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### A. Basic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country:</th>
<th>Senegal</th>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>Senegal EFA-FTI Catalytic Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project ID:</td>
<td>P116783</td>
<td>L/C/TF Number(s):</td>
<td>TF-94753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR Date:</td>
<td>06/30/2015</td>
<td>ICR Type:</td>
<td>Core ICR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lending Instrument:</td>
<td>SIL</td>
<td>Grantee:</td>
<td>REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Total Commitment:</td>
<td>USD 81.50M</td>
<td>Disbursed Amount:</td>
<td>USD 80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Amount:</td>
<td>USD 81.50M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Category:</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementing Agencies:** Ministry of Education (*Ministère de l’Education Nationale*)

Name: S.E.M. Serigne Mbaye Thiam  
Title: Minister  
Telephone No.: +221 33 849 54 54

**Cofinanciers and Other External Partners:** N/A

### B. Key Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Original Date</th>
<th>Revised / Actual Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal:</td>
<td>05/22/2009</td>
<td>Restructuring(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/1/2010 12/28/2012 09/30/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Closing:</td>
<td>12/31/2011</td>
<td>09/30/2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Ratings Summary

#### C.1 Performance Rating by ICR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes:</th>
<th>Moderately Satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk to Development Outcome:</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Performance:</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee Performance:</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C.2 Detailed Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance (by ICR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Borrower</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality at Entry:</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
<td>Government:</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Supervision:</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
<td>Implementing Agency/Agencies:</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Bank Performance: Moderately Satisfactory  
Overall Borrower Performance: Moderately Satisfactory  

C.3 Quality at Entry and Implementation Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Performance</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>QAG Assessments (if any)</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Problem Project at any time (Yes/No):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Quality at Entry (QEA):</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Project at any time (Yes/No):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Quality of Supervision (QSA):</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO rating before Closing/Inactive status:</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Sector and Theme Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector Code (as % of total Bank financing)</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration- Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme Code (as % of total Bank financing)</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education for all</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Bank Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>At ICR</th>
<th>At Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President:</td>
<td>Makhtar Diop</td>
<td>Obiageli Katryn Ezekwesili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Director:</td>
<td>Louise Cord</td>
<td>Habib M. Fetini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Manager:</td>
<td>Peter Materu</td>
<td>Eva Jarawan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Leader:</td>
<td>Atou Seck</td>
<td>Meskerem Mulatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR Team Leader:</td>
<td>Meskerem Mulatu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR Primary Author:</td>
<td>Maria Rosa Puech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mouhamadou Moustapha Lo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Results Framework Analysis

Project Development Objectives
According to the main text of the Project Appraisal Document (PAD), the Project “aims to contribute to the Government's goal of attaining universal primary education by 2015, through construction, extension and equipment of classrooms and ancillary buildings.”1 According to the Grant Agreement (GA), the “objective of the Project is to contribute to the Recipient's goal of attaining universal primary education by 2015.”

Revised Project Development Objectives
The PDO was not revised during the life of the Project.

(a) PDO Indicator(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Original Target Values (from approval documents)</th>
<th>Formally Revised Target Values</th>
<th>Actual Value Achieved at Completion or Target Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1</td>
<td>Gross intake rate into grade 1 of primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value (qualitative or quantitative)</td>
<td>113.6%</td>
<td>110.3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>108.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>09/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>Target exceeded. End-of-project target was set lower than the baseline value since the Project sought to support the Government’s efforts in reducing the number of over-aged children entering into grade 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2</td>
<td>Increase in primary gross enrollment rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value (qualitative or quantitative)</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>09/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>Progress was observed under the Project, although falling short of end-of-project target.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 3</td>
<td>Increase in primary completion rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value (qualitative or quantitative)</td>
<td>58.45%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>09/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Target exceeded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The PAD datasheet also specifies that the project will help finance the following: (i) construction and equipping of new elementary schools; (ii) extension of existing schools by adding new classrooms and ancillary buildings; and (iii) coordination and monitoring/evaluation. This PDO is taken from the main text of the PAD.
**Indicator 4**  
Reduction in repetition rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value (qualitative or quantitative)</th>
<th>7.9%</th>
<th>6.8%</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>09/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>Target exceeded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 5**  
Reduction in dropout rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value (qualitative or quantitative)</th>
<th>10.9%</th>
<th>6.3%</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>7.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>09/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>Progress was observed under the Project, although falling short of end-of-project target.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The baseline figures used above are taken from Annex 3 (Results Framework) of the project appraisal document (PAD) which were subsequently used by the Ministry as baseline and target values. This ensures consistency and comparability between ICR values and those reported by the Government.*

**(b) Intermediate Outcome Indicator(s)**

Additional intermediate outcome indicators have been included in Section 3.2 of the ICR to provide evidence of the achievements realized under the Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Original Target Values (from approval documents)</th>
<th>Formally Revised Target Values</th>
<th>Actual Value Achieved at Completion or Target Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1</strong></td>
<td>Number of completed classrooms financed under the Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value (qualitative or quantitative)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>09/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>Target exceeded. The target figure included new additional and replacement classrooms in existing schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 2</strong></td>
<td>Number of classrooms delivered to complete incomplete cycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value (qualitative or quantitative)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,010 classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,591 classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>09/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>Target exceeded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 3**  
Number of temporary structures *classrooms* replaced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value (qualitative or quantitative)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1,900</th>
<th>1,936</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>Target exceeded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 4**  
Number of new schools constructed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value (qualitative or quantitative)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>150</th>
<th>198</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>Target exceeded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 5**  
Number of elementary schools receiving a water point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value (qualitative or quantitative)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>814</th>
<th>538</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>Despite the large number of water points constructed under the Project, the end-of-project target was not achieved largely due to the unexpected high cost of construction and the difficulty in their construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 6**  
Number of schools receiving a latrine block

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value (qualitative or quantitative)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>814</th>
<th>839</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>Target exceeded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 7**  
Number of schools receiving an administrative block

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value (qualitative or quantitative)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>522</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>Target exceeded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indicator 8

Number of meetings held by the Construction Committee and the Steering Committee in 2009, 2010 and 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value (qualitative or quantitative)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>Target exceeded. This includes the Steering Committee meetings chaired by the DPRE. The Minister chaired a monthly meeting during the last year of project implementation to ensure full delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indicator 9

Frequency of monitoring reports provided by the DCS following field visits/technical supervision missions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value (qualitative or quantitative)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Quarterlly</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>06/30/2008</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>Target Achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G. Ratings of Project Performance in ISRs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date ISR Archived</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>Actual Disbursements (USD millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>03/18/2010</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
<td>9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>03/27/2011</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>21.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>09/06/2011</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>26.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>04/08/2012</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>45.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12/23/2012</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>63.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06/22/2013</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>65.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12/30/2013</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>70.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>06/25/2014</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>75.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10/20/2014</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>76.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### H. Restructuring (if any)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restructuring date</th>
<th>ISR ratings at restructuring</th>
<th>Amount disbursed at restructuring US$ million</th>
<th>Reasons for restructuring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/1/2010</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>The Project was restructured to: (i) diversify the modalities of implementation to accelerate the delivery of the second phase of construction under the Project; and to (ii) extend the project closing date from June 30, 2011 to December 31, 2012 to allow for completion of the construction activities planned under the Project. Under the restructuring, six additional agencies were designated to supervise construction under the second phase of the Project. These included the Directorate of School Construction (DCS) and five Regional Development Agencies of the Kaolack, Thies, Diourbel, Louga, and St-Louis regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/28/2012</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>US$63.40</td>
<td>The Project was extended by nine months to September 30, 2013 in order to utilize savings generated through efficient procurement. These resources were then allocated to additional construction programs and allowed for the construction program’s completion. Specifically, these additional resources funded the construction of classrooms and auxiliary buildings in junior secondary schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/30/2013</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>US$65.08</td>
<td>The Project was extended by one year to September 30, 2014 in order to allow the Project to continue to make use of savings generated through an efficient procurement process. These funds were used to continue to build additional lower secondary schools as well as additional sanitary blocks and to support the rehabilitation of two girls’ secondary schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Disbursement Profile
1. Project Context, Development Objectives and Design

1.1 Context at Appraisal

Country Context

1. At the time of project appraisal, Senegal was considered a low-income country. The gross domestic product (GDP) per capita was US$1,018 and more than one-half of the population was living below the poverty line. During the period from 1995 to 2005, Senegal had benefited from sound macroeconomic performance reflected in an average annual growth of 4.5 percent. The country’s political environment at the time of project preparation was also relatively stable. Following this period, however, economic performance slowed and was accompanied by increases in budget deficits and inflation. A hike in fuel and food prices was also negatively affecting the country’s economy. As a result, and in an effort to control the impact of these shocks on the country’s public finances, the Government reduced investment and recurrent expenditures. In addition to these economic challenges, at the time of project appraisal, Senegal’s human development index (HDI) was relatively low when compared to other countries worldwide (UNDP, 2008).

Sector Context

2. Access to education in Senegal had improved significantly in the years prior to project preparation, largely as a result of efforts to stimulate the demand for education during the 1990s. Increasing access to primary education had been highlighted as a major priority in the country’s ten-year Education Sector Plan (Plan Décennal l’Éducation et Formation – PDEF 2000-2011) which had been developed with support from various development partners (DPs) and was complemented by successive three-year medium-term expenditure frameworks (MTEFs). Given the rapid increases in primary gross enrollment observed from 1990 to the time of project appraisal, most schools had become overcrowded and were unable to meet the growing demand. The lack of schools and classrooms – and a preponderance of schools which could not provide the complete cycle 2 – was particularly problematic within rural areas.

3. With an insufficient number of school buildings, the Government adopted interim measures, including renting of space and the construction of temporary classrooms/schools (abris provisoires) to accommodate the growing number of students. By 2009, these temporary classrooms accounted for nearly one-fifth of all classrooms in Senegal. For the most part, classes could only be held in these temporary structures during the period spanning from December to May since they were typically unusable during the rainy season which begins in early June 3. This lack of suitable infrastructure was negatively impacting learning outcomes as children attending these schools were receiving only two-thirds of the instructional time allotted within a given school year.

---

2 At the time of project appraisal, only 52 percent of students in rural areas were in schools that offered the complete cycle (compared to 93 percent of students in urban areas).
3 The school year in Senegal spans from early October to end of July.
4. As enrollment rates were increasing, infrastructure needs became more pronounced while overcrowding of existing schools continued. Significant disparities between urban and rural areas also existed. Further, at the time of appraisal, primary school dropout and repetition rates were high which was hindering further progress on the primary completion rate (PCR). A number of additional factors were contributing to these observed trends: an absence of schools offering the complete primary cycle; the lack of continuity of education in many areas of the country but mostly in rural areas; a lack of attention on limiting repetition at the primary level; the absence of water points and sanitary facilities (including separate toilets for girls) in many schools; and a lack of options for more traditional communities where the teaching of religion and Arabic are significant determinants in their willingness to send their children to school.

5. At the time of project appraisal, a number of DPs were providing technical assistance (TA) and funding to the sector under the leadership of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). For the most part, DPs provided financing for recurrent expenditures related to quality inputs and investments. During the first phase of the PDEF (2000-2004), the DPs had also financed the construction of around one-quarter of the elementary classrooms that were built during this time. Though the DPs continued to provide support in the phase which followed (2005-2007), the global financial crisis in 2007-2008 resulted in a much lower than expected financial contribution to the PDEF. Prior to Project effectiveness, most DPs were providing funding to support quality inputs and little funding was provided for school construction.4 Given a reduction in the Government’s investment budget, limited public funding was available to support the construction of classrooms/schools and ancillary structures.

6. In line with the priorities as laid out in the PDEF, the Government aimed to achieve universal primary education (UPE) by addressing growing infrastructure needs as these constituted a major barrier to access and completion of primary education. By replacing and upgrading inadequate school buildings, reducing the number of schools using rented spaces, and increasing the number of classrooms in existing schools, the education system could increase the supply of schooling available and also increase the number of schools that offered the full primary cycle. In addition, the Government also sought to increase the number of French-Arab schools as part of the country’s public school system.5 By increasing both the number and type of schools in areas with significant demand, it was expected that enrollment and completion would also increase in these areas. With the aim of achieving UPE by 2015 (a Millennium Development Goal (MDG) for Senegal), the Government requested support from the EFA-FTI Catalytic

---

4 The Ministry of Education (Ministère de l’Éducation Nationale – MEN), in particular its Directorate for Planning and Education Reform (Direction de la Planification et de la Reforme de l’Education – DPRE) had been and continued to be in charge of managing the construction program under the PDEF. Construction activities during the first phase of the PDEF (2000-2004) had suffered delays primarily as a result of capacity constraints within the Directorate of School Construction (Direction des Constructions Scolaires – DCS) and at the local levels to carry out construction and as a result of an insufficient allocation of resources to school construction.

5 This measure was aligned with a 2002 ruling which determined that French-Arab schools should be incorporated within the country’s public school system.
Fund (CF). With this funding, the Senegal EFA-FTI Project embarked on the most ambitious construction program within the education sector in the country up until that point.

7. The International Development Association (IDA) was supporting the sector through the IDA-funded Senegal Quality Education For All 2 (QEFA2) Project. The QEFA2 Project was Phase 2 of an Adaptable Program Lending (APL). The project development objective (PDO) was to enhance the quality of the Recipient’s education system through the improvement of teaching and learning practices. The Project aimed to achieve this by: (a) improving both access and retention by expanding the number of middle school places in the system, improving conditions in existing elementary schools, and by supporting additional literacy courses; (b) improving education quality, with a focus on elementary education by providing school grants, learning materials, training and improving testing and evaluations; and (c) strengthening management at central, deconcentrated and decentralized levels to ensure attainment of PDEF objectives.

8. The Senegal EFA-FTI Project was designed to support, in tandem with the QEFA2, the larger government agenda for the sector as embodied in the PDEF and later in the plan which followed the PDEF – the Plan for Improvement in Quality, Equity and Transparency in Education and Training (Programme d’Amélioration de la Qualité, de l’Équité et de la Transparence dans l’Education et la Formation – PAQUET). While the QEFA2 focused primarily on quality inputs and management of the sector, the EFA-FTI Project was designed to focus largely on addressing limitations in infrastructure. These two projects had many similar elements – and were able to rely on the same Government institutions and disbursement modalities. Further, they used some of the same performance measures.

1.2 Original Project Development Objective (PDO) and Key Indicators

9. As described in the project appraisal document (PAD), the PDO was to contribute to the Government’s goal of attaining UPE by 2015, through construction, extension and equipment of classrooms and ancillary buildings. According to the GA, the PDO was to contribute to the Government’s goal of attaining UPE by 2015.

10. As was standard practice at the time for EFA-FTI funded Projects, in an effort to support the Government’s Program, this operation would use performance measures taken from the PDEF Matrix for its PDO-level indicators and would adapt a number of indicators from the Matrix to be used as intermediate-level indicators to measure specific outputs achieved under the Project.

---

6 The PAQUET, the plan which followed the PDEF, was for the period from 2013 to 2025. The PDEF was extended to 2012.
11. The PDO-level (outcome) indicators and targets were the following:

- Change in admission rate into grade 1\(^7\) from 113.6 percent to 110.3 percent;
- Increase in primary gross enrollment rate (GER) from 90.1 percent to 95.9 percent;
- Increase in primary completion rate (PCR) from 58.45 percent to 70.4 percent;
- Reduction in primary repetition rate from 7.9 percent to 6.8 percent; and
- Reduction in primary dropout rate from 10.9 percent to 6.3 percent

12. The intermediate-level (output) indicators and targets included:

- Delivery of 3,910 classrooms;
- Replacement of 1,900 temporary structures used as classrooms;
- Delivery of 2,010 classrooms to complete incomplete cycles;
- Construction of 150 new schools;\(^8\)
- Construction of water points for 814 schools;
- Construction of latrine blocks for 814 schools;
- Construction of administrative blocks for 814 schools;
- Holding of 8 meetings by the Construction Coordination and Monitoring Committee; and
- Provision of quarterly monitoring reports by the Directorate of School Construction (Direction des constructions scolaires – DCS) after field visits/technical supervision missions

1.3 Revised PDO

13. The PDO remained unchanged during the life of the Project.

1.4 Main Beneficiaries

14. The Project intended to benefit children of primary school-age in all regions of the country where access to schooling was limited. The project also specifically sought to increase access and completion rates among girls by selecting sites for construction where girls’ attendance was low. The construction and rehabilitation of lower secondary schools\(^9\) sought to benefit children in their last year of primary school who were transitioning into lower secondary cycle as well as youth of secondary school-age. It was also expected that education staff would benefit from improvements made to school infrastructure and additional structures for schools built under the Project.

\(^7\) Sometimes this indicator is referred to as Gross Intake Rate (GIR) into Grade 1.
\(^8\) The PDEF had a target of 9,617 public primary classrooms for the period 2008-2011 (the last phase of the ten year sector plan).
\(^9\) Additional construction activities supported under the Project included the construction of 48 lower secondary schools, 181 classrooms for primary education and 10 administrative blocks as well as the rehabilitation of two secondary schools.
1.5 Original Components

15. The Project had three components:

16. **Component 1: Construction and equipment of classrooms (Estimated cost at Appraisal: US$65.6 million; Actual Cost: US$67.4).** This component aimed to build and equip a total of 4,360 classrooms in primary schools, comprised of: (i) 2,010 additional classrooms in existing schools in areas where schools were overcrowded; (ii) 1,900 classrooms to replace existing classrooms in temporary structures built to accommodate a growing demand; and (iii) 450 classrooms as part of the 150 new schools (supported under this component), each with a 3-classroom block, a water point, an administrative building, a sanitary (or toilet) block and a surrounding fence. Of these 150 schools, 100 schools (300 classrooms) in the regions of Diourbel, Louga and Kaolack would be French-Arab schools, offering the official curriculum. Construction would be undertaken in areas where enrollment was low and construction was not financed or planned to be financed by another funding source. Construction activities were to be sequenced in two phases and managed by contracted construction management agencies (CMAs). An assessment of the performance during the first phase was to be carried out to inform execution arrangements for the second phase.

17. **Component 2. Construction of auxiliary facilities in existing schools (Estimated cost at Appraisal: US$7.5 million; Actual Cost: US$6.4).** This component aimed to bring existing schools up to minimum quality standards. The criteria for the selection of schools would be the same as those used for selecting schools under Component 1. This component would finance: (i) the construction of 814 water points in elementary schools; (ii) the construction of 814 toilet (sanitary) blocks each with four cabins (two for girls and two for boys); and (iii) 500 administrative buildings each with a headmaster’s office and a storage room. Construction activities were to be sequenced in two phases, as mentioned under the description of Component 1.

18. **Component 3. Coordination and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) (Estimated cost at Appraisal: US$8.4 million; Actual Cost: US$6.2).** This component would finance: (i) the activities necessary to coordinate the construction under Components 1 and 2; (ii) the M&E mechanisms for the Project, consistent with the PDEF; and (iii) activities to provide capacity development assistance to the DCS. Specifically, Component 3 would provide funding for: (a) coordination meetings for the actors involved in the construction: the Ministry of Education (Ministère de l’Éducation préscolaire, élémentaire du moyen secondaire et des langues nationales) at central, regional and district levels; the Ministry of Urbanism (Ministère de l’Urbanisme), local government authorities, parents, teachers, students, delegated management agencies; (b) Technical monitoring and supervision visits by the DCS and activities of the Directorate of Environment (Direction de l’Environnement et des Etablissement Classés – DÉEC) within the Ministry of Environment; (c) communications, especially with local partners

---

10 The complete criteria used for the selection of beneficiary sites for new schools, schools to be extended, temporary structures to be replaced and location of auxiliary facilities can be found in Annex 2 of the ICR (Outputs by Component).
and actors; (d) capacity development activities for the DCS; and (e) technical and financial audits.

1.6 Revised Components

19. The Project’s components remained unchanged throughout the life of the Project.

1.7 Other significant changes

20. The Project was restructured three times. The first restructuring was in 2010, the second in 2012 and the third restructuring in 2013. Details on each of these restructurings are provided below.

21. First Restructuring: A level 2 restructuring was approved on November 1, 2010 in order to: (i) diversify the modalities of implementation in order to accelerate the delivery of the second phase of construction under the Project; and to (ii) extend the project closing date from June 30, 2011 to December 31, 2012 to allow for completion of the construction activities planned under the Project. In addition to AGETIP (a major public works and employment agency, Agence d’Exécution des Travaux d’Intérêt Public contre le sous-emploi), the delegated implementing agency for the first construction phase, DCS and the Regional Local Development Agencies (Agences Régionales de Développement - ARDs)\(^\text{11}\) in the Kaolack, Thies, Diourbel, Louga, and St-Louis regions were designated to manage the second phase of construction.

22. Second Restructuring: A level 2 restructuring was approved on December 28, 2012 which introduced a nine-month extension of the closing date from December 31, 2012 to September 30, 2013 to allow for the use of funds still available, which had been, in part, generated through competitive procurement under the construction program. These additional resources were allocated to the construction of classrooms and auxiliary buildings in 48 lower secondary schools, supporting the Government’s mandatory ten-year basic education policy.\(^\text{12}\)

---

\(^{11}\) The ARDs are government institutions created in 1996 as public local agencies with administrative and financial autonomy to provide TA, capacity-building and implementation support to municipalities. In 2008, the Bank-financed National Local Development Program, provided support to strengthen them. They are fully operational as local development institutions.

\(^{12}\) Mandatory basic education was defined in 2010 to include ten years of schooling, which includes primary and lower secondary schooling. The Project financed additional primary classrooms and classrooms in lower secondary schools, contributing to increases in the PCR and thus contributing to the achievement of the PDO.
23. **Third Restructuring:** A level 2 restructuring was approved on September 30, 2013 in order to extend the Project’s closing date for one year to September 30, 2014. This extension was needed to allow the Government to use the remaining resources which were still available in part as a result of cost-savings observed up until that point as a result of highly competitive procurement. This allowed the Government to support additional activities, including: the continued construction of 48 additional lower secondary schools; rehabilitation of two all girls’ secondary schools (Lycées Mariama Ba and Ameth Fall in Goree and St-Louis, respectively); the construction of 181 classrooms for primary education and 10 administrative blocks; and the provision of equipment for computer and office equipment for 25 of the secondary schools that had been built.

2. **Key Factors affecting Implementation and Outcomes**

2.1 **Project Preparation, Design and Quality at Entry**

24. **Background analysis.** Project preparation benefited from extensive sector work undertaken by the Government, the Bank and other DPs. The analytical work included an annual Education Country Status Report (CSR), the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRSP), an Accelerated Growth Strategy, and an MTEF. The findings of the CSR carried out by the Economic and Social Science Research Center of Cheikh Anta Diop University were discussed with relevant stakeholders each year. The Project also benefited from project evaluations undertaken by the Bank in the sector as well as regional and national work done in the area of school construction. The design and activities supported under the Senegal EFA-FTI Project complemented interventions being implemented under the QEFA2 Project and built on lessons learned in the context of both QEFA1 and QEFA2. The EFA-FTI Project was able to use the same monitoring arrangements that had been established under the QEFA2 and used the same implementation entities and disbursement modalities. Although the EFA-FTI Project was prepared in a timely manner and strongly aligned with the Government’s overarching sector program, an in-depth feasibility study on the construction of water points was not conducted until after project effectiveness.

25. **Government ownership and partnership.** The Government was strongly committed to achievement of the PDO and to the implementation of project-supported activities. Increasing access to primary education, meeting the demand among communities for various types of schools, and improving the quality of the school infrastructure were clear national priorities, each of which were noted in the PDEF, the country’s program for the utilization of CF, the revised 2005 sector policy and the country’s international commitments (i.e., as reflected in the MDGs). The Government supported the Project’s focus on upgrading existing schools and increasing the number of schools in order to meet the growing demand for education and to accommodate the influx of students into the system. A concerted effort was made to ensure that schools built under the Project adhered to high-quality standards. The Bank worked with the Government to develop an effective implementation plan to achieve the aforementioned objectives during the project timeframe. Further, the preparation of this operation
benefitted from the long established relationship between the Government, Bank and other DPs operating in the Senegalese context.

26. **Participatory and transparent selection of schools and sites.** Project preparation and the selection of sites for construction were undertaken using a highly participatory approach. The information provided by the national school map (*carte scolaire*) undertaken in 2007-2008\(^\text{13}\) was used as a diagnostic tool in the context of the micro-planning exercise which took place in the latter part of 2008. This informed the identification of those schools and areas to be supported under the Senegal EFA-FTI Project. This was supplemented with workshops which involved decentralized levels of the MEN and were useful in helping to identify eligible schools, determine priorities, and to select beneficiary schools and construction sites. In addition to the specific and agreed criteria employed, a selection and validation process was also undertaken at the local level which provided input to the MEN.\(^\text{14}\)

27. **Quality at entry is rated Moderately Satisfactory.** The PDO was well-aligned with the national sector strategy and approaches. It also supported the country’s larger development objectives as outlined in various key strategic documents. The project design, including its choice of components and activities within these, was appropriate for achieving the PDO. The implementation arrangements which relied on a major public works and employment agency (AGETIP) were appropriate given the agency’s experience in implementing large-scale construction programs in the country. The design also incorporated key capacity-building activities for the Ministry and a two-phased approach to construction as a way to ensure that the second phase could build on lessons learned from the first phase.

28. Despite these strengths, there were some shortcomings in the project design. The design was overly ambitious in light of the originally planned two-and-a-half year implementation period. The annual school construction activities and associated targets proved to be more challenging than initially anticipated given the scale of the construction activities and level of supervision needed to meet existing infrastructure needs in the country and to ensure the construction was of high quality. Though the two phased approach was innovative and provided for an opportunity to take stock of both successes and constraints experienced during the first phase, there was insufficient time originally allotted to undertake this assessment prior to the beginning of second phase of the construction program. Further, as previously noted, the feasibility study related to the construction of water points was not undertaken during project preparation which, in turn, required a roll back of this activity during the course of implementation.

### 2.2 Implementation

29. The implementation of the Project was generally satisfactory and the large majority of envisaged outputs and outcomes were achieved by project closing.

\(^{13}\) The *carte scolaire* was developed within the framework of the PDEF.

\(^{14}\) This process was carried out by the IAs (*Inspections d’Académie*) and the IEFs (*Inspections de l’Education et de la Formation*). IEFs were previously referred to as IDENs.
Implementation Arrangements

30. The Project benefited from the implementation arrangements for the QEFA1 and QEFA2 Projects. The QEFA2 Project and this EFA-FTI Project which were implemented during the same period also supported the PDEF and used the same implementation modalities and reporting arrangements. Project implementation was led by the DPRE within the MEN. The DPRE was also in charge of coordinating activities under the PDEF. As such, the DPRE was responsible for the implementation of the largest nationwide program of infrastructure which employed different executing arrangements than those previously used in the sector. In addition, two coordinating structures supported the Project’s implementation – the Steering Committee for the PDEF (chaired by the Minister of Education) and the Committee for Construction Coordination and Monitoring – both of which met regularly under the Project. The DCS was responsible for overall supervision of construction activities and for providing quarterly progress reports.

Implementation of construction activities under the Project

31. The following provides an overview of the construction program by phase as well as some notable aspects of project implementation.

Phase 1

32. The implementation of the first phase of the construction program was delegated to AGETIP given its experience in undertaking large civil work projects in Senegal. The MEN and AGETIP signed an agreement establishing the role and responsibilities of AGETIP. Though the first phase began in 2009, actual construction commenced only in late 2010. Further, AGETIP (which was the only entity responsible for this during the first phase) encountered some challenges in undertaking regular monitoring and supervision of construction sites. The large scale of construction and the vast terrain to be covered made site visits of AGETIP and local construction agents (Conseiller Technique Régional - CTRs) difficult. Furthermore, since the majority of sites included a variety of structures (e.g., classrooms, sanitary blocks, etc.), monitoring of these activities relied on a number of supervising entities. Additional challenges were observed due to the inclement weather in certain regions as well as unrest caused by conflict in Casamance.

33. Despite AGETIP’s prior experience in supervising large civil works programs, at the time of project implementation it did not possess sufficient manpower to supervise such a large number of civil works activities throughout the entire country. A lack of qualified staff in some of the firms hired to undertake civil works activities – particularly given their involvement in contracts which outweighed their capacity – negatively affected the quality of construction in a small number of sites (for example, poor quality of cement flooring was noted in some instances). These limitations were due, at least in part, to the limited availability of qualified human resources (or even a site supervisor) by AGETIP to ensure adherence to the technical specifications. Despite the existence of a high quality standard school design, without an adequate number of sufficiently trained
experts it was difficult to always ensure a firms’ full compliance with technical construction requirements.

34. Though the planned evaluation of AGETIP’s work during the first phase had not been undertaken before the start of the second phase, regular monitoring of construction activities and progress provided up-to-date information on areas requiring strengthening in the second phase. In addition, the DPRE had carried out a technical, safeguard and procurement analysis prior to the second phase. Given the delays experienced in the first phase and AGETIP’s difficulties as described above, the MEN requested that the second phase of the construction program be launched prior to completion of the first phase. The MEN and its financial partners were eager to scale up school construction as the needs gap was significant and no construction of public school classrooms had been undertaken from 2009 to late 2010. This strategy was agreed and pursued in order to increase the pace of construction and complete the entire construction program by the Project’s closing date.

**Phase 2**

35. A marked improvement in the Project’s overall performance was observed during the second phase. In order to increase the pace of implementation while simultaneously enforcing adherence to high quality standards, the Bank and Government agreed to restructure the project and include additional contract management agencies (i.e., DCS, five regional local development agencies (ARDs) in addition to AGETIP) during the second phase of the construction program. To this end, the MEN signed, through the IAs at the decentralized level, a partnership agreement with the ARDs. The ARDs, which were present at the local level and had good relations with local communities, were made responsible for the construction of the new French-Arab schools. Each ARD had a local construction agent who oversaw the implementation of construction activities. The MEN also signed a performance agreement with the DCS to carry out the construction of other schools during the second phase.

36. AGETIP continued to be responsible for around 43 percent of construction during the second phase of the construction program, but its focus was narrowed geographically, thus largely overcoming problems encountered during the first phase. The use of these entities was very much in line with the general thrust of decentralizing and de-concentrating responsibilities from the central to the regional and local levels of the MEN. This decision paid high dividends as construction activities gained significant momentum during the second phase. Further, the construction program benefitted from improved and increased monitoring and supervision.

*Additional Resources from Competitive Procurement*

37. The MEN managed around 171 construction contracts during the life of the Project, awarded to 83 construction firms from all over Senegal. Throughout the Project, procurement processes had resulted in bids that were lower than expected, with firms lowering prices in order to win the bids competitively. Firms were more inclined to seek
these contracts as there was a higher likelihood that the payments would be made in full and in a more timely manner than programs financed by the Government’s own resources. Undertaking this work would also provide them with the opportunity to work with local development agencies, who were successfully managing construction at the local level. Decentralized procurement resulted in lower overhead costs which allowed more firms to compete for contracts. As firms aimed to secure contracts, the bids were lower than expected under the Project. This resulted in significant cost savings to the Project which are described in more detail in Section 3.3 and in Annex 3 of this report.

38. The additional resources made possible through the cost savings mentioned above were allocated to the construction of 48 lower secondary schools, 181 additional primary classrooms, two girls’ secondary schools and 10 administrative blocks. Together, these activities contributed to the achievement of the PDO, as they further enabled an increase in the PCR, a lower repetition rate, and constituted a positive move towards achieving UPE. And, they provided additional places which would be required in order to ensure continued increases in the PCR and reduced repetition at primary level. Together, this additional infrastructure supported the Government’s efforts to provide 10 years of mandatory basic education (implemented during the 2010-2011 school year).

39. The decision to allocate a large portion of additional resources to secondary education was informed by analytical work supported by the Bank and Government following the first year of project implementation. In order to ensure the EFA-FTI Project could achieve its PDO, a study was undertaken to better understand factors driving continued high repetition and dropout rates and limited improvement in the PCR. One of the primary bottlenecks identified was the grade 6 competitive exam\textsuperscript{15} and the limited number of lower secondary school spaces thwarting the transition of students from the primary to the lower secondary level. In response to this finding, the Bank team and the MEN agreed that the grade 6 exam should be eliminated and available resources, as a result of procurement savings, should be allocated to build additional classrooms to ensure a fluid transition to lower secondary education. The MEN also issued a \textit{circulaire} limiting repetition within the primary cycle. As a result, repetition and dropout rates reduced considerably and for the first time, the PCR that had been progressing by 1 percent per year, increased by 6 percent.

\textsuperscript{15} This 2010 Bank-supported survey determined that the high dropout rates at the primary level were largely driven by high dropout rates in grades 1 and 5. When examined more closely, the second most important cause for dropping out of grade 1 cited was the lack of teaching in Arabic, in addition to health problems, limited financial means, and children’s need to work in order to support the household. While in grade 5, poor learners (almost one-half of all dropouts) were actually pushed out of the schooling system so that schools could achieve a higher success rate on the grade 6 national exam (which recognizes school-level performance). Repetition rates were also high – reaching around 38 percent in grade 6 because many of those who failed the grade 6 national exam would repeat grade 6 with the hope of doing better the second year. This, however, prevented these spaces from being given to graduates of grade 5 so that they could complete their last year of secondary. This blockage at one level was then reflected in similar blockages throughout each year of primary school.
Challenges in Construction of Water Points in Some Sites

40. Despite strong achievements over the course of project implementation, the complexity of constructing such a large number of water points, and the associated costs, had been underestimated at appraisal. This led to the reduction in the total number of water points that would be constructed under the Project. Given the short amount of time allotted to project preparation, a feasibility study was undertaken after project effectiveness. The study found that in some sites selected for water points more extensive excavation would be needed to reach the water table (if it could be reached at all) and, further, some of these sites had limited connections to the water networks (either the *Senegalaise Des Eaux* (SDE) or the rural water network – (ASUFO)). The unit cost of constructing a water points was initially estimated to be around US$1,398 while the actual unit cost was US$2,479. Given the higher costs and the complexity of constructing water points in some of the identified sites, the Project was only able to build 538 out of 814 water points envisaged in the original project design. It is worth mentioning however that this activity was only 0.4 percent of the program.

Close collaboration and partnership among stakeholders

41. During the Project, frequent and regular meetings among key stakeholders were held to track progress, identify challenges and devise solutions. Particularly during the construction program’s second phase, the DPRE played an important role in ensuring that the construction program adhered to the pre-established selection criteria while also ensuring that in instances where needs had changed on the ground, the program was adjusted to ensure that those areas with the greatest need were prioritized. It worked closely with the CMAs to support them in addressing any issues encountered with various construction firms, reassessing the feasibility of constructing water points in previously identified locations and ensuring adequate on-site supervision. The additional resources garnered under the Project and the strategic decision of the Bank and Government to also support construction and rehabilitation of secondary schools was important in increasing the PCR and transition rates between primary and secondary. Though a very small number of firms stretched themselves too thin making it difficult to fulfill their contractual obligations, this did not negatively impact what was ultimately achieved under the Project. The CMAs, including AGETIP and DCS, worked with these firms, providing support, so that all originally planned classrooms were completed under the Project. In fact, by project closing, the vast majority of the outputs planned under the operation had been achieved or exceeded. By the end of Project, 98.2 percent of project funds had been disbursed.
2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Design, Implementation and Utilization

**M&E Design**

42. The M&E activities supported under the Project were part of the overall M&E framework of the PDEF. The implementation progress reports and financial and technical updates under the PDEF included information on the EFA-FTI Project. The Directorate for General Administration and Equipment (Direction de l’Administration Générale et de l’Équipement – DAGE), the DCS and AGETIP were to provide quarterly progress reports as well.

43. The PAD included a clear Results Framework (RF) with outcome and output indicators, baselines and targets to monitor the progress of the Project. These performance indicators were aligned with those in the PDEF (with an indicator matrix to be reviewed annually and agreed by Government and donors) in an effort to ensure that progress towards achievement of the Project’s PDOs and the long-term sector goals were consistently assessed. As was common practice at the time, the PDO-level indicators measured sector-wide gains which were drawn directly from the Government’s PDEF matrix, while the intermediate-level indicators closely measured project-specific activities and outputs. When it was decided that cost savings would be used to build secondary school classrooms, the original RF did not need to be revised as the indicators allowed for these activities to be measured (since the indicator and the construction was not restricted to primary education). The Bank and Government monitored the construction/rehabilitation of these schools. In addition, although the total number of water points that could be constructed under the Project was reduced on the basis of a feasibility study early in the project life, the end-of-project target for this activity was not modified accordingly.

**Implementation**

44. The MEN, through the DPRE, was responsible for leading and coordinating M&E activities under the Project. The DAGE monitored the fiduciary aspects of the Project during implementation. The DCS, AGETIP and the ARDs submitted quarterly reports of progress in activities, providing key inputs for M&E. Field supervision and technical visits were carried out regularly and allowed for close follow up of project progress. The quality of the data was generally adequate and progress reports were satisfactory overall. The Project used the M&E mechanisms of the MEN, already being used by other Bank projects as well (including the QEFA2). These M&E mechanisms, being part of the regular M&E arrangements of the MEN, are sustainable beyond the life of this Project.
The DPRE provided updated data which were useful in preparing this ICR.\textsuperscript{16} Despite these strengths, close monitoring of each construction site in Phase 1 proved to be challenging given the large number of sites as well as the capacity constraints of some of the selected firms.

\textit{Utilization}

45. M&E data collected under the Project provided up-to-date information to guide project activities and to highlight areas which needed additional support on the part of the Bank and the Government. The implementation progress, monitoring and financial reports were used consistently by the MEN and the Bank throughout the project life. The monitoring reports were specifically useful in ensuring that the new and replaced classrooms were built in those areas where there was high demand. The DPRE (located within the MEN) worked closely with the regional level (IAs) and the district/local level (IEFs, previously referred to as IDENs) to ensure that the construction responded to any changes in the needs and demands of the communities. These project-based reports were also useful in preparing and carrying out the additional construction activities. Workshops were also held at various points to assess progress under the Project and to discuss collectively ways in which bottlenecks to project implementation could be better addressed. At the end of Phase 1, based on the evaluation of the quality of construction, MEN and the Bank’s technical expert organized training workshops for all contractors to help them address common challenges encountered in their work.

46. On the basis of the above information, M&E under the Senegal EFA-FTI Project is rated \textbf{Substantial}.

\textbf{2.4 Safeguards and Fiduciary Compliance}

\textbf{Financial Management}

47. Financial management (FM) is rated \textit{Moderately Satisfactory} under the Project. The DAGE of the MEN was responsible for FM under this operation. FM was well-managed by a seasoned team who had experience working on other internationally-funded operations. External audits were carried out in a timely manner, were unqualified and any observations (which were limited) were addressed prior to Project closing. Some small ineligible expenditures by AGETIP during supervision missions were identified which were subsequently reimbursed in full. There were also some instances in which there were insufficient funds (or a shortage of funds) in AGETIP’s account to provide full

\textsuperscript{16} Senegal had a new census in 2013 and the data were shared with the MEN during early 2015. This exercise brought two key changes to the calculation of the outcome indicators: the use of actual population data (versus a growth projection estimate used up to 2013) and the change in the age group to define primary education (6-11 years-old versus 7-12 previously). The DPRE and the National Statistics Agency (NSA) carried out some initial work looking into the data in order to revise the PDO indicators to have revised comparable values to assess the achievement of the PDO. By the time of the completion of this report, despite repeated requests by the Bank, the MEN and the NSA had not recalculated the education indicators, to provide a new set of data and baseline values going back to 2008 which would have allowed for a comparison of figures with the new rates for key education indicators for 2014.
payment to the construction firms pointing to some difficulties with cash flow management. In some instances, documentation was not fully complete or consistent. Despite these challenges, FM performance was generally strong and financial transactions were appropriately carried out under the various project components.

**Procurement**

48. Procurement under the project was generally satisfactory. The assessment of procurement capacity during project preparation was adequate for project implementation. To strengthen capacity-building, training in procurement was provided under the Project to key actors, including DCS. There was a significant amount of procurement under the Project, particularly given the size of the construction program. During the first phase of the construction program, there were only minor delays in procurement. The procurement activities under the Project were, for the most part, quite efficient as a large number of firms submitted proposals in order to be selected to undertake civil works – reducing the costs of awarded bids. As noted, this highly competitive process resulted in significant cost savings under the Project which, in turn, allowed the operation to support additional construction activities. Despite any small difficulties, procurement under the Project adhered to the Bank’s institutional guidelines.

**Environmental and Social Safeguards**

49. The Project used the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) developed and used for the QEFA2, as the tool to address any negative impact that might occur as a result of construction under the Project. Similar to the approach used under the QEFA2, requirements were introduced in the bidding process to address social concerns related to ramps for people with disabilities and sanitary blocks separated by gender which were complied with by the construction firms.

50. The Project also used the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) prepared for the QEFA2 to address any resettlement issues what could arise as a result of the construction activities. There was one small issue related to resettlement in the city of Thies which was subsequently fully addressed and fixed. In certain instances, where the selected site may not have been the most appropriate, the various stakeholders (including MEN, the CMAs and the communities) discussed and agreed on slight modifications to its exact location within the targeted community.
2.5 Post-completion Operation/Next Phase

51. The classrooms constructed under the Project were in use by project completion and have maintained their functionality. The Government has taken over the management of the additional spaces and has provided teachers for all classrooms. Further, progress has been made in ensuring effective deployment of teachers.\(^{17}\) It is also taking steps to ensure that adequate support is provided to these schools in order to offer diverse schooling options for many communities in the country. In addition, the Government has started to allocate budgetary resources to implement a maintenance policy for schools which would be handled at the local level in line with the move towards decentralization and the use of a school-based management approach.\(^{18}\) School-based management committees (SMCs) have been established in all schools and have received training in management and maintenance.

52. At an institutional level, the M&E system and activities used to monitor progress under the Project have been – and will continue to be – maintained as an integral aspect of MEN’s support to the sector. In addition to being useful to various DPs, this system is essential in monitoring progress towards achievement of the various goals outlined in the country’s long-term sector strategy (Programme d’Amélioration de la Qualité, de l’Équité et de la Transparence dans l’Education et la Formation – PAQUET, 2013-2025). The Bank continues to work closely with other donors and the Government to support efforts to achieve key sector objectives. Specifically, the Senegal Quality Improvement and Equity of Basic Education Project (QIEBE, P133333) supports the Government’s goal of providing equitable access to quality education for all children in Senegal.

53. A number of activities which were supported under this Project will continue to be financed by various donors operating in the sector in Senegal. Section 4 of this ICR provides further details on the contributions of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), French Development Agency (Agence française de développement – AFD) and Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA).

3. Assessment of Outcomes

3.1 Relevance of Objectives, Design and Implementation

54. The relevance of the PDO is rated as High given its strong alignment with key Government aims as outlined in strategic documents including the ten-year PDEF and the 2013-2015 PAQUET. The latter plan aims to support improvements in the accessibility of education and its ability to meet the varying needs of students as well as to provide adequate resources to address the needs of other major stakeholders. Specifically, the achievement of universal equitable primary education is one of the priorities highlighted in both the PDEF and the PAQUET. These plans are derived from, and also aligned with,

---

\(^{17}\) The project co-financed with CIDA the Canadian the establishment of a software for an effective deployment of teachers (Mirador: http://www.mirador.education.gouv.sn/). This system can ensure that each school is properly staffed.

\(^{18}\) Starting with the 2014 government budget, schools started receiving block grants that could be used for any needs including the maintenance of facilities.
the National Economic and Social Strategy and the 2012 Letter of Sector Policy. The PDO remains highly relevant and is supportive of Senegal’s current Country Partnership Strategy (CPS) (2012-2017).

55. The relevance of design is rated Substantial. The Project activities were appropriate and adequate for achieving the PDO. One of the key strengths of the operation’s design was its use of a participatory approach (i.e., micro-planning exercise, workshops, etc.) which involved central and decentralized levels of the MEN and other key stakeholders. This approach was particularly important in determining infrastructure needs at the community level, identifying issues affecting implementation, and devising solutions to address any bottlenecks. Another positive feature of the design was the sequencing of the classroom construction in two phases to allow for an evaluation exercise following the first phase to introduce modifications as needed based on performance up until that point. The planned duration of the project (2½ years), however, was too short in light of the significant amount of infrastructure planned to be undertaken during the project life. Another limitation was the underestimation of the actual costs for the construction of water points which resulted in the scaling back of this activity.

3.2 Achievement of Project Development Outcomes

56. This evaluation explores progress made and achievements observed with regards to supporting the Government’s main objective of attaining UPE. As articulated in the PDEF, promoting UPE in the Senegal context at the time required reducing identified barriers to enrollment. Some of the barriers to enrollment identified, included: (i) an insufficient number of schools and classrooms; (ii) inadequate facilities in existing schools to meet basic needs (administrative offices as well as water points and sanitary blocks); (iii) a lack of schooling which corresponded to communities’ demands (in terms of religion, cultural and linguistic preferences); and (iii) limited attention to girls’ schooling needs. Each of the activities supported under the Senegal EFA-FTI Project aimed to address these specific barriers which, in turn, would lead to increased enrollment at the primary level.

57. As described in the PAD, the Project aimed to support the Government’s efforts in increasing access to primary education, improving the internal efficiency of the education system, and increasing the PCR. This was achieved by diversifying the network of public primary and junior secondary schools, improving the quality of the school environment, and constructing classrooms and schools. These activities, in addition to increasing the number of children who could access primary education – improved various aspects of the teaching and learning environment and promoted equity in access.

---

19 In compliance with the established OPCS guidelines, this ICR does not carry out a split evaluation of the Project since the PDO and associated end-of-project targets remained unchanged throughout the life of the project. The assessment of the achievement of outputs and outcomes is, therefore, analyzed across the Project as a whole.
58. The achievement of the PDO is rated *Substantial*. The Project achieved a majority of its PDO- and intermediate-level indicator targets as discussed below. The ICR provides the most up-to-date and accurate figures on the level of achievement observed across all output and outcome indicators.

**PDO-level Indicators**

59. The gross intake rate (GIR) decreased from 113.6 percent in 2008 to 108.9 percent while the GER for primary education increased from 90.1 percent to 93 percent by the end of the Project. As planned, the number of over-aged students enrolled in grade 1 was reduced which contributed to the observed improvement in the GIR. The number of students enrolled in the first year of primary education increased by 20 percent between 2008 and 2014, at an annual average of 3.1 percent (from around 337,000 to 406,000 students) while the number of students enrolled in primary education increased by 16 percent between 2008 and 2014 (from 1.62 million to 1.89 million students). The end-of-project target of 95 percent for GER was not achieved primarily as a result of improvements in efficiency with the sharp drop of repeaters in the primary education system. The PCR increased from 58.4 percent to 73.4 percent during the life of the project, exceeding the end-of-project target of 70.4 percent. This was a significant achievement under the EFA-FTI Project which was accompanied by important reductions in repetition and dropout rates.

60. The increases in the PCR and the reductions in the repetition and dropout rates observed under the Project were largely the result of the strategic decision made by the Government, with the World Bank team support, to adjust its approach to a number of issues causing bottlenecks at the primary level. As described earlier, a survey was carried out in 2010 to better understand trends observed with regards to repetition, dropout and completion rates. This study identified the grade 6 competitive exam as one of the major drivers of the high repetition and dropout rates and low PCR. In light of these findings, the Bank undertook effective policy dialogue with the Government. The Bank encouraged the Government to implement its ten-year compulsory basic education policy while eliminating the grade 6 competitive exam and promoting to grade 7 (first year of lower secondary) all students that met the requirements for promotion.

61. As a result of these important changes in policy, the transition rate from primary to lower secondary increased from an average of 62 percent during the period 2008-2010 to 90 percent in 2011. Repetition rates at the primary level decreased from 7 percent to 3 percent (exceeding the end-of-project target) and dropout rates decreased from 10.9 percent to 7.7 percent between 2008 and 2014 (an important achievement but falling short of the end-of-project target). Finally, the PCR which had been increasing by one percentage point per year up until that time, increased from 59 percent in 2010 to 66.5 percent in 2011 and then increased further and exceeded the end-of-project target.

---

20 As described earlier, as a result of this exam and no regulations related to repetition, many children were being forced out of the system and many others wanted to repeat the grade, in turn, causing blockages and repetition throughout the system.
Table 1: PDO-level Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline %</th>
<th>End of Project Target (%)</th>
<th>Actual Achievement (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Intake rate in Grade 1 of Primary</td>
<td>113.6</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>108.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Enrollment Rate in Primary</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Completion Rate</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition Rate in Primary</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout Rate in Primary</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MEN

62. The achievement of the PDO-level indicators as described above was supported by significant achievement on the Project’s intermediate-level indicators as described below.

*Increase Access to Primary Education*

63. During the life of the Project, 4,977 classrooms were constructed, exceeding the end-of-project target of 3,910 classrooms. Specifically, the Project financed: (i) the construction of 2,591 classrooms in existing schools (exceeding the end-of-project target of 2,010\(^{21}\)); (ii) the replacement of 1,936 classrooms in temporary structures (exceeding the target of 1,900); and (iii) the construction of 150 new basic primary schools, each of which had three classrooms (a total of 450 new classrooms), a sanitary block, an administrative building and a surrounding wall. The construction of an additional 41 classrooms had been initiated under the Project but had not been fully completed by project closing as a result of challenges faced with one of the 83 construction firms which had been used under the Project. The Government intends to use its own public resources to finalize their construction in 2015.

64. As a result of cost savings observed under the Project, additional civil works activities were supported including the construction of 48 lower secondary schools, 181 primary classrooms, and 10 administrative blocks as well as the rehabilitation of two all girls’ secondary schools. The construction of these 48 secondary schools provided critical support to the Government in its capacity to implement its mandatory ten-year basic education policy. As a result of additional spaces at the secondary level, combined with changes in policy described above, there was an increase in transition rates from primary to secondary and in the PCR, as well as an important reduction in repetition and dropout rates at the primary level. Each of these lower secondary schools constructed in rural areas consisted of two to six classrooms, an administrative block, sanitary blocks (with separate cabins for girls and boys), a library, and a multi-purpose room while those schools constructed in urban areas consisted of eight classrooms, a guardhouse, and a

---

\(^{21}\) Almost one-half of the 2,010 classrooms to be constructed would be devoted to increasing these schools’ capacity to provide the entire primary cycle and to reducing overcrowding of schools.
surrounding wall. In addition to these 48 schools, 129 additional classrooms were built in overcrowded lower secondary schools.

65. The Project also supported the Government’s goal of expanding and diversifying the network of public primary schools through both the construction of primary schools in areas where a public school was not in close proximity or in areas where the type of schooling available did not meet the community’s education demands. Of the 150 primary schools constructed under the Project as described above, two-thirds of these (100 schools, a total of 300 classrooms) were French-Arab public primary schools. These were built in the regions of Diourbel, Louga and Kaolack where a shortage of this type of school existed and where there was significant demand for this type of school. Each of these schools was comprised of three classrooms, a sanitary block, an administrative block and a surrounding wall. By 2014, around 9,750 students were enrolled in these schools, representing 20 percent of the total enrollment in French-Arab schools in the country.

66. The Project supported the largest school construction and rehabilitation program in the country to date. The new classrooms to be constructed under the Project represented close to 40 percent of the estimated total number of classrooms needed at the time of project appraisal in the country in order to address the existing infrastructure needs. If these new classrooms had not been constructed, the education system’s capacity would be significantly more limited today in terms of its ability to provide needed space for the growing demand. Through the construction of new schools, the Project was able to promote enrollment in various regions which did not have sufficient access to schooling (as a school was not in close proximity or the available schooling did not meet the community’s schooling needs) and to support increased enrollment among girls.

**Improve School Environment**

67. Improving the school environment was an important activity in the effort to achieve UPE in Senegal as limitations in school infrastructure had been a barrier to access. The Project’s support to the construction of 839 sanitary blocks (exceeding the end-of-project target of 814) was critical in increasing school attendance, particularly amongst girls. The construction of 522 administrative blocks (exceeding the end-of-project target of 500) contributed to improving the environment for teachers and principals. Further, the construction of 538 water points has provided important access to water in these communities. Unfortunately, however, given the complexity of constructing these water points in certain areas (and, in turn, an underestimation of costs for this activity), around two-thirds of the water points originally planned were successfully constructed by the Project’s closing date. In many instances, despite significant efforts and funding provided towards reaching the water table in some sites, it could not being reached.
3.3 Efficiency

68. The Operation’s PAD updated the economic analysis that had been carried out for the QEFA2 Project which also aimed to support the implementation of the PDEF. This efficiency analysis undertaken herein focuses on the Project’s contribution to increasing the efficiency of the sector, as well as provides unit cost analysis for some of the main project-supported activities. Moreover, this section reviews the efficiency of project implementation as well as analyzes the externalities and results to which the Project contributed.

69. The Project contributed to the Government’s efforts to improve efficiency in the education system, measured by the key indicators in the PDEF (also used as PDO-level indicator for this Project). Improvements observed in the PCR and transition rate, as well as decreases in primary repetition and dropout rates have contributed to the overall efficiency of the education system. Though these improvements cannot be fully attributable to the Project, it is reasonable to infer that the activities supported by the Project and the policy dialogue undertaken by the Bank team during implementation positively contributed to these observed trends.

Cost effectiveness

70. The Project was largely effective in delivering the expected outputs. As a result of both initial delays in phase 1 of the construction program as well as cost-savings realized under the Project, the operation was ultimately extended from its original closing date of June 30, 2011 to September 30, 2014. This resulted in the construction of: (i) an additional 48 lower secondary schools to support the Government’s policy to implement a compulsory ten-year basic education program; and (ii) 181 classrooms for primary education and 10 administrative blocks; as well as the rehabilitation of (iii) the two oldest secondary schools for girls. Regarding the unit costs, the construction of schools and classrooms and administrative facilities under the Project were cost-effective when the average cost per classroom at appraisal is compared to the final cost.

71. The main reasons behind this achievement are: (i) the more competitive procurement environment generated by the Project; and (ii) the design of a classroom prototype/model under the EFA-FTI Project, which contributed to savings in construction. This prototype was standardized during implementation and all new school buildings are now based on this cost-effective prototype. The unit cost of installation of water points was significantly higher than expected – the initial estimated cost was around US$1,398 while the actual cost was US$2,479. The lower estimate was due to a lack of accurate knowledge of the hydrological situation.

Social rates of return

72. The Project contributed to the Government’s agenda of improving access, quality and participation in schooling, associated with important externalities. This ICR followed the same rate of return analysis carried out for the QEFA1 ICR (2012). Both analyses are
based on the latest household survey data (2011). The social rate of return of primary education is 4.9 percent, while the private rate of return is even higher at 15.9 percent. The social rate of return in junior secondary schools is 11 percent higher than the rate observed for primary education. Similarly, analysis of the 2011 household survey shows a positive impact of primary and secondary education on health outcomes. The infant mortality rate in 2011 was 97/1,000 for children with a mother who had not completed primary school, 63/1,000 with a mother who had completed primary school, and 36/1,000 with a mother who had some secondary schooling. Similar outcomes are evident for malnutrition or knowledge of HIV/AIDS. In sum, while the cost of construction of classrooms and schools was lower or on par with relevant comparator countries, the cost of water points was significantly higher than what was initially appraised. Despite the large and significant number of outputs and outcomes achieved under the Project, implementation delays did lead to three separate extensions of the Project’s closing date.

**Efficiency of implementation**

73. Although the Project achieved the large majority of envisioned outputs and outcomes, the initial phase of implementation was significantly delayed. As a result of these delays, and cost savings realized under the construction program, the Project was extended three times to allow for the completion of activities planned under the Project.

74. Therefore, on the basis of the information above and detailed in Annex 3, efficiency under the Project is rated **Modest**.

**3.4 Justification of the Overall Outcome rating**

75. The overall outcome of the Project is rated as **Moderately Satisfactory** in light of the operation’s performance in relation to the Project’s relevance of objectives/design, efficacy and efficiency.

76. **Relevance of Objectives is rated High and Relevance of Design is rated Substantial.** The PDO was and remains highly relevant to the Government’s strategic priorities for the education sector. The project activities supported progress towards achievement of the PDO and the Government’s larger sector aims. There were a number of positive aspects of the original design. It was underpinned by rigorous analytical work and incorporated lessons learned from similar projects and operations in the Senegalese context. Furthermore, the preparation was highly participatory and innovative by adopting a phased approach to construction which would allow for corrective action to be taken as needed during project implementation. There were also some minor limitations to the project design including an implementation plan which could not be feasibly achieved within the original project’s time frame.

77. **Efficacy is rated Substantial.** The Project succeeded in improving access to primary, completion of primary education and the transition from primary to lower secondary education; meeting demands for a more diversified educational offering; reducing disparities in access to education by building new classrooms and auxiliary...
facilities in various regions; contributing to improvements in the quality and efficiency of education; and supporting improvements in the overall school environment. Targets were, for the most part, largely achieved and in some instances, exceeded. Moreover, the Project also financed additional construction activities which further supported the Government’s objectives of improving transition rates between primary and secondary school while also addressing overcrowding in schools.

78. **Efficiency is rated Modest.** The Project supported the Government’s efforts to improve access and quality of education and to improve the efficiency of its education sector. Unit costs for classroom construction/rehabilitation were lower than planned or on par with unit costs in other relevant settings while the unit costs for construction of water points was significantly higher than estimated at appraisal. Cost savings were indeed realized under the construction program as a result of a competitive procurement process. However, in addition to providing more time to utilize the newly available resources, the three extensions were also required given the observed delays in delivering some contracts in the initial phase of the construction program.

### 3.5 Overarching Themes, Other Outcomes and Impacts

**(a) Poverty Impacts, Gender Aspects and Social Development**

79. The Project has supported the Government in its efforts to close the gender gap in primary education. By Project closing, girls represented 51.5 percent of the total number of students in primary school (versus 47.5 percent in 2003) and gender parity was achieved at the lower secondary level. In 2013, the GIR in first grade was higher for girls for all regions in Senegal, except for Kedougou and Sedhiou. The GER of girls in the country was substantially higher (98.4 percent) than for boys (87.9 percent). The project contributed to these important outcomes through the construction of classrooms, French-Arabic schools, and sanitary blocks (separate for boys and girls), the latter of which is positively correlated with an increase in girls’ enrollment and attendance in primary school. Enrollment of girls was one of the criteria for the selection of sites to construct school auxiliary buildings. School construction took place in Diourbel, Kaffrine, Matam, Louga, Kaolack and St. Louis, all areas which had lower rates of schooling and where the communities were skeptical of traditional schools (boys are sent to Koranic schools). Girls were no longer required to move to another city from their village to attend school. The project also supported the renovation of two all girls secondary schools that would have otherwise been closed given their poor condition.

80. The Project supported the Government’s efforts to strengthen community participation in education. Under the Project, communities participated in the identification of school needs and selection of construction sites. The use of local development agencies (ARDs) in the management of construction during the second phase allowed local communities to play a more prominent role in the implementation of civil works activities.
(b) Institutional Change and Strengthening

81. The micro-planning exercise contributed to strengthening the planning-process with participation from the regional and local levels. This successful approach was also used for planning classroom construction to be financed under the national Consolidated Investment Budget (Budget consolidé d’investissement – BCI) and implemented by the municipalities. The MEN also organized workshops at the regional level, involving all local actors: planning officers from the IAs and IEFs (regional level); planners from the ARDs (local level); local technical coordinators; non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the education sector; municipalities; and communities. These workshops contributed to the effective identification of sites for construction and provided a forum to assess progress under the construction program and to devise solutions to any observed challenges or bottlenecks.

82. The Project supported the strengthening of the geographic information system (Système d’information géographique – SIGE) to undertake a more in-depth national school mapping (Carte Scolaire), providing the necessary resources to include all of the public and private schools in the SIGE. By Project completion, around 98 percent of all schools (preschools, primary, secondary and high schools) were identified in the SIGE. The MEN now possesses detailed information on each of these schools gathered during information campaigns. This has allowed for a more accurate assessment of school needs and better planning of activities and programs.

83. The Project also supported the design of a prototype/model of classrooms and primary schools that was adopted by the MEN for the construction of all primary classrooms and schools throughout the country. All construction activities from this point forward were required to adhere to these established standards. Through the adoption of prototypes/models for classrooms and auxiliary buildings, the Project promoted a harmonized approach to school construction based on quality standards.

84. Under the Project, in 2009 and 2010, TA was provided to the DCS to strengthen its institutional capacity. An organizational audit of the DCS was not carried out though this had been planned at appraisal. The capacity of the DCS was also strengthened with the recruitment of additional staff, training on procurement, and the provision of IT equipment and vehicles to carry out its responsibilities as a CMA. The DCS’s technical capacity to monitor and supervise civil works on behalf of the Ministry had improved. The capacity of ARDs was also strengthened as they were exposed to safeguards management and procurement and were responsible for supervising construction on the basis of agreed models and standards.

85. Finally, the Project co-financed the establishment of software for an effective

---

22 Key features of this standard design included higher ceilings, roof ventilation, and additional classroom windows.

23 The Project took advantage of the main recommendations of infrastructure evaluations carried out under the QEFA2 – to design these models, use them for construction under the Project, and ensure that they are used as models for other construction activities financed under the BCI and other donors.
deployment of teachers called *Mirador (Management Intégré des Ressources Axé sur une Dotation Rationnelle)* with CIDA. The software permitted the assignment of an identification number to all schools in Senegal, ensuring improvement of human and financial resource allocation at the school level.24

(c) Other Unintended Outcomes and Impacts

Not Applicable.

3.6 Summary of Findings of Beneficiary Surveys and/or Stakeholder Workshops

Not Applicable.

4. Assessment of Risks to Development Outcome

86. The risk to development outcome is rated *Moderate*. As a result of additional classrooms and schools constructed and rehabilitated under the Project it is expected that primary school enrollment gains will be maintained and continue to increase in those regions which were provided with additional schools and classrooms. In addition to increased enrollment, the increase in the PCR is expected to be maintained given the additional number of primary schools now able to offer the full primary cycle and the reduction in primary repetition and dropout rates. Further, as a result of additional construction and rehabilitation at the secondary level, it is expected that transition rates will continue to increase. The Government and DPs intend to finance demand-side measures (including school grants and capitation grants) to encourage school attendance, retention and completion.

87. Support to the continued maintenance of these structures will be critical in ensuring that they are able to continue to provide an adequate teaching and learning environment for students and education staff. To improve the management and maintenance of schools, the Government has supported the establishment of an SMC for each school and this is a key feature of the follow-on operation. The empowerment of these SMCs should contribute to the sustainability of achievements observed under the project in terms of improvements made to the teaching and learning environment. Further, the Government has committed to hire bilingual teachers for the new French-Arab schools, in an effort to be more efficient consistent with its commitment to meeting the demand for education throughout the country.

88. Since 2006, the Government has increased the share of financial resources allocated to the sector out of its national budget – a shift which is particularly important in light of the current demographic trends. In order to maintain some of the capacity gains under the EFA-FTI Project at the local, regional and national levels, the Government intends to provide TA and training in procurement, FM, M&E, as well as environment/social safeguards.

24 Information pertaining to this database can be found at: http://www.mirador.education.gouv.sn/
In addition to funding from the Government, key strategic areas including capacity-building continue to receive financial and technical support from a number of DPs working in Senegal. Some of the major donors who are providing support to capacity-building and to build on activities undertaken under this Project, include: (i) U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) - with an estimated contribution of US$109 million during the 2012-2017 period to support school construction, equipment, institutional strengthening and improvements in the quality of basic and secondary education; (ii) French Development Agency (Agence francaise de développement – AFD) with a commitment of Euros 12 million during the 2013–2016 period for lower secondary school construction and equipment; and (iii) Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) with a US$37 million program for the 2012-2017 period for school construction and equipment and quality improvements. This support will increase the likelihood that the gains observed under this Project will be maintained and scaled-up in the future.

5. Assessment of Bank and Borrower Performance

Bank Performance

(a) Bank Performance in ensuring Quality at Entry

Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The Bank team worked in close collaboration with the country team tasked with the implementation of the PDEF. The Project’s design and objectives were strongly aligned with the Government’s strategic agenda and incorporated a number of important lessons learned from other relevant operations and relevant analytical studies. The operation was also able to use similar arrangements as the QEFA2 Project, relying on the same implementation arrangements, disbursement modalities and M&E system. The Bank preparation team worked closely with the Government to define how the EFA-FTI Project could best contribute to and complement ongoing Government and other donor initiatives. Identification of sites for construction was highly participatory using a micro-planning approach and a series of selection criteria were employed to strategically target those areas to be prioritized for support under the Project. There were, however, some shortcomings in the original design, including the short duration of the project in light of the ambitious construction program planned under the Project.

(b) Quality of Supervision

Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The Bank team was highly focused on achievement of the PDO. The project was restructured a first time to introduce modifications to implementation of the construction program in order to increase the pace of civil works activities and to ensure adherence to quality standards. In order to promote an increase in the pace of construction and to ensure achievement end-of-project targets, the Project design was modified to increase the number of agencies supporting construction management and the closing date was
extended. During project implementation, the Bank also supported a study which was important in improving the positive impact of the Project as it related to reducing repetition and dropout rates while increasing PCR. The Bank then worked closely with the Government to make the necessary adjustments in the sector to address existing challenges and to achieve the PDO.

92. The Bank carried out supervision missions throughout the Project life, and focuses, as needed on technical, financial, procurement, and safeguards issues. The Bank team also ensured that the follow-on project design would secure gains observed under this project by supporting the establishment and training of an SMC in each primary school. Though a formal evaluation of the first phase of the construction program was not carried out as planned, the Bank did work closely with DPRE to carry out a technical, procurement and safeguard assessment prior to launching the second phase. The modifications which were introduced under the second phase, resulted in a marked improvement in the construction program. The Bank provided guidance and TA to the MEN, supporting workshops and participating in meetings on progress made under the PDEF.

93. The coordination of this Project’s supervision missions with those of the QEFA2 was beneficial as both operations aimed to support the implementation of the PDEF in coordination with other DPs in the sector. Given their complementarity, the joint monitoring and supervision approach (including a joint mid-term review (MTR)) was appropriate and efficient. The fiduciary responsibilities were adequately fulfilled under the Project and the Bank ensured that quarterly financial reports were prepared and submitted in a timely manner. Procurement activities were also implemented in compliance with the agreed upon guidelines. By project closing almost 98.2 percent of project funds had been disbursed. Despite the overall strong performance on the part of the Bank, the Bank did not formally modify the RF by reducing the target number of water points to be delivered by the end of project.

94. On the basis of the Bank’s performance in ensuring Quality of Entry as well as the Bank’s Quality of Supervision, the overall Bank Performance is rated Moderately Satisfactory.
Grantee Performance

Overall Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

(a) Government Performance

95. The Government performance is rated Satisfactory. The Government was committed to the overall sector policies and the development objectives supported by the Project. The Government increased the financial resources allocated to the education sector as a proportion of the national budget as well as a proportion of the country’s annual GDP, showing its tangible commitment to achieve the goals laid out in the PDEF. The Government also worked closely with the Bank to identify and address any bottlenecks which occurred over the course of project implementation.

(b) Implementing Agencies’ Performance

96. The implementing agencies’ performance is rated Moderately Satisfactory. The implementation arrangements where the MEN was in charge of project implementation, DPRE was responsible for the technical aspects and overall project coordination and the DAGE was in charge of the management of fiduciary matters were the same as those used for the QEFA2 Project. As such there was continuity in the team overseeing implementation of these projects within the MEN. This was beneficial in terms of coordination and harmonization of activities amongst the various DPs working in the sector. The MEN fulfilled its responsibilities from project preparation and throughout project implementation.

97. During Phase 1 of the Project, AGETIP experienced some challenges in monitoring and supervising construction under the Project. Though it did have some experience in managing large construction programs, it did not have sufficient technical manpower to undertake oversight of all planned construction activities under the largest school construction program up until that time. This resulted in limitations in quality during phase 1, in some instances, that had to be addressed. In addition to the sheer number of civil works activities, there were often large distances between some sites. AGETIP did, however, apply some of the lessons learned to its work under the second phase and provided support to firms which faced some difficulties in completing construction activities supported under the Project.

98. During the second phase, a marked improvement was observed in the pace and quality of the construction program. The addition of other CMAs (including DCS and ARDs) into the Project designed, allowed for increased supervision and more effective monitoring at the local level. The DCS adequately carried out its supervision activities during the first phase and its management of civil works for secondary schools during the second phase of the construction program. The CMAs worked closely with those firms which faced some difficulties in completing construction under the Project in order to ensure the effective completion and delivery of all civil works activities planned under
the Project. The ARDs also collaborated closely with the DEEC to adhere to safeguards requirements for construction activities.

99. On the basis of the information provided above – Government Performance (Satisfactory) and Implementing Agencies’ Performance (Moderately Satisfactory) as well as the Overall Outcome Rating (Moderately Satisfactory), the Grantee’s Overall Performance is rated Moderately Satisfactory.

6. Lessons learned

100. **A micro-planning exercise is a useful approach to identifying priorities and agreeing on infrastructure needs.** The micro-planning approach used in the Project’s initial phase was important in supplementing the Carte Scolaire and allowed the Project design to benefit from the input of various stakeholders. Since reality on the ground changes over time and there are many different actors and activities in large scale projects such as this one, it is essential to complement this type of exercise with the establishment of a centralized database on construction activities.

101. **The support of a Government’s sector-wide program translates into a commitment towards coordination.** Similar to all EFA-FTI funded operations, this Project was designed to support the country’s priorities for the education sector. As such, its design was guided by the Government’s objective of achieving UPE, embodied in the PDEF. The EFA-FTI project supported the Government in increasing access to schooling through infrastructure while other projects focused on different challenges faced by the sector (i.e., addressing quality inputs). Support to a common objective is a unifying force and can result in increased coordination.

102. **Efficient procurement can generate significant cost-savings which can be used to advance a country’s sector-wide goals.** The savings generated in large part as a result of an efficient procurement process (driven by greater competition among firms) under this Project translated into additional resources which were used to construct classrooms within secondary schools and other additional school structures. This construction contributed to further attainment of the PDO as it provided additional places for students to transition from primary to secondary education. Despite the benefits of this competition, careful evaluation of the capacity of firms bidding for a contract should always be carried out in order to deter those firms with insufficient financial and technical capacity to fulfill the requirements stipulated in the contract.

103. **Flexibility in project design provides the opportunity to take corrective measures, as needed, during the course of project implementation.** The Project’s two-phased approach to construction was useful in introducing measures to improve the pace of construction under Phase 2 and to address any limitations observed under Phase 1.

104. ** Undertaking a large construction project, such as this one, requires a realistic implementation schedule.** While it is positive that the EFA-FTI project supported the largest school construction program in Senegal given the country’s
growing infrastructure needs, the activities proved to be more complex and time consuming than the Project’s original 2½ year planned implementation duration. As a result of both delays and cost-savings, the project closing date was extended three separate times. Though an ambitious timetable can provide a source of motivation and momentum, it should be tempered with a realistic assessment of what can be feasibly completed during the allotted time frame.

105. **Close supervision of civil works and careful evaluation of technical capacity of firms is crucial in ensuring adequate compliance of construction with technical requirements.** First, this requires ensuring that companies possess the technical capacity to build according to the technical specifications required and build with high quality materials. Although the vast majority of civil works activities were successfully completed during the project life, there were some instances in which lack of technical capacity resulted in construction delays and shortcomings in terms of full compliance with technical specifications. Closer supervision, which was provided in the second phase, allowed for these limitations to be addressed more expeditiously.

106. **Individual operations should, as possible, support key elements of a country’s sector program.** While the Project supported investments in education related infrastructure, it also supported other very relevant activities related to the PDEF. Given the Project design, the MEN was able to use the Project support to strengthen key technical areas, including: defining standards for classroom construction and school design; designing and implementing the SIGE; strengthening the DCS; and delegating responsibility to the regional and local levels, reinforcing the efforts supported under other projects (such as the QEFA2) to decentralize and de-concentrate the management of education.

7. **Comments on Issues Raised by Borrower/Implementing Agencies and Partners.**

(a) **Borrower/implementing agencies**

107. The Borrower provided a report on the main achievements of the Project. A summary of this report is included in Annex 7 of this ICR. The full report has been archived in WBDocs.

(b) **Cofinanciers**

Not Applicable.

(c) **Other partners and stakeholders**

Not Applicable.
### Annex 1. Project Costs and Financing

#### (a) Project Cost by Component (in USD Million equivalent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Appraisal Estimate (USD million)</th>
<th>Actual/Latest estimate (USD million)</th>
<th>Percentage of appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Construction and equipment of classrooms</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Construction of auxiliary facilities in existing schools</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordination, monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisbursed</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>81.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>80.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The undisbursed amount has been returned to the Grant Fund.

#### (b) Financing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Appraisal Estimate (US$ millions)</th>
<th>Actual/Latest Estimate (US$ millions)</th>
<th>Percentage of Appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Recipient</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA-FTI</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>81.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>80.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A: Not applicable, as the Grant financed 100 percent of the project components.
Annex 2. Outputs by Component

1. The project development objective (PDO), according to the project appraisal document (PAD) was to contribute to the Government’s goal of attaining universal primary education (UPE) by 2015, through construction, extension and equipment of classrooms and ancillary buildings. According to the Grant Agreement (GA), the PDO was to contribute to the Government’s goal of attaining UPE by 2015.

2. As described in the PDEF, the Government aimed to achieve UPE by addressing growing infrastructure needs as these constituted a major barrier to access. By replacing and upgrading inadequate school buildings, reducing the number of schools using rented spaces, and increasing the number of classrooms in existing schools, the education system could increase the supply of schooling available and also increase the number of schools that offered the full primary cycle. In addition, the Government sought to expand the number of French-Arab schools as part of the country’s public school system.25 By increasing both the number and type of schools in areas with significant demand, it was expected that enrollment would also increase in these areas.

3. In light of the pressing infrastructure needs and with the aim of achieving UPE by 2015 (a Millennium Development Goal (MDG) for Senegal), the Government requested support from the Education for All-Fast Track Initiative (EFA-FTI) Catalytic Fund (CF). With this funding, the Senegal EFA-FTI Project embarked on the most ambitious construction program within the education sector in the country up until that point. The Senegal EFA-FTI Project was designed to support the Government, in tandem with the ongoing Senegal Quality Education for All 2 (QEFA2) Project, in achieving its aims as described in the PDEF.26 While the QEFA2 focused primarily on quality inputs and management of the sector, the EFA-FTI Project was designed to focus largely on addressing limitations in infrastructure. These two projects had many similar elements – and were able to rely on the same Government institutions and disbursement modalities. Further, they used some of the same performance measures.

4. The Project was comprised of the following three components:

5. **Component 1: Construction and Equipment of Classrooms (Estimated cost at Appraisal: US$65.6 million; Actual Cost: US$67.4).** This component aimed to: (i) accommodate either new students or students attending overcrowded schools; (ii) create additional classrooms to allow the completion of the primary school cycle; and (iii) address the disconnect between the communities’ demands for education and the type of schooling offered in their areas. This component sought to achieve its specific objectives by financing the construction of new and replacement classrooms and the construction of new primary schools.

---

25 This measure was aligned with a 2002 ruling which determined that French-Arab schools should be incorporated within the country’s public school system.

26 And later in the PAQUET (2013-2025) which began following the PDEF, which was extended to 2012.
6. **Component 2: Construction of Auxiliary Facilities in Existing Schools** *(Estimated cost at Appraisal: US$7.5 million; Actual Cost: US$6.4).* This component aimed to upgrade existing schools in an effort to increase access, improve the quality of the teaching and learning environment and improve efficiency through an increase in the retention of students and particularly, among girls. To achieve its aims, the Component focused largely on the construction of water points, sanitary blocks and administrative blocks in existing schools that were lacking these facilities. Similar to Component 1, construction was implemented using the two-phase approach.

7. **Component 3: Coordination and Monitoring and Evaluation** *(Estimated cost at Appraisal: US$8.4 million; Actual Cost: US$6.2).* Component 3 aimed to support coordination and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities. Specific activities planned for in the PAD included: coordination activities led by the DPRE (in the MEN) of the overall group of institutions involved in the construction activities (AGETIP, DCS, ARDs) with support from the decentralized and de-concentrated levels of the MEN to involve stakeholders (communities and parents); technical monitoring and supervision by the DCS and by the DEEC; communications activities, in particular to create awareness of the French-Arab schools under construction; and capacity-building activities for the DCS.

**Selection of sites**

8. The formal criteria for identifying the location for project-supported construction, were the following:

**Criteria for site selection of new schools**
- The enrollment rate in the area, with preference given to areas with low rates;
- Distance of the communities from existing schools, with preference given to those at more than 3 kilometers from the nearest elementary school;
- The number of school-age children within a radius of 3 kilometers;
- The availability of land, with preference given to those communities that have clear, uncontested title for the proposed site; and
- The new school is not financed or planned to be financed by another funding source

**Criteria for site selection of schools to be extended**
- The type of school, with preference given to schools with incomplete cycles;
- Trends in enrollment for past three years, with preference given to those with the highest annual enrollment growth rates;
- The average class size, with preference given to the ones with a higher number of students;
- The type of classes in the school, with preference given to those with “complex” classrooms, including multi-grade and double shift; and
- The school extension is not financed or planned to be financed by another funding source
Criteria for selection of temporary structures to be replaced

- The number of classrooms in temporary structures;
- The number of pedagogic groups in the school, with preference given to those with “complex” classrooms, including multi-grade and double shift;
- The average class size; and
- The replacement of classrooms is not financed or planned to be financed by another funding source

Criteria for selection of schools where auxiliary facilities would be built (water points, sanitary and administrative blocks)

- The size of the school as measured by the number of students;
- The percentage of girls enrolled;
- The number of years a school has been functioning; and
- The realization of facilities is not financed or planned to be financed by another funding source

9. Information provided by the national school map (Carte Scolaire) undertaken in 2007-2008 within the framework of the PDEF was used as a diagnostic tool in the context of the micro-planning exercise which took place in the latter part of 2008. This was supplemented with workshops which were carried out at the regional and department levels. These workshops, which involved decentralized levels of the MEN (Inspections d’Académie – IAs and the Inspections de l’Education et de la Formation – IEFs27) helped identify eligible schools, determine priorities, and to select beneficiary schools and construction sites.

10. In addition to the specific and agreed criteria used (as listed above), a selection and validation process was also undertaken at the local level which provided input to the MEN. Though this was an extremely useful exercise and provided accurate information at the time in which it was undertaken, by the time the Project was under implementation, some local level needs (regional, departmental) had changed – resulting in a mismatch between support planned to be provided by the Project and support that was most needed. To address this, workshops using the same approach as the micro-planning exercise were carried out in 2011 and 2012 where progress under this Project and under the QEFA2 was also described and discussed.

11. In order to ensure the quality of the school environment, standards for school construction (a school model) were developed and agreed as a result of construction supported under this Project. This model and approach to planning have been used by other construction programs supported by various donors.

12. The following section provides an overview of achievements under the Project by component.

---

27 Previously referred to as IDENs.
Component 1. Construction and equipment of classrooms

13. Under this Component, 4,977 classrooms across the country were constructed and equipped, including classrooms in 48 lower secondary schools (a total of 368 classrooms) and two all girls’ secondary schools were rehabilitated – Ameth Fall in St. Louis and Mariama Ba in Goree (Dakar). Construction and equipment of classrooms was organized in two phases. Table 1 below shows the planned and actual amounts for each construction phase – and the additional activities that could be undertaken as a result of the cost-savings resulting from the efficient procurement of these works.

Table 1: Construction and Replacement of Classrooms under Senegal EFA-FTI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Construction</th>
<th>First Phase</th>
<th>Second Phase</th>
<th>Additional Programs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New classrooms in existing schools</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement classrooms in primary schools</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>1,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New classrooms in 150 newly built primary schools</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools rehabilitated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 schools comprised of 62 classrooms in total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>3,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total planned at Appraisal</td>
<td>4,360 primary classrooms</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
<td>4,977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project-supported Construction

14. The following provides a more detailed overview of the type of construction completed under this Component by phase.

Classrooms in existing schools

15. The Project financed the construction and equipment of 2,591 classrooms in existing primary schools exceeding the end-of-project target of 2,010 classrooms.

- A total of 980 classrooms in existing primary schools were built and equipped during the first phase. This phase would be implemented from 2009 to 2010. It was implemented between 2010 and 2012. These classrooms were built by AGETIP.
- A total of 1,611 classrooms were built during the second phase, which took place during the period from 2011 to 2013. AGETIP, DCS and the ARDs were in charge of implementing the construction of these classrooms.
**Construction of replacement classrooms**

16. A total of 1,936 classrooms were built compared to 1,900 planned to replace existing classrooms in primary schools and temporary structures that had been accommodating students. The temporary structures were made of non-durable materials, were often rented, and did not provide an adequate teaching and learning environment.

- A total of 920 classrooms were built and equipped during the first phase in 2010 and 2011 managed by AGETIP;
- A total of 1,016 classrooms were built and equipped during the second phase by AGETIP, DCS and ARDs in 2011 through 2013.

**Construction of new classrooms in new schools**

17. The Project financed the construction of a total of 450 classrooms in 150 new primary schools. Each of these schools was composed of a three-classroom block, a sanitary block, a water point, an administrative building and a wall fence, surrounding the school. Of the 150 new schools, 100 of these (with a total of 300 classrooms) were French-Arab schools, built by the ARDs in the Diourbel, Kaolack, Louga, Thies and St. Louis regions. These were areas where the local communities did not have access to schooling which met their needs. The other 50 new schools were built in locations where communities did not have access to a nearby school.

18. The first 20 new schools were built by AGETIP during the first phase of the construction program. Each of these schools was completed in full except for six where water points could not be constructed due to the much higher than anticipated cost. The remaining 130 new schools were built during the second phase of construction. The ARDs executed the construction of 115 new schools (as a partnership agreement had been signed between the MEN, the IAs and the ARDs to delegate the execution of the construction of 100 new schools to the ARDs) and AGETIP constructed the remaining 15 schools. All schools were completed with the sanitary and administrative blocks, the surrounding walls and the water point, except in the region of Diourbel where 4 water points, 10 sanitary blocks and 4 walls were not completed.

19. In order to raise awareness among communities about the French-Arab schools, the IAs and ARDs carried out a communications campaign in each of the five regions in which they were to be built. The campaign informed communities as to the curriculum to be taught in these schools, the training of the teachers to be brought to these schools, and of the textbooks that would be used by students in these schools. These efforts were undertaken to ensure that the population was aware of the Government’s efforts to provide communities with schooling options that corresponded to their specific interests and needs.

20. The project also built 48 lower secondary schools. The lower secondary schools constructed in rural areas consisted of two to six classrooms, an administrative block, sanitary blocks (with separate cabins for girls and boys), a library, and a multi-purpose
room. Those in urban areas consisted of eight classrooms, a guardhouse, and a surrounding wall. In addition, 129 classrooms were built in existing overcrowded lower secondary schools.

Component 2. Construction of auxiliary facilities in existing schools

21. Significant progress was observed under this Component as can be observed in Table 2 below, though falling short of the end-of-project targets.

Table 2: Construction of Auxiliary Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Construction</th>
<th>Planned (number)</th>
<th>Achieved (number)</th>
<th>Actual (expressed as percentage of planned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Construction Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water points</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Blocks</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Blocks</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source MEN: Some of the targets for the second phase were higher in the table provided by MEN, as there was expectation of building more sanitary blocks and less water points, given the costs and constraints.

22. The construction of administrative blocks in primary schools supported under this Component was carried out at the same time as the construction of new classrooms in existing primary schools (supported under Component 1). The construction of administrative blocks was carried out by AGETIP during the first phase of construction and by AGETIP, DCS and ARDs during the second phase. The construction of
administrative blocks was largely completed (as were the additional classrooms) by Project closing.

23. Difficulties were encountered, however, during implementation with regards to the construction of water points. As was the case in the QEFA2 (also under implementation during the same period), the cost of construction for the water points exceeded appraisal estimates. The unit cost of water points was significantly higher (US$2,479) than appraisal estimates (US$1,398). The main reasons for the higher costs were: (i) the need to excavate deeper than foreseen; and (ii) the distance from the main national and rural water lines were much greater than expected. As a result of this cost difference, out of a planned 814 water points, the end-of-project target was reduced to 607 (though not through a formal restructuring of the RF). By project closing, 538 water points had been constructed under the Project.

24. During the first phase of construction, the amount of water points planned and completed was 213 (from the original 393 planned at design time for this phase). AGETIP completed the construction of water points that cost under FCFA 4 million and that required an excavation not exceeding 20 meters deep and the connection to main water systems did not surpass one thousand meters. During the second phase of construction, the construction of water points faced additional challenges such as the security situation in the Casamance Region. Combined, DCS, AGETIP and ARDs built 325 water points during this phase.

25. The quality of the civil works was for the most part satisfactory. In a few instances, quality was affected by some of the same issues that affected classroom construction: (i) construction firms lacked qualified staff to understand technical specifications; (ii) firms were stretched as they committed to build in sites that were far apart from each other; (iii) firms over-committed and lacked appropriate financial resources to complete the works in time and adhering to the quality standards required. It is important to note that these issues were addressed with the support of ARDs and DCS who worked closely with the firms to overcome these issues and to complete the planned civil works as possible. By project closing, the vast majority of the construction planned under the Project had been successfully completed.

26. Supervision of civil works was emphasized as a way to ensure that the sanitary blocks were working properly before the terms of the contract were considered fully met. The ICR mission did, however, observe in a significant amount of the schools visited, that there were problems in terms of the proper functioning of the sanitary blocks. The Government, along with the SMCs, plan to provide the necessary support to address any remaining issues.
Component 3. Coordination and Monitoring and Evaluation

27. In terms of M&E, there were some delays in generating the reports on the progress of the construction activities, in form and time, as required by the DPRE. This required an extra effort for the DPRE and the DCS to closely monitor the progress of the activities at the school level in order to flag bottlenecks and to take necessary action to address these challenges.

28. In addition, this Component supported:

(i) the MEN (in particular the DPRE) in strengthening data collection at all levels, which was crucial to elaborate education indicators and in strengthening the learning assessment system;

(ii) the establishment of software for an effective deployment of teachers called Mirador (Management Intégré des Ressources Axé sur une Dotation Rationnelle)28 in cooperation with CIDA. The software allowed each school in the country to have a unique identification number, useful in ensuring improvement of resource allocation at the school level; and

(iii) the strengthening of a geographic information system (SIGE) for the national school mapping with the Project providing the necessary resources to include all of the public and private schools in the SIGE. By Project completion, around 98 percent of all schools (pre-schools, primary, secondary and high schools) were identified in the SIGE. As a result, the MEN now possesses detailed information on each of these schools which was gathered during information campaigns. This has allowed for a more accurate assessment of schools’ needs and has been critical in planning activities and programs.

---

28 For more information, see http://www.mirador.education.gouv.sn/
Annex 3. Economic and Financial Analysis

1. This economic analysis of the Senegal EFA-FTI Project focuses on: (i) sector-wide efficiency gains; (ii) cost-benefit and/or unit-cost analyses under the project; (iii) efficiency of implementation; and (iv) financial sustainability of the operation.

Sector-wide efficiency gains (increased completion and transition rates, reduced repetition and drop-out rates, etc.)

2. Sector-wide efficiency gains are measured by key indicators monitored in the PDEF, some of which were also included in the PAD to assess achievement of the PDO including increased primary completion and transition rates and reduced repetition and dropout rates. These indicators were calculated using the same demographic projection data as the reference year (2008) for the 2008-2013 period. The RGPHAÉ (Quatrième Recensement Général de la Population, de l’Habitat, de l’Agriculture et de l’Elevage), the most recent census, was undertaken in 2013. Prior to this, and for Project appraisal, all indicators were calculated based on projections using data from the 2002 national census. To better measure the Project’s achievements, this analysis uses the values for the indicators up until 2013 but does not include RGPHAÉ 2013 data as these are not comparable with the initial figures on which the initial baseline values were determined or the data on which the end-of-project targets values were based.

3. The data below show improvement across the key indicators included in the PDEF (and at the PDO-level) to monitor improvements in the education sector. The majority of indicators have shown improvements between 2008 and 2011. However, a few of the PDO-level indicators did not fully achieve their end-of-project targets. This may be attributable to a number of factors. First, teachers’ and students’ strikes contributed significantly to low performance of the education system in a context of political transition. Between 2010 and 2014, Senegal faced some unrest on the political and education fronts. The longest ever inspectors’ strike happened during this period, lasting about two years. As a result of this strike, training on the implementation of the Curriculum of Basic Education (CEB) has not yet begun. Furthermore, the increase in the number of teachers’ unions (especially volunteer teachers, teachers under temporary contracts, and contractors) resulted in more frequent cyclical strikes with growing demands for better working conditions. As a result, the required number of hours in school (called quantum horaire) was drastically reduced by about one-fifth (19 percent). In 2009, on average, each primary school teacher conducted 733 hours while the required quantum horaire is 900 hours (Sene29, 2010).

29 Etude sur l’efficacité de l’enseignement primaire au Sénégal. Sous la Direction de la CEPOD et l’ANSD.
Table 1: Key PDO indicators progression (in percentage)\textsuperscript{30}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission rate into grade 1</td>
<td>113.6</td>
<td>110.3</td>
<td>113.0</td>
<td>108.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary gross enrollment rate</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Completion rate</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition rate</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout rate</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unit-cost analysis under the Project**

4. The contribution of the EFA FTI Project reduced the unit cost and other sources of funding aligned their costing to that level. Initially the unit cost for one classroom was FCFA 5.5 million. This cost was widely used by all entities (Government and donors) supporting construction. During appraisal, the unit cost was re-estimated to be FCFA 4.9 million. As a result of the competitive procurement process under the Project, the unit cost decreased to between FCFA 3.6 million to FCFA 3.9 million (differences depending on the proximity of schools, close vs. remote). Thus, the savings per classroom was, therefore, between FCFA 1 million to FCFA 1.3 million. As such, for 4,977 classrooms, the total savings is estimated to be between FCFA 4.97 billion and FCFA 6.47 billion (around US$10.1 to US$13.1 million)\textsuperscript{31}. Another driver of these costs savings under the Project was the use of a classroom model which is standardized and cost-effective.

5. By contrast, the actual unit cost of the construction of a water point was significantly higher than the appraisal estimate. In fact, the Project had planned to install more water points (814) than it actually was able to construct under the Project (538). In the second phase of construction, the Project intended to build 266 water points for a total cost of US$435,047. During implementation, in a number of the initially planned sites, water points could not be constructed because it would require more extensive excavation than had originally been foreseen. Moreover, in some instances, the distance of these sites from the main national and rural water lines were much greater than expected.\textsuperscript{32} As a result of the unforeseen challenges, the unit cost of water points was significantly higher (US$2,479) than appraisal estimates (US$1,398). This required a reduction in the number of water points that could be constructed under the Project.

\textsuperscript{30} Indicators drawn from the PDEF matrix.

\textsuperscript{31} The exchange rate used is an average based on the rate at appraisal and at closing (US$1 = FCFA491)

\textsuperscript{32} Many rural areas were not served by the National Water Company of the Senegal (SDE) or by the rural water supply (ASUFOR), but for some of them the distance from the served areas is not quite long. So they can benefit from easily.
Social rates of return and externalities\textsuperscript{33}

6. The Project contributed to the Government’s agenda of improving access, quality and participation in schooling, associated with important externalities. This ICR followed the same rate of return analysis carried out for the QEFA\textsuperscript{34} ICR (2012). Both analyses are based on the 2011 household survey data. The social rate of return of primary education is 4.9 percent, while the private rate of return is even higher at 15.9 percent. The social rate of return in lower secondary school is 11 percent higher than the rate observed for primary education. Similarly, analysis of the 2011 household survey shows a positive impact of primary and secondary education on health outcomes. The infant mortality rate in 2011 was 97/1,000 for children with a mother who had not completed primary school, 63/1,000 for children whose mother had completed primary school, and 36/1,000 for children whose mother had some secondary schooling. Similar outcomes are evident in terms of malnutrition and knowledge of HIV/AIDS.

Financial sustainability of the Project

7. The Government's commitment to sustain these gains is visible in its arbitration at the BCI. The Government is planning to allocate budgetary resources for a large program to continue to replace temporary classrooms as follows: (i) 1,861 primary schools will replace schools currently in temporary facilities; (ii) 259 teaching schools will replace those in temporary facilities; and (iii) 22 rural high schools will replace the existing ones, which are currently unsuitable for teaching and learning. To achieve the targets in this program the Government intends to implement a Public Private Partnership (PPP) model. Contracts will be signed between the Government and private companies for the design, construction and maintenance of infrastructure. Furthermore, the financial sustainability of the operation can be partly shown by the trend of public investment allocated to education. Over the last five years (2008-2013), the Government investment spending on education increased on average by 35 percent (Figure 1). Primary education captured the largest share of investment expenditure (PER, 2015).

\textsuperscript{33} This section is based on the latest ICR of the Quality Education for All Project, which used the results of the 2011 household survey.

\textsuperscript{34} QEFA2 is the Phase 2 of an APL. In line with APL original document, the project objective as reflected in the Credit Agreement (CA) was to enhance the quality of the Recipient’s education system through the improvement of teaching and learning practices.
8. The Senegalese authorities have historically allocated a significant share of public funds to the provision of public education and the implementation of sector policy. The proportion of the budget allocated to public education has continued to rise considerably in recent years (Table 2). Over the period from 2008 to 2013, public expenditure on education grew at twice the annual rate of public revenue (including grants) and was 70 percent higher than the growth in total public expenditure. As a result, public expenditure on education rose from 5.7 percent to 6.8 percent of GDP, with the highest allocation in 2012 when 7.5 percent of the GDP was allocated to education expenditure. As a share of the total government expenditure, the allocation to education increased from 20.9 percent to 23.3 percent of total public spending over this period, reaching a peak of 26.6 percent in 2010. Compared with other countries in SSA and taking the averages for different income groups, Senegal spends significantly more on education as a share of GDP\(^{35}\).

\footnotesize

\(^{35}\)This section is drafted based on the Senegal Education Sector Public Expenditure Review (June, 2015).
### Efficiency of implementation

9. Although the Project did effectively achieve the large majority of envisioned outputs and outcomes, the initial phase of implementation was significantly delayed. As a result of these delays, and cost savings realized under the construction program, the Project was extended three times to allow for the completion of activities planned under the Project. During the Project, 4,977 classrooms, 522 school administration facilities, 839 sanitary blocks, and 538 water points were constructed. The cost-savings under the Project was used to fund the construction of: (i) an additional 48 middle schools to support the Government’s policy to implement a compulsory ten year basic education program; (ii) 181 classrooms for primary education and 10 administrative blocks in primary schools; as well as the rehabilitation of (iii) the two oldest secondary schools for girls (Mariama Ba and Ahmed Fall). Table 3 below shows that, with the exception of water points, all of the end-of-project targets related to construction were exceeded.

36 Please see the Section 2 for more details.
Table 3: Achievement of Project Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and equipment of classroom</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>4,977</td>
<td>127.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative blocks</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>105%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water points</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>66.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary blocks</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>103.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. In light of the information above, efficiency under the Project is rated Modest.
Annex 4. Grant Preparation and Implementation Support/Supervision Processes

(a) Task Team members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Responsibility/ Specialty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lending/Grant Preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meskerem Lily Mulatu</td>
<td>Senior Education Specialist</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>Task Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfgang Chadab</td>
<td>Senior Financial Officer</td>
<td>WFALA</td>
<td>Loan operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astou Diaw-Ba</td>
<td>Senior Program Assistant</td>
<td>AFCF1</td>
<td>Project Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saidou Diop</td>
<td>Senior Financial Management Specialist</td>
<td>GGODR</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidi Diop</td>
<td>Senior Procurement Specialist</td>
<td>GGODR</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathalie Lahire</td>
<td>Senior Education Economist</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>Team member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathalie Munzberg</td>
<td>Senior Counsel</td>
<td>LEGEN</td>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atou Seck</td>
<td>Senior Education Specialist</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>Team member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheick A.T. Traore</td>
<td>Senior Procurement Specialist</td>
<td>GGODR</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souleymane Zerbo</td>
<td>Consultant, Construction Spec.</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>School Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision/ICR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atou Seck</td>
<td>Senior Education Economist</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>Project Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meskerem Lily Mulatu</td>
<td>Senior Education Specialist</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>ICR Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Nicolas Materu</td>
<td>Practice Manager</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>Practice Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda English</td>
<td>Sector Leader</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>Team member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Joseph Kamano</td>
<td>Senior Education Specialist</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>Team member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldo Joao Martins</td>
<td>Senior Education Specialist</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>Team member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moustapha Lo</td>
<td>Economist/Education Specialist</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>Economic Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astou Diaw-Ba</td>
<td>Program Assistant</td>
<td>AFCF1</td>
<td>Project Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maimouna Mbow Fam</td>
<td>Senior Financial Management Specialist</td>
<td>GGODR</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheick Traore</td>
<td>Senior Procurement Specialist</td>
<td>GGODR</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boury Ndiaye</td>
<td>Program Assistant</td>
<td>AFCF1</td>
<td>Project Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aminata Ndiaye Bob</td>
<td>Program Assistant</td>
<td>AFCF1</td>
<td>Project Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khady Fall Lo</td>
<td>Program Assistant</td>
<td>AFCF1</td>
<td>Project Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamadou Mansour Mbaye</td>
<td>Consultant Procurement Specialist</td>
<td>GGODR</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergine Bassirou Niang</td>
<td>Consultant Civil Engineer</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>School construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semou Diouf</td>
<td>Consultant Architect</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>School construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbaye Mbengue Faye</td>
<td>Consultant Environmental Spec.</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Wakeman</td>
<td>Consultant Architect</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>School Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura S. McDonald</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardo Da Cruz Vasconcellos</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>GEDDR</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage of Project Cycle</td>
<td>Staff Time and Cost (Bank Budget Only)</td>
<td>USD (including travel and consultant costs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of staff weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lending</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,377.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,377.20</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision/ICR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>49,295.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>17,835.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.72</strong></td>
<td><strong>69,507.75</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5. Beneficiary Survey Results

Not Applicable.
Annex 6. Stakeholder Workshop Report and Results

Not Applicable.
Annex 7. Summary of Borrower's ICR and/or Comments on Draft ICR

The MEN (specifically the DPRE) prepared the document “Contribution du Sénégal au Rapport d’Achèvement du Programme d’Utilisation du Fonds Catalytique de L’Initiative Fast Track”. The document has been filed in its entirety in WBDocs. This annex summarizes the aforementioned report which is written in French.

Achievements in light of the PDOs of the Program

The development objectives of the program funded by the Catalytic Fund EFA-FTI are: (i) increase the enrollment capacity of elementary schools; (ii) diversify the public education options; and (iii) improve the education environment. To achieve these objectives, the project was built around three components:

Component I – Construction and equipment of classrooms.
Component II – Upgrade of existing schools, building auxiliary facilities.
Component III – Coordination, monitoring and evaluation of the project activities.

The Project’s achievements are described in reference to the results indicators defined for the sector program PDEF, as agreed during the project’s negotiations. These measure mainly the development of access, participation and internal efficiency of the education system in Senegal during the 2008 to 2014 period. It should be taken into account that 2014 meant a breaking point as the last population census data were used in the calculation of the access and participation indicators for 2014. This report analyses the situation of the education sector in 2013, which uses the same demographic projection data than the reference year 2008, thus enabling data comparisons for the two points in time.

Access to primary education Senegal has experienced significant progress in terms of increasing access to primary education, as shown by the evolution of the number of new students enrolled in the first year of primary (cours d’initiation – CI), who increased from a total of 337,163 in 2008 to 405,951 new students in 2014, which meant a global increase of 20.4% and an average annual increase of 3.1%. Contrary to the trend observed for the increase of new students in CI, the Gross Enrollment Rate in the first year of primary has decreased from 113.6% in 2008 to 108.9% in 2013. This is attributable in part to the estimated demographic data used, which were based on the 2002 projection for population growth, if one knows that the global growth population rate is 2.7%.

The students’ participation in the education efforts intensified during the last five years: the total number of students enrolled in primary education increased from 1,618,308 students in 2008 to 1,805,170 in 2013, reaching 1,888,159 students in 2014. These figures translate in the Gross Enrollment Rate (GER) for primary, which went from 90.1% in 2008 to 93% in 2013, and a parity index of 1.12 in favor of girls. When calculated with the population data from the 2014 population census, the GER for primary reaches 82.6%.
Progress was achieved in term of the evolution of the Primary Completion Rate (PCR): out of 100 enrolled in the first year of primary, 55 percent completed primary in 2008. This proportion has improved to be 65.9% in 2013 and 73.9% in 2014. This improved performance is due in part to the improvements in the internal efficiency of the education system in Senegal, in particular to the decrease in the repetition rate that went from 7.9% in 2008 to 2.8% in 2013 and 3% in 2014. Regarding the dropout rate, it experienced a slight reduction from 10.9% in 2008 to 9.8% in 2013 and 7.7% in 2014. The objective set for the reduction of the repetition rate for 2015 has been achieved mainly because of the elimination of repetition within education cycles and the increase of the transition rates between primary and secondary cycles, reducing the strong bottleneck that existed at the end of the primary cycle.

**Achievements in Project’s Activities**

**Achievements in terms of programming of construction activities**
The program preparation was carried out through a detailed and highly participatory programming exercise. The MEN organized regional micro-planning workshops, involving all local actors to identify sites and beneficiary communities, based on school mapping information. This methodology has been later on regularly used for programming classroom construction to be financed by the national budget (BCI) and the execution is delegated to the municipalities.

Moreover, the Project enabled (through support) the MEN to operationalize (implement) a geo-referenced information system (*système d’information géographique*) to prepare the country’s school map. The project provided resources that allow to geo-reference all of the public and private schools in Senegal. By the end of 2014, a total of 98 percent of all schools in Senegal (13,840 out of 14,137) have geographical coordinates, providing a more accurate school map with the numeric details and characteristics of each of these schools.

**Achievements in terms of architectural designs of the school infrastructure**
The Project provided an opportunity to revise the existing plans for classrooms and auxiliary facilities. Under EFA-FTI, new prototypes were developed and implemented during the life of the Project, contributing to harmonize the school landscape. These prototypes included the recommendations gathered in evaluations financed under the PEQT2. The prototypes were used for classrooms and auxiliary building construction financed by the national budget.

The Project provided an opportunity to implement a process of environmental evaluation. This created a framework for managing environmental and social issues. Besides, it also meant the use of a framework for resettlement. These became a point of reference and a resource for new projects.
Achievements by Components – Primary Education Program

- The Fast-Track program allowed extending and diversifying the primary network of public schools in Senegal. This was achieved through the construction of 150 new primary schools, comprising a block of three classrooms, a sanitary block, an administrative block, a water point and a surrounding wall. These schools were built in areas where either the population did not access to a primary public school nearby or the existing school did not meet the educational demands of the community. The project gave the Government the opportunity to implement a strategy to diversify the school offer by creating 100 French-Arab schools (out the 150), highly demanded by a significant population group in those communities. These schools enrolled close to 9,744 students (20 percent of the total number of students enrolled in French-Arab schools by the end of 2014).

- The Program contributed to increasing the enrollment capacity of the primary public education system. The Project contributed to this result by financing the construction of additional classrooms in existing public schools, in particular in those who lacked enough teaching space to provide the full elementary cycle. This supported the strategy to bring existing schools to have a minimum of three classrooms and to implement a multi-grade system in the least populated communities to achieve the provision of the full primary cycle in these schools. In the most populated communities, the option was to bring the existing public primary schools to have a minimum of six classrooms. Out of a total of 2,010 foreseen, 1,980 (96.1%) had been completed by Project completion date. The classrooms not completed were all part of the second phase.

- The Project significantly contributed to the replacement of unsuitable classrooms in primary schools. At appraisal stage, these represented 20% of the total number of classrooms. The Government focused on replacing them as they were seen as limiting factor to the provision of quality of education. Thus by Project completion 1,837 classrooms had been built (out of a target of 1,900, 96.6%). The classrooms not completed were all part of the second phase. This construction brought the total number of temporary classrooms to 9% of the total number of classrooms.

- The project contributed to upgrade existing elementary schools through the improvement of their physical infrastructure and environment. The government focused on upgrading elementary schools, as it was aware of the influence this had on access and permanence in schools for some students, particularly for girls. The results of this activity were mixed: the administrative blocks, carried out at the same that the construction of classrooms, were executed to a rate of 96.1%. The water points and the sanitary blocks had a rate of execution of 89% and 75% respectively. The reasons for this performance are the lack of financial and human resources of the construction firms, which had started by the construction of classrooms and were experiencing shortages of both by the time the construction of water points and sanitary blocks started.

The budget to construct 413 points during the first phase was FCFA289.1 million (FCFA0.7 million per unit).
During the second phase, the DCS carried out a total of 207 water points (out of a target of 266). The 59 not carried out were due to the fact that, once on the location, the distances to link to the water network had increased due to a relocation of the construction. In these cases there was no a nearby ASUFOR or SDE close to the selected location.

Activities non-foreseen and carried out: While the EFA-FTI program was conceived to address to the infrastructure needs of the primary education sub-sector, the implementation of the second phase of construction coincided with the implementation by the government of a mandatory ten-year basic education policy. Thus, the government needed to ensure access to adequate and quality education to students between the ages of 6-16. In this light, the resources that were available after the successful and more efficient procurement of civil works and equipment for the new classrooms were dedicated to two additional construction programs to build turnkey lower secondary schools to replace temporary classrooms, which included blocs of three classrooms, sanitary and administrative blocks, to increase the enrollment capacity of secondary schools in better teaching and learning conditions. The main construction activities were the following:

1. First additional program: the DCS managed the construction and equipping of: (i) 26 lower secondary schools (15 rural and 11 urban); (ii) of 129 classrooms and 32 sanitary blocks in overcrowded lower secondary schools.

2. Second additional program: the DCS managed the construction of: (i) 20 lower rural secondary schools; (ii) 50 classrooms and (iii) 10 administrative blocks in lower secondary schools. These infrastructures were not equipped with the Project resources.

Two additional lower secondary schools were built by the ARDs of Kolda and Kaolack. Additionally, the Project financed the IT and office equipment of 25 lower secondary schools built under the PEQT2.

The Government decided to rehabilitate two important secondary schools (high schools) – Mariama Ba in Goree and Ameth Fall in St. Louis – given their high symbolic value in the education system and the deteriorated conditions of their infrastructures.

Finally, the DCS carried out additional classroom construction and rehabilitation activities, in an effort to use resources from construction program managed by AGETIP in Bignona, an area where due to insecurity conditions, the school construction activities could not be carried out before completion: (i) 22 classrooms and sanitary blocks in primary schools; (ii) 17 classrooms and 8 sanitary blocks in lower secondary schools; and (iii) 13 classrooms and sanitary blocks in high schools; and (iv) the rehabilitation of one CEM and one primary schools. All of these construction activities took place in areas of Senegal were construction companies were already working and additional construction could be added to be completed within the timeline of the project.
Factors influencing implementation

Among the positive factors were:

- The increasing demand for French-Arab school coincided with the provision of this type of schools under the project. The communities mobilized themselves to find the terrains to build the schools;
- The ARDs experience in working with local communities and the inclusion of the environmental and social dimensions in the school construction projects;
- The experience of AGETIP in implementing school construction programs; and
- The experienced acquired through the project implementation by the structures in charge of coordination and supervision of education projects and programs.

Among the factor negatively affecting implementation of the project were:

- The difficulties in accessing the construction sites: this was due to weather conditions, in particular during and after the rainy season; the distance between work sites in one lot; the situation of insecurity in certain areas of Senegal, in particular in north part of the Bignona department, which delayed construction activities and lack of available terrain to build schools due to divergent points of view within some communities.
- The weak technical, financial and organizational capacity of some of the construction firms: as some firms used not sufficiently qualified personnel able to read architectural plans and technical specifications; some firms did not have foremen at the construction sites and some firms were overcommitted and unable to allocate sufficient human and material resources to all work sites.
- The insufficient monitoring and supervision of the construction activities: the supervision of the construction programs was not carried out with full efficiency. The weaknesses observed during construction at the construction sites were not notified to the management construction agencies to enable them to take corrective measures. This resulted in poor construction practices, as the technical specifications were not applied.
- The procurement process was challenging: (i) the length and complexity of the procurement process brought delays to launching civil works; (ii) the lengthy termination procedures applied to failing contracts with certain firms, which could last over six months; and (iii) the very low bidding prices presented by some firms, which made them completion of the works impossible for them.

Sustainability

The meetings regularly organized by the DPRE constituted a forum to exchange the difficulties faced during implementation and formulate solution, contributing to an improvement and durability of the civil works. Though some of the initial weaknesses can be observed, the constructions of the Fast-Track program are characterized by the sound quality of its foundations, roofs and blackboards, all parts that experienced fast deterioration before.
It will be advisable to take advantage of the establishment of management committees at school level to develop and implement a policy of preventive maintenance of school infrastructure to ensure a lasting sustainability of the Project’s investments.

During the implementation of the Fast-Track program, the Government carried out the construction of additional infrastructure for primary and secondary cycle, ensuring the catalytic aspect of bringing additional resources to the sector, sought by the program.

The DCS and the ARDs were strengthened through the provision of additional human and material resources and gained experience through their role in implementing the program.

Lessons learned

- In order to avoid delays in the construction program, it is important to have updated information on the construction activities being carried out by different institutions. This would allow knowing when needs have been addressed, avoiding duplications and having to reprogram civil works;

- The Project started implementation without pre-appraisal studies. Such a study would have allowed to better estimate civil works’ cost, especially for water points and to address the required financial needs.

- The monitoring and supervision arrangements used for the project were those of the PDEF. But, the execution agency had difficulties complying with the format and periodicity of the reporting. Civil engineers had not been trained on M&E. It will be necessary for projects of this caliber to put in place a specific specialist in monitoring and supervision, as the ARDs have done to correctly meet the demands of the different actors.

Conclusion

Given the financial size of the program, the number and the diversity of types of school constructions, the national coverage and the multiple layers of execution entities, construction companies and specialists involved, the EFA-FTI program constituted the most significant infrastructure construction program of the MEN. The implementation of this program has enabled the Senegalese education system to increase its enrollment capacity at primary level while improving the school environment. It has allowed a greater diversification of education institutions with the French-Arab schools, established in those area were there was greater reticence with the traditional public school model. These execution achievements have had a considerable impact in the creation of access to and participation in the primary cycle as reflected in the evolution of the number of enrolled students and the internal efficiency of the primary system. The EFA-FTI program has contributed in a remarkable way to create the conditions for a quality of all,
setting the stage for other projects to focus on improving student performance in a content of transparent governance of the education system.
Annex 8. Comments of Cofinanciers and Other Partners/Stakeholders

Not Applicable.
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