

Ex ante appraisal of the impacts on poverty of the project  
"Plateforme du Millénaire de Diamniadio"

Process documentation of the first Poverty Impact Assessment  
(PIA) in the Republic of Senegal

Kerstin Meyer, Andrea Warner, Roland Hackenberg, Nathalie Manga Badji

Dakar, June 2007

## CONTENTS

A	Introduction .....	3
B	Analytical review of the PIA Diamniadio Appraisal .....	4
	1. PIA Diamniadio Players .....	4
	2. PIA Diamniadio Process .....	7
	3. Lessons learned about PIA the tool .....	14
C	Prospects for the use of PIA in Senegal.....	18

## A Introduction

1. A Poverty Impact Assessment (PIA) was conducted for the first time in Senegal between February and April 2007. The object of the assessment was the Diamniadio<sup>1</sup> Industrial Platform, a prestigious investment project of the Senegalese Government, which aims to attract funds from the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA), among other sources. The assessment of the impacts the project is likely to have on poverty was conducted during the (advanced) planning stage of the project. The executing agencies for the assessment were the PRSP Monitoring Unit within the Ministry of Economics and Finance (Cellule de Suivi des Programmes de Lutte contre la Pauvreté CSPLP/MEF) and the organisation responsible for implementing the "Diamniadio Millennium Platform" project (Agence de la Mise en Oeuvre de la Plateforme du Millénaire Diamniadio). The German-Senegalese advisory project attached to the Ministry of Economics and Finance (gtzMEF) provided technical support services.

2. The "Diamniadio Millennium Platform" project aims to generate growth through employment in the agricultural, industrial and services sectors in Dakar. Optimistic estimates reckon that within the next twenty years, 2,000 companies could be attracted to set up operations in the programme area, which covers more than 6,000 hectares. Together they ought to create 75,000 new jobs. The overall costs of the project are put at USD 1.2 billion, of which 250 million are to be sought from the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA), 630 million from the private sector and the remainder, of over 400 million dollars, from the Senegalese Government and its partners.

3. The PIA evaluation process was officially launched in mid-March 2007, and the method presented to a wider audience. The training and analytical work was conducted during an intensive phase in April lasting about four weeks. On 19 April 2007, the initial results were presented and discussed at a meeting chaired by the two executing organisations, and on 21 May the final report of the ex-ante impact assessment of the Diamniadio project was presented. The results of the PIA are currently being incorporated into the development of a project monitoring system for Diamniadio.

4. The Poverty Impact Assessment has spawned two reports. The "Projet de la Plateforme du Millénaire de Diamniadio, Analyse préalable de son impact sur la pauvreté (PIA)" (Diamniadio Millennium Platform Project. Ex-ante Poverty Impact Assessment), published on 21 May 2007, lays out the results of the Poverty Impact Assessment. This present report documents the course of the Poverty Impact Assessment in retrospect, in order to identify lessons learned that might be of use for future Poverty Impact Assessments.

5. In this present report we will look firstly at the actors involved, the roles they played, their motivation, agendas and overriding interest with regard to the PIA exercise. Then we will analyse the process in retrospect, and identify lessons learned. Subsequently, we will look at the PIA as a tool, at difficulties encountered and possible ways of overcoming these. Finally, we will look at prospects for the future utilisation of the PIA in Senegal. This documentation is based primarily on planning documents, minutes of meetings held and systematic feedback. Additional information was gleaned from interviews conducted with some participants and from an evaluation meeting held with the core group of analysts at the end.

---

<sup>1</sup> Diamniadio is the name of a locality. The same word in Serer means « hopefully you are bringing peace and good news » .

### PIA Diamniadio Players

The parties responsible for the Poverty Impact Assessment of the Diamniadio project were the Agence de la Mise en Oeuvre de la Plateforme du Millénaire de Diamniadio (AMPMD), the PRSP Unit attached to the Ministry of Economics and Finance (CSPLP) and the German-Senegalese advisory project (gtzMEF).

6. Along with the governments of other countries, the Government of Senegal has undertaken to reduce poverty and, to this end, implemented a pertinent Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP). The PRSP II (2006-2010)<sup>2</sup>, which came into force in October 2006, is the overarching strategy to promote growth and reduce poverty. It stakes out the framework for Senegalese economic and social policy. The PRSP aims to enhance the coherence of the various sector policies and projects, and gear them more strongly to the imperatives of reducing poverty. With the first of its four priorities, the strategy devises approaches for broad-based economic growth<sup>3</sup>. The Diamniadio project is intended to be a key element of this policy, and great hopes are vested in it. The second generation PRSP is marked by the participatory procedure used to produce it, as indeed was its predecessor, the PRSP I. Five stakeholder committees were not only involved in drafting the PRSP, but are also to be involved in implementation and monitoring at sub-national level during the implementation phase up to 2010<sup>4</sup>.

**PRSP  
Monitoring  
Unit  
(CSPLP/MEF)**

7. The PRSP Monitoring Unit within the Ministry of Economics and Finance (CSPLP) has the task of coordinating the design and monitoring of the strategy. In addition to observing quantitative indicators of the PRSP, it is responsible for providing the conceptual back-up for various policies and interventions. The CSPLP also supervises the financial aspect of the PRSP and communicates progress made throughout the course of the process.

8. The CSPLP believes that the range of instruments that make up the Poverty Impact Assessment meet specific needs resulting from the implementation of the poverty reduction strategy. In several cases projects were initially planned only on the basis of concrete activities (inputs) and direct benefits (outputs), whereas more complex or larger-scale impacts on the direct poverty situation have been surmised without any prior assessment. The officers of the CSPLP also feel that the PIA is:

- capable of being more easily adapted to the Senegalese context
- easier to use than other instruments and involves fewer resources<sup>5</sup>
- a capacity development tool, which above all allows the regional-level PRSP committees to better plan their interventions and to gear them more specifically to the imperatives of poverty reduction.

<sup>2</sup> Document de Stratégie de Croissance et de Réduction de la Pauvreté (DSRP-2) (Poverty Reduction and Growth Strategy Paper)

<sup>3</sup> Work is currently ongoing on the growth policy strategy under the aegis of the Primature (Stratégie de Croissance accélérée, SCA)

<sup>4</sup> five committees represent the various views of the government, the local authorities, civil society, the private sector and donors.

<sup>5</sup> PSIA is generally considered a comparable instrument.

Thanks to this positive attitude, the CSPLP was initially a crucial driving force behind the introduction of the PIA in Senegal.

9. At the end of the process, the CSPLP was asked about its initial expectations and new achievements on completion of the PIA. It was particularly impressed by

- having an instrument on which donors and the Government of Senegal agreed and which also required fewer human, financial and logistical capacities than other comparable instruments
- how much it had learned and understood about the Diamniadio Millennium Platform
- the fact that it had helped influence the monitoring system for the Diamniadio project
- the fact that the strategic link between the Diamniadio project and the PRSP 2 had been clarified
- the new improved institutional relations between the CSPLP and the Diamniadio Millennium Platform
- the fact that the respective roles and inter-relations between the most important actors involved in the platform had been clarified and identified, opening the way for a sustainable participatory process to support implementation.

10. The German-sengalese policy advisory project to the Ministry of Economics and Finance (MEF) assists the Ministry to improve effectiveness and efficiency of ongoing policy reforms. The advisory services are meant to be geared closely to ongoing processes and provide assistance in the development of specific technical solutions and capacities. Adopting a systemic understanding of reforms, they take into account a wide spectrum of actors. As in this case, the project can also generate advantageous links at an international level.

**The gtz/MEF  
policy advisory  
project**

11. The project had the following expectations when the Poverty Impact Assessment was introduced:

- to offer a methodical alternative that would oblige even large-scale programmes or projects to take a results-oriented approach to planning rather than an output-oriented one, and to put poverty orientation explicitly on their agenda
- to have at its disposal a tool which is demanding as regards economic analyses but which at the same time helps communicate and explain these.
- to strengthen the new participatory approach of the Diamniadio agency.

At the end of the PIA process, project staff made positive mention of the following:

- They had been involved in extremely informative and differentiated discussions of the concept and the transmission channels of broad-based growth.
- They had contributed to upgrading national capacities.
- They had been part of a process marked by the extremely high level of commitment and motivation of all involved.
- They had been able to observe changes in the project and monitoring concept of the Diamniadio Platform, resulting from the participatory PIA work, which will continue to have an impact in the future.
- They might well have triggered greater demand for PIA in Senegal.

**The Agency for the  
implementation of the  
Diamniadio Millennium  
Platform (AMPMD)**

12. The Agency for the Implementation of the Diamniadio Millennium Platform (AMPMD) is preparing the project on behalf of the Senegalese Government and with initial funding from the Millennium Challenge Account<sup>6</sup> (MCA). Although a complete and correct application for project funding was submitted by the Senegalese as far back as 2004, (conceptual paper plus preliminary study), there have been subsequent delays in financing. There is not yet a cast-iron guarantee that the MCC<sup>7</sup> will provide funding. It is expected to authorise funding by the end of 2007, however. The fact that the AMPMD was under a certain amount of pressure to complete various preliminary studies was almost certainly a contributory factor in its decision to conduct a PIA. The move of a staff member from the CSPLP to the AMPMD at the start of 2007 also played a part. In spite of the risk of the impact assessment turning up critical findings, the AMPMD was, from the outset, extremely committed and accepted ownership. Several staff members of the AMPMD were largely released from their other duties to allow them to take part in the group of analysts. It financed both workshops in Yenne, chaired the public presentation of the results, and will have the PIA report translated into English.

13. In retrospect, the AMPMD staff members were highly impressed by the Poverty Impact Assessment conducted for the Diamniadio project because:

- They feel that their role has been strengthened vis à vis the MCC. It did not previously have methods at its disposal to analyse in particular the socioeconomic impacts of the project, of which the MCC takes a critical view.
- The PIA has highlighted new (social and political) dimensions and underlined the complexity of the project. It has enabled a differentiated assessment of the complex interrelations between the planned industrial growth and poverty reduction.
- For the project there is now a concrete overview of sensitive, critical and decisive factors, risks and recommendations on how to prevent these risks becoming reality.
- It is becoming clear that, through the PIA process, communication structures have been improved, which will facilitate a long-term exchange of information, views and experience among stakeholders.
- The demands made of the Platform management by the Senegalese Government have been more clearly formulated and the understanding of the political aspects of the scope and challenges of the project has been expanded.
- Stakeholder capacities were strengthened.
- Advocacy work has been performed for the project.
- A clear vision has emerged as to what measures will be needed to counter risks and how the risks are to be monitored.
- The PIA process has generated a high-quality final document, which sets out the socioeconomic and poverty-reduction impacts of the project in a very clear way, and which gives the AMPMD a better negotiating position vis à vis the MCA.

---

<sup>6</sup> The Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) is the product of an initiative of the US President George W. Bush, which benefits various countries.

<sup>7</sup> The Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) is a control instrument of the MCA, funded by the US Government.

14. Since January 2007 the Diamniadio project has also been aiming to adopt a participatory procedure, based on the experience gained during the PRSP process; thus the central actors in the Diamniadio region were invited to attend fact-finding and discussion events along with representatives of national non-governmental organisations. Civil society representatives at national and local level were involved at various points throughout the PIA process. A local monitoring committee set up by the AMPMD (comité local de suivi (CLS)<sup>8</sup> was able to play a valuable part in the analytical process, particularly towards the end of the process. The CLS made the most of the PIA workshop as a platform, and focused on the subject-specific matter, in order to clearly put forward local interests and obtain information felt to be important for the local people. The civil society representatives felt it important to become familiar with the PIA instrument at the outset of the process. As work progressed it was more important to them to have the opportunity to look in more depth at the Diamniadio project. Because of personnel constraints, the PRSP committee of local authorities only became involved in the PIA at a very late stage. The absence of the private-sector was only noticed very late in the proceedings. All participants pointed out that private-sector involvement would have been important and that they would have liked to see the private sector play a greater part.

#### Other actors

15. Since there were no financial incentives, it seems safe to assume that the actors became involved in the PIA process out of genuine interest.

"To start with, we were mainly curious to see how a Poverty Impact Assessment would work. Soon, however, the concrete assessment of the impacts of Diamniadio on poverty became more and more interesting, because this is a project that could play an important role in our country in the future." (statement of a participant)

## PIA Diamniadio Process

16. The initial conceptual draft of the introduction to Poverty Impact Assessments from January 2007 laid the emphasis on capacity development for all participants and addressed the PRSP officers in the 11 regions of Senegal. The PIA training courses were to be held on a pilot basis in one region, ideally under the aegis of the "Comité Régional de Suivi du DSRP" (PRSP Regional Monitoring Committee) and in the hope that regional and local development plans for implementing the PRSP could be better geared to reducing poverty in future by using a PIA. Shortly thereafter, a change of management at the top of the AMPMD and the move of one team member from the CSPLP to the AMPMD generated important synergy between the two organisations, and the Diamniadio Millennium Platform was proposed as a practical example for testing the application of the PIA. Because Senegalese decision-makers attach great importance to the project for the development of Senegal, an ex-ante assessment of its impact on poverty appeared to be particularly appropriate and interesting.

---

<sup>8</sup> The involvement of beneficiary groups and groups involved is one of the most important preconditions for MCC funding. For this reason a local monitoring committee "Comité Local de Suivi" (CLS) was set up, which integrates representatives of the administration, local authorities and regional representatives of civil society in the process. Another task of the CLS is to sensitise the population and keep them informed about the project.

17. The table below sets out the original conceptual draft and compares this with the actual course taken by the PIA process between February and April 2007.

Original Conceptual Draft	Actual course of the PIA process
<p><b>1. Preliminary phase</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Selection of the pilot region</li> <li>- Selection of participants for training</li> <li>- Preparation and planning of the individual training phases</li> <li>- Major actors: CSPLP and gtzMEF</li> </ul>	<p><b>1. Preliminary phase</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Selection of the Diamniadio project</li> <li>- Selection of participants for training</li> <li>- Preparation and planning of the PIA</li> <li>- Expanding the group of actors involved to include the AMPMD</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Presentation of the PIA to policy-makers in Dakar</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At top/high political level, PIA was to be presented 1-2 months before the training per se was launched</li> <li>- <b>Duration:</b> 1-2 hours, mornings</li> <li>- <b>Objective:</b> Anchor PIA at political level and launch the process</li> <li>- <b>Participants:</b> Ministry of Economics and Finance (MEF: budget, statistics, project planning), donor representatives, CSPLP, appraisers</li> </ul>	<p><b>2. Presentation of the PIA to policy-makers in Dakar</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PIA presented at political level</li> <li>- <b>Duration:</b> 9.30-13.00</li> <li>- <b>Participants:</b> National and regional decision-makers, GTZ representatives, other donor representatives</li> <li>- Presentation of the PIA which, for reasons unrelated to the process, took place immediately prior to the first workshop; nevertheless, the process rapidly took on a positive momentum</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Dakar: First training course: Training of Trainers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training for a PIA core group of key individuals</li> <li>- PIA training on the basis of concrete examples taken from the national context.</li> <li>- <b>Duration:</b> 2 days</li> <li>- <b>Objective:</b> Key individuals are able to use PIA, provide back-up for PIA processes and facilitate PIA processes as well as guiding appraisers in the correct use of the instrument. They also help disseminate the approach at national level.</li> <li>- <b>Participants:</b> Government representatives, resource persons from the regions and appraisers</li> </ul>	<p><b>3. First training and analysis workshop in Dakar</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presentation of the PIA instrument</li> <li>- Practical example for the use of a PIA: Diamniadio Platform</li> <li>- Initial revision of the PIA manual: Proposal that the instrument be adapted to the national context</li> <li>- <b>Duration:</b> 1.5 days</li> <li>- <b>Participants:</b> Selected representatives of the CSPLP and other staff members of the MEF, AMPMD, civil society representatives, GTZ, appraisers</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Project region: Presentation of PIA to policy-makers/ regional PRSP committees</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presentation of the instrument to regional decision-makers and a wider audience</li> <li>- <b>Duration:</b> 1-2 hours</li> <li>- <b>Participants:</b> Selected government actors and appraisers from Dakar, representatives of regional committees, representatives of civil society, GTZ representatives</li> </ul>	<p><b>4. Further work on the content of the Diamniadio project in module groups</b></p> <p><b>Steering group:</b> (Comité de Pilotage) comprising gtzMEF, CSPLP, AMPMD and appraisers.</p> <p><b>Objective:</b> Further work on Diamniadio as the basis for the second analytical workshop</p> <p><b>Steering group meetings:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creation of working groups for the individual PIA modules</li> <li>- Presentation of the interim results, exchange of views</li> <li>- Joint agreement on the key definitions and concepts, list of participants for the second analytical workshop, scope and format of the PIA report, further course of the process</li> <li>- Identification of the existing information material and gaps in existing information</li> </ul> <p><b>Work of the module groups:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collection of data and information for the individual modules</li> <li>- Matching up data with the individual modules and initial evaluation</li> </ul>
<p><b>5. Project region: Second training course: Training representatives of regional committees</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PIA training on the basis of practical examples taken from the project region and PIA process consultancy for implementation in the region</li> <li>- Some participants from the first course act as co-trainers (objective: further consolidation of the PIA contents and process)</li> <li>- <b>Duration:</b> 5 days</li> <li>- <b>Objective:</b> Participants are able to use PIA in a concrete project in the project region</li> <li>- <b>Participants:</b> Some participants from the first course, representatives from the provinces (regional committees, civil society, etc.) and important regional resource persons</li> </ul>	<p><b>5. Diamniadio region: Second training and analytical workshop</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presentation of the individual PIA modules and direct application in working groups, taking the example of Diamniadio</li> <li>- Joint optimisation of the interim results of the module groups</li> <li>- <b>Duration:</b> 2 days</li> <li>- <b>Participants:</b> Members of the steering group (CSPLP, gtzMEF, AMPMD), representatives from the region of Diamniadio (municipal authorities of Diamniadio and neighbouring communities, civil society groups), appraisers</li> </ul>
<p><b>6. Project region: Conducting a PIA in the region and compiling a report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evaluation of a plan, a policy intervention or a project using PIA and production of a PIA report</li> <li>- <b>Duration:</b> 5 days</li> <li>- <b>Objective:</b> Participants conduct a PIA on the basis of a concrete project</li> <li>- <b>Participants:</b> Participants of the second training course</li> </ul>	<p><b>6. Core group: First draft of the PIA document</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further work of the module groups from phase 4 using the data from phases 4 and 5</li> <li>- 3-4 members per module group (total of 4 module groups)</li> <li>- <b>Duration:</b> 2 days</li> <li>- <b>Participants:</b> CSPLP, AMPMD and appraisers</li> </ul> <p><b>7. "Buffer days"</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4 days</li> <li>- Further elaboration and development of the PIA document</li> </ul>

	<p><b>8. Working meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further work on the document and preparations for the final session</li> <li>- <b>Participants:</b> Core group of AMPMD, CSPLP and appraisers</li> </ul>
<p><b>7. Assessment and evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessment of results of the PIA application</li> <li>- Evaluation and feedback</li> <li>- Objective: Participants reflect on their experience and difficulties encountered which, along with the previous practical exercises, should enable them to conduct PIAs independently or with the support of local appraisers</li> <li>- <b>Duration:</b> 2 days</li> <li>- <b>Participants:</b> Regional committees, appraisers, CSPLP and participants of the first training course, local representatives</li> </ul>	<p><b>9. Presentation of the results of the PIA to decision-makers/ assessment and evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Morning: presentation of the process and the PIA document on Diamniadio to national and regional decision-makers</li> <li>- Afternoon: evaluation of the process and the PIA application within the steering group, feedback and lessons learned</li> <li>- <b>Duration:</b> 1 day</li> <li>- <b>Participants:</b> Morning: National and regional decision-makers, GTZ representatives, other donor representatives Afternoon: Steering group</li> </ul>
	<p><b>10. Completion of the PIA document</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Working session of the core group to complete and agree on the modules</li> <li>- Completion of the document by two appraisers (7 working days each)</li> </ul>

18. In the course of the process, the training and testing aspects originally planned were relegated to the background as a result of the overriding political importance of the Diamniadio project. Participants were primarily interested in ensuring a well-founded and concise ex ante investigation of the project, obviously also with the hope of supporting political decisions and influencing these in this way. This "politicisation" probably also explains why the process as a whole was so dynamic, and why all the actors involved demonstrated such commitment and so much initiative.

Lessons learned can be deduced from the process itself. These are discussed below on the basis of concrete questions.

### How to plan and design the timeframe and the schedule of the analysis?

19. All in all there was considerable time pressure. This was partly because the planning for the Diamniadio project was continuing at top speed and the results of the PIA were needed rapidly.

These results also had to be convincing if they were going to be incorporated. Secondly, the trainer was only available for a limited period. After a two-month preliminary phase from January to March 2007, the actual training and practical PIA phase lasted barely a month (21 March to 19 April 2007). The initial feedback received from a number of participants was critical of this time pressure. After further discussion, however, it was realised that the various actors would in any case not realistically have been able to invest more time in the process, and that more time would not in all likelihood have significantly improved the quality of the assessment. The time pressure in fact also contributed to concentration and efficiency. In retrospect, the group also noted that a lot of time was spent at the start of the process on research, data gathering and detailed analyses which subsequently proved to have been superfluous for the production of the PIA matrices. By contrast, too little time was allowed for comparing the synthesis matrices. The group discussion of central key concepts, such as pro-poor growth, output versus results, capabilities, etc. at the outset of the process takes a certain amount of time (half a day in our case). In retrospect it proved a good idea that, from the outset, time was allowed for so-called buffer days, particularly towards the end of the process.

20. The double workload of members of the steering group, who had to perform their regular duties in addition to the four-week PIA process, was a problem. As a result, the CSPLP/MEF increasingly withdrew from the content-related discussion and from monitoring, justifying this by its mandate as facilitator and its limited human resources.

## Recommendations for time planning

- Reduce the time pressure during the training phases. Two days is not long enough to run once through PIA from start to finish for learning purposes in the group. Allow for enough time for group work during training.
- Attach less importance to training all participants, and invest more time in training a small core group of PIA facilitators.
- Allow more time for the work of the steering group
- Plan the preliminary phase soundly: research available documents at an early stage; do not try to pack too much in. Allow for buffer days particularly towards the end of the process.
- Allow sufficient time for the joint discussion of core concepts (e.g. output versus results, capabilities) and to find an agreement on definitions (e.g. pro-poor growth).
- Allow enough time for synthesis and coherence work and for discussion when filling in the PIA matrices together at the end of the process.
- Recap, consolidate and summarise interim results at an early stage; allow time for this.
- Break down responsibility: Select module group leaders at an early stage.
- Allocate experts not only for analytical work but also for process support, e.g. external trainer/supervisor and other individuals to support the process, who call for process control and monitor it (e.g. facilitating and documenting meetings, assuming responsibility for e-mail communications, controlling logistics, conducting evaluations, etc.).
- Provide enough time for deliberation and an in-depth examination of the results between the individual training sections (buffer days).
- At the end of the process, allow enough time to summarise the results in matrices and produce the report.
- Decide at an early stage to produce a short, concise document rather than a wide-ranging assessment.

## How do you deal with the institutional and political interests of participants and with subsequently unbalanced analyses?

21. Because the Diamniadio project is a prestige government project entailing capital inflows and job creation on a massive scale, Senegalese actors have great expectations. Most participants of the assessment, who came from a wide variety of backgrounds, also had a very positive attitude to the expected development results of the project at the start

of the PIA – with the possible exception of the local residents and neighbouring communities, who were somewhat cautious at the moment. Also, the assessment process was organised by the executing agency of the Diamniadio project, and major stakeholders participated in the analyses. An objective and critical assessment (e.g. of individual stakeholders interests in Module 2). was thus not always to be had in a straightforward manner. Elected community representatives, for instance, or the state agency that is in charge of the project, were all quite naturally inclined to claim for themselves a strong interest in poverty reduction. Where this legitimate but more political stance conflicted with a strictly analytical approach during the assessment, it was the job of the PIA facilitator to reduce the bias. One way was to point out that one actor can in fact have or may have to concede to a variety of even contradictory interests. Another method to differentiate overly euphemistic or superficial analyses was to go through well-founded economic argumentation, in particular during work on the module no 3 on transmission channels. Thirdly, it helps objectivity if you ensure a coherent estimation of the various quantitative (!) dimensions of different impacts and use them when filling in the matrices, even if there may be some resistance to this in the group at first.

22. Basically, however, it should be noted that in the end, the PIA did identify and present a large number of critical points and risks of the Diamniadio project in a differentiated way. The project executing agency was impressed, above all by the assessment of the political and socio-economic transmission channels, which they had not hitherto taken into account. It is now planning a series of measures for risk-mitigation in response.

## Recommendations for "political and institutional balance"

- Ensure heterogeneity among participants to involve as many relevant viewpoints as possible in the process.
- Appoint module leaders/PIA facilitators with strong analytical skills and, for Module 3 in particular, who are trained in economic thought and analysis.
- Results must be comparable. PIA facilitators must as far as possible insist on a quantified assessment of the scale of results.
- Encourage stakeholders to see the PIA not as criticism of the project but as a chance to perform an objective study of the intervention, which will allow to foresee and minimise risks or to reinforce positive impacts.
- The tendency not to make any negative assessments can be countered by changing the way opinions are recorded, for instance by using a scale of 0 to 5 rather than using plus and minus symbols.

## How to organise the analytical work?

23. It should be noted at the outset that the PIA guidelines and experience gained in other countries to date are based on the assumption that an external team of appraisers conducts the entire PIA process, in as participatory a way as possible given the prevailing time constraints. In Senegal, however, it was the institutions concerned that conducted and steered the PIA themselves.

24. After the first training workshop produced initial usable results, working groups of 2 – 4 analysts per module were set up and a leader appointed for each one. These groups were to analyse the subject matter in more depth. The module groups were a crucial factor in the success of the pilot PIA which was being conducted for an extremely complex project, since they made it possible to break down the responsibility for the assessment process manageable way. There were also other pragmatic reasons for setting up the groups, i.e. to allow analysts to organise their research flexibly and keep communication channels short over a number of national holidays and weekends. It was important to ensure that module leaders had the technical and specialist skills required and that they were available for the period in question.

25. It was also important that the groups met at regular intervals with all other module groups. At these plenary sessions, the focus was on the coherence of the overall assessment: the interim results of the individual module groups were presented and discussed and clear agreement reached which applied for all modules throughout the analytical process to ensure that the individual analyses were comparable. Most importantly, these included definitions of key concepts such as pro-poor growth, definitions of the project scenarios to be analysed, definitions of the results zones, the structure of the PIA report (wide-ranging or concise) and of the further process to be adopted. The alternation between group work and plenary sessions was one of the most important factors in ensuring efficient group work. Agreements and responsibilities were laid down in a process document. At the end of the assessment, it fell to the plenary session to discuss once again in detail every module matrix and to arrive at a common understanding.

26. In spite of this it was no easy task at the end of the day to produce a continuous line of argument from the results of one module to the results of the next. This problem arose partly because the module groups did not always keep to the agreed criteria and definitions as many participants only perceived the problem of coherence at a later stage in the process. Another reason was that the distinction between output and results, which is constantly called for in the PIA assessment, was not a familiar distinction to work with for some participants and thus caused confusion. A trained project planning mindset also often surfaced, meaning that, instead of looking in more depth at an idea and precisely wording the impacts expected with respect to the poverty situation, groups "automatically" moved on to plan corrective measures. Another contributory cause was that a consensus on the comparative and hence small-scale character of the PIA document, the heart of which is the PIA matrices and the overview they provide, was only achieved after much discussion and in the course of the process. And finally, the module groups often went further in their deliberations than actually required. For instance, in Module 2 not only were stakeholder interests analysed, but the group tended to postulate results along the individual transmission channels – thus trespassing into Module 3. Against the background of this experience, participants proposed in the final evaluation that Module 3 (transmission channels) be taken as the core module of the PIA assessment. On the basis of a common understanding of all module groups with respect to Module 3, the stakeholder groups in Module 2 can be combined and an assessment of interests conducted and, as a next step, the impacts on their capacities (Module 4) investigated.

27. Much discussion was needed from the outset to clarify in particular the term pro-poor growth and the concept of results. These discussions and the subsequent economic and sociological analyses which the PIA framework requires compared to working through simulations with a macroeconomic model. They were in themselves extremely productive and - with hindsight- constitute an important part of the capacity development of the entire exercise.

As a guide for costing, it is fair to say that the process took 5-7 full-time experts over a period of 3-4 weeks. This covered not only the assessment itself, but also process steering, administration and logistics. In reality, the work of some team members was spread over a longer period. These figures do not take into account the working days of many workshop participants who were involved for a shorter period.

### Recommendations regarding organisation

- Alternate module groups and plenary sessions.
- 2-4 participants per module group.
- Record all important agreements regarding the framework, criteria and key concepts used in the assessment, which apply to all module analyses: at an early stage, together and in writing.
- Appoint appraisers already familiar with PIA as module group leaders. They should pay special attention to a rigorous analytical argumentation.
- Make Module 3 the entry point for the assessment of other modules.
- Sensitise analysts at an early stage to the need to have PIA findings that give an overview and are comparable, which is why the report can be short and compact rather than detailed and wide-ranging.
- Focus and delimit available data at an early stage (identify key questions, focus on central aspects).

### And actors

The following groups of actors were important for process steering:

- A steering group with representatives of the executing agency of the PIA process to ensure ownership and to generate responsibilities for coordination and steering.
- (A minimum of) one external appraiser/trainer/supervisor fully familiar with PIA as an instrument, capable of providing training and acting as a resource person to supervise the process; even better: a team of PIA facilitators who can provide back-up for the module groups.
- Module leaders, with analytical skills, who are familiar enough with the PIA method (e.g. having taken part in the first analytical workshop plus training) and available for the entire period. The module leaders are key persons who push forward with the process and make decisive contributions to ensuring the quality of the assessment.
- Additional process-support personnel for organisational, logistical and communication services.

## Lessons learned about PIA the tool

The following section looks at lessons learned for the use and further development of the Poverty Impact Assessment.

28. A key concern of the group was initially to adapt the document to the imperatives of the Senegalese context, in order to transform the donor perspective of the original document into their own perspective, and to make the work required more easily understood. Participants were not satisfied with the French translations of a few key concepts and replaced these (e.g. "pouvoir" rather than "autorité" for the English "authority"). Finally, they recommended to formulate key questions for each module as well as the titles for the matrices such as to make them more easily understood.

30. If your interest is capacity development, PIA and in particular its Modules 2 to 4 is a long-awaited innovation - an instrument which makes it possible to extend the regular planning work to include rigorous economic and sociological analysis. PIA has the advantage that every individual analysis is logically thought through and documented in itself. It remains easy to understand even for the non-initiated and the various results are presented alongside one another in the form of an overview, without being mysteriously packaged to present a surprising final situation - as is the case with the macroeconomic model. This makes PIA discussion-friendly and allows it to communicate, educate(!) and convince much more effectively than the macroeconomic model alone.

31. PIA has the further advantage of ensuring that socioeconomic and politico-economic criteria and analyses enjoy the same status as economic criteria. In the case of the Diamniadio assessment, the economists responsible were particularly impressed by the socio-political results, and were convinced that they themselves had overlooked these so far.

32. During the Diamniadio analyses the discussion turned frequently to the term governance (good or poor), which is not truly reflected in the PIA matrices in the report. For instance, the establishment of a parallel agency to manage the Diamniadio platform was heavily criticised, as participants predicted it would weaken the country's regular governance structure. In the PIA matrices however, this argument was only inadequately recorded (e.g. as a loss of power on the part of particular municipalities). It was generally difficult to find a suitable place in the PIA findings to record the negative (or positive) results for the governance system as a whole (e.g. for the negative case: weakening the municipal and regional governments per se, drawbacks in decentralisation, spread of favouritism and corruption, loss of planning links with sector ministries, etc.), although changes of this sort are every bit as relevant for the system as a change in price levels, for instance. With time, it became clear to us that PIA does not take into account the establishment (or dismantling) of governance structures - not synonymous with a gain or loss of power on the part of individual institutions nor with public service delivery. PIA does not acknowledge or compare changes of the kind that citizens are being "better or more poorly governed". Thus, in our opinion, governance is an important transmission channel for structural poverty reduction which is still missing in the PIA framework. It might even be worthwhile establishing a separate module to analyse the field "better/more poorly administered and governed", in particular if PIA is to be used for large-scale projects such as Diamniadio, or for programmes or even policies.

33. The group originally planned to conduct a control assessment, i.e. to compare the development results of a Senegal with Diamniadio and a Senegal without Diamniadio scenario. Unfortunately the group did not have the time to complete this. But the idea of comparing two projects or scenarios using the Poverty Impact Assessment, say to support funding allocation decisions, could be developed if PIA is to become a tool for political decision making at meso and macro levels.

## General recommendations for all modules

The concrete lessons learned from the individual modules:

- Identify one or more project scenarios (optimistic, realistic or pessimistic) for the assessment and record the pertinent assumptions in writing.
- Define the geographical area to be observed (concentric circles in the case of Diamniadio).
- Define the concept of broad-based growth/pro-poor growth (e.g. specify the percentage of the poor who must benefit for pro-poor growth to be achieved).
- In the case of larger-scale interventions, to be implemented over a longer period, it is recommended that you modify the definitions of short-term, medium-term and long-term results. If we take the example of the Diamniadio project with its term of twenty years, short-term would be five years, medium-term six to ten years and long-term eleven to twenty years.
- Per module, identify one key question as a guide to provide assistance for the matrices.
- Record results in the PIA matrices using a scale from 0 to 5 to get round people's reluctance to award negative marks.
- Always incorporate the gender aspect throughout the assessment, i.e. in all modules you should ask exactly who is meant and whether there are gender-specific differences; in particular in the analysis of transmission channels, always ask who precisely will benefit and for whom the results will be achieved.
- Differentiate matrix assessments according to the (positive or negative) project results for the "poor" and the "non-poor". Assessments relating to the impacts on the "non-poor" were put in brackets in the case of Diamniadio.
- In the case of extremely complex interventions with a large number of stakeholders, you should initially ensure that all stakeholders and all aspects have been taken into account. The next step is to reduce the complexity and, in the report at least, you should limit yourself to the most important aspects. Discussions were heated as to whether or not this reduction should take place during the assessment (preferred by the PIA trainer) or whether extremely detailed matrices should be produced at an interim stage and then summarised at the end of the process (preferred by the group).

## Recommendations for individual modules and matrices

- The size of the individual stakeholder groups (Module 2) and thus the contribution that they make to the MDGs (Module 5), in particular with respect to the overarching goal of reducing national poverty, must be clearly presented. The analytical importance of the various stakeholder groups is not always identical to their quantitative importance (e.g. in the case of Diamniadio, women and young people as a group account for some 80 percent of the population).
- Ensure you focus on analysing and selecting your data needs , since there is a danger of getting overwhelmed by the sheer quantity of data on poverty. It is important to ask what

**Modules  
2 and 5**

**Module 1  
Assesement of  
the poverty  
situation**

information is likely to be needed for the subsequent analysis (and what can be used at a later date for monitoring).

- Break the “impact area” down into zones and at a later point examine the project results methodically for all modules in the various zones.
  - Clearly define the categories "poverty" and "poor sections of the population" and subsequently check whether or not the definitions have been used consistently in the assessment.
- 
- Clear definition of the concepts of pro-poor growth and good governance
  - A distinction should be made between
    - the pro-poor interests of the group or individual and the pro-poor programmes of the institutions
    - the desired/planned and actual role of stakeholders within the framework of the intervention
    - the official/declared and actually implemented pro-poor programmes of an institution
    - the stakeholder groups which influence the intervention and those that are influenced by the intervention (add an extra column in Matrix 4, giving the reasons why the groups influence/are influenced)
  - Combine stakeholder groups before the analysis and work only with a manageable number.
  - The size of the individual stakeholder groups (Module 2) and thus their contribution to achieving the MDGs (Module 5) and above all the overarching goal of national poverty reduction must be clearly presented. The analytical importance of the stakeholder groups is not always identical to their quantitative importance (e.g. in the case of Diamniadio, women and young people as a group account for some 80 percent of the population).
  - Analyse relations between stakeholder groups, in particular when there is a risk of conflict between the groups. Klare Definition der Konzepte „Pro-Poor“ und „Good Governance“.
- 
- The various evaluations have indicated that Module 3 is the central module of the Poverty Impact Assessment. Because of its complexity, it offers the ideal entry point for the analysis and is also crucially relevant for the quality of the PIA report. To improve this module it was noted that it is absolutely essential to clearly designate a) the explanation of the transmission channels and b) the risks.
  - Heated and inconclusive debates raged regarding the introduction of "intermediary" matrices between Modules 3 and 4 (e.g. along the results chain or to give a detailed presentation of primary and secondary transmission channels) to give evidence of every analytic step. In all cases, it is extremely important to ask who is the recipient for every transmission channel (rich, poor, how poor, gender, belonging to which group) and to attempt to quantify the response.
  - The distinction between the transmission channel and its results proved to be difficult to make. Should all results go into column no 5 (irrespective of whether they are short- or long-term results) ? Or should all impacts which are short-term in nature be noted as part of the transmission channel (direct and indirect) in column no 2 while medium-term changes qualify as “results” and are noted in column no 5? In Senegal we

**Module 2  
Analysis of  
stakeholders**

**Module 3:  
Analysis of trans-  
mission channels**

decided to adopt the latter approach.

- It comes quite natural to development trained people to identify measures to mitigate predictable risks of a project or intervention. But PIA also offers an unusual line of thought, that is to define measures that support and strengthen the predictably positive results or dynamics of an intervention.
  - Where the Poverty Impact Assessment is used in a complex intervention, it is only possible to investigate the most important stakeholder groups from Module 2. When stakeholders are combined into groups, however, care should be taken to ensure homogeneity within each group, because otherwise important analytical results will be lost (as was the case to some extent in Diamniadio).
- Module 4:  
Analysis of project  
results on capacities**
- Investigate the achievement of the MDGs within the context of national operational objectives (e.g. PRSPs).
  - Make it clear that Module 5 focuses on the significance of the project in the national context. The dimensions of the individual stakeholder groups (Module 2) and hence their contribution to achieving the MDGs and above all the overarching goal of national poverty reduction must be clearly presented. Perceived analytical and quantitative relevance are not, however, always identical (e.g. the PIA for Diamniadio puts women and young people together as one stakeholder group which accounts for 80 percent of the population, or approx. 9 million people. In contrast, the 10,000 inhabitants of Diamniadio, the focus of project planners' attention, were split up into several different stakeholder groups.)
- Module 5:  
Analysis of project  
results on the  
MDGs and other  
goals**
- At the end of the Poverty Impact Assessment, a separate section should lay out the major conclusions and recommendations.
- Module 6:  
Conclusion**

## C Prospects for the use of the Poverty Impact Assessment in Senegal

In the course of the process, the actors involved were convinced of the effectiveness of the Poverty Impact Assessment and of the advantages it offers. The following perspectives have been drawn up:

34. The AMPMD, which played the part of PIA client, integrated the findings of the assessment in its planning work. From the findings of the Poverty Impact Assessment, an action plan was immediately derived, which is intended to ensure that the project can respond to the potentials and risks identified in terms of poverty impact. The AMPMD would also like to use the PIA for progress reviews, and it was emphasised that the participatory nature of the PIA process is to be retained for monitoring during the implementation phase. The PIA report is to be translated into English in order to present it to the Americans, and to support negotiations with the MCC.

35. The PRSP coordination unit of the MEF (CSPLP) welcomes the positive launch of the instrument in Senegal and considers the sub-national (regional) PRSP bodies, which are to monitor the poverty orientation of development planning at a regional level, as particularly relevant future users of the method. Additional representatives of the National Statistics Agency and the Department of Economic Studies and Forecasts (DPEE) at the Ministry of Economics and Finance are to be trained in the use of the method. Future possibilities for using PIA have already been discussed, including the assessment of the national local development plan (PNDL), which is currently in the planning phase, and the development programme for agricultural markets in Senegal (PDMAS). In principle, the CSPLP would like to promote the use of this sort of "upstream" poverty impact assessment in new programmes in Senegal.

36. The advisory services project attached to the Ministry of Economics and Finance reports that cooperation proposals have been discussed with the Centre for Political Studies and Development (CEPOD) with respect to ex post evaluations of policies and impact assessments and with the Directorate General of Finance (DGF) in connection with the quest to find a format for CDMT and CDSMT monitoring. Civil society actors called for an introduction in the use of PIA for themselves. From the point of view of the project, new Poverty Impact Assessments should include further training courses which would make it possible in future to call on the services of a small group of experienced PIA facilitators.

37. Here are the views and perspectives of various actors interviewed after completion of the PIA:

"The concept is good for the country. Senegal should adopt the PIA, if only because donors too can be better integrated than before within the framework of the PIA process. The times in which each side pulled in a different direction are over." (G. SONKO, advisor)

"I see several prospects, but above all Senegal can make a contribution to further developing the range of instruments that make up the Poverty Impact Assessment." (I. DIA, AMPMD)

"The concept has fully convinced me, and my colleagues are waiting impatiently for my report. Since I am the only person from ANSD (National Statistics Agency) with experience of PIA, it would be good if I had some support." (D. NDOYE, ANSD).

"As the officer responsible for monitoring and evaluation in the Diamniadio project I have gained many new ideas for implementation." (S. LY, AMPMD)

CD with list of participants and reports on and minutes of the most important activities (introduction for decision-makers, training of trainers, steering group meetings, workshop to compile findings) and bibliography