

REPORT ON THE FOLLOW-UP MISSION OF THE UNIFEM GENDER RESPONSIVE BUDGETING PROGRAMME (GRB) IN SENEGAL (February 27th-March 3rd)

Nathalie Holvoet, Policy advisory research on Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (BOS-PRSP), Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Antwerp

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	2
I.INTRODUCTION	3
II.REALITY CHECK ON THE GROUND	5
II.1. Results of phase I.....	5
II.2. Phase II: progress so far	6
II.2.1. Alignment with the PRSP process	7
II.2.2. Alignment with the budget cycle	8
II.2.3. Sectoral focus	8
II.2.4. Expenditure tracking and local level processes	9
II.2.5. Cooperation with mainstream actors	10
II.3. Management of the programme	12
III.FEEDBACK AND RECOMMENDATIONS	13
III.1. Validity of programme theory and logframes	13
III.2. General strategy adopted	14
III.3. Comments related to selected programme components	15
III.3.1. Support for line ministries	15
III.3.2. Support for ministry of finance	17
III.3.3. Collaboration with the IDRC CBMS/IDRC UNDP Regional Energy Programme	18
III.4. Programme Management	19
ANNEXES	21
Annex 1: Overview of main topics for the follow-up mission	21
Annex 2: Overview of the programme of the follow-up mission.....	27
Annex 3: Presentation of Senegal's GRB (by UNIFEM Dakar)	28
Annex 4: Partners present at the opening meeting (February, 27 th).....	35

FOREWORD

This note summarises the main findings from the follow-up mission to the Senegal GRB programme. Information included below is primarily based upon our own primary data collection through interview with key stakeholders of the GRB, sometimes complemented by information from secondary sources (including among others UNIFEM documents).

The audience of this debriefing note is UNIFEM (GRB) Dakar, UNIFEM (GRB) New York, and the Belgian Directorate of Development Co-operation (DGDC). For reasons of clarity and information dissemination, in particular towards DGDC staff, the following annexes have been added to this note:

- Annex 1: overview of main topics for the follow-up mission¹
- Annex 2: overview of the programme of the follow-up mission
- Annex 3: presentation of Senegal's GRB (by UNIFEM Dakar)
- Annex 4: partners present at the opening meeting (February, 27th)

The purpose of the mission was two-fold, including both control (accountability) and feedback-related tasks, (see also annex 1). Feedback and suggestions for improvement in this debriefing note only include those directed at UNIFEM (Dakar). Recommendations for the Belgian DGDC will be elaborated in a separate note that will be directed at DGDC staff only. The largest majority of mission's findings, particularly those related to feedback and recommendations have been discussed during the debriefing meeting (Friday 3rd of March). Participants at the Dakar debriefing included:

- Cécile Mukarubuga, UNIFEM Dakar, regional director UNIFEM
- Zo Randriamaro, UNIFEM Dakar, consultant (GRB programme manager)
- Adji Fatou Ndiaye, UNIFEM Dakar, GRB programme manager
- Nisreen Alami, UNIFEM New York, GRB programme manager
- Marleen Thomas, Directorate General for Development Co-operation Brussels, multilateral aid department, desk officer
- Nathalie Holvoet, Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Antwerp (Belgium), lecturer/researcher

¹ The range of issues mentioned is quite broad. It also includes more in-depth research questions and extends beyond the (Senegal) GRB programme. In this debriefing note we do not intend to include an in-depth discussion or analysis on all of these issues. The aim is to elaborate further on some of these issues in a discussion paper. The latter will obviously be shared with UNIFEM NY and Senegal, as well as with their partners involved.

I. INTRODUCTION

First and foremost, the Belgian mission would like to thank UNIFEM Dakar for the excellent organisation of the follow-up mission (see annex 2).

The concise presentation on Senegal's GRB provided by UNIFEM Dakar (see annex 3) was a useful take-off activity as was the frank and open discussion with UNIFEM Dakar and New York program managers on their appreciation of the GRB programme in general and the Senegal programme in particular. At the opening meeting we could get a first grasp of the different partners who are involved in implementing the programme² as well as those that run other programmes with whom the GRB Senegal has started (or intends to start) collaboration³. This well-attended opening meeting enabled us to get a general sense of the main achievements, weaknesses, hindrances and opportunities as perceived by different partners. It also allowed us to get a first impression about the level of interaction among the different partners involved and about the diverse settings in which the programme operates (both inside and outside government; including bureaucracies, NGOs, universities, ...). Aside from the more general discussion during the opening meeting, we also got the opportunity to meet and interview separately a large sample of partners involved in the programme (see annex 4). This gave us a chance to add to the general questions more specific topics relevant to each of the specific partners.

We would like to highlight in particular the remarkable degree of openness and receptiveness for feedback; both by UNIFEM Dakar and UNIFEM NY. At no instance was there a feeling of manipulation in the selection of partners we could meet or in the type of questions or issues we could discuss. We were able to meet all the interviewees in private without having someone from UNIFEM Dakar present. The programme manager of UNIFEM NY attended the large majority of the interviews but did not interfere during the interviews. At maximum, she added some questions at the end of the interview. In short, for respondents it was clear that the mission was mainly driven by the Belgian DC. Whereas one may never exclude the possibility of social desirable answering, we did not have the impression that respondents were systematically providing us with biased answers as to either provide us with an 'overstated' (as to ensure e.g. further funding or inclusion in the programme) or 'understated' (as to take revenge e.g. for possible misunderstandings in the past, or for non-inclusion in the programme) picture of the effective reality on the ground. Furthermore, we tried to include mainly

² Including among others representatives from the PRSP M&E unit, several line ministries, gender laboratory of the University of Cheikh Anta Diop (UCAD), locally elected, women's organisations.

³ Including among others the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) who runs the Community Based Monitoring System (CBMS), the Parliamentary Center, UNDP West and Central Africa Sub-Regional Resource Facility (SURF-WCA) (particularly with the Gender Focal Point), World Bank Regional Programme for Integration of Gender Issues in the Budget.

questions that were as specific as possible in order to limit the possibility of social desirable answering.

The aim of the Belgian mission was both related to control (accountability) and feedback, learning functions. In what follows we structure the findings and discussion as much as possible following these specific functions.

II. REALITY CHECK ON THE GROUND

II.1. Results of Phase I

Firstly, we were able to get a general impression about the different documents used and distributed during training sessions. Training workshops were among the main activities performed during the first phase of the programme and documents used and distributed within this context were to-the-point and up-to-date. Furthermore as these documents have been produced in French (and given the fact there is a shortage of documents on this topic that are produced in French) they clearly have a value added that extends beyond their direct usage in training workshops in the context of the Senegal's GRB. Also the CD-rom that was jointly elaborated with the UNDP includes valuable documents and is an interesting tool. The idea of further customizing documents towards different audiences is worth mentioning and deserves further attention (see also III). It matches evidence from various interviews indicating the expressed need from different audience for material that is more directly targeted at their specific setting and purpose.

The overall picture that may be distilled from interviews is a visible increase in the awareness on the importance of gender issues in general and in the level of knowledge on gender budgeting in particular. Interestingly, the majority of the interviewees pointed at the fact that the increase of the awareness and knowledge base could for the largest part be attributed to the input delivered by UNIFEM's GRB. The latter evidence is obviously interesting for the follow-up mission who particularly aimed at getting more grasp on the specific value-added of UNIFEM's activities (mainly workshops, trainings). It would for instance not have been impossible that changes in knowledge and awareness are indeed recorded but that these were largely due to other factors, including activities of other organisations working on similar issues. The impression that changes could be, to a considerable degree, put on the account of the GRB's activities is for the mission an important element in the identification of the GRB's net impact.

Furthermore, we appreciated the depth of the awareness and knowledge base. Several of the interviewees spontaneously raised the critical importance of GRB in the context of the ongoing changes in aid instruments and reforms linked to the latter. More specifically, there is an understanding of the role GRB and its tools could play as 'management' instrument within government line ministries, ministry of finance and M&E in particular. More specifically, the role of GRB in improving gender-sensitiveness, effectiveness and efficiency of government interventions (both centrally and at decentralised levels) was emphasized. Moreover, interviewees from within these settings pointed themselves at linkages among principles underlying the GRB and medium-term expenditure frameworks (several of the line ministries are actually preparing the sectoral medium-term expenditure frameworks; see also II.2.). Also partners located at decentralised levels indicated that GRB is extremely useful in their planning, implementation and M&E activities. Interestingly,

some of the interviewees indicated that because of the GRB training, they started to better understand the fundamentals of MTEF and SWAPs (programme approach, results-orientation, etc.).

Aside from this, several of the interviewees (mainly outside government actors, including representatives of locally elected bodies, of women's organisations) indicated the importance of GRB within the context of good governance. They considered it extremely powerful in their efforts to track expenditures and keep government (both central, regional and local) accountable for its promises made. Interviewees operational at the local level also mentioned the usefulness of GRB in the context of local on-going experiments with more inclusive forms of budgeting (participatory budgeting experiments).

Another proxy that could be indicative for the increased awareness and understanding on GRB is the visible increase in demand from diverse settings (both inside and outside government actors, both at central and decentralised levels) to be included in GRB activities or to be the focus of future GRB activities. As further elaborated on below (see III.2), one of the strategic issues for UNIFEM Dakar concerns dealing with the demand from diverse settings.

Aside from notable awareness raising and knowledge building, it was obvious that phase I activities (lobbying, informal discussion, ...) also levelled the ground for phase II activities. More specifically, the basis was laid for strategic 'partnerships' with the PRSP M&E Unit (located within the Ministry of Finance) and for cooperation with a.o. collaboration with the IDRC Community Based Monitoring System (CBMS) and the IDRC/UNDP Regional Energy Programme.

II.2. Phase II: progress so far

Phase II started in January 2005. At this stage it is too early to make an assessment about outcomes. It is only possible to assess progress in activities and outputs (process evaluation), which is important given the fact that one may only expect impact from GRB when it is also effectively implemented on the ground.

Phase II aims to valorise results of phase I activities of training, capacity building and awareness-raising and by moving towards effective implementation of GRB both within and outside government, both at centralised and decentralised levels. This move has also been stimulated by the Belgian DC that formulated a number of recommendations at the start of phase II. Reviewing these recommendations, one may notice that Senegal GRB phase II seriously tries to take into account the majority of these recommendations:

II.2.1. Alignment with the PRSP process

One of the major implementing partners in Senegal GRB phase II is the PRSP unit in charge of the coordination regarding the elaboration and monitoring (Cellule de Suivi du DSRP, CSPLP), strategically located within the Ministry of Finance (Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances, MEF). Interviews with staff responsible within this unit revealed their eagerness to implement gender budgeting and to take on a leadership role in Senegal GRB. An action plan has been elaborated with several of the partners involved and validated during a workshop with the major partners involved. Of this action plan several activities (including training and sensitization of the members of the ministerial and regional committees responsible for the preparation, elaboration and M&E of projects; training of members of sub-group 'Gender and Budgets'; technical support to the commissions that need to revise the PRSP) have already been implemented whereas others still need to take off. At the opening meeting some frustration was felt among several partners (and explicitly expressed) about the lagging implementation of (parts of) the action plan. Responsibilities for this lagging implementation were not clear and the buck was passed to several of the partners and to UNIFEM. Positively, the opening meeting of the follow-up mission brought to the surface the different frustrations while several partners at the same time also forcefully highlighted the fundamental importance of GRB as well as their willingness to implement the action plan. A meeting with the different partners was organised at the end of the mission to relaunch the implementation of the full action plan.

Another indication of the fact that there is close alignment with the PRSP process is the fact that there has been input from several partners involved in the GRB in the review of the PRSP as well as in the elaboration of the second PRSP. In order to integrate gender issues in a more systematic way, the M&E PRSP unit has established a 'working group' 'gender' (with subgroups: Gender and Budgets, Gender and Indicators; Gender and elaboration of policy, programmes and projects). Whereas other processes (including e.g. those stimulated by other donors including UNDP and the World Bank) may also have added to this evolution we see a major influence from the GRB.

We consider the influence to be both at the level of the 'participation' processes (their degree of 'inclusiveness') and at the level of the quality of input provided. Firstly, we may somehow assume that the GRB being embedded within the PRSP M&E unit affects both the attention this unit itself attaches to gender issues in the review process as well as its own quality of input. Secondly, it is also likely that GRB has increased 'PRSP core' actors' responsiveness towards UNIFEM (Dakar)'s inputs in the PRSP review⁴ and towards other gender actors' input in the elaboration of the second PRSP. Thirdly, it is also highly probably that the quality of the input of gender actors

⁴ See UNIFEM (Dakar). *Commentaires de l'Unifem sur la Révision du DSRP* (10 p.).

was also influenced by the trainings they received within the context of the GRB.

II.2.2. Alignment with the budget cycle

Efforts have been/are made to align with the budget cycle. At this moment sectoral programmes and sectoral MTEFs (for some sectors including education, health, agriculture, energy) are elaborated to feed into the 2007 budget. The sectoral budget proposals (MTEFs) need to be ready and sent to the Ministry of Finance by June 2006. The support to selected line ministries (see sectoral focus) within the framework of the GRB was planned for the period December 2005 to January 2006 in order to catch the deadline of June 2006. Unfortunately, due to some practical (bureaucratic) misunderstandings regarding authorization letters needed by consultants to provide their 'coaching' (selected line ministries received the needed authorisation letters but consultants did not receive a copy of it), there has been some delay incurred. At this moment, problems are settled and it is foreseen that it will still be possible to catch up with the June 2006 deadline.

II.2.3. Sectoral focus

GRB Senegal has selected 5 line ministries, including the 4 ministries that currently use a programme approach and prepare MTEF (Agriculture/Hydraulique; Energie/Mines; Santé; Education), and the Ministry of Family, Social Development and National Solidarity (including gender issues) (*Ministère de la Famille, du Développement Social et de la Solidarité Nationale, MFDSSN*). In order to introduce GRB in those ministries, cooperation was set up with the Gender Laboratory of UCAD (*Laboratoire Genre et Recherches Scientifiques, IFAN, Université Cheikh Anta Diop*), who will support the ministries (the departments in charge of budgeting, i.e. the DAGES and SAGES) through a process of 'learning by doing'. The following activities are included in the contract with the GL/UCAD:

- Elaboration of tools, analysis scheme for all different sectors
- Analysis of the gender situation (and underlying causes) in the different sectors
- On-the-job-training of ministry staff in charge of budgeting as to integrate gender in the budget preparation for the 2007 budget (support for the utilization of tools for planning, implementation, M&E within the framework of results-oriented budgeting)
- Application of the tools on the specific policies (programmes, projects) and budgets identified for the 2007 budget process and discussion with the budget departments of the different ministries
- Organization of a meeting with the departments involved to identify the weaknesses, the limitations of the gender integration and possible remediation

II.2.4. Expenditure tracking and local level processes

Gender-responsive budgeting aims to introduce a gender dimension throughout the full cycle of policy-making, planning, budgeting, implementation and M&E. One way to include a gender dimension during the implementation and M&E phase of programmes is by including a gender dimension in expenditure tracking (financial sphere) and in the follow-up of realisation of outputs and outcomes (real sphere). This follow-up should be integral part of a good government management system and some sources⁵ suggest that such systems are currently being put in place in Senegal in several sectors (including among others education). Aside from internal management systems, there is also need for external independent tracking and follow-up by outside government actors, including the beneficiary population itself. One promising approach, system, that may contribute to this, is the Community Based Monitoring System (CBMS). It has been elaborated by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and enables to collect and analyse in a relatively 'simple' way local-level data (with a specific focus on 'poverty') that can be used for development planning and monitoring.

The IDRC and UNIFEM have longstanding relationships: the IDRC has from the start been a partner in the overall GRB programme. At this moment, there are plans to make the cooperation between the two organisations more concrete on the ground⁶. A conceptual note on the potential cooperation between CBMS and GRB has been drafted⁷ and there has been some pilot testing in Senegal (Tambacounda) and in the Philippines. While so far no formal cooperation agreement has been signed, there are several possible routes for cooperation. One of the areas for cooperation would be firstly to check the degree of gender-sensitiveness of the actual CBMS. As IDRC and CBMS is itself doing major efforts to include a gender dimension, one may assume that the gender-sensitiveness will be rather high. The draft agreement specifically points at the elaboration of specific methodological tools for data collection on women's time use and unpaid work; awareness-raising and training on this data collection and analysis as well as the data collection and analysis itself. These activities would be done through the CBMS/Regional Energy Programme through GRB/UNIFEM financial support.

Secondly, the aim is to study to what extent and how the information from the CBMS could be more effectively used in several GRB-related activities. One route is to check how CBMS-information could be more effectively used as input in local planning and budgeting. Gender-sensitive CBMS may provide mainstream local actors involved in planning and budgeting with the

⁵ See World Bank (2004). *Public Expenditure Management HIPC Country Assessment and Action Plan (AAP) Senegal* (February-September 2004).

⁶ Additionally, there would also be a linkage to the IDRC/UNDP Regional Energy Programme.

⁷ See Budlender D., C. Reyes and M. Melesse (2005). *Gender-Responsive Budgeting through the CBMS Lens. Implementing the Community-Based Monitoring System in a way that facilitates gender-responsive budgeting*. (29 p.)

necessary gender-sensitive information. Where participatory budgeting and gender-responsive budgeting activities are simultaneously implemented, it may provide important information in hands of gender actors as to strengthen their participation in local planning, budgeting and follow-up. Additionally, gender-sensitive CBMS could be powerful in hands of local level actors when it used as a gender-sensitive accountability tool to follow-up effective implementation and results on the ground of policy-making at more centralized levels.

II.2.5. Cooperation with mainstream actors

□ Mainstream actors inside government

As is clear from above, Senegal GRB is strongly engaging with mainstream actors inside government, particularly with the CSPLP (unit responsible for the coordination regarding elaboration and monitoring of the PRSP). The Dakar programme officers convincingly argued the crucial importance of having the GRB embedded within the Ministry of Finance and PRSP M&E unit. Importantly, this unit has a crucial role in the overall reform processes ongoing while it also expressed its willingness to be included as a major partner in Senegal's GRB. Surprisingly (?), the cooperation with the main gender actor inside government (Ministry of Family, Social Development and National Solidarity) seems to be less straightforward. While the Ministry is on paper a major implementing partner in the GRB programme, on the ground the collaboration seems to be far from satisfactory. It is difficult to make an analysis about the underlying reasons for this, except for the fact that several interviewees (not belonging to UNIFEM or the Ministry involved) indicated the lack of expertise and capacity within the concerned Ministry.

Aside from the fruitful cooperation with the M&E PRSP Unit, there is also cooperation with the four sectoral line ministries. This cooperation mainly focuses on the SAGE and DAGE, while it does not include the gender focal points. As the most important share of this cooperation still needs to be implemented on the ground (the 'coaching' in order to engender the sectoral policies, plans and budgets), it is too early to make any assessment on the quality and outputs of this cooperation. An important actor involved in the cooperation with line ministries is the Gender Laboratory of the UCAD, who delivers the main capacity-building activities.

□ Mainstream actors outside government

In addition to its contacts with outside government gender actors, including in particular:

- umbrella's of women's organisations and individual women's organizations (such as la Fédération des Associations Féminines du Sénégal (FAFS); le Réseau des femmes africaines économistes; le Conseil Sénégalais des Femmes)
- the Gender Laboratory of UCAD

Senegal's GRB has also established contacts with several mainstream actors outside government including:

- parliament (in particular some particular commissions: Commission des Finances, Economie Générale et Plan; Commission Technique sur Genre)
- representatives of elected in several local communities (and particularly including elected from the 4 pilot communities (Tambacounda, Tivaouane, Matam, Rufisque)
- other programmes (CBMS (IDRC); IDRC/UNDP Regional Energy Programme)
- other donors (the most important being UNDP (UNDP WCA SURF); World Bank)

Contacts range from rather minimal to more intensive forms of cooperation. Minimal contacts include participation at trainings organized by GRB (all actors listed above have participated at GRB trainings and workshops), while more intensive forms include formal agreements to organize joint activities or to elaborate joint action plans (e.g. with the Gender Laboratory of UCAD, with IDRC CBMS & IDRC/UNDP Regional Energy Programme, the World Bank, the UNDP).

Importantly, all actors interviewed, both inside and outside government, expressed a clear demand for further and strengthened collaboration with the GRB. While most assessed their contact/collaboration with the GRB as very positive, there were obvious also some frustrations about:

- lack of information dissemination: e.g. some ministries' staff or representatives from women's organisations who participated in training or a workshop clearly expected further information about other activities. Some also expressed the need for more information about the focus the programme would take in the future as well as information on the budget of Senegal's GRB.
- lack of follow-up: some of the partners involved expected from UNIFEM a more pro-active leadership role, pushing all actors involved to deliver their part of the collaboration

- lack of more in-depth training or support: once they participated in GRB trainings, several actors demand and expect more in-depth support. Various Dakar-based women's organizations and umbrella's indicated their need for more resources as they wanted to spread their knowledge and training to their base organizations at the decentralized levels. Several locally elected asked for additional resources to start GRB training in their communities as they considered it to be a necessary accountability tool to keep the local government accountable, ...
- lack of coordination: several programmes and donors are often present in the same villages, often working on closely linked or similar issues. While some national actors clearly take advantage of this situation to maximize their own resource base, most of the actors considered that there was room for improvement and for a more optimal use of existing resources.

II.3. Management of the programme

While there are some of the frustrations mentioned above that could be minimized by some improvements in the programme's strategy and management (see III.2. and III.3. for some suggestions), we are positive about the efforts ongoing within UNIFEM Dakar and UNIFEM NY to (further) improve the management of the programme as well as the overall organizational effectiveness. There are several indications to substantiate this assessment:

- UNIFEM Dakar and UNIFEM NY use the logframe as a tool for planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and they apply it properly (in a flexible way). They are fully aware of the strengths of the logframe and its weaknesses (it may become a 'lockframe', a 'less-frame').
- UNIFEM Dakar's new regional officer has experience in organizational effectiveness, is clearly aware of its importance and is strongly committed to take all necessary measures in the future to improve it further.
- UNIFEM NY GRB programme officer is investing in a more systematic follow-up and feedback of the different country programmes; involving as well NY geographic desks. This process also feeds into the six-monthly progress reports.
- The excellent GRB mid-term review was used within UNIFEM as an instrument of feedback and learning. Its information base and the follow-up linked to it deliberately engaged not only those directly involved in GRB but also the NY geographic desks. This experiment was positively assessed by UNIFEM staff in general and will be replicated for other UNIFEM thematic reviews and evaluations.

III. FEEDBACK AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Preliminary note: As already highlighted in footnote 1, we do not intend to include an in-depth discussion or analysis on all of the issues raised in annex 1. The aim is to further elaborate on some of these issues in a separate discussion paper. The latter will be shared with UNIFEM NY and Senegal, as well as with their partners involved. Specific suggestions for DGDC staff, both related to the GRB programme as well as to more general efforts in engendering poverty reduction and aid will be discussed in a separate note addressing DGDC staff only.

III.1. Validity of programme theory and logframes

From discussions with the GRB programme officers it was obvious that the programme logframe was not drafted with a purely presentational purpose. It is obviously based upon an underlying vision. The programme logframe has also slightly been adjusted over the past year (the outcomes are e.g. more realistic than in the original programme logframe). One dimension on which further improvement would be possible is on the horizontal logic in the logframe. 'Indicators' are often extremely general and vague and are not really objectively verifiable; targets and baselines are often not included. This information is necessary if one wants to assess later on changes and impact produced.

Probably, the logframe could also be more intensively used as an instrument for fine-tuning the strategy, (iterative) planning and follow-up.

In order to increase the probability of success, and as a means to decide about which specific actions to include in the near future, it might e.g. be worthwhile to go through the logframe with the programme officers and ask the following specific questions:

- Are all the links implicit in the logframe realistic? Is it realistic that it will be able to move from one level in the logframe to another?
- What are the crucial ingredients (success factors) that are needed to move from one level to another? (e.g. knowledge, political willingness, financial and human resources, willingness and openness of mainstream actors, well-functioning M&E unit, capacity of gender actors, ...)
- Are we able as a programme to have an influence on these ingredients? Are we able to elaborate actions that assure or that contribute to the realisation of these ingredients?
- Can we realise some of the success ingredients alone?
- Are there success ingredients whose realisation is realistic but dependent upon interventions of other actors? Is it likely that these actors will realise these success ingredients alone, without our influence? If not, is it possible that some of our activities are directed

towards those other actors? Is it possible, desirable, and feasible to establish a form of cooperation with those actors?

- Are there crucial ingredients that are fully beyond our control but who are crucial for the realisation of the expected outcomes? (e.g. stable political and macro-economic environment). If so, it is important to include these as external assumptions.

III.2. Strategy adopted

From discussions, it was obvious that programme officers are aware of the different potential GRB entry points (both within and outside government, both at centralised and decentralised levels) existing at different levels (national/regional/local). They seemingly have made some implicit kind of analysis of strengths and weaknesses of various entry points and have acted upon this in their choice of level of operation (national/regional/local) and in their selection of major partners. As potential entry points are numerous, particularly when all different levels are considered, it might be interesting to map these explicitly. This could be done by using e.g. the following scheme and specifying for each of the levels the different actors (government as well as non-governmental) that are operational and that might have an influence.

Actors involved →	GOVERNMENTAL (direct influence)	NON-GOVERNMENTAL (indirect influence)
Levels of entry points ↓		
NATIONAL		
REGIONAL		
LOCAL		

Secondly, it could be helpful to explicit indicate on the map:

- What types of activities have been done/are currently being done by the GRB at which level, targeted at which actors? Types of activities could e.g. include:
 - Training (general)
 - Coaching/On-the-job training (tailored to the needs of a specific audience)
 - Learning missions to other countries (tailored to specific audiences)
 - Information dissemination
 - Lobbying
 - Financial aid
 -
- What types of activities have been done/are currently done by other programmes, other donors that add to the outcomes of the GRB programme.

- With which of those other programmes, other donors has there been what kind of cooperation.
- What types of activities will be done, are planned, would GRB like to plan for what audience (possibly through sub-contracting) in the future.
- With which other programmes, other donors would GRB like to set up which kind of cooperation.
- What types of activities would GRB prefer other programmes, other donors to focus on (these need not necessarily be explicitly spelled out to other programmes and donors but it is strategically important in negotiations to have in mind an ideal scenario; certainly when you want to take the lead in GRB).

Such an exercise would be helpful in order to:

- Keep an oversight of what has been done in the field of gender-budgeting (gender-sensitive planning, budgeting, M&E); both by the GBR itself and by others. Such an oversight is necessary if UNIFEM wants to take/keep a lead in gender budgeting.
- Be aware of what part of all actors potentially involved has been involved so far.
- Inform in a structured way all actors, who have been involved in the past and/or who have put an explicit demand on the GRB for future support, about the activities foreseen for the future and about what kind of support they might expect in the future. This support might be very minimal and be limited to information dissemination on the general progress of the GRB. Even if the support for specific actors is very minimal, it is important that they are aware of this and that they receive some minimal information on the progress of the programme in order to keep them somehow on board.
- Refine what is currently in the logframe.
- Plan strategically for the coming years.

III.3. Comments related to selected programme components

In what follows we highlight recommendations that are related to some of the programme components.

III.3.1. Support for line ministries

One set of important activities of the GRB are directed at the four line ministries that are currently experimenting with programme-based budgeting and that are preparing a sectoral MTEF (the fifth line ministry involved is the ministry of social development wherein gender issues are positioned). At the moment of the follow-up mission, some of the activities were already implemented (e.g. elaboration of sector-specific checklists for analysis of gender issues in sectors involved) but the specific on-the-job-training/coaching had not taken place yet. It is thus too early to assess the

successfulness of these activities in terms of increased gender-sensitiveness of the sectoral plans and MTEFs. As the line ministries are in their crucial phase of finalising their preparatory work for the 2007 budgetary process, it is of paramount importance that the coaching for which the Gender Laboratory has been engaged will be implemented as foreseen. Failing to achieve June deadlines would obviously de-motivate several of the actors involved.

Given the importance of this successful implementation of activities and given the fact that there has already been some delay incurred, it might be necessary for GRB Dakar to follow up on this implementation more closely for a short period (just assuring that the activities effectively take place. It will also enable to take immediate action when small practical problems occur, even if this is strictly speaking not really UNIFEM GRB responsibility).

The process of supporting line ministries through specific input of the gender experts from Gender Laboratory is conceived as an experiment. This entails that it crucial to assess its effectiveness in terms of increased gender-sensitiveness of tools/procedures used within those line ministries as well as in terms of gender-sensitiveness of sectoral plans and MTEFs. This assessment should help to decide about the future directions that are taken regarding support of line ministries:

- In case gender-sensitiveness is considered to be increased and in case the assessment is that no further increase could be achieved with more intense follow-up, one could decide to start a similar process with other line ministries. One limitation to a simple generalisation is obviously that the other line ministries are only in the early stages of programme budgeting.
- In case the impression is that gender-sensitiveness could further increase through more intense follow-up, one could opt to select two out of the five line ministries and provide these with a more intense form of follow-up.

On the basis of interviews with staff from two of the five line ministries currently involved (education and agriculture), I personally doubt whether all potentials have really been exploited so far. One of the reasons underlying this conclusion is the fact that the follow-up given so far to the five line ministries has been targeted at staff from specific departments (SAGE and DAGE) involved in one particular phase (budgeting) of the overall intervention cycle. The choice for these departments is straightforward but linked to a (too) strict interpretation of the notion of gender budgeting itself.

However, as there is clearly a linkage between real and financial spheres and as increasing gender-sensitiveness of sectoral plans and MTEFs is strongly conditional upon what happens in earlier phases (starting from the preparation of the policy note (*note politique sectorielle*) and including at least the planning phase), I think it would be interesting to also include at

least the policy-makers and planning departments in line ministries (and ideally also those responsible for implementation and M&E) and provide these with specific on-the-job training and follow-up. This kind of support that envisages all stages in the cycle is expensive. In order to optimise results and learning, I would rather select two out of the five ministries for this type of support (instead of going on with the five included so far) and conceive them as a pilot.

The latter necessitates that also enough resources are foreseen for follow-up through the GRB, for documentation and learning. This would involve e.g. adequate description of activities undertaken, types of audience/department included, output and outcome generated and identification of success ingredients and obstacles.

In order not to de-motivate the three ministries that are not chosen for this experiment, it would be important to inform them as soon as possible about the option taken for experimentation with the two line ministries as well as foresee a restitution meeting where all five ministries are invited and where adequate time is foreseen to document process, outputs and outcomes.

III.3.2. Support for the ministry of finance

Currently, support for the ministry of finance mainly goes through the CSPLP. As indicated above, the choice to include this unit as one of the major implementing partners is straightforward and resulting from some implicit analysis of strengths and weaknesses of different actors involved in the PRSP. Aside from this unit, one might think about including some more actors within the ministry of finance as to strengthen, complement and make the interventions at the level of the line ministries even more effective. The elaboration of the overall MTEF is a result of actions both at the ministry of finance and at line ministries (combination of top-down and bottom-up budgeting). So far, there is specific support foreseen at the sectoral level without however providing specific support at the level of the specific unit(s) (the Directorate of Budget; Directorate of Economy and Finance) within the Ministry of Finance that normally intervenes in the elaboration of the overall MTEF at two specific instances:

- the very beginning of the budgetary process through the instructions given at the different line ministries
- when collecting and mediating between the different sectoral MTEF

It might be interesting to see how these specific units/departments could somehow be included (if not through support from GRB, maybe through support from other programmes or even other donors).

III.3.3. Collaboration with the IDRC CBMS/IDRC UNDP Regional Energy Programme

The option taken to invest in the cooperation with the CBMS and the Regional Energy Programme is potentially valuable for all parties involved. This is obviously one of the ways in which GRB could also be spread to the local arena and it is a way for CBMS/Regional Energy Programme to increase the likelihood of having the information collected also being effectively used at the local level:

- inside local governments as an input in the policy-making, planning, budgeting etc.;
- as an instrument of accountability in hands of the local population and their associations

In order for this cooperation to be interesting from the perspective of the GRB (and to put financial resources in it), it is important to identify very explicitly the expected value added from this cooperation. More specifically, it is important to identify what additional outputs and outcomes will be produced by the CBMS that would not have been produced without the additional GRB resources. In other words, the money of the GRB should be additional and not finance activities that the CBMS/Regional Energy Programme would anyhow have implemented (and thus would have been financed by the CBMS/IDRC & IDRC/UNDP Regional Energy Programme). From the information we have, it is not possible to make an assessment on the 'additionality'. The activities included in the draft agreement (including engendering data, indicators and poverty analyses with a focus on women's time use and unpaid work; elaboration of data collection tools on women's time use and unpaid labour; awareness raising and training on data collection and analysis on women's time use and unpaid work to inform policy and programme development and evaluation) are obviously all crucial activities but it is not clear whether these would also have been realised without GRB/UNIFEM involvement (as part of the CBMS/Regional Energy Programme itself). If these activities would indeed be realised as part of the CBMS/Regional Energy Programme, providing financial resources for these activities through GRB/UNIFEM would only substitute for IDRC/UNDP resources and not create additional value. I would thus recommend that GRB/UNIFEM assesses the 'additionality' of its financial support to the IDRC CBMS/Regional Energy Programme.

It would also be useful to consider the cooperation with CBMS/Regional Energy Programme as an experiment. This entails the need to include an assessment of the realisation of the activities, outputs and outcomes as well as an assessment of the cooperation itself. Documenting of this experiment might be helpful in the future (and not only for the specific communities of the experiment but also for others, even beyond Senegal) when deciding about the generalisation of the cooperation.

III.4. Management of the programme

As described above in section II.3., efforts are taken to further improve the management of the programme. It is obvious that we fully appreciate and underscore intentions spelled out and initiatives ongoing. We even would like to stress the importance of making these initiatives more explicit, also on paper.

In order to contribute to the efforts, we would also like to make some additional suggestions that have to a large extent already been highlighted throughout the discussion of the various topics in section III. One of the 'management issues' that runs throughout several of the discussions is the need for (closer) follow-up, certainly when pilots are implemented. In order to exploit the full potential of pilots, there is need for close follow-up in terms of description of processes, outputs and outcomes; distilling of lessons learned; identification of strong and weak points; information dissemination to those directly involved in the pilot but also to a wider audience (i.e. the broader group of subjects that are similar to those included in the pilot; other actors involved in the programme; similar programmes in other countries, ...). One might also think about different information 'products' for different audiences (it might e.g. be enough to provide a one-page overview with lessons learned to more distant audiences; whereas those more directly involved would probably need some more detailed information).

This kind of follow-up of pilots (from a learning and feedback perspective) is necessary and should be distinguished from the more general (control) follow-up. The latter is obviously more sensitive. As rightly pointed out during discussions with the Dakar GRB programme management, there is a need for the national actors to be in the drivers' seat, to own the GRB themselves and to align it fully to their own time schedules and procedures. This often entails slower (but more sustainable) implementation than when GRB programme management would implement all activities themselves. However, on the basis of interviews with several of the national actors, they did not always seem to be aware of their specific role in the programme. At the least, different actors seem to have different perceptions about their role in the programme (some national actors expect GRB programme management to take the lead on some issues whereas GRB programme management (rightly) expects national actors to lead), which sometimes leads to absence of any action. Some more explicit (renewed) clarity on roles of different actors would clearly be helpful, without however ruling out all misinterpretations and delays in activities. The latter is inherent to the type of programme implemented, which necessitates a lot of trial-and-error and experimentation.

Last but not least, there is on the one hand an increasing demand of various actors for support coupled to, on the other hand, an increasing range of programmes and donors that intervene on the matter involved (supply). From various interviews, it became obvious that there is an effective need for some partner to take the lead in establishing coordination (at least information-

sharing) in order for the full potential to be realised with a minimum of production and transaction costs. Several actors, both national as well as international, clearly consider UNIFEM GRB as the lead actor. The mapping (see strategy adopted) could be helpful in taking up this role. There is obviously also a responsibility for other multilateral organisations involved. Rather than starting isolated 'gender responsive budgeting' initiatives separate from their core business, it might generate much more impact (and create less problems of coordination and confusion among national actors) when they would integrate some dimensions, some tools of gender budgeting in their mainstream activities⁸.

⁸ E.g. UNDP is currently implementing a capacity building programme within parliament. Integration herein a section on GRB would certainly be appropriate and is even expected from national actors involved (who get confused by the contradictory messages that arise from the absence of any GRB tools and notions in 'mainstream' capacity building on the one hand and 'isolated' GRB workshops and trainings on the other hand). A similar observation could be made regarding the World Bank who obviously could use GRB tools in its Public Expenditure Review, its various assessments of PFM issues (e.g. in the Public Expenditure Management HIPC Country Assessment and Action Plan) and its PEM capacity building. Such a mainstreaming would probably better underscore the importance the World Bank attaches to gender budgeting than setting up 'sterile' training workshops on gender budgeting that are not explicitly integrated or linked to the core business.

ANNEXES

Annex 1: overview of main topics for the follow-up mission

A. Accountability (reality check on the ground)	B. Learning, feedback to management and policy
<p>A.1. Follow-up of logframe</p> <p>As the second phase of the programme has only started recently (January 2005), it will only be possible to check the lower levels of the logframe (as well as the underlying plausibility of the logic chain, see B.1). Checking the lower levels of the logframe (process evaluation, operational effectiveness rather than impact evaluation) is nevertheless important for the evaluation of the higher levels in the future (no impact evaluation without process evaluation).</p> <p><i>Lower levels include in particular:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ex-ante assumptions (have OVI criteria been identified for this which helps assessment? See also A.3) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1a. selection criteria (including) (see Programme Document Phase II, p. 7) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ what kind of analysis has been done to check the realization of the selection criteria? Are these realizations of programme phase I? ✓ p. 19 it is stated that at the inception of GRB II a more in-depth country analysis would be provided. Has this been done? 1b. realizations of previous programme (see Annex II, Evaluation of Phase I): 	<p>B.1. Check of the logframe and particularly the underlying programme theory + if possible, further construction of programme theory which might help future programmes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is het logic chain (the cause-effect linkages) realistic? (or is the logframe mainly made for presentational purpose?) 2. Are the necessary external assumptions mentioned? What could be additional assumptions? (see also below) 3. Who has made this logic chain? (actors on the ground, headquarters?) (see also planning, M&E capacity). On the basis of what has this logic chain been made? On the basis of past evidence? On the basis of theoretical literature? You might expect that from the evidence from diverse countries, from the previous phase something is learned about the underlying programme theory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ what links are realistic? ▪ what are crucial ingredients in interventions to move from one level to another? (elements that are already part of the intervention) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ what are crucial factors needed to move from one level to another, that might be under the control of the programme, but not yet included in the programme? (so necessary to add these in the future as programme activities + foresee also inputs for this) ▪ what are crucial factors needed to move from one level to another, but unrealistic to expect to influence through GRB ?

<p>.reality check on the ground of these realisations .were these realizations necessary to start with programme phase II (are capacity building and lobby e.g. necessary conditions to be able to have entry points in the Ministry of Finance, M&E unit? What were other factors that influenced this location</p> <p>2. activities</p> <p>3. expectations about outputs, outcome and impact (see also B.1)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ are outcome and particularly impact as mentioned in logframe realistic? <p>4. strategy adopted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Why did they choose for the specific location of the M&E unit? Is it known as a strong unit? Why? Is the M&E unit taken seriously by the other ministries? On p. 20 of the programme document II it is stated that the initiative would be institutionalized in the Directorate of Previsions and Statistics. (why not? What is the relationship between this one and the M&E unit?) ✓ Specific approach adopted within the unit? (functioning as a separate group within the unit or focus on integrating a gender dimension in all activities the M&E unit does) ✓ Has similar location of GBI in some other countries (like Mexico e.g.) been instructive? (cross-country learning; see also A.3.) 	<p>(these are external assumptions that need to be made explicit; if not realized by other interventions, these are killing assumptions, some of these might also function as selection criteria to start with GRB)</p> <p>→ one of the external assumption is the quality of M&E as such (if the M&E is not good, if the M&E unit has no power, then this strongly affects the possible effect of GRB)</p> <p>Not very clear to what extent the GRB can influence the quality of the M&E & quality of M&E unit, to a certain extent it may have an influence (through introduction of budget tracking tools; through influence at the demand side; these are not mentioned as outcomes of the GRB!, but GRB can certainly not be considered the most important actor here.</p>
<p>A.2. Have the recommendations of</p>	<p>B.2. Usefulness of GRB in context of</p>

<p>the Belgian DC (which were based upon the results of the Mid-Term Review) been put into practice?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. valorize training, capacity building, awareness-raising and moving towards effective implementation 2. alignment with PRSP process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ what is the actual usage of GRB within different phases of PRSP? ▪ Which actors actually applies GRB? 3. alignment with budget cycle 4. efforts to align with mainstream actors ? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1. inside government (supply side) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • alignment with M&E unit because of its location within this unit? How does that collaboration work? Has their view upon gender issues changed? Has this location effect on the collaboration between M&E unit and the existing gender actors (Ministry of Family and National Solidarity) • alignment with other mainstream actors? 4.2. outside government (demand side) <p>Is it part of the strategy to keep on working at the demand side?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • civil society (including universities as well) .is there collaboration with outside government gender 	<p>PRSP? (check of a number of own assumptions from review of literature) (strongly linked to B.1)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. is it valid to consider the GRB as a useful undertaking in different phases of the PRSP? Why? Why not? 2. what do different stakeholders think about the usefulness of GRB in the context of PRSP? Differentiate between different stakeholders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ gender actors inside government ▪ gender actors outside government ▪ mainstream actors inside government (M&E unit, Ministry of Finance) ▪ mainstream actors outside government (civil society actors, mainstream budget groups) 3. what are crucial ingredients, factors of influence that might influence the usefulness of GRB in context of PRSP? (importance of looking both at supply and demand factors) (opinion of different stakeholders on this) some of the factors that have been mentioned in literature: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1. supply related factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ results-oriented approach within line ministries & performance-oriented budgeting. Is this present in Senegal? ✓ ongoing reform processes (openness created: PRSP, fiscal reform). A crucial issue is clearly how to introduce policy change to budgetary processes in general (comes close to politics of M&E) ✓ strategic location (political location) (how was that realized in Senegal, to get the initiative within such a strategic location (is it a strategic location or only a unit with marginal power)? Result of first phase? Result of demand related factors?) Was there first a location within gender Ministry ✓ strategic alliances between
---	--

<p>actors? .is there collaboration with outside government mainstream actors ? which ones?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • donors (bilateral and multilateral) <p><u>-bilateral donors:</u> .does the project try to establish linkages with bilateral donors? (strategic alliances to create a demand side for GRB). Which ones? Why?</p> <p>.specifically in the case of Belgium (interaction Belgium bilateral aid and multilateral aid: to what degree does Belgium bilateral aid links up with the GRB programme? To what extent is this used in this policy dialogue over the PRSP?)</p> <p><u>-multilateral donors and development banks</u> .WBI .UNDP .WB</p> <p>5. sectoral focus, focus on poverty-related sectors, focus on MDG sectors?</p>	<p>mainstream and gender actors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ strategic linkages with outside government actors (see also demand related factors) ✓ political willingness & commitment (influenced by first phase GRB?) ✓ personal motivation of some influential ministers? ✓ Knowledge on tools, approaches (results of first phase GRB?) Is there a clear vision on which instruments to use? <p>3.2. demand related factors (push factors)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ push by inside government gender actors ✓ push by outside government actors <p><u>-donors (bilateral & multilateral)</u></p> <p>Have donors pushed for GRB? Which donors? What is the strategy of different donors? How can donors support GRB? Could the Belgian donor learn from other donors? (e.g. Germany, Canada: to what extent are they using, linking up with GRB? From documents it is clear that Germany has a specific strategy)</p> <p><u>-Civil society:</u> Have gender groups and mainstream groups pushed for GRB? Is it still supported by outside government actors? (effect on sustainability) Are there cases of outside actors doing independent budget analysis?</p> <p>4. what are hindering factors, risks? (opinion by different stakeholders; on the basis of earlier evidence)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ too close involvement with PRSP or ongoing budgetary reform processes ? (versus rights based approach, limits transformatory
---	---

	<p>approach + PRSP could be a parallel process to the normal budgetary process + there could be resistance against reform processes which then also has an effect on the resistance against GRB)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ marginality of M&E unit? (In a lot of countries, M&E is a politically very sensitive issue. E.g. the relationship between a centralized M&E unit and the line ministries is important. One of the outcomes & outputs mentioned are inclusion of gender perspective throughout the budget cycle in different line ministries (this necessitates a good relationship between the M&E unit and the line ministries) ▪ too close involvement with mainstream actors? (versus gender actors, limits transformatory approach) ▪ rotation in government staff might be a problem (! one important problem in public sector reform): and gender budgeting demands a time before results may be seen. ▪ program coordination: wide range of tasks including training, establishment of coordination structures, implementation processes, research, monitoring and sharing of information: this requires a lot of coordination (check programme organization: different committees) ▪ minimal budgetary power of many lawmakers might be a problem ▪ government and civil society collaboration: dialogue is necessary, previous initiatives that were combined initiatives have proved to be the best (enhances accountability, efficiency and effectiveness). But often both groups have reservations
--	--

	<p>about working together. Due to historical tensions between the two groups (due to differences in goals and objects; issues of mandates and representativeness, concerns over confidentiality, varying time-horizons.</p>
<p>3. planning, M&E framework of the GRB programme? (organisational effectiveness; relationship between headquarters & field; see also several of the issues highlighted in the MTR)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How does the planning happen? Relationship headquarters & field? Bottom-up & top-down. 2. Is there a sound integrated M&E framework in place to facilitate learning and accountability within the organisation? Check on the following criteria: policy, methodology, organization, capacity, quality 3. Are there plans to produce changes in this in the near future? 4. What has the UNIFEM done with the results & recommendations of the MTR of 2003? 	

Annex 2: overview of the programme of the follow-up mission

PROGRAMME DE LA MISSION DE SUIVI DU PROGRAMME GENRE ET BUDGET
27 février au 03 mars 2006

	Lundi 27 février	Mardi 28 février	Mercredi 1er mars	Jeudi 2 mars	Vendredi 3 mars
<i>Activités</i>	<p><i>AM:</i></p> <p>- 9h00: Réunion avec le staff du Bureau de l'UNIFEM</p> <p><i>PM:</i></p> <p>-15h 00 : Réunion avec tous les partenaires (3ème étage, salle de conférences PNUD)</p> <p>- 16h30: Réunion avec Mr Magatte Sow (SAGE du MFFDS et membre du Comité de Pilotage)</p>	<p><i>AM:</i></p> <p>- 10h00: Rencontre avec Mr Ibrahima Dia (membre du Comité de Pilotage, CSPLP/MEF) au Ministère des Finances</p> <p><i>PM:</i></p> <p>- 15h00: Monsieur Sow Mountaga (Ministère de l'Education) au bureau de l'UNIFEM</p> <p>- 16h00: rencontre avec Mme Fatou Sarr, Directrice du Laboratoire Genre et Recherches Scientifiques</p>	<p><i>AM:</i></p> <p>- 10h : Mr Erick de Muynck et Mme Odile Balizet (IDRC/UNDP Regional Energy Programme) 2ème étage de l'immeuble Mariama, sur la VDN</p> <p>M Elias Ayuk, Coordinateur (Proramme MIMAP/CBMS) au CRDI</p> <p><i>PM:</i></p> <p>15.00 Rencontre avec le Representant Resident du PNUD M. Albert Kacou</p> <p>16.00 Rencontre avec Mr Mamadou Lamine Diouf (Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Hydraulique)</p>	<p><i>AM:</i></p> <p>9h30: Rencontre avec Mmes Coumba Mar Gadio (Directrice a.i.) et Isabelle de Goussencourt (Point focal Genre), UNDP/SURF, au Bureau du SURF, Point E</p> <p>11h: Rencontre avec Mme Abibatou Ndiaye (Presidente de la FAFS) et Mme Marième (Coordinatrice du REFAE) au bureau de la FAFS</p> <p><i>PM:</i></p> <p>14h 00: Rencontre avec Mme Astou Kane Sall, (Présidente de la Commission du Développement Rural à l'Assemblée Nationale et Mr Dib Miom (Député et Vice-Président de la Commission des Finances)</p>	<p><i>AM:</i></p> <p>10h00: Nisreen Meeting with Adji and Cecile</p> <p>12.00 Rencontre avec Mme Oumou diallo, Adjointe au Mair de Tambacounda</p> <p><i>PM:</i></p> <p>15h00: Debriefing meeting by Nathalie and Marleen to UNIFEM team</p> <p>17.00 Steering Committee meeting at Ministry of Women's Affairs with Ms. Fatou of Ministry of Finance, Mr. Sow of Ministry Women's Affairs</p>

Annex 3: presentation of Senegal's GRB (by UNIFEM Dakar)

Dia 1

Gender Responsive Budgeting
SENEGAL

Dia 2

Phase I (2003-2004):
Key Challenges

- How to overcome resistance and institutional barriers?: Need to raise awareness of the gender dimension of budgets
- How to institutionalize and build national ownership of the GRB initiative?

Dia 3

Phase I (2003-2004):
Key Challenges

- Need to increase understanding of concepts and tools for gender budget analysis and formulation
- Need to reach out to a critical mass of stakeholders in policy making and budgeting processes

Dia 4

**Phase I (2003-2004):
Responses**

- Steering Committee chaired by the MFFDS, (UNIFEM's key national counterpart) and supported by a Technical Committee established in October 2003 to ensure national ownership of the National Budget Initiative

Dia 5

**Phase I (2003-2004):
Responses**

- Inception and Conceptualisation workshop on gender budgeting (16-19 June 2004) : training of more than 40 representatives from government, civil society, research institutions, parliament ...
- Formalization of a partnership with the PRSP Monitoring Unit at the Ministry of Economy and Finance for the implementation of the National Gender Budgets Initiative
- This partnership has led to the creation of a Commission on Gender and PRSP, including 3 sub-commissions on (1) Gender and Budgets,(2) Gender and Indicators,(3) Gender and Participation in Policies and Programmes.

Dia 6

**Phase I (2003-2004):
Responses**

- Training workshop on gender budgeting (22 to 25 November 2004) in close collaboration with the PRSP Monitoring Unit
- Development of an Action plan for the Commission on Gender and Budgets

Dia 7

**Phase I (2003-2004):
Key results**

- Institutionalisation of the GRB initiative in Senegal, with a Steering Committee and a Commission on Gender and PRSP
- Strategic entry points in budgeting processes identified
- Increased awareness of the gender dimension of budgets among national partners, including the Ministry of Economy and Finance
- Links established between the PRSP process and the GRB initiative

Dia 8

**Phase II: 2005
Key challenges and responses**

At the institutional level:

- **How to activate the institutional mechanisms that have been established ?**
- Support to the Sub-Commission on Gender and Budgets, which is currently the only one that has been active within the Commission on Gender and PRSP.
- Support will also be provided to the Sub-Commission on Gender and Indicators

Dia 9

**Phase II: 2005
Key challenges and responses**

- **How to ensure coordination between the GRB programme and partners ?**
- Continued dialogue and partnership with the World Bank regional programme on gender integration in the PRSPs and Budgets, which has the same objectives and audience as the GRB programme
- In June 2005, validation of a National Action Plan for the Commission on Gender and PRSP, that incorporates both the action plan of the Sub-Commission on Gender and Budgets and the draft action plan developed by national partners with the World Bank

Dia 10

Phase II: 2005
Key challenges and Responses

- **How to sustain national partners' commitment to the GRB initiative ?**
 - Targeted actions have been taken to provide incentives to key partners, such as opportunities to participate in international conferences, and a planned study tour in successful GRB countries.

Dia 11

Phase II: 2005
Key challenges and Responses

At the operational level:

- **How to operationalize the concepts and tools for GRB ?**
 - Agreement with partners, including the World Bank, to provide practical training to the government officials responsible for budgets in 5 pilot ministries (Agriculture, Energy, Education, Health, Social Development)

Dia 12

Phase II: 2005
Responses

How to strengthen institutional capacity to use GRB tools ?

- In order to build institutional capacity in these 5 pilot ministries in gender budgets analysis and formulation, support to the creation of and partnership agreement with the Laboratory for Gender Research at the University Cheikh Anta Diop

Dia 13

**Phase II: 2005
Responses**

- **How to create an increased demand for GRB ?**
 - Partnership agreements and collaboration with UNDP/SURF, IDRC/UNDP Regional Energy/Poverty Programme, Parliamentary Center
 - Reach out to actors at the local level, such as municipalities, civil society, community-based and women's organisations, building on the GRB-CBMS linkages exercise

Dia 14

**Phase II: 2005
Responses**

- **How to align the GRB process with the PRSP and MDGs ?**
 - Focus on training and capacity building in MDG-based gender budgeting and indicators for the Commission on Gender and PRSP and other stakeholders
 - Participation in and support for the PRSP review

Dia 15

**Phase II: 2005
Impact**

- Increased involvement of other UN agencies in gender budgeting
- Recognition of UNIFEM as a key player in GRB
- A network of experts on GRB is being consolidated at the national and regional level
- Increased demand for GRB, notably among parliamentarians, civil society and women's organisations, elected representatives at the local level, and the new Ministry of Decentralization

Dia 16

**Phase II: 2005
Perspectives**

- Gender integration into
- (1) Data collection and analysis, planning and budgeting at the local level: 2 municipalities have started to develop participatory, result-based and gender responsive budgets
- (2) The Social Accounting Matrix for Poverty Social Impact Analysis in the Department of Statistics
- (3) The on-going reform of the decentralization process

Dia 17

**Phase II: 2005
Perspectives**

- (4) The monitoring and evaluation component, which is the weakest part of the PRSP, will be more effective and gender sensitive
- (5) Sectoral and line ministries will have more gender responsive budgets
- (6) The partnership with the World Bank for the implementation of their GRB-OL program will strengthen the work of the GRB programme in Senegal and allow for its replication at the sub-regional level

Annex 4: partners present at the opening meeting (February, 27th)

**REUNION DE LA
MISSION DE SUIVI DU
PROGRAMME GENRE
ET BUDGET
27 février au 03 mars
2006**

	NOMS / PRENOMS	INSTITUTIONS	TITRE	TEL / FAX	EMAIL
1	De Feyter Marc	Ambassade de Belgique	Conseiller à la Coopération	Tel: 822 38 74 Fax: 823 66 76	coopbel@sentoo.sn
2	Holvoet Nathalie	Université d'Anvers	Lecturer	Tel:3232204507	nathalie.holvoet@ua.ac.be
3	Thomas Marlène	Coopération Belge	Program Officer	Tel: 32 2 519 0 789	marleen_thomas@diplobel.fed.be
4	Abdou Pathé Dia	Ministère de l'énergie et des mines	Gestionnaire du ministère de l'énergie et des Mines	Tel: 551 18 56/ 849 71 84	diaabdoupathe@yahoo.fr
5	Fatou Sarr	Laboratoire Genre/ IFAN Université	Directrice au Laboratoire Genre	Tel: 827 60 29 / 658 89 08	sarsow@yahoo.fr
6	Marieme Diop	REFAE / APAPS	Consultante	Tel: 860 03 21 / 644 08 20	mdiop@pisr.org apaps@sentoo.sn
7	Adjil Fatou Ndiaye	UNIFEM	chargée de programme	Tel: 522 59 65 / 839 90 83	adjaratou.fatou.ndiaye@unifem.org
8	Magate Sow	Dage/Ministère de l'éducation	Chargé de l'Elaboration du budget	Tel: 573 99 36 / 822 16 18	agatmount@yahoo.fr

9	Elias T. Ayuk	CRDI	Spécialiste principal de programme	Tel:864 00 00 poste 2233	eayuk@idrc.org.sn
10	Mactar Diop	Bureau de suivi de programmes Ministère du dev. Social		Tel: 552 52 07	
11	Galo Mbengue	Commune de Tivaouane coordonnateur AL 21	Coordonnateur AL21	Tel: 955 15 06 / 642 26 30	tivagenda21local@sentoo.sn
12	Fatou Diouf Ndiaye	CSPLP / MEF	chargée du suivi qualitatif du DSRP	Tel: 652 22 40 / 889 21 66	ffdiouf@hotmail.com
13	Abibatou Ndiaye	FAFS / GIF DSRP	Présidente	Tel: 634 78 78 / 827 22 54	fafsnaionale@yahoo.fr
14	Odile Balizet	PREP	Responsable formation	Tel: 572 22 62 / 867 27 97	odile.balizet@ptfm.net
15	Zo Randriamaro	UNIFEM	Consultante	Tel: 839 90 79	zo.randriamaro@unifem.org
16	Nisreen Alami	UNIFEM	Program Specialist		nisreen.alami@unifem.org
17	Mukarubuga Cécile	UNIFEM	Directrice Régionale UNIFEM	Tel: 839 90 79	cecile.mukarubuga@unifem.org
18	Stevie Michèle Mikala	UNIFEM	Assistante de programmes	Tel: 839 90 92	michele.mikala@unifem.org