



# 2006 Survey on Monitoring The Paris Declaration

## Country Chapters

### SENEGAL

**T**he 2006 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration was undertaken in 34 countries that receive aid. The results of the survey are presented in two volumes. **Volume 1** provides an overview of key findings across 34 countries. **Volume 2** presents the baseline and key findings in each of the 34 countries that have taken part in the survey. This chapter is based primarily on the data and findings communicated by government and donors to the OECD through the Paris Declaration monitoring process. A more detailed description of this process, how this chapter was drafted and what sources were used is included in Volume 1, Chapter 2.

Both Volume 1 (Overview) and Volume 2 (Country Chapters) of the 2006 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration can be downloaded at the OECD website:

[www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/monitoring](http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/monitoring)

A second round of monitoring will be organised in the first quarter of 2008 and will be an important contribution to the Accra High-Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in September 2008.

IN 2005, SENEGAL HAD A POPULATION OF APPROXIMATELY 11 MILLION. According to the latest survey conducted in 2001-02, the level of poverty in Senegal remains high despite the fact that the poverty level decreased significantly during the period of 1994-2002. The proportion of the population which lives under the poverty line has decreased from 67.9% in 1994-95 to 57.1% in 2001-02, which is a reduction by 10.8 points in absolute terms, or 16% in relative terms.

The donors providing responses to the 2006 survey accounted for over 92% of Senegal's official development assistance (ODA). These responses were considered alongside the World Bank's desk reviews to create the baseline for 2005 and targets for 2010. The key challenges and priority actions arising from this analysis are summarised below. The ongoing development of Senegal's Action Plan on Aid Harmonisation and Effectiveness should provide an important focus for these efforts.

DIMENSIONS	BASELINE	CHALLENGES	PRIORITY ACTIONS
Ownership	Moderate	Need to reflect development priorities more effectively in budgeting process.	Embed medium-term expenditure frameworks (MTEFs) and clarify relationship with other external budget planning frameworks.
Alignment	Low-Moderate	Limited use of national systems, low reporting of aid in the budget.	Improve data on aid disbursements, step up donor use of public financial management systems.
Harmonisation	Moderate	Limited use of harmonised procedures or budget support in programme-based approaches (PBAs).	Identify obstacles in using pooled systems and budget support.
Managing for results	Moderate	Monitoring and evaluation systems only partially in place for monitoring <i>Document de Stratégie de Réduction de la Pauvreté</i> (DRSP) implementation.	Support implementation of co-ordinated approach to monitoring and evaluation at national, regional, sectoral levels.
Mutual accountability	Low	Lack of formal mutual accountability mechanism.	Establish mutual accountability mechanism within the Action Plan for Aid Harmonisation and Effectiveness.

## OVERVIEW Box 28.1 Challenges and priority actions

## OWNERSHIP

OWNERSHIP IS CRITICAL to achieving development results and is central to the Paris Declaration. The Paris Declaration defines ownership in terms of a country's ability to exercise effective leadership and co-ordination of its development policies and strategies. Achieving this – especially in countries that rely heavily on aid to fund their development – is not a simple undertaking. Nor, of course, can it be measured by a single indicator. Indicator 1 assesses the extent to which a country has translated its national development strategies into 'prioritised, results-oriented operational programmes' with which donors can align their assistance.

## INDICATOR 1

---

Senegal received a C rating in the World Bank's 2005 Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) assessment, which provides the baseline for Indicator 1. According to the CDF, an operational strategy calls for a coherent long-term vision and a medium-term strategy derived from it; specific targets serving a holistic, balanced, and well-sequenced development strategy; capacity and resources for its implementation; and the participation of national stakeholders in strategy formulation and implementation.

A C rating implies that Senegal has 'taken action' towards achieving good practice in its operational development strategy. Although Senegal does not have a unified national long-term vision in place, the World Bank's Aid Effectiveness Report (AER) for 2006 reports that long-term reference points include a long-term perspective study, Senegal 2020, currently in preparation; the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD); and the African Union strategic plan. Medium-term development plans are articulated through Senegal's second *Document de Stratégie de Réduction de la Pauvreté* (DSRP2). This was developed with inputs from a wide range of national stakeholders before being approved by the executive in October 2006. It sets out national development strategies from 2006-10.

In response to some of the challenges arising during the implementation of the first DSRP, the AER reports that Senegal's DSRP2 demonstrates a number of improvements in relation to the identification, prioritization, and sequencing of development targets. It has increased its emphasis on rural

poverty and healthcare; it has improved integration of the MDGs, including improvements to costing and prioritization of social programmes; and it has added a fourth area of focus, namely governance and decentralized/participatory development. This latter is intended to strengthen the effectiveness of public sector reform.

The government is using the DSRP as the basis of budgetary reform. Since 2005, it has begun to introduce medium-term expenditure frameworks (MTEFs) to guide the general budget as well as some sectoral budgets. Spending on DSRP priority areas such as education and health has increased. However, more needs to be done to embed MTEFs in the budgeting process, and to clarify the relationship between the global and sectoral MTEFs and the government's triennial investment plans which also impact on budget decisions.

The AER reports that capacity for implementation is improving although more efforts are needed to turn plans into effective actions. Local government powers and resources to support the delivery of social services have increased through a programme of decentralization.

Senegal should aim for at least a B rating by 2010, corresponding to having operational development strategies that are 'largely developed' or 'substantially in place'. The ongoing development of Senegal's Action Plan for Aid Harmonisation and Effectiveness should provide a framework for improvements in relation to the areas of weakness listed above.

---

## ALIGNMENT

THE PARIS DECLARATION REQUIRES DONORS TO MOVE TOWARDS aligning their assistance with national development strategies, institutions and procedures. Improving alignment requires action on the part of both governments and donors. Governments are required to strengthen financial and programme management capacities, and to elaborate coherent and effective policies and plans, while donor agencies are required to overcome institutional blocks to the use of national systems and management structures. Indicators 2 to 8 seek to assess the extent to which assistance is being aligned with Senegal's national development strategies and plans. They consider the extent to which donors are aligning their assistance with Senegal's national development and poverty reduction policies, and also provide an indication of the extent to which donors and government are achieving systems alignment.

INDICATOR 2a

### BUILDING RELIABLE COUNTRY SYSTEMS

Under the World Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) for 2005, the quality of Senegal's budget and financial management systems was rated at 3.5 on a scale of 1 (lowest score) to 6 (highest score), just above the average of 3.2 for all International Development Assistance (IDA) borrowers.

Following the adoption of an action plan based on a Country Financial Accountability Assessment (CFAA) in 2003, the government has taken a number of measures intended to improve the management of public expenditure. The World Bank's AFR 2006 report notes that progress has been made in several areas, such as budget preparation and control, simplification of expenditure channels, and stronger cash and debt management. The introduction of Medium-Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs) is expected to improve expenditure tracking and transfers to beneficiaries. Since the end of 2004, an integrated public financial management system (SIGFIP) has been operational within the Ministry of Economy and Finance. SIGFIP is now integrated into the financial management structures of six ministries (with plans for further extension), and into the budget preparation process for 18 ministries. However, the report also notes that control of budget execution and of state-owned enterprises requires further strengthening.

The government should work to strengthen these weak areas, and must also maintain and extend the improvements that have already taken place, if Senegal is to meet the Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) target of 4.0 set for 2010.

No score is currently available for Indicator 2b on the assessment of the quality of Senegal's procurement systems. Following a review of procurement systems in 2003, the government adopted improved procurement procedures in 2004. However, the World Bank AER 2006 report notes that implementation of the new measures has been slow. The new procurement code has been adopted by the Ministerial Council in March 2006, and its signature by high-level authorities should facilitate speedy implementation. However, the code will only come into effect when all the relevant institutional bodies (Government Procurement Regulatory Board and the Central Government Office for Public Markets) and various decrees related to its implementation are taken up by the Ministry of Economy and Finance. The effective implementation of this will be essential for the improvement of procurement practices, and will require both leadership and capacity.

INDICATOR 2b

INDICATOR 3  
Table 28.1

Are government budget estimates comprehensive and realistic?

	Government's budget estimates of aid flows for FY05 (USD m)	Aid disbursed by donors for government sector in FY05 (USD m)	Baseline ratio*	
	a	b	(%) c=a/b	c=b/a
African Development Bank	6	22	29%	
BADEA	11	3		23%
Belgium	8	7		86%
Canada	26	7		27%
European Commission	76	43		57%
France	32	36	90%	
Germany	18	31	59%	
Global Fund	3	12	25%	
IFAD	8	14	61%	
International Monetary Fund	0	5	0%	
Italy	1	2	42%	
Japan	4	27	16%	
Luxembourg	11	10		92%
Netherlands	5	13	35%	
Switzerland	0	0	38%	
United Nations	7	23	31%	
United States	20	30	66%	
World Bank	165	168	98%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>89%</b>	

\* Baseline ratio is  $c = a / b$  except where government's budget estimates are greater than disbursements ( $c = b / a$ ).

### ALIGNING AID FLOWS ON NATIONAL PRIORITIES

The introduction of the DSRP as the guiding framework for external assistance in Senegal has created the conditions for better alignment of aid flows with national priorities. The World Bank AER 2006 report indicates that several major donors are using the DSRP priorities to guide their assistance strategies. However, this has not yet, in most cases, been translated into use of country systems.

Indicator 3 is a proxy for measuring the alignment of aid flows with national priorities: it measures the extent to which donors' aid disbursements were accurately reflected in the national budget for the year in question. Where planned aid disbursements are accurately reflected in the budget approved by the legislature, this suggests the existence of accurate planning and timely information flow between the government and its external partners, as well as a high level of budget realism.

The table above provides two measures for Indicator 3. The first is based on the ratio between the volume of aid recorded in the budget (numerator) and the amount of aid disbursed for the government sector (denominator). This ratio tells us the degree to which there is overall under-inclusion of aid in the budget (ratio under 100%) or over-inclusion (ratio over 100%). The survey indicates that 89% of the aid disbursed in 2005 had been recorded in the budget, a result which already exceeds the global target figure of 85% for 2010. However, this high overall figure obscures the fact that there were significant variances between the government's budgeted figures and the actual disbursements for 18 donors recorded here. Because the ratios for each donor are either under or above 100% the average value for a country does not provide a good indication of aggregate discrepancies. This is why, in addition to measuring the ratio, a measure of the 'budget gap' is also provided. This better reflects the degree of discrepancy between aid reported by donors as disbursed for the government sector, and that recorded in the budget.

The survey suggests a number of explanations for this variance. For example, donors do not always provide timely information on planned disbursements to enable their accurate inclusion in the budget. Secondly, the budget may itself reflect inaccuracies or lack of realism in the estimation of the rate of programme execution and hence spending; and thirdly, it is a challenge to keep track of expenditures arising from externally-resourced projects and programmes.

The survey also notes that aid disbursed directly to non-governmental organisations and other organisations is not reflected in the national accounts, and nor is spending by donors managing their own operational programmes.

Although the overall percentage of aid on budget was high for the 2005 fiscal year, the line-by-line variances indicate that there is significant room for improvements in planning and communication between donors and government in relation to aid disbursements and their relation in the budget, and that donor participation in budgeting could be strengthened. The survey recommends that the procedures for aid disbursement within the framework of the annual budget exercise be speeded up. The government should put in place a better system for managing information relating to aid flows, and donors should commit to supporting this through improved information provision. Within this context, the process of finalising the implementation of the project on the Action Plan on Aid Harmonisation and Effectiveness in Senegal offers an opportunity to find solutions thin in area. A consultative group, which brings together donors and the government, has been established since February 2007 to analyse how public aid flows are recorded. The group has decided to hire a consultant on this issue to provide a more in-depth analysis.

## CO-ORDINATING SUPPORT TO STRENGTHEN CAPACITY

Capacity constraints significantly undermine the ability of country systems to capture and co-ordinate aid flows effectively. The Paris Declaration commits donors to providing more co-ordinated support for capacity building under country leadership, with the target that 50% of such support should be co-ordinated by 2010.

The survey indicates that only 18% of technical assistance is currently defined as co-ordinated, although the majority of donors state that they have contributed to co-ordinated programmes. Lack of agreement on the definition of co-ordinated support may have led to some under-reporting. (For example, the European Commission response states that none of its technical assistance is coordinated, yet the World Bank AER 2006 report lists the Commission as one of the donors co-ordinating capacity development for fiduciary systems.) The survey also notes that lack of disaggregation of donor data made this indicator difficult to verify.

### How much technical assistance is co-ordinated with country programmes?

	Co-ordinated technical co-operation (USD m) a	Total technical co-operation (USD m) b	Baseline ratio (%) c=a/b
African Dev. Bank	1	1	100%
BADEA	0	0	100%
Belgium	1	1	59%
Canada	6	15	38%
European Commission	0	6	0%
France	2	25	10%
Germany	2	8	29%
Global Fund	0	0	--
IFAD	0	0	--
IMF	0	0	--
Italy	0	0	0%
Japan	3	18	19%
Luxembourg	0	0	0%
Netherlands	1	1	100%
Switzerland	0	1	0%
United Nations	3	10	27%
United States	0	23	0%
World Bank	0	0	30%
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>18%</b>

INDICATOR 4  
Table 28.2

INDICATOR 5  
Table 28.3

How much aid for the government sectors uses country systems?

	Aid disbursed by donors for government sector (USD m) a	Public financial management				Procurement	
		Budget execution (USD m) b	Financial reporting (USD m) c	Auditing (USD m) d	Baseline ratio (%) avg (b,c,d) / a	Procurement systems (USD m) e	Baseline ratio (%) e / a
African Dev. Bank	22	0	0	0	0%	0	0%
BADEA	3	3	3	3	100%	3	100%
Belgium	7	0	0	0	0%	2	33%
Canada	7	0	0	0	0%	0	0%
European Commission	43	13	13	13	29%	13	29%
France	36	18	18	16	49%	22	63%
Germany	31	20	20	0	44%	21	68%
Global Fund	12	0	0	0	0%	0	0%
IFAD	14	0	0	0	0%	14	100%
IMF	5	--	--	--	--	--	--
Italy	2	2	0	0	33%	2	100%
Japan	27	1	1	1	3%	1	3%
Luxembourg	10	0	0	0	0%	--	--
Netherlands	13	11	11	12	89%	12	92%
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	46%	0	0%
United Nations	23	6	0	5	17%	2	8%
United States	30	0	0	0	0%	0	0%
World Bank	168	39	39	39	23%	39	23%
<b>Total</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>29%</b>

Senegal's DSRP includes capacity building as a key development objective, and identifies a range of specific sectoral capacity needs. The World Bank AER 2006 reports that some donors have responded to several of these needs through co-ordinated action, and the survey reports that some sectoral initiatives are now in place. However, despite the existence of the DSRP framework, no national capacity building programme exists so far, and interventions remain fragmented. There is also no comprehensive list of existing co-ordinated capacity building programmes, which would facilitate donor targeting.

Going forward, the survey recommends that donors and government should work together to identify the continued obstacles to co-ordination of technical assistance. On the basis of the findings, the DSRP and the development of the national Action Plan for Aid Harmonisation and Effectiveness could provide a guiding framework for the development of a co-ordinated national capacity building programme effective at global, sectoral and thematic levels with selected time-bound targets.

## USING COUNTRY SYSTEMS

The Paris Declaration encourages donors to make increasing use of country systems where these provide assurance that aid will be provided for agreed purposes. Indicator 5 looks in particular at donors' use of countries' public financial management (PFM) and procurement systems.

Table 28.3 shows that 23% of aid to the government sector uses the government's budget execution, financial reporting and audit systems. Seven of the ten donors surveyed make some use of all three systems. The low figures in part reflect the relatively low use of direct budget support by many donors (see also Table 28.6 below).

Senegal remains a long way from its 2010 target of 49% of aid flows making use of country PFM systems. Although the World Bank AER report notes that there have been some moves towards reliance on country systems, particularly as a result of moves towards budget support by some partners, the majority of externally-financed projects do not yet rely on national financial management or procurement systems. The AER reports



that support for PFM systems is being built into the move towards budget support, as well as into some areas of project implementation, for example a World Bank nutrition programme contributes to building fiduciary capacity within the *Cellule de la Lutte contre la Malnutrition*.

All of the donors listed in table 28.3 make use of national procurement systems to some degree, but this reflects only about 29% of aid disbursements in total. The survey notes that ‘the weak alignment of donors with national procurement systems means that they have to use other procedures for the remaining 71% of aid disbursements to the public sector, with the transaction costs that this implies’.

As set out in relation to Indicator 2, above, the survey reports that the government is in the process of implementing a number of measures intended to improve PFM and procurement practices, including the implementation of the CFAA and the adoption of a new national procurement code. The data from 2005 do not yet show the effects of these reforms. It is to be hoped that these actions will increase donor confidence in the country systems, and that this in turn will lead to increased usage of country systems for aid disbursements.

#### AVOIDING PARALLEL IMPLEMENTATION STRUCTURES

The Paris Declaration invites donors to ‘avoid, to the maximum extent possible, creating dedicated structures for day-to-day management and implementation of aid-financed projects and programmes’. The survey identifies 23 parallel project implementation units (PIUs) in Senegal.

The survey indicates that difficulties in agreeing a shared definition of PIUs affected the data provided by donors for this indicator: ‘different positions emerged, based on differing interpretations of the definitions, which led to some donors reporting overly high numbers of parallel units, while others reported very low numbers or none

at all... In future, the survey should use either the international DAC/OECD definitions or definitions adapted to the local context.’ Assessment of Senegal’s position in relation to the 2010 target will therefore depend on further work to iron out inconsistencies in the interpretation of the definition.

The survey notes that many semi-autonomous programme and project implementation structures have already been integrated into sectoral ministries, where they maintain dual accountability to both government and donors. The survey identifies other management structures, particularly those of bilateral donors, which it considers to be ‘more autonomous but which cannot be considered to be PIUs as such.’ The World Bank’s AER report suggests that the integration of many such implementation units remains only partial, but that there is general agreement on the need to phase out PIUs and to move towards increasing integration into country structures.

How many PIUs are parallel to country structures?

	Parallel PIUs (units)
African Development Bank	0
BADEA	0
Belgium	0
Canada	--
European Commission	11
France	1
Germany	0
Global Fund	0
IFAD	5
International Monetary Fund	--
Italy	0
Japan	0
Luxembourg	--
Netherlands	1
Switzerland	1
United Nations	4
United States	0
World Bank	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>

INDICATOR 6  
Table 28.4



INDICATOR 7  
Table 28.5

Are disbursements on schedule and recorded by government?

	Disbursements recorded by government in FY05 (USD m) a	Aid scheduled by donors for disbursement in FY05 (USD m) b	Aid actually disbursed by donors in FY05 (USD m) FOR REFERENCE ONLY	Baseline ratio* (%) c=a/b c=b/a
African Development Bank	36	69	22	52%
BADEA	1	--	3	
Belgium	7	8	7	88%
Canada	1	7	7	10%
European Commission	8	54	43	15%
France	18	2	36	14%
Germany	14	27	31	50%
Global Fund	--	8	12	
IFAD	9	12	14	76%
International Monetary Fund	5	21	5	23%
Italy	0	2	2	0%
Japan	--	27	27	
Luxembourg	5	11	10	48%
Netherlands	12	13	13	91%
Switzerland	--	--	0	
United Nations	2	21	23	7%
United States	24	30	30	80%
World Bank	191	165	168	87%
<b>Total</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>453</b>	<b>69%</b>

\* Baseline ratio is  $c = a / b$  except where disbursements recorded by government are greater than aid scheduled for disbursement ( $c = b / a$ ).

#### PROVIDING MORE PREDICTABLE AID

The table above looks at predictability from two different angles. The first angle is donors' and government's combined ability to disburse aid on schedule. In Senegal, donors scheduled USD 479 million for disbursement in 2005 and actually disbursed — according to their own records — slightly less than expected (USD 453 million). The discrepancy varies considerably between donors and is mainly due to late disbursements carried over to fiscal year 2006 and to delays in implementing programmes. The second angle is donors' and government's ability to record comprehensively disbursements made by donors for the government sector. In Senegal, government systems recorded USD 332 million out of the USD 453 million notified as disbursed by donors (69%) indicating that a significant proportion of disbursements were not captured either because they were not appropriately notified by donors or inaccurately recorded by government.

Indicator 7 on predictability has been designed to encourage progress against both of these angles so as to gradually close the predictability gap by half by 2010. In other words it seeks to improve not only the predictability of actual disbursements but also the accuracy of how they are recorded in government systems — an important feature of ownership, accountability and transparency. In Senegal, this combined predictability gap amounts to USD 147 million (31% of aid scheduled for disbursement). Closing this predictability gap will require donors and government to work increasingly together on various fronts at the same time: be more realistic on their ability to disburse on schedules, for donors to notify these disbursements to government and for governments to accurately record disbursements in their systems.

Several possible reasons for this predictability gap is put forth by the study group on recording aid flows within the Action Plan on Aid Harmonisation and Effectiveness. Some of the reasons centre around the lack of information

sharing, including the lack of communication by the donors on the information on annual disbursements of aid to Senegal, and more specifically, lack of sharing financial information by donors for which projects they finance themselves. Other reasons include the fact that the Ministry of Economy and Finance does not keep track of projects that are directly executed by donors, nor keep track of all the projects carried out by grass-roots institutions (non-governmental organizations and local communities), particularly those without signed agreements with the government. Donors not respecting disbursement agreements and the government not meeting conditionalities set for aid mobilisation are also factors that affect the predictability of aid. Currently, the study group is carrying out an in-depth study which will shed light on the concrete reasons, and also propose an improved mechanism for recording aid flows.

## UNTYING AID

According to OECD data covering 89% of aid committed to Senegal in 2004, 91% of aid was untied. No specific target has been set for aid untying for 2010.

INDICATOR 8

## HARMONISATION

AID IS INCREASINGLY BEING ALIGNED WITH COUNTRY POLICIES in Senegal, with the growing adoption of Programme-Based Approaches (PBAs) ensuring increased co-ordination of assistance, and with evidence of some efforts towards co-ordinating donor missions and analytical work. The ongoing development of Senegal's Action Plan for Harmonisation and Aid Effectiveness should provide a platform for donors and government to identify actions to support further improvements to harmonisation.

## USING COMMON ARRANGEMENTS

The survey reports the proportion of aid using programme-based approaches (PBAs) as 57% in Senegal in fiscal year 2005. The survey notes that there are some 17 programmes already adopting this approach, albeit at varying stages of maturity, and that further extension to new sectors and activities is envisaged. Ostensibly, Senegal is well on the way to meeting its target of 66% of aid using PBAs by 2010.

### How much aid is programme based?

	Budget support (USD m) a	Other PBAs (USD m) b	Total (USD m) c=a+b	Total disbursed (USD m) d	Baseline ratio (%) e=c/d
African Development Bank	0	10	10	22	45%
BADEA	0	2	2	3	81%
Belgium	0	6	6	17	37%
Canada	0	6	6	24	25%
European Commission	0	0	0	55	0%
France	2	10	13	47	27%
Germany	0	28	28	33	86%
Global Fund	0	12	12	12	100%
IFAD	0	0	0	14	0%
International Monetary Fund	5	0	5	5	100%
Italy	0	0	0	5	0%
Japan	0	27	27	27	100%
Luxembourg	0	0	0	11	0%
Netherlands	11	0	12	15	77%
Switzerland	--	2	2	3	64%
United Nations	1	17	18	23	77%
United States	0	19	19	33	59%
World Bank	39	96	135	168	80%
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>515</b>	<b>57%</b>

INDICATOR 9  
Table 28.6

However, the survey return also indicates that the figures may reflect a more inclusive understanding of what constitutes a PBA than the definition suggested in the survey guidance, but that it is difficult to assess this on the basis of the limited information submitted by donors for the survey. It seems likely that the true baseline for PBAs may lie somewhere below 57%, and that more work is needed to determine the proportion of these aid flows that rigorously meet all four specified identifiers of a PBA.

Particular concerns are raised in relation to the continued use of donors' own financial systems and procedures in the management of PBAs. Only 20% of the aid for PBAs was given as direct budget support, with 80% being delivered through other mechanisms. It is unclear how much of the PBA funding, defined as being delivered through 'other mechanisms' in this survey, actually adopts joint funding approaches. The survey states that no pooled funding mechanisms exist as yet in Senegal, although basket funding or trust fund implementation is expected as part of the Project for the Co-ordination of Budgetary and Financial Reforms. Although the World Bank AER report cites a number of examples of the development of co-ordinated parallel financing mechanisms between donors, the survey reports that: 'Donors use their own procedures for the majority of resources allocated to programme approaches. The total resources allocated to programme approaches obscures the fact that donors can continue to use their own procedures. Conversely, the quantity of resources using common mechanisms gives us a real indication on the level of efforts being made to reduce transaction costs.' The government and donors need to work together to identify and overcome continuing obstacles to the use of pooled or country systems. Further, considering the broad and diverse understanding of the concept, further discussion and clarifications at the OECD-level are called for.

INDICATOR 10a  
Table 28.7

#### How many donor missions are co-ordinated?

	Co-ordinated donor missions (missions) a	Total donor missions (missions) b	Baseline ratio (%) c=a/b
African Dev. Bank	1	27	4%
BADEA	3	3	100%
Belgium	2	9	22%
Canada	4	10	40%
European Commission	3	37	8%
France	10	58	17%
Germany	8	10	80%
Global Fund	0	2	0%
IFAD	5	7	71%
IMF	2	2	100%
Italy	0	7	0%
Japan	0	10	0%
Luxembourg	2	5	40%
Netherlands	1	6	17%
Switzerland	0	2	0%
United Nations	24	52	46%
United States	0	18	0%
World Bank	7	45	16%
<b>Total (discounted*)</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>15%</b>

\* The total of co-ordinated missions has been adjusted to avoid double counting. A discount factor of 35% has been applied.

#### CONDUCTING JOINT MISSIONS AND SHARING ANALYSIS

Of the 310 donor missions to Senegal reported to have taken place by donors in fiscal year 2005, only 47, or 15%, were conducted jointly. Given the large numbers of missions involved, both government and – increasingly – donors recognise the burden that this imposes. The country survey and the World Bank AER both report that donors have made some efforts towards increasing mission co-ordination. However, more needs to be done both to track and manage numbers of missions, and to identify areas where there is scope for more co-ordinated approaches, particularly amongst the larger donors. The survey suggests that the development of Senegal's Action Plan for Aid Harmonisation and Effectiveness offers a forum for donors and government to identify and commit to key steps in support of reaching the 2010 target of 40% joint missions.

In terms of coordinating country analysis, the overall picture is more positive, with some 40% of analysis having been co-ordinated in fiscal year 2005. The World Bank AER report also indicates that there has been important progress in this area by several major donors. However, it is important to note that the survey result is strongly influenced by the efforts of a single donor, the Arab Bank for the Economic Development in Africa (BADEA), which carried out 34% of the analyses listed for Senegal, of which 100% were conducted jointly. The overall percentage therefore hides the fact that the majority of donors performed rather less of their analysis jointly: the co-ordinated figure drops to 29% if BADEA is removed.

The country survey notes that it is also important to consider the quality and depth of collaboration

on joint analysis, aspects which do not emerge from this survey. It proposes that better overall monitoring of country analysis would help to identify more opportunities for co-ordination. All of these issues will be subject to the discussion within the framework of the Action Plan for Aid Harmonisation and Effectiveness.

## MANAGING FOR RESULTS

**MANAGING FOR RESULTS IS KEY** to enhancing aid effectiveness. The Paris Declaration recommends that donors work alongside partner countries to manage resources on the basis of desired results, and to use information effectively to improve decision making. Indicator 11 focuses on one component of managing for results: the establishment by the partner country of a cost-effective, transparent and monitorable performance and assessment framework. Senegal scored a C rating in the World Bank's 2005 Comprehensive Development Framework assessment, which provides the baseline for this indicator.

According to the World Bank's 2006 AER report, the quality and availability of poverty and development data in Senegal is improving as a result of a range of new activities and structures. Following the 2001-02 census, a demographic and health survey was conducted in 2004, and a poverty monitoring survey is being finalised. The government has established a Directorate of Forecasting and Economic Study and a National Statistics and Demographics Agency. These measures, in conjunction with a new national statistical development strategy, are expected to strengthen national data collection and analysis still further.

### How much country analysis is co-ordinated?

	Co-ordinated donor analytical work (units) a	Total donor analytical work (units) b	Baseline ratio (%) c=a/b
African Dev. Bank	0	1	0%
BADEA	38	38	100%
Belgium	2	4	50%
Canada	0	4	0%
European Commission	0	4	0%
France	2	10	20%
Germany	3	5	60%
Global Fund	0	2	0%
IFAD	2	2	100%
IMF	0	0	--
Italy	0	3	0%
Japan	0	0	--
Luxembourg	1	2	50%
Netherlands	0	3	0%
Switzerland	--	0	--
United Nations	12	24	50%
United States	1	6	17%
World Bank	0	5	0%
<b>Total (discounted*)</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>40%</b>

\* The total of co-ordinated analysis has been adjusted to avoid double counting. A discount factor of 25% has been applied.

INDICATOR 10b  
Table 28.8

INDICATOR 11

---

Although some efforts have been made to increase stakeholder access to development information in Senegal, more efforts are needed to increase the accessibility of information to the majority of citizens, who neither speak or read French, nor benefit from internet access. To date, the majority of efforts to communicate about the DSRP in local languages have been led by religious groups and local media.

A national level monitoring and evaluation system to track progress in the implementation of the DSRP is planned through the establishment of a National Poverty Observatory and the development of a national monitoring and evaluation (M&E) strategy. Currently, progress in DSRP implementation is tracked at sub-national level by Regional Monitoring Units. However, gaps in data and the need for improvements in some key indicators mean that the coverage remains patchy.

The World Bank AER report also reports that a number of sectoral M&E systems have been established, such as a results-based management system for the education sector, and an energy information system. Although a national HIV/AIDS M&E system has been established in conjunction with a national surveillance system, its capacity to analyse captured data remains low.

The continued implementation of these measures, combined with adequate attention by the government and its partners to capacity needs in data collection and analysis, should place Senegal within reach of the target of achieving a B or an A by 2010.

## MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY

**INDICATOR 12** **THE PARIS DECLARATION** calls for donors and partner countries to be accountable to each other for the use of development resources, in such as way as to strengthen public support for national policies and development assistance. This in turn requires governments to take steps to improve country accountability systems and donors to help by being transparent about their own contributions.

Indicator 12 measures one important aspect of mutual accountability: whether country-level mutual assessments of progress in implementing agreed commitments take place. No mutual assessment of progress has taken place in Senegal to date, and as yet there is no framework in place to support such an assessment. However, the government is currently engaged in the development of an Action Plan for Aid Harmonisation and Effectiveness, in consultation with external partners. The Government and its partners should ensure that the resulting action plan provides the framework and impetus for regular country-level mutual assessments to take place.

## BASELINES AND TARGETS

THE TABLE BELOW presents the 2005 baselines and the 2010 targets for Senegal. The baseline values are based on the discussion above, which draws on a range of information sources. The primary source is the 2006 baseline survey undertaken in Senegal under the aegis of the national co-ordinator (Thierno Seydou Niane).

INDICATORS	2005 BASELINE	2010 TARGET
1 Ownership – Operational PRS	C	B or A
2a Quality of PFM systems	3.5	4.0
2b Quality procurement systems	Not available	Not applicable
3 Aid reported on budget	89%	94%
4 Co-ordinated capacity development	18%	50%
5a Use of country PFM systems (aid flows)	23%	48%
5b Use of country procurement systems (aid flows)	29%	Not applicable
6 Parallel PIUs	23	8
7 In-year predictability	69%	85%
8 Untied aid	91%	More than 91%
9 Use of programme-based approaches	57%	66%
10a Co-ordinated missions	15%	40%
10b Co-ordinated country analytical work	40%	66%
11 Sound performance assessment framework	C	B or A
12 Reviews of mutual accountability	No	Yes

Table 28.9  
Baselines  
and targets

## ACRONYMS

AER	Aid Effectiveness Review
BADEA	Arab Bank for the Economic Development in Africa
CDF	Comprehensive Development Framework
CFAA	Country Financial Accountability Assessment
CPIA	Country Policy and Institutional Assessment
DRSP2	<i>Document de Stratégie de Réduction de la Pauvreté</i>
IDA	International Development Assistance
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)
M & E	monitoring and evaluation
MTEF	medium-term expenditure frameworks
ODA	official development assistance
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
PFM	public financial management
SIGFIP	integrated public financial management system