



## AIP Water Investment Scorecard Technical Working Group Meeting Minutes

**Meeting Date:** 04/11/2021 14:00 -15:00CAT

**Location:** Zoom

### Participants Present

- Patrice Leumeni, AMCOW
- Jose Antonio Gesti Canuto, UNICEF
- Silvia Gaya, UNICEF
- Fiona Margaret Gore, WHO
- Themba Gumbo, UNDP CapNet
- Madeleine Nyiratuza, UNDP
- Heng Liu, UNIDO
- Eva Kremere, UNIDO
- Anton Earle, SIWI
- Rebecca Ilunga, C40
- Stuart Crane, UNEP
- Alex Simalabwi, GWP
- Andrew Takawira, GWP
- Kidanemariam Tiruneh, GWP
- Annah Ndeketeya, GWP
- Shamiso Kumbirai, GWP
- John Matthews, AGWA
- Kelsey Harpham, AGWA
- Kasonde Mulenga, ARC

- Joep Verhagen, GCA
- Muyatwa Sitali, SWA
- Matus Samel, EIU
- Harsheen Sethi, EIU
- Ashish Niraula, EIU
- Dina Alborna, EIU
- Helen Pankhurst, Vocab International
- Jorge Alvarez-Sala, UNICEF
- Collin Herron, GWPO
- Nico Elema, NEPAD CoE-STI

#### Apologies

- Wahabou Ibrah, AUDA-NEPAD
- Kitch Bawa, AMCOW
- Loreen Katiyo, GWP
- Jean Boroto Ruhiza, FAO
- Davison Saruchera, IUCN
- Jonathan Farr – WaterAid
- Len Abrams, GWP
- Greenwell Matchaya, IWMI
- Boniface Aleobua, AfDB
- Simbini Tichakunda, AUDA-NEPAD

#### Notes

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
1. Welcome	The Secretariat welcomed all members to the meeting, and new participants were introduced to the meeting.	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
<p><b>2. Brief feedback on recent AIP steering Group, Core Group, and ARG Meetings</b></p>	<p>The Secretariat presented the outcomes from the AIP Steering Group meeting, highlighting the following key points.</p> <p>During the meeting, the AIP Scorecard Steering Group Members: His Excellency Dr. Abram Mayaki, His Excellency President Jakaya Kikwete, Chair of GWP and ACU, Mr. Thomas Banda, Acting Executive Secretariat for AMCOW, and Representatives from AFDB, DBSA representative, Representative from South African Department of Water and Sanitation and other board members from GWPSA side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commended the efforts of the Core Group and Technical Working Group in supporting the development of the AIP Water Investment Scorecard to date.</li> <li>• Noted the outcomes of the AIP Water Investment Scorecard Kick-Off Event Report.</li> <li>• Noted the roadmap for the development of the AIP Water Investment Scorecard and the agreed timelines, and the different support structures facilitating its development.</li> <li>• Directed the AUDA-NEPAD, AMCOW, and GWP to ensure the smooth and timely implementation of the agreed roadmap with partners.</li> <li>• Noted the terms of reference of the Core Group and Technical Working Group supporting the development of the AIP Water Investment Scorecard.</li> <li>• Adopted the Guiding Principles driving the development of the AIP Water Investment Scorecard.</li> <li>• Adopted the proposed Framework for the AIP Water Investment Scorecard.</li> <li>• Requested the outputs of the AIP Scorecard be reviewed and expanded beyond the development of reports.</li> <li>• Noted the upcoming High-Level Investment Conference to be held in Zanzibar on 17 December 2021 at Melia Hotel, Zanzibar.</li> <li>• Noted the International High-Level Panel on Water Investments for Africa to be launched on 18 January 2022 in Davos-Klosters, Switzerland, during the World Economic Forum Annual Meeting.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments from the TWG</b></p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p><b>UNDP:</b> Elaborate request from the Steering Group on the output of the AIP Scorecard that needs to be reviewed and expanded beyond the development of reports.</p> <p><b>The Secretariat:</b> The Steering Group directed that the AIP Scorecard Framework needs to be more ambitious because what is there currently as the output of this work will be reporting for bottlenecks and the gaps that would be identified. They recommended that the output level should go beyond the reports. Therefore, the AIP Scorecard Groups need to come up with what could be on the output level and try to come up with what the Scorecard needs to achieve.</p> <p><b>Key Comments and outcomes from the AIP Scorecard Core Group Meeting held on the 25th of October 2021.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Core Group members requested the development of an explainer for some of the various AIP Scorecard Framework result areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Reported that the Secretariat and EIU received feedback from several members of Independent Reference Group on the use of the terminology “Theory of Change,” and it was proposed that the theory of change now be referred to as AIP Scorecard Framework because AIP Programme has a theory of change itself.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Development of AIP Scorecard indicator methodology for adoption due to the positive feedback from the Steering Group on the development and adoption of guiding principles. They proposed that similar practices be used for the selection criteria of indicators.</li> <li>• Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engagement with focus groups will be parallel to formulating indicators because they will provide some unique perspectives that will help guide on the relevance of the Scorecard, particularly with private sector focus groups.</li> <li>• In the development of a long-term reporting system, there is a need to develop a measure to ensure that the Scorecard is used as an adjustment equaliser and does not have unintended consequences of limiting support to fragile countries.</li> <li>• The Scorecard needs to be balanced to ensure that the economic, financial, and social returns are well translated.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Core Group and TWG will be invited to the FGDs, and the two groups will actively participate in the discussions. The ARG member will be observers because their main priority is to give feedback from a fresh perspective.</li> </ul> <p>The Secretariat presented key questions on the AIP Scorecard Framework, asked by the ARG based on their independent review. Highlighted that the ARG comprised of experts and specialists to provide independent review of the AIP Scorecard development processes. Their role is to give critical feedback on key deliverables and outputs developed during this process. Accordingly, the AIP Scorecard Framework was shared with them for comments and review, and the Secretariat received feedback as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Who is the AIP Scorecard talking to, and do we answer their questions? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For example, would a head of state ask themselves, “how large is the investment gap?” and how best can I reduce it? To answer the first question, indicators are needed to assess the investment gap and evaluate future changes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>ii. Is a Scorecard Theory of Change (ToC) relevant? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove all references to a Scorecard ToC and refer to it as AIP Scorecard.</li> <li>• “AIP Scorecard Theory of Change” will be referred to as the “AIP Scorecard Framework.”</li> </ul> </li> <li>iii. What is required for the Scorecard to properly support the integration of gender and social inclusion?</li> <li>iv. How do we develop useful indicators? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The indicator development is still in progress. What do we propose to develop SMART indicators?</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	
<b>3. Presentation of indicator selection criteria</b>	<p>The EIU presented indicator selection criteria, highlighting that EIU has compiled a long list of potential result areas and indicators from inputs from the AIP Scorecard coordination groups. The final list of indicators should be robust, comprehensive, practical, and usable in creating that narrative and the clear assessment we need. As we are going through the individual indicators and their methodologies, we will highlight top priority indicators by assessing each of them across a set of key criteria that are aligned to the guiding principles.</p> <p>The EIU is currently working on.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of relevant metadata for each of the indicators.</li> </ul>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritisation of indicators.</li> <li>• Developing a possible list of proxy indicators and proxy data, particularly for indicators that are likely to be challenging in terms of data creation or collection.</li> </ul> <p>i. <u>AIP Scorecard prioritisation: relevance:</u> The selection of indicators will be based on the following key criterion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevance, purpose/value addition of the indicator is for indicators that directly impact investments in water along with the following scale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low</i>- the indicator is unlikely to affect the willingness to invest directly.</li> <li>• <i>Medium</i>-the indicator is likely to affect willingness to invest directly.</li> <li>• <i>High</i>- the indicator is likely to affect willingness to invest.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Comments from TWG</b></p> <p><b>SIWI:</b> Is the ranking going to warn of the risks or try to lock in investments by making certain investments look attractive than they might otherwise be?</p> <p><b>AMCOW:</b> Asked if the ranking will differ from one indicator to another. The understanding is that the ranking should be on the quantitative or the qualitative indicators, will there be a different value from one indicator to the other?</p> <p><b>The EIU:</b> This is an internal tool for the AIP Scorecard developers to agree on the relative importance of individual indicators, flag the extremely important ones, and find a way to capture data for that area. Those that might be interesting but not so relevant might be put in the parking lot and later merged with others. We will be starting from scratch because we want to align to the objective of the Scorecard. But we are open to discussion if anyone feels strongly about a particular indicator that has not performed well or has not captured the desired data; therefore, there is room to flag that. The objective of the Scorecard is to provide benchmarking exercise and framework, which is by its</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>nature comparative. We want to capture elements that are as relevant to most countries in the regions as possible. The framework must be applicable across all countries, but there will be some differences here and there.</p> <p><b>UNDP:</b> Asked whether the historical performance of the indicator will determine whether its rating is low, medium or high, or is the Scorecard starting afresh on this prioritisation?</p> <p><b>UNIDO:</b> Since indicator relevance can be different from country to country, will the Scorecard be used in different ways or use the same criteria for all countries?</p> <p>ii. <u>AIP Scorecard Prioritisation: feasibility</u></p> <p>Practicability/feasibility of measuring the indicator: this is for indicators in which data is readily available and can be used annually along the following scale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Low:</i> There are no publicly available data sources to provide data for the indicators or replace them as a proxy.</li> <li>• <i>Medium:</i> There is no single data source to provide data for the indicator, but consistent, high-quality data is likely to be obtained.</li> <li>• <i>High:</i> The indicator can utilise readily existing publicly available data series with clear sources, high country coverage.</li> </ul> <p>iii. <u>AIP Scorecard Prioritisation: Credibility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reliability or creditability of data sources and the ability to validate that data. Low, Medium, and high based on the reliability and credibility of the data sources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments from TWG</b></p> <p><b>NEPAD CoE-STI:</b> Inquired if the EIU has tested the data or indicators to look at reliability or credibility? Can it be applied? Would it be effective? So that we start looking at the real data.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p><b>Vocab International:</b> Explained that on the feasibility of the data, some data is changed over time. It might be useful to highlight which indicator sets might be telling interesting stories and could be used as a pilot. Asked if the indicators can be mapped against SDG indicators? As lateral thinking whether these indicators are adding value in that way. There is tension between issues of sustainability versus extraction and conservation versus development. How are we picking up that data?</p> <p><b>NEPAD CoE-STI:</b> Commented that there is no clear alignment of the Scorecard to Agenda 2063, its aspirations, and specific goals, whereas most comments are towards SDGs. Advised that the indicators should be aligned to Agenda 2063.</p> <p><u>AIP Scorecard Indicator Development Process</u></p> <p><b>Step 1: Metadata identification</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identifying the specific metadata for potential and existing indicators,</li> <li>• define each concept and potential indicator clearly,</li> <li>• explore proxy indicators for qualitative indicators</li> <li>• Conduct comprehensive data audits to understand the availability and coverage of data, data frequency, the latest data available, the baseline.</li> </ul> <p><b>Step 2: Indicator Prioritisation</b></p> <p>The prioritisation process is aimed to identify essential/ critical and relevant indicators that will be based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Value /purpose</i></li> <li>• <i>Practicability</i></li> <li>• <i>Sustainability</i></li> <li>• <i>Reliability</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Step 3: Methodology Development</b></p> <p>As the next step, EIU will be developing more detailed methodologies for individual indicators. This will be presented in more detail in the next meeting.</p>	



AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
<p><b>4. Presentation on proposed AIP Scorecard focus group discussions and key participants</b></p>	<p>EIU gave a brief presentation on proposed AIP Scorecard focus group discussions, highlighting that currently, EIU is organising FGDs on the particular indicators and their methodologies to have an in-depth discussion on each indicator. Looking particularly at data sources, data collection methodologies.</p> <p>Four Thematic Expert Consultations are planned:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Gender</li> <li>ii. Climate Policy</li> <li>iii. Finance, specifically green finance</li> <li>iv. Asset performance/utility management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The aim is to identify a few indicators relevant to these topics/areas to discuss and design detailed methodologies.</li> <li>• The FGDs will discuss all indicators in the AIP Scorecard Framework.</li> <li>• The TWG is invited to participate in the discussions. They can choose the thematic area that they are most passionate about.</li> <li>• EIU will start organising dates for FGDs and share them once they are finalised.</li> <li>•</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b>Comments from TWG</b></p> <p><b>SIWI:</b> Enquired if the proposed four thematic areas become new indicator areas or stand-alone indicator areas? Or do they still fall under the existing areas of governance and the other areas? Very keen on participating in the discussions on gender area.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p><b>EIU:</b> These are areas with some lack of clarity in terms of data required. There are some specific challenges in incorporating these elements and how best to capture some of them. They are underpinning areas but will not affect the framework.</p>	
<p><b>5. Next steps and way forward</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of AIP Scorecard Indicator Methodologies.</li> <li>• TWG are invited to FGDs.</li> <li>• TWG to guide if anything is missing that they may want the FGDs to discuss. If there is any, that could be shared with Shamiso.</li> <li>• Follow-up with TWG to find out which group discussions they are keen to participate in.</li> <li>• Need to agree on the key issues that need to be considered in the selection criteria for prioritisation.</li> <li>• The FGDs will start in two weeks, and the proposed dates will be shared with the TWG.</li> <li>• The Secretariat will be in touch with the TWG regarding the AIP Scorecard Presentation at the PIDA Water Week, which will take place in the first week of December. Further details will be shared with TWG in due course.</li> </ul> <p><b>AMCOW:</b> asked if a set of indicators will be accompanied by the methodologies that EIU will be sharing.</p> <p><b>The Secretariat:</b> The methodologies will be shared with the framework to guide the review of these methodologies.</p>	<p><b>Action 1:</b> EIU to develop and share indicator methodologies with the Secretariat on the 10<sup>th</sup> of November 2021. It will be shared with the TWG.</p> <p><b>Action 2:</b> The TWG to suggest key issues that need to be considered in the indicator selection criteria for prioritisation.</p> <p><b>Action 3:</b> The Secretariat to follow up with individual TWG members on which discussions they would want to participate in.</p>
<p><b>6. AOB</b></p>	<p>The Secretariat proposed having 90 minutes meetings to give room for more discussions on the indicators.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
<b>7. Meeting close</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mr. Takawira thanked all members for their participation and closed the meeting.</li></ul>	