

SENEGAL:

**FINAL EVALUATION
RURAL DECENTRALIZATION
SUPPORT PROGRAM
(PADMIR)**

**SUBMITTED TO:
UNITED NATIONS
CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

06 JUNE 2007

Prepared by:

ECI Africa

Maple Place North

Woodmead Business Park

145 Western Service Road

Woodmead 2148

Tel: +2711 802 0015

Fax: +2711 802 1060

www.eciafrica.com



TABLE OF CONTENT

1. PROGRAM SUMMARY	1
2. PROGRAM PROFILE	2
3. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	4
4. KEY FINDINGS	5
5. LESSONS LEARNED	10
6. RECOMMENDATIONS	11
7. TEAM COMPOSITION	15

“The analysis and recommendations of this report do not necessarily reflect the view of the United Nations Capital Development Fund, its Executive Board or the United Nations Member States. This is an independent publication of UNCDF and reflects the views of its authors”

1. PROGRAM SUMMARY

Project number:	SEN / 98 / C01 (UNCDF) SEN /98 / 001 (UNDP)
Project title:	Rural Decentralization Support Project (PADMIR)
Government agency:	Directorate of Local Authorities, Ministry of Home Affairs
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
Project closing date:	June 2007
Initial budget:	\$7.500.000
Of which,	
UNCDF:	\$ 6.000.000
UNDP:	\$ 1.500.000
Additional Budget:	\$2.888.150
European Union:	XOF1 Billion ¹
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
Date of mid-term evaluation:	December 2001
Last tripartite review of PADMIR:	21 November 2006

¹ Currency is the CAF Franc (XOF). Exchange rate : 1 \$US=XOF542.40

2. PROGRAM PROFILE

The Rural Decentralization Support Project (PADMIR) aims to promote “sustainable human development” for people in 37 Rural Communities (RC) in the Kébémér and Kafrine Departments² by, on the one hand improving local governance, through better provision of local public infrastructures and services (PIS) and support changes to the decentralized planning and funding system and policies, and on the other hand by promoting the birth of local economic dynamics by supporting local economic investments.

The two immediate objectives, corresponding to the two PADMIR main components, were:

Component A: “Produce and document a noticeable improvement in delivering infrastructures and services in view of development in the RC, through a mechanism of decentralized funding supported by a local participative planning process”. To this objective was added the sub project “Local Economic Governance”, integrated to PADMIR in 2001 aiming to contribute to the birth of local economic dynamics.

Component B: “Supporting the Senegalese Government, through the instigation of a national political dialogue, in adopting concrete legal and regulatory measures to institutionalize and strengthen decentralized planning and funding for rural/local development”.

Initially planned for a five-year period, PADMIR has been extended for 2 more years in 2004, following the recommendations made by the tripartite review, in order to encourage a dynamic of take over for the program.

PADMIR works in two departments, where there are project’s local offices called Technical Assistance Units (TAU). The program started with a pilot phase in nine RCs (corresponding to the Ndande districts in Kébémér and the Nganda District in Kafrine). In 2002, the program was extended to all the RCs (37 in total) in the two departments, representing a total population of around 600 000 inhabitants.

PADMIR’s national context is characterized by the implementation on the one hand of the second Strategic Document for Poverty Reduction 2006-2010 (*Document Stratégique de Réduction de la Pauvreté 2006-2010* - DSRP II) based on the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and, on the other hand the National Program for Local Development (NPLD) supported by the World Bank, which aims to continue the decentralization and local development process by creating a unique policy and implementation framework that the development partners are encouraged to use for their interventions.

To fit in that context, the UNS in Senegal has defined a Development Assistance Framework in Senegal (UNDAF) for the period 2007-2011. This framework is based on three strategic axes of cooperation, as per the Strategic Document for Poverty Reduction (DSRP II) priorities:

1. “Wealth creation and fight against hunger and poverty to achieve sustainable development” (with the objective of a “pro-poor” growth based on an accelerated growth

² Situated respectively in the Louga and Kaolack Regions.

strategy and on re-defining sectoral policies which can enhance and accompany wealth creation),

2. “Promoting basic social services” (through the valorization of human capital, natural environment and capacity building),
3. “Governance and the promotion of development partnership” (by backing the rule of law in a democratic society, promoting efficiency and transparency in economic and social management and decentralization of local development).

3. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of the evaluation is broken down as follows:

- To assess whether the PADMIR anticipated results have been achieved, compared to the project design and to the logical framework as revised in 2003, focusing specifically on the dialogue mechanisms put in place by the project and on the potentiality for increasing internal resources in rural communities in order to boost the local economy.
- To grapple with the issue of allocation and productivity effectiveness of PADMIR compared to other strategies or approaches.
- To assess how relevant PADMIR has been in terms of its expected impact on local governance, Provision of Infrastructures and Services (PIS), Natural Resources Management (NRM), Local Economic Development (LED) and on decentralization policy in Senegal.
- Evaluate PADMIR performance compared to the indicators set in the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF).
- Review the impact of PADMIR on poverty reduction.
- Give an opinion on the main orientations that could be developed for supporting decentralization and local development within a future UNDP and UNCDF program.
- Comment on the strategy of a new Program, which has been described in a conceptual document submitted to the UNCDF in June 2006.

4. KEY FINDINGS

Finding 1: Conception and promotion of a Local Participative Planning process (LPP)

In total, 32 RCs have been able to benefit from Local Development Plans (LDP) and Local Investments Plans (LIP), developed by the population through the dialogue structures, validated and approved by local and administrative. Generally speaking, we can say that the LPP process has taken into account priority needs of the poor. The LIP integrating priority investments that were undertaken during a first three-year period and the Annual Investment Plan (AIP)³, have been relevant tools for piloting investments in the RCs, while LDPs have shown some weaknesses, which raises the question of their relevance concerning the implementation of local development inclusive strategies.

There is no doubt that one of PADMIR's achievements has been breaking down the LDPs in LIPs and AIPs, which allow for a better execution of the LDP and a faster updating process of the LIP, as well as connecting these tools with the national planning system. Another of PADMIR major achievements was to be able to mobilize various development partners around the LIP, for instance through "Partners' Forums" organized by the TAUs, therefore contributing to harmonizing various planning approaches, following the principle established by the Paris Declaration.

However, the LPP process implemented by PADMIR proved to be long, complex and relatively expensive, making his reproducibility uncertain. Moreover, the TAUs have continued to exercise the leadership in interventions and the existing structures have not been made responsible, as per the UNCDF's intervention philosophy. Regarding the dialogue structures put in place by PADMIR (Village Committees for Development⁴ and Inter-Village Committees for Development⁵) we have to note that most of them did not work besides the development of the LDPs and we have to wonder whether the idea of institutionalizing these committees in the NPLD would be a good move.

Finding 2: Conceptualization and introduction of a funds transfer mechanism for financing local public infrastructures and services

Enabling the Local Development Fund (LDF) to be operational as both an innovative system for managing public expenditure and a mechanism to take participative decision concerning the development of community investments via the National Treasury channel is certainly PADMIR's most innovative achievement. It pictures beforehand how the UNS could increase the budget support with the view to re-enforce the national ownership of such programs.

³ Constituted by some elements from the LIP integrated in the investment section of the budget for the relevant year.

⁴ *Comités villageois de Développement (VDC).*

⁵ *Comités Inter-villageois de Développement (IVDC).*

The budgetary support has been considered as a true “breath of fresh air” by the RCs, as it allowed them to use their budget for investment expenditures and to promote their responsibility since they pay a matching contribution. Since its introduction, this mechanism has managed to catalyze some interventions from other development partners⁶, by providing a coherent framework for testing and using their own funding.

The efficiency of using the Public Treasury channel has however been low, because of amongst other things, the difficulty for the different stakeholders (such as the Treasury services and the RCs) to master the LDF channel, Complex procedures for implementing public expenditures, delays in LDF transfers and payments and, the utilization of different levels of matching contribution and criteria for attributing funds by the partners with the consequence that PADMIR could not always recover the RCs matching contribution.

Le DFL has had a definite impact on the RCs’ financial performance, through a marked growth of their own revenues, in particular regarding the recovery rate of the rural tax. However, we have to admit that the level of own revenue is too low to expect a proper takeover on investment expenditures after PADMIR departure. This means that the RCs will continue to depend for several years on transferred revenues and assistance from development partners.

Finding 3: Improving local institutions’ capacity to sustainably manage the LAs (planning, budgeting and undertaking development projects)

The LPP and LDF’s operations have been sustained by the TAUs’ effort to build technical and managerial capacity of local stakeholders, for instance through training on the LPP and on budget development and management of infrastructures. Some communication activities have been embarked on, particularly through using “traditional communicators”, broadcasting radio programs on the theme of decentralization, distributing media material and translating didactic material in local languages. Above all, with a view to encourage the taking over of the funding supported by the program, PADMIR has provided since 2004 some strong support to raise local funding, through a number of activities in eight RCs, representing both departments⁷.

It is however not possible to state that all the RCs have a “functioning” administration. It is probably preferable to refer to a “seed” of local administration. Indeed, significant disparities remain among the RCs in their communal management ability. Besides, one can regret that there was no monitoring process in place regarding the organized training sessions which could have measured the acquired knowledge, especially in terms of financial capacity.

Finding 4: Development of local community investments up to the planning ceiling established by the LDF (infrastructures, IGA and NRM)

⁶ Such as the European Union.

⁷ Surveying the potential of weekly markets, organizing one-day pilot to test the collection of the rural tax and hold “feedback Forums” within targeted RCs, as well as adopting “resources mobilization work plans” in the RCs.

72 % of the LDF has been used for collective social infrastructures, 23 % for income generating activities, 2% only for the natural resources management (NRM) and 3 % for institutional support. The team believes that PADMIR reached its immediate objectives of improving the PIS, through the LDF mechanism underpinned by a LPP process. It is however more difficult to form an opinion on the question of whether the PIS as managed by the program, was more effective and efficient than in other programs. Indeed if PADMIR has enabled the development of infrastructures and services corresponding to priority needs of poor people at reasonable costs for them, it has been less efficient than other programs such as the World Bank's Social Development Fund Program (*Programme du Fonds de Développement Social* - PFDS) regarding delivery schedules. However, even if we take into account this last point, we also have to consider the nature of the system in place and its probable sustainability compared to other systems: as opposed to the PFDS and a number of NGOs, PADMIR has tried not only to ensure that the PIS reflects people needs, but also to re-enforce the integrity of the local governance system. The PFDS did not have this imperative and could act more quickly and directly than PADMIR. While evaluating PADMIR performance, we also have to consider the position adopted by the UNS and other development partners which favor budgeting support that strengthens Government systems and procedures within a strategy of national development, but to the detriment of support to projects that work outside of government systems. Considering these issues, PADMIR's results regarding the PIS can be seen as very positive.

The evaluation team noted that the major constraint to sustainable local investments developed thanks to PADMIR was that the issues related to maintenance were not sufficiently taken into account, given the objective of sustainable investments. We note that the program did not manage to promote the establishment of Management Committees (MC) for the infrastructures (or to enhance their value when they existed), through careful consideration of the most appropriate management mechanisms.

Regarding the Income Generating Activities (IGA), more than 500 Grassroots Community Organizations (GCO) benefited from micro-credits. The micro-projects' Local Granting Committee (LGC) put in place by the program contributed to a high rate of reimbursement, even if in Kébémér there were difficulties for the LGC regarding the technical and financial monitoring. PADMIR's major innovation in this area has been to associate the savings and credit unions to the micro-projects, by supporting the establishment of a contractual relationship with the CRs.

We believe that the IGA constituted a way of fighting poverty, contributing to better life conditions for the population, to food self-sufficiency, to a better social status and more autonomy for women. However, the activities (essentially linked to petty trading) were not part of a strategy of wealth creation, as per the UNDAF strategy. Besides, the micro-projects did not allow exploiting synergies with the NRM initiatives, which might compromise the achievement of the program development objective, namely "sustainable human development".

Promotion of the Local Economy component:

Regarding the implementation of the "local economic governance" sub-project, a diagnosis study of the local economy following the ECOLOC methodology from the Partnership for Municipal Development (*Partenariat pour le Développement Municipal* - PDM) was certainly justified and so was the mobilization of the main local stakeholders around the LED theme. It is however

appropriate to highlight the slowness, the cumbersome process and the high cost of this research. We wonder whether the invested time and resources justify the results, even more as these studies did not lead to concrete activities, even small, promoting the local economy which could have motivated the already mobilized local stakeholders and committed them more firmly to a concrete LED process.

Finding 5: Design and introduction of a Monitoring and Evaluation System (MES) for PADMIR in connection with the national stakeholders/decision makers

We have to note first that the conception and implementation of a MES for PADMIR depended on the development by the UNCDF headquarter of an electronic database management system, the Management Information System (MIS), which was only done in 2002. The team believes that the system put in place has facilitated the effective monitoring of the program implementation, at the national and TAU levels, even if we have to mention that the lack of a baseline at the start up of the program has been a constraint.

Finding 6: Support to formulating a national policy on decentralized rural development

Soon after the program started, the Senegalese Government stopped the decentralization process several times, by for instance dissolving the LA in 2001 and holding local elections in 2002, with a high proportion of new representative and some institutional instability regarding the decentralization portfolio between 2002 and 2006. All these elements have affected negatively the anticipated results of the PADMIR component B supporting decentralized rural development. Despite all this, PADMIR managed to build capacity of national stakeholders and decision makers, to promote the coordination between development partners through the donors sub-committee for decentralization and, generally to contribute to the political national debate on decentralization.

Amongst the PADMIR expected results, was the development of a reform proposal for the Local Authorities Equipment Fund (*Fonds d'Équipement des Collectivités Locales* - FECL)⁸ and the LPP tools and LPP procedures. PADMIR tried to develop some proposals related to that, by on the one hand drafting the terms of reference for a study on the FECL reform and, on the other hand starting a process supported by the National Pilot Committee (NPC) to capitalize on the LPP procedure. However, the sustainability of these interventions was compromised by some persistent hurdles to institutionalize the experiences and the NPLD was entrusted with leading these reforms.

The support provided by PADMIR to the authorities in charge of the decentralization has been conducted in close link with the succession strategy put in place by the program since 2004. That was in particular done by strengthening its partnership with the NPC and with some of its internal structures: a NPC Technical Monitoring Committee NPC was established which took over the

⁸Created in 1977 to facilitate the funding of local public investments and is annually funded par a percentage of the Value Added Tax (VAT).

process of learning from the PADMIR's experience on several themes (such as budgetary support, cooperation between municipalities, IGA and micro-finance). At local level, the result of this assistance was the implementation of "Agreed Plans for capacity building" for the stakeholders involved in the program take over.

Finally, PADMIR initiated a major reflection on the establishment of an integration process targeting local stakeholders at department level, through the concept of a "Local Development House" (LDH). Conceived as a space and a tool to enhance participatory local development and solidarity amongst municipalities, the LDH was supposed to provide close-up assistance and advice to build the capacity of local stakeholders. However, it is not certain that the local elected representatives and their associations have fully agreed with the principle and it would be important to pursue some activities of sensitization and negotiation with the Associations of Local Representatives to strengthen the political and institutional legitimacy of the concept.

Regarding PADMIR component B, the issue of sustainability is broader than at the local level: PADMIR's work at national level supports the NPLD in its undertaking to provide a funding support mechanism. In that regard, the NPLD provides some guarantee at national level for the LDF in all RCs. To this extent, the UNCDF should pay more attention within the framework of a new program, to supporting the persons responsible at national level to implement the NPLD, given its widely recognized role as a "laboratory" of decentralization.

If one refers to the distinction established in the Evaluation Manual between the two types of Local Development Programs (LDP)⁹, we note that PADMIR has mostly achieved LDP 1 given the above-mentioned series of factors. Instead, LDP 2 remains in an embryonic state. In fact, the local circumstances for implementing the model were quite unfavorable and it was difficult despite PADMIR's efforts to build capacity to overcome these issues within the available time period. Even if the LDP model has proven to be pertinent and efficient, it seems that more time would be required to be able to consolidate it. This is in any case the opinion of numerous local and national stakeholders in the decentralization process in Senegal. Continuously building on capacity will be key to ensuring the long-term sustainability of programs supporting decentralization such as PADMIR.

⁹ LDP 1 is a program designed and supported by UNCDF with its own funding (and/or government or donor partner) and its own technical assistance managed according to its specific logical framework and time frame. LDP 2 is a collection of practices and institutions incorporated in a local and national government system which carries on after the end of UNCD intervention.

5. LESSONS LEARNED

PADMIR has demonstrated that a LDP focusing on introducing a decentralized funding mechanism for developing community infrastructures could lead to improved PIS, with a positive impact on poverty reduction. However, introducing this system in RCs with a low financial, technical and human capacity can only be done slowly. Thus, the initial duration scheduled for 5 years was too short for such a program to have a real impact on behaviors and practices linked to decentralization. Moreover, the sustainability of such a system and especially, ensuring that continued growth and a development dynamic based on learning and innovation are well rooted represent major challenges for a program such as PADMIR. This requires not only a longer period of assistance, but also taking into account new elements which are not yet fully developed within the LDP model, namely the LED and NRM.

The second lesson refers to risk management in the PADMIR implementation. In particular, it would have been important to update regularly the critical conditions of a pilot project such as PADMIR, which intervention philosophy is based on the accountability of existing structures. Such a process would have allowed for better responses to unfavorable changes in the political, institutional and economic context and would have been particularly relevant at the end of the program pilot phase.

Specific lessons:

- i. The formalization of relations between the different players at the local level and the satisfaction of their needs for capacity building are necessary pre-conditions to effectively develop community investments and their sustainability.
- ii.
- iii. Budget support for the Local Authorities was a constraint for the development of infrastructures and slowed down the pace of investment and, of implementation of micro-projects. It must therefore be accompanied at institutional level by some strengthening of the State services that are supposed to support it.
- iv. The sustainability of processes already in place can only truly occur once the different partners at local level take part in the decision making process, in the monitoring and evaluation of the activities and will strengthen their capacity to support the RCs. As such, setting up of a system for monitoring the activities of capacity building is an integral part of the effort to improve the capacity of the local authorities.
- v. Pursuing the objective of "sustainable development" should be done through the recognition of three essential elements: local capacity building, creating basic infrastructures and developing sustainable livelihoods.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The mission recommends that the UNCDF supports a new program in assisting the decentralization and local development process in Senegal. The purpose would be to consolidate the work done by PADMIR, to finalize work in some intervention areas, to introduce some new elements, while supporting the Senegalese State in the implementation of the NPLD. This new program could be implemented in one of the PADMIR implementation zones (more specifically, in the Louga region).

Recommendations for the Senegalese Government:

- To simplify the planning tools and reduce the duration of the LPP: the revision of the LDP format seems obvious, linked to their half-way update.
- To promote the development of community investments, following the principle of solidarity between municipalities, as a preferred strategy to optimize the LDPs and local development activities.
- To capitalize on and make sustainable the synergy between partners around the LPP, over and above the PADMIR experiences, by for instance broadening the NPC to other programs.
- To simplify the expenditure channel and promote its full electronic automation, to improve the efficiency of the budgetary support to the LAs.

Specific Recommendations for the UNCDF:

- To assist the RDA in preparing the “Conferences on harmonization” planned in the NPLD framework, aiming to better take into account the sectoral policies.
- To plan some strong programs to build the capacity of the private sector, with a view to revitalize the local economy.
- To instill a culture of maintaining the infrastructures, through for instance more support to the MCs.
- To establish a distinction between micro-credits for improving the life conditions and reducing poverty and, micro-credits that promote the development of small and micro enterprises, with a view to create growth and wealth.
- To envisage the creation of funding structures benefiting village communities, within the ambit of the IGA funds.
- To raise the awareness of the RCs and the population with regard to the interest to undertake actions in natural resources and environment management. This should demonstrate that any action in this area is useful, whatever its level, and that NRM is an effective way to fight poverty. Linked to that, one should promote a contractual process with the RCs and the GCOs in the framework of implementing the IGAs that would link the fight against poverty to environment conservation.
- Regarding the LED fledgling structure in the Kébémér department, it would be appropriate to ensure that its supporting roles are clearly defined, that the resources available will be

adequate to achieve its objectives and that it will be able to meet the expectations of local stakeholders. There should be a parallel and complementary approach between the creation of that structure and the implementation of concrete LED-related actions, so that the two could reinforce each other.

- To make a clear difference between the implementation of the LDH (as a place and mechanism of assistance and advice, training and information for local representatives, with the objective to promote some solidarity between communities) and the LED structure, with well identified missions (improving business environment, strengthening small and micro enterprises. Lower barriers to entry to markets).

Specific Comments on PADIET:

A Conceptual Document on the “Program supporting the institutional, economic and technological Development of Local Authorities” (PADIET¹⁰) was presented to the UNCDF in June 2006. This is seen as the UNCDF and UNDP’s operational response to the NPLD, which would use innovations to advance the process of decentralization. The immediate objective of PADIET is “local capacity building to support an inclusive and sustainable regional development”. By taking as a point of departure some of the PADMIR’s achievements (such as those regarding the LPP and the LDF), the suggested innovations focus on supporting the LAs in their role as the engine of local development, through mastering the LED better, the use of new technologies for promoting investments and, providing “local public service” leading to LED with a better coordination between the PIS, the IGA, NRM.

On the basis of the main elements contained in the Conceptual Document, the team can comment on the following:

- The LED which is PADIET major theme is particularly relevant given the weak links so far between the decentralization process and the promotion of local economies. Both the NPLD and the PNBG¹¹ focus on that theme and on strengthening economic governance; PADIET also and appropriately focuses on the same issues. To complement this strategy, it would be important to prioritize activities promoting a “pro-poor” growth, by reference to the Accelerated Growth Strategy (SCA), by for instance strengthening existing small and micro-enterprises.
- If the validity of the “wealth creation” approach through the LED is recognized, it would however be essential to promote a link with the protection and valorization of natural resources, in a perspective of more sustainable livelihoods for vulnerable groups.

¹⁰ *Programme d’Appui au Développement institutionnel, économique et technologique des Collectivités locales.*

¹¹ Six components: improving the quality of public service; local governance; economic governance; judicial governance; improving the quality of parliament work, and; developing information and communication technologies.

- The objectives assigned to PADIET should be more explicitly consistent with the UNDAF Program Effects (UNDAF effect 1) such as:
 - Program Effect 1.1 : “A strong improvement of the national productive capacity in terms of competitiveness, products quality, value added, creation of qualified jobs and investments in the UNS focus areas (MDG 1 : reduction of extreme poverty and hunger)”,
 - Program Effect 1.2: “Increasing income of the poor and vulnerable groups in the UNS focus areas (MDG 1, 3, 6)”.
- Regarding the improvement of national productive capacity, PADIET could focus on improving employment for the youth and women, through the acquisition of competencies and qualifications and, the development of small and micro-enterprises and, micro-projects for instance in the framework of the Millennium Villages.
- The principle of "competitiveness" should be an important element in the design of this program, according to the SCA guidelines. The German Cooperation is about to test some new approaches based on participatory methodologies for evaluating competitiveness in the Kaolack region; the future program could pay attention to that.
- In the course of implementing LED, the notion of “development poles” should be taking into account as well as promoting the integration of the three LC level (regional, departmental and local), while focusing on the key role played by the RCs.
- Following the "co-production by players" principle brought forwards by the NPLD, it would be important in the framework of a new program to pay attention to capacity building targeting the private sector, since this is an essential directive in the National Development Strategy for the Private Sector.
- The deepening of the decentralization process can only continue in parallel with a process of increased devolution of power. In this context, the new program should explicitly include in its objective of capacity building, the regional and departmental technical services of the State, and encourage the Senegalese government to conduct a more proactive policy in terms of regionalization.
- The team recommends that the formulation of a new program takes fully into account the process of learning from and disseminating the PADMIR experiences (which finalization should, in our view, be subject to a broader consultation), particularly as regards the LPP process.
- PADIET should promote a better coordination with the sectoral policies adopted by the technical Ministries (including Education, Health, and Environment), so that the objectives of supporting decentralization and the objectives of sectoral Programs could be mutually reinforced at the local level, with a view to support sectoral approaches (SWAp).
- More specifically, the team suggests that the future program fits into the NPLD, by improving the budget support mechanism to the LAs, piloting planning procedures at inter-municipality level and standardizing current LPP procedures, coordinating sectoral policies at local level,

developing viable maintenance systems for the infrastructure, supplying economic infrastructure (Markets, abattoirs, truck stops and rural phone systems), continuing to mobilize RCs' own resources (using the SAFIC methodology) and piloting new LED approaches; all these elements correspond to the NPLD strategic orientations.

- Finally, the mission recommends that the future program continues supporting the reflection process on the decentralization policy at national level, on the basis of the competitive advantage developed by PADMIR in this area. A partnership could be considered with the NPLD Executive Secretariat.

7. TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team included three persons, amongst which two local consultants, Mr. Seydou Sow and Mr. Ibrahima Gaye and an international consultant, Mrs. Valérie Hindson, acting as project leader.

Mr. Sow, expert in public infrastructure, planning and environmental issues, was responsible for the areas related to infrastructures and local development funds.

M. Gaye, lecturer on project monitoring and evaluation and on rural economy, was responsible for the areas related to Income Generating Activities, micro finance and the monitoring and evaluation system.

Mrs. Hindson, LED specialist, was more specifically responsible for the areas related local participative planning and the promotion of local economy.