



AIP Water Investment Scorecard Core Group Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: 08/11/2021 11:30 -13:00 CAT

Location: Zoom

Participants Present

- Graham Chingambu, DBSA
- Paul Orengho, AMCOW
- Kathleen Dominique, OECD
- Andrew Takawira, GWP
- Kidanemariam Tiruneh, GWP
- Shamiso Kumbirai, GWP
- Len Abrams, GWP
- Diego Rodriguez, World Bank
- Sylvia Gaya, UNICEF
- Patrice Leumeni, AMCOW
- Samel Matus, EIU
- Martina Chow, EIU

Apologies

- Catherine Tovey, World Bank
- Boniface Aleobua, AfDB
- Towela Nyirenda-Jere, AUDA-NEPAD
- Loreen Katiyo, AUDA-NEPAD
- Dominick de Waal, World Bank
- Kelly Ann Naylor, UNICEF
- Alex Simalabwi, GWP

Minutes

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
1. Welcome	Mr. Takawira welcomed all members to the meeting.	
2. Review of actions from the previous meeting and adoption of minutes	<p>The Secretariat presented the key actions noted in the meeting on the 25th of October 2021.</p> <p>Action 1: Secretariat to update the AIP Scorecard Framework outputs as guided by the Steering Group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This action is still in progress, and as soon as it is done, it will be shared with the Core Group <p>Action 2: Secretariat to develop AIP Scorecard indicator selection criteria for presentation at the next Core Group meeting</p>	
3. Presentation of AIP indicator selection criteria	<p>The Secretariat presented an overview of the indicator development process, highlighting that several consultations led to the development of the AIP Scorecard Framework. The framework has a long list of potential indicators for each result area. The next step will prioritize the indicators using the guiding principles.</p> <p>The next steps for indicator development and prioritization are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of relevant metadata that reflects the indicators that were developed. • Prioritization of indicators, looking particularly at relevant indicators according to the selection criteria. • Development of individual indicator methodologies, which will be done by identifying key methodological steps to obtain the data and construct the indicators. <p><u>AIP Scorecard prioritization exercise criterion 1: Relevance</u></p> <p>i. Relevance, purpose/value addition of the indicator: This assesses if a certain indicator provides an added value to the framework and how it aligns and contributes to the objectives. This is also to assess whether the indicators directly measure and impact investments in water based on the following scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Low</i>- the indicator is unlikely to affect the willingness to invest directly. 	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Medium</i>-the indicator is likely to affect willingness to invest directly. • <i>High</i>- the indicator is likely to affect willingness to invest. <p><u>AIP Scorecard prioritization exercise criterion 2: feasibility and repeatability</u></p> <p>ii. Practicability/feasibility of measuring the indicator: new and bespoke indicators will require time and energy to obtain the data based on a scale of how easy it is to obtain or collect that data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Low</i>: There are no publicly available data sources to provide data for the indicators or replace them as a proxy. • <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. • <i>High</i>: The indicator can utilize readily existing publicly available data series with clear sources, high country coverage, and regularly published. <p><u>AIP Scorecard prioritization exercise criterion: Credibility</u></p> <p>iii. Reliability or creditability of data sources and the ability to validate that data by the third parties, coming from respective sources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This depends on whether the available data is publicly scrutinized with clear methodology or processes versus • those indicators which will rely on data that may be difficult to validate or rely more on qualitative assessment. <p>The Scorecard will then need to develop mitigating methodologies that are robust and address potential credibility risks. This will be measured on the following scale, <i>Low, Medium, and high</i>, based on the reliability and credibility of the data sources.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>Comments from the Core Group</p> <p>UNICEF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commended the three criteria that are proposed for the selection of indicators. Commented that the sectors are not measuring; they have no monitoring framework for measuring climate resilience of water and sanitation. • Highlighted that we may end up proposing things that do not have tracking systems in place. • Advised that we need to consider new indicators that have not been measured before. <p>EIU:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first principle is to identify the best possible ways that we can use to measure all elements. • We are relying on the existing efforts that are available. However, the team is open to suggestions on available efforts that could be incorporated or utilized. • We do not want to rule out the indicators just because they do not have the available data. <p>OECD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the Scorecard evolve going forward? • How important is the comparability across the countries for the positioning and utility of the Scorecard going forward? <p>GWP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a good idea to think of the methodology used when applying the indicators. • The first thing to look at is what is "useful" to the user of the Scorecard. • What gives them the most information in the particular indicator? This is a way that could help reduce the number of indicators. • Firstly, we have to consider the most useful indicators to the Scorecard and target audience, then look at the other criteria for repeatability and credibility. • The Scorecard needs to apply these criteria in a certain order to ensure that the Scorecard remains pertinent. • If the criteria are applied equally, we might find that the Scorecard result is not as strong as it should be. 	
<p>4. Update on the AIP Scorecard</p>	<p>Prior to the focus group discussions (FGDs), the EIU will develop specific indicators and methodologies for those specific thematic areas to provoke in-depth discussions on the draft methodologies, alternative methodologies, and sources so that we could produce the best potential measures.</p>	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
<p>focus group discussions</p>	<p>EIU: Requested guidance from the Core Group on whether the identified groups are relevant and suggestions on what might have been missed. Requested the Core Group to participate in the FGDs</p> <p>Comments from the Core Group</p> <p>OECD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed a nature-based solution (NBS) group discussion, highlighting the group's relevance as some performance metrics are related to NBS investments. This type (NBS) of investments could be different from conventional infrastructure investments. • In the finance category, what will this discussion entail? Will it include the enabling environment, types of policies, regulations that influence enabling environment investments, or is it about mobilization types of finance? <p>EIU: Responded that there are a couple of indicators on the nature-based solutions in the framework under climate policy and within finance. The nature-based solution could be covered between these two sections. The nature-based solutions will be part of the discussions, particularly because the session will discuss performance metrics.</p> <p>GWP: The objective of the FGDs is to get input from users of the Scorecard themselves. The finance group should not only be deliberating on the issues of finance but also seek to include financiers who will be using the Scorecard as part of their decision-making process. Likewise, the FGD for utility management includes international water utilities seeking to do business in various countries. We will not only be discussing a topic but get input from the very people who will be using the tool.</p> <p>The Secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responded that Mr. Abram's proposition will add value to the FGDs and will try inviting utilities to the FGDs. • Requested confirmation from the Core Group on the approach used for indicator selection, prioritization, and FGDs and asked if they are well-defined. <p>AMCOW: Commented that they are content with the process but will provide input or comment on the first indicators to be developed.</p>	<p>Action 1: The Secretariat to invite utilities to the FGDs to give their input on the Scorecard as users.</p>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>DBSA: They are fine with both processes; however, they inquired if any effort was taken to bring on board the utilities to the FGDs. Will they be active players in the discussions?</p> <p>The Secretariat: Responded that they approached Regulators Association to be part of the discussions and requested them to suggest their counterparts within the regulatory and utility spheres.</p> <p>EIU: Highlighted it will be valuable to have the utilities on board. However, from previous experience, they are the most difficult audience to catch due to some sensitivities. Will try to exhaust all efforts to incorporate them because a lot of data from this area is not available or in the public domain.</p> <p>Gender Focus Group Discussion</p> <p>A big question is how to incorporate gender elements across all pillars. These are the four focus preliminary key indicators that will lead the discussion on incorporating gender across the Scorecard Framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator 1.1.2; Integrated climate resilient national water investment plan and strategy. • Indicator 1.3.1; Gender Transformative Water Investment: • Indicator 1.3.2; Social Inclusion, specific gender considerations. • Indicator 3.2.4; Gender impact evaluation and monitoring of water investments. <p>Climate Policy Focus Group Discussion</p> <p>The session is expected to clarify what indicators/sub-indicators need to be developed to track climate policy integration in water investments in Africa. It is also expected to identify some methodologies, data collection and reporting mechanisms for climate policy-related indicators. The key indicators to discuss during this focus group are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator 1.1.2; Integrated climate resilient national water investment plan and strategy. • Indicator 1.1.6; Integration of water in national climate change and development plans. • Indicator 1.1.7; Integration of water investments in national development plans. • Indicator 2.3.6; Climate financing and investments. • Indicator 3.2.1; Climate-resilient water investments. 	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<p>Finance/Private Sector Focus Group Discussion</p> <p>The session is expected to clarify what are the key indicators/sub-indicators that need to be developed to support private sector engagement into the water sector. The key indicators to discuss during this focus group are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Indicator 1.1.3—Monitoring of bankable projects pipeline ● Indicator 1.2.1.1—Ease of access to finance ● Indicator 2.2.1—ODA commitment / allocation for water (WASH, agriculture, energy, Nature and biodiversity protection) per capita ● Indicator 2.2.2—ODA disbursement for water (WASH, agriculture, energy, Nature and biodiversity protection) per capita ● Indicator 2.2.3—ODA execution rate for water (WASH, agriculture, energy, Nature and biodiversity protection) per capita ● Indicator 2.2.4—Modalities of ODA disbursement ● Indicator 2.3.1—Domestic private sector investment (WASH, agriculture, energy, Nature and biodiversity protection) ● Indicator 2.3.2—Foreign Direct Investments on water (WASH, agriculture, energy, Nature and biodiversity protection) ● Indicator 2.3.3—Public Private Partnerships on water (WASH, agriculture, energy, Nature and biodiversity protection) ● Indicator 2.3.4—Blended financing investments in water, sanitation and environment ● Indicator 2.3.5—Philanthropic finance to water sanitation and environment ● Indicator 2.3.6—Climate financing and investments (WASH, agriculture, energy, Nature and biodiversity protection) <p>Asset Performance and Utility Management Focus Group Discussion</p> <p>The session is expected to clarify what indicators/sub-indicators need to be developed to track asset performance and utilities management in water investment in Africa. It is also expected to identify some methodologies, data collection and reporting mechanisms for asset performance and utilities management indicators. The key indicators to discuss during this focus group are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Indicator 2.2.3—ODA execution rate for water (WASH, agriculture, energy, Nature and biodiversity protection) per capita 	

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION ITEMS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator measures the country's actual per capita official development assistance utilisation for the water sector • Indicator 3.1.1—Water and sanitation pricing efficiency • This indicator measures the country's capacity to efficiently price water resources • Indicator 3.1.2—Operation and maintenance capacity (including management of utilities and assets) • This indicator measures the country's capacity to manage and maintain its assets in the water sector • Indicator 3.1.3—Cost recovery accounts for water services • This indicator measures the country's enforcement of cost recovery mechanisms (fees, tariffs, etc) for water services • Indicator 3.2.3—Economic impact evaluation of water investments • This indicator measures the country's capacity to conduct an evaluation of economic impact of ongoing and past investments 	
5. Next Steps and way forward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat will engage in the prioritization of the indicators. • The focus group discussions will commence after the 18th of November, 2021. • The Secretariat will invite the identified participants to the FGDs. • The Secretariat will share the dates for FGDs with the Core Group. • During PIDA Water Week, between the 6th and 10th December 2021, there will be a session on the AIP Scorecard where the Core Group members will be invited to support the running out of that session. The Secretariat will share further details on that in due time. • The Secretariat will share a draft concept note for the PIDA Water session with the Core Group. • The next meeting will be on the 22nd November 2021. 	<p>Action 2: The Secretariat to share FGDs dates with the Core Group.</p> <p>Action 3: The Secretariat to share draft concept note for PIDA water session with the Core Group for review.</p>
6. AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat noted that GWP is preparing letters of invitation for the Zanzibar Water Investment Conference, scheduled for the 17th December 2021. It will be a hybrid event taking place in Zanzibar as well as online. • The Core Group members and other members of the senior leadership team within respective corporate organizations will receive invites for this event. 	
7. Meeting close	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat thanked all members for their contributions to the development of the Scorecard. 	

