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Executive Summary

Background

Independent Development Evaluation (IDEV) at the African Development Bank Group (AfDB or “the Bank”) launched, in March 2020, a mid-term evaluation of the Bank’s Results Measurement Framework (RMF) for 2016–2025, as part of its 2020 work program.

The AfDB’s RMF for the period 2016–2025 is designed to measure and enhance development impact. The RMF aims to track progress towards the Bank’s twin goals of inclusive growth and green growth set out in its Ten-Year Strategy (TYS) for Africa’s Transformation (2013–2022). The RMF uses four levels to track the Bank’s performance in meeting its development objectives. Level 1 tracks development progress across Africa. Level 2 measures the Bank’s contributions towards development in all its operations. Level 3 assesses the quality of the Bank’s operations. And Level 4 monitors the Bank’s efficiency as an organization. With this RMF, the Bank is increasing its strategic focus on five priority areas of development, the “High 5s”: Light Up and Power Africa, Feed Africa, Industrialize Africa, Integrate Africa, and Improve the Quality of Life for the People of Africa. The Bank has also introduced the Development and Business Delivery Model (DBDM) to increase its effectiveness and efficiency. In total, the RMF identifies 14 objectives for the Bank that summarize the theory of change that guides the Bank’s actions and underpins the RMF.

Within the scope of the 2016–2025 RMF, the Bank decided to take five major actions to boost its impact on development, which are described in detail in this report: (i) increasing the Bank’s strategic focus on five of the TYS priority areas, the High 5s; (ii) supporting the implementation of a more effective delivery model; (iii) better measuring the Bank’s development impact; (iv) improving the way the Bank assesses the private sector’s contribution to development; and (v) increasing the Bank’s attention to gender equality.

Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

This mid-term evaluation of the RMF (2016–2025) aims to provide evaluation knowledge that will contribute to a better understanding of the progress of RMF implementation so far and assist the Bank’s Management in improving the RMF execution for the rest of the period until 2025. It will inform a mid-term review of the RMF that Management intends to present to the Board in Q4 2021. The evaluation covered the period from 2016 to 2020. It assessed the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Bank’s RMF, and provides evidence of the RMF’s strengths and weaknesses, as well as recommendations for Management to chart a course of action that will subsequently help the Bank to implement its strategies more effectively and efficiently.

The evaluation addressed the following overarching questions:

- To what extent is the design of the RMF robust in supporting the Bank’s development effectiveness?
- To what extent has the RMF achieved its strategic objectives of being an accountability, decision-making and learning tool for the Bank?
- To what extent and how has the RMF been optimal in achieving its objectives?
Methodology

An evaluation framework was prepared for this evaluation. The approach used is non-experimental and applies mixed methods, with a participatory characteristic. The evaluation approach is also utilisation-focused in that there is clarity from the onset as to who the evaluation is for, and how it will be disseminated and used. In particular, it will inform a review of the RMF by the Bank’s Delivery, Performance Management and Results Department (SNDR). The formative nature of the evaluation entails that the evaluation team examines whether the RMF approach is achieving efficiency and effectiveness expectations that were part of its initial raison d’être.

The evaluation methods applied are primarily qualitative, complemented by a review of the quantitative information reported on in the RMF. The evaluation benefitted from a substantial amount of relevant evaluation evidence generated by IDEV, and other internal and external reviews. The evaluation was informed by three main lines of evidence: (i) benchmarking with similar organisations; (ii) an assessment of the quality of the data reported in the Annual Development Effectiveness Review (ADER); and (iii) an assessment of the quality of the RMF’s design. Data collection and analysis for the evaluation were partly desk-based due to the COVID-19 pandemic situation, and interviews with key stakeholders were conducted remotely. The qualitative interviews were complemented by an evaluation survey of relevant Bank staff at Headquarters and in Regional and Country Offices. The low response rate for the online staff survey, and the inability to validate the accuracy of the actual results indicator values reported in Project Completion Reports (PCRs) and Expanded Supervision Reports (XSRs), were among the key limitations encountered. However, the use of triangulation helped to mitigate these limitations.

Findings

Relevance

The evaluation assessed to what extent the design of the Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF was robust enough to support the Bank’s development effectiveness.

The alignment of the RMF with the Bank’s TYS, the High 5s, other Bank policies and strategies, and the SDGs (strategic level): The Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF was found to be relevant in supporting the AfDB’s development effectiveness, demonstrable through its strategic alignment with the Bank’s corporate policies and strategies, as well as international goals. The RMF is strategically aligned with the Bank’s TYS (2013–2022) and new developments, including the High 5s agenda, other Bank policies and strategies, and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). By placing the High 5s at the centre of Levels 1 and 2 of the RMF, the Bank made a conscious effort to realise two things: The first is to push towards the highest goals through indicators that measure progress towards results achievement regarding infrastructure development, regional integration, skills and technology, private sector development, and governance. The second is to concurrently realise the SDGs given the high level of congruence between them and the High 5s, at nearly 90 percent.

However, the evaluation found that specific adjustments are necessary to ensure the continued alignment of the RMF, especially given the multi-layered work ongoing at the Bank, namely a new private sector development strategy, cross-cutting strategies such as gender, green growth and fragility, and a proposal to increase the Bank’s selectivity, as well as new or updated sector and corporate policies and strategies that have direct causal linkages with the RMF. The Bank is also advised to re-visit its assumptions and the identified risks in the RMF’s Theory of Change, especially those related to: (i) the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic; (ii) the climate crisis, in particular, drought- and flood-prone and
Executive Summary

An IDEV Corporate Evaluation

water-challenged states, and related food scarcity; (iii) fragility and conflict; and (iv) the incentives required for private sector participation and Non-Sovereign Operations (NSOs) reporting.

Furthermore, the corporate results measurement framework, which has different names in different Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs), is the highest-level tool for monitoring performance and achievement of the corporate strategic objectives set out in the overall long-term corporate strategy. In line with the findings from the RMF evaluation benchmark study and emerging good practices in managing for development results, the corporate results measurement framework should be aligned, and the business cycle synchronised, to the long-term corporate strategy to ensure the RMF’s continued relevance and usefulness as a performance management tool. However, the evaluation pointed out that, unlike other MDBs, the Bank’s RMF business cycle (2016–2025) was not synchronised with the Bank’s long-term corporate strategy (2013–2022). To this end, the alignment and business cycle synchronisation of the RMF 2016–2025 with the Bank’s corporate strategic priorities of the TYS (2013–2022) and the Bank’s upcoming corporate strategy (2023–) is of paramount importance in ensuring that the Bank’s RMF continues its relevance and usefulness in terms of being an accountability, decision-making, and learning tool for the Bank.

The alignment of the RMF with the Bank’s country, sector, and project-level results frameworks (operational level): In theory, results should be aligned, underpinning the importance of the results chain hierarchy. In practice, however, the evaluation found that the strength of the causal links between Levels 1 and 2 of the RMF could be strengthened. It also observed some areas for improvement in the intervention logic and alignment among the long- and medium-term objectives, the organisation’s operations (programs/projects), and the Bank’s corporate set-up (i.e., the corporate RMF and sectoral results frameworks). This can be attributed to a number of factors: first, due to inadequate application of a standardised set of results and performance indicators that are cascaded at sector and project levels. Second, there is the issue of how to aggregate disparate results indicators at different RMF layers so as to provide a holistic but focused picture of results at the corporate layer. While alignment of the corporate results framework and the Bank’s country, sector, and project-level results frameworks has been challenging, more recent Bank strategies and initiatives demonstrate improvement in this area.

Robustness of the RMF design: The quality of the design of the Bank’s RMF is assessed as good, albeit with some weaknesses in indicator selection, target setting, and stakeholders’ consultation.

Design: The RMF was found to largely satisfy the characteristics of a good corporate results framework, as it encompasses an implicit logic model and results matrix with baseline, targets, assumptions/risks, and results tracking and reporting, as well as the inclusion of cross-cutting issues. For example, the Bank’s RMF undertook a thorough analysis of the continent and prioritized its actions, translating the 2013–2022 corporate strategy into the High 5s, with corresponding targets. Furthermore, the RMF design considered the cross-cutting issues of: (i) climate change and green growth; (ii) gender equality and women’s empowerment; (iii) fragility and resilience; and (iv) economic governance.

Indicator selection and target setting: By setting time-bound and quantified targets for all the indicators that the Bank tracks, the desired level of impact and service delivery has been established. However, the evaluation found that the Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF process of selecting indicators and targets did not sufficiently consider the need to match aspirations with the available resources. This is inherent in the limitations associated with the available approved sector strategies, as the RMF took targets from country and sector strategies that were aspirational rather than achievable during the RMF design stage. However, not all indicators need or are suited to having targets. The Bank is advised to consider how useful a proposed target is likely

to be, and who will use it and how. When setting a numerical target is not appropriate or possible, the indicators in the RMF could make greater use of the target type “monitor”. In addition, target setting at all four levels of the RMF needs to be reviewed and adjusted to facilitate tracking performance against the Bank’s corporate targets.

Stakeholders’ consultation: A review of the RMF design process indicated that, while internal consultations took place, a deeper stakeholder mapping and consultations with Regional Member Countries (RMCs) and donors would have enriched the RMF. Key stakeholders often have a perspective that is important to consider in order to improve accuracy, accountability, and shared commitment to targets. During the design of the RMF, no stakeholder mapping was conducted.

Effectiveness

The effectiveness of the RMF was assessed by examining to what extent it achieved its strategic objectives of being an accountability, decision-making, and learning tool for the Bank.

The Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF was found to be an effective tool for accountability, and it has improved the communication of corporate performance. However, learning and decision-making have to some extent taken a backseat. The AfDB systems’ focus on accountability drives the shape, scope, timing, and content of reporting, and limits the usefulness of the exercise for learning and decision-making. The evaluation found that the RMF contributes to some extent to decision-making, but the causal linkage is less in evidence in a way that follows a plan. The RMF is helping to promote learning, but not to the extent that lessons are used in future operations. Numerous references in Key Informant Interviews (KII) to an “approval culture” and a “compliance focus” rooted in the completion of mandatory reports indicate a focus on short-term approaches that limit the attention for learning. KII also confirm the view that the Bank’s RMF reporting is aimed mainly at an external stakeholder audience, rather than at the internal management process to improve performance and achieve better results. Nevertheless, other reporting processes (Annual Portfolio Performance Review, Dashboards) are aimed at the internal audience.

Factors promoting or hindering the use (or non-use) of the RMF: Among others, the evaluation highlighted the following key factors that enable or hinder the use (or non-use) of the RMF:

i. The Bank’s strategic focus on the High 5s and greater attention to the drivers of operational performance enable the use of the RMF: The Bank is introducing new methodologies that will: (i) allow it to better assess the development impacts of its operations; (ii) support the RMF with departmental incentives—including updated key performance indicators—that are better aligned with its corporate priorities; and (iii) strengthen business processes to increase its capacity to track and report on its development impact, including an approach for capturing and leveraging the development impact of its private sector operations. This is a key aspect of achieving the High 5s, and one that has been identified by KII and surveys as being inadequately captured by the current monitoring and reporting approaches and tools.

ii. Frequency of reporting of Level 1 indicators should be clear and consistent with the data source parameters. The primary purpose of Level 1 indicators is to monitor the development progress of the RMCs. The existing AfDB RMF targets for these indicators are based on aspirational long-term targets linked to multiple strategies, guided by the High 5s. What has been established during the evaluation is that at Level 1, the AfDB (similar to all MDBs) selectively chooses what to report from the available evidence in order to demonstrate its performance and contribution to development in Africa at the highest levels. Accordingly, since 2020, the Bank stopped reporting targets for Level 1. In addition, given the reporting requirement to report on the
progress made on the RMF’s Level 1 indicators on an annual basis, it is extremely challenging (and not cost-effective) to report on long-term progress achieved annually and, instead, it is more effectively presented once or twice in the RMF cycle. For example, the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) presented aggregated data on its achievements and progress in its 2020 Development Effectiveness Review for the 2017–2020 Corporate Results Framework.

iii. The current RMF indicators mainly capture results and performance that are measurable by quantitative metrics, and thus fail to capture the Bank’s full contribution to development in Africa, including the “soft” elements of the Bank’s support, such as non-lending operations. A case in point is the use of inadequate indicators or inadequate measurement of the results of the Bank’s non-lending operations, specifically policy dialogue, knowledge management, and Economic and Sector Work. Increased appreciation of the importance of reporting that captures progress and development, or reporting of the qualitative aspects of the Bank’s efforts and investments, is warranted. Also, the Bank’s RMF can be further enhanced by additional narrative reporting to ensure a complete statement on the Bank’s work program and achievements. The 2020 ADER has demonstrated marked improvements and progress in this area, and is consequentially much more informative.

iv. The AfDB’s corporate results reporting can be better complemented by proactive analysis and reporting on the regional/country and sector/High 5s results frameworks, to strengthen the effectiveness of Results-Based Management (RBM). As noted in multiple references, the existing corporate system is supported by thematic and country development effectiveness reviews. During 2016–2019, the Bank undertook a thematic review of agriculture and country reviews of Ethiopia, Sierra Leone, Cameroon, Tanzania, Egypt, Mozambique, Guinea and Morocco, with reviews of Niger, Uganda and Ghana ongoing. However, the themes and countries to be covered are not strategically planned, but rather based on responding to country requests. More systematic and detailed reporting of results at the country/regional/sector/High 5/thematic level, to complement the corporate-level RMF reporting, would strengthen the basis for learning and RBM.

v. Measuring the AfDB’s impact on certain indicators such as the support to job creation and regional corridors remains challenging, and the Bank is exploring an appropriate methodology for measuring impact. For instance, to measure support to job creation, the AfDB has introduced a new methodology that was finalised in early 2020 and is based on project approvals (ex-ante)-a different methodology from other RMF indicators. The objective is to include data on direct, indirect, induced and forward-effect jobs in the next ADERs, with adequate explanations on the methodology. Moreover, in the 2020 ADER, the Bank piloted the use of high-resolution impact mapping to assess the impact of regional corridors.

vi. Assessing the attribution of development results to the Bank’s efforts vs. the contribution of the Bank’s efforts to development results. Compared with other MDBs, the Bank’s approach to measuring the development impact of co-financed operations differs, even though some degree of harmonisation exists. Interactive discussions and collaboration among MDBs have contributed to the near-convergence of their corporate-level results frameworks and/or scorecards. MDBs’ tiers or levels cover both development results and performance, adjusted to the needs of each MDB based on its mandate and operational circumstances. Nonetheless, the AfDB is the only MDB that has chosen to report exclusively on its own contribution and the results that can be attributed to it, and not on the aggregate project contribution, which includes co-financiers (outputs are pro-rated according to the level of the Bank’s financial support against total project costs). The rationale behind the
AfDB’s choice to report exclusively on its own contribution is mainly due to the fact that the Bank’s interventions are increasingly co-financed with other development partners and reporting the total sum of outputs might not adequately reflect the financial inputs of the Bank and would lead to double counting. Outputs are therefore pro-rated according to the Bank’s share in the total project costs. That is, the AfDB is utilising an attribution approach whereas comparator institutions such as the World Bank Group and the Asian Development Bank are using the contribution approach. This choice by the AfDB is not aligned with the Paris Declaration principle of mutual accountability for development results and the partnership-driven nature of its main High 5s Strategies (New Deal on Energy for Africa and Feed Africa). By pro-rating its results, the Bank is reporting substantively fewer results than others.

Efficiency

The evaluation examined the RMF’s efficiency by assessing to what extent and how the RMF has been optimal in achieving its objectives.

The main findings of the evaluation are as follows:

i. Level 2 data reported in the ADER presented shortcomings that were linked with the quality of the self-evaluation (PCR/XSR) data used, for which evidence sourcing practices are inadequate, as well as with the quality of data management and analysis. The main issues concerned a lack of formal procedures and foundations for a strong data-driven culture at all levels (project/country/sector), insufficient evidence in the PCRs/XSRs, and the limited institutional use of the knowledge generated by self-evaluation. Also, the Data Quality Assessment (DQA) undertaken within this evaluation observed that the ADER-reported data were computed using the three-year moving average method for Level 2 data. The use of a moving average smoothens trends by eliminating outliers, particularly those due to seasonality or business cycles. Data reported in the 2017–2020 ADERs computed using a three-year moving average differed significantly from annually computed indicator values for the same years. What becomes apparent is that annual data tend to be better for assessing annual results, as they can be used to focus attention on problem areas, while three-year averages can be useful to identify trends. Thus, given that the ADER serves the twin purposes of accountability and facilitating decision-making through learning, the Bank is advised to carefully consider the most appropriate methodological approach for each indicator, depending on what it will be used for.

ii. The DQA observed substantial attention to data disaggregation, particularly for women, the African Development Fund (ADF), and transition situations. The evaluation found some data quality issues on gender-disaggregated data. The 2017–2020 ADERs provide a considerable level of detail for gender-sensitive indicators. Of the 49 items of data on women beneficiaries verified by the evaluation, it was confirmed that nine (or 18 percent) are the subject of further review. Of these nine, seven are proxies (national-level sex compositions or other methods) and two are data-entry errors.

iii. The relatively large number of RMF indicators has significant implications for cost-efficiency. While the average number of indicators for the five institutions compared (including the AfDB) is 84, the AfDB has 21 indicators more. For the AfDB, this means that more effort is required in terms of time and costs to collect, collate, process, and disseminate meaningful data and information. This calls for a streamlining of the current pool of indicators to a level that guarantees cost-efficiency without compromising the quality of the data and the reporting process. Indeed, the Bank in its 2016–2025 RMF reduced the number of its RMF indicators, bringing them down to the current 105, compared with 111 in the previous RMF. However, from a cost-efficiency perspective, it would be useful to consider further streamlining the current number of indicators.
iv. The Bank identified the Results Reporting System (RRS) as a potentially effective reporting tool linked with quality results data, although its implementation was delayed. The improvement of AfDB information systems is expected to enhance the RMF’s effectiveness and efficiency, but only if the quality of results data entered into the IT system are guaranteed.

v. Finally, the Bank is already aligning corporate incentives with corporate priorities, although this process needs further development. This is in line with the RMF expectations as indicated in its design document.

Lessons

The following are the key lessons from this evaluation.

Lesson 1: The robustness and credibility of the Bank’s self-evaluation system are critical for tracking RMF indicators.

The Bank’s RMF results reporting, especially in the case of Level 2 indicators, is only as good as the robustness and credibility of the self-evaluation system, which by extension includes its results reporting system and processes for generating quality results data.

Lesson 2: A sense of ownership among key stakeholders is essential for delivering the RMF.

Ensuring ownership of the RMF at all levels of the organisation is essential. RMF indicators and targets should be selected and set based on a good understanding of what areas are important to measure and what level of performance is both ambitious and achievable, considering accurate baseline data, where applicable. It is therefore important to continue drawing upon specialists who are most likely to have this knowledge and data early on in the indicator-selection and target-setting process. This will also ensure broad ownership by those responsible for successfully meeting the targets. The inclusion of the operations departments and staff in setting the targets was identified by the key stakeholders surveyed as particularly important to the results achieved. Their involvement will allow an ambitious yet attainable target to be agreed upon, effective monitoring to be put in place, and staff ownership to be fostered.

Lesson 3: Stretching to maintain flexibility is vital.

The RMF should remain sufficiently flexible to accommodate other indicators and refinements in the future. This is particularly important for areas where: (i) there is a changing development context in the RMCs and the Bank’s emerging new strategies; (ii) self- and independent evaluation studies are planned to generate lessons relevant to target setting; and (iii) provisional indicators need to be tested before they are formally integrated into the RMF.

Lesson 4: Finding the balance between realism and ambition is important.

To function as an effective management tool, the RMF should have targets that are ambitious yet realistic. Historical data and Management’s forecasts combined with staff assessments of expected Bank performance should guide the determination of target attainability. The extent of the Bank’s control over specific performance areas should also inform target setting.

Recommendations

IDEV makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: Improve the RMF design.

Priority areas of action to consider include:

- Updating the theory of change and related indicators to align them with changes in Africa’s development context and the Bank’s emerging priorities.
Ensuring consistency and business cycle synchronisation between the RMF 2016–2025, the TYS (2013–2022), and the Bank’s upcoming Corporate Strategy (2023–). In line with other MDBs, the TYS and RMF should be the centrepiece of results measurement and reporting for both accountability and learning.

Reconciling the Bank’s ambitions with its resources by reviewing the targets set across the RMF levels to ensure that they are ambitious yet realistic.

**Recommendation 2:** Enhance the Bank’s results reporting.

Priority areas of action to consider include:

- Improving the reporting of outcomes and impacts at regional, country, sector/High 5 and thematic levels to ensure greater results orientation, with results brief at the country level, and clarity of responsibility for results reporting.

- Developing appropriate tools and guidance for measuring the results of the Bank’s non-lending operations such as policy dialogue, knowledge management, and Economic and Sector Work.

**Recommendation 3:** Enhance the utility of the RMF for better RBM and evidence-based decision-making.

Priority areas of action to consider include:

- Improving the aggregation at the RMF level and streamlining the number of core indicators at the project level by implementing core standard indicators and supporting staff in using them.

- Enhancing the capacity of Bank staff and project staff through ramping up awareness and training on results measurement, including the role of the RMF.

- Revising Bank guidance on PCRs and XSRs to provide clarity to teams on the level of supporting evidence expected to be included in these reports, and the results data quality assurance process.

- Collaboration between IDEV and Management to ensure that independent validations of PCRs and XSRs can take place in time to inform the ADER.
Management Response

The Bank’s Results Measurement Framework (RMF) was designed with two overarching objectives: to guide the Bank in delivering its Ten-Year Strategy, and to account for the Bank’s performance in doing so. Management is encouraged that IDEV’s evaluation found that the RMF was not only “relevant in supporting the Bank’s development effectiveness” and “aligned with the Ten-Year Strategy,” but also an “effective tool for accountability that has improved the communication of corporate performance.” The evaluation helpfully suggests areas where Management can further improve the RMF’s design and focus on results. These findings are timely as the Bank undertakes the mid-term review of the RMF.

Introduction

The RMF was designed in 2017, with two overarching objectives: to guide the Bank in delivering its Ten-Year Strategy, and to give the Bank a tool to benchmark, and publicly account, for its performance in doing so. The information generated by the RMF was also intended to help Management and the Board of Directors learn from past performance and inform decisions going forward.

IDEV’s evaluation is particularly timely as the Bank undertakes a mid-term review of the RMF.[2] In this connection, Management is pleased that the evaluation found that the RMF was not only “relevant in supporting the Bank’s development effectiveness” and “aligned with the Ten-Year Strategy,” but also an “effective tool for accountability that has improved the communication of corporate performance.” Management is also pleased that the evaluation suggests ways to improve the RMF’s design and focus. To this end, by January 2022, Management will present CODE with a proposal for revising the RMF.

To complement IDEV’s evaluation, Management commissioned an external study.[3] The study benchmarks the Bank’s RMF against the results frameworks of six other multilateral development banks (MDBs).[4] Management’s principal objective was to identify international best practices and adapt and apply those practices to the revised RMF. The study also reveals where the Bank is best in class. It concludes, for example, that the theory of change that underpins the Bank’s RMF is more comprehensive than the theories of change of the six comparator institutions. The benchmarking study is guided by the OECD’s inventory of good practices for corporate results frameworks (Box 1). An assessment of how the Bank applies these practices is presented in Annex A.

This management response discusses the principal issues raised in IDEV’s evaluation, especially in six areas of strategic value:

- The RMF’s logic
- Development outcomes
- Alignment with Bank strategies
- Targets’ level of ambition
- Measurement and reporting
- Usefulness as an accountability and decision-making tool

The Management Action Record presents the principal actions that Management will take to address the evaluation’s findings as Management reviews and strengthens the Bank’s RMF.
Box 1: Summary of the OECD’s Inventory of Good Practices for Corporate Results Frameworks

GOALS: Linking results to goals and building narratives
- Design results-based management approaches to align to and address development goals.
- Communicate narratives that logically link the contribution of activities to development results.
- Avoid reporting results in isolation: embed them in context.

PURPOSE: Ensuring RMF approaches are fit for purpose
- There can be no one size fits all.
- Articulate and communicate the why, what and how.
- Build external evaluation and reviews into the approach.

ATTRIBUTION: Being realistic about attributing results
- Be realistic about attributing results.
- Keep it simple: focus on a small number of output indicators.
- Limit use of aggregated targets.
- Harmonise standard indicators.

OWNERSHIP: Enabling country ownership of results information
- Support RMC’s measurement and use of country results.
- Consider using SDGs as a common framework prioritised by partners.

PERFORMANCE: Linking results and performance to inform delivery
- Distinguish clearly between organisational performance and development results.
- If aggregating self-assessments- ensure data are moderated and robust.

CULTURE: Enhancing resources to build a learning culture
- Enhance incentives for results-based management.
- Embed results officers to work with staff in country offices.
- Build bridges between results and evaluation.
- Plan ‘results modules’ in aid management platforms that avoid proliferation of parallel data systems.

Adapted from the OECD’s Strengthening the Results Chain (2017)

The RMF’s Logic

All development organisations have the same fundamental challenge: designing an RMF that accurately measures the organisation’s contribution to development. Corporate RMFs were introduced two decades ago to shift organisations’ focus from managing inputs to achieving development results. This approach rests on a results chain logic where inputs and activities lead to outputs (results directly produced by the organisation and largely under the organisation’s control) and to outcomes (changes that the organisation’s interventions seek to achieve). Over the longer term, these outputs and outcomes contribute to a desired impact (higher-level development results). Organisational effectiveness and portfolio performance are equally important drivers of development effectiveness. To capture this logical chain, the Bank uses a four-level framework:

Level 1: Development outcomes
Level 2: Aggregate project results
Level 3: Portfolio performance
Level 4: Organisational effectiveness
While all MDBs use these four levels, some MDBs combine the indicators of different levels in different ways. The Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank Group, for example, combine Level 3 and Level 4 indicators into a level called “performance.” The European Investment Bank and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development do not track Level 1 development outcomes but discuss them in their reports.

IDEV assesses the design of the Bank’s RMF as good and does not suggest adjusting its four-level design. Management agrees that the design serves the Bank’s purposes well. The design clearly links the Bank’s investments (Level 2) to the achievement of development outcomes (Level 1). And while Management has considered merging indicators of portfolio performance (Level 3) and indicators of organisational effectiveness (Level 4), in the last analysis, Management believes that for the sake of conceptual clarity, it is best to keep them separate. Level 3 and Level 4 indicators are, however, discussed within the same chapter in the Annual Development Effectiveness Review (ADER).

Development Outcomes

The ultimate goal of any development organisation is to deliver development outcomes—the lasting changes that interventions make to people’s lives. In practice, however, measuring lasting changes is difficult, both for conceptual and for practical reasons. The main reason, but not the only one, is that it is not possible to attribute a development outcome to a single intervention or a single organisation. Development outcomes are always the result of a broad range of factors and decisions made by countless agents: governments, companies, households, development agencies, and others. Development outcomes also depend on factors that are beyond any agent’s control: health crises, climate events, the global economy, etc. That is why the RMF relies mainly on the four-tiered results chain discussed above to assess its impact on development. In recent years, however, the Bank has introduced important innovations to how it measures development impact. These innovations generate data that make it possible for the Bank to measure its impact on development more accurately and better understand the dynamics of development that inform and guide the Bank’s interventions.

The most ambitious innovation so far is the Joint Impact Model (JIM). Developed with ten other development finance institutions, the JIM is an econometric model that assesses how much an MDB’s investments contribute to economic growth and job creation. It estimates the number of indirect jobs supported through the institution’s investments: jobs in the supply chain, induced jobs, and jobs created by an operation’s enabling effects (e.g., the steady supply of energy, better infrastructure). According to the JIM, 121 operations approved by the Bank in 2019 will support 800,000 direct jobs and 2.1 million supply chain, induced, and enabling-effect jobs (Annex B). The benchmarking study points out that of six MDBs it analysed, only the European Investment Bank measures how its interventions affect economic growth or the creation of indirect jobs.

Satellite imagery is another innovation introduced by the Bank to better assess and understand the development impact of its operations. Drawing on state-of-the-art technology developed by Fraym, an American start-up, the Bank uses high-resolution impact mapping to assess changes in living conditions before and after the construction and rehabilitation of regional infrastructure. By comparing data from household surveys and applying geotagged datasets and satellite imagery, the methodology assesses changes in people’s living conditions with a high degree of reliability. The map reveals, for example, how Bank-financed road projects transformed people’s lives by giving communities better access to water and education and reducing travel times (Annex C). Because of the time and cost required to gather and analyse the data, the technology has only been applied to two regional corridors so far. The Bank is one of the leading organisations to employ high-resolution impact mapping.
These two innovations complement other tools, such as the Additionality and Development Outcome Assessment Framework (ADOA). The Bank introduced ADOA in 2009 to improve the quality at entry of non-sovereign operations (NSOs) and better rate NSOs’ expected development outcomes and additionality. IDEV recently evaluated ADOA: the evaluation is discussed in a separate management response.5

Alignment with Bank Strategies

Management is pleased that IDEV’s evaluation found the RMF to be “relevant and strategically aligned with the Bank’s Ten-Year Strategy.” The evaluation also raises good questions about the alignment between the RMF and lower-level strategies, namely sector, country, and project strategies. The extent to which a corporate RMF can realistically align with multiple lower-level strategies is open to question. The Bank has more than 15 sector strategies, close to 60 country and regional strategies, and more than a thousand active project logframes. These numbers reflect the need for the Bank to adapt its intervention to the great diversity of Africa’s regions, countries, and operating environments. All of the Bank’s strategies are, however, guided by a single overarching strategy: the Ten-Year Strategy. That is why, Management believes that it makes sense for the RMF to continue aligning closely to the Ten-Year Strategy while strengthening links to other strategies, in three ways.

First, Management will make the RMF more selective by focusing on the 18 development priorities agreed by the Board of Directors earlier this year.6 These priorities aim to sharpen the Bank’s strategic focus within the High 5s in areas where the Bank has a strong comparative advantage. By becoming more selective, the Bank aims to increase its development impact while making better use of its resources.

Second, Management will adjust and strengthen the theory of change that underpins the RMF. An extensive theory of change is already part of the current RMF. The theory of change is broken down into 14 logics of intervention that give a clear rationale for each indicator of the RMF’s four levels.7 The logics also capture the Bank’s strategies and High 5s. For example, the logic of intervention for the first High 5—Light Up and Power Africa—was derived from the Bank’s New Deal on Energy for Africa, which informed the logic’s priorities, objectives, choice of indicators, and the targets’ ambition. This approach was applied at all levels of the RMF, including the levels of portfolio performance (Level 3) and organisational effectiveness (Level 4). As a result, the benchmarking study found the theory of change that currently underpins the Bank’s RMF to be more comprehensive than the six examined in the benchmarking study.8 As the Bank reviews the current RMF, it will fine-tune the 14 logics of intervention to align the RMF’s indicators with the 18 development priorities agreed in the Bank’s selectivity paper. It will also review the targets for each indicator (see below).

Third, Management will strengthen the links between the RMF and individual operations. An important decision when designing an RMF is whether to mandate the use of standard indicators in project results frameworks. In other words, is it useful to force an operation’s logframe to choose among a standard list of indicators? On one hand, mandating the use of standard indicators reminds project designers of the importance of contributing to corporate objectives and makes it possible to aggregate results at a high level. On the other hand, highly standardised project indicators can create perverse incentives by preventing an operation from using indicators that may be more meaningful to its context. The benchmarking study shows that MDBs manage the trade-offs between standardisation and flexibility differently. At the European Investment Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Finance Corporation, projects must select from a fully standardised list of indicators. In contrast, the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the World Bank Group maintain a fully standardised list of indicators, organised by sector, from which projects must select. But their projects may also employ additional indicators from outside
the list. In strengthening the links between the RMF and individual operations, Management will adopt the second, semi-flexible approach (see Management Action Record).

**Targets’ Level of Ambition**

IDEV’s evaluation draws an important conclusion: RMF targets need to be achievable and commensurate with the Bank’s financial and human resources. Otherwise, results are misunderstood or impossible to realise. Take the case of the targets for Light Up and Power Africa. The Bank increased the number of people with new or improved electricity connections sixfold, from 73,000 in 2015 to 468,000 in 2019. The Bank’s New Deal for Energy in Africa, however, had set a target of 2.4 million people per year. As a result, even a sixfold increase seems mediocre. In addition, IDEV’s evaluation notes that targets are sometimes disconnected from the Bank’s past performance or do not correspond to the results targeted in the medium-term by planned operations (the indicative operations plan, or IOP).

Management agrees with the evaluation’s findings and will set more realistic targets in the revised RMF. To this end, as discussed above, it is reviewing the RMF’s 14 logics of intervention with the objective of increasing the RMF’s strategic selectivity and setting more realistic targets commensurate with the Bank’s resources (including the IOP) and past performance. In setting targets, the Bank will balance ambition and realism. Management will also decide whether to continue setting targets for Level 2 indicators (Box 2).

**Measurement and Reporting**

Both the evaluation and benchmarking study note that the Bank is the only MDB to report only its own contributions on a pro-rata basis. In other words, when the Bank co-finances 50% of an operation, it only reports 50% of the project results. The other MDBs report 100% of project results, regardless of the proportion of their co-financing. Thus, by prorating its results, the Bank reports substantively lower results than comparator institutions. Management believes that this is the right and best way of reporting its results as it avoids double counting at the aggregate level. Because the Bank is the only MDB to report in this way, however, Management will consider whether to continue doing so. Aligning its reporting practices with the practices of other MDBs would make the Bank’s data more comparable.

**Usefulness as an Accountability and Decision-making Tool**

IDEV’s evaluation concludes that the RMF is an “effective tool for accountability and has improved the communication of corporate performance.” Management is pleased to see that the evaluation recognises progress in these areas. In 2020, Publish

**Box 2: Benchmarking the Targets set by Multilateral Development Banks**

The benchmarking study found that the Bank was the only MDB to set Level 2 targets, that is, targets for aggregate project results.

Rather than setting quantitative Level 2 targets, other MDBs report against expected results or against a baseline of results achieved in earlier years. This prevents the results of a few large country programmes from dominating aggregate output figures. By freeing projects from the pressure to contribute to corporate-level targets, it also makes the portfolio more responsive to client demand.

The benchmarking study also notes that results reporting for infrastructure projects is subject to a significant time lag, with any given year’s results reflecting the priorities of seven or eight years in the past. For that reason, a missed target for Level 2 implies that the Bank’s infrastructure projects have been unsuccessful, which is not generally the case.
What You Fund, an independent organisation that ranks the transparency of the major development organisations, ranked the Bank the fourth-most transparent development institution of 47 other bilateral and multilateral organisations (Table 1). This reflects the Bank’s systematic efforts to publish information on all its operations in line with the exacting standards set by the International Aid Transparency Initiative.

The Bank’s transparency is guided by Management’s policy of communicating its results and performance to a broad audience. The main vehicle for communicating the Bank’s performance against the RMF is the Annual Development Effectiveness Review (ADER). The ADER not only accounts for the Bank’s performance, but also builds the public’s understanding of Africa’s development challenges and how the Bank addresses them.

In addition to the ADER, the Bank communicates its activities through dedicated tools such as MapAfrica (Figure 1) and its data portal. MapAfrica is an interactive platform that maps the Bank’s investments and allows users to navigate through the Bank’s operations, seeing their development impact across African countries by High 5. MapAfrica shows more than 14,000 project locations.

Finally, IDEV’s evaluation examined the extent to which the RMF served as a decision-making tool for implementing the Bank’s Development and Business Delivery Model (DBDM). It found that the RMF contributes to decision-making indirectly. The RMF was not designed as a decision-making tool, but rather as a framework that provides valuable information on the Bank’s performance in meeting its development mandate. In this sense, it helps the Board of Directors exercise its oversight function and hold Management accountable for the Bank’s performance. However, like other MDBs, the Bank mainly relies on tools other than the RMF to make decisions. This includes, for example, the Executive Dashboard that Management developed to track operations’ performance at a very high level of disaggregation and in real time. By applying filters, Management can analyse performance against a diverse range of criteria: size of operation, country, region, task manager, and status (e.g., operations eligible for cancellation). In addition, Senior Management reviews the Bank’s performance every quarter using key performance indicators broken down by region and sector. Finally, Management consults other analytical tools, such as the annual portfolio performance review, which analyses the performance of the Bank’s portfolio, and budget performance reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AsDB*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>World Bank-IDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>African Development Bank*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IDB*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>US-MCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Global- Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>UK-DFID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Canada- Global Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sovereign Portfolio | Source: Publish What You Fund
Conclusion

The findings, lessons, and recommendations in IDEV’s evaluation reaffirm efforts that are already underway. Management’s actions for each of IDEV’s main recommendations are detailed in the Management Action Record.

Figure 1: MapAfrica Communicates Key Information about the Bank’s Operations

The High 5s

- Light up % power Africa
- Feed Africa
- Industrialize Africa
- Integrate Africa
- Improve the quality of life

Source: AfDB, MapAfrica (2021) (extract)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Management Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 1: Improve the RMF design</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Update the theory of change and related indicators to align them with changes in Africa’s development context and the Bank’s emerging priorities.</td>
<td><strong>I AGREED</strong> – Management recognises the need to update and adjust the theory of change in line with current events and the development priorities noted in the Bank’s selectivity paper. To this end, SNVP/SNDR will update the theory of change in the revised RMF that will be shared with CODE by <strong>January 2022</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ensure consistency and business cycle synchronisation between the RMF 2016–2025, the Ten-Year Strategy (2013–2022), and the Bank’s new Ten-Year Strategy (2023–).</td>
<td><strong>I AGREED</strong> – Management will ensure that the RMF aligns strongly with the Bank’s new Ten-Year Strategy (SNDR/SNSP, Q4 2022).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Reconcile the Bank’s ambitions with its resources by reviewing the targets set across the RMF levels to ensure they are ambitious yet realistic.</td>
<td><strong>I AGREED</strong> – Management will propose more realistic targets and ensure a good balance between ambition and realism. The new targets will be part of the revised RMF that will be shared with CODE by <strong>January 2022</strong> (SNVP/SNDR).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 2: Enhance the Bank’s results reporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Improve the reporting of outcomes and impacts at regional, country, sector/High 5, and thematic levels to ensure greater results orientation, with results brief at the country level, and clarity of responsibility for results reporting.</td>
<td><strong>I AGREED</strong> – Management will continue to build and improve on its suite of tools: results briefs, MapAfrica, satellite imagery, etc. (SNDR, Q4 2023).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Develop appropriate tools and guidance for measuring the results of the Bank’s non-lending operations such as policy dialogue, knowledge management, and economic and sector work.</td>
<td><strong>I AGREED</strong> – New requirements to report on dialogue on policy reforms and results are being rolled out in the context of country strategy papers. The next step is to automate the system so that the data thus generated can be exploited in full (RDVP, Q2 2022).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 3: Enhance the utility of the RMF for better results-based management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Improve the aggregation at the RMF level and streamlining the number of core indicators at the project level by implementing core standard indicators and supporting staff in using them.</td>
<td><strong>I AGREED</strong> – Management will design standard indicators for project results frameworks and organise the indicators by sector. Management will then require operations to draw from this list. Management will also allow operations some flexibility to add project-specific indicators. The standard indicators will be built into the Bank’s results reporting system (SNDR/SNOQ, Q4 2022).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Enhance the capacity of Bank staff and project staff through ramping up awareness and training on results measurement, including the role of the RMF.</td>
<td><strong>I AGREED</strong> – Management launched the Operations Academy in 2019 as a means of increasing staff knowledge and capacity. The Operations Academy Gateway has a dedicated module on the Bank’s RMF that is accessible to all Bank staff. The new Task Manager Pathway in the Academy includes a module focused on results tools at the project level, as does the forthcoming pathway for non-sovereign operations. In addition, training and information sessions on applying results tools are taking place throughout 2021, with close to 30 sessions already held and more than 300 staff trained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Management Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Revise Bank guidance on PCRs and XSRs to provide clarity to teams on the level of supporting evidence expected to be included in these reports, and the results data quality assurance process.</td>
<td>AGREED – The new operational instruction on project completion reports (PCRs) will give task teams detailed guidance and greater clarity on the evidence required to support their assessments and their ratings of Bank projects (SNOQ/IDEV Q4 2021).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Improve collaboration between IDEV and Management to ensure that independent validations of PCRs and XSRs can take place in time to inform the ADER.</td>
<td>AGREED – Management will continue to collaborate with IDEV to ensure that the ADER presents validated data on a timely basis (SNDR, ongoing).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management Response
Annexes
### Annex A: How the Bank applies the OECD’s Good Practices for Corporate Results Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD Good Practice</th>
<th>Bank Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOALS: Linking results to goals and building narratives</strong></td>
<td>The Bank has designed a results-based corporate results framework (2016-2025) that is strongly aligned with its Ten-Year Strategy and the High 5s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design results-based management approaches to align to and address development goals.</td>
<td>The RMF is structured along four levels that track the Bank’s contributions to development objectives. Level 1 tracks development progress in Africa, Level 2 measures the Bank’s contribution to Africa’s development, and Levels 3 and 4 assess the quality of the Bank’s operations and the Bank’s efficiency as an organisation. The RMF’s theory of change is broken down into 14 logics of intervention that give a clear rationale for each indicator at each level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate narratives that logically link the contribution of activities to development results.</td>
<td>To avoid reporting results in isolation, the Bank’s Annual Development Effectiveness Review (ADER) reports the Bank’s global results yearly. Through narrative, the ADER explains the context in which results are achieved and reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid reporting results in isolation: embed them in context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>PURPOSE: Ensuring RMF approaches are fit for purpose</strong>                          | The Bank’s RMF includes a small set of indicators drawn from the High 5s that assess the Bank’s contributions to development in Africa. In relevant areas, the Bank also seeks to align the results frameworks of projects with the corporate RMF. This alignment needs to be improved. |
| There can be no one size fits all.                                                | To foster a results culture and build capacity in results management at all levels of the organisation, the Bank has launched an online training program, the Operations Academy. The Academy helps operational and support staff develop their knowledge and skills in results-based management. |
| Articulate and communicate the why, what and how.                                 | Building on IDEV’s evaluation of the RMF, the Bank is reviewing its corporate results framework in 2021 to ensure that the framework is relevant and aligns with corporate priorities. The Bank is also enhancing the RMF approach by incorporating best practices from MDBs (benchmarking reviews) and reviewing the RMF every three years. |
| Build external evaluation and reviews into the approach.                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD Good Practice</th>
<th>Bank Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTRIBUTION:</strong> Being realistic about attributing and aggregating results</td>
<td>Recognising that Bank operations are increasingly co-financed, the Bank only reports its own contributions to development. This practice ensures that the results reported to stakeholders are an accurate reflection of the Bank’s investments. It avoids double counting. The Bank is reducing the aggregation of different indicators and targets by introducing standard indicators to complement its corporate indicators. Through the Harmonised Indicators for Private Sector Operations (HIPSO) platform, the Bank is also harmonising its approach to measuring jobs and the results of non-sovereign operations with the approach of other development partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Be realistic about attributing results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Keep it simple: focus on a small number of output indicators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Limit use of aggregated targets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Harmonise standard indicators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OWNERSHIP:</strong> Enabling country ownership of results information</td>
<td>The Bank has adopted a results-based framework for its country and regional strategy papers. By comprising alignment and performance matrices, the framework better aligns corporate and national reporting, provides a comprehensive view of how the lending and non-lending activities planned in each strategy will contribute to national development goals, and captures the broad spectrum of results related to country strategies. To enhance countries’ ability to manage for results, the Bank has supported its regional member countries through the Support to African Community of Practice (AfCoP) project. The RMF draws on sustainable development goal indicators that are relevant to the Bank’s development mandate. For example, under Light Up and Power Africa, the “share of population with access to electricity” indicator draws on the seventh sustainable development goal: to ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all. A report by the United Nations Development Program found that the High 5s are 86.4% compatible with the sustainable development goals and Agenda 2063.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Support RMC’s measurement and use of country results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Consider using SDGs as a common framework prioritised by partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD Good Practice</td>
<td>Bank Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERFORMANCE:</strong> Linking results and performance to inform delivery</td>
<td>The Bank uses a four-level results framework that distinguishes the Bank’s institutional results (Level 4) from the Bank’s operational performance (Level 3) and project development results (Level 2). Designing the RMF this way ensures a strong conceptual link between Africa’s development challenges, the Bank’s interventions to address those challenges, and the Bank’s performance as an organisation. It also helps to assess performance at each level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Distinguish clearly between organisational performance and development results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If aggregating self-assessments- ensure data are moderated and robust.</td>
<td>The Bank’s RMF and ADER disclose the methodology used to assess performance at each level of the RMF. While data is assessed for quality, more effort is needed for project completion reports to supply supporting evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURE:</strong> Enhancing resources to build a learning culture</td>
<td>A small set of RMF indicators is cascaded to top-level key performance indicators that are broken down by region and sector and are tracked by Senior Management quarterly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enhance incentives for results-based management.</td>
<td>The Bank has staffed its five regional hubs with quality and results monitoring officers to support task managers with results-based project planning and management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Embed results officers to work with staff in country offices.</td>
<td>The Delivery, Performance Management and Results Department (SNDR) and the Evaluation Department collaborate closely. SNDR coordinates management responses and follows up on Management actions. Together with IDEV, SNDR has designed the Management Action Record System (MARS) to track Management’s implementation of recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Build bridges between results and evaluation.</td>
<td>The Bank has rolled out the results reporting system (RRS), an automated system that makes it easier for task managers to capture operations’ results systematically and continuously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Plan ‘results modules’ in aid management platforms that avoid proliferation of parallel data systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex B: The Bank’s Joint Impact Model for Assessing the Impact of Bank’s Investments

Produced in collaboration with 10 development finance institutions, the Joint Impact Model is a tool that measures the number of jobs created with the support of the Bank’s operations: direct jobs, jobs in the supply chain, induced jobs, and jobs created by the operations’ enabling effects. The JIM estimates that 121 public and private sector operations approved by the Bank in 2019 will support the creation of 0.8 million direct jobs and 2.1 million jobs in the supply chain, induced jobs, and enabling-effect jobs. Of the three million jobs created, 1.3 million jobs will be held by women. Altogether, the jobs will add $17.2 billion to African economies.
The Bank is assessing the impact of its investments on jobs

Produced in collaboration with 10 development finance institutions, the Joint Impact Model is a tool that measures the number of jobs created with the support of the Bank’s operations: direct jobs, jobs in the supply chain, induced jobs, and jobs created by the operations’ enabling effects. The JIM estimates that 121 public and private sector operations approved by the Bank in 2019 will support the creation of 0.8 million direct jobs and 2.1 million jobs in the supply chain, induced jobs, and enabling-effect jobs. Of the three million jobs created, 1.3 million jobs will be held by women. Altogether, the jobs will add US$ 17.2 billion to African economies.

### Investments vs. Jobs vs. Added value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>Added value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Million jobs supported, by type of impact

- Finance enabling jobs (jobs made possible by better access to finance)
- Power enabling jobs (jobs made possible by better access to power)
- Induced jobs (jobs produced when new job holders spend their income)
- Supply chain jobs (suppliers and investors)
- Direct Jobs

#### Million jobs supported, by sector

- Transport
- Social
- Power
- Industry & mining
- Finance
- Agriculture

#### Value added ($ billions)

- Finance enabling jobs
- Power enabling jobs
- Induced jobs
- Transport
- Social
- Industry & mining
- Finance
- Agriculture

Source: AfDB, Annual Development Effectiveness Review 2021

### Annex C: Using Satellite Imagery to Assess the Impact of Bank Projects on Living Conditions

The Bank is using high-resolution impact mapping to assess the changes in well-being before and after the rehabilitation of the Mombasa Nairobi-Addis Ababa Road Corridor, with a focus on individuals that own at least two hectares of land suitable for agricultural use. Focusing on an unprecedented geographic scale, the map provides details on the roads’ economic footprint, improvements in human development and how they promote integration throughout the entire corridor. By comparing data from household surveys in 2005 (before) and 2020 (during or after) and applying geotagged datasets, and satellite imagery, the methodology can assess with a high degree of reliability the changes in people’s living conditions for example, additional people with access to energy within 20 km of the roads. Not all changes are directly attributable to the project: they reflect broader improvements in living conditions over time.
High-resolution impact mapping: Assessing living conditions of smallholder households in East Africa

The Bank is using high-resolution impact mapping to assess the changes in well-being before and after the rehabilitation of the Mombasa-Nairobi-Addis Ababa Road Corridor, with a focus on individuals that own at least two hectares of land suitable for agricultural use. Focusing on an unprecedented geographic scale, the map provides details on the roads’ economic footprint, improvements in human development and how they promote integration throughout the entire corridor. By comparing data from household surveys in 2005 (before) and 2020 (during or after) and applying geotagged datasets, and satellite imagery, the methodology can assess with a high degree of reliability the changes in people’s living conditions — for example, additional people with access to energy — within 20 km of the roads. Not all changes are directly attributable to the project: they reflect broader improvements in living conditions over time.

Access to essential services

1 million additional individuals with access to electricity

1.6 million additional individuals with access to piped drinking water

Improved health conditions

Child stunting rates decreased by 3% in Kenya

Child wasting rates decreased by 3% in Kenya

Economic significance

3.1 million additional individuals with access to a bank account

Trade between Kenya and Ethiopia increased from $35 million to $175 million

Mobility to market

20 hours reduction in total travel time on concerned sections

75% reduction in average time spent on border

Household assets

487,000 additional individuals with access to a scooter

708,000 additional individuals live in a household with goats

658,000 additional individuals live in a household with cattle

Better access to education and jobs

Women

287,000 additional women completed up to primary school

276,000 additional women completed secondary education or higher

1.2 million additional women employed

Youth

479,000 additional youth completed up to primary school

425,000 additional youth completed secondary school or higher

1.3 million additional youth employed in Ethiopia

432,000 additional youth are employed in agriculture

Notes:

1 Smallholder households are defined as households that own at least 2 hectares of land suitable for agricultural use. In Kenya, smallholder households make up 11 million out of 12.7 million people living within a 20 km radius from the Corridor in 2020. In Ethiopia, this number is 8.4 million out of 10.5 million.

Source: AfDB/Fraym
Introduction

Independent Development Evaluation (IDEV) at the African Development Bank Group (AfDB or “the Bank”) launched, in March 2020, a mid-term evaluation of the Bank’s Results Measurement Framework (RMF) for 2016–2025, as part of its 2020 work program approved on 5 February 2019. This document presents the summary report of the evaluation.

This mid-term evaluation of the RMF 2016–2025 aims to provide evaluation knowledge that will contribute towards a better understanding of the progress in the implementation of the RMF so far, and assist the Bank’s Management in improving the RMF’s execution for the rest of the period until 2025. It will inform a mid-term review of the RMF that Management intends to present to the Board in Q4 2021. It assesses the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Bank’s RMF, and provides evidence of the RMF’s strengths and weaknesses, as well as recommendations to Management on charting a course of action that will subsequently help the Bank to implement its strategies more effectively and efficiently.

At the strategic management level, the results information is used for accountability, to inform decision-making and for learning. The Organisation for Economic Corporation and Development (OECD) confirmed the importance of this focus. It is also important to mention that the evaluation profession, since its origin in the 1980s/1990s, combines accountability and learning to enhance its value addition. The Bank’s sixth RMF covers the period 2016–2025 and aims to track progress towards the Bank’s twin goals of inclusive growth and green growth as set out in the Ten-Year Strategy (TYS) for Africa’s Transformation (2013–2022). It also tracks strategic progress indicators and targets drawn from the Bank’s strategies for its top priorities (the “High 5s”) by 2025 and the progress towards the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by 2030. In this sense, the RMF is seeking to attribute the Bank’s investments and contributions on an annual and cumulative basis across a prolonged time continuum.

Background

The focus on performance reporting in the context of the RMF is grounded in the past 15 years’ efforts to improve information on the effective use of development resources, in particular on the results produced with investments and providing evidence of value for money. The AfDB was among the early adopters of the RMF with its first initiative in 2003.

At Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs), results frameworks emerged from 2002 to 2014. The earliest MDBs to adopt results frameworks were the International Development Association (IDA, 2002), the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD, 2003), and the African Development Bank (AfDB, 2003). Next to implement the results framework were the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD, 2007), the Asian Development Bank (AsDB, 2008), the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB, 2010), and the World Bank, comprising the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD, 2010), and the World Bank, comprising the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and IDA (2011). Subsequently, the World Bank Group (WBG), consisting of the International Finance Corporation (IFC), the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA), and the World Bank, launched the first bank-
wide corporate scorecard (2014) to track the results and performance of these three organisations.

This early period of work with Results-Based Management (RBM) and corresponding RMFs continually evolved and, over time, demonstrated the need for improved alignment to support collaboration and measurement, and reduce the burden on aid-recipient countries. The adoption of the SDGs in 2015 spurred the development of revised and aligned corporate strategies among MDBs to enable reporting against progress towards achievement of the goals, alongside support to countries to improve their monitoring and evaluation capacity. As part of this effort to streamline results frameworks, corporate scorecards were revisited, and performance indicators adjusted. Subsequent efforts have focused on harmonisation, improved quality at entry and exit, and an enhanced ability to link investments to results, in order to provide improved evidence of performance, decision-making, learning, accountability, and transparency. This has involved reducing the number of indicators, while re-focusing reporting protocols around the enhanced utility of information.

The Bank’s RMF Experience over Time

The Bank aims to accelerate Africa’s transformation by 2025. Accordingly, it has set ambitious targets within its five priority areas, the High 5s, as further articulated in the Bank’s TYS. To help the Bank to deliver on its High 5s, the RMF was set up to increase its development impact, track and improve the Bank’s performance over time, communicate corporate priorities, and draw lessons from experience to guide and guard future operations. The Bank considers itself to be a learning organisation, accountable to the people it serves. As such, having an effective framework to measure and track results is essential in identifying the impact of this work and measuring the change (i.e., the results).

The Bank introduced a Results Measurement Framework (RMF) for the African Development Fund (ADF) during the mid-term review of the Ninth ADF Replenishment in 2003, in order to “demonstrate more effectively how its operations increase the productive capacity of its borrowing countries and reduce poverty.” The corporate results framework was adopted upon the approval of the consolidated and corporate-wide Strategic Plan 2003–2007 produced in late 2002. This was further enhanced for use in the ADF-10 period (2005–2007). In 2005–2007, the framework was refined to better focus on ADF-specific priorities and converge towards a common methodology for MDBs. This methodology involved a two-tiered approach: it measured development effectiveness at an aggregated country level and it measured aid effectiveness at the institutional level, both in terms of the ADF’s contribution to country results and in terms of its institutional performance. However, according to IDEV’s 2010 report, the framework adopted in the Strategic Plan concentrated on outputs and processes rather than on development impacts and development effectiveness and, as a result, it did not achieve the goal of facilitating progress towards RBM.

The ADF-11 (2008–2010) background report on “Results Reporting for ADF-10 and Results Measurement Framework for ADF-11” defined a medium-term agenda on quality and results, which focused on institutional reforms in five areas: (i) enhancing quality at entry of operations and strategies; (ii) instilling a results-oriented supervision culture; (iii) enhancing learning and accountability through evaluation; (iv) improving data and results reporting systems; and (v) accelerating decentralisation and harmonisation for better results on the ground.

The RMF for ADF-12 (2011–2013) consolidated and refined the ADF-11 framework by introducing two important features:
A “One Bank” Results Measurement Framework. First, under ADF-12, the RMF was expected to increasingly focus on supporting all Bank Group operations and strategies. As part of these efforts, responsibility for monitoring the implementation of the RMF was assigned to the Chief Operating Officer. The Bank also put in place systems and initiatives that could better capture the contributions to the development of a range of Bank Group activities, including private sector operations.

A four-level Results Measurement Framework. The second feature of the ADF-12 RMF was that it refined the ADF-11 framework by reviewing progress at four, rather than three, levels: development outcomes in Africa (Level 1); the Bank’s contributions to development outcomes (Level 2); the Bank’s operational effectiveness (Level 3); and the Bank’s organisational efficiency (Level 4).

Reforms that fell under ADF-12 included: (i) sustaining efforts to strengthen the quality at entry of strategies and operations; (ii) revising supervision reporting to focus on progress towards results and facilitate field-based supervision; (iii) improving the Bank’s ability to track its contributions towards development results; (iv) meeting the commitments made in the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action; and (v) stepping up decentralisation and improving business processes.

The Bank’s 2013–2016 RMF not only built on lessons learned from its experience in implementing the previous RMF, but also benefitted from consultations from other multilateral development institutions, including the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Fund for Agricultural Development, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The Bank found that previous RMFs of its separate financing windows did not account for all the transformations and intermediate milestones that occurred in the process of translating Bank Group inputs into country results. It then effectively introduced, since the 2013–2016 RMF, the “One Bank” RMF covering all the three financing windows. The internal architecture of the 2013–2016 RMF was re-engineered to match the priorities set out in the Bank’s Corporate Strategy 2013–2022. It tracked around 100 performance indicators organised into four interconnected levels: (i) development progress in Africa (Level 1); (ii) the AfDB’s contribution to development in Africa (Level 2); (iii) the AfDB’s operational performance (Level 3); and (iv) the AfDB’s organisational efficiency (Level 4). Helping the Bank successfully meet its new ambitions was one of the 2013–2016 RMF’s main objectives. It did so by increasing attention on six critical areas cited in the RMF document: (i) strategic focus; (ii) better assessing the Bank’s development impact; (iii) stronger focus on gender; (iv) delivering better value for money; (v) ambitious targets that stretch the Bank’s performance; and (vi) harmonising indicators across MDBs.

The 2013–2016 RMF was defined as first and foremost a management tool designed to improve the Bank’s development effectiveness, by enhancing the planning cycle, systematically tracking performance and fostering organisational learning. With this objective in mind, the Bank reinforced the tools, processes and systems that underpinned the RMF, and sought to ensure that the results informed the Bank’s strategies, operations and staff incentives. During this period, the Bank took actions at four different levels to effect implementation: (i) tracking results throughout the project lifecycle; (ii) monitoring results in “real-time” of ongoing operations through the Results Reporting System (RRS), which was piloted in 2013. The aim of the RRS was also to track portfolio performance by sector, region and country, providing Management with critical information essential for improving portfolio performance (Level 3); (iii) mapping the Bank’s portfolio of ongoing operations through a new geocoding tool-MapAfrica; and (iv) assessing the Bank’s development effectiveness through a series of Development Effectiveness Reviews.
To achieve its development goals, the Bank needs to be a learning organisation committed to improving its operations continuously, and an organisation that draws lessons from past and ongoing activities to inform its business decision-making and programming. With the 2013–2016 RMF and the management information systems that underpinned it, the Bank expected to be better equipped to improve the lives and livelihoods of the people of Africa.

It is important to mention that a separate document, the One Bank Results Measurement Framework (2013–2016) Glossary of Indicators, defines all indicators, providing a detailed rationale for the choice of the indicators, an explanation of the methodology, and how each indicator is calculated.
The Bank’s RMF 2016–2025

The 2016–2025 Results Measurement Framework

The 2016–2025 RMF is envisaged not only as an accountability tool but also as a crucial management tool that enables the Bank to carry out the learning process and better meet its responsibilities to the people of Africa. With the focus on the High 5s, the Bank re-engineered Levels 1 and 2 of the 2016–2025 RMF with a special focus on the key drivers of performance to improve the delivery of corporate priorities.

The fundamental goal of the 2016–2025 RMF is to improve the Bank’s development effectiveness, which requires helping managers to manage better. Within the scope of the 2016–2025 RMF, the Bank decided to take five major actions to boost its impact on development, namely: (i) increasing the Bank’s strategic focus on five of the TYS’s priority areas, namely the High 5s; (ii) supporting the implementation of a more effective delivery model; (iii) better measuring the Bank’s development impact; (iv) improving the way the Bank assesses the private sector’s contribution to development; and (v) increasing the Bank’s attention to gender equality.

To achieve these five objectives, the Bank decided to take action beyond the immediate scope of a results framework, including the following: (i) re-engineering the RMF architecture to increase the Bank’s strategic focus on the High 5s and to give greater attention to the drivers of operational performance; (ii) introducing new methodologies to allow the Bank to better assess the development impact of its operations; (iii) supporting the new RMF with departmental incentives—including updated key performance indicators—that are better aligned with the Bank’s corporate priorities; and (iv) strengthening business processes to increase the Bank’s capacity to track and report on its development impact, including a new approach for capturing and leveraging the development impact of its private sector operations.

Structure of the Results Framework. All MDBs are typified by cascading results frameworks: long-term development outcomes are tracked at the corporate level, and development results articulated by sector strategies and regional/sub-regional programs are monitored at the country level. Previous comparative overviews of the structure of the corporate results frameworks and/or scorecards of selected MDBs conducted by the AsDB’s Independent Evaluation Department (IED) point to the fact that: “While MDBs’ results frameworks share common uses and framework tiers, they necessarily reflect MDBs’ specific mandates and governance arrangements. In the case of regional MDBs, they also emphasise regional and sub-regional priorities. Consequently, while all MDBs’ results frameworks track the achievement of outputs and outcomes, and monitor operational and organisational effectiveness to varying extents, this information needs to be interpreted in an institution-specific context.” These frameworks are segregated by Tiers, of which there are either three or four. Output and outcome data are generated by Project Design, Approval and Implementation Progress Monitoring and Completion Reports at the project level. Interactive discussions among MDBs have contributed to the near-convergence of their corporate-level results frameworks and/or scorecards. Two MDBs—the AfDB and the AsDB—have a four-tier framework that covers both development results and MDB performance,
adjusted to the needs of each MDB based on its mandate and operational challenges (Table 2). IDB, IFAD, and the WBG, however, have a three-tier framework, opting to combine operational and organisational performance under a single category on performance.\(^\text{17}\)

The AfDB’s RMF was designed to gauge the Bank’s success on how well it improves the lives of Africans, rather than by how much money it spends or how many projects it supports. However, as recognised in the framework, measuring the Bank’s development impact is challenging, due to the complexity of the dynamics of economic development. It is also difficult to attribute outcomes to a single institution, as the Bank often works concurrently with other Multilateral or Bilateral Development Institutions in the Regional Member Countries (RMCs).

To address these challenges, the Bank uses a four-level RMF together with key priorities at each of the four levels that track performance in meeting its development objectives, along with cross-cutting priorities in Levels 1 and 2:

**Level 1:** Tracks development progress across Africa, using the AfDB’s strategic priorities—the High 5s: (i) Light Up and Power Africa; (ii) Feed Africa; (iii) Industrialise Africa; (iv) Integrate Africa; and (v) Improve the Quality of Lives of the People of Africa.

**Level 2:** Measures the Bank’s contributions towards development in all its operations, using the High 5s and cross-cutting priorities.

**Level 3:** Assesses the quality of the Bank’s operations: Increase development impact, enhance quality and speed, ensure strong portfolio performance, and enhance knowledge and advisory services.

**Level 4:** Monitors the Bank’s efficiency as an organisation: Move closer to clients, improve financial performance and mobilise resources, and increase value for money, staff engagement, development, and productivity.

### The Annual Development Effectiveness Reviews (ADERs)

To unify results reporting across the institution, the AfDB prepares an Annual Development Effectiveness Review (ADER) to be presented to the Board on an annual basis. A summary of the ADER, the Results Scorecard, presents cumulative progress towards results to the Senior Management Coordination

---

**Table 2:** Tiers in the Corporate Results Frameworks of Selected MDBs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multinational Development Banks</th>
<th>Tiers or Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Bank for Reconstruction and Development(^\text{16})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Development Bank</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank Group</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee. The ADER is discussed formally by the Committee on Operations and Development Effectiveness (CODE), with a copy to the Board for information. In addition, quantitative reporting on operational results is provided. It is also discussed formally by CODE, which takes note of the review and provides comments before publication. The ADER assesses Africa's development and the contribution of the Bank. The ADER is vital to the Bank’s reflection on its achievements and areas where it can improve its performance. This reflection is even more vital amid the COVID-19 pandemic, as the Bank has to reorient its operations to respond to the socioeconomic effects of the pandemic in RMCs. The crisis requires the Bank to ensure that it uses its resources and expertise all the more effectively.

The ADER assesses progress against the Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF. It monitors the contribution of the Bank’s activities to its High 5s-Light Up and Power Africa, Feed Africa, Industrialise Africa, Integrate Africa, and Improve the Quality of Life for the People of Africa-to its cross-cutting priorities, and to its long-term goals of promoting inclusive growth and green growth. The ADER also measures the progress made on strengthening the portfolio and reforming the internal systems and processes, to position the Bank to deliver better development results for Africa. The Bank complements its corporate-wide use of the RMF with two series of Development Effectiveness Reviews (DERs) at country and thematic levels in an ad-hoc manner. Until recently, the results scorecard used a three-coloured “traffic light” system to indicate whether the Bank reached or fell short of its targets for all four levels of the RMF. Each level receives a green light when performance is on track, an amber light when performance requires attention, and a red light when performance is off track. The scorecard data are updated regularly to track key performance drivers and impact. For Level 1, the scorecard measures Africa’s performance compared with progress in Africa’s peer group (low- and middle-income countries around the world); for Level 2 it compares the Bank’s expected performance with actual achievements for all operations that have been completed; and for Levels 3 and 4, it measures the Bank’s progress against its 2025 targets as set out in the RMF. The AfDB 2020 scorecard shows at a glance how effectively the Bank contributed to Africa’s development in 2019. It indicates whether the Bank advanced or regressed with respect to the targets at each level of the RMF.

Recent Changes in the AfDB to Improve Results Presentation and Readability. Management has recently revised the summary scorecards for 2020 and 2019 using arrows rather than traffic lights, as part of its commitment to improving the presentation of results and readability for both external and internal audiences. In the ADER tables for Levels 1 and 2, indicators are also separated for ease of reference. As such, for Level 1, tables focus on the baseline and actuals to measure progress, which is more relevant for this level. During the ongoing RMF review process, the Bank will review whether having targets for Level 1 is still relevant, taking into consideration the practices of other MDBs.

The Results Reporting System and MapAfrica

In 2011, the automated Results Reporting System (RRS) was scheduled to be fully launched in January 2014, but it was not fully rolled out until 1 May 2021. The aim is to link expected results (as per the logical frameworks in Project Appraisal Reports) to progress towards results (as documented in Implementation Progress Reports) and results achieved (as reported in Project Completion Reports).

The AfDB is at the forefront of initiatives to make its results available to the wider public and be transparent in managing its business. In 2016, the Bank launched MapAfrica 2.0, an online tool that enables anyone in the world to see at a glance how the Bank’s projects are boosting Africa’s economies and making the lives of Africans better. MapAfrica 2.0 is an interactive online portal that shows where the Bank is making an impact on the continent—and how 800 of the Bank’s projects relate to its High-5s development priorities (Figure A3.1 in Annex 3 of the
technical annexes to this report). Users can view all projects within a country or choose one project to see related locations throughout the country. Impact stories have been developed for a number of projects, focusing on the beneficiaries of the project, the approach, the main results and the lessons learned. There is a plan for MapAfrica to add functionalities that allow project beneficiaries to provide feedback on the quality of the Bank’s operations. To make information about development spending easier to access, use and understand, the Bank publishes data according to the international standards on transparency established by the International Aid Transparency Initiative. In 2020, the Bank’s efforts to enhance access to information were recognised by Publish What You Fund, a British think tank, which ranked the Bank fourth for the second time in its Aid Transparency Index. 21
Methodology

Methodological Approach

Overall, the design and methodology described in the evaluation’s inception report were implemented as planned, based on consistent triangulation of evidence from multiple data sources.

Evaluation Framework: RMF’s Logical Model and Theory of Change. The framework used in this evaluation reflects the evaluation team’s understanding of how the RMF links to development results (Figure 2), and was developed based on the Bank’s actual RMF Theory of Change (TOC) and findings from the documentation. It was adapted from the Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (SDC). The TOC points to the fact that, first, the framework links RMF inputs, activities (i.e., the policies, processes and instruments), and outputs to increased institutional capacity and performance, which in turn is expected to result in increased direct outcomes, which are called “RMF purposes” (Table 3). The RMF system is supposed to ensure that Management gets better in its task of managing. This refers to the “decision-making” as part of the direct outcomes of the TOC; which in turn contributes to achieving the intermediate outcomes related to the High 5s, and finally results in increased contributions to inclusive growth and green growth. This realisation of the results chain depends on synergies and trade-offs, assumptions, contextual factors and RMF impact hypotheses.

Figure 2: Development Linkages (Logic Model)

Source: Evaluation Team - Adapted from the Independent Evaluation of SDC RBM System with focus on Poverty Reduction, 2017
These include the following facts: (i) the RMF should be built on stakeholder involvement and participation; (ii) leadership signals about the value of self-evaluation can be strengthened by making better institutional use of the knowledge generated; (iii) a close linkage of the RMF with the statistical and evaluation functions of the organisation is paramount, of which data quality is a crucial component; and (iv) the need for flexibility and procedures for accommodating quick adjustments in case of special and unforeseeable circumstances.

**Purpose of the Results Framework.** To understand the role that the Bank’s RMF plays, it is paramount to stress the importance of management over reporting. That is, tracking progress against the RMF aims of enhancing the cycle of planning, encouraging periodic performance monitoring and fostering organisational learning. Table 3 indicates the overview of the purpose of the AfDB’s RMF.

**Evaluation Questions.** Based on this framework, the evaluation is divided into three questions and 10 sub-questions. The evaluation questions concern the issues of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.

The first evaluation question asks: “*To what extent is the design of the RMF robust in supporting the Bank’s development effectiveness?*” This question focuses on the relevance/robustness of the design of the Bank’s RMF and is divided into three sub-questions:

1. To what extent is the RMF aligned with the 2013–2022 TYS, the High 5s, and other Bank policies and strategies?

2. How relevant/robust is the RMF design (encompasses a well-designed logical results chain/TOC and well-articulated results matrix with baseline, targets, assumptions/risks; and an appropriate approach to measuring results, results tracking, results communication and reporting system, including the Information Technology system, etc.)?

---

### Table 3: Overview of the AfDB’s RMF Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RMF purpose</th>
<th>Managing for results</th>
<th>Accountability for results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is the RMF’s purpose and how is it achieved?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and results information is used to inform the AfDB’s internal decision-making processes. Decision-making covers strategic and operational decisions about projects, programs and policy, budgeting, and management and performance appraisal of Bank’s staff.</td>
<td>Management and results information is used for personal and organisational learning in the AfDB (and of development partners).</td>
<td>Accountability by and to development partners means all forms of communication on management and results information between the AfDB and its development partners (developing country governments, implementing partners, other donors, and, ultimately, intended ultimate beneficiaries).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How does it contribute to development?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better decision-making is assumed to improve the AfDB’s performance in contributing to development results.</td>
<td>Strengthened personal and organisational skills and capacity are assumed to increase the contribution of the AfDB’s projects and programs to development results.</td>
<td>Communication from the Bank to partners is assumed to ensure legitimacy, support, harmonisation, and international recognition of the AfDB’s work in developing countries. Communication from partners to the AfDB serves the AfDB’s information requirements for other RMF purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from the Independent Evaluation of SDC RBM System with focus on Poverty Reduction, 2017.
Methodology

To what extent does the corporate RMF fit with the Bank’s country, sector, and project-level results frameworks?

The second evaluation question asks: “To what extent has the RMF achieved its strategic objectives of being an accountability, decision-making and learning tool for the Bank?” This question focuses on the effectiveness of the Bank’s RMF. The question is divided into three sub questions:

1. To what extent is the RMF used for better tracking of development results and serving as a management tool for the implementation of the Development and Business Delivery Model (DBDM)?

2. To what extent has the RMF influenced decision-making and learning by relevant stakeholders through its use?

3. What incentives or barriers contribute to the use or non-use of the RMF?

The third evaluation question asks: “To what extent and how has the RMF been optimal in achieving its objectives?” This question focuses on the efficiency of the Bank’s RMF. The question is divided into four sub-questions:

1. To what extent are the RMF performance indicators and information credible, reliable, accurate, and valid, and are they reasonably easy to collect on time?

2. To what extent are the resources, roles, and responsibilities assigned for RMF implementation appropriate?

3. To what extent is the RMF able to track the private sector’s contribution to development?

4. To what extent is the RMF cost-effective?

Evaluation Approach. The approach for this evaluation is non-experimental. The approach has participatory characteristics, although led and facilitated by the Independent Development Evaluation. Efforts were made to ensure that representative groups of stakeholders were directly involved in evaluation design, implementation and reporting. This participatory approach is supported by the range of data-collection methods chosen.

The evaluation approach is also utilisation-focused in that there is clarity from the onset as to who the evaluation is for, and how it will be disseminated and used. In particular, it will inform the ongoing review of the RMF by SNDR. Given the formative nature of the evaluation, it was important for the evaluation team to examine whether the RMF approach is achieving efficiency and effectiveness expectations that were part of its initial raison d’être. The evaluation’s findings, conclusions and recommendations are expected to help guide the Bank and its members as they, together, continue to conceptualise, experiment, adopt and adapt the RMF.

Research Methods. For the broader mid-term evaluation, the approach utilised mixed methods, namely a combination of largely qualitative complemented by quantitative approach. The evaluation leverages a substantial amount of relevant information produced by IDEV from different evaluations (self-evaluation systems and processes, DBDM Evaluation, Evaluation of Quality Assurance across the Project Cycle, etc.) and other internal and external reviews (such as the Common Performance Assessment System, or the COMPAS Reports and related AfDB Management responses, corporate results frameworks and scorecards, the UK’s Department for International Development [DfID] Multilateral Aid Reviews, and the experience of selected MDBs and bilateral organisations, etc.).

Data Collection Sources, Lines of Evidence and Evaluation Matrix

Data collection and analysis for the evaluation were partly desk-based due to the COVID-19 pandemic situation. To ensure that findings, conclusions, and
recommendations are based on a representative range of stakeholder viewpoints, consultations using interview guides were conducted remotely. The qualitative interviews were complemented by an evaluation survey of the Bank’s staff, at Headquarters and in Regional and Country Offices. The evaluation applied the following evaluation instruments:

1. Desk review of relevant documents/reports and databases, covering RMF guidance materials, policy and strategy documents, and RMF research literature, evaluation reports, and other internal and external reviews, as mentioned above;

2. Substantive interviews and discussions with key stakeholders within and outside the Bank; and

3. Semi-structured interviews with Bank staff and other stakeholders.

Evaluation Lines of Evidence. The complex and multi-dimensional nature of this evaluation requires that we apply a multi-method strategy, implying the use of more than one line of evidence to triangulate sources of information and perspectives, as well as draw on quantitative and qualitative data to ensure a comprehensive, robust, and evidence-based understanding of the RMF’s relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. The main lines of evidence used by the evaluation include: (i) an assessment of the quality of the Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF design; (ii) benchmarking with similar organisations; (iii) an assessment of the quality of the data reported; and (iv) an audit of the Bank’s results monitoring and reporting. The lines of evidence are detailed in Annex 2 of the technical annexes to this report.

Evaluation Matrix. The judgment criteria and data sources for responding to the evaluation questions were presented in a comprehensive evaluation matrix (see Annex 1 of the technical annexes to this report) that established a coherent framework for triangulating the different lines of evidence collected in this evaluation.

Sampling Strategy

The evaluation team, in consultation with the SNDR, developed a sampling strategy for: (i) selecting structures for interviews; (ii) indicators for the quality of the Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF design; (iii) countries and related data reported for quality assessment; and (iv) a selection of comparator institutions for benchmarking. The sampling strategy is detailed in Annex 2 of the technical annexes to this report.

Limitations

Similar to all evaluations, a number of limitations were encountered while undertaking the RMF mid-term evaluation. Those key among them are highlighted below.

Considering the scope of the RMF and the multiple linkages to use high-level documents, this exercise has been implemented as efficiently as possible within a compressed timeframe. This has led the team to take a flexible approach that continually updates the resource pool of relevant information. Consequently, the review of documents obtained in January and February 2021 was rapid and some further study and reflection of the more recent sources are warranted. These include new Corporate Results Frameworks of other MDBs (the World Bank, IDB and the AsDB, in particular), their guidance, and recent AfDB internal proposals on selectivity, among others. This was critical as it provided more recent information, albeit contributing to delays in delivering the main evaluation products, mainly the benchmarking report.

Regarding the ADER Data Quality Assessment (DQA), this did not validate the accuracy and veracity of the actual results indicator values reported in PCRs and XSRs. Also, the difficulty in assessing the quality of data reported in the PCRs or XSRs was due to the insufficient related sources of data and methodology used to compute the results. To mitigate these
limitations, the assessment used a triangulation approach by using other self- and independent evaluations done by the Bank. Also, the decision to focus on 10 Level 2 indicators means that the findings derived from the assessment cannot be generalised for all 30 Level 2 indicators. However, due to the mid-term nature of the evaluation of the RMF, the relatively important size (33 percent) of indicators, the results provide useful insights for strengthening the overall ADER reported data management processes and strategies.

Time constraints also limited the amount of time available for conducting the internal survey. Accordingly, a small sample size (62 out of 573 people targeted) was realised due to the low rate of response (11 percent) from targeted Bank staff. However, the incorporation of open-ended questions helped to obtain useful narratives to complement the raw data. More importantly, the research roll-out strategy adopted-namely, conducting the online survey first, before executing the key informant Interviews-helped to focus some of the questions captured in the online survey in the interviews, thus mitigating against the low survey response rate.

Last but not least, the sub-evaluation questions under the efficiency dimension - “To what extent are the resources, roles, and responsibilities assigned for RMF implementation appropriate?” were not thoroughly addressed. This was because the evaluation team could not find proper documentation describing the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders assigned for RMF implementation for the main stakeholders.
Main Findings

Relevance

This section addressed the following question: “To what extent is the design of the Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF robust in supporting development effectiveness?”

Extent to which the RMF aligned with the TYS (2013–2022), the High 5s, and other Bank policies and strategies (strategic level)

Finding 1: The Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF is relevant in supporting the AfDB’s development effectiveness, demonstrable through its strategic alignment with the Bank’s corporate policies and strategies, as well as international goals.

The RMF is strategically aligned with the Bank’s TYS (2013–2022) and new developments, including the High 5s agenda, and other Bank policies and strategies, and the SDGs. The Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF reflects its new strategic orientation as stated in its five priority areas of intervention, the High 5s, as well as with other corporate policies and strategies such as the Ten-Year Strategy (TYS) for Africa’s Transformation (2013–2022), the DBDM model and the SDGs. At the highest level, the Bank seeks to be transformative. At the project and program levels (Tier 2), this has been defined as likely to be transformative if it meets three criteria:

- **Impact:** Is the project’s development impact likely to be high in terms of creating jobs, boosting incomes, and promoting inclusive growth?

- **Catalytic effect:** Would the project mobilise and shape additional investments and partnerships?

- **Additionality:** Would the project complement the private sector and demonstrate the potential for Africa’s industrial development?

The architecture of the RMF is that Levels 1 and 2 are vertically aligned, with both levels organised around the High 5s and grouped into a single cluster. Designing the RMF in this way built stronger conceptual linkages between Africa’s development challenges (Level 1) and the Bank’s actions to address them (Level 2). The five Bank goals together with four cross-cutting strategic areas—(i) climate change and green growth; (ii) gender equality and women’s empowerment; (iii) fragility and resilience; and (iv) economic governance—come together in a comprehensive vision of what the Bank aims to achieve. There is alignment between Levels 3 and 4, which are focused on the Bank’s operations and underpin its efforts to comprehensively deliver on Levels 1 and 2, without which achievement would not be possible. Only the AfDB and the World Bank Group (WBG) have aligned Level 1 statements with Level 2 statements, making the relationship between the levels clearer, while the AsDB stands with its Level 1 clearly separated from the other three levels of the results framework.

The AfDB’s RMF approach is conceptually valid and logical, and has three specific purposes: accountability, decision-making, and learning (see the reconstructed RMF’s TOC in Figure 2). An assessment by the United Nations Development Program shows that achieving the Bank’s High 5s will allow Africa to achieve about 90 percent of the SDGs. By placing the High 5s at the centre of Levels 1 and 2, the Bank made a conscious effort to push towards the highest goals. The indicators that measure progress towards results achievement, specifically infrastructure development, regional integration, skills and technology, private sector
development, and governance and accountability, remain central means of achieving the High 5s.

In practice, however, the causal links between Levels 1 and 2 could be strengthened. The Bank does not present an enhanced TOC that could help to minimise the gap between these levels of results, better capturing the pathway to results achievement and capturing critical assumptions that are better reflective of the new decade. This is a challenge that all MDBs face. Even though the AfDB’s RMF under review stipulated that the TOC is captured in the 14 logics of intervention presented in Appendix A of the RMF document, the understanding of the logic across all operational departments is uneven. The recent comprehensive energy sector evaluation, for instance, points to the need for the Bank to “ensure that the design, monitoring, and evaluation of energy sector interventions and strategy documents are based on a well-articulated TOC.” The TOCs presented in Appendix A of the AfDB’s RMF document could benefit from further development to better address modified assumptions and increased risks. The strategies under development (water, pharmaceutical industry support, skills development for innovative entrepreneurship and productivity, and improving the lives of people in Africa) are moving in that direction.

Finding 2: Specific adjustments are necessary to ensure the continued alignment of the RMF, especially given the multi-layered work ongoing at the Bank now, including a new private sector development strategy, and cross-cutting strategies such as gender, green growth, fragility, and a proposal to increase the Bank’s selectivity, as well as new or updated sector and corporate policies, and strategies that have direct causal linkages with the RMF.

The Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF integrated a review process to keep it relevant and aligned with new developments. To ensure that the RMF remains relevant to the Bank’s top priorities, it is to be reviewed every three years, synchronised with the ADF replenishment process, and the following principles applied to revise subsequent versions of the RMF: (i) discontinuing tracking indicators that have reached 100 percent and can no longer be improved; (ii) tracking emerging development priorities of increased relevance to Bank objectives; and (iii) adjusting the direction of the pathway for the annual targets to reach the 2025 targets.

Considering the multi-layered work ongoing at the Bank now, including this mid-term evaluation, in terms of renewal, it may be stated that the RMF is generally aligned with corporate strategies and policies. However, with several proposals approved by the Bank, specific adjustments are necessary to ensure optimum alignment of the RMF, in particular the Proposal on Selectivity, which proposes selecting fewer but more strategic investments aimed at increasing the quality and impact of operations, the new cross-cutting strategies (in particular the Gender Strategy), and new or updated sector policies and strategies that have direct causal linkages with the RMF indicators.

The Bank is also advised to revisit its assumptions and the identified risks in the RMF’s TOC, in particular those related to: (i) the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic; (ii) the climate crisis, especially low-lying, drought-prone, and flood-prone and water-challenged states, and related food scarcity; (iii) fragility and conflict; and (iv) the incentives required for private sector participation and Non-Sovereign Operations (NSOs) reporting.

Furthermore, the corporate results measurement framework, which have different names in different MDBs, is the highest-level tool for monitoring performance and achievement of the corporate strategic objectives set out in the overall long-term corporate strategy. In line with the findings from the benchmark study of this evaluation, and emerging good practices in managing for development results, the corporate results measurement framework should be aligned, and its business cycle synchronised, to the long-term corporate strategy to ensure the RMF’s continued relevance and usefulness as a performance management tool. However, the
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Evaluation noted that, unlike other MDBs, the Bank’s RMF business cycle (2016–2025) is not synchronised with the Bank’s TYS (2013–2022). To this end, the alignment and business-cycle synchronisation of the RMF 2016–2025 with the Bank’s corporate strategic priorities of the TYS (2013–2022), and the Bank’s upcoming corporate strategy (2023–), is of paramount importance in ensuring that the Bank’s RMF continues to be relevant and useful in terms of being an accountability, decision-making, and learning tool for the Bank.

Extent to which the corporate RMF fits with the Bank’s country, sector, and project-level results frameworks (operational level)

Finding 3: The evaluation found room for improvement in the intervention logic and alignment between the corporate results framework and the Bank’s country, sector, and project-level results frameworks, although more recent Bank strategies and initiatives demonstrate improvement in this area.

In theory, results should be aligned, underpinning the importance of the results chain hierarchy. In practice, however, this is a challenge, and the evaluation observed some areas for improvement in the intervention logic and alignment among the long- and medium-term objectives, the organisation’s operations (programs/projects) and the Bank’s corporate set-up (i.e., the corporate RMF and sectoral results frameworks). This can be attributed to a number of factors. First, it was due to inadequate application of a standardised set of results and performance indicators that are cascaded at sector and project levels, particularly between the project/country/sector and corporate layers. Second, there is the issue of how to aggregate disparate results indicators at different RMF layers, so as to provide a holistic but focused picture of results at the corporate layer. The issues around inter-linkages do not appear to have any ready solutions, although better information technology systems that allow easier reporting across RMF layers could be part of the answer for the aggregation issue.

Considering the complexity of alignment, it is a challenge for Bank staff developing country, sector, programs, portfolios, and projects to develop results frameworks for their initiatives. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) indicate limited staff capacity and understanding in the development of country or project-specific results chains.

The review of a selection of more recent Bank strategies or initiatives demonstrates some improvement. For example, the expected outcomes of the Strategy for Economic Governance in Africa (SEGA) 2021–2025 are all in line with the RMF. Projects sampled indicate a similar, albeit lower, level of ambition than the outcomes in the SEGA, but are clearly aligned with its expected outcomes: (i) equitable delivery of basic public services for improved livelihoods; (ii) macroeconomic stability and fiscal discipline; (iii) private sector investment in transformative sectors; (iv) global competitiveness; (v) jobs created; and (vi) corruption in the public and private sectors reduced.

Robustness of the Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF design for supporting the Bank’s development effectiveness

Finding 4: The quality of the design of the Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF is assessed as good, albeit with some weaknesses in indicators selection, target setting, and stakeholders’ consultation.

Quality assessment of results chains

The Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF encompasses a well-designed logical results chain and TOC, even though this is not made explicit in the RMF document. The results chain is a description of the various stages of an intervention that lead to the changes that are intended—from the inputs at the start, to the end effects at a societal level for the beneficiaries. The use of an RMF has its theoretical foundation in the assumed existence of a chain of results that links all four levels. Thus, the development of a good results framework requires clarity with respect to the TOC. In practice, developing well-
articulated theories of change remains a challenge for development agencies.

The Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF presented at the design stage an incomplete TOC that elaborated objectives but was not fully constructed. To facilitate its work, the evaluation team, through its document review and KII, reconstructed the Bank’s RMF TOC (Figure 2) to facilitate its analysis. The first three links in the results chain are under the control of the Bank and there is clarity in the RMF on links in the chain. As can be seen in Figure 2, the RMF’s main inputs and activities (policies, process and instruments) and outputs (Development Effectiveness Reviews, Summary Performance Scorecard, MapAfrica, Results Reporting Systems, Executive Dashboard and the Portfolio Flashlight) are evident, demonstrable and measurable. On a practical level, the Bank has established mechanisms and personnel to monitor and report accordingly within specific timeframes, and metrics that reflect its expectations.

It is the direct outcome of these outputs that inform the Bank’s decision-making, where learning occurs and where accountability is evidenced. At these outcome levels, specific contextual factors must be taken into account and assumptions must hold for the expected outcome to be produced.

The 10-year timeframe adopted in the RMF was specifically designed to enhance the performance level and pointed to the need for continuous improvement. This is embodied in increased institutional capacity and performance, which underpins the Bank’s focus and has been determined as necessary to support the achievement of the High 5s (the intermediate outcomes).

In sum, the totality of the RMF’s pathways is designed to contribute to inclusive and green growth. While this represents a sound logic of intervention, many assumptions must take hold for this to occur. Among these, of key importance are states experiencing fragility and conflict, and limited progress on economic growth. High levels of youth unemployment may persist if, for example, opportunities are not created for new youth entering the workforce. Table 4 presents the summary of the quality of results chain analysis.

Process of selecting indicators and setting targets

The Bank’s process of selecting indicators and setting targets did not sufficiently consider the need to match aspirations with available resources. Aspirational targets (“the extra challenge”) for the Bank staff were added to encourage attaining high levels of performance beyond past trends without corresponding increases in inputs (Figure 3).

The careful selection of indicators is crucial to effectively measure performance. For example, if indicators do not measure the intended effects, the data produced will be misleading, which in turn will undermine decisions taken based on these evaluation indicators. International experience indicates that a results framework should not be overburdened with too many indicators. However, keeping results frameworks simple while maintaining their usefulness as a management tool and also capturing complexity is a challenge faced by all development practitioners. Due to the technical difficulties of measuring results, it is tempting to choose indicators that track quantifiable effects and are easy to achieve and easy to measure, but these can fall short of measuring complexity and progress towards long-term changes.

The evaluation assessed the approaches used by the Bank to set targets for the RMF’s indicators. In Level 1 of the RMF, the targets are drawn from High 5s strategic documents and internationally agreed targets, where possible.

The Bank’s RMF undertook a thorough analysis of the continent, prioritised its actions translating the TYS into High 5s with corresponding targets to understand and answer key questions, while establishing specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound, and gender-sensitive indicators for tracking and reporting. The key questions addressed by
## Table 4: Analysis of the Quality of the Results Chain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement: An appropriate, sufficiently detailed, and logical results chain(s) is articulated explicitly for each of the interventions</th>
<th>RMF Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Criteria:** An individual results chain is developed and documented for each intervention. | - Each chain is identified with specific expected results and the relational aspects clear; the RMF has analysed the complementarity and presented validation internally and externally.  
- Global (SDGs), Pan African (TYS), Strategic Priorities (High 5s) and Corporate Strategies (DBDM, Sector Strategies, Cross-Cutting)  
- Apex Level Pathways with measurement methods:  
  - Inclusive growth: Economic inclusion - Reducing poverty and income inequality;  
  - Spatial inclusion - Expanding access to basic services;  
  - Social inclusion - Ensuring equal opportunities for all;  
  - Political inclusion - Securing broad-based representation.  
- Green growth: Building resilience and adapting to a changing environment; Managing natural assets efficiently and sustainably; Promoting sustainable infrastructure, reducing waste and pollution  
- Each intervention results chain shows all key changes, arranged in a logical order, and illustrates how the intervention is expected to lead to development goals.  
- Multi-Tier pointing upwards, foundational internally and addressing Continental, RMCs, regional, individual levels of interventions and related expected outcomes and contribution to development goals  
- Each intervention results chain is sufficiently detailed so that quantitative and qualitative changes at each level are easily understood, including who or what is expected to change and the direction of the change.  
- 105 RMF indicators  
- Core indicators  
- Quantitative indicators  
- Qualitative Indicators required to detail policy-based achievements  
- Directional change identified and methodology using the color-coded system; adjustments made with directional arrows in 2021  
- Social Accounting Matrix details directional change and complexity of changes |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement: Senior and mid-level staff are familiar with the results chain(s) and use them as guides for decision making and a means to measure results achievement.</th>
<th>RMF Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Criteria:** Mid and senior-level program staff can fully and clearly describe the respective results chain(s) relevant to their work and the logic underpinning them. | KIs pointed to the fact that the ownership of the results measurement framework is rather limited.  
Directionally, there is a solid knowledge of the High 5s.  
Mid- and senior-level program staff use results chains to guide their work.  
Results chain is apparent to staff, in particular at the sector and country level. Appreciation of the use of indicators requires upgrading in terms of capacity. |

The RMF include: (i) development challenges and constraints in the continent, regions, countries, sectors, and themes; (ii) opportunities for regional collaboration; (iii) what are potential beneficiaries’ problems and why are they facing them? (iv) in addition to the RMCs, who are the different actors present in the sector (NGOs, CSO, private sector)? (v) why are the different players not already resolving the problems? What are their incentives? (vi) what can the Bank do (solutions, programs, PBOs, SOs, NSOs) to assist players to resolve problems? (vii) why would the solution work? (viii) the feasibility of programming, projects, risk, sustainability; and (ix) targets established against 2016 baselines.
Consequently, it was determined that the links between resources required, and strategy and priorities, are not sufficient and require improvement. This has been recognised by Management and adjustments to address this gap are in process.

In designing quantitative and time-bound targets, the Bank developed challenging and attainable objectives that are relevant to its priorities. The Bank framed the targets it committed to achieving by 2025 based on certain principles (Annex 3 of the technical annexes to this report).

A customised approach was used for each level of measurement and type of indicator, and for targets that are not drawn from international agreements, analysis was carried out using several methods and modelling techniques. Mixed-method approaches guided the Bank. RMF targets were set to international targets pro-rated to 2025 value (Figure A3.2 in Annex 3 of the technical annexes to this report).

For Level 2, the Bank identified a high level of delivery as part of its High 5s. Targets drawn from High-5s strategies approved by the Board were reproduced as expressed in the documents. Those that were not set in a High-5s strategy used indicators that were designed by looking at the portfolio’s projected performance within the first five-year period. The level of expected results was taken from Project Appraisal Reports (PARs) for the period (2015–2020) and the data based on the outputs that the Bank had committed to delivering with its partners at project initiation. To reach 2025, the 2016–2020 value was multiplied by 2 to cover the additional five years. Sector teams identified a target within a range that fell around the mid-point, using their judgment and adding a dose of challenge that can be expected because of the Bank’s scaled-up focus on the High 5s.

Finally, targets are also pro-rated to the expected level of Bank financing to identify the level of results that the Bank will be directly responsible for achieving. Both the total and pro-rated Bank targets are presented.

For Levels 3 and 4, the Bank set its standards of operational performance (Level 3) and organisational efficiency (Level 4) based on the levels of measurement under its control. Setting targets was challenging due to the range being measured and the available aspects to report against. Nevertheless, these represented where the Bank wants its operational performance and organisational efficiency to reach. Consequently, the reporting

---

**Figure 3:** An Extra Challenge Was Added with the High 5s

Source: 2016-2025 RMF Document
targets were set and the following multiple scenarios were prepared.

- **The RMF reports against DBDM and Presidential Directives targets as stated.**

- **Custom indicators.** Data for indicators were available most often for only the past four years; an average value was used and computed from these data set at a 95 percent confidence interval at year 10. This interval at 2025 was then retrofitted to form the width of the target range for the full period of time from 2016 to 2025. Eventually, the target band was changed to allow for a more important margin of progress, by moving it towards a more desired data point than the highest point of the confidence interval. Based on this range, corporate departments identified a target and used this range to guide their process.

- **Required expert judgment.** The target band was manually adjusted together with sector experts in order to identify a target more in line with the Bank’s ambition when the above methodology was not good enough (Figure A3.3, Annex 3 of the technical annexes to this report).

Improvements at Level 3 were to lead to better delivery and higher quality of outputs, enabling the Bank to enhance its contribution to development outcomes through all its financing windows. Level 4 indicators aimed to capture progress on internal reforms and processes.

Review of sequential ADERs provides reporting against the indicator metrics and demonstrates enhanced performance, reflecting progress based on enhanced processes and reforms. There is some concern regarding whether the indicators selected are keeping pace with the reforms and processes.

- **Number and quality of tiers and indicators:** The AfDB is currently using more indicators than any other MDBs. There is a consensus within MDBs that a number of indicators can be removed, refined, or re-aligned. Indeed, they have done so in their Corporate Results Frameworks (CRFs), given the emerging and renewed focus on new priorities as evidenced in the Proposal on Selectivity, and the various revised strategies and priorities, make this necessary for the Bank.

- **Data sources and methods used to collect data, and frequency:** The Bank’s RMF clearly specified the results measured and provided guidance on indicator definition, data source, and unit of measurement. However, more efforts need to be made for further improving the data quality by clearly specifying the methods for data collection, including required disaggregation level, frequency of collection and reporting, and a link to the source document (source of data reported in the PCRs/XSRs) and the proposed data quality assurance mechanism when applicable. This ensures the validity, reliability, and appropriateness of the frequency of data collection for all indicators included in the results framework.

- **Statistical capacity-building in monitoring and evaluation systems:** More effort needs to be made to bolster the national-level capacity-building that is currently underway, through an AfDB Trust Fund dedicated towards this effort, in conjunction with the World Bank. A high data completeness rate was observed both at the aggregate and project levels. At the aggregate level, a completeness rate of 100 percent was observed for ADER 2017–2020 for the 10 selected indicators. These results hold for gender-disaggregated data both at the aggregate level data.

- **Indicators’ datasets:** The sector strategies have indicators that report beyond the ADER level. Key indicators are linked to the SDGs to ensure comparability. Suggestions have been made for a Bank-wide guide on how many indicators should be incorporated, especially for the mid-
term review of strategies. This is the approach utilised in comparator institutions and should be considered. The AsDB, for example, has created enriched guidance to draw on.

**Stakeholders’ consultation:** A review of the RMF design process indicated that, while internal consultations took place, a deeper stakeholder mapping and consultation with RMCs and donors would have enriched the RMF. Key stakeholders often have a perspective that is important to consider in order to improve accuracy, accountability, and shared commitment to targets. During the design of the RMF, no stakeholder mapping was conducted.

**Finding 5:** The RMF design considered cross-cutting issues.

One of the criteria that the AfDB has for identifying a transformative operation is its contribution to the Bank’s cross-cutting priorities. These priorities include: (i) climate change and green growth; (ii) gender equality and women’s empowerment; (iii) fragility and resilience; and (iv) economic governance. The AfDB’s cross-cutting objectives are explained by individual strategy documents (see Table A3.2 in Annex 3 of the technical annexes to this report). In selecting and designing its operations, the Bank considers opportunities to advance its cross-cutting objectives by adding features to projects, introducing policy dialogue, conducting knowledge work, and building capacity. In addition, the Bank adds conditions to program-based lending, by using trust funds, forming strategic partnerships with development partners, and creating platforms for African countries to share expertise.

In addition, as indicated in the Bank’s selectivity document, the Bank plans to pursue these objectives in other ways as well, for example by adding conditions to program-based lending, by using trust funds, by forming strategic partnerships with development partners, and by creating platforms for African countries to share expertise. Cross-cutting individual strategy documents that have been updated and the associated indicators in the RMF should be necessarily reviewed to ensure alignment.

**Effectiveness**

This section addressed the question on “To what extent has the RMF achieved its strategic objectives of being an accountability, decision-making and learning tool for the Bank?”

**Extent to which the RMF is used for better tracking of development results and serves as a management tool for the implementation of the DBDM, and influences decision-making and learning by relevant stakeholders through its use**

**Finding 6:** The Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF was found to be an effective tool for accountability and improved the communication of corporate performance. However, it has not been fully utilised for learning and decision-making.

Generally, four major purposes are associated with Results-Based Management (RBM), namely: accountability, communication, decision-making, and learning. The RMF contributes effectively to the accountability function in a methodological manner that is evidenced through specific indicators. The benchmarking study shows that information generated by RBM systems is being used mostly for accountability and communication purposes, rather than for actual decision-making and learning, and there is a need for ongoing improvement and development. The AfDB has set targets at all four levels of its RMF (except for Level 1, since 2020), tracking performance against these targets to help Management ensure that the Bank meets its development commitments and keeps its institutional reforms on track. By setting time-bound and quantified targets for all the indicators that the Bank tracks, the desired level of impact and service delivery has been established. The results framework has enabled the AfDB to score and publish its performance against pre-set targets in
the ADERs. This has helped the AfDB to strengthen its accountability for results. In addition, the quality of presentation of the Development Effectiveness Reports, including the use of visualisation, improved the AfDB’s communication with key stakeholders regarding its work, performance, and efforts to improve its development effectiveness. The document is widely disseminated through different communication channels such as websites and social media. The MapAfrica is also a useful accountability tool, although with limited information on outcomes and impact that could provide more insightful information on results and, for instance, help to showcase success stories.

“The ADER has not only indicators and the data but it also captures some interesting stories of people behind the numbers and all of that. I think it’s useful communication tool, particularly for external stakeholders.” Key Informant, AfDB.

The evaluation found that the RMF contributes to some extent to decision-making, but the causal linkage is not so clear programmatically. Typically, decision-making is not characterised by specific indicator achievement that informs decisions, but rather the influence the sum of the outputs has by achieving medium-term expected outcomes. For example, within the project appraisal report (PAR), there is an upward level of association with the RMF (in particular with the High 5s), but the link is formal and not necessarily directly attributable. The RMF identifies a small set of strategic indicators and targets drawn from the strategies approved by the Board of Directors. Some indicators are included in more than one cluster when their focus is relevant to different clusters.

The RMF is helping to promote learning but not to the extent that lessons are being used in future operations. Numerous references point to an over-focus on getting projects approved, while neglecting quality, implementation and results. Results were mainly measured by inputs and outputs, the completion of activities, procurement, disbursement, and timeliness rather than measuring change. In addition, there has been a disconnect, as approved projects point to the indicators in the RMF but are not specifically compelled to use the indicators in the RMF as a management tool. However, the recent introduction of the new project results framework operational instructions should address this challenge.

IDEV evaluated the Bank’s Quality Assessment (QA) processes, with the ultimate objective of increasing the extent to which the QA chain contributes to learning and development impact. Three standalone evaluations have now been completed: (i) quality at entry (QaE); (ii) quality of supervision and at exit; and (iii) Self-Evaluation System and Processes (SESP). Findings from the Bank’s recent evaluations on program quality point to a weakness in applying learning, in that problems seem to persist despite efforts to resolve them. The Management response to the evaluation of the QaE of the Bank’s operations thus states that:

“Over the past few years, the Bank has made marked progress in results measurement and reporting in the Annual Development Effectiveness Review. However, incentives and organizational KPIs continue to emphasize lending and disbursement targets. In operations, staff incentives still tend to reward new lending approvals and lending volume.” Furthermore, it states that Management “acknowledges that the effort to transform the approval culture into one that incentivizes and focuses on results and development effectiveness in RMCs is unfinished business. Nonetheless, it is vital to ensure that all projects emphasize quality of outcomes and results over lending volumes. To reinforce this message, Management will adopt additional KPIs that emphasize quality and results and will embed quality in performance evaluations for staff and managers.”

While project performance relies to a large extent on the performance of RMC governments, partners, and local stakeholders, as well as external factors, the SESP are entirely under the Bank’s control, as
well as within its capacity to adopt and implement recommendations.

The evaluation found that the Bank’s RMF reporting is mainly aimed at an external stakeholder audience, rather than at the internal management process to improve performance and achieve better results. The benchmarking study has also identified similar challenges across the comparators. In a recent paper, the World Bank’s Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) argues that the results system, while prioritising reporting and upward accountability, has become dislodged from the critical cycle of feedback, learning and improving.35

**Incentives or barriers contributing to the use or non-use of the RMF**

**Finding 7:** The evaluation found various factors promoting or hindering the use (or non-use) of the RMF. These factors related to: (i) the Bank’s strategic focus on the High 5s; (ii) the frequency of reporting; (iii) a failure to capture the “soft” elements of the Bank’s support, such as non-lending operations; (iv) results communication and reporting system; (v) the AfDB’s impact measurement; and (vi) assessment of attribution vs. contribution.

Among others, the evaluation highlighted the following key factors that enable or hinder the use (or non-use) of the RMF:

The Bank’s strategic focus on the High 5s includes greater attention on the drivers of operational performance at all levels. These include: (i) introducing new methodologies that will allow the Bank to better assess the development impacts of its operations; (ii) adopting a results-based finance policy that enables the provision of flexible financial and technical support, while linking disbursements to the delivery of results and helps countries achieve structural reforms to their economies; (iii) using evaluation findings to improve the quality and impact of lending, and tracking the implementation of agreed evaluation recommendations each quarter, using the Management Action Record System; (iv) strengthening business processes to increase the Bank’s capacity to track and report on its development impact, which has introduced an approach for capturing and leveraging the development impact of its private sector operations; (v) reducing delays in preparing projects to achieving development effectiveness in a timely way; and (vi) supporting the RMF with departmental incentives, including updated KPIs that are better aligned with the Bank’s corporate priorities. Importantly, all of these were identified by KIs and surveys as aspects not being suitably captured by the current monitoring and reporting approaches and tools.

**Frequency of reporting of Level 1 indicators** should be clear and consistent with the data source parameters. The primary purpose of Level 1 indicators is to monitor the development progress of the RMCs. The existing AfDB RMF targets for these indicators are based on long-term, aspirational targets linked to multiple agendas and guided by the High 5s. What has been established during the evaluation is that at Level 1 the AfDB (similar to all MDBs) selectively chooses what to report from the available evidence to demonstrate performance and its contribution to development in Africa at the highest levels (Table A3.1, Annex 3 of the technical annexes to this report). Core indicators are drawn from the AfDB’s list and aligned with their respective contribution to the High 5s (Table A3.2, Annex 3 of the technical annexes to this report). The logic of this approach is that the depth of the change sought (i.e., the results) is multi-dimensional and complex, and the basis of selection appears to provide a fair (but not comprehensive) representation of achievements at the highest level, with a quantitative validation. Progress is measured against the aspects that are most relevant and in alignment with the targets established (i.e., the High 5s or AU 2063, etc.).36 It is generally accepted that this is not sufficient to demonstrate comprehensive progress and therefore needs to be supplemented with a qualitative and representative (Pan-African, Regional or Thematic) explanation. Accordingly, since 2020, the Bank has stopped reporting on targets for Level 1.
Analysis from the benchmarking exercise confirmed the need for qualitative representation or models/examples to provide a more holistic representation of progress. This is reflected in the several new CRFs adopted by MDBs in 2020, as well as the 2020 DER, 2020 AsDB Development Effectiveness Review (DER), the World Bank’s Gender Action Plan (GAP), and annual reports produced in 2020. Current strategic approaches among MDBs provide a narrative descriptor of contributions based on examples of success, which provide supportive evidence to validate the achievement (or progress towards achievement) of the targets and demonstrate the Bank’s contributions. As such, Level 1 reporting and measurement is presented as (and largely is) a representation of what is being achieved. The logic is that this will require a consolidated effort of data gathering at multiple levels (i.e., continental, regional, national, provincial, societal) that takes into account key factors that impact at all levels, i.e., cross-cutting (gender, climate change and environment, governance, fragility), over an extended multi-year period of time to effectively and accurately capture the data. Ultimately in the process, this does occur, usually at the end of a cycle.

In addition, given the requirement to report on the progress made on the RMF’s Level 1 indicators on an annual basis, it is extremely challenging (and not cost-effective) to report on long-term progress achieved annually. Instead, it is more effectively presented once or twice in the RMF cycle. For example, the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) presented aggregated data on its achievements and progress in its 2020 Development Effectiveness Review for the 2017–2020 CRF.

The current RMF indicators mainly capture results and performance that are measurable by quantitative metrics, and thus fail to capture the Bank’s full contribution to development in Africa, including the “soft” elements of the Bank’s support such as non-lending operations. A case in point is the use of inadequate indicators or inadequate measurement of the results of the Bank’s non-lending operations, specifically policy dialogue, knowledge management, and Economic and Sector Work. Increased appreciation of the importance of reporting that captures progress and development, or reporting of the qualitative aspects of the Bank’s efforts and investments, is warranted. Also, the Bank’s RMF can be further enhanced by additional narrative reporting to ensure a complete statement on the Bank’s work program and achievements. The 2020 ADER has demonstrated marked improvements and progress in this area, and is consequently much more informative.

The AfDB’s corporate-level results reporting can be better complemented by proactive analysis and reporting on the regional/country and sector/High 5s results frameworks, to strengthen the effectiveness of RBM. As noted in multiple references, the existing corporate system is supported by thematic and country development effectiveness reviews. During 2016–2019, the Bank undertook a thematic review of agriculture and country reviews of Ethiopia, Sierra Leone, Cameroon, Tanzania, Egypt, Mozambique, Guinea and Morocco, with reviews of Niger, Uganda and Ghana ongoing. However, the themes and countries to be covered are not strategically planned, but rather based on responding to country requests. Corporate-level reporting is necessarily restricted in the level of depth it can enter into. More systematic and detailed reporting of results at the country/regional/sector/High 5/thematic level to complement the corporate RMF reporting, would strengthen the basis for learning and RBM.

The Bank’s flagship results report, the ADER, is structured around the AfDB’s RMF and helps demonstrate how the institution’s operations impact development effectiveness in the RMCs. Each version of the ADER has represented an improvement over its predecessor, and there are continual efforts to enhance the content and its presentation, in particular with visualisation. While the ADER does indeed report on a number of indicators at different levels of the results chain, the evaluation of the Sixth General Capital Increase (GCI), ADF-12 and ADF-13 found that “…both Bank Management and
the Board and, as a result, staff, are focused on the delivery of outputs, with less attention paid to following through on ensuring implementation and therefore securing intended outcomes.” Since the Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN) report, there have been significant steps to enhance the content and presentation of the ADER. For example, the 2020 version was restructured and presents a useful summary of the progress over the previous three years, as well as presenting thematically, sectorally and against the High 5s, while putting forth strong examples of results achieved in specific RMCs.

The ADER can be complemented by increased reporting, in different forms and different areas, using different mechanisms, with clarity of responsibility for results reporting. Strengthening reporting on the Bank’s results in countries will enhance the use and, by extension, the quality of data. Personnel vacancies at the Country Offices have hampered progress in this area, according to the Independent Evaluation of the Implementation of the Development and Business Delivery Model of the African Development Bank Group (May 2019).

Other MDBs have identified that better reporting of progress against SDG targets contributes towards providing stronger ownership and requires improved monitoring and reporting by governments. The AsDB’s efforts provide an interesting perspective on this aspect.

“**The ADER is an exercise which is delivered by one department but is the result of the combined work of the AfDB. This is similar to the AsDB DER, which is built on data produced by a number of AsDB departments, several of which also produce their own more comprehensive and analytical reports, such as the Annual Evaluation Report written by the Independent Evaluation Department on success rates for completed operations, the APPR written by the Procurement, Portfolio and Financial Management Department (PPFD) on disbursement ratios and contract awards, and Key Indicators for Asia and the Pacific written by the Economic Research and Regional Cooperation Department (ERCD) on SDGs. Some of the information is drawn from or related to the Work Program and Budget Framework (WPBF) coordinated by SPD and the AsDB Budget, as coordinated by the Budget, Personnel, Management Systems Department (BPMSD). So far, the CRF and DER have gone in part another way, complementing the results framework indicators by a very large set of “standard explanatory data indicators” to provide more detailed information. A listing of these is provided in an appendix to the CRF policy paper, and an analysis of the progress of these indicators is attached annually in a linked document of the DER.”**

Nevertheless, the AsDB’s efforts have not yielded new CRFs that perfectly align, or are complementary, with other AsDB frameworks. The AsDB has several results frameworks that should ideally correspond fully with the CRF: (i) the Country Partnership Strategy (CPS) results framework (appended to a CPS); (ii) the country sector results framework, which forms part of country sector assessments; (iii) the project Design and Monitoring Framework (DMF) included in each report and recommendation of the AsDB President; and (iv) AsDB-wide sector operational plan results frameworks in the AsDB’s sector operational plans (produced since 2010). However, they have different structures and often have very limited or no overlap in indicator sets, as is elaborated below. The AsDB’s Private Sector Operations Department (PSOD) issues a useful annual private sector development effectiveness report, though it is not based on a separate private sector results framework, and has no performance signalling or scorecard. Board members responding to an AsDB IED survey regarded the CPS results framework as a useful document, but they viewed the DMF as being more useful.

The SDGs outlined in 2015 encourage the alignment of corporate strategies and led MDBs to streamline their results frameworks, revisit their corporate scorecards, and modify some of their performance indicators. The AsDB reduced the number of
indicators in its Transitional Results Framework 2017–2020 from 91 to 85, to sharpen the focus on strategic priorities and improve the cost-effectiveness of results measurement. It changed some indicators on development outcomes to correspond with those in the SDG framework. Examples of these indicators are presented in a subsequent section on SDGs. Similarly, the IADB revisited its results framework and reduced its main indicators to 55 (from 84 in the previous framework) to focus on key strategic priorities. The IADB also introduced a set of auxiliary indicators to complement the results framework indicators.39

The WBG underwent a process of refining the corporate scorecard and the measurement systems that support it, guided by the principles of strengthening strategic alignment, enhancing data quality and the validity of reported results, and balancing monitoring needs with harmonisation and efficiency. A main driver of the revision was ensuring that the SDGs were adequately reflected in results systems. The revision was geared towards harmonising, aligning, and rationalising the internal indicator sets used across the WBG.

Measuring the AfDB’s impact on certain indicators such as jobs supported and regional corridors remains challenging, and the Bank is exploring an appropriate methodology for measuring impact. For instance, to measure jobs supported, the AfDB has introduced a new methodology that was finalised in early 2020 and is based on project approvals (ex-ante) a different methodology from other RMF indicators. The objective is to include data on direct but also indirect, induced and forward-effect jobs supported in the next ADERs, with adequate explanations on the methodology. Moreover, in the 2020 ADER, the Bank piloted the use of high-resolution impact mapping to assess the impact of regional corridors.

As a measure of its utility, the RMF can use multiple sources of information to gather results for different types of indicators. For example, the AfDB has introduced in the RMF document the Development
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Impact Approach using social accounting matrices to facilitate this aspect and this is reflected in the ADER 2020. As the Bank has uniquely adopted an attribution model, it has simultaneously attempted to apply an “Input-Output model” that attempts to analyse its outputs using a Social Accounting Matrix, as depicted in Figure 4.

Using constrained and unconstrained Social Accounting Matrix (SAM) multipliers, growth linkages of the sectors are explored, and those sectors that best promote growth and income distribution are identified. It is argued that the long-term sustainability of economic growth and its welfare-improving impact largely depend on the magnitude and strength of inter-sectoral linkages and how income is distributed.

Conceptually, it is argued that, in order to optimise the development strategies and the selection of feasible policy instruments, a deeper understanding of the growing linkages between sectors and the structure of income is necessary. It is further argued that the type of investment will determine the flow of capital and, ultimately, the development impact. The application of the SAM and its impact on reporting were not determined in this evaluation.

Moreover, in the 2020 ADER, the Bank piloted the use of high-resolution impact mapping to assess the impact of regional corridors.

The AfDB corporate results framework has been harmonised to the extent practicable with the results frameworks of other MDBs and IFIs. At the same time, the Bank is the only MDB that is using a different approach in measuring impact. The MDBs improved their collaboration and learning from each other, and interactive discussions among them have contributed to near-convergence of their corporate-level results frameworks and/or scorecards. The MDBs’ Tiers cover both development results and MDB performance, adjusted to the needs of each MDB based on its mandate and operational circumstances. Typically, this is a three- or four-tier framework. All MDB results frameworks track the achievement of outputs and outcomes, and monitor operational and organisational effectiveness. The development context (Tier 1) refers to long-term development outcomes that countries are achieving, while results supported by MDB operations (Tier 2) refer to outputs and outcomes contributed by the MDB. Operational performance (Tier 3) generally covers implementation quality, quality at entry, development finance, and implementation of development agendas or special themes. Organisational performance (Tier 4) refers to human resources, budget resources, and process efficiency. In the case of MDBs that have combined operational and organisational performance into one tier, this also covers innovation and knowledge, leverage and partnerships, and responsiveness, among others.

The AfDB has worked with the other MDBs on CRFs and their improvement. Harmonisation of indicators has progressed, though each organisation has also its own flavour in the set of indicators. The indicator set for each MDB continues to evolve, with a corresponding effort to align CRF goals and targets with the SDGs. To support the harmonisation process to the extent practicable with the results frameworks of other MDBs and International Financial Institutions (IFIs), the AsDB reviewed the results frameworks of seven other MDBs and IFIs—the African Development Bank, the Caribbean Development Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Development Association, the Islamic Development Bank, and the World Bank Group. Eleven results framework indicators in the AsDB’s proposed framework are harmonised or are similar or equivalent to indicators used by at least three MDBs and/or IFIs. At Levels 2 to 4, 13 IFIs (26 percent) are harmonised with, or are similar or equivalent to, those used by at least one other MDB or IFI. This work is ongoing and it is agreed among MDBs that it supports aid effectiveness reporting, reduces the burden on national level government reporting systems, and enables better reporting against SDGs progress achievement.
Assessing the attribution of development results to the Bank’s efforts vs. the contribution of the Bank’s efforts to development results. Compared with other MDBs, the Bank’s approach to measuring the development impact of co-financed operations differs, even though some degree of harmonisation exists. Interactive discussions and collaboration among MDBs have contributed to the near-convergence of their corporate-level results frameworks and/or scorecards. MDBs’ Tiers or levels cover both development results and performance, adjusted to the needs of each MDB based on its mandate and operational circumstances. Nonetheless, the AfDB is the only MDB that has chosen to report exclusively on its own contribution and the results that can be attributed to it alone, and not on the aggregate project contribution, which includes co-financiers (outputs are pro-rated according to the level of the Bank’s financial support against total project costs). The rationale behind the AfDB’s choice to report exclusively on its own contribution is mainly due to the fact that the Bank’s interventions are increasingly co-financed with other development partners, and reporting the total sum of outputs might not adequately reflect the financial inputs of the Bank and would lead to double counting. Outputs are therefore pro-rated according to the Bank’s share in the total project costs. That is, the AfDB is utilising an attribution approach whereas comparator institutions such as the World Bank Group and the Asian Development Bank are using the contribution approach. This choice by the AfDB is not aligned with the Paris Declaration principle of mutual accountability for development results and the partnership-driven nature of its main High 5s Strategies (New Deal on Energy for Africa and Feed Africa). By pro-rating its results, the Bank is reporting substantively fewer results than others.

It is important to mention that “the notion of attribution of results, which puts forward the ‘results’ of the agency, runs counter to this general consensus, while the contribution perspective does indeed put the onus on client countries rather than on development agencies, as has been called for by the Paris Declaration and the Busan Agenda.”

The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) identified the five imperatives of country ownership, alignment, harmonisation, managing for results, and mutual accountability as the core of the global development agenda. Besides, due to the role of the AfDB’s High 5s in achieving the SDGs and the Agenda 2063 goals, and the partnership-driven High 5s-related strategies (e.g., NDEA, Strategy for Agricultural Transformation in Africa, …), the AfDB’s use of the attribution approach is questionable.

“We should not spend too much effort on attribution. We should measure what we can measure and use appropriate proxies so we keep transaction cost low. Let’s not try to be over complicated just in order to isolate the Bank’s contribution. Focus on the instruments and the results that the Bank can really influence and that are relatively easy to measure with regard to the structure and the type of indicators we are using.”

“We see attribution as good practice but it a very difficult exercise owing to the complexity of development interventions. But, it’s something to aspire to. The science behind it is something that’s a work in progress. However, it is important to note that not all MDBs are using this approach and, comparatively, it makes our results look pale. So there is a trade-off to be made as to aspiring to do what we believe is good practice and what actually happens in reality.”

In contrast, the AsDB and the WBG focused on contribution. For instance, the WBG identifies its Level 2 reporting as “Country Results Supported by the Bank,” and the focus is similar to that of the AsDB on contribution. The AsDB review of the Results Framework highlighted the value of using a contribution approach in monitoring intermediate or long-term outcomes, given that development outcomes are a result of combined resources, actions, policies, and measures of developing countries and the private sector.
Efficiency

This section addressed the question: “To what extent and how has the RMF been optimal in achieving its objectives?”

Extent to which the RMF performance indicators and information are credible, reliable, accurate, and valid, and are reasonably easy to collect on time

Finding 8: Level 2 data reported in the ADER presented shortcomings that were linked with the quality of the self-evaluation (PCR/XSR) data used, and for which evidence sourcing practices are inadequate, as well as with the quality of data management and analysis.

Reported data quality

In the ADER, Bank-funded operations (Level 2 indicators) are measured for completed operations. However, the Bank is using results data from not only Project Completion Reports (PCRs) for Sovereign Operations (SOs) and Expanded Supervision Reports (XSRs) for Non-Sovereign Operations (NSOs), but also from Appraisal Reports (for SOs) and ADOAs (for NSOs). As self-evaluation products, the use of PCRs and XSRs, as well as PARs and ADOAs, to account for results jeopardises to some extent the quality of reported data for various reasons. The RMF is only as good as the self-evaluation. The 2021 Bank Operational Instructions on strengthening results planning and monitoring in the Bank’s operations pointed to some problematic indicators often seen in the past, including: (i) non-alignment with the Bank’s RMF or NSO Portal indicators; and (ii) indicators that are from an unreliable source.

This finding points to general concerns regarding PCR/XSR quality, especially when it comes to providing adequate evidence to back up reported project outputs and outcomes. For example, nearly half of the 52 PCRs/XSRs from 2019 reviewed by IDEV received an unsatisfactory or highly unsatisfactory score on “adequacy of accessible evidence”. This has also been found by the validation exercises of previous years’ PCRs and XSRs. In sum, practices in referencing sources of reported data can be improved. For clarity of observation and validation of the Bank’s reporting, a decision should be made on the use of PCRs and XSRs validated by IDEV, which should go beyond rating validation by also assessing the results data reported through self-evaluation.

The benchmarking indicates that, for the World Bank, each project is monitored through the Implementation Status and Results Report (ISR), which includes an update on the specific indicators in the RMF. The Implementation Completion and Results Report (ICR) records achievements against the project’s development objectives. Each ICR is validated by IEG and its ratings are included in corporate reports. For the AsDB, assessment of the progress on key results achieved by the AsDB’s operations is based on the evaluative evidence derived from the thematic, corporate, country, and sector-level evaluation work (i.e., high-level evaluations conducted annually by IED). The Annual Effectiveness Report (AER) maps the key results achieved to the seven operational priorities of Strategy 2030. Finally, the Annual Report on Results and Impact of IFAD Operations (ARRI) is issued by IFAD’s Independent Office of Evaluation and examines IFAD’s overall program performance each year. It is IFAD’s principal external accountability tool and allows stakeholders to monitor the effectiveness of IFAD’s work.

Reviews of PCRs/XRSs have noted a tendency to report a “satisfactory” outcome for PCRs (for example, 94 percent of the 2019 projects were rated satisfactory). Regarding XSRs, the percentage is 89 percent for economic sustainability and 91 percent for private sector development. This speaks to the issue of the quality of reporting in PCRs/XRSs and the fact that oversight in the process by Management is not working effectively. IDEV evaluations (IDEV, 2019; IDEV, 2020) also pointed to various issues, including the backlog in producing XSRs (67 percent for NSOs approved over the 2011–2014 period) and a lack of candour in self-evaluation, particularly in Implementation Progress Reports (IPRs)/Annual
Supervision Reports (ASRs) and PCRs/XSRs, which can be explained by, among others, the lack of a proper incentive structure.

Self-evaluations underpin the entire reporting systems at the AfDB and are meant to strategically bridge knowledge gaps, support developing frameworks for capturing and acting on evaluative lessons, tracking projects with high-quality results frameworks, and testing approaches to uphold accountability and learning needs. This was complemented by the KII and IDEV reports. This is generally recognised and, consequently, a greater emphasis is placed on IDEV analysis, which is seen as more objective, and focused more on learning and less on compliance. The AfDB’s self-evaluation could be strengthened by making better institutional use of the knowledge generated. The Bank’s quality plan will address this issue. This may require a second Bank quality plan to address the learning aspect, which is not covered by the current plan.

The Data Quality Assessment (DQA) undertaken within this evaluation noted some issues with ADER-reported data associated with the three-year moving average method. The use of a moving average smoothenes trends by eliminating outliers, particularly those due to seasonality or
business cycles. To assess the Bank’s development impact for each year, the ADER provides data in the form of a three-year moving average as a way to avoid data volatility. For example, to determine the Bank’s development impact for 2019 (reported in ADER 2020), data for respective indicators represent averages for 2017–2019, and 2016–2018 for assessing the Bank’s development contribution for 2018. Data reported in the 2017–2020 ADERs computed using a three-year moving average differed significantly from annually computed indicator values for the same years. What becomes apparent is that annual data tend to be better for assessing annual results, as they can be used to focus attention on problem areas, while three-year averages can be useful to identify longer-term trends. Thus, given that the ADER serves the twin purposes of accountability and facilitating decision-making through learning, the Bank is advised to carefully consider the most appropriate methodological approach for each indicator, depending on what it will be used for. Other MDBs use different methods for different indicators. Using the moving average rather than actual values for certain indicators may imply missing important information related to the changes that occurred over time, including shifts in results. This can be revealed by using statistical process control charts, which help to identify and highlight a range of typical patterns (in addition to the gradual trend) in the performance results.

Finding 9: The DQA observed an appreciable level of attention to data disaggregation, particularly for women, the ADF and transition situations. The evaluation found some quality data issues on gender-disaggregated data. High data consistency and completeness rates were observed.

The 2017–2020 ADERs provide a considerable level of detail for gender-sensitive indicators. The main challenge lies with data quality issues. Of the 49 items for data on women beneficiaries verified by the evaluation, it was confirmed that nine (18 percent) are the subject of further review. Of these nine, seven are proxies (national-level sex compositions or other methods as proxies) and two are data-entry errors. In the case of using nation-level gender, compositions are used as proxies to determine the proportion of women who benefitted from a particular operation. While this also raises concerns about best practices, proper documentation of these practices could be helpful. Also, gender in the RMF refers to “women” and this is exhibited by presenting a sub-category “of which women…” to depict gender. While it is valid that women are the more vulnerable in most instances, a holistic approach to present both genders would be more informative in highlighting existing disparities, unless for those specific indicators targeting women. It is worth noting that not all gender statistics are categorised as male and female. Some general indicators depict gender disparities directly due to culturally defined gender roles.

Similarly, disaggregated data for the ADF were amply provided both at the aggregate and database levels. In particular, the 2020 ADER goes beyond gender and ADF disaggregation to incorporate data on transition situations. That said, there is more scope for the ADER to report on detailed data. The ADER should be able to capture the number of projects that result in aggregate values for RMF indicators. This is important for verification and evaluation purposes. So far, this is not clearly captured in the ADERs being assessed (except for the 2020 ADER).
On a more positive note, high data consistency and completeness rates were observed for all the years under review. The consistency of ADER-reported data was 100 percent for all indicators over the review period. All 10 select indicators yielded 100 percent consistency rates in terms of the approach used in arriving at the reported values. These results hold for gender-disaggregated data both at the aggregate and project levels. In terms of completeness, at the project level, all 76 values for the 10 select indicators that should have been reported in the ADER database for the ADER 2020 were duly completed. This yields a completeness rate of 100 percent, albeit that nearly 10 percent (8 values) were obtained from sources other than PCRs/XSRs, such as ADOAs and Project Appraisal Reports, especially in situations where a project beneficiary’s data reported in the PCRs/XSRs are deemed “inadequate”. The practice of sourcing some indicator values from non-PCRs/XSRs sources has raised concerns when it comes to data quality and management. It has also been interpreted as a signal of the need to improve the quality of the PCRs and XSRs.

Nearly 97 percent of indicator values captured in the ADER database for the ADER 2020 were deemed accurate when compared with self-evaluation-reported data. Of the 76 projects reported on for the ADER 2020 (using the 10 select indicators), 74 projects (or 97 percent) were captured accurately. This means that only two reported values (or 3 percent) were found to be inaccurate, albeit with less than 1 percent margin of error in both cases. These are mainly data-entry errors and issues of data management linked with the use of Excel, as highlighted by an audit of the Bank’s results monitoring and reporting.

**Extent to which the resources, roles, and responsibilities assigned for RMF implementation are appropriate**

A Custodian Department of the AfDB’s Results and Quality Assurance Department (ORQR) was established in 2008 to support the Bank’s ambition to move from being a volume- and target-driven organisation to becoming one that manages for results. The ORQR was changed to results measurement systems, as the Delivery, Performance Management and Results Department (SNDR), as a result of the Development and Business Delivery Model (DBDM). The SNDR is responsible for articulating and measuring development results with operational departments and has central quality control. The evaluation did not find any document describing the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders assigned for RMF implementation for the main stakeholders. Nevertheless, the evaluation pointed to the fact that the ownership of the RMF remains rather limited, with overall perceptions of the RMF belonging in the SNDR and therefore the results unit should be responsible for it.

**Extent to which the RMF is able to track the private sector’s contribution to development**

While the RMF’s reporting system fairly captures the Bank’s private sector contribution to development through, for instance, the ADOA and XSRs at the project level, some weaknesses need to be addressed. For instance, although XSRs play an important role in tracking intermediaries and the number of SMEs that benefit from the Bank’s range of private sector interventions, such as lines of credit, its current reporting mechanism fails to systematically capture beneficiaries at the SME level. This situation results in under-reporting of the Bank’s contribution. This clearly raises concerns about the complexity of measuring such operations and the need to find the right mix of methodological approaches to ensure an optimal measurement of the Bank’s private sector contribution to development.

Another key weakness in tracking the Bank’s private sector contribution to development partly relates to the set of outcome indicators. The current RMF lacks outcome indicators that track how the Bank’s private sector efforts, through for instance budget support and reform efforts, contribute to the broader business environment in RMCs.
Extent to which the RMF is cost-efficient

Finding 10: The relatively large number of RMF indicators has significant implications for guaranteeing cost-efficiency.

While the average number of indicators for the five institutions compared (including the AfDB) is 84, the Bank has an additional 21 indicators. For the AfDB, this means more effort is required in terms of time and costs to collect, collate, process and disseminate meaningful data and information. This calls for a streamlining of the current pool of indicators to a level that guarantees cost-efficiency without compromising the quality of the data and the reporting process. Indeed, the Bank in its 2016–2025 RMF reduced the number of its RMF indicators, bringing them to the current 105, compared with 111 in the previous RMF (Table A3.3, Annex 3 of the technical annexes to this report). However, from a cost-efficiency perspective, it would be useful to consider further streamlining the current number of indicators.

The need to be cost-efficient regarding the Bank’s RMF was also emphasised during the KIIs. The views underscored the need to focus on indicators that matter, while ensuring that the costs associated with measuring these indicators are reasonable. One respondent expressed the following:

“…I think we also need to streamline the indicators in terms of the quantity of indicators bearing in mind the Bank’s capacity to support.”

Benchmarking this against peer organisations and the broader RBM literature shows that among the MDBs each has reduced and sharpened its performance indicators. The AsDB reduced the number of indicators in its transitional results framework in the period 2017–2020 from 91 to 85 to sharpen the focus on strategic priorities of results measurement. IDB revisited its results framework and reduced its main indicators to 60 (from 84 in the previous framework) to focus on key strategic priorities.

Finding 11: The Bank identified the Results Reporting System (RRS) as a potentially effective reporting tool, linked with quality results data, although its implementation was delayed. The improvement of the AfDB’s information system is expected to enhance RMF effectiveness and efficiency.

The ADER data quality assessment provides evidence that the most relevant Tier for the AfDB to report on is Level 2. This is where greater efforts should be made and where the convergence of key RBM objectives and evidence of compliance, learning and accountability can be clearly demonstrated, harvested, utilised, and made available publicly (transparency).

Box 3: The AfDB’s Results Reporting System

The Bank’s automated Results Reporting System (RRS), which was launched for public operations on 16 February 2021, makes it easier for Task Managers to capture the results of operations more systematically and continuously. The RRS helps staff manage operations more easily and with less time and effort. At the same time, the RRS also makes it possible for the Bank as an organisation to better monitor progress and report on results.

The RRS IT system automates and digitises Task Managers’ preparation of the Implementation Performance and Results Report (IPR), and the Project Completion Report (PCR). By tracking results in real-time, it embodies the Bank’s commitment to using technology to improve operations.

The RRS is built around the project cycle: it encodes the results framework at appraisal, records progress during implementation, and it produces a Project Completion Report (PCR) when the project ends. The RRS leverages the capabilities and ubiquity of the Bank’s SAP HANA information system. Task Managers across Africa can access the RRS on a desktop interface. In September 2020, a new version of the RRS was piloted with a small number of Task Managers in sectors and regions. The use of the RRS has been made mandatory since 1 May 2021.

Source: Evaluation Team and The Results Reporting System (RRS) Communique of 16 February 2021.
An effective reporting system requires an IT platform to ensure that the results are not only reported at completion but can also be tracked during the implementation of projects. Both the EBRD and IFC—through the Transition Impact Monitoring System and the Development Outcome Tracking System replaced since 2017 by the Anticipated Impact Measurement and Monitoring System, respectively—have implemented systems for the “live” reporting of results (EBRD, 2013; IFC, 2011). Indicators used to monitor development effectiveness through the project cycle should be similar to the ones used in an institution’s corporate scorecard. While the AfDB, until now, does not use such technology, it dedicated a long-term effort to produce an operational automated Results Reporting System (RRS). The RRS is an integrated IT platform that allows tracking results from project approval to project completion for public sector operations (Box 3).

It is important to mention that the issue is not only on the use of an IT system but in ensuring the data quality of the results. Accordingly, the ADER was constrained by the lack of standard core sector indicators or a rule that RMF indicators must be used. Also, KIs pointed to the need to reconcile all the IT-based platforms that relate to data collection on operations, as there are many initiatives across the Bank relating to operational-level data. This will improve the quality of data and enhance the RMF. The following is a statement from a key informant:

“One of the things that have been limiting us from learning from our operations relative to other peer institutions is that a lot of information is paper-based or manual. These digital platforms and systems will be very useful in helping. We should be able to make good use of these technologies. It is however important to note that it’s not just about having the digital systems but what we put in the systems, as the data that are input must be of good quality.”

Finding 12: The Bank is already aligning corporate incentives with corporate priorities, though this process needs further development.

The RMF demonstrates the logical linkage and alignment between the long-term and medium-term objectives, and the Bank’s operations, i.e., programs/projects (Level 2) and institutional corporate/organisation-wide set-up. The RMF identified in its design that it needed to be supported by departmental incentives that are better aligned with the Bank’s corporate priorities. This can be done through: (i) increasing incentivisation for Bank staff to support a more comprehensive understanding and use of the RMF; and (ii) updating and streamlining the Bank’s set of corporate key performance indicators (KPIs), making them leaner and better suited to tracking the contribution of each department to the High 5s and corporate priorities. While the RMF integrated the Bank’s High 5s goals and cross-cutting strategic areas in a vision of what the Bank aims to achieve, it has not necessarily provided effective information to support decision-making. This evaluation pointed out that the ownership of the RMF remains rather limited, with a feeling that the RMF belongs in the results department, and therefore that the results department should be responsible for it.

The 2017 IDEV Comprehensive Evaluation of Development Results already pointed to the need to strengthen accountability frameworks and align incentives to influence changes in behaviour, moving towards a performance culture. Accordingly, new performance contracts have been signed with Vice Presidents and cascaded to Directors, Managers, and staff, with clear responsibilities and identified KPIs. Management uses KPIs to track the performance drivers of its operational and non-operational departments. This will ensure that each department focuses on a set of objectives that it needs to achieve within a year and link it to the budget planning process. The Bank is reviewing and rationalising its KPIs to make sure they are fully aligned with the Bank’s High-5s priorities and the DBDM.
Conclusions, Lessons and Recommendations

Conclusions

The mid-term evaluation of the Bank’s 2016–2025 RMF acknowledges that the AfDB’s corporate results framework and its various reporting tools (Development Effectiveness Reviews, Summary Performance Scorecard, MapAfrica, Results Reporting Systems, Executive Dashboard, and the Portfolio Flashlight) have been valuable in steering the AfDB’s work and in reporting progress on results and key processes. The convergence of challenges facing both developing nations and industrialised countries demonstrated by the COVID-19 pandemic, the multi-layered RMF-related work ongoing at the Bank in terms of renewal—in particular the Proposal on Selectivity, which represents selecting fewer but more strategic investments aimed at increasing the quality and impact of operations, the new Cross-Cutting Strategies (in particular the Gender Strategy), and new or updated sector and corporate policies and strategies that have direct causal linkage with the RMF indicators—requires a refinement of the lens of measurement.

Lessons

The following are the key lessons from this evaluation.

Lesson 1: The robustness and credibility of the Bank’s self-evaluation system are critical for tracking RMF indicators.

The Bank’s RMF results reporting, especially in the case of Level 2 indicators, is only as good as the robustness and credibility of the self-evaluation system, which by extension includes its results reporting system and processes for generating quality results data.

Lesson 2: A sense of ownership among key stakeholders is essential for delivering the RMF.

Ensuring ownership of the RMF at all levels of the organisation is essential. RMF indicators and targets should be selected and set based on a good understanding of what areas are important to measure, and what level of performance is both ambitious and achievable, considering accurate baseline data, where applicable. It is therefore important to continue drawing upon specialists who are most likely to have this knowledge and data early in the indicator-selection and target-setting process. This will also ensure broad ownership by those responsible for successfully meeting the targets. The inclusion of the operations departments and staff in setting the targets was identified by the key stakeholders surveyed as particularly important to the results achieved. Their involvement will allow an ambitious yet attainable target to be agreed upon, effective monitoring to be put in place, and staff ownership to be fostered.

Lesson 3: Maintaining flexibility is vital.

The RMF should remain sufficiently flexible to accommodate other indicators and refinements going forward. This is particularly important for areas where: (i) there is a changing development context in the RMCs and the Bank’s emerging new strategies; (ii) self- and independent evaluation studies are planned to generate lessons relevant to target setting; and (iii) provisional indicators need to be tested before they are formally integrated into the RMF.
Lesson 4: Finding the balance between realism and ambition is important.

To function as an effective management tool, the RMF should have targets that are ambitious yet realistic. Historical data and Management’s forecasts, combined with staff assessments of expected Bank performance, should guide the determination of target attainability. The extent of the Bank’s control over specific performance areas should also inform target setting.

Recommendations

IDEV makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: Improve the RMF design.

Priority areas of action to consider include:

- Updating the theory of change and related indicators to align them with changes in Africa’s development context and the Bank’s emerging priorities.

- Ensuring consistency and business cycle synchronisation between the RMF 2016–2025, the TYS (2013–2022), and the Bank’s upcoming Corporate Strategy (2023–). In line with other MDBs, the TYS and RMF should be the centerpiece of results measurement and reporting for both accountability and learning.

- Reconciling the Bank’s ambitions with its resources by reviewing the targets set across the RMF levels to ensure that they are ambitious yet realistic.

Recommendation 2: Enhance the Bank’s results reporting.

Priority areas of action to consider include:

- Improving the reporting of outcomes and impacts at regional, country, sector/High 5 and thematic levels to ensure greater results orientation, with a results brief at the country level, and clarity of responsibility for results reporting.

- Developing appropriate tools and guidance for measuring the results of the Bank’s non-lending operations, such as policy dialogue, knowledge management, and Economic and Sector Work.

Recommendation 3: Enhance the utility of the RMF for better results-based management and evidence-based decision-making.

Priority areas of action to consider include:

- Improving the aggregation at the RMF level and streamlining the number of core indicators at the project level by implementing core standard indicators and supporting staff in using them.

- Enhancing the capacity of Bank staff and project staff by ramping up awareness and training on results measurement, including the role of the RMF.

- Revising Bank guidance on PCRs and XSRs to provide clarity to teams on the level of supporting evidence expected to be included in these reports, and the results data quality assurance process.

- Collaboration between IDEV and Management to ensure that independent validations of PCRs and XSRs can take place in time to inform the ADER.
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About this evaluation

This report presents the findings, lessons and recommendations of IDEV’s mid-term evaluation of the AfDB’s Results Measurement Framework (RMF) for 2016-2025. The evaluation covers the first five years of implementation of the RMF (2016-2020) and assesses how it has performed so far, to help the Bank to improve the execution of the Framework for the remaining period until 2025. The evaluation examined the robustness of the RMF’s design in supporting the Bank’s development effectiveness, and the extent to which it has achieved its strategic objectives of being an accountability, decision-making, and learning tool for the Bank. It also assessed how well the RMF has performed in achieving its strategic objectives.

The evaluation finds that the RMF is relevant in supporting the Bank’s development effectiveness. Design quality is assessed as good and in conformity with the characteristics of a good corporate results framework, albeit with some weaknesses in indicator selection, target setting, and stakeholders’ consultation. The evaluation also finds that the RMF is an effective tool for accountability, and that it has improved the communication of corporate performance. However, its use for learning and decision-making is not optimal. The evaluation further draws attention to the large number of RMF indicators, which has implications for cost efficiency.

The evaluation outlines lessons on the credibility of the Bank’s self-evaluation system, ownership among key stakeholders, the flexibility of the RMF to accommodate future indicators, and the need to balance realism and ambition in setting RMF targets. It recommends improvements to the RMF design and the Bank’s results reporting, with a view to better results-based management and evidence-based decision-making.