

Independent Evaluation of SDC's Bilateral Engagement in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) Process

Part 2: Case Studies

BURKINA FASO

By Richard Gerster and Kimseyinga Sawadogo

March 2003

Gerster Consulting
Richard Gerster,
Sonja Zimmermann
Switzerland
www.gersterconsulting.ch

Development Initiatives
Judith Randel,
Tony German
UK
www.devinit.org

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Context
 - 2.1 Burkina Faso: Trends and Challenges
 - 2.2 Overview of the Donor Community
 - 2.3 The Swiss-Burkina Faso Cooperation Programme
- 3 The PRSP
 - 3.1 The PRSP process
 - 3.2 Key Issues in the PRSP
 - 3.3 Evolution
- 4 Mapping Swiss Involvement in the PRSP Process
 - 4.1 Motivation
 - 4.2 Activities & instruments
 - 4.3 The Washington connection
 - 4.4 Extent of involvement
 - 4.5 Content of interventions
- 5 Effects of Swiss Intervention
 - 5.1 Effects on the PRSP content
 - 5.2 Effects on the PRSP process
 - 5.3 Consequences for the Swiss Cooperation Programme
 - 5.4 Consequences for donor coordination

6 Activities of other donors

7 Concluding observations

Annexes

1 Abbreviations

2 References

3 List of Interviews & Consultations

4 End-of-mission Workshop: List of Participants

5 Overview of Official Development Assistance (ODA) to Burkina Faso

6 Overview of the Swiss-Burkina Faso Cooperation Portfolio

7 Chronology of the PRSP Process and Swiss Involvement

Executive Summary

Burkina Faso faces a lot of **challenges** as a landlocked country with a population estimated at 11.3 million. There are high migration rates to the neighbouring coastal countries, especially Côte d'Ivoire. The economy is heavily dominated by rain-fed agriculture. About 45% of the population live in absolute poverty, at less than one dollar a day; most of them in rural areas, the majority women. On the UNDP Human Development Index, the country was ranked 169 out of 174 countries in 2000. Life expectancy at birth was 45 years and infant mortality was 105 per 1000 in 2000. Despite efforts by the government to increase schooling, gross primary school enrolment was only 40% in 2000, one of the lowest rates worldwide. The tolerance margin in politics and for civil society improved, the most significant signal having been the 2002 elections, which took place as scheduled.

Burkina Faso is highly dependent on foreign aid. It is estimated that, on average, aid resources constitute up to 15% of GDP, ahead of export earnings. Over the 1998-2000 period, the country received a total of US\$1.134 billion in net official development assistance (ODA). **Switzerland** ranks number six among the bilateral donors, with disbursements of US\$11.5 million in 2000. It is the eighth largest donor, with a 3% share, if multilateral agencies are included. Swiss Cooperation follows a strategy of support to social and economic initiatives at the local and regional level, linked to the improvement and protection of the environment as well as to decentralisation. Significant coordination and cooperation has developed among the few donors providing budget support, including Switzerland.

The **PRSP**, adopted in 2000, was one of the first comprehensive PRSPs. As such, it was and still is a pioneering exercise for Burkina and the donors as well. Burkina Faso paid and still pays a high price for the initial rush in drafting the document. Perceived as a vehicle to get access to HIPC funds, the responsibility for the PRSP remained with the Ministry of Finance. Other ministries, let alone other parts of society, were hardly involved, leading to weak ownership. Sector ministries perceived the PRSP as a vehicle to mobilise additional HIPC funds for sector programmes and noticed only later – if at all – that the PRSP might have implications of changing their overall sector policies, leading to weaknesses in implementation such as parallel structures, absorption problems and an accountability bias. A PRSP up-date is supposed to take place in 2003.

The PRSP rests on **four strategic levers**:

- *Accelerate the rate and equitable repartition of economic growth* through macro-economic stability, increased competitiveness, rural development, and incentives to productive sectors;
- *provide the poor with social services*, in particular education, health, potable water, and improved housing (habitat);
- *increase incomes and employment for the poor* in the rural areas, through modernisation, intensification, and securitisation of agriculture, and through the provision of communication infrastructure; and
- *promote good governance*, including democratic, local, and economic governance, and fight corruption.

Swiss involvement in the PRSP process has been very active. The main motivation behind this move was poverty as the overarching goal of Swiss Cooperation as well as for the PRSP. Switzerland was one of the driving forces for donor cooperation. Joint Budget Support is directly linked to the PRSP. In addition to the donor-donor, and donor-government dialogue there is regular channel to feed comments into the Swiss-led chair in the IMF and World Bank Boards. Swiss Cooperation made a special effort to strengthen civil society participation by funding a study and a workshop. As a consequence of the PRSP, Swiss Cooperation aligned its budget support procedures with those of other donors, although its sector composition and geographical focus remained unchanged.

Major **concluding observations** are:

- Swiss Cooperation in Burkina Faso substantively invested in the PRSP as a window of opportunity. In combination with the donor coordination effort, PRSP-related activities contributed to the good reputation of all Swiss supported activities (seco as well as SDC).
- As a consequence of increased coordination, a lot of meetings take place just among donors without having the local partners' voice.. Moreover, headquarters missions concentrate on the formal review meetings and tend to neglect the richness of a multitude of contacts with the Burkinabé side. An assessment of unintended side effects of donor cooperation is indicated.
- It is a question of effectiveness and efficiency in poverty reduction that gender concerns are part of the picture and that women have a voice in the PRSP process. Swiss Cooperation may consider extended support to gender analysis in view of the PRSP re-design and implementation.
- Local research in view of competing analyses and policy proposals deserves to be strengthened. If donor cooperation neglects the issue of how to promote critical analysis and alternatives, it indirectly reinforces the policy monopoly of the Bretton Woods Institutions.
- Access to international independent PRSP-related research and analysis should also be facilitated for Swiss Cooperation. Participation in training seminars or the launch of a PRSP related information service are promising options to follow.
- Mainstreaming PRSP implementation in the decentralisation process is key. Swiss Cooperation is well placed to contribute here as Swiss Cooperation is directly involved in the decentralisation process and in local development.
- Civil society participation in the PRSP process is on the move but still unsatisfactory and needs to be strengthened. Swiss Cooperation – eventually with like-minded partners – could envisage measures to expand civil society capacity.
- The National Parliament has been slowly gaining ground in the PRSP process. Since the 2002 elections, it has gained much in legitimacy and profile. Switzerland is well advised to enhance the capacities of Parliament to deal with the PRSP.
- The donors have made a great effort to move from an input to an output-oriented conditionality. For Swiss Cooperation, it is important to avoid a self-created conditionality trap and to keep flexibility, also in view of the policy dialogue.
- The argument of coinciding priorities between the PRSP and Swiss Cooperation is obvious. However, poverty reduction is a never-ending mainstreaming affair.
- SDC's field experience and seco's macro perspective are complementary and sources of synergies. The Swiss COOF is representing both institutions. A joint approach SDC/seco to deal with PRSPs is required.

1 Introduction

The Burkina Faso case study is **part of a larger effort** to evaluate the involvement of Swiss Cooperation¹ in the processes of developing, implementing and monitoring Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). The PRSP process addresses many issues of concern to Swiss Development Cooperation. Against that background, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) has commissioned an independent evaluation of its bilateral engagement in PRSPs. The independent evaluation is being carried out by Judith Randel and Tony German of Development Initiatives (UK) www.devinit.org and Richard Gerster and Sonja Zimmermann of Gerster Consulting (Switzerland) www.gersterconsulting.ch. The evaluation comprises three major elements:

- An SDC-wide survey of SDC's experience of PRSPs to date;
- Case studies in four SDC partner countries (Kyrgyz Republic, Burkina Faso, Nicaragua, Vietnam) to look in detail at how Swiss Cooperation, governments, other bilaterals, multilateral agencies, NGOs and civil society interact on PRSP processes;
- A synthesis report, based on the survey and the case studies, analysing the findings and making recommendations to SDC on how to improve its role in the PRSP processes.

The **terms of reference** for the overall evaluation are described in SDC's approach paper. Concerning the case studies, the approach paper mentions more specifically:

- Detailed case studies of SDC engagement in the PRSP process in Nicaragua, Vietnam, Burkina Faso and the Kyrgyz Republic, consisting of interviews with key actors, surveys of processes, interactions, results achieved and lessons drawn, based on the key questions. Identification of successes and shortcomings. Interpretation of key determinants (analysis), recommendations.
- Interviews with similar bilateral donor coordination offices (COOFs) in the four case study countries to determine what other similar donors are doing. Review of readily available information on donor practices in the PRSP context. Comparison with SDC activities and recommendations.
- End-of-Mission Workshop in each country conducted by the evaluators, COOF staff, government representatives, NGOs, and representatives of like-minded donors.

In the **case of Burkina Faso**, the execution of the evaluation was entrusted to the following international team:

- Richard Gerster (Switzerland), economist and Director of Gerster Consulting (www.gersterconsulting.ch);
- Kimseyinga Sawadogo (Burkina Faso), Professor at the School of Economics and Management, University of Ouagadougou and consultant in development economics with an emphasis on rural development and poverty reduction.

The **methodology** for the evaluation in Burkina Faso embraced the following steps:

- The evaluation was prepared by analysis of relevant project documents and related studies (see references in Annex 2).

¹ The term „Swiss Cooperation“ includes the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) as well as the activities of the State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (seco).

- The evaluation took place between January 13 and 23, 2003. It consisted of 40 interviews and consultations with representatives of national government, civil society and donor organisations (see Annex 3). SDC staff were not present during the interviews.
- An end-of-mission workshop took place on January 23, 2003.

The **end-of-mission workshop** was chaired by Vincent Kaboré². More than 30 representatives of Government, SDC, other donors and Swiss local NGOs attended (list of participants in Annex 4). It was the objective of the presentation of preliminary findings by the evaluators to interview partners, SDC staff and other interested participants, providing feedback on the analysis and observations brought forward by the evaluation team. Feedback from the stakeholders ranged from confirmation of the findings to slight corrections and provision of additional information and views. Jean-Robert Moret, Head of Swiss Cooperation in Burkina Faso, made an introductory statement on the background and follow up of the evaluation.

The evaluation team would like to **acknowledge** the support of the Swiss Cooperation team in Burkina Faso in making this evaluation a success. In particular, we would like to thank Jean-Robert Moret, Head of Office and Sita Malick Sawadogo, Economist and Programme Officer. We express our gratitude to our interview partners for their time and the information shared.

2 Context

2.1 Burkina Faso: Trends and Challenges

Geography

Burkina Faso is situated at the heart of the Sahel, bordering Mali in the West and North-west, Niger in the East and Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Togo and Benin in the South. The country is landlocked, and the capital city, Ouagadougou, is 1000 km from the nearest seaport. The country is endowed with limited natural resources and the climate varies from semi-arid with 350 mm rainfall in the north to moderately humid with 1000 mm rainfall in the south-west.

With a population estimated at 11.3 million in 2000, the country is characterised by high migration rates to the neighbouring coastal countries, especially Côte d'Ivoire, where an estimated 2-3 million Burkinabè earn their living. With the recent political turmoil in that country, the prospects for these migrants to contribute to Burkina's economy through remittances are poor.

Political and social issues

Following a succession of short-lived governments from the Sixties to early Eighties, the state emerged as the leading economic actor with the advent of the Revolution in

² Appui, Recherche-action, Conseils (ARC), Ouagadougou

1983. Revolutionary rule continued until 1989, at which time negotiations started both internally and with international agencies to move the country to a state of representative democracy, which materialised in 1991. Burkina Faso has just recovered from serious governance problems, including the question of trade in diamonds with opposition parties in Angola and Sierra Leone, and the murder of an investigative journalist (Zongo). The tolerance margin in politics and for civil society improved, the most significant signal having been the 2002 elections.

The country has a one-chamber Parliament whose members are elected by universal vote. International observers were satisfied with the conduct of the most recent legislative elections in May 2002. These elections brought major changes as the dominance of the ruling party was significantly reduced from 101 seats to 57 (out of a total of 113). The resulting emerging representation of opposition parties may work to modify government policymaking in the future.

Most social indicators suggest that Burkina suffers from large deficits. On the UNDP Human Development Index, the country was ranked 169 out of 174 countries in 2000. The latest large-scale household survey (1998) revealed that 45.3% of the population was classified as poor, living on a mere 70,000 FCFA (US\$130) per capita per year. Life expectancy at birth was 45 years and infant mortality was 105 per 1000 in 2000. Despite efforts by the government to increase schooling, gross primary school enrolment was only 40% in 2000, one of the lowest rates worldwide.

Economic situation

The Burkinabè economy has usually been presented as meeting the major macroeconomic fundamentals: low inflation, manageable fiscal and current account deficits, and absence of an excessively overvalued exchange rate. This is however associated with less than favourable outcomes, as estimates for 2000 show that total GDP was only US\$2.4 billion, and per capita national income US\$230, placing Burkina in the group of low income countries. The positive side is that GDP growth reached 5% annually over the 1994-1999 period, as compared to 3% on average over the 1980-1993 period, and GDP per capita growth became positive.

The economy is heavily dominated by rain-fed agriculture. The agricultural sector (broadly defined) currently accounts for over one third of GDP and provides the livelihoods for 80% of the population. Most of this share is accounted for by rain-fed crops, including food crops (cereals, tubers and leguminous crops) and cash crops (mainly cotton). Low and irregular rainfall together with poor soils and low use of fertiliser (9kg per ha) combine to produce a highly vulnerable situation where aggregate growth rates can swing from positive to negative from one year to the next. The export earnings of the economy are highly dependent on a single product, cotton, which accounts for nearly 40% of the value of exports.

The economy is also highly vulnerable to external shocks through its reliance on international aid and the contribution of migrant incomes. Out-migrants' remittances contributed to nearly 6% of GDP throughout the Eighties, up to 1990-91, before dwindling down to 4% following the severe downturn of the Côte d'Ivoire's economy in 1992, which eventually prompted the currency devaluation of 1994. The recent crisis faced by Burkinabè workers in Côte d'Ivoire is thought to have had even more

profound effects on workers' remittances. International aid makes up to 15% of GDP, putting it ahead of export as a source of foreign exchange earning.

Burkina embarked on a stabilisation and structural adjustment programme supported by the IMF and the World Bank in 1991. Major economic reforms were undertaken, including domestic and foreign trade liberalisation, public enterprises sector reform, and fiscal reform featuring the introduction of VAT (value added tax) and the reform of the budget preparation and execution. The positive performance of the economy since 1994 was the result of these economic liberalisation measures, the positive impact from the devaluation of the CFA in 1994, and a prudent monetary and budget management policy.

The low level of social indicators that persisted³ and the positive appreciation of government's efforts in economic management made Burkina eligible for debt relief under the HIPC Initiative. In 1999, the country was invited to prepare a PRSP, which was submitted and approved by the IMF and the World Bank in June/July 2000. In its PRSP, the government targeted an annual growth rate of 6 to 7%, but this rate has failed to materialise due partly to the unpredictable contribution of the rural sector and the drop in cotton world market prices. The typical growth rate has not exceeded 5% in the three years the PRSP process has been underway.

Major development problems

Reducing poverty is a major challenge for Burkina's population. Improving the living conditions of the population, both rural and urban, beyond day to day subsistence is high on the agenda. To achieve this, there are several issues that need to be dealt with. We list some of the determinant ones below.

- The human capital base needs to be expanded. The education system needs to be made more efficient and effective. This is particularly important for girls and women.
- To promote growth, there is a need to initiate actions to increase productivity, in particular in agriculture but also in industry and services.
- Empowering grassroots rural community organisations to take collective action on issues in the areas of marketing of inputs and outputs is needed to overcome the problem of thin markets in many zones of the country.
- While the role of the private sector in the propulsion of growth is recognised, there is a need to create an enabling environment for this sector. This can be done by, among other things, creating an attractive environment for business, including improved rule of law in business start-ups as well as dispute resolution.
- From the perspective of the poor, food security and sanitation are key concerns.
- Poverty reduction requires more than improved social services. To deal with poverty in a sustained way, there is need to move away from dependency on rain-fed agriculture. There is need for diversification of rural income sources, in particular in the vulnerable zones of the country.
- There is a massive structural deficit of public expenditure.⁴

³ Despite considerable economic growth after 1994, the share of poor people even slightly increased up to 1998.

⁴ In the budget 2002, CFA 578 billion expenditure contrast with CFA 347 billion own revenues. CFA 168 billion are planned to be covered by grants and loans, while for the remaining CFA 63 billion further financing has to be sought.

- To lessen the permanent foreign account deficit, there is a need to promote export earnings, both through the diversification of the export base as well as through innovative actions to exploit the opportunities made available through the globalising economic system.
- Relating to the previous point, innovative efforts need to be put forth to attract foreign investment.
- Concomitant with the above, the country should work toward decreasing its high dependence on international ODA.
- The above can be secured if there is a conscious and effective effort to improve fiscal recovery and the contribution of fiscal resources to the budget.

To address all of the issues raised, there is an urgent need to create a dynamic framework for generating new ideas on development issues. The country seems to be satisfied with ready-made solutions that are handed over by the international institutions. A think tank type approach to generating ideas is needed, and this group should be delinked from any political pressure.

2.2 Overview of the Donor Community

Over the 1998-2000 period, the country received a total of US\$1.134 billion in net official development assistance (ODA)⁵. For a population estimated at 11.3 million people, this works out to US\$100 per person over the three-year period, or roughly US\$33 per person per year. These ODA dollars comprised three elements:

- Direct budget support
- Financing of the budget deficit
- Investment through specific projects

The data mentioned above cover bilateral and multilateral aid. Private donations through non-governmental organisations (NGOs) are not included⁶. Total bilateral aid accounted for an average of 53% of total (gross) aid over the three years, with a substantial drop to only 45% in 2000.

Official Development Assistance to Burkina, 1998-2000

Receipts	1998	1999	2000
Net ODA (US\$ million)	400	398	336
Bilateral share (gross ODA)	56%	57%	45%
Net ODA/Gross national income	15.6%	15.5%	14.0%
Net private financial flows (US\$ million)	-9	41	13

Source: OECD (DAC).

⁵ OECD/DAC 2002

⁶ ODA channelled through NGOs is accounted as ODA, not as private donation.

For net disbursements totalling US\$ 336 million in 2000, the **top ten donors** account for 80% of all ODA. Number one by far is France, accounting for 24% of the total. The European Union follows with 12%. The World Bank (IDA) contributes 10%. Denmark (7%), Germany (7%), Japan (6%) and the Netherlands (5%) follow. Switzerland ranks number 8 with 3%, followed by the African Development Bank (Fund) with 3% and Belgium with 3%. Taking the bilateral donors only, Switzerland ranks number 6 with disbursements of US\$11.5 million in 2000. Annex 5 gives a detailed picture of bilateral and multilateral donor contributions in 1999 and 2000.

The decentralised nature of **NGOs** contributions make it difficult to obtain comparable information. An estimated more than 200 NGOs operate in Burkina, working with some more than 14,000 grassroots community organisations. Existing data show that the contribution of NGOs to the economy totalled US\$45 million in 1991, 24 million in 1994 and 34 million in 1995. The decrease in the dollar amount reflected the effect of the 1994 devaluation, as the amount in CFA terms actually increased. UNDP⁷ mentions an amount of US\$11.3 million of NGO disbursements in 1999. NGOs finance various activities ranging from education to health to production (land conservation, commercialisation of agriculture) to community capacity building.

The **community of donors** has developed rather close ties these past years. On the joint initiative of the European Union and Switzerland, a Protocol of Intention regarding Joint Budget Support for the PRSP was prepared (September 2001) and signed on 18 April 2002 by Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and the European Union. On the practical side, Switzerland drew on the positive experience of budget support in Mozambique. The protocol defines a follow up mechanism to the PRSP, providing in particular for dialogue with Government, reporting, evaluation, auditing and indicators. This cooperation sensibly reduces the administrative burden of the Government. While appreciating this close donor cooperation, it has to be noted that it embraces only six out of about 40 donors⁸ – there is still considerable room to extend donor cooperation. France and Canada are associated members of the extended group without practising budget support (yet). Closer and improving ties are also in place between the Budget Support Group and the large multilateral donors (World Bank, IMF).

Budget support, as a recent form of development cooperation, is not advocated by all the Burkinabé partners. It is very much welcomed by the Ministry of Finance through which the resources are channelled. The sector Ministries, however, dislike this system as their dependency on the Ministry of Finance is increased. They lose the option to mobilise funds directly from foreign donors in case the Ministry of Finance reduces or cancels the budgetary allocation to their specific programmes in agriculture, education or whatever.

2.3 The Swiss – Burkina Faso Cooperation Programme

The Swiss Cooperation Programme in Burkina Faso is a joint effort and an umbrella for the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) as well as the State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (seco). Orientations and priorities are laid down in a

⁷ UNDP 2002

⁸ Harvey 2002, 11

country programme 2001-2006. On an average, disbursements of US\$11 million (CHF 16 million) are planned. As mentioned in chapter 2.2, in the year 2000, Switzerland had a share of 3.4% of total bilateral and multilateral ODA and ranked no. 6 among the bilateral donors with disbursements of US\$11.5 million. As Swiss aid is usually offered as grants, it is particularly attractive to the indebted Burkina Faso. For an overview regarding Swiss ODA to Burkina Faso, see Annex 6.

Swiss Cooperation follows the **strategy** to support social and economic initiatives at the local and regional level, linked to the improvement and protection of the environment as well as to decentralisation. Swiss support is supposed to strengthen local capacities for the benefit of groups at the grassroots and local communities, to use and develop their space in decision-making. Given the on-going process of decentralisation, these local entities should transform and develop their institutional capacities at the local, regional and national level.

Swiss cooperation includes an overall line of support to macroeconomic reforms – budget support and technical assistance for public sector reform – and is directed towards four **areas of activity**:

- Rural development with the priority aim being to intensify modes of production,
- Trades and vocational training to strengthen micro-enterprises in pursuit of better access to markets and production factors,
- Literacy and education prioritising programmes prepared and used by rural groups and communities,
- Local development and decentralisation: Support to public and private initiatives, strengthening decentralisation

Three **cross-cutting issues** are to be observed throughout the programme:

- The idea of citizenship, corresponding to good governance, to reinforce democratic behavior and gender balance;
- Sustainable use of natural resources, to defend and restore the natural environment;
- Aid policies, shaping the relationship between partners and the viability of support.

The programme focuses on four poverty stricken **regions**:

- Yatenga (Ouahigouya, Titao, Gourcy),
- Gulmu (Fada N’Gourma and five provinces of the East),
- Koudougou as an urban space,
- Sahel (Dori).

Swiss Cooperation works with three different kinds of **partners**:

- Grassroots and their local and regional representations having first priority,
- Public services and their adjustment in the process of decentralisation as a second priority,
- Vocational structures at all levels as a third priority.

A few projects funded by the Swiss government are implemented through Swiss NGOs. In 2003 Helvetas started implementing a rural roads programme in the East of the country. Other Swiss NGOs present in Burkina Faso are the Swiss Workers’ Relief Agency, Swisscontact, Terre des Hommes, and the Catholic Lenten Fund.

3 The PRSP

3.1 The process

In Burkina Faso, the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper is known as the Cadre Stratégique de lutte contre la Pauvreté (CSLP), or Strategic Framework to fight Poverty. Due to the international readership of this report, we continue to use “PRSP” as the abbreviation in English.

The PRSP was prepared in a relatively short period of about 7 months between November 1999 and June 2000. The Government opted not to go through an Interim PRSP as it deemed it had sufficient macroeconomic and sector analyses readily available and considered the PRSP an attractive option to get access to additional HIPC funds. The Bretton Woods Institutions as well were keen on quickly acquiring concrete examples of the new PRSP paradigm. A detailed chronology of Burkina Faso’s PRSP process can be found in Annex 7.

The PRSP process relied on several preparatory phases not known as part of the PRSP. The main parent source document of the PRSP is the *Lettre d’Intention de Politique de Développement Humain Durable (LIPDHD)*, which was prepared for the Third Roundtable in Geneva, in 1995 and covers the 1995-2005 period. The LIPDHD is the first comprehensive effort by the Burkinabé Government to present to the donors the country’s own vision of its development and poverty reduction strategy. The LIPDHD is considered by numerous Burkinabé stakeholders as the true starting point for the development of the country’s poverty reduction strategy.

Another input that was fed into the PRSP is the Test to Reform Conditionality, which covered the period 1997-2000 in the context of the Strategic Partnership with Africa (SPA). The test was led by the European Union and was intended to help build a consensus between donors and the Government on a common set of performance indicators that could be used to disburse budgetary support.

Other major initiatives used to develop the PRSP document include the following:

- A study on growth and competitiveness of the Burkina economy, conducted in 1999-2000, provided inputs on the key constraints to growth and competitiveness. This study also provided a series of strategic considerations for Burkina to embark on a growth path fuelled by improved competitiveness of the economy.
- Medium term (ten-year) sector plans in education and health, from which the PRSP document got its social sector strategic visions.
- A strategy document in the area of rural development, the Document d’Orientation Stratégique (DOS), with the underpinnings of the strategy detailed in the Plan Stratégique Opérationnel (PSO).

It is worth noting that when discussing with different stakeholders, the perceived quality of the PRSP varies from a simple donor-imposed – or, more politely, “inspired” – document to a comprehensive framework for development policy orientation. High-level civil servants, particularly those close to the ministries in

charge of finance and economy, would tend to espouse the latter view, while private actors and the NGOs would tend to reduce the PRSP to a simple document serving conditionality. As is well-known, the perception of the PRSP is closely related to the level of involvement in the process of its development. Having been written rather quickly, the PRSP failed to involve various stakeholders, and this is in contrast with many of the parent documents of the PRSP. During the end-of-mission workshop, some participants forcefully stated that the PRSP is just a replacement for the failed structural adjustment programme, and that the process will only perpetuate the need for foreign aid rather than foster development. Rather than assisting with overall orientation, the PRSP was viewed by some as a means to coordinate aid among donors and between donors and the government. Another statement worth noting is that high level officers had noted that even some of the initiators of the PRSP have a wrong interpretation of what the document is meant to be by assuming it is *another* development *programme*.

One may summarise the findings by saying that Burkina Faso paid and still pays a high price for the initial rush in drafting the document. Perceived as a vehicle to get access to HIPC funds responsibility for the PRSP remained with the Ministry of Finance. Other ministries, let alone other parts of society, were hardly involved, leading to weak ownership (see chapter 3.2). Sector ministries perceived the PRSP as a vehicle to mobilise additional HIPC funds for sectorial programmes and noticed only later – if at all – that the PRSP might have implications of changing their overall sector policies, leading to weaknesses in implementation (see chapter 3.2). As a process, the PRSP was a pioneering exercise for Burkina, as the country had been one of the first in Africa to submit a full PRSP. As a matter of fact, the pioneering extends beyond PRSP design but encompasses also on-going implementation, monitoring and revision. Several interviewees perceive Burkina Faso as having served as laboratory for donors to test new mechanisms. The PRSP has become a key reference frame for coordination among donors and for government to donors relations.

3.2 Key Issues

As finally acknowledged by the Bretton Woods Institutions in June-July 2000, the PRSP rests on **four strategic levers**. The four roads to poverty reduction obviously meet a broad consensus. It was said, however that the time horizon of three years, followed by a revision, is inappropriately short and should be extended to 5-8 years. The PRSP should be more than just another short-lived donor fashion, to be dropped after a few years. The four strategic pillars:

- *Accelerate the rate and equitable repartition of economic growth* through macro-economic stability, increased competitiveness, rural development, and incentives to productive sectors;
- *provide the poor with social services*, in particular education, health, potable water, and improved housing (habitat);
- *increase incomes and employment for the poor* in the rural areas, through modernisation, intensification, and securitization of agriculture, and through the provision of communication infrastructure; and
- *promote good governance*, including democratic, local, and economic governance, and fight corruption.

A fundamental question refers to the nature and the **added value of the PRSP** for Burkina Faso. There is no doubt about the additionality of the HPIC funds accessed through debt reduction. The leverage of these funds was used by donors and government to target and increase the overall share of the social sectors, education and health in government expenditure. The PRSP idea, however, is more than that: it claims to mainstream poverty reduction throughout the economic policies of the country. If that is the main significance of the PRSP, there is no need to create other institutions and policies but just to reinforce and better focus the existing ones. From such a viewpoint, the PRSP has the potential to strengthen the coherence of government policies around poverty reduction and stimulate their coordination and cooperation with donors. There is still widespread⁹ disagreement on the nature and added value of the PRSP. More important even, the contribution of the PRSP to coherence depends entirely on its effective implementation.

This source of confusion can be traced in many of the key issues referred to below. They can be categorised either by type or according to the different phases of the process. We adopt an issue type classification with cross-cutting across phases.

- **Matching growth and poverty reduction.** Several voices criticised the bias of the PRSP in neglecting the dimension of economic growth and focusing too much on the social sectors. Poverty reduction is perceived as a development affair and not only a humanitarian concern. If Burkina Faso achieves a 7% growth rate over the next 15 years it will only be where Senegal is now. The fundamental macroeconomic assumptions are seen as overoptimistic, leading to a scenario of overestimated growth. Contradicting opinions could be heard on how to match growth with equity. Trusting in the trickle-down effects of economic growth, streamlining the economy to make it competitive and to attract foreign investment was avocated on the one hand. On the other hand, clear-cut pro-poor policies, including the productive valorisation of water and vocational training were called for.
- **Ownership.** One source of ownership weakness is related to the origins of the PRSP concept and its intimate relationship to the HIPC initiative. Only the Ministry of Economy and Finance was involved, along with the donor community. Sector Ministries did not participate in the drafting process. Ownership was lacking as well at key republican institutions, including parliament and civil society. Civil society was not consulted but rather informed, and only selected NGOs were invited¹⁰. Likewise, in spite of the emphasis placed on decentralisation and 'deconcentration' of the administration, little use was made of these regional level structures. The PRSP is largely unknown outside Ouagadougou. There are no official translations into local languages¹¹. The private sector was only weakly associated. A learning institution such as the university was not fully associated with the process (although a few resource persons were); this was a missed opportunity to tap on qualified resources. Some of these initial mishaps have started to be straightened up (see below, chapter 3.3).

⁹ In Government, but also a major donor described the PRSP mainly as a social sector affair.

¹⁰ On civil society participation see Hassane 2002

¹¹ An NGO, Recif-ONG, had a PRSP summary translated into three local languages (Moré, Jula, Peul), supported by a financial contribution of the Netherlands.

- Implementation & Monitoring:** The Council of Ministers created in March 2001 a threefold PRSP implementation and monitoring structure: (1) Ministerial committee for political decisions; (2) Interministerial Technical Committee for technical issues; (3) Sector working groups, including civil society and donors. This effort led to parallel structures at the central level with very limited effectiveness and efficiency. Confusion prevails in the sense of very different interpretations of the tasks of sector groups, high transaction costs of meetings and heterogeneity of participants. NGOs consider it as a heavy and opaque follow-up mechanism, duplicating the ordinary established channels instead of empowering them. Some donors qualify the follow-up set-up bluntly as “dysfunctional”. Moreover, since mid-2002, the implementation is overshadowed by the rivalry between the two key Ministries in charge of PRSP (Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Budget). The most efficient alternative would be to fit the day-to-day monitoring of the process within existing structures, rather than duplicating tasks by creating new structures. In particular it was emphasised that at decentralised level the duplication of structures should not be repeated.
- Absorption.** Due to HIPC, debt servicing was reduced in August 2000 by CFA 60 billion (CFA 10 billion 2000, CFA 25 billion 2001, CFA 25 billion 2002). However, at the end of October 2002 only CFA 53 billion was mobilised, only CFA 32 billion was committed and much less, CFA 22 million, was disbursed. The rest is in special accounts or was used to bridge the liquidity crisis of the Government. Delays in execution of the 2000 programme, for which the payment account was closed in September 2001, and the ensuing delay in adoption of the 2001 budget, are immediate causes of the low spending on HIPC funds. Note the cumulative nature of the problem, as the decree governing spending of 2002 HIPC resources was adopted only in April 2002. NGOs claim a lack of transparency, in particular as regards the use of the HIPC funds. “Strategies are widespread but results are practically non-existent”, a key donor said. Are the underlying factors related to low local absorption capacity, or donor side delays, or other factors? A way to resolve these problems is to include HIPC resources and their allocation in the medium term expenditure framework (CDMT), and this is supposed to start in 2003.
- Capacity.** Capacity seems to be lacking at all levels. Civil servants are spread thin between the many meetings, talking with consultants, evaluating the PRSP process, and carrying out their regular daily duty. There is also generally weak capacity of civil society to provide usable inputs to the PRSP process. An issue is how to enhance capacity at all these levels. For civil society, UNDP has been funding the civil society unit within SPONG. Donor coordination can be useful in avoiding each donor preying on limited local capacity for information. There is a risk that economic information can be equated with survey generated data. Base economic and financial statistics are missing or inadequate. For example, a disaggregated account of national spending by sector with specification of sources of financing (national, foreign aid, HIPC) is lacking.
- Accountability:** NGOs monitored the lack of operationalisation of the PRSP, observing the risk that policies in practice might even turn against the poor. Donors acknowledge the many figures on output, such as the construction of 800km of rural roads, but it is another question whether poverty has been reduced. Questions were raised as to who in the process represents the poor,

many of them women, many of them small-scale food crop farmers to whom a PRSP implementing government should finally be accountable. Parliament so far has had very weak role. Civil society organisations have limited legitimacy in that respect. The PRSP can also be seen as an instrument of Government to attract budget support from bilateral and multilateral donors. From such a perspective, donor ownership of the PRSP becomes crucial.¹² The high dependency of Burkina Faso on foreign aid leads to an accountability bias towards donors, instead of the domestic constituency. "Donors' favourite programmes are the real priorities in this country", a NGO representative noted. The trend towards increased donor coordination and cooperation based on the PRSP could even reinforce that bias.

3.3 Evolution

There is broad agreement that **progress** on several fronts has been made since the inception of the PRSP, albeit that satisfactory levels have not yet been reached in many respects. On-going efforts to involve the republican institutions (parliament and the Conseil économique et social) and civil society, to monitor success by identifying indicators, to decentralise into the regions have to be noted.

The PRSP is an evolving concept, an evolving document. The scheduled **revision** of the document is 2003, and currently preparation is under way to accomplish that. First, new information needs to be generated to characterise poverty. This will be done through the Enquêtes Prioritaires (EP III) carried out by the National Statistics Institute (INSD). The PRSP had been based on the poverty assessments from 1998 (EP II) and 1994 (EP I). Now it is to be repeated and EP III will make it possible to show the difference. Unlike 1999/2000, there is no undue time pressure created by the needs of the Bretton Woods Institutions. The IMF prepares a new three-year PRGF in parallel to the revision of the PRSP. And the World Bank prepares a new CAS, which is to be finalised by the last quarter 2003.

The ability of the government to meet the objectives of the PRSP depends in part on many **exogenous factors**. The first factor is the ongoing Côte d'Ivoire crisis that is impacting on Burkina in key areas (transport, provision of imported goods, exports of goods, workers' income remittances, absorption of part of the active population and hence a buffer against unemployment, etc.). The other sets of factors are related to the world price of the major export crop, cotton. With the advent of Bt cotton, high subsidies in the US, world prices may be experiencing downward pressures that will prove lethal for economies such as Burkina. What the country should do is to pursue an aggressive diversification strategy away from cotton, as its victory in a price and policy war is rather unlikely.

Overoptimistic assumptions may make it difficult to achieve poverty reduction targets. Already, the objective of 7.4% aggregate growth rate has not been met. This growth rate came from scenarios provided by the study on growth and competitiveness undertaken by the Ministry of Finance and the World Bank over 1999-2000. To achieve this growth rate requires (i) efficiency gains, i.e. the materialisation of the so-called static gains, which requires better management, the

¹² A note made by one of the interviewees.

elimination of some harmful transaction costs; (ii) productivity gains, which requires investment in education, roads, telecommunications; (iii) lower production costs, which requires a decrease in unit costs of the key utilities, including electricity, water, transport and telecommunications. Although there is some progress, particularly in the telecommunication sector, it is slow and the changes that have occurred since the competitiveness study are short of a level that can bring positive changes and translate into substantial poverty reduction.

For October 2003, a country/donor **Round Table on Burkina Faso** is planned in Geneva. It is expected that the Government intends to present an updated PRSP on this occasion. In 2003, five years after the household survey/poverty assessment of 1998, a new survey is being launched. Apart from that, it is astonishing to note that at the time of the mission (January 2003) there is neither an agreed agenda nor a schedule yet for the PRSP revision, which is supposed to take place during this year. The reason may be the already mentioned fact that since mid-2002 two ministries are responsible for the PRSP, sharing tasks and competences.

4 Mapping Swiss Involvement in the PRSP Process

4.1 Motivation

Swiss macroeconomic support started in 1994 and shifted gradually from balance of payments support, via a combination of debt relief and budget support to the current situation where it all goes to budget support in the PRSP context¹³. This historical component must not be neglected when assessing the Swiss involvement.

The following reasons were brought forward as to why Swiss Cooperation is involved in the PRSP:

- Swiss Cooperation shares the basic orientation of the PRSP: Poverty reduction, macroeconomic stability, private sector promotion, improvement of the mobilisation of public resources and of the allocation of expenditures, more focus of the social sectors on the poor.
- The PRSP with its orientation towards poverty reduction should be based on a credible process and is seen as an opportunity to influence policies.
- The PRSP is a unique framework based on shared values, to include all partners in development and to improve coordination.
- Broad participation in the process paves the way to a national debate with civil society on key issues of development

4.2 Activities & instruments

Due to the on-going balance of payments support, Swiss Cooperation participated in the PRSP process actively right from the start. In January 2000, the Government

¹³ See for a brief history SDC/seco, Country programme 2001-2006, Berne 2001, p. 9, or Harvey 2002, 24-25

presented a first draft to the loose group of Technical and Financial Partners (PTF). There is a **comprehensive chronology** of the PRSP process and the interventions by Swiss Cooperation in Annex 7.

Regular activities of Swiss Cooperation include:

- Participation in the annual review of the PRSP, jointly with all bilateral partners and Government;
- Participation in the quarterly meetings with the Minister of Economy and Finance;
- Participation in meetings of the working group on budget management;
- Participation in meetings to enhance the system of relevant indicators;
- Participation in three conferences to consult civil society (July-August 2001);
- Swiss participation in sector forums beyond the formal PRSP process but which matter in substance for PRSP implementation: Decentralisation, Fund for water and Rural Infrastructure, extended group to fight HIV/AIDS, vocational training, private sector.

Beyond the regular activities, **special efforts** related to the PRSP were:

- In September 2001 an **internal discussion on poverty reduction** of Swiss Cooperation staff took place. The workshop served to familiarise staff with the process, contents, implementation and monitoring of the PRSP. The discussion permitted to define how Swiss Cooperation would deal with the PRSP process. Support to civil society was identified as an option. The PRSP was presented and it was related to the sectors and regions of intervention. This day was also supposed to provide answers to questions that had been asked by SDC's Committee for Fundamentals.
- In agreement with the Ministry of Economy and Finance, Swiss Cooperation funded a study on **civil society participation** in the PRSP process¹⁴. The Panafrican Institute for Development delegated a scientist to make an empirical enquiry into the experience and perception of civil society participation so far. It clearly revealed the weaknesses and limitations, including the gender imbalance. The study led to a broad debate and ended in a feedback workshop.
- Swiss Cooperation sponsored the **feedback workshop** on the study on Civil Society Participation in PRSP Implementation, convened by the Ministry of Economy and Finance on 19 March 2002 in Ouagadougou¹⁵. The workshop produced three important recommendations: (1) The National Unit ("Cellule Nationale") of NGOs should be associated with the PRSP follow up as an NGO focal point, (2) The Inter-ministerial Technical Committee should be open to at least three representatives of civil society, (3) The follow up mechanism should be complemented by a participative follow-up at decentralised levels. Recommendation one was implemented.
- Several **PRSP-related surveys** took place, with the participation of Swiss Cooperation. Donor engagement with national PRSP processes was scrutinised by the Special Program for Africa (SPA) in 2001. The World Bank sent an evaluation mission to assess Government-donor relations in the Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) in May 2002. Swiss Cooperation participated in the special meeting and completed the questionnaire of the evaluation team.

¹⁴ Hassane 2002

¹⁵ See Burkina Faso (Ministry of Economy and Finance), Rapport de l'atelier de restitution de l'étude sur la participation de la société civile dans la mise en oeuvre du CSLP, 2002

- Seco commissioned an independent **evaluation of Swiss budget support**, in the context of the PRSP, by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS)¹⁶ in January-May 2002. While appreciating the beneficial effects of increased donor coordination, the evaluation encouraged Switzerland to specialise in one or two key sectors, and to provide Swiss research and experience on behalf of the donor group. Swiss Cooperation was recommended to devote additional resources (finance, staff) to identify and remedy remaining weaknesses in the PRSP and its implementation, to intensify a coordinated and research-based policy dialogue with Government. A clear follow-up to that evaluation in implementing some of its recommendations could not be traced. Astonishing as it may seem, the evaluation report has, so far, not been actively shared¹⁷ with other donors despite their close collaboration.

4.3 Donor cooperation

The core of donor cooperation in Burkina Faso is the Joint Budget Support Group (SBC). It includes Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and the European Union, with Canada and France as associated members. An overview on donors in Burkina Faso and their cooperation is given in chapter 2.2.

The SBC core group meets monthly (donors only). There are also informal meetings of the extended group, including the associated members (donors only), on a quarterly basis. In addition, there have been special working groups following the second review in 2002 on (1) Revision of PRSP, (2) Plan to strengthen budget management (PRGB), (3) repercussions of the Cote d'Ivoire crisis.

The conditionalities and procedures, however, are not completely harmonised. While the Netherlands rely on IMF conditionality plus the joint PRSP progress assessment/conclusions by the donors, Switzerland retains the option of analysing progress in budget management, and the European Union relies on result indicators¹⁸ for the disbursement of the second tranche..

Despite the Budget Support Group (SBC), donor cooperation in Burkina Faso is usually perceived rather critically. The formulation "Cooperation is correct but could be better" was heard several times as an overall appreciation, combined with confidence that it will improve in future. So far, bilaterals are excluded or sidelined: the IMF and the World Bank have special reports¹⁹ and dialogues with the Government, and have easier access to information. The bilateral donors largely recognise the efforts made by the Bretton Woods Institutions to improve the cooperation. In some cases internal rules of the World Bank (e.g. joint documents of bilaterals and Bank staff are said to be non-acceptable for presentation to the World Bank Board of Directors while joint missions are possible) created bureaucratic, artificial barriers to cooperation. The World Bank has approached or will approach

¹⁶ Harvey 2002

¹⁷ Country case studies are not disseminated. The synthesis report of the budget support evaluation can, however, be downloaded at seco's homepage since early January 2003 under [http://www.seco-admin.ch/seco/seco2.nsf/Atts/ET_Aktiv_Bilanz/\\$file/IDS_Evaluation_e.pdf](http://www.seco-admin.ch/seco/seco2.nsf/Atts/ET_Aktiv_Bilanz/$file/IDS_Evaluation_e.pdf).

¹⁸ See chapter 6

¹⁹ See e.g. Harvey 2002, 10-11

the Government to offer equal access to information. Several interviewees stated that aid coordination often meets passive resistance by the Government. Apart from the agricultural sector, country-led aid coordination is absent.

On the occasion of the second PRSP review in 2002, the newly founded SBC-PRSP group participated in the dialogue with a joint declaration and a common understanding on sector issues. A note (“aide-mémoire”) was finalised by the donor group and later handed over to the Government, which appreciated this active role.

In 2001 and 2002, the SBC group and the BWI had separate evaluation missions immediately one after the other. For 2003, a joint donor review is planned, including the SBC bilateral donors’ group, the IMF and the World Bank, provided the Government of Burkina Faso agrees to that proposal.

4.4 Extent of involvement & content of interventions

Given the fact that the PRSP follow up is part of the budget support, participation in the various meetings is not considered as a substantial additional burden by the COOF. Therefore, opportunity costs are also low. Neither personnel nor financial resources have so far been a major limiting factor on the extent of the Swiss PRSP involvement²⁰. The limiting factor is said to be on the demand side. There is a perceived lack of pertinent proposals on how to strengthen the PRSP process, as neither Government nor Civil Society come forward with new proposals.

A non-exhaustive number of concerns, which were taken up in Swiss interventions, include:

- The notion of poverty was not defined (2000);
- The lessons learnt from the poverty reduction strategies to date were insufficiently analysed (2000);
- Major issues of national concern, such as desertification and HIV/AIDS, were absent (2000);
- The strategy was criticised as having vague objectives and being inadequate in its orientation (2000);
- Satisfactory answers to the challenges of regional and socio-economic disparities are missing (2000).
- While acknowledging slow progress regarding indicators and in linking the PRSP to the budget, in many sectors clear strategies to fight poverty are still missing (2001);
- Switzerland evokes strong reservations on the joint IMF/World Bank evaluation, which was considered to be too optimistic. Instead, weak functionality of the PRSP follow up mechanism, weak ownership with Government as well as with civil society should be emphasised (December 2001);
- The (in-)effectiveness of the implementation set-up was questioned and the participation of civil society was brought up again while appreciating progress in governance, education and health (May-July 2002).

²⁰ The IDS evaluation of budget support (Harvey 2002) recommends to allocate additional funding in particular for research purposes. COOF and seco are prepared to examine eventually forthcoming requests carefully.

- The ordinary schedule provides for a revision of the PRSP after three years. This means a revision in 2003 for Burkina Faso. Switzerland regarded this as too short a period for a revising exercise. On the other hand, commissioning background studies means a delay of 18 months. The *aide mémoire* invites the Government to present its deliberations (2002).

4.5 The Washington connection

As a matter of routine, there are well-established and satisfactorily functioning forms of cooperation and flows of information between COOF Ougadougou, SDC/seco Berne and the IMF as well as World Bank staff of the Swiss Executive Directors in Washington. Inputs did not only relate to the PRSP but also to different phases of the HIPC-process, the Art. IV-consultation of the IMF, the Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility (PRGF) of the IMF, and the Poverty Reduction Support Credit (PRSC) of the World Bank. The experiences and concerns of COOF presented are usually reflected in the positions taken in the framework of the Swiss-led constituency in Washington. There is also feed back on the position taken and the debate in the Executive Board.

Major concerns repeatedly brought forward include

- Link between growth and poverty reduction: There is no automatism in poverty reduction when economic growth is due to cotton output increases, as cotton producers contribute little (15%) to poverty incidence;
- Neglect of private sector development: Beyond public sector reform, governance and pro-poor sector policies, the development of the private sector should also be addressed, including the delicate question of privatisation;
- Overoptimistic projections: rates of real economic growth can hardly be achieved. There is a contrast between assumptions and performance in revenue collection by the Government, and high risks in the export sector given the high dependency of Burkina on cotton and the adverse world market conditions; all this undermining the debt sustainability analysis;
- Unsatisfactory social achievements: IMF/Bank rate the social progress as satisfactory despite the fact that the results in education and health are very modest compared to the objectives embedded in the PRSP;
- Relevance of indicators: The indicators used by the World Bank in the PRSC are mainly input indicators oriented towards the adoption and implementation of laws which may not have any impact on the poor population, while neglecting the PRSP result-oriented indicators developed in the PRSP-document;

In one recent case the Washington staff took a position without informing or consulting either SDC/seco or COOF. On 13 November 2002, the IMF Board of Directors discussed the sixth review under the PRGF. Switzerland took an outspoken stand in arguing for an appropriate form of a precautionary arrangement to secure IMF monitoring instead of further financial assistance to Burkina Faso. From this viewpoint, financial assistance may no longer be needed, a position which COOF did not express.

Overall problem: In Burkina Faso (and elsewhere in international cooperation) people from the Ministries of Foreign Affairs are active. In the IMF the countries are represented by staff originating from the Ministry of Finance or the Central Banks.

Due to this split, country representatives in the Fund usually do not take up the criticism and concerns of the donors' field staff (IMF).

5 Effects of Swiss Intervention

5.1 Effects on the PRSP content

The general problem of attribution has to be mentioned first. As a rule, a highly developed culture of donor cooperation forbids attribution of a specific change in the PRSP and its implementation to a specific actor such as Switzerland. Usually there are numerous comments going into the same direction.

5.2 Effects on the PRSP process

The study on civil society participation commissioned by Swiss Cooperation exposed the sidelining of civil society despite the requirements of an inclusive process. It led to first steps of improvements, including a

- recognition of the umbrella organisation ("cellule") which is considered by Government since 2002 as the principle partner in its dialogue with civil society on the PRSP;
- the demand to open the "medium" technical level of the PRSP follow up structure to civil society representatives is still pending;
- the inclusion of civil society in decentralised PRSP implementation activities is expected to meet open doors without being a formal obligation.

5.3 Consequences for the Swiss Cooperation Programme

As a consequence of the joint budget support based on the PRSP, seco has reviewed and revised its procedures regarding the follow up and disbursement of budget support. These **procedures are largely harmonised** with the other donors of the budget support group. The Director General of the then Ministry of Economics and Finance is reported to speak "warmly of the benefits of donor coordination, because the donors now receive the same monitoring and reporting documents"²¹. In summer 2002, policy dialogue between participating bilateral donors and the Government also took place as a joint exercise for the first time.

No revision in **sector or geographical orientation** has taken place or is planned. It is argued that

- The priority sectors of Swiss intervention (education, decentralisation, local development, rural development, vocational training) are priority sectors of the PRSP;

²¹ Harvey 2002, 26

- Partners of Swiss Cooperation are diversified and include capacity building of government structures as well as local initiatives and decentralised entities, considered as key actors for PRSP implementation;
- The North and the East as regional priorities for Swiss interventions coincide with the poor priority regions of the PRSP.

The PRSP confirms Swiss Cooperation efforts to analyse the impacts on poverty of on-going programmes, and strengthens a poverty reduction focus within these programmes.

5.4 Consequences for donor coordination

The intensity of donor coordination and cooperation increased substantially due to the PRSP and its implementation. The firm Swiss commitment to strengthening cooperation facilitated this evolution. Two achievements have to be mentioned particularly:

- the largely joint follow up procedures that are in place now and which relieve the reporting burden on Government, and
- the preparation²² of a common fund for institutional support to implement the PRSP.

6 Activities of other donors

Austria: There is no guidance from headquarters on whether and how to be involved in PRSPs. As a small donor, Austria considers the PRSP as a given framework to relate to instead of trying to influence it. Austria follows a project approach and does not contribute to budget support. Hence, it is not part of the SBC group. Core competencies are at the sector level of rural development and vocational training. Activities to be mentioned more specifically

- Participation in preparation and review meetings, on invitation of Government.
- In 2001, the Government organised three major PRSP related workshops, one of which included vocational training. Austria used this forum to emphasise the importance of vocational training for poverty reduction.
- In the second review (2002) Austria participated in one of the working groups with sector orientation (rural development).
- Austria participates in monthly coordination meetings of the European Union and gets here basic information on progress and problems.

Canada: An official CIDA policy statement emphasises the relevance of PRSPs for Canadian cooperation: CIDA “aligns its programming along the priorities identified by the governments in their PRSPs. ... CIDA will develop a portfolio of initiatives that reflect these effectiveness principles. ... In keeping with the principles of local ownership and donor coordination, CIDA will also firmly situate its country

²² End of February 2003, the fund was not yet formally established as the development partners were discussing the modalities of operationalisation.

programming orientations within the locally owned frameworks identified by developing countries, particularly through the PRSP process where CIDA is satisfied that this process involves a legitimate participatory approach".²³ The PRSP is considered as the umbrella for Canadian assistance to Burkina Faso. Canada is an associated member of the Budget Support Group (SBC) without contributing to the budget yet. However, Canada considers a budget support in future not least in order to have full access to all the policy dialogue going on in the core group. There is a five-year country programme, developed in 2000, which prioritises poverty reduction and more particularly basic education and the local economy. It was said that the PRSP does not require Canada to modify its assistance. Recently, Canada launched and financed a study analysing the follow up and evaluation procedures to implement the PRSP²⁴.

Denmark: Denmark was one of the first donors to initiate a study to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the PRSP. The now well-known Danish report²⁵ has set the stage for subsequent investigations looking at different aspects of the PRSP. The Danish report raised, among other things, the issues of participation of civil society, ownership by the line ministries, the unfortunate consequence of linking the PRSP to the HIPC initiative, and the issues of lack of capacity within civil society. This report was also presented to the Boards of Directors of the IMF and the World Bank in Washington. Denmark was among the first bilaterals to provide budget support, but this stopped in 2000 for political reasons. Denmark remains a member of the SBC (Budget Support Group) and of an informal macroeconomic group (SBC plus IMF, World Bank, UNDP). Moreover, Denmark participates in the coordinating group of the European Union members. Denmark has adjusted its intervention mode in response to the PRSP. For instance, in agriculture, there has been a shift from institutional support to the ministry in charge of agriculture, to more direct intervention at local village community level. In the area of energy, a shift occurred from supporting SONABEL to a direct rural electrification intervention. In the vital water sector, Denmark shifted its support from the West to the Northern and the Eastern part of the country. These shifts in action aim to address poverty where it is prevalent. In the case of Burkina Faso, Danish cooperation does not appear to have leeway in making autonomous decisions; most decisions originate from Copenhagen. And the Embassy is expected to provide feedback to Copenhagen every quarter. Denmark is also pushing for mainstreaming gender in the PRSP process.

European Union (EU): There is explicit guidance²⁶ on how to deal with PRSPs in countries of Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific (ACP). For the Country Strategy Papers the PRSPs are the point of departure to assess the partner country's own development agenda²⁷. The mode of intervention of the EU is through the European Development Fund (EDF), which is common to all ACP countries. Each EDF programme is for a 5-6 year period. The Government of Burkina Faso and the

²³ Canadian International Development Agency, Canada making a difference in the world. A policy statement on strengthening aid effectiveness, Canada 2002, pp. 7-8

²⁴ EEC Canada, Burkina Faso. Etude Diagnostic du Dispositif de Suivi/Evaluation du Cadre Stratégique de Lutte contre la Pauvreté, Version préliminaire, Octobre 2002

²⁵ DANIDA Revue du Processus CSLP au Burkina Faso. Rapport Final, Development Associates, May 2002

²⁶ Petit Bernard, Note to Heads of Delegation, Heads of Unit and Desk Officers on PRSPs Guidance Notes, B2(00)D/4371, European Commission, Brussels 11.05.2000

²⁷ European Commission, Guidelines for Implementation of the Common Framework for Country Strategy Papers, D(2001), Brussels 4 May 2001

European Union signed a strategic orientation for the 2001²⁸-2007 cooperation, which is based on the PRSP as an overall framework. The Cotonou Convention for the cooperation with ACP countries gives priority to budget support if (1) public funds are managed appropriately, and if (2) a PRSP is in place. With Burkina Faso, the EU concluded the first-ever multi-year agreement (2002-2004) on budget support. Of the total of 265 million Euros spent on Burkina 2002-2007, a large portion, about 150 million Euros, are destined to budget support. The EU plays a leading part in the donor group that provides budget support to Burkina. The EU's budget contribution consists of a decreasing fixed share (2002 60%, 2004 50%) and an increasing variable share (2002 40%, 2004 50% as a maximum). Whereas the disbursement of the fixed share is linked to IMF conditionality, the variable share is based on achievements in poverty reduction (budget management, education and health) which are measured by precisely defined indicators. This unique result based conditionality was the outcome of a major effort to revise conditionality²⁹.

France: France is a major donor in Burkina Faso but so far has relied on a project approach and not on budget support. France has 53 technical experts in the priority sectors of the PRSP. Indirectly, as a member of the European Union, it is linked to the budget support of the EU. Since 2002, France is an associated member of the core budget group. It may consider budget support in future. There are no guidelines from headquarters on how to deal with PRSPs.

Netherlands: PRSPs are a corporate priority for the Dutch cooperation but there are no detailed instructions from Headquarters on how to support or intervene. Coordination with other likeminded donors is the preferred way of cooperation. The Netherlands pursue three priorities in relation to the PRSP:

- Cooperation with the Ministry of Finance. The Netherlands are part of the Budget Support Group.
- Strengthening civil society in the PRSP process. In cooperation with Recif-ONG, the Netherlands funded activities to make the PRSP better known in the country. 10 workshops in different regions of the country took place and a translation of a PRSP summary into three local languages (Moré, Jula, Peul) was made.
- Gender balance. The Netherlands are lead donor for gender in view of the PRSP revision 2003, supported by Denmark and Switzerland. Beyond these participants it was said to be difficult to mobilise donors (as well as Burkinabé) around gender concerns.

The PRSP is considered the baseline for the bilateral support but no changes of the bilateral programme were considered to be required. As a matter of routine, they provide inputs related to Burkina Faso to the Dutch Executive Directors in the IMF and the World Bank in Washington.

Sweden: The establishment of a desk in Ouagadougou is recent, since April 2001. Sweden's cooperation approach is similar to that of Denmark, the Netherlands or Belgium. Sweden is a member of the Budget Support Group (SBC) and a large part (40% 2003) of the Swedish contribution to the country is channelled through budget support and linked to the PRSP. The cooperation with Burkina is in progress, and according to the Resident representative, funds made available to the country could substantially increase in 2004 (plus 50%) and beyond. The very slim capacities of the

²⁸ The document was signed on 21 March 2002 only.

²⁹ Known as „Test sur la reformulation des conditionnalités“.

Swedish office did not allow any further initiatives related to the PRSP. Poverty reduction is a corporate priority but there are no specific instructions from headquarters how to intervene in the PRSP process.

International Monetary Fund (IMF)/World Bank: The IMF and the World Bank are the initiators of the PRSP-concept, originally linked to the HIPC-initiative and then broadened to other concessionary financial flows. They are, particularly the World Bank through the soft loan window IDA, major ODA providers to Burkina and key actors in shaping policies for the country. As such they enjoy preferential access to Government, leading to tensions with bilateral donors. In 2002, the World Bank initiated a study to evaluate the extent to which the PRSP was in line with the Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) proposed by the President of the World Bank in 1999, as a general framework for country-led development.³⁰ This exercise should also provide a framework for suggesting ways to make the PRSP more effective and to incorporate concerns of various stakeholders, both at the centre (cities) and the periphery (villages, province headquarters)³¹.

United Nations Development Program (UNDP): UNDP is actively involved in the PRSP process. UNDP has played key roles in capacity building to support the PRSP. In terms of contents, UNDP pushed in particular the inclusion of HIV/AIDS in the PRSP. The National Observatory for Poverty and Sustainable Human development (ONAPAD) and the National Employment Observatory (ONEF) were established in 2001 with UNDP support and are charged with designing a monitoring and evaluation system to respond to the needs of the PRSP. ONAPAD has done an inventory of the 100 indicators available, and held a workshop in June 2002 with a large number of stakeholders to identify the most relevant indicators. UNDP has also helped set up a civil society unit (“Cellule”) with the objective of strengthening the capacity of civil society. This unit is now accepted by government as a partner in PRSP-related dialogue. UNDP has sponsored the organisation of seminars in the area of capacity building of civil society. UNDP also contemplates new perspectives with the upcoming revision of the PRSP, and stands ready to provide an effective contribution in updating the document as well pushing for the mainstreaming of local development, gender, employment and environment issues in the new strategy.

³⁰ The CDF rests on four principles that are (i) long-term and holistic vision of the development framework; (ii) country ownership of the process; (iii) country-led partnership, and (iv) results orientation.

³¹ The final report of this World Bank study on the CDF & the PRSPs has not yet been published

7 Concluding Observations

Swiss Cooperation in Burkina Faso substantively invested into the PRSP as a window of opportunity: Despite the absence of any general or specific instructions by the Swiss headquarters (SDC and seco) and despite considerable weaknesses of the PRSP in content and process, the PRSP was dealt with as a priority. This is the merit of pragmatically operating seco and COOF staff. The capacity of COOF staff should be carefully monitored in order not to limit support to the PRSP from that practical angle. It is time consuming to monitor carefully the PRSP design and implementation from a pro-poor perspective as Swiss Cooperation is doing it³². In combination with the donor coordination effort, PRSP related activities strengthened the perception of Swiss Cooperation by the Government as well as other donors and ultimately contributed to the good reputation of all Swiss supported activities (seco as well as SDC).

An assessment of unintended side effects of donor cooperation: In Burkina Faso donor cooperation has resulted in a joint budget support group for the PRSP (SBC – PRSP). The need for a better cooperation between bilateral and multilateral agencies has been mentioned earlier, as well as the reluctance of the Government to take a strong lead in aid coordination. Further concerns were mentioned in our interviews. As a consequence of the increased coordination a lot of meetings take place without having the local partners' voice³³. Moreover, headquarters missions concentrate on the formal review meetings and tend to neglect the richness of a multitude of formal and informal contacts with the Burkinabé side they previously enjoyed. The donor coordination had as one of its objectives harmonising the procedures of the participating agencies, a task which is neglected for the time being despite the obvious advantage of reducing the administrative burden on the Government. As Swiss Cooperation played a key role in the architecture of the present cooperation arrangements, Switzerland could raise these issues in SBC discussions.

Swiss Cooperation to consider an extended support to gender analysis: Traditional inequality between men and women in Burkina Faso is significant as e.g. the adult literacy rates indicate (women 14%, men 34%). Usually, women are affected worse by poverty than men. Despite such well known facts, gender aspects in relation to the PRSP do not enjoy a high priority either with the government or with NGOs. The PRSP includes two short chapters on gender issues³⁴. Switzerland has made a summary comparison how gender aspects are dealt with in the PRSPs of Burkina Faso, Mali and Niger³⁵. Among the donors, three are said to consider gender as an important issue and to cooperate in a working group: The Netherlands, Denmark and Switzerland. One of the NGOs³⁶ intends to make a thorough gender

³² The inputs offered by COOF to Swiss positions taken in the IMF and the World Bank (see chapter 4.5) obviously apply such a pro-poor perspective often leading to a respectful but critical assessment of multilateral assumptions and proposals.

³³ This situation also mirrors the situation of the Government as a partner. The outreach of donor activities is not only determined by the donors' will and possibilities, but also by the Government's strengths and weaknesses as a partner.

³⁴ Chapter 2.4.5 and 4.1.5

³⁵ Jean François Burki, La question genre dans les CSLP du Burkina Faso, du Mali et du Niger, Ouagadougou 15.01.03

³⁶ Recif-ONG

assessment of the PRSP in 2003. It is a question of effectiveness and efficiency in poverty reduction that gender concerns are part of the picture and women have a voice in the PRSP process.

Strengthen local research in view of competing analysis and policy proposals:

Poverty reduction and growing disparities (equity) matter equally, as the PRSP suggests in its lines of action. Equity implications are, however, almost absent in the document. At the design level, the weak competing analysis and policy debate on the basic framework put forward by IMF and the World Bank³⁷, and taken up by Government, is striking³⁸. The design of economic policies must not remain the monopoly of the Bretton Woods Institutions. If close donor cooperation neglects the issue of how to promote critical analysis and alternatives, it indirectly strengthens the policy monopoly of the Bretton Woods Institutions in the dialogue with Government. An interviewed BWI staff mentioned: "All bilateral donors together do not produce a fraction of the often criticised and even more often used analysis by the BWI". The Joint Staff Assessment of the PRSP Annual Progress Report 2002 notes that "the 2003 update of the PRSP should detail the trade practices and lay out the government's further plans for trade liberalisation"³⁹. In what way will it contribute to that kind of pro-poor growth and job creation that is so urgently needed in rural areas? Whether further trade liberalisation will prove beneficial for the poor of Burkina Faso merits in-depth analysis. Capacity building for independent economic research and policies at the university and/or through NGOs should become an important direction of future support to PRSP implementation⁴⁰.

Facilitate access to international independent PRSP-related research and analysis:

A need was expressed by Swiss Cooperation staff to have easier access to independent information on PRSPs. There is a wealth of government and donor related information – in particular originating in the BWI – on the PRSP of Burkina Faso, which is exchanged and easily accessible. However, there is a perceived lack of independent analysis, of comparisons with other countries, and of general assessments of PRSPs done by universities or NGOs. Despite internet access it works so slowly that under the permanent time pressure of the officer in charge it is not attractive to spend hours and hours searching and downloading documents. In 2001 seco made the participation in a training seminar in Washington possible. This might be reconsidered in future. Another option for SDC and seco could be to start a PRSP related information service in support of the COOFs.

Mainstreaming PRSP implementation in the decentralisation process is key:

The heavy PRSP follow-up structure at the level of the central government should not

³⁷ In 2001, in the joint staff assessment of the PRSP progress report, the IMF and the World Bank revised the target growth rate downwards „while preserving the poverty reduction objectives” , quoted in Harvey 2002, 5. This confirms that other variables beside the growth rate determine poverty reduction and that, therefore, there are a number of different options.

³⁸ The IMF's Independent Evaluation Office, established in 2001, chose, as its first study, to investigate the issue of prolonged use of IMF loans. Evidence was found that there is an inherent tension between the quasi-permanent conditionality and country ownership and that prolonged use hinders the development of robust domestic policy formulation processes. One of the key recommendations is that the IMF should provide the international community with credible alternatives to IMF-supported programs as a precondition for the provision of many other sources of financing. See the IMF's journal Finance & Development, December 2002, pp. 34-37

³⁹ IMF/IDA, Joint Staff Assessment of the PRSP Annual Progress Report, October 8, 2002, p. 2

⁴⁰ In his evaluation, Harvey 2002 also postulates an increase of resources for research.

be repeated at the decentralised level. Channelling of resources through regular structures should be envisaged, empowering them to deal with it in an adequate, transparent and participative way. Swiss Cooperation is directly involved in the decentralisation process and in local development. Programme partners of Swiss Cooperation could stimulate forums of information in the provinces by the sector ministries about the implications of the PRSP for their region as regards policy changes and funding. Such forum projects will require the representatives of the Ministries to ask for specific and relevant information. Proceeding in such a way had been a positive experience in communicating structural adjustment issues at decentralised level (ADELE).

Civil society participation in the PRSP process is on the move but still unsatisfactory and needs to be strengthened: Are the key constraints of PRSP implementation lack of capacity, mismanagement and corruption, or weak political will? Meaningful answers in view of improvements can best be given by civil society groups. Absorption capacity is a limiting factor, and the implementation capacity constraints of Government, the private sector and civil society should be analysed in depth. Based on it, Swiss Cooperation – eventually with like-minded partners – could envisage measures to expand civil society capacity. The role of civil society in the PRSP is said so far to have been rather one of giving legitimacy to the process and not yet one of a co-implementer. Grassroot NGOs are not associated with the process of spending the HIPC funds despite their pioneering efforts in poverty reduction. In the PRSP follow-up structure NGOs are accepted at the lowest (operational) level only.

Switzerland could support the Parliament in extending its capacities to deal with the PRSP: The National Parliament has been slowly gaining ground in the PRSP process. Since the 2002 elections, it has gained much in legitimacy and profile. The PRSP is supposed to link poverty oriented priorities with the annual budget and the Medium Term Financial Framework. The Parliament has, therefore, a crucial role to play but is neither used to that role nor adequately prepared. Switzerland could have examined how the Parliament can in future better fulfil the role it is supposed to have related to the PRSP and its implementation. As a second step, either together with other donors or on its own, Swiss Cooperation could consider a targeted support of capacity building, strengthening specific processes and issues but avoiding party political implications. There is considerable support and even a Handbook for Parliamentarians⁴¹ by the Parliamentary Centre of Canada, the World Bank Institute (WBI) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) to involve parliaments in a better way.

Keep flexibility in PRSP conditionality and related policy dialogue: In Burkina Faso, the donors have made a great effort to move from an input to an output oriented conditionality. It has become necessary to look for indicators of success, indicators which are relevant, which can reasonably be traced and mirror short term changes. In a weak economy and with even weaker statistical capacities, this donor need runs counter to what can be expected under the conditions of Burkina Faso. It is part of the self-created conditionality trap some donors are caught in. The margin of error exceeds the expected margin of change, while neither the basis nor the procedures of the data collection are considered trustworthy. Switzerland is well

⁴¹ See www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/pdf/laurent_poverty.pdf. See also the Website of the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) at www.ipu.org.

advised to maintain in the budget support group a generally positive appreciation of PRSP implementation progress as conditionality for disbursements, and not to insist on artificially precise data. Burkina Faso takes a cooperative position in world politics, is a stabilising factor in the region, and is macro-economically largely on track. Against that background, quantitative conditionality criteria may be renegotiated if targets are missed, and the credibility of the process suffers.

Poverty reduction is a never ending mainstreaming affair: The argument of coinciding priorities between the PRSP and Swiss Cooperation is obvious. This insight could provoke an exercise to examine how far the poor are really the beneficiaries of the sector programmes supported by Swiss Cooperation. In view of mainstreaming poverty reduction concerns, the links between PRSP/budget support and sectors of intervention should be strengthened. It took half a year until the PRSP was presented to the programme staff in the COOF and a broad based discussion took place to position Swiss Cooperation in the PRSP process. This event was provoked by PRSP-related questions asked by the SDC headquarters and used for a broader poverty consultation of staff. Swiss Cooperation in Burkina Faso has a regional advisor on poverty issues. However, his services are not sufficiently used. In the PRSP context, he did not become part of the internal process to play a substantial role. Effective engagement should not fall victim to departmentalism⁴². PRSP design, implementation and monitoring can only be a joint SDC/seco concern.

A joint SDC/seco approach is required to deal with PRSPs: The positive message first: The cooperation between the two units of the Swiss administration dealing with development (SDC, Ministry for Foreign Affairs; seco, Ministry of Economy) is obviously working well in practice in Burkina Faso. SDC's field experience and seco's macro-perspective are complementary and sources of synergies. So far, neither SDC headquarters nor seco headquarters has provided general guidance on the (non-)involvement in PRSPs. However, related to the balance of payments contributions and the continuing budget support, seco headquarters has offered specific guidance to the Swiss Cooperation in Burkina Faso. The coordination office is representing both institutions. The PRSP involvement of Swiss Cooperation has, therefore, been decided by seco, in agreement with the COOF. SDC – considering itself as lead agency in poverty reduction and commissioning this review – is only indirectly, through the COOF, associated. This situation should be food for thought in view of the joint inter-ministerial approach of SDC and seco to deal with PRSP design and implementation in future. The next case might easily be more conflictive.

Align interested Swiss based NGOs to the PRSP process: Swiss based NGOs are weak in Burkina Faso and those present did not announce their interest in the process. With Helvetas as new Swiss NGO partner in the field of rural road construction, one of the priority sectors of the PRSP, it is advisable to find a common understanding which channels the field experience to the COOF and equally keeps Helvetas staff informed on PRSP progress.

Switzerland to continue with distinctive contributions even in joint donor programme: Several donors underlined how much they welcome the Swiss presence in the Budget Support Group (SBC). One reason is the professional,

⁴² The advisor being from SDC, and budget support being a seco affair.

practical and positive approach of Swiss cooperation – a modest visibility. Equally important are political implications. Due to Switzerland the SBC membership goes beyond European Union members and the SBC cannot be reduced to be “merely” EU. In time of tensions between SBC donors and the World Bank, Swiss SBC membership was said to have been helpful because it prevented an escalation and politicisation compared to pure a EU-World Bank relationship. At the same time it implies that EU members can only participate in SBC if they contribute bilaterally to the budget support scheme. It may be important to note that Swiss Cooperation can continue with well founded, distinctive contributions even within a joint donor programme of budget support⁴³ – and even if the Swiss role would become more courageous⁴⁴.

⁴³ Harvey 2002, 27

⁴⁴ The crisis in the Ivory Coast derails the economy of Burkina Faso. A lack of funds of 23 Mrd CFA has been diagnosed which threatens to undermine PRSP implementation. Additional emergency funding is required to keep the Government on track despite this external shock. Switzerland is prepared to consider a contribution but waits for the estimates of the IMF and the positions taken by the other members of the budget group. This prudence contradicts the emergency nature of the crisis and will cost visibility. A lack of courage, a missed opportunity?

Annex 1:

Abbreviations

ABP	Aide au Balance des Payments
CDF/CID	Comprehensive Development Framework
CDMT	Cadre ?? medium term expenditure framework
CES	Conseil économique et social
COOF/BUCO	Coordination Office
CSLP	Cadre Stratégique de la Lutte contre la Pauvreté
DOS	Document d’Orientation Stratégique
ED	Executive Directors
GTZ	German Technical Cooperation
HIPC/PPTE	Heavily Indebted Poor Countries
IDA	International Development Association
IFI	International Financial Institutions
IMF/FMI	International Monetary Fund
INSD	French? National Statistics Institute
LIPDHD	Lettre d’Intention de Politique de Dév. Humain Durable
MTBF/CDMT	Medium Term Budget (?) Framework
NGO/ONG	Non-governmental Organisation
PER	Public Expenditure Review
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PSO	Plan Stratégique Opérationnel
PTF	Partenaires Techniques et Financiers
SBC	Soutien Budgétaire Conjoint
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
Seco	State Secretariat for Economic Affairs
SPA	Strategic Partnership with africa
SWAP	Sector Wide Approach
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB/BM	World Bank

Annex 2:

References

- Burkina Faso (Ministry of Economy and Development/ Ministry of Finance and Budget), PRSP Progress Report 2001, September 2002
- Burkina Faso/PNUD, Indicateurs de suivi du CSLP et des objectifs internationaux, Ouagadougou Juin 2002
- Burkina Faso (Ministry of Economy and Finance), Rapport de l'atelier de restitution de l'étude sur la participation de la société civile dans la mise en oeuvre du CSLP, 2002
- Burkina Faso (Ministry of Economy and Finance), PRSP Progress Report 2000/01, September 2001
- Burkina Faso (Ministry of Economy and Finance, Institut Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie), Cadre stratégique de lutte contre la pauvreté. Profil et évolution de la pauvreté au Burkina Faso, Ouagadougou Juillet 2001
- Burkina Faso (Ministry of Economy and Finance), Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, 25 May 2000
- Canadian International Development Agency, Canada making a difference in the world. A policy statement on strengthening aid effectiveness, Canada 2002
- DANIDA Revue du Processus CSLP au Burkina Faso. Rapport Final, Development Associates, May 2002
- Development Initiatives/Gerster Consulting, Evaluation of SDC's Bilateral Engagement in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) Process, Part 1: SDC Wide Survey, February 2003
- Development Initiatives/Gerster Consulting, Evaluation of SDC's Bilateral Engagement in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) Process, Part 2: Case Study Kyrgyz Republic, December 2002
- EEC Canada Burkina Faso. Etude Diagnostic du Dispositif de Suivi/Evaluation du Cadre Stratégique de Lutte contre la Pauvreté, Version préliminaire, Octobre 2002
- Harvey Charles Review of Swiss budget support to Burkina Faso, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex May 2002
- Hassane Ide Amadou, Evaluation du processus participatif dans le cadre de l'évaluation du cadre stratégique de lutte contre la pauvreté (CSLP) du Burkina Faso, Institut Panafricain pour le Développement (IPD), Ouagadougou 2002

- IMF/World Bank Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP) – Progress in Implementation, Development Committee, DC2002-0016 of September 13, 2002
- Jubilee Research Analysis of Burkina Faso’s Completion Point Deal, [www](#).
- OECD/DAC Geographical Distribution of Financial Flows to Aid Recipients 1996 – 2000, OECD, Paris 2002
- Partenaires ayant souscrit au protocole d’intention SBC-CSLP, Aide-Mémoire. Appréciation annuelle conjointe dans le cadre de la revue de la deuxième année de mise en oeuvre du CSLP au Burkina Faso, Version définitive 1^{er} Août 2002
- SDC Burkina Faso. Programme annuel, Berne 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003
- SDC/seco Burkina Faso Programme par pays. Orientations et priorités 2001 – 2006, Berne 2001
- UNDP/PNUD Coopération au Développement. La Reforme de l’Aide. Rapport 1999, Ouagadougou Juin 2002
- Wilks Alex/Lefrançois Fabien, Blinding with Science or Encouraging Debate? How World Bank Analysis Determines PRSP Policies, Bretton Woods Project & World Vision International 2002

Annex 3:

List of Interviews & Consultations

In addition to the mainly individual interviews listed below, the evaluators had the possibility to attend a meeting with about 40 participants of the sector implementing groups of the PRSP.

Achour Ali	Ministry of Economy and Development, Assistant Technique
Badini Dieudonné	Ancien Secrétaire Général du MEF
Bayiu Paul Pérré	Consultant, Management Urbain et Environnement
Bonkougou Maxime	Observatoire Nationale de la Pauvreté et du Développement Humain Durable, Statisticien-Economiste
Bonnefoy Paul	Union Européenne, Conseiller économique
Bonoudaba Dabiré	Secrétariat permanent pour la Coordination des Programmes de Développement Economique et Social (STC – PDES)
Briand Denis	Ambassador of Canada
Bürki Jean-François	Coopération Suisse, Conseiller régional pauvreté
Dagano Joseph M.	Fédération Nazionale des Organisations Paysannes (FENOP), Président
Damiba Luc	Réseau National de Lutte Anti-Corruption (REN-LAC), Coordinateur des programmes
Diop Mariam	Embassy of Denmark, Economist
Franco Robert	International Monetary Fund, Resident Representative
Hassane Ide Adamou	Institut Panafricain de Développement, Conseiller en Formation et Recherche
Kaboré Alexis	Programme d'Appui au Développement Local à l'Est (ADELE), Coordinateur, Fada N'Gourma
Kabre Tinga Vincent	Conseil Economique et Social (CES), Chargée de Mission

Karlsson Lennart	Embassy of Sweden, Counsellor
Klokkers Marian D.	Embassy of the Netherlands, First Secretary
Lecluze Philippe	Ambassade de France
Lemaire Christian	UNDP, Resident Representative
Loada Augustin	Centre pour la Gouvernance Démocratique, Executive Secretary, Law Professor University of Ouagadougou
Mazurelle Jean	World Bank, Country Office Manager Burkina Faso
Meuwly Monteleone Danielle	seco, Deputy head, International economic relations
Moret Jean-Robert	Coopération Suisse, Chef du Bureau
Nyamba André	Department of Sociology, University of Ouagadougou, Professor
Ouédraogo Albert	Association Le Tocsin, Président, Professeur à l'Université de Ouagadougou
Ouédraogo Boukary Miknaam	Trésorier Regional de l'Est, Fada N'Gourma, Inspecteur du Trésor
Ouédraogo François	Secrétariat Permanent des Organisations on Gouvernementales (SPONG), Directeur executif
Ouédraogo Idrissa M.	School of Economics and Management, University of Ouagadougou, Professor
Samou Issouf	Fédération Nazionale des Organisations Paysannes (FENOP), Chargé de Programme
Sanogo Ernestine	Réseau de Communication, d'Information et de Formation des Femmes dans les ONG au Burkina Faso (RECIF/ONG-B.F.), Coordinatrice
Sanon Kaléfa Rigobert	Réseau National de Lutte Anti-Corruption (REN-LAC), Chargé des enquêtes
Sawadogo Baba Blaise A.	Commision Nationale de la Décentralisation (CND), Administrateur Civil
Sawadogo Kimseyinga	School of Economics and Management, University of Ouagadougou, Professor
Sawadogo Sita Malick	Coopération Suisse, Economiste

Straessler Jakob	Programme pistes rurales à l'est, chef, Fada N'Gourma
Tandamba Idrissa	Maire et Président du Conseil Municipal de la Commune de Fada N'Gourma
Traoré Nouou	Etablissement Public Communal pour le Développement (EPCD), Directeur, Fada N'Gourma
Vorhausberger Erik	Ambassade d'Autriche, Chef du Bureau de Coopération
Zonon Abdoulaye	Centre d'Analyse des Politiques, Economiques et Sociales (CAPES), Economist
Zoundi François	Secrétaire permanent pour le suivi des programmes financiers (SPPF)

Annex 4

End-of-mission Workshop: List of Participants

Venue: "Eau Vive" Restaurant, Ouagadougou, January 23, 2003

Name	Organization	Contact information
ACHOUR Ali	AT-MEF	32-43-94
BANGOU Yénignia	Assemblée Justice et Démocratie	26-83-19
BONKOUNGOU Maxime	Observatoire National de la Pauvreté et du DHD	32-46-34/32-49-75 mbonkougou@yahoo.com
COULIBALY Adolphe	SP/CNCC/MCPEA	31-79-30
DAMIBA Luc	REN-LAC	33-04-73 renlac@renlac.org
DEMBELE Souleymane	STC-PDES	32-43-77 demsou@yahoo.fr
DIALLO Issa Joseph	Maire Ouahigouya	55-03-36 / 20-37-42 maire.ouahigouya@fasonet.bf
DIOP Mariam	Ambassade Royale de Danemark	mardio@um.dk
GERSTER Richard	Gerster Consulting	richard.gerster@gersterconsulting.ch
GUIGMA Salif	SPCPSA/Groupe sectoriel développement rural	31-84-61 squigma.sp.cpsa@cenatrin.bf
HASSANE IDE Adamou	IPD/AOS	36-48-07 / 36-52-35
IBRIGA Justine	DGPSP/MCPEA	ibrigajustinesophie@yahoo.com
KABORE Emmanuel	Fédération Nationale des Organisations Paysannes	36-60-17
KABORE Vincent	ARC/Bureau d'études	30-19-11 arc@fasonet.bf
KAFANDO Ambroise	STC/PDES	Tel 32-40-56 a_kafando@yahoo.com
KARLSSON Lenmart	Ambassade de Suède/Asdi	Lenmart.karlsson@undp.org
KOANDA Habibou	INADES-Formation Burkina	34-28-29 inadesb@fasonet.bf
KYELEM Bonaventure	PNUD	30-67-62 bonaventure.kyelem@undp.org
LECLUZE Philippe	Ambassade France SCAC	Philippe.lecluze@diplomatie.fr
LOADA Augustin	Centre pour la Gouvernance Démocratique	33-58-81 cgdbf@hotmail.com
MAZURELLE Jean	Banque Mondiale	30 62 37 jmazurelle@worldbank.org
MORET Jean-Robert	Swiss Cooperation	BuCo, Ouagadougou
OUATTARA Bamory	FMI	Tel 33-52-23 obamory@hotmail.com
OUEDRAOGO Bernadette	RECIF-ONG	43-51-33/63-38-19 gradefrb@yahoo.fr

OUEDRAOGO A. Bertin	Ministère Infrastructure Transp. Habitat	32-49-34
OUEDRAOGO Jean-Baptiste	STC-PDES	32-40-56 ramondgue@hotmail.com
OUEDRAOGO Saidou	Fédération nationale des Artisans du Burkina	34-04-06 caab@liptinfor.bf
OUBA Benoît	Assoc. Tin Tua	77-03-10 B.Ouoba@caramail.com
SACAZE Jean-Pierre	Ambassade France SCAC	Jean-pierre.sacaze@diplomatie.fr
SANOOGO Ernerstine	RECIF-ONG	31 22 25 recif@fasonet.bf
SAWADOOGO Drissa	DGDI/MCPEA	31-86-24 dgdi@cenatrin.bf
SAWADOOGO Kimsey	UFR Sciences Economiques & Gestion Université de Ouagadougou	226 307064 Ext. 3030 ksavadogo@cenatrin.bf
SAWADOOGO Raogo Antoine	Indépendant	38-37-51 raogoantoine@yahoo.fr
SAWADOOGO Sitta Malick	Swiss Cooperation	BuCo, Ouagadougou
SAWADOOGO Siméon	Député Assemblée Nationale	35-09-26 / 23-40-54
TIENDREBEOGO Aimé Magloire	Ambassade du Canada	30-76-77
VORHAUSBERGER Erik	Coopération Autrichienne	Coop.autriche@liptinfor.bf
ZONGO A. Thierry	Cellule Société Civile	82-36-23 zongo_th@yahoo.fr

Annex 5:

Overview Official Development Assistance (ODA) to Burkina Faso

Total Official Development Assistance (ODA)*, net disbursements, in US\$ millions

Donor	1999 (UNDP)	1999 (DAC)	2000 (DAC)
France	40.3	55.5	82.2
Denmark	25.5	34.6	24.5
Germany	34.0	36.5	22.2
Japan	10.7	28.2	21.3
Netherlands	22.5	21.1	16.1
Switzerland	16.7	14.1	11.5
Belgium	6.6	7.9	9.6
United States	-	11.2	9.3
Canada	11.3	6.9	8.3
Italy	0.5	0.7	8.2
Luxembourg	4.1	3.5	6.2
Austria	2.7	3.0	3.0
Spain	4.9	5.4	2.5
Sweden	-	0.6	1.2
Norway	2.0	1.5	0.4
Taiwan	13.8		
Koweit	8.0		
Saudi Arabia	3.9		
Arab Agencies		2.1	2.4
Other bilateral DAC**	-	1.3	1.3
Other non-DAC donor agencies		9.4	3.8
Total bilateral	207.6	241.4	231.6
EU	56.5	53.3	41.6
World Bank/IDA	59.4	57.3	35.2
African Dev. Bank & Fund	11.7	9.5	10.2
UNDP	3.4	5.3	4.2
UNICEF	6.1	3.2	3.3
UNTA	3.5	2.9	2.6
IFAD	2.5	2.3	2.5
WFP	4.1	4.7	1.3
IMF	17.0	11.4	- 2.5
European Investment Bank	13.6		
Islamic Development Bank	7.3		
Arab Bank for Ec. Dev. In Africa	6.6		
Other multilateral	14.4	4.4	1.1
Total multilateral	206.1	156.8	104.5
Total	413.7	398.2	336.0

* The figures between UNDP and DAC differ because of differing ODA concepts

** Finland, Ireland, United Kingdom

Note: NGOs disbursed US\$ 11.3 mio. in 1999 (UNDP)

Sources: OECD/DAC, Geographical Distribution of Financial Flows to Aid Recipients 1996 – 2000, OECD, Paris 2002; UNDP/Burkina Faso, Coopération au Développement. La Réforme de l'Aide. Rapport 1999, Ouagadougou Juin 2002

Annex 6:

Overview of the Swiss – Burkina Faso Cooperation Portfolio

	Versements		Planifiés			
	effect. 2001	estimés 2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Programme DDC						
1 A) Déve. Rural						
1.1. Programme en cours (programme blanc)						
FEER (41)	756	1'816	2'500	3'000	3'000	3'000
Fédération OP (48)	482	133	500	500	500	500
Appui FNGN (45)	280	372	500	500	500	500
Ass. éleveurs / Apess (851-255)	-					
Déve. rural, programme en cours	1'518	2'321	3'500	4'000	4'000	4'000
1.2. Programme en préparation (programme bleu)						
Amélioration des services à la production			100	100	150	150
Déve. rural, programme en préparation	-	-	100	100	150	150
1.3. Total Déve. rural (1.1 + 1.2)	1'518	2'321	3'600	4'100	4'150	4'150
1.4. Budget Déve. rural						
(+)sur- (-)sousprogrammation Déve. rural	-1'882	-1'429	-150	-400	-350	4'150
2 B) Artisanat et Form. Prof.						
2.1. Programme en cours (programme blanc)						
PAB (18)	1'649	1'344	1'500	1'500	1'500	1'500
CAFP (55)	305	260	510	500	500	500
Artisanat et Form. Prof., programme en cours	1'954	1'604	2'010	2'000	2'000	2'000
2.2. Programme en préparation (programme bleu)						
Contribution à la formation professionnelle			500	500	500	500
Artisanat et Form. Prof., programme en préparation	-	-	500	500	500	500
2.3. Total Artisanat et Form. Prof. (2.1. + 2.2.)	1'954	1'604	2'510	2'500	2'500	2'500
2.4. Budget Artisanat et Form. Prof.						
2.5. (+)sur- (-)sousprogrammation Artisanat et Form. Prof.	354	-146	760	400	400	2'500
3 C) Education et syst. de formation						
3.1. Programme en cours						
Education de base / Alpha (39)	1'353	2'111	1'400	1'500	1'500	1'500
CREPA (Afr.12)	309	826	700	700	700	700
CESAO (5)						
EIER (31)	1'460	800	1'000	1'000	1'000	1'000
IPD-AOS	93	100	150	150	150	150
Education et syst. de formation programme en cours	3'215	3'837	3'250	3'350	3'350	3'350
3.2. Programme en préparation						
Education bilingue			500	500	500	
Contribution au Fonds d'éducation non formelle						
Education bilingue						

Contribution au Fonds d'Education Non Formelle		150	650	650	800	800
Education et syst. de formation, programme en préparation	-	150	650	650	800	800
3.3 Total Education et syst. de formation (3.1 + 3.2)	3'215	3'987	3'900	4'000	4'150	4'150
3.4 Budget Education et syst. de formation	2'400	2'650	2'650	2'800	2'800	
3.5 (+)sur- (-)sousprogrammation Education et syst. de formation	815	1'337	1'250	1'200	1'350	4'150
4 D) Dév. local et décentralisation						
4.1. Programme en cours						
Décentralisation (46)	454	472	500	500	500	500
Déc. Communale (Fodecom/Sagedecom) (53)	808	224	1'000	1'000	1'000	1'000
Citoyenneté (57)		200	200	200	200	200
Association Tin-Tua (58)		550	550	550	550	550
Villes moyennes (42)	1'503	3'165	3'000	3'000	3'000	3'000
Appui dév. à l'est (52)	996	1'408	1'500	1'500	1'500	1'500
Min. Eau et Env. (51)	91	225	250	250	250	250
Dév. local et décentralisation programme en cours	3'852	6'244	7'000	7'000	7'000	7'000
4.2. Programme en préparation		500				
Pistes rurales	-		850	850	1'000	1'000
Dév. local et décentralisation, programme en préparation	-	500	850	850	1'000	1'000
4.3. Total Dév. local et décentralisation (4.1 + 4.2)	3'852	6'744	7'850	7'850	8'000	8'000
4.4. Budget Dév. local et décentralisation	4'600	4'750	4'750	5'250	5'250	5'250
4.5. (+)sur- (-)sousprogrammation Dév. local et décentralisation	-748	1'994	3'100	2'600	2'750	2'750
5 E) Coordination et autres contributions						
Buco (24)	1'284	1'021	1'200	1'400	1'400	1'400
Micro réalisations buco (54)	-40	109	100	100	100	100
Petites actions, divers (et actions terminées)	69	524	200	200	200	200
Dév. Social et Pauvreté (Afr. 26)	231	225	250	250	250	250
5.1. Total Coordination	1'544	1'879	1'750	1'950	1'950	1'950
5.2. Budget Coordination	1'500	1'600	1'600	1'800	1'800	1'800
5.3. (+)sur- (-)sousprogrammation Coordination	44	279	150	150	150	150
6 Total projets en cours DDC (1.1. + 2.1. + 3.1.+ 4.1. + 5.1.)	12'083	15'885	17'510	18'300	18'300	18'300
7 Total projets en préparation (1.2 + 2.2 +3.2 +4.2)	-	650	2'100	2'100	2'450	2'450
8 Budget (1.3 + 2.3 + 3.3 + 4.3 + 5.2)	13'500	14'500	14'500	16'450	16'450	7'050
8 (+)sur- (-) sousprogrammation	-1'417	2'035	5'110	3'950	4'300	13'700
9 contribution progr. NGO (utiliser chiffres année précédente)	300	300	300	300	300	300
10 Coopération DDC total (6+7+9)	12'383	16'835	19'910	20'700	21'050	21'050
11 Aide humanitaire	650	300	500			
12 paiements seco	6'100	6'100	8'000	8'000		
13 Total générale de la contribution Suisse (10+11+12)	19'133	23'235	28'410	28'700	21'050	21'050

Annex 7:

Chronology of the PRSP Process and Swiss Involvement

Dates	Chronologie de la mise en œuvre du CSLP	Actions de la Coopération Suisse
Septembre 1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Le Burkina Faso est admis au bénéfice de l'Initiative PPTE. Point de décision en avril 2000 	
1999		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1ère tranche ABP3 versée sur Fonds de dette multilatérale pour permettre au Burkina de payer le service de la dette multilatérale et réaliser ainsi les objectifs fixés dans les secteurs sociaux
Janvier 2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elaboration du Document CSLP (DCSLP) par le Gouvernement. Premier Draft soumis aux bailleurs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation de SMS aux discussions préalables entre le Ministre et les PTF sur le 1er Draft du DCSLP
Février 2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Atelier de validation et d'approfondissement du DCSLP à Ouahigouya 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation de SMS
Février 2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rencontre du MEF avec les PTF Elaboration d'un deuxième draft discuté avec les bailleurs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation de SMS aux séances de travail avec le Ministre sur le 2ème Draft
Mars 2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Atelier de validation et d'approfondissement du DCSLP tenu à Bobo Dioulasso 	Commentaires du Buco (SMS) sur DCSLP
---avril 2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Le Burkina atteint le point de décision en satisfaisant aux conditionalités liées à la préparation d'un DCSLP, à l'atteinte d'objectifs précis dans les secteurs sociaux. 	
Juin 2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Endossement du CSLP par le Conseil d'administration de la Banque Mondiale 	
Juillet 2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Endossement du CSLP par le Conseil d'administration du FMI ▪ Atteinte du completion point de l'Initiative PPTE originale et Point de décision de l'Initiative PPTE Renforcée. Point de décision lié aux progrès dans trois domaines : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintien politique macro et structurelles dans cadre du programme du FMI - Mise en œuvre du CSLP - Mise en œuvre de politiques dans domaine social (Edu+santé) et bonne gouvernance 	
Décembre 2000		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2ème tranche ABP3 versée sur Compte spécial du Trésor et affectée aux sect sociaux dans le cadre de la réduction de la pauvreté
Mars 2001	Adoption par le gouvernement des textes relatifs au mécanisme de suivi du CSLP à trois paliers	
Avril 2001	Mise en place des Comités de suivi du CSLP	
Avril-Juin 2001	Initiatives de sensibilisation et d'information sur le CSLP conduites par : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - La Direction Générale de l'Economie , DGEP, la Banque mondiale en collaboration avec l'IPD-AOS, auprès de la société civile, de l'administration centrale et locale. - Le RECIF-ONG auprès de ses membres à travers la traduction du CSLP en trois 	

	langues nationales.	
Juillet 2001	Rencontre bilan du MEF avec les partenaires au développement sur le CSLP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation de MJR et SMS
Juillet-Août 2001	Ateliers de consultation de la société civile sur le CSLP organisé par le MEF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation de HTR à l'Atelier de Bobo + SMS ▪ Participation de PR à l'Atelier de Ouahigouya ▪ Participation de BJJ à l'Atelier de Ouagadougou ▪ Lancement de l'étude sur la participation de la société civile à l'évaluation du PRSP financée par le Buco
Septembre 2001		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Réunion pauvreté au Buco sur le CSLP - Présentation du CSLP par aux chargés de Prog Buco par SMS. - Discussions et prise de position sur questions posées par <i>Comité DDC sur les questions fondamentales</i> relatives au CSLP ▪ Réponse au sondage DDC sur Survey of Donor Engagement with the CSLP en vue de la discussion du SPA d'octobre 2001
Septembre 2001	Evaluation annuelle de septembre conduite par le Gouvernement avec la participation des PTF et de la société civile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation du Buco (SMS +BJF) à l'évaluation ▪ Participation d'une mission du seco (keo) à l'évaluation ▪ Préparation d'une prise de position commune (seco+buco) sur l'évaluation du CSLP.
Octobre 2001		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compte rendu de la réunion pauvreté du 17 septembre avec prise de position du Buco préparée par BJJ
Novembre Décembre 2001	Réunions des Groupes sectoriels Gestion Budgétaire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation de SMS
Novembre décembre 2001	Revue du processus PRS par le Danemark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Commentaires Buco sur TDR ▪ Rencontre des consultants sur position du Buco (BJJ +SMS) ▪ Participation de SMS à la restitution
Décembre 2001	Réunions trimestrielles de Bilan sur le CSLP du Ministre de l'Economie avec les PTF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation du Buco (MJR/SMS.
Décembre 2001	Approbation par les Conseils d'administration de la Bmondiale et du FMI du Annual PRSP progress report préparé conjointement par le Banque Mondiale et le FMI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Envoi inputs Buco pour prise de position lors des discussions au Borad de la BM et FMI
Décembre 2001		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Signature Accord ABP4 avec conditionalités axées sur FRPC du FMI et Evaluation du CSLP Déboursement 1ère tranche.
Mars 2002	Atelier de restitution Etude sur la participation de la société civile à l'évaluation du CSLP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Atelier financé par Coopération Suisse ▪ Participation de SMS à l'Atelier
Avril 2002	Atteinte par le Burkina du Completion point de l'initiative HIPC Renforcée avec Topping up.	Inputs envoyés par Buco pour prise de position Suisse au Board
Avril 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Réunions Groupes sectoriels Gestion budgétaire ▪ Réunion du Groupe sectoriel compétitivité 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation de SMS
Avril 2002	Mission d'Evaluation du Cadre de Développement Intégré (CID)de la Banque	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation du Buco (SMS) à la rencontre avec les PTF

	Mondiale et rencontre avec gouvernements , société civile, PTF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Réponse au questionnaire CID.MJR/AZ/SMS
Mai 2002	Rencontre avec MEF et les partenaires au Développement sur la mise en œuvre du CSLP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation de DOE +SMS
Mai-Juin 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mise en place du nouveau gouvernement à la suite des élections législatives qui ont permis une entrée massive de l'opposition au parlement. ▪ Partage du Ministère de l'Economie et des Finances en deux Ministères distincts: Ministère des Finances et du Budget et Ministère de l'Economie et du Développement. 	
Juin 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assises Nationales sur le CSLP avec la participation de l'administration et des ministères sectoriels. Recommandations fortes au niveau du dispositif de suivi du CSLP. ▪ Partenaires et société civile peu représentés 	
Juin 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Préparation d'un canevas d'appréciation conjointe des partenaires sur la mise en œuvre du CSLP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposition initiée par la Suisse d'avoir un canevas d'analyse
Juillet 2002	<p>Revue annuelle de la 2ème année de mise en œuvre du CSLP :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Présentation-Discussion du rapport général de mise en œuvre entre le gouvernement et les partenaires ▪ Présentation –discussion sur les rapports sectoriels entre gouvernement/partenaires/société civile. ▪ Engagements pris par le gouvernement pour la relecture du CSLP et du dispositif de suivi 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Préparation d'une appréciation conjointe par le Groupe SBC-CSLP dont la Suisse sur la mise en œuvre du CSLP. L'appréciation conjointe est plutôt favorable mais reste très critique sur le dispositif de suivi du CSLP. ▪ La France et le Canada se sont joints au Groupe pour réaliser l'appréciation conjointe. ▪ Participation d'une mission du seco et de la DDC (Peter Beez) à la revue annuelle du CSLP
Août-septembre 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mission du FMI et de la Bmondiale Discussion du rapport définitif de mise en œuvre du CSLP avec le gouvernement et les partenaires 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation côté suisse de M Dolfus aux discussions entre les partenaires et la mission ▪ Déboursement de la 2ème tranche de l'appui budgétaire de la Suisse (Seco)
Octobre 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Préparation d'une prise de position conjointe des Partenaires de l'Union Européenne et de la Suisse sur le Draft du Joint Staff Assessment (JSA) du FMI et de la BM. Les partenaires ont trouvé que le JSA s'alignait globalement sur les conclusions de l'appréciation conjointe du Groupe SBC-CSLP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ La Suisse a été invitée à y participer Contribution aux commentaires des partenaires de l'Union Européenne
Octobre 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Présentation-discussion au Board de la Bmondiale du Joint Staff Assesment de la Banque et du FMI sur le progress Report du Burkina 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Préparation de la position du Bucu sur le Joint Staff Assessment. La position du Bucu était assez proche de celle réalisée avec les partenaires de l'Union Européenne.
Novembre 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Présentation discussion au Board du FMI, de la revue PRGF, et du JSA sur le progress report du CSLP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Position suisse préparée et présentée par le Bureau Exécutif suisse au FMI
Novembre 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Table ronde organisée par le gouvernement (Ministres de l'Economie et du Développement et Ministre des Finances et du Budget) sur la situation des expatriés de Côte d'Ivoire 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Le Chef du Bureau a pris part à la Table ronde
Décembre 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mission de la Banque Mondiale sur le CASRP. Rencontre des partenaires et 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation du Chef du Bureau et de l'économiste du Bucu à la rencontre

	<p>question sur l'impact de la crise ivoirienne.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - La mission relève le faible niveau d'informations venant du gouvernement sur les impacts financiers et macro-économiques - Le problème de conflit institutionnel entre les 2 ministères est évoqué. 	
Décembre 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mise en place du cadre de concertation élargi en appui au CSLP. Création d'un secrétariat technique pour ce cadre composé de la Banque Mondiale, le PNUD, la Suisse, la France, le Canada, l'Union européenne. ▪ Mise en place de trois groupes de travail : Suivi du CSLP et des indicateurs, Impact de la crise ivoirienne et questions macro-économiques, Renforcement des capacités et Renforcement de la gestion budgétaire. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ La Suisse dans le cadre du groupe SBC-CSLP a poussé avec les autres partenaires du Groupe pour la mise en place de ce cadre élargi.
Janvier 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transmission des rapports finals sur la mise en œuvre du CSLP en 2002. 	
Janvier 2003		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Réunion du Groupe SBC-CSLP à l'initiative de la Suisse pour clarifier les activités du groupe SBC-CSLP avec la mise en place du cadre élargi des partenaires en appui au CSLP
Janvier 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rencontre entre le Groupe SBC-CSLP et le STC-PDES, en charge de la coordination des politiques de développement et du suivi du CSLP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation de la Suisse à la dite rencontre
Janvier 2003		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluation Indépendante de la contribution de la Coopération Suisse au processus CSLP commanditée par la DDC.