

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE



United Nations Capital Development Fund
United Nations Development Program

Terms of reference of the final evaluation

Rural Decentralization Support Project (PADMIR)

December 2006

Summary

A. Objectives of the final evaluation, timing and anticipated use

- 1. Objectives**
- 2. Factors intervening in determining the timing of the final evaluation**

B. Analysis of the national environment and local development

- 1. National context**
- 2. Evolution of decentralization policy**
- 3. Presentation of PADMIR**
- 4. Main principles in the implementation of Padmir**

C. Framework and Object of the evaluation

- 1. Results achieved**
 - 1.0 Globally**
 - 2.0 Specifically**
- 2 Sustainability of results**
- 3 Factors that affected the achievements of the program**
- 4 Strategic positioning of the UNCDF and partnerships**
- 5 Prospects for the near future**

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR*Final Evaluation of the Rural Decentralization Support Program (PADMIR).*Program reference data.

Country:	Republic of Senegal
Project number:	SEN / 98 / C01 (UNCDF)
	SEN /98 / 001 (UNDP)
Project title:	Rural Decentralization Support Project (PADMIR)
Government executing Agency:	Directorate of local authorities (DLA)
Executive agency:	United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)
Date of signature for the project document:	30 June 1999
Date of starting the activities in Senegal:	January 2000
Planned duration:	5 years, revised to 6 years and 6 months
Initial budget:	\$7.500.000
Of which,	
UNCDF:	\$ 6.000.000
UNDP:	\$ 1.500.000
Additional Budget:	\$2.888.150
Luxembourg Cooperation	\$500.000
European Union:	XOF1 Billion
Government (Fiscal transfer):	XOF 147 Millions
Nature:	XOF 103 Millions
Local Authorities:	XOF 123 Millions
Micro finance institutions:	XOF 104.161.491
Actual total budget:	\$10.389.000
Mid-term evaluation date:	December 2001
Last PADMIR tripartite review:	21 November 2006

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR**A. Objectives of the final evaluation, timing and anticipative use****1 Objectives**

- To assist the Government of Senegal, the local authorities, the UNCDF and the UNDP to demonstrate the effectiveness, the efficiency and the relevance of PADMIR to achieve the impact and results expected by the communities, the institutions as well as the impact on decentralization policy at local and national levels and, the sustainability of results through the two implemented components.
- To analyze the level of ownership on the main results of the project by the local authorities (Rural Communities and the Regional Development Agencies - RDA) and by the associations (*Association Nationale des Conseillers Ruraux*), grassroots organizations and, the government structures involved in the program (*Centre d'Appui au Développement Local*, Pilot National Committee, National Treasury, Directorate of Economic and Financial Cooperation, Directorate of Local Authorities, etc.).
- To analyze the outreach, the effectiveness, the sustainability, the relevance and the consistency of the implementation i.e., the dialogue structures, building the capacity of the local authorities, the role of technical support played by the coordination team at national level and the partnership. Regarding innovations, re-visit the ideas of local economic development and who will take over.
- To assess the level of satisfaction of the project beneficiaries and their expectations concerning the chances of growing the local economy in Kébémér, micro-finance in Kafrine and, the role expected to be played by the Regional Development Agencies and the rural communities in taking over and mobilizing funding.
- To analyze the use of the Treasury channel for the transfer of investment funds, the LDF management procedure and the related financial plan, the process of budgetary support, the diversity of rules on accessing funding for the partners, in particular the rate of return on matching contribution. It would also be important to examine the procedures for transferring resources from the State (*Fonds d'Équipement des Collectivités Locales and Fonds de Dotation de la Decentralization*).
- In terms of investment, to analyze the Padmir's contribution on its own and in partnership, to the overall evolution of certain indicators including in sectors such as education, health, water and income generating activities.

It is also expected that the evaluation team will undertake a strategic review of the project's performance with the view to:

- Help the project managers and partners to assess to which extent the demonstration effect of pilot projects undertaken at local level may contribute to the emergence of a political environment favorable to decentralization through the National Program for Local Development (NPLD).
- Evaluate the UNCDF – European Union co-funding through Padmir and the Support Program for Local Development Initiatives (PSIDEL) which represents the most important proportion of

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR

financial support to local authorities. This would allow a better appreciation of the conditions for mobilizing additional funds outside of the UNCDF.

- Assess the strategic positioning of the UNCDF compared to other key partners operating in Senegal in the field of decentralization, the relevance of its partnerships, and the lessons to learn for these (European Union, World Bank, German Cooperation, etc.).
- Describe the environment for decentralization policy in Senegal by identifying the remaining gaps and major challenges that a new program cycle should meet.
- Provide comments based on observations and on lessons learned, on the strategy of a new program as the one defined in the Conceptual Document presented to the Projects Review Committee at the UNCDF headquarters on the 27th June 2006.

2 Factors intervening in determining the timing of the final evaluation

The decision from the Senegalese authorities to put in place the NPLD in 2006 with all development partners pegged to that has changed the context of all partners' interventions. In addition for Padmir, the recommendations of the last tripartite meetings held respectively on 23th October 2003 and on 21st November 2006 set the end of the program to June 2007.

We have to recall that the first decision of extending Padmir until 2006 took into account the major constraints which the program had to face internally as a result of multiple departures at the TAU and national coordination level and, externally given the national context at that time:

- The advent of special delegations,
- The delays in local elections in 2002,
- The low harvesting level in the 2002 agricultural season.

All these elements have been detrimental and as a result there was a delay in the implementation of the project. This had negative impacts on a) the ability of people to participate in financing local development, particularly through the payment of the rural tax and, b) the participation of community organizations in the funding of basic income generating activities.

Despite these difficulties, Padmir has been implementing during the period 2000 - 2003, the bulk of the activities in both components A and B. To these were added the innovations introduced within the local economic development, which despite a delay noted in the studies, offer some interesting prospects for the implementation of the NPLD.

The years 2004 and 2005 confirmed these quite promising results. However given the government's position which set the end of the project in June 2007, the innovations introduced by Padmir that have just started in a number of rural communities and finally the current context as defined by the NPLD, a final evaluation will have to be conducted in the first quarter of 2007 to define the recommendations linked to the follow up to the UNCDF program in Senegal.

Moreover, in order to develop a reference framework to better meet the national priorities and to increase the impact, the United Nations System in Senegal has defined a United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) whose purpose is to adopt a synergistic and harmonized way to combat poverty through governance, one of the three UNDAF focus areas.

Also, the UNDP country program document (CPD-2007-2011) is based on a) conclusions and recommendations of the review of the country cooperation framework 2002-2006 b) The revised

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR

document on poverty reduction strategy, c) The new framework plan of the United Nations Development Assistance Senegal UNDAF. One of the objectives in this area is improving governance by consolidating the process of decentralization, involving rural communities in local management and, by piloting decentralization and testing budgetary support through the Treasury channels. Concerning local governance, an effort must be made to improve the budget support mechanisms which the UNCDF has initiated with others. The major weaknesses were observed in the following areas: slow fund transfers at local level and a lack of coordinated monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. To this extend, the implementation of the NPLD is an opportunity.

It is in this context that the UNCDF and the UNDP have developed a conceptual document which is seen as an operational response to this national program from the United Nations System and in particular from the United Nations Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) and from the United Nations Development Program (UNDP).

The UNCDF and UNDP's objective is to continue the research of innovations which has always characterized their interventions in Senegal in order to advance the decentralization process.

In the framework of the NPLD, the UNDP and the UNCDF want to ensure the promotion of the implementation of components which will bring some real added value to the NPLD and to the decentralization policy.

Presently, the local planning and the investment funds are certainly the backbone of decentralization but they are not innovating any more in the current context. The United Nations System will need to support the local communities in their catalytic role of local development. The promotion of local economic development and ICT within the framework of investments promotion and provision of local public service are two essential triggers for local development and good local governance. The strengthening of managerial skills and the implementation of gender inclusive tools will be the new UNCDF/UNDP niches for future programs supporting local development during the 2007-2011 period.

B. Analysis of the National Environment and Local Development

1 National Context

Senegal is situated in the Sahel region at the western tip of the African continent and extends over an area of 196 722 Km², sharing borders to the North with Mauritania, to the East with Mali, to the South with Guinea and Guinea-Bissau. Another sovereign country, the Gambia, is located within the southern portion of the Senegalese territory.

In August 2002, the Senegalese population was estimated at à 10 425 200 inhabitants with a 2.5% annual growth rate. Women constitute the majority (52%) particularly in rural areas. The population is young with an average age of 21.8 years for men and 22.6 years for women. In fact, more than half of the population is less than 20 years old (55.6%). The population is mainly rural (58.5%) and more than half of urban dwellers live in the Greater Dakar. This is not a rural exodus which increase the population in the Capital City but rather some migration of urban origin i.e., from inland urban municipalities.

In 2005, Senegal belongs to the group of least developed countries and has a Human Development (HDI) which is relatively low (0.458), ranking the country 157 over 177.

Table 1: Economic and social Indicators

General Indicators	2004	2005 (e)
--------------------	------	----------

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR

Population (in millions)	10,028	10,4					
GNP/inhabitant (XOF)	379 297	-					
Growth rate for the real GDP	6 %	5.3%					
GDP at current prices (MDS. XOF)	4,023.70	4,346					
GDP at constant prices (MDS. XOF)	2,117.73	2,208.69					
Exportations Goods and services (FOB)	775	841					
Importations Goods and services (FOB)	1 434	1 532					
Social Indicators	2004	2005					
Life expectation (in years):	54	54					
Under-5 Mortality rate:	145.7	142.5					
Maternal mortality rate (0/00)	510	Na					
Malnutrition rate (under 5-year old):	23	Na					
Schooling growth rate:	79.9%						
Education Budget (% total budget)	40%						
Health Budget (% total budget)	10%						
Water provision rate (liters./inhbts/days)	Na						
National electrification rate	31%						
Rural electrification rate	Na						
Urban electrification rate	Na						
Years	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2004	2005
HDI	0.332	0.359	0.382	0.398	0.416	0.437	0.458

Source: *Note de stratégie, UNDP Senegal, Unité de Politique and d'Analyse Stratégique, November 2005*

(e) Estimates

The Senegalese economy has returned to a growth trend during the second half of the 1990s. GDP has increased in real terms by an average 5.2% over the 1995-2002 period. In 2005, the objectives of the macro-economic framework have globally targeted the consolidation of results obtained in 2004 and the elimination of constraints prohibiting a strong and accelerated growth. The Senegalese economy has registered a relatively satisfactory performance in most sectors of activities and that, in a context of excessive rains and major difficulties such as an invasion of desert locusts. The real GDP growth rate achieved in 2005 has been around 5.3%, substantially below the initial forecasts of the macro-economic framework, but also below the minimum rate (7%) necessary to halving poverty by 2015.

1. Evolution of the Decentralization Policy

The 1996 Acts and the implementing Decrees constitute the legal and regulatory framework of the decentralization policy. Its evolution has been marked by the following steps:

- In 1960, all existing urban municipalities got municipal legal status, which had the effect of increasing the number of municipalities from 12 to 24;
- In 1966, enactment of the Municipal Administrative Code (Act 66-64, 30 June 1966) which formalized the existing structures of Territorial Administration;
- In 1972, the Act 72-55 of 25 April 1972 created the concept of rural communities which were put under the legal and operational supervision of the deputy-prefect;

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR

- In 1990, the Act 90-90 and 35-37 removed the special status of regional capitals and reinstalled the function of authorizing officer¹ to the mayor and to the president of rural communities;
- Last, the 1996 Acts completely transformed the legal framework of intergovernmental relationships by significantly broadening the competencies areas of the local authorities and by modifying the role of administrative supervision (*tutelle*). Besides, regions are now considered as local authorities.

Nowadays, Senegal has 441 local authorities, 14 352 elected local representatives and a staff complement of about 6 000 agents. Each level (region, urban municipality and rural community) has its own council, which is a deliberative body elected for five years. Each council elects among its members a chair who acts as the responsible executive for: President of the Regional Council for the region, mayor in the urban municipalities and President of rural communities; these persons are also by law the budget authorizing officer for their entity, which was not the case before the 1972 reform. The three categories of local authorities are regrouped in three national associations: the Association of regional councilors, the Association of urban municipalities and the Association of rural communities.

1. Presentation of the Rural Decentralization Support Program (PADMIR)

Since 1999, the UNDP and the UNCDF have been involved in the Rural Decentralization Support Program. This project went through a mid-term review which recommended to carry on assisting both institutions in its extension zones in order to some bring real long term impact to the projects. It seeks to reduce poverty and to improve living conditions in rural areas by financing community infrastructures through a participatory and decentralized approach improving local governance.

Decentralized communities are considered by law and by the State institutions as the only institutions able to act as the engine of development and as providers of local services. Therefore the UNCDF approach is to support the local authorities in the Kébémér and Kaffrine Departments in their efforts to ensure the delivery of local public services and to work with them to promote and boost local development.

PADMIR broke new ground, but also introduced a new dynamic in local development practice in several areas. Its impact has been important regarding the increased provision of basic social services within local communities in the two intervention zones. The aggregated results give the following indicators:

- 72 % of total funding is used for collective social infrastructures;
- 23 % of total funding is used for income generating activities;
- 2% of funding is used to for the NRM component;
- 3 % of funding is used for institutional support.

Even if PADMIR has encountered some difficulties in implementing certain aspects of its implementation (slowness in terms of planning, weakness in the monitoring/evaluation mechanism, location in two remote geographical areas, etc.), the fact remains that significant lessons can be learned from this experience.

¹ *Ordonnateur*, person authorized to pass the account.

1. Main principles in the implementation of Padmir

. The dialogue structures

• Advantages

The establishment of dialogue structures in the Padmir intervention areas constitutes one of several major innovations. This has facilitated the coordination of interventions, strengthened the operational or financing synergies between players from various backgrounds. In some cases, they played the role of relay between grassroots organizations and the rural councils. The instruments which have been put in place are mostly: The "focus groups", the village and inter-village assemblies and the workshops.

The VCD and IVCD have also been tools to facilitate citizens' participation and mobilization. They have contributed to the process of prioritizing of local investments and facilitated the process of taking into account the characteristics of villages and particularly of the most disadvantaged groups.

At the national level the main innovation was the creation and animation of a Technical Committee for Monitoring PADMIR that was supported by the NPC.

• Constrains

Local representatives and their partners created several frameworks to show the specificity of their projects et programs; among these frameworks, we can mention in the areas of Padmir, the management and coordination committees led by the rural infrastructure national program funded by the World Bank (only in Kafrine), the international NGO World Vision's steering committees, the VCD et the IVCD led by Padmir, the local coordination structures for Producers' Organizations (LICOP) put in place within the PSAOP by the National Agency for Rural and Agriculture Advice (*l'Agence Nationale de Conseil Agricole and Rural* - ANCAR).

The numerous structures have sometimes been a factor blocking the attempts to harmonizing approaches. The ownership and the sustainability of these mechanisms might not be in place when the Programs end up.

At the national level the coordination has been much more harmonious which has facilitated the donors' coordination with the State as a partner.

The donors' sub-committee (*sous-comité des bailleurs de fonds* - SCBF) and the local representatives' associations played a very important in this coordination.

For Padmir, the establishment of a national pilot committee has been crucial in the implementation of the project and also in some way in its positioning at the national level.

. The experience of funding the LDF through the Padmir channel

In the context of building capacity that would benefit the decentralization policy in Senegal, a memorandum was signed between the UNDP/UNCDF and the Government to initiate an experience regarding the use of the National Treasury channels and the compliance with the procedures of public accounting and with public tendering rules to transfer funds for investments in local communities in the Kafrine and Kébémér departments.

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR

The financial resources of the LAs come mostly from local taxation which is insufficient and therefore does not respond to the growing needs of local communities; to overcome this, the State has implemented mainly two financial instruments that are the Local Authorities Equipment Fund (LAEF) and the endowment fund which uses the Treasury channel.

In its approach, Padmir has introduced in the rural Senegalese areas a type of investments for funding of rural communities based on global budget support; creating a better traceability of local public spending et greater transparency of the budgetary process.

. **Budget support**

Padmir has therefore established a Local Development Fund (LDF) for supporting the targeted local communities based on the budgetary support principle.

The funding system introduced by the LDF is based on co-financing and is articulated with the budget of rural communities. It takes care of the projects selected during the process of participatory planning that falls in the Local Investment Programs (LIP) and in the Annual Investment Programs (AIP). This experience was far from perfect but had positive consequences which are: better control of the local financial capacity and better adequacy between transferred funds and responsibilities transferred from the central government to the rural communities.

Some constraints remain however and deserve to be reviewed. They are primarily linked to human resources and to the shortcomings of the code of public procurement currently in force.

. **The Treasury channel**

The conduit used by PADMIR for transferring funds is the National Treasury channel. The UNCDF funds the LDF based on the annual decisions regarding the LIP funding. The funds are then transferred in a special account managed by the General Treasurer (*Trésorier Payeur Général - TPR*). The latter transfers the full amount to the regional TPR. Thereafter, the department's Collectors in the project zones proceed to allocate and transfer the funds in the accounts of local authorities which benefit from these funds according to demographic and performance criteria. The procedure allocating annual funding to the RCs obviously follows the rules established by the Code of local authorities and the financial regimen thereof.

The use of the Treasury channel address a concern regarding the sustainability of the public funding mechanisms for local authorities and allows the rural communities to acquire greater control over the budget process.

. **Partnership**

• **Institutional Partnership**

PADMIR has developed a partnership structured around its main axes of intervention i.e., at the institutional level with the Government centralized and regionalized services which support the process of piloting an implementing the program, with local authorities, the RDA, the bilateral and multilateral donors (UNCDF, Luxembourg cooperation, etc.)

• **Financial Partnership**

The partnership with PSIDEL, amounting to XOF1 billion is an important financial contribution to deliver local infrastructures. This has allowed:

- to increase and complement the LDF level of funding,

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR

- to increase the local public tender management capacity with adequate ownership by the rural councils in processing the files,
- to raise the limits of individual indicative financial allocations for rural communities in the PADMIR intervention zones which went from XOF8 million on average to more than XOF20 million,
- to consolidate the mechanisms of budgetary support,
- to re-enforce the visibility of the program,
- to start a new way of getting some synergy and harmony between interventions from various funding partners in the field;

with the institutions of credit and savings in financial support to the local authorities for supplementary funding of income generating activities to community-based organizations including women.

- **Specific partnerships**

Partnerships have been initiated for specific operations with several development organizations which support local development e.g.: The Konrad Adenauer Foundation, CISV (Italian NGO), SOS SAHEL, the decentralized Spanish Cooperation, World Vision, Alcatel, the IDRC, ASER, etc.

- **Support to the central level or missions of component B**

In the context of the implementation of Padmir, component B which ensures the coordination of the program has the objectives to monitor component A, to give some direction to the studies required to the definition of good policy for decentralized rural development, to monitor and evaluate the component A, to support and advise the government agencies in charge of local authorities in the areas of strategies and procedures, setting up some tools for local planning and decentralized funding (For example a study for the setting up a Technical Secretariat).

At this level Padmir is followed up by a National Pilot Committee (NCP) chaired by the Directorate of Local Authorities and comprising members such as the General Directorate of the Treasury and Public Accounting, the Directorate of Planning, the Directorate of Local Development, the Directorate of the Economic and Financial Cooperation, the National Association of Rural Advisors, the National Framework of Cooperation and Consultations with Rural People and, other technical directorates. The NPC contributes to positioning PADMIR, to learn from and disseminate its experience and to create good conditions for the program ending and its takeover.

- **Local Economic Development**

The UNCDF has developed, in the framework of Padmir in Kébémér, a sub-project of local economic development which objectives are i) improving the knowledge of the local economy, ii) promoting a dialogue between stakeholders in the local economy, iii) looking for better channeling of public investments in order to foster the emergence of local economic dynamics. The sub-program revolves around the following components:

- To assist with structuring the investment;
- To create a common space for investment;
- To put in place a technical services and equipment fund for the development of local entrepreneurship.

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR

The local economy diagnostic and prospective study conducted by the PMD has experienced a significant delay in its development. Despite the withdrawal of PMD, the national consultants were able to finalize and deliver the various sectoral and synthesis reports as well as the local economy synthesis matrix.

The second phase of the project implementing the other components started in 2005 with the methodological support of the Paul Guérin La Joie Foundation.

There is a finding that the strategies to promote local economic development have been absent from the local authorities programs. The bulk of their activities are oriented toward the delivery of infrastructures which is certainly an important social dimension but which is not sufficient.

. **Building Local authorities' capacity**

Padmir has developed an important capacity building program targeting elected representatives and the community stakeholders to improve their management capacity. This is a major element accompanying the PADMIR withdrawal process in order to create a national takeover to the program. It is in this context that the State regionalized structures have work along the program on the local participatory planning, the financial system, strengthening public work management and promoting local public services.

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR**C. Framework and object of the evaluation****1 Results achieved****1.0 Evaluation of the overall performance**

- i. What is the performance of the project in terms of expected results achievement (with reference to the indicators in the logical framework and the targets in the annual work plans), provision of inputs and achievement of planned activities (analyzed by "Results"/" Product " - output)?
- ii. In light of the achieved results (Results–Outputs) and in connection with the resources made available and the effective activities, what are the signs and evidence that the program has achieved or will very probably achieve its immediate objectives and will thus contributed to the objective of development? Regarding the development objective (sustainable local development is promoted through the process of decentralization and the fight against poverty):
 - What are the measurable improvements from the point of view of the beneficiaries? Does the funding mechanism put in place through the Local Development Fund pay some attention to the achievement of sectoral results, such as the increase of primary school attendance rate, improved access to water, reduction of morbidity, etc?
 - What percentage of the population uses the basic infrastructures and services made available to them by the project? (summary analysis by type of infrastructure, sector, intervention area and, disaggregating the data by socio-economic status and sex).
 - Is the access to local services and infrastructures open to all and equitable? Is there any obstacle to access for the beneficiaries in general or certain marginalized groups (for example, fee / financial contributions for utilizing some infrastructures, etc?).
- iii. To assess the performance of this program compared to indicators in the UNCDF Reference Strategic Framework: at general level and program level.
- iv. Are the results described in the UNCDF monitoring reports (including the MIS) validated by the observations made by the final evaluation team? Analyze the possible differences between these data and observations.
- v. How were the project's efficiency and effectiveness for each expected Result's Output? What was the quality thereof?
- vi. How were the efficiency and effectiveness of the deployed strategy (cost-benefit, "value for money") compared to other strategies or approaches pursued by the Government, other development partners or other types of players to achieve the same results or effects? Was there any negative impact resulting from the program activities and/or its results?

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR

- vii. What is the satisfaction level for the various stakeholders with the program and the achieved results? Such as:
- How is PADMIR perceived by women, the youth, the stockbreeders and farmers, etc? What is their satisfaction level with PADMIR achievements?
 - How is PADMIR perceived by the administration in the Kaffrine and Kébémér departments and, at national level by the Ministry of Decentralization and local authorities?
 - How is PADMIR perceived by the other development partners (donors) in terms of value added compared to other approaches to local development?
 - How is PADMIR perceived by the civil society players?
 - How is the program perceived by elected representatives in municipalities outside of PADMIR zone (Kaffrine and Kébémér)?
- viii. Have the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation which have been accepted by the UNCDF been implemented? How did it affect the performance, the relevance and the management of program?
- ix. Reminder: over the above-mentioned questions, the evaluation of the overall program includes the following dimensions, as defined in the Final Evaluation Template:

“Evaluate any other critical issues relating to results achievement (for example, time and cost effectiveness of infrastructure delivery, quality of infrastructure, operations and maintenance, provision for recurrent costs, quality of participation in different phases of planning and infrastructure delivery, linkages between investment planning and budgeting and from local to regional/national planning frameworks, contribution of the program to co-ordinate multi-sectoral planning, local resource mobilization, local governance culture and accountability, etc.)”.

All these dimensions are included in the various sections of these terms of reference, but with the risk that their statement is too restrictive because of the context, hence this point.

The evaluation team will particularly examine the the following experiences:

1.0.0 The dialogue structures put in place around the “Rural Community” institution:

- Dialogue structures: National Pilot Committees (NPC), Village Committees for Development (VCD) Inter-Villages Committees for Development (IVCD), Local Granting Committees (LGC), put in place during the PADMIR start up phase.

This dual experience will be analyzed on the one hand in terms of team findings about the apparent sustainability of the dialogue structures, and on the other hand regarding the possibility and opportunity to generalize and institutionalize at national level these

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR

interfaces between civil society, local authorities and the local structures of the Central Government.

The general parameters for this analysis are suggested below:

- Have the pilot activities led to new regulations; have they influenced the design of any decentralization policy or its implementation?
- What is the quality of the participatory approach adopted by the project (nature, quality and level of participation of local stakeholders – in particular of civil society's representatives and of other categories of local players), especially keeping in mind the objectives of ownership and sustainability?
- What were the major problems encountered by the local authorities and the communities with the implementation of the participative process introduced by the project?
- What is the trend in terms of effective participation in the local communities and in the various stages of the local public spending cycle?
- Does the local planning and budgeting system take into account the harmonization with the requirements of the national and regional planning?
- Is the local planning approach consistent with the sectoral policies on education, health, potable water, etc. and, are the actions carried out at the local community level consistent with the LDF?
- What is the impact of PADMIR on strengthening the capacity of local elected officials? Are there appropriate and institutionalized systems which build on the capacity of the local authorities in the long term?
- What is the institutionalization level of good governance practices and their implementation (participation, transparency, fairness)?
- Have there been major changes in the relationships between the local authorities and the population and, in the population's perception towards local authorities? Have there been any change in terms of the culture of dialogue, respect of equity, etc. What are the consequences and impact of these changes?
- Has there been any change in women's status and in the status of traditionally marginalized groups? Has there been any social exclusion (included gender-based)?
- What is the satisfaction level of local authorities that were partners in the program and of the population regarding the new local governance systems and mechanisms that were introduced by PADMIR?

2.0.0 What are the relevance, efficiency and sustainability of the approach, the methodology and the tools advocated by PADMIR for increasing internal resources in the targeted communities in view of energizing the local economy in Kaffrine and Kébémér?

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR

- What was the participation level of local elected representatives, government representatives, private sector and civil society in the design, implementation and monitoring & evaluation of the tools created for energizing the local economy?
- What is the level of control and ownership by local players over this approach and tools?
- What has been the impact of these tools and this approach on the effort of local authorities to mobilize local resources? Can one already observe some effect on the local economy?
- What type of investments has been made by the municipalities and what are the quantitative and qualitative impacts which have strengthened the local production and household incomes (how many recipients?).
- Do these investments answer the needs identified in the various municipalities? Have these investments reached a critical mass level likely to have a real catalyst effect on the local economic environment?

In addition, for the arrival of the evaluation team in Senegal, the project team will be required to make available any "record" of income generating activities (co)financed by the Local Development Fund through rural communities since the beginning of the program, as well as the contributions to these activities under other partnerships, such as the PSIDEL, etc.

The evaluation team is not responsible for the quality/completeness of that record, but will strive to determine if a link exists between these activities and the local economic development approach adopted in Kébémér.

Finally, the constraints and opportunities in accessing financial services (primary banks and micro finance institutions) will be treated as a parameter for the analysis of local economic development factory.

Notwithstanding the obligation to analyze the two above-mentioned experiences, the evaluation team will retain the ability to judge the innovative character or not of any practice developed within the framework of PADMIR (e.g. the UNCDF MIS software for monitoring which the Government was interested in to monitor the performance of local communities), and therefore to determine whether there are any innovation susceptible of being replicated and having an impact on national policies and if they exist, which were the most significant.

2 The Sustainability of results

- i. What is the probability that the program results will be sustainable in the longer term, independently from any outside assistance specifically conceived for maintaining these results, in terms of:
 - Piloted systems (planning, funding, etc.)

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR

- Strengthened institutions and capacity
- Culture of local governance
- Funding channels
- Delivered infrastructures and services, for example:
 - Level of de functionality and durability (quality of the physical infrastructure and quality of the provided service) of the investments undertaken within the Local Development Fund
 - Level of maintenance for the investments and basic services (recurring costs pertaining to the infrastructures' usage and maintenance, material, staff, responsibilities, training, etc.)
- Impacts / effects on the local population way of life and income?

While taking into account the program implementation and the non quantifiable results in the initial situation in which were the local authorities.

- ii. Are there adequate financial resources (at Government and/or development partners level) to support the continuation of new practices introduced in the pilot-zone and the adoption or reproduction on a larger scale of the "model" that was piloted by PADMIR?

1.0 The project exit strategy and/or the decision to extend the assistance from the UNCDF, the UNDP and may be other partners: is this adequate in regard to the fostering of the process sustainability as engaged by the present program?

3 Factors that affected the achievement of the program

1.0 External factors

- 1.0. Has the political environment had any impact on the project and local authorities' performances?
- 1.0. Does the political environment remain conducive to the replication of lessons learned from the du project?
- 1.0. Are the project's critical assumptions, the amendments adopted by consensus in the October 2003 tripartite meeting, as well as their logical frameworks still relevant?

2.0 Factors linked to implementation

Preceding implementation: relevance of the program design given the implementation results.

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR

- 1.0. Quality of the concept / of the project *raison d'être* / of the logical framework: Have these been relevant for achieving the expected results, given the development local, regional and national context?
- 1.0. Have the logical frameworks, performance indicators, baseline data, if they exist and, the monitoring system (UNCDF MIS, which PADMIR used), provided a sufficient and efficient platform for performance monitoring and evaluation?
- 1.0. Was the project well designed and did it fit in the national strategies such as poverty reduction, the national policy of decentralization and local development and, in the UN system planning framework (CCA, UNDAF, results matrix)?
- 1.0. Relevance, clarity and realism of the immediate objective, of the expected results and of the implementation strategy as defined in the project document and the amendment, as well as other modifications that might have been brought up during the project implementation.
- 1.0. Was a gender approach taken into consideration during the design of the project?

3.0 Program implementation institutional design:

- Relevance and/or malfunction of the established institutional design (roles and responsibilities of the parties)?
- Intrinsic quality of the PADMIR Procedure Manual and effectiveness/efficiency of its usage.
- Relevance of the project targeting and the timing?

4.0 Program management:

- Management and implementation efficiency.
- Has the program management been geared towards results achievement? Can it be considered as innovating?
- Efficiency in human and financial resources management?
- Has there been any bottleneck concerning disbursements between the UNCDF, the UNDP, the support team and the local authorities? Have there been important delays in the process making funds available by various parties? If yes, what has been the impact thereof?
- Have the management, monitoring & evaluation and reporting systems been used as management support tools to ensure an efficient project implementation and to establish an objective basis for evaluating the project performance?

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR

- Are there within the program support team, in the government services or elsewhere, sufficient qualitative and quantitative elements related to the pre-project situation to measure the impacts that can be attributed to the project interventions in the end of funding present phase?
- Besides the above mentioned question 1.1.9, have the accepted mid-term recommendations had an effect on the program management style and, on results achievement?

Technical Support by the UNCDF and UNDP: Quality, relevance and availability of technical support, according to the needs expressed by the key players in the implementation of the program and, the impact on the progress of activities and achieving on results.

Other factors identified by the team which affect the performance of the program support team in achieving the expected objectives and results.

4 Strategic positioning of the UNCDF and partnerships

Evaluating the significant changes (positive or not) that intervened at national level in terms of decentralization and of local development during the program implementation period and the contribution of the latter to these changes: Have the PADMIR results critically influenced the implementation of the decentralization process in Senegal? What are the added value and the importance in terms of development policies that can be credited to PADMIR in this area?

- The UNCDF comparative advantages, regarding its investment mandate in the least developed countries, but also its approach of local development local and the implementation methodologies; do these give the UNSDF a specific role regarding:
 - 1.0. The focus of the UNDP and other development partners (UN agencies, donors, Government) on the same areas i.e., decentralization and local development?
 - 1.0. The implementation of national priorities as reflected in the development national strategies? Were there important hurdles to overcome in this implementation?
- What are the main characteristics of the local development “PADMIR model” regarding governance, capacity creation and services delivery to the population? Is the model innovative? What makes it different from the other models implemented in the country?
- What interaction (in a broad sense: collaborating or influencing) has there been between PADMIR and the other projects intervening in neighboring and similar zones? Besides (or by default), has there been such an interaction at national level between the UNDP group and the associated funds, The United Nations System and the other donors in Senegal regarding the dialogue with the Government on local

SENEGAL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT: PADMIR

development and the institutions that would allow to implement and maintain that dialogue?

- If within this framework, the PADMIR experience may have some value as an example, where can the UNDP and UNCDF resources have a multiplier effect by targeting domestic resources and other donors' contributions in favor of local development and local public services? Would this depend on the specific needs of different regions in the country and the attention they get from development partners? Or rather, is it an matter of "sectoral decentralization" to achieve the national objectives in terms of health, education, basic infrastructures, etc.? Where would the co-funding of a future intervention by the UNDP, the UNDCF and other donors be the more susceptible to reproduce and sustain the PADMIR's achievements: at the level of funding system, regional coverage, Local Authorities, etc.

5 Prospects for the near future

Analyzing the vision, strategies and proposals concerning either the withdrawal or the continuation of some UNCDF programming alongside the UNDP in the country: What are the findings and lessons learned from the PADMIR final evaluation that should influence any decision on the future role of the UNCDF and its partners?