

*Third Party Evaluation FY 2005*  
*The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan*

## **Country Assistance Evaluation of Senegal**

*- Summary -*

**March 2006**

## *Preface*

This report is a summary of Country Assistance Evaluation of Senegal carried out by the External Advisory Meeting on ODA Evaluation, an informal advisory body of the Director-General of the Economic Cooperation Bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan.

Japan has been one of the top donor countries of ODA (Official Development Assistance) and there have been domestic and international calls for more effective and efficient implementation of assistance. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as the responsible ministry of ODA, has been conducting ODA evaluation mainly at the policy level with two main objectives: to support the implementation and management of ODA, and to ensure its accountability. The first purpose of this evaluation lies in obtaining lessons and suggestions that would serve to formulate the Country Assistance Programme for Senegal. The second purpose of this evaluation is to ensure accountability by publication of the evaluation results.

The External Advisory Meeting on ODA Evaluation was formed to improve objectivity in evaluation. The Meeting is commissioned to conduct ODA evaluation and to report its results and recommendations to the Economic Cooperation Bureau of MOFA. Mr. Tatsuya Watanabe, a member of the Meeting, and a Trustee of the Japan NGO Center for International Cooperation, was in charge of this evaluation.

Mr. Shozo Kamo, Lecturer at the Faculty of Humanity, Meijo University, made enormous contributions to the evaluation report. Likewise, cooperation was received from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Japan International Cooperation Agency, including the Embassy of Japan in Senegal and JICA's Senegal office. We would like to take this opportunity to express our sincere gratitude to all those who were involved in this review. The Aid Planning Division of the Economic Cooperation Bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was in charge of coordination. All other supportive work was received from Earth and Human Corporation, which was commissioned by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for such work.

Finally, we should add that the opinions expressed in this report do not reflect the view and position of the Government of Japan or any other institutions.

March 2006

### The External Advisory Meeting on ODA Evaluation:

*Hiromitsu MUTA (Professor, Tokyo Institute of Technology)*

*Koichiro AGATA (Professor, Waseda University)*

*Kiyoko IKEGAMI (Director, UNFPA Tokyo Office)*

*Yoshikazu IMAZATO (Editorial Writer, The Tokyo Shimbun)*

*Teruo KAWAKAMI (CPA, Office ASAHI)*

*Yasunaga TAKACHIHO (Professor, Tamagawa University)*

*Yayoi TANAKA (Associate Professor, University of Tokyo)*

*Hiroko HASHIMOTO (Professor, Jumonji University)*

*Tatsuya WATANABE (Trustee, Japan NGO Center for International Cooperation)*



***The list of Abbreviations used in French & English***

Abbreviations	French	English/German
AFD	Agence Française de Développement	-
AfDB	Banque Africaine de Développement	African Development Bank
ASUFOR	Associations des Usagers de Forages	-
FCFA	Franc de la Communauté Financière Africaine	-
CFPT	Centre de Formation Professionnelle et Technique	-
CSPLP	Cellule de Suivi du Programme de Lutte contre la Pauvreté	Poverty Reduction Program Monitoring Unit
DJE(ECD)	Développement. des Jeunes Enfants	Early Childhood Development
DRDR	Directions Régionales du Développement Rural	-
DSRP(PRSP)	Document Stratégique pour la Réduction de la Pauvreté	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper The full PRSP
EC	Commission Européenne	European Commission
ENDSS	l'Ecole Nationale de Développement Sanitaire et Social	-
EPSA	-	Enhanced Private Sector Assistance for Africa
EU	Union Européenne	European Union
FAO	-	Food and Agriculture Organization
FNUAP(UNFPA )	Fond des Nations Unies pour la Population	United Nations Population Fund
GDP	Produit Intérieur Brut	Gross Domestic Product
GNI	-	Gross National Income
GNP	Produit National Brut	Gross National Product
GTZ	-	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
HIPCs	Pays Pauvres Très Endettés	Heavily Indebted Poor Countries
IDA	-	International Development Association
IMF	-	International Monetary Fund
JBIC	-	Japan Bank for International Cooperation
JICA	-	Japan International Cooperation Agency
JOCV	-	Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers
KfW	-	Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau
MDGs	Objectifs du Millénaire pour le Développement	Millennium Development Goals
NEPAD	-	New Partnership for Africa's Development

Abbreviations	French	English/German
OCDE(OECD)	Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Économiques	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
ODA	Aide Publique au Développement	Official Development Assistance
PADRHS	Projet d'Appui au Développement des Ressources Humaines dans le domaine de la Santé au Sénégal	-
PDEF	Programme Décennal d'Éducation et Formation	Ten-year Education and Training Program
PDIS	Programme de Développement Intégré de la Santé	Integrated Health Development Program
PEPTAC	Projet Eau Potable pour Tous et Appui aux Activités Communautaires	-
PNAE	Plan National d'Action pour l'Environnement	-
PRODEFI	Projet Communautaire de Développement Forestier Intégré	-
PROVERS	Programme pour la Promotion de la Verdure au Sénégal	-
PRSC	-	Poverty Reduction Support Credit
SWAP	Approche Sectorielle	Sector-Wide Approaches
TICAD	Conférence de Tokyo sur le développement de l'Afrique	Tokyo International Conference on African Development
UN	Organisation des Nation Unies	United Nations
UNDP	-	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	-	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	-	United States Agency for International Development
WHO	Organisation Mondiale de la Santé	World Health Organization

## *Table of Contents*

### **Preface**

### **Abbreviations**

	<i>pages</i>
<b>1. Outline of the Evaluation</b> .....	1
1.1. Purpose of the Evaluation .....	1
1.2. Target of the Evaluation .....	1
1.3. Framework of the Evaluation .....	1
<b>2. General Situation of Development in Senegal</b> .....	1
2.1. Overview of Development in Senegal .....	1
2.2. National Development Strategy of Senegal .....	2
<b>3. Trends in Aid to Senegal</b> .....	2
3.1. Japan's Aid in Senegal .....	2
3.2. Aid trends of other donors.....	3
<b>4. Evaluation of Purpose</b> .....	3
4.1. Relevance of Japan's Aid Policy for Senegal.....	3
4.2. Consistency with High Level Japanese ODA Policies.....	5
4.3. Consistency with International Development Initiatives .....	5
4.4. Consistency with Senegal's National Development Programmes .....	5
<b>5. Evaluation of the Process</b> .....	5
5.1. Appropriateness of the Formulation Process .....	5
5.2. Appropriateness of the Implementation Process of Aid Policy.....	7
<b>6. Evaluation on the Results</b> .....	8
6.1. Effectiveness for Priority Sectors.....	8
6.2. Effectiveness for Cross-cutting Issues, Aid Schemes and Aid Modalities.....	8
6.3. Contribution toward Sustainability .....	9
<b>7. Recommendations</b> .....	9
7.1. Recommendations for future Country Assistance Programme for Senegal.....	9
7.1.1. Definite Objectives and Goals.....	9
7.1.2. Strict Application of "Selection and Concentration" .....	10
7.1.3. Clear Presentation of Japan's Assistance .....	11
7.1.4. Consideration on Appropriate Choice of Aid Schemes and Modalities.....	11
7.1.5. Efficient and Effective Use of Aid Types.....	11
7.2. Establishment of a Senegal-Japan Cooperation Framework and Regular Policy Dialogue .....	12
7.2.1. Agreement on a Senegal-Japan Cooperation Framework .....	12
7.2.2. Regular Policy Dialogue Meetings .....	12

# Country Assistance Evaluation of Senegal

## Summary

### 1. *Outline of the Evaluation*

#### 1.1. Purpose of the Evaluation

The first purpose of this evaluation lies in obtaining lessons and recommendations for a future formulation of the Country Assistance Programme for the Republic of Senegal by comprehensively reviewing Japan's past Aid Policies to Senegal. The second purpose is to ensure accountability by publicizing the evaluation results to the public.

#### 1.2. Target of the Evaluation

This evaluation targets past Japanese Aid Policies and interventions/achievement to Senegal between the Japanese fiscal years (JFY) 1995 and 2004. As the Country Assistance Programme for Senegal has not yet been formulated, the Country Aid Policy for Senegal formulated in 1995 and updated every year from 1996 to 2000, is taken as a basic target for this evaluation. Evaluation of Japan's ODA performance and related policies after JFY 2001 would take into consideration the "Project Verification Mission" in 2000, as well as modifications through assistance policy dialogues by the local ODA task force. ODA Country Data Books and JICA Country Implementation Programme of Senegal were also referred to as necessary.

#### 1.3. Framework of the Evaluation

Japan's ODA policy for Senegal has been evaluated based on the perspectives and viewpoints in the table below.

Viewpoints	Criteria of evaluation
Purposes	(1) Consistency with Japan's higher level aid policies (the former ODA Charter & the former ODA Medium-term Policy) (2) Consistency with Japan's assistance policy for Africa and/or Country Assistance Policy for Senegal (3) Consistency with the development needs of Senegal (4) Comparison with the aid assistance policies of other major donors
Processes	(1) Appropriateness of the formulation of Aid Policy (2) Appropriateness of the implementation of Aid Policy
Results	(1) Effectiveness (2) Impact (3) Sustainability

### 2. *General Situation of Development in Senegal*

#### 2.1. Overview of Development in Senegal

The Republic of Senegal is one of the most democratic states in Africa. The macro-economic situation has improved due to the devaluation of CFA francs in 1994, and the country is

making economic progress under the structural adjustment programme. Despite such progress, population growth rate is high, GDP per capita growth is low, and disparity between urban and rural area is widening. The UNDP Human Development Index (2004) ranked Senegal 157th among 177 countries. While tertiary industries focused on commercial businesses, accounting for 62% of GDP, the agricultural sector, which employs half of the country's population, accounts for only 9% of GDP. The low productivity of the agricultural sector has been one of the important development issues. Main development issues for Senegal over the past 10 years include poverty reduction, decentralization, resolving regional disparities and gender issues, human resource development, the private sector development, and debt reduction.

**2.2. National Development Strategy of Senegal**

In 1995, the government of Senegal drew up the “9th Socio-Economic Development Plan (1996–2001)” which embraced the following main strategies: 1) economic growth by strengthening the manufacturing sector; 2) increased investment and increased productivity; 3) human resource development; 4) expansion of agriculture and irrigation projects; and 5) reduction of poverty. In 2002, the government released the final full PRSP (Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper: F-PRSP) (2002-2005) outlining the government’s policy to pursue development in the following 4 main areas: 1) wealth creation; 2) promotion of capacity-building for basic social services; 3) improving the living standards of vulnerable groups in society; 4) participatory M&E (monitoring and evaluation) approach based on decentralized management and implementation. The second version PRSP (2006-2008) is in the process of formulation as of November 2005.

**3. Trends in Aid to Senegal**

**3.1. Japan’s Aid in Senegal**

Japan’s ODA Policy for Senegal can be outlined below, based on policy discussions in 1995, 1998, 2000 and 2004.

The Japanese Government established its Country Aid Policy for Senegal on the basis of policy discussions in 1995, and on the policy discussions afterwards in 1998, 2000 and 2004.

<u>Japan’s ODA Policy for Senegal</u>	
1) Objectives	
Long-term Objective	: (Sustainable economic growth)
Mid-term Objectives	:
(1)	Poverty reduction, development of economic and social infrastructure, development of social services
(2)	Environmental conservation
(3)	Increase of food production (improvement of productivity)
2) Priority Areas	
(1)	Water : Groundwater development
(2)	Education : Primary education
(3)	Basic health and medical services : Primary health care, Public health, HIV/AIDS issues (since 1997)

- (4) Environment (desertification prevention) : Provision of young plants, afforestation
- (5) Agriculture : Enhancement of food production, irrigation scheme development
- (6) Fisheries : Promotion of small-scale fisheries

The two areas below have been added in 2004:

- (7) Human resource development
- (8) Development of (economic) infrastructures

### 3) Cross-cutting issues/other points

- (1) Situation of armed independence movement in the southern region (the *Casamance* Region)
- (2) Capacity-Building
- (3) Mainstreaming the gender issue and development
- (4) Poverty Reduction
- (5) External Debt problem

### 4) Aid Schemes

Grant Aid and Technical Cooperation

### 5) Aid Modalities

- (1) Coordination with other donors
- (2) Coordination among Aid schemes
- (3) South-South Cooperation

The total amount of Japanese ODA to Senegal during the target period (JFY 1995–2003, Net disbursement) was US\$386.24 million, which accounted for 9 % of all donor contributions. Japan was the 4<sup>th</sup> largest bilateral donor to Senegal in 2003. As for the Aid scheme, 75 % of Japanese aid to Senegal was in the form of Grant Aid, and the remaining 25 % was in Technical Cooperation. Loan assistance has not been provided since 1991. Education is the largest area of intervention, followed by water and sanitation, agriculture, fisheries, and health and medical services in order of budget size.

## 3.2. Aid trends of other donors

From JFY 1995–2003, including multilateral and bilateral donors, France was the largest donor country, followed by IDA, EU, Japan, USA, and Germany. In terms of areas of investment, education, health and medical services, water and sanitation, and good governance were the largest. In recent years, donors such as France, IDA, Germany, and the USA have been making efforts to promote decentralization process.

NGOs are important development partners in Senegal. With access to relatively ample financial resources and capability of assembling competent human resources, donor countries such as the USA, Canada, and France are proactively enlisting the assistance of international and national NGOs. With its various networks, abundant information, and activities covering rural areas steadily increasing, NGO influence toward the government and donor agencies is increasing.

## 4. Evaluation of Purpose

### 4.1. Relevance of Japan's Aid Policy for Senegal

Japan's aid policy for Senegal was set forth in 1995 and was revised as and when appropriate afterwards up to 2000. As this aid policy was drawn up in the 1990s at a time when Country

Aid Policies were just started to be introduced, its purpose (long-term and medium-term objectives) and achievement objectives were not clarified enough, specific development targets were not sufficiently described, and development issues and needs were not systematically described.

To ensure that the aid policy to Senegal is consistent and enhance its effectiveness and efficiency, it is necessary that medium-term objectives are clarified, and concrete targets to achieve should be set forth. It is also desirable that effective periods of aid policies and timings of reviews should be clarified.

The Country Aid Policy for Senegal appropriately clarified 6 priority areas, as well as priority sub-sectors among them. Perhaps, the priorities should have been more organized and narrowed down in the light of the scale of Japan's aid for Senegal. Hence, it was perhaps not appropriate that aid scope was expanded to cover 8 priority areas in 2004. On the other hand, with respect to Senegal's request for assistance toward the private sector development which is an important issue for Senegal, while Japan described assistance for the private sector development as an important issue under the high level aid policy (especially in relation to former ODA medium-term aid policy), it may not have been appropriate that Japan did not include this sector as a priority area in its aid policy for Senegal.

Among cross-cutting issues, the Country Aid Policy listed the issue of the armed independence movement in the Southern region as the one to be paid attention to. Although the policy did indirectly cover some of the cross-cutting issues, such as mainstreaming of the gender issue, capacity-building, external debt, and poverty reduction under the category of those to be dealt with for promotion of the "TICAD II Tokyo Agenda for Action," the plan did not specify them clearly. On the other hand, a policy addressing decentralization, which is an important issue for Senegal, was not mentioned.

Two points should be considered for the sake of preparation of the future country assistance programme. First, it is necessary to narrow down and specify cross-cutting issues to be dealt with in the programme. Second, it is necessary to explicitly describe how to deal with those cross-cutting issues while avoiding the use of ambiguous expressions such as "taking note," so as to improve the consistency (for officials/staff concerned with ODA implementation), transparency (for the public) and predictability (for recipient countries) in Japanese ODA policies.

With respect to debt reduction issue for Senegal which is burdened with an accumulated debt, it was highly appropriate that Japan responded only with Grant Aid and Technical Cooperation, without providing additional yen loans. Although there remain unclear points, the policy is for the most part appropriate as it clearly describes coordination with other donors and among aid schemes, and also implies a willingness to deal with South-South Cooperation by the expression of promotion of the TICAD II Tokyo Agenda for Action. On the other hand, as the NGO sector in Senegal has matured and is active, the policy may have been insufficient as it did not address the issue of promoting partnership with NGOs in Senegal.

#### **4.2. Consistency with High Level Japanese ODA Policies**

These country-level ODA policies are generally consistent with the first ODA Charter, in terms of the Charter's four principles and priority issues. They generally agree with the new ODA Charter as well.

The country-level ODA policies were generally consistent with the first ODA medium-term policy too in terms of priority issues to be addressed for development in Senegal, with the exception of gender issues. Although this policy did not address some issues described in the ODA medium-term policy, such as assistance to the private sector development and partnership with NGOs, consistency as a whole can be observed.

There was a general consistency between the aid policies and the African Aid Initiative (2003), with the exception of assistance to the private sector.

#### **4.3. Consistency with International Development Initiatives**

As the Country Aid Policy contributes toward promotion of the "Tokyo Agenda for Action," it is generally consistent with the TICAD II initiative. However, some priority areas and issues which were addressed in this Agenda were not addressed individually in the Country Aid Policy, such as aid to the poor, and private sector development. Although the priority areas generally coincided with TICAD III, there were some areas which did not, such as private sector development and dialogue with the public.

#### **4.4. Consistency with Senegal's National Development Programmes**

The priority areas addressed in the Country Aid Policy for Senegal were consistent with the 9th Socio-Economic Development Plan with the exception of the decentralization issue. Overall consistency with the F-PRSP is also observed, with the exception of the issues of decentralization and assistance to the socially vulnerable.

As the above facts show, Japan's aid policy to Senegal for the past 10 years was generally consistent with higher level ODA policies, international initiatives, and Senegal national development programmes. Areas and issues which were weak or lacking in consistency were private sector development, assistance to the poor and socially vulnerable people, decentralization, gender and development, cooperation with NGOs, and dialogue with the civil society.

### **5. *Evaluation of the Process***

#### **5.1. Appropriateness of the Formulation Process**

As for the timing of policy dialogue meetings (including the semi-policy dialogue in 2000), the 1995, 1998, and 2000 meetings were held at appropriate timings in light of domestic movements in Japan and Senegal. However, it can be said that the 2004 meeting should have been held much earlier, considering that the full PRSP – the most important policy guideline for Senegal's current development plans – was formulated in 2002.

With respect to the preparatory process in policy formulation, Senegal indicated that a mechanism for systematically understanding Senegal's development needs was not adequate. After 2004, initiatives are being spearheaded by the local ODA task force and the appropriateness in understanding of development needs seems to be improved. There was not a systematic mechanism (on both sides of Japan and Senegal), to involve stakeholders for preparation of the aid policy (especially for participation by the general public and NGOs). In that respect, it was appropriate that local NGOs and other donors were invited to the policy dialogue meeting in 2000, in which opinions over Japanese assistance were exchanged among stakeholders.

When we look at the content, level, and impact of policy dialogues, which were held during the evaluation period, the 1995 and 1998 policy dialogue meetings seemed to have been productive, with the results being incorporated in the Country Aid Policy for Senegal. Although the 2000 meeting can be considered as a "policy dialogue" in terms of substance, the conference results were only partially incorporated into the aid policy for Senegal, due to the fact that the meeting was entitled a "Project Verification Mission" and only JICA representatives participated from the Japan's side. As a result of the 2004 local policy dialogue meeting attended by ODA implementors which lasted for only a half-day, priority issues were identified, two of which were added as the priority sectors under the aid policy for Senegal.

From the above facts, it can be concluded that policy dialogue meetings in the 1990s were appropriate in terms of content, level, and impact. After 2000, when the effective period for the initial Country Aid Policy was supposedly over, it can be said that high level policy dialogue meetings attended by representatives from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and JICA headquarters should have been held periodically, and aid policies should have been formulated anew or revised.

Country Aid Policies are normally formulated and revised in approximately 5 year spans, and it is appropriate that high level policy dialogue meetings are held to coincide with periods of formulation, revision, and intermediate reviews of Country Aid Policies. As Senegal has made a proposal based upon other donors' cases, it is desirable that the following be carried out in the future: 1) high level policy dialogue meetings are held once every 3–5 years to agree upon medium-term frameworks for development assistance; 2) a framework is designed for jointly conducting programme formulation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of development assistance; 3) present a rough estimate for a provision of Japan's aid for Senegal on a medium-term basis.

With respect to policy dialogue meetings, respect should be paid to local task force initiatives. During the period in which high level dialogue meetings are not conducted, the local ODA task force should conduct an annual policy dialogue meeting, and a framework which allows stakeholders such as the civil society and NGOs to systematically participate in such policy dialogues should be established to enhance better understanding and to ensure the legitimacy of identification process of development needs.

## **5.2. Appropriateness of the Implementation Process of Aid Policy**

It is important that an implementation of Japan's aid be consistent with priority sectors/sub-sectors under the aid policy for Senegal. With respect to water supply, education, environment, and agricultural sectors, the number of issues have been narrowed down into priority sub-sectors. However, with respect to the environmental sector for example, village level needs for nurseries were administered at the regional level, and with respect to the agricultural sector, rather than providing for soft component aid which was high in terms of the Senegal's priority list, aid in the form of materials (fertilizers and pesticides) was predominant. In the area of health and sanitation, assistance toward priority sub-sectors such as primary health care and basic health and medical services was delayed, and aid was instead directed toward health facilities at the national and regional levels. In the area of fisheries, many issues were identified, but they were not directly related to the promotion of small-scale fisheries, a priority sub-sector of Japan's assistance to Senegal.

The evaluation team points out that some of the selected priority sub-sectors were not consistent with the Japanese aid capacity at the time. Soft component assistance for the education sector, and primary health care and basic health and medical services in the health sector are among such examples. In the fishery sector, the emphasis of assistance shifted away from the selected priority sub-sectors (promotion of small-scale fisheries) towards indirect support to the fishery sector addressing the needs for creation of a favorable environment for investment in the sector during the evaluation period. It was not appropriate that such a shift was not reflected in the description of Aid Policy for Senegal. Therefore, priority sub-sectors need to be selected and sufficiently described in the future Country assistance programme, taking into consideration the existing aid capacities among other things.

As for cross-cutting issues, the Country Aid Policy only described the situation of the armed independence movement in the South as the issue to be paid attention to. Aid was not conducted toward this Southern region during the evaluation period. In that respect, the policy was implemented perhaps appropriately, however, the actual meaning of "paying attention to" was not clear. Therefore, it is difficult to determine if appropriate actions have been taken. As the Country Aid Policy only indirectly covered the other cross-cutting issues under the heading of "promotion of the TICAD II Tokyo Agenda for Action," it is again difficult to evaluate if policies have been implemented appropriately. In relation to the Agenda stated above, although the issues of capacity-building and external debt were addressed, the mainstreaming of gender issues, poverty reduction, and decentralization were inadequate.

As for selection of aid schemes during the evaluation period, it can be said that policies were implemented appropriately in that grant aids and technical cooperation were provided, while new loans were not provided.

Among aid modalities, although donor cooperation primarily took the form of information exchange at the policy level and, collaboration initiatives at the project level, it is difficult to evaluate their appropriateness as the Country Aid Policy for Senegal did not specify modalities for donor cooperation,. Coordination between various schemes was appropriate, as a combination of grant aid and technical cooperation was regularly being considered and

tie-up projects were constantly being formulated. Since the issue of South-South cooperation was only indirectly mentioned in the aid policy, evaluation of appropriateness in policy implementation is difficult. The cases for collaboration among various sectors and with NGOs were only observed on a limited basis.

Finally, the lack of an adequate framework for monitoring and evaluation of aid policies also made it difficult to ensure the appropriateness of policy implementation. In addition to incorporating indices into a country assistance programme to measure the degree of achievement toward the development goals and objectives, it is important that an agreement be reached with Senegal as regards monitoring and evaluation timings, and their methodologies. Establishing and implementing of systematic monitoring and evaluation will ensure the appropriate implementation of programmes.

## **6. *Evaluation on the Results***

### **6.1. Effectiveness for Priority Sectors**

Regarding the results in each priority sector, namely water supply, human resource development (vocational training), and the fishery sectors, the results were significant and the impacts in the region were important in comparison with other sectors of intervention. In the education and environment sectors, contributions, to a certain extent, were observed. But in the areas of health and agriculture, only limited results were seen. As there has been very little input for the economic infrastructure, no remarkable contribution was observed in this sector.

Water supply (rural water supply in particular), vocational training and fishery sectors are the areas into which donors other than Japan or even the Government of Senegal have not made a significant level of inputs. Japan's assistance has comparatively had an advantage in these sectors and, as a consequence, the achievements and impacts made by Japanese interventions have been very important. Significant impacts have been made toward these sectors since 2000 when Japan's Technical Cooperation programmes were strengthened, in such sub-sectors as pre-school education in the education sector and community forestry in the environment sector. In these sub-sectors, Japanese assistance contributed to improve the capacities of counterparts, local authorities and local communities through such activities. A JICA expert, with significant experiences and knowledge in the fishery sector, had devoted much time and efforts toward its development and, as a result, brought about large contribution to the sector.

### **6.2. Effectiveness for Cross-cutting Issues, Aid Schemes and Aid Modalities**

Japanese aid has responded to such cross-cutting issues as poverty reduction, gender and decentralization. As for poverty reduction efforts, much more Japanese aid has been delivered to farming or fishing villages in remote areas (where many poor people reside) in contrast to other donors. It can, therefore, be said that Japanese aid has targeted poor groups. However, such assistance is not especially focused on the poorest groups. There might be cases in which non-poor groups benefit whereas the poorest groups do not. It is difficult to recognize that Japan's aid contributed to poverty reduction on a sustainable basis.

Regarding gender issues, although women were beneficiaries in the water supply, fisheries and pre-school education sectors, it is uncertain if women also benefited from Japanese interventions in terms of their empowerment and participation in socially important decision makings. As for decentralization, since Japan has just started its cooperation programme for local administration, it is too early to evaluate its performance.

With respect to aid schemes, Technical Cooperation has contributed to enhance the capacity of the Government of Senegal. Grant Aid has been highly evaluated by the Senegalese government and by NGOs, especially with respect to its quality. However, grant aid comes at high costs due to the fact that it is tied for its implementation.

Among numerous aid modalities, “Aid coordination” has not yet produced any significant results due to its short history in Senegal. While aid coordination has both advantages and disadvantages, the readiness for each donor operating in Senegal seems to be varied. Taking these into consideration, it might be difficult for Japan to engage in it to full extent. But in order for Japan to encourage the ownership of Senegal and to take leadership in Japan’s priority sectors and those in which Japan has a comparative advantage, Japan should consider giving more focus to the issue of aid coordination in the near future. In terms of coordination among aid schemes, positive results are being reported especially in the cases of cooperation between Grant Aid and Technical Cooperation. As for South-South cooperation, cases as well as results are limited. Other modalities such as multi-sectoral cooperation and cooperation with NGOs have been utilized only for a limited number of cases, but have already made certain achievements. Taking into consideration the social and economic situations and development needs in Senegal, various types of cooperation, especially cooperation with NGOs, should be promoted and strengthened in the near future.

### **6.3. Contribution toward Sustainability**

Finally, Japan’s assistance has, in principle, always respected ownership by the government of Senegal. By doing so, Japan’s assistance has contributed toward strengthening of Senegal’s ownership and sustainability. In particular, Japan’s “soft-” component assistance enhances capacities at grassroots-level and heightens the ownership in Senegal. It then improves sustainability and self-development in the country. On the other hand, it was observed that a portion of Japan’s “hard-” component aid might hinder the Senegal side from developing self-reliance because Japan’s ODA is being “tied” and the choice of technology/skills to be transferred is not entirely appropriate.

## **7. Recommendations**

### **7.1. Recommendations for future Country Assistance Programme for Senegal**

#### **7.1.1. Definite Objectives and Goals**

The past Country Aid Policy for Senegal did not necessarily specify its development objectives and goals in clear terms. Because of this, it seems that the purpose of Japanese ODA has not been well understood, nor has it been very clear on what aid practitioners are

expected to achieve through the implementation of Japan's aid policy/strategies. It is necessary to clarify the objectives at the higher level of Japan's ODA Policy for Senegal in order to enhance its consistency, transparency, predictability and effectiveness. This can be realized by describing clearly mid- to long-term objectives. The mid-term objectives are expected to be more concrete and set specific indicators as much as possible in response to Senegal's development objectives.

### **7.1.2. Strict Application of "Selection and Concentration"**

Narrowing down the number of priority sectors for Japan's assistance to a more limited one might be necessary for Japan in light of its position as a semi-major donor. That would help to produce high quality development outcomes and impact. The current 8 priority sectors might be too many for Japan as a semi-major donor. There is a likelihood that Japan's assistance might turn out to be ineffective given the current limited size of human and financial resources. Some of the current priority sectors for Japan's assistance might be considered as less significant in terms of impact and outcomes it can bring about.

As for selection and concentration, it is appropriate that choices be made, taking into account first and foremost development needs in Senegal, as well as the past performance and comparative advantages for Japan's assistance in Senegal. Taking all of these into consideration, this report will make propositions based upon alternative approaches: one approach is based on selection of priority sectors for Japan's assistance and the other on prioritization of development issues.

As regards selection of priority sectors, agricultural and private sectors can be considered as high in development needs in Senegal. Water, fisheries and human resource development are the sectors with which Japan seems to have a comparative advantage based upon its past achievements.

In terms of prioritization of development issues, "sustainable economic growth," "alleviation of poverty and social disparity," and "capacity-building" are the three important issues PRSP addresses. "Sustainable economic growth" is to be achieved through promotion of the agricultural and fishery sectors, support to the private sector, development of economic infrastructure, vocational training and environmental conservation. "Alleviation of poverty and social disparity" will be achieved by providing basic social services (education, health and water supply), mainstreaming gender issues and cooperation with NGOs. "Capacity-building" can be realized by human resource development for government officials and local populations.

These days, it seems that an issue-focused approach is being more commonly chosen in formulating aid strategies vis-à-vis a sector-focused approach. As a result, it seems necessary to focus the areas of Japan's interventions even further so that they do not get dispersed when the issue-focused approach is chosen. For targeting Japan's interventions, promotion of small-scale agriculture/fisheries, development of small and medium-scale enterprises, and rural infrastructure development could be suggested because they could lead to "alleviation of poverty and social disparity." Further focusing on primary education, non-formal education, and health and medical services in rural areas are also important. Regarding

“capacity-building”, it is necessary to focus on providing training opportunities at the local and grass-roots level, rather than at the central level.

### **7.1.3. Clear Presentation of Japan’s Assistance**

With regard to development issues, it is desirable that language and phrases should be clear-cut and Japan’s stance and positions for its Country Assistance Policy in Senegal should be more easily understood, rather than using such expressions as “take note of the issue.” Although there might be cases in which too clear descriptions would make flexible application difficult, the policy and position can be modified later on with clear explanations according to the changes in development circumstances.

### **7.1.4. Consideration on Appropriate Choice of Aid Schemes and Modalities**

#### **(1) Cautious approach for resumption of loan aid**

Since Senegal is one of the HIPC’s, it is necessary to carefully examine Senegal’s debt sustainability for resuming provision of loan aids, so that Senegal will not fall back again into the state of accumulation of debt. It is necessary for Japan to explain its decision as and when Japan has determined that Senegal has become again eligible for receiving new loans

#### **(2) An attempt for budget support**

While Japan’s aid to Senegal is to be implemented on a project basis for the time being, it is desirable that Japan starts to be involved in budget support on a trial basis. This is to enhance Senegal’s ownership. By maintaining a passive position for this type of support, it may become difficult for Japan to take leadership in its priority sectors or to deepen discussions on such sectors for future formulation of Country Assistance Programmes. This is because there is a possibility that important policy discussions will be increasingly coordinated under the common framework held by a number of donors.

However, taking into account the issue of accountability with respect to Japan’s ODA, it is necessary to learn from other countries which have experience in budget support and to gradually advance Japan’s involvement with it. It is also desirable to combine a project-based assistance with budget support when necessary and appropriate.

### **7.1.5. Efficient and Effective Use of Aid Types**

#### **(1) Enhanced coordination among different types of development partnership**

For more effective and efficient assistance, it is desirable to coordinate various types of cooperation such as cooperation among donors, coordination among aid schemes, multi-sectoral interventions, and partnership with NGOs, under concrete strategies toward Senegal. Coordination among schemes has already brought about concrete results. In a country like Senegal where the NGO community is active and mature, and where decentralization is making progress, it is appropriate to strengthen cooperation with NGOs.

#### **(2) Promotion of South-South Cooperation**

It is desirable to promote South-South Cooperation within West Africa by making good use of Senegal’s position as a leading country in the sub-region (West Africa and also francophone

African countries), as well as the presence of JICA's Regional Support Office for West and Central Africa, which was recently established in Senegal. In response to strong wishes of Senegal to learn from East Asian countries' experiences in achieving economic development, it is advisable to actively work on South-South cooperation between Asia and Africa, mentioned in the high-level Japanese ODA policies.

## **7.2. Establishment of a Senegal-Japan Cooperation Framework and Regular Policy Dialogue**

### **7.2.1. Agreement on a Senegal-Japan Cooperation Framework**

In order to enhance Senegal's ownership and strengthen partnerships between Senegal and Japan, it is recommended that a medium term framework of development cooperation be agreed upon while a country assistance programme be established on the basis of such framework. The formulation and revision of such a framework agreement and country assistance programme should be synchronized.

Predictability for Japan's assistance in Senegal can be enhanced by the framework agreement on the medium term objectives, priority development issues/sectors to be tackled, modalities to achieve such objectives with, schedules and criteria for mid-term reviews and evaluations, and the roles and obligations of both countries, as well as by presenting an estimated total budget for Japan's aid for Senegal during the agreed period,

### **7.2.2. Regular Policy Dialogue Meetings**

At the time of formulation and revision of the above mentioned framework agreement and country assistance programme, it is necessary to hold high-level policy dialogue meetings. It is also desirable to organize similar meetings during mid-term reviews. At the time of such high-level policy meetings, while respecting and making good use of roles of the local ODA Task Force, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and JICA Headquarters in Tokyo should consider sending a delegation in order to ensure consistency with high level Japanese ODA policies and any other related initiatives. In other years, the local ODA Task Force should hold annual meetings with the government of Senegal.

It is important to ensure participation of various stakeholders such as from civil society (e.g., NGOs) to achieve a participatory and transparent process for aid policy formulation (framework agreement and country assistance programme) and for organizing regular policy dialogue meetings.