



AIP Water Investment Scorecard Technical Working Group Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: 07/10/2021 14:00 -15:30 CAT

Location: Zoom

Participants Present

- Simbini Tichakunda, AUDA-NEPAD
- 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
- 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

Apologies

- Wahabou Ibrah, AUDA-NEPAD
- Patrice Leumeni, AMCOW
- Kitch Bawa, AMCOW
- Loreen Katiyo, GWP
- Jean Boroto Ruhiza, FAO
- Davison Saruchera, IUCN
- Jonathan Farr – WaterAid
- Nico Elema, NEPAD CoE-STI
- Len Abrams, GWP
- Greenwell Matchaya, IWMI
- Boniface Aleobua, AfDB

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
1. Welcome and introductions	The Secretariat welcomed all members to the meeting, and a round of introduction was done by all members present.	
2. Discussion on revised AIP Water Investment	The EIU presented the revised AIP Scorecard Theory of Change (hereafter referred to as the AIP Scorecard Framework) that factored in the comments noted during the Pan-African Stakeholder engagement meeting and the comments from the Core Group Meeting (see attached slide deck for the revised Framework).	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
Scorecard Framework	<p>The main revisions made under pillar 1 are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Indicator integration of water in national climate change and capacity development (NDCs, NAPs) was added under 1.1.6 ii. Indicators under section 1.2.1: Regulatory Risks were added to address the link between water and public health related risks (including COVID-19, hygiene, and sanitation) <p>Key changes made under Pillar 2:</p> <p>Some revisions were made on Water Investments and Financing, which tries to measure government allocation to water, based on three things: Public Budget Allocation to the water sector, ODA allocation to the water sector, and Domestic and International /Private allocation to the water sector. We want to determine the actual amount disbursed (and spent) to the key water-related sectors for each allocation. Therefore, the following have been included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The inclusion of public budget commitment/allocation on water (WASH, agriculture, energy, nature, and biodiversity protection per capita. ii. Public budget execution rate. iii. Public budget allocation to transboundary water cooperation. iv. Blended financing investments in water, sanitation, and environment. v. Philanthropic finance to water, sanitation, and environment. <p>Key changes made under Pillar 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Rephrasing of 3.2.2 on disaster management planning to include early warning forecasting and response. ii. The inclusion of an indicator on allocation efficiency and demand management. 	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>Comments from the Technical Working Group</p> <p>SIWI:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to consider opportunities for investments in natural infrastructure. • If in the enabling environment there are mechanisms that quantify the value of natural ecosystems, that can be agreed on in the natural resources of countries catchment areas. <p>WHO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is going to be challenging to monitor the entire water sector using the Framework, particularly coming up with indicators to monitor the whole sector. • There is some discrepancy in the way that some indicators are captured; some are captured more broadly while some are very narrow. • Is the information and data only on water resources? If so, why not focus on other aspects of the water sector? • The language and level of details should be consistent and clearer across all the indicators. • What is meant by public health risks, including covid-19, hygiene, and sanitation? • Why do we have public budget allocation to transboundary water corporation which gets its own input and there is also public budget commitment allocation which lumps together WASH, agriculture, energy, and biodiversity protection. There is a need for consistency across sub-sectors. • ODA and philanthropy could be a better combination than private sector investments and philanthropy. <p>AGWA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NBS are not automatically climate adaptation projects, and not all of them have climate adaption benefits; hence they should be explicitly seen as infrastructure development projects. 	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The more progressive multilateral development banks (MDBs) do not have a separate NBS or grey infrastructure track. They use green bonds and a hybrid supporting integrated investments; therefore, we should consider including an indicator to track integrated investments <p>GCA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The national adaptation plans (NAP) do not give a good indication of where countries are compared to each other. Moreover, most NAPs are weak and do not inform the budget. The length and scope of the programme requires lots of effort and intensive resources to be accomplished. <p>UNICEF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for clear indication of climate resilience at the outcome level. Need to track how Climate financing increases towards the water sector. <p>AGWA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive data on climate finance is difficult to find. <p>The EIU:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to develop comprehensive Framework but move to feasible and practical indicators. <p>UNIDO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no balance from the first column regarding investment to the last column regarding performance. Consider including "<i>contribution for national economic goals and empowering women or gender equity</i>" to cater for social, environmental, and economic contributions. 	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>ARC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to expand operations and maintenance to utility asset management and capacity. <p>SWA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public health risks should be reflected somewhere. • Budget allocation should go beyond budget commitment, budget disbursement and rates of utilisation. It should also include the modalities through which the order is passed, such as the budget support sector. Need to track the modalities of funding allocation. • Need to add 2.2.4 of budget disbursement modalities. • Refer to data sources collected by GLAAS <p>C40:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate financing should cease to be a separate "type" of finance as it should be mainstreamed across all investment channels as we advance <p>UNICEF: Adaptation deficit should be explicitly indicated.</p> <p>AGWA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two separate metrics would be useful and informative to track private sector sources such as bonds and climate financing. Climate financing should be mainstreamed across all the pillars. <p>The Secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reiterated that climate financing should be incorporated and promised to seek further guidance from the Steering Committee. Countries need to commit to what they pledged, and there are more innovative funds 	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>that are deployed, including climate funds and others. No system is used to track that yet, but we could find ways to track that from countries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to include financing to water to support sanitation and hygiene. <p>UNDP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The indicators are imbalanced across pillars. There are about 23 indicators under the enabling environment, 12 under investment and finance, and 6 under performance and sustainability. The distribution does not imply relative weight or relative importance of the pillars. Need to balance the number of indicators. <p>SIWI:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enquired if there has been an exploration of how to define the different indicators for the topics presented in the theory of change, or when it would be done? <p>The Secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the comments made, there is a clear direction with some refining required to balance the three pillars. 	
<p>5. Next steps and way forward</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat will submit the revised AIP Scorecard Framework to the Steering Committee. • The Secretariat will convene two specific focus discussions with the private sector and finance institutions from Africa and beyond to understand why the private sector is not investing in water. The Secretariat will request support from the TWG to reach out to their acquaintances in financing private organisations and the finance ministry. The focus discussion will be arranged in the next two to three weeks. • The second one will be with the finance ministries, specifically with permanent secretaries for finance or treasury in charge of the national resources and funds that come up with national budgets. The aim is to have a discussion with them and see if what we are proposing makes sense and if we can get information or not. The 	<p>Note: Steering Committee Meeting to be scheduled towards the end of October</p>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>Secretariat learned some challenges faced around funding water versus funding other sectors from an earlier discussion with the permanent secretary of the Ministry of Finance in Tanzania. Hence the Secretariat would like to engage in more discussion with the ministry of finance on the Scorecard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An investment conference on the Scorecard is scheduled for mid-December, and it will be hosted by the President of Zanzibar and Former President Jakaya Kikwete. The Secretariat is preparing a letter of invitation for all the Heads of Institutions participating in the Scorecard. GWPSA will share the invitation letters with TWG members for review before sending them to the invitees. They will be invited by the President of Zanzibar. • As the indicators are being developed, we will start to define the long-term strategy for the Scorecard, in terms of how it will be rolled out, the roles of partners involved, 25% is the work done on the development of the Scorecard, and 75% will be the follow-up on the implementation of Scorecard being piloted in 2022. The Scorecard will be updated looking particularly at the bottlenecks identified and the roles of the partners; after that, it will then be rolled out across Africa. • The AIP is developing an international finance investment facility that can be used for public and private funding. The international finance facility is supposed to be a vehicle through which large scale funding can be mobilised to be deployed for countries. • The next meetings will be on the 4th of November, 2021 and 18th of November 2021. 	
6. AOB	No AOB was discussed	
7. Meeting close	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Takawira thanked all members for their participation and closed the meeting. 	