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1. Background, Context and Objectives of the Evaluation

1.1 Background and Changing Context

1. As part of its 2021 work program, the Independent Development Evaluation function (IDEV) has been tasked with undertaking an evaluation of the African Development Bank Group’s Transition Support Facility (TSF). This comes at the request of the African Development Bank’s Committee on Operations and Development Effectiveness (CODE). The evaluation is also expected to be of interest to the ADF Deputies at the ADF-15 Mid-Term Review and during the ADF-16 replenishment discussions.

2. The TSF evaluation follows closely after the evaluation of the Bank’s 2014-2019 Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience. In 2020, an independent evaluation of the AfDB Group’s strategy for addressing fragility and building resilience in Africa (2014–2019) was undertaken by IDEV. The evaluation was broad and appraised components and tools used to achieve the Bank’s Strategy. The role of the TSF was assessed in this regard, but the assessment of the TSF instrument was not comprehensive given the wide scope of the evaluation. The 2020 evaluation of the AfDB’s (“the Bank”) strategy did however ignite a conversation within the Bank of the need to have a deeper understanding of the TSF instrument - and in particular its relevance, effectiveness and ability to sustainably impact on reducing fragility and building resilience. This evaluation will address these questions and draw out lessons to help the Bank optimise its use of TSF in fragile situations.

3. The TSF was established with a specific mandate to target fragile situations.1 It is a special facility which targets a subset of African Development Fund (ADF) countries which are deemed eligible for TSF funding.2 The main objective of the TSF is to provide additional funding and operational flexibility for Bank operations in eligible countries classified as being in fragile situations. This allows the Bank to assist eligible Regional Member Countries (RMCs) to address fragility issues and build resilience.

4. According to the 2015 Operational Guidelines, the TSF is managed and administered by the Transition Support Department (ORTS), in partnership with Resource Mobilization and External Finance Department (FIRM).3 The ORTS has since been converted into the Transition States Coordination Office (RDTS) under the new Development and Business Delivery Model (DBDM).4 Together, RDTS and FIRM are responsible for ensuring proper management, financial administration and reporting of TSF activities, in line with commitments under the respective ADF cycles.

---

2 The ADF contributes to the promotion of economic and social development in 37 least developed African countries by providing concessional funding for projects and programmes, as well as technical assistance for studies and capacity-building activities. See https://www.afdb.org/en/about-us/corporate-information/african-development-fund-adf.
3 ORTS, December 2014, op. cit.
5. **The TSF works alongside other Bank instruments to support the Bank’s objectives in least developed countries on the continent.** This group of 37 least developed countries are all eligible for ADF financing, with a new ADF-cycle of funding being approved every three years. Since ADF-10 in 2005, the issue of fragility has emerged as an important priority of the Bank, and one which required some type of special instrument. This has given rise to the TSF, and to its pre-2015 predecessors.

**Figure 1: Timeline of fragility-related policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Establishment of the Post-Conflict Country Facility (PCCF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Bank introduced a post-conflict enhancement factor helping to channel more resources to transition countries under the allocation framework of ADF-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Strategy for Enhanced Engagement in Fragile States (SEEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCCF evolved into the Fragile States Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012 IDEV evaluation of Bank assistance to Fragile States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Adoption of the Bank Group’s Ten-Year Strategy (2013-2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High-Level Panel on Fragile States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>FSF renamed the Transition Support Facility (TSF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Adoption of the High 5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>IDEV independent evaluation of the 2014-2019 Fragility Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


6. **The TSF and its predecessors have historically been closely aligned with the Bank’s overarching Strategy and policies related to fragility** – Figure 1. The AfDB was one of the first multilateral organisations to embrace the fragility agenda, and to institutionalise it as part of its business model. Nearly two decades ago in 2004, the Bank established the Post-Conflict Country Facility (PCCF) to assist post-conflict countries in clearing their arrears to the Bank. This was the first specific instrument targeting the unique challenges faced by Transition States. A year later, in 2005, the Bank introduced a Post-

---

Conflict Enhancement Factor (PCEF) into the formula of the Performance-Based Allocation (PBA) system in ADF-10, again with the aim of specifically targeting what were then classified as fragile states.

7. **In 2008, during ADF-11, the PCCF was transformed into the Fragile States Facility (FSF).** The FSF was introduced because the PCEF in the PBA formula was not found effective enough in allocating additional resources to fragile states. Therefore, with the creation of the FSF, the PCEF was abandoned. The FSF was established as an operationally autonomous special purpose entity within the Bank Group. With the creation of the FSF, the PCEF was abandoned. The FSF comprised three windows – the supplemental financing (top-up) Window, the Arrears Clearance Window and the technical assistance and capacity building (Targeted Support) Window.

8. **The FSF was renamed the TSF in 2015 and aligns with the 2014-2019 Strategy.** Unlike the 2008 Strategy which emphasised Fragile States, the 2014 Strategy shifted focus to situations of fragility. In considering situations of fragility, the 2014 Strategy is based on an understanding of fragility as a condition of elevated risk of institutional breakdown, societal collapse or violent conflict. According to the Strategy (p.3), drivers of fragility include: “economic, social, political and environmental dimensions, but all too often, demands for inclusion and equity underlie these drivers.” The Strategy sees situations of fragility as cross-border phenomena, and as an issue which must be addressed in order to minimise the risks posed to Africa’s development potential. As noted (p.4): “the stakes are high, as fragility is already holding back development on the continent.” Annex I provides the categorisation of fragile situations used to operationalise the 2014 Strategy.

9. **Central to the 2014 Strategy is the application of the fragility lens.** The application of a fragility-lens in the Bank’s engagement refers to the use of a range of analytical tools that assess and monitor the drivers and manifestations of fragility, their interactions, the political economy behind changes and the role of the Bank. Such tools include watching briefs, and country and regional fragility assessments, each of which are designed to better inform the Bank’s engagement with countries and regions experiencing situations of fragility. In terms of operational engagement in these contexts, the TSF is a key instrument.

10. **The TSF is an integral tool for achieving the objectives under the Bank’s Strategy,** and by extension its development goals on the African continent. According to the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the Strategy (p.19): “The use of resources of the TSF is determined within the framework of the Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience (2014-2019) in support of the operational priorities articulated in the Bank’s Ten-Year Strategy.” In its current structure, the TSF aims to target situations of fragility,

---

7 The FSF was designed this way specifically to enable donors to make additional voluntary contributions to the Facility (ADF-11 Deputies Report; December 2007).
build resilience and impact on development through its three pillars of funding. The funding structure of the TSF builds on that of the FSF which also comprised three windows.

11. **The TSF is structured into three financing windows**, which include the Supplemental Support Window (Pillar I), the Arrears Clearance Window (Pillar II) and the Targeted Support Window (Pillar III). Figure 2 illustrates the objectives of these three “Pillars”, as established in 2015 and applied under ADF 13, 14 and 15. The rational and operational modalities for each of these Pillars is explained in further detail below.

**Figure 2: Three-Pillar Structure of the Transition Support Facility**


12. **Pillar I provides resources that supplement those available to eligible countries through the performance-based allocation (PBA) system.** The need to supplement PBA allocations arises from the fact that by design the PBA favours countries with a strong Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) and a good portfolio performance record, which are the very elements lacking in countries emerging from crisis or suffering from structural fragilities. The introduction of a PCEF in the PBA formula did not sufficiently alleviate this issue, hence the need for a separate window. Pillar I financing can be either on a loan or grant basis, depending on the composition of the underlying PBA allocation – since Pillar I provides

---

11 Note that the ORTS is now designated as the RDTS and FRMB as FIRM.

supplemental resources, they match the composition of the country’s PBA allocation. To be eligible for Pillar I financing, countries must meet stage 1 criteria which entail (i) a commitment to consolidate peace and security and (ii) having unmet social and economic needs; and stage 2 criteria which include: (i) improved macroeconomic conditions and sound debt policies, (ii) sound financial management practices, and (iii) transparent public accounts. Initial indicative Pillar I allocations to countries that could potentially meet the two-stage eligibility criteria are made at the beginning of the ADF-cycle. In addition to this, there is an unallocated reserve which is set aside to enable the Bank to respond to changing situations (10 percent of the allocated amount for ADF13, raised to 15% for ADF 14). The unallocated reserve thus builds in an element of flexibility under Pillar I, an important dimension whose significance will be assessed in this evaluation.

1. **Pillar II aims to provide funding for clearing concessional debt arrears**, thus facilitating the normalisation of the relationships of the eligible RMCs with the Bank, and with other potential lenders of concessional resources. Eligibility for the arrears clearance window is open to countries with chronic arrears with the Bank, and support under this window is given on a grant basis. For the last three ADF Cycles (ADF-13, ADF-14 and ADF-15), Somalia, Sudan and Zimbabwe were identified as eligible countries.

2. **Pillar III provides a limited pool of resources to support capacity building and technical support activities in ADF countries**. These activities cannot easily be undertaken through traditional institutional support projects and programmes. Priority is given to activities that have potential for high impact due to their innovative character, strategic positioning, or potential for scaling up. Also important are the potential to contribute to leveraging other development-related resources, including private sector investment financing. Only ADF countries are eligible for Pillar III support, and support is given on a grant basis.

3. **The strategic importance of the TSF has been noted in the most recent evaluation of the 2014-2019 Bank Strategy**. The Facility contributes a meaningful share of Bank financing to Transition States, allocation to the Facility has been increasing over the past two ADF cycles, and is set to increase again in the ADF-15 cycle. Against this background, there is a need to comprehensively evaluate the TSF in order to assess its relevance, effectiveness and ability to sustainably impact on addressing fragility and building resilience in TSF-funded countries.

1.2 Rationale for the Evaluation

4. **There are several justifications for evaluating the TSF at the present time**. These can be largely separated into three main reasons, namely:

- The important role the TSF has played in the Bank’s interaction with countries experiencing situations of fragility, and/or transitioning from fragility;
- The need to explore further the important issues raised in previous evaluations;
- The need for an evidence-based evaluation of the TSF instrument to feed into a) the Bank’s reassessment of its broader Strategy and engagement with countries experiencing situations of
fragility, and b) the re-examination of the PBA allocation formula under the aegis of the ADF-16 Working Group and the ADF-15 Mid-Term Review, due to be held in November 2021, to examine a Management proposal for a comprehensive holistic review of the TSF and ADF Resource Allocation Framework (including the PBA), including how to best address vulnerability.

5. The TSF has been one of the main instruments used by the Bank to channel finances to the least developed countries in Africa. TSF funding accounted for 26 percent of total resources allocated to Transition States during the 2014-2019 period.\textsuperscript{14} Resources allocated to the TSF also increased by 7.5 percent between ADF-13 and ADF-14, despite a decline in ADF funding in total over the same period (Figure 3). The increase in resources allocated to the TSF under the ADF14 cycle demonstrates the Bank’s commitment to increase its support to transition countries in line with its strategy on addressing fragility. Over the 2014-2019 period, both Pillars I and III had high absorption rates. Through these two pillars, the Bank financed 88 projects in 21 Transition States between 2014 and 2019, with a cumulative absorption rate of 95 percent (2014-2019 Strategy Evaluation, p.iii).

Figure 3: Disbursements under ADF 13 & 14, including TSF

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure3.png}
\caption{Disbursements under ADF 13 & 14, including TSF}
\end{figure}


6. The Bank’s unallocated Pillar I reserves also allowed for substantial and rapid intervention in contingency situations such as the Ebola outbreak in Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia, the drought in the Horn of Africa, and the 2019 IDAI cyclone in Southern Africa. Based on these findings and preliminary interviews (see more on this below), the TSF has demonstrated its potential to contribute meaningfully in

situations of fragility. A comprehensive evaluation is needed to better unpack this hypothesis and concretely understand how the TSF can best continue to contribute to reducing fragility and building resilience.

7. **Despite the potential benefits, there are some existing challenges that need to be better understood.** According to the 2020 Independent Evaluation of the 2014-2019 Strategy, the volume and scope of the TSF did not allow the Bank to respond adequately to certain difficult situations. For instance, the TSF’s limited resources and eligibility criteria, even when added to Country PBA allocations, have not allowed the Bank to intervene at scale to address the multifaceted and evolving factors of fragility and associated inequalities such as exclusion, irregular migration and forced displacement. Emerging issues related to migration and forced displacement have been noted in other AfDB documentation.\(^\text{15}\) Moreover, Pillar II resources (to clear payment arrears) could not be used because eligible countries (Somalia, Sudan and Zimbabwe) did not meet the relevant conditions during the period\(^\text{16}\). The 2020 Independent Evaluation also highlighted issues related to monitoring of TSF resources (p.7), better linking TSF funding to the fragility lens (p.23) and the need to leverage more resources to increase the TSF envelope (p.23). The Strategy evaluation also highlighted the importance of maintaining a balance between selectivity (for preventing and addressing structural fragilities and promoting long-term resilience) and flexibility (for addressing crisis situations, for example). Building on this, the TSF evaluation will allow IDEV to deep dive and fully interrogate these relevant issues, in order to inform the Bank’s response and strengthen its ability to achieve its strategic objectives.

8. **An evaluation exercise is timely as the Bank is in the process of producing its new Strategy.** Despite several positive results and achievements, the 2020 Independent Evaluation noted that the Bank’s work on reducing fragility still faces limitations.\(^\text{17}\) These include the challenge of translating strategic engagements into fragility-sensitive programming, identifying entry points for building resilience in public and private sector operations, and balancing selectivity and flexibility for increased responsiveness. Moreover, the sustainability of AfDB’s operations could be improved, to build capacity and address structural constraints. A better understanding of how the TSF can help to address some of these challenges will emerge from the evaluation exercise which will address questions related to the TSF’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and will develop a systematic analysis of collective “lessons learned”. The evaluation will also propose lessons that can be learnt from other multilaterals working in the fragility space.

21. **The evaluation is thus highly pertinent to the ongoing development of the Bank’s Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa,** and also to the re-examination of the PBA allocation formula under the aegis of the ADF-16 Working Group and the ADF-15 Mid-Term Review. The new Strategy is planned to be submitted for approval during the fourth quarter, simultaneously with the proposals of the ADF-16 Working Group and the ADF-15 Mid-Term Review.

---


\(^{16}\) Somalia was able to access Pillar II resources in late 2020 and Sudan is in the process to access resources in 2021.

1.3 Purpose, Objectives, Scope and Expected Outcomes

22. The main purpose of the evaluation is to deeply examine the TSF and generate lessons which feed into future Bank planning, programming and strategic frameworks. It will evaluate the TSF holistically as a core instrument in the Bank’s toolbox of addressing fragility, and in particular, it will determine the relevance, responsiveness, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and coherence of the TSF instrument.

23. The evaluation will limit its scope to TSF activities over the 2014-2019 period. This period allows the evaluation to cover the two most recent completed ADF funding cycles (ADF-13 and ADF-14), and the implementation period of the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa and for the TSF itself, which was approved in January 2015. Previous work by IDEV evaluated the 2014-2019 Strategy in its entirety: the present evaluation limits its scope to the TSF instrument and dives deeper into TSF-specific activities. At the same time, it is mindful of the recent Internal Audit exercise which addressed the operational aspects of the TSF and will endeavour to avoid any duplication in this regard.

24. Embedded in the overall aim, there are five objectives. These align with the detailed evaluation questions presented in Section Error! Reference source not found.. The five objectives include:

   a. To assess the extent to which the Transition Support Facility is relevant and responsive to the specific and changing needs of RMCs and regions in fragile situations;
   b. To assess the extent to which TSF operations under the three pillars have been effective in addressing fragility and building resilience;
   c. To assess how efficiently and coherently TSF-funded operations have been managed and delivered;
   d. To assess the extent to which the results generated by TSF funded operations may be considered to be sustainable;
   e. To identify the lessons which may be learned to ensure the Bank optimises its use of TSF to help RMCs and regions in fragile situations.

25. The expected outcome of the evaluation is to generate findings which feed into future Bank operational and strategic frameworks. The goal of the TSF evaluation is to provide the Board and Management of the AfDB (the main target audience), as well as ADF Deputies, with timely and relevant evidence on the TSF to help shape its successful implementation going forward, to address the Facility’s responsiveness to the drivers of fragility, and to strengthen sources of resilience in TSF-funded countries. Moreover, the findings will inform the ongoing development of the new Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa which is planned to be submitted to the Board for approval during the fourth quarter of 2021, as well as the ongoing ADF resource allocation review (including TSF and the PBA) under the ADF-16 Working Group and the ADF-15 Mid-Term Review. The evaluation will therefore include a retrospective aspect as well as an explicitly forward-looking dimension.
2. Overview of TSF-Financed Activities 2014-2019

26. During the review period 2014-2019, TSF allocation has evolved. Changes have been especially noteworthy with respect to Pillar I and Pillar III. As such, the portfolio analysis presented in this section mainly covers the evolution and the distribution of TSF allocations under Pillar I and Pillar III of ADF 13 and ADF 14 cycles. With respect to Pillar II, an overall amount of UA 392.29 million was made available to TSF countries under ADF-13 for the clearance of payment arrears. The countries eligible under ADF-13 were Zimbabwe, Somalia and Sudan. However, at the end of this cycle none of these countries met the criteria to be able to benefit from these resources. The total allocation was carried over to ADF-14 with additional funding of UA 20 million. During ADF14, the only use of the Pillar II resources has been a UA 89 million allocation to Somalia, transferred via Pillar I. The remaining resources were rolled over to ADF-15.

27. Increased resources to the TSF have mainly been channelled to Pillar I (Figure 4). Resources allocated under Pillar III of the TSF barely increased from 64.56 million UA during ADF-13 to 64.62 million UA during ADF-14, representing a 0.18 percent increase in resources. In contrast, there was a 27 percent increase in the resources allocated under Pillar I between ADF-13 and ADF-14, increasing from 590.88 million UA to 750.61 million UA. The difference in resource allocation increments between Pillar I and Pillar III for the two cycles is partly explained by additional resources leveraged under Pillar I during ADF-14. Pillar I received 30.47 million UA of resources from Italy and the UK Department for International Development (DFID) as well as 89 million UA transferred from Pillar II, approximately 12 percent of the overall allocation.

Figure 4: Total allocations under Pillar I and III during ADF-13 and ADF-14

![Graph showing resource allocation under Pillar I and III]

Source: RDTS Data, 2021.

28. Overall, the additional donor contributions represent a small share of the total resources allocated under Pillar I over the ADF-14 cycle (Figure 5). Italy’s contribution represented one percent of the total resources, while assistance from DFID represented around three percent. An amount of UA89 million was added to Pillar I from Pillar II, approximately 12 percent of the overall allocation.

---

18 The data used is provided by the Transition States Coordination Office (RDTS).
During ADF-13, the only additional resources came from the ADF-12 carryover. This contributed three percent of all resources and was allocated to Somalia in its entirety.

**Figure 5: Pillar I resources over ADF13 and ADF14**

29. **A total number of 21 countries and six institutions have benefitted from Pillar I and Pillar III resources during the two cycles.** Under Pillar I of the ADF-13 cycle, the top five countries funded were Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Sudan, Madagascar and Mali, which each received around 10.15 percent of total approvals (Annex 2). The dynamics have changed during the ADF-14 cycle, with the top five countries being Somalia (15.7 percent), Mali (8.15 percent), Niger (8.1 percent), Chad (8 percent), and the Democratic Republic of Congo (8 percent). These changes suggest that using Pillar I, the TSF has adapted its support to target changing environments and countries’ fragile situations. The top five countries that have received the highest shares of the total resources committed under Pillar III are Somalia (10.86 percent), Ethiopia (10.10 percent), Guinea (7.85 percent), Liberia (7.85 percent), and Sudan (7.85 percent), during ADF-13 and Zimbabwe (9.29 percent), Mozambique (7.74 percent), Sierra Leone (6.42 percent), Burundi (6.19 percent) and Somalia (3.33 percent) during ADF-14 (Annex 3).

30. **The unallocated resources under Pillar I increased over the period and were utilised to address emerging needs in various countries.** The share of unallocated Pillar I reserves increased from 10 percent under ADF-13 to 15 percent under ADF-14. Under ADF-13, these resources were allocated to Eritrea (9.2 percent), Guinea (43.32 percent), Liberia (2.08 percent), Sierra Leone (2.08 percent) and Chad (43.08 percent). For ADF-14, the unallocated Pillar I reserves totalled UA 94.67 million (15 percent of Pillar I). For ADF-14, reserves were divided between Eritrea (15.84 percent), The Gambia (15.84 percent), Guinea (15.84 percent), Zimbabwe (7.39 percent), Somalia (10.56 percent), Mozambique (23.24 percent), and South Sudan (10.56 percent) with less than one percent remaining as a reserve.

31. **The evolving use of the TSF is also observed in the regions covered during the two cycles.** During both ADF-13 and ADF-14 cycles, projects funded under Pillar I covered four regions. During ADF-13, the West region received most of the funding (39 percent), followed by the East region with (29 percent) and the Central region (25 percent). Only seven percent went to the South region under ADF-13. During
ADF-I4, the East region had the highest share of approval (35 percent), followed by the West region (32 percent), the Central region (26 percent) and the Southern region with again only seven percent.

**Figure 6: Shares of Pillar I approvals by region**

![Pie charts showing regional approval shares for Pillar I ADF-I3 and ADF-I4.]

*Source: RDTS Data, 2021.*

**Figure 7: Sector of activities under Pillar I during ADF-I3 and ADF-I4 cycles**

![Bar charts showing sectoral distribution for Pillar I ADF-I3 and ADF-I4.]

*Source: RDTS Data, 2021.*

32. **Figure 7 shows the sectors of activities of the projects funded under Pillar I during the two cycles.** During ADF-I3, the funding covered five key sectors - transport, water and sanitation, power, social, agriculture. The multi-sector projects included eight sectors - transport, water and sanitation, power, social, agriculture, finance, environment, governance. The top three sectors covered during the ADF-I3 cycle were the transport sector (14 percent), the power sector (16.1 percent), and the agricultural sector (12.7 percent), with multi-sector projects representing 34.3 percent. During the ADF-I4 cycle, the transport sector...
sector gained more traction with 27 percent, followed by the agricultural sector (15.3 percent) and the social sector (15 percent).

33. Thus, the TSF has evolved and allocations between ADF-13 and ADF-14 have changed across countries, sub-regions and sectors. This evolution demonstrates that the fund can adapt to changing priorities and showcases the alignment of the TSF with the Bank’s strategies. Notably, changes at the sector level align with the Ten-Year Strategy and the High 5s, which emphasize the importance of the agricultural sector, the transport sector, the energy sector, and the lives of people on the continent (social). The responsiveness and targeting of the TSF will be further addressed as part of the evaluation exercise.
3. Key Themes Emerging from Preliminary Document Analysis and Scoping Interviews

34. Preliminary document analysis and interviews with Bank staff highlighted five overarching themes. These themes will be examined in detail in the evaluation itself alongside other key issues, all of which are incorporated into the Evaluation Questions presented in Section 4. A list of documents reviewed can be found in the reference list and a list of the interviews undertaken in the Inception phase appears as Annex 4. These overarching themes are presented here to give a flavour of the issues to be addressed in the evaluation. They include:

a. The scale and allocation of TSF resources;
b. Selectivity versus flexibility of the TSF instrument;
c. Targeting and relative effectiveness of TSF resources;
d. Issues related to efficiency; and

e. Coordination and coherence of the TSF instrument.

3.1 Scale and Allocation of TSF Resources

35. The TSF has been regarded as a key source of funding to countries in transition. TSF funding accounted for 26 percent of total resources allocated to Transition States during the 2014-2019 period, making it the second largest financing instrument to Transition States after the PBA allocations.19 TSF funding increased from UA661.77 million under ADF-13, to UA711.15 million under ADF-14 and UA899.06 under ADF-15. Pillar I, in particular saw a boost as allocations to transition countries through the Pillar I increased by almost 250 percent between ADF-11 and ADF-14.20 From interview data, the TSF was perceived by most respondents as a crucial source for funding projects in transition countries. For example, staff noted that over 50 percent of the Bank’s funding to the Central African Republic (CAR) and close to 80% for the South Sudan comes from the TSF.21

36. Despite its importance, available TSF resources do not seem to be adequate and evidence suggests that demand from target countries is still unmet. All respondents interviewed during the Inception phase noted that resources were inadequate, being reported to amount to approximately one twelfth (1/12) of the resources allocated by the World Bank’s IDA window to address fragility. AfDB regional and country staff noted in particular the limitations in funding with respect to Pillar III, where the country cap on allocations is considered grossly insufficient in relation to capacity building needs. Moreover, the maximum 3-year time period for Pillar 3 projects, combined with the changing thematic focus in each cycle are reported to be major constraints in providing sustained, long-term support to capacity building.

---

20 Discussion Paper: Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience: Progress and Next Steps – October 2018;
21 Interviews 5 & 7, 27th and 28th January 2021.
operations under Pillar III. Compared to Pillar III, resources allocated to Pillar I were nine times higher under ADF-13 and 11 times higher under ADF-14 – see Figure 4.

37. **Pillar III funding is in high demand, but accounts for a small share of total TSF allocation.** Of the UA$99.06 million allocation to the TSF under the ADF-15 cycle, only 12 percent was allotted to Pillar III. A similar pattern can be observed for allocations under ADF-13 (total of UA$ 661.77 million) and ADF-14 (UA$ 711.15 million), with only 9 percent and 8 percent being allocated to Pillar III respectively. Not surprisingly, demand for financing via Pillar III was generally higher than available resources. For instance, in the case of the Central African Republic, the proposals the Bank receives following an annual competitive Call-for-Proposals repeatedly outnumber by far the available resources. Bank staff also stressed that they were not able to respond to all of the proposals in a commensurate manner.

38. **Pillar II accounts for a larger share, but again, demand exceeds resources available.** Resources to Pillar II remained unchanged for ADF-15, with non-disbursed allocations of UA$412.29 million being carried over from ADF-14. Interviewees mentioned that the resources to Pillar II would currently not be sufficient to finance arrears clearance for Sudan and Zimbabwe. Resources are allocated on a first-come-first serve basis. This means that if all arrears for Sudan were to be cleared, there would not be sufficient funds remaining to clear arrears in Zimbabwe.

39. **Country-level allocations under Pillar I are linked to the PBA allocation formula, which drives the division of resources among TSF countries, meaning that allocations are only partly targeted by fragility measures.** According to documents and interviews, donors who fund the Bank prefer Bank instruments (including the TSF) to be closely linked to performance-based measures. The implication is that any revision of the formula for PBAs may require change in the allocation of TSF funding among eligible countries. A study conducted by FERDI in 2018, recommended a revision of the PBA formula (and therefore allocations under Pillar I) in order to address fragility not only in a “curative” way, but also in a “preventative” way. More specifically, the report suggested that indicators of structural fragility be incorporated into the PBA allocation formula. However, it should be noted that the past allocation formula through the PCEF did not succeed in allocating sufficient resources to fragile states via the PBA allocation.

---

22 Interview 7, 28 January 2021.


24 Three countries were identified as being eligible for arrears clearance - Somalia, Sudan, and Zimbabwe. For Somalia arrears clearance was successfully financed, whereas Sudan and Zimbabwe had not in 2020 fulfilled the necessary conditions to access funding via Pillar II (FIRM 2020). The necessary conditions have now been fulfilled in Sudan and the Pillar II allocation under ADF-15 is expected to be disbursed in 2021 as a part of a package to clear arrears.

25 Interview 6, 28 January 2021.

26 Interview 3, 26 January 2021.

27 Interview 3, 26 January 2021, Interview 8, 29 January 2021; Interview 9, 1 February, 2021.

28 The recommendations by FERDI were not directly adopted in the ADF-15 allocation (FIRM 2020). However, an ADF-16 working group is currently working on revising the PBA formula (AIDB 2020).
Moreover, if a revised PBA formula does manage to allocate sufficient resources to transition states, then the question can also be posed whether a supplemental financing window remains necessary.

40. **Given the relatively modest scale of the TSF, the question of additional “leveraged” resources becomes important.** Some funders have provided additional resources to countries in fragile situations via the TSF. For example, between 2014 and 2019, the TSF mobilised additional resources from DFID (UA 23.6 million) and Italy (UA 7.3 million). However as noted in Section 2, Italy’s contribution represented one percent of the total resources, while assistance from DFID represented around three percent. Co-financing options with other donors, such as the World Bank, are usually only project-specific, and generally involve parallel financing rather than any direct transfer to the TSF. The scale of resources directly leveraged through the TSF therefore appears to be modest.

### 3.2 Selectivity versus Flexibility of the TSF

41. Both interviews and document analysis highlight a tension between the flexibility and focus of the TSF instrument and its respective selection criteria. TSF eligibility is mainly driven by the harmonized Multilateral Development Banks’ (MDB) list of fragile situations. In addition to this, a case-by-case eligibility assessment is done to determine if a country is eligible for Pillar I and Pillar III funding. Eligibility is determined by exposure to sudden events and changing circumstances which can lead to a deterioration in security, political stability, state institutions, governance, or economic performance. In addition, a country could be made eligible for Pillar III funding, though it may not be eligible for Pillar I funding, based on decisions by the Board of Directors – for example Djibouti under ADF-15. Such detailed eligibility criteria and selection may imply there is limited flexibility to respond to emerging fragility issues in non-TSF funded RMCs. The 2020 Independent Evaluation of 2014-2019 Strategy for Addressing Fragility noted that the eligibility for funding has been rigid and not flexible enough to address fragility as a phenomenon that can affect non-transition countries, either through problems of security or fragility in specific areas within non-transition countries or through cross border issues such as displacement.

42. The majority of interviewees agreed that fragility should be regarded as a structural rather than a temporary issue, but others stressed the importance of emerging ‘situations of fragility’. The contrasting views have implications for the use of TSF resources. A focus on structural issues would require the TSF to target deep-rooted structural weaknesses in transition countries that hold back development, rather than more temporary manifestations of fragility. This is essentially the rationale behind......
the existing classification of transition countries. On the other hand, others stress that the TSF should be flexible enough to address emerging situations of fragility and “pockets of fragility” in countries that are not currently classified as transition countries - to permit interventions to address temporary fragility due to issues such as internal displacement, such as in Burkina Faso. Related to this, fragility can also be viewed as a regional phenomenon in which the transition of a country out of fragility (or its resilience in avoiding slipping into fragility) may depend significantly on neighbouring countries and possible spill-overs that may be stabilising or destabilising.

43. Pillar III funding is both praised and criticised for its flexibility, while Pillar I is regarded as potentially being too closely linked to the PBA.s. Funding for projects under Pillar III follows an annual competitive Call-for-Proposals. RDTS launches the call in the first quarter of each year, making available around one third of resources for the funding cycle. Regional and Sector Departments are eligible to submit proposals with priority for thematic areas that are determined during the call (ibid.) The exact approval and procedures vary depending on the level of funding. Some interviewees mentioned that funding for Pillar III has not been targeted enough and that there is a need for some form of screening such as a capacity needs assessment in order to better focus support. On the other hand, others opined that the flexibility of Pillar III is precisely what is needed in countries in transition. Pillar I funding was considered as being very closely linked to the PBA (and thus essentially a top-up to the PBA allocations), thus limiting the extent to which resources in this pot could be easily reallocated.

44. The selectivity vs flexibility tension is recognised within the Bank and the new Bank Strategy to address fragility aims to find coherence between these issues. According to the Concept Note which presented early discussions on the Strategy, the new Strategy will aim at “optimising effectiveness through selectivity, and enabling greater flexibility for increased responsiveness.” Greater flexibility should enable the bank to respond to changing needs as well as to prevent a country from transitioning into a situation of fragility in the first place. At the same time, the new Strategy will stress that responsiveness and flexibility should not be achieved at the expense of selectivity (ibid.). While the Bank has shown some flexibility in its programming in the past – for example with the unallocated reserve under the TSF - the Concept Note recognises that the Bank’s interventions could be more focused (ibid.).

34 Interview1, Multiple dates.
35 Interview1, Multiple dates; Interview 2, 25 January 2021.
37 The Fragile States Facility (FSF), Guidelines on Administration of the Technical Assistance and Capacity Building (TCB) Program of Pillar III Operations” – OSFU, May 2010
3.3 Targeting and Relative Effectiveness of TSF Resources

45. **Initial assessments indicate that projects in transition countries perform worse than those in non-transition countries.** A comparative analysis based on Project Completion Reports between 2014-2019 showed that projects in Transition States performed worse than projects in non-fragile ADF countries in terms of effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Clearly, the defining features of fragility – notably, weak governance and institutions, limited human resources and precarious security situations – will themselves impact upon the effectiveness of development projects. However, the interviews and document analysis raised a number of potential reasons for limited effectiveness, linked to issues of TSF programming, design and implementation. Regarding Pillar III, one interviewee critically noted that funding was only available via a short time frame, potentially limiting the effectiveness and sustainability of impacts. The lack of beneficiary ownership of the operations was also highlighted as another critical factor compromising long-term effectiveness and success of the TSF in relation to the 2014-2019 Bank Strategy. It can also be argued that the ability to effectively address some sources of fragility may be limited by the need to work with central governments, rather than the affected regions themselves. Issues with effectiveness may also be amplified by difficulties in getting “mainstream” service providers and staff to work in extremely fragile contexts, such as the north of Mali or the eastern regions of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). In such cases, other innovative strategies such as community-driven approaches may be needed.

46. **Targeting and effectiveness are also directly related to how fragility is assessed, defined and monitored.** The assessment and subsequent categorisation of Transition States has mostly been driven by CPIA measures. The 2018 FERDI report argues that this may miss some types of vulnerabilities. Moreover, as noted above, the issue of flexibility and responsiveness was raised in various interviews and documents. This relates to the Bank’s ability to effectively monitor changing fragility, and by extension the effectiveness of the TSF. This was named as an area for improvement in the 2020 Independent Evaluation of the 2014-2019 Strategy, which noted the lack of a coherent monitoring framework of sources and situations of fragility. This can be addressed by better mainstreaming the use of the Country Resilience and Fragility Assessment (CRFA) tool, which is a current objective of the Bank. According to the Bank’s Operational Guidelines, in-depth Fragility and Resilience Assessments (FRA) are only conducted for category 1 countries for which fragility is considered a crucial development challenge. In 2018, the Bank adopted the CRFA tool...
as “an innovative analytical, knowledge and policy dialogue tool designed to deepen understanding of the capacities and pressures underpinning fragile and conflict-affected situations.” 49 (AfDB 2020). The tool aims at mainstreaming fragility assessments across all ADF countries, and not only countries classified as Transition States. This type of monitoring of fragility through the CRFAs would also lay the foundation to better focus operations on strengthening resilience. 50.

47. Assessing and monitoring sources and situations of fragility is one of the core responsibilities of the RDTS, but there are mixed views on the effectiveness of this function. Some expressed concerns about the capability of RDTS to champion the fragility lens across the Bank and its operations, specifically with respect to training operational staff on mainstreaming and monitoring sources and changes in fragility. 51 Organisational capability may have been influenced by the downgrading of ORTS (a department) to RDTS (a coordination office) under the new DBDM, and the subsequent 30 percent decrease in professional staff from 23 to 16 staff members. 52 To address fragility as a more cross-cutting issue – similar to issues like gender and climate change – some reflection on the position of RDTS within the Bank’s hierarchy may also be needed. According to one respondent, 53 a coordination unit operating from the President’s Office might have more authority to mainstream fragility. Recent IDEV evaluations of safeguards, gender and green growth & climate change have also recommended to place responsibility for such cross-cutting issues at the highest level within the organization, in order to build ownership, responsibility, coordination and accountability across the Bank. Other respondents also noted that RDTS does not have sufficient control over the use and disbursement of the TSF, 54 so there may also be a gap to be addressed between the processes for assessment and monitoring of fragility and the targeting of disbursements.

3.4 Issues Related to Efficiency

48. Countries with a Bank office might be more efficient in addressing sources of fragility via the TSF 55. The number of country offices in Transition States increased from 13 in 2015 to 15 in 2019, and professional level staff increased by 12 percent in Transition States from 82 in 2015 to 92 in 2019. 56 The Bank has the objective of managing at least 50 percent of its portfolio from Country Offices by the end of 2019. Such a shift may be beneficial to the TSF as local presence of Bank staff is commonly associated with

---

51 Interview 5, 27 January 2021; Interview 8, 29 January 2021.
53 Interview 3, 26 January 2021.
55 The CEDR (2016) found that the Bank performed better in countries where it has an office.
an increased agility and effectiveness of responses to requests by stakeholders. A local presence can also enable the Bank to engage more actively in a dialogue at the political level, providing it with a better understanding of the real drivers of fragility.

49. **The presence of fragility experts on the ground may improve the Bank’s ability to address and prevent sources of fragility.** Interview data suggest that a fragility expert can play a crucial role in providing key inputs in preparing fragility assessments and country strategy papers. In the absence of fragility experts, the identification of sources of fragility and actions to address them are mainly made by country economists and managers, who might not be sufficiently trained to perform these assessments. Some potential sources of fragility might therefore not be addressed without the contribution of a fragility expert. Some countries currently either have a local fragility expert or a fragility expert in the corresponding regional office. However, the Bank aims at hiring 10 additional fragility specialists to be located in country offices in transition states, or nearby, by the end of ADF-15 with the idea that they “will support operations, deepen country knowledge, and enhance ability to engage in continuous policy discussions with governmental and other partners.”

50. **Efficiency and effectiveness of the TSF might be compromised by insufficient communication.** Although the TSF was regarded as a core source of funding for countries in transition, not all Bank staff and potential beneficiaries are sufficiently aware of it, especially some operational staff on the ground. One contributing factor to this might be a lack of communication and coordination at the central level. For instance, the Strategy evaluation reports that there is no centralised archiving mechanism for Fragility and Resilience Assessments (FRA), thus limiting access to information, particularly for country team members, and especially those working at sector level. In terms of communication challenges within the Bank, the Independent Evaluation of the Implementation of the Development and Business Delivery Model (DBDM), cites anecdotal evidence of poor communication and coordination, which include missions from headquarters not informing ROs and COs, or the initiation of sector operations by headquarters staff in countries or sectors that were not included in the Country Strategy Paper (CSP). As such, there is a need for continued and sustained communication across all levels of the organisation (ibid.).

---

58 Interview 7, 28 January 2021.
60 Interview 5, 27 January 2021.
62 Interview1, Multiple dates; 3, 26 January 2021; Interview 5, 27 January 2021.
3.5 Coordination and Coherence

51. The coordination of the TSF with other instruments of the Bank is an issue that will need to be examined. There is little understanding on the extent to which the TSF complements and interacts with other Bank instruments. It was noted that PBA funding is mainly used for projects, and TSF Pillar I allocations may be used to “top up” these PBA project allocations; at the same time, it is reported that TSF Pillar I funding is increasingly used for budget support. Neither interviews nor documents reviewed thus far provided guidance on the procedures and systems by which to ensure complementarity of other ADF financing instruments to the TSF as a whole. Although this function should be performed by the CSP for each country, interviewees stressed the need for better coordination between the TSF and other instruments.

52. There is also the need to examine how the TSF functions alongside instruments by other donors. Since the Bank established the TSF, many other multilateral donor institutions have launched instruments targeting countries in situations of fragility. Arguably, the efforts of various donors, including the Bank, should be complementary for the benefit of recipient countries. There could also be lessons from the approaches of other donors operating in TSF-funded countries which could be learned and adapted by the Bank, if deemed useful. For example, the European Union has established an adequate set of procedures to allow for the financing of infrastructure projects in the eastern DRC, an area of extreme fragility in which the Bank has struggled to identify feasible projects. More generally, the World Bank recently set out its approach to fragility, conflict and violence for IDA 19. The World Bank’s approach comprises four pillars of fragility. This includes a separate pillar on regional spill-overs, while other pillars differentiate between “preventive” and “curative” measures. Given the frequent references to regional spill-overs and issues related to displacement in interviews and documents reviewed, the World Bank approach may potentially serve as a useful case to explore.

---

65 Interview 3, 26 January 2021.
66 Interview 4, 26 January 2021.
67 Interview 6, 28 January 2021; Interview 4, 26 January 2021.
4. Methodological Approach, Theory of Change, Evaluation Questions and Sources of Evidence

4.1 Overall Goal and Approach

53. The goal of this evaluation is to provide the Board and Management of the Bank and ADF Deputies with timely, relevant evidence on the performance of the TSF so as to help shape an improved approach to its implementation, and thus address more effectively the drivers of fragility while building on sources of resilience. The evaluation will be primarily summative – assessing the ‘sum’ of the TSF outputs and outcomes to date and making a judgement on its efficacy, but it will also have a strong formative or forward-looking dimension, providing a synthesis of the lessons that may be learned from TSF implementation to date and developing specific recommendations to improve the design, programming and implementation of the TSF. In particular, as previously noted, the evaluation is expected to inform the ongoing development of the Bank Group’s new Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience in Africa, planned to be submitted to the Board for approval in the 4th Quarter of 2021, the ADF-15 Mid-Term Review due to take place in November 2021, and the ADF-16 replenishment discussions planned for 2022.

54. The evaluation will be conducted as a collaborative effort led by IDEV, supported by a senior evaluator and two experienced researchers from Fiscus\(^70\), with case study information also collected by six consultants resident in the chosen case study countries. Table 2 below clearly indicates the types of information to be collected during the evaluation and the identified sources of this information.

55. The evaluation will involve five phases spread over January to first quarter of 2022:

- **The Inception Phase (January – June)** to produce the Inception Report, for which the Fiscus team will have primary responsibility, drawing on discussions with IDEV, interviews with key informants and analysis of the main background documents.

- **Data collection and analysis (April to July)**, in which data will be compiled and analysed from the ten sources of information described below.

- **Synthesis Phase (July to September)**: produce Technical Report, which will be discussed and reviewed at a validation workshop with ERG in Abidjan in September.

- **Possible presentation to ADF-15 Mid-term Review (November)**; a presentation can be prepared and shared with CODE and subsequently presented at the ADF-15 MTR in November (to be confirmed after Technical Report).


- **Presentation of evaluation and Management Response to CODE in Q1 2022.**

- **Communication and dissemination of evaluation results (Q1 2022).** Evaluations results will be disseminated by IDEV in a variety of formats and venues, for example at the first meeting of the ADF-16 replenishment.

---

\(^{70}\) Andrew Lawson, Jamelia Harris and Stefanie Heerwig. Further details on the management of the evaluation are presented in Section 5.
4.2 Theory of Change

56. **The evaluation is designed to ensure that any findings and recommendations are based on a strong foundation of evidence.** It is theory-based and, as such, its starting point is the Theory of Change outlined below. This has been newly developed from an analysis of the documentation outlining the objectives and strategy of the TSF, as well as from discussions with key resource persons within the Bank.

57. **The Theory of Change seeks to illustrate in visual form the objectives and strategy underlying the design of the TSF and its complementarity to the PBA allocations to transition states** (Figure 8). It postulates a series of cause-effect linkages between TSF inputs and subsequent outputs and outcomes. These postulated linkages illustrate the evaluators’ understanding of how it is intended that the TSF should generate results under certain reasonable assumptions.

58. As formulated here, the Theory of Change (ToC) for the TSF instrument includes five levels:

   a. **Inputs** constitute the measures undertaken and the resources made available by the Bank in order to achieve the objectives of the TSF. (Those Inputs which are not shaded do not comprise Inputs of the TSF instrument itself but rather of the wider Strategy.)

   b. **Direct Outputs** comprise the immediate products generated by the Bank with the TSF inputs; they are described as “direct” because they are internal to the Bank and require no significant supporting actions by the TSF beneficiary countries or regions. (Again, those not shaded do not comprise Direct Outputs of the TSF instrument itself but rather of the wider Strategy.)

   c. **Intermediate outcomes** are the products generated by the TSF beneficiary governments as a consequence of the TSF. At this level, there is an interaction between the TSF interventions and the governments and public service structures of the beneficiary countries and regions: TSF projects “induce” positive changes, in terms of increased public investments of different kinds and an enhanced institutional framework.

   d. **Outcomes** represent the results of the investments and improvements in institutional capabilities achieved by the government; they are the consequence of the “demand” response of economic agents and society to the improved “supply” of institutional systems and goods and services provided by the government. The ToC postulates that these outcomes would be manifested in the enhanced resilience and reduced vulnerability of TSF beneficiary countries and regions.

   e. **Development impacts** represent the final consequences of these improved outcomes. At this level, the effects of the TSF instrument are interacting with a wide range of economic, social and other factors; hence, the underlying assumptions of the Theory of Change (continued peace and security, favourable economic conditions, etc.) assume greater importance.

---

71. The Inputs and Direct Outputs which are not shaded do not comprise Inputs and Direct Outputs of the TSF instrument itself but rather of the wider Strategy. As such, they are not formally part of this evaluation but are clearly important elements in the Theory of Change, and the evaluation may well generate certain lessons relating to the design and delivery of these elements of the wider Transition/Fragility Strategy.
Figure 8: Theory of Change for the TSF Instrument and Strategy

**Inputs**
- **Transition Support Facility:**
  - Pillar I: Access to supplementary resources to top-up PBA allocations
  - Pillar II: Access to Arrears Clearance
  - Pillar III: Financing for capacity building & TA
  - Unallocated reserves for Pillar I

**Direct Outputs**
- Increased, more flexible, rapid & responsive funding targeted to Transition States:
  - TSF allocations through Pillars I, II and III;
  - Flexibility to respond to needs through TSF Pillar I unallocated reserves;
  - Synergies with PBA and regional allocations to leverage additional funds for TSF countries

**Induced outputs/Intermediate outcomes**
- Organisational capacity to address fragility:
  - Bank ownership of TSF instrument & objectives
  - Improved Bank internal organisation;
  - Increased staff incentives and capability to address needs of Transition States
- Enhanced AfDB convening role:
  - Sensitisation with RMCs, Devpt. Partners and Private Sector in support of Transition Strategy
  - External communications

**Outcomes**
- Development impacts in Transition States:
  - Economic growth and poverty reduction;
  - Sustained improvements in social welfare
  - Lasting peace with effective law & order
  - Improved adaptation to climate change and environmental hazards
- Enhanced Resilience and reduced Vulnerability in Transition States:
  - Strengthened State capacity and enhanced effectiveness of institutions;
  - Inclusive and equitable access to employment, basic services and shared benefits from natural resource endowments;
  - Increased citizen confidence & trust in Legal & Democratic framework
  - Normalised relations with international community and access to debt relief

**Commitment by beneficiary countries to use TSF instrument to address fragility**
- Sufficient stability in TSF countries, with respect to Peace & Security, and Democratic processes
- Conductive international economic environment for TSF countries
4.3 Evaluation Questions

59. The evaluation will address five questions which collectively seek to assess how effectively the transmission mechanisms underlying the Theory of Change (ToC) have operated in practice. The five Evaluation Questions (EQs) are detailed in Table 2 below, which also presents Judgement Criteria (JC), some potential indicators and Sources of Evidence. They assess the following criteria:

- **The Relevance of the TSF** to provide additional funding and operational flexibility in RMCs and regions in fragile situations. This EQ considers the scale of TSF funding, the continuing appropriateness of its targeting, the extent to which it has contributed to leveraging increased funding for fragility needs, the flexibility, rapidity and responsiveness of the TSF, and the extent to which there is a sense of ownership over the TSF instrument by Bank operational staff and RMC officials.

- **The effectiveness of the TSF operations under its three Pillars**, assessing indicators of the TSF Induced Outputs and Outcomes identified in the ToC, and the evidence of a contribution by the TSF to the achievement of these Induced Outputs and Outcomes.

- **The efficiency and coherence of TSF funded operations**, considering disbursement rates, perceptions of the level of transaction costs involved in TSF implementation, and coherence across the 3 Pillars and with other bank instruments, with respect to consistency of objectives, complementarity and appropriate sequencing.

- **The sustainability or potential sustainability of Induced Outputs and Outcomes**, considering where there is evidence of induced outputs and outcomes being sustained over time, where there is evidence of high potential for sustainability due to improvements in revenue generation and/or in the administrative capabilities of beneficiary countries, and how far Bank procedures promote and protect the sustainability of results.

- **The lessons that may be learned so as to improve the design, programming and implementation of the TSF**, specifically considering for each Evaluation Question which “enabling factors” or “blocking factors” may be identified and what may be done to enhance the former, while eliminating or minimising the latter. It is these ‘lessons learned’ that will provide the basis for recommendations on the future design, programming and implementation of the TSF instrument.

---

72 For each EQ, there are 3-6 sub-questions, which together allow a response to the EQ to be formulated. For each sub-question, there is one Judgement Criterion (JC) which provides the basis for giving a favourable answer to the sub-question. For each JC, a (non-exhaustive) list of potential indicators has been identified, which are denoted with a tick. Most indicators have several sources of information; for this reason, they have not been directly linked in the table.

73 Targeting of resource allocation is guided by the definition of the strategic priority areas of the 2014 Strategy for Addressing Fragility and Building Resilience but it will be important to examine whether that has continued to serve as an adequate basis for targeting resource allocations in the light of the changing needs of RMCs in fragile situations.

74 Many programmes in TSF-eligible countries do not rely on TSF funding alone. Often, the TSF Pillar I allocations provide supplemental financing on top of PBA resources to close financing gaps, supporting programmes to build long term resilience. Thus, Outputs and Outcomes may be co-financed with PBA allocations and not exclusively TSF financed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Sub Questions</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria and Potential Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ. 1: To what extent is the Transition Support Facility relevant to provide additional funding and operational flexibility in RMCs and regions in fragile situations?</td>
<td>1a) Is the scale of TSF funding alongside PBA allocations sufficient to make a significant difference?</td>
<td>▪ (1a &amp; b) Portfolio data show that the scale of TSF funding is relevant and its allocation across TSF beneficiary countries is well targeted: ✓ TSF has increased over time in real terms and as % of ADF allocations ✓ TSF compares favourably to allocations by other multilaterals ✓ TSF represents 3% or more of public spending in TSF countries ✓ TSF allocations across countries illustrate a degree of correlation to fragility indicators, taking account also of performance indicators.</td>
<td>▪ TSF Portfolio Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b) Is TSF funding appropriately targeted to the RMCs and regions in fragile situations?</td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Comparative institutional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1c) Have TSF Eligibility criteria evolved so as to remain relevant to the changing needs of RMCs and regions in fragility?</td>
<td>▪ (1c) TSF Eligibility criteria have evolved over ADF 13 &amp; 14 so as to remain relevant to the changing needs of RMCs and regions in fragility: ✓ Changes in TSF eligibility criteria over ADF 13 &amp; 14 have occurred in response to changes in the understanding and measurement of fragility ✓ TSF eligibility criteria compare favourably to the equivalent eligibility criteria used by other multilateral development agencies ✓ TSF eligibility criteria include sufficient flexibility to be allocated to ‘pockets of fragility’ in non-TSF eligible countries. ✓ Bank staff consider the eligibility criteria to be relevant and sufficiently adapted to changing needs.</td>
<td>▪ Cross-referring of TSF Portfolio Review with TSF Country Data-base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1d) Has the instrument directly or through leverage significantly increased funding for fragility needs and can an upward trend in leverage be seen?</td>
<td>▪ (1d) Available evidence shows that significant additional funding has been leveraged for TSF beneficiary countries either through the TSF itself or through other channels ✓ Allocations to the TSF have been supplemented significantly during programming and implementation; ✓ The extent of leveraging into the TSF has grown over time. ✓ Allocations to TSF countries from other sources have increased ✓ Stakeholder testimonies suggest an important leverage/demonstration effect arising from the creation and operation of the TSF.</td>
<td>▪ Interviews with Bank staff and RMC Officials involved in programming and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1e) Is there adequate flexibility, rapidity and responsiveness built into the TSF funding and programming arrangements?</td>
<td>▪ (1e) Portfolio data, case studies and stakeholder interviews confirm that TSF funding and programming arrangements show high flexibility, rapidity and responsiveness: ✓ Greater flexibility, rapidity and responsiveness than is evidenced in other ADF instruments, including scope for use of TSF funds in ‘pockets of fragility’ not falling within designated TSF countries. ✓ Flexibility, rapidity and responsiveness compare favourably to reported procedures of other multilaterals</td>
<td>▪ E-Surveys of Bank staff, and Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Case studies of Pillar 2 operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Analysis of existing PPERS/PRA for Pillar 1 operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Newly completed PPAR case studies for Pillar 3 operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Questions

#### 1f) Is the TSF perceived by Bank operational staff and RMC officials to be relevant, and is this reflected in a sense of ownership?

- 
  ✓ A majority of in-country stakeholders attest to the flexibility, rapidity and responsiveness of the TSF instrument.
  - (1f) TSF is perceived as relevant by Bank operational staff and RMC officials and there is a strong sense of ownership over the instrument:
    ✓ Majority of Bank operational staff and RMC officials surveyed and/or interviewed assess TSF as relevant or highly relevant.
    ✓ Majority of Bank operational staff and RMC officials surveyed and/or interviewed confirm a strong or very strong sense of ownership of TSF.
    ✓ Case studies point to specific examples of in-country stakeholders influencing the programming and/or implementation of TSF.

#### EQ. 2: To what extent have TSF operations under the three pillars been effective in addressing fragility and building resilience?

#### 2a) Is there evidence of increased investment in RMCs and regions in fragile situations?

- 
  ✓ Private and Public investment in the RMCs and regions in fragile situations has increased in real terms since 2014.
  ✓ Country data on investment show increases in majority of TSF countries.
  ✓ In countries where investment has not increased, this is attributable to external factors outside of the influence of the TSF instrument.
  ✓ Case study information points to increased investment across multi-country, regional corridors affected by fragility.

#### 2b) Is there evidence of enhanced attention to institutional development in RMCs and regions in fragile situations?

- 
  ✓ Pillar 3 operations have raised AfDB funding to institutional development needs in RMCs and regions in fragile situations.
  ✓ Other multilaterals are also providing enhanced funding to institutional development issues in TSF countries.
  ✓ Country Case studies point to specific examples of collaborative, structured approaches to institutional development issues, involving partnerships with Governments, other donors and/or NGOs.

#### 2c) Is there evidence of enhanced resilience and reduced vulnerability in RMCs and regions in fragile situations?

- 
  ✓ Quantitative and qualitative data are indicative of trend improvements in resilience and reduced vulnerability in RMCs and regions in fragile situations:
    ✓ Data on debt vulnerability show trend improvements (including in countries benefiting from Pillar 2 allocations.)
    ✓ Trend improvements in Indicators of economic and social well-being, including indicators of gender inequality and income inequality;
    ✓ Trend improvements in governance indicators.

### Sources of Evidence

- TSF Country Data-base
- Analysis of existing PPERs/PRAAs for Pillar 1 operations
- Document review
- Newly completed PPAR case studies for Pillar 3 operations
- TSF Country Data-base
- Case studies of Pillar 2 operations
- Document Review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Evaluation Questions</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sub Questions</strong></th>
<th><strong>Judgement Criteria and Potential Indicators</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sources of Evidence</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2d) To what extent has the TSF contributed to these changes?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a) Has there been efficient disbursement of allocated funds under the 3 TSF pillars?</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3a) Disbursement rates under each pillar compare well with relevant benchmarks:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Disbursement rates have remained good and/ or have improved over time;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Disbursement rates compare well with other ADF instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Disbursement rates compare well with comparable instruments of other multilateral agencies, based on available reports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b) What is the perception of Bank staff and RMC officials in beneficiary countries regarding the transaction costs of designing and implementing TSF funded operations?</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3b) Transaction costs of designing and implementing operations under each Pillar indicate a good level of administrative efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Majority of Bank operational staff and RMC officials surveyed and/ or interviewed assess Transaction costs to be low or very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ TSF compares favourably with data and/or perceptions for transaction costs of equivalent instruments of other multilaterals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c) How coherent is the programming and management of TSF across the 3 Pillars and with other bank instruments, in terms of consistency of objectives, complementarity and sequencing?</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3c) Programming &amp; management processes for TSF operate so as to ensure consistency of objectives, complementarity and coherent sequencing across the three Pillars:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Documentary analysis, case studies and PPARs point to specific examples of procedures adopted to ensure coherence in TSF operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Majority of Bank operational staff and RMC officials surveyed and/ or interviewed assess coherence across Pillars to be high or very high.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ TSF compares favourably with documentation and/or perceptions of coherence of equivalent instruments of other multilaterals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Sub Questions</td>
<td>Judgement Criteria and Potential Indicators</td>
<td>Sources of Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ.4: To what extent may the results generated by TSF funded operations be considered sustainable?</td>
<td>3d) How does the efficiency and coherence of the TSF compare with comparable instruments of development institutions working in fragile situations in Africa?</td>
<td>(3d) Overall, the efficiency and coherence of the TSF compare well with comparable instruments of development institutions working in fragile situations in Africa.</td>
<td>Comparative institutional assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4a) Within TSF beneficiary countries, is there evidence of improvements in domestic revenues and institutional/administrative capabilities likely to enhance sustainability?</td>
<td>(4a) Domestic revenues and institutional/administrative capabilities in TSF countries have improved sufficiently to improve the likely sustainability of TSF results: ✓ Increase in domestic revenues as % GDP in majority of TSF countries ✓ Improvements in governance, CPIA and PEFA indicators ✓ Case study evidence of sustained improvements in institutional and administrative capabilities.</td>
<td>TSF Country Data-base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b) What evidence is there of achieved results of TSF operations at the output or outcome level being sustained over time?</td>
<td>(4b) Relevant indicators of results at the Output and Outcome levels have shown continued improvements after the close of the associated TSF operations.</td>
<td>Analysis of existing PPERs/PRAs for Pillar 1 operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4c) Do Bank procedures for the design and implementation of TSF operations under each Pillar give adequate attention to issues of sustainability (environmental, technical, financial, institutional)?</td>
<td>(4c) Bank procedures under each Pillar give adequate attention to issues of sustainability (environmental, technical, financial, institutional): ✓ Document analysis, Case studies and PPARs illustrate clear operational procedures for addressing the full range of sustainability issues, as well as evidence of the application of those procedures. ✓ These procedures compare favourably to those of other multilaterals with similar instruments. ✓ Majority of Bank operational staff and RMC officials surveyed and/or interviewed assess the attention to sustainability to be satisfactory or more than satisfactory.</td>
<td>Case studies of Pillar 2 operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQ.5: What lessons may be learned to ensure the Bank</td>
<td>5a) Is there evidence of specific “enabling and blocking factors” which have enhanced the relevance, efficiency, coherence, effectiveness and sustainability of TSF funded operations?</td>
<td>Interviews with Bank staff and RMC Officials involved in programming and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5a) “Enabling factors” which have enhanced the effectiveness of TSF funded operations have been identified through the analysis of the evaluation team in response to EQs 1-4.</td>
<td>E-Surveys of Bank staff and Board Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Competitive institutional assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Sub Questions</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria and Potential Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| optimises its use of TSF to help RMCs and regions in fragile situations? | 5b) Is there evidence of specific “blocking factors” which have hindered the relevance, efficiency, coherence, effectiveness and sustainability TSF funded operations?  
5c) How best might enabling factors be sustained and enhanced?  
5d) How best might blocking factors be eliminated or at least minimised? |  
▪ (5b) “Blocking factors” which have hindered the effectiveness of TSF funded operations have been identified through the analysis of the evaluation team in response to EQs 1-4.  
▪ (5 c & d) Relevant measures to sustain and enhance “enabling factors” and to eliminate or minimise “blocking factors” are identified and presented in the Evaluation Report:  
  ✓ Analysis underlying Evaluation Questions 1-4 helps to identify lessons learned and potential responses to those lessons.  
  ✓ Analysis and discussion within the evaluation team, supported by peer review processes and feedback during dissemination helps to refine the understanding of lessons learned and possible responses. | Reference Group of those responses. |
4.4 Main Sources of Evidence

60. **The evaluation will draw on multiple sources of information to identify findings and overall conclusions in respect of the five Evaluation Questions.** These will include secondary sources of quantitative data, documentary analyses and primary sources of qualitative data from interviews, an e-Survey and case studies. These data will be systematically organised, using appropriate classification and ranking systems, so as to permit a range of cross-tabulations and analyses; different sources of data will be triangulated in order to draw conclusions, and those conclusions will be validated by a Reference Group.

61. **The evaluation will draw evidence from nine separate sources, allowing for wide triangulation of all findings and conclusions.** The nine data gathering instruments or methods which will bring together information from these sources are presented in Table 2 below. They represent three different types of information, which will provide evidence by which to answer the Evaluation Questions:

- Reference documents, evaluation reports and existing secondary data;
- Qualitative primary data on the perceptions and opinions of key resource persons; and
- Case studies of TSF operations, drawing both on existing secondary data and new in-country research.

### Table 2: Overview of Proposed Sources of Evidence for TSF Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Type</th>
<th>Source of Evidence/ Data Gathering Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reference documents, evaluation reports and existing secondary data | (i) **TSF Document Review** – Relevant evaluations, internal audits, Bank Policy & Strategy Documents and documentation on TSF systems & procedures  
(ii) **TSF Portfolio Review** - Analysis of spending by TSF Pillar, Country, and Region under ADF 13 and 14  
(iii) **TSF Country Data Base** – compilation of key economic, social, fiscal and institutional indicators for TSF beneficiary countries, structured for easy cross-tabulation with Portfolio Review  
(iv) **Comparative Institutional Review** – analysis of practices of 3 comparable institutions (Asian Development Bank, IFAD and World Bank) for support to countries and regions in situations of fragility. |
| Qualitative Primary Data on Opinions & Perceptions of Key Resource Persons | (v) **Semi-structured interviews with Bank resource persons and RMC Officials** involved in design, management or evaluation of the TSF.  
(vi) **E-Survey of Bank Staff and Board Members**, working at headquarters regional and country levels with TSF. |
| Case Studies of TSF Operations | (vii) **Analysis of existing PPERs/PRAs for Pillar 1 Operations** – review of existing PPERs/PRAs against a standard assessment grid to score performance on Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability and identify potential Lessons Learned.  
(viii) **Case studies of Pillar 2 Operations** – review of documentation and interviews with task managers for Pillar 2 operations in Somalia and Sudan  
(ix) **New PPAR case studies for Pillar III Operations**, based on analysis of documentation and in-country interviews in 6 TSF beneficiary countries. |
We summarise below the primary purpose, technical approach and anticipated coverage of each of the data gathering instruments which comprise the sources of evidence for the evaluation. It should be noted that each of these may provide evidence to address several Evaluation Questions, as illustrated in Table 1 above; and by implication each is likely to contribute to the triangulation of findings. The design of these data gathering instruments is now complete and examples of the templates and other data gathering instruments are presented in annex:

a. **The TSF Document Review** has the primary purpose of providing an orientation framework for the evaluation, so that it may be based on a clear understanding of the objectives and operational procedures for the TSF, while also drawing on the key issues and themes emerging from past evaluations and assessments – such as those presented in Section 3 of this report. The Document Review will also serve to validate hypotheses emerging from other sources of evidence. It has been undertaken by the Fiscus team, based on a selection of relevant documents provided by IDEV. These have been examined utilising a simple matrix system to classify observations by issue/ theme. Coverage has included relevant evaluations (notably of the Bank Strategy for addressing fragility), the preliminary Bank internal audit report on the TSF, Bank policy & strategy documents, and documentation on TSF systems & procedures.

b. **The TSF Portfolio Review** is the second key element of the orientation framework for the evaluation. It provides an understanding of the TSF “population”, documenting the scale and coverage of spending by TSF Pillar, Country, and Region under ADF 13 and 14. It has been summarised in Section 2 of this Report, with further details provided in Annexes 2 and 3.

c. **The TSF Country Data Base** will provide a contextual framework against which to analyse country by country allocations under the TSF. It will compile the most relevant secondary data for the TSF beneficiary countries (key economic, social, fiscal and institutional indicators) within a database which will be structured for easy cross-tabulation with the TSF Portfolio Review. Annex 5 provides a list of the secondary data which have been assembled for the Country Data Base, together with the associated sources.

d. **The Comparative Institutional Review** will give a point of reference against which to compare the systems and procedures of the TSF and will thus facilitate the identification of potential lessons to inform future policies and procedures. It will present a summary analysis of the practices of 3 comparable multilateral institutions (Asian Development Bank, IFAD, and the World Bank) for providing support to countries and regions in situations of fragility.

e. **Semi-structured interviews with key Bank resource persons** will serve both as a source of initial hypotheses and issues to investigate through the evaluation, and also as a means to validate findings as they emerge from other sources of evidence. These semi-structured interviews will be focused on the 15-20 Bank staff, who by virtue of their experience or their position within the Bank management structure can speak most authoritatively about the design, management or performance of the TSF. Interviewees will be selected by IDEV.

f. **The E-Survey of Bank Staff and Board Members** will generate a contrasting “ground-level view” of operational perspectives and experiences with the TSF. It will survey some 40-80 bank staff and Board members...
Members working at headquarters, regional and country levels with the TSF instrument. It will assess the wider perceptions within the Bank and within TSF beneficiary countries of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of TSF operations and of the lessons learned from implementation. The questionnaire to be used for this e-Survey is presented in Annex 6. Its distribution, collection and analysis will be managed directly by IDEV.

g. **The analysis of existing PPERs/PRAs for Pillar 1 Operations** will synthesise the findings and conclusions from the existing evaluations documents for Pillar 1 operations. These comprise PPERs/PRAs for 13 Pillar 1 operations over ADF 13 and 14 in six countries (Chad, Côte d’Ivoire, Comoros, Liberia, Mali and South Sudan). They will be analysed against a standard assessment grid to score performance on Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability and identify potential Lessons Learned. The assessment grid to be used is included as Annex 7.

h. **Case studies of Pillar 2 Operations** will provide a comparable body of evidence for the two Pillar 2 operations which have been completed, namely in Somalia (2020) and Sudan (2021). Due to their nature (focusing on arrears clearance), PPERs/PRAs are not produced for these operations. Therefore, the Fiscus team will prepare the analysis from a review of relevant project documentation and interviews with the respective task managers. The framework for analysis will be very similar to the assessment grid which has been developed for Pillar 1 PPERs/PRAs (Annex 6.)

i. **The new PPAR case studies for Pillar III Operations** will in turn provide a comparable body of evidence for a sample of Pillar III operations to answer the evaluation questions. They will be developed based on an analysis of existing documentation and in-country interviews for 12 projects (two per country) in a sample of 6 Pillar III beneficiary countries. Local consultants in the sample countries will prepare the Pillar III PPARs, following a template which will be developed by Fiscus following the broad structure of the assessment grid which has been prepared for Pillar 1 PPERs/PRAs. (Annex 6). The proposed sample countries are DRC, Liberia, Madagascar, Sierra Leone, Somalia and Zimbabwe. The basis for this sample is presented below and a listing of all the countries with commitments for Pillar III operations under ADF 13 and 14 is included in Annex 3.

63. **A clear set of criteria are proposed for rating the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions** based on the quality of evidence which will emerge from the different sources of information outlined in Table 2 above. The evaluation will utilise a four-point rating scale of: 1-Highly Unsatisfactory; 2-Unsatisfactory; 3-Satisfactory; and 4-Highly Satisfactory.

64. **Notwithstanding the wide scope for triangulation of evidence which these sources provide, gaps in information will inevitably arise and it will be important to account for these in a systematic way.** It is intended that answers to the five Evaluation Questions (EQs) should be built up from the answers to the sub-questions which correspond to each EQ (Table 1 Above).
4.5 Selection of sample countries for Pillar III case studies

65. The Pillar III case studies provide the main opportunity for undertaking primary data collection as part of the evaluation. As such, they represent a key source of new evidence. However, the time and resources available to the evaluation limit the potential coverage of these case studies to six in-country assessments. With 20 countries and 8 regional institutions having benefited from Pillar III allocations over ADF 13 and 14 (Annex 3), the selection of an appropriate sample of 6 countries and 12 projects (two projects for each country) in which to assess Pillar III operations is especially important.

66. The evaluation team have selected the sample of countries based on four primary criteria (Figure 9). These four criteria, in order of importance, are as follows:

- The overall level of budget allocations for Pillar III operations over ADF 13 and 14;
- The presence of at least one completed Pillar III project (so as to allow some judgement to be reached on effectiveness and sustainability);
- The presence of at least one regional/multi-country project in one of the sample countries;
- A reasonable balance across the African regions and official languages.

67. For each country two projects have been selected based on three criteria: (i) At least one of the projects per country has to be completed. Where there are two projects that have been completed, the two are selected; (ii) Projects with the highest levels of disbursement are chosen among the projects that have not been completed; (iii) If there are uncompleted projects with a similarly high level of disbursement, then preference has been given to projects focusing either on private sector development or on gender, two thematic areas of focus of significant importance to the TSF and to wider Bank objectives.

68. Based upon these criteria, the proposed sample countries are DRC, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Madagascar, Somalia and Zimbabwe. The 6 case studies will generate PPARs for two Pillar III projects in each country. A listing of the projects to be assessed is presented below in Table 4. In the event that there are difficulties in identifying and mobilising local consultants or other logistical problems, two further “back-up” countries are proposed: South Sudan and Burundi.
The justification for the selected sample is as follows:

- **In terms of Pillar III financing during ADF-13 and ADF-14**, with 16 million UA the African Legal Support Facility (ALSF) received the highest amount of TSF-Pillar III funding. Somalia and Zimbabwe received the second and third highest allocations (UA 8.8 million each), while the other selected countries are also amongst the higher recipients of Pillar III allocations.

- **In all selected countries at least one TSF-pillar III funded project has been completed.** Completed projects are more likely to provide adequate evidence to assist in reaching conclusions on the EQs covering effectiveness and sustainability. For this reason, Eritrea was not selected, despite having high numbers of ongoing Pillar III operations.

- **Addressing regional or multi-country sources of fragility is an important strategic objective of the TSF.** Liberia and Sierra Leone have been participants the regional project, “Technical Assistance Project in Support of the Countries Most Affected by the Ebola Epidemic” (with total funding of 6.59 million UA for all affected countries).

- **The selection ensures that all of the Bank’s four administrative sub-regions (East, West, Central and South) are represented.** The selected sample contains two countries from the Western sub-region (Liberia and Sierra Leone), one from the Eastern (Somalia), two from the Central (Madagascar and DRC) and one from the Southern (Zimbabwe). At the same time, the selection ensures a balance in the main language groups, with 3 of the countries having French as an official language and 3 countries English.

70. The selection of Pillar III projects will also allow attention to be given to additional factors that may potentially contribute to improved relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.
In this respect, three of the selected country case studies have projects that received co-financing from non-TSF sources. In the case of Liberia, the “Support Project to Youth Employment and Entrepreneurship” received co-financing via the Bank’s Fund for African Private Sector Assistance, while the project “Improving Access to Water and Sanitation Services in Somalia received co-financing via the ADF PBA allocations. Finally, the selection has the added advantage of including one example of a country without a country office (Somalia) as well as five with country offices. The projects that have been selected for each of the countries are outlined in Table 4 below.
Table 3 List of Selected Pillar III Projects in the Six Case Study Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Countries and Projects</th>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Approved Amounts</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Disbursement Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOMALIA</strong></td>
<td>P-SO-KF0-005</td>
<td>90,577</td>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant to finance technical assistance for the Somalia aid coordination project</td>
<td>8,840,852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving access to water and sanitation services in Somalia</td>
<td>P-SO-E00-002</td>
<td>2,075,000</td>
<td>OnGo</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZIMBABWE</strong></td>
<td>P-ZW-HZ0-001</td>
<td>2,080,000</td>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African trade insurance (ATI)</td>
<td>P-ZW-K00-006</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>OnGo</td>
<td>90.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative solutions to support livelihood of vulnerable communities</td>
<td><strong>8,799,165</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIERRA LEONE</strong></td>
<td>P-ZI-KF0-039</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance in support of the countries most affected by Ebola epidemic (Sierra Leone, Guinea, Liberia)</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to youth employment and entrepreneurship project</td>
<td>P-SL-KB0-001</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>OnGo</td>
<td>84.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIBERIA</strong></td>
<td>P-ZI-KF0-040</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance in support of the countries most affected by Ebola epidemic (Sierra Leone, Guinea, Liberia)</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to youth employment and entrepreneurship project</td>
<td>P-LR-KB0-001</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>OnGo</td>
<td>93.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MADAGASCAR</strong></td>
<td>P-ZI-KF0-046</td>
<td>162,076</td>
<td>OnGo</td>
<td>96.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multisectoral project for targeted technical assistance and capacity building in the field of gender in Madagascar and Comoros</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malagasy agriculture transformation programme</td>
<td>P-MG-AA0-040</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRC</strong></td>
<td>P-CD-I00-012</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>OnGo</td>
<td>92.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRG integration of young people into employment PAT-PUIDC*</td>
<td>3,255,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to the Ministry of Planning and Economic Development for the elaboration of the QUIBB survey</td>
<td>P-CD-IZ0-005</td>
<td>1,255,520</td>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Management of the Evaluation

5.1 Quality assurance and validation

71. **Quality assurance will be built into the process and will involve (i) internal IDEV peer reviewers, (ii) a Bank Evaluation Reference Group, and (iii) an external expert peer reviewer.** Quality assurance will be a necessary part of the finalisation of the Inception report, the Synthesis Technical Report and the TSF Summary Evaluation Report. Comments provided through these quality assurance mechanisms will be taken into account in finalising reports and actions taken clearly recorded.

72. **The data collection methods presented in Section 4 will be reviewed and tested before they are administered.** Questionnaires and assessment templates will be reviewed, firstly by experts within the Bank that are familiar with the topic to ensure technical appropriateness. Secondly, they will be tested on a selection of respondents. Based on the outcome of these two exercises, questionnaires and assessment templates will be updated.

5.2 Synthesis and Dissemination

73. **The synthesise findings from the various strands of analyses into a Technical Report.** The Technical Report will summarise all lines of evidence available. It will include an executive summary, background and context, evaluation purpose, objectives and questions, key aspects of the methodological approach and limitations, findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations, and annexes. The organisation of the Technical Report should allow dissemination of constituent parts if necessary. For instance, the IDEV could decide to publish the executive summary and annexes separately, alongside the report as a whole.

74. **IDEV will draft the Summary Report which will include formal recommendations to the Bank.** In order to enable synthesis for the final Summary Report, each of the evaluation components is designed to link to the overall evaluation matrix. The matrix provides the basis for assessing each Evaluation Question – specifically using the Sub-questions and corresponding Judgement Criteria shown in Table 2 above. Consistent use of this system will be the principal tool to enable the IDEV team to bring together evidence from different component parts of the evaluation.

75. **The Summary Report will cover the evaluation questions – including highlighting where evidence is insufficient to provide an answer. However, more attention will be given to issues where both evidence and importance is considered high.** The idea of the Summary Report will be more to highlight selected themes and related stories. The evaluation questions will be the starting point to structure the report, though the final report may not adhere to that structure fully. The consultative validation phase will play a central role in prioritising which issues the summary report should elaborate upon and what kind of recommendations are required. An outline structure for the Summary Report will therefore be finalised only after the validation and synthesis work has been conducted.

76. **The Summary Report will be submitted for formal management response and then to CODE for discussion.** The Summary Report is the main publication, although technical reports may also be published. The Summary Report will be based on the Technical Report and its constituent parts as described
above, as well as feedback from the validation workshop. The final Summary Report will also be submitted to the Reference Group, external expert reviewer and internal quality control processes before submitting to the Bank's management response process. Based on existing practice, after CODE discussion, IDEV reports are usually disseminated to stakeholders outside the Bank and the general public to allow for use of this evaluation information.

5.3 Evaluation Work plan, Timetable and Next Steps

77. The evaluation exercise will span twelve months, commencing January 2021 and will be delivered for management response in 31st December 2021. Figure 10 presents the updated timetable proposed for the completion of the evaluation. The timeline allows for the completion of the data collection components of the evaluation by end May 2021, presentation of the Technical Report with a validation exercise in August 2021, and submission of the Summary Report for management response in December 2021.

78. The key milestones for the completion of the evaluation are as follows:

- **March 2021** Submission of Draft Inception Report;
- **June 2021** Submission of Final Inception Report;
- **End of July 2021** Submission of Draft Technical Report;
- **August 2021** Presentation of Technical Report for validation exercise;
- **Early September** Final Technical Report
- **End of October 2021** Possible presentation of preliminary evaluation findings to CODE (to be confirmed after Technical Report);
- **November 2021** Possible presentation of preliminary evaluation findings to ADF-15 MTR (to be confirmed after Technical Report).
- **December 2021** Submission of final Summary Report for Management Response (MR);
- **Q1 2022** Presentation of evaluation + MR to CODE
- **Q1 2022** Presentation to first ADF-16 replenishment meeting
Table 4: Anticipated Implementation Schedule for the TSF Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Phase/Task</th>
<th>Anticipated Timeline</th>
<th>Timeline (2021)</th>
<th>Timeline (2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1: Inception Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review of TSF Documentation</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Jan-12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with Primary Stakeholders</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Jan-12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Draft Inception Report</td>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Feb-25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and Discussion of Inception Report</td>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Mar-25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Inception Report</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Apr-10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2: Data Collection and Document Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEV Portfolio Review Report</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Mar-31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Analysis of TSF Country Data</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Apr-31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of PPERs/PRAs for Pillar I Operations</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Apr-31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Institutional Assessment i.e Bench Marking Study) (AfDB with AsDB, WB and IFAD)</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Apr-31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-survey of Bank Staff and Board Members</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Apr-30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Case Studies of two Pillar II Operations</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; May-30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of PPAR Case Studies for Pillar III Projects in six countries</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; May-16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Phase/Task</td>
<td>Anticipated Timeline</td>
<td>Timeline (2021)</td>
<td>Timeline (2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3: Synthesis Phase — Technical and Final Evaluation Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of Technical Evaluation report</td>
<td>1st Jun-14th July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of technical report to Reference Group</td>
<td>25th July-31st July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Final Technical Evaluation Report</td>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Draft Summary Evaluation Report</td>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible presentation of evaluation key findings to ADF15 MTR</td>
<td>8th Nov-9th Nov.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Final Summary Evaluation Report for MR</td>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 4: Publishing and Dissemination of Report</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of evaluation to CODE</td>
<td>Q1 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to first ADF-16 replenishment meeting</td>
<td>Q1 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of Final Evaluation Reports</td>
<td>Q1 2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Likelihood of Occurring</td>
<td>Main Impacts</td>
<td>Mitigation Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low capacity of local consultants</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Difficulties in preparing Deliverables (case studies and PPARs). Potential delays.</td>
<td>IDEV conducts a robust recruitment process, and general coordination of activities with local consultants. Fiscus will deliver training and PPAR templates in an accessible manner with clear and simple instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for Pillar III PPARs).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscus will deliver training and PPAR templates in an accessible manner with clear and simple instructions. Fiscus will also identify interviewees and coordinate with IDEV to facilitate introductions and organise meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-participation of some key</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Some views may be omitted. Findings from the evaluation may be contested if there is not sufficient buy-in.</td>
<td>Fiscus will closely follow recommendations by IDEV on which stakeholders should be engaged. The Fiscus Team will also familiarise themselves with the roles and responsibilities and potential conflicts of interests of each stakeholder before interviews to ensure a broad range of perspectives. Fiscus will also identify interviewees and coordinate with IDEV to facilitate introductions and organise meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>key stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscus will closely follow recommendations by IDEV on which stakeholders should be engaged. The Fiscus Team will also familiarise themselves with the roles and responsibilities and potential conflicts of interests of each stakeholder before interviews to ensure a broad range of perspectives. Fiscus will also identify interviewees and coordinate with IDEV to facilitate introductions and organise meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication of effort</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Limited value addition from the evaluation exercise.</td>
<td>Fiscus will consult recent and on-going assessments conducted by the Bank in order to avoid duplication. The Team will also ensure recommendations are forward-looking, feasible and generated through dialogue with IDEV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays in data collection</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Risk of schedule delays in relation to data analysis and integration of findings.</td>
<td>Identifying at the outset data to be collected and the key contacts and departments necessary to provide the relevant information. Continuous communication between Fiscus and IDEV to avoid unnecessary delays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political conflict or increased</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Reduced ability of local consultants to conduct interviews and successfully carry out the PPARs. Replacement case studies may be biased toward less fragile situations.</td>
<td>In sampling, Fiscus have selected countries with a lower impending risk of conflicts, but still a broad range of vulnerabilities. The templates will also be tailored toward both face-to-face and online data collection, both for potential safety reasons from conflict, but also bearing in mind limitations in contact owing to the Covid-19 pandemic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security risks in selected case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscus will consult recent and on-going assessments conducted by the Bank in order to avoid duplication. The Team will also ensure recommendations are forward-looking, feasible and generated through dialogue with IDEV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscus will consult recent and on-going assessments conducted by the Bank in order to avoid duplication. The Team will also ensure recommendations are forward-looking, feasible and generated through dialogue with IDEV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low response rates to the e-survey</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Biased results, gaps in the analysis and the formulation of recommendations.</td>
<td>Low response rates to e-surveys were noted as a limitation of the 2020 IDEV evaluation of the 2014-2019 Strategy. IDEV will seek support of key stakeholders within the Reference Group and Country Offices in TSF countries to better understand the reasons for this, and take remedial measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Potential Risks and Mitigation Strategies

79. There are various risks to the evaluation in general which may arise, and must therefore be considered. These include more micro-level/method-specific challenges such as low response rates to e-surveys, to project-level issues like partial or delayed communication of information, to more macro-level issues like political instability in case study countries. Table 5 above outlines potential risks, associated likelihood of occurring, impacts on the evaluation exercise, and potential mitigation strategies. In general, careful planning, and regular exchanges and consultation with IDEV are envisioned to mitigate any of the potential risks and their negative impacts on the evaluation process.
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Annex 1: Categories of Fragile Situations

**Category 1**
- Harmonized list of fragile situations by MDBs, targeted qualitative fragility assessment, presence of armed conflict in the state’s territory, presence of violent political/social uprisings
- Great Lakes and Central Africa Region, Horn of Africa, Mano River Union, Senegal

**Category 2**
- Risk of spill-over from neighboring conflict, increasing trend and/or sudden onset of governance problems; high risk of sustained social/political unrest
- Declining trend in policy and institutional performance and/or presence of important non-political drivers of fragility

**Category 3**
- Relatively low risks of violence or societal breakdown; relatively high capacity of social and political institutions to manage challenges within a legitimate/inclusive framework

Annex 2: Pillar I - Percentage share by country of total commitments during ADF 13 and ADF 14 cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>% of total TFS Pillar I commitment</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>% of total TSF pillar I commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>15.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Rep. of Congo</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>Democratic Rep. of Congo</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Rep.</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea Bissau</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>Central African Rep.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Pillar III - Percentage share by country of total commitments during ADF 13 and ADF 14 cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>% of total TFS Pillar I commitment</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>% of total TSF pillar I commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>Multinational</td>
<td>25.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERITREA</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>9.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTINATIONALE / (RCA, RDC, BURUNDI, CIRGL)</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>Central African Rep.</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMOROS</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sud du Soudan</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEEAC</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRICA UNION</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAD</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>East / Horn of Africa</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECSA</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinee Bissau</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRU</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Regional Organisation (RECSA)</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDEAO</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4: List of Stakeholder Interviews (for Inception Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interviewee(s)</th>
<th>Role/Department/Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Clément Banse, Racky Balde, Clement Mensah</td>
<td>IDEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25/01/2021</td>
<td>Alain Pierre Mbonampeka</td>
<td>Chief Regional Programme Officer at East Africa Regional Development and Business Delivery Office (RDGE); Previously worked as the Programme Manager in Liberia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26/01/2021</td>
<td>Karen Rot-Münstermann</td>
<td>IDEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26/01/2021</td>
<td>Rufael Fassil</td>
<td>IDEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27/01/2021</td>
<td>John Bosco Bukenya, Flavio Soares Da Gama</td>
<td>South Sudan Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>28/01/2021</td>
<td>Yero Baldeh, Emile Kemayou, Riadh Ben Messaoud, Gilberte Faly</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28/01/2021</td>
<td>Hercule Yamuremye</td>
<td>Country Portfolio Manager Central African Republic (Previously worked as an Economist in Burundi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>29/01/2021</td>
<td>Boulard Gauthier</td>
<td>Director &amp; Special Advisor to the President at African Development Bank Group - Relationships with Non-African Shareholders and International Financing Institutions Previously work in FIRM - Sovereign Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>01/02/2021</td>
<td>Désiré Vencatchellum, Veronica Giardina, Malek Sefi</td>
<td>FIRM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 5: Secondary Data and Associated Sources (for Country Database)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSF- Specific Data (country-level for both ADF-13 and ADF-14)</td>
<td>TSF Allocation</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TSF Disbursement</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADF Allocation</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADF Disbursement</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pillar I - support (actual)</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pillar II - support (actual)</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pillar III - support (actual)</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation from reserve (Pillar I)</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loan share (TSF)</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant share (TSF)</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country Office (Yes/No)</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year Country office was established</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size of country office</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of sectors supported</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of projects supported</td>
<td>RDTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Governance Indicators
- CPIA | World Bank
- Ibrahim Index of African Governance (IIAG) | Mo Ibrahim Foundation
- PEFA Indicators | PEFA Secretariat

#### Economic and development-related indicators
- GDP per capita | World Bank
- Debt sustainability measures | IMF
- Government expenditure | IMF
- Government revenue | IMF
- GDP growth | World Bank
- Human Development Index | UNDP
- Share of population living below the poverty line | World Bank
- Net ODA received | OECD
- Infrastructure Development Index | ABD
- Vulnerable employment (share) | World Bank

#### Demographic Indicators
- Population size | World Bank
- Internally displaced (total no. of persons) | World Bank
### Annex 6: Template for Review of Pillar 1 PPERs/PRAs

1. **Basic data of Project and corresponding PPER/PRAs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>IDEV Database</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
<td>IDEV Database</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of PPER/PRAs containing project assessment</td>
<td>PPER/PRA</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the assessment address more than one project?</td>
<td>PPER/PRA</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title(s) of other project(s) covered by assessment?</td>
<td>PPER/PRA</td>
<td>If previous question answered with yes, name title(s) of other project(s) funded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>PPER/PRA</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key components of project</td>
<td>PPER/PRA</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of approval:</td>
<td>IDEV Database</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount approved:</td>
<td>IDEV Database</td>
<td>Number (in UA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project funding supplemented by ADF PBA funding?</td>
<td>PPER/PRA</td>
<td>YES/NO; if YES, detail of amount of funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Evaluation Matrix for Project Assessment and Ranking**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria of Analysis</th>
<th>Issues Assessed</th>
<th>Issue Rating</th>
<th>Overall Rating for Criterion</th>
<th>Explanatory Comments or Examples from PPER/PRA text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including scores on Ownership &amp; Leverage, as evidence of Relevance)</td>
<td><strong>A1.</strong> Project design and implementation applies fragility lens by</td>
<td>1-4 rating for each Issue (A1 – A4)</td>
<td>Aggregate Score for Relevance: 1-4 (average of individual issue scores to 2 decimal places.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Explicitly referencing fragility/resilience factors identified in fragility assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clearly outlining how the project responds to fragility/resilience factors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A2.</strong> Project responds to the needs of the country in a clear and focused manner. (objectives are clear, and focused on a defined and relevant problem)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A3.</strong> Assessment shows that additional non-TSF funds have been leveraged or are likely to be leveraged for this or related projects. (NB. If data not available, do not score this.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A4.</strong> Project assessment suggests strong partnership of Bank with in-country stakeholders on the political and implementation level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B1.</strong> Project assessment points to specific examples of success in producing targeted project Outputs, e.g.:</td>
<td>1-4 rating for each Issue</td>
<td>Aggregate Score for Effectiveness: 1-4 (average of individual issue scores to 2 decimal places.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improved infrastructure provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- new laws or regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- agreements or procedures facilitating regional economic partnerships
- Improved skills, capacities or technologies

**B2.** Project assessment identifies contributions of the project to addressing fragility through influence on positive Outcomes, e.g:
- Strengthened State capacity
- Improved or more equitable access to basic services
- Improved or more equitable access to employment
- Increased citizen trust in legal and democratic framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Efficiency &amp; Coherence</th>
<th>C1. Disbursements were realised within the agreed deadlines</th>
<th>1-4 rating for each Issue</th>
<th>Aggregate Score for Efficiency &amp; Coherence: 1-4 (average of individual issue scores to 2 decimal places)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2. Project assessment indicates a high level of cost-effectiveness (e.g. Unit costs appear competitive, costs for project administration are reasonable)</td>
<td>“NS” means “not scored”, due to lack of information in the PPER/PRA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3. Transaction costs were controlled: Project assessment points to specific examples of procedures adopted to minimise transaction costs such as unnecessary administrative checks, duplications, slow approval processes etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4. The project forms part of a wider country strategy, and contributes to that strategy in a structured way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C5. The project complements and avoids duplication with other TSF projects, other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Sustainability</td>
<td>Project assessment shows evidence that project outputs have been sustained after completion. (NB. If project incomplete or data not available, do not score this.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.</td>
<td>Existence of an analysis of the specific constraints on the sustainability of the project resulting from the country’s fragile situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.</td>
<td>Assessment illustrates clear operational procedures for addressing the:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- environmental sustainability of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the financial sustainability of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the institutional sustainability of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Lessons Learned</td>
<td>Which “enabling factors” enhancing the effectiveness of the TSF project are identified in the assessment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 2.</td>
<td>Which enabling factors are identified that complement and/or reinforce each other?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3.</td>
<td>Which “blocking factors” hindering the effectiveness of the TSF funded project are identified in the assessment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where ratings range from 1 – 4, the numbers correspond to the following qualitative scale:
1 – Highly Unsatisfactory
2 - Unsatisfactory
3 - Satisfactory
4 - Highly Satisfactory

Aggregate Score for Sustainability: 1-4 (average of individual issue scores to 2 decimal places.)
Annex 7: E-Survey Questionnaire for Bank Staff and Board Members

Section A: E Survey Questionnaire for Bank Staff

1 Introduction
This survey is part of the independent Evaluation of the African Development Bank’s (hereafter “AfDB”) Transition Support Facility (TSF) for the period 2014-2019. The Evaluation covers all three pillars of financing under the TSF, and relatedly all sectors and activities funded during the 2014-2019 period. The evaluation is being carried out by the AfDB’s Independent Development Evaluation function (IDEV) together with a team of external consultants from Fiscus.

The survey takes a minimum of 5 minutes up to 15 minutes, depending on your involvement with the TSF. You can pause the survey anytime by clicking the ‘save and continue survey later’ button at the very bottom of each page. A link will be sent to your email address allowing you to continue the questionnaire at a later stage. Your input is highly valuable to us and will help to assess key aspects related to the design and implementation of TSF funded projects, while also informing the design and management of future operations. Responses are completely anonymous.

Please complete the survey by 8th June 2021.

If you have any further questions or comments on the survey or evaluation in general, please contact: Clement Banse, Chief Evaluation Officer, Phone: +2250777307598, E-mail: c.banse@afdb.org

We really appreciate your input and would like to thank you in advance for your co-operation.

The evaluation team

2 Instructions
Using the survey:
- Required questions are marked by an asterisk *
- Click ‘Next’ at the end of each page to save the current page and to get to the next set of questions.
- Click the ‘Back’ button to refer to earlier pages and/or edit earlier answers. However, the data you entered on any page is only saved by clicking ‘Next’ on that page. Do not go back before saving the current page by clicking Next first to avoid losing data you entered.
- A 'Save and continue survey later' bar can be found at the very bottom of each page of the survey.
- By clicking the button, a link will be sent to your email address, which allows you to continue the questionnaire at the point where you have interrupted it.
3 Identification Questions

1) How long have you been employed at the AfDB?*
   [ ] Less than a year
   [ ] Between 1 to 3 years
   [ ] Between 4 to 6 years
   [ ] Between 7 to 9 years
   [ ] 10 year and over

2) Which part of the AfDB are you currently assigned to?*
   [ ] Headquarters
   [ ] Regional Office - Write in name of RO: __________________
   [ ] Country Office - Write in name of CO: __________________

3) Which Complex do you belong to within the AfDB.*
   [ ] Regional Development, Integration and Business Delivery (including Transition States Coordination Office)
   [ ] Power, Energy, Climate and Green Growth
   [ ] Agriculture, Human and Social Development
   [ ] Private Sector, Infrastructure and Industrialization
   [ ] Other - Write in: __________________

4) Have you worked in any other department/office before your current one?*
   [ ] Yes - Write in the 2 most recent other departments/ offices: __________________________
   [ ] No

5) Please indicate your current professional affiliation at the AfDB.*
   [ ] AfDB staff - Director General/Deputy Director General/ Country Manager/Sector Director
   [ ] AfDB staff – Sector/Thematic Manager
   [ ] AfDB staff - Sector Specialist/Country Programme Officer
   [ ] AfDB staff - Task Manager
   [ ] AfDB staff - Other - Write in: __________________

4 Knowledge/Awareness and Ownership of the TSF

6) Are you aware of the Bank’s Transition Support Facility (TSF)?* (Please save and discontinue survey if your answer to question 6 is 'No')
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No

7) Where did you first hear about the TSF instrument in the Bank?*
   [ ] Workshop/seminar/webinar organized by RDTS
   [ ] Workshop/seminar/webinar organized by FIRM
   [ ] AfDB reports (eg. Annual Development Effectiveness Report, IDEV Evaluation Report etc)
   [ ] Other - Write in: __________________

8) In your own words, please describe what you believe is the main objective of the TSF?*
   __________________

9) Using a scale from 0-5 please rate the following* (0 is the lowest score possible and 5 is the highest score possible on the rating scale)
   a. Awareness of the TSF within your organisation 0 _____ [ ]____ 5 [ ] Don't know
   b. Degree of engagement amongst staff during the design phase of the TSF 0 _____ [ ]____ 5 [ ] Don't know
   c. Degree of engagement amongst staff during the
implementation phase of the TSF (2014-2019) 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don’t know

d. To what extent do you view your role as being integral to the successful operation of the TSF and/or successful implementation of a TSF funded intervention? 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don’t know

e. To what extent is there a strong partnership between the Bank and in-country stakeholders with regard to TSF funded interventions? 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don’t know

10) a. Have you participated in any training(s) (eg.including webinar, brownbag sessions etc) on the TSF instrument?*
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

b. If yes, who provided this training/ sensitisation?*
[ ] FIRM
[ ] RDTS
[ ] Other - Write in: ____________________

11) To what extent was this training relevant to your work?* (0 is the lowest score possible and 5 is the highest score possible on the rating scale) 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don’t know

12) Do you have any suggestions on how ownership of the TSF can be strengthened amongst Bank staff?__________________

13) Have you ever worked with the TSF? * (Please save and discontinue survey if your answer to question 13 is ‘No’)
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

5 PILLAR I BLOCK*

14) Do you have experience working with the TSF funding through the Pillar I window? [ ] Yes
[ ] No

15) How many Pillar I funded projects have you been involved in?*
__________________

Relevance and Responsiveness of Pillar I

16) Based on your experience, to what extent has Pillar I funding performed well in the following areas?* (0 is the lowest score possible and 5 is the highest score possible on the rating scale)
a. Volume of funding sufficient given objectives and context 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don’t know

b. Adoption of the fragility lens in project design 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don’t know

c. Alignment to the country’s relevant policy framework(s) 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don’t know

d. Learning from previous experience with similar or other instruments in the country. 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don’t know
To what extent do you assess Pillar I as a relevant instrument in addressing fragility/fragile situations?*

18) In your opinion, how flexible and responsive is Pillar I in addressing fragility/fragile situations?*

19) What would you say is the “value added” from Pillar I funding?*

20) Do you have any other comments on the relevance and responsiveness of Pillar I funding? 

Effectiveness of Pillar I

21) To what extent do you assess Pillar I funding as having contributed to each of the following?*

(0 is the lowest score possible and 5 is the highest score possible on the rating scale)

22) Do you have any other comments on how the effectiveness of Pillar I funding could be improved (in terms of helping to ensure projects achieve their objectives)?

Efficiency and Coherence of Pillar I

23) How would you rate the ease of accessing Pillar I funding?* (0 is the lowest score possible and 5 is the highest score possible on the rating scale)

24) Have you encountered any barriers to accessing Pillar I funding?*

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

25) Please explain these barriers.

26) In your opinion, what could reduce these barriers?
27) How does the approval process of TSF funded projects compare to those funded by other ADF instruments?

[ ] Faster on average
[ ] Slower on average
[ ] The same
[ ] Don’t know

28) How does the disbursement of TSF funded projects compare to those funded by other ADF instruments?

[ ] Faster on average
[ ] Slower on average
[ ] The same
[ ] Don’t know

29) Do you have any other comments on how the efficiency and coherence of Pillar I funding could be improved?

__________________

Sustainability of Pillar I

30) Based on your experience, to what extent has Pillar I funding illustrated clear operational procedures for addressing the following areas of sustainability:  

* 0 is the lowest score possible and 5 is the highest score possible on the rating scale

a. Environmental sustainability

0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

b. Financial sustainability

0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

c. Institutional sustainability

0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

d. Country Ownership

0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

31) In your opinion, to what extent has the Pillar I funding prevented the emergence of fragile situations?

0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

32) Do you have any other comments on how the sustainability of Pillar I could be improved?

__________________

6  PILLAR II BLOCK

33) Do you have experience working with the TSF funding through the Pillar II window?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

34) You mentioned that you have been involved with TSF funding through the Pillar II window. Briefly describe your involvement

__________________

35) Using a scale from 0-5, how would you rate the following?  

* (0 is the lowest score possible and 5 is the highest score possible on the rating scale)
a. The relevance of Pillar II to addressing fragility? 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don't know
b. Targeting of Pillar II funding? 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don't know
c. Ease of accessing Pillar II for eligible countries? 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don't know
d. Effectiveness/impactfulness of Pillar II funding? 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don’t know
e. Contribution to fiscal space of beneficiary countries 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don’t know
f. Potential to contribute to sustainable outcomes? 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don’t know

36) In your opinion, are there any barriers to accessing Pillar II funding under the current framework?* 
[ ] Yes 
[ ] No

37) Please explain these barriers. 
________________________

38) If you were to improve how Pillar II funding currently works, name the main three factors you would address.*
________________________
________________________
________________________

39) Do you have any other comments on Pillar II funding?
________________________

7  PILLAR III BLOCK*

40) Do you have experience working with the TSF funding through the Pillar III window? 
[ ] Yes 
[ ] No

41) How many Pillar III funded projects have you been involved in?*
________________________

Relevance and Responsiveness of Pillar III

42) Based on your experience, to what extent has Pillar III funding adhered to good practices in the following areas?* (0 is the lowest score possible and 5 is the highest score possible on the rating scale)

a. Assessment of eligibility criteria for accessing funding 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don’t know
b. Volume of funding sufficient given objectives and context 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don’t know
c. Adoption of the fragility lens in project design 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don’t know
d. Alignment to the country’s relevant policy framework(s) 0 [ ] 5 [ ] Don’t know
e. Learning from previous experience with similar or other instruments in the country.

f. Relevance of the thematic areas for call for proposals

43) To what extent do you assess Pillar III as a relevant instrument in addressing fragility/fragile situations?*  
0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

44) In your opinion, how flexible and responsive is Pillar III in addressing fragility/fragile situations?*  
0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

45) How would you rate the relevance of Pillar III-funded interventions to the capacity development priorities of beneficiary countries?  
0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

46) What would you say is the value addition from Pillar III funding?*  
__________________

47) Do you have any other comments on the relevance and responsiveness of Pillar III funding?  
__________________

**Effectiveness of Pillar III**

48) To what extent do you assess Pillar III funding as having contributed to each of the following?*  
(0 is the lowest score possible and 5 is the highest score possible on the rating scale)

a. Improvements in governments technical capacity  
0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

b. Improvements in private sector capacity  
0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

c. Increased private investments in recipient countries  
0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

d. Increased public investments in recipient countries  
0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

e. Reduced fragility/ increased resilience in countries in situations of fragility?  
0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

f. Reduced fragility/ increased resilience in regions in situations of fragility?  
0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

49) Do you have any other comments on how the effectiveness of Pillar III funding could be improved?  
__________________

**Efficiency and Coherence of Pillar III**

50) Using a scale from 0-5, how would you rate the following? * (0 is the lowest score possible and 5 is the highest score possible on the rating scale)

a. Efficiency of the selection process for the call for proposals 0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

b. Transparency of the selection process for the call for proposals 0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

c. Ease of accessing Pillar III funding?  
0 _____[__]_____ 5 [ ] Don’t know

51) How would you rate the efficiency of the approval processes for Pillar III compared to the other ADF instruments?
52) How would you rate the efficiency of the disbursement processes of Pillar III compared to the other ADF instrument?
[ ] More efficient
[ ] Less efficient
[ ] The same
[ ] Don’t know

53) Have you encountered any barriers to accessing Pillar III funding?*
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

54) Please explain these barriers.
____________________

55) In your opinion, what could reduce these barriers?

56) Do you have any other comments on how the efficiency and coherence of Pillar III funding could be improved?
____________________

Sustainability of Pillar III

57) Based on your experience, to what extent has Pillar III funding illustrated clear operational procedures for addressing the following areas of sustainability:* 0 is the lowest score possible and 5 is the highest score possible on the rating scale)

a. Environmental sustainability
   0 _ _ _ _ _ 5 [ ] Don’t know
b. Financial sustainability
   0 _ _ _ _ _ 5 [ ] Don’t know
c. Institutional sustainability
   0 _ _ _ _ _ 5 [ ] Don’t know
d. Country ownership
   0 _ _ _ _ _ 5 [ ] Don’t know

58) In your opinion, to what extent has the Pillar III funding prevented the emergence of fragile situations?*
   0 _ _ _ _ _ 5 [ ] Don’t know

59) Do you have any other comments on how the sustainability of Pillar III could be improved?
____________________

8 General Lessons Learned

60) In your opinion which are the three main “enabling factors” that contribute to the successes of the TSF instrument.*
____________________
____________________
61) In your opinion which are the three main “blocking factors” that hinder the success of the TSF instrument.*
• Click the ‘Back’ button to refer to earlier pages and/or edit earlier answers. However, the data you entered on any page is only saved by clicking ‘Next’ on that page. Do not go back before saving the current page by clicking Next first to avoid losing data you entered.
• A ‘Save and continue survey later’ bar can be found at the very bottom of each page of the survey.
• By clicking the button, a link will be sent to your email address, which allows you to continue the questionnaire at the point where you have interrupted it.

3. Identification Questions

62) How long have you been in your current position at the AfDB?* (answer in years to 1 decimal space)
__________________

63) Which part of the AfDB are you currently assigned to?*
[ ] Headquarters
[ ] Regional Office - Write in name of RO: __________________

64) Have you worked in any other department/office before your current one?*
[ ] Yes - Write in the 2 most recent other departments/offices: ________________________
[ ] No

4. Knowledge/Awareness and Ownership of the TSF

65) Are you aware of the Bank’s Transition Support Facility (TSF)?* (Please save and discontinue survey if your answer to question 4 is ‘No’)
[ ] Yes
[ ] No

66) Where did you first hear about the TSF instrument in the Bank?*
[ ] Board presentations by AfDB departments
[ ] Workshop/seminar/webinar organized by RDTS
[ ] Workshop/seminar/webinar organized by FIRM
[ ] AfDB reports (eg. Annual Development Effectiveness Report, IDEV Evaluation Report etc)
[ ] Other - Write in: __________________

5. Perceptions on the TSF

Using a scale from 0-5, how would you rate the following? * (0 is the lowest score possible and 5 is the highest score possible on the rating scale)
a. The usefulness of the Bank’s Transition Support Facility (TSF) in addressing issues of fragility in transition countries

Please provide reason(s) for your rating __________________________

b. The adequacy of the volume of TSF funding given objectives and context

Please provide reason(s) for your rating __________________________

c. The efficiency of the allocation process for accessing TSF

Please provide reason(s) for your rating __________________________

d. The level of ownership of the TSF amongst Bank staff

Please provide reason(s) for your rating __________________________

e. The alignment of the TSF with beneficiary countries’ development policy priorities

Please provide reason(s) for your rating __________________________

f. Usefulness of TSF in helping fragile and transitional states to accelerate their attainment of the High 5s

Please provide reason(s) for your rating __________________________

67) Do you have any final suggestions on how ownership of the TSF can be strengthened amongst Bank staff?

________________________

68) Do you have any final recommendations for improving the effectiveness of the TSF going forward?

________________________

End

Thank you for taking part in this survey. The evaluation summary report will be available later in 2021 if you are interested in the results of the exercise. For more detailed on this, please contact: Clement Banse, Chief Evaluation Officer, Phone: +2250777307598, E-mail: c.banse@afdb.org
Annex 8: Template for Assessment of Pillar II Operations

Pillar II Assessment Questions

RELEVANCE

1. Why is Arrears Clearance of specific importance for TSF countries, relative to other needs?

2. Why were Somalia, Sudan and Zimbabwe selected for Pillar II funding? Were they the most relevant amongst all TSF countries to receive Pillar II funding? Why/why not?

3. To what extent has the volume of Pillar II funding been sufficient given the context and objectives in Somalia/Sudan/Zimbabwe?

4. To what extent did these Pillar II allocations succeed in leveraging additional resources for arrears clearance in TSF countries? How did this happen? Should the leveraging effect have been greater?

EFFECTIVENESS & SUSTAINABILITY

5. How important has arrears clearance been in Somalia in order to reduce/prevent fragility? Do you think it is likely to prove equally important in Sudan?

6. Do you think this reduction in debt vulnerability will be sustained?

7. Is there a risk of ‘moral hazard’, i.e. that the easy availability of funding for clearing debt arrears may encourage debt mismanagement by TSF countries?

LESSONS LEARNED

8. What have been the main barriers to accessing Pillar II funding in Somalia/Sudan/Zimbabwe?

9. How could barriers to accessing Pillar II funding be reduced?
10. To what extent are the current allocation and operational processes appropriate to ensure a successful utilisation of Pillar II funding?

11. How could the current allocation and operational processes be improved?

12. What are potential alternative funding options to support arrears clearance in countries in fragile situations?
Annex 9: Template for Assessment of Pillar III Operations

Project Performance Assessment Report (PPAR) Template for Pillar 3 Activities under the Transition Support Facility

I. Explanation of Assessment Process and Use of Template

The Template below provides the structure of the Project Performance Assessment Reports (PPARs), to be completed by the consultants undertaking the 12 Pillar III project case studies (2 project case studies for each country).

✓ For each of the two projects, this PPAR template must be completed, i.e. two PPAR templates per country.
✓ Annexed to each PPAR template, there should be a list of persons met and a list of references consulted.
✓ In addition, the consultants will be required to submit interview notes, summarising the key information and opinions expressed in those interviews.

Steps in the completion of the Project Performance Assessment Report (PPAR)

There are four steps in the process of completing each PPAR:

(i) Project Document Review

The first stage in the analysis – to be undertaken well in advance of field work - will be the detailed document review of the two projects selected in each country for review. This documentation should provide basic data on project objectives, activities and outputs, as well as information on management structures, financing and disbursement. IDEV will provide the relevant project documentation needed for this stage.

(ii) Analysis of country-level documentation and data

Prior to initiation of field work, some analysis of essential country-level documentation and data would also need to be undertaken. This could also continue during field work. The purpose would be three-fold:

a) To ensure an adequate understanding of the key policy documents, national strategies, reports and evaluations relevant to the area of intervention of the project being assessed.
   - For example, the National Development Strategy or its equivalent, specific sectoral or sub-sectoral strategies in the area of intervention of the project, reports/evaluations on related or parallel interventions in the same sector or sub-sector, etc.

b) To permit a good understanding of the political and governance context for the project, and how it may have evolved during implementation.
   - Here country level data from the World Bank’s World Development Indicators (WDI), the UNDP’s Human Development Index (HDI) and associated annual report, the Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) and the AfDB’s own CPIA are likely to be useful. It would also be necessary to consult existing reports and evaluations concerning the nature of the political leadership and its commitment to development.

c) To collect and analyse socio-economic data related to the targeted Outcomes of the Project.
   - For example, data on trends in youth employment, (specific) agricultural exports, improvements in revenue collection, indicators of citizen satisfaction with law & order, etc. (subject to the specific performance areas where improvements in outcomes are targeted by the project). Normally, the project documentation should identify the anticipated outcome indicators and sources of information but the Consultant should also search more widely for relevant data.
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(iii) In-country triangulated interviews to conduct assessment

It is anticipated that the consultants would need to dedicate 5 person days per project for interviews and Focus Group Discussions, spread over an elapsed time period of 2-3 weeks.

The PPAR template itself makes clear which questions need to be answered for each sub-section of the template. Therefore, drawing on the PPAR template itself, the Project Document Review and the review of Country-level documentation and data, the consultant should prepare a brief Operational Plan, outlining the planned programme of interviews and focus group discussions for each of the PPARs. This Operational Plan should be submitted to IDEV for review and approval.

In designing the Operational Plan, consultants should aim to ensure that each piece of evidence collected to address the questions in the PPAR template can be triangulated with at least one but ideally two separate information sources, e.g., information from an interview with an AfDB staff member might be compared with that from an interview with an RMC official, and also with information on the same subject from an independent evaluation report (or from a third interview, e.g., with a Civil Society representative.)

The programme of planned triangulated interviews and focus group discussions should then be undertaken, following the Operational Plan where possible but making any necessary adaptations that might be necessary to take account of stakeholders’ availabilities. In addition, where new important sources of information come to light during the interview process, every effort should be made to follow these up. In other words, the Operational Plan should provide a flexible structure for the triangulated interviews and focus group discussions.

In general, the programme of interviews should seek information from five types of stakeholders:

- The Project implementers, namely the Technical Assistance team managing and delivering the project who may potentially be consultants, NGO staff or staff of the RMC government (or local government);
- The Project beneficiaries, such as the people who may have been trained or coached via the project, or others benefitting from its services;
- RMC staff, acting as supervisors to the project, including the key contact person for the project from the respective ministry or administration;
- AfDB staff designing and managing the project, including the Task Manager, and potentially the Sector Lead and the Country Economist; and
- Informed 3rd Party Observers, who have been involved in the project in some way, or other Development Partners working in similar areas.

A mix of individual interviews and focus group discussions should be organised with these stakeholders. As a general rule, individual interviews should be favoured for those stakeholders with the most knowledge of the project, so that the views of different ‘key resource persons’ can be contrasted and compared through the triangulation process. Indeed, this is likely to comprise the bulk, or even all, of the information collected orally. However, focus group discussions may be useful where there is a large group of stakeholders – such as the project beneficiaries, who are too numerous to interview individually and who are likely to have similar, complementary views. For example, those who have been trained through the project or who have used its services in one way or another might be interviewed jointly as a focus group. Similarly, if there has been a project management team made up of several staff, it may again be helpful to interview them jointly as a single focus group.
Due to travel and meeting restrictions relating to Coronavirus or other causes, it may not be possible to undertake all meetings and focus group discussions in person. The consultant is therefore expected to organise some meetings to take place on a virtual basis, and this should be indicated in the Operational Plan, where applicable.

**(iv) Completion of PPAR template**

The completion of the PPAR template would be the final step in the process. This would be completed by the consultant during and immediately after fieldwork, so as to avoid delays and ensure key findings are captured while they are fresh in the mind. Although this may be considered the final aspect of the work, it is recommended that consultants begin completing the PPAR as soon as possible, filling in the sections for which data is available — for example, based on the document review, and completing some sections in an interim way, as hypotheses to be tested and confirmed or corrected as further information is collected and analysed.

The completed PPAR for each project should be submitted to IDEV in line with the deadlines specified in the ToR. Thereafter, it should be presented by the consultant to IDEV and the international consultant working with IDEV on the TSF evaluation in a virtual meeting. The verbal comments provided at this meeting, as well as the written comments provided should then be addressed by the consultant in the final version of the PPAR to be submitted.

In completing the PPAR template, it is important for consultants to go beyond simply entering a series of ratings for each evaluation criterion: each rating must be justified with a clear reference to the source or sources of supporting evidence. In addition, consultants should draw on their own perceptions and experience of capacity-building initiatives to identify the lessons that may be learned from each project. (It will without doubt be necessary for Consultants to expand the text boxes provided for narrative explanations, although at the same time Consultants are encouraged to be concise and to respond directly to the questions posed in the template.)

For most of the Pillar III projects that are to be assessed, it is expected that all parts of the template should be filled. However, there are two instances where it may be appropriate not to provide a rating or a comment for certain sub-questions:

- **Either** when the issue being assessed is simply not applicable, e.g. where there are no other TSF projects in the country making the question of complementarity not applicable: in this case, consultants should mark the relevant rating of the sub-question as “n.a.”, and this rating should not be counted in assessing the average for that criterion;

- **Or** when the available evidence is highly incomplete and does not provide an adequate basis to reach an evidence-based score: in this case, consultants should mark the relevant rating of the sub-question as “n.s.” (“not scored”), and this rating should not be counted in assessing the average for that criterion.
### 9 Key facts and Description of Pillar III Project Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Guidance Notes/Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of project assessment and PPAR Author:</td>
<td>DD/MM/YY; Name of consultant</td>
<td>Date and Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/Countries</td>
<td>e.g. DRC</td>
<td>Name of country/countries that are part of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>IDEV Database</td>
<td>Code i.e. “P-CD-IZ0-005”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of project</td>
<td>IDEV Database</td>
<td>Title of Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>IDEV Database</td>
<td>i.e. “social”, “finance”, “agriculture” etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>IDEV Database</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of approval:</td>
<td>IDEV Database</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount approved:</td>
<td>IDEV Database</td>
<td>Amount stated (UA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount disbursed to date and Disbursement ratio:</td>
<td>IDEV Database</td>
<td>Amount disbursed (UA), and Ratio %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary Project Description

Provide a brief description of the project, explaining (i) the background to the project — why it was started, why it was considered important/relevant and who identified the need for the project; (ii) the objectives of the project; (iii) the main activities that have been completed under the project and key outputs produced, indicating whether there were significant differences from the original design; (iv) the status of the project — has it been completed and is there a follow up anticipated; and (v) Other relevant information, relating for example to co-financing or parallel projects by the RMC government or other Development Agencies, etc. (NB. Text Box should be expanded if necessary).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background to the Project</th>
<th>Xxxx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Objectives</td>
<td>Yyy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Activities &amp; Outputs</td>
<td>Zzz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Status</td>
<td>Aaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relevant information</td>
<td>Bbb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10 Assessment of Project Relevance, and Ownership

#### 10.1 Assessment of the Relevance of the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect Assessed</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Basis of Rating</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1.1 To what extent was the Fragility lens applied in project design and implementation?</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1 = The project documentation makes no mention of any fragility/resilience factors identified in a fragility assessment; or there is no relevant fragility assessment at all. 2 = The project documentation mentions fragility/resilience factors identified in a fragility assessment, but does not address them through any planned actions. 3 = The project documentation refers directly to some fragility/resilience factors identified in a fragility assessment, but actions to alleviate them are only indirectly linked to those factors. 4 = The project documentation explicitly references fragility/resilience factors identified in a fragility assessment and outlines detailed actions to alleviate those.</td>
<td>List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g. - Project documentation at design or implementation stage from local project implementation team and/or AfDB sources. - Country Resilience and Fragility Assessment (CRFA) and general fragility assessment reports. - Other assessments of Fragility, prepared by other parties (Govt., NGOs, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1.2 To what extent does the Project respond to the expressed capacity building needs of the country?</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1 = No evidence available that the project responds to expressed capacity building needs of the country. 2 = There is some oral evidence from stakeholders but no documentary evidence that the project responds to expressed capacity building needs of the country. 3 = There is documentary evidence as well as some credible testimonies which illustrate that the project responds to expressed capacity building needs of the country. 4 = There is clear documentary evidence as well as a wide range of credible testimonies which illustrate a direct response to expressed capacity building needs of the country.</td>
<td>List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g. - Project documentation at design or implementation stage from local project implementation team and/or AfDB sources. - Relevant reports or Government statements of needs - Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed; - Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1.3 Targeting &amp; Scale of the project: to what extent is it appropriate to the needs and consistent with the potential “reach” of the project in terms of funding, etc.?</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1 = No evidence that the project is adequately targeted and has feasible objectives, given the available funding. 2 = The project objectives appear feasible, given the available funding but there is insufficient attention to how to target the right beneficiaries. 3 = Project objectives are clearly feasible, given the available funding, and there is some attention to how to target the right beneficiaries. 4 = Project objectives are clearly feasible, given the available funding and there is a clear and explicit process to target the right beneficiaries.</td>
<td>List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g. - Project documentation at design or implementation stage from local project implementation team and/or AfDB sources. - Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed; - Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Ranking of Relevance</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Enter the average of the above scores, to two decimal places, e.g. 2.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment on Overall Ranking of Relevance**

[Present overall rating (1 = Highly Unsatisfactory; 2= Unsatisfactory; 3= Satisfactory; 4=Highly Satisfactory) and briefly explain the justification for the rating.]

Text xxx

NB:
- Outline sources (documentation and interviews/ focus group discussions) and the reasoning reached for each sub-component, highlighting any significant complementarities or differences between evidence sources.
- Where possible outline specific examples of qualitative and quantitative evidence identified to illustrate the basis of your assessments, e.g. specific quotations from reports or from interviews, specific data, etc.
## 10.2 Assessment of the Ownership of the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect Assessed</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Basis of Rating</th>
<th>Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10.2.1 To what extent do Bank staff at Country and other levels show a strong sense of ownership over the Project? | 1-4    | 1 = There is limited awareness of the project within the Bank both at Country Office and higher levels.  
2 = Bank staff at country level are aware and supportive of the project but at higher levels of the Bank there is limited awareness of the project.  
3 = Bank staff at Country and higher levels are aware of the project and supportive but are unable to commit time and attention to the project due to competing demands.  
4 = Bank staff at Country and higher levels show a strong sense of ownership and commitment to the project and its objectives. | List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g.  
• Relevant reports or evaluations  
• Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed;  
• Etc. |
| 10.2.2 To what extent do target beneficiaries and involved RMC officials show a strong sense of ownership over the Project? | 1-4    | 1 = There is limited awareness of the project both amongst targeted beneficiaries and the relevant RMC officials.  
2 = RMC officials are aware and supportive of the project but knowledge and understanding of the project amongst beneficiaries is limited.  
3 = RMC officials and targeted beneficiaries are aware of the project and supportive but are unable to commit time and attention to the project due to competing demands.  
4 = Both project beneficiaries and involved RMC officials show a strong sense of ownership and commitment to the project and its objectives. | List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g.  
• Relevant reports or evaluations  
• Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed;  
• Etc. |
| 10.2.3 To what extent do the Project part of a wider Partnership of Bank with in-country stakeholders at the strategic and implementation level? | 1-4    | 1 = No credible evidence of a wider “capacity building partnership” between Bank, RMC officials and project stakeholders to promote synergies between the project and other similar initiatives.  
2 = Oral evidence from interviews suggests some notions of a wider partnership but this is not defined and documented.  
3 = There is significant evidence of an operational partnership between Bank, RMC officials, project stakeholders and other actors based on shared objectives but this is not formalised or documented.  
4 = There is clear evidence of an operational partnership between Bank, RMC officials, project stakeholders and other actors based on shared objectives and a formalised and documented partnership framework. | List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g.  
• Project documentation at design or implementation stage from local project implementation team and/or AfDB sources;  
• Relevant reports or Government statements on a “capacity building partnership”;  
• Documents formalising such a partnership;  
• Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed;  
• Etc. |

### Overall Ranking of Ownership

| Rating | Enter the average of the above scores, to two decimal places, e.g. 2.67 |

#### Comment on Overall Ranking of Ownership

[Present overall rating (1= Highly Unsatisfactory; 2= Unsatisfactory; 3= Satisfactory; 4=Highly Satisfactory) and briefly explain the justification for the rating.]

Text xxx

**NB:**

- Outline sources (documentation and interviews/ focus group discussions) and the reasoning reached for each sub-component, highlighting any significant complementarities or differences between evidence sources.
- Where possible outline specific examples of qualitative and quantitative evidence identified to illustrate the basis of your assessments, e.g. specific quotations from reports or from interviews, specific data, etc.
## Assessment of Effectiveness of the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect Assessed</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Basis of Rating</th>
<th>Guidance Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11.1.1 To what extent has the project accomplished, or is likely to accomplish its stated objectives? | 1-4    | 1 = No evidence of the project accomplishing or being likely to accomplish its stated objectives.  
2 = Evidence suggests that 50% or less of the project’s objectives have been or are likely to be accomplished.  
3 = Evidence suggests that the majority of the project’s objectives have been or are likely to be accomplished.  
4 = Evidence suggests that all or very nearly all of the project’s objectives have been or are likely to be accomplished. | List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g.  
• Relevant project progress reports during implementation  
• Independent evaluation or monitoring reports  
• Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed;  
• Etc.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 11.1.2 To what extent has the project contributed to the strengthening of public sector capacity and the increased effectiveness of state institutions? | 1-4    | 1 = No credible evidence of the project contributing to the strengthening of public sector capacities and increased effectiveness of state institutions.  
2 = Evidence of the project moderately contributing to the strengthening of capacities and increased effectiveness of state institutions.  
3 = Evidence of the project contributing in a significant way to the strengthening of capacities and increased effectiveness of state institutions.  
4 = Evidence of the project contributing in a major/transformational way to the strengthening of capacities and increased effectiveness of state institutions. | List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g.  
• Relevant project progress reports during implementation  
• Independent evaluation or monitoring reports  
• Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed;  
• Etc.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 11.1.3 To what extent has the project contributed to the improvement of the enabling environment for private sector development? | 1-4    | 1 = No credible evidence of the project contributing to the strengthening of the enabling environment for private sector development.  
2 = Evidence of the project moderately contributing to the strengthening of the enabling environment for private sector development.  
3 = Evidence of the project contributing in a significant way to the strengthening of the enabling environment for private sector development.  
4 = Evidence of the project contributing in a major/transformational way to the strengthening of the enabling environment for private sector development. | List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g.  
• Relevant project progress reports during implementation  
• Independent evaluation or monitoring reports  
• Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed;  
• Etc.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

**Overall Ranking of Effectiveness**  
1-4 Enter the average of the above scores, to two decimal places, e.g. 2.67

**Comment on Overall Ranking of Effectiveness**  
[Present overall rating (1 = Highly Unsatisfactory; 2 = Unsatisfactory; 3 = Satisfactory; 4 = Highly Satisfactory) and briefly explain the justification for the rating.]  
Text xxx

**NB:**  
- Outline sources (documentation and interviews/ focus group discussions) and the reasoning reached for each sub-component, highlighting any significant complementarities or differences between evidence sources.
### 12 Assessment of Efficiency and Coherence of the Project

#### 12.1 Assessment of Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect Assessed</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Basis of Rating</th>
<th>Guidance Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12.1.1 To what extent has the disbursement of funds been consistent with the implementation plan? | 1-4    | 1 = Disbursements made with significant delays impacting the implementation of the project considerably.  
2 = Disbursement made with delays that impacted the implementation of the project moderately.  
3 = Disbursements not always made within agreed deadlines but delays did not impact the implementation of the project.  
4 = Disbursements made on time and within agreed deadlines. | List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g.  
- Relevant project reports at design and implementation stages  
- Independent evaluation or monitoring reports  
- Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed;  
Etc. |
| 12.1.2 To what extent have the Transaction Costs of project implementation been adequately controlled? (e.g. costs from slow approval processes, unnecessary administrative checks, duplications, etc). | 1-4    | 1 = A majority of the informed stakeholders assess transaction costs to be excessively high and/or there is no evidence of procedures adopted in project design and implementation to control transaction costs.  
2 = A majority of the informed stakeholders assess transaction costs to be too high, although there may be some evidence of procedures being adopted to control transaction costs.  
3 = A majority of the informed stakeholders assess transaction costs to be moderate and there is evidence of procedures being adopted to control transaction costs.  
4 = A majority of the informed stakeholders assess transaction costs to be insignificant and there is evidence of procedures being adopted to control transaction costs. | List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g.  
- Relevant project reports at design and implementation stages  
- Independent evaluation or monitoring reports  
- Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed;  
Etc. |

#### Overall Ranking of Efficiency

| Overall Ranking of Efficiency | 1-4    | Enter the average of the above scores, to two decimal places, e.g. 2.50 | List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g.  
- Relevant project reports at design and implementation stages  
- Independent evaluation or monitoring reports  
- Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed;  
Etc. |

### Comment on Overall Ranking of Efficiency

[Present overall rating (1 = Highly Unsatisfactory; 2 = Unsatisfactory; 3 = Satisfactory; 4 = Highly Satisfactory) and briefly explain the justification for the rating.]  
Text xxx

**NB:**  
- Outline sources (documentation and interviews/ focus group discussions) and the reasoning reached for each sub-component, highlighting any significant complementarities or differences between evidence sources.  
- Where possible outline specific examples of qualitative and quantitative evidence identified to illustrate the basis of your assessments, e.g. examples of measures introduced to minimise transaction costs, etc.
### 12.2 Assessment of Coherence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect Assessed</th>
<th>Basis of Rating</th>
<th>Guidance Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.2.1</strong> To what extent is the project coherent with the overall AfDB country</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategy paper?</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Relevant project reports at design and implementation stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Independent evaluation or monitoring reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.2.2</strong> To what extent is the project coherent with other TSF projects in the</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country or region?</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Relevant project reports at design and implementation stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Independent evaluation or monitoring reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.2.3</strong> To what extent is the project coherent with other projects funded by</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-TSF ADF funds and/or by other funding agencies?</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Relevant project reports at design and implementation stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Independent evaluation or monitoring reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Overall Ranking of Coherence                                                    | 1-4             | Enter the average of the above scores, to two decimal places, e.g. 2.33                                                                           |

#### Comment on Overall Ranking of Coherence

[Present overall rating (1= Highly Unsatisfactory; 2= Unsatisfactory; 3= Satisfactory; 4=Highly Satisfactory) and briefly explain the justification for the rating.]

Text xxx

**NB:**
- Outline sources (documentation and interviews/ focus group discussions) and the reasoning reached for each sub-component, highlighting any significant complementarities or differences between evidence sources.
- Where possible outline specific examples of qualitative and quantitative evidence identified to illustrate the basis of your assessments, e.g. examples of particular complementarities between projects, etc.
## 13 Assessment of Sustainability of the Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect Assessed</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Basis of Rating</th>
<th>Guidance Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13.1.1 To what extent are the results achieved by the Project likely to be sustained over time? | 1-4 | 1 = No credible evidence that the project results will be sustained much beyond the project lifetime. 2 = Evidence suggests that there are significant risks which put in doubt the sustainability of results, i.e. less than 50% chance of results being sustained. 3 = Evidence suggests that the probability of results being sustained are positive, i.e. more than 50% chance of results being sustained. 4 = Evidence suggests that the institutional, financial and other conditions are in place to sustain results for the long term. | List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g.  
- Relevant project reports at implementation and completion stages  
- Independent evaluation or monitoring reports  
- Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed;  
- Etc. |
| 13.1.2 To what extent have the procedures applied by the Bank in the Project given due attention to issues of sustainability (institutional, financial and environmental where applicable)? | 1-4 | 1 = No evidence of operational procedures being introduced to enhance the sustainability of the project. 2 = Evidence of some operational procedures being introduced to enhance the sustainability of the project but there are significant doubts over their scope and/or their effectiveness. 3 = Evidence of specific operational procedures being introduced to enhance sustainability of the project but these may not be sufficient if the project environment becomes unfavourable. 4 = Evidence of comprehensive operational procedures being introduced to enhance sustainability of the project which should be sufficient even if the project environment becomes unfavourable. | List here the sources of information supporting the rating, e.g.  
- Relevant project reports at design, implementation and completion stages  
- Independent evaluation or monitoring reports  
- Testimonies of relevant stakeholders interviewed;  
- Etc. |

### Overall Ranking of Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Enter the average of the above scores, to two decimal places, e.g. 3.30

### Comment on Overall Ranking of Sustainability

[Present overall rating (1 = Highly Unsatisfactory; 2= Unsatisfactory; 3= Satisfactory; 4=Highly Satisfactory) and briefly explain the justification for the rating.] Text xxx

**NB:**
- Outline sources (documentation and interviews/ focus group discussions) and the reasoning reached for each sub-component, highlighting any significant complementarities or differences between evidence sources.
- Where possible outline specific examples of qualitative and quantitative evidence identified to illustrate the basis of your assessments, e.g. examples of particular measures introduced to support sustainability, etc.
## 14 Overall Assessment and Identification of Lessons Learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANCE</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS</th>
<th>COHERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enter overall rating from above, e.g. 2.5</td>
<td>Enter overall rating from above</td>
<td>Enter overall rating from above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNERSHIP</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enter overall rating from above, e.g. 1.5</td>
<td>Enter overall rating from above</td>
<td>Enter overall rating from above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT PERFORMANCE

Provide your personal summary of the overall assessment: which aspects of the project have performed well and why? Which aspects have performed less well and why?

Text

Xxx

### KEY LESSONS LEARNED

**POSITIVE FACTORS,** (to be reproduced in other Pillar III projects if possible)

- Xxx
- Yyy
- Zzz
- Etc.

**NEGATIVE FACTORS,** (to be avoided in other Pillar III projects if possible)

- xxxx
- yyyy
- zzzz
- etc.