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CURRENCY EQUIVALENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currency Unit</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>CFA Franc (CFAF) (BCEAO) (XOF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USD 1.00</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>XOF 610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XOF 1.00</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>USD 0.001642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 kilogram (kg)</td>
<td>2.204 pounds (lb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 000 kg</td>
<td>1 metric tonne (t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 kilometre (km)</td>
<td>0.62 miles (mi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 metre (m)</td>
<td>1.09 yards (yd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 square metre (m²)</td>
<td>10.76 square feet (ft²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 acre (ac)</td>
<td>0.405 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hectare (ha)</td>
<td>2.47 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFD</td>
<td>Agence française de développement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>French Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSFD</td>
<td>Association professionnelle des systèmes financiers décentralisés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLM</td>
<td>Professional Association of MIFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAEF</td>
<td>French Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGEL</td>
<td>Ministère de l’agriculture et de l’éllevage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFI</td>
<td>Microfinance institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINFI</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>Natural resource management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMU</td>
<td>Programme management unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSN</td>
<td>Special Country Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>Research and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Steering committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Technical centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEMOA</td>
<td>West African Economic and Monetary Union</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF NIGER

Fiscal Year

1 January - 31 December
Source: IFAD Appraisal Report
The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this map do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IFAD concerning the delimitation of the frontiers or boundaries, or the authorities thereof.
REPUBLIC OF NIGER

RURAL FINANCIAL SERVICES DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

LOAN SUMMARY

INITIATING INSTITUTION: IFAD
BORROWER: Republic of Niger
EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Finance (MINFI)
TOTAL PROGRAMME COST: USD 27.30 million
AMOUNT OF IFAD LOAN: SDR 8.8 million (equivalent to approximately USD 11.79 million)
TERMS OF IFAD LOAN: 40 years, including a grace period of ten years, with a service charge of three fourths of one per cent (0.75%) per annum
COFINANCIERS: French Development Agency (AFD), French Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MAEF) and the World Bank (discussions ongoing)
AMOUNT OF COFINANCING USD 11.75 million
CONTRIBUTION OF BORROWER: USD 3.10 million
CONTRIBUTION OF BENEFICIARIES: USD 0.32 million
CONTRIBUTIONS OF APSFD AND RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS: USD 0.34 million
APPRASING INSTITUTION: IFAD
COOPERATING INSTITUTION: United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)
PROGRAMME BRIEF

Who are the beneficiaries? Within ten years, the programme will benefit 20 to 25% of the active rural population (i.e. 1.0 to 1.2 million people, two thirds of whom are considered poor, and 35% as very poor. Through research and development (R&D) activities, the programme will develop specific microfinance technologies (in terms of organization, methodologies and products), matching the needs of vulnerable groups such as women, farmers in poor areas and pastoral communities. Women are considered the main target group since they already constitute two thirds of the current users of microfinance activities in the country.

Why are they poor? Niger is one of the poorest countries in the world. Poverty in Niger stems primarily from the severe environmental constraints facing the country, and the overwhelming political, social and economic difficulties that resulted in fifteen years of economic decline and seven years of social and political instability. At the household level, poverty is strongly associated with the following factors: large family size; lack of education; farmers owning little or no livestock; diets deficient in protein, vegetables and dairy products; and, in rural areas, women as heads of households. In addition to specific constraints (e.g. the social status for women), limited access to financial services (for credit and savings) is one of the main factors of poverty incidence that prevent the poor from developing efficient poverty-alleviation strategies, such as income diversification and/or labor-productivity improvements.

What will the proposed programme do for them? The programme addresses the needs of the rural population and of poorest groups in terms of microfinance services aimed at income growth and income-generating activities. This will allow the rural poor to seize additional economic opportunities. These include: (a) increase of agricultural production; (b) development of trade-related activities; and (c) avoiding deals with usurious local moneylenders. In order to provide for social sustainability, the programme will support the empowerment of grass-roots and self-help groups (through training, technical assistance, etc.), and foster the development of new approaches specifically targeting the needs of the rural poor and agricultural development through R&D activities.

How will beneficiaries participate in the programme? The beneficiaries will participate in the programme through: (a) self-help organizations supported by the programme; (b) existing microfinance institutions once reorganized to be more responsive to the beneficiaries and the needs of the poor (the programme will provide selective support to existing microfinance institutions (MFIs) adopting or willing to adopt participatory methodologies); and (c) the pro-poor innovative microfinance technologies and systems to be developed within the R&D component. Moreover, rural organizations will participate in the programme’s steering committee (SC), and will have an important role in designing the microfinance policy at the national level. The programme’s flexible approach will also ensure that programme activities are demand-driven.
I submit the following Report and Recommendation on a proposed loan to the Republic of Niger for SDR 8.8 million (equivalent to approximately USD 11.79 million) on highly concessional terms to help finance the Rural Financial Services Development Programme. The loan will have a term of 40 years, including a grace period of ten years, with a service charge of three fourths of one per cent (0.75%) per annum. It is proposed that this IFAD-initiated programme, which was designed under the Flexible Lending Mechanism (FLM), be supervised by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS), unless the World Bank confirms programme cofinancing. The main focus and innovative features of the programme are its national scope and policy orientation on the one hand, and its flexibility and learning process on the other. The programme will focus on testing innovative microfinance technologies, while restructuring the whole sector in the first cycle, extending the networks of microfinance institutions (MFIs) and consolidating the whole sector in the two other cycles.

PART I - THE ECONOMY, SECTORAL CONTEXT AND IFAD STRATEGY

A. The Economy and Agricultural Sector

1. General background. Niger is a landlocked country located in the Saharan/Sahelian belt, about 1 000 km from the nearest seaport. It covers an area of 1 187 000 km² with a population of 10.1 million, which is increasing quickly (3.3% per annum). About 85% of the population lives in a narrow 100-150 km-wide strip along the 1 500 km Nigerian border, causing great pressure on the narrow natural resource base of the country.

2. Economic settings. The economy of Niger is dominated by agriculture (39% of the gross domestic product (GDP)) and services (43%). Uranium represents 50% of export earnings. Overall performance of the economy is very poor. Annual per capita GDP is estimated at USD 200, which makes Niger one of the poorest countries in the world. It is estimated that around 60% of the population of Niger survives on less than USD 1 per day. Moreover, the annual growth rate of per capita GDP has decreased sharply; the population is poorer now than in 1967, before the uranium boom. Political instability, weak macroeconomic management, a drop in uranium revenues, drought and changes in Nigeria’s economic situation are the main causes of these negative trends. These also include the rise of inequality and poverty due to cuts in health, education, agriculture and infrastructure programmes. The performance of the economic reforms is also regarded as mixed, given the weakness of economic growth and aggravation of poverty. In the short and medium-term, Niger will continue to depend on the full resumption of foreign aid contributions. The improvement of

1 See Appendix I for additional information.
living conditions in Niger will rely mainly on the evolution of the regional situation, i.e. sustained
growth in Nigeria and growth in the West African Economic and Monetary Union (UEMOA) coastal
countries.

3. **Public debt management.** The average annual net official development assistance to Niger
decreased sharply, from USD 52 per capita in 1990 to USD 28 in 1996. The very heavy burden of
external debt (two thirds of it is multilateral) compared to the limited per capita GDP, places Niger in
the group of countries eligible for the Heavily-Indebted Poor Countries Debt Initiative (HIPC DI).
Although the country suffers under high budgetary and financial constraints, it has since 1997 been
rather committed to paying its arrears, especially to IFAD. In this context, Niger will continue to
require foreign aid in the short and medium-term, since public investment relies almost completely on
aid assistance. It is very likely that most of the donors will resume their assistance following the
reactivation of the democratic process initiated by the October 1999 presidential elections.

4. **The rural economy.** Contribution of the agricultural sector to GDP is estimated at 39% and
contribution to exports at 25%. Agricultural GDP increased by 3% from 1987 to 1996, with very high
annual fluctuations depending on the rainfall. Agricultural production growth is, however, slightly
inferior to population growth, including cereal production. Still, there are structural factors
constraining agricultural investment and development. These include: (a) degradation of natural
resources due to high vulnerability to drought, poor soil fertility, inadequate natural resource
management (NRM) practices (over-grazing, decline of fallow practices, etc.), and inconsistent land
 tenure; (b) insufficiently productive agroforestry, farming and livestock systems; (c) failure of large-
scale irrigation systems and insufficient development of small-scale irrigation, despite the high
potential for irrigation; and (d) poor agricultural services, including rural finance. The efforts of Niger
to define a clear rural development strategy also need to be consolidated.

5. The main economic opportunities in the agricultural sector consist of meeting both food
security and the demand of urban and regional markets. The majority of smallholders will continue to
give priority to rainfed food crops (millet, sorghum and cowpea). As a result, there is a need to
concentrate on developing research activities pertaining to these orphan crops and improving the
access of the smallholder to agricultural inputs and equipment, mainly by providing financial services.
In addition, agricultural activities need to be promoted for which Niger has a valuable comparative
advantage (vegetables, legumes and livestock). Other economic opportunities include development of
small-scale trade activities within the scope of selected agricultural commodity chains or village
business, principally for women.

6. **Programme-related sectoral services and institutions.** No formal rural agricultural banks in
Niger exist as three of them closed in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The two chief existing
commercial banks (Sonibank and the International Bank for Africa in Niger (BIA)) show no interest
in managing rural credit programmes at their own risk, considering it expensive and risky. To meet
this need, about 50 local credit operations initiated by projects or non-governmental organizations
(NGOs) were developed. Almost all of them still depend upon the financing of donors and NGOs,
including lines of credit. Microfinance development is clearly regarded as one of the main instruments
under the national programme of economic reforms to increase job opportunities and to further
vitalize the rural sector. A legal framework for the sector was established at the regional level under
the auspices of the UEMOA in 1993 to regulate mutualist and cooperative microfinance activities. As
a result, the PARMEC (Support Project to Regulate Mutualist Institutions) law was approved in 1996,
and a specific unit (Cellule de suivi et de contrôle (CSC) des systèmes financiers décentralisés (SFD))
was created under the Ministry of Finance (MINFI) to follow up on the application of the law. Non-
mutualist microfinance activities fall within the scope of the Convention-cadre, a specific legislation
whereby such systems are allowed to extend savings and credit activities. Thus far, the CSC-SFD has
not effectively piloted the establishment and control of microfinance institutions (MFIs). Another unit
for monitoring and promotion of rural credit (Cellule de suivi et de promotion du crédit rural), has
been set up under the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAGEL). Recently, the Professional Association of MFIs (APSFD) was created at the national level in order to contribute to the policy dialogue with other stakeholders (users, banks, the Government and donors), and to develop central services for member MFIs.

7. **Microfinance activities by other major donors.** Many donors actually support microfinance initiatives. On the supply side, the French (including the *Agence française de développement* (AFD)), the German, the Canadian and the Danish cooperation agencies (as well as the European Union), support the setting-up of professional microfinance schemes. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) also supported two schemes before pulling out in 1996. On the demand side, multilateral donors such as the World Bank and the African Development Bank (AfDB) are currently interested in extending existing microfinance networks to cover the needs of their ongoing projects. IFAD thoroughly consulted with the major interested microfinance donors during programme development. As a result, cofinancing arrangements will likely be concluded with two of them (the World Bank and AFD).

**B. Lessons Learned from Previous IFAD Experience**

8. Total IFAD assistance to Niger comprises the following: (a) the IFAD-cofinanced Second Maradi Rural Development Project; (b) the ongoing Aguié Rural Development Project; (c) the Special Country Programme (PSN), Phase I (which also comprised assistance for the return and socio-economic reintegration of displaced nomads); and (d) the ongoing PSN - Phase II. All four projects focus on integrated rural development, including natural resources management and provision of credit. Total IFAD loans amount to USD 57.0 million. Recently, an NGO/extended cooperation programme (ECP) grant was approved for the NGO *Association de développement des activités rurales* (ADAR), to carry out artisanal development activities in the area adjacent to the National Park of the W of the Niger River. IFAD is also assisting Niger in the process of designing the national action plan to combat desertification within the scope of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (CCD), under Italian supplementary fund financing.

9. After more than two years of IFAD portfolio suspension due to non-payment of arrears, IFAD’s assistance resumed in 1997 following the agreement between the Government and IFAD on a settlement of arrears. Consequently, IFAD’s portfolio was reactivated and a strategy for IFAD intervention was designed. The findings of IFAD’s evaluation and review exercises showed that IFAD operations were affected chiefly by the limited institutional and weak management capacities at both the project and ministry levels, and the political and security situation in the northern areas. Many lessons were learned. Activities such as the rehabilitation of degraded land, transhumance corridors, small-scale irrigation in the Komadougou valley and a provision of credit in the same zone proved to be successful. The performance of project-provided, rural finance services and small-scale irrigation in the Tillabery area was weak.

10. As far as the provision of rural financial services is concerned, the experience of IFAD-financed operations to 1997 consisted mainly of credit provided by the projects for agricultural production purposes (input purchase and equipment). The experience had mixed results in the dry areas; it was successful in the Komadougou-irrigated area only because market opportunities existed (for red pepper). The main shortcomings pertained to the insufficient professional capacity both at project and bank levels, which resulted in high transaction costs and insufficient monitoring and follow-up. As a consequence, credit systems for both projects were streamlined in 1997 with the downsizing of the project and bank units, and the transfer of credit activities to microfinance-specialized schemes.
11. IFAD’s experience in rural finance is shared by other donors actively involved in the microfinance sector, such as the French Cooperation, AFD and the World Bank. The principal lessons include:

- building-up sustainable and professional systems through specialized institutions. This entails that a clear separation be established between credit/savings activities and other agricultural and rural development operations; efforts should be made over the long-term to develop upstream services such as training, financial control, auditing, etc.; and

- responding to the needs of the target group both in quantitative (i.e. percentage of the population with access to financial services and the total amount of lending and savings operations) and qualitative terms (i.e. delivery of diversified services such as savings, microcredit and short and medium-term loans).

C. IFAD’s Strategy for Collaboration with Niger

12. Rural poverty in Niger. In 1996, two thirds of the Nigerien population qualified as poor (USD 81 per capita in rural areas), and more than a third as extremely poor (USD 55). Eighty-three per cent of the poor live in rural areas. From 1980 to 1997, GDP per capita dropped by 74% in real terms. Food security, both at national and household levels, can only be achieved exceptionally in years with good rainfall. Difficulty in accessing arable land was identified as the main factor leading to poverty. Poverty is strongly associated with large family size, lack of education, farmers owning little or no livestock, and diets deficient in protein, vegetables and dairy products. The social status of women and their limited access to land, credit and knowledge accounts for the significant incidence of poverty among them. Looking beyond income indicators, the social indicators are hardly any better: 318‰ child mortality, 32% primary health coverage, 47 year life expectancy, 86% illiteracy (with a strong disparity between men and women), and 29% primary school attendance.

13. National strategy for rural poverty eradication. Various programmes to combat poverty have been implemented intermittently with limited impact. In response, a new anti-poverty plan (PCLCP) was designed to seek a better balance between sound economic management and sustainable human development. Promotion of agropastoral and rural finance activities for the poor is at the heart of the PCLCP. The same is true of the social sectors. Political options towards democracy, people’s participation and the pursuit of the decentralization process come together in the establishment of the new institutional environment. These developments have not yet been elaborated given recent political developments.

14. Poverty alleviation activities of other major donors. Major bilateral and multilateral donors operating in the fight against poverty are the European Union (EU), Denmark, France (50% of total bilateral aid), Germany, The Netherlands, the World Bank and AfDB. Most of these donors, however, recently ceased their support due to the prevailing political and/or financial situation in Niger. The EU finances several irrigation projects and a development project for the pastoral zone. It also funds food aid and food-security programmes, information systems on prevention of food crisis, pest-control programmes, and supports marketing activities. The World Bank has only two ongoing projects, the NRM Project and the Private Irrigation Promotion Project. French Coopération finances institutional support to MAGEL and offers technical assistance. The AFD funds microfinance schemes and NRM activities. German cooperation concentrates chiefly on NRM and the development of a microfinance scheme.

15. IFAD’s strategy. The strategy has two phases. The first phase (1999-2001) aims at consolidating the ongoing IFAD-financed operations and improving access of the poor to financial services. Provided that the political, social and economic situation improves, and that the debt burden is reduced to sustainable levels, then the second phase (2001-2003) will be implemented. The strategy
for this phase will focus on: (a) securing productive potential through better NRM; (b) promoting microenterprise development, including small-scale irrigation, livestock and off-farm activities; (c) implementing a negotiated approach to development that involves grass-roots organizations; and (d) improving access to basic social services.

16. **Programme rationale.** Development of rural finance services was identified as an effective leverage for IFAD’s target group to seize existing economic opportunities. These consist of producing to meet food security and the demand of urban and regional markets. Agricultural activities for which Niger has a valuable comparative advantage at the regional level are vegetables, legumes, oil seeds and livestock. Small-scale irrigation and farm-based livestock are the principal areas for investment. Other opportunities include trade-related activities within the scope of agricultural commodity chains (filières), or small-scale village businesses, chiefly for women. On the supply side, financial services are available for only 3 to 4% of the active population, two thirds of whom are women. The country’s limited resource base and institutional capacities generally hinder the development of financial systems, as does a very low population density, which results in high transaction costs. Moreover, existing MFIs show other signs of weakness. These include: (a) limited response to the users’ needs; (b) high atomization and insufficient structuring that prevent long-term sustainability and increase risks both for the schemes (arrears) and the users (indebtedness); (c) limited professional capacity; (d) short-term vision due to links with projects that have a short duration; and (e) absence of refinancing mechanisms from the formal banking sector.

17. In order to address these constraints, the programme will support the microfinance sector as a whole over ten years. It will create an enabling environment, including the policy and regulatory framework, restructure the existing microfinance schemes and further develop their capacities and expand their networks. Moreover, it will promote innovative microfinance technologies through an adequate research and development (R&D) approach. The programme is also designed in a flexible way to adapt to Niger’s evolving needs, and to the specific requirements of the main donors concerned with the microfinance sector.

**PART II - THE PROGRAMME**

**A. Programme Area and Target Group**

18. Since the programme will have a national scope, the target group will therefore comprise the whole of Niger’s active rural population (i.e. about 4 million people), of which only 3 to 4% currently have access to financial services, two thirds of the users being women. Special priority will be given to operations that target vulnerable groups and areas. The programme will reach the target group directly (mainly through training activities) or indirectly by enhancing the MFIs’ capacity to supply rural financial services that meet the needs of the poor, and the setting-up of an enabling environment for microfinance development. The programme will also complement IFAD’s interventions in Niger since the MFIs operating in both the Aguié Rural Development Project and the PSN – Phase II will be partners of the programme, especially for R&D activities to be implemented in IFAD project areas or within other projects (e.g. the World Bank-financed NRM or Private Irrigation Promotion Projects). The target groups of these projects will also benefit from an expanded MFI outreach.

**B. Objectives and Scope**

19. The overall objective of the programme is to improve the income and living conditions of the rural population. Its specific objective is to improve and make durable the access of the rural population, including the poor, to financial services (savings, credit, etc.) by establishing viable MFIs. It is anticipated that the share of the rural active population with access to financial services will
increase from 3-4% to an ambitious 20-25% by the programme’s end. To meet this objective, the programme will develop along the following lines:\(^2\)

- strengthening the microfinance sector as a whole through enhanced partnership in sector management between the various stakeholders (rural organizations, APSFD, MFIs, MINFI, MAGEL, bank associations and donors); elaboration of a consistent and evolutionary microfinance policy and strategy; establishment of effective control instruments at the national level; the emergence of APSFD and the creation of a technical centre (TC) to provide effective services to MFIs and to implement R&D activities;

- restructuring and strengthening MFIs (institutionally, technically and financially) and expanding their networks, with a special focus on innovations targeting vulnerable groups/areas and the empowerment of grass-roots organizations, chiefly through training; and

- fostering the development of new approaches and financial products that specifically target the needs of the rural poor and agricultural development through R&D activities.

20. It is proposed that IFAD’s commitment last ten years along the Flexible Lending Mechanism (FLM) instrument. The programme will be organized in three cycles, the first covering four years, followed by two three-year cycles. When IFAD’s contribution covers the programme’s core activities, other cofinanciers will join, either during the first cycle or at later stages, taking advantage of the dynamic created in the sector and of the instruments and procedures set up by the programme. The long-term scope of the programme will allow for effective institutional development – MFIs, national level control and regulatory institutions – and for adaptation to the evolving needs of the sector. Indeed, the first cycle will focus principally on consolidating the entire sector (MFIs and national level institutions) and undertaking R&D activities. This will lead during the following two cycles to expanding steadily the networks of MFIs and developing innovative microfinance technologies that match the needs of vulnerable groups. The final cycle will aim at the completion of the sector structure and creating its long-term sustainability.

C. Components

21. The programme has four components: (a) enhancing sectoral and professional capabilities; (b) consolidation and development of professional MFIs; (c) R&D; and (d) programme management.

22. **Enhancing sectoral and professional capabilities.** The programme will: (a) promote a constructive policy dialogue among public institutions (the Government and the Central Bank of West African States (BCEAO)), the MFIs and APSFD (currently being created), the rural organizations and the donors, both at the national and UEMOA levels; (b) support the present dynamic towards the creation and effectiveness of APSFD; and (c) support both the Government’s and MFIs’ implementation of appropriate legal and regulatory standards. The programme will also support the unit within MINFI that controls and monitors the MFIs; the MAGEL office charged with the follow-up and promotion of rural financial services; and the APSFD. It will build a TC, staffed with national professionals and supported by long-term technical assistance, to deal with sector animation, training, support to MFIs and other partners, and R&D. Housed by the programme management unit (PMU) during the first cycle, some TC activities will be transferred to APSFD in the second cycle.

---

\(^2\) Articulation between programme goal, specific objective and outputs is presented in the Logframe in Appendix III.
23. **Consolidation and development of professional microfinance institutions (MFIs).** This component aims, in the first instance, at restructuring and strengthening MFIs, and subsequently, at developing and expanding their networks. It will especially focus on innovations targeting vulnerable groups and areas. The MFIs will be supported in order for them to design and implement relevant strategy and business plans, streamline their internal organization, develop their human resources and comply, progressively, with existing legal and regulatory provisions. Expanding MFI outreach, particularly in addressing the needs of the poor, will be achieved by developing new markets (building upon R&D outputs), training of grass-roots users and MFI staff, and enhancing MFI management capacity. The programme will also emphasize the development of informal innovative microfinance schemes at the grass-roots level.

24. **Support will include training, short-term or longer-term technical assistance and studies, and the provision of equipment and management tools. Partial funding (decreasing over time) will also be considered for operating costs incurred for innovations regarding vulnerable groups or areas. Support will also be provided to a limited number of MFIs that are able to provide refinancing services for other MFIs.**

25. **Research and development (R&D).** A resolutely pro-active attitude from the programme is thus required as experience shows that MFIs, especially when assigned sustainability objectives, tend to concentrate their limited resources on the lowest risk social clusters: the poorest and the vulnerable areas are thus excluded (*de facto*). In the first cycle, two themes will be explored: (a) promotion of microfinance technologies that match the needs of vulnerable groups; and (b) development of financing instruments, including microfinance, to address the requirements of agriculture and livestock activities. Two major crosscutting issues, savings and refinancing, will also be examined. To this end, the programme will support the design and field testing of innovative methodologies and financial products, and finance field-impact assessment networks and scientific back-up, based on a long-term partnership with a university or a research institute working on the same lines. Eventually, the programme will provide for the dissemination of R&D outputs, principally through training and supporting emerging MFIs.

26. **Programme management.** The programme will fund the investment and recurrent costs of the small-scale PMU.

27. **Programme phasing.** The first four-year cycle will focus mainly (though not only) on the following: restructuring the microfinance sector through the animation of an effective policy dialogue at the sector level; implementation of adequate legal and regulatory rules, consolidation of existing MFIs; creation and structuring of the APSFD; training at the grass-roots level; and creation and/or strengthening of impact-assessment networks and a first set of tests under the two R&D themes. In the second cycle, the programme will emphasize the expansion of MFI outreach, in particular towards the poor, in terms of lending and savings capacity, product lines and area coverage. As a result, MFIs will be better appropriated by grass-roots organizations. The APSFD will be able to play an active role in providing member MFIs with specific services and in self-regulating the sector. Depending on R&D results, new methodologies and systems can be developed on a larger scale, which target the needs of the poor and match some of the agricultural development financing requirements. Moreover, mechanisms to link MFIs with the banking sector will be explored. In the third cycle, the coverage of the rural areas will continue to increase, including possible progressive intervention in all the stages of production chains and the coverage of northern areas of the country. At that time, it is foreseen that the representatives of rural organizations will intensively participate in the MFIs’ network management and policy dialogue. Refinancing mechanisms will be finalized. More complex financial services will be made accessible, such as mutualism between MFIs, insurance and common funds, etc. The financial sustainability of the principal institutions active in the sector will be secured.
D. Costs and Financing

28. The programme is designed as a long-lasting, flexible national intervention that allows for effective partnership and complements other donors. It is configured in such a way as to be successfully implemented on a reduced size, with IFAD funding only, throughout its ten-year duration. However, other donors could join in at various implementation stages. For the first cycle, cofinancing arrangements are currently being discussed with AFD and the World Bank to fund activities that complement IFAD-funded operations, such as further expanding some MFI networks and additional R&D testing. AFD and World Bank financing will also contribute to building strategic partnerships in the microfinance sector and accelerate policy dialogue among the stakeholders.

29. The cost of the programme by component is presented in Table 1.

30. The programme will be financed by an IFAD loan of USD 11.79 million, which represents 43% of total costs. Other cofinancers will contribute USD 11.75 million, or 43% of total costs. The Government will contribute USD 3.10 million (11%), including duties, taxes and salaries for MINFI and MAGEL control and for monitoring units’ civil servants. The contribution of beneficiary MFIs and other partners (research institutions, etc.) is estimated at USD 0.66 million (2%). The cost of the first cycle is estimated at USD 12.53 million, of which IFAD will finance USD 4.30 million and the other financiers USD 6.38 million. The World Bank envisages mobilizing cofinancing within its coming activities, or from resources already available for its ongoing portfolio. The French Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MAEF) is interested in the cofinancing of the first cycle’s long term technical assistance for an estimated amount of around USD 0.7 million. AFD’s interest in cofinancing the programme was also confirmed. First cycle cofinancing arrangements with the MAEF, AFD, the World Bank and other donors will be finalized at programme start-up. For the second cycle, programme costs are estimated at USD 7.33 million, with IFAD and other donors to be identified in the course of the programme implementation financing. These are, respectively, USD 3.68 million and USD 2.70 million. For the third cycle, the programme costs are estimated at USD 7.44 million. IFAD and the other donors will finance USD 3.81 million and USD 2.67 million, respectively. The financing plan is presented in Table 2.
### TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF PROGRAMME COSTS\(^a\)  
(USD '000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Foreign</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Foreign Exchange</th>
<th>% of Base Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing sectoral and professional capabilities</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>4,462</td>
<td>7,671</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation and development of professional MFIs</td>
<td>9,178</td>
<td>9,206</td>
<td>18,384</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>4,068</td>
<td>4,362</td>
<td>8,430</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme management</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>2,793</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total base costs</strong></td>
<td>17,792</td>
<td>4,904</td>
<td>22,695</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical contingencies</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>2,224</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price contingencies</td>
<td>2,111</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total programme costs</strong></td>
<td>21,636</td>
<td>5,657</td>
<td>27,293</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Discrepancies in totals are due to rounding.

### TABLE 2: FINANCING PLAN\(^a\)  
(USD '000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Government Amount</th>
<th>Government %</th>
<th>IFAD Amount</th>
<th>IFAD %</th>
<th>Cofinancing (Cycle 1) Amount</th>
<th>Cofinancing (Cycle 1) %</th>
<th>Cofinancing (Cycles 2 and 3) Amount</th>
<th>Cofinancing (Cycles 2 and 3) %</th>
<th>Beneficiaries and Others Amount</th>
<th>Beneficiaries and Others %</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Foreign Amount</th>
<th>Foreign %</th>
<th>Local (Excl. taxes) Amount</th>
<th>Local (Excl. taxes) %</th>
<th>Taxes and Duties Amount</th>
<th>Taxes and Duties %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing sectoral and professional capabilities</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,723</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,219</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3,572</td>
<td>496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation and development of professional MFIs</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,492</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3,331</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,904</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9,651</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,038</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,327</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,139</td>
<td>848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme management</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total disbursement</strong></td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11,789</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6,385</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5,363</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27,293</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5,657</td>
<td>18,838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Discrepancies in totals are due to rounding.
E. Procurement, Disbursement, Accounts and Audit

31. **Procurement.** Vehicles and equipment will be procured under international competitive bidding procedures for amounts over USD 50 000. For amounts under USD 50 000, but more than USD 10 000, the local competitive bidding procedure will be applied. For amounts under USD 10 000, the local shopping procedure will be applied. Hiring long or short-term international technical assistance and national staff will be done using procedures acceptable to IFAD. Contracts with operators/executing agencies will be designed along contracting procedures defined below, in order to provide transparency and competitiveness.

32. **Disbursement.** The IFAD loan will be disbursed over a period of ten years. The withdrawal of funds from the loan account for vehicles and equipment, international technical assistance, financial instruments (for selected MFIs to provide refinancing to other schemes), and audit and evaluation exercises will be fully documented. Expenditure for operating costs, local training, salaries and fees will be made against certified Statements of Expenditure (SOE). Supporting documents related to SOEs will be maintained by the PMU and operators for periodic review by supervision missions and audits. A special account will be opened and maintained by the PMU in a commercial bank acceptable to the Fund to finance IFAD’s share of eligible expenditures. The authorized allocation will be USD 600 000.

33. The Government’s contribution is estimated at USD 3.10 million over ten years, from which USD 1.48 million will be utilized in the first cycle. The Government will exempt from taxes all imported goods and services purchased from the proceeds of the IFAD loan; it will contribute to paying the salaries of civil servants assigned to MINFI and to MAGEL’s monitoring and control units. During the first cycle, the Government will deposit an amount in CFA francs equivalent to USD 40 000 per year to compensate for local taxes on operating costs financed under IFAD loan.

34. **Accounts and audit.** The PMU and the operators will maintain accounts in accordance with internationally accepted standards. Procedure manuals will be developed and implemented beginning the first year of the programme. The PMU will compile quarterly financial reports received from every operator in order to prepare a comprehensive quarterly report to be submitted to the Government, IFAD and the other financiers. All programme-related accounts will be audited on an annual basis and follow terms of reference acceptable to IFAD. The audit report will be made available to IFAD, not later than six months after the close of the fiscal year. It will provide a separate opinion on SOEs and the special account. Moreover, MFI-specific audit exercises will be carried out as part of long-term contracts to be negotiated with concerned MFIs.

F. Organization and Management

35. The programme’s institutional set-up will include the following units: the steering committee (SC), the PMU, the APSFD and the TC.³

36. The SC will include representatives of the following institutions: MINFI and MAGEL (acting as co-Chairs), the Ministry of Planning, the Central Bank, the APSFD and not less than four representatives of the MFIs’ client and rural organizations. The donors and the banks’ professional association will also be represented. The SC will approve the annual work programme and budget, as well as contracts to be negotiated. It will participate actively in the intercycle review exercises and in the evolution of programme strategy.

³ See organigrammes for cycle 1 and cycles 2 and 3, respectively, in Appendix VI. Detailed organization and management previsions may be found in Appendix IV.
37. The TC will be in charge of the technical dimension and implementation of programme activities and instruments (design and monitoring and evaluation (M&E)), while the PMU will be charged with administrative and financial execution and control tasks. Under specific conditions, the TC could be incorporated into the APSFD from the beginning of the second cycle. The option of transferring substantial management responsibilities to the APSFD will be considered at the end of the first and/or second cycles.

38. Programme management unit (PMU). A small-scale PMU will deal with financial management, administrative and financial implementation of contractual arrangements with MFIs or any other partner institution, and the programme’s central accounting and financial management, including audit.

39. Contractual arrangements. Programme activities will be implemented through three types of partnership agreements. Institutional support to MINFI, MAGEL and APSFD will be channelled through contracts for the duration of each cycle. Comprehensive support to selected, promising MFIs will be implemented in three-year contracts (contrats-plans (CPs)), to be negotiated with concerned MFIs. Short-term support to MFIs on a case-by-case basis will be administered through short-term contracts (appuis hors contrat-plan). R&D activities will also be executed through contracts using similar procedures with a more flexible duration.

40. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E). The M&E unit, to be established within the TC, will play a critical role in providing decision-makers and stakeholders with adequate information. It will carry out four types of activities: monitoring of activities and outputs; assessment of the impact on target groups; and, at the institutional level, follow-up on the effectiveness of instruments and procedures.

41. Intercycle transition review. The TC will be charged with the preparation of supporting documents and fostering a participatory review process at the local level. The external review team will then be mandated by IFAD and the other cofinanciers to review programme achievements, verify compliance with transition criteria, amend proposals elaborated at the local level and finalize the design of the following cycle of the programme. In consultation with the other partners, IFAD may also decide to interrupt the programme.4

42. The triggers for commencing with the second cycle include, inter alia:

- policy: (a) microfinance policy (lettre de politique) is established and implemented with the participation of all stakeholders; (b) control of the MINFI unit over MFIs involved in the programme is effective; and (c) self-regulation by APSFD is operational;

- MFI development: (a) at least two three-year CPs are concluded with promising MFIs; and (b) MFIs under CP comply with the prevailing policy, legal and regulatory framework;

- R&D: (a) microfinance technologies targeting the poor and matching agricultural development financing needs are tested and validated; and (b) an impact assessment network is established; and

- management: (a) operation manuals are ready; and (b) appropriate funding and contractual mechanisms are implemented.

43. Triggers for commencing the third cycle were also identified.5 It will be revised during the review exercise at the end of the first cycle.

---

4 Indicators to be measured at the end of cycles 1 and 2 are shown in Appendix V.
5 See Appendix V.
G. Economic Justification

44. The programme will focus on institutional reforms, capacity-building at the national, MFI and grass-roots levels, and the development of financial services to seize existing and new economic opportunities. Hence, a classical cost-benefit analysis was not feasible. However, expected benefits for the rural population can be identified qualitatively. They include: (a) increased opportunities for income-generating activities (agricultural and livestock activities, small-scale irrigation, trade-related activities and small-scale village business), due to improved access to financial services; (b) improved value-added distribution for the poor (through specific financial instruments such as storage-adapted microfinance products, credit for processing and marketing, and consumption loans); and (c) strengthened and financially viable microfinance schemes.

45. **Gender impact.** Women currently represent two thirds of the small portion of the population that has access to microfinance services. Their share in terms of lending amount is much less. The programme will substantially increase both the number of women having access to microfinance services through the expansion of MFI networks and the economic opportunities for rural women (trade-related activities, small-scale village business, savings, etc.). Moreover, specific microfinance methodologies targeting women will be developed through the R&D component.

46. **Sustainability.** By setting up an enabling institutional and policy environment and restructuring the microfinance sector, the programme will ensure the sustainability of the institutional framework in the long run. Sustainability is further enhanced by: (a) the programme’s emphasis on the financial viability of MFI networks and on the social viability (ownership) at the grass-roots level; and (b) specific refinancing arrangements under the second phase to link-up with the formal financial system.

H. Risks

47. In order to mitigate the risk that microfinance services chiefly benefit richer social clusters, the programme emphasizes the development of pro-poor technologies through R&D activities, and provides greater support to poor-friendly MFIs. Another risk is the continued inadequate interventions from projects or institutions that supply financial services without complying with existing rules or best practices, and whose perspective of long-term sustainability is limited. This risk was already identified, and measures to mitigate it are currently being implemented through the promotion of an effective policy dialogue among stakeholders, including donors. Strengthening APSFD as a self-regulatory body and supporting the MINFI’s monitoring and control unit will also contribute to limiting the risk.

I. Environmental Impact

48. The scope of individual economic activities is limited and, *a priori*, will have no negative impact on the environment. Nonetheless, contractual agreements with MFIs will include: (a) provisions for the assessment of potential environmental hazards; and (b) a section whereby activities with any substantial negative impact on environment will not be financed by them.

J. Innovative Features

49. The programme is innovative in a number of ways. It is designed as a sector-wide operation based on partnership arrangements between the state, microfinance professionals and beneficiaries and donors. Programme activities will be implemented through negotiated contractual arrangements, in order to promote ownership by local stakeholders. They will increasingly assume management responsibilities as the programme proceeds. In addition, R&D activities, a major component, consist in developing innovative microfinance technologies that suit the needs of the poor and the financing requirements of agricultural production.
PART III - LEGAL INSTRUMENTS AND AUTHORITY

50. A loan agreement between the Republic of Niger and IFAD constitutes the legal instrument for extending the proposed loan to the borrower. A summary of the important supplementary assurances included in the negotiated loan agreement is attached as an annex.

51. The Republic of Niger is empowered under its laws to borrow from IFAD.

52. I am satisfied that the proposed loan will comply with the Agreement Establishing IFAD.

PART IV - RECOMMENDATION

53. I recommend that the Executive Board approve the proposed loan in terms of the following resolution:

RESOLVED: that the Fund shall make a loan to the Republic of Niger in various currencies in an amount equivalent to eight million eight hundred thousand Special Drawing Rights (SDR 8 800 000) to mature on and prior to 15 January 2040 and to bear a service charge of three fourths of one per cent (0.75%) per annum, and to be upon such terms and conditions as shall be substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions presented to the Executive Board in this Report and Recommendation of the President.

Fawzi H. Al-Sultan
President
1. For the purpose of implementing the programme, the Government of the Republic of Niger (the Government) shall make the proceeds of the loan available to the lead programme agency as called for in the annual work programmes and budgets (AWPBs) and in accordance with customary national procedures for development assistance.

2. The Government shall, during the course of programme implementation, provide the lead programme agency with counterpart funds equivalent to USD 3,100,000. During the first phase of the programme the Government shall, on a yearly basis, deposit counterpart funds into the Programme Account, net of all taxes, dues and customs duties on imported goods and staff costs, for a total amount in CFA Francs equivalent to USD 40,000. During the successive phases of the programme, the Government shall replenish the Programme Account on a yearly basis by depositing into it in advance the counterpart funds called for in the AWPB for the relevant programme year. The counterpart funds shall be registered under the Public Investment Programme.

3. The Government shall make the proceeds of the loan and grants available to the lead programme agency as called for in the AWPBs.

4. The programme will be divided into three distinct phases, consistent with the objectives of the Flexible Lending Mechanism. Progression from one phase to the next will be subject to satisfaction of a number of triggers. During the course of the fourth year of the programme, a joint review by the Government, representatives of the beneficiaries and IFAD will assess the achievements of the programme and submit recommendations for proceeding to the second phase or for closing the programme. The joint review will be expected to submit recommendations with regard to the suspension, or otherwise, of the programme or to proceed to the successive phase, and with regard to any possible modification in the programme. The joint review will also define the major activities and thrusts of the programme; draw up a list, and define the contents, of three-year contracts required for the next phase of the programme; reach agreement on the objectives and types of support eligible under the programme, with a view to selecting activities to be executed under short-term contracts; and, for this purpose, earmark funds under annual budgets for the duration of the relevant phase. The final decision on whether or not to proceed from the first to the second phase will rest with IFAD.

5. From Phase I to Phase II: the triggers for proceeding from the first to the second phase of the programme will be as follows:

   (a) Component for enhancing sectoral and professional capabilities:
       (i) a microfinance policy will have been established and implemented with the participation of all stakeholders;
       (ii) MFIs involved in the programme will have been supervised in an effective and constructive manner;
       (iii) the APSFD is effective and assures self-regulation of the profession; and
       (iv) proposals for improving the prevailing regulatory framework in terms of the programme’s strategy will have been drawn up by local stakeholders.

   (b) Component for the consolidation and development of professional microfinance institutions:
       (i) two contracts will have been concluded with MFIs;
(ii) the selected MFIs will have responded satisfactorily to assessments of their activities; have drawn up a development plan; and have strengthened their internal structures; and

(iii) information will have been made available on methodologies and products for providing rural financial services to the target group.

(c) Component for research and development:
   (i) microfinance technologies and products corresponding both to the needs of the target group and to the requirements of agricultural development financing will have been tested and validated;
   (ii) a functional impact assessment network will have been set up; and
   (iii) the selected MFIs will have effectively participated in research and development activities.

(d) Component for programme management:
   (i) the operations manuals will have been prepared;
   (ii) appropriate funding mechanisms will have been implemented;
   (iii) the disbursement of funds will have complied with the strategy of the programme;
   (iv) the contracts will have been implemented effectively; and
   (v) the M&E unit is operational.

6. From Phase II to Phase III: the triggers for proceeding from the second to the third phase will be as follows, subject to any modification introduced at the end of the first phase:

   (a) Component for enhancing sectoral and professional capabilities:
      (i) the microfinance policy will have been implemented with the participation of all stakeholders;
      (ii) at least 75% of all MFIs in the programme area will have been supervised in an effective and constructive manner;
      (iii) the APSFD will have assured self-regulation of the profession, provided services to MFI members and represented the profession in any dealings with UEMOA; and
      (iv) proposals for improving the prevailing regulatory framework in terms of the programme’s strategy will have been drawn up by local stakeholders.

   (b) Component for the consolidation and development of professional microfinance institutions:
      (i) two other contracts will have been concluded with MFIs;
      (ii) at least two thirds of all local MFIs will have responded satisfactorily to assessments of their activities;
      (iii) the MFI network will have increased its clientele and geographic coverage, giving priority to the most vulnerable groups and areas; and
      (iv) information on methodologies and products tested under the research and development component will have been made available.

   (c) Component for research and development:
      (i) microfinance technologies and products will have been tested and validated and will have responded both to the needs of the target group and to the requirements of agricultural development financing;
      (ii) the impact assessment network will be functional; and
      (iii) the selected MFIs will be effectively participating in the testing and validation of research and development activities.
(d) Component for programme management:
   (i) funding mechanisms are functional;
   (ii) the disbursements of funds will comply with the strategy of the programme;
   (iii) the contracts will be implemented effectively; and
   (iv) the M&E unit is operational.

7. The programme will have no direct impact on the environment. Nonetheless, the MFIs will support the Government’s rural development policies and practices that accord prime importance to the preservation and reconstitution of the environment by local populations.

8. As part of maintaining sound environmental practices as required by the General Conditions, the Government shall maintain appropriate pest management practices under the programme. To that end, the Government shall ensure that pesticides procured under the programme do not include any pesticide either proscribed by the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, as amended from time to time, or listed in Tables 1 (Extremely Hazardous) and 2 (Highly Hazardous) of the World Health Organization’s Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard and Classification 1996-97, as amended from time to time.

9. The Government shall be responsible for the payment of value-added tax and all taxes and duties on imported goods and services procured under the project, as well as for registration charges by settling such charges directly with the suppliers by means of a cheque drawn on the Treasury.

10. The Government shall insure all programme personnel against health and accident risks, in accordance with current national laws pertaining to working conditions.

11. All things being equal, the Government undertakes to give priority to women candidates for appointments to vacant positions under the programme.

12. The following are specified as conditions precedent to disbursement of the proceeds of the loan:
   
   (a) no withdrawals may be effected from the loan account until such time as an operations manual has been prepared and approved by IFAD for the financial management of the programme, for the management of contracts and short-term support and for pluri-annual agreements; and until such time as a Programme Account shall have been opened and the yearly amount of counterpart funds shall have been deposited therein;
   
   (b) no withdrawals may be effected in respect of expenses for Phase II of the programme until such time as the triggers for proceeding from Phase I to Phase II are satisfied;
   
   (c) no withdrawals may be effected in respect of expenses for Phase III of the programme until such time as the triggers for proceeding from Phase II to Phase III are satisfied.

13. The following are specified as additional conditions precedent to the effectiveness of the loan:
   
   (a) the PMU and the steering committee will have been constituted by decree of the Minister of Finance;
   
   (b) the programme will have been registered in the National Budget;
(c) the staff of the PMU and of the TC will have been recruited in accordance with selection procedures open to members of the public and private sectors, and their nomination will have been approved by IFAD;

(d) a letter of intent will have been received from the Government expressing its willingness to: (i) strengthen the sector; (ii) support the creation and development of a professional microfinance sector by means of a partnership arrangement; (iii) apply the existing legal and regulatory framework while contributing actively to its development and improvement; and (iv) establish a concertation framework with a view to bringing together all credit operations, ongoing or future, undertaken by the project or NGOs within a professional system; and

(e) a favourable legal opinion, issued by a competent legal authority within the Republic of Niger and acceptable in both and substance, shall have been delivered by the Government to IFAD.
## COUNTRY DATA

### NIGER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land area (km² thousand) 1996 1/</th>
<th>1 267</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population (million) 1997 1/</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNP per capita (USD) 1997 2/</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual real rate of growth of GNP per capita, 1990-97 2/</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density (people per km²) 1996 1/</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local currency (CFA Franc BCEAO (XOF))</td>
<td><strong>ADD RATE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual rate of inflation, 1990-97 2/</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange rate: USD 1 =</td>
<td>XOF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Indicators

| Population (average annual population growth rate) 1980-97 1/ | 3.3   |
| Crude birth rate (per thousand people) 1997 1/ | 52    |
| Crude death rate (per thousand people) 1997 1/ | 18    |
| Infant mortality rate (per thousand live births) 1997 1/ | 118   |
| Life expectancy at birth (years) 1997 1/ | 47    |
| Number of rural poor (million) (approximate) 1/ | 5.2   |
| Poor as % of total rural population 1/ | 66.0  |
| Total labour force (million) 1997 1/ | 4.6   |
| Female labour force as % of total, 1997 1/ | 44    |

### Economic Indicators

| GDP (USD million) 1997 1/ | 1 855 |
| Average annual rate of growth of GDP 1/ | -0.1  |
| Sectoral distribution of GDP, 1997 1/ | -38   |
| % agriculture | 38    |
| % industry | 18    |
| % manufacturing | 7     |
| % services | 44    |

### Education

| Primary school gross enrolment (% of relevant age group) 1996 1/ | 29    |
| Adult literacy rate (% of total population) 1995 3/ | 14    |
| Consumption, 1997 1/ | 14    |
| General government consumption (as % of GDP) | 83    |
| Private consumption (as % of GDP) | 3     |
| Gross domestic savings (as % of GDP) | 3     |

### Nutrition

| Daily calorie supply per capita, 1995 3/ | 2 135 |
| Index of daily calorie supply per capita (industrial countries=100) 1995 3/ | 68    |
| Prevalence of child malnutrition (height for age % of children under 5) 1992-97 1/ | 40    |
| Prevalence of child malnutrition (weight for age % of children under 5) 1992-97 1/ | 43    |

### Health

| Health expenditure, total (as % of GDP) 1990-97 1/ | n.a.  |
| Physicians (per thousand people) 1990-97 1/ | 0.03  |
| Percentage population without access to safe water 1990-96 3/ | 52    |
| Percentage population without access to health services 1990-95 3/ | 1     |
| Percentage population without access to sanitation 1990-96 3/ | 83    |

### Agriculture and Food

| Food imports as percentage of total merchandise imports 1997 1/ | n.a.  |
| Fertilizer consumption (hundreds of grams per ha of arable land) 1995-97 1/ | 19    |
| Food production index (1989-91=100) 1995-97 1/ | 118.4 |
| Total debt service (% of exports of goods and services) 1997 1/ | 19.5  |

### Land Use

| Arable land as % of land area, 1996 1/ | 3.9   |
| Forest area (km² thousand) 1995 1/ | 26    |
| Forest area as % of total land area, 1995 1/ | 2.0   |
| Irrigated land as % of cropland, 1994-96 1/ | 1.4   |

---

n.a. not available.

Figures in italics indicate data that are for years or periods other than those specified.


## PREVIOUS IFAD LOANS TO NIGER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Initiating Institution</th>
<th>Cooperating Institution</th>
<th>Lending Terms</th>
<th>Board Approval</th>
<th>Loan Effectiveness</th>
<th>Current Closing Date</th>
<th>Loan/Grant Acronym</th>
<th>Currency</th>
<th>Approved Loan/Grant Amount</th>
<th>Disbursement (as % of approved amount)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Maradi Rural Development Project</td>
<td>World Bank: IDA</td>
<td>World Bank: IDA</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>07 May 80</td>
<td>19 Nov 80</td>
<td>30 Sep 88</td>
<td>L - 1 - 37 - NG</td>
<td>SDR</td>
<td>9 700 000</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguié Rural Development Project</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>BOAD</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>11 Dec 91</td>
<td>28 Aug 92</td>
<td>30 Jun 99</td>
<td>L - 1 - 292 - NG</td>
<td>SDR</td>
<td>8 250 000</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Country Programme - Phase II</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>13 Sep 95</td>
<td>27 Feb 98</td>
<td>31 Dec 03</td>
<td>G - 1 - 36 - NE</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>30 000</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Country Programme - Phase II</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>13 Sep 95</td>
<td>27 Feb 98</td>
<td>31 Dec 03</td>
<td>G - S - 45 - NE</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>50 000</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Country Programme - Phase II</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>13 Sep 95</td>
<td>27 Feb 98</td>
<td>31 Dec 03</td>
<td>L - I - 381 - NG</td>
<td>SDR</td>
<td>7 950 000</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Country Programme</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>03 Dec 87</td>
<td>13 Jul 88</td>
<td>31 Mar 95</td>
<td>G - S - 7 - NG</td>
<td>SDR</td>
<td>700 000</td>
<td>07.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Country Programme</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>03 Dec 87</td>
<td>13 Jul 88</td>
<td>31 Mar 95</td>
<td>G - S - 8 - NG</td>
<td>USD</td>
<td>587 000</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Country Programme</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>03 Dec 87</td>
<td>13 Jul 88</td>
<td>31 Mar 95</td>
<td>L - S - 23 - NG</td>
<td>SDR</td>
<td>3 350 000</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Country Programme</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>03 Dec 87</td>
<td>13 Jul 88</td>
<td>31 Mar 95</td>
<td>L - S - 9 - NG</td>
<td>SDR</td>
<td>10 250 000</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CADRE LOGIQUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Indicateurs</th>
<th>Moyens de Vérification</th>
<th>Risques et mesures de limitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenu et conditions de vie des populations rurales, notamment des pauvres et des femmes sont améliorés</strong></td>
<td>Accroissement des revenus et niveau de vie (population rurale en général et groupes vulnérables (pauvres, femmes) en particulier)</td>
<td>Statistiques sur la clientèle des SFD (MinFin, MAG/EL)</td>
<td>Les SFD sont obligés pour assurer leur viabilité de concentrer leurs activités sur les créneaux les plus rentables et délaissent le monde rural et en particulier les groupes et zones vulnérables. L’orientation des appuis du programme et sa démarche volontariste de R&amp;D et d’innovation vise en priorité ces groupes cibles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L’accès durable des populations rurales, notamment des plus pauvres, à des SFR adaptés est amélioré</strong></td>
<td>Accroissement significatif du nombre ruraux ayant accès aux SFR (20% à la fin du programme) ; part des groupes vulnérables ; Augmentation de la couverture géographique vers les zones rurales les plus vulnérables ; Institutionnalisation et viabilité d’un nombre de SFD suffisant pour garantir une offre satisfaisant l’objectif du programme</td>
<td>Statistiques de suivi d’impact de la composante R&amp;D</td>
<td>Les intérêts divergents des SFD et des institutions de l’Etat amènent à un blocage du dialogue. L’organisation (institutionnelle et en cycles) du programme, ses procédures et ses instruments fournissent des opportunités et des incitations pour l’établissement d’un dialogue constructif. Les autorités monétaires ont une attitude inflexible et refusent les aménagements proposés. Les orientations des Lettres de Politique ne sont pas mises en œuvre. Qualité du dialogue politique, rôle d’interface joué par la Cellule du MAG/EL, adhésion des principaux bailleurs de fonds à la stratégie.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Le secteur de la microfinance est restructuré et professionnalisé

1.a Un dialogue de politique associant l’ensemble des partenaires traduit par une stratégie sectorielle effectivement mise en œuvre par le Gouvernement. Une lettre de politique cohérente avec les objectifs du PDSFR est rédigée (D) et mise à jour (1-2, 2-3) et appliquée (1-2, 2-3). Des proposition de perfectionnement du cadre réglementaire cohérentes avec les objectifs du PDSFR sont élaborée par les partenaires nigériens et présentée au niveau de l’UEMOA (1-2, 2-3). Les utilisateurs des SFD participent au dialogue politique (2-3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Produits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Indicateurs</th>
<th>Moyens de Vérification</th>
<th>Risques et mesures de limitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.b Le renforcement de la Cellule du Ministère des Finances permet la sécurisation (mise aux normes légales et réglementaires) des opérations de microfinance.</strong></td>
<td>Les contrôles menés par la Cellule du Ministère des Finances sont suffisants et efficaces (1-2) (et les SFD capables d’y répondre (cf : 2.1))</td>
<td>Registres et statistiques du Ministère des Finances</td>
<td>Le cadre juridique et réglementaire reste inadapté à certains types de SFD. L’exigence excessive de mise aux normes entraîne la fermeture de SFD intéressants. Le cadre juridique et réglementaire reste inadapté à certains types de SFD. Les orientations des Lettres de Politique ne sont pas mises en œuvre. Qualité du dialogue politique, rôle d’interface joué par la Cellule du MAG/EL, adhésion des principaux bailleurs de fonds à la stratégie.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Les SFD sont obligés pour assurer leur viabilité de concentrer leurs activités sur les créneaux les plus rentables et délaissent le monde rural et en particulier les groupes et zones vulnérables. L’orientation des appuis du programme et sa démarche volontariste de R&D et d’innovation vise en priorité ces groupes cibles.** | | | |


1. L’association professionnelle des SFD est opérationnelle, L’APSFD est représentative et active dans le dialogue politique au niveau national (1-2) et régional (2-3) Elle fournit des services à ses membres Elle assume avec succès la tutelle du Centre Technique (2-3) Elle joue un rôle important dans l’autorégulation (1-2) et le développement du secteur (2-3) **Rapports d’activité de l’APSFD, Évaluations institutionnelles menées au cours des examens inter-cycles.**

L’APSFD ne dispose pas du poids suffisant pour jouer ses rôles. **Éléments de mitigation**

Dialogue de politique services et tutelle du CT : appuis du programme

Autorégulation : Cellule du MinFin peut alors intervenir de façon autoritaire

2. **Les SFD fournissent des SFR pérennes accessibles par l’ensemble de la population rurale et notamment les pauvres**

Les arbitrages budgétaires réalisés sont cohérents avec la stratégie du programme (1-2, 2-3), les appuis fournis sont jugés efficaces (1-2, 2-3), leur impact est conforme à la stratégie : qualitativement (1-2) et quantitativement (2-3) **Rapports d’exécutions, Enquêtes de satisfaction, Evaluation d’impact**

Des dérives par rapport à la stratégie de produire

**Organization du programme et procédures imposent des références fréquentes et explicites à cette stratégie**

La fourniture d’appuis par le PDSFR n’est pas assez conditionnée par l’impact 1

Tdr explicites de la cellule de S&E vis à vis du Comité de Pilotage

3. **Les SFD s’étendent et diversifient leur offre de services adaptés aux plus pauvres (notamment épargne) et aux zones vulnérables**

Voir : Objectif spécifique du Programme

Les méthodologies déjà disponibles pour fournir des SFR aux plus pauvres sont diffusées (1-2)

Les acquis de la R&D sont vulgarisés et valorisés par les SFD (2-3) **Voir : Objectif spécifique du Programme**

4. **De nouveaux opérateurs ont émergé**

Nombre de nouveaux opérateurs, cohérence de leur stratégie avec celle du programme **Statistiques du Ministères des Finances, Rapports d’activité et de suivi-évaluation du Programme**

Peu de nouveaux opérateurs apparaissent ou ils ne se dirigent pas vers les cibles prioritaires du programme

La composante R&D leur ouvrira des pistes et leur permettra de tester des méthodes ou des produits nouveaux dans des conditions très favorables et dans les directions cohérentes avec la stratégie générale du programme

---

1 Result oriented » en anglais
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Indicateurs</th>
<th>Moyens de Vérification</th>
<th>Risques et mesures de limitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.d Des mécanismes pérennes de refinancement sont établis</td>
<td>Nombre de SFD accédant au refinancement et volume, « destinataires » finaux du refinancement Les lignes projets sont budgétisées et administrées de façon transparente</td>
<td>Statistiques du Ministère des Finances</td>
<td>Les SFD, même consolidés ne constituent pas des opportunités intéressantes pour les banques Promotion d’établissement(s) financier(s) issus des SFD L’aide extérieure continue à échapper aux procédures budgétaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. De nouvelles méthodologies et produits permettent de mieux atteindre les ruraux et les groupes/zones défavorisés</td>
<td>Résultats obtenus et validation par le Comité de Pilotage comme cohérents avec les objectifs du PDSFR et vulgarisables (1-2, 2-3) Nouvelles pistes de R&amp;D identifiées (1-2, 2-3)</td>
<td>Rapports d’activité, évaluations inter-cycles, études et suivi d’impact, couverture géographique</td>
<td>Un cadre réglementaire trop contraignant (ou son application trop rigide) ne permet pas la réalisation d’expériences se situant en marge de celui-ci Les autorités de contrôle seront des partenaires à part entière du programme et participeront donc au choix des actions de R&amp;D entreprises par celui-ci Ne pas déboucher sur la mise au point de solutions répondant à l’objectif général, opérationnelles et financièrement viables C’est un risque inhérent à toute démarche de recherche il sera limité par un fort ancrage opérationnel de la R&amp;D du programme et par l’accent mis sur les opérations de terrain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a SFR répondant aux besoins des zones et groupes vulnérables identifiés</td>
<td>Pertinence des innovations « créées par » le programme (1-2, 2-3) et nombre Nombre et qualité des capacités de vulgarisation créées Appropriation par les SFD et clientèle concernée</td>
<td>Rapports d’activité, évaluations inter-cycles, études et suivi d’impact, couverture géographique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b SFR répondant aux besoins du financement de l’agriculture et de l’élevage identifiés et vulgarisation préparée</td>
<td>Pertinence des innovations « créées par » le programme (1-2, 2-3) Nombre et qualité des capacités de vulgarisation créées Appropriation par les SFD et clientèle concernée Utilisation des acquis dans les opérations de développement rural (2-3)</td>
<td>Rapports d’activité, évaluations inter-cycles, études et suivi d’impact, couverture géographique Part de la valeur ajoutée générée par les activités financées revenant aux populations rurales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gestion du programme</td>
<td>Administration saine et efficace (1-2, 2-3) Réalisations du programme, efficacité des procédures Contribution des procédures à l’animation du secteur</td>
<td>Suivi des réalisations et suivi des procédures (S&amp;É du programme) Qualité des débats et des décisions prises localement (transparence, adéquation à la stratégie du programme), avancement et internalisation de la réflexion stratégique</td>
<td>Ressources humaines de L’UGP insuffisamment qualifiées ou insuffisamment habituées à un fonctionnement de type partenariat et contractualisation Assistance technique au cours du premier cycle Déboucher sur des blocages du dialogue Le programme est organisé de façon que chaque partenaire y trouvant un intérêt propre soit incité à faciliter la mise en œuvre du programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 à la fois modules développés, ressources humaines formées et institutions de formation (ONGs bureaux privés) créées
ORGANISATION ET GESTION

Schéma institutionnel et rôle des différents organes

1. Le dispositif institutionnel comprendrait: i) le Comité de pilotage (CP); ii). l’Unité de Gestion du Programme (UGP); iii). l’Association Professionnelle des SFD (APSFD); le Centre Technique (CT). Des schémas organiques pour le premier cycle et pour les cycles suivants sont présentés en Appendice 4.

2. Comité de pilotage (CP). Créé par décret, il sera en outre composé des membres suivants :
   • représentant de la tutelle (Ministère des Finances) qui en assurera la présidence ;
   • deux représentants de structures gouvernementales (MAG/EL et Plan);
   • représentant de la Banque Centrale;
   • représentant de l’Association Professionnelle des SFD;
   • des représentants (au moins quatre) des usagers des SFD.

3. Seraient également conviés comme observateurs sans droits de vote:
   • un représentant de l’Association Professionnelle des Banques;
   • un ou plusieurs représentants des bailleurs de fonds internationaux actifs dans le secteur de la microfinance au Niger.

4. Le rôle principal du Comité de Pilotage sera d’assurer l’orientation stratégique du programme en consultation avec le FIDA et les autres bailleurs de fonds et de garantir la conformité des appuis octroyés par le PDSFR avec celle-ci. Pour cela il :
   • approuvera les Programmes de Travail et Budgets Annuels (PTBA);
   • préparera et participerait aux travaux d’examen inter-cycle;
   • approuvera à cette occasion la stratégie définie pour les second et troisième cycles;
   • sélectionnera les SFD appuyés au moyen de contrats-plan;
   • décidera des appuis accordés par le Programme « hors contrat-plan ».

5. Toutes les délibérations et prises de décision du Comité de Pilotage (ou des instances auxquelles il délègerait un pouvoir de décision) devront faire l’objet de procès verbaux diffusés ou rendus accessibles à l’ensemble des partenaires présents ou représentés en son sein. L’UGP sera chargée d’assumer le secrétariat du Comité de Pilotage. Le Comité de Pilotage se réunira au moins trois fois par an.

   • consolidation de la comptabilité du programme (données fournies par les différents opérateurs);
   • préparation et signature des demandes de décaissement de fonds du FIDA et des autres bailleurs;

6 Le Comité de Pilotage aurait la possibilité de déléguer une partie de cette dernière attribution à un comité organisé par le Centre Technique.
suivi des procédures nécessaires à la mise à disposition du programme de la contribution du Gouvernement;
• canalisation des fonds vers les opérateurs suivant les contrats (pluriannuels ou annuels) passés avec le programme et sur la base des Plans de Travail et Budgets Annuels (PTBA) approuvés par le Comité de Pilotage;
• consolidation et transmission des rapports contractuels au FIDA, au Gouvernement et aux autres bailleurs de fonds;
• la charge du secrétariat du Comité de Pilotage;
• passation, contrôle et suivi administratif et financier des contrats et conventions passés avec les opérateurs.

7. L’UGP comprendra trois cadres (contractuels recrutés par le programme) : directeur du programme et responsable administratif et financier et un contrôle financier, assisté d’un comptable, d’un secrétaire, d’un chauffeur/logisticien et d’un gardien. Elle sera dotée des équipements (véhicule, postes informatiques et photocopieuse, mobilier) et des moyens de fonctionnement nécessaires, et ce pendant toute la durée du programme. Elle bénéficiera d’assistance technique permanente en année 1 (CTP qui serait ensuite affecté au Centre Technique) et de missions d’appui pour la conception, la mise en place et le perfectionnement des procédures de gestion.

8. Association professionnelle des SFD (APSFD). L’APSFD représentera la profession au sein du Comité de Pilotage. Elle assurera également la tutelle du Centre Technique à partir de la seconde cycle (sous réserve de confirmation par l’évaluation inter-cycles). Un certain nombre de fonctions développées ou assumées initialement par le Centre Technique lui seront progressivement transférées.

9. Centre Technique (CT). C’est une unité technique autonome, dotée d’un budget et d’un patrimoine bien individualisé, qui aura pour tâches de:

• assurer la coordination technique et l’animation de l’ensemble du programme en conformité avec la stratégie et les programmes de travail définis au travers du Comité de Pilotage;
• préparer les contrats et conventions avec les opérateurs et d’en suivre l’exécution technique;
• mettre en œuvre directement certaines activités;
• assurer le suivi-évaluation du programme.


11. Le Centre Technique sera doté dès le démarrage du programme de l’ensemble du personnel et des moyens matériels nécessaires à son autonomisation. L’ensemble de son personnel national sera composé de contractuels recrutés selon des procédures acceptables par le FIDA. Le programme prendrait en charge l’équipement et le fonctionnement du Centre Technique sur l’ensemble de sa durée.
Instruments contractuels

12. Mis à part les activités exécutées directement par l’UGP ou le Centre Technique, le programme interviendra au travers des trois instruments suivants:

- contrats-plans passés entre l’UGP et un opérateur qui couvriront la durée d’un cycle,
- appuis ou contrats « hors contrats-plans » ou « à la carte » décidés sur une base annuelle,
- instrument de nature financière (prêts subsidiaires ou dépôts à long terme).

13. Les contrats-plans seront décidés au cours des évaluations inter-cycles sur la base de critères transparents (par la mission de pré-évaluation pour le premier cycle). Ils sont conçus pour appuyer la mise en œuvre des plans de développement des SFD. Chaque contrat-plan comportera des étapes intermédiaires clairement définies et vérifiables qui conditionneront la poursuite des appuis fournis par le programme.7 Chaque proposition de contrat-plan devra être approuvée au préalable par le Comité de Pilotage et le FIDA. Une logique similaire sera appliquée pour la mise en œuvre des Conventions d’appui institutionnel passées avec l’APSFD et les cellules des deux ministères et des contrats de R&D d’une durée supérieure à un an. Chaque bénéficiaire d’un contrat-plan ou d’une convention présentera chaque année à l’UGP un PATB discuté au préalable avec le Centre Technique et qui sera validé en Comité de Pilotage.

14. Les appuis « hors contrat-plan » ou « à la carte » seront décidés localement par le Comité de Pilotage et inclus dans le PATB, lequel est soumis à l’approbation préalable du FIDA. Des appels à propositions seront réalisés annuellement. Ils porteront sur des axes d’intervention, des types d’appui éligibles, ou des tâches concrètes à réaliser qui auront été définis au début de chaque cycle sur la base de la stratégie du programme (pré-évaluation puis examens inter-cycles) et auxquels auront été affecté une enveloppe budgétaire. La sélection des propositions par le Comité de Pilotage se fera de façon transparente en fonction de critères permettant d’évaluer l’adéquation des propositions à la stratégie du programme et leur qualité. Le procès-verbal de ces délibérations sera rendu accessible à l’ensemble des partenaires.

15. Les prêts subsidiaires ou les dépôts à long terme seront accordés par le Ministère des Finances (Direction de la Dette Publique) à quelques SFD sélectionnés afin de stabiliser leur structure financière ou de leur permettre de franchir des étapes de développement cohérentes avec la stratégie générale du programme. Les durées des prêts seront longues (au moins dix ans) et les taux d’intérêts calculés sur la base du coût de la ressource (commission sur le prêt FIDA) assorti d’une marge destinée à couvrir le risque de change (de l’ordre de 2%), les coûts de gestion, et le risque de l’Etat. Leur mise en œuvre sera soumise à l’approbation préalable du FIDA. Cet outil sera utilisé exclusivement dans le cadre de contrats-plan.

Gestion des composantes

16. Chaque opérateur établira chaque année, et dans les délais impartis, un Plan de Travail Annuel et Budget (PTBA) en consultation avec le Centre Technique et l’UGP. L’UGP sera responsable de la consolidation de ces plans et de leur soumission, dans les délais, au comité de pilotage puis à l’Institution Coopérante désignée par le FIDA. Le PATB consolidé devra être exécutoire (élaboré, discuté, adopté et approuvé) au plus tard deux mois avant sa date prévue d’entrée en vigueur, de manière à éviter les tensions dans la trésorerie du programme.

7 Par exemple: la consolidation de l’organisation interne d’un SFD pourrait constituer un préalable objectivement vérifiable au déclenchement d’appuis visant à permettre l’extension de son réseau.
8 Par exemple formation des élus des structures de base des SFD, développement d’un outil informatique de suivi du portefeuille, subvention d’une moto pour un agent de crédit, etc.
9 Par exemple: conception d’un module de formation sur la gestion de la trésorerie des paysans, audit organisationnel d’un SFD, réalisation d’une enquête d’impact sur un thème spécifique, etc.
17. **Sécurisation et professionnalisation de l’environnement sectoriel.** Des conventions pluri-annuelles seront passées entre l’UGP et chacun des deux Ministères (un par cycle et par cellule). Elles suivront les règles et procédures définies pour les contrats-plans. En particulier chaque cellule devra s’engager sur une progression et des résultats objectivement vérifiables. Au cas où l’APSFD est légalement constituée avant le démarrage du programme, elle signera également une convention pour la durée de chaque cycle avec l’UGP, couvrant l’ensemble des appuis institutionnels fournis par le programme à l’association.

18. Le Centre Technique disposera d’un budget et d’un patrimoine distincts de ceux de de l’UGP ou de l’APSFD jusqu’au terme du programme, y compris dans le cas où il est placé sous l’autorité de cette dernière. Le budget du centre de ressources sera géré de façon autonome. A cette fin, le centre de ressource sera doté d’un professionnel administratif et financier.

19. **Consolidation, professionnalisation et développement des Systèmes Financiers Décentralisés (SFD).** Hormis les prestations réalisées directement par le Centre Technique, les appuis du PDSFR seront réalisés au travers des instruments décrits ci-dessus.

20. **Recherche-développement.** La coordination de la composante serait assurée par le responsable placé au sein du Centre Technique. L’essentiel de la composante sera géré au moyen d’instruments contractuels structurés comme des contrats-plan, mais plus flexibles dans leur durée. Ces contrats seront conclus avec les partenaires suivants :

- partenaires extérieurs chargés de l’appui scientifique;
- opérateurs chargés de la mise en œuvre des systèmes de suivi d’impact;
- opérateurs chargés de la mise en œuvre des tests;
- organismes de formation.
CRITÈRES DE TRANSITION DES SECOND ET TROISIÈME CYCLES

Tableau 1: Critères de transition du premier au second cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Produits</th>
<th>Critères</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sécurisation et professionnalisation de l'environnement sectoriel | La lettre de politique de microfinance est rédigée et actualisée avec la participation de tous les partenaires  
Les SFD impliqués dans le programme sont contrôlés de façon efficace et constructive  
L’APSFD est fonctionnelle, elle exerce l’auto-régulation de la profession  
Des propositions de perfectionnement du cadre réglementaire allant dans le sens de la stratégie du programme ont été élaborées par les partenaires nigériens |
| Consolidation, professionnalisation et développement des SFD | Deux contrat-plan sont conclus avec des SFD prometteurs  
Les SFD appuyés répondent de façon satisfaisante aux contrôles et disposent d’un plan de développement et d’une organization interne renforcée  
Les méthodologies et les produits déjà disponibles permettant de fournir des SFR aux populations cibles sont diffusées |
| Recherche Développement | Des technologies et des produits de microfinance sont testés et validés, qui correspondent aux besoins des groupes cibles, et à celui du financement des besoins de l’agriculture  
Les dispositifs d’évaluation de l’impact sont fonctionnels.  
La participation des SFD dans les activités de R&D est effective |
| Gestion du programme | Les manuels de procédures sont opérationnels  
Des mécanismes adéquats de financement sont fonctionnels  
Les flux financiers du programme sont cohérents avec la stratégie du programme  
Les rapports contractuels sont efficacement administrés  
Le dispositif de suivi et évaluation est opérationnel |
Tableau 2: Critères de transition du second au troisième cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Produits</th>
<th>Critères</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sécurisation et professionnalisation de l’environnement sectoriel        | La lettre de politique de microfinance est actualisée avec la participation de tous les partenaires  
75% des SFD sont contrôlés de façon efficace et constructive  
L’APSFD exerce l’auto-régulation de la profession, fournit des services aux SFD membres et représente la profession au niveau de l’UEMOA  
Des propositions de perfectionnement du cadre réglementaire allant dans le sens de la stratégie du programme ont été élaborées par les partenaires nigériens |
| Consolidation, professionnalisation et développement des SFD             | Deux autres contrat-plan sont conclus avec des SFD  
Au moins deux tiers des SFD nigériens répondent de façon satisfaisante aux contrôles  
Les réseaux de SFD sont étendus en termes de clientèle et de couverture géographique, en priorité vers les groupes et les zones vulnérables  
Les méthodologies et les produits testés par la R&D sont disséminés |
| Recherche Développement                                                  | Des technologies et des produits de microfinance sont testés et validés, qui correspondent aux besoins des groupes cibles, et à celui du financement des besoins de l’agriculture  
Les dispositifs d’évaluation de l’impact sont fonctionnels.  
La participation des SFD dans les tests et la validation des activités de R&D est effective |
| Gestion du programme                                                     | Des mécanismes adéquats de financement sont fonctionnels  
Les flux financiers du programme sont cohérents avec la stratégie du programme  
Les rapports contractuels sont efficacement administrés  
Le dispositif de suivi et évaluation est opérationnel |
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