

Document of
The World Bank

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Report No: 35062

IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION REPORT
(PPFI-P9680 PPFI-P9681 PPFI-P9682 IDA-32190 TF-29433)

ON A

LOAN/CREDIT/GRANT

IN THE AMOUNT OF US\$38.1 MILLION

TO THE

SENEGAL

FOR A

AGRICULTURAL SERVICES AND PRODUCER ORGANIZATIONS PROJECT

IN SUPPORT OF THE FIRST PHASE OF THE AGRICULTURAL SERVICES AND PRODUCER
ORGANIZATIONS PROGRAM

June 20, 2006

Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development 4 (AFTS4)
Country Department 14
Africa Region

This document has a restricted distribution and may be used by recipients only in the performance of their official duties. Its contents may not otherwise be disclosed without World Bank authorization.

CURRENCY EQUIVALENTS

(Exchange Rate Effective)

Currency Unit = CFA Franc (CFAF)

CFAF 520 = US\$ 1

US\$ 1 = SDR 1.52

FISCAL YEAR

January 1 – December 31

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AfDB	African Development Bank
ANCAR	<i>Agence Nationale de Conseil Agricole et Rural</i> National Agency for Rural and Agricultural Counsel
APL	Adaptable Program Loan
ASPRODEB	<i>Agence Sénégalaise pour la Promotion du Développement à la Base</i> Senegalese Agency for the Promotion of Grassroots Development
CAR	<i>Conseiller Agricole et Rural</i> Agricultural and Rural Advisor / Counselor
CAS	Country Assistance Strategy
CLCOP	<i>Cadre Local de Concertation des Organisations de Producteurs</i> Producer Organizations Local Council
CNCR	<i>Conseil National de Concertation et de Coopération des Ruraux</i> National Rural People Council for Consultation and Cooperation
CRCR	<i>Cadre Régional de Concertation et de Coopération des Ruraux</i> Regional Rural People Council for Consultation and Cooperation
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FNDASP	<i>Fonds National de Développement Agro-Sylvo-Pastoral</i> National Agricultural Development Fund
FNRAA (NARF)	<i>Fonds National de Recherche Agronomique et Agro-alimentaire</i> National Fund for Agricultural and Agro-food Research (National Agricultural Research Fund)
FSRRD	<i>Fonds de Services Ruraux Régis par la Demande</i> Demand Driven Rural Services Funds
GoS	Government of Senegal
ICR	Implementation Completion Report
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ISRA	<i>Institut Sénégalais de Recherches Agricoles</i> Senegalese Agricultural Research Institute
ITA	<i>Institut de Technologie Alimentaire</i> Food Technology Institute
LOASP	<i>Loi d'Orientation Agro-Sylvo-Pastorale</i> Framework Law for the Development of Agriculture, Forestry and Livestock

ONIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PO	Producer Organizations
PSAOP	<i>Programme des Services Agricoles et appui aux Organisations Paysannes-</i> Agricultural Services and Producer Organizations Program
QEA	Quality at Entry Assessment
QAG	Quality Assurance Group
SDR	Special Drawing Rights
SODEFITEX	<i>Société de Développement des Fibres Textiles</i> (Cotton Company)
SODEVA	<i>Société de Développement pour la Vulgarisation Agricole</i> Agricultural Extension Services Agency

Vice President:	Gobind T. Nankani
Country Director	Madani M. Tall
Sector Manager	Mary Barton-Dock
Task Team Leader/Task Manager:	Renato Nardello

SENEGAL
Agricultural Services & Producer Organizations Program

CONTENTS

	Page No.
1. Project Data	1
2. Principal Performance Ratings	1
3. Assessment of Development Objective and Design, and of Quality at Entry	2
4. Achievement of Objective and Outputs	5
5. Major Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcome	14
6. Sustainability	15
7. Bank and Borrower Performance	16
8. Lessons Learned	18
9. Partner Comments	19
10. Additional Information	20
Annex 1. Key Performance Indicators/Log Frame Matrix	21
Annex 2. Project Costs and Financing	25
Annex 3. Economic Costs and Benefits	27
Annex 4. Bank Inputs	28
Annex 5. Ratings for Achievement of Objectives/Outputs of Components	31
Annex 6. Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance	32
Annex 7. List of Supporting Documents	33
Annex 8. Borrower's Project Completion Report	34

<i>Project ID:</i> P002367	<i>Project Name:</i> Agricultural Services & Producer Organizations Project
<i>Team Leader:</i> Renato Nardello	<i>TL Unit:</i> AFTS4
<i>ICR Type:</i> Core ICR	<i>Report Date:</i> June 19, 2006

1. Project Data

Name: Agricultural Services & Producer Organizations Project *L/C/TF Number:* PPFI-P9680; PPFI-P9681; PPFI-P9682; IDA-32190; TF-29433

Country/Department: SENEGAL *Region:* Africa Regional Office

Sector/subsector: Agricultural extension and research (56%); Central government administration (31%); Agricultural marketing and trade (13%)

Theme: Technology diffusion (P); Participation and civic engagement (P); Rural services and infrastructure (S)

KEY DATES

	<i>Original</i>	<i>Revised/Actual</i>
<i>PCD:</i> 06/08/1995	<i>Effective:</i> 12/31/1999	05/03/2000
<i>Appraisal:</i> 06/03/1998	<i>MTR:</i> 12/31/2001	10/15/2002
<i>Approval:</i> 05/20/1999	<i>Closing:</i> 12/31/2002	12/31/2005

Borrower/Implementing Agency: GOV. OF SENEGAL/ MIN. OF AGRI. & LIVESTOCK / ANCAR / ASPRODEB / ITA & ISRA

Other Partners:

STAFF	Current	At Appraisal
<i>Vice President:</i>	Gobind T. Nankani	Jean-Louis Sarbib
<i>Country Director:</i>	Madani M. Tall	Mahmood Ayub
<i>Sector Manager:</i>	Mary A. Barton-Dock	Jean-Paul Chausse
<i>Team Leader at ICR:</i>	Renato Nardello	Marie-Helene Collion
<i>ICR Primary Author:</i>	Olivier Durand	

2. Principal Performance Ratings

(HS=Highly Satisfactory, S=Satisfactory, U=Unsatisfactory, HL=Highly Likely, L=Likely, UN=Unlikely, HUN=Highly Unlikely, HU=Highly Unsatisfactory, H=High, SU=Substantial, M=Modest, N=Negligible)

Outcome: S
Sustainability: L
Institutional Development Impact: SU
Bank Performance: S
Borrower Performance: S

QAG (if available) *ICR*

Quality at Entry: S S

Project at Risk at Any Time: No

3. Assessment of Development Objective and Design, and of Quality at Entry

3.1 Original Objective:

The PSAOP has been designed as a three-phase and ten-year program, financed by an Adaptable Program Loan (APL). The present Implementation Completion Report (ICR) analyses the execution and results of the first phase from May 2000 to May 2003 (extended to December 2005).

As stated in the original PAD, the development objective of the overall three-phase program is **the substantial increase of smallholder agricultural productivity, production and incomes through technological change**. The focus of the program is on: (i) institutional reforms to make agricultural services accountable, more demand-driven and cost-efficient, and to increase the participation of the private sector in a number of functions previously executed by the public sector; (ii) generation and transfer of technologies, to improve agricultural productivity in a sustainable way; and, (iii) empowerment and capacity-building of producer organizations.

The long-term vision of the PSAOP is characterized by: (i) strong and effective producer organizations capable of co-managing the nature and quality of the services they receive and pay for, as well as influencing the policy dialogue in the sector; (ii) efficient and de-concentrated sector ministries focusing on their essential functions of policy formulation, planning, monitoring and evaluation, as well as in the definition of the regulatory framework; and, (iii) financially sustainable agricultural services, accountable to producers and relevant to their needs, evolving in a competitive environment and responsible for the generation and dissemination of technologies on a contractual basis.

The objective of the first phase was to set in place the institutional reforms to achieve autonomy and accountability of public agencies and empower producer organizations. The objective was clearly defined and translated the willingness to promote in-depth reforms of the framework and environment of agricultural services, to move out of a state-led extension system, to increase accountability of public services and to give more voice and responsibility to producers in expressing their needs. It was relevant to the context of agricultural services in Senegal at the time of project preparation by taking into account approach changes and by drawing lessons from experiences in other African countries, especially the mixed and disappointing results of the training and visit model. Specific objectives were set as guiding principles for the different types of institutions: (i) for research, the objective was to improve scientific and managerial capacities of the research institutes, while establishing open and transparent financing mechanisms for research programs; (ii) for agricultural extension, the priority was to reform existing extension services to make them more accountable to producers and responsive to their needs through contractual arrangements; (iii) for producer organizations, the objective was to help POs undertake capacity-building activities at the national, regional and local levels; (iv) for the sector Ministries, the objective was to help public services refocus on their core functions of regulation, policy-formulation and monitoring and evaluation.

The first phase's cost was US\$47.1 millions with a IDA contribution of US\$ 27.4 millions (SDR 20.2 millions equivalent).

3.2 Revised Objective:

The project objectives were not revised.

3.3 Original Components:

Based on the five specific objectives, mentioned above, the project was divided in the seven following components:

1- Component 1 – National Agricultural Research Fund (US\$ 3.7 millions or 14.9 percent of IDA financing): this component aimed at establishing a national agricultural research fund to finance priority research programs, selected on a competitive basis and implemented under contractual arrangement.

2- Components 2 and 3 – Research institute development: this component aimed at improving research institutions' efficiency by strengthening their scientific and managerial capacities, rehabilitating their infrastructure and upgrading their equipment:

- **Component 2** (US\$ 3.2 millions / 12.9 percent) supports ISRA (*Institut Sénégalais de Recherches Agricoles* - Senegalese Agricultural Research Institute);
- **Component 3** (US\$ 0.9 millions / 3.6 percent) support ITA (*Institut de Technologie Alimentaire* - Food Technology Institute).

3- Component 4 – Agricultural extension (US\$ 7.5 millions / 30.1 percent): this component aimed at creating a semi-public agency, co-managed by the GoS and POs, which will deliver extension activities based on producers' demands and under contractual arrangements.

4- Component 5 – Producer organizations (US\$ 3.5 millions or 14.1 percent): this component aimed at strengthening producer organizations' capacities to provide services to their members, to participate in research extension programs elaboration and services, and to become effective partners for policy formulation.

5- Components 6 and 7 – Strengthening Public Services: the project aimed at reorganizing and decentralizing the two sector Ministries and at refocusing services on their core public functions (regulation, policy formulation, monitoring and evaluation...):

- **Component 6** (US\$ 3.3 millions or 13.3 percent) helps the Ministry of Agriculture;
- **Component 7** (US\$ 2.8 millions or 11.2 percent of IDA financing) helps the Ministry of Livestock.

3.4 Revised Components:

The project components were not revised.

3.5 Quality at Entry:

QAG assessment: The project was rated satisfactory by a quality at entry assessment (QEA) carried out by the Bank's Quality Assurance Group in 2000. The QEA rating was based on the following justifications: (i) the concept, objectives and the approach of the project are ambitious, high-risk but high-reward and could result in radical transformation of Senegalese agricultural services; (ii) the technical and economic aspects received great attention during components design; (iii) environmental aspects were taken into account; (iv) poverty and social aspects were analyzed, even a lack of specific measures to ensure that rural poor will get maximum benefit from reformed services; (v) in-depth institutional capacity analysis were carried-out, and; (vi) risks and sustainability were correctly evaluated.

Overall, the project was judged ambitious and risky but appropriately designed to promote an innovative approach that could result in substantial institutional changes. The QAG appreciated the country ownership and the political commitment towards project objectives. A great attention was given to the design of the project, along with a sound consultation process with producer organizations.

However, the QEA rated readiness for implementation unsatisfactory, as the implementation schedules were judged unrealistic given that the project was brought to the Board prematurely. Another 6 months was needed to complete preparation. The three-year implementation period initially planned has, thus, been extended twice by a total of 30 months, due to time required to set-up reforms in the ground, to process procurement and award contracts (especially for NGOs to support grassroots POs). The elaboration of the first year work programs for the different institutions took time as well. In addition, the Government turnover following the 2000 Presidential elections further delayed more concrete implementation: incoming Ministers and key managers of public services had to apprehend PSAOP philosophy and approach and then to adopt the proposed agenda for implementation.

ICR assessment: The quality at entry has also been rated **satisfactory** by the ICR mission. All the major QEA comments are shared by this ICR and have been confirmed by implementation. The project concept was of very good quality and very innovative. At time of preparation, it represented a real and huge change with past practices in Africa and aimed at promoting completely new ways of working with producers and their organizations. The preparation team took time to dialogue with partners to reach a common understanding of past failures and a shared vision of what could be done. Considerable reflection and maturation time were required to collectively design the project but the process resulted in a sound agreement among stakeholders around project concept and content. The proposed project arrangements were indeed very complex with 7 components but this set-up was justified by the fact that the PSAOP merged three former projects (the “National Agricultural Research Project”, the “National Agricultural Extension Project and the “Small Grassroots Development Project”*) into a more comprehensive approach to agricultural services. The project was also very innovative, almost for all West Africa, by getting on board producer organizations as full partners for project elaboration and negotiation. In addition, POs were given responsibilities in project implementation arrangements and modalities, based on the promising results achieved in the field with pilot activities undertaken during the preparation phase.

However, the M&E indicators that were judged satisfactory by the QEA appeared very difficult to monitor, such as “30 percent of the total operational financing of ag. research allocated by the research fund”, “POs provide at least 75 percent of the services requested by producers” or “50% of identified producer's needs translated into research projects”. Targets set to the different components were assessed as excellent by the QEA but some of them appeared unrealistic or irrelevant. For instance: “470 agents recruited by ANCAR in year 2” while the new extension system had first to be tested before being extended; at the end of the project ANCAR has been able to deploy a network of 316 agents only. Other example for the research component: “at least, 50 projects were to be financed by the research fund at the end of the project” but this

criterion did not take into account the size and amount of proposed projects with respect to funds allocated, and was not coherent with the objective of promoting quality; finally, the research fund was very selective and financed only 30 projects out of 92 proposals. During project implementation, these indicators were not closely monitored some of them were even dropped but unfortunately they were not formally revised or cancelled.

*NB: * the “Small Grassroots Development Project” was cofinanced by IFAD which was willing to cofinance the PSAOP for US\$ 6 million but finally withdrew its contribution as the project approach was judged too much innovative and risky by a new coming manager at IFAD headquarter.*

4. Achievement of Objective and Outputs

4.1 Outcome/achievement of objective:

The overall outcome of the first phase is rated **satisfactory** because the project met its major objective by **contributing effectively to reforming the institutional framework and environment of agricultural services**. It effectively contributed to empower producer organizations, to establish decentralized and demand-driven services, and to increase their responsiveness and accountability to producers. All the key performance indicators (annex 1 - table 1) and the nineteen triggers for proceeding to the second phase (annex 1 - table 2) have been fully completed and, in the case of POs, have been exceeded.

As such, the project achieved its five major objectives, presented in section 3.1, as follows (detailed results for each of these objectives are presented in the next section): (i) ISRA and ITA have improved their scientific and managerial capacities and a competitive financing mechanism (FNRAA) is fully operational for the selection and funding of research programs; (ii) a semi-private agency for agricultural advisory services (ANCAR) has been created to replace the former extension services; (iii) POs have set up their autonomous financing mechanism (FSRRD – *Fonds de Services Ruraux Régis par la Demande*) to help grassroots POs access capacity building programs and to support participation of producers in policy formulation; and, (iv) the two Ministries have been reorganized at the central and regional levels with a complete reformulation of core public services’ functions.

The reforms and approaches promoted by the project, as well as the first results achieved in the field (see section 4.2), strongly influenced Government officials and policy makers within the sector ministries. The promulgation of the new framework law for agriculture (Loi d’Orientation Agro-Sylvo-Pastorale – LOASP), in June 2004, brought legal recognition to, and confirmed interest and relevance of, the institutional reforms supported by the PSAOP. The LOASP provides institutional sustainability to the reforms undertaken during the first phase and sets the framework for their financial sustainability.

As part of the PSAOP results recognized by the LOASP, the following major achievements must be highlighted:

⇒ **Producer empowerment at the grassroots levels:** a network of rural consultative fora (CLCOPs) has been successfully established in 152 rural council areas (out of 320) to

organize the demand of producers and their organizations. CLCOPs cover 63 percent of POs inventoried in these areas and represent almost 50,000 producers. Thanks to the PSAOP, POs now fully contribute to the definition, implementation and evaluation of research and extension programs. It is now mandatory for the national agency for agricultural and rural advisory services (ANCAR) to formulate its field programs based on diagnostics conducted with grassroots organizations and consultations with producers. POs have established their own capacity building fund (FSRRD - Demand Driven Rural Services Funds) that allocates resources to micro-projects prepared by POs and selected within the framework of CLCOPs. Beyond FSRRD, CLCOPs have been instrumental to organize consultation with grassroots organizations and to disseminate information to producers. Many development partners, including local governments, now recognize CLCOPs as the entry point for any activity dealing with producers and their organizations at the field level.

⇒ **Effective participation of producers to policy formulation:** thanks to PSAOP, POs have taken part to decision-making processes as a real proposing force. For instance, the contribution of the national umbrella federation of POs (CNCR) to the LOASP's formulation has been substantial: CNCR pushed the Government to switch its vision on some issues or even to withdraw some proposals not accepted by producers (on land tenure issues for instance). In the board of the national research fund (FNRAA), they contributed to the complete reformulation of research programs.

⇒ **Redefinition of the role of sectoral public services:** the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Livestock disengaged from productive and marketing activities; they are refocused on their core public functions of policy formulation, monitoring and evaluation, with the creation of specific divisions for policy analysis, forecasts and statistics. Services have been de-concentrated with the creation of Rural Development Regional Directorates (DRDRs), which focus on field activity monitoring, statistical data collection, control and regulation, elaboration of regional and departmental agricultural policies. Veterinary Regional Inspections are responsible for designing, controlling and monitoring actions related to the control of epizootic diseases, supervision of private veterinary practices, and animal food safety. Seventy percent of staff has been assigned to decentralized offices. As demonstrated by the recent elaboration of the LOASP, agriculture public services are less reluctant and more active in collaborating and consulting producer organizations.

⇒ **From “top-down” extension services to demand-driven private providers of agricultural advisory services:** Institutional changes brought by PSAOP have strongly contributed to make the delivery of agricultural services evolve from a “top-down” and centralized approach to a demand-driven and regionalized approach. Many multi-stakeholders workshops were organized to plan activities with producers and then to evaluate and draw lessons with them. Some initiatives led by CNCR, such as an experimental project focusing on groundnuts quality control, have also introduced the idea of private delivery of services. Through the creation of the semi-private National Agency for Agricultural and Rural Counsel (ANCAR), co-managed with POs and private agro-businesses, the PSAOP has replaced the traditional “top-down” model of dissemination of technical packages with a demand-driven and client oriented approach to agricultural advisory services (see details in section 4.2). It is

too early to measure the economic impact of such evolutions, especially on productivity, but beneficiary's assessments of agricultural services show that agricultural services and advisory programs do answer farmers' needs and preoccupations.

⇒ **Transparent and competitive research financing mechanism:** the project helped establish the National Fund for Agricultural Research (FNRAA), a competitive funding mechanism for agricultural and agro-processing research programs (see figures in section 4.2). By separating the funding of research from its execution, FNRAA has increased transparency of resources allocation to research projects. These resources are accessible to a range of competences that goes beyond the traditional and dominant research institutes. FNRAA has forged partnership not only among research institutions but also with other private operators, such as agro-processors. Producers take part to the decision making process and are involved in the implementation of research programs in the field. PSAOP has also contributed to strengthen the scientific and managerial capacities and competitiveness of the two major agricultural research institutes (ISRA and ITA).

4.2 Outputs by components:

Component 1 – National Agricultural Research Fund: this component is rated **highly satisfactory** as it has fully achieved its objectives and indicators. It has also extensively contributed to promote new approaches in the agricultural research sector. These are example of the major achievements of FNRAA:

- The competitive financing mechanism for agricultural research is accessible, beyond traditional research centers, to various institutions such as the University of Dakar (4 projects financed by FNRAA), SODEFITEX (2 projects), the Veterinarian University (1 project) or the Geomantic Laboratory (1 project).
- A rigorous selection process has been set up: scientific quality is analyzed by peer reviewers and a scientific and technical committee (that includes international researchers), relevance is assessed by a multi-stakeholder management committee with a sound participation of producers.
- Eligibility criteria have successfully promoted partnership among research institutions: all projects were required to involve a minimum of two institutions but more than 80 percent of approved projects had at least three partners.
- POs' participation has been encouraged at all stages of the process to ensure relevance of research programs with producers' needs; applied-research and research/development proposals submitted to FNRAA were endorsed by a producer organizations.

The FNRAA is managed by a small Executive Secretariat, which comprises only 8 people (4 senior staff and 4 assistants) and which operating costs remains fairly limited at US\$100,000 per year including salaries and field monitoring and evaluation of activities (less than 10 percent of the research fund managed by the secretariat).

Since its creation in 2000, FNRAA has received 92 proposals, which confirm the interest of the mechanism, and has financed 30 programs for a total of CFAF 1.7 billion (US\$3.4 million). Details by call for proposals are presented in annex 1 – table 2. Based on the first results achieved and as a confirmation of the relevance and efficiency of the FNRAA mechanism, other donors

expressed their interest in contributing to the fund: (i) AfDB financed research activities in the livestock sector based on a call for proposal organized by FNRAA; (ii) the EU delegation transferred food-security resources to FNRAA to organize a specific call for proposal targeting local cereal development programs.

As part of the PSAOP second phase, FNRAA mandate and competences could be strengthened to play a stronger role in the overall orientation and evaluation of research activities, beyond its current financing mechanism role.

Components 2 and 3 – Research institute development: these components are rated **satisfactory**. Thanks to project support, ISRA and ITA have improved their scientific, administrative and financial performances. Both institutions are operating satisfactorily according to management and organizational manuals. Research infrastructure have been rehabilitated and scientific equipment have been acquired. As expected, ISRA and ITA successfully competed to FNRAA and have been awarded 19 projects to coordinate for ISRA and 5 for ITA.

In details for ISRA, significant results are the followings:

- ISRA scientific board has been opened to representatives of POs, local governments and private sector;
- ISRA has been reorganized and consolidated in five regional research centers;
- Thanks to the establishment of a technical and scientific programming commission, scientific methodologies, the definition of research objectives and activities have improved, as well as the allocation of human and financial resources;
- Staff benefited from an extensive training program: full curriculum for 36 agents, specific modules for 116 and study tours for 6 researchers; a new research evaluation process for researchers' promotion has been adopted;
- Scientific partnerships have been established at the national, regional and international levels (26 memorandums of agreement and 15 collaborative projects signed with a large range of partners from the private sector, the international research community and development projects and regional agencies);
- Numerous publications have been disseminated, including technical pamphlets for producers, scientific articles in international research journals and the recently created ISRA bulletin;

For ITA, major results can be summarized as follows:

- Scientific and technical performances have significantly improved thanks to training programs that benefited to almost 60 researchers; ITA is now recognized by private institutions as a key scientific resources for laboratory analyses and technology tests (16 partnership agreements and 60 contracts signed since 2000); in addition, ITA researchers are solicited for organizing courses and practical workshops;
- New strategic partnerships have been developed at the national and international level, with ANCAR, private firms, World Vision, UNIDO, FAO and other projects and programs;
- 17 new technologies have been developed and demonstrated to users; 50 training modules benefiting almost 700 private entrepreneurs were organized to demonstrate innovative technologies in the field of post-harvest operations for fruit and vegetable, meat, milk, fish produce and cereals.

The PSAOP helped national research institutions improve significantly their scientific and management performances. The second phase of PSAOP will support research institutions to deepen and strengthen their competencies and methods to: (i) develop innovative mechanisms to ensure technology dissemination to producers on a larger scale; (ii) carry out economic analysis, beyond technical and agronomic results, to measure the potential and actual impact of technologies and techniques at farm level on production and incomes.

Component 4 – Agricultural extension: this component is rated **moderately satisfactory**. Major objectives have been satisfied with the creation of the National Agency for Agricultural and Rural Counsel (ANCAR) in March 1997, following the dissolution of SODEVA, the relatively ineffective para-governmental extension service agency operating mainly in the groundnuts production area. Through ANCAR, the PSAOP has promoted a new approach of agricultural extension activities, which are no more the top-down dissemination of technical messages but a demand-driven support to producer needs. Senegalese agricultural services have moved out of the traditional public extension services, based on the training and visit model, and have opened the sector to private providers of advisory services. ANCAR has been fully operational since 2002 and has adopted a regionalized organization with more than three quarters of its 316 staff working in the field. The state participation in ANCAR capital has been reduced from 51 to 42 percent. Thus, as requested for the PSAOP second phase transition, the private sector becomes the majority shareholder with producer organizations holding 38 percent and private agribusiness enterprises 13 percent.

ANCAR operates through eleven regional divisions covering 144 rural communities where 105 Agricultural and Rural Advisor / Counselors (CAR) provide assistance to POs in the formulation and implementation of extension activities under contractual arrangements. As of today, 2,817 contracts have been executed for a total cost of CFAF 365 million, including a producer participation of CFAF 131 million (36 percent). Extension activities have benefited to more than 1,460 POs representing 24,000 farmers as direct beneficiaries and almost 54,000 people as indirect beneficiaries.

CARs have adopted a more comprehensive approach to farm operations and farming systems. CARs' extension programs cover a large range of issues and activities such as: agriculture (41 percent of contracts), horticulture (15 percent), facilitation (access to credit, input suppliers or traders, 17 percent), training (8 percent), livestock production (6 percent), organizational and management of POs (5 percent), forestry and environment (5 percent), communication and information (1 percent), fishing (1 percent) and water and health (1 percent). They help farmers get in touch with other public or private service providers that can resolve technical issues that are beyond ANCAR core competences. As a result, ANCAR established 47 memorandum of agreement with: NGOs, private firms, umbrella producer organizations and other agricultural and rural development programs.

PSAOP has brought significant changes to agricultural extension in Senegal but ANCAR can still make progresses in terms of governance, decentralization and accountability: (i) POs do participate in ANCAR board but they are not always equally treated (late transmission of documents or restricted access to information, decisions taken without board approval for staff

recruitment for instance, etc.); (ii) three quarters of the staff are indeed operating at the regional level but only one third (105 CARs) works in direct contact with producers on a daily basis; recent recruitment gave priorities to administrative or supervision tasks to the detriment of direct support to POs; (iii) during the second phase, regional divisions will be more autonomous for taking initiatives and establishing independent contractual arrangements with other clients or service providers; (iv) ANCAR accountability to POs will also be strengthened (CARs primarily report to their respective regional division not to producers), thus the flow of financing should be reversed to allow farmers to buy their services and become the real client of ANCAR.

As far as agronomic aspects are concerned, CARs have adopted a more comprehensive approach to farming systems but extension activities and the monitoring of results remain too much focused on technical aspects and should take more into account economic results for farmer production and incomes. For some advisory services, technically specialized, and for farm economic management advice, ANCAR does not have all the required skills and should not intervene in a too large spectrum of technical competences. The second phase will thus go further in promoting the establishment of specialized private providers.

Component 5 – Producer organizations: the PO component deserves a **highly satisfactory** rating as all objectives have been achieved and some of them have been surpassed. The financing mechanism specifically dedicated to POs (FSRRD - Demand Driven Rural Services Funds) has been successfully implemented by the private association ASPRODEB. At the local level, 152 CLCOPs have been set up (as compared to the initial objective of 142). They cover 67 percent of the rural communities, group 63 percent of POs inventoried in these areas and represent almost 50,000 producers. Up to date, the FSRRD has financed 1,235 projects (against an initial objective of 852) for a total amount of CFAF 885 million. In the 11 regions, CRCRs have been created for regional POs to access the FSRRD and 49 projects have been financed for a total amount of CFAF 104 million. All these projects benefited almost 62,000 producers and were comprised of training sessions and study tours (52 percent), as well as of innovation and demonstration activities (38 percent). Project topics covered mainly agricultural production (77 percent), post-harvest operations (11 percent) and organization and management of POs (6 percent). According to a beneficiary assessment undertaken in 2004, more than 80 percent of POs' individual members were satisfied by services delivered and activities undertaken by their organizations under the FSSRD financing mechanism. POs contributed to project costs for 10 to 50 percent depending on the nature of the project. To the exception of a very limited number of projects (less than 5 percent), this beneficiary contribution was recovered without any difficulty confirming the interest of the approach for producer organizations and their members.

Beyond FSRRD and the funding of micro-projects for POs, CLCOPs have been instrumental to organize consultation with grassroots organizations and to disseminate information to producers. As such, CLCOPs are now recognized by many programs, public services and local governments as their entry point to dialogue and collaborate with producers and their organizations. For instance, ANCAR's extension programs are presented and discussed with farmers in the framework of CLCOPs. Several local governments are already collaborating with CLCOPs as a way to consult with producers or to financially contribute to PO capacity-building.

When participating in policy dialogue, for the formulation of the LOASP for instance, the national umbrella producer organization, CNCR, relied on CLCOPs and CRCRs to get feedback and views from as many farmers as possible. Thanks to PSAOP support, CNCR has been able to organize effective and regular communication campaigns and consultation with grassroots producers and local organizations. By regularly consulting and informing its grassroots members, CNCR has thus gained substantial credibility, as a legitimate farmer representative association, has increased its bargaining power. Its contribution to the formulation of the new agricultural framework law was substantial. POs' participation in the elaboration and implementation of extension and research programs is now generalized all over the country and highly appreciated. Senegalese experience is now cited as an example of producer empowerment in the sub-region.

Components 6 and 7 – Strengthening Public Services: these components are rated **satisfactory** for the following achievements:

- the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Livestock disengaged from productive and marketing activities; they have been refocused on their core public functions of policy formulation, monitoring and evaluation, with the creation of specific divisions for policy analysis, forecasts and statistics;
- the de-concentration of services is effective with the creation of Rural Development Regional Directorates, which focus on field activity monitoring, statistical data collection, control and regulation, elaboration of regional and departmental agricultural policies;
- for the Ministry of Livestock, Veterinary Regional Inspections are responsible of designing, controlling and monitoring actions related to herd protection against economically significant diseases, public health and trade protection on domestic, regional and international markets;
- as demonstrated by the recent elaboration of the new framework law for agriculture (LOASP), agriculture public services are less reluctant and more active in collaborating and consulting producer organizations.

Both Ministries benefited from PSAOP financial resources for office and logistic equipment, for building rehabilitations and for capacity building activities. Studies for the construction of a one-site ministry have been completed but execution has been postponed to PSAOP second phase.

Despite strong changes brought by PSAOP and favorable evolutions in civil servants' mindset, public services remain weak due to a rapid turnover of staff and the lack of financial and logistic means. De-concentration is well advanced but the linkages between central and regional levels still need to be strengthened. During the first phase, the two Ministries were not sufficiently active in taking the lead to ensure the overall orientation, coordination and monitoring of the PSAOP various components. They actively managed to integrate PSAOP approaches in the LOASP content, but they partially failed to implement Presidential special programs along the line of the PSAOP approach. The second phase will help the two Ministries get reforms operationally converted in concrete field interventions and get public services' mandates and missions translated into day-to-day activities for field staff.

4.3 Net Present Value/Economic rate of return:

The economic and financial appraisal of the program was done during project preparation based on a benefit and cost analysis per standard type of farm and herd. As outlined in the PAD, the first phase has been primarily focusing on institutional changes and on setting-up reforms of rural and agricultural services. It is therefore too early to be able to measure significant economic impact of PSAOP both at the macro and micro-economic levels but it has already been agreed with PSAOP actors that the second phase will pay particular attention to economic impact analyses.

4.4 Financial rate of return:

Not applicable for the first phase for the reason stated in section 4.3.

4.5 Institutional development impact:

The institutional development impact of the first phase has been **substantial** on all institutions thanks to PSAOP support in terms of reorganization, mission redefinition and capacity building activities, but also thanks to office rehabilitation and equipment. Beyond logistical inputs that have improved work conditions, PSAOP soft investments have contributed to re-define the role and responsibilities of the different stakeholders.

As a result, three major impacts should be highlighted:

1- Producer empowerment both at the local level and at the national level: Producer organizations have been able to increase their participation in decision-making processes and take part to projects/programs implementation. They now contribute to the definition, implementation and evaluation of research and extension programs. In the framework of FSRRD and CLOPs, POs have learned to formulate and implement by themselves small-scale capacity building projects. Compared to other countries, Senegalese POs do not just participate in discussion as alibi for development partners to consult with poor producers but they do really contribute to policy formulation as a real and sound proposing force. As mentioned earlier, CNCR's contribution to the LOASP's formulation has been substantial, pushing the Government to switch approaches on some issues or even withdraw some proposals not accepted by producers. In the FNRAA board, they contributed to the complete reformulation of research programs. At the local level, CLCOPs are increasingly invited by local governments to contribute to the formulation of local development plans.

2- Demand-driven approach: Institutional changes brought by PSAOP have strongly contributed to make the delivery of agricultural services evolve from a "top-down" and centralized approach to a more demand-driven and regionalized approach. Accountability to producers as clients is another important step forward that public services are in the process of adopting. Many multi-stakeholders workshops were organized to plan activities upfront with producers and to evaluate and draw lessons downstream with them. Some initiatives led by CNCR, such as an experimental project focusing on peanut quality control, and to a lesser extend the ANCAR activities, have also introduced the idea of private delivery of services.

3- Partnership: the different financing mechanisms set up during the first phase have instilled the habit of regular consultations among stakeholders, beyond the allocation of financial resources. In that way, the PSAOP has contributed to promote public-private partnership, especially between

policy makers and producer representatives. This aspect appears also in the field in the framework of CLCOPs as a way to coordinate activities and to seek synergies among interventions under the leadership of producers.

On social aspects, although it was the first phase objective, project contribution to poverty reduction is rated **modest**. The project is on track towards the overall development objectives and it made tangible contributions to improve smallholders access to agricultural advisory services through CLCOPs, ANCAR and research. The project approach in particular has strongly contributed to advocate for effective smallholders participation in decision-making processes at all level. At the national level, through their network of CLCOPs and CRCRs, POs make the voice of the poor heard in the policy dialogue. The Senegalese experience is regularly cited in neighboring countries as the best practice in terms of consultation with smallholders and of dissemination of information to grassroots organizations.

On the gender dimension, the project contribution has been **substantial** thanks mainly to the producer organizations component. At the grassroots levels, and to a lesser extend at the national level, women and female organizations have been able to increase their participation to decision-making processes regarding research and extension needs, capacity building program elaboration and implementation. Field surveys undertaken by research institutes have shown that, on average in a given village, 70 percent of female producers are members of a producer organization, against 53 percent for male. It is mandatory for CLCOPs and CRCRs to have female PO representatives in their executive board. In the 152 rural communities that benefitted from the PO component, 20 percent of CLCOPs have a female president. At the national level, through its support to CNCR, the project supported the development of the national federation for the promotion of female POs (institutional diagnostic, action plan elaboration and implementation, and capacity building). Created in 1987, this federation covers all the regions and rural communities, and provides support to its grassroots members (6.815 associations representing an estimate of 1,056,000 women) to ensure a sound participation of women in CLCOPs and CRCRs.

However, further efforts are still required to sustain these achievements and to maintain the first phase momentum of institutional changes, of agricultural services reorganization and of producer empowerment. Research institutions and agricultural advisory services would increase further more their accountability to producers if financial flows were reversed, meaning that producers really buy their services. As far as public services are concerned, the two sector Ministries needs to consolidate their new mandates by taking a more active part, at the central level, in ensuring the overall coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the agricultural sector. At the regional level, regional directorates will translate their new missions in day-to-day activities for field agents.

The project contribution to good environmental management is **modest** as the first phase mainly focused on institutional reforms and capacity building aspects. Micro-projects carried out by POs did not benefitted from any environmental impact assessment before implementation and were not monitored regarding pest management issues or any other safeguard issues during execution. But most of this projects were capacity building activities with no direct implication on the environment and the small number of productive projects were conducted as demonstration on

very small scale. As the second phase will invest more in productive projects, its design must pay particular attention to environmental management capacities within public services in charge of the safeguards enforcement and within producer organizations. The GoS has already prepared an environmental and social management framework consistent with Bank policies. Project activities will contribute to strengthen ANCAR capacities in assisting ASPRODEB, POs and producers to respect this framework. The CLCOPs and CRCRs network set up during the first phase will be valuable tools for organizing information and awareness raising campaigns and reaching a large number of grassroots producers.

5. Major Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcome

5.1 Factors outside the control of government or implementing agency:

No major external factors affected project implementation. It should be only noted that the slow depreciation of the SDR against the CFA Franc reduced the budget available in local currency. As a result, some activities were reduced or postponed to the second phase (such as the construction of the new headquarters for the sector Ministries).

5.2 Factors generally subject to government control:

Following the 2000 election and the political shift that occurred, project implementation slowed down for nearly one year. The new Ministers and high ranked managers were at first skeptical with regards to the PSAOP approach and somewhat reluctant to responsibilities given to POs. However, based on the promising results achieved by the PO component under the first pilot CLCOPs and by the research component with the setting up of FNRAA, the PSAOP implementing agencies gained Government's adhesion to the project.

The project also suffered from perturbations caused by the different Presidential annual initiatives, which aimed at promoting some specific crops such as cassava or maize and were implemented in partial or complete disconnection of existing programs such as PSAOP. As a consequence, contradictions in implementation strategies and approaches occurred in the field (free distribution of inputs or seeds for instance). Human resources of ANCAR were mobilized to support these initiatives to the detriment of their existing programs agreed upon with CLCOPs.

5.3 Factors generally subject to implementing agency control:

The project may have lacked some coordination efforts to seek complementarities between components and to increase synergies between interventions. At the local level in the field and on specific actions, project promoters did ensure coordination, in the framework of CLCOPs for instance or between research programs and agricultural advisory services. At the national level, the two sector Ministries could have been more active in leading the overall coordination of the program to increase the scale and the impact of some interventions. Coordination with other national programs funded or not by the Bank could have been stronger.

Again the two sector Ministries could have been more pro-active in channeling the additional financial resources made available by these Presidential initiatives toward PSAOP decision-making mechanisms and implementation modalities. In that sense, they could have further tested and promoted the different institutional innovative arrangements and financial mechanisms set up under PSAOP.

5.4 Costs and financing:

The original total budget was estimated at US\$47.1 million with a US\$6 million contribution from IFAD that was cancelled before project effectiveness. A new coming manager at IFAD headquarter, who did not participate in project preparation, was not comfortable with the proposed innovative approach of PSAOP and decided to withdraw IFAD contribution. This budget reduction resulted in the cancellation of civil works but did not change the overall approach and objectives of the project. Thanks to budget reallocation, soft investments (institutional reforms, capacity building and producer empowerment) were not affected by IFAD withdrawal. The IDA contribution was appraised at US\$27.4 million but reached US\$29.1 million at project closure due to SDR fluctuation. The project closed at a disbursed rate of 99.4 percent. A small fiduciary unit was set up within the Ministry of Economy and Finance to specifically coordinate PSAOP financial management and procurement. This unit staffed with two specialists had operated all along project implementation to the satisfaction of the different components and with respect to Bank procedures.

6. Sustainability

6.1 Rationale for sustainability rating:

The sustainability of the project achievements is rated **likely**. As mentioned above, the PSAOP approach has been validated and thus consolidated thanks to the new agricultural framework law (LOASP). In that sense, the LOASP institutionalize the reforms and the strategies promoted under the project. It provides institutional sustainability to the reforms undertaken during the first phase and sets the framework for their financial sustainability. The new approach to agricultural services promoted by PSAOP becomes mandatory, especially for supporting producers. As such, agricultural extension is now conceived and promoted as an advisory service, as opposed to the former top-down technology transfer under the training and visit approach. The new legal framework promotes diversity and plurality as regards to service providers, encouraging private and non-governmental firms to play a more active role under the leadership of POs and commercial actors.

The LOASP also recognizes the core role of producer organizations as key stakeholders for the definition of rural and agriculture policies, as well as for the elaboration and implementation of projects and programs. Overall, the empowerment of producers thanks to PSAOP support and the appropriation of reforms by POs, especially the national umbrella CNCR, will prevent any push back of reforms and ensure the long-term sustainability of demand-driven approaches.

However, sustainable financing resources for agriculture services remain the key issue for the future. To partially solve this concern, the LOASP has inscribed the creation of a national fund for agricultural development (*Fonds National de Développement Agro-Sylvo-Pastoral – FNDASP*). But, beyond state budget transfer, no specific financing mechanism has yet been set up such as levys or taxes along supply chains. This aspect will be a priority area of discussion for the CNCR and Government officials during the next PSAOP phase. At this stage, it is encouraging to see that POs have contributed for 36 percent to the cost of extension programs elaborated and executed jointly with ANCAR. As mentioned above, they also co-financed for 10 to 50 percent capacity building activities supported by FSRRD.

6.2 Transition arrangement to regular operations:

The project is transitioning to the second phase of the three-phase APL thanks to PHRD grants and PPF. The provisioning of CFAF 500 million has already been made in the 2006 budget to launch the FNDASP and ensure a regular financing of agricultural services. During the transition period, further evaluations and studies will be undertaken to refine activities that will be carried over to the second phase. The expansion of the CLCOPs network all over the 320 rural communities will be prepared by CNCR and its implementing agency. ISRA and ITA on-going and regular activities will be continued thanks to budget support received from the Government and other programs funded by other donors or private clients. On its GoS' contribution, ANCAR will maintain a minimum of field activities with POs and will take this opportunity to refine its strategic business plan for the future in close collaboration with POs. FNRAA only will have to wait for the second phase or the effective launching of FNDASP to get funding and to be able to organize further selections of research programs.

7. Bank and Borrower Performance

Bank

7.1 Lending:

The performance of the Bank preparation team is rated **satisfactory**. Bank staff provided in-depth support to the preparation team and was very open to discussion. The team really wanted to introduce innovations and to promote strong institutional changes in the organization and working habits of Senegalese agricultural services. It should be commended for having offered large responsibility to producer organizations and for having resisted Bank internal pressure urging it to speed up the preparation process or to drop the concept. The project elaboration took almost three years but that maturation time was really required for the team to get national agreement on the proposed reforms and to introduce in-depth institutional changes. All along project preparation and implementation, the Bank team adequately managed to get additional and external fundings from bilateral trust funds to undertake further analyses and to provide outside evaluation for the benefit both of Senegalese stakeholders and Bank knowledge.

7.2 Supervision:

Bank performance during supervision is rated **satisfactory**. Supervision missions provided an adequate skill mix of expertise. Bank guidance and recommendations were relevant to implementing agencies' expectations. For such a large and complex project, Bank budget was not sufficient to carry on more than one supervision mission per year. However, the project implementing agencies benefited from close and sound support from field-based Bank staff who were very knowledgeable about local agriculture services and institutions. They were very involved in project implementation and provided "day-to-day" advice to activities. The Bank team responsible of the PSAOP remained stable, with a low turnover of task team leaders. The first TTL was replaced by another member of the team who had been involved from the beginning of the project.

7.3 Overall Bank performance:

Based on the above comments, the overall Bank performance is rated **satisfactory**.

Borrower

7.4 Preparation:

The Borrower performance during project preparation is rated **satisfactory**. The Government and the key institutions, especially CNCR, showed interest in reforming agricultural services and great openness to the new approaches proposed by the Bank team. The Government's acceptance to get producer organizations fully associated to the preparation of a Bank funded project was also exemplary in the sub-region. Although considerable discussions were required on content, institutional arrangements and implementation modalities, the project was slowly but collectively designed, resulting in a sound general agreement around project concept and content.

7.5 Government implementation performance:

As mentioned earlier, the Government performances have been impaired by the political transition, the weak coordination capacities of the two sector Ministries and by the lack of pro-activity in managing adequately the Presidential agricultural initiatives in coherence with the PSAOP approach. However, the proposed reforms with strong implication on staff deployment and work program have been successfully implemented. The Government performances are thus rated **moderately satisfactory**.

7.6 Implementing Agency:

To the exception of ANCAR, the implementing agencies (FNRAA executive secretariat and ASPRODEB) have achieved and surpassed all their major objectives. They have been very dynamic, competent and effective in undertaking their respective tasks. Beyond fulfilling their assignment, they have shown strong commitment to national discussion and to animating discussion around their activities and results. Their performances are thus rated **highly satisfactory**.

ANCAR performances lead to a much more mixed assessment: (i) its field objectives have been fulfilled and appreciated by POs, but the total coverage of the initial objective of 142 rural was delayed and occurred only towards the end of the project; (ii) ANCAR governance still has to be improved based on a stronger implication of producers (as members of ANCAR's board) in decision-making processes and in the management of activities. As such, ANCAR performance is rated **moderately unsatisfactory**.

In addition, it should be noted that the project did not suffer from any misprocurement (to the exception of one bid that had to be relaunched) and audits from 200 to 2004 for all implementing agencies were unqualified (2005 audit reports are due for June 30, 2006 but no issues are foreseen).

Overall, implementing agencies' performances are rated **satisfactory**.

7.7 Overall Borrower performance:

Based on the above comments, the overall Borrower performance is rated **satisfactory**.

8. Lessons Learned

1- Institutional changes take time and require adequate support: reforming public institutions, while building private providers and empowering producers organizations to take over functions, requires time. From project identification to the end of the first phase, nearly ten years have past, while three years were necessary to get the project presented to the Bank Board and one more year to really jump-start activities. However, all these years were not useless or inactive years but, on the contrary, they were critical to prepare the ground for changes with capacity building activities and communication programs to help key stakeholders understand the interest of reforms and apprehend their new roles. APL is the right financial instrument but the first phase should be designed for at least four or five years. In addition, as demonstrated by other projects, institutional changes cannot occur by itself. This is a complex process involving various stakeholders who may oppose resistance to change and evolution. Adequate support must be provided in terms of technical assistance, institutional reinforcement and capacity-building. Financial resources must be available to accompany the transition. The design of M&E indicators is another crucial aspect: as discussed in the quality at entry section, indicators should be well defined, limited in number and focused on specific issues. They should be easy to monitor and useful for beneficiary institutions to measure progress towards project objectives. In that sense, triggers for the next phase should go beyond basic performance indicators, and not just duplicate them, by setting clear targets to be achieved by project actors. All these aspects should be taken into account in the design of PSAOP-type projects.

2- Producer organizations are key drivers to foster changes and ensure sustainability: compared to other countries (such as Mali and the cotton sector reform), the Senegalese experience demonstrates that institutional reforms and the development of new relationships (clients / service providers) can be really pushed forward if producers are empowered. This means that POs require not only financial resources but also technical support either internalized in the organization or contractualized with a private firm. Thanks to its internal staff and its implementing agency ASPRODEB, CNCR has been able to develop capacities to become proactive and able to ask for services, as well as to participate in policy formulation. Demand-driven services become efficient and accountable only thanks to producer empowerment to build the demand side and get the voice of farmers heard. Producer participation in all stages of the project cycle is thus one of the key lessons that explain why the project worked well and achieved its objectives. More specifically, the critical aspect was the participation and active contribution of CNCR to project preparation from the very beginning of the process. Producers were able to give their pragmatic views on project design, institutional arrangements and implementation modalities. As a result, they were fully on board when the project became effective and they were able, without any objection from other partners, to take part in decision-making and evaluation of research and extension activities. This has also induced a new reflex from public institutions to consult with producers for specific issues and more generally on a regular basis (even if ANCAR management still has to improve in that field).

3- Multi-stakeholder financing mechanisms: the FNRAA, ANCAR and CLCOP experiences in the framework of PSAOP implementation show that multi-stakeholders decision-making mechanisms are efficient for allocating funds to activities that are relevant and

coherent with producer needs and interests. These mechanisms foster dialogue, partnership and collaboration among institutions and ensure stronger coordination in the field. But, as mentioned above, participation of producers through their organizations is critical to design interventions relevant to farmer real needs and consistent with what has already been implemented by other partners. As such, FNRAA mechanism is exemplary and very innovative as it has really changed the way research institutions had worked previously. Funding of research programs was traditionally based on an annual allocation and there was very little control over research activities carried out. Nowadays in Senegal, funding of research is separated from its execution: researchers have to compete with solid research proposals, on both scientific soundness and development relevance, and they are accountable to producers on spending and results (but bulk fundings are still provided to maintain research institutes' scientific capacities with training and up-to-date equipment).

4- Implementing agency vs. PIU: the PSAOP experience has demonstrated that asking local institutions, such as FNRAA secretariat, ANCAR and CNCR, to be fully responsible of their respective component as implementing agencies can be more efficient than having a temporary PIU (that generally takes the lead over local institutions as seen in other agricultural services projects in the region). Learning by doing is obviously the best way to improve institutional capacities and to ensure sustainability of actions beyond project completion. However, without a PIU, coordination of interventions undertaken by several implementing agencies remain complex. In that sense, public services should be responsible for ensuring coordination among components as part of their function of sector coordination. Arrangements will be made in that direction for the second phase in the framework or under the responsibility of the Ministry of Agriculture.

5- Economic impact: (i) as already demonstrated by other projects, to get economic results and measurable impacts, demand-driven funds should not be restricted to soft investments but should allow for physical investments and equipment. These funds should give the opportunity to promote innovations, disseminate technologies and demonstrate techniques in rural areas that have been proved to be generating additional incomes at the farm level. (ii) in addition, M&E system should work beyond monitoring project activities and measuring technical results. M&E indicators have to provide guidance to project implementers for achieving economic results. Especially for researchers and technical advisor (CARs for instance), indicators should be incentives to go beyond measuring technical outputs by undertaking economic analysis at farm level and by developing economic references of technologies/innovations.

9. Partner Comments

(a) Borrower/implementing agency:

As described in more detail in the Borrower's implementation completion report in Annex 8, the Borrower shares the analysis presented in the Bank implementation completion report. It acknowledges the innovative features of the PSAOP approach as: (i) the project represented a real rupture with previous research and extension programs that did not take into account farmer needs and were not accountable to them; (ii) it aimed at promoting producer organizations to participate in policy formulation, in the design, execution and evaluation of research and extension activities, in the elaboration and implementation of capacity building projects for POs by

themselves; (iii) it promoted a broader approach to extension as agricultural advisory services and introduced competitive grant mechanism for research; (iv) it fostered deconcentration and decentralization of public services.

Beyond concrete results detailed in its report, the Borrower emphasizes the key following impacts on institutions: (i) through their own financing mechanisms (CLCOPs and CRCRs), POs have been instrumental in guiding and ensuring consistency among project intervention; they have gained credibility by participating actively in the formulation of the new agricultural law and by improving their internal organization and efficiency; (ii) thanks to project support and to the new financing mechanism (FNRAA), national research institutes have improved their scientific capacities and management efficiency, while strengthening collaboration and partnership with other research institutions and universities within the country and at the regional level; (iii) the creation of ANCAR was essential to reverse the past top-down approach of extension in Senegal and to develop more demand-driven advisory services that are accountable to producers; (iv) within the two sector Ministries (agriculture and livestock), reforms and new approaches to rural development are well adopted and confirmed under the new agricultural law; regional public services are in a better position to ensure coordination of interventions at the local and regional levels.

One of the key lessons for the Borrower is the participative approach adopted at the very beginning of project preparation that contributed to forge consensual views on reforms and institutional changes required to improve agricultural services, as well as on supporting measures needed to facilitate reform adoption. Recommendations for the second phase include the need for a stronger coordination efforts under the leadership of the two sector Ministries, as well as the need to better communicate on project activities, results and achievements. Thanks to phase 1, all agricultural institutions have greatly improved their technical and managerial competencies but each of them will take the opportunity of the second phase to make further progresses on transparency, governance and accountability.

(b) Cofinanciers:

IFAD was the only co-financier but withdrew its contribution as the project approach was judged too much innovative and risky by a new coming manager at IFAD headquarter. However, based on the positive assessment of the first phase results, IFAD has revised its opinion towards PSAOP approach, with a particular appreciation for the role and responsibility given to producers and their organizations. IFAD participated in the elaboration of the second phase and will co-finance it for US\$ 6 million in addition to the IDA contribution of US\$ 20 million.

(c) Other partners (NGOs/private sector):

Not applicable.

10. Additional Information

The Borrower implementation completion report is presented in annex 8.

Annex 1. Key Performance Indicators/Log Frame Matrix

Table 1 – Key Performance Indicators for Phase I (as defined in the PAD)

<p>Component 1 – National Agricultural Research Funding: Establish an effective national agriculture and agro-processing research system</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NARF is a legal entity governed by private law with terms of reference satisfactory for the Association. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ The financing mechanism is established under the name of NARF. ⇒ It is an association of “public interest”, governed by private status and rules.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NARF functions satisfactorily according to agreed upon policies and procedures, certified by an independent management audit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ NARF functioning is governed by a manual of procedures. ⇒ Between 2000 and 2004, all independent audits were fully satisfactory (the 2005 report has not been yet released, but no issue foreseen for the last year of project execution).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two other donors contribute to NARF, for a minimum of 10%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ AfDB and EU have financed research projects under NARF system.
<p>Components 2 & 3 – Research Institutes Development: Improve ISRA and ITA efficiency</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISRA and ITA are operating satisfactorily according to their various management and organizational manuals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ ISRA and ITA are operating satisfactorily.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial management and accounting systems are functioning adequately as reflected in the annual audit reports, which are unqualified, except for minor qualifications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ All independent audits were satisfactory without any major qualifications.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 15 ISRA projects and 5 ITA projects have been approved by NARF. Four of these are joint ventures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ NARF financed 19 projects under ISRA’s leadership and 5 under ITA’s responsibility.
<p>Component 4 – Agricultural Extension: Establish extension services accountable to producers and responsive to their needs through contractual arrangements</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The government holds a maximum of 49% of ANCAR’s share. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Government’s participation to ANCAR’s share has been reduced to 42%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ANCAR successfully established a decentralized extension service, with contractual arrangements with producer organizations, over at least 142 rural communes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ The ANCAR is represented in the 11 regions and its network of rural and agricultural advisors cover 142 rural communities.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Producer organizations contribute to ANCAR’s operating costs (including salaries), either directly or through contractual arrangements at the local level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ POs contribute for 36% in average to the costs of ANCAR activities.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An evaluation of staff performance has been carried out after a two-year probation period and for each staff, a decision has been made (contract renewal or redeployment to the civil service). 	⇒ An assessment of ANCAR staff was done in 2005 but implementation of recommendations is pending.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All ANCAR staff is contractual. 	⇒ All ANCAR staff is contractual.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ANCAR operates according to satisfactory policies and procedures, in particular as far as the financial management and accounting system is concerned, as reflected in the audit reports. 	⇒ ANCAR's audit were satisfactory without reserves.

Component 5 – Support to Producer Organizations:

Improve producer organizations' ability to provide services to their members to access inputs, credit and marketing and to make their voice heard in the decision making processes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory functioning of the Demand-Driven Rural Services Fund, with at least 142 local and 10 regional committees effectively functioning and 5 subprojects approved per committee. 	⇒ The FSRRD is operating in 152 rural communities and in all the 11 regions; at least, 5 projects have been financed by each CLCOP.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Rural People Council for Consultation and Cooperation (CNCR) contributes to the funding of its own operating costs (excluding its public service functions) out of its own resources. 	⇒ CNCR covers its operating costs thanks to internal financial resources; PSAOP contribution to CNCR activities has decreased from 36% in September 2003 to less than 25% in October 2005.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • POs provide at least 75% of the services requested by their members. 	⇒ The FSSRD has financed 1,284 projects (1,235 through CLCOPs and 49 through CRCRs). ⇒ more than 80% of producers are satisfied with services offered by POs under FSSRD (beneficiary assessment - March 2004)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All POs requests for technology are taken into account either in research proposals or extension programs. 	⇒ POs needs for technology generation and transfer are taken into account thanks to their participation to FNRAA and ANCAR boards.

Component 6 & 7 – Support key Ministries functions:

Focus the Ministries' services on their regulatory, policy- making and monitoring functions and strengthen their capabilities in these domains

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agreed upon redeployment of personnel is completed, including for the personnel currently seconded to projects and to the <i>Sociétés Régionales de Développement Rural (SRDR)</i> 	⇒ Staff has been redeployed according to the agreed plan.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extension mandate of the SRDRs and ANCAR has been redefined on the basis of an external evaluation including the cost-efficiency of each structure, beneficiary satisfaction and 	⇒ An external evaluation of ANCAR activities has been carried out with satisfactory conclusions on ANCAR mandate; recommendations will be implemented during the PSAOP second phase

relevance of extension services in order to decide on the institutional modalities for carrying out extension services.	based on an on-going complementary beneficiary assessment undertaken under CNCR leadership.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ministries focus only on their regulatory, policy-making and monitoring functions. 	⇒ Mandates of sector Ministries, for central services and regional directorates, were revised and are under implementation. Further improvement or clarification will be prepared for the PSAOP second phase based on the on-going public expenditure review (to be completed in March 2005).

Table 2 – Achievement of triggers for the second phase

Component	Triggers achieved
NARF	NARF is a private association of public interest, whose funds are supplied by GoS, IDA resources and two other donors. Its management is certified without reserves by external audits.
Research institutes	ISRA and ITA organizational and scientific capacities have been improved and their financial management is certified without reserves by external audits. They have accessed competitive funding through NARF for joint research programs.
Extension	ANACR is a public agency, with a minority share of the State, decentralized in 142 rural communities (out of 320). Staff is contractual and its performances have been evaluated. Producers participate in the formulation and financing of extension activities.
POs	FSSRD finances services requested by POs in 142 local and 10 regional committees. The national umbrella PO (CNCR) is financially autonomous. POs get actively involved in the formulation and execution of research and extension programs.
Public services	Public services mandates focus on core public functions and staff have been redeployed accordingly, with priority to decentralized services. Respective mandates of SAED, SODEFITEX and ANCAR for delivering extension services have been clarified.

Annex 2. Project Costs and Financing

Project Cost by Component (in US\$ million equivalent)

Component	Appraisal Estimate US\$ million	Actual/Latest Estimate US\$ million	Percentage of Appraisal
Restructuring the Ministry of Agriculture	3.29	3.61	42
Ministry of Livestock	2.81	2.67	48
Strengthening the Dir. Dette et Investissement	0.52	0.79	115
Institut de Technology Alimentaire (ITA)	0.89	1.20	57
Strengthening Institut Sénégalais de Recherche Agricole	3.17	3.42	58
National Agricultural Research	3.66	3.21	78
Agricultural Extension	7.53	7.13	71
Producer Organizations	3.55	5.65	124
PPF Financing	2.00		
Total Baseline Cost	27.42	27.68	
Physical Contingencies	1.77		
Price Contingencies	1.87		
Total Project Costs	31.06	27.68	
Total Financing Required	31.06	27.68	

Disbursed data has been provided by the Fiduciary Coordination Unit on January 24, 2006 and information is based on expenses already paid or reimbursed by LOAG but also expenses not yet submitted to LOAG for review. Once grace of period expired (Avril 30, 2006) actual data should be more reliable.

Project Costs by Procurement Arrangements (Appraisal Estimate) (US\$ million equivalent)

Expenditure Category	Procurement Method ¹			N.B.F.	Total Cost
	ICB	NCB	Other ²		
1. Works	2.18 (0.92)	3.22 (1.36)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	5.40 (2.28)
2. Goods	10.50 (5.06)	0.57 (0.30)	1.03 (0.50)	0.03 (0.00)	12.13 (5.86)
3. Services	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	14.83 (11.91)	0.00 (0.00)	14.83 (11.91)
4. Operating Cost	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	8.82 (7.35)	5.91 (0.00)	14.73 (7.35)
Total	12.68 (5.98)	3.79 (1.66)	24.68 (19.76)	5.94 (0.00)	47.09 (27.40)

Project Costs by Procurement Arrangements (Actual/Latest Estimate) (US\$ million equivalent)

Expenditure Category	Procurement Method ¹			N.B.F.	Total Cost
	ICB	NCB	Other ²		
1. Works	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.69 (0.73)	0.00 (0.00)	0.69 (0.73)
2. Goods	5.05 (4.53)	0.03 (0.00)	0.16 (0.18)	0.00 (0.00)	5.24 (4.71)
3. Services	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	1.85 (1.71)	0.00 (0.00)	1.85 (1.71)
4. Operating Cost	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Total	5.05 (4.53)	0.03 (0.00)	2.70 (2.62)	0.00 (0.00)	7.78 (7.16)

^{1/} Figures in parenthesis are the amounts to be financed by the Bank Loan. All costs include contingencies.

^{2/} Includes civil works and goods to be procured through national shopping, consulting services, services of contracted staff of the project management office, training, technical assistance services, and incremental operating costs related to (i) managing the project, and (ii) re-lending project funds to local government units.

Project Financing by Component (in US\$ million equivalent)

Component	Appraisal Estimate			Actual/Latest Estimate			Percentage of Appraisal		
	Bank	Govt.	CoF.	Bank	Govt.	CoF.	Bank	Govt.	CoF.
Restructuring the Ministry of Agriculture	3.29	5.01	1.02	3.61			109.7	0.0	0.0
Ministry of Livestock	2.81	2.46	0.75	2.67			95.0	0.0	0.0
Strengthening of the DDI	0.52	0.07	0.13	0.79			151.9	0.0	0.0
Strengthening the Agricultural Research National Fund for Agricultural Research	4.06	3.35	1.24	3.42			84.2	0.0	0.0
Agricultural Extension	3.66	0.10	0.75	3.21			87.7	0.0	0.0
Producer's Organizations	7.53	2.10	1.27	7.13			94.7	0.0	0.0
Refinancing of the PPF	3.55	0.25	0.89	5.65			159.2	0.0	0.0
Total	2.00						0.0		
	27.42	13.34	6.02	27.68			100.9	0.0	0.0

Annex 3. Economic Costs and Benefits

An economic and financial analysis was done during project preparation for the overall program. It was subdivided in a farm-level financial analysis, based on a benefit and cost analysis per standard type of farm and herd, and a project-level economic analysis, based on adoption rates of technologies by standard individual farms and herds taking into account specificity of natural regions in Senegal. For the base case, the appraisal calculated an internal rate of return for the whole program of 19 percent with a net present value of 12 billion CFAF. Implementation of the proposed methodology based on farm models was difficult during the first phase and never put in practice by the project. Interventions were determined with POs during the course of project implementation and producer requests focused mainly on capacity building activities that do not have an immediate economic impact on the ground. The method will be revised to take more into account the demand-driven nature of the project. On the other hand, as outlined in the PAD, the first phase has been primarily focusing on institutional changes and on setting-up reforms of rural and agricultural services. It is therefore too early to be able to measure significant economic impact of the PSAOP both at the macro and micro-economic levels.

In addition, an impact analysis of recurrent project costs on public finances was carried out. It concluded that the recurrent costs generated by PSAOP constituted an acceptable burden on public finances and well within the Government of Senegal's financial means. This aspect has not been monitored during project implementation because the recurrent cost estimation declined to less than 5 percent of the public expenditures for the primary sector in the year 2010 and was judged reasonable and justified compared to the importance of agricultural research, extension and PO empowerment.

Annex 4. Bank Inputs

(a) Missions:

Stage of Project Cycle	No. of Persons and Specialty (e.g. 2 Economists, 1 FMS, etc.)		Performance Rating		
	Month/Year	Count	Specialty	Implementation Progress	Development Objective
Identification/Preparation					
	06/07/1995	2	AG. SERVICES SPECIALIST (1)		
	07/31/1995	3	FIN. MGMT SPECIALIST (1) AG SERVICES SPECIALIST (3)		
	11/24/1995	4	AG SERVICES SPECIALIST (2) RESEARCH-DEVELOPM (1) LIVESTOCK SPECIALIST (1)		
	01/23/1996	11	AG. SERVICES SPECIALIST (3) FIN. MGMT SPECIALIST (1) RESEARCH INFRASTRUC (1) PRODUCERS ORGANIZAT (1) RESEARCH-DEVELOPMENT (1) LIVESTOCK SPECIALIST (1) AG. POLICY (1) INSTITU. DEV (1) AG SERVICES (1)		
	04/15/1996	1	GENDER SPECIALIST (1)		
	05/07/1996	3	AG. SERVICES SPECIALIST (2) PRODUCERS ORGANIZAT (1)		
Appraisal/Negotiation					
	06/15/1998	11	RESEARCH SPECIALIST (2), OPERATIONS ANALYST (1), SECTOR MANAGER, AG. ECONOMIST (1), AG. SERVICES SPECIALIST (1), MINISTRY RESTRUCTURING SPECIALIST (1), PRODUCERS ORG. SPECIALIST (1), PROJECT ANALYST (1), LIVESTOCK SPECIALIST (1), FMS (1), PROJECT CONTROLLER (1)		
Supervision					

09/10/1999	2	AG. SERVICES SPECIALIST (2)	S	S
02/01/2000	6	AG. SERVICES & RESEARCH (1); MIN. RESTRUCTURING (1); LIVESTOCK (1); FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT (1); PRODUCER ORGANIZATIONS (1); AG. SERVICES (1)	S	S
06/05/2000	11	AG. SERVICES SPECIALIST (2); PRODUCERS ORGANIZATION (1); RESTRUCTURATION MINIST (1); AGR. EXTENSION (1); LIVESTOCK SPECIALIST (1); RESEARCH (1); FMS (1); PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST (1); ASSISTANT (1); M&E SPECIALIST, CONSUL (1)	S	S
10/09/2000	9	AG.SERVICES, RES,CO-TT (1); MINISTRY REORGANIZATION (1); CONSULT. M&E (1); LIVESTOCK SERVICES (1); EXTENSION SERVICES (1); FMS (1); RESEARCH, SPAAR (1); OR. PRODUCERS, RDV (1); EXTENSION SERV.CO-TTL (1);	S	S
06/22/2001	6	INSTITUTIONAL DEV. SPEC (1); RURAL DEV.SPC. (1); STRATEGIC ISSUES (1); TTL (1); LIVESTOCK SPC. (1); POS SPC. (1)	S	S
02/22/2002	2	AG.SERVICES, RES,CO-TT (1); MINISTRY REORGANIZATION (1);	S	S
10/21/2002 Mid-Term Review	11	PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST (1); SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT SPECIALIST (1); AG. SERVICES SPECIALIST (1); LIVESTOCK SPECIALIST (1); OPERATIONS OFFICER (1); PO SPECIALIST (1); AG .ECONOMIST S/E (1); FINANCIAL ANALYST (1); CONSULTANT (1)	S	S
07/02/2004	8	TTL, SR. AG. SERVICES SPECIALIST(1); SOCIAL DEV. SPECIALIST(1) ; SR.	S	S

			ECONOMIST (1); AG. SPECIALIST (1); LIVESTOCK SPECIALIST (1); FINANCIAL MNGT SPECIALIST (1); SR. PROCU. SPECIALIST (1); POS SPECIALIST (1)		
	11/20/2004	2	SR. AG. ECONOMIST(1); SR. OPERATIONS OFFICER TTL (1)	S	S
	02/14/2005	8	SR. AG. ECONOMIST (1); SR. OPERATIONS OFFICER (1); AG. SPECIALIST CONS.(1); OPERATIONS ANALYST (1); SPECIALIST PROCUREMENT (1); FIN MNGT SPECIALIST (1); ENGINEER (1); TEAM ASSISTANT (1)	S	S
ICR	06/19/2005	3	SR. AG. SERVICES SPECIALIST (1); AG. SERVICES SPECIALIST (1); MINIST. RESTRUCTURING (1)	S	S

January 1996 mission (first pre-appraisal mission) was a joint mission WB, French Ministry of Cooperation and French Development Agency

July 1996 mission (second pre-appraisal mission) was a joint mission WB, French Ministry of Cooperation, and IFAD. There was a close collaboration with USAID, the Canadian Agency, the European Union and FAO during that same mission.

(b) Staff:

Stage of Project Cycle	Actual/Latest Estimate	
	No. Staff weeks	US\$ ('000)
Identification/Preparation	145.7	540.6
Appraisal/Negotiation	42.3	124.4
Supervision	268.18	765.8
ICR		
Total		

Annex 5. Ratings for Achievement of Objectives/Outputs of Components

(H=High, SU=Substantial, M=Modest, N=Negligible, NA=Not Applicable)

	<u>Rating</u>				
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Macro policies</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Sector Policies</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Physical</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Financial</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Institutional Development</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Environmental</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input checked="" type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<i>Social</i>					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Poverty Reduction</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input checked="" type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Gender</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other (Please specify)</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Private sector development</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Public sector management</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input checked="" type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other (Please specify)</i>	<input type="radio"/> H	<input type="radio"/> SU	<input type="radio"/> M	<input type="radio"/> N	<input checked="" type="radio"/> NA

Annex 6. Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance

(HS=Highly Satisfactory, S=Satisfactory, U=Unsatisfactory, HU=Highly Unsatisfactory)

6.1 Bank performance

Rating

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lending | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supervision | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overall | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |

6.2 Borrower performance

Rating

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preparation | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Government implementation performance | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation agency performance | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Overall | <input type="radio"/> HS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> S | <input type="radio"/> U | <input type="radio"/> HU |

Annex 7. List of Supporting Documents

- Summary of outcome of negotiations for the PSAOP Senegal - World Bank - March 1999
- Project Appraisal Document for the first phase of the Agricultural Services and Producer Organization – World Bank – April 1999
- Panel report for the PSAOP quality at entry assessment - Quality Assurance Group -
- Back-to-office report for the PSAOP launching workshop (June 2000) - World Bank - September 2000
- Mid-term review aide-memoire and annexes - World Bank - 2002
- Enhancing the Capacities of Rural Producer Organizations – The Case of the PSAOP in Senegal – M.R. Mercoiret – CIRAD – 2003
- Reforming Agricultural Services in Partnership with Producer Organizations – Lessons of the Agricultural Services and Rural Producer Organizations Program (PSAOP) in Senegal – P. Rondot and M.H. Collion – World Bank – March 2004
- *Organisations paysannes villageoises et développement rural au Sénégal* - A. de Janvry and E. Sadoulet - Berkeley University - March 2004
- *Bilan d'exécution des activités de la composante OP - ASPRODEB - December 2004*
- *Evaluation de la composante Fonds National de Recherches Agricoles et Agro-Alimentaires – Dr. Amadou Barro – FAO – June 2005*
- *Rapport d'achèvement de la première phase du PSAOP - Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Hydraulique - August 2005*
- *Rapport de mission d'évaluation de la composante conseil agricole et rural - Franz Schorosch - FAO - August 2005*
- *Bilan et perspectives du conseil agricole et rural - ANCAR - October 2005*

Additional Annex 8. Borrower's Project Completion Report

REPUBLIQUE DU SENEGAL

==--==--==

MINISTERE DE L'AGRICULTURE ET DE L'HYDRAULIQUE

==--==--==

PROGRAMME DES SERVICES AGRICOLES ET ORGANISATIONS DE PRODUCTEURS (PSAOP)

I. INTRODUCTION

Né d'un long processus qui a démarré en 1995, le «Programme Services Agricoles et Organisations des Producteurs » (PSAOP) a abouti à la signature, le 14 octobre 1999, de l'Accord de Crédit n° 3219 SE d'un montant de 20 200 000 DTS. La mise en vigueur est intervenue le 3 mai 2000. Initialement fixée au 30 juin 2003, la date de clôture a été prorogée au 31 décembre 2004 puis au 31 décembre 2005. Le présent rapport résume les enseignements tirés de l'exécution de la première phase du PSAOP. Il est structuré comme suit : (i) une présentation globale du projet qui insiste sur sa conception, ses objectifs et les résultats globaux obtenus ; (ii) une analyse rétrospective des différents facteurs qui ont influencé son exécution aussi bien du côté de l'emprunteur que de la Banque Mondiale, et des réalisations des composantes du programme ; (iii) une analyse des mécanismes institutionnels mis en place pour la pérennisation des acquis de la première phase. Un accent particulier est mis sur les leçons à tirer, les recommandations et les perspectives.

II. Conception du projet

2.1 contexte et processus de formulation du projet

Jusqu'en 1995, le secteur agricole sénégalais était confronté à une crise grave et persistante qui s'est traduite notamment par la stagnation de la production agricole globale, la précarité de la situation alimentaire de nombreux ménages et par une forte prévalence de la pauvreté en milieu rural. A la base de cette situation certaines contraintes avaient été répertoriées :

- des sécheresses cycliques, une dégradation des ressources naturelles et une baisse de la fertilité des sols ;
- une persistance du monopole de l'Etat sur des produits tel que l'engrais, avec des obstacles réglementaires pour les exportations et les importations malgré son désengagement des fonctions marchandes;
- un environnement socio-économique de l'agriculture peu incitatif pour la majorité des agriculteurs dont la capacité d'investissement reste très limitée;
- la faiblesse des organisations des producteurs dans les domaines de la gestion et de l'organisation ;
- un système de recherche très peu centré sur les préoccupations des producteurs ;
- des services publics de conseils agricoles non réceptifs et inefficaces pour disséminer les technologies ;
- des infrastructures socioéconomiques de base insuffisantes.

Pour faire face à ces problèmes, le Sénégal a démarré à partir de 1995 le processus de formulation du PASA accompagné du PISA dont le PSAOP est une composante. Le programme a été élaboré avec la participation de différents partenaires comme la Banque Mondiale, la Coopération Française, le FIDA, l'USAID, l'UE, la FAO et le CRDI. Des structures nationales étaient aussi impliquées ; il s'agit des Ministères de l'Agriculture, de l'Elevage, de la Recherche, de l'Economie et des Finances, de l'Environnement et des producteurs à travers le CNCR et l'ASPRODEB, sous la coordination de l'Unité de Politique Agricole (UPA) du Ministère de l'Agriculture. Les domaines ciblés étaient : la recherche agricole et agro alimentaire, le conseil agricole, les services centraux et décentralisés de l'agriculture et de l'élevage, et l'appui aux OP. Au cours de cette phase dite d'évaluation, plusieurs missions comprenant des visites de terrain ont été organisées. Elles ont permis de faire le point sur les progrès

dans l'élaboration du dossier et de mobiliser des experts de 11 spécialités du côté des partenaires. Du côté de l'Etat du Sénégal, les cadres techniques, administratifs, financiers des Ministères et structures ci dessus cités ont participé aux rencontres sectorielles et aux réunions de restitution. L'évaluation proprement dite s'est tenue au mois de juin 1998 au Sénégal. Elle s'est effectuée sous forme d'ateliers sectoriels, avec la participation des cadres nationaux et des experts de la Banque Mondiale, qui ont permis d'élaborer les documents de base des négociations avec la Banque Mondiale en mars 1999 à Washington. Une LPDI du secteur a ensuite été élaborée en 1999 par le Gouvernement avant le démarrage officiel du projet en mai 2000.

2.2 Objectifs et stratégie du projet

L'enjeu de la première phase du PSAOP était d'aider à mettre en place les réformes institutionnelles pour le développement agricole contribuant ainsi à la réduction de la pauvreté en milieu rural et la conservation de l'environnement. Ces réformes ont été définies dans la Lettre de Politique de Développement Institutionnel du secteur pour répondre au nouveau contexte, marqué par la libéralisation, la décentralisation, l'émergence de nouveaux acteurs et d'une société civile forte.

Par rapport à cet objectif global, dans la première phase, les objectifs spécifiques visaient à : a) accroître la productivité, la production et les revenus des petites exploitations agricoles grâce à l'évolution des techniques, b) donner des pouvoirs aux producteurs et à leurs organisations, c) rendre les services publics plus responsables à l'endroit des producteurs et des organisations des producteurs ; et d) répondre de façon équilibrée aux besoins identifiés par les différentes catégories de ruraux, tenant compte notamment des besoins spécifiques des populations démunies, des femmes et des jeunes ruraux.

Les aspects sectoriels couverts par le programme ont été axés sur i) les réformes institutionnelles pour responsabiliser les services agricoles et les baser sur la demande pour les rendre plus efficaces, transférer ou partager certaines fonctions avec le secteur privé et la société civile, ii) la génération et le transfert des technologies dans le but d'améliorer la productivité agricole de façon durable, la diversification des cultures et la conservation des ressources naturelles et iii) l'habilitation et le renforcement des capacités des OP.

Les stratégies retenues au vu des résultats enregistrés sur les projets précédents étaient les suivantes :

- une rupture d'avec des projets de recherche et de vulgarisation qui n'étaient pas comptables de leurs résultats devant les producteurs et ne tenaient pas compte de leurs besoins ;
- Un soutien aux organisations de producteurs pour les habiliter à participer à la définition de l'agenda et des priorités de la recherche et du conseil agricole et à prendre leurs propres décisions de renforcement de capacités au moyen d'un mécanisme appelé FSRRD ;
- Une structure de conseil couvrant l'ensemble des services de conseil et moins dépendante de la tutelle du Ministère ;
- un système de recherche qui intègre la production et la transformation ;
- une structure de financement qui encourage les complémentarités et le partenariat des divers acteurs impliqués dans la recherche ;
- Une déconcentration/décentralisation et une redéfinition des fonctions des Ministères.

Dans sa mise en oeuvre, le programme s'est articulé autour de composantes toutes indépendantes les unes des autres, avec leurs propres manuels de procédures et leurs systèmes financiers et comptables devant développer des synergies d'actions :

- (a) Le Fonds National de Recherches Agricoles et Agro-alimentaires (FNRAA) chargé de financer le système national de recherches agricoles et agro-alimentaires, capable de répondre aux besoins des clients et utilisant au mieux les ressources disponibles ;
- (b) La Recherche Agricole et Agro-alimentaire à travers l'Institut Sénégalais de Recherches Agricoles (ISRA) et l'Institut de Technologies Alimentaires (ITA) en vue d'améliorer leurs performances, leurs capacités scientifiques et de gestion, en réhabilitant leurs infrastructures et en apportant de nouveaux équipements ;
- (c) L'Agence Nationale de Conseil Agricole et Rural (ANCAR) comme service de conseil agricole

- comptable de ses résultats envers les producteurs et répondant à leurs besoins à travers des arrangements contractuels ;
- (d) Les Organisations de Producteurs pour améliorer leurs capacités à fournir des services à leurs membres pour accéder aux intrants, au crédit et au marché et à faire entendre leurs voix dans les processus de prise de décision ;
 - (e) Les Ministères déconcentrés dans les régions et davantage focalisés sur leurs fonctions de définition des politiques, de suivi et de contrôle ;
 - (f) Une unité fiduciaire, dépendant de la DDI, chargée de coordonner la passation de marchés et les décaissements.

Il n'a pas été créé une unité de gestion de projet au sens classique du terme. Le système mis en place était ainsi structuré : une coordination technique confiée à la DAPS et une coordination des aspects décaissements et passation des marchés exercée par une cellule composée d'un chargé des décaissements et d'un spécialiste en passation des marchés et placée sous l'autorité du Directeur de la DDI. Ce système inédit dans les projets financés par la Banque Mondiale au Sénégal, a été conçu et mis en oeuvre pour deux raisons principales : (1) les difficultés nées de l'exécution des PPF 968-1 et 968-2 ; (2) la volonté commune de la Banque Mondiale et du Gouvernement de renforcer les capacités de l'Emprunteur.

III. EXECUTION DU PROJET

L'exécution du Programme a été marquée par la conjonction de facteurs à la fois favorables et défavorables aussi bien du côté de l'emprunteur que du côté du bailleur.

3.1 Facteurs ayant influencé l'exécution

3.1.1 Du côté du Sénégal

Facteurs favorables

1. La qualité des leaders des OP et de l'équipe d'appui technique ayant accompagné leurs Fédérations ;
2. La reconnaissance par l'Etat des OP comme partenaires crédibles ;
3. La stabilité politique du pays ;
4. L'accroissement substantiel des crédits de fonctionnement des services centraux et décentralisés des Ministères et des structures de recherche agricoles et agro-alimentaires ;
5. L'engagement de tous les acteurs impliqués dans le programme, notamment certains cadres des Ministères ;
6. La mise en place d'une unité fiduciaire au niveau de la DDI ;
7. La mise en place du FNRAA.

Facteurs défavorables

1. Le retard dans la mise en place des cadres responsables du MAE et de l'ANCAR et les conditions contraignantes d'éligibilité aux premiers décaissements appliquées à certaines composantes (ISRA et ASPRODEB) ont entraîné, entre autres facteurs, la prolongation de juin 2003 à décembre 2005 ;
2. Les longs délais mis dans la passation des marchés au démarrage du programme ont affecté le chronogramme de certaines activités ;
3. La faiblesse de la coordination technique du programme tant au niveau régional que national liée à la non satisfaction des importants besoins en appui institutionnel (ressources humaines, infrastructures et équipements, budget de fonctionnement et faible rémunération des agents des Ministères) ;
4. Les difficultés de mobilisation des fonds de contrepartie sur le budget d'investissement ;
5. L'évolution rapide du portefeuille de projets de recherche au sein du FNRAA n'a pas été suivie d'une augmentation conséquente des moyens humains et logistiques en matière de suivi technique et financier ;
6. L'absence d'une stratégie de communication du PSAOP ;
7. La faiblesse de la concertation entre les acteurs de la R&D en particulier au niveau national ;
8. L'insuffisance des ressources pour la réhabilitation des centres et stations de recherche de

- l'ISRA ;
9. L'insuffisance dans la couverture à temps des CLCOP existants par l'ANCAR;
 10. L'absence de mécanismes de prise en charge et d'intervention des animateurs, auxiliaires ou relais des OP ainsi que la faiblesse du montant plafond des sous projets ont affecté le renforcement des capacités de ces dernières ;
 11. Le manque de ressources humaines au niveau des Ministères a entravé le bon déroulement du programme et la coordination des interventions des différents projets au niveau local en particulier PSAOP, PNIR, AFDS, POGV ;
 12. L'absence d'un manuel de procédures (reporting financier, passations des marchés), la mise en place tardive ou l'inexistence d'outils de suivi des marchés et des décaissements (logiciels) pour mieux formaliser les rapports de travail entre l'unité fiduciaire et les autres composantes ;
 13. Les nombreux changements institutionnels au sein des Ministères (MAE, MAH, MEL, Directions, etc.) pendant la durée du programme.

3.1.2 Du côté de la Banque Mondiale

Facteurs favorables

1. La qualité de la supervision assurée par une forte équipe de la Banque Mondiale, ainsi que la fréquence des missions;
2. La disponibilité à temps des aides mémoires ;
3. La décentralisation des décisions au siège de la banque à Dakar ;
4. L'instauration des revues trimestrielles du portefeuille des projets de la Banque.

Facteurs défavorables

1. La longueur des délais de traitement des dossiers soumis à la Banque Mondiale pour avis de non objection ;
2. La rigidité des procédures de la Banque quant à l'utilisation des fonctionnaires et/ou compétences internes aux structures comme consultants;
3. Les procédures de décaissement sont peu adaptées à une exécution correcte des projets de recherche ;
4. La fermeture de sous compte et/ou l'absence de caisse d'avance ont gêné respectivement le fonctionnement du FNRAA et de l'ANCAR.

3.2 Les réalisations des composantes du projet

3.2.1 Résultats globaux du projet

Depuis mai 2000, date d'entrée en vigueur du PSAOP, les réformes institutionnelles se sont mises en place et les institutions ont fonctionné avec l'orientation prévue : La déconcentration des Ministères est effective avec la création des DRDR et des IRSV et la séparation des différentes fonctions d'appui au développement agricole tient compte des missions de chacun des partenaires (MAE, OP, secteur privé, ANCAR, institutions de recherche); Un dispositif institutionnel régional est mis en place dans certaines régions en partenariat avec les OP, les institutions de recherche et de conseil agricole et les DRDR ; Les organisations de producteurs se sont habilitées à travers des mécanismes de concertation mis en place à différents niveaux (CRDR, CLCOP) ; Des changements sont opérés dans les stratégies d'intervention en milieu rural à travers un système national de CAR décentralisé ; Les structures de recherche sont mieux organisées et ouvertes aux autres acteurs ; Un FNRAA comme outil de financement de la recherche est mis en place et est opérationnel.

3.2.2 Le Fonds National de Recherches Agricoles et Agroalimentaires (FNRAA).

Le fonds a été créé en 1999 et a pu bénéficier d'un statut d'Association d'utilité publique en janvier 2004 ; il dispose de manuels relatifs à la gouvernance et à la gestion de projets de recherche. Les différents organes (comité de gestion, comité scientifique et technique et secrétariat exécutif) sont mis en place et sont fonctionnels. Le personnel du Secrétariat exécutif mis en place, a bénéficié de formations qualifiantes sur la passation des marchés, le suivi évaluation, l'élaboration et le suivi des indicateurs de performance, l'utilisation optimale du logiciel TOMPRO. Depuis son démarrage, le fonds a lancé 05

appels à propositions. Ces appels ont permis de financer 30 projets de recherche sur 92 soumis répartis comme suit du point de vue de la coordination: ISRA (19), UCAD (4), ITA (3), SOEFITEX (2), LERG (1), EISMV (1) et couvrant toutes les zones agro écologiques du pays et exécutés en partenariat avec les acteurs du Système National de recherches Agricoles et Agroalimentaires (SNRAA) pour un montant global de 1,7 milliards FCFA. Le taux d'approbation des projets est de 33% et 50% des projets financés portent sur de la R&D. Le Fonds a aussi contribué à la consolidation du Système National de Recherche Agricole et Agroalimentaire (SNRAA) et favorisé le décloisonnement des institutions de recherche en les associant autour de : 11 projets regroupant 20 institutions partenaires pour le 1er appel ; 05 projets fédérant 13 institutions pour le 2nd appel ; 10 projets associant 22 institutions pour le 3ème appel ; 02 projets pour 08 institutions pour le 4ème appel ; 02 projets associant 08 institutions pour le 5ème appel

Le FNRAA a organisé deux séminaires ateliers sur l'élaboration des projets de recherche et un atelier sur la valorisation des résultats de la recherche au profit des agents (chercheurs, enseignants-chercheurs) de diverses structures du SNRAA. Il a aussi assuré la coordination de la mise en place d'un système informatisé de suivi évaluation des trois composantes FNRAA, ANCAR, ASPRODEB avec des bases de données interconnectées. Quant à la diversification des sources de financement, la Banque Africaine de Développement (BAD) et l'Union Européenne ont participé au financement du FNRAA à travers respectivement le PAPEL et le reliquat du Fonds Commun de Contrepartie à l'Aide Alimentaire (FCAA). Les audits financiers de 2000 à 2004 ont été réalisés, transmis dans les délais et jugés satisfaisants.

3.2.3 La recherche agricole et agroalimentaire

L'Institut Sénégalais de Recherches Agricoles (ISRA).

Le conseil d'administration a été élargi aux OP, aux élus locaux et au Privé à travers le Conseil national du patronat (CNP). L'ISRA est à présent redimensionné avec la création d'un parc de recherche (regroupement des centres nationaux de Dakar sur le site du LNERV en cours de réhabilitation) et des centres régionaux de recherche ; il est renforcé en équipements de laboratoire et de station, en matériels informatiques et roulants (voitures, motocyclettes). La consolidation de l'équilibre financier a permis la couverture des charges de structures, l'application des dispositions du règlement d'établissement et la redynamisation de la politique sociale. Pour pérenniser cet équilibre, un plan pluriannuel de financement a été élaboré et soumis aux autorités de tutelle. Le système de gestion financière a été renforcé et fonctionne normalement grâce à la formation, l'amélioration de l'environnement et des procédures informatiques et une meilleure coordination interne des fonctions financières. L'Institut coordonne 18 projets régionaux et participe à la mise en oeuvre de 27 projets de recherche financés par le FNRAA sur 15 attendus ; il coordonne 20 de ces projets. Le programme de formation a permis le renforcement des capacités des personnels d'appui, du potentiel scientifique et technique de l'Institution : formation diplômante (30 agents) ; formation qualifiante continue (06) ; formation modulaire (116) ; et voyages d'étude (06). L'ISRA a mobilisé 88% des ressources prévues dans son plan stratégique grâce notamment à une forte contribution des financements extérieurs.

L'Institut de Technologie Alimentaire (ITA)

L'organisation interne de l'ITA est rationalisée, la séparation des activités de Recherche et les activités commerciales est effective. Le cadre de gestion interne est renforcé avec l'élaboration de manuels de procédures (qualité, GRH, administratives, comptables et financières). En matière de transfert de technologie, l'ITA a réalisé 50 modules de formation au bénéfice de 690 personnes dans les domaines de la transformation/conservation des fruits et légumes, de la viande, du lait, des produits halieutiques, des céréales et légumineuses, etc. Depuis le démarrage du PSAOP, l'ITA a exécuté 27 projets financés par des partenaires au développement dont 5 par le FNRAA. La mise en oeuvre du plan de renforcement des capacités a permis le développement du potentiel scientifique et technique du personnel par le biais de formations diplômantes (08 agents), des formations modulaires (43 agents), séminaires de perfectionnement (18 agents). L'ITA a bénéficié d'un appui en équipements d'ateliers pilotes, en matériels de laboratoire, en ouvrages scientifiques et en matériels informatiques et logistiques (voitures, motocyclettes).

3.2.4 L'Agence Nationale de Conseil Agricole et Rural (ANCAR).

Créée en 1997 avec un statut de société anonyme à participation publique majoritaire, l'ANCAR a démarré ses activités en 2002. Elle a développé un système de conseil agricole décentralisé travaillant au service des OP à travers une approche participative basée sur le partenariat (sociétés privées, ONG, SRDR, filières et organisations faitières, institutions de crédits, projets et programmes, institutions de recherche, médias, etc.) et la coopération internationale à travers plus de 30 protocoles d'accord et 10 conventions. Le système de conseil agricole et rural s'est mis en place avec des équipes décentralisées fonctionnelles (Directions régionales). A la date du 30 avril 2005, le personnel du conseil agricole et rural (71 CAR, 21 chefs d'équipe et 23 Techniciens spécialisés) couvre 112 communautés rurales avec CLCOP, 28 communautés rurales avec groupes d'OP et 15 communes rurales. Le plan de déploiement, en cours, avec le recrutement de 35 conseillers agricoles et ruraux, permettra à l'agence d'exécuter des programmes dans les 142 communautés rurales prévues. La prise en charge de la demande en matière de conseil agricole et rural est un processus continu qui implique tous les agents des Directions régionales. La première phase était axée principalement à la mise en place institutionnelle et le test des démarches de conseil (mécanismes décrit dans le manuel des procédures techniques de l'ANCAR). Ainsi, au 31 décembre 2004, 2817 contrats ont été signés avec les OP qui ont contribué à hauteur 36% dans le financement. Grâce à un partenariat diversifié et sa stratégie d'intermédiation et de faire faire, les producteurs qui travaillent avec les équipes de l'Agence ont davantage accès aux différents systèmes de crédit. L'Agence a mené des initiatives concluantes dans le domaine de la production communautaire de semences (arachide, maïs, etc.), l'amélioration des productions animales (production laitière dans la région de Kolda, apiculture), l'appui contractuel aux OP en synergie avec le secteur privé local pour la commercialisation, le renforcement des capacités organisationnelles des OP (mise en place du Comité National de l'Interprofession de la Pêche artisanale au Sénégal - CONIPAS). Elle a initié des activités sur la gestion de la qualité des produits : (i) la méthode de Gestion Intégrée de la Production et des Déprédateurs dans le cadre du programme GIPD, (ii) la vulgarisation des Bonnes Pratiques Agricoles phytosanitaires (BPA) (iii) un système de traçabilité est en test dans le cadre du projet d'opération pilote d'amélioration de la filière de production et valorisation d'arachide de bouche en cours avec le CLCOP de Paoskoto.

L'élaboration et la mise en oeuvre des programmes de conseil agricole et rural ont été rendues possibles grâce à un ensemble d'instruments méthodologiques construits ou adaptés par l'ANCAR : un Manuel des procédures techniques (MPT) qui décrit les mécanismes relatifs au fonctionnement technique de l'Agence ; un Manuel des procédures de gestion administrative, financière et comptable (MPG AFC), des notes d'orientation sur le fonctionnement technique des DR. La mise en place de l'Agence a été appuyée par l'acquisition d'équipements informatiques, audiovisuels, de mobiliers de bureau, de voitures et de motocyclettes, etc. L'Agence a hérité et réhabilité les anciens locaux de la SODEVA (dans les régions de Thiès, Diourbel, Kaolack, Fatick et Louga) et le bâtiment de l'ex-Projet Semencier pour son siège. Deux catégories de formation ont été dispensées sur la culture d'entreprise et sur les méthodes participatives pour 104 agents. Des formations qualifiantes au Sénégal et à l'étranger ont concerné 68 agents de base (47 conseillers agricoles, 9 chefs d'équipe et 12 techniciens spécialisés) et 11 cadres et agents administratifs. L'audit stratégique et organisationnel et l'évaluation du personnel ont été conduits à son terme et respectivement les rapports final et provisoire sont disponibles. Un système de gestion financière et comptable décentralisé est mis en place comprenant notamment un manuel de procédures administratives et comptables, un cadre et un référentiel comptable intégrant les aspects analytique et budgétaire avec des missions d'audit interne régulières. Ainsi, les rapports d'audit sur les différents exercices de 2000 à 2004 sont produits à temps et sans réserve majeure. L'ANCAR a joué le rôle d'agence d'exécution financière dans le cadre du programme pastoral pilote (PPP) qui a acquis des équipements informatiques et des véhicules. Le PPP a mis en place en zone sylvo-pastorale 4 sites expérimentaux (Asré bani, Lol lol, Borboral et Boki Ndawé), des plans de gestion et renforcé les capacités des acteurs sur l'approche holistique.

3.2.4 Les Organisations des Producteurs.

Des mécanismes de concertation des OP sont mis en place et fonctionnent à travers 152 CLCOP au niveau des communautés rurales et 11 Cadres régionaux de Concertation des Ruraux (CRCR) au niveau régional avec des manuels de procédures de gestion et de fonctionnement. Ces outils sont aujourd'hui des mécanismes facilitant la concertation, le financement, la communication et la mobilisation des producteurs à différents niveaux. Les CLCOP ont facilité le dialogue entre, d'une part, les OP et les conseillers ruraux et, d'autre part, les OP et les services de développement et d'autres projets ; Une bonne circulation de l'information entre les cadres de concertation du niveau national et régional est favorisée grâce à l'appui de conseillers en communication. Le Fonds des services ruraux régis par la demande géré par l'ASPRODEB a financé 1235 sous projets sur 852 prévus, permettant la formation de 61 855 exploitants familiaux et leurs accès à des technologies (amélioration de races d'animaux, multiplication de semences sélectionnées) et aux systèmes de financement décentralisés. Un bulletin trimestriel d'information (canal rural) paraît régulièrement. L'appui institutionnel s'est traduit par l'acquisition de véhicules pour le CNCR et pour 04 CRCR, d'équipements informatiques, de matériels audiovisuels. L'étude de faisabilité du fonds National de Développement rural a été restituée en Décembre 2004 et les OP ont libéré leurs parts du capital de l'ANCAR. Le diagnostic des fédérations a été fait et a débouché sur des plans d'action soumis à différents bailleurs de fonds. La composante a appuyé l'implication du CNCR dans le processus d'élaboration de la LOASP, de la définition de la lettre de politique de la filière arachide, et dans les différents organes de gouvernance, d'instituts et de services agricoles

3.2.5 Les Ministères de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage.

La restructuration des Ministères a conduit :

Pour l'Agriculture : (i) à la création de la DAPS dotée de locaux fonctionnels, chargée entre autres de la coordination technique du programme, (ii) au recentrage des missions des Directions nationales (Agriculture, Protection des végétaux, Horticulture, etc.) ; (iii) à la déconcentration avec la création des Directions Régionales de Développement Rural (DRDR) rattachées au Cabinet avec des fonctions élargies (pilotage du développement rural au niveau de la région, suivi-évaluation, contrôle), l'installation des services départementaux du développement rural. Par ailleurs, le Ministère dispose d'un manuel de planification budgétaire.

Pour l'Elevage : i) à la création de la CAPSE, ii) à des Inspections Régionales de Services Vétérinaires (IRSV) recentrées dans leurs fonctions régaliennes en santé animale et en contrôle de qualité des denrées alimentaires d'origine animale; (iii) à l'installation des Inspections Départementales de Services Vétérinaires (IDSV). Les programmes de formation ont permis le renforcement des capacités : Pour l'agriculture : 213 agents au niveau central et 508 au niveau régional sur des thèmes différents dont 24 formations qualifiantes et 05 diplômantes. Six (6) de ces formations ont été effectuées à l'étranger. Pour un accès équitable à la formation, un manuel des procédures a été élaboré. Pour l'élevage : les formations ont mobilisé 559 hommes/sessions au niveau local et 30 hommes/sessions à l'étranger.

Les Ministères de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage ont bénéficié d'un appui institutionnel (équipements informatiques, véhicules et motocyclettes, mobiliers de bureau, matériels audiovisuels) aussi bien au niveau central, régional que départemental. La Direction de l'Administration Générale et de l'Equipement (DAGE) a été renforcée avec le recrutement d'un comptable. Le PSAOP a permis une augmentation significative des budgets de fonctionnement des Directions centrales, des DRDR, des IRSV, des IDSV et SDDR, la réalisation de 05 études pour le compte des Ministères dont celle sur la revue des dépenses publiques en cours ; et a accompagné la privatisation de la médecine vétérinaire en supportant la formation de vétérinaires privés et le mandat sanitaire. Pour le siège du Ministère de l'Agriculture, toutes les études sont terminées et la construction différée à la 2ème phase. Le Ministère de l'Elevage a bénéficié d'un programme de réhabilitation des locaux des laboratoires des IRSV de Thiès, Kaolack et de St Louis, de la mise en réseau informatique des services centraux et décentralisés et de la construction d'un centre de quarantaine à Rosso Sénégal.

3.2.6 L'Unité Fiduciaire /DDI

Une Cellule légère rattachée à la Direction de la Dette et de l'Investissement du Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances, a été mise en place pour coordonner les décaissements et la passation des marchés du programme. Elle est composée d'un Chargé des décaissements et d'un Spécialiste en passation des marchés recrutés au démarrage du programme, ainsi que d'une assistante au Chargé des décaissements dont le recrutement est intervenu en cours de la troisième année. La Cellule a bénéficié de locaux fonctionnels, de mobiliers de bureau, de matériel informatique et de véhicules. La quasi-totalité des marchés programmés a été réalisée à l'exception de la construction du siège du Ministère de l'Agriculture qui est reportée à la deuxième phase, après que toutes les études techniques ont été achevées. Le personnel de la cellule a bénéficié de formations qualifiantes en passation des marchés, en gestion financière et suivi budgétaire et en perfectionnement en Anglais, ainsi que de deux formations diplômantes (comptabilité et gestion MBA). Les réunions (bimensuelles puis mensuelles) tenues par la cellule avec les composantes ont permis le décloisonnement des composantes et la capitalisation en interne des procédures de passation des marchés et de décaissements, ce qui a permis une réduction des délais et une amélioration de la qualité des documents de passation des marchés. Dans le cadre des revues périodiques des états certifiés, organisées par la Banque Mondiale, deux missions ont concerné le PSAOP en 2003 et en 2005. Toutes ces missions ont noté dans leurs conclusions, la bonne qualité des DRF du Programme. De 12% en année 2 du Projet, le taux de décaissement a atteint à la date du 20 août 2005, le niveau de 95% avec un taux de progression moyen de 20% /an.

IV. Impacts et leçons apprises

4.1 Impacts sur les institutions

4.1.1 Les Organisations de producteurs : Les producteurs et leurs organisations aux niveaux national (CNCR/fédérations nationales), régional (CRCR) et local (CLCOP) ont participé à la mise en cohérence de l'ensemble des activités et réformes entreprises dans le cadre du PSAOP. Ils sont des partenaires reconnus des services publics. Les CLCOP participent aujourd'hui à la création d'un environnement organisationnel local. Les OP aux niveaux national, régional et local sont capables de formuler et de négocier des propositions de politiques et de stratégies de développement agricoles. Elles font maintenant entendre leur voix dans les décisions qui sont prises les concernant. Elles ont pu améliorer leur niveau d'organisation, ce qui a permis, aux niveaux local et régional, d'accéder à des fonds d'investissements détenus par d'autres projets ou disponibles à travers les institutions bancaires. Elles ont pu commencer à résoudre des contraintes structurelles du secteur agricole, à savoir la disponibilité des semences de qualité, l'accès aux crédits et la mise en marché de leurs produits.

4.1.2 Le Fonds National de Recherches Agricoles et Agro-Alimentaires (FNRAA) : Grâce au programme, le fonds existe, dispose d'un statut juridique approprié avec des organes de gestion fonctionnels, s'appuie sur un Comité Scientifique et Technique mobilisant un réseau de 100 experts nationaux, sous régionaux et internationaux ; Il finance des projets qui résultent de la demande des utilisateurs. Son expérience est en train de faire tâche d'huile dans la sous région (Tchad, Bénin, Burkina Faso, Mali & Tunisie) et il a contribué à la consolidation du SNRAA à travers entre autre la mise en place d'un plan stratégique validé par ses membres.

4.1.3. La Recherche Agricole et Agro-alimentaire

4.1.3.1. Institut sénégalais de Recherches Agricoles (ISRA) : L'élargissement du conseil d'administration aux OP, aux élus locaux et au secteur privé à travers le Conseil national du patronat (CNP) a permis leur participation à la définition des orientations de l'Institut qui a diversifié et consolidé son partenariat scientifique tant au plan national que sous régional. L'équilibre financier a été amélioré avec un effet de levier sur la mobilisation des financements au titre de conventions particulières et des recettes tirées des offres de services aux partenaires (Ministères, ANCAR), et a permis une meilleure maîtrise de ses charges de structures. Le renforcement des capacités a permis le renouvellement des profils et compétences, l'amélioration du contrôle interne et la production à temps des états financiers. La gestion scientifique s'est nettement améliorée avec la tenue régulière des réunions du comité scientifique et technique, la valorisation des acquis (bilan de la recherche redynamisation de sa revue scientifique avec l'ITA) et l'évaluation des chercheurs.

4.1.3.2. Institut de Technologie Alimentaire (ITA) La séparation des fonctions de recherche et des fonctions commerciales est effective. La diversification des sources de financement est une réalité avec la contribution de l'ICRAF, l'ACDI, l'AIEA, l'ONUDI, l'UEMOA et la Coopération espagnole). Les états financiers sont produits à temps et sans réserves majeures.

4.1.4. L'Agence nationale de Conseil Agricole et Rural (ANCAR) L'Agence diversifie son partenariat à travers des arrangements contractuels, ce qui permet à de nombreux acteurs publics et privés d'harmoniser et de rationaliser leurs interventions en direction des OP et d'adopter une démarche de réponse à la demande.

4.1.5. Les Ministères de l'Agriculture et de l'élevage La stratégie qui supporte la mise en oeuvre des réformes est maintenant bien ancrée et bien orientée avec une claire compréhension des missions de chacun des partenaires. Cela s'est traduit par la LOASP adoptée par l'Assemblée nationale en juin 2004. Les services régionaux assument mieux leurs responsabilités de coordination du développement rural et le Ministère s'est doté d'un bureau de la formation professionnelle agricole. Le financement de la déconcentration par l'Etat, malgré son insuffisance, est devenu systématique, ce qui devrait en assurer la pérennité.

4.1.6 L'Unité fiduciaire/DDI Les rapports d'audit du compte spécial et des composantes ont été régulièrement établis et transmis à la Banque Mondiale sans réserves majeures. Les demandes de retrait de fonds pour la reconstitution du compte spécial ont été préparées et envoyées en moyenne chaque mois, conformément aux procédures de l'IDA en la matière.

4.2 Leçons apprises

La démarche participative adoptée dans la préparation comme dans l'exécution du programme a permis de manière consensuelle, de définir la nature et la profondeur des changements institutionnels, le contenu, les cibles et les moyens des actions d'accompagnement. Ainsi, des actions non prévues initialement ont été ainsi prises en charge parce que répondant aux préoccupations des OP et/ ou du Gouvernement. Cependant, le PSAOP reste peu connu des partenaires régionaux (Sociétés régionales, autres Projets, ONG, etc.). Le pari de ne pas disposer d'une unité de gestion du projet aurait dû être accompagné d'une dotation suffisante de moyens à la disposition du service en charge de la coordination technique. L'absence d'unité de gestion du projet ne devait pas signifier une absence de moyens notamment en ressources humaines qualifiées et en logistique. A cela s'ajoute une faiblesse de la coordination technique du programme aux niveaux régional et national par des administrations qui sortent affaiblies des programmes d'ajustement structurel. Aussi, les différences de traitement salarial entre les personnels des différentes composantes et la faiblesse du système indemnitaire ne facilitent pas la collaboration et le partenariat.

Spécifiquement, les enseignements suivants peuvent être tirés :

- **Au niveau du FNRAA :** L'option prise de ne pas financer les équipements et les modalités de mise à

disposition des fonds ne sont pas souvent adaptées à la spécificité des projets. Il en est de même de la durée des projets qui ne correspond pas souvent au phasage du programme. Les ressources humaines pour le suivi technique et financier des projets ont été insuffisantes et la construction du partenariat autour des projets FNRAA a posé des problèmes pour la justification des dépenses et l'élaboration des rapports.

· **Au niveau de l'ISRA et l'ITA** : La spécificité de la recherche fait qu'un certain nombre de formations ne trouve pas de spécialistes chez les prestataires locaux. En dépit des réalisations du plan de formation, le potentiel scientifique de l'ISRA reste insuffisant du fait des départs massifs des chercheurs. L'appui institutionnel ne prend pas en compte tous les besoins en équipements des programmes de recherches à soumettre au FNRAA, il importe de reconsidérer cette disposition qui constitue une contrainte pour les chercheurs. Le transfert de toute technologie dans le domaine de la transformation s'accompagne de connaissances dans le domaine industriel dont les études de faisabilité n'étaient pas prévues dans le PSAOP constituant ainsi un frein au transfert et à la valorisation des résultats. L'insuffisance des crédits alloués au Génie Civil et aux équipements a obligé l'ISRA à différer certains investissements relatifs à la réhabilitation et à l'équipement des centres et stations régionaux.

· **Au niveau de l'ANCAR** : Le statut de l'ANCAR comme Société Anonyme à participation publique majoritaire est difficilement conciliable avec l'objectif d'être comptable vis-à-vis des OP (influence de la tutelle) ce qui a des conséquences sur ses performances et la qualité de ses services. La non prise en compte des besoins de conseil agricole et rural dans les zones urbaines et périurbaines et des communes rurales pose un problème d'équité. La privatisation des services de conseils agricoles et ruraux nécessite une bonne connaissance des catégories d'OP et une modulation de leur niveau de participation aux coûts du conseil. Malgré toutes ces difficultés inhérentes à la mise en place d'une structure nouvelle, l'Agence a réalisé des activités de conseil agricole et rural répondant à la demande des organisations de producteurs. Le mécanisme de réponse à la demande a atteint une masse critique qui autorise une approche technique plus structurante.

· **Au niveau des OP** : Les ressources publiques mises à leur disposition ont été gérées de manière transparente et efficiente et leur ont permis de renforcer leurs relations avec leur base et leur capacité d'analyse et de propositions. Elles sont à même de participer à la mise en oeuvre des réformes des services de l'agriculture et de l'élevage. Le personnel existant de l'ASPRODEB et du CNCR est surchargé de travail parce que sollicité par une série de partenaires nationaux et internationaux et ne peut mobiliser toutes les ressources disponibles pour mettre en oeuvre les activités prévues. Malgré la promotion des CLCOP, d'autres cadres continuent d'exister en totales contradictions et la dépendance des cadres de concertation (CRCR et CLCOP) à la subvention du FSRRD limite leur autonomie de fonctionnement. Les Agences d'Exécution Technique ont coûté cher au programme et n'ont pas pallié à l'absence de dispositif devant accompagner une réelle construction de la demande de services. La faiblesse des montants alloués par sous projet n'ont pas permis une prise en charge suffisante de la demande. Les conditions d'accès aux virements du FSRRD de l'ASPRODEB par l'intermédiaire de structures financières décentralisées, encore peu habituées à ce mécanisme, retardent l'exécution des activités des CLCOP. Malgré les mécanismes et procédures mis en place, il existe encore des problèmes de transparence et de gouvernance au niveau de certains CLCOP.

· **Au niveau des Ministères de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage** : L'absence de motivation du personnel impliqué dans la gestion du Programme n'a pas permis de fidéliser les agents à leurs postes. Malgré la mise en oeuvre de la réforme, des conflits de compétences demeurent entre les Directions Centrales et les Directions Régionales. Les crédits alloués à la formation ont été insuffisants par rapport aux besoins des Ministères. Les véhicules acquis au profit des DRDR/SDDR se sont révélés inadaptés.

· **Au niveau de l'unité fiduciaire/DDI** : La mise en place d'une cellule légère de coordination de la gestion financière et de passation des marchés a permis une gestion de proximité et un suivi rapproché des composantes.

V. Recommandations/Conclusions

5. 1. Pour le Sénégal: Globalement, le Sénégal devra, avec les ressources du PSAOP2, mettre en oeuvre concrètement les orientations de la LOASP. Il faudra également élaborer une stratégie nationale de communication et d'information, améliorer la coordination technique du programme et accélérer le processus de mise en place du FNDASP. Pour redynamiser les cellules régionales R&D, l'ISRA, le CNCR et l'ANCAR doivent instaurer des réunions de concertation au niveau national. Le plan stratégique du SNRAA devra servir de document d'orientations lors de l'élaboration des plans sectoriels des instituts de recherche et des établissements d'enseignement supérieur. Le programme devra aider à harmoniser les systèmes d'indemnisation pour les missions de terrains au niveau des différentes composantes et actualiser le manuel des procédures de mobilisation du BCI élaboré par les Ministères.

FNRAA L'évolution rapide du portefeuille des projets nécessite le renforcement des ressources humaines pour faciliter le suivi technique et financier des projets de recherche. Il faudra, pour l'amélioration du fonctionnement du fonds, un siège fonctionnel mis à disposition par l'Etat, la révision des manuels régissant la gestion des projets et l'élaboration d'un manuel de suivi technique et financier des projets de recherche.

ISRA et ITA : L'appui en crédits de fonctionnement est nécessaire pour le recrutement de chercheurs et d'allocataires de recherche compte tenu des nombreux départs enregistrés et des besoins nouveaux. Pour améliorer le transfert aux industries des résultats de recherche, il sera nécessaire d'inscrire des crédits pour les études de faisabilité industrielles des technologies. Le plan pluriannuel de financement de l'ISRA devra être approuvé avec les autorités étatiques en vue notamment de la révision de son règlement d'établissement et du recrutement de chercheurs.

ANCAR : Il faudra inscrire des ressources supplémentaires dans le budget de l'Etat pour permettre le recrutement du dispositif de base nécessaire à la couverture de tous les CLCOP, en attendant la mise en place du FNDASP. L'Agence devra étendre les services fournis aux OP dans toutes les Communautés rurales, les zones urbaines, périurbaines et les communes rurales pour plus d'équité et déterminer la part des OP dans le financement des programmes de conseil agricole et rural selon les catégories des OP et les types de services à fournir. La mise en place du Système d'Information Technologique Agricole et Rural (SITAR) est aussi nécessaire pour capitaliser les informations existantes. La mise à disposition de locaux fonctionnels au niveau central et régional

Composante OP : Les collectivités locales étant les premiers partenaires des OP, il sera nécessaire d'assurer un meilleur ancrage institutionnel des cadres de concertation (CRCR et CLCOP) pour leur pérennisation. Dans ce sens, il conviendra de renforcer la concertation régionale des OP. L'ASPRODEB devra réviser les différents manuels de procédures et de gestion en vue d'augmenter les capacités de répondre à la demande de financement des sous projets et de définir des mécanismes de prise en charge et des interventions des animateurs, auxiliaires ou relais des OP. Le Gouvernement devra encourager une plus forte synergie avec les programmes du secteur pour une utilisation plus rationnelle des fonds d'investissement. La composante OP devra mettre plus l'action sur les OP faîtières nationales en ce qu'elles sont les outils pour le développement des filières. Dans ce sens, la composante devra aider à une plus grande maîtrise économique et technique des OP.

Ministères de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage : Pour permettre aux Ministères d'assumer leurs missions, il est nécessaire de renforcer la composante Ministères en ressources humaines et matérielles. Par ailleurs, pour la mise en oeuvre des réformes, le principe de la subsidiarité devra être formalisé en particulier sur le contrôle phytosanitaire, la certification des semences et les statistiques. L'importance de la formation et son caractère transversal à plusieurs composantes implique de prévoir une sous composante stratégie nationale de formation agricole et rurale au sein de la composante Ministère. L'appui à la mise en oeuvre de la LOASP devra être un axe majeur d'intervention de la phase II. Le PPP devra être évalué pour apprécier sa pertinence et son ancrage institutionnel. La composante élevage devra être dotée d'une unité de gestion autonome.

Unité Fiduciaire DDI Un manuel de procédures formalisant les rapports de travail entre l'Unité fiduciaire

et les composantes devra être élaboré.

5.2. Pour la Banque mondiale

Un fonds d'investissement productif en faveur des OP pour favoriser la maîtrise technique et économique de leurs activités et des segments de filière sur lesquels elles sont maîtresse d'œuvre et un mécanisme de financement de la R/D doivent être mis en place. Les appuis institutionnels des composantes (national, régional et local) doivent être renforcés tant pour les équipements que pour le fonctionnement de même que les capacités des institutions partenaires impliquées dans les projets de recherche. La mise en place d'un dispositif d'aide à la formulation des sous projets suivant le processus de construction de la demande serait nécessaire. Un mécanisme assurant la continuité des projets indépendamment de la durée des phases du programme, des procédures de mise à disposition des fonds conformes au calendrier d'exécution et des mécanismes souples de fonctionnement du secrétariat exécutif et de sécurisation des subventions aux projets devront être mis en place. La rémunération, sur le crédit IDA, des compétences internes pour l'animation de séminaires /ateliers pour certaines formations modulaires devra être autorisée. La phase 2 du PSAOP devra financer en priorité les investissements complémentaires de l'ISRA et l'ITA notamment les équipements des locaux réhabilités et le matériel agricole. Pour la deuxième phase, des orientations majeures sont proposées pour consolider les acquis, améliorer la connaissance du programme, promouvoir les investissements productifs, intégrer la formation agricole et rurale, étendre le conseil agricole et rural dans les zones périurbaines et les communes rurales. La note conceptuelle élaborée en trace les grandes lignes.

