

MID-TERM REVIEW – INDICATIVE COOPERATION PROGRAMME - BURKINA FASO - LUXEMBOURG

Mid-term review - Final report

Version dated 30/03/2012

(Original: French)

Team members:

Sandrine BEAUJEAN
Elisabeth LAMP
Adrien NOUGTARA
Saïdou OUEDRAOGO
Thierry PACCOUD
Serge Alfred SEDOGO

InSyDe, Information, Systèmes et Développement sàrl

31, Boulevard Grande Duchesse Charlotte

L-1331 Luxembourg

TVA N° LU 20935729

RCL N° B 108583

www.insyde.lu

Ref: Service contract 5-EVAL-2011 signed with the Luxembourg Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 29/09/2011.

FACT SHEET AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - EN

FACT SHEET – BURKINA FASO

	PIC II	PIC I
Period	2008-2012	2003-2007
Budget	62,9 millions €	21,6 millions €
Objective	Contribute to capacity building for a sustainable economic development and poverty reduction	Poverty Alleviation
Priority sectors	Natural Resources Management Technical and Professional Education and Training	Education, Technical and vocational training
Ad hoc sectors	Health, Alphabetisation	

Political commitment	Challenges
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity building through a sector-wide approach (SWAp) and programme approach - Application of Aid efficiency principles (Paris Declaration) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tripling the budget in comparison to PIC I - New modalities, more complex and time demanding - Set up of a sector wide approach in sectors poorly structured and supported - Three weak domains (Coordination, Mid-term Expenses Framework, Monitoring-Evaluation): targeted for capacity building

Implementation in figures (on 15/01/2012)

Commitment rate: 56 % - Financial execution rate: 25 %-
Disbursements spread over and estimated between 12 and 13 millions € in 2013 and 2014

Projects / Programmes	Terms - Financial execution on 15.01.12									
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
BKF010 - Alpha										
BKF011 - FP										
BKF012 - PAGREN										
BKF013 - Transfusion										
TPET	BKF014 - Alpha				81%					
	BKF018 - EFTP									
	FONAENF				60%					
NRM	BKF015 - IFN 2				23%					
	BKF016 - PN-PTFM				37%					
	BKF017 - Zébu Azawak				16%					
	BKF019 - PASF									
	FAO - PAGED-PFNL				73%					
	PNUD - PTFM				25%					
Health	BKF020 - Transfusion									
	FNUAP - Fistule				100%					

Situation	Identified weaknesses	Opportunities - Perspectives
Governance	Small operational steering committees Transparency and reciprocity of information on the execution	Targeted by BKF18 and 19 through capacity building
Monitoring - Evaluation	Not results oriented	
Synergies	Opportunities not always exploited within and between projects and sectors	Potential integration and consolidation of ongoing projects experiences via BKF18 and 19
Transversal themes	Not a systematic concern	More systematic integration in BKF18 and 19

Main conclusions and recommendations

SWAp	Solid foundations established. To be continued.
Sector programmes	Watch BKF18 and 19 structuring potential. Exploit their integration potential.
Aid efficiency	Higher ownership. Good alignment with regard to sector strategies. Encouraging initiatives at the level of harmonization. Efforts needed to continue to increase the use of the national systems and improve result based management.
	Extension of the PIC II length up to 2015. Time for the first lessons to

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The PIC II marks an acceleration of the cooperation between Burkina and Luxembourg with a budget that is three times the one of PIC I. The PIC II is also a turning point for the implementation of the cooperation. The two partners demonstrated notable willingness and perseverance in anchoring their cooperation programs in the two PIC II priority sectors (vocational training and management of natural resources) as part of sector wide approaches.

The result is a mitigated one: on the one hand, tripling the budget has increased the pressure on the effectiveness of the programs implementation. On the other hand, establishing a sector-wide approach has called for new implementation modalities, more complex and lengthier to be effective in sectors which were poorly structured in 2008. Two risks could be expected from this duality: either a longer than expected period to move from the formulation phase to the implementation phase or a limitation in applying the principles of the Paris Declaration.

Four years after signing the PIC II, the risk that has materialized is the one linked to the implementation of the programs. One year from the term of the PIC, the commitment rate is only 56% compared and the budgetary execution rate is 25% in comparison to the total budget. There are several reasons for this delay, the main ones being the late definition of operational sector policies; the time for understanding, owning and constructing the sector-wide approach; the delays associated with the co-formulation; the discussion on the choice of the procedures to use; the heaviness of some national procedures.

Both partners are very committed to the implementation of the Paris Declaration. Clear progress is noted in terms of the alignment with strategic and sector policies, the ownership and the harmonization. Progress is also visible but less strong in terms of the alignment with national systems and mutual accountability. Efforts are still needed in terms of results-based management. At the implementation level, this overall positive assessment is confirmed in the case of the bilateral cooperation. The picture is more mitigated for projects/programs supported by Luxembourg through multilateral agencies. These programs have a lower performance management, the information is less accessible compared to bilateral cooperation and the implementation is less opened to national procedures (FAO, UNFPA).

The perspectives at the level of the implementation in 2012 are encouraging with acceleration in the pace of projects/programs' implementation that should continue until the end of 2014 and lead to a level of disbursement which should be about 12 and 13 million respectively in 2013 and 2014. The majority of projects/programs will expire in 2015, this deadline is extended to 2016 and 2017 for both sector programs (BKF18 and 19).

The period of early 2015 appears to be a key milestone for the cooperation between Burkina and Luxembourg. This period seems convenient for the definition of a new PIC, successor to the PIC II. Defining a new PIC in 2012 seems premature given the slow progress achieved in the new projects/programs. An early new PIC would have little added value because the formulation phase for two major sector programs is still under completion. To increase the pressure on the two priority areas would be risky, the

capacity of these sectors being already heavily mobilized by the two new sector programs.

The recommendations of the mid-term review for the current PIC and the successor are developed at three levels:

1. Strategic recommendations which concern more the 2 governments as the driving forces of the PIC
2. Recommendations regarding the implementation which rather concern those involved at the operational level
3. More specific recommendations which concern one or the other partner.

STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations	Actions to plan	Actors
<p>Define a successor to the PIC II after December 2012:</p> <p>Option 1: Extension of PIC II until early 2015 keeping the focus on the two current priority sectors</p>	<p><u>Benefits from option 1:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To take into account the gap between the projects / programs schedules and the term of the PIC II; - Reaching the expected level disbursements in 2013 and 2014; - Alignment with the principles of the EU Code of Conduct (maximum two sectors of concentration per TFP). <p><u>Disadvantages of option 1:</u> This option does not allow Luxembourg to meet its financial commitments as it does not require an increase in the budget.</p>	DG Coop, MAE
<p>Option 2: Option 1 + opening of the cooperation to a third priority sector</p>	<p><u>Benefits from option 2:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alignment with the principles of Burkina Faso (maximum three areas of concentration per TFP); - Guarantees of more regular disbursements and at the expected level; - For Luxembourg, a solution to meet its financial commitment in the context of the extension of the PIC <p><u>Disadvantages of option 2:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shift of calendars with a support to a new sector overlapping with the PIC III <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preserve the efforts made for concentrating the support and increase the overall consistency of Luxembourg interventions - Conduct a strategic consultation at the level of the Burkina Faso government and of the other donors on the issue of sector concentration of Luxembourg 	DG Coop, MAE, TFP

	<p>and the opening of Luxembourg's cooperation to a new area.</p> <p>For the choice of a potential new priority sector: Work to maintain the overall coherence of the Luxembourg cooperation strategy in Burkina by exploring ways to choose the new sector within the two priority areas identified by the mid-term review: <i>basic education or livestock</i>.</p> <p><i>Benefits of supporting basic education:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a direct contribution to the fund PDSEB is an operational and quick solution that could ensure more regular disbursements for the Luxembourg cooperation. - a timely solution for Burkina that is looking for partners in this sector to overcome the withdrawal of the Netherlands. <p><i>Benefits of supporting livestock:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a sector currently poorly supported <p><i>Disadvantages of supporting livestock:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not an immediate solution since an institutional diagnostic, followed by a formulation phase enrolling preferably in a sector-wide approach, should be made. 	
Begin preparatory work for the definition of the PIC III late 2014, early 2015	<p>Late 2014, early 2015: For the priority sectors of PIC II:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draw the first lessons of the sector programs that are being put in place, through mid-term evaluation (if the schedules are ok) or a new lighter mid-term review focused on this aspect. - Based on the results of these studies (evaluation, review, diagnosis), explore in a better informed manner the possibility of sector budget support in the next PIC <p>For the new sector:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Depending on the option selected, continue and consolidate the commitment made in the framework of the extension of the PIC II 	DG MAE Coop,
Improve the political and strategic follow-up of the PIC	<p>Hold more regular meetings of the Partnership Commission at the ministerial level, if not every year, at least every two years.</p> <p>If the Partnership Commission can not be held at ministerial level every year, hold joint meetings at the level of Cooperation Directors / General Directors</p>	DG MAE Coop,

	<p>every year.</p> <p>Inform discussions and decisions of the Partnership Commission with a dashboard related to global and specific objectives of the PIC and with a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the effects of interventions supported by Luxembourg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The progress of sector policies based on the monitoring framework in place in the sectors - The level of technical and financial implementation of the projects / programs - The monitoring of the implementation of the principles of aid effectiveness based on the indicators defined in the Paris Declaration 	DG Coop, MAE, projects and sector actors, Lux-Development
Increase aid previsibility	<p>Identify the reasons limiting the recording of the aid financed by Luxembourg in the national budget.</p> <p>Strengthen national mechanisms to ensure that project teams transmit the required financial information in a timely manner for the preparation of the Budget Law</p>	DG Coop, Sector Ministries and projects teams
Continue the efforts to harmonize interventions with other TFP	<p>Maintain the active involvement and participation of Luxembourg within the TFP community, particularly as leader in the vocational training sector (see specific recommendations for Luxembourg: resource vs. commitments).</p> <p>Learning from the three exercises of co-formulation that Luxembourg has just made, record them in a document that will guide and ease future co-formulation exercises in Burkina and elsewhere, for Luxembourg cooperation or other cooperation. This document could be enriched with other experiences of co-formulation, later be complemented with experiments of co-implementation and an orientation guide for Luxembourg.</p>	MAE (Embassy), concerned TFP and Lux-Development
Support DG Coop's role as coordinator of donors' support	<p>In identifying the next PIC, repeat the experience of the past and leave the final choice of the priority sectors to the MEF, in coordination with other ministries.</p> <p>Associate DG Coop to the decision on budget allocation across sectors.</p> <p>Exchange, at the level of Burkina Faso government, the cooperation programs of the different TFP.</p> <p>Make sure to respect the coherence of the division of</p>	<p>MAE, MEF/DG Coop</p> <p>DG Coop, Burkina government</p>

	labor between donors as planned. In case of support request not planned in a cooperative program, it should be subject to a dialogue at the government level, coordinated by DG Coop. TFP should be involved in these discussion.	
Enhance the role of multilateral agencies	<p>Short term: Conduct a tripartite consultation to discuss and exploit the results of internal strategic reflection conducted at UNDP, to enhance its role and define new strategic directions for its intervention.</p> <p>Medium term (at the time of identification of the next PIC): Expand this consultation to other multilateral agencies that could be supported by Luxembourg through its next PIC</p>	<p>DG Coop, MAE (Embassy), PNUD</p> <p>DG Coop, MAE, multilateral agencies</p>
Communicating around the experience of Luxembourg cooperation in Burkina and draw lessons	<p>Document this unique experience for Luxembourg to have gone that far in anchoring its intervention in the context of a sector wide-approach and program and in applying the principles of aid effectiveness already in a PIC of second generation.</p> <p>From the first lessons drawn, communicate around the benefits and risks both in Burkina within the community of TFP, and in Luxembourg.</p> <p>Communicate better on this approach would actually bring more arguments to discuss conclusions that sometimes can quickly be drawn from an implementation rate unusually low for the Luxembourg cooperation. It could also help removing any remaining doubts about new approaches and modalities.</p>	DG Coop, MAE

RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL

Recommendations	Actions to plan	Actors
<p>Exploit the opportunity of BKF 18 and 19:</p> <p>(1) to ensure the sustainability of the benefits from the other projects supported by Luxembourg (former and current)</p> <p>(2) to consolidate</p>	<p>Continue to inform and sensitize the TFP contributing with Luxembourg to sector programs BKF18 and BKF19, as well as concerned sector actors about the ongoing projects supported by Luxembourg cooperation which potentially have a relationship with these two programs.</p> <p>Associate to this awareness action national project teams, in charge within Lux-Development and FAO (PAGED / PFNL), of the implementation of these interventions.</p> <p>At the level of the steering committees of ongoing</p>	<p>Sector Ministries, national projects teams, MAE (Embassy), concerned TFP, FAO and Lux-Development</p>

and build on successful experiences	<p>projects, exploit the mid-term evaluation of the projects to identify best practices (BKF12) that could benefit other programs and the achievements that could be supported by the sector programs to enhance their sustainability (BKF11 and 14).</p> <p>At the level of the steering committees of sector programs, study the possibility of integrating in their work programs the priority actions that have been identified</p>	
Strengthen the national monitoring system (mechanisms and tools) for greater mutual accountability at all levels (project-sector operator-recipient) and fully integrated across sectors	<p>Share on time relevant information on the technical and financial implementation, on the one hand, from the national teams and projects to the DEP and, on the other hand, from the project teams to the implementing agencies and vice versa.</p> <p>Ensure that national project teams are the cornerstone of this system and have access to comprehensive information on the implementation of the interventions.</p> <p>Depending on the partners, identify the level of detail of information that is relevant to communicate and develop a system of accountability which varies according to each type of partner.</p>	<p>Responsible: National Teams projects, sector ministries (DEP)</p> <p>Support: Implementing agencies</p>
Promote and implement the principle of results based management at the level of the two sector programs	<p>Use or develop indicators to measure qualitative and quantitative progress of sector policies at the level of the outcomes and the objectives: this involves going beyond the measure of inputs and outputs and better assessing results and performance.</p> <p>Give preference to using existing indicators or develop new indicators appropriate for the national players in terms of concept (which results), definition (which indicator) and method (how to calculate it regularly).</p> <p>Formulate realistic indicators, easy to measure and reduced in number able to inform the progress at the sector and national strategies levels. This involves the establishment of monitoring mechanisms (dashboards, collection devices with planning resources...).</p> <p>Connect these monitoring devices with sector medium-term expenditure frameworks to align planned activities, expected results and available resources (or resources to mobilize)</p>	<p>Responsible: National Projects Teams, sector ministries (DEP, monitoring, evaluation and statistical cell)</p> <p>Support: Implementing agency I</p>
Strengthen or set up ad hoc structures to make operational	<p>For ongoing projects:</p> <p>Avoid major changes that would slow the pace of</p>	Sector Ministries, MEF (DG)

<p>decisions outside of the Steering Committees meetings</p>	<p>implementation of ongoing projects. Wherever possible, open the Steering Committees of ongoing projects to provide more space for stakeholders (beneficiaries and operators) concerned by the interventions but not represented in the committees, at least as observer.</p> <p>In case of the unavailability of the Secretary-General, give delegated authority to referents of projects to ensure regularity and punctuality for the meetings of the steering committees.</p> <p>For purely operational matters, transfer operational skills to a lighter technical body liable vis-à-vis the Steering Committee.</p> <p>For programs in formulation:</p> <p>From the start, identify existing national bodies that could take over the role of the Steering Committee and strengthen the sector dialogue framework.</p> <p>If a new instance is to be set up, integrate it into the organizational structure of ministries, establishing fully integrated mechanisms and sustainable beyond the program</p>	<p>Coop), MAE (Embassy), Lux-Development</p>
<p>Accelerate the implementation of the PIC II, by removing some institutional and organizational barriers</p>	<p>Exploit the results of the discussions of the workshop on procurement reform.</p> <p>Speed the review of procurement procedures. Ensure that these revised procedures allow an acceleration of the implementation of interventions and are quickly applied.</p> <p>Associate the DEP of the Ministry of Health in BKF20 and include this project in the list of projects and programs of the Ministry of Health</p>	<p>Burkina government</p> <p>Ministry of Health, Lux-Development</p>
<p>Ensure a better integration of cross-cutting themes</p>	<p>Make more systematic baseline studies prior to sector programs (foreseen in the BKF19 and to be foreseen in the BKF18) to integrate these topics and formulate gender, environment, ... strategies more effective in these areas.</p> <p>Use the results of baseline studies provided in the BKF 19 (and to include in the BKF18) for the definition of indicators to be included in the monitoring system.</p>	<p>Responsible : Sector ministries</p> <p>Support : Implementing agencies</p>

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BURKINA FASO

Recommendations	Actions to plan	Actors
Make widely and readily accessible information contained in the Platform Aid Management	Accelerate work on the online access to the information of the PGA in a dynamic form, to enable establishing the mapping of different TFP interventions in the territory and to make specific requests by sector, by region, by TFP, by modalities of intervention.	DG Coop

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LUXEMBOURG

Recommendations	Actions to plan	Actors
Optimize the information system with multilateral agencies	<p>Move towards decentralization of exchanges of purely operational information between the representations of agencies on the field and the Embassy of Luxembourg.</p> <p>Establish or strengthen the mechanism for copying mails to ensure a comprehensive and systematic information exchange at all levels (field and headquarters).</p> <p>Establish a regular monitoring system detached from the implementation of the interventions (by tranches) and from the triggering the payment of the next tranche.</p>	MAE, Multilateral agencies
Review the commitments and/or the resources of the Embassy	<p>Perform diagnostics of the capacity (human resources) of the Luxembourg Embassy and compare it with its commitments as a leader in the vocational training sector and the commitments related to the sector-wide and program approach.</p> <p>Depending on the outcome of the diagnostic and of the policy choices of Luxembourg, decide whether to strengthen the cooperation office in Ouagadougou or to refocus its commitments.</p>	MAE
Ensure more work complementarity between the Embassy and Lux-Development	Exploit the experience of Luxembourg in other countries (Nicaragua) to define a clearer division of work between the Embassy and Lux-Development in the field. This is essential in the context of sector-wide approaches where the boundaries between the operational and policy levels are not always clear.	MAE, Lux-Development
Continue adjusting the mandate of Lux-Development	At the headquarters level, reflect on the changing role of Lux-Development in the context of SWAp and program around a support and advisory role to the MAE and to the sectors.	MAE, Lux-Development