



Canadian International
Development Agency

Agence canadienne de
développement international

[Translated from French]

Evaluation of CIDA's Senegal Program from 2001 to 2010 Synthesis Report



Evaluation Directorate
Strategic Policy and Performance Branch
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
February 2011

Canada

Acknowledgments

CIDA's Evaluation Directorate wishes to thank all who have contributed to this evaluation exercise for their valued input, their constant and generous support, and their patience.

Our thanks go first to the independent team of the firm Groupe-conseil Interallia, made up of five Canadian specialists from Interallia and supported in the field by two Senegalese specialists: i) Francine Trempe, team leader and senior evaluation specialist, strategic management; ii) Margot Rothman, methodological support and senior specialist, governance and equality between women and men; iii) Luc Gilbert, senior specialist, education; iv) Chantal Lewis, senior specialist, popular economy and the crosscutting theme of the environment; v) Louise Pesant, intermediate specialist, program financial management; vi) Cheikh Touré, Senegalese specialist, education; vii) Ousseynou Fall, Senegalese specialist, popular economy.

The Evaluation Directorate would also like to thank the management team of the Senegal Country Program at Headquarters in Gattineau and in Dakar, including Ivan Roberts, Director and Head of Aid, and Susan Pereverzoff, Luc Pincince, and Catherine Gangloff for their valuable support. We are also grateful to the Program Support Unit in Dakar, particularly Ghislain Rivard.

Our thanks also go to the representatives of the Government of Senegal for their helpfulness and their useful, practical advice to the evaluators. We would also mention the staff in the regional and district sectoral offices, as well as UN agency staff in the field (UNICEF, UNPF, World Bank and UNDP), the representatives of technical and financial partners (European Union, France, the United States, Germany and others), and the representatives of other donor agencies and civil-society organizations – Canadian, Senegalese and other – working in Senegal.

We also have to thank CIDA Evaluation managers Rémy Beaulieu and Frantz Pierre-Jérôme, Evaluation Directorate, and Sandra Gagnon, for the help they gave us by providing statistical data and analyses.

Goberdhan Singh
Director General
Evaluation Directorate

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| List of abbreviations..... | iv |
| Executive Summary..... | vi |
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| 1 Evaluation approach and method | 1 |
| 1.1 Objectives, scope and, issues of the evaluation..... | 1 |
| 1.2 Main elements of the evaluation methodology | 2 |
| 1.3 Evaluation challenges and limitations..... | 3 |
| 2 The development environment in Senegal | 3 |
| 2.1 Social, economic, and political environment..... | 3 |
| 2.2 National development strategies..... | 4 |
| 2.3 Overview of ODA in Senegal | 5 |
| 2.4 The CIDA Program in Senegal..... | 6 |
| 3 Principal Results by Sector and by Theme | 9 |
| 3.1 Introduction..... | 9 |
| 3.2 Results of education activities..... | 10 |
| 3.3 Results in popular economy..... | 13 |
| 3.4 Results achieved in governance | 15 |
| 3.5 Results achieved in Gender Equality (GE) | 17 |
| 3.6 Results in the environment..... | 18 |
| 4 Key findings based on criteria | 19 |
| 4.1 Relevance..... | 20 |
| 4.2 Effectiveness | 21 |
| 4.3 Sustainability | 22 |
| 4.4 Crosscutting themes | 23 |
| 4.5 Coordination and coherence | 24 |
| 4.6 Efficiency | 25 |
| 4.7 Management principles | 26 |
| 4.8 Performance management..... | 27 |
| 5 Performance in aid delivery..... | 28 |
| 5.1 Aid delivery channels | 29 |
| 5.2 Aid delivery modalities | 30 |
| 6 Main conclusions, lessons and recommendations | 33 |
| 6.1 Main conclusions..... | 33 |
| 6.2 Main lessons | 35 |
| 6.3 Corporate Considerations and Recommendations..... | 36 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Appendix A – Summary of the Terms of Reference | 38 |
| Appendix B – Characteristics and list of sample projects | 43 |
| Appendix C – List of documents consulted | 45 |
| Appendix D – List of persons met | 51 |
| Appendix E – Summary of detailed ratings by mechanisms and channels | 56 |
| Appendix F – Management Response | 59 |

List of tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 2.3: Amount of ODA to Senegal | 5 |
| Table 2.4.2: Disbursements by Sector and by Delivery Mechanism | 7 |
| Table 2.4.3: Portion of Official Development Assistance for Education in Senegal | 8 |
| Table 4.0: Summary of ratings for each analysis criterion, by CDPF area of intervention | 19 |
| Table 5.1: Analysis of ratings by aid delivery channels | 29 |
| Table 5.2: Analysis of ratings by aid delivery modalities | 31 |

List of abbreviations

| | |
|------------|---|
| ACAB | Framework arrangement for budget support |
| APIMEC | (Former) Professional association of decentralized financial services |
| AP-SFD | Professional association of decentralized financial services |
| ARM | Market regulation agency |
| AUMN | Niayes association of market gardening unions |
| CAEL | Local representative support unit |
| CCHS | CFAA/CPAR joint reform harmonization and monitoring committee |
| CCPTF | TFP (technical and financial partner) consultation committee |
| CCSU | Canadian Cooperation Support Unit |
| CDPF | Country Development Programming Framework |
| CEA | Canadian executing agency |
| CIDA | Canadian International Development Agency |
| CNC | National (microfinance) consultation framework |
| CNCR | National rural consultation committee |
| CNRE | National educational resource centre |
| COCOGEN | Niayes water management consultation |
| CSO | Civil society organization |
| DAC | Development Assistance Committee |
| DFS | Decentralized financial systems |
| DGPRE | Water resource management and planning directorate |
| DID | Développement international Desjardins |
| DMF | Microfinance directorate |
| DPRE | Education reform planning directorate |
| ECB | Basic community school |
| EFI | Teachers' college |
| EPE | Education for Employment project |
| FADAD | Decentralized ownership and dialogue support fund |
| FAN | Niayes support fund |
| FEEB-SBA | Primary-school teacher training / Skills-based approach |
| FPA | Federation of self-managed areas |
| FREP-AESOR | Fund to strengthen the popular economy – Improvement of sectoral framework & rural supply |
| GDP | Gross domestic product |
| GE | Equality between women and men (gender equality) |
| GER | Gross enrolment ratio |
| GNI | Gross national income |
| GNP | Gross national product |
| HACCP | Hazard Control Critical Points |
| IADB | Inter-American Development Bank |
| IAPDE | Ten-year education program support initiative |
| IMF | International Monetary Fund |
| IPF | Indicative planning figure |
| LDC | Least developed countries |
| LOASP | <i>Agro-sylvo-pastoral Act</i> |
| MEF | Ministry of the Economy and Finance |
| MEN | Ministry of National Education |
| MEPN | Ministry of the Environment and Protection of Nature |
| METFP | Ministry of Technical Education and Vocational Training |
| MFI | Microfinance institution |
| NGO | Non-governmental organization |
| ODA | Official Development Assistance |
| OECD | Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| PACEB | Basic education curriculum support project |

| | |
|---------|--|
| PAD | Project Approval Document |
| PADEC | Casamance economic development support program |
| PADEN | Economic development of Niayes support program |
| PAEFK | Kolda forestry entrepreneurship support project |
| PAEP | Rural entrepreneurship support project |
| PAES | Saint-Louis school support project |
| PAFPNA | Neo-literate vocational training support project |
| PAGIRE | National integrated water resource management action plan |
| PALAM | Literacy and trade learning program to reduce poverty |
| PAMECAS | Sahel savings and credit mobilization partnership |
| PAOA | Agri-food operators support project |
| PAPA | Project to support the action plan support program in basic education for youth and adults |
| PAVÉ | Volunteers in Education support project |
| PAVPA | Agricultural product enhancement support project |
| PDEF | Education and training development program |
| PFAI-MF | Contribution to the microfinance institutional support fund |
| PNBG | National good governance program |
| PNDL | National local development program |
| POBA | Annual operational budget plan |
| PREFER | Forest and rural area rehabilitation project |
| PRSP | Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper |
| PWCB | Partnerships with Canadians Branch |
| RBM | Results-based management |
| RSJ | Siggil Jigéen network |
| SBA | Skills-based approach |
| SCA | Accelerated growth strategy |
| SDAG | Great Coast development master plan |
| SEA | Strategic environmental assessment |
| SIGFIP | Integrated public finance management system |
| SNEEG | National equality and gender equality strategy |
| TFP | Technical and financial partner |
| TVT | Technical and vocational training |
| UAEL | Union of associations of local elected representatives |
| UNCTAD | United Nations Conference on Trade and Development |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Program |
| UNESCO | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund |
| UNS | United Nations System |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| WFP | World Food Program |
| WTO | World Trade Organization |

Executive Summary

The general objective of this evaluation was to assess the overall performance and results achieved through CIDA's activities in Senegal in implementing the 2001–2011 Country Development Programming Framework (CDPF). The evaluation covered only the first nine years of implementation of the CDPF (2001-2010). An operational review of the CDPF was conducted in 2008, and the conclusions and recommendations from that review were considered in preparing this evaluation.

1. Senegal: Background

Senegal is a major recipient of official development assistance (ODA) from OECD countries to Africa. It is above average among the 50 sub-Saharan African countries in terms of per-capita ODA. Over the entire evaluation period, however, assistance totalled less than 10 percent of annual gross national income (GNI), while playing a crucial role in the Government's capital budget. In 2008, Canada was the fourth-largest bilateral donor to Senegal.

With an average population growth rate of 2.5 percent, Senegal has a population of 12.4 million. It remains one of the poorest countries in Africa. Just over half of its people still live below the poverty line. In 2010, it ranked 144th out of 169 countries on the United Nations Development Programme's Human Development Index.

Economically, unemployment remains very high. The labour market is largely dominated by the informal sector, the main source of job creation. The primary sector (agriculture, fisheries, livestock breeding) accounts for 77 percent of the working population, but only 16 percent of the Gross domestic product (GDP), and remains essentially traditional. Senegal has been able to develop a tertiary sector (trade, telecommunications), now the mainstay of the economy, contributing 60 percent of the GDP.

Politically, Senegal has a presidential system. Since becoming independent in 1960, it has enjoyed a relatively stable political climate, characterized by a strong democratic tradition. Political pluralism has been established, multi-

party elections are regularly held, and a change in power took place in 2000. However, despite current efforts to improve economic and financial governance, democratic governance is criticized for the politicization of government institutions, fuelled by political patronage and lack of transparency in public-sector financial management.

As a CIDA country of focus, Senegal has committed to reduce poverty through successive strategies, including an initial Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (GPRSP I) adopted by the Government of Senegal in 2001. The preparation of the GPRSP coincided with the implementation period for CIDA's Country Development Programming Framework. The Government prepared and approved a second GPRSP in 2006. GPRSP II covers a longer period (2005-2010) and seeks to achieve continuity.

2. Purpose, approach, methodology and scope of the evaluation

The evaluation of CIDA's Senegal Program pursued the following main objectives:

- to analyze the overall performance of CIDA's activities in Senegal;
- to evaluate the performance and results of the various channels and mechanisms of program delivery;
- to identify lessons learned; and,
- to develop recommendations and considerations to improve the performance of the Program's current and future strategies.

Eight criteria were used to evaluate the performance of CIDA's Senegal Program: i) relevance, ii) effectiveness, iii) sustainability, iv) crosscutting themes, v) coherence, vi) efficiency, vii) management principles, and viii) performance management/monitoring and evaluation. There were assessed on a scale of 1-5, five being highly satisfactory and one highly unsatisfactory.

The 2001–2011 Program, as defined in the CDPF, aimed to help reduce the incidence of poverty in Senegalese households by 2015

by supporting Senegal's strategy in the education and popular economy sectors.

During the evaluation period, CIDA's disbursements to Senegal (all mechanisms combined) totalled about \$350 million. Annual disbursements more than tripled from 2001 to 2010. Bilateral accounted for 69.6 percent. Education represented the largest share (56.8 percent). Partnership and Multilateral totalled 15 percent of disbursements. This period saw a considerable increase in funding allocated to program-based approaches.

For the purposes of this evaluation exercise, a sample of 25 out of 69 initiatives (valued at \$250,000 or more) were chosen for a more specific review. These 25 initiatives accounted for nearly 60 percent of the total budget, and were chosen on the basis of their distribution by sector, delivery channel or mechanism.

3. Main Observations and Conclusions

Overall

CIDA's Senegal Program was implemented in an evolving context marked by national and international change, including: i) introduction of aid effectiveness principles; ii) introduction of the program-based approach; iii) greater efforts to achieve better coordination and cooperation between donors and Senegalese authorities. Internally, we should mention the adoption of new priorities at CIDA, the selection of Senegal as a country of focus, decentralization, and the substantial increase in budgets and annual disbursements.

In this context, the evaluation team reached the following conclusions regarding the Country Program:

- CIDA innovated by establishing a ten-year program, which allowed good continuity in pursuing the main sectoral priorities identified. Education remained central to programming, along with support for the popular economy, focusing primarily on rural entrepreneurship and microfinance. Governance – initially a crosscutting theme, and later a strategic focus – concentrated on decentralization.
- Despite the many different results achieved by executing numerous activities relating to priority sectors and crosscutting themes, we can conclude that the Senegal Program

has generally been relevant, and its performance has been satisfactory in relation to the evaluation criteria.

- Program-based approaches have gradually been adopted and grew continually in the education sector. More recently, program-based approaches have been adopted in the popular economy. This has altered relations with Senegalese institutions, and significantly changed the architecture of the delivery of Canadian assistance to Senegal. For example, fewer Canadian organizations or NGOs in Senegal are used as executing agencies to implement the bilateral program. Moreover, CIDA is perceived as a reliable and important financial and technical partner, especially in education.
- We should also note the gradual, dynamic involvement of the program management team (headquarters, field and support unit) in many areas of coordination/cooperation. The team has become influential and very widely recognized among key stakeholders for the quality of its contribution.
- However, the Evaluation noted that the Agency's heavy process demands and slow approval procedures have to some extent hindered the team from performing as well as it would have wished. This has already been mentioned by the Auditor General in the 2009 Report.

4. Activity sectors and themes

In education, CIDA's disbursements have grown to make Canada Senegal's key partner in the sector. CIDA's activities have made a great difference by providing one fifth of the external funding for Senegal's ten-year education and training program. Results have been generally positive in areas such as support for curriculum reform, teacher training, revision of the training system for volunteers in education, literacy, and basic education of adults and youth. The introduction of sectoral budget support for education also meant more involvement by Senegalese government bodies, especially the Ministry of Education. However, constraints such as institutional instability, arbitrary environment between ministerial priorities and budgeting for education in Senegal, as well as CIDA's slow approval processes

still prevented to achieve better results. It seems that the Government of Senegal will not achieve its objective of universal primary education by 2015, in accordance with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

Overall, education is the pillar of Canadian cooperation in Senegal but it's a modest contribution to the overall budget allocated to that broad sector; between 1 and 4% depending on the period.

The popular economy constitutes a crucial sector in helping to rectify the endemic problems of poverty, underemployment and food insecurity that plague Senegal. CIDA's activities in this sector have influenced many areas, including: i) productivity in the agri-food sector, targeting small-scale rural entrepreneurs; ii) implementation of forestry policy, better natural resources management, strengthening of producer organizations and selected professional organizations; and iii) consolidation/organization of microfinance to serve small business and rural organizations.

Individually, these activities have allowed the achievement of useful and significant results for those concerned. However, CIDA being one of many players in the field, it is too early to quantify their overall cumulative contribution of these activities to higher employment and poverty reduction in Senegal.

As pointed out in the 2008 operational review, the program evaluation team noted a lack of organized or structured synergy between the two key areas of Canadian cooperation: education and popular economy.

In governance, Canadian activities have helped to reform local taxation and to build the capacity of local elected representatives, in the context of the decentralization process. CIDA's efforts have also helped to strengthen dialogue on financial and budget reform, as well as management of school feeding in the education sector. These activities have helped to restructure rural and agricultural organizations, and the association of financial system professionals. There is a lack of synergy among sectors, projects and stakeholders, and a lack of clear direction on the theme of governance, in particular with regard to the place and strengthening of civil society. This has prevented a measurable

cumulative impact. In addition, institutional instability on the part of Senegalese authorities, with respect to decentralization and local development, makes it difficult to pursue effective policy dialogue that can bring about more significant change.

CIDA's **gender equality (GE) and environment** activities have been well integrated into the Programming Framework, with positive results. For example, CIDA's efforts have allowed restructuring and capacity building of women's networks. They have also allowed progress in the education and popular economy sectors. Canada's leadership and expertise in promoting GE are well recognized by all stakeholders. Nevertheless, added effort would allow more systematic incorporation of GE to produce results and to broaden policy dialogue.

Analysis of results shows that the theme of the environment has produced various outcomes. These include the development of a Great Coast development master plan, forestry development plans, a national geomatics plan, and a water resources plan.

5. Performance against criteria

5.1 Relevance: The Program's performance was rated highly satisfactory (an average of 4.5) in terms of relevance. The evaluation shows that CIDA's Senegal Program has been highly relevant to the objectives and priorities of Senegal's successive poverty reduction strategies and to the MDGs. The Program is consistent with CIDA's evolving key strategic policies and directions. On the other hand, the Government of Senegal has delayed adopting key sectoral policies, such as in agriculture or job creation. As a result, the theme of the popular economy has been more or less overlooked. Meanwhile, CIDA's changing approaches to the theme of governance have prevented the Program from positioning itself as well as possible.

5.2 Effectiveness: The Program's performance is rated generally satisfactory in terms of effectiveness (with an average of 3.6). CIDA's Senegal Program has achieved significant results in all areas of intervention specified in the 2001–2011 CDPF, including: i) significant contributions to improving access to education, literacy, and teacher training;

ii) contributions to access to microcredit, the structuring of the microfinance sector, and better sales for microbusinesses supported in the agri-food sector; and iii) in governance, capacity building of local and national organizations/institutions, decentralization, and public-sector financial management reform.

In short, the Program has created and expanded opportunities for vulnerable populations in various fields. However, during the evaluation period, the Program has been unable to report its results sectorally or for the program as a whole. From the available data it is not possible to measure the Program's actual contribution to poverty reduction in Senegal.

5.3 Sustainability: Against this criterion, the Program's performance obtained its lowest rating of "moderately satisfactory" (an average of 2.9 across all three priority sectors). This was due mainly to the shortcomings of local partners. CIDA's long-term commitment to a ten-year program was a positive sustainability and performance factor. However, a number of other factors account for this lower rating: i) there is recurrent weakness in the financial capacity of Senegalese institutions to make gains sustainable; ii) support is spread among separate multi-phase projects, without phasing-out strategies; iii) a risk analysis could have gone farther (given the weak absorption capacity of local institutions) to reinforce the establishment of corresponding capacity-building strategies

5.4 Crosscutting themes of Gender Equality (GE) and the Environment: The Program's performance was rated satisfactory in terms of GE and the environment (an average of 3.2 with the highest rating in Popular economy- 3.9). With respect to Gender Equality (GE), it was formally integrated in programming. Canadian cooperation helped to achieve a substantial increase in recognition of this issue in Senegalese society. CIDA helped the Government to develop national action plans in this area. Technical and financial partners recognized CIDA's leadership and ongoing contribution to GE policy dialogue. However, integration of this issue into program-based approaches could have benefited from more sustained attention/articulation by developing

action plans with performance indicators and suitable technical and financial resources.

With respect to the environment, the CDPF did not include a specific strategy, including policy dialogue with other donors, or specific outcomes, despite the significant degradation of natural resources observed in Senegal. However, the evaluation noted that several projects have been designed to address environmental concerns. There is a need to implement a coherent plan of action with clear objectives, outcomes, strategies, key partners and financial means.

5.5 Coherence: The Program's performance earns a fairly strong satisfactory (3.8) rating against this criterion. The Program's strengths include many examples of activities to coordinate with international partners. As a leader in the education sector, CIDA's activities have allowed restructuring of the working group's operations, and revitalized harmonization among donors in the technical and vocational training sector. In microfinance, CIDA has helped to develop a sectoral policy action plan, with international partners coordinating its implementation. In governance, CIDA has acted as a catalyst in coordinating decentralization initiatives.

Within the Program, we noted undeveloped potential for synergy among sectors and delivery mechanisms, which would ultimately make the Program more effective. The operation of CIDA's various delivery channels during the period of the CDPF, did not enable a corporate vision and management of all of CIDA's activities in Senegal.

5.6 Efficiency: The Program's performance was rated satisfactory against this criterion. The rating (3.4) was due mainly to the quality, ongoing commitment, and adaptability the Program's management, staff and consulting support functions. They constituted a valuable asset in the operation of the Program, which faced management issues and challenges as noted by the Auditor General in her report on aid effectiveness in 2009, the main challenges and limitations are: i) the decentralization process, which has not been accompanied by appropriate delegation of authority; ii) significant slowness and complexity in planning processes and approval procedures; iii) changes in strategic directions and their

lack of operational clarity and specificity; and iv) lack of predictability regarding the annual financial resources available to the Program.

In short, these limitations or weaknesses negatively affected CIDA's credibility with its partners in Senegal, and its efforts to comply with the Paris Declaration in practical terms.

5.7 Management principles: The Program's performance, reviewed here in connection with three principles of the Paris declaration, is rated highly satisfactory (3.9). In terms of both design and operations, the Program strongly supported the principle of ownership, respecting Senegal's lead role in designing its development policies and programs, and supporting the Government's role and capacities in coordinating assistance. In this respect, and since Senegalese authorities recognize CIDA as a key partner, CIDA could have been more forthcoming about its new cooperation strategy for 2010–2015.

In accordance with the principle of alignment, to the extent that Senegal has sectoral action plans and strategies, CIDA's bilateral initiatives were aligned with them, and even helped to develop them. Despite a less suitable environment for harmonization than in other countries of the sub-region, the CIDA Program agreed to experiment with program-based approaches and budget support, in the face of reluctance among some technical and financial partners (TFPs) and the Agency's weak predictability of its aid. Finally, we should mention the Program team's many policy dialogue activities. While they cannot be quantified, efforts in this area represent a large share of the team's work, including the CCSU.

5.8 Performance management: The Program's performance was rated satisfactory (3.2) in this area. Results-based management was project-oriented. At the program level, the performance measurement framework was not systematically monitored. However, the 2008 operational review sought to remedy weaknesses in this area. With regard to program-based approaches, efforts must still be made to provide the CIDA team and its partners with appropriate monitoring and evaluation tools. The changing nature of CIDA's policy directions require risk management, as does the partners' absorption capacity. Finally, not enough has been

invested in knowledge management, considering the potential return.

6. Delivery channels and mechanisms:

The evaluation was to assess the relative performance of the various delivery mechanisms (projects, program-based approaches, directive, responsive) and channels (bilateral, partnership, multilateral) that CIDA uses in its Senegal Program. The reviewed initiatives varied significantly in scope, budget, and duration. Comparisons among them are subject to limitations that should be kept in mind.

That said, with respect to channels, the evaluation saw no significant differences in overall performance between Bilateral and Partnership. Analysis showed that the bilateral channel has a marked advantage, in that the Government of Canada is in a better position to control its strategies, particularly with respect to meeting its commitments under the Paris Declaration. Canada can also promote specific interests, such as GE, or assert its distinctive expertise in areas such as decentralization, or training using the skills-based approach. Partnership has shown its value added in areas such as microcredit, and technical and vocational training. Partnership also made it possible to maintain effective relations with civil-society organizations in Senegal, thus contributing to the democratization process.

The small sample of multilateral channel makes it impossible to evaluate this channel for the delivery of Canadian assistance. It is worth mentioning, however, that productive synergy exists between multilateral investment in school feeding, and major bilateral investments in education.

With respect to aid delivery mechanisms, we see that the traditional modalities— institutional projects and programs— tend to rate higher overall than the newer program-based approaches. This maybe because their full effects are still to become evident as the program-based approach is also slower in achieving and institutionalizing results, since it implies consensus among many partners, and its aid delivery depends on national systems that need strengthening. Finally, CIDA and its partners are learning iteratively through their

involvement in this aid environment, making it necessary to define new roles, responsibilities, and skills.

7. Corporate considerations:

This evaluation acknowledges CIDA's current efforts to resolve and remedy general corporate weaknesses through the Agency's Aid Effectiveness Agenda, its response to the 2009 report of the Auditor General of Canada, and its Business Modernization Initiatives, including decentralization and delegation of authorities to the field. For example,

- accelerating the approval processes for its various intervention types (bilateral, multilateral or Partnership with Canadians, directive and responsive) would enable the Program to respond more effectively and position itself strategically with respect to emerging initiatives in the context of policy dialogue and donor coordination;
- completing the decentralization process underway and increasing the level of delegation of approval authorities for program managers on the ground and being more transparent in terms of the medium and long term predictability of budget allocations to the programs would enhance the Program's ability to meet commitments under the Paris Declaration; and,
- these above measures would also enable greater transparency and information sharing in dialogue with partners on its country programming framework and strategies.

8. Program recommendations

Recommendation #1 – Relevance: That as part of its new CDPF, CIDA's Senegal Program maintain and build on the good practices observed during the development of the CDPF 2001-2011 and adopt a proactive approach to sharing its medium- and long-term programming intentions with its national and international partners. That the Program maintain the necessary flexibility to adjust the current CDPF to Senegal's new PRSP III, which is expected to be approved shortly, while at the same time taking into account the recommendations of the Program Evaluation.

Recommendation #2 – Effectiveness:

Considering the level of cooperation of the Government of Senegal with the jointly-approved Canadian aid program, that CIDA's Senegal Program maintain and build on the good practices in: (i) the education sector while stressing quality; (ii) the agri-food sector, while continuing its support for microfinance and economic development in Niayes and Casamance; and (iii) the area of governance, particularly in terms of decentralization.

Recommendation #3 – Sustainability:

That CIDA's Senegal Program: (i) ensure that activities in priority sectors are systematically subject to diagnostic analyses and risk analyses with regard to the technical, organizational and financial capacities of the partners for which these activities are carried out; and (ii) put in place the consequent action plans and strategies for capacity building.

Recommendation #4 – Cross-cutting themes:

To maintain the gains made in gender equality, help implement the gender equality strategy and ensure that it is properly integrated into the various strategies and projects, that the Program: (i) develop an action plan that includes clear initiatives, a stronger dialogue on policy and the role of civil society; (ii) identify specific and measurable expected outcomes, as well as an adequate set of performance indicators; (iii) and identify appropriate human, technical and financial resources.

Recommendation #5 – Cross-cutting themes:

To strengthen the environmental dimension of its programming, that CIDA's Senegal Program: (i) implement an action plan in this area, (ii) identify objectives, outcomes, strategies and financial means; (iii) include measures to train the appropriate partners and staff and make them accountable; and (iv) strengthen the policy dialogue on such issues as sustainable land management, while taking account of the climate change problem.

Recommendation #6 – Coherence:

That the Bilateral, Multilateral and Partnerships with Canadians Branches be CDPF stakeholders and consider ways to promote, foster and develop synergies and complementarities within and among sectors in order to improve

implementation and ensure achievement of results under the CDPF.

Recommendation #7 – Harmonization : To optimize its harmonization efforts, that CIDA's Senegal Program : (i) maintain and build on efforts to increase synergy among donors, (ii) devote more attention to carrying out joint diagnoses and assessments (CIDA-TFP-Senegalese institutions) and to sharing lessons learned and knowledge in these priority sectors.

Recommendation #8 – Management principles: Given the substantial energy already invested and the success already achieved, that the Senegal Program (i) document its policy dialogue activities in the various CDPF priority sectors, and (ii) consider developing a Policy Dialogue Strategy for Senegal.

Recommendation #9 – Performance management: That CIDA's Senegal Program adopt (and periodically update) instruments to measure results-oriented performance, identify and specific and realistic results accompanied by initial basic data, targets and appropriate indicators.

Introduction

This evaluation of the Senegal Program was conducted between April 2010 and February 2011. Its essential purpose was to assess, against various criteria, the performance of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) in providing development assistance to Senegal from the initial implementation of the 2001-2011 Country Development Programming Framework (CDPF) for cooperation between Canada and Senegal, to the time of the evaluation. The evaluation focused on the first nine years of the implementation of the CDPF and covered the Program's main areas of intervention, as well as crosscutting themes. Note that a CDPF operational review was conducted in 2008–2009.¹ It led to recommendations that were brought to the attention of the Program's managers.

This synthesis report is based on observations made and analyses done in the technical report prepared by the team of evaluators, and comments from the various stakeholders within CIDA.

1 Evaluation approach and method

1.1 Objectives, scope and, issues of the evaluation

This evaluation of CIDA's Senegal Program had the following objectives:

- to take stock of the results achieved through CIDA's activities during the period of the 2001-2011 Country Development Program Framework (CDPF);
- to assess the Program's overall performance (program and projects) against eight criteria: relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, crosscutting themes, coherence, efficiency, management principles and performance management;
- to measure the performance of various aid delivery mechanisms (bilateral, multilateral, and partnership programs) and channels (program-based approaches, budget support, directive and responsive projects, and so on); and,
- to identify and inventory lessons learned in Senegal, and to make recommendations to improve the performance of the current or future strategy for CIDA's activities in Senegal.

The evaluation covered the first nine years of implementation of the 2001-2011 Country Development Programming Framework (CDPF) for cooperation between Canada and Senegal. The evaluation focused on the CDPF's main areas of intervention (education and the popular economy) and main crosscutting themes (equality between women and men, governance,² and the environment). The evaluation was limited to projects valued at \$250,000 or more. Priority was given to the bilateral component of the Program, which accounts for 70 percent of CIDA's disbursements. However, the other delivery mechanisms (multilateral and partnership) were also considered. The new CDPF, approved in March 2010, is not considered in this evaluation.

¹ Operational Review of CIDA's 2001-2011 Programming Framework for Senegal. RBMG-Results-Based Management Group. 2009.

² Governance changed from a crosscutting theme to a strategic focus during the CDPF implementation period. In this report, as per the terms of reference for the evaluation, governance is thus addressed as a strategic focus (in that there is a sample of projects in the relevant sector that were the focus of a targeted analysis) and as a crosscutting theme (in that the evaluation focused on how the Program articulated, planned, and monitored governance outcomes in the priority sectors of education and the popular economy).

The evaluation addressed the following main issues and challenges, which formed the basis for the criteria and sub-criteria used, as defined in the Terms of Reference (summarized in Appendix A) and in the methodology developed by Evaluation Directorate.

- *Program achievements during the evaluation period - What has been accomplished? What progress has been made toward development outcomes expected by Canada and Senegal? In relation to the needs expressed by recipients?* To address these issues, the Program and its components were analysed against the following criteria: (i) relevance; (ii) effectiveness or results; (iii) sustainability; and (iv) crosscutting themes.
- *Program management - How were the expected results achieved?* To address this issue, the Program and its components were evaluated against the following criteria: (i) coherence; (ii) efficiency; (iii) management principles; and (iv) performance management.

1.2 Main elements of the evaluation methodology

Country program evaluation involves three levels of analysis: country program, sector, and project. The method entailed defining identifiable country program results in 2009–2010 compared with those planned in 2001, and assessing the value added of Canada's contribution to those results through its strategic decisions and specific investments. The exercise aimed, not to conduct a project-performance type of evaluation, but generally to assess the performance of CIDA's Senegal Program. Specific sectors or projects were analyzed mainly to provide material and support for this overall assessment.

The Senegal Program evaluation was based on expected sectoral outcomes, as defined in CIDA's 2001-2011 CDPF:

- *increased access to basic education, literacy and vocational training, particularly for women;*
- *increased access for small economic operators to savings and credit, and vitalization of rural groups, with consequent gains in productivity; and,*
- *strengthening of local bodies and increased participation by citizens in decision-making.*

Evaluation matrix and standard tools – The evaluation team adopted a common methodological approach to ensure the reliability and validity of data, observations, and conclusions. To that end, an evaluation matrix was developed to guide data collection and analysis, based on the evaluation criteria set out in the Terms of Reference.

Sampling - Given the large number of projects funded during the evaluation period, a sample of 25 projects were selected for review, representing 60 percent of the Program's total budget. Appendix B contains a table showing the sample's characteristics by sector, delivery channel, and mechanism.³

Data collection and analysis methods – The team of Canadian evaluators collected data in Canada at CIDA Headquarters and from Canadian stakeholders (CEAs, NGOs) in implementing the Program. Supported by two Senegalese specialists, the team also conducted a three-week mission to Senegal from September 18 to October 7, 2010. Four data collection methods were used: literature review; semi-structured individual or group interviews; a few visits to key project sites in each sector; and roundtable discussions with managers of the Program upon arrival in the field, at the end of the visit to Senegal, and on returning to Headquarters. Appendix C lists the documents consulted. Appendix D lists the persons met.

³ The following definitions were used. "Delivery channels" means the three CIDA branches: Geographic, Multilateral and Partnership. "Delivery mechanisms", under the terms of reference for the evaluation, means a project, program, program-based approach or budget support.

The evaluation matrix and project fact sheets served as references in analyzing the data collected. This report summarizes the results of these analyses: (i) sample projects, based on their specific characteristics; (ii) the literature review and interviews, based on the evaluation's main issues and challenges; (iii) rating of projects based on evaluation criteria, delivery channels and mechanisms, and type of investment. Triangulation of data and use of standard tools ensured that analysis was as valid as possible. Finally, sectoral specialists completed data sheets for sample projects in their respective sectors.

1.3 Evaluation challenges and limitations

As in any evaluation of this magnitude, the team faced several limitations in the evaluation process, and in applying its methodology.

Availability and reliability of data

- Evaluating a ten-year country program was a challenge in itself, as CIDA's corporate memory is not always complete over such a period, and some key informants could not be traced.
- CIDA's various data systems such as CRAFT and data from CFO make it difficult to compile a complete, accurate overall view of the Senegal Program's programming and funding by year, sector, and delivery mechanism.
- Because of inconsistencies and some difficulties of comparison, CIDA's data systems did not allow a full comparison of the Program's efficiency in terms of operating and development costs.
- Project monitoring and evaluation reports were difficult to obtain from Partnership and Multilateral, and did not always contain data on Senegal.

To overcome these constraints, the evaluation team thus adopted a strategy of searching data available within CIDA, corroborating and comparing data sources, and validating them with the largest possible number of contacts within and outside CIDA, to be sure of developing a valid and reliable picture of the Program's performance.

Attribution of results

- Program-based approaches mean that CIDA operates within country programs where CIDA's disbursements often represent only a small percentage of total program budgets. This makes it difficult to attribute results directly to CIDA. To overcome this constraint, we first reviewed results achieved by the program in question, including policy dialogue (such as participation in institution-building and coordination mechanisms and committees). We then assessed CIDA's performance in terms of its efficiency, coherence, and performance management.

2 The development environment in Senegal

2.1 Social, economic, and political environment

With an average population growth rate of 2.5 percent, Senegal now has a population of about 12.4 million, of whom 68 percent are under 25 and 58 percent live in a rural area. In 2010, Senegal ranked 144th out of 169 countries on the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Human Development Index. As a least developed country (LDC), Senegal remains one of the poorest in Africa. Despite some improvement up to 2006, over 33.5 percent of Senegal's people still live below the poverty line. In monetary terms, poverty is worse in rural areas (56 percent) than in urban areas (38%), and affects women more than men. Some 100,000 new job seekers, many with little

or no training, enter the labour market each year.⁴ The unemployment rate is about 48 percent.⁵ This puts considerable pressure on the labour market, and constitutes a significant risk to Senegal's social and political stability.

From the mid-1990s until 2005, Senegal experienced good macroeconomic performance. While there were periods of slow growth, a healthy economy and political stability generated an average annual increase of 4.5 percent in the gross domestic product (GDP). Between 2005 and 2008, however, Senegal's economy suffered a series of shocks. Oil prices rose sharply, and food prices soared early in 2007. This affected the economy, leading to a period of inflation. In 2008, problems were encountered in budget management, due mainly to weak public-sector financial monitoring and control mechanisms. Combined with exogenous constraints, this triggered an economic crisis. Senegal's economy suffers from a lack of diversification, especially where exports are concerned, and a business environment that does not favour investment. The primary sector (agriculture, fisheries, livestock breeding) employs 77 percent of the labour force, but represents only 16 percent of the GDP, and is still essentially traditional in nature.⁶ Senegal has been able to develop a strong tertiary sector (trade, telecommunications) that now constitutes the mainstay of the economy, contributing 60 percent of the GDP.⁷ But this development has not improved the lot of the rural poor, who depend on a stagnating primary sector.

A secular state with a presidential system, Senegal enjoys a relatively stable political climate, and has a strong democratic tradition. Since 1974, political pluralism has been established. Multi-party elections are regularly held. A change of power took place in 2000 when Abdoulaye Wade, a lawyer, was elected President. The most recent presidential, legislative, and local elections were deemed generally free and transparent, especially by the international community. Although the Opposition contested the election results, and subsequently boycotted the June 2007 legislative elections, President Wade was re-elected in February 2007. As a result, the coalition supporting him has a strong majority in the National Assembly and the Senate. This means substantially less pluralistic debate. Reform is underway to improve economic and financial governance. However, Senegal has problems related to widespread politicization of government, fuelled by political patronage and a lack of transparency in public-sector financial management.

2.2 National development strategies

When CIDA's 2001-2011 Programming Framework was being developed, Senegal was also developing its first Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP I, covering 2001-2005). PRSP I targeted three priority objectives: (i) to double per-capita income by 2015 within the framework of strong, balanced and better distributed growth; (ii) to make essential social services more accessible by expediting the establishment of basic infrastructure to strengthen human capital by 2010; (iii) to eradicate all types of exclusion in Senegal and to adopt gender equality in primary and secondary education by 2015. The overall strategy was based on three areas of intervention: (i) creation of wealth; (ii) capacity building and promotion of basic social services; and (iii) improving the living conditions of vulnerable groups.

In the interest of continuity, the second strategy paper, PRSP II (2006-2010), reiterated the focuses of PRSP I but grouped them differently. The following elements were targeted at that time: 1) creation of wealth, pro-poor economic growth; 2) promoting access to basic social services, social protection, including risk avoidance and disaster management; 3) good governance and decentralized development. In 2004, the *Stratégie de Croissance Accélérée* (SCA) (accelerated growth strategy) was also added. The SCA is defined as a framework for ensuring the coherence of sectoral policies

⁴ OECD/AfDB: *African Economic Outlook 2008*, <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/5/63/40571530.pdf>

⁵ CIA World Factbook, <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/sg.html>

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

and programs, especially in matters related to the PRSP's strategic focus on the creation of wealth. The SCA is based on two essential components: (i) establishing a world-class business environment, and (ii) identifying and promoting growth clusters. For the second component, the SCA identified five clusters and the following sectors: (i) the primary sector (agriculture, livestock breeding, fisheries, forestry), in an inter-sectoral dynamic with all other sectors likely to contribute to its growth: industry, water, transportation, handcrafts; (ii) microfinance and women's entrepreneurship; (iii) SME/SMI and agro-industry; and (iv) any opportunity to develop private initiatives that generate employment in other economic sectors (mining, energy, construction and public works, ICT), which can be implemented in either a rural or an urban environment.

As for national action plans or programs that relate more specifically to the sectors targeted by Canadian cooperation, we should mention the ten-year education and training development plan (PDEF) in the education sector, which will soon come to an end. In 2000-2010, moreover, several policy documents enhanced the vision of the sector. With regard to the popular economy, and more specifically agriculture, it must be recognized that, despite a considerable number of strategic and operational policy documents, none could be used as a unifying framework for harmonized development activities by technical and financial partners (TFP). In microfinance, however, we should mention the Microfinance Policy Letter and its Action Plan (2004), updated for 2008-2013. In governance, we should note the national good governance program (PNBG), the national local development program (PNDL), and action plans related to budget/financial reform and government procurement.

2.3 Overview of ODA in Senegal

Senegal is a major beneficiary of official development assistance (ODA) provided to Africa by OECD countries. Table 2.3 shows that, between 2001 and 2008, there was an increase in ODA resources to Senegal. With two exceptions, Senegal remained one of the 15 lead beneficiaries of ODA among the 50 Sub-Saharan African countries.⁸ Senegal is also above average for these countries in terms of per-capita ODA. Over the entire period, however, ODA accounts for less than 10 percent of the annual Gross National Income (GNI), even though it plays an essential role in the Government's capital budget.

Table 2.3: Amount of ODA to Senegal⁹

| Senegal | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
|--------------------------------------|---|------|------|------|---|------|------|------|
| Net ODA disbursements ⁽¹⁾ | 505 | 516 | 446 | 953 | 769 | 900 | 872 | 998 |
| Ranking out of 50 ⁽²⁾ | 9 | 13 | 18 | 10 | 16 | 13 | 15 | 13 |
| Per-capita GNI ⁽³⁾ | 480 | 460 | 540 | | 710 | 750 | 820 | 970 |
| Ranking out of 50 ⁽²⁾ | 16 | 15 | 15 | | 15 | 17 | 19 | 19 |
| ODA/GNI (%) | 9.05 | 9.17 | 6.97 | | 8.44 | 9.3 | 7.69 | 8.07 |
| Ranking out of 50 ⁽²⁾ | 25 | 26 | 28 | | 26 | 24 | 27 | 26 |
| | Net disbursements at the 2003 exchange rate | | | | Net disbursements at the 2007 exchange rate | | | |

(1) in US\$ million

(2) out of 50 Sub-Saharan African countries

(3) in US\$

According to the OECD, Senegal's five leading bilateral partners in 2008 were (in decreasing order) France, Spain, Germany, Canada, and the United States. France alone provided over 50 percent of the technical aid disbursed by Senegal's ten leading partners.¹⁰ According to the various documents

⁸ OECD, Development Co-operation Report, 2005 and 2010

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ DAC Statistics, 2000-2010

consulted, although ODA represented around 8 percent of the Government's budget in 2008, it constituted about half of the Government's capital budget and was thus an important, even essential, source of development in Senegal.

2.4 The CIDA Program in Senegal

2.4.1 CIDA's programming framework 2001-2011

The CIDA Cooperation Program in Senegal was guided primarily by its 2001-2011 Country Development Programming Framework (CDPF), which was developed further to the participatory assessment of its 1996-2001 transition program. It should be stressed that this CDPF was developed in close collaboration, and in consultation, with the Government of Senegal. Moreover, this was the first time that the program had a CDPF of ten years' duration. This is an initiative that allowed ensuring the program's continuity and sustainability.

The Programming Framework's ultimate purpose was to contribute to reducing the poverty of Senegalese households by 50% by 2015 by supporting Senegal's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, targeting two sectors, education and popular economy¹¹. Its purpose was to "broaden and create opportunities for vulnerable populations". The Program's expected outcomes read as follows:

- Impact: reduced economic and social disparities; development progressively taken over by the citizens.
- Effects: opportunities created and expanded by i) increased access to basic education, literacy and professional training, especially for women; ii) increased access for small economic operators to savings/credit as well as the dynamization of rural groups, resulting in increased productivity; and iii) the strengthening of local bodies and increased citizen participation in decision-making.

In the CDPF, governance, as well as gender equality (GE) and the environment, were considered and treated as cross-cutting themes in the CDPF. Besides, this CDPF identified some principles that were to guide the Program's implementation, namely: (i) Senegalese leadership and steering; (ii) inter-donor harmonization; (iii) concentration on a limited number of sectors; (iv) synergy among Canadian activities; (v) balance between support for the government and involvement of civil society; and (vi) communication strategies with the entities affected by the Program.

During this period, to varying degrees, several external and internal contextual aspects influenced the programming and its management. The following, especially, should be mentioned.,

- Reaffirmation of aid effectiveness principles (Rome 2003).
- The adoption of the Declaration of Paris on aid effectiveness for development (Paris 2005).
- Multiplying areas of joint activity and coordination in Senegal.
- A world financial crisis that also affects Senegal (2008).
- Senegal: a Canadian ODA country of focus (2003, reconfirmed in 2009).
- The start of the Program's decentralization (2005).
- New international aid commitments by Canada and changes in CIDA's direction and strategic priorities, especially in 2008-2009.
- Bilateral annual budgets that increased substantially.
- The introduction within the program of new aid delivery mechanisms, with much larger budgets for initiatives.

¹¹ Popular economy is not, in and of itself, a "sector" as such as defined in Senegal's policies and strategies but rather a label peculiar to Canadian cooperation which groups, overall, rural entrepreneurship/agriculture as well as micro-financing. This blurs the concept somewhat with its disparate elements, which are difficult to delineate in terms of programming and synergy.

- CIDA's initial budget support in Senegal (education sector - 2007).

2.4.2 Summary profile of CIDA investment in Senegal

According to the available data¹² exclusively in the education and popular economy sectors and under the theme of governance, there were 62 projects or initiatives that were supported by CIDA through its various channels (bilateral, partnerships and multilateral) and were active during the evaluation period. The total amount disbursed for these initiatives was \$341,349,638. Specifically:

- 27 education projects with total budgets of \$225,881,082.
- 29 popular economy projects (including agriculture, microfinance and the environment) with total budgets of \$96,598,019.
- 13 governance projects with total budgets of \$18,870,537.
- Approximately 75% of the total budgets for active bilateral projects over this period were approved in 2006 and subsequent years.
- In the list of projects, there is only one initiative (under the heading of governance) that specifically deals with GE, which is a cross-cutting theme.
- The data show that the popular economy and governance sectors were proportionally more divided into multiple projects than the education sector.

Table 2.4.2: Disbursements by Sector and by Delivery channel¹³

| SECTOR | GRAND TOTAL 2000-2010 (\$) | % of Grand Total (%) |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Education</i> | 148,612,768 | 43.1 |
| <i>Popular Economy</i> | 82,880,037 | 24.0 |
| <i>Governance</i> | 37,826,762 | 11.0 |
| <i>Health</i> | 44,909,402 | 13.0 |
| <i>Environment</i> | 6,694,370 | 1.9 |
| <i>Humanitarian Assist.</i> | 8,667,458 | 2.5 |
| <i>Peace and Security</i> | 663,747 | 0.2 |
| <i>Other</i> | 14,362,787 | 4.2 |
| TOTAL | 344,617,331 | 100 |

| DELIVERY CHANNELS | GRAND TOTAL 2000-2010 (\$) | % of Grand Total (%) |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| <i>Bilateral</i> | 239,987,942 | 69.6 |
| <i>Multilateral</i> | 52,305,557 | 15.2 |
| <i>Partnerships</i> | 51,969,927 | 15.1 |
| <i>Other</i> | 353,905 | 0.1 |
| TOTAL | 344,617,331 | 100 |

Summary observations regarding investments and disbursements

Total CIDA disbursements in Senegal during the period – all delivery channels included – more than doubled. The greatest increase was in the *education* sector, with disbursements increasing from \$4.3 million in 2000/01 to \$52.6 million in 2008/09 and to \$20.5 million in 2009/10, for a total of \$148.6 million, which represented 43.1% of all CIDA disbursements during the period. These percentages are in line although they are beyond the target set in the CDPF's Logic Framework (2001-2006) which estimated that 60% of the indicative planning figure (IPF) would be dedicated to the education sector. The disbursements in the *popular economy* sector varied considerably during the period for a total of \$82.8 million, or 24 % of total disbursements, quite close to 30% of the IPF, as estimated in the CDPF. Disbursements for *governance* accounted for 11% of the total, while the CDPF had planned for 10% of combined investments for the cross-cutting themes of governance and GE. Finally, it should be noted that although *health* was not among the priority sectors identified in the CDPF, it accounted for 13% of total disbursements (mainly from multilateral) compared with investments in school canteens, which have a strong correlation with education investments disbursed by the bilateral program.

¹² Sources: Program Profile, CIDA, June 2010 and addenda – PWCB Programming, July 2010.

¹³ Sources: CRAFT 20 September 2010 – Unofficial ODA Figures by Channel by Sectors of Focus; CIDA file: 2001_2009_by_Channel_1. The 2009-2010 data are preliminary and subject to change..

2.4.3 Summary programming characteristics – priority sectors and governance themes

Education

Education is the cornerstone of Canadian cooperation in Senegal. Canadian intervention in this sector, at the bilateral level, involves numerous projects/activities: support for curriculum reform; teacher training; non-formal education; vocational and technical training; and the literacy project. For the Partnership with Canadians Directorate, the Canadian presence mainly involves the twinning of technical and vocational training institutions. The 2001-2011 CDPF has specific result indicators in the education sector, namely: (i) progress towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDG)¹⁴, which relates to universal primary education goals, eradicating poverty through vocational training that would help to generate employment, and women's equality and empowerment; (ii) budget and resource allocation decisions within a long-term framework of poverty reduction; and (iii) the level of democratic governance, which covers not only skills-based school management through decentralization policy-driven skills transfer, but also the overall planning and follow-up process on education development plans and education expenditure budgeting and execution. At the multilateral level, CIDA worked with the World Food Programme (WFP) to support the school canteen program.

Table 2.4.3: Portion of Official Development Assistance for Education in Senegal¹⁵

| | 2000 | | | 2006 | | | 2007 | | |
|--|---------|---------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|--------------------|
| | Senegal | rank ⁽²⁾ | SSA ⁽³⁾ | Senegal | rank ⁽²⁾ | SSA ⁽³⁾ | Senegal | rank ⁽²⁾ | SSA ⁽³⁾ |
| Total aid for education ⁽¹⁾ | 169 | 3 | 2,686 | 341 | 4 | 4,182 | 153 | 6 | 3,630 |
| <i>Aid from CIDA⁽⁴⁾</i> | 4 | | | 19 | | | 19 | | |
| Aid for basic educ. ⁽¹⁾ | 91 | 6 | 1,352 | 141 | 6 | 2,248 | 49 | 12 | 1,698 |
| Aid for basic educ. per student | 56 | 8 | 13 | 76 | 3 | 18 | 26 | 11 | 14 |
| % basic educ. in total educ. | 54 | 11 | 50 | 41 | 25 | 54 | 32 | 28 | 47 |
| % education in ODA | 17 | 15 | 12 | 32 | 3 | 9 | 25 | 3 | 10 |

(1) in millions of US dollars/constant 2007 dollars

(2) out of 45 Sub-Saharan African countries that receive aid for education

(3) Sub-Saharan Africa

(4) in millions of Canadian dollars according to CIDA data from CRAFT

During the 2000-2007 period, Senegal was one of the largest Official Development Assistance (ODA) recipients in the education sector among Sub-Saharan countries (Table 2.4.3). The ODA profile in Senegal changed during this period: the education sector received a larger portion of ODA, from 17% in 2000 to 25% in 2007. However, this aid was redirected from basic education to other levels of education, and the amount of ODA per student at the basic education level was reduced by more than 50%. Support from Canadian cooperation in the education sector increased substantially during this period, from CAN\$4.4 million in 2000 to \$19.1 million in 2007. As CIDA's aid was concentrated at the basic education level, at the end of the period, Canada was one of the largest technical and financial partners (TFPs) in Senegal at the basic education level.

Popular Economy (rural entrepreneurship and microfinance)

This sector attracts a large number of donors: the World Bank, the European Union, the African Development Bank, France, etc. However, their activities are not always coordinated. Considering

¹⁴ The eight MDGs are: eradicate poverty and hunger; achieve universal primary education; promote gender equality and empower women; reduce child mortality; improve maternal health; combat HIV/Aids, malaria and other diseases; ensure environmental sustainability; develop a global partnership for development.

¹⁵ Source: UNESCO Education For All Global Monitoring Report, 2010

that the agriculture sector provides a means of subsistence for close to 60% of the population but accounts for less than 20% of GDP, Canadian activity is concentrated in the following areas.

- Continuing and consolidating its activities in rural development in Niayes and Casamance, to improve the prospects for income for small rural entrepreneurs and to promote economic development and protection of fragile ecosystems.
- Continuing and consolidating its expertise in microfinance. The focus is on consolidation and organization of the sector, which is in full expansion mode, and to improve access, especially for the rural population, to Decentralized Financial Systems (DFSs).
- New agri-food processing initiatives and food security enhanced that initial vision, making this a very diversified sector.

The concept of popular economy covers a series of employment, production and income-generating sectoral activities for the poor. However, as it is not a targeted sector for intervention as such for the Senegalese government or the other economic and financial partners, the CIDA program has more or less remained “orphaned” in this field, both in terms of policies and in terms of coordination in the field. Nevertheless, extensive collaboration was developed at the sectors and sub-sectors level.

Governance

CIDA governance funding from 2001 to date has been characterized by support for *ad hoc* projects related to decentralization (support for associations of locally-elected representatives [PAEL] being the largest of these projects) and the study of local taxation and to strengthening civil society organizations for the advancement of women’s rights. These bilateral projects all ended in 2008. Since 2001, CIDA has also been very active in decentralization, but the continuity of its support refers especially to the coordination of technical and financial partners (TFPs) and policy dialogue with the government, rather than to funding specific initiatives.

Since 2002, through its sector budget support, CIDA has also been active in financial and budget reform in terms of policy dialogue and direct financing, although that effort was not articulated in the effects and expected outcomes in the CDPF. Finally, in spite of the intention expressed in the CDPF to give equal importance to support to civil society and the government of Senegal, there is no program strategy or clear objective with regard to the place and strengthening of civil society. CIDA’s support in this regard is relatively modest and spread out across activity sectors, key stakeholders and geographic locations.

3 Principal Results by Sector and by Theme

3.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with development results achieved *at the level of selected projects*, by activity sector and cross-cutting theme. The following points are especially noteworthy:

- The results described below deal only with the 25 projects selected (24 projects were initially selected but one more has been added to address a lack of valuable data) for the sample for this evaluation and do not deal with all development results of CIDA’s Program in Senegal overall.
- Data sources for this chapter include various documents available from key stakeholders regarding projects and interviews, in Canada and Senegal.
- The effectiveness of the CIDA Program in Senegal and the achievements specified in the 2001-2011 CDPF are analyzed in Chapter 4, section 4.2, which deals with efficiency.

3.2 Results of education activities

During the 2001-2011 period, the CIDA Program in Senegal achieved relatively positive education results in areas such as support for curriculum reform, teacher training, revision of the training system for volunteers in education, literacy, and basic education of adults. However, uneven results and some constraints are observed in other sub-sectors. For example:

Support for curriculum reform – Since 2001, CIDA's contribution has helped to develop teaching modules in the four mandatory subjects for teachers of non-formal education and pre-school, as well as for the six elementary levels. For capacity-building in the Ministry of Education, CIDA supported a group of 40 Senegalese writers and curriculum-building experts using the competency-based approach (CBA) and the training of some 260 inspectors and 8,000 teachers in CBA. However, these results are also challenged by the following factors: (i) no evaluation for the active construction phase and generalization, which could have highlighted the need to include training evaluation earlier into the strategic planning of curriculum reform ; (ii) the absence of a dialogue framework between the team responsible for developing elementary curricula, funded by CIDA, and the one for intermediate, funded by USAID; (iii) the government's concern with redefining the exit profile of the basic levels (elementary and intermediate), so as to harmonize it with education system legislation and new policy documents; and (iv) the absence of linkages between the skills necessary to develop accelerated strategic growth clusters and those that remained discipline-focussed.

Teacher training – CIDA's activities in supporting volunteers in education (PAVÉ) helped to review the system of initial training for volunteers and transform it into diploma-gear training. It also helped to enhance continuous training, especially teaching conditions in *Écoles de formation d'instituteurs* (EFIs) [teachers' colleges], through the provision of teaching equipment, tools and instruments. Following those two phases, PAVÉ created a ripple effect, with the 14 first generations of volunteers, or 12,000 to 13,000 people, requesting and receiving requalification. The volunteers felt the initial training was satisfactory but insufficient, and the training profile needs to be reviewed in light of the curriculum reform. Capacity-building for trainers in EFIs and practice schools was also deemed insufficient. For continuous training, refresher training was irregular, too short, and did not sufficiently flesh out the initial training. The material provided was interesting and relevant but was available in insufficient quantities, distributed late and, at the end of the project, 25% of it was unusable due to maintenance and repair problems. However, PAVÉ had a positive effect on improving access to elementary education through a substantial influx of volunteers in the classrooms, which expanded the education offering, especially outside urban centres.

Non-formal education and vocational and technical training – Senegal still has an elitist system of education and training which excludes a significant portion of the population, including illiterate people, those who became so after dropping out of the formal system, or those who are unemployed because they lack skills adapted to the needs of their surroundings. CIDA has contributed to major non-formal education projects such as the literacy component in the PAPA I and II projects and, as explained below, in the case of Technical and Vocational Training (TVT). It used various aid transfer mechanisms and methods, including the program-based approach; traditional, reactive bilaterally funded projects; and activities supported by the Partnerships with Canadians Branch through institutional twinning or multi-annual program financing.

The Neo-literate Vocational Training Support Project (PAFPNA) has resulted in linkages between literacy, technical ministries, businesses and communities managing local development plans¹. Its actions have helped to train 687 neo-literates into craftsmen, to develop 12 specialty supervisors and to strengthen trade guild oversight of cottage industries. Although PAFPNA is a linkage model between literacy, vocational training and apprenticeship, the literacy challenge remains, as the project did not yield labour-force entry solutions when it ended in 2008.

Literacy – The project to support the Action plan in basic education for youth and adults Phase 2 (PAPA II) contributed to a paradigm shift. From a “State conducting literacy activities”, Senegal successfully shifted towards a “Pilot State for its sector in partnership with civil society”. To do so, a procedures manual was developed and tools for the democratic selection of operators were defined, the *Centre national de ressources éducationnelles* (CNRE) [national education resource centre] was established and a national model of *École communautaire de base* (ECB) [basic community school] was developed as the project unfolded. PAPA also contributed to supporting the coaching of half a million neo-literates. However, since the end of PAPA II in 2009, the number of those coached has decreased.

Learning environment – Through its Multilateral Program, CIDA has supported the school canteen program of the World Food Program (WFP) since 2003. This support has helped to achieve WFP’s objectives by covering approximately 80% of WFP’s 3,700 schools (including 5% of pre-schools) out of the 7,000 public primary schools in Senegal in 2009¹⁶. According to WFP reports, the project exceeded expected objectives in terms of public school enrolment, the rate of school success and the gross enrolment ratio (GER) both for boys and girls. Moreover, the project helped to reduce the percentage of household income spent on food and supported the creation of a *Division des cantines scolaires* (school canteen division) within the *Ministère de l’Éducation nationale* (MEN) [ministry of national education] and the development of a school canteen management system.

Sector budget support – The *Initiative d’appui au plan décennal d’éducation* (IAPDE) [ten-year education program support initiative] made its first disbursement in late Summer 2008. This first segment of budget support was paid into a special account with action plan-targeted budget lines. The funds became fungible in the State budget only as of 2009. After less than two years of operation, the mission was not able to judge the effectiveness of the IAPDE, especially because the indicators used rely on relatively long processes before producing results, such as the review of the relevance of the teachers’ curriculum and continuous training. An external evaluation of this initiative is planned by CIDA in early 2011.

The strengths and weaknesses of the education program – The primary factors for success depend on: (i) the ability to address government priorities, to help the government find solutions and support innovative approaches; (ii) the introduction of skills and tools that become milestones for achieving sustainable results and the success of future programming, such as management capacity-building in planning, management and follow-up based on management-based results. The major constraints to achieving results in the sector are: (i) Senegalese institutional instability, which makes it difficult to have sustainable policies and to meet commitments; (ii) the arbitrary environment between priorities and budgeting among ministries responsible for education, which undermines the leadership of the different ministries in their specific field of activity; (iii) at CIDA, the project approval processes that have a direct impact on program structure, which can lead to identifying unrealistic results, limitations on implementing activities and improving teaching quality, and losing impetus in the field. The following Table indicates some of the major results in the Education Sector; not all of them could be attributed to Canada’s support.

¹⁶ Figures from the Direction de la planification de la réforme de l’éducation (DPRE) (Education reform planning directorate), 2009 Report.

Results of Canadian investments in Education in Senegal

- Education is a crucial element of the Senegalese Government strategy toward poverty reduction. Although Senegal is a major beneficiary of official development assistance (ODA) in Africa, ODA represented around 8% of the Government total budget in 2008.
- In the Education sector, the Government of Senegal remains the main source of funding. For example, in 2000, around 80% of the funding in that sector originated from the government's budget; that proportion was around 72% in 2001 and 84% in 2008. In 2000, ODA represented 17% of funding in the Education sector; the TFPs contributed to 26.8% in 2001; that percentage was close to 25% in 2007.
- With the introduction of sector budget support, CIDA's funding to Education in Senegal increased substantially during the 2000-2007 period from \$4 million to \$19.1 million in 2007. Although Canada is considered as one of the largest technical and financial partners (TFPs) in basic education, its contribution remains modest in the broad spectrum of education spending. Canada's contribution was estimated at 1% of the total budget in education in 2000, around 4.5% in 2007 and 1% in 2008.
- In 2001, Canada's contribution to Education in Senegal represented 3.5% of the total funding provided by the TFPs; and in 2007, it was 17%.
- Overall, Canada is one of the key providers of funding in education among the technical and financial partners; but it's a modest contribution to the overall budget allocated to the education sector; between 1 and 4% depending on the period. Consequently, it remains difficult to assess correctly the achievements of Canada's effort. Some indicators of success in Senegal are presented below:

Access to Education

- Gross illiteracy rate based on Gender in 2001: 41.4% for men and 62.2% for women;
- Proportion of girls at school: with parity index of 0.79 at the elementary level in 2001 and 1.07 in 2007.
- Admission rate at the primary level based on gender: 84.7% in 2005 for boys and 89% for girls. In 2006, it was 88.3% for boys and 94.6% for girls.
- Net rate of schooling 69.4% in 2001 and 86% in 2007
- Net admission rate at the elementary level 68.9% in 2001 and 95% in 2007

Quality of Education

- Net completion rate at the elementary level: 52.6% for boys and 47.2 for girls in 2005; and 46.6% for boys and 45.1 for girls in 2006.
- Success rate at the elementary level: 47,3% in 2005; 69.28% in 2006
- Literacy rate among women: 87% in 2005; 85% in 2006
- CIDA's supported PAVÉ I & II helped train 13.000 volunteers in education
- CIDA supported activities under PAFPNP helped train 687neo-literates into craftsmen and 12 supervisors. The Projects success leads to the creation of a Directorate responsible for training within the Ministry of Education; today more than 400000 are waiting for apprenticeship training.

3.3 Results in popular economy

During the 2001-2011 period, the CIDA Program in Senegal achieved significant and varied results in various sectors related to popular economy, including in agri-food, forestry and micro-credit. The following are especially noteworthy:

Contribution to the implementation of the new forestry policy, which makes producers' organizations accountable and encourages sustainable and cost-effective development of forestry resources through: (i) forestry income from the band of filao, which, although smaller than expected, helped to consolidate the place given to groups in the protection and maintenance of this vegetation barrier, which is indispensable for protecting market gardening pockets against desertification; (ii) it also generated some income for forestry services through timber cutting licenses, a part of which should return to local communities; and (iii) some income from the Casamance forests through the sale of non-ligneous forestry products.

Significant contribution to the agri-food sector, in connection with the *Politique de Redéploiement industriel* [policy of industrial redeployment] and the *Stratégie de croissance accélérée* (SCA) through the *Projet d'appui aux opérateurs de l'agroalimentaire* (PAOA) [agri-food operators' support project], which dealt with several types of constraints in the sector. The 120 supported agri-food micro-businesses increased their sales by approximately 50% by creating or consolidating 1,437 permanent jobs, 85% of which were for women. The women operators who were supported increased their sales by 31%, with an 89% increase in the quantity of processed and marketed products. The *Institut de Technologie Alimentaire* [institute of food technology] had its capacities strengthened and provides better support to sector businesses.

Contribution for removing certain constraints from agricultural systems, through the following: (i) general improvement in the quality of onions produced in les Niayes, with reduced post-harvest losses and an increase in meeting domestic requirements, which helps to limit imports; (ii) an increase in the volume of soble- Niayes'- label high-quality onions marketed from centres established under the *Projet d'appui à l'entrepreneuriat paysan* (PAEP) [rural entrepreneurship support project]; (iii) the reduction of constraints in the cashew system through significant planting of cashew trees, improving the Senegalese system of cashew nuts at the beginning of the 2000s with an improvement in the quality of the raw nut and the price to the producer; and (iv) improvement in the performance of the honey system in Casamance through training in production and marketing, the introduction of a better-performing hive and the introduction of a honey processing unit through the *Projet d'appui à l'entrepreneuriat forestier de Kolda* (PAEFK) [Kolda forestry entrepreneurship support project].

Strengthening of certain professional organizations that benefit from better governance and can better represent the interests of their members and provide services to them such as the *Association des unions maraîchères des Niayes* (AUMN) [les Niayes association of market gardening unions] for market gardening producers in les Niayes, the *Unions forestières exploitant la bande de filao dans les Niayes*¹⁷ [forestry unions using the band of filao in les Niayes], the groups of honey and cashew producers and the groups of foresters working in the reserve forests of Casamance. The professional agri-food associations also improved the services available to members and increased women's leadership within these associations; the revitalization of the *Forum de l'agroalimentaire* [agri-food forum] has not really yielded any results.

Capacity-building of government technical bodies involved in projects - The *Direction des Eaux et Forêts* [water and forests directorate] of the *Ministère de l'Environnement et de la protection de la nature* (MEPN) [ministry of the environment and the protection of nature], which is involved in the

¹⁷ Membership in the AUMN, which had 8,375 members and 16 group unions at the end of the PAEP in 2006, had 17,500 members and 18 Unions in 2010. The unions and their members were given several types of training, which strengthened their technical and organizational skills.

management of two CIDA projects, strengthened its technical and financial management capacities by managing two CIDA projects. The *Direction de l'Horticulture* [horticultural directorate], the *Direction de la Protection des Végétaux* [vegetable protection directorate], the *Direction Générale de la Planification des Ressources en Eaux* [water resources planning branch] and the *Direction Générale de l'Aménagement du Territoire* [land use branch] improved their technical performance and the knowledge of their respective sectors: market gardening production, pesticides, water resources, and the development of land-use planning.

Contribution to food security, although not targeted at the start of the CDPF, using supplementary income generated by activities within projects that improve household access to food products; the processing of agricultural products that improves availability; the consolidation of the iodized salt system which helps to eliminate iodine deficiency in Senegal and the sub-region; the establishment of 27 new grain banks in Casamance; the creation of anti-erosion installations by means of a distribution of food supplies to vulnerable populations in crisis situations (36,000 families); and the planning of projects that will improve the availability of rice (Bey Dunde and the *Programme de développement des marchés agricoles au Sénégal* (PDMAS) [program for developing agricultural markets in Senegal]).

Significant contribution to the microfinance policy and institutional framework through its support for the development and implementation of the microfinance action plan, the support given to certain key bodies such as the (former) *Association professionnelle des services financiers décentralisés* (APIMEC) (professional association of decentralized financial services), the *Cadre national de concertation* (CNC) [national [micro-finance] consultation framework] and the *Direction de la micro finance* (DMF) [microfinance directorate]. CIDA helped to improve access to financial services by supporting the *Partenariat pour la mobilisation de l'épargne et du crédit au Sahel* (PAMECAS) [Sahel savings and credit mobilization partnership] network, which consolidated and extended its urban network and created new rural credit unions (six with the *Fonds de renforcement de l'économie populaire - Amélioration de l'encadre du secteur et de l'offre en milieu rural* (FREP-AESOR) [fund to strengthen the popular economy – improvement of sectoral framework & rural supply] and some thirty with the support of the PFAI-MF (Participation au Fonds d'appui institutionnel en micro finance) [contribution to the microfinance institutional support fund]. Adapted rural credit products were also developed within the FREP-AESOR project, but their performance was not compared against existing products. There is also no analysis on the cost-effectiveness and sustainability of activities financed by credit.

The principal factors of success depend on: (i) close follow-through in time and continuity – CIDA is a leader in microfinancing and has been a coordinator for many years; (ii) the degree of involvement and the participation of recipients in all the projects; (iii) the focus on technical capacity-building; and (iv) an integrated approach that allows several elements to be addressed at the same time: production, marketing, financing, the strengthening of sectoral organizations and institutions, as in the case of micro finance support. Initially, however, in some cases (Kolda, for example), the lack of focus of support strategies for rural organizations, incomplete analyses of areas of intervention and the needs of recipients, weak exit strategies and transfer plans, as well as not sufficiently drawing on lessons learned and best practices of other donors, limited the scope of the results. This was accompanied by a lack of political will in certain areas such as the approval of the *Schéma directeur d'aménagement de la Grande Côte* [Grande Côte development master plan] and weak government technical and financial capacities, especially in the environment sector, in which the government does not have sufficient human and financial means to implement the forestry management plans that were developed. Finally, at the sub-regional level, there are platforms for rural development and food security in West Africa. These platforms are areas for the dialogue between stakeholders in the

agricultural sector, political decision-makers and certain TFPs, although Canada does not take part in these platforms.¹⁸

3.4 Results achieved in governance

During the 2001-2011 period, CIDA's Program in Senegal achieved a range of significant results in the field of public governance at the national and local levels and in decentralization. The following are especially noteworthy:

Results in decentralization

- **Study of the local taxation system** – This allowed for a better understanding of taxation realities at the level of local communities and, on that basis, a “White Paper on local taxation” was submitted to the government. The reform proposal introduced the concept of a citizen’s duty to be more involved in the management of public funds at the local level and, after the study, a reform to the general code of taxation was undertaken. Unfortunately, since that time, local taxation reform has not advanced significantly, in spite of the concerted efforts of CIDA and other TFPs in terms of technical assistance and policy dialogue on decentralization. The ratio of government transfers into local community budgets during the period covered has remained relatively unchanged, and local revenues have not evolved according to PRSP II’s overall assessment.
- **Support for the Union des associations d’élus locaux (UAEL)** (Union of associations of local elected representatives) – CIDA contributed significantly to structuring, capacity-building and internal governance of the UAEL. Though not very functional and not very visible in 1997, the UAEL is now a key partner in policy dialogue on decentralization. The project helped to establish a permanent support unit for locally elected representatives (CAEL) [local representative support unit] and the development of a national referential for training locally elected representatives. Through its advocacy efforts, the UAEL was able to advance several major files in terms of decentralization including: the decentralization of the consolidated investment budget and the indexing of the Value Added Tax (VAT); the formal definition of the status of locally elected representative; the development of the *Programme national de développement local* (PNDL) [national local development program]; and the redefinition of the partnership between communities, NGOs and grassroots groups within the program.

Governance/education sector crosscutting theme

- **Budgetary and financial reforms** – Since 2008, CIDA has supported the Senegalese government’s program of budget and financial reform through its sector budget support to education (\$9.5 million). In the education sector, CIDA’s support has made possible the computerization of the management of the chain of expenses, the decentralization of the authorization of budget expenditures, the introduction of budget programs established according to Results-based Management (RBM) and the phasing-in of the new *Code de passation des marchés* [contracting code].¹⁹ The geographic coverage of the *Système intégré de gestion des finances publiques* (SIGFiP) [integrated public finance management system] allowed local stakeholders to update financial information in the system in real time, which led to significant improvement in the predictability and availability of funds for the commitment of expenses. Although there has been notable progress since 2008, it must be emphasized that management capacity is very weak, especially at the regional and departmental levels. CIDA’s tardiness in

¹⁸ Operational Review... RBMG, pp. 52.

¹⁹ CIDA (February 2009). Joint Annual Bilateral Review of the CIDA Program in Senegal.

implementing the "capacity-building" component provided for in the IAPDE framework limited the effectiveness and the implementation of reforms.

- **Literacy** – CIDA transformed the literacy sector by supporting the outsourcing strategy, which introduced and institutionalized contracting between the government and civil society service providers, and by supporting the establishment of the Centre national de ressources (CNRE) [national education resource centre], a tripartite body – public, private and civil society – which manages supply and demand of literacy services while leaving a significant place for decentralized and unconcentrated structures of national education.
- **School Canteens** – World Food Program's (WFP) school canteen program supports the strengthening of *Comités de gestion des écoles* [school management committees] to ensure the management of the canteen program. WFP also supported the establishment of a *Division des cantines scolaires* [school canteen division] within the Ministry of Education and is now developing a database to ensure the continuation of this program and promotion of a better distribution of resources. WFP also developed a progressive strategy for transferring all canteen management to the government, which should greatly reduce parallel projects and allow the government to effectively take over the management of the entire sector.

Governance/popular economy sector crosscutting theme

- **Rural organizations and agricultural producers** – CIDA helped set up a recognized apex organization of producers (AUMN) which has a clear vision of the services that it would like to provide to the members of its network, within a context where there were three apex organizations that did not interact. Several projects also helped to strengthen organizational management and internal government of rural organizations such as the Fédération des producteurs d'arachides [federation of cashew producers] and the Fédération des périmètres autogérés (FPA) [federation of self-managed areas]. Moreover, the communication strategy of the Conseil national de concertation des ruraux (CNCR) [national rural consultation committee], the principal advocacy organization for rural stakeholders, has been strengthened.
- **The Schéma directeur d'aménagement de la Grande Côte (SDAG) [Grande Côte development master plan]**, which was developed in a participatory manner, is a powerful governance tool for all the stakeholders involved in les Niayes. Elected representatives are currently exerting pressure to have it adopted.
- **Microfinance** – CIDA supported the structuring of the *Association professionnelle des systèmes financiers décentralisés* (APSF) [professional association of decentralized financial services] by recruiting an executive director, establishing an ethics code, developing the association's development plan and setting up the *Comité national de coordination* (CNC) [national [micro finance] consultation framework]. This support helped to strengthen dialogue between stakeholders and promote coordinated oversight of the implementation of the sectoral policy letter. The various types of support to the sector also fostered the implementation of best practices such as indicators to promote the good governance of IMFs (microfinance institutions).

The principal factors of success were: (i) the strategic targeting of initiatives and key stakeholders in governance by CIDA; and (ii) major efforts to coordinate and harmonize the Program with TFPs in decentralization and financial reform. However, there was a shift in CIDA's programming in decentralization, a lack of definition of governance as a crosscutting theme in the two activity sectors, and a lack of synergy among initiatives in decentralization/governance across sectors, projects, stakeholders and regions. In addition, there is a lack of political will and institutional instability in terms of decentralization and local development.

3.5 Results achieved in Gender Equality (GE)

During the 2001-2011 period, the CIDA Program in Senegal achieved a variety of significant varied results in matters of gender equality. It is an area in which there is still much to do but in which Canada has played a leadership role. The following are especially noteworthy:

The strategic interests of Senegalese women and national political mechanisms in GE - The Réseau Siggil Jigéen (RSJ) [Siggil Jigéen network], supported by CIDA since 1997, was once the only Senegalese network of women's Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) to be concerned with women's strategic interests. The project allowed the network to be structured and its capacities strengthened in terms of political analysis, advocacy, joint action and internal governance. The efforts of the RSJ contributed to the passage of the bill on violence against women, the national action plan against female genital mutilation, and revisions to the Family Code. The network was able to diversify its sources of financing and continues its activities today, but on a more limited basis. Through CIDA's support, the *Centre d'appui aux élus locaux* (CAEL) [local representative support unit] was able to strengthen its capacity to support *the Commission des femmes élues* [commission of elected women] and execute their action plan for promoting women in politics. One should note the work in advocacy of the *Réseau Siggil Jigéen* [Siggil Jigéen network] and of the UAEL's *Commission des femmes élues* [commission of elected women] regarding women's participation in politics and the influence these stakeholders had on the passage, in 2010, of the *Loi sur la Parité hommes-femmes dans les instances politiques* [law on gender parity in political institutions]. Through the *Fonds d'appui décentralisé à l'appropriation et au dialogue* (FADAD) [decentralized ownership and dialogue support fund], CIDA supported the evaluation of the second *Plan d'action national de la femme* [women's national action plan], which led directly to the development of the *Stratégie nationale de l'égalité et de l'équité du genre* (SNEEG) [national equality and gender equality strategy]. CIDA supports the Family Ministry in the implementation of SNEEG, the creation of a gender audit in national mechanisms and support for better integration of GE in the next PRSP (III), through its policy dialogue and technical assistance.

GE in the education sector – There has been a progressive increase in gross enrolment and schooling rates for girls, which now outstrips those for boys. Although CIDA concentrated its activities on the quality component of education, it has also contributed significantly to improving girls' access to education by its support to education volunteers, whose increased presence in the system has made it possible to open new classes. CIDA aims to improve the quality of education so as to increase school retention and success rates for girls, through its funding for *the Paquets de services intégrés pour la qualité de l'éducation* [integrated education quality services packages] project. This "services package" has become an instrument of education policy included in the Policy Letter of 2009.

With UNICEF's support, CIDA helped to accelerate the generalization phase of the "services package," to cover a total of 1,000 schools out of the 2,500 in the areas covered by the project. In terms of curriculum, all primary education curricula were reviewed to ensure that GE was taken into consideration. Special attention was also paid to textbooks, to ensure that they avoid sexist stereotypes. Between 2000 and 2009, the percentage of women among teaching staff rose from 25% to 30%, but it is still far short of the objective of parity.²⁰ In literacy, PAPA II's gender equality strategy ensured a very satisfactory attendance rate for women in functional literacy classes, namely 90%, compared with PAPA II's estimated standard of 75%. During its learning activities, PAFPNA had 76% of women out of 687 learners, and it gave them access to trades that are traditionally reserved for men, such as electricity and mechanics. The same was true for the *Partenariat Canada/Sénégal* [Canada/Senegal Partnership] project in technical and vocational training, in which girls represented 35% of learners in automobile maintenance classes.

²⁰ DPRE, Rapport national sur la situation de l'éducation en 2009 (national report on education in 2009)

GE in the popular economy sector – Overall, there is considerable targeting of CIDA investments in the areas of production in which women are most active. In the rural groups and apex organizations in the agri-food sector that are supported by CIDA projects, the number of women sitting on decision-making bodies has increased by 47%. In the microfinance sub-sector, and through support from PAMECAS, women represent 60% of the membership of savings and credit organizations, 60% of their clients, 33% of their executives, and they receive close to 52% of credits. The microcredit for women was used as a strategy for setting up six new credit unions in the St. Louis region. In *Développement international Desjardins* (DID)'s “*La finance au service des pauvres*” [finance serving the poor] program, women represent 40.3% of clients, 52.2% of employees, 33.8% of executives, and they obtained 39.5% of credit. However, generally speaking, the cost-effectiveness of activities dealing with giving credit to women has not been documented in the projects. That said, in the agri-food processing sector, CIDA has contributed to an average sales increase of approximately 50% for the 120 microbusinesses that are supported, the creation of 1,437 permanent jobs, 85% of which were for women, and a 31% increase in income for women operators.²¹

CIDA's principal factors of success include: (i) ongoing attention to the integration of GE into the CDPF; and (ii) leadership and expertise in promoting GE that are recognized by the Senegalese government, other donor countries and civil society. However, the current systems and structures of the CIDA program in Senegal do not yet facilitate a systematic integration and generalized accountability for achieving GE results. Moreover, in certain cases, the external context for promoting GE is not very favourable. For example, there is limited support and interest on the part of the other TFPs and a limited institutional capacity by the government of Senegal to integrate GE effectively into its planning, follow-up and reporting mechanisms.

3.6 Results in the environment

The CIDA program in Senegal for the period 2001-2011 achieved various results in the environment, especially in the natural resources sector (agriculture, water, planning, etc.). The following are especially noteworthy:

Several results – The CDPF did not include specific indicators for the environment as a crosscutting theme. The analysis of the results confirms that this theme is well integrated and has generated several results. The development of the *Schéma directeur d'aménagement de la Grande Côte* [Grande Côte development master plan], with its legal texts and its coordination structure, will help to rationalize the use of water and land resources through innovative mechanisms. The lack of government approval, however, limits the scope of this result. *L'élaboration de Plans d'aménagement forestiers* [developing forest management plans] for the management of the band of filao in les Niayes (2004) and for the Bakor and Mahon reserve forests in Casamance, confirmed the role of riverbank populations in forest management and allowed them to generate some income, thus laying the foundations for the rational and sustainable management of forestry resources.

A contribution to water resource management: Through support from the Global Water Partnership, which is financed by CIDA, the *Direction de la Gestion et de la Planification des Ressources en Eau* [water resources management and planning directorate] was able to conduct its *Programme de Gestion Intégrée des Ressources en Eau* (PAGIRE) [national integrated water resource management action plan] in 2007, which is a strategic document for the sector, in line with developments in this area in the sub-region and the priority on water in CIDA's *Stratégie sous-régionale pour l'Afrique de l'Ouest* [sub-regional strategy for West Africa] (2009). This priority is reinforced in the context of climatic change. Other initiatives include: (i) awareness-raising about water resources by PAEP since 1999, subsequently taken up by the *Fonds d'appui aux Niayes* (FAN 1) [les Niayes support fund], with the implementation of a structure for joint action on the resource

²¹ PAOA, SNC Lavalin, Final Report 2008, June 2008

(*Concertation sur la gestion de l'eau dans les Niayes* – COCOGEN [les Niayes water management consultation]) which helped to raise awareness of communities and authorities of the fragility of water resources in les Niayes; (ii) an analysis conducted on the application of pesticides in les Niayes by FAN 1 and biological efforts to eradicate the mango fly under PDMAS; (iii) a database of water resources for les Niayes was developed and transferred to the *Direction de la gestion et de la planification des ressources en eau* (DGPRE) [water resource management and planning directorate]; and (iv) tests on micro-irrigation, which were somewhat conclusive and reprised under FAN 1 and PDMAS.

The development of a Project Design Document (PDD) for the sale of carbon credits emerging from reforestation within the framework of the *Projet de réhabilitation des forêts et des espaces ruraux* (PREFER) [forest and rural area rehabilitation project]. Although considered to be a good technical and scientific document and developed in a participatory manner, this project has not yet been able to find financing in spite of a round table of donors. These calculations were used as models for developing other reforestation projects that are admissible to the carbon market.

Results in hygiene, of the safety of foodstuffs through PAOA training (creation of posters, an introduction to the *Hazard Control Critical Points (HACCP)*, and of PDMAS in the meat system (*Plan d'Action contre les abattages clandestins* [action plan against illegal slaughter], strengthening veterinary inspection services, involving consumer associations, *Guide des bonnes pratiques* [best practices guide]. **A structuring contribution:** The *Plan national de géomatique* [national geomatics plan] being developed will give Senegal the infrastructure (data, information, protocols) needed for authorities to make informed decisions about economic (e.g., taxation), social (e.g., natural disasters) or environmental (e.g., land administration) problems using harmonized, up-to-date, reliable and accessible data. However, as mentioned above, these results did not make it possible to gauge the frequency or the impact of the policy dialogue, or collaboration and coordination with other donors.

4 Key findings based on criteria

This chapter contains the key findings of the Senegal Program evaluation, based on the performance criteria defined in the terms of reference (Appendix A). The analysis focuses mainly on the program and sector levels; sample projects are mentioned to support general conclusions. That said, sample projects were used to determine the ratings against the evaluation criteria for each sector of the Program (see Table 4.0, below).

Table 4.0: Summary of ratings for each analysis criterion, by CDPF area of intervention

| Criterion | Education | Popular economy | Governance | Average |
|-----------------------------|------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| 1. Relevance | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 4.5 |
| 2. Effectiveness or results | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| 3. Sustainability | 2.4 | 3.4 | 2.8 | 2.9 |
| 4. Crosscutting themes | 3.1 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 3.2 |
| 5. Coherence | 3.3 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 3.8 |
| 6. Efficiency | 2.7 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.4 |
| 7. Management principles | 3.7 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 3.9 |
| 8. Performance management | 2.7 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| Average | 3.2 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 3.6 |

Ratings: highly satisfactory (4.1 to 5); satisfactory (3.1 to 4); moderately satisfactory (2.1 to 3); unsatisfactory (1.1 to 2); highly unsatisfactory (0 to 1); not applicable or not evaluated, given the progress of the project (N/A)

Highly satisfactory ratingsⁱⁱ for the criterion of relevance, for all sectors, are far higher than the average ratings obtained for the evaluation criteria in general. The evaluation shows that the

investments chosen by the Senegal Program, the priorities of the Government of Senegal, and the policies of the Government of Canada are very much in line with each other. The criterion of sustainability produces the lowest average of 2.9 (the only criterion to be rated *moderately satisfactory*). Ratings vary considerably from one sector to another. The education sector has the lowest rating for sustainability at 2.4, given the fairly limited financial management capacity of the government partners to ensure sustainable results. At 2.8, the sustainability ratings for the governance sector are moderately satisfactory, given the limited absorption capacity of partners and the lack of effective phasing-out strategies for CIDA. The results for popular economy projects appear to be more sustainable.

All other criteria were rated *satisfactory*, with averages ranging from 3.2 to 3.9. The criteria for crosscutting themes and performance management both received the lowest rating, an average of 3.2. In the case of crosscutting themes, this is due to the unequal treatment of GE from one project to another, as well as the failure to integrate environmental considerations in the education and governance sectors. In performance management, weaknesses are noted in program monitoring and capitalization. Efficiency is rated satisfactory, but is slightly below average. This is because delays (caused by the lengthy and complex project approval process at CIDA Headquarters) affect all sectors, but are offset by efficient mobilization of human resources in the field. Finally, the criteria of coherence and management principles have been rated satisfactory in every case, and are slightly above average because of CIDA's significant efforts to align and harmonize its Program with its development partners in Senegal.

4.1 Relevance

Compatibility with Senegal's development policies and priorities – The Program's directions are very much in line with the objectives and priorities of successive poverty reduction strategies in Senegal. They also consider the Millennium Development Goals, particularly those respecting the eradication of poverty and hunger, universal primary education, promotion of gender equality, and empowerment of women. In education, CIDA opted for a core contribution by deciding to align its sectoral program with the ten-year education and training program (PDEF). The program provides a unifying framework for activities in this sector. The concept of the popular economy is not clearly spelled out in the policy directions of the Government of Senegal, nor included in CIDA's policy directions.²² During the evaluation period, Canadian support focused on structuring the microfinance sector and being open to new opportunities for rural entrepreneurship, as well as emerging issues, including food security following the crises of 2007 and 2008, and the agri-food processing sector. In governance, CIDA's program was formally aligned with the policies and priorities of the Government of Senegal regarding good governance and decentralized participatory development, focusing on (i) improved public-sector financial management and procurement procedures (awarding and executing government contracts), and (ii) local development and decentralization.

Canada's strategic policies and priorities – The CDPF does not systematically link the Program's priorities to CIDA's current policies and priorities. However, analysis of activities in the CDPF's key sectors shows programming in line with Canada's general and sectoral strategic policies and priorities (governance, GE, microfinance, education, sustainable development, private sector). Similarly, despite the many changes in the Agency's priorities and directions during the evaluation period, the Program was able to maintain operational continuity in its two priority sectors and in the area of governance/decentralization, as well as a sectoral focus in accordance with CIDA's Policy Statement on Strengthening Aid Effectiveness.

²² The Government of Senegal's objectives focused mainly on a major agricultural initiative to produce food in abundance (*Grande offensive agricole pour la nourriture et l'abondance*). PSRP II gives priority to agriculture, forestry and the agri-food industry, among other things, and these directions are emphasized in the *Agro-sylvo-pastoral Act* (LAOSP). *Revue opérationnelle du cadre de programmation de l'ACDI au Sénégal* [operational review: CIDA's programming framework for Senegal], pp.43-44. RBMG (2009). As far as CIDA is concerned, this concept is now better defined and more consistent with the priority themes of CIDA's new aid effectiveness strategy.

Best practices – Best practices include the following. i) An ongoing focus on the education program to improve the quality of education, and a commitment for periods of over 10 years in key areas such as literacy and curriculum reform, have enabled Canada to position itself as one of the most influential stakeholders in this field in Senegal. (ii) At the same time, there has been a focus on developing a viable and sustainable supply of suitable products, strengthening the microfinance sector, and considering shared concerns about decentralized financial systems (SFD) in the sub-region, via regional programs sustained for a period of over 10 years. This has also strengthened Canada's positioning and expertise in this sector. (iii) There has been policy dialogue and ongoing coordination in the area of decentralization.

Program constraints – Canada's programming has evolved in a context in which one might question the genuine political will of the Government of Senegal to put the necessary conditions in place to establish long-term growth. This is demonstrated by the lack of a genuine national long-term vision of development; delays in adopting key sectoral policies, such as in agriculture, or in adopting the land-use planning scheme (*Schéma d'aménagement du territoire*); and little progress in improving people's living conditions. Some attribute this situation to the growing politicization of government institutions, and lack of transparency in public-sector financial management. Moreover, shifting priorities in governance at CIDA have affected the Senegal Program's flexibility to promote effective and ongoing programming in that area, while key governance indicators have declined in Senegal since 2004.²³ The Program has nevertheless evolved in this environment, to which it has gradually adapted and is still adapting today.

4.2 Effectiveness

Goal of the program – The goal of the Program was to help to halve the incidence of poverty in Senegalese households by 2015. According to the most recent studies by international donors and the Government of Senegal, the objective of halving poverty will not be achieved. While significant, the Senegal Program's contribution to poverty reduction cannot be accurately quantified. First, not all of the necessary data are available, collated, and reliable. Second, the baseline data were not supplied, and targets were not set.

Purpose of the program – The purpose of the Program was to create and expand opportunities for vulnerable segments of the population, particularly through increased access to education, savings and credit, and increased participation in decision-making. The Program has not developed appropriate performance measurement systems or tools so that it can accurately monitor and evaluate its sectoral effectiveness. However, the Program's activities have addressed the determinants of poverty, and have benefited vulnerable segments of the population.

We may conclude that CIDA's Senegal Program has achieved meaningful results in all the areas of intervention specified in the 2001-2011 CDPF.

Education results – The Program has helped to achieve positive results with respect to access, and mixed results with respect to quality. The primary enrolment ratio rose from 85 percent in 2000 to 117 percent in 2009. The gender gap between girls and boys has been reversed, and now favours girls. The gross enrolment ratio (*taux brut de scolarisation* – TBS) similarly increased from 67 percent to 95 percent over the same period, with a parity index that also favours girls. The results are less satisfactory with respect to quality: the chosen indicator – the primary-school completion rate – rose only from 47 percent in 2000 to 61 percent in 2009. Unlike the primary enrolment ratio and the gross enrolment ratio, moreover, the completion rate is lower for girls. Canada has provided 23 percent of Senegal's literacy resources since 2000, and has made it possible to open 75 percent of literacy classes in Senegal. The literacy rate rose from 33 percent in 2000 to 39 percent in 2009, but has

²³ Source: World Bank Governance Indicators 1996-2010

stagnated over the past three years. Finally, the management of basic education has progressed in terms of planning and monitoring activities, while financial management remains poor, as shown by the audits conducted in 2009.

Popular economy results – While most indicators were not monitored as such, some progress can be measured based on documented results. In microfinance, (i) the Program has given people greater access to microcredit; (ii) the Program has helped to strengthen decentralized financial systems (*systèmes financiers décentralisés* – SFD) to sustainably meet the needs of a growing clientele; and (iii) the Program has significantly helped to structure the sector. In agri-food, funded microbusinesses have increased their sales. However, support for processors' associations did not succeed in making them financially independent. Unfortunately, the Program's performance indicators also did not measure the Program's substantial contributions to removing constraints on such products as onions, honey, cashews, and non-timber forest products, for which rural groups increased their operational revenue, and results with regard to the environment and security.

Governance results – CIDA acted as a catalyst among donors in alignment and harmonization in the areas of decentralization and public-sector financial management reform. The Program helped to strengthen local mechanisms by giving women greater access to decision-making. Through capacity building, the union of associations of local elected representatives (*Union des Associations d'élus locaux* – UAEL) was able to contribute to progress in key areas, such as decentralizing the consolidated capital budget, preparing the national local development program (*Programme national de développement local* – PNDL), and formal defining "local elected representative" status. The Program enabled rural organizations to influence the drafting of the LOASP, and to participate in the activities of the market regulation agency (*Agence de régulation des marchés* – ARM). With respect to women's participation, we note the advocacy work of the Siggil Jigéen network and the elected women's committee of the UAEL in the 2010 adoption of legislation providing for gender parity in political bodies (*Loi sur la parité hommes-femmes dans les instances politiques*). With respect to citizen engagement in decision-making, women are now in the majority among presidents and vice-presidents of most rural organizations and federations. Targeted organizations have achieved significant outcomes. However, the crosscutting theme of governance is not adequately defined in the Program's two priority areas of intervention. There is also a lack of synergy in CIDA's contributions to governance via funded projects, sectors, geographic regions, and stakeholders. This potentially limits CIDA's impact on decentralization.

4.3 Sustainability

Sustainability of results – The Program's planning documents do not expressly address sustainability of results, and do not present specific strategies in this regard. The issue is addressed in project planning, and particularly in project approval documents (PADs), in terms of sustainability factors, such as appropriate and sufficient duration of activities, allowance for the absorption capacity of partners, appropriate institutional support, and a phasing-out strategy. These factors are present, but to varying degrees by sector and project.

Risk management – In all sectors, risk management constitutes a weak element of the Program. In the popular economy and education sectors particularly, appropriate mitigation measures do not exist for key risks. This is apparent in the financial sustainability of civil service status for volunteers in education, or changing or non-existent political will in the case of literacy or the Niayes master development plan (*Schéma directeur d'aménagement*). Risks associated with the organizational capacity of partners in the governance sector were poorly analyzed from the outset, leading to the identification of overly ambitious results. However, the budgetary and financial reform program represents a key strategy for managing fiduciary risks in budget support for the education sector. That said, CIDA's delays in implementing the capacity-building component of the ten-year education initiative (IAPDE) have tended to limit the effectiveness of this risk management strategy.

Time allowed to achieve results – The education sector requires long-term commitments, which Canada has met relatively well. This is true of curriculum and literacy, although in the latter case, CIDA withdrew before the end of the process, making the achievements fragile. The learning and technical and vocational training sectors were those to which Canada devoted the least time for firm institutional and technical establishment in the community. This raises a question about the direction to be given to Canada's support in these areas, compared with what has been done in curriculum and literacy: developing models, conducting pilot projects, and establishing long-term approaches. CIDA's long-term involvement in the microfinance sector has made it possible to improve its structure. However, redevelopment has wasted precious time for several projects. Because of a lack of immediate continuity for some projects, there may be regression in some areas of achievement. In governance, given the low absorption capacity of Senegalese partners, deadlines for most governance projects proved to be too tight and had to be extended.

Institutional, organizational and technical capacity to maintain results – CIDA's activities in the education sector have made it possible to establish a set of institutional and technical mechanisms to ensure sustainable results. This includes developing support mechanisms within the ministries responsible for education, and introducing more effective management systems, including RBM. On the other hand, the limited progress in the institutionalization of some projects did not offer favourable conditions for sustainable achievements. Institutional instability and the constant rewriting of policy documents, in areas such as literacy, presented major obstacles to achieving sustainable results. Finally, the education system faces three major difficulties: (i) mobilizing resources; (ii) transferring them to schools, where they need to go; and (iii) converting them into learning results. The system has only teachers, not administrators, and there is a great need for management capacity building. With regard to the popular economy, trainees have applied their acquired technical capacities to their operations. Most of the information provided has been incorporated into documents that allow the information to be duplicated and disseminated. Institutionalization has facilitated skill development in the accountable institutions. Governance activities have built the organizational and financial capabilities of funded mechanisms. Organizations are still in existence and have diversified their sources of funding, but poor phasing-out strategies mean that some achievements are now at risk.

Senegal's dependence on ODA – Net disbursements of ODA to Senegal have substantially increased, almost doubling between 2001 and 2008, from 505 US\$ million to 998 \$million. ODA is an important source of development funding for Senegal, representing around 8 percent of the Government's budget, and constitutes half of its capital budget. In education, the Government does not have the financial capacity to bear the cost of textbooks while maintaining the principle of free education. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that households are already heavily involved in funding education. In view of the financial crisis that has hit Senegal hard since 2007, we may see a reduction in what households contribute to educational operating costs. With regard to the popular economy, despite the capacities built in governance and management, producers' and processors' organizations are always at risk of regressing as institutions. Similarly, there is limited financial capacity to maintain activities with regard to the popular economy, because of inadequate revenue generation or government funding. All this has a direct impact on Senegal's dependence on foreign aid.

4.4 Crosscutting themes

CIDA's leadership on gender equality – Canada is helping to make gender equality a legitimate issue in Senegalese society. As a founding member of the technical financial partners (TFP) gender working group, CIDA has helped the Government of Senegal to develop two national action plans for women, to analyze the gender-related institutional environment, and to implement a process to incorporate gender into the next-generation PRSP. CIDA's policy dialogue and GE coordination efforts seem to focus increasingly on the political and institutional levels. The resources of the decentralized ownership and dialogue support fund (FADAD) are being mobilized to support these

efforts. CIDA's influence on strategic GE policy dialogue could be limited in the future, without a substantial and ongoing program of investment in this area. CIDA makes a relevant contribution in terms of supporting GE-related political and institutional mechanisms in Senegal. However, CIDA must maximize its impact, mainly by ensuring that GE is effectively and systematically integrated across its two priority programming sectors.

Integration of GE into the CDPF – It can be seen that GE is continually integrated into the Program's logical framework. A new GE strategy was developed in 2008 and revised when the 2010-2015 CDPF was prepared. CIDA increased the contribution of its gender consultant in 2008, and she thus plays a larger role in supporting the Program's planning and monitoring, and in GE policy dialogue. That said, the current systems and mechanisms of CIDA's Senegal Program do not facilitate systematic integration and generalized accountability for achieving GE results. Thus, GE integration may prove to be greater in some sectors or projects than in others. For example, GE seems to have been integrated more systematically in the popular economy than in the education sector. This problem is not unique to the Senegal Program, and is further complicated by the program-based approach, in which CIDA has little experience or few tools to facilitate effective involvement of the gender consultant in planning and joint monitoring of policies and programs. Thus, in the next CDPF, the Program would benefit from a more focused sectoral statement of GE expected results, with measurable performance indicators and detailed action plans for each sector.

The environment as a crosscutting theme – This theme was not clearly defined in the CDPF in terms of strategy and expected results. The Country Strategy developed in 2008 also did little to specify expectations with regard to the environment, even though it is clear that Senegal's natural resources have significantly deteriorated. However, a number of projects have been designed to integrate environmental considerations, especially a study of compliance with Senegal's environmental legislation (2001), a strategic environmental assessment of the CDPF, and a few expert missions.

Environmental action plan – The 2006 strategic environmental study (EES) and the interim action plan provided the basis for a proposed appendix to the future CDPF (2010-2015). The two documents argue in favour of (i) defining results and indicators in the new CDPF; (ii) implementing an action plan, with appropriate human and financial resources; (iii) building the environmental capacity of CIDA, the Canadian Cooperation Support Unit (CCSU), government, and civil-society project partners; and (iv) intensifying Canada's policy dialogue on the environment. This constitutes a sound basis for improving the environmental content of CIDA's future activities.

4.5 Coordination and coherence

Several national and international partners active in Senegal have told us Canada plays a positive role as a development partner. We might specifically mention the roles Canada plays in education, gender equality, and decentralization. Senegalese authorities have told us how much they appreciate this partnership. This open and sincere cooperation was unfortunately affected by the approach adopted in developing the most recent programming framework.

Coordination with other donors (a.k.a. Technical and financial partners-TFPs) – During the evaluation period, CIDA significantly increased its efforts to improve coordination and cooperation among donors. CIDA is active in eight thematic groups, including three as leader (education, and previously decentralization and microfinance), and on all high-level joint committees. CIDA is also very active on the joint committee on harmonization and monitoring of public-sector financial management reform (CCHS), the joint committee on aid effectiveness, both chaired by the Ministry of the Economy and Finance (MEF), and the donors coordinating committee (CCPTF), which focuses mainly on preparing PSRP III. All these coordination activities have enabled CIDA to position its Program more effectively in relation to the programs of other donors. As the leader in the education sector, for example, CIDA's activities have made it possible to restructure the working group's operations and to revitalize the harmonization of donors in the technical and vocational training sector. In microfinance, CIDA

and donors activities are well coordinated in implementing the sectoral policy letter action plan that CIDA helped to put in place. In governance, CIDA acted as a catalyst in coordinating decentralization activities, helped to prepare the national local development program (PNDL), and funded a study of local taxation to assist the efforts of other donors.

External coherence – In technical terms, with respect to monitoring of the Senegal program, aid effectiveness could be strengthened if CIDA paid more ongoing attention to external coherence. In the education sector, for example, Canada and the United States do not yet share a skills-based approach (SBA) model (in preschool and primary school for Canada, and in middle school for the United States). In technical and vocational education, the three main partners – France, Luxemburg, and Canada – have not harmonized their approaches. In the popular economy sector, opportunities for synergy with the projects of other donors are not systematically developed. Moreover, there is little analysis or monitoring of CIDA's Program in terms of complementarity or value added vis-à-vis other donors. Annual reports deal only very superficially with CIDA's positioning in its areas of intervention.

Internal coherence over time – CIDA's Senegal Program was innovative in terms of its ten-year programming framework, which allowed significant continuity and coherence in its investments. For the past decade, CIDA has been active in the same priority sectors, consolidating its positive achievements through successive activities. In governance, despite CIDA's shifting policy priorities and few new investments since 2005, there is programming coherence in terms of decentralization.

Internal coherence among CDPF sectors – The CDPF expresses a desire to develop synergy among sectors, but this synergy is not systematically sought, and the Program's management structure reinforces a scattered approach. Yet there are numerous opportunities for synergy among activities in the education and popular economy sectors. This is especially true of integrating youth into the job market, or developing complementarity with literacy for beneficiaries of vocational and microfinance institutions.

Coherence among delivery channels and with regional programs – Synergy among the various channels for Canadian cooperation was one of the guiding principles of programming. The evaluation noted that efforts are being made, especially by Partnership with Canadians Branch, to get Canadian organizations working in Senegal to align their programs with the CDPF's priority focuses. For instance, l'Union de *producteurs agricoles (UPA)* supported capacity building in of agro-food in rural communities; the ACCC piloted a youth-oriented training project in the Casamance region; *Développement et Paix* and the International Centre for Sustainable Cities (ICSC) were both involved in Governance and Civil society participation in local government. However, this synergy should be further strengthened, since CIDA's various channels still tend to operate in isolation. This prevents the development of a shared vision of the Program as a whole, which necessarily includes contributions from all three branches: Geographic Programs, Multilateral, and Partnership.

4.6 Efficiency

Comparison of ratios between operating costs and development contributions – When we compare ratios between the operating costs and development contributions of two programs of similar scope in Africa (Senegal and Mozambique), we find that the ratios are substantially the same.

Human resources involved in the Program – The quality and commitment of the human resources involved in the Program's management and consulting support functions are an operational asset. Their technical and professional contributions are noted by partners and development stakeholders in Senegal, at various levels in implementing the Program. However, insufficient attention has been paid to their ongoing training, especially in view of changes in Senegal's development environment and issues, in aid delivery modalities, and finally the requirements of aid effectiveness principles.

Program decentralization – The Program’s decentralization process began in 2005 and is well underway. Decentralization has undeniably had positive effects, especially on the quality and scope of coordination/cooperation among the program team, other donor countries, and national authorities, the number and type of human resources available in the field, and the team’s analytical capacities. Until decision-making and approval authority is more widely delegated, however, decentralization will not have the expected impact. Note that this situation is not specific only to the Senegal Program.

Corporate considerations – The main weaknesses in the Program’s management are also noted to varying degrees in other country programs. These weaknesses have more to do with CIDA’s overall management issues than with the Program’s management team as such, since it has little control over such issues. These issues are (i) slow and cumbersome planning processes and approval procedures; (ii) frequent changes in strategic direction, and lack of operational clarity or precision; (iii) lack of precision in the annual financial resources available to the Program; and (iv) relatively significant turnover among the Program’s team members. These weaknesses have a negative effect on CIDA’s credibility with its partners in Senegal, and on the Senegal Program team’s significant efforts to achieve practical compliance with the Paris Declaration. These weaknesses hinder the Program’s sectoral effectiveness to some extent, and also affect its transaction costs.

Corporate decisions – The country program’s improved efficiency depends on corporate decisions and their effective and properly resourced application. This is mainly the responsibility of CIDA’s senior management, especially with respect to efficient and less cumbersome planning and approval processes, timely predictability of financial resources available to the Program, and clarification of the operational implications of strategic directions. As previously indicated, efforts are being deployed to resolve and remedy general corporate weaknesses through the Agency’s Aid Effectiveness Agenda, its response to the 2009 report of the Auditor General of Canada, and its Business Modernization Initiatives, including decentralization and delegation of authorities to the field.

4.7 Management principles

Ownership principle – CIDA’s Senegal Program strongly supports this principle, in the sense that (i) it has respected Senegal’s lead role in designing its development policies and programs; and (ii) it has helped Senegal to strengthen that role by helping to develop operational policies and programs, especially in the Program’s priority sectors. The 2001-2011 CDPF was consistent with the priorities defined at the time in PSRP I. In PSRP II, Senegal included its accelerated growth strategy, which expressed its own priorities even more effectively. Canadian cooperation largely endorsed those priorities in its programming, and also supported Senegal in monitoring PSRP II. The Program also sought to support the role of the Government of Senegal and its capacity to coordinate the activities of TFPs by participating actively in numerous forums and coordination/cooperation activities directly or indirectly related to its priority sectors.

Alignment principle – Where national strategies and action plans exist, CIDA-funded bilateral initiatives are aligned with them. Where appropriate conditions are met, these initiatives have gradually begun to use national systems, also aligning themselves with Senegal’s budget and accounting mechanisms. In accordance with the commitments made in the Paris Declaration, Canadian cooperation has sought to build Senegal’s public-sector financial management capacities, and has been closely involved in the coordination activities of donor countries with respect to national procurement systems.

Harmonization principle – The Program has sought to increase its contribution to the harmonization principle in Senegal. However, the particular environment of Senegal and the technical financial partners (TFPs) is less conducive to harmonization. This is apparent from the two evaluations of the Paris Declaration in Senegal. Senegal has in fact achieved little progress on donor harmonization. Donors still make too little use of program support and budget support mechanisms, mainly owing to lack of confidence in public-sector financial management and the problem of corruption in Senegal.

As examples of meaningful contributions by CIDA's Senegal Program with regard to harmonization, we note its participation in the framework arrangement for budget support (ACAB) and its active efforts to improve that arrangement in cooperation with participating donors, and with the Ministry of the Economy and Finance (MEF). We also note efforts made in the education sector and in designing the national local development program (PNDL). However, there is still work to be done, in cooperation with other TFPs, to establish shared mechanisms for program planning, joint funding, monitoring, and evaluation. Joint efforts also remain to be made in reducing the number of field missions, participation in joint diagnoses, and joint training activities, to share information and best practices with all stakeholders.

Policy dialogue: an unquantifiable but essential Program contribution to the Paris Declaration – The Program team's many policy dialogue activities, in all sectors, have helped to further Senegal's application of the principles of the Paris Declaration. The Program team has actively participated in the various coordination and cooperation efforts among donor countries and with the government, and has carried out more direct policy dialogue activities with Senegalese authorities on issues related to specific program activities. This has required considerable effort, and more and more time and resources, which are not quantified as such in development investments, but represent a significant share of the work of team members, including CCSU staff. It is the Program's responsibility, however, to define effective strategies of intervention with Senegalese civil society, to ensure that policy dialogue is truly inclusive.

Aid effectiveness – The signatories to the Paris Declaration committed themselves “to taking concrete and effective action to address the remaining challenges, including insufficient delegation of authority to donors' field staff.”²⁴ CIDA restated that commitment in its recent Aid Effectiveness Agenda (2009-2012),²⁵ the implementation of which is still in progress. Work also remains to be done to make Canadian assistance to Senegal more predictable.

4.8 Performance management

Performance management of the Program and its components – Provided mainly by the Program team, the Program's performance management theoretically adopts a results-based management (RBM) approach. However, performance management has faced many corporate requirements and tools that have varied widely during the evaluation period, sometimes even from year to year. Review of the various tools and mechanisms used – or not used – to manage performance, especially at the program level, reveals many weaknesses in RBM. This makes it impossible to measure achievements appropriately and systematically, compared with what was planned, and thus to account fairly and accurately for the results of the Program as a whole or of its components, especially but not solely in relation to the central objective of helping to reduce poverty.

At the program level, the operational review of the CDPF, at the end of 2008, gave managers useful food for thought regarding directions to emphasize as the Program moved forward. The Program's staff implemented several of the operational review's recommendations, or considered them for additional analysis or monitoring. Note that, in 2010-2011, CIDA launched an initiative to follow up on programs in 2009-2010. However, data were not available from this exercise when data were collected for the current program evaluation.

Monitoring and measuring mechanisms – The CDPF, the Logical Framework (2001-2006), and the performance management framework (2007) do not meet all of the minimum requirements. Results are too broadly defined, not all indicators are appropriate, and targets and baselines are lacking. The Program's managers thus could not systematically use these mechanisms. Moreover, this is apparent in the Program's annual report, which only very rarely discusses the gap between expected

²⁴ Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005), Accra Agenda for Action (2008), p. 1

²⁵ CIDA's Aid Effectiveness Agenda (2009-2012), 2009

and actual results. On the other hand, projects – especially “conventional” projects – have more appropriate monitoring and reporting mechanisms. Project monitoring was generally adequate and, in many cases, allowed timely application of necessary adjustments.

However, monitoring remains inadequately documented, except where executing agencies or monitors are involved. Given staff turnover among team members, the situation weakens corporate memory. The Program’s mechanisms and procedures for monitoring its program-based approaches were not specifically or adequately suited to this type of modality, which is more complex than “conventional” projects. Monitors recognize the need to develop their knowledge and build their capacities in this regard, using appropriate mechanisms. The same is true of Senegalese partners, who require strengthening in this respect. Finally, it should be noted that the Program’s monitoring which focuses mainly on bilateral activities, excludes an entire dimension of Canadian cooperation in Senegal, provided by Multilateral and Partnership branches. This deprives CIDA of an overview of its contribution and its performance in Senegal.

Financial audit and evaluation – Project evaluation as a management tool is much in evidence within the Program. Thus, 14 sample projects were evaluated. While they varied in quality and coverage, they were useful in managing the Program’s performance. Similarly, the financial audit reports consulted confirm the importance and usefulness of audits in performance management. Ideally, regular and systematic evaluation exercises are to be encouraged, in an environment where programming increasingly adopts a program-based approach. However, significant weaknesses persist in operational, administrative, and financial management of partner national public institutions, and the risk of corruption remains relatively high in Senegal. A single financial audit was carried out in 2006, covering the entire Program. This management tool is especially useful in reviewing the Program’s efficiency, but remains underutilized, especially since project evaluations do not adequately address issues of efficiency.

Management of internal and external risks – CIDA’s internal risks, with respect to approval delays and changing directions, did not receive sufficient attention in the CDPF’s risk analyses or during the Program, although the risks were known and predictable, and affected the Program’s management. Similarly, one of the Program’s major acknowledged risks concerned the partners’ poor absorption and management capacity. Project planning did not adequately and systematically analyze this capacity, to offset these weaknesses in the project, or provide suitable guidance in implementation.

Knowledge and information management – CIDA’s compartmentalized operations and country program teams, focused on bilateral activities, do not promote a vision or performance management of its overall contributions. The relevant sources of information and documentation are scattered and difficult to collate, if not impossible in many cases. The Program has accumulated knowledge and learned lessons in the sectors where it is active, but does not adequately develop or capitalize on its corpus of knowledge. The Program lacks a specific strategy in this respect, even though the CDPF identified communication as one of the guiding principles of the Program’s implementation.

5 Performance in aid delivery

The CIDA Senegal Program evaluation analyzed performance in aid delivery from two perspectives: the delivery channel used, and the modality chosen. Three Canadian aid delivery channels were reviewed: bilateral, partnership, and multilateral. Four delivery modalities were analyzed: the program-based approach, including sector budget support, the project approach, and partnership and multilateral support for institutional programs.²⁶

²⁶ Delivery channels as defined in the terms of reference for this evaluation, established by CIDA’s Evaluation Directorate.

5.1 Aid delivery channels

Table 5.1: Analysis of ratings by aid delivery channels

| Analysis criterion | Bilateral (n=19) | Partnerships (n=5) | Multilateral (n=1) | Average (tot=25) |
|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Relevance | 4.6 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.3 |
| 2. Effectiveness / results | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.6 |
| 3. Sustainability | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.7 |
| 4. Crosscutting themes | 3.1 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.3 |
| 5. Coherence | 3.9 | 3.9 | 2.5 | 3.4 |
| 6. Efficiency | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.4 |
| 7. Management principles | 4.1 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.8 |
| 8. Performance management | 3.2 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 3.0 |
| Average | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 3.4 |

Ratings: highly satisfactory (4.1 to 5); satisfactory (3.1 to 4); moderately satisfactory (2.1 to 3); unsatisfactory (1.1 to 2); highly unsatisfactory (0 to 1); not applicable or not evaluated, given the progress of the project (N/A)

The role played by Multilateral – More than three quarters of the formal evaluation's 25 sample projects²⁷ were bilateral. Only one sample project was multilateral. This limits the possibility of a meaningful comparison of its performance (3.1) with that of other mechanisms. Since there was only one multilateral sample project, we cannot provide an adequate assessment of that delivery channel. The multilaterally funded sample project –the WFP's school feeding project – shows satisfactory performance and has several benefits. By using an agency of the United Nations System (UNS) as the executing agency, (i) CIDA benefits from the status of this type of agency, which ensures security in the use of funding; (ii) CIDA benefits from recognized expertise supported by the UN system's broad international network; (iii) CIDA can easily achieve its disbursement objectives. Moreover, there is strong synergy between the school feeding project and the bilaterally funded education sector.

On the other hand, CIDA is not equipped for the monitoring of this type of project. In the case of the WFP project, a single project manager, working in the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance, manages the food aid that CIDA provide across the world. Under these conditions, activities are tenuously rooted in the program country. It is difficult to establish potential synergy with projects executed through other channels and to sustain this synergy through the multilateral channel. Monitoring is largely restricted to expenditure control through "standardized" reports submitted by the WFP to all donor countries (TFPs). The WFP sample project also illustrates poor recognition of Multilateral's importance in the Senegal Program. In 2010-2011, CIDA disbursed nearly \$18 million for the WFP school feeding program in Senegal, which comes under the education sector. Yet the disbursement data provided to the evaluation team reported only \$6.67 million in education for Multilateral, no more than 33 percent of that mechanism's actual contribution to the education sector. The WFP sample project ultimately reveals Multilateral's huge underdeveloped potential, which can be seen (again in the education sector) from parallel but complementary bilateral funding of UNICEF, another agency of the UN system, for the same target clientele in some areas of intervention. Synergy stemmed from the respective initiatives of these agencies, and not from CIDA.

Complementarity between Bilateral and Partnership – Little differences exist between the satisfactory overall performance of Bilateral (3.6) and Partnership with Canadians (3.6) sample projects. Based on the scores obtained, Bilateral appears to have more of an edge over Partnership with Canadians ,

²⁷ The bilaterally funded sectoral budget support initiative has three separate components. One directly addresses governance. The analyses regarded this component as a separate project for reasons of coherence. This increases the total number of sample projects from 24 to 25.

mainly with respect to management principles (4.1 vs 3.3). Partnership appears to have more of an edge with respect to both crosscutting themes and efficiency (3.7 for CPB and 3.1 for bilateral). Given the slight variations with respect to five of the other criteria, the identical overall rating (3.6) suggests that, where performance is equal, these mechanisms can be more complementary than interchangeable, or substitutes for each other. A more detailed analysis shows the following:

- By choosing its bilateral projects, Canada has been better able to control its international policy in Senegal in terms of honouring the commitments of the Paris Declaration, particularly in relation to the principles of alignment, ownership, and results-based management. Analysis shows that Bilateral offers other advantages for CIDA. Via this mechanism, (i) CIDA has promoted specific Canadian policy interests that are not necessarily priority interests for other TFPs, such as advocating the strategic interests of women; (ii) CIDA has supported initiatives neglected by other TFPs that are nevertheless priorities for the Government, such as supporting training of volunteers in education to obtain a diploma; and (iii) CIDA has promoted Canada's distinctive expertise in areas such as decentralization, local taxation, or training using the SBA. However, significant approval delays affected several bilateral projects. This meant that Canada was unable to honour its commitments. While this is an isolated example, we should mention the flexibility of a project such as the decentralized ownership and dialogue support fund (FADAD). This fund enables Canada to respond quickly to relevant and urgent requests from the Government of Senegal. This, in turn, strengthens Canada's strategic positioning in Senegal.
- Partnership projects have shown the value that this aid delivery mechanism adds to the bilateral program. For example, the twinning of institutions has contributed significantly, not only to the development of the technical and vocational training sector, but to Canada's recognition as a key stakeholder in that sector in Senegal. In sectors such as governance and the popular economy, partnership has also made it possible to maintain an effective Canadian presence when the renewal or provision of bilateral funding was delayed. These contributions rely in part on the relative independence of institutions in relation to the changing nature of Canada's key policies. In many cases, however, this independence is exercised at the expense of often more modest resources. As a result, partnership activities are small-scale, more piecemeal, and often unknown or little known to Bilateral. All of this limits opportunities to generate synergy, although activities remain consistent to a degree. As in the case of the multilateral channel, moreover, CIDA manages partnership activities in such a way that (i) management is based, not on a country program, but on an organization that is active in several countries; and (ii) Bilateral does not really allow any room for partnership in its programming and, in the field, there are not enough resources for detailed monitoring of activities.

5.2 Aid delivery modalities

Use of program-based approaches – Since the sample is representative of the Program, two general conclusions may be drawn. Between 2001 and 2010, the Senegal Program opted to make greater use of new aid modalities (the program-based approach especially sectoral budget support).

Table 5.2: Analysis of ratings by aid delivery modalities

| Criterion | Other PBAs (n=5) | PBA-SBS (n=2) | Directive (n=8) | Responsive (n=10) | Average (tot=25) |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Relevance | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 4.4 | 4.6 |
| 2. Effectiveness / results | 3.2 | 2.8 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.4 |
| 3. Sustainability | 2.9 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.8 |
| 4. Crosscutting themes | 3.3 | 2.3 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.1 |
| 5. Coherence | 3.8 | 5.0 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 4.1 |
| 6. Efficiency | 2.6 | 2.5 | 4.2 | 3.5 | 3.2 |
| 7. Management principles | 3.8 | 4.8 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 |
| 8. Performance management | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.2 |
| Average | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 3.5 |
| Ratings: highly satisfactory (4.1 to 5); satisfactory (3.1 to 4); moderately satisfactory (2.1 to 3); unsatisfactory (1.1 to 2); highly unsatisfactory (0 to 1); not applicable or not evaluated, given the progress of the project (N/A) PBA: program-based approach; SBS: sector budget support; Directive: directive projects (exclusively bilateral); Responsive: responsive projects (including the Bilateral, Partnerships with Canadians, and Multilateral branches) | | | | | |

Most often, however, Canada’s aid to Senegal was delivered in terms of the number of activities, through the modalities of projects and institutional programs. The various aid delivery modalities are not applied uniformly throughout the Program. The education sector lent itself to the program-based approach much earlier than the other sectors²⁸. As early as the year 2000, it used a coordination framework that the various donor countries could adopt. In the popular economy and governance sectors, we found greater use of more conventional projects and programs modalities, although this trend is changing with the development of new investments using the program-based approach.

Analysis of ratings – The education sector thus enabled CIDA to learn the ropes of the program-based approach in Senegal. With respect to the above ratings, we see that the conventional delivery modalities (institutional programs and projects) tend to be rated higher overall than newer modalities. That said, program-based approaches (including budget support) have higher ratings than conventional programs and projects on relevance and management principles, and lower ratings on effectiveness and sustainability.

This situation is probably attributable to various issues. First, program-based approach initiatives (including budget support) are relatively recent and thus have had less time to produce sustainable results. This is especially true in the case of the ten-year education program support initiative (IAPDE), which began in 2008. Moreover, the program-based approach can be slower in achieving and institutionalizing results, because it entails the emergence of consensus among many partners, and aid delivery depends on national systems that require strengthening. Finally, CIDA and its partners are learning iteratively as they become involved in this new aid environment, which requires the development of new roles and responsibilities and new skills.

²⁸ Sectoral budget support is part of PBAs. However, purposely, in the table 5.2 above the five projects in the education sector were classified as PBS and separated from the other SBS to illustrate the importance of the sector in Canada’s support to Senegal.

In view of the learning curve during the CDPF period with respect to program-based approaches, it is difficult to compare the actual performance of the various aid delivery modalities by using the ratings without considering the operational environment. This should provide food for thought in CIDA's review of the specific role of each modality in its strategy for delivering the Program. Initiated in December 2009 in preparing the education strategy, that review addressed the possible role, for example, of sector budget support and a partnership program or a responsive project. The exercise should be extended throughout the Program, paying specific attention to managing the risks associated with each channel, and the human, technical, and financial resources required.

Internal adjustments for CIDA – The main advantage of the program-based approach is that it puts Senegal in the driver's seat in executing and managing activities. This aid delivery modality has proven effective in responding adequately to the Government's priority requirements, while enabling the Government to strengthen and own mechanisms, as in the case of literacy, initial teacher training, and curriculum development. The use of Senegalese procedures represents a significant step forward in aid alignment. However, it required numerous adjustments on CIDA's part, since CIDA had neither the experience to adapt the operation of the Government of Senegal's internal financial management mechanisms to its own, nor the tools to monitor activities effectively in accordance with Senegalese standards. This situation led to misunderstandings. There were delays in executing some projects, such as the one on basic education curriculum support (PACEB) and the other on primary-school teacher training/skills-based approach (FEEB-APC). There were also weaknesses in management and reporting, as revealed by the four audits conducted in 2009.

Finally, one of the expected benefits of the program-based approach – reduced aid transaction costs from not having to set up an executing agency – failed to materialize. Theoretically, the lack of such agencies enables the partner country to benefit from a higher percentage of aid funding. However, the use of PBA substantially increases the management responsibilities of donors field personnel, who deal directly with the Government in implementing the project. The use of PBA also requires action on their part at two levels: i) maintain program policy dialogue with the Government while managing day-to-day project operations; and ii) manage aid workers who provide direct technical assistance²⁹. These require new skills, especially in policy dialogue and technical familiarity with the sector. These problems have been partially resolved (i) by strengthening the education team in the field, and clarifying the levels of technical, operational, and policy responsibility for CIDA staff; and (ii) by building the management capacities of the central directorates of the Ministry of Education, by introducing results-based management (RBM) tools in Senegal's national planning and management systems: the sectoral medium-term expenditure framework (MTEF) and the annual operational budget plan (POBA).

Program-based approach transaction costs – The partners and other respondents interviewed in the most recent evaluation of the Paris Declaration in Senegal³⁰ in 2010 were divided on improved partnerships and probable gains in efficiency or reductions in operating costs to be achieved by implementing the Paris Declaration. The donor countries that have made the most progress in reform believe that the cost savings are much less than hoped, as the program-based approach includes budget support that demands a lot of time, expertise, and resources. Some feel that efforts over the past five years to strengthen partnerships, especially those related to coordination mechanisms in Senegal, have not improved policy dialogue, and have not had the expected results.

Prerequisites for budget support – Sector budget support should allow better alignment with Senegalese procedures, but still generates a lot of misunderstanding and questioning. Since SBS was implemented two years ago, CIDA has used two mechanisms to allocate funds. Although

²⁹ Such as having to maintain program policy dialogue with the Government while managing day-to-day project operations, without an executing agency, plus managing aid workers who provide direct technical assistance, but often only on an ad hoc basis.

³⁰ RBMG and EMAP. *Évaluation de la mise en œuvre de la Déclaration de Paris Phase II. Rapport d'évaluation préliminaire au Sénégal* [evaluation of the implementation of the Paris Declaration, Phase II - preliminary report on evaluation in Senegal], September 2010. p. 78

at odds with the principle of budget support, the mechanism targeting sectoral line items was appreciated by its main beneficiary, the Ministry of Education, unlike the inclusion of funding in the Government's budget which, again according to the Ministry of Education, creates frustration and reduces the volume of funding actually available for the sector. Budget support is ideal in a well-regulated financial and budgetary environment with experienced managers. Budget support also requires guidance and coordination mechanisms. These requirements are not fully met³¹ in Senegal. The capacity building program, included in budget support, was meant to help correct this. However, that project is not yet underway.

CIDA could pursue its reflection, since one possibility considered for future programming would be to entrust all aspects of tangible investments (such as textbooks, buildings, and equipment) to budget support, while funding less tangible activities (such as teacher training) through a program-based approach, such as the one that has been tested to date, or a conventional project approach.³² Unfortunately, while the evaluation team spoke to some people who believe that funding through the Government's budget is not entirely suited to activities such as teacher training (which can only repay expenditures incurred), the lack of school construction from the Government's budget in 2009 does not support the view that budget support, under the current circumstances, is more effective for this type of investment.

Canadian value added in projects and programs – Forming the second component of the Program's delivery, institutional program and project mechanisms make it possible to meet needs expressed by Senegalese partners, while retaining greater control over management of the Program, particularly in the case of project-based approaches. By entrusting the implementation of activities to Canadian executing agencies, CIDA has been able to provide advanced technical expertise that Senegalese partners appreciate, as in the case of the Niayes master development plan. However, executing agencies are less conducive to Senegal's ownership of results. The CDPF experience shows that, to be more effective, such expertise should be provided by support agencies, as attested by some popular economy projects.

Institutional programs allow civil society to express itself in both Senegal and Canada. Canadian civil society is free to develop its strategies outside the somewhat rigid bilateral framework, through support that is often less substantial, but more sustained. These advantages must be preserved by earmarking a portion of the CDPF budget for partnership and more responsive projects.

6 Main conclusions, lessons and recommendations

6.1 Main conclusions

Senegal is a substantial beneficiary of the official development assistance (ODA) provided to Africa by OECD countries. Canada ranks fourth among Senegal's donor countries. The purpose of the 2001-2010 CDPF was to help reduce the incidence of poverty in Senegalese households by 50% by 2015, by concentrating efforts on the priority sectors of education and the popular economy – with an emphasis on rural entrepreneurship and microfinance – and the crosscutting themes of governance, gender equality and the environment.

Implementation of CIDA's Senegal Program has proceeded in an evolving context marked by many changes both in ODA and in CIDA's strategic orientations. This refers mainly to adoption of the

³¹ Note that the education sector, the test sector for Canadian budget support, has very few managers. The sector is administered mainly by teachers, with little or no administrative training. The Volunteers in Education Support Project (PAVÉ) should remedy this situation.

³² The people that the mission spoke to, and the draft strategy for the education sector, said: "Achieve what is difficult through budget support, and what is easy through projects."

Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the aid effectiveness principles of the Paris Declaration. Internally, CIDA has gone through redefinition of some of the Agency's strategic priorities, the selection of Senegal as a country of focus, adoption of budget support in education, decentralization and a substantial increase in budgets and annual disbursements under the Program which, taking all delivery mechanisms into consideration, doubled between 2001 and 2010 and more than tripled in the bilateral sector, and finally the increase in human resources in the field. The CDPF has thus evolved against this manifold and changing background, to which it has gradually adapted and is still adapting today.³³

- Education has remained the mainstay of CIDA's activities in Senegal, and these activities have yielded good results. CIDA has provided substantial support for curriculum reform and the teacher training system by supporting capacity-building among Senegalese experts in curriculum design, using the skills-based approach. It has also helped to improve continuing education, including teaching conditions in teacher training schools. A portion of the education budget has been devoted to non-formal vocational training for neo-illiterates, technical and vocational training, and literacy training for adults and young people. CIDA has supported the establishment of the School Canteen Division within the Ministry of Education, and the development of a system for managing canteens. This support has made it possible to exceed public school registration objectives, graduation rates and attendance rates wherever the program is in operation.
- CIDA's interventions in the popular economy, as reported before achieved some good results. However this sector could be restructured in order to be more consistent: 1) improved productivity and performance in the agri-food sector, the initial target being small rural entrepreneurs; 2) implementation of the forestry policy, better management of natural resources, management capacity-building, (including RBM), and working with producer organizations and professional associations; and 3) organization and consolidation of microfinance serving small entrepreneurs and rural organizations.
- Development in governance, initially based on decentralization and regarded at the same time as a crosscutting theme within the CDPF, has at some point suffered from a lack of direction and clear objective from the Agency; shifting initially from a strategic focus theme to a crosscutting theme. CIDA's efforts have led to intensified dialogue among sectoral stakeholders, financial and budget reform, and management of school canteens in the education sector. CIDA's activities have also facilitated the restructuring of agricultural and rural organizations, the Great Coast development master plan and the association of financial system professionals. They have also enabled more strategic targeting of specific governance activities, and better coordination and harmonization with other donors in the areas of financial reform and decentralization. However, there is a need to strengthen synergy among sectors, projects and all stakeholders including the place of civil society, as well as to clarify the place of that theme of all together in the CDPF. In addition, institutional instability on the part of Senegalese authorities, with respect to decentralization and local development, makes it difficult to pursue effective policy dialogue that can bring about more significant change. This situation has prevented a measurable cumulative impact of CIDA's efforts.
- CIDA has played a leadership role in gender equality both strategically and at the project level, but will need to continue efforts to have the issue taken into consideration in terms of program-based approaches.
- The gradual but constantly growing adoption since 2004 of program-based approaches in the education sector and, more recently, in the popular economy have altered relations with Senegalese institutions and, more generally, have transformed the architecture of Canadian aid delivery in

³³ The new 2010-2015 CDPF approved in March 2010 incorporates these adaptations.

Senegal. We thus find that, among other things, the use of Canadian organizations or national NGOs as executing agencies gradually became the exception, rather than the norm, in the implementation of the Bilateral Program during the evaluation period.

- The growing and progressive involvement of the Senegal Program's management team in many areas of coordination and cooperation, have increased its influence and secured broad recognition by major stakeholders of the quality of Canada's contribution.
- Management tools and methods that have not followed the same pace or process in adapting to the new aid delivery mechanisms, and thus require further development or fine-tuning. CIDA's existing corporate level of a management culture focused on resource control and processes, in many cases to the detriment of building a management culture based on development knowledge, issues and processes.

6.2 Main lessons

Developmental lessons

Lesson 1: *10-year programming, and continuity of commitments in a given sector, constitute a critical condition for real change contributing to development.* In this respect, CIDA's Senegal Program has demonstrated a remarkable performance, acquiring a 10-year programming framework and persistently pursuing its support, particularly in basic education, microfinance and rural entrepreneurship.

Lesson 2: *The sustainability of results is based, among other things, on appropriate capacity-building at various levels, which requires a specific strategy. On the other hand, when capacity-building is inappropriate or insufficient, there is a significant risk of losing momentum.* In this respect, CIDA's Senegal Program has yielded mixed results. More systematic and better-equipped efforts by the team will be required within the new programming.

Operational lessons

Lesson 3: *In a context of harmonized and aligned aid, country programs must have access to speedy, flexible and decentralized funding mechanisms in order to meet emerging priority needs and thus offset the limited approval authority in the field, and the lengthy and complicated approval procedures at CIDA Headquarters.* Decentralized funding mechanisms like FADAD I and II have proven useful in enabling the Program to provide support for emerging issues, enhance existing project activities and offset specific programming weaknesses.

Lesson 4: *Each delivery mode or mechanism has specific advantages that can be used strategically and complementarily to improve the performance of a country program.* The Senegal Program employed a variety of channel and mechanisms to deliver aid: program approaches, the Partnerships and Multilateral programs, and directive or responsive projects. Each has demonstrated its respective effectiveness. It is less a question of giving priority to one mode rather than another, than of seeing how to combine these various tools and make them complementary in order to support effective adaptation and implementation of CIDA's country program over time, and as the context develops.

Lesson 5: *Knowledge capitalization and management are essential to effective operation in the context of the new aid modes.* In the context of program-based approaches, CIDA's role in Senegal has been transformed, moving away from aid delivery and management and towards policy dialogue, risk analysis and joint monitoring and evaluation. Knowledge capitalization and management are becoming crucial in the new context. This could require a realignment of roles, responsibilities and resources within the Program.

6.3 Corporate Considerations and Recommendations

Considerations

This evaluation acknowledges CIDA's efforts to resolve and remedy general corporate weaknesses through the Agency's Aid Effectiveness Agenda, its response to the 2009 report of the Auditor General of Canada, and its Business Modernization Initiatives, including decentralization and delegation of authorities to the field. For example:

- accelerating the approval processes for its various intervention types (bilateral, multilateral or Partnership with Canadians, directive and responsive) would enable the Program to respond more effectively and position itself strategically with respect to emerging initiatives in the context of policy dialogue and donor coordination;
- completing the decentralization process underway and increasing the level of delegation of approval authorities for program managers on the ground and being more transparent in terms of the medium and long term predictability of budget allocations to the programs would enhance the Program's ability to meet commitments under the Paris Declaration; and,
- These above measures would also enable greater transparency and information sharing in dialogue with partners on its country programming framework and strategies.

Program-level recommendations

Recommendation #1 – Relevance: That as part of its new CDPF, CIDA's Senegal Program maintain and build on the good practices observed during the development of the CDPF 2001-2011 and adopt a proactive approach to sharing its medium- and long-term programming intentions with its national and international partners. That the Program maintain the necessary flexibility to adjust the current CDPF to Senegal's new PRSP III, which is expected to be approved shortly, while at the same time taking into account the recommendations of the Program Evaluation.

Recommendation #2 – Effectiveness: Considering the level of satisfaction of the GoS with the jointly-approved Canadian aid program, that CIDA's Senegal Program maintain and build on the good practices in: (i) the education sector while stressing quality; (ii) the agri-food sector, while continuing its support for microfinance and economic development in Niayes and Casamance; and (iii) the area of governance, particularly in terms of decentralization.

Recommendation #3 – Sustainability: That CIDA's Senegal Program : (i) ensure that activities in priority sectors are systematically subject to diagnostic analyses and risk analyses with regard to the technical, organizational and financial capacities of the partners for which these activities are carried out; and (ii) put in place the consequent action plans and strategies for capacity building.

Recommendation #4 – Cross-cutting themes: To maintain the gains made in gender equality, help implement the gender equality strategy and ensure that it is properly integrated into the various strategies and projects, that the Program: (i) develop a specific action plan accompanied by clear initiatives, including a stronger dialogue on the policy side and the role of civil society; ii) identify specific and measurable expected outcomes, as well as an adequate set of performance indicators; iii) and ensure the allocation of specific and consistent human, technical and financial resources.

Recommendation #5 – Cross-cutting themes: To strengthen the environmental dimension of its programming, that CIDA's Senegal Program: (i) implement an action plan in this area, (ii) identify objectives, outcomes, strategies and financial means; (iii) include measures to train the appropriate

partners and staff and make them accountable; and (iv) strengthen the policy dialogue on such issues as sustainable land management, while taking account of the climate change problem.

Recommendation #6 – Coherence: That the Bilateral, Multilateral and Partnerships with Canadians Branches be CDPF stakeholders and consider ways to promote, foster and develop synergies and complementarities within and among sectors in order to improve implementation and ensure achievement of results under the CDPF.

Recommendation #7 – Harmonization: To optimize its harmonization efforts, that CIDA's Senegal Program : (i) maintain and build on efforts to increase synergy among donors, (ii) devote more attention to carrying out joint diagnoses and assessments (CIDA-TFP-Senegalese institutions) and to sharing lessons learned and knowledge in these priority sectors.

Recommendation #8 – Management principles: Given the substantial energy already invested and the success already achieved, that the Senegal Program (i) document its policy dialogue activities in the various CDPF priority sectors, and (ii) consider developing a Policy Dialogue Strategy for Senegal.

Recommendation #9 – Performance management: That CIDA's Senegal Program adopt (and periodically update) instruments to measure results-oriented performance, identify and specific and realistic results accompanied by initial basic data, targets and appropriate indicators.

Appendix A – Summary of the Terms of Reference

1. Background

The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) is subject to the *Federal Accountability Act*, which requires all federal institutions to evaluate all their programs every five years. The Treasury Board Policy on Evaluation, which came into force on April 1, 2009, restates that requirement. Under the new policy, evaluation is defined as "the systematic collection and analysis of evidence on the outcomes of programs to make judgments about their relevance, performance and alternative ways to deliver them or to achieve the same results."

This Terms of Reference for the evaluation of CIDA's Senegal Program is designed to meet those requirements. To that end, it contains an evaluation method based on assessment of the performance of the Country Development Programming Framework (CDPF), including its project components, delivery review of the various mechanisms, the role of the various delivery channels, identifying and sharing lessons learned, and recommendations to improve future strategies and performance with respect to the Program.

CIDA's Evaluation Directorate will follow the standards and recommendations of the DAC with respect to the contributions of stakeholders and participants in the evaluation process.³⁴ The Directorate will accordingly consult and seek opinions from the Senegalese authorities concerning the proposed procedure and terms of their participation. It will also explore, with other donor countries active in Senegal, the possibility of conducting more joint evaluations.

2. Objectives of the evaluation of CIDA's Senegal Program

2.1 The evaluation of CIDA's Senegal Program will have the following objectives:

- To report on results achieved through CIDA's activities during the period covered by the 2001-2011 CDPF; to analyse the overall performance of CIDA's activities in Senegal, from the program and project perspectives, according to the following criteria: relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, coherence, efficiency, management principles, crosscutting themes and performance management;
- to assess the performance of the various aid delivery mechanisms (bilateral, multi-lateral and partnerships) and execution modes (program-based approaches, budget support, directive and responsive projects);
- to document and share lessons learned from experience in Senegal, and to make recommendations to improve the performance of the current and future strategies of CIDA's Senegal Program.

2.2 Scope of the evaluation: The evaluation will cover a nine-year period, reviewing the performance of the country program from 2001 to 2010, and the results obtained. In order to analyse and report on results obtained, projects will have to be selected whose planning and implementation cover a sufficiently lengthy period of the programming framework. The emphasis will be on the main activity sectors of the country program and the crosscutting themes of the CDPF, and will be limited to projects with a minimum value of \$250,000.

3. Evolution of CIDA's cooperation in Senegal

Canada-Senegal cooperation has evolved broadly in recent years towards:

greater concentration on two main themes: basic education and the popular economy, followed by the crosscutting themes: governance, gender equality and, to a lesser extent, the environment;

- i) greater compatibility with Senegal's strategy, designed to reduce the poverty index by 50% by 2015;

³⁴ DAC Guidelines and Reference Series. Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, p. 11.

- ii) more coordination and cooperation with other donor countries to develop a common approach to the principles of aid effectiveness set out in the Paris Declaration;
- iii) decentralization of the Senegal program, with the challenge of renewing the project pipeline; and
- iv) transition from the project mode to the program support and budget support modes, particularly in the education sector.

3.1 Interim report on disbursements:

Since the implementation of the second CDPF, CIDA's disbursements in Senegal have trended upwards, in general through all three channels of cooperation: bilateral, multilateral and partnerships.

3.2 Disbursements by cooperation channel:

From 2004-2005 on, there has been a gradual increase in the proportion of disbursements through the Bilateral Program. Over the last 10 years, more than 70% of disbursements – \$275.2 million – went through the Bilateral Program; disbursements through the Multilateral Program amounted to \$65.6 million, or 17% (a multi-bilateral and multi-core combination); partnerships accounted for \$46.7 million, or 12%. In 2008-2009, 90% of CIDA's disbursements in Senegal were bilateral. On the other hand, partnerships and multilateral disbursements remained stable, and in some cases decreased.

3.3 Disbursements by activity sector: in sectoral terms, over 50% of CIDA's disbursements (\$127.9 million) went to education. The Bilateral Program alone provided \$116.4 million, or over 90% of such disbursements. The partnerships contribution accounted for 5.21%, with a total of \$6.6 million, and the multilateral contribution was \$4.8 million, or 3.81%.

The second largest total of disbursements went to development of the private sector: the popular economy. The largest contribution in this sector was through the Bilateral Program, accounting for 65% of disbursements with a total of \$48.7 million. The partnerships contribution was \$20.3 million, or nearly 28% of the total; the multilateral contribution was \$3 million, or nearly 4%.

Health came third in terms of disbursements in Senegal. Over the past 10 years, CIDA has disbursed a total of \$45.62 million in the health sector. The Multilateral Program is the primary donor for health, with a contribution of over \$27.6 million, or 60% of the total, followed by the Bilateral Program with a contribution of nearly \$9 million, or 20%, and partnerships with 10%. While health is not among the priority sectors of the CDPF, it nevertheless represents over 16% of CIDA's disbursements in Senegal.

The evaluation will review a sample of projects in the Program's priority sectors: basic education, the popular economy, governance and the crosscutting themes: the environment, and gender equality.

4. Evaluation approach

The evaluation will report on the overall performance of CIDA's Senegal Program during the period covered by the 2001-2011 CDPF. It will also analyse the effectiveness, efficiency and performance of the various execution mechanisms used. The following execution mechanisms will be examined: i) directive bilateral projects, ii) responsive bilateral projects, iii) general budget support, iv) sector budget support, v) joint funding, vi) directive multilateral projects, and vii) partnership projects.

The evaluation team will analyse the contributions made by these mechanisms, both at the program level and with respect to selected projects; their potential complementarity or synergy, and their strengths and weaknesses on the basis of the following criteria: program and activity sector, development approach, and cooperation channel.

5. Evaluation criteria and key questions

CIDA has adopted the broad standard questions recommended by the OECD's DAC in connection with program evaluations. The evaluation will be based on the two broad standard questions advocated by CIDA's Evaluation Directorate:

5.1 What progress was accomplished in relation to the development results expected by Canada and Senegal; and in relation to needs expressed by the recipients?

- **Relevance:** to what extent the development activity objectives match Senegal's needs, the policies of donors and overall priorities.
- **Effectiveness or results:** to what extent the development activity objectives were achieved or are being achieved, having regard to their relative importance.
- **Sustainability:** maintenance of the benefits resulting from a development activity after the conclusion of a major development assistance operation.
- **Crosscutting themes:** degree of integration of crosscutting themes: gender equality, environment and governance as taken into consideration within the program framework.

5.2 How were the expected results achieved?

- **Coherence:** coherence in development activities in the context of donor coordination (external coherence); coordination of CIDA's various execution mechanisms (bilateral, multilateral, partnerships) and between Canadian development stakeholders, including governmental, non-governmental and private stakeholders.
- **Efficiency:** extent to which resources (funding, expertise, time and so on) are converted into results in an economic fashion.
- **Management principles:** extent of compliance with the principles of local ownership, alignment and harmonization as defined in the Paris Declaration.
- **Performance management:** management strategy based on outputs, effects and impact, including the monitoring and evaluation functions performed by CIDA or jointly; analysis of tools and mechanisms of mutual responsibility.

5.3 Considerations relating to program and projects: The evaluation will be based on information collected at both program and project level. The sample of projects will be taken from CIDA's various areas of activity, but without losing sight of the program as a whole in order to identify certain aspects that would not emerge from an analysis of projects.

The analysis will be based on the questions and issues listed above (relevance, effectiveness and so on), but will use other indicators and sources of information.

5.4 Evaluation of results: It is not always possible, in evaluating a country program, to use impact evaluation methods, such as household and other types of surveys, because of the diversity of the subject matter of the evaluation.

However, the question of results will be addressed in reports and other evaluation documents relating to specific projects. The evaluation can nevertheless include recommendations designed to improve future evaluation of the results of the projects and programs in which Canada takes part: additional analytical measures (national statistics, detailed interviews with recipients, reports from other donors) in order properly to document the question of results.

6. Evaluation methods

6.1 Common approach and joint effort: The evaluation of the Program will be managed in consultation with stakeholders and participants, as stipulated in the DAC standards for quality evaluation (section 3.3, Consultation and Protection of Stakeholders, OECD-DAC). Discussions will take place with representatives of the Senegalese government and other members of the international community, with priority for DAC members, in order to explore possibilities for cooperation and determine how it might be achieved. A number of scenarios will then be considered.

6.2 Sampling: The sample of projects over \$250,000 must represent a sufficient portion of the Program as a whole. It will include sectoral and thematic projects, and a variety of execution and cooperation mechanisms. For the time being, the overall CIDA's activities in Senegal include the following components:

- 13 program-based approach projects with a value of nearly \$270 million;
- a total of 50 directive projects with a value of \$197 million. Of these, 48 were funded by the Senegal Program, and 2 by the Partnerships with Canadians Branch.
- 6 projects with core funding;

- 73 responsive projects with a value of \$138.6 million, broken down as follows: 15 from the Senegal Program, 47 from the Partnerships with Canadians Branch and 11 from the Multilateral Branch.

6.3 Data collection: Secondary data sources will be used, for the most part. Four data collection methods will be used to ensure the gathering of more than one kind of evidence:

- **Document review:** CIDA's program documents, international studies and other documents addressing strategic issues in relation to Senegal. The consultants will also be encouraged to use the meta-evaluation criteria developed by CIDA, as well as international statistical data and studies.
- **Interviews:** A series of interviews with the main stakeholders – Canadian, Senegalese and other – for each field or sector of activity.
- **Field visits:** Visits will be arranged to the locations of key projects in each field or sector of activity.
- **Round tables:** A series of roundtable discussions will be held to encourage debate with all stakeholders: at the beginning of the exercise, when data are collected; upon arrival in the field and at the end of each field visit, to present ideas and issues emerging during the data collection visit; a report on the field visit to the country program management team.

An interview guide will be prepared beforehand and will be included in the work plan, in order to ensure compatibility of data on the program as a whole with data from the various projects selected.

7. Management of the evaluation

Managers from the Evaluation Directorate of CIDA's Strategic Policy and Performance Branch will be responsible for the process, and for the results of the program evaluation. They will work closely with other stakeholders, including:

- country program managers and staff at Headquarters and in the field will take part in various key stages of the evaluation; representatives of the Multilateral and

Partnerships programs will take part on an ad hoc basis;

- representatives of the Senegalese government, generally those who have the most dealings with CIDA through official channels and the Embassy of Canada. The details of their participation will be worked out in due course. The level of effort will then be reviewed on the basis of their level of involvement in the evaluation process.

A team of professionals will be recruited for the evaluation of CIDA's Senegal Program, on the basis of its specific profile. The team will include: a senior consultant, two specialists on the main priority sectors of the Program (education and the popular economy), and two local consultants (possibly one for education and one for health). Skills related to gender equality, governance and the environment may be associated with the sectoral expertise of one or more experts, or found locally.

Impartiality and freedom from conflict of interest will be among the criteria for selecting the consultants. Accordingly, applications from people actively participating in a significant way, now or in the past, in the design and monitoring of the Program may be subject to particular scrutiny.

8. Schedule of activities

The process for evaluating the Senegal Program should be spread over a period of 10 months. The milestones are as follows:

- preparation of basic documentation and drafting of the program profile;
- preliminary field visit by evaluation managers: April 2010;
- drafting of the final reference framework and formation of a team of consultants: May 2010;
- completion of the consultant recruiting process: May 2010;
- meeting of the evaluation team and preparation of the consultants' provisional work plan for the evaluation: June 2010;
- data collection and interviews in Canada: August and September, 2010;

- data collection field visit (lasting about three weeks, dates to be determined in cooperation with Program staff): September and October, 2010;
- drafting of an initial version of the technical report: November 2010;
- review of the technical report: November and December 2010;
- drafting of the comprehensive synthesis report: December 2010-January 2011;
- presentation of the Report by the Evaluation Directorate to the Evaluation Committee, including the response from Program management: February 2011;
- submission of the comprehensive Report to the Minister, and publication.

9. Deliverables

The consultants will prepare a work plan, a PowerPoint presentation and a detailed technical report.

The Evaluation Directorate will prepare a comprehensive report, in cooperation with the senior consultant.

After inclusion of the response from Program management, the comprehensive Report will be submitted to CIDA's Evaluation Committee for approval. The Report will then be published on CIDA's website in both official languages and will be included in CIDA's response to Treasury Board on the program approach.

10. Budget

The evaluation of CIDA's Senegal Program will cost between \$300,000 and \$350,000.

Appendix B – Characteristics and list of sample projects

CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE PROJECTS

| Delivery Mechanisms / Delivery Channels / % of Total Sector Budget | Sector | | |
|--|------------|-----------|--------------------|
| | Governance | Education | Popular Economy |
| <i>Delivery Mechanisms</i> | | | |
| Partnership | 9.40% | 0.43% | 8% |
| Bilateral | 86.50% | 97% | 92% |
| Multilateral | 4% | 1.58% | 0% |
| <i>Delivery Channels</i> | | | |
| Project | 91% | 2% | 56% |
| Program | 9% | 2% | 8% |
| *Program-based approach | 0% | 31% | 37% |
| *Budget support | 0% | 65% | 0% |
| <i>% of Total Sector Budget</i> | 80% | 75% | 57% |

* Budget support, general budget support, sectoral budget support are all part of Program-based approach (PBAs). However, given the specific nature of Canadian contribution to basic education in Senegal through general budget support, it was determined in this evaluation to consider GBS as a distinct entity.

List of sample projects by sector

| WBS Number | Branch | Project Name | Start Date | End Date | Type of Investment | Business Model | Budget Allocation |
|---|--------|---|------------|------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Governance | | | | | | | |
| S063452PRG | GPB | CCODP 2006-2011 Program | 2006-11-01 | 2011-08-31 | Program | Responsive | \$1,271,010 |
| A020248001 | GPB | Support for local elected representatives | 1999-03-31 | 2008-04-30 | Project | Directive | \$7,142,107 |
| A019412001 | GPB | Rights advocacy & strengthening | 1997-07-31 | 2008-03-31 | Project | Responsive | \$3,109,877 |
| A019939001 | GPB | Local taxation study | 1998-10-01 | 2007-03-30 | Project | Directive | \$927,901 |
| SN31788 | GPB | FADAD I | 2002-05-01 | 2005-03-01 | Project | Directive | \$499,655 |
| M012464001 | MULTI | Municipal good governance (pilot) | 2007-02-02 | 2009-03-31 | Project | Responsive | \$550,000 |
| All sample projects | | | | | | | \$13,500,550 |
| All projects under this sector in the Program (see note) | | | | | | | \$16,731,499 |
| Basic education | | | | | | | |
| S063639PRG | PWCB | FPGL 2006-2010 Program | 2008-07-01 | 2010-06-30 | Program | Responsive | \$686,000 |
| M013115001 | MULTI | WFP School Feeding | 2007-01-01 | 2011-12-31 | Program | Responsive | \$2,500,000 |
| A032121001 | GPB | IAPDE | 2007-12-18 | 2014-06-30 | PBA SBS | *Core* | \$103,156,902 |
| A034379001 | GPB | Teacher training in skills-based approach | 2008-08-29 | 2013-06-28 | PBA | Directive | \$19,995,600 |
| A033363001 | GPB | PACEB | 2006-09-15 | 2011-02-28 | PBA | Directive | \$4,860,000 |
| A030635001 | GPB | PAPA II | 2002-10-01 | 2008-09-30 | PBA | Directive | \$19,145,000 |
| A031535001 | GPB | PAFPNA | 2003-03-28 | 2008-09-22 | Project | Responsive | \$3,500,000 |
| A033361001 | GPB | PAVÉ II | 2006-09-10 | 2010-10-01 | PBA | Directive | \$3,926,000 |
| All sample projects | | | | | | | \$157,769,502 |
| All projects under this sector in the Program (see note) | | | | | | | \$209,356,636 |
| Popular economy | | | | | | | |
| A020246 | GPB | AESOR | 2006-04 | 2009-03 | Project | Responsive | \$2,000,000 |
| A033360001 | GPB | PDMAS | 2006-10-31 | 2012-06-29 | PBA | Directive | \$18,250,000 |
| A021806001 | GPB | Agri-food operators support | 2002-03-26 | 2009-09-01 | Project | Directive | \$8,550,000 |
| A021306001 | GPB | Rural entrepreneurship support | 1998-09-30 | 2009-03-31 | Project | Directive | \$7,300,000 |
| A020250001 | GPB | Kolda PAEFKS forestry entrepreneurs | 1999-03-31 | 2009-09-30 | Project | Directive | \$5,876,000 |
| A032149001 | GPB | Niayes-Ataden economic development | 2003-06-26 | 2011-03-31 | Project | Responsive | \$3,144,590 |
| A032993001 | GPB | Niayes support fund | 2006-12-29 | 2009-06-30 | Project | Directive | \$499,000 |
| A032305001 | GPB | Forest rehabilitation project | 2004-01-30 | 2007-03-30 | Project | Responsive | \$471,054 |
| S062337PRG | PWCB | DID 03-07 | 2002-02-22 | 2007-10-30 | Program | Responsive | \$2,318,133 |
| S061077PRG | PWCB | UPA-DI Program 03-07 | 2001-01-08 | 2008-12-30 | Program | Responsive | \$1,508,000 |
| All sample projects | | | | | | | \$49,916,778 |
| All projects under this sector in the Program (see note) | | | | | | | \$87,594,568 |
| GRAND TOTAL for projects in the Program | | | | | | | \$343,268,695 |

Note: Source: Program Profile, CIDA, June 2010. Program project totals by sector cannot be complete unless they include some of the projects listed under "Multisectoral", for which we were able to identify a dominant characteristic in an area of focus.

Appendix C – List of documents consulted

General documents

- CIDA, *CIDA's Country Development Programming Framework for Senegal 2010-2015, Draft*, January 8, 2010
- CIDA, Evaluation Directorate, *CIDA's Review of Program-Based Approaches. Draft Technical Report*, February 22, 2010
- CIDA, Evaluation Directorate, *CIDA's Review of Program-Based Approaches. Synthesis Report*, March 28, 2010
- CIDA, Chief Financial Officer's Branch, *CIDA's Operational Guide to Program-Based Approaches. Version 2.0*, March 2010
- CIDA, *Aid Effectiveness Agenda (2009-2012)*, no date
- CIDA, *Senegal – Country Strategy 2008. Final version*, July 2008
- CIDA, Canadian Partnership Branch, *Partenariat canadien – Rétrospective du pays – Senegal. Ébauche* [Canadian Partnership – Country retrospective – Senegal. Draft], July 2007
- CIDA, Audit Division, Performance and Knowledge Management Branch, *Senegal Program – Audit Report*, March (?) 2006
- CIDA, *2001-2011 Programming Framework, Canadian Cooperation– Senegal*, Dakar, November 8, 2008
- CIDA, *Minutes of the Annual Joint Review of the Cooperation Program Between Senegal and Canada*, December 2005
- CIDA, *Annual Performance reports, Senegal Program 2003-2004, 2004-2005, 2005-2006, 2006-2007*, June 2010
- CIDA, *Colloque sur le partenariat CANADA – SÉNÉGAL* [Canada-Senegal partnership forum], Dakar, November 14, 15, and 16, 2005, lessons learned by projects
- CIDA, CCSU, *Coopération canadienne au Senegal Panorama d'un partenariat renforcé* [Canadian cooperation in Senegal: panorama of a strengthened partnership], June 2003
- World Bank, *Développements Récents et les Sources de Financement du Budget de l'État* [recent developments and funding sources of the government budget] – *Public Expenditure Review*. September 18, 2006
- Office of the Auditor General of Canada, *Report of the Auditor General of Canada to the House of Commons – Chapter 8—Strengthening Aid Effectiveness – CIDA*, Fall 2009
- E.T Jackson & Associates, Partnership Branch, *Évaluation à mi mandat de la coopération volontaire* [mid-term evaluation of volunteer cooperation], October 2007
- GANGLOFF, Catherine, *Contexte du programme Senegal et Revue opérationnelle du Cadre de programmation 2001-2011* [Senegal program environment and operational review of the 2001-2011 programming framework], CIDA Senegal Program retreat, November 2008
- GUAY, Madeleine, Werner MEIER and Amacodou NDIAYE, *Revue opérationnelle du cadre de programmation de l'ACDI au Senegal 2001-2011. Rapport final* [operational review of CIDA's programming framework in Senegal, 2001-2011], Results-Based Management Group, January 2009
- OECD, *2008 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration – Making Aid More Effective by 2010*, 2008
- Plan-Net et Margot Rothmans, *Ethiopia Country Program Evaluation*, Technical Report, December 2009
- PIERRE-JÉRÔME, Frantz, *Évaluation du programme de l'ACDI au Senegal. Profil du programme (Ébauche)* [evaluation of CIDA's Senegal program – program profile (draft)], CIDA, Evaluation Directorate, June 2010
- RBMG, *Phase 2 Evaluation of the Implementation of the Paris Declaration*, September 22, 2010
- Republic of Senegal, *Arrangement cadre entre le Gouvernement du Senegal et les Partenaires au développement relatif aux appuis budgétaires* [budget support framework arrangement between the Government of Senegal and development partners], Dakar, January 11, 2008
- Republic of Senegal, Ministry of the Economy and Finance, *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper 2003-2005*
- ---, *Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper 2006-2010. PRSP II*, Dakar, October 2006
- ---, *Dispositif de suivi du DSRP 2. Feuille de route de la revue de mise en œuvre du DSRP 2. Année 2008* [PRSP II monitoring mechanism. PRSP 2 implementation review roadmap. 2008], Dakar, no date
- ---, *Plan d'action conjoint pour l'efficacité de l'aide au Senegal 2008-2010* [joint aid effectiveness agenda for Senegal], Dakar, no date
- ---, *Formulation du document de référence de la politique économique et sociale 2011-2015* [development of the economic and social policy reference document], *Concept Paper*, Dakar, January 22, 2010
- Republic of Senegal, *Rapport de Suivi - Suivi des Objectifs du Millénaire pour le Développement – Situation des OMD en 2008 et Orientations Stratégiques pour 2015 – Version finale* [monitoring report – monitoring of the Millennium Development Goals – status of the MDGs in 2008 and strategic directions for 2015]. Dakar, November 2009
- ---, *Revue annuelle du DSRP – Rapport d'avancement – Rapport de synthèse, version provisoire* [status report – summary report], Dakar, May 2009
- Republic of Senegal and CIDA, *Rapport du séminaire de restitution du bilan du programme de coopération canado sénégalais (1996-2000)* [report of the assessment debriefing seminar on the Canada-Senegal cooperation program], October 2000

- SYLLA, Momar Balle and DIA Ibrahim, *Profils de pauvreté au Senegal. Programme de recherche sur la pauvreté chronique en Afrique de l'Ouest. Document de travail No. 3.* [Poverty profiles in Senegal. Research program on chronic poverty in West Africa. Working paper no. 3] No date
- World Bank, *International Development Association and International Finance Corporation Country Assistance Strategy for the Republic of Senegal for the Period FY 07-FY10.* May 2, 2007
- World Bank, *Republic of Senegal Joint IDA-IMF Advisory Note of the Second Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper.* December 20, 2006
- World Bank, *Senegal Country Assistance Evaluation*, Document No. 36286, May 2006

Documents on the education sector

- CIDA, Africa Branch, A-030635 / *Literacy (PAPA II). Project Approval Document (PAD)*, November 29, 2001
- ---, A-030635 / *Literacy (PAPA II). Project Performance Reports (PPR)*, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2008-09
- ---, A-031535 / *Neo-literate vocational training (PAFPNA). Project Approval Document (PAD)*, December 23, 2002
- ---, A-031535 / *Neo-literate vocational training (PAFPNA). Project Performance Reports (PPR)*, 2002-03, 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07
- ---, A-032121 / *Ten-year education program. Project Approval Document (PAD)*, August 11, 2006
- ---, A-032238 / *Stratégie de construction active [active curriculum development strategy]. Project Approval Document (PAD)*, November 19, 2003
- ---, A-032737 / *Achèvement du curriculum [curriculum completion] (PACACEB). Project Approval Document (PAD)*, July 7, 2005
- ---, A-032737 / *Achèvement du curriculum [curriculum completion] (PACACEB). Project Performance Report (PPR)*, 2006-2007
- ---, A-033361 / *PAVE II. Project Approval Document (PAD)*, September 15, 2006
- ---, A-033361 / *PAVE II. Project Performance Reports (PPR)*, 2006-07, 2007-08 and 2008-09
- ---, A-033363 / *PACEB. Project Approval Document (PAD)*, March 9, 2007
- ---, A-033363 / *PACEB. Project Approval Document (PAD)*, June 29, 2007
- ---, A-033363 / *PACEB. Project Performance Reports (PPR)*, 2006-07, 2007-08 and 2008-09
- ---, A-033553 / *PDEF Phase II Action Plan Support. Project Approval Document (PAD)*, March 9, 2007
- ---, A-033553 / *PDEF Phase II Action Plan Support. Project Performance Reports (PPR)*, 2006-07 and 2007-08
- ---, A-034379 / *Training for teachers using a competency-based approach (FEED/SBA). Project Approval Document (PAD)*, April 1, 2009
- ---, A-034379 / *Training for teachers using a competency-based approach (FEED/SBA). Project Performance Report (PPR)*, 2008-09
- ---, A-032121 / *Initiative d'Appui au programme décennal d'éducation du Senegal (IAPDE). Project Performance Report (PPR)*, 2008-2009
- CIDA, President, *Ten-year Education Program Support Initiative (A032121). Memorandum for the Minister*, October 10, 2006
- CIDA, Senegal Program, *Senegal's Ten-year Education Program Support Initiative (IAPDE). Results and Risk Management Accountability Framework*, no date
- ---, *Education Sector Strategy 2010-2015. Draft*, 3rd version, November 2009
- ---, *Education Sector Strategy 2010-2015. Éléments d'analyse en appui à la préparation de la stratégie [analytical elements to help plan strategy]. Internal document*, December 2009
- CIDA and Paul Gérin-Lajoie Foundation, *Contribution Agreement (2006)*
- Aides-mémoires conjoints des Partenaires Techniques et Financiers et de la coordination du PDEF, *Quatrième revue annuelle du PDEF – Récapitulatif des principales conclusions et recommandations, Huitième revue du PDEF, Neuvième revue du PDEF* [joint memorandums of the technical and financial partners and PDEF coordinators, 4th annual PDEF review – summary of main conclusions and recommendations], Dakar, February 2004, July 2009, and June 2010
- BOISVERT, Liziane, *Projet d'appui au curriculum de l'éducation de base (PACEB) (A-33363). Rapport d'évaluation de fin de projet. Version finale* [Basic education curriculum support project. End-of-project evaluation report], April 19, 2010
- BOISVERT, Liziane and Mohamadou SY, *Programme d'appui au plan d'action en matière d'éducation de base des adultes et des jeunes au Senegal (PAPA II) (A-30635). Rapport d'évaluation de fin de projet. Version finale* [Project to support the action plan support program in basic education for youth and adults. End-of-project evaluation report. Final version], April 29, 2009
- DESTEFANO, Joseph, Mark Robert LYND and Barbara THORNTON, *The Quality of Basic Education in Senegal: A Review. Final Report*, USAID/Senegal, April 14, 2009
- DIAGNE, Abdoulaye, *Ten-year Education and Training Program (PDEF). Economic and Financial Report 2006*, Dakar, May 2007
- FIDECA, *Financial audit report as at June 30, 2009. CAREES*, Dakar, October 2009

- ---, *Financial audit report as at June 30, 2009. PACEB*, Dakar, October 2009
- ---, *Financial audit report as at June 30, 2009. PAVÉ II*, Dakar, February 2010
- ---, *Financial audit report as at September 30, 2008. PAPA II*, Dakar, February 2010
- Paul Gérin-Lajoie Foundation, *2006-2010 Program (48 months)*, revised version of February 2, 2006
- ---, *2006-2010 Program. Annual Workplan from July 1, 2009, to June 30, 2010*, November 2009
- ---, *2006-2010 Program. Annual Reports, 2008 and 2009*
- ---, *Neo-literate vocational training support project. Project Implementation Plan*, December 2003
- FROMENT, Jean-Louis and Louise LAHAYE, *Evaluation of the Volunteers in Education support project. Mission Report*, July 2006
- Government of Canada and Government of Senegal, *Exchange of correspondence, "Budget Support for the PDEF Phase II Action Plan for 2007"*, Dakar, December 12, 2007
- ---, *Contribution Agreement. Project A-032737 / Achèvement de la construction active du curriculum de l'éducation de base* [completion of active basic education curriculum development] (PACACEB), Dakar, July 26, 2005
- ---, *Contribution Agreement. Project A-033363 / Basic education curriculum support project (PACEB)*, Dakar, November 20, 2006
- ---, *Memorandum of Understanding, Project A-030635 / Project to support the action plan in basic education for youth and adults in Senegal – Phase II (PAPA II)*, Dakar, August 7, 2002
- ---, *Memorandum of Understanding, Project A-031535 / Neo-literate vocational training support project (PAFPNA)*, Dakar, February 13, 2003
- ---, *Memorandum of Understanding, Project A-032238 / Stratégie de construction active du curriculum* [active curriculum development strategy] (SCA/CEB), February 19, 2004
- ---, *Memorandum of Understanding, Project A-032737 / Achèvement de la construction active du curriculum de l'éducation de base* [active basic education curriculum development strategy] (PACACEB), Dakar, July 26, 2005
- ---, *Memorandum of Understanding, Project A-033363 / Basic education curriculum support project (PACEB)*, Dakar, November 26, 2006
- ---, *Memorandum of Understanding, Project A-034379 / Training for teachers using a competency-based approach (FEEB/SBA)*, Dakar, March 30, 2009
- Le Groupe-conseil baastel ltée, *Program Evaluation. Paul Gérin-Lajoie Foundation. Final Report*, August 2006
- MANE, Daouda, « Le système sénégalais à l'épreuve de la qualité » [Senegal's system: Meeting the test of quality], Dakar, *Le Soleil*, July 7-8, 2009
- OXFAM-Quebec and Groupe Conseil CAC International, *Project to support the action plan in basic education for youth and adults in Senegal – Phase II (PAPA II). End-of-project report*, July 2008
- ---, *Project to support the action plan in basic education for youth and adults in Senegal – Phase II (PAPA II). Project Implementation Plan (2004-2006). Draft*, May 2004
- World Food Programme (WFP) in Senegal, *School Feeding Activities*, Dakar, September 2010
- ---, *Country Programme – Senegal 10451.0 (2007-2011)*, December 1, 2006
- ---, *Country Programme – Senegal 2007-2011. Standard Project Reports, 2007, 2008 and 2009*
- ---, *Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation. PRRO 10612.0. "Post-conflict Rehabilitation in the Casamance Naturelle"*, no date
- Republic of Senegal, *Lettres de politique générale pour le secteur de l'éducation et de la formation* [general policy letters for the education and training sector], Dakar, December 2004 and April 2009
- Republic of Senegal, Ministry of Education, *Procès-verbal de clôture du PAPA II* [minutes – closure of PAPA II], Dakar, January 4, 2007
- Republic of Senegal, Ministries responsible for education, *Ten-year Education and Training Program (PDEF)*, Dakar, September 2000
- Republic of Senegal, Ministry of Education, *Ten-year Education and Training Program (Education for All). PDEF/EFA*, Dakar, 2003
- Republic of Senegal, Ministry of Preschool, Primary, and Middle School Education and National Languages, DPRE (PDEF), *National reports on the status of education, 2007, 2008 and 2009*, Dakar
- ---, *Operational Plan and Annual Budget of the Education and Training Sector (POBA) 2010. Presentation*, Dakar, April 2010
- ---, *Synthèse des communications de la rencontre de restitution de la mission de supervision* [summary of communications at the monitoring mission debriefing], Dakar, April 2010
- ---, *PDEF economic and financial analysis. Interim report*, Dakar, April 2010
- ---, *Annuaire statistique national. Année scolaire 2008-2009* [national statistical yearbook, 2008-2009 academic year], Dakar
- ---, *2009 technical and financial implementation report*, Dakar, April 2010

- Republic of Senegal, Ministry of Preschool, Primary, and Middle School Education and National Languages, and UNICEF, *Mise en place du Paquet de services intégrés dans les écoles élémentaires des régions de Ziguinchor, Kolda et Tambacounda. Rapport d'évaluation* [Implementation of the integrated service package at primary schools in the Ziguinchor, Kolda and Tambacounda regions. Evaluation report], Dakar, December 2009
- RIOUX, Marie-Claude, *End-of-project evaluation – PAVÉ II. Evaluation report*, January 2010
- SICOTTE, Alfred, *PAFPNA Project. Neo-literate vocational training support project (CIDA: 7026738). Evaluation report*, March 2007
- UNESCO, *Reaching the Marginalized. Education for All (EFA) Global Monitoring Report 2010*, Paris, 2010

Documents on the governance sector

- CIDA, SPPB, *Integrating Governance into CIDA's Geographic Programs: A Working Tool*. May 2010
- CIDA/CPB, *Trip Report – African Mission 2007 on CCODP*
- ---, *Senegal Programming Strategy Overview*, June 2008
- ---, *Concept paper on the new governance program*, September 2010
- CIDA, Senegal Program, *Senegal Local Elected Representative Support Project (PAEL), Concept paper*, June 1998
- ---, *Joint annual bilateral review: Thematic note on governance/decentralization*, Dakar, 2007
- ---, *Senegal Local Elected Representative Support Project (PAEL), Project approval documents*, June 1999
- ---, *Senegal Local Elected Representative Support Project (PAEL), Project performance reports*, 2002/2003; 2006/2007; 2007/2008; 2008/2009
- ---, *FADAD I: End-of-project report*. February 2008.
- ---, *Women's rights and empowerment project (PDPF), project performance reports*, 1999/2000; 2005/2006
- ---, *Taxation study project (PEFL), project approval document*, March 1999; *End-of-project report*, February 2008; *Project implementation plan*, December 1996, and *Project performance reports: 1999/2000;2006/2007*
- ---, *Women's rights and empowerment project (PDPF): End-of-project report*, February 2008; *Project approval documents*. May 1997
- AIMF, *Municipal good governance support project in Dakar and Niamey : Project description*, January 2007
- AIMF, *Preliminary briefing note: 66th meeting of the AIMF Board and General Assembly*, Paris, October 2009
- Anwer, A. *PAEL final evaluation. Evaluation report*. February 2008
- CECI, *Women's rights and empowerment project (PDPF): Project implementation plan*. April 1998
- CCODP, *2006-2011 program performance framework*
- ---, *Profiles of partners in Senegal: RADI, Oxyjeunes, Siggil Jigéen network*
- Diagne Diop, A. and Vaillancourt, P. *PDPF final evaluation*, November 2002
- Government of Canada and Government of Senegal, *Memorandum of Understanding, Senegal local elected representative support project, Dakar*, April 2000
- ---, *Memorandum of Understanding, Taxation study project (PEFL)*, Dakar, October 1995
- Republic of Senegal, Ministry of Decentralization and Local Communities, *National local development program*, PNDL, Dakar, 2006
- Republic of Senegal, President's Office, Government reform and technical assistance delegation, *National good governance program*. PNBG, Dakar, 2003
- Republic of Senegal, Ministry of the Economy and Finance. *Public-sector financial management group reports*, 2009 and 2010
- ---, *2009 annual report on the status of budget and financial reform in Senegal*, January 2010
- ---, *Implementation status of measures and activities in the 2009-2012 budget and financial reform plan*, July 2010
- ---, *Minutes of CFAA/CPAR joint reform harmonization and monitoring committee meetings*, 2009 and 2010
- --- *Responses to observations by TFPs regarding the 2009 annual report on the status of budget and financial reform*, March 2010
- --- *Public-sector financial management performance report (PEFA)*, November 2007
- Sarr, F. and Vaillancourt, P. *PDPF mid-term evaluation*, August 2000
- Sene, Socé. *FADAD I: Evaluation report*. Dakar.
- Tecsub/CAC/Scorpion. Senegal Program, *Senegal local elected representative support project (PAEL), Project implementation plan*, May 2003
- Vachon, B. and Vaillancourt, P. *Évaluation à mi-parcours du PAEL. Rapport d'évaluation*, July 2005

Documents on the crosscutting theme of equality between women and men

- CIDA, *Strategy on gender equality for the Senegal program*
- CIDA, Geographic Programs Branch, *Gender Equality Strategy in Senegal 2008-2011*
- CIDA, Gender Equality Division. *Aid effectiveness and gender equality survey*, May 2010
- Diop Diagne, Aissatou and Martin, Louise, *Études sur les opportunités d'intervention de l'ACDI sur les questions genre au Senegal* [studies on opportunities for CIDA involvement in gender issues in Senegal], CIDA, Nov. 2006

- Laforce, Jocelyne, *Évaluation de l'implantation de la politique ÉS au Senegal* [evaluation of the implementation of gender equality policy in Senegal] (1997-2007). *Final evaluation report*. CIDA, Senegal Program, June 2007

Documents on the crosscutting theme of the environment

- CIDA, *Strategic environmental assessment report, Senegal programming framework 2010-2015*, December 2009
- CIDA, *Senegal ten-year education program support initiative, Appendix D, Strategic environmental assessment report*, January 2005
- CIDA, *Country equivalence report for the applicability of the CEAA: Environmental Impact Assessment Legislation: Senegal, 2001*
- CIDA, *2009-2011 environmental action/monitoring plan (EAP) proposal, Senegal bilateral program, discussion draft*
- CIDA, Christian Alix, *Support in developing the environmental action plan for CIDA's bilateral program in Senegal*, mission report, February 1-13, 2010
- CIDA, BFP, DGA, Sector and Thematic Specialists Division, Geographic Programs Branch, Christian Alix, *Exploratory mission, April 11-14, 2007, for the environment sector in the Ziguinchor region with a view to planning PADEC*
- CIDA, CPDF 2010-2015, Appendix E, *Analysis of Environmental Sustainability, Version 2*
- World Bank, *Senegal: Country Environmental Analysis*, 2007
- Minutes of the environmental donor group meeting of February 4, 2010
- Minutes of workshops to popularize experiments in sustainable land management (SLM) and support in coordinating SLM development partners in Senegal, April 2010
- ECORYS Research Consultant, *Cinquième revue de l'appui budgétaire sectoriel pour le secteur de l'environnement au Senegal, financé par les Pays-Bas, rapport final tome 1 et 3* [fifth review of Dutch-funded environment sector budget support in Senegal, volumes 1 and 3], May 2009
- Republic of Senegal, *PANA project profiles*, Web document on UNFCCC site
- Republic of Senegal, Ministry of the Environment, Natural Protection of Retention Ponds and Artificial Lakes, Research, Planning, and Monitoring Unit, *PowerPoint presentation of the sectoral Medium-Term Expenditure Framework*, January 2010
- ---, *Report on the technical and financial implementation of the MEPNBRLA 2009 annual workplan*, March 2010

Documents on the popular economy sector

- CIDA, *CIDA's Microfinance Guidelines: Supporting the Development of Inclusive Financial Systems*, 2007
- CIDA, Memorandum of September 16, 2008, extending only the duration of the PACEB (A-033363) and PAOA/A-0218061 projects
- CIDA, Memorandum of February 6, 2009, extending only the duration of the PAEFK (A0202501), PAOA (A021806), ATADEN(A072149), FAN (A032993), PDMAS (A0333b01), ATPEP (A0335659) and PAPSU (A02031539) projects
- CIDA, *Casamance economic development project, Appendixes to the project approval document*, no date
- CIDA, Senegal Program. Project to support the rice sector for food security in Senegal (Bey Bunde) A-03455, November 2009
- CIDA, West Africa Program, *Niayes economic development project, Appendixes to the project approval document*, April 2009
- CIDA, Project approval document, *National Geomatic Plan*, 2008
- CIDA, Appendixes to the project approval document, Food emergency social program support project in Senegal
- CIDA, *Private Sector Development Strategic Directions for CIDA*, Draft, September 29, 2005
- CIDA, CCSU, Babacar Diop, *Sectoral memorandum on the popular economy*, internal document, March 2009
- CIDA, Pierre Larocque, *Feasibility of the FRPAMF project under the microfinance action plan support program (PAPAM) in Senegal*, March 2009
- World Bank, *Agricultural Services and producer organizations project in support of the first phase of the Agricultural Services Producer Organizations Program, Implementation Completion Report*, 2006
- CECI, WUSC, Uniterra, *Uniterra volunteer cooperation program, annual report, April 2008, March 2009, and 2004-2009 annual report*, June 2009
- CESA/CILSS, *Senegal food security profile*, 2008
- CGAP, *Microfinance and Climate Change: Threats and Opportunities*, March 2009
- CGAP, Donor Brief No. 9, *Microfinance and the Millennium Development Goals*, December 2002
- CIRAD, Anne Chaboussou and Magali Ruello, *Étude d'un processus de concertation pour l'élaboration d'une politique publique : le cas de la Loi d'Orientation Agro-Sylvo-Pastorale (LOASP) sénégalaise* [study of a consultation process to develop a public policy: the case of Senegal's Agro-sylvo-pastoral Act (LOASP)], December 2006
- Minutes of the microfinance technical partners' technical group, 2009
- Coordination Sud, Arlène Alpha, *La protection des marchés agricoles : Un outil de développement* [protection of agricultural markets: a development tool], November 2006
- DID, *Le financement agricole : un levier pour le développement des régions rurales* [agricultural financing: leverage for the development of rural areas], December 2005

- DID, *Mise en place d'un centre de traitement Informatisé au Senegal (CTI), 1er rapport d'étape semi-annuel (mars à décembre 2009) et Plan de travail annuel 2010* [establishment of a data processing centre in Senegal (CTI), 1st semi-annual status report (March to December 2009)], January 2010
- African Development Fund, ADF, *Small-scale local irrigation support project (PAPIL), Project evaluation document*, 2003
- Frankfurt School of Economics, Elizabeth Holmes, Nicolas Karambadzakis, Willemien Libois, *Étude sectorielle sur le besoin de financement du secteur de la microfinance au Senegal (Analyse du gap)* [sectoral study of the funding requirements of the microfinance sector in Senegal (gap analysis)], Final report, May 2010
- Géomar International, Senegal, Agriculture and agro-industry AGS cluster group, *Appui à la formulation de la stratégie de croissance accélérée 'Agriculture et agro-industrie, rapport provisoire* [support in developing the agriculture and agro-industry accelerated growth strategy, interim report], October 2006
- Horus Development Finance, *Étude de faisabilité projet mobile banking mutualisé* [mutualized mobile banking project feasibility study], March 2010
- Ministry of the Family, National Solidarity, Women's Entrepreneurship, and Microfinance, Microfinance Directorate, *Sectoral policy letter, Strategy and action plan*, December 2005
- ---, *CNC minutes*, November 2008, June 2009, February 2010
- ---, *Sectoral policy letter and action plan update 2008-2013*
- ---, UNCDF, UNDP, CIDA, Sectoral policy letter support program, Activity report, July 2010
- ---, *Compte rendu de l'atelier : Harmonisation des Interventions et Synergies entre projets et programmes intervenant dans le secteur de la micro-finance* [workshop report: harmonization of activities and synergy among projects and programs active in the microfinance sector], June 2009
- ---, *Fund mobilization report*, December 31, 2009
- ---, *Rapport sur le niveau de réalisation des activités du Plan d'Action de la Lettre de Politique Sectorielle de la Micro-finance* [report on the degree of implementation of activities in the action plan for the microfinance sector policy letter] (PA-LPS/MF) as at August 31, 2010
- ---, KFW, *Étude sur l'offre et la demande de financement des PME au Senegal, Conclusions et recommandations, Rapport final* [supply and demand study of small-business funding in Senegal, conclusions and recommendations, final report], September 2009
- Republic of Senegal, *Law 2004-16 of June 4, 2004 (Agro-sylvo-pastoral Act)*
- ---, *Law 2008-47 of September 2008, regulating decentralized financial systems in Senegal*
- ---, *National Agricultural Investment Program, 2011-2015 Investment Plan*
- Republic of Senegal, World Bank, FAO, WFP, Luxembourg, FewNet, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, MDGIF, *Analyse globale de la vulnérabilité, de la sécurité alimentaire et de la nutrition Mission d'évaluation conjointe du 20 au 29 juillet 2009* [general analysis of vulnerability, food security and nutrition, joint mission of July 20-29, 2009], mission report
- European Union /ADF, *Minutes of meetings of the Rural Development and Food Security technical group*, March 7, 2008; October 9, 2008; December 2, 2009; February 23, 2010

Documents by popular economy projects

PDMAS A-0336001: Project documents and reports produced by CIDA, the World Bank, and the Ministry of Agriculture of Senegal, PDMAS, *2009 annual activity report*, January 2010

PREFER A-032305001: Project documents and reports produced by CIDA and the Ministry of the Environment of Senegal

PAEP A-021306001: Project documents and reports produced by CIDA, the executing agency, and the Ministry of the Environment of Senegal

ATADEN A-032149001: Project documents and reports produced by CIDA, the executing agency, and the Ministry of Urban Planning and Land-Use Planning

PAOA A-021806001: Project documents and reports produced by CIDA, the executing agency, and the Ministry of Urban Planning and Industry

PAEFK A-02025001: Project documents and reports produced by CIDA and the Ministry of the Environment and Sanitation of Senegal

FAN A-032993001 (Niayes support fund): Project documents and reports produced by CIDA

FREP-AESOR A-020246: Project documents and reports produced by the project executing agency

UPA institutional support program: Project documents and reports produced by CIDA and the project executing agency

Appendix D – List of persons met

| CIDA | BRANCH/DIVISION | |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| Rémy Beaulieu | Evaluation | CIDA Hull |
| Frantz Pierre-Jérôme | Evaluation | CIDA Hull |
| Luc Pincince | Deputy Director, Senegal Program | CIDA Hull |
| Catherine Gangloff | Analyst, Senegal Program | CIDA Hull |
| Christian Alix | Environment Specialist, Geographic Programs Branch | CIDA Hull |
| Rachel Bruneau | Former Project Manager – Dakar | CIDA Hull |
| Marie France Houle | Environment Specialist, Geographic Programs Branch | CIDA Hull |
| Mamadou Faye | Project Manager | CIDA Hull |
| Shannon Fougere | Advisor Partnership | CIDA Hull |
| Marc-André Fredette | Former Program Director, | CIDA Hull |
| Agathe Frappier | Former Program Director | CIDA Hull |
| Nathalie Labonté | Project Manager | CIDA Hull |
| Lynn McMillan | Senior Officer, Bilateral | CIDA Hull |
| Patricia Miaro | Education Specialist, Bilateral | CIDA Hull |
| José Montabes | Former CIDA representative, Dakar | CIDA Hull |
| Miliça Nauman | Senior Officer, Multilateral | CIDA Hull |
| Wassala Nimaga | Aid Effectiveness, Partnership | CIDA Hull |
| Francine Proulx | Advisor, Partnership | CIDA Hull |
| Jennifer Toth | Education Specialist, Partnership | CIDA Hull |
| Gérard Bélanger | Project Manager , Partnership | CIDA Hull |
| Paule Parent | Economic Advisor, Partnership | CIDA Hull |
| Simon Boivin | Former project manager in Senegal | CIDA Mali |
| Ivan Roberts | Director | CIDA Dakar |
| Suzan Pereverzoff | Deputy Director, Dakar | CIDA Dakar |
| Geneviève Brown | Analyst, Dakar | CIDA Dakar |
| Marie Ève Fortin | Project Manager, Dakar | CIDA Dakar |
| Roxane Robert | Analyst, Dakar | CIDA Dakar |
| Carolle Lépine | Cooperant | CIDA Dakar |
| Linda Chiasson | Project Manager, Dakar | CIDA Dakar |
| Marc Olivier Jean | Project Manager, Dakar | CIDA Dakar |
| Edith Gouin | Project Manager, Dakar | CIDA Dakar |
| Benoit Gauthier | Counsellor (Public Affairs) | Canadian Embassy in Senegal |
| Carlos Roja Arbulu | | Canadian Embassy in Senegal |
| Marie Frédérique Roche | Regional projects | CIDA Ouagadougou |
| Ghislain Rivard | Director | CCSU |
| Samba Diop | Governance advisor | CCSU |
| Babacar Diop | Agriculture and microfinance advisor | CCSU Senegal |
| Daouda Diop | Counsellor (Development) | Canadian Embassy in Senegal |
| Idrahima Diome | Education advisor | CCSU Senegal |
| Cheik Seck | Public-sector financial management advisor | CCSU Senegal |
| Evelyne Sylva | Gender equality advisor | CCSU Senegal |
| Pierre Albert Coulabétouba | Rural development advisor | CCSU Senegal |
| Ibrahima Sow | Advisor | CIDA Dakar |

| Canadian execution agencies | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Louise Minville | Former CIDA project manager | ACCT Senegal |
| André Lauzon | Vice-president, Environment | AECOM Tecscult |
| Jean Bernard Fournier | Public Relations | DID Quebec |
| Yvon Bernier | Project Manager | DID Quebec |
| Paule Drouin | Director | DID Senegal |
| Hélène Jollette | Project Manager | UPA-DI |
| André Beaudoin | Director | UPA-DI |
| Gérard Coté | Project Manager | CECI Montreal |
| Dominique St Cyr | AUMN cooperant | CECI Thiès |
| Oumar Thiam | Uniterra program manager | CECI Dakar |
| Mouhamadou Leye | Country director | CECI Dakar |
| Marianne Coulibaly | | CECI Dakar |
| Katrbyn Touré | Regional director | CRDI Dakar |
| Paul Jolicoeur | Natural Resources Canada | Dakar |
| Jean Thompson | Monitor | FREP AESOR |
| Jean Marc Lewis | Monitor | PAEP |
| Technical and Financial Partners | | |
| Aminata Niane Badiane | Natural Resources Management specialist | USAID |
| Pape Momar Sow | Education Team Leader | USAID |
| Mohamed Gueye | Education Specialist | USAID |
| Jennifer Sprat | Monitoring/Evaluation Officer | RTI – USAID |
| Saverio Frazzoli | Senior Technical Advisor | Italian Embassy |
| Jean Philippe Tré | Agro-economist | World Bank, Dakar |
| Demba Baldé | Local Development Specialist | World Bank, Dakar |
| Xavier Boulanger | Irrigation Engineer | AfDB |
| Stéphane Halgand | Rural Development Advisor | European Union |
| Ibrahima Diallo | Education Specialist | AFD |
| Jean-Christophe Pecresse | Deputy Director | AFD |
| Omar Ba | Educational Consultant, SCAC | French Embassy |
| Vincent Bigot | SCAC | French Embassy |
| Suzanne Berghauss | Microfinance Project Manager | KFW |
| Bernard Braune | Head of Cooperation | German Embassy |
| Hamadou Konaté | Deputy Head of Cooperation | Embassy of Luxembourg |
| Rita Santos | Head of Cooperation | Spanish Embassy |
| Rolph Link | Advisor | GTZ |
| Christophe Cheik Gueye | Dakar Office | FAO |
| Danièle Salvani | Dakar Office | FAO |
| Tembo Maburuki | Senior Economist | UNDP |
| Boubacar Fall | Program Manager | UNCDF – UNDP |
| Irénée Zévoudou | Education Manager | UNICEF |
| Cheikh Hamidou Kane | Education Team | UNICEF |
| Adjaratou Fatou Ndiayes | | UNIFEM |
| Bienvenue Djossa | Country Director and Representative | WFP |
| Pascale Caprouse | Deputy Director | WFP |
| Isabelle Dia | Program Manager | WFP |
| David Vaudrin | Logistics Manager | WFP |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---------------|
| Abdoulaye Faye | Education Manager | WFP |
| Civil society | | |
| Mariem Diop Diey | | AJS |
| Djibril Badiame | | ONDH |
| Fatou Kama, Raddho | | |
| Adama Mbengue | National Coordinator | FAWE |
| Boubacar Seck | | CONGAD |
| Fatou Ba Diop | | COSEP |
| Samba Guèye | President | CNCR |
| M Dia | Coordinator | ASPRODEV |
| Mass Lo | LEAD Project Manager | ENDA Senegal |
| Project partners in Senegal | | |
| Malick Camara Ndiaye | Directorate General of Finance | MEF |
| Massar Wagué | Director, DCEF | MEF |
| Aissatou Fall | DCEF | MEF |
| Moustapha Ba | DCEF – Primary sector | MEF |
| Abdoulaye Dieng | DCEF – Primary sector | MEF |
| Maguette Ndiaye Diop | DCEF – Primary sector | MEF |
| Ablaye Conté | Coordinator – School health | Min Education |
| Kassa Diagne | Former director, PAPA | Min Education |
| Abdou Diao | Director, Primary Education | Min Education |
| Abdoulaye Diatta | Director, Communication Training | Min Education |
| Aissatou Dieng | DPRE – gender Equality Coordinator | Min Education |
| Assane Dieng | DAGE – Head, Budget and Financial Division | Min Education |
| El Hadj Meissa Diop | DALN – Director of Literacy | Min Education |
| Djibril Ndiaye Diouf | DPRE, PDEF Coordinator | Min Education |
| Saliou Diouf | Director, Technical and Vocational Training | Min Education |
| Mame Moussé Ndoye | DAGE, Director | Min Education |
| Mame Limoulaye | Director of Learning | Min Education |
| Aminata Ndiator Mbodj | Coordinator– School Health | Min Education |
| Moctar Samb | Assistant Executive Secretary – STP | Min Education |
| Malick Sembene | Head – School Health | Min Education |
| Abdoulaye Touré | Head, School Feeding Division | Min Education |
| Mafhaka Touré | Secretary General | Min Education |
| Moustapha Touré | Executive Secretary – STP | Min Education |
| Diatou Cissé | Former coordinator | PDPF |
| Atoumane Fall | Former coordinator | PAFNA project |
| Absa Wade Ngom | DEEG | Min of Women |
| Mrs. Gassama | Access to Credit for Women project | PAMECAS |
| Nafiassou Gassama | Director | CNRE |
| Diouma Gning | Project Coordinator | EPE |
| Soyebou Thiam | Public-Sector Financial Management Specialist | |
| Aliou Faye | | CEPOD |
| Samba Guèye | Executive Secretary | PNDL |
| Mrs. Sall | Director | CAEL |
| Colonel Baba Sarr | Director, DEF | MEPN |

Evaluation Directorate, Strategic Policy and Performance Branch

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Daniel André | Head, Training Division, DEF | MEPN |
| Mamoudou Kane | Head, Reforestation, DEF | MEPN |
| Madeleine Diouf | Impact Study Manager, DCE | MEPN |
| Momar Sow | Impact Study Division, DCE | MEPN |
| Dr. Assize Touré | Director General | Environmental monitoring centre |
| Seydi Ababacar Sy Gaye | Director, Horticulture Division | Min Agriculture |
| Ndiaye Oumar | PAGIRE, DGPRES Manager | MHCH |
| Mariam Sy Fall | Hydro-geologist, DGPRES | MHCH |
| Waly Clément Faye | Acting Director, Microfinance Directorate | MEFM |
| Waly Cissé | Chargé de mission | PAMECAS Dakar |
| Sidy Lamine Diaye | Executive Director | AP-SFD |
| Mamadou Sybil Kebe | Division Head, Industry Directorate | MMIAP |
| Dr Ababcar Ndoye | Director General | ITA |
| Dr Amadou Kane | Research Director | ITA |
| M Cissé | External Relations Directorate | ITA |
| Aissatou Diagne Deme | President | Agri-food Forum |
| Aliou Badara Diaye | Packaging Manager | Kumba Company |
| Fatou Diaw | President | Safna Plus Company |
| Alexis Campal | Director, DAT | MTTTFAT |
| Hamath Sall | Director General | ANAT |
| Abdourhamane Faye | Office Manager, BFPA | Min Agriculture |
| Babacar Diabate | Assistant Manager, BFPA | Min Agriculture |
| El hadj Amadou Wone | Director PDMAS | Min Agriculture |
| Regional interviews | | |
| Ibrahima Ba | Assistant Academy Inspector | Thiès Academy |
| Cheikh Hamidou Kane | Manager | Thiès Academy |
| Seydou Sy | Literacy Officer, Inspector | Thiès Academy |
| Adbou Ndar Fall | Academy Inspector | St Louis Academy |
| Mamadou Ly | Inspector | St Louis Academy |
| Bouna War | Director | ARD St Louis |
| Alioune Badara Fall | Focal Point, Luxembourg Coop. | ARD St Louis |
| Cheik Bamba Dièye | Mayor | City of St Louis |
| Fatou Diop Ndiaye | Departmental Inspector | IDEN Thiès |
| Samba Laobé Diop | Departmental Inspector | IDEN St Louis |
| Alassane Diaye | Director | EFI of Thiès |
| Aissata Kane | Teacher | Thiès |
| Amar Guèye | Director | EFI St Louis |
| Mamadou Goudiaby | Comptroller General of Finance | Thiès |
| Idrissa Camara | Chair, Regional Council | Thiès |
| Mady Diop | PAEP/PADEN Forestry Component | DEF Thiès |
| Beydi Ba | Inspector | IREF Thiès |
| Moustapha Dieye | Deputy Inspector | IREF Thiès |
| Baydi Ba | Forestry Engineer | IREF Thiès |
| Diallo | Forestry Officer, Notto | DEF Notto |
| Pape Dieng | Manager | Notto forestry union |
| Cheick Ndoye | Member of the Board of Directors | AUMN Thiès |
| Ibrahima Nieng | Member of the Board of Directors | AUMN Thiès |
| Mamadou Ndiaye | Coordinator | AUMN Thiès |

Evaluation Directorate, Strategic Policy and Performance Branch

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------|
| Mamdou Aidara | Financial Services | ARD Thiès |
| Modou Ndiaye + 4 office staff members | President, UGPM | Mboro, Thiès |
| Ousmane Sow + 13 members | President, Forestry Union | Mboro, Thiès |
| 6 office staff members | GE Takku Liggeye | Nbadiagou |
| Fallilou Ndiaye | President | UGP Meckhé |
| Samba Beye + facilitation team | LSGT Manager | UGPM Meckhé |
| Pierre Diouf | Director | DRDR Tambacounda |
| Cheik Daouda Diallo | PADEC Coordinator | Kolda |
| Ngora Diop | Inspector | IREF Kolda |
| 7 members | Women's group - Cashews | Tamassanka Centre |
| Mrs. Mouskoto Touré + 6 officers | President | MFK Kolda |
| Camara Koita | President, Naagué Fouladou | Kolda |
| Sara Coulibaly | Sector Technician | PADEC Kolda |
| 30 people | Saré Souma honey house | Kolda |
| 40 people | Cashew producers' group | Kolda |
| | Guïro Yéro Bocar | |
| Babou Guèye | Advisor | ANCAR-Kaffrine |
| 10 members | Séane group | Séane Kaffrine |
| Pierre Diouf | Director | DRDR Tambacounda |
| Mamadou Diallo | Team Leader | ANCAR Tambacounda |
| Hebou Fall | Business Manager | Le Fermier, Kolda |

Appendix E – Summary of detailed ratings by mechanisms and channels

Mechanisms and channels:

| Tables by sector | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| Education Sector | Results by delivery channel | | | | Results by delivery mechanism | | | | |
| Criteria | Bilateral | PWCB | Multilateral | Average | PBA | SBS | PROJ | PROG | Average |
| 1. Relevance | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.4 |
| 2. Effectiveness / Results | 3.2 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 3.2 |
| 3. Sustainability | 2.6 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.3 |
| 4. Crosscutting Themes | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.3 |
| 5. Coherence | 3.4 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.1 | 3.5 | n/a | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| 6. Efficiency | 2.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.9 |
| 7. Management Principles | 3.9 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.8 |
| 8. Performance Management | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.9 |
| Average | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| Popular Economy sector | Results by delivery mechanism | | | | Results by delivery channel | | | | |
| Criteria | Bilateral | PWCB | Multilateral | Average | PBA | SBS | PROJ | PROG | Average |
| 1. Relevance | 4.5 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 4.6 |
| 2. Effectiveness / Results | 3.8 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.6 |
| 3. Sustainability | 3.3 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.4 |
| 4. Crosscutting Themes | 3.9 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.8 |
| 5. Coherence | 4.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.9 |
| 6. Efficiency | 3.8 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 3.7 |
| 7. Management Principles | 3.9 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 3.4 | 3.7 |
| 8. Performance Management | 3.7 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.7 |
| Average | 3.8 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.8 |
| Governance Sector | Results by delivery mechanism | | | | Results by delivery channel | | | | |
| Criteria | Bilateral | PWCB | Multilateral | Average | PBA | SBS | PROJ | PROG | Average |
| 1. Relevance | 5.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.7 |
| 2. Effectiveness / Results | 3.6 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.4 |
| 3. Sustainability | 2.8 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.8 |
| 4. Crosscutting Themes | 2.3 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 2.6 | 4.0 | 2.5 |
| 5. Coherence | 4.3 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| 6. Efficiency | 3.8 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 4.1 | 3.5 | 3.4 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| 7. Management Principles | 4.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.2 |
| 8. Performance Management | 3.2 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Average | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 3.5 |
| Tables by criteria | | | | | | | | | |
| Relevance | | | | | | | | | |
| | Results by delivery mechanism | | | | Results by delivery channel | | | | |
| Sector | Bilateral | PWCB | Multilateral | Average | PBA | SBS | PROJ | PROG | Average |
| Education | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.4 |
| Popular Economy | 4.5 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 4.6 |
| Governance | 5.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.7 |
| Average | 4.6 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.6 | 4.2 | 4.5 |
| Effectiveness | | | | | | | | | |
| | Results by delivery mechanism | | | | Results by delivery channel | | | | |
| Sector | Bilateral | PWCB | Multilateral | Average | PBA | SBS | PROJ | PROG | Average |
| Education | 3.2 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 3.2 |
| Popular Economy | 3.8 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.6 |
| Governance | 3.6 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.4 |
| Average | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.3 |
| Sustainability | | | | | | | | | |
| | Results by delivery mechanism | | | | Results by delivery channel | | | | |
| Sector | Bilateral | PWCB | Multilateral | Average | PBA | SBS | PROJ | PROG | Average |
| Education | 2.6 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 2.3 |
| Popular Economy | 3.3 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.4 |
| Governance | 2.8 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.8 |
| Average | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.8 |
| Crosscutting Themes | | | | | | | | | |
| | Results by delivery mechanism | | | | Results by delivery channel | | | | |
| Sector | Bilateral | PWCB | Multilateral | Average | PBA | SBS | PROJ | PROG | Average |
| Education | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.3 |
| Popular Economy | 3.9 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.8 |
| Governance | 2.3 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 2.6 | 4.0 | 2.5 |
| Average | 3.1 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.3 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 3.1 |
| Coherence | | | | | | | | | |
| | Results by delivery mechanism | | | | Results by delivery channel | | | | |
| Sector | Bilateral | PWCB | Multilateral | Average | PBA | SBS | PROJ | PROG | Average |
| Education | 3.4 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.1 | 3.5 | n/a | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Popular Economy | 4.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.9 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| Governance | 4.3 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Average | 3.9 | 3.9 | 2.5 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 2.5 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.4 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Efficiency | Results by delivery mechanism | | | | Results by delivery channel | | | | |
| Sector | Bilateral | PWCB | Multilateral | Average | PBA | SBS | PROJ | PROG | Average |
| Education | 2.5 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.9 |
| Popular Economy | 3.8 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 3.7 |
| Governance | 3.8 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 4.1 | 3.5 | 3.4 |
| Average | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.1 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Management Principles | Results by delivery mechanism | | | | Results by delivery channel | | | | |
| Sector | Bilateral | PWCB | Multilateral | Average | PBA | SBS | PROJ | PROG | Average |
| Education | 3.9 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.8 |
| Popular Economy | 3.9 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 3.4 | 3.7 |
| Governance | 4.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.2 |
| Average | 4.1 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 4.8 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.9 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Performance Management | Results by delivery mechanism | | | | Results by delivery channel | | | | |
| Sector | Bilateral | PWCB | Multilateral | Average | PBA | SBS | PROJ | PROG | Average |
| Education | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.9 |
| Popular Economy | 3.7 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.7 |
| Governance | 3.2 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Average | 3.2 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.1 |

Appendix F – Management Response

| Recommendations | Commitments/measures | Responsible | Completion date | Status |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>Recommendation #1 – Relevance: That as part of its new CDPF, CIDA's Senegal Program maintain and build on the good practices observed during the development of the CDPF 2001-2009 and adopt a proactive approach to sharing its medium- and long-term programming intentions with its national and international partners. That the Program maintain the necessary flexibility to adjust the current CDPF to Senegal's new PRSP III, which is expected to be approved shortly, while at the same time taking into account the recommendations of the Program assessment.</p> | <p>Recommendation accepted: In developing the 2010-2015 CDPF, the Senegal Program had indicated that the CDPF would be reviewed during the period to take account of the conclusions and recommendations of the present Senegal Program evaluation, as well as the development directions defined by Senegal in its PRSP III, which should be available by March 2011. The Program also indicated that commitment in its 2009-2010 annual performance report.</p> <p>It should be noted that CIDA actively participated in the various drafts of Senegal's PRSP III, and was thus able to support the PRSP directions in some of its programming sectors.</p> <p>The CDPF will be reviewed in a participatory fashion with the major development stakeholders in Senegal. The Program hopes to review the current document jointly with the Government of Senegal. To do so, however, the nature of the 2010-2015 CDPF will need to be addressed, as CIDA considers it to be an internal document.</p> | <p>CIDA Senegal Program Director</p> | <p>March 2012</p> | <p>Pending finalization of Senegal's PRSP III. Work should begin in April-May 2011.</p> <p>Bilateral review with the Government of Senegal in May or June 2011.</p> |
| <p>Recommendation #2 – Effectiveness: Considering the level of cooperation of the GoS with the jointly-approved Canadian aid program, that CIDA's Senegal Program maintain and build on the good practices in: (i) the education sector while stressing quality; (ii) i the agri-food sector, while continuing its support for microfinance and economic development in Niayes and</p> | <p>This recommendation is in line with the current directions of the Senegal Program. Based on consultations with Senegalese and Canadian partners, and the recommendations of the Program's 2008 Operational Review, the Senegal Program decided to ensure programming continuity by maintaining its main areas of intervention. Accordingly, the 2010-2015 CDPF continues to focus on education, particularly quality, while striving to improve management effectiveness of the education system. It is</p> | <p>CIDA Senegal Program Director</p> | <p>Done – included in 2010-2015 CDPF</p> | |

| Recommendations | Commitments/measures | Responsible | Completion date | Status |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|--------|
| <p>Casamance; and (iii) the area of governance, particularly in terms of decentralization</p> | <p>also focussing on agriculture and agrifood in les Niayes and Casamance, which have promising agricultural potential for Senegal's economic development. The Program is also continuing its microfinance activities, both to strengthen the national institutional context and to support the offer of financial products and services adapted to rural areas, especially in les Niayes and Casamance. Finally, the 3rd priority for the Senegal Program, decentralization, will help to improve the delivery of core services at the local level while building on the gains made to support local elected officials. Other governance initiatives have been introduced to strengthen efforts in our key areas of intervention, such as support for budgetary and financial reforms, including contracting, and support for civil society participation and citizens' ownership of public decisions.</p> | | <p>Undertaken annually - July</p> <p>March 2012</p> | |
| <p>Recommendation #3 – Sustainability: That CIDA's Senegal Program : (i) ensure that activities in priority sectors are systematically subject to diagnostic analyses and risk analyses with regard to the technical, organizational and financial capacities of the partners for which these activities are carried out; and (ii) put in place the attendant action plans and strategies for capacity building.</p> | <p>The Program agrees with this recommendation. To that end, the Program has begun to implement an education sector strategy so as to more effectively target the sector and its stakeholders, ensure consistency among its projects/programs and mitigate the risks associated with activities in the sector. The Program has also developed a major capacity-building component for education budget support that will respond to Senegal's various technical, organizational and financial needs.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Program updates its fiduciary risk profile annually and monitors its risk register on an ongoing basis, The Program will more systematically analyze its partners' capacities in connection with its food security and decentralization programming.</p> <p>The Program will continue to use all means at its disposal to reinforce capacity-building for its partners (bilateral and joint technical assistance, support, policy dialogue and</p> | <p>CIDA Senegal Program Director</p> | <p>Dec. 2011</p> <p>Undertaken annually -July</p> | |

| Recommendations | Commitments/measures | Responsible | Completion date | Status |
|--|--|-------------------------------|--|---|
| | Partnership with Canadians Directorate's significant contribution). | | | |
| <p>Recommendation #4 – Cross-cutting themes: To maintain the gains made in gender equality, help implement the gender equality strategy and ensure that it is properly integrated into the various strategies and projects, that the Program: (i) develop an action plan that includes clear initiatives, a stronger dialogue on policy and the role of civil society; ii) identify specific and measurable expected outcomes, as well as an adequate set of performance indicators; iii) and identify appropriate human, technical and financial resources</p> | <p>Recommendation accepted: The Senegal Program developed an initial GE strategy in 1999. The Program developed a new strategy in 2008 that was updated in 2010 in connection with the 2010-2015 CDPF and is included as Appendix D thereto. The Program now needs to develop an Action Plan to facilitate implementation of the strategy. Some elements of the recommendation are already contained in the Program's LM and PMF, including results and indicators linked to policy dialogue with and support for Senegalese partners for institutionalizing GE, and capacity-building. Canada has been a key partner of the Government of Senegal in developing its national gender equality strategy (SNEEG).</p> <p>The Program is currently considering options aimed at assisting GoS to implement the SNEEG.</p> <p>In addition to the full-time services of a GE advisor to the Support Unit, the inclusion of a GE work team in the Program and the support of a GE specialist at Headquarters, the GE Action Plan will identify the human, technical and financial resources needed to fully integrate GE into the Program.</p> | CIDA Senegal Program Director | <p>GE Action plan : September 2011</p> <p>Decision on way forward by Aug. 2012</p> <p>Sept. 2011</p> | <p>Strategy developed</p> <p>GE Action plan to be developed</p> <p>Assessment phase</p> |
| <p>Recommendation #5 – Cross-cutting themes: To strengthen the environmental dimension of its programming, that CIDA's Senegal Program: (i) implement an action plan in this area, (ii) identify objectives, outcomes, strategies and financial means; (iii) include measures to train the appropriate partners and staff and make them accountable; and (iv) strengthen the</p> | <p>Recommendation accepted: In planning its 2010-2015 CDPF, CIDA's Senegal Program conducted a strategic environmental assessment which is summarized in a report included as Appendix E of the CDPF. The Senegal Program also developed an environmental action plan, which was approved by Program management in 2010. The Program's LM and PMF identify the environmental results, including policy dialogue and better integration of the environmental dimension into Program projects.</p> | CIDA Senegal Program Director | <p>Action plan developed</p> <p>Results monitored annually</p> | <p>Completed</p> <p>Underway</p> |

| Recommendations | Commitments/measures | Responsible | Completion date | Status |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| policy dialogue on such issues as sustainable land management, while taking account of the climate change problem. | The Program has access to the services of an environmental work team in the Program and the support of an environmental specialist at Headquarters. An environmental advisor will be added to the Support Unit. | | Recruitment during FY 2011-2012 | |
| <p>Recommendation #6 – Consistency: That the Bilateral, Multilateral and Partnerships with Canadians Branches be CDPF stakeholders and consider various organizational options so as to promote, foster and develop synergies within and among sectors in order to improve implementation and ensure follow-up, achievement of results and assessment of activities under the CDPF.</p> | <p>Recommendation accepted: The Program has begun exploring some avenues to develop synergy among sectors. For example, a clear linkage can be established between technical education and vocational training (TEVT) and activities in the agri-food sector, through activities focussing on the fit between training and employment.</p> <p>With respect to synergy among mechanisms, discussions will be undertaken with Multilateral and Partnership during the CDPF review.</p> <p>Given the specific nature of Partnership with Canadians Programming with regard to innovation, knowledge sharing between partner countries and its participatory approach at the community level, the Senegal Program will continue to pursue its quest for synergy between popular economy and education in order to better integrate Partnership’s achievements into the implementation of the CDPF and the country strategy.</p> <p>Strong ties are already in place with Partnership since the introduction of CDPF country focal points, allowing for more consistent and sustained information-sharing. With respect to the Bilateral Program, two officers (one at Headquarters and one at the Embassy in Dakar) ensure coordination of relations with Partnership and Multilateral. In addition, as health is not one of the priority sectors of the Bilateral Program, but Partnership and Multilateral have a substantial health component in their program-</p> | <p>CIDA Senegal Program Director</p> <p>In collaboration with Partnership with Canadians and Multilateral</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> | <p>Underway</p> <p>Underway</p> |

| Recommendations | Commitments/measures | Responsible | Completion date | Status |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>Recommendation #8 – Management principles: Given the substantial energies already invested and the success already achieved, that the Senegal Program (i) document its policy dialogue activities in the various CDPF priority sectors, (ii) look into developing a Policy Dialogue Strategy for Senegal.</p> | <p>Recommendation accepted: Policy dialogue is included in the Program's LM and the PMF as an output in all its sectoral results.</p> <p>The Program agrees to document its policy dialogue experience and to establish a specific policy dialogue strategy. The Program produced a briefing note in 2010 on its experiences as a leader in Senegal. The Program will also try to see whether a standardized approach could be developed Agency-wide, to capitalize on experiences and lessons learned from other programs for CIDA as a whole.</p> <p>Policy dialogue goes beyond sectors and is not only bilateral. The Program has played a key role in policy dialogue with the Government of Senegal on various matters. Recent examples include the MDG Report, PRSP II and PRSP III, and Contracting Code reforms.</p> <p>In developing the Program's Policy Dialogue Strategy, as recommended, the importance of developing joint strategies with other TFPs will be considered.</p> | <p>CIDA Senegal Program Director</p> | <p>Done</p> <p>December 2011</p> | <p>To be discussed with the relevant CIDA division(s).</p> |
| <p>Recommendation #9 - Performance management: That CIDA's Senegal Program adopt (and periodically update) adequate, effective instruments to measure results-oriented performance management, identifying specific and realistic results accompanied by initial basic data, sufficiently precise targets and appropriate but accessible indicators.</p> | <p>Recommendation accepted: CIDA has developed new results-based management tools that have been used by the Program. The Program developed a logic model, a PMF and a risk log in developing its 2010-2015 CDPF. During the CDPF review in 2011, the LM and the PMF will likely be revisited to determine whether the selected results and indicators are still appropriate and are sufficiently realistic and measurable.</p> | <p>CIDA Senegal Program Director</p> | <p>New instruments established</p> <p>December 2011</p> | <p>Review activities to begin in Spring 2011</p> |

