini in 1972 and to date, cumulative investment is estimated at UA242 million (76.7% from the ADB window, 19.8% from ADF, 2.8% from NTF and 0.6% from the MIC Trust Fund) from twenty-five (25) projects, four (8) studies, two institutional support/capacity building projects and two (2) lines of credit. Sector wise, the portfolio composition composed of, transport (60%) agriculture (19%) and water (15%) with telecommunication, education, power and health making up the rest of 6%. Two private sector operations, The Ragen and Fabulous Flower Projects approved in 1992 and 2006 respectively have terminated.

3.1 Strategies and Theories of Change

3.1.1 Country strategies

Two strategic documents have framed the Bank’s assistance to Eswatini over the period evaluated; one was revised after the 2011 crisis. The documents are detailed below.

- **Country Strategy Paper 2009-2013**
  The strategy focuses on infrastructure, notably agriculture and irrigation with the LUSIP I (pillar 1); and on the health sector (pillar 2). The Bank’s operations include technical assistance and advisory and analytical work. Emerging challenges in the aftermath of the financial crisis that hit Eswatini in 2009 necessitated a review of the proposed interventions. Indeed, the initial version of the CSP did not provide sufficient scope for a response to the crisis. The mid-term review (MTR) of this CSP was done in 2011. Though medium to-long-term development challenges facing Eswatini were similar to those identified at the beginning of the CSP, the economic environment had changed drastically. Both internal and external balances were under serious strain leading to both an economic and social crisis. There was an urgent need to halt further deterioration in macroeconomic conditions, restore private sector confidence, and safeguard the welfare of vulnerable populations. The MTR therefore proposed the modification of both pillars of the strategy. The components, outcomes, goals and indicators contemplated by the initial CSP 2009-2013 are presented in Annex 4.

  Following the drastic changes in government priorities and the MTR of the initial CSP 2009-2013, a revised CSP was established. Modifications to pillar 1 sought to explicitly refocus the Bank’s interventions in support of the reforms process and the possibility of future policy-based operations, in order to strengthen the foundations for strong,

---

26 Source: Swaziland Country Portfolio Performance Report 2008 (AfDB)
sustainable and shared growth. In pillar II, the Bank focused on developing skills needed in the modernisation of the agriculture sector. Support to the health sector was put aside. As a result of these modifications, the new pillars were:

- **Pillar 1**: Improving Public Financial Management, and
- **Pillar 2**: Enhancing Agriculture Development.

To ensure selectivity and development impact, the Bank’s interventions focused on:

- Building the government's capacity to use the budget as a development tool and better manage public financial resources;
- Investments in irrigation infrastructure to ensure greater participation of the rural poor population in commercial and other value addition activities in the sector.
- Improving the business environment to attract the investments needed for output diversification and private sector development, including investments in human capital development; and
- Dialogue with the government to enable it to implement the reforms necessary to ensure macroeconomic stability, fiscal sustainability and higher growth.

In line with the new orientations of the revised CSP and as a response to the financial crisis, the government made an undertaking to implement structural reforms including:

- Designing a PFM reform program, to be supported by development partners;
- Making efforts to enhance domestic revenue mobilization through the establishment of the Swaziland Revenue Authority;
- Finalizing the investment policy and private sector development strategy; and
- On-going measures to commercialize and privatize some of the public enterprises.

The impact of the financial crisis on the Bank’s portfolio is highlighted in its new 5-year CSP; by the end of the 2009-2013 period none of the proposed nine original CSP or two modified CSP lending projects had been implemented. For non-lending operations, only three out of six planned projects were implemented.

### Country Strategy Paper 2014-2018

The 2014-2018 CSP aimed at contributing to turn the economy around through sustainable high inclusive economic growth. The strategy, aiming to position the country as a competitive node for the region and to maintain its macroeconomic stability, is based on two pillars: i) **supporting infrastructure development for sustainable and inclusive growth**, notably in the agricultural (LUSIP II), water and sanitation (ESWSSDP), transport (MR3), and energy sectors (technical assistance) for pillar 1; and **strengthening governance and institutional capacity** for pillar 2.
Within the context of these two themes, the CSP activities have been grouped into four so called “results clusters” that take into account cross-sectoral synergies for maximum impact.

Moreover, within this CSP, the Bank starts operating with lending operations, notably infrastructure interventions (irrigation, highways, water supplies).

The design of the CSP is informed by recent Bank-supported analytical work, such as the 2013 Economic Diversification Study (EDS), the 2010 Fiscal Adjustment Roadmap (FAR) and the updated 2012 FAR, as well as the CSP Completion Report (CSP-CR) and the Country Portfolio Performance Review (CPPR).

More generally, the Bank seeks to support Government’s efforts to achieve broad-based sustainable high economic growth through: (i) connecting people and regions to markets by upgrading infrastructure, (ii) creating economic opportunities, (iii) providing clean water, and (iv) enhancing public financial management to ensure efficient public spending. This includes strengthening the budgetary process to enhance resource allocation and capacitating oversight bodies to ensure effective delivery of their core mandate and foster transparency in procurement and accountability.

By supporting improved governance and institutional capacity, the Bank also seeks to increase efficiency and effectiveness in public sector resource use and to enable the Government to invest in productive capital, thereby addressing some of the binding constraints to economic growth.

Furthermore, the CSP aims at achieving synergies from the full range of Bank instruments to enhance effectiveness. These should be delivered in partnership with the private sector, the government and other development partners, enabling to leverage additional resources.

The logic of the CSP 2014-2018 is summarized a result-based framework presented in Annex 4. This result-based framework presents, in relation to five “Country Development Goals” which correspond to the five sectors studied more in detail through this evaluation, constraints, outputs, outcomes and final deliverables associated with each sector.

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) of this CSP was held in 2017 and agreed that the CSP’s strategic focus remains pertinent and should not change.

The evolution of AfDB strategy and intervention logic in Eswatini is summarised in the following figure:
**Figure 7: Evolution of AfDB strategies and interventions during the period 2009-2017**

- **Mitigate the impacts of the fiscal crisis in the short-to-medium term, and provide strategic assistance for long-term growth and development**
  - Strengthened health systems; improved and equitable access to quality education and skills development.
  - Enhanced GDP growth; increased employment levels and reduced poverty.
  - Enhanced food security.

- **Position the country as a competitive node for the region and maintain its macroeconomic stability**
  - Improve and commercialize agricultural production; reduced level of food insecurity; diversification of agricultural exports.
  - Improved quality of life, reduced environmental risk, reduced waterborne diseases and lower expenditures on health services, enhanced social interaction and economic engagement for women and children.

- **Increased level and quality of public service delivery**
  - Increased private sector investment; improved revenue mobilization; improved business climate and budget processes.
  - Enhanced agriculture productivity.
  - Irrigation increased access and use of irrigation services; increase of crops cultivated.
  - Water and sanitation improve access to safe drinking water and proper sanitation services.
  - Transport improve the quality, coverage and safety of transport services.
  - Energy Sustainable energy supply.

- **Governance and institutional capacity improve efficiency in management and coordination between Government and implementing agencies**
  - Pillar 1: Investing in infrastructure to improve productivity and competitiveness.
  - Pillar 2: Enhancing agriculture development.
  - Pillar 3: Supporting infrastructure development for sustainable and inclusive growth.
  - Pillar 4: Strengthening governance and institutional capacity.

Source: AfDE
According to actors met during the scoping mission, the choice of its main sectors of intervention in Eswatini is relevant (including energy as a potential future sector of intervention presently prioritised by the country). All sectors are a priority and make economic sense enabling to support trade and provide revenue for the state as well as addressing food security. The fact that the initial focus on health was abandoned after the 2011 economic crisis is considered understandable; moreover, it is underlined that supporting water and sanitation has direct effects upon health.

Intensifying support around the five sectors mainstreamed by the current evaluation is supported by the RGoS. It is also indicated that Information Technology (IT) is also emerging as a priority for the country.

### 3.1.2 Southern Africa Regional Integration Strategy Paper 2011-2015 (RISP)

The goal of the Southern African regional integration agenda is to create a fully integrated and internationally competitive region with the overarching objective of poverty reduction. In support of such goal, the RISP is strategically focused on the two pillars specified in the Bank’s Regional Integration Strategy, namely, regional infrastructure and capacity building, which includes regional public goods, macroeconomic convergence, and knowledge management and networking.

The development of regional corridors is the overarching approach of the Southern Africa Regional Integration Strategy Paper in sustaining economic growth and social development through intra-regional trade, greater legal, institutional and regulatory harmonization and lower production cost structures. On regional infrastructure, the AfDB is focusing on transport (roads and railways), power generation (hydroelectricity and renewable sources of energy) and information communication technology (ICT), with emphasis on the corridor approach.

In addition, the AfDB should take lead in promoting environmentally sustainable and climate friendly infrastructure programmes in order to reduce carbon emissions. For example, the Bank should support the development of railway lines, which produce less carbon emissions and have a comparative advantage in handling bulky and long-haul transportation in prominent extractive industries in the Southern Africa. Hydropower generation should also be supported, as it is clean and has a huge potential in the region at a competitive cost.

In capacity building, the Bank should focus on strengthening capacity at legal, regulatory and institutional levels for the successful implementation of selected infrastructure programmes. More specifically, it should lay emphasis on training, in the design,
sequencing, preparation, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of corridor infrastructure programmes.

3.1.3. Institutional AfDB strategies

Several other key strategies frame the Bank’s work at a country level:

- The African Development Bank’s Strategy for 2013–2022;
- The Regional Integration Policy and Strategy (RiPoS) for 2014–2023
- The AfDB Gender Strategy 2014-2018: Investing in Gender quality for Africa’s Transformation;
- Strategic Framework for Enhancing Bank Group Support to Middle Income Countries (MIC).

These are presented in Annex 10.
3.1.3 Global theory of change

A global theory of change summarising the logic of AfDB action in Eswatini has been constructed on the basis of the Country strategy papers and the project documents.

Figure 8: Global AfDB Theory of Change for Eswatini

Mitigation of fiscal crisis impact and long term sustainable economic development within a fully integrated region: poverty reduction, increase and stabilised household income, enhanced food and nutritional security and better health

Increased interregional trade and exports (and reduction of imports)  
Inclusive employment, SME and added value creation  
Cheaper, better and more accessible social services (water, education and health)  
Improved business climate, private investment levels and investor interest in Eswatini

Increased, more competitive, diversified and inclusive crop production and services (economical and social)  
Improved transport and market access  
More sustainable management of natural resources: higher water use efficiency, increased use of renewable energy  
Improved regulatory and institutional environment, governance and public services  
Increased knowledge availability and capacity to tackle development issues in an inclusive way

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

- Economic and social infrastructure development (irrigation perimeters, roads (national axis and rural feeder), on farm equipment and infrastructure, hydroelectric plants, pipelines, power pool interconnections; drinking water and sanitation systems

**GOVERNANCE**

- Establish an effective and inclusive infrastructure and equipment management system
- Development of efficient financial institutions adapted to Swazi needs
- Review and update national policies and strategies, negotiation of national and international agreements (water rights), business advisory services
- Human resource and institutional development (capacity building, institutional support, development of awareness and corporate social responsibilities related to gender, environmental protection, governance, HIV/AIDS, and hygiene

**Activity**

- HARD: Projects: KDDP, LUSIP (loan), MR3, Manzini by-pass, FINCORP...
- SOFT: Budget support (loan or grant?)
- SOFT (outsourced): Technical assistance, studies, investigation and institutional support grants
- SOFT (AfDB Swaziland Team): Policy dialogue (reform and regional harmonization of regulations and trading, partnerships among national and regional bodies...)

**Context:** Financial crisis

**Hypothesis:** The political landscape is stable and the Government continues to implement ongoing economic and structural reforms that are critical to addressing the developmental challenges facing the country.
3.2 AfDB Eswatini Portfolio

The Bank’s portfolio over the period 2009-2017 comprises 14 interventions for a total of UA 119 million (Table below). Five of the 14 interventions were approved during the CSP 2009 – 2013 while the rest were approved in CSP 2014 – 2018. Overall, the agriculture sector takes the largest share in term of volume, followed by the transport sector (Figure below).

The LUSIP II, an irrigation project, accounts for almost 40% of the Bank’s portfolio over the period. It represents the second phase of a project that ‘played a critical transformative role for Swaziland’ according to the Bank (CSP 2014-2018). The MR3, a road transport project valued at UA 33.4 million, is the Bank’s second largest project over the period. Other important projects in terms of budget include the line of credit to SDFC (UA 18.7 million) and the water supply and sanitation project ESWSSDP (UA 16.1 million).
Table 4: Bank’s portfolio in Eswatini (2009-2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>First Disbursement</th>
<th>End date (planned)</th>
<th>Final Disbursement</th>
<th>Budget (UA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Usuthu Smallholder Irrigation Study</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>22/05/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>840,314,90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Usuthu Samllholder Irrigation Project II</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>ADB loan</td>
<td>04/05/2016</td>
<td>06/04/2017</td>
<td>31/12/2021</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>45,098,991,60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Humanitarian Relief Assistance For Drought Affected Populations</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>27/06/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>702,602,40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3 project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46,641,908,90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Transportation Master Plan Study</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td>25/10/2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>350,179,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manzini-Mbadlane (MR3) Highway Project</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>ADB and MIC grant</td>
<td>28/05/2014</td>
<td>02/06/2015</td>
<td>31/13/2019</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>33,449,452,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td>2 projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,799,631,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line of Credit to Swaziland Development Finance Corporation</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/05/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,722,443,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance</strong></td>
<td>1 project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,722,443,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezulwini Sustainable Water and Sanitation Service Delivery Project</td>
<td>Water Sup/Sanit</td>
<td>ADB loan</td>
<td>18/06/2014</td>
<td>22/10/2015</td>
<td>31/12/2018</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>16,168,989,90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbabane Manzini Corridor Multipurpose Dam Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Water Sup/Sanit</td>
<td>AWF</td>
<td>21/12/2015</td>
<td>11/02/2016</td>
<td>31/12/2018</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>1,076,679,80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbabane Manzini Corridor (Nondvo) Multipurpose Dam Study</td>
<td>Water Sup/Sanit</td>
<td>MIC TAF</td>
<td>21/12/2015</td>
<td>11/02/2016</td>
<td>31/12/2018</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>797,416,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Sup/Sanit</strong></td>
<td>3 projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,043,085,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Diversification Study</td>
<td>Multi-sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>14/04/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207,283,80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance for Public Finance Management Reforms</td>
<td>Multi-sector</td>
<td>MIC grant</td>
<td>03/11/2011</td>
<td>10/10/2013</td>
<td>31/12/2013</td>
<td>30/11/2015</td>
<td>381.185,90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Capacity Building Programme - Phase II</td>
<td>Multi-sector</td>
<td>01/02/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>490.600,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.079.069,70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Sector Technical Assistance Program</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>08/12/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>717.652,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>717.652,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing Readiness For Investment in Low Carbon and Climate Resilient Development in Swaziland</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>23/10/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>218.741,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>218.741,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>119.222.532,50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>14 projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>119.222.532,50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost half of the operations in the portfolio—all those approved under the first CSP and one of those approved under CSP 2014-2018—have been completed (6 out of 14). One operation was recently approved (May 2017) and is not yet under implementation. Among the remaining seven ongoing operations, the overall disbursement ratio is low (less than 35%).

During the first CSP (2009-2013), AfDB support was mainly characterised by technical assistance and advisory and analytical work while investment projects appeared stronger in the second CSP (2014-2018).

At least at the beginning of the evaluation period, the Eswatini portfolio suffered from slow implementation. At the time of the 2009-2013 CSP MTR, two MIC grants were not disbursed due to signature, effectiveness and procurement delays and two non-lending projects were cancelled due to unsatisfactory implementation. The scoping mission tends to indicate that, though they are not declared off track, many actions are still suffering from significant delays.

In April 2016, the Bank’s portfolio was dominated by the transport sector representing over 65% of the entire portfolio followed by water and sanitation (31.5%), multi-sector (1.8%) and power (1.4%). This however was before the approval of LUSIP II.

**Figure 10. Portfolio dynamism: intervention budget, sector and year of approval**

The Terms of Reference (ToR - Annex 1) indicate that, for five operations (in bold in table 4), a case study approach with site visits will be conducted. These case studies will feed into sector reports.
Five case study operations as per ToR

The Lower Usuthu Smallholder Irrigation Project II (LUSIP II)
The plan for the entire LUSIP (Phase I & II) is to divert part of the peak flow of the Usuthu River into a 155 million m³ capacity off-river storage reservoir to be used to irrigate, in two phases, 11,500 ha of downstream land for the growing of sugarcane. The objective of the project is to alleviate poverty in the project area by transforming the existing subsistence farmers into commercial farmers of irrigated lands producing cash crops (principally sugarcane). It should be noted however that LUSIP II is only in its initial stages of implementation; the main canal is only starting to be built.

Manzini-Mbadlane Highway Project (MR3)
The scope of the project comprises an upgrade from the existing two-lane single carriageway to a two-lane dual carriageway for a 30km road between the cities of Manzini and Mbadlane on the MR3, a major road on the SADC regional network. Other activities include rehabilitation of rural feeder roads in order to (i) improve access to health services, (ii) facilitate implementation of environmental and social measures, and (iii) facilitate implementation of institutional reform in the road subsector. In practice, Bank support is financing 13km of the MR3 Highway with the Kuwait Fund financing the rest. Bank support also contributes to building about 20km of feeder roads. Currently, the project is only 5% implemented (although it should be closer to 30% at this time).

Ezulwini Sustainable Water and Sanitation Service Delivery (ESWSSDP)
The project seeks to spur growth in the Ezulwini Valley which is currently constrained mainly by lack of reliable water supply and sanitation services. It is based on development of more reliable and sustainable water sources in the area, and promotion of more environmentally friendly solutions for sanitation. Project activities include the design and construction of the raw water intake system, raw water pipeline, treatment plant, reservoir, delivery mains and auxiliary works. Currently, the sewage system is almost finalised (700 connections out of 840) but infrastructure for water provision has hardly started being built. The project is mainly urban but involves carrying water from one community to another whilst integrating the rural households in between.

Line of Credit to Swaziland Development Finance Corporation
Swaziland Development Finance Corporation Limited, founded in 1995, offers business and agricultural loans to new and existing SME entrepreneurs. It offers general business loans across all sectors, for working capital, order finance, long-term contract finance, asset lease finance, business acquisition on title deed land, and lines of credit. The company also provides agribusiness loans, including a strong proportion of general agricultural and sugar-cane loans due to the importance of these activities in Eswatini's economy. FINCORP is the largest financial institution supporting SMEs in Eswatini; though commercial banks also lend to SME’s, they do so as an ancillary activity. At the moment, the AfDB intervention has provided TA to build capacity within FINCORP but no credit line has yet been disbursed.

Technical Assistance for Public Finance Management Reforms
The technical assistance includes provision of advisory services and technical support to the Ministry of Finance (long-term resident adviser), the re-introduction of a Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), and assistance in the implementation of a budget reform strategy. This action is the only completed one amongst the 5 case studies.

The choice of these five interventions makes it possible to cover in financial terms more than 95% of the Bank's portfolio over the period.
The intervention logic relating to each of these five projects will be reconstructed, which will enable better understanding of the causal links between the means implemented, the activities carried out and the results obtained. These case studies are targeted primarily on ongoing operations (four out of five) and various have quite a low disbursement ratio (lower than 35%). Hence the extent to which they can inform the question of effectiveness and sustainability is questionable. However, the scoping mission has established that all projects are built on experiences which predate them (LUSIP I and the KDDP for LUSIP II, other Water and Sanitation projects for the ESWSSDP, other Roads for the MR3 construction, the financing of other SMEs for the line of credit to FINCORP); as a result, the evaluation team will have tangible experiences on the basis of which to develop an argument concerning such criteria.

In addition to this, it should be noted that the selected case study projects are generally considered to be among the best performing compared to others within the AfDB's portfolio.

Furthermore, as the case study selection does not enable to cover the energy sector, it was decided during the scoping mission that a detailed analysis of the "Energy Sector Technical Assistance Program" would be conducted in a manner similar to a case study.

Finally, one can note that though a logical framework exist for the other 4 projects suggested for detailed study (see Annex 5), no logical framework is available concerning the "Technical Assistance for Public Finance Management Reforms" (or the "Energy Sector Technical Assistance Program") which has been implemented on the basis of ToR. On the other hand, it should be recognised that the "Technical Assistance for Public Finance Management Reforms", approved in 2011, is the only completed intervention.

3.3 Complementarity with other donor activities

An overview of the providers of external assistance to Eswatini is provided in the figure below. The largest providers over the period 2012/13-2016/17 are the United States, the European Union, the OPEC Fund for International Development (OFID), and Taiwan.
Figure 11. External assistance to Eswatini, by development partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>Total Over Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td>607,026</td>
<td>785,474</td>
<td>227,162</td>
<td>2,238,386</td>
<td>6,352,444</td>
<td>10,210,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADEA</td>
<td>2,234,530</td>
<td>477,013</td>
<td>1,620,390</td>
<td>4,331,183</td>
<td>3,156,369</td>
<td>11,819,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>25,123,863</td>
<td>41,810,762</td>
<td>36,805,814</td>
<td>38,249,893</td>
<td>46,681,336</td>
<td>178,671,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>2,586,538</td>
<td>796,929</td>
<td>1,502,631</td>
<td>882,596</td>
<td>3,152,280</td>
<td>8,920,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund</td>
<td>7,738,954</td>
<td>23,797,241</td>
<td>3,997,694</td>
<td>12,869,735</td>
<td>30,919,969</td>
<td>79,323,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>6,215,550</td>
<td>16,848,550</td>
<td>25,595,831</td>
<td>5,624,593</td>
<td>54,284,523</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1,135,497</td>
<td>1,527,515</td>
<td>757,982</td>
<td>520,216</td>
<td>1,994,586</td>
<td>54,284,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>3,847,177</td>
<td>1,895,872</td>
<td>1,726,604</td>
<td>4,046,308</td>
<td>5,574,182</td>
<td>5,935,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFID</td>
<td>10,755,849</td>
<td>12,280,269</td>
<td>81,418,797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of China (Taiwan)</td>
<td>18,343,961</td>
<td>16,429,790</td>
<td>16,521,840</td>
<td>15,461,231</td>
<td>14,661,975</td>
<td>81,418,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>6,913,202</td>
<td>6,913,202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>14,252,595</td>
<td>16,470,312</td>
<td>11,103,584</td>
<td>11,127,054</td>
<td>19,783,788</td>
<td>72,737,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>32,626,682</td>
<td>34,660,104</td>
<td>39,145,854</td>
<td>43,421,769</td>
<td>57,041,337</td>
<td>206,895,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>3,331,154</td>
<td>4,502,484</td>
<td>10,166,977</td>
<td>5,527,533</td>
<td>11,109,786</td>
<td>34,637,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>111,827,977</td>
<td>153,026,331</td>
<td>130,425,081</td>
<td>175,117,584</td>
<td>224,246,116</td>
<td>794,643,088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Aid Coordination and Management Section, 2017

Till at least 2011, in spite of the large presence of donors active in Eswatini, the country did not have any formal coordination mechanism among donors, or between them and the government. Since then however, the government has shown greater interest in coordinating donor community actions. However, although it has mentioned the possible organisation of annual meetings (Donors’ Retreat) involving the Donor Community, these do not according to the Development Partners met during the scoping mission, appear to be functional. In addition, further actions such as adoption of similar monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting requirements and use of country PFM systems as the fiduciary environment improves are said to be needed.

Moreover, since then, in a context of division of labour, a stronger donors’ cooperation and coordination framework to ensure effective monitoring of reforms has been put into place. 4 institutions “The Quartet”, which include the AfDB, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the South African Treasury and the World Bank (WB), have come together to share monitoring different components of the reform process. This is aimed at enabling the Bank to focus on economic and structural reforms while allowing the other partners, especially the South African government, to leverage their position and existing agreements with Eswatini to promote political reforms.

Furthermore, the Bank has been asked by the Government to co-lead the National Agriculture Sector Working Group (NASWG), which is in its infancy. However, the fact that the AfDB does not have an in country office appears to be complicating its playing such a role.
At the government level, the organ responsible for aid coordination in Eswatini is the External Assistance Unit in the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development. The unit also manages and monitors externally funded projects and the implementation of the Aid Policy. In this sense, the fact that the AfDB's main interlocutor is the Ministry of Finance does not favour an optimum aid coordination.

The potential complementarities and synergies of AfDB activities with those of other donors may be summarized in the following table:

Table 5: Sector presence of Eswatini’s development partners, 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Partner</th>
<th>Education &amp; Training</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Water &amp; Sanitation</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Fuel &amp; Energy</th>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>ICT</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Social Protection</th>
<th>Capacity Building</th>
<th>Cross Cutting</th>
<th>Multi Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>BADEA</td>
<td></td>
<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>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>Silent</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>GEF</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>Global Fund</td>
<td></td>
<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>India</td>
<td></td>
<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>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>Kuwait</td>
<td></td>
<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>OFID</td>
<td></td>
<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>Republic of China (Taiwan)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>UAE</td>
<td></td>
<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>United Nations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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>United States</td>
<td></td>
<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>World Bank</td>
<td></td>
<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>No. of DPS</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. funding (US$)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Aid Coordination and Management Section.

How this potential translates into concrete terms will be the subject of further analysis during the proper field phase.

Specifically concerning the sectors upon which this evaluation focuses, the main Development Partners which emerged from the scoping mission discussions are:

- Agriculture: AfDB, European Union (EU) and Taiwan (with the EU giving particular attention to smallholders)
- Water supply and sanitation: Mostly Taiwan and the EU
- Transport: the Kuwait Fund, Saudi Arabia and the Chinese Bank
- Energy: Mainly Taiwan
- Governance: EU, WB\(^{28}\) and IMF (along with the USA which supports several NGOs).

\(^{28}\) The World Bank have a Country Economist based in Pretoria but no office in Eswatini
4. Methodological approach

4.1 Approach

Building on the Theories of Change (ToC) presented in parts 3.1.3 and 3.1.4, a theory of change approach will be employed. This will address not only what results were achieved, but also how and why the results were achieved or not. In so doing, it will combine both quantitative and qualitative methods through multiple data collection processes.

The ToC approach will be coupled to a pyramidal approach. The later aims to provide specific inputs at three levels of analysis: i) Strategic (CSP), ii) sectoral (Provision of five sector reviews) and iii) project (Analysis of the portfolio of 14 interventions). It places strong emphasis on the articulation and integration between the outputs obtained (see figure below) in order to provide an overall analysis and synthesis of AfDB support to Eswatini over the period under evaluation.

Though all projects will be assessed, including non-lending analytical and advisory work, mainly through the use of secondary data and key informant interviews or Focus Group Discussions (FGD), five projects have been selected as case studies and will undergo a more thorough assessment including field visits. This assessment will be based on the case study templates provided in Annex 6.

![Pyramidal approach – inputs & outputs by level of analysis](image)

There are five key principles in the proposed pyramidal approach: clustering, scoring, aggregation, triangulation and sourcing:

- Clustering and scoring serve for the analysis of each of the 14 interventions. Clustering differentiates the assessment of interventions according to their characteristics. Scoring occurs using a rating scale provided by IDEV and applied to each criterion included in
the evaluation framework. The rating scale includes 4 levels (from 1 "very unsatisfactory" to 4 "very satisfactory"). This common scoring scale aims at ensuring sound qualitative assessment based on evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Very unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Very weak, not at all appropriate design and very limited / non-existent alignment</td>
<td>Weak, improper design and limited alignment / several gaps</td>
<td>Rather strong and appropriate design, strong alignment</td>
<td>Very solid and appropriate design, complete alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Expected outputs not achieved in most cases</td>
<td>Expected outputs achieved with significant gaps</td>
<td>Expected outputs achieved in most cases</td>
<td>Expected outputs fully achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None or very few of the intended results are achieved</td>
<td>Few targeted results are achieved</td>
<td>Most of the targeted results are achieved</td>
<td>All targeted results are achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Very significant difference between the ERR and the opportunity cost of capital</td>
<td>Significant difference between the ERR and the opportunity cost of capital</td>
<td>Moderate difference between the ERR and the opportunity cost of capital</td>
<td>Little or no difference between the ERR and the opportunity cost of capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very significant gap between planned and actual timing of implementation</td>
<td>Significant gap between planned and actual timing of implementation</td>
<td>Moderate gap between planned and actual timing of implementation</td>
<td>Little or no difference between planned and actual timing of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Mechanisms guaranteeing sustainability (technical, economic, financial, institutional, partnership, environmental and social) are not assured</td>
<td>Mechanisms guaranteeing sustainability (technical, economic, financial, institutional, partnership, environmental and social) are hindered by significant risks</td>
<td>Mechanisms guaranteeing sustainability (technical, economic, financial, institutional, partnership, environmental and social) are generally ensured, with certain minor risks</td>
<td>Mechanisms guaranteeing sustainability (technical, economic, financial, institutional, partnership, environmental and social) are fully assured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Aggregation will facilitate the sector-specific analysis and the strategic review. The aggregation approach proposed includes: i) observed synergies and complementarities at sector, country or strategic level, as well as between lending and non-lending activities; and ii) weighted judgment on performance according to the budgetary importance of each intervention; the degree of relevance and role of the criteria and indicators in the evaluation; and the basis of the evidence on which the analysis rests. As a result, the overall score by sector or at portfolio level will not derive from an arithmetical average.

- Triangulation and sourcing are transverse principles used throughout the evaluation work at each level of analysis. They foster quality and soundness by ensuring the consistency of findings obtained through different data collection tools and sources, increasing the ability to assess and make explicit the multiple causes influencing the analysis, and enabling the evaluator to deepen and widen understanding of the analysed question or issue. Triangulation will occur between the various experts involved in the evaluation, between the various complementary tools used to gather data, and by comparing the various times, sectors and types of stakeholders at or from which data is derived.
Sourcing aims to ensure traceability of argumentative chains which is crucial for an evidence-based evaluation approach such as the one we are undertaking. Linkages between data sources, findings and conclusions and recommendations will be established and demonstrated using a specific sourcing scheme.

In the case of the literature review, the sourcing will be ensured by referencing all documents according to their type (CSP, portfolio review, appraisal report, etc.), compressing their titles with acronyms and indicating the page numbers where the evidence is found.

In the case of survey/real time field consultation, observations during field visits, interviews and focus groups, all the collected data will be summarized in a systematic and harmonized manner using the evaluation framework and a sourcing scheme (see Annex 7). It will contain key messages from verbal interactions, structured against the Indicators and Criteria of the EQs.

The analysis of the portfolio of 14 interventions will be undertaken through the use of an assessment grid derived from the evaluation questions: the evaluation framework. It will include an analysis of the intervention logic of each intervention. The results of this analysis will be aggregated for interventions relevant to a given sector and will feed in to the sector reviews, articulating itself with an analysis of the sector-specific context and challenges in the country during the period.

The sector reviews will be based on a contribution analysis using as a starting point sector-specific Theories of Change of the AfDB’s support to Eswatini from 2009 to 2018. The use of a theory of change has a strong heuristic potential as it puts the emphasis on the identification of causal links between various levels of intervention and results (activities, outputs, outcomes, impacts).

Based on sector reviews, an examination of the overall Theory of Change and an analysis of specific strategic issues, a technical report will be drafted. Key findings, conclusions and recommendations will be further synthetised in a summary report.
4.2 Evaluation framework

The ToRs define a set of key issues and criteria that will frame the evaluation. Key issues include the following:

- **Development Results**: This set of issues will focus on what the Bank has achieved on the ground. In particular, assessing the extent to which the AfDB contributed to development results will examine relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the Bank's operations. Results in terms of cross-cutting issues (gender, environment...) evolution are also analysed.

- **Managing the Bank's intervention**: In terms of assessing management of the Bank's engagement, the evaluation will focus on design (including coherence) and efficiency, as well as knowledge work, policy dialogue with the country, partnerships, harmonisation and leverage, and the degree of management for development results.

- **Borrower's performance**: The borrower (Government's) performance is analysed as a contextual element which may both support or complicate the Bank's action. The contribution of project executing agencies, sector ministries and other actors responsible for project/program design and implementation is assessed.

- **Success factors and lessons**: This issue is one of the main objectives of the evaluation. It examines and identifies the key facilitating or constraining factors for achieving development results - drivers of success, and provide lessons for the future.

The ToR associate the key criteria and issues presented above with 26 Evaluation Questions to be answered in this study. The large majority will be covered both at the level of each intervention included in the portfolio and at the strategic or country level (cf. table below):

- An analysis of strategic issues will be carried out in relation to all EQs, except the question on internal management (EQ13). Furthermore, three questions, notably EQ10 on the quality of CSP, EQ22 on aid coordination, and EQ24 regarding management of development results, will be addressed only at country level.

- The EQs will be addressed through the evaluation framework for each intervention and sector (as well as at strategic level) in accordance with the maturity of implementation. The evaluation framework is common, but will be completed in accordance with the specific requirements for each intervention cluster (see clustering principle in section 4.1).

- To deal with each evaluation question, the relevant information (both qualitative and quantitative) has been organised in criteria and for each criteria, in indicators. Each indicator (related to the different levels: project, sector and global) is associated to one or more source of information.

Identification questions, criteria, indicators and sources of information constitute the evaluation framework. It was established on the basis of project documentation, of the revised theory of change and of exchanges with the actors met during the scoping mission.
## The evaluation framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/issue: Relevance</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Suggested indicators or elements of analysis</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                          | EQ1. To what extent are the Bank’s interventions relevant to the needs, development challenges and priorities of the country? | Relevance and quality at strategic/sector level  
  - Degree of correspondence between listed global and sectoral priorities in the Bank’s CSPs and those of the strategic framework of Swaziland  
  - Perception of stakeholders on the alignment of strategies with the needs and priorities of Swaziland  
  - Adequacy of financial instruments mobilized in the implementation of the Bank strategy (private sector, ADF, BS, etc.)  
  - Bank personnel’s opinion on quality at entry of CSP (including results framework)  
  - Stakeholder opinion on quality of CSP  
  - Have Bank activities tackled a sector in a global way?  
  - Relevance and quality at intervention level (project design)  
  - Opinion of stakeholders (and evaluation team) on the alignment of intervention objectives (Bank portfolio) with the needs and priorities of Swaziland | Documentary review (CSP, national strategies, sectoral strategies, project documents); Interviews (AfDB, RGoS, DP, beneficiaries) |
|                          | EQ2. To what extent do the Bank’s interventions address the needs of target groups in the country? | Strategic/sector level  
  - Clear and explicit identification of target groups within the CSPs and for each sector  
  - Rationale for selecting target groups - (i) detailed analysis of their needs; (ii) justification of geographical choices  
  - Intervention level  
  - Clear and explicit identification of target groups within each intervention  
  - Rationale for selecting target groups - (i) detailed analysis of their needs; (ii) justification of geographical choices; (iii) justification of the action modalities | Documentary review (CSP, national strategies, project documents); Interviews with stakeholders |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ3. To what extent are the interventions in the country aligned with the Bank’s priorities?</th>
<th>Strategic level beyond country</th>
<th>Documentary review: AfDB regional and continental policy documents (High five, MICs, Regional Integration, Medium term, 2013-2022, gender, private sector...), CSP; Interviews (AfD B, RGoS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>❖ Degree of coherence between the needs identified and the activities undertaken to respond to them</td>
<td>❖ Strategic alignment and operational translation of intervention objectives and Bank priorities at the regional level (taking into account the principles of regional integration)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Opinion of stakeholders on relation between intervention objectives and needs of beneficiaries</td>
<td>❖ Bank personnel's opinion on adequacy of AfDB continental and regional policy documents in Swazi context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Correspondence of beneficiaries with target groups identified in CSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Correspondence of beneficiaries with target groups identified in country policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Opinion of stakeholders on how far Bank and RGoS strategy papers focus on priority needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral/intervention level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Level of correspondence between intervention objectives and objectives specified in CSP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>❖ Bank personnel's opinion on quality at entry of CSP (including results framework)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria/issue : Effectiveness</td>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Suggested indicators or elements of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4. To what extent have the Bank’s interventions achieved their expected development objectives and results?</td>
<td>Intervention level</td>
<td>Presence of tangible and demonstrable outputs: execution rate of outputs (percentage of outputs that are reached or are likely to reach the target expected at the end of the project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of tangible and demonstrable outcomes: execution rate of direct effects and intermediaries effects listed in the projects’ logical frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of additional effects (positive and negative) not expected during the project cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder and evaluation team opinion on quality of intervention logic in terms of objective attainment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic/sector level</td>
<td>Estimated contribution to sector key indicators of: (i) intermediate outcomes; (ii) long-term results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ5. To what extent have the Bank’s interventions benefited target group members?</td>
<td>Intervention level</td>
<td>Perception of beneficiaries on the adequacy of the project with their needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beneficiaries’ perception of what has changed for them during implementation and following the intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of beneficiaries of the AfDB’s role - knowledge, visibility, support, added value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of interventions’ ownership by beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opinion of stakeholders (beyond beneficiaries) on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EQ6. To what extent have the Bank’s interventions contributed to the achievement of development objectives and expected development results of the country, including impacts (both intended and unintended)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/issue: Sustainability</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Suggested indicators or elements of analysis</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic/sector level</strong></td>
<td>EQ6.</td>
<td>Evidence of the Bank’s support contribution to the country development objectives</td>
<td>Documentary review (project documents, Swazi development indicators); Interviews (AfDB, RGoS, DP); Field visits (final beneficiaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of stakeholders (government, DP, civil society) on the Bank’s support contribution to the country development objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of the interventions’ contribution to the country development objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of stakeholders (implementing agency, beneficiaries, civil society) on the AfDB interventions’ contribution to the country development objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intervention level**

- Attention paid to sustainability and results sustainability factors in the AfDB strategies and policy dialogue
- Perception of stakeholders on the importance given to sustainability by the Bank
- Technical soundness of investments
- Existence of satisfactory institutional arrangements and regulations to ensure infrastructure and equipment maintenance; or territorial management
- Degree of institutional sustainability and contribution to capacity building
- Influence of the political and governance environment
- Degree of ownership and sustainability of partnerships

**Sources of information**

- Documentary review (CSPs, project documents);
- Interviews (AfDB, RGoS, DP, Implementing agencies)
Criteria/issue: Crosscutting issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Strategic level</th>
<th>Sector level</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ8. To what extent are the Bank’s interventions inclusive (i.e. bringing prosperity by expanding the economic base across the barriers of age, gender, youth and geography) in terms of gender equality and regional disparity?</td>
<td>Explicit and targeted consideration (analysis of the context) in country strategies (CSPs): most vulnerable groups, gender equality, youth employment, regional disparities</td>
<td>Proportion of interventions of the country portfolio in the &quot;social&quot; sector</td>
<td>Documentary review (CSP, project documents); Interviews (RGoS, Implementing agencies); Field visits (final beneficiaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition of specific objectives, specific indicators, and mobilisation of specific skills</td>
<td>Attention paid to inclusiveness (gender equality, youth employment, geographic disparities) in the other sectors’ interventions: definition of specific objectives, specific indicators, and mobilisation of specific skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ9. To what extent are the Bank’s interventions environmentally sustainable and support the transition to green growth?</td>
<td>Explicit and targeted consideration in country strategies (CSPs): analysis, definition of specific objectives, specific indicators, and mobilisation of specific skills</td>
<td>Importance paid to inclusiveness (gender equality, youth employment, geographic disparities) in the design and implementation of projects (main activities and associated activities): definition of specific objectives, specific indicators, and mobilisation of specific skills</td>
<td>Documentary review (CSP, project documents); Interviews (RGoS, Implementing agencies);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria/issue : Design</td>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Suggested indicators or elements of analysis</td>
<td>Sources of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ10. To what extent is the quality of the CSP satisfactory?</td>
<td>Strategic level</td>
<td>Assessment of the CSPs quality at entry by the Bank's services (including the quality of the results frameworks)</td>
<td>Documentary review (CSP); Interviews (AfDB, RGoS, DP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of stakeholders on the quality of CSPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ11. To what extent has the Bank applied selectivity in designing its country portfolio and focused on areas where it brings added value?</td>
<td>Budgetary share of interventions under the priority sectors of the Bank (global and by sector)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Documentary review (CSP, National strategic documents, project documents); Interviews (AfDB, RGoS, DP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justification of priority areas and thematic choices (specific issues &amp; constraints; links with the national strategy; consistency / leverage for other DP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specific interventions at critical times (context)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interventions in fields or specific areas not covered by other DP and critical for the country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuity of the Bank's leadership in selected sectors / thematic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ12. To what extent has the Bank been innovative in adapting its approach to the country's context and development challenges/needs?</td>
<td>Relative shares in the intervention portfolio of each aid modality / fund mobilized and their evolution during the period</td>
<td>Documentary review (CSP, regional and continental AfDB policies -MIC strategy in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| EQ13. To what extent are the Bank’s interventions coherent and well-coordinated internally? | Sector level  
- Importance of explicitly coordinated and synergistic interventions  
- Degree of liaison / mutual reinforcement between (i) interventions; (ii) sectors; (iii) instruments and aid modalities  
- Degree of liaison between the analytical work carried out and the sectors / themes of intervention  
- Degree of dissemination of analytical work to stakeholders of funded interventions (knowledge and awareness of the existence of analytical work)  
- Degree of consideration of lessons learned from |
|                                                                         | Intervention level  
- Perception of stakeholders on the instruments mobilized by the Bank and their relevance to the situation of the sector / area of intervention  
- Comparison between the instruments used by the Bank and those of the other main donors during the period  
- How far have the latest development concepts, approaches and tools been taken into account in strategic and project design  
- Middle income status:  
  - Quality of analysis and targeting of CSP on middle income status and associated issues (social, economic, political and institutional factors)  
  - Consideration on the causes and consequences of middle income status in the political dialogue  
  - Assimilation of good practices in approaching middle income status  
  - Inclusion of regional context evolution in approaching middle income status countries  
  - Stakeholder perception on the consideration of middle income status factors  |
|                                                                         | Project documents  
- Interviews with project stakeholders |
<p>|                                                                         | Interviews (AfDB, RGoS, DP) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/issue : Efficiency</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Suggested indicators or elements of analysis</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| EQ14. To what extent are the Bank’s interventions delivered in an efficient manner (i.e. whether resources and inputs are economically converted to results)? | Comparison of the benefits obtained compared to the costs (economic rate of return)  
Comparison with the costs of alternative / comparable means to reach the objectives of the intervention | Documentary review (project documents);  
Interviews (implementing agencies);  
Field visits (final beneficiaries) |
| EQ15. To what extent are the Bank’s interventions implemented in a timely manner and in compliance with operational standards? | Compliance with the implementation schedule (comparison of the estimated duration and the actual duration of execution from the date of entry in force)  
Duration for intervention approval  
Duration before first disbursement  
Stakeholder appreciation on the timeliness of the Bank interventions | Documentary review (project documents);  
Interviews (implementing agencies);  
Field visits (final beneficiaries) |
| Criteria/issue : Knowledge and policy advice | Evaluation Questions | Suggested indicators or elements of analysis | Sources of information |
| EQ16. To what extent has the Bank actively engaged in and influenced policy dialogue through relevant advice? | Explicit and targeted engagement of the Bank for his involvement in the policy dialogue (objectives and dedicated resources)  
Participation and frequency of meetings / working groups with involvement of the Bank  
Role of the Bank in the coordination and synergies between DP  
Stakeholder appreciation of the role of the Bank and its contribution to political dialogue (influence) | Documentary review (CSP, CSP evaluations);  
Interviews (AfDB, RGoS, DP); |
| EQ17. To what extent has the Bank delivered adequate analytical work in support of its interventions, positioning and policy advice? | Strategic, sector and intervention levels  
Achievement rate of analytical work (list of analytical work completed / planned)  
Relevance of links between analytical works conducted and areas of concentration of Bank assistance | Documentary review (analytical works);  
Interviews (AfDB, RGoS, DP); |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria / issue: Partnerships, harmonisation &amp; leverage</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Suggested indicators or elements of analysis</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ18. To what extent are the Bank’s interventions harmonized with those of other donors (avoiding duplication, simplifying procedures, etc.)?</td>
<td>Degree of sector / thematic specialization of the main development partners and place / role of the Bank</td>
<td>Role and influence of the Bank in the coordination and synergies of support provided</td>
<td>Documentary review (CSP, project documents); Interviews (AfDB, RGoS, DP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria / issue: Managing for development results</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Suggested indicators or elements of analysis</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ20. To what extent has the Bank successfully implemented a performance management strategy that focuses on performance and the achievement of outputs, outcomes and impacts?</td>
<td>Strategic level</td>
<td>Existence of mid-term reviews and other M&amp;E modalities of the Bank portfolio in Swaziland. Stakeholder appreciation on the proportionate</td>
<td>Documentary review (CSP, project documents); Interviews (AfDB, RGoS, DP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria/issue: Borrower performance</td>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Suggested indicators or elements of analysis</td>
<td>Sources of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ21. To what extent has the Bank supported the development of national capacities and management systems that focus on results?</td>
<td>Strategic level</td>
<td>Attention to development of national capacities and management systems that focus on results in CSP</td>
<td>Documentary review (CSP, project documents, CSP reviews); Interviews (AfDB, implementing agencies, RGoS, DP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role of TA in terms of national institutional building and results management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention level</td>
<td>Presence of tangible and demonstrable outcomes in terms of capacity building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N° of capacity building events related to the development of national capacities and management systems that focus on results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role of TA in terms of project support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ22. To what extent the borrower partner shows leadership in aid coordination/harmonization?</td>
<td>Strategic level</td>
<td>Organization of ODA coordination in the areas of intervention of the Bank</td>
<td>Documentary review (CSP, national strategies); Interviews (AfDB, RGoS, DP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political dialogue: modality and quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarity of orientations set out in national policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ23. To what extent the borrower partner and other clients participate in design and implementation of interventions (CSP, preparing for AfDB operations, compliance with AfDB loan covenant and conditionality, timely provision of counterpart funds, following</td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of ownership in the development of successive national strategies covering the evaluation period (role of the Bank and other partners)</td>
<td>Documentary review (Project documents, CSP, national policy documents); Interviews (AfDB, RGoS, DP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of ownership of the implementation of national strategies and the importance of support from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
procurement guidelines, etc.)?

- Proportion of aid to the country included in the national budget and change during the period
- Perception of the role and contribution of the Bank to the respect of the principle of appropriation
- Level of participation in project orientation or management committees
- % of national contribution to intervention budgets

Degree of AfDB intervention alignment with national policies

**EQ24. To what extent does the country support the management of development results?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Suggested indicators or elements of analysis</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic, sector and intervention levels</strong></td>
<td>List of key factors positively and negatively influencing the achievement of development results and rational explaining their effect</td>
<td>Documentary review (CSP, national policies, project documents, M&amp;E reports of all types); Interviews (AfDB, RGoS, project stakeholders, civil society, private sector representatives, DP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ25. What are the key factors positively and negatively influencing the achievement of development results?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ26. What are the key lessons learned that could inform future strategies and program in Swaziland?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criteria/issue : Drivers of success & lessons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Suggested indicators or elements of analysis</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic, sector and intervention levels</strong></td>
<td>List of key lessons learned that could inform future strategies and program in Swaziland and rational explaining them.</td>
<td>Documentary review (CSP, national policies, project documents, M&amp;E reports of all types);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of lessons learned</td>
<td>Interviews (AfDB, RGoS, project stakeholders, civil society, private sector representatives, DP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To help fill in the evaluation framework, an interview guide is presented in Annex 8. Moreover, a checklist of issues to touch upon during the interviews (Annex 9) is also provided as guidance to the various team members.
4.3 Specific analysis of cross-cutting issues

Transverse themes gender equity, environment, inclusive growth / development, private sector support, regional integration, employment, middle-income country status

The approach to these themes and issues aims to cover all the levels considered in this evaluation, including the specific intervention level, the sector level and the strategic level. The approach to each cross-cutting theme will be based on experience gained from previous country evaluations for IDEV or other DPs. The proposed method seeks to maximize a systematic evidence-based assessment.

The proposed approach includes four main steps:
1. Preliminary analysis, framing and understanding of specific country issues for each cross-cutting theme.
2. Screening of the importance of the discourse and perspective(s) for taking into account the expectations for each cross-cutting theme.

To this end the following matrix will be used for each cross-cutting theme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Analysis of the context</th>
<th>Reference to / alignment on country’s strategy</th>
<th>Mobilization of specific skills</th>
<th>Definition of specific objectives</th>
<th>Definition of specific indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic level (CSP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector specific planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio level (14 interventions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of non-lending activities (advice, policy dialogue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. On the basis of the specific objectives and indicators previously identified, a set of open interviews with project stakeholders, AfDB personnel, RGoS services and other DPs will contribute to understanding and analysis of key trends in the evolution of each cross-cutting domain/theme - progress recorded, risks and issues encountered during the evaluation period.

4. Specific analysis of the implementation of planned activities by the Bank, their achievements and demonstration of those achievements through the monitoring, documentation analysis and interviews with project stakeholders.

This analysis will be included in each specific grid by intervention, the sectoral analysis and the strategic review. The following items will be explored:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Key challenge</th>
<th>Specific AfDB intervention</th>
<th>Observed trends (progress-risks-issues) at country level</th>
<th>Contributions of AfDB interventions</th>
<th>What more could have been done to better address the theme?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Non-lending activities

Non-lending activities mainly include analytical work for supporting decision-making processes (often studies supported by MIC grants), the related advisory role (often TA), and policy dialogue. These knowledge deepening activities can be linked and reinforce each other but they also concern each level of intervention and analysis within the pyramidal approach (intervention, sector and strategic levels).

With regard to the analytical work, the following approach will be used:

- establish the list of analytical work, studies and inputs explicitly envisaged at strategic or sectoral levels, as well as in the context of specific interventions;
- collect evidence on the implementation, publication and dissemination of planned works and studies, contextualizing their specific success factors and barriers;
- understand the level of use and usefulness of analytical work and studies according to perceptions and feedback from the stakeholders encountered.

As for policy dialogue activities, the evaluation team will proceed by:

- mapping intended domains and themes for dialogue within the Bank’s strategies (CSP);
- analyzing the human resources and technical capacities mobilized to lead and follow this dialogue;
understanding the nature and importance of achievements, and of factors and issues that constitute a hindrance, based on discussions with the Bank's in-country representatives as well as with strategic stakeholders interviewed in the key national ministries, mainly during the sectoral case studies.

Beyond these specific issues, non-lending activities will be assessed in the same way as lending projects on the basis of the criteria, Evaluation Questions and indicators specified in the evaluation framework.

Further issues for investigation identified during the inception period

A set of -non-exhaustive- issues needing further analysis have been identified during the inception period. These include:

- The coherence between the objectives of a) increasing agricultural productivity and b) ensuring food security;
- The relevance of supporting the agricultural sector with an objective of high economic growth, in a context where “The economy continues to experience a gradual structural shift from the primary to the secondary and tertiary sectors” (CSP 2009-2013) and the primary sector is by far the smallest contributor to GDP.
- Issues of implementation delay such as those experienced in CSP 2009-2013 (beyond EQ 15);
- Degree of complementarity and synergy of AfDB activities with those of other donors (beyond EQ 18 and 19).
- Improvements achieved in terms of Public Finance Management, particularly budgeting, procurement, accounting and auditing, including their level of transparence.
- Why, before 2011, budget support was planned but did not materialise? Are causes linked to governance, macroeconomic management or other issues?
- The reasons why the consolidated MTEF is not yet implemented?
- How far are agricultural/irrigation projects sustainable, considering KDDP and LUSIP I are still under implementation?
- In the agricultural sector, how well is AfDB coordinating with other actors considering it mainly focuses on infrastructural dimensions of agricultural support?
- How far do Bank activities tackle a sector in a global way? Should they focus on a more limited set of sectors and deal with them more exhaustively?
- In the agriculture sector, is financing 3 projects (such as KDDP, LUSIP I & II) concentrating on infrastructure, better than financing one project in a cross-cutting way?
- How far future support to PFM by the AfDB is relevant considering EU, WB and IMF involvement?
- How far support to the railways sub-sector should be considered in next CSP?
- How far Bank supervision processes are sufficient?
- How far is sufficient data available to assess water availability in Eswatini on the long term?
- Why were several investment operations planned but ultimately not approved during the first CSP period?
- Swaziland appears to be under fiscal stress—will restoration of fiscal restraint weaken future borrowing demand? How does fiscal stress affect prospects for government operations and maintenance of infrastructure developed with AfDB support?
- Swaziland faces very high levels of poverty and inequality. This is also linked to gender inequity and high levels of HIV incidence. How do the country strategies and programs take the inequality-poverty-gender nexus into account, and can this be improved?
- AfDB support has shifted from one sector to another during these two CSP periods, presumably in response to government requests for support. A lack of continuity within a sector is bound to weaken results and will limit prospects for policy dialogue and synergies within particular sectors. Agriculture seems to be an area where the Government wishes AfDB to play a strong role. Are there prospects for focusing the portfolio in areas to build core country competence and to create platforms for delivering results beyond those of single operations?
- A number of non-lending operations have been completed. In line with Swaziland’s status as a low middle-income country, are the non-lending operations paying off in terms of improving public sector management and informing policy choice?

4.4 Data collection tools

The team will use a combination of quantitative and qualitative tools to collect evidence and data on which the analysis will be based, the evaluation questions answered and the cross-cutting issues tackled. Tools are an important component of the methodology since the manner in which information is collected affects the analysis. The tools used in this evaluation use both primary and secondary information. They seek to blend both qualitative and quantitative data in support of the analysis. They enable to cover both the evaluation criteria and the various levels of their analysis (pyramidal approach). Moreover, the choice of tools will make it possible to crosscheck the evidence collected so as to ensure validity and avoid bias.

The following development outcome categories will be taken into account when analysing results:

- Household Benefits and Job Creation
- Infrastructure building
- Governance and Fiscal Effects
- Regional Integration and Economic Resilience
- Environmental Effects and Contribution to Green Growth
- Gender and Social Effects
- Private Sector Development and Demonstration Effects

Following the scoping mission, the data collection tools have been adjusted when necessary. The following data collection and analysis methods will be used:

- Literature and documentary review: to ensure that the evaluation takes into account the relevant contextual elements, a contextual analysis of the country will be carried out, based on collected documentation. The analyses published by the international partners will also be reviewed. The contextual analysis is essential for addressing the criterion of relevance. Such an analysis will enable the evaluator to structure a timeline with key milestones of the cooperation and country policies during the period. The evaluation team will also analyze the AfDB strategy documents for assessing the coherence of the Bank’s policies.

At country level the literature review will include an analysis of the evolution of the context and an analysis of the specific challenges faced by the country (land-locking and economic dependency, HIV, etc.). Wherever a sector report is conducted, a thematic literature review will be conducted as far as required. In particular the national strategies for the main sectors of intervention will be examined. At project level the document review will in particular provide a first assessment and rating of the DAC criteria and relevant information for each question.

On the basis of this initial information gathering, the mission will be able to formulate a first draft response to the Evaluation Questions and identify hypotheses to be tested during the field phase.

- Interviews: the evaluation team will conduct interviews with representatives of different stakeholders. These interviews will be semi-structured and adapted according to the interviewees and the missing information. Where useful, group interviews (e.g. with beneficiaries) will also be conducted. The main stakeholders to be interviewed include Bank staff (management and field staff), government officials (South Africa, Eswatini), Civil Society Organizations, private sector organisations, and other Development Partners. Interview guides are presented in Annex 8 of this report.

- Focus groups: this method is very useful for interviewing a large number of people in a structured way and for gathering and comparing testimonials. These groups may be homogeneous (beneficiaries of specific interventions, or members of the same organisation) or made up of people with different functions. We propose to examine, on a case-by-case basis, the relevance, composition and organisation of the focus groups which will be a component of this study.

- Case studies / field visits: In addition to the interviews that will take place at strategic level, the field mission will also make it possible to visit targeted interventions and thus make a
first cross-comparison of the information collected during the documentary phase with the observed realities on the ground. Site visits will be selected and organised in consultation with the main stakeholders, in order to better cover the information needs of the study. A clearer idea of the agenda will be presented following the scoping mission. A template has been proposed and accepted by IDEV (Annex 6).

The map below details the main beneficiary areas of projects to be the subjects of case studies. It is already essential to plan site visits in:

- Mbabane, for the government and other stakeholders’ headquarters;
- South of Hhohho district (Ezulwini city) for the ESWSSDP water and sanitation project;
- Axis Manzini (Manzini district) - Mbadlane (Lubombo district), for the MR3 highway project;
- South East of Lubombo district (Big Bend city), for the LUSIP II.

Map 2: Geographical distribution of the Bank’s interventions

**E-Survey**: The relevance of implementing an E-survey has been assessed and discussed with IDEV during the scoping mission and at the beginning of the field mission. The main challenges of implementing such a tool are: i) no sufficient stakeholders’ email addresses for a representative e-survey; ii) a revised evaluation calendar giving the team less than a month after the field mission to collect the E-survey responses and include the analysis in the deliverables (sector report and technical report).

In agreement with IDEV, the tool will not be used. The same challenges and decision apply for the Real Time Field Consultation.
Statistical analysis: The collection of primary and secondary data will lead to statistical analysis.

Workshop: At the end of the field mission, the evaluation team will organize a workshop in Eswatini with the government. The AfDB regional office staff will be invited. The workshop will focus on the following:

- report on the evaluation work completed at this stage;
- presentation and discussion of key preliminary findings and initial draft EQ responses;
- discussions of perspectives and options for recommendations.

At this stage, it will not be a question of presenting definitive conclusions and recommendations but of opening a discussion with the stakeholders and potential users of the evaluation so that they can actively participate in the evaluation exercise. The evaluation team will share the workshop presentation support (PowerPoint) with the Reference Group.

4.5 Reporting and synthesis phase

The collection of information and filling in the evaluation framework will be completed with the integration of the results of the field phase and the processing of the questionnaires. This consolidated framework will be the starting point for the preparation of the five sector reports and the technical report.

During the synthesis phase the information gathered during the field phase will be used to enrich, balance, and amend the data gathered during the documentary phase so as to allow formulation of the final answers to the EQs. On this basis the conclusions and recommendations of the study will be drafted.

Triangulation of information to verify its validity will be systematically undertaken. In particular, the accuracy and credibility of oral sources will be compared with those of written sources. Similarly, whenever possible data from national sources will be compared with those from international sources. The team will indicate its level of appreciation of the quality of the information available in the main findings in order to inform their strength.

The conclusions and recommendations will result from exchanges within the team conducted during the field phase. This will benefit both from a multidisciplinary approach and from a comparison of sectoral analyses and perspectives of different evaluators (local, international).

This phase will culminate in the drafting of a draft technical report to be presented to the Bank for discussion. On the basis of these exchanges, a final version will be prepared. Once this final comprehensive technical report is approved, a summary report will be prepared. As with previous reports based on exchanges and comments received, a final version (with executive summary) will be prepared and sent to the client.
In addition, the final versions of the five sector review reports will be presented in a standard format provided by IDEV. These sector review reports will be submitted prior to the technical report.

The evaluation team will make use of appropriate data visualisation tools in order to ease communication and diffusion of the main results from this evaluation. The evaluation team will also provide IDEV with all raw data (databases, meeting notes, figures, etc.) for traceability and reporting purposes.

4.6 Engagement strategy for key stakeholders

ADE proposes a participatory approach to sharing of information, comparison of points of view, development of a framework of common understanding, and strengthening of the ownership of the evaluation process by the various stakeholders.

4.6.1 Involvement of the AfDB actors

During the inception phase this involvement mainly entailed the following activities:

- **Information session (teleconference):** during this meeting with the evaluation managers, the objectives of the study have been further elucidated through, on the one hand, clarifications of the Bank's expectations and, on the other hand, additional explanations that the evaluation team provides in this offer of services.

- **Preparatory Mission to Eswatini and South Africa:** this mission provides a valuable opportunity to discuss with stakeholders key elements to be considered in the development of the general Theory of Change (ToC), sectoral ToCs, and in the formulation of Evaluation Questions. Discussions also focus on: (i) understanding the context and its evolution throughout the period evaluated, (ii) the strategic directions for cooperation and (iii) the main challenges encountered during the period 2009-2017 in the main areas of cooperation between the AfDB and Eswatini.

- **Discussion session of the draft Inception Report (teleconference, if requested by IDEV):** this meeting would be an opportunity to discuss the approaches and tools proposed by ADE. This will include validation of the reconstructed general ToC, sectoral ToCs and the evaluation framework, which will then be incorporated into the final Inception Report.

During the field phase:

At the very beginning of the field mission, the team will present the AfDB officials with the detailed procedure for carrying out the investigations (which will have been sent previously). This meeting will be an opportunity to gather suggestions on particular interlocutors to be met.

In Eswatini, in-depth interviews will be held with the various AfDB executives. In addition, and as far as possible, focus groups bringing together appropriate members of the AfDB for a few key themes (for example: coordination with other TFPs, articulation between political dialogue and cooperation measures, etc.) will be organized. These two modalities
of interaction will contribute to feeding into the evaluation team’s reflections on the effectiveness, efficiency and impacts of AfDB interventions in Eswatini.

The workshop at the end of the field mission will be a unique opportunity to allow all invited stakeholders to respond to the first results of the evaluation and to participate actively in reflections on the perspectives and recommendations of the study.

**During the reporting and synthesis phase:**

During the reporting and synthesis phase, a discussion session of the draft technical report will be organized. This teleconference meeting will seek to validate the mission's analysis and discuss the relevance of the conclusions and recommendations. It is on the basis of this discussion and of the other comments received that the final technical report will be prepared.

### 4.6.2 Involvement of the other actors

The involvement of other categories of actor in the evaluation exercise will be carried out mainly through the activities described below.

During the preparatory mission that was carried out at the beginning of the documentary phase and during the field mission, meetings are held with:

- Swazi authorities, in particular with the ministries most concerned (Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy, Ministry of Public Works, Ministry of Economic Planning, Central Statistical Office, parastatal implementing organisations such as SWADE and SWSC, possibly SACU National Contact Point);
- Private sector organizations (e.g. professional organizations and agricultural unions) and Civil Society Organisations (including NGOs);
- Other donors, multilateral development banks (UN agencies, USAID, European Union), etc.

Then more specifically during the field mission:

- Visits will be made to the intervention sites selected for detailed analysis; these visits will lead to interviews with those responsible for implementing these measures, along with the beneficiaries (or their representatives) and other stakeholders (for example: Civil Society Organizations, other TFPs, etc.).
- In addition to these visits (or as needed), focus groups will be organized on certain topics, in particular to gather information on the beneficiaries’ points of view, on the structures for implementing the projects (if any), and on the Civil Society Organizations. These interactions will address issues of relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the interventions.

The scoping mission has enabled to identify the main actors to be meet according to the sector investigated. They are the following:

- **Governance:**
PFM: i) Accountant General (also manager of IFMIS); ii) Auditor General; iii) Internal audit team; iv) Swaziland Procurement Authority (SPPA); v) Director of Budget; vi) Chief economist in Ministry of Economic Planning; vii) Macroeconomic section; viii) EU, IMF consultant and WB consultant; and IX) UNDP.

Credit line: i) Ministry of Finance; ii) FINCORP; iii) SME’s benefiting from FINCORP loans.

Transport: i) Ministry of Public Works and Transport (particularly the Permanent Secretary, the Principal Planning Officer, the Corporate Planner and the Roads Department Chief Engineer); ii) Consulting Engineers on MR 3 project; iii) Swaziland Railways (management team - Director Engineering, Corporate Planner); iv) Ministry of Finance (Permanent Secretary); v) Director of Budget & Economic Affairs; vi) Swaziland Environmental Authority (SEA).

Water and Sanitation: i) Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy: Department of Water & Sanitation; ii) Swaziland Water Services Corporation (SWSC); iii) EU; iv) UNICEF; v) Ezulwini Water and Sanitation Project beneficiary communities; vi) Swaziland Environmental Authority (SEA).

Energy: i) Ministry of Natural Resources & Energy (both Energy and Water Resource departments); ii) Swaziland Environmental Authority (SEA).

Agriculture: i) Ministry of Agriculture; ii) Swaziland Water & Agricultural Development Enterprise Limited (SWADE); iii) EU (due to its dominance in the sugar sector - though it is now drawing away from it); iv) LUSIP and KDDP beneficiary households and production society representatives; v) Swaziland National Agricultural Union (SNAU); vi) Sugar Association (Cane growers); vii) National Agricultural Marketing Board; viii) Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy; ix) Swazi Bank (a key financial institution) and FINCORP (for their perspective on agricultural finance); x) Swaziland Environmental Authority (SEA).

All sectors should consider meeting the following cross-cutting ministries:

- Ministry of Finance;
- Ministry of Economic Planning (particularly its Aid Coordination Unit);
5. Field mission organization

5.1 Tasks distribution

The distribution of responsibilities during the field phase must enable to cover all sectoral themes as well as crosscutting issues. The principles which will guide our field work are interaction, multidisciplinarity and integration of the evaluation approach.

The organizational structure for this assignment is illustrated below.

Figure 14: Evaluation team organizational structure

The organization of the team includes a clear distribution of responsibilities and tasks, which is summarised below:

A Team Leader involved throughout the evaluation

The philosophy of the team composition is to have a Team Leader managing the entire process, supported by a professional ADE evaluator.

The mandate of the central team will be as follows:

- The Team Leader will assume overall responsibility for the evaluation (including the methodology and deliverables. He will organize the work throughout the evaluation process and ensure the distribution of tasks between evaluation team members.
- Coordination of all the experts and of the different thematic contributions: an individualized follow-up of the contributions of each of the experts will be ensured, as well as verification of the coherence and quality of the sectoral analyses offered.
by the various members of the team, in order to ensure the maintenance of a global vision of the evaluation.

More specifically, the Team Leader, assisted by the in-house ADE evaluation expert, will play a structuring role at the different stages of the study:

- **Documentary phase**: analysis of the Theory of Change; structuring of Evaluation Questions; leadership of the scoping mission, collection of information, drafting and presentation of inception report, distribution of documentation to experts; integration of their contributions after proofreading, validation and deepening of the findings.

- **Field phase**: in country coordination of investigations conducted in Eswatini and South Africa, organization of team meetings, validation of sectoral mission programmes and joint work, cross-analysis of results, responsibility for the Agriculture and Environment sector report.

- **Synthesis phase**: Revision of all the sector reports, formulation of conclusions and recommendations based on the elements proposed by each sectoral expert and a cross-sectional analysis of the answers to the Evaluation Questions leading to his drafting of the technical report, preparation and participation to the workshop to formulate main lessons learned and recommendations, and finally, drafting and presentation of summary report.

**Sectoral and national experts**

It should be noted that the Team Leader will also contribute to the sectoral analysis, having responsibility for the agriculture and environment sector report. Sector experts will provide the team with their sector-specific and thematic expertise. They will be in charge of case studies, sector reports and country-level Evaluation Questions and will actively contribute to the other questions, in accordance with the structure of the study established during the inception phase. More specifically:

- At each stage, the experts will contribute in line with the instructions of the Team Leader.

- They will carry out revision and proofreading of the different deliverables, contributing to the feeding of the global analysis produced by the team. To do this, exchange times will be organized for all members of the team: work sessions will be organized during the field mission to cross-check the data collected by the different team members and feed into the overall analysis.

- At the request of other experts, they may also be required to collect data for other areas of analysis.

The two Swazi experts, in addition to their respective expertise in the field of gender and capacity-building, will provide the entire team with their detailed knowledge of the country (particularly as part of the contextual analysis) and facilitate exchanges with the authorities. One of these experts provides support to the team for planning the work upstream of the preparatory mission and the field mission and, if necessary, their logistical organization.
Support functions
The Team Leader will be supported throughout the study by a quality control manager, Jean-Marie Wathelet. He will provide support and advice to the team on aspects relating to the study methodology, clarity and thoroughness of the content of the reports, and will be responsible for the quality control system (see below).

Finally, the team will benefit throughout the process from the standard services provided by ADE to the evaluation teams. ADE has more than 40 employees, including many internal analysts, a financial department and a secretariat. ADE facilitates the work of the teams through, inter alia, providing support for the organization of workshops, booking of trips, formatting of reports, provision and maintenance of computer equipment and user licence software, and so forth, as well as for exchanges on specific issues of content or methodology. Depending on the needs, the team could be reinforced by ADE staff analysts, who will participate in the computer encoding of data collected during the evaluation process (NVivo software).

The organization of the team involves a clear division of tasks and activities between the experts. The distribution of the tasks made it possible to estimate the number of days per expert in order to build the financial proposal. This distribution is summarised below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Distribution of tasks between team members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature and documentary review; portfolio analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the evaluation framework (EQs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a robust methodological approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping mission in Swaziland and South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of methodological tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS PHASE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature and documentary review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design, launch and monitoring of the e-survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis by EQs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>REPORTING PHASE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- P: Perform (carry out the task)
- A: Accountable (ultimately answerable, and delegate the work)
- S: Suggest (advice based upon recognized expertise)
- C: Control (right of veto)

5.2 Field mission calendar
The field mission in Eswatini is planned to start the 13th May and finish the 31st May. The team leader and local evaluation expert will be present all through that period whereas sectoral experts will spend 2 weeks in Eswatini. The indicative plan for this mission is presented below.
The first 3 days of the sectoral evaluators’ mission will take place in Mbabane and will enable to conduct a final harmonisation meeting with the TL, meet the Swazi government services, the project execution agencies as well as development partners.

As from day 4 of their mission, evaluators will undertake site visits at the level of the projects corresponding to their thematic area (and institutional visits in the case of non-lending activities such as TA provision). Site visits include visits of the project area and meetings with the various project stakeholders. The last two days of their assignment will be dedicated to complementary visits at central level, a debriefing with concerned Swazi authorities and a team exchange meeting.

In practice, only 3 actions will entail visits outside Mbabane and only 1, the LUSIP II project, whose area is around 100km away, might imply spending several days on site. The Ezulweni Water and Sanitation project is situated less than 20km away from Mbabane and can be visited from the capital on a daily basis. The MR3 highway will probably not require extensive field visits as it is not very advanced; besides, the project area can be reached in less than an hour from Mbabane.

As far as possible, the whole team will start the mission at the same time, so as to conduct a kick-off meeting in Mbabane before breaking up for sectoral data collection. The sectoral investigations will close with a team workshop at the end of the initial two weeks. After the rest of the team’s departure, the team leader will spend 4 additional days conducting complementary investigations identified during the team debriefing workshop, as well as prepare a global debriefing (possibly another workshop) for Swazi authorities and Bank personnel.

### Table 9: Field Mission Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Consultants</th>
<th>Activities and concerned institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13th May</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Travel to Eswatini via South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th May</td>
<td>TL, gender</td>
<td>Meetings with Swazi government services, the project execution agencies as well as development partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expert and</td>
<td>(If necessary, a day may be spent in Pretoria to meet AfDB personnel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>local evaluator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th May</td>
<td>TL, gender</td>
<td>Meetings with Swazi government services, the project execution agencies as well as development partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expert and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>local evaluator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th May</td>
<td>Entire ADE team</td>
<td>Final harmonisation meeting and meetings with Swazi government services, the project execution agencies as well as development partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th May</td>
<td>Entire ADE team</td>
<td>Meetings with Swazi government services, the project execution agencies as well as development partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th May</td>
<td>Entire ADE team</td>
<td>Meetings with Swazi government services, the project execution agencies as well as development partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th May</td>
<td>Entire ADE team</td>
<td>Visits of the intervention areas corresponding to each thematic experts projects and meetings with the various project stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th May</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st May</td>
<td>Entire ADE team</td>
<td>Visits of the intervention areas corresponding to each thematic experts projects and meetings with the various project stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>Activities and concerned institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd May</td>
<td>Entire ADE team</td>
<td>Visits of the intervention areas corresponding to each thematic experts projects and meetings with the various project stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd May</td>
<td>Entire ADE team</td>
<td>Visits of the intervention areas corresponding to each thematic experts projects and meetings with the various project stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th May</td>
<td>Entire ADE team</td>
<td>Visits of the intervention areas corresponding to each thematic experts projects and meetings with the various project stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th May</td>
<td>Entire ADE team</td>
<td>Complementary visits at central level and debriefing with concerned Swazi authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th May</td>
<td>Entire ADE team</td>
<td>Team exchange meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th May</td>
<td>Sectoral experts</td>
<td>Travel to home base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th May</td>
<td>TL and local evaluator</td>
<td>Complementary investigations identified by the team during their meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th May</td>
<td>TL and local evaluator</td>
<td>Complementary investigations identified by the team during their meeting and preparation of a global debriefing for Swazi authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th May</td>
<td>TL and local evaluator</td>
<td>Debriefing with Government Travel to home base</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


6. Evaluation calendar

The calendar is presented in its basic elements in the table below and in detail in the following chart.

Note that the proposed agenda takes into account the time needed for internal and external reviews and revision by the evaluation team. The duration of each activity and deliverable conforms to the provisional calendar set out in the Terms of Reference but deadlines have shifted due to the inception mission starting 2.5 months late following the unavailability of AfDB and RGoS personnel at the dates indicated in the ToR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Starting date</th>
<th>End date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inception phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping mission</td>
<td>April 6th</td>
<td>April 11th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td>February 5th</td>
<td>April 18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection and analysis phase</strong></td>
<td>April 30th</td>
<td>June 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection mission</td>
<td>May 14th</td>
<td>May 31st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting and synthesis phase</strong></td>
<td>June 4th</td>
<td>July 25th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector reports (5) drafts</td>
<td>June 4th</td>
<td>June 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector reports final</td>
<td>June 25th</td>
<td>June 29th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical report draft</td>
<td>June 11th</td>
<td>June 22nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical report final</td>
<td>2nd July</td>
<td>6th July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary report draft</td>
<td>July 9th</td>
<td>July 13th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation workshop</td>
<td>July 16th</td>
<td>July 18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary report final</td>
<td>July 23rd</td>
<td>July 25th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Months</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCEPTION PHASE</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team meeting and information session (teleconference)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature and documentary review; portfolio analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the evaluation framework (EQs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a robust methodological approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping mission in Swaziland and South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of methodological tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Inception report – Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on the inception report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Inception report – Final</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of the Inception report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS PHASE

|                                 | Months | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  |
| Literature review | | | | | | | | | |
| Documentary review for non-case study projects | | | | | | | | | |
| Mission preparation | | | | | | | | | |
| Field mission including data collection at strategic and intervention level: interviews of main stakeholders and beneficiaries, case studies, field visit, focus groups, survey, briefing and debriefing IDEV and team meeting, workshop with stakeholders | | | | | | | | | |
| Project grids | | | | | | | | | |
| Project grids case study | | | | | | | | | |
| Inputs per sector | | | | | | | | | |
| Data analysis by EQs | | | | | | | | | |

#### REPORTING PHASE

|                                 | Months | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  |
| D2 Sector reports – Draft | | | | | | | | | |
| D3 Technical report – Draft | | | | | | | | | |
| Comments on the Sector Reports | | | | | | | | | |
| Comments on the Technical report | | | | | | | | | |
| D2 Sector reports – Final | | | | | | | | | |
| D3 Technical report – Final | | | | | | | | | |
| Approval of the Sector reports and Technical report | | | | | | | | | |
| Presentation in South Africa / Swaziland | | | | | | | | | |
| D4 Summary report – Draft | | | | | | | | | |
| Comments on the Summary report | | | | | | | | | |
| D4 Summary report – Final | | | | | | | | | |
| Approval of the synthesis report | | | | | | | | | |

### Main deliverables
- Report
- Meeting