Mid-term Review
Social Accountability Programme, SDC
Phase 3, 2019-2022

Mbarali District Hospital

June 2021

ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS	
ANSAF	Agricultural Non-State Actors' Forum
ARI	Aggregated Reference Indicators
CCM	Chama Cha Mapinduzi
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CI	Community Initiative
COOF	Cooperation Office
CRC	Citizens Report Card
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DFID	Department for International Development (replaced by FCDO)
FCS	Foundation for Civil Society
FCDO	Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office
GESI	Gender & Social Inclusion
HFGC	Health Facility Governing Committee
IC	International Cooperation
LGA	Local Government Authority
LGWG	Local Governance Working Group
MEL	Monitoring Evaluation Learning
MIKIKI	Mtandao wa Usimamizi wa Misitu Kanda ya Kitapilimwa
MtR	Mid-term-Review
MWECO	Mbarali Water, Sanitation and Environment Organisation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NDP	National Decentralization Policy
O&OD	Improved Guidelines for Opportunities and Obstacles to Development
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PACOBA	Pangani Coastal Paralegal Association
PCCB	Prevention of Combating Corruption Bureau
PETS	Public Expenditure Tracking System
PF	Policy Forum
PO-RALG	Office of the President, Ministry of Regional Administration and Local Government
RBM	Results Based Management
SAM	Social Accountability Monitoring
SAP	Social Accountability Programme
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
TRI	Thematic Reference Indicators
TZS	Tanzanian Shillings
USANGONET	Usangu Non-Governmental Organizations Network

Table of Contents

1.   Executive summary

During the period 22nd March to 16th April 2021, the team of consultants conducted the mid-term review of SDC's Social Accountability Programme, phase III. The meetings with stakeholders took place shortly after the passing of President Magufuli and throughout the inauguration of the successor, President Samia Hassan and her 6th Administration. Although this prompted some re-scheduling of appointments, the consultancy team managed to meet with all respondents to the review thus conducting all semi-structured interviews and key informant interviews as planned, either face-to-face or through virtual means. Importantly, it was also possible to meet with community members who are active in SAM and PETS committees. All in all, more than 100 persons were consulted during the review, comprising representatives from core CSO partners of SAP III; Local Government Authorities and Central Government agencies, international development partners; SDC's Heads of Domain and Programme Officers, and SAM/PETS Committee members. The review findings – and thereby the structure of the report - follows the **OECD DAC Evaluation Criteria**[1]. The conclusions and recommendations from the mid-term review are, as per SDC ToR, clustered into **four analytical areas** presented at the end of the report: Strategic Steering; Results Monitoring and Evaluation; Sustainability & Impact; and Social Inclusion.

It is apparent that the objectives of SAP III are entirely **relevant** for Tanzania's Development Vision 2025 and the current context of shrinking space as well as democratic governance deficits specifically related to accountability mechanisms, oversight bodies, transparent public finance management, gender and socially responsive public services, and participatory and inclusive decision- and policy making. SDC Tanzania is commended for adopting a sector-wide integrated approach cutting across its domains, and the Social Accountability Programme's Theory of Change is proven **coherent** as it facilitates strengthening of democratic governance and enhanced accountability in multiple sectors such as Health, Agriculture and Water. SDC's (and other international development partner's) core contribution support to CSO partner's organisational strategies is a testimony to a flexible, strategic, and equal partnership approach that fosters collective ownership of social accountability interventions. The team of consultants however flag that the "minimalist programmatic steering approach" carries risks of in-coherent and ineffective attainment of SDC's envisaged outcomes and impact. Accordingly, the review has found several examples of "asymmetric" interventions across and within each of the CSO partnerships, e.g.: working at different levels of Local Government; applying different approaches and tools; working both on- and off system; and operating in identical districts but with diverse committee structures and in different social sectors. Still, it is found that the mix of CSO partners largely covers the needed civil society expertise for local level social accountability and national level policy engagement.

SAP III has been set up to **effectively** measure and deliver results **efficiently**. SDC Tanzania has an applaudable intention to foster and measure systemic change which captures the value of democratic governance and policy processes happening at local and national level. However, SAP III is somewhat sandwiched between its desire to cultivate change-orientated outcome reporting from CSO partners and aggregating these qualitative results into a global SDC system of Aggregated Reference Indicators and Thematic Reference Indicators that are rather quantitative in nature. Although SDC Tanzania promotes systemic change and outcome narratives in CSO partner's annual reports, the actual monitoring and reporting template is rather comprehensive and presumes that output level indicators (23 of them) can also be reported on.

---

[1] Evaluation Criteria - OECD

Creditable CSO partner efforts have been made to set up gender disaggregated Management Information Systems and hiring capable MEL staff. Still, attention to continuously improving outcome level reporting is needed. CSO partners are implementing their social accountability interventions reasonably cost effectively, timely and are conscious of cost efficiency & value for money. Although the execution of SAP III is effective and efficient, the team of consultants nevertheless question the impact potential and sustainability of some local and national level interventions. The CSO partner reports and the mid-term review consultations with SAM and PETS committees clearly indicate that sound local level outcomes have been achieved in terms of amplifying citizens' voice in influencing decision-making processes and prompting more transparent and accountable public resources management. Yet, the primary interventions happen at mtaa and ward level – as opposed to district level – which according to the findings of the consultant's – hinder SAP III to reach its full potential for **impact**, scalability, and systemic change. As one example, the SAM and PETS interventions typically revolve around public services and expenditures funded by LGAs own source revenue which only accounts for 15% of the total LGA budget. I.e. district level budgets, services and strategic priority investment projects are under less scrutiny.

The CSO partners have over the first two years of SAP III also achieved sound results from their engagement in national policy processes and consultations, including reviewing and commenting on the draft Decentralization Policy, Statistics Act and Cybercrime Act. CSO partners have exhibited adept policy approaches when engaging with individual MPs, beyond formal invited spaces for CSO consultations. Through a "Trojan Horse approach" CSO partners have worked inside the Governance system with decision makers and technocrats through formal MoUs and informal engagements. In the interest of achieving impact, the consultants however question whether CSO partners should be more selective in their multiple lobby and advocacy engagements and instead focus on fewer strategic policy outcomes. Also, it would be critical for SAP III partners to avoid that CSOs get stuck in the "public debate sphere" where such Government consultations only lead to lose policy commitments and minor legislative revisions. Whereas the national level interventions contribute to the expected SAP outcome that civic space is preserved and dialogue between public officials and CSOs improves, it remains challenging with the current legislative framework for CSOs to generate their own resources and be **sustainable** and self-reliant. Despite good efforts from CSO partners to diversify their income and become less donor dependent, it can only be expected that the majority of social accountability interventions would discontinue or be reduced without continued financial donor and philanthropy support.

Finally, the review finds that **gender & social Inclusion** has been well integrated in SAP III. Most partners by now have articulated GESI strategies and as for the programme interventions, women and youth have effectively been targeted. Nevertheless, the review finds that SAP III could do more to develop capacities amongst duty bearers and rights holders to better understand and adopt socially inclusive and gender responsive budgeting and provision of services that are responsive to the needs of the most disadvantaged groups.

Based on the DAC findings, the main recommendations for the four analytical areas as follows:
Strategic steering: Identify alternative programme steering modality for SAP IV; Consider mixed funding modalities for CSO partners for SAP VI; Review and revise partner portfolio for SAP III and IV. **Results monitoring and evaluation:** Revise MEL framework for SAP III, incl. eliminating output level reporting; Introduce Policy Results Verification track partners' contribution and impact of policy & advocacy interventions. **Sustainability & Impact:** Orientate SAP III-IV to gradually work more on-system, e.g. with formal local governance committees; Consider reducing / abandoning lowest level Government interventions; Foster CSO alliances (e.g. through catalyst

funding) that collectively and more efficiently generate policy outcomes with hight impact potential; Reinforce SAP III commitment to develop CSO partner strategies for diversification of incomes and self-reliant growth. **Social Inclusion:** Nudge remaining partners to develop GESI strategies; Develop common approach and facilitate commensurate capacity and knowledge development for SAP III partners; Consider identifying expert GESI CSO partner for SAP IV; Make use of available GESI resources developed by SDC.

2.   Background

2.1.   National Context and Introduction to SAP III

Tanzania is perceived as a peaceful country which in different global perception studies, barometers and indexes typically ranks above neighbouring countries regards good governance principles such as transparency, accountability, and rule of law. Despite late President Magufuli's public crusade against corruption and an ineffective civil service, democratic deficits have during the 5th administration posed serious challenges to a democratic and pluralistic society as well as a free enabling environment for civil society organisations and independent media. A main concern has been the shrinking political and civic space which over the past 5 years has undermined the social dialogue, mutual trust and ultimately the social contract between civil society, communities, local authorities, and private sector actors. The Civicus Monitor currently rates the conditions for citizen action in Tanzania as "repressed" and the factors underlying the shrinking civic space have, as in many other countries, been exacerbated during the Covid-19 pandemic.

The country has also been experiencing a re-centralization of power, e.g. temporarily revoking Local Government Authorities' right to collect property tax, which goes against the principles of a decentralized system of governance where communities and local governments are meant to have enhanced devolved powers to jointly set local development priorities while more autonomously generating own resources and managing financial resources. However, winds of change are now blowing in Tanzania following the inauguration of the first female President of Tanzania, Ms. Samia Suluhu Hassan and the emergence of a new 6th administration that includes a new energetic female minister for PO-RALG Ms. Ummy Mwalimu. This comes at a time where a new National Decentralization Policy is about to be approved together with its implementation plan – the regional and local government strategy programme, which spans over 10 years, 2 phases, so far with 1.5 billion TZS earmarked from the Government of Tanzania. The new NDP was articulated in consultation with CSOs after a review of the current "Decentralization by Devolution Policy" revealed (somewhat unsurprisingly) that although Tanzania was intending to fully devolve decision making powers, human resources and finances management to LGAs, the decentralized system of governance was in reality still undermined by strong elements of deconcentration and delegation. In a nutshell this means that Central Government Line Ministries retained a lot of powers and resources and were reluctant to relinquish their firm grip. A classic tale of decentralization designed to fail. Presumably the draft National Decentralization Policy will address these challenges.

As a response to the plethora of challenges to democratic governance and public service delivery, the SDC funded SAP III provides core contribution support to five national Civil Society Organizations in Tanzania who are specialized in enhancing transparency and accountability in public resource management at national and local level and in empowering citizens and local organizations to engage effectively in public oversight, decision making and advocacy on social issues of concern:

- Policy Forum
- Foundation for Civil Society
- Agricultural Non-State Actors' Forum
- Twaweza East Africa
- MVIWATA[2]

SAP III is part of a social accountability basket funding arrangement with other bilateral donors and foundations like e.g. Danida, SIDA, Irish Aid, Hewlett, and Ford Foundation. The envisaged outcomes of SAP III are:

a. Citizens' voice, including women and youth in influencing decision-making processes on issues that concern them, is increased.
b. Partner CSOs are more effectively influencing policies regarding public resources management both at the national and local level.
c. Civic space is preserved and dialogue between public officials and CSOs improves

2.2. Scope of the Mid-Term-Review

In accordance with the Terms of Reference for the Mid-term-Review of SAP III (RE: Annex 1), the two consultants from HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation and HELVETAS Tanzania conducted the review through the OECD DAC criteria lens to assess the Social Accountability Programmes' **Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability** and to inform SDC's thinking beyond the current 3rd phase. The review was conducted based on the progress made during the 3rd phase's first two years of implementation 2019-2020. Through the DAC lens the review has generated findings that are presented in section 3 of the report. These findings lead to a set of conclusions and recommendations connected to four areas of analysis which are presented in section 4 of the report:

i. **Strategic Steering**: Conclusions and recommendations pertaining to the progress of SAP III towards achieving its 3 envisaged outcomes, incl. identification and documentation of major successes and challenges; areas of improvement; and assessment of synergies with other SDC (and other international development partner) programmes.

ii. **Results Monitoring and Evaluation**: Conclusions and recommendations related to monitoring and evaluation approaches used by SDC and SAP III partners to monitor qualitative and quantitative results.

iii. **Impact and Sustainability**: Conclusions and recommendations that inform SDC's and CSO partners' understanding of what and how change is happening through social accountability activities at local and national levels; including reflections on the sustainability of the approaches used and on how the changes can be sustained over time within the formal Tanzanian systems and structures of decentralized governance.

iv. **Social Inclusion: Gender Mainstreaming** Conclusions and recommendations based on an assessment of how issues such as gender-based budget analyses, gender-based violence, women in peace and women's land rights and other initiatives has been successful. Lastly, the report concludes and recommends on the Youth Empowerment elements of SAP III, i.e. to what extent youth have been engaged and empowered to participate in accountability initiatives and policy influencing.

---

[2] MWIVATA only joined SAP III in 2020 and was therefore not part of the review

2.3. Applied Methodology and Approaches

The consultancy team applied a mix of tools and approaches in order to generate DAC findings and provide conclusions and recommendations to the aforementioned four areas of analysis. These include:

✓ **Desk review** the consultancy team conducted a desk review of key SAP III documents in order to ensure that the most pertinent evaluation questions were addressed during the field visit[3]. The literature review included key documents such as: SAP III project document; Swiss Cooperation Programme Tanzania 2021-2024; CSO partner strategies and progress reports, partner monitoring and reporting templates, and relevant strategies and policies of the Government of Tanzania.

✓ **4x CSO partner consultations** to harvest review inputs and lessons learned from Foundation for Civil Society, Policy Forum, ANSAF and Twaweza. Instead of the initially proposed 1-day partner workshop, the team of consultants conducted 4 separate semi-structured Focus Group Discussions with senior programme staff and M&E focal points.

✓ **Semi-structured Focus Group Discussions & Key Informant Interviews** for consultations with Local Government Authorities and Central Government agencies, international development partners and SDC's Heads and Programme Officers from each of the three domains: Governance; Health; and Employment & Income.

✓ **Community meetings** with local CSOs receiving funding support through the CSO partners; SAM and PETS committees. For these meetings, the team of consultants made use of the citizens report card methodology. The combined results of the CRCs are presented in section 3.5.1. Meetings with the local CSOs and community members from SAM and PETS committees were crucial in order to thoroughly understand and assess the nature of the implemented activities and to what extent they contribute to enhanced local government responsiveness; improved community perceptions regarding their voice and ability to influence allocation and spending of public funds; and harvesting reflections about the ability and space of CSOs to represent their concerns. The community level meetings were held along the central corridor regions and the selection of local CSOs ensured that the social accountability work within the sectors of health, agriculture and water was covered. Special attention was made to include disadvantaged groups such as women, youth, elderly and differently abled. Additional meetings with Twaweza animators, local community radio stations and investigative journalist were also conducted at community level.

In summary, the stakeholder institutions below, totalling 105 respondents, (RE: annex 2) were interviewed during the field visits. Despite some delays and postponements of appointments (caused by the unexpected passing of late President Magufuli, Inauguration of President Samia Suluhu Hassan and the 6th administration, Easter break and Karume day), the consultants eventually managed to meet with all respondents. ll interviews were carried out in a cordial and effective manner, observing appropriate Covid-19 measures (RE: Annex 5) which led to the findings, conclusions and recommendations presented in the ensuing sections 3 and 4.

---

[3] The SAP III MtR was, in agreement with SDC, conducted in parallel with an internal scoping mission for Helvetas Tanzania.

> ➢ **SDC COOF**: All Heads and POs of domains: Governance, Health; and Employment & Income
> ➢ **4 CSO partners**: Twaweza, ANSAF, FCS, Policy Forum
> ➢ **5 Central Government Agencies**: PO-RALG, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Health & Community Development, NGO registrar and PCCB
> ➢ **4 International Development Partners**: Danida; Hewlett Foundation; DFID (KPMG implementer), SIDA
> ➢ **3 Local Authorities**: Pangani, Mbarali, Mbeya
> ➢ **5 Local CSOs** (Pangani, Mbarali, Iringa, Mbarali) + 1 individual ANSAF member from Mbarali district
> ➢ **6 SAM/PETS committees** (Pangani, Mbarali, Iringa): 4 ward level, 2 Mtaa level
> ➢ **3 Media representatives:** Independent Journalist Pangani (2), Mbeya (1)
> ➢ **Animators:** 1+ Mbogwe group

3.   DAC Findings

3.1. Relevance

On the Relevance criterion, The ToR (RE: annex 1) posed a set of questions under the overall heading: *"Are we doing the right things"?* Consequently, this DAC criterion assesses the extent to which the SAP III objectives and programme design respond to beneficiaries', country, global and partner/institutional needs, policies, and priorities. The underlying questions for the Relevance criterion contribute to the following analytical areas: **Strategic Steering; and Social Inclusion.**

The overall goal and three expected SAP III outcomes are entirely relevant for the social, economic, and political context of Tanzania.

> **Overall goal:**
> Enhanced responsiveness and accountability of public authorities, both at national and local levels, which leads to more inclusive and equitable public policies and better services for women, men, and youth in Tanzania

> **Expected outcomes:**
> I. Citizens' voice, including women and youth in influencing decision-making processes on issues that concern them, is increased
>
> II. Partner CSOs are more effectively influencing policies regarding public resources management both at the national and local level.
>
> III. Civic space is preserved and dialogue between public officials and CSOs improves

The goal and outcomes are aligned with the Tanzania Development Vision 2025 which states that *"Tanzania cherishes good governance and the rule of law in the process of creating wealth and sharing benefits in society and seeks to ensure that its people are empowered with the capacity to*

make their leaders and public servants accountable". Furthermore, SAP III contributes to SDG 16 (peace, justice, and strong institutions) and SDG 5 (gender equality and women's empowerment).

In a context where the civic space has been shrinking it is more relevant than ever to foster an enabling environment for civil society and retain a constructive policy dialogue between public officials and CSOs, particularly related to policies regarding public resources management both at the national and local level. The CIVICUS monitor in 2020 rated the conditions for citizen action in Tanzania as "repressed" and the Universal Period Review submission on Civic Society Space highlighted concerns about Tanzania's persistent onslaught on media freedom, and the freedom of expression in general, which has been evidenced through the enactment and enforcement of stifling laws and regulations (such as Cybercrimes Act, Statistics Act, NGO Act) to silence critical opinions, including those of citizens, journalists, bloggers and opposition parties. The trend of shrinking civic space and infringement on civic freedoms[4] was even further exacerbated during the 2020 elections[5] and during the Covid-19 pandemic

The Decentralization by Devolution Policy from 1998 and the Local Government Acts for Rural and Urban Local Government Authorities from 1982 were based on the cardinal thinking of increasing government responsiveness to citizens' needs, improve the effectiveness of the allocation of public goods, mobilize citizens through new venues of local participation, increase accountability, and generally improve democracy from the lower level to the higher level of the government system. This included a special focus on enhancing citizens' voice, including women and youth in influencing decision-making processes. However, a review of the Decentralization by Devolution policy conducted in 2017 by PO-RALG concluded that: there was an insufficient fiscal architecture in place to effectively resource LGAs to implement their devolved mandates; bottom-up planning and budgeting processes meant to amplify the voice of communities were undermined by de facto top-down decision making processes; several Central Ministry departments and government agencies remained reluctant to devolve decision making power and financial resources to LGAs; the involvement of private sector actors in Local Economic Development was poor; and the recentralization of human resource management to the Employment Secretariat had compromised the quality and availability of LGA staff. All of these findings manifest the continued relevance of SAP III.

The current changing political context with President Samia Hassan and her 6th Administration however presents a new window of opportunity for SAP III to deepen and increase the impact potential of its interventions towards protecting and expanding the civic space; promoting rights of women and youth; and to generally improve the performance of Local Government Authorities in view of the new National Decentralization Policy and the 10 years Regional and Local Government strategy programme. The new "Improved Guidelines for Opportunities and Obstacles to Development" nevertheless contains messages that are concerning for effective, efficient, accountable, transparent and inclusive local governance in Tanzania: *"The principle of Improved O&OD is to encourage communities to implement development activities by themselves…People should make efforts to overcoming their challenges by themselves whenever they can instead of waiting for the government action".* The O&OD thereby puts a lot of emphasis on transparent, accountable, and inclusive Community Initiatives which are however minor and primarily community-financed projects at village level that citizens can proactively plan and implement to

---

[4] Government tightens reins on civic freedoms during the last year - CIVICUS - Tracking conditions for citizen action

[5] 2020 elections marred with gross irregularities spark growing concern for civic space in Tanzania - CIVICUS - Tracking conditions for citizen action

overcome challenges identified by themselves. Meanwhile, bottom-up planning & budgeting processes as well as accountability mechanisms at ward and district level are only vaguely described in O&OD.

SAP III is equally relevant to and consistent with parts of the overall goal of the Swiss Cooperation Programme for Tanzania 2021-2024 which is to *"empower young people, especially poor young women, to advance socially and economically, thus enabling them to be a main driver of Tanzania's move to an equitable and stable middle-income country and contributing to regional stability and prosperity"*. Whilst young people through SAP III have been empowered to know their rights, raise their voice, and thereby advance socially, there is less evidence to suggest that young people are getting empowered economically. This has to do with the weaker governance link to the employment and income domain – compared to the synergies with the health domain where CSOs and communities are effectively tracking the public expenditures and financial flows to health clinics and monitoring the quality of health services. It should however be highlighted that ANSAF has engaged in discussions on facilitating loans for youth. ANSAF's 2020 report states that "*Local Governments have shown commitment to allocate land for youth. The Regional Commissioner in Songwe is committed to allocate land for youth as a result of the youth zonal workshops held in Songwe. Subsequently, the Tanzania Agriculture Development Bank has entered into contract with 8 banks to guarantee loans offered to the youth engaged in agriculture*".

During the 4-year programme period, SDC in Tanzania has the ambition to transition from a domain-based approach to a cross-sectoral approach toward integrated planning, programming, implementation, monitoring and financing. With this integrated and cross sectoral approach, the intention is to foster stronger synergies between the three current domains and through coordinated efforts achieve higher impact and systemic change. At the moment though, SDC COOF budgets are still organised in domains. The consultants are of the opinion that the cross sectoral approach, Theory of Change and design of SAP III both facilitates a strengthening of democratic governance and enhanced accountability in Health, Agriculture, Water, Education sectors which is fully coherent with the aforementioned overall goal of the Swiss Cooperation Programme in Tanzania. More specifically, SAP III is highly relevant for the attainment of all the 3 programmatic outcomes for strengthening state institutions; protecting and promoting civic space; and improving youth livelihoods. The relevance to sub-objectives 7,9,10 is high. Meanwhile, the relevance to sub-objective 2 – linked to the E+I domain - is less prominent although ANSAF, in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture, Prime Minister's office and PO-RALG through its advocacy interventions has continued to promote youth involvement in agriculture, livestock, and fisheries sector for self- employment, increased income, and improved living standards. Also, ANSAF has organized youth zonal workshops to change mindsets, share opportunities and finding solutions to challenges facing youth in agriculture.

IC Strategy Sub-objectives
2: Promoting innovative private sector initiatives to facilitate the creation of decent jobs
7: Strengthening equitable access to quality basic services
9: Strengthening and promoting human rights and gender equality
10: Promoting good governance and the rule of law and strengthening civil society

In line with SDC's approach to aid effectiveness, support for local systems and actors remains the preferred avenue to bring about systemic change, namely through core contributions to Tanzanian non-state actors. The philosophy is to nurture CSO partners to grow into independent sustainable organisations that are recognised by Government as development actors in their own right. The core contribution modality that supports CSOs to flexibly implement their strategic plans is very

relevant and applaudable towards nurturing mutually respectful, equal, and strategic partnerships where bilateral donors nudge full ownership over the organisations strategic goal setting and use of resources. However, despite the relevance of the core contribution modality, the subsequent sections exemplify that it does carry risks of reduced programmatic steering mechanisms which can translate into programmatic asymmetries and reduced collective impact of social accountability interventions.

3.2. Coherence

The overarching ToR question for the Coherence criterion is about *"How well the SAP interventions fit"?* Therefore, the coherence criterion analyses the compatibility of the SAP III intervention with other interventions in the Governance Sector of Tanzania, i.e. how other particular policies and international development partners strengthen or weaken the SAP interventions, and vice versa. This part of the review report both analyses the synergies and interlinkages between SAP III and other interventions carried out by SDC (internal coherence), as well as the consistency of SAP III with other international actors' interventions in the same context (external coherence). The underlying questions for this DAC evaluation criterion contribute to the following analytical areas: **Strategic Steering; and Results Monitoring and Evaluation**

Although the SAP III project document does not present a Theory of Change as such, it is safe to say that the results framework outlines a coherent set of 9 outputs that contributes to the 3 outcomes focused on: enhancing citizens' voice in influencing decision-making processes; supporting CSOs to more effectively influencing policies regarding public resources management; and preserving civic space and improving dialogue between public officials and CSOs. It is also important to highlight that the respective partners' ToCs and strategic goals are well aligned to the results framework of SAP III.

While most SAP III outputs focus on empowering and engaging citizens and building evidence for policy influencing, it is noteworthy and commendable, that outputs 2.3. and 2.4 explicitly focus on developing internal capacities of the CSO partners to have in place organisational strategies (which is the basis of the core contribution contracts), viable funding models and income diversification plans. Learning from the previous phase SAP III also explicitly focuses on strengthening MEL systems of partners to better capture outcomes at policy level, rather than only reporting on local level service improvement outcomes. This gels well with SDC's ambition for SAP III to increase CSO support towards building coalitions and more structured national level policy influencing.

The mid-term review also confirms that the SAP III outcomes and outputs are coherent with the expected SAP III impact to enhance responsiveness and accountability of national and local level public authorities thus leading to equitable public policies and services. The main question though, is to what extent the impact potential of SAP III, and social accountability strengthening mechanisms from other bilateral donors (e.g. Danida, SIDA, DFID/FCDO) and Foundations (e.g. Hewlett and Ford) is fully exploited or whether additional programmatic steering and coordination could accelerate impact and systemic change.

The review confirms that SAP III is coherent with strategic priorities of other international development partners. The CSO partners of SAP receive core contributions from other IDPs through a basket funding arrangement. The main interests of interviewed co-funders, related to SAP III, include citizens voice; women's rights, youth engagement; access to information; mainstreaming GSE; civic space and support to media, CSOs and independent oversight bodies.

Table 1: Selected International Development Partner Programmes with SAP III synergies

IDP	Programme
SDC	Accountability and domestic revenue mobilisation; Scope Sustaining Culture of Peace; Health Basket; SDC media support; Anti-Corruption Program with PCCB and Basel Institute
SIDA	Democracy, human rights, gender equality, and the rule of law program which e.g. supports: The Legal and Human Rights Centre; Tanzania Human Rights Defenders Coalition to defend legal and human rights and Union of Tanzania Press Clubs to promote press ethics and journalists' right.
Danida	Good Governance and Human Rights Programme which supports non-state actors to play a pivotal role in strengthening rights holders' voice, demand for accountability and the promotion of women's rights.
Irish Aid	The strategic priority focus on Governance includes support to human rights, accountability, building effective institutions and international cooperation against corruption

According to the respondents from Danida, SIDA, SDC and DFID (KPMG implementer), the general coordination and information sharing among like-minded international development partners is working fairly well, both within partner specific governance structures and in the realm of the Local Governance Working Group. Regular meetings are held to coordinate efforts, share lessons learned, analyse, and adapt to changing local contexts. However, the consultants' findings and subsequent analysis from the SAP III MtR review indicate that more in-depth programmatic steering, perhaps even jointly, may be needed to optimise the collective impact and minimise programmatic asymmetries between CSO partners' efforts. Several bilateral donors and some of SDC's respondents also mentioned that joint programme steering could be strengthening without necessarily compromising the core contribution approach. Still the team of consultants recognize that SAP III is not a programme as such, but a set of core contributions, which is why program management as well as steering and decision-making processes was never intended nor designed to be comprehensive. The annual SAP III partners meeting has proven effective as a reflective space for shared learning, contextual analysis, and discussions on possible programme adaptations, e.g. in connection to the 2020 elections and Covid-19 pandemic. However, based on the programmatic findings below, the team of consultants would argue that such one-off events would need to be complemented with a more continuous programme steering mechanism that would consistently and effectively coordinate and guide application of local level accountability approaches; connect disjointed local level interventions; weed out overlaps and duplications in local interventions; coordinate national level policy interventions and trace their outcomes through improved partner MEL systems. This would ultimately demand higher investment of CSO partner's time and human resources. Therefore, different suitable modalities for programme steering should be discussed and agreed with them. In the interest of enhanced collective impact such additional investment in improved programme steering, coordination, and shared learning is from the perspective of the consultant's however highly recommendable.

While subscribing to the SDC philosophy of cross-sectoral approach between domains and providing core contribution, flexible funding and partner ownership of strategic priorities and results reporting, the review finds that a too minimalist programmatic approach and -steering mechanism in SAP III (including core contributions from other DPs to CSO partners) carries risks of in-coherent and ineffective attainment of intended collective outcomes and impact. This finding is based on

some observed programmatic asymmetries during local field visits to CSO grantees, PETS and SAM committees:

In Mbarali district the consultants met with the FCS grantee MWECO and the Lugelele ward PETS committee which performs bottom-up planning and budgeting as well as public expenditure tracking and social accountability monitoring of health services by interviewing (i) health clinic patients 2) nurses, 3) health committees and 4) district medical officers. Within the health domain, support is also rendered directly to Health Facility Governing Committee to conduct social accountability activities. The review team could not confirm to what extent participatory planning & budgeting and social accountability activities conducted respectively by CSO led SAM/PETS committees and formal health committees instituted under the Ministry of Health are linked and coordinated. In Mbarali district the FCS grantee MWECO only covers 3 of the 20 wards. A similar situation exists in Iringa district where the FCS grantee MIKIKI conducts SAM interventions in the agriculture sector in only 6 of 28 wards. While the social accountability interventions have generated sound mtaa and ward level findings in Mbarali (shortage of medicine and medical equipment, limited number of health personnel, only 68% community members contribute to the National Health Insurance Fund due to lack of trust and benefits) it is unlikely that the interventions can have systemic impact at district level. Meanwhile, another FCS grantee USANGONET implements social accountability interventions in 8 different wards, but within the agriculture sector. In such instances, stronger programmatic steering and coordination could potentially achieve higher impact if CSO support could cover all wards of a district, but only perform social accountability interventions in one sector at a time. Interestingly, MWECO is a member of USANGONET and the MWECO CEO is also a coordinator in USANGONET. Yet, there is no evidence of project synergies between the two organisations' work in the 11 wards.

Another indication of programmatic asymmetries relates to the multiple local government levels of SAP interventions. In the case of Mbarali and Iringa districts the SAM/PETS committee functions at ward level whereas in Pangani district the committees operate at mtaa/village level. It is also noteworthy that some SAM/PETS committees invite public officials for their own organised meetings whereas others feed into formal District Development Committee meetings where government sector stakeholders are provided with the findings of the SAM/PETS committees. However, the most important question may not be whether to synchronise the levels of intervention, but rather to what extent mtaa and ward level interventions (e.g. lower level local government) can achieve big enough impact and systemic change or whether social accountability interventions should rather happen at higher local government level e.g. at district level upwards? Elevating the level of social accountability interventions would certainly fit better with SDCs vision for phase IV to work towards more structured policy influencing that will lead to sustainable changes that anchor accountability processes within the system.

SDC's vision for SAP IV, described in the SAP III Project Document also talks about institutionalizing citizen's participation in existing formal structures in key areas of partners' work. The "off-system" SAM/PETS committees were established to hold formal local governance structures to account such as Village Development Committees, Ward Development Committees, and sector specific committees such as Health Facility Governing Committees. Setting up "parallel committee structures" may at that time also have been the correct strategy amidst the 5th administration's hostile attitude towards working directly with civil society organisations and facilitating spaces for state-citizen dialogue and engagement as envisaged in the Decentralization by Devolution Policy. With the incoming 6th administration, new National Decentralization Policy and the Regional and Local Government strategy programme, time may be ripe to work increasingly on-system through the local governance structures outlined in the Improved O&OD

Guidelines. Whilst working on-system – at district level or higher - demands a strengthening of local government capacities (both elected leaders and executive) and closing of accountability gaps, the potential for sustainable social accountability interventions, developed capacities and coordinated collective impact may be much higher than continuing to solely work off-system at mtaa and ward level. Particularly the discussions with PO-RALG and Local Governments gave promise that there is interest to work closer with both national level CSOs and district level CBOs to advance and bolster decentralized governance. However, a political economy and power analysis could be conducted to assess to what extent other Government agencies under the new administration will truly champion the decentralization agenda. According to the interviewed sector coordinator for PO-RALG, the inaugural meetings with the new minister indicates that there is now a stronger commitment from line ministries to forge ahead with devolution of powers and commensurate resources to LGAs.

A final, yet minor, example of programmatic asymmetries occurred in Pangani district where the FCS grantee PACOBA developed capacities of mtaa level PETS committees whilst trying to link the findings to district level committees and public officials. One of the most collaborative public officials is the District Community Development Officer who together with the District Planning Officers is responsible for supporting community initiatives and linking participatory planning and budgeting processes at mtaa and ward level to the district development committees and district council. At the same time, the District Community Development Officer is functioning as Twaweza animator meant to conduct participatory action research, instigate discussions, and establish synergies between the social accountability work of different local level committees. When asked about his role as an animator vs. that of a District Community Development Officer it was clear that he could not distinguish between the two. While this example is minor, it does indicate that the same public officials, CSO representatives, elected wards councillors, village leaders and community members meet time and time again to strengthen accountability mechanisms and local democratic governance but in different formal and informal committee structures and development processes that appear to be rather uncoordinated, ineffective and cost in-efficient. The discussions with Twaweza's animators' group in Mbogwe, on the other hand, exhibited a plethora of local level outcomes and good practices of how they can effectively function as community development facilitators. Despite the aforementioned examples of programmatic asymmetries or in-coherences, there are several good practices towards enhancing the programmatic coherence such as:

FCS has through its internal learning processes revised its granting mechanism to cluster grants around specific themes with CSO cluster leads in charge of grantee coordination and learning for each theme. This is a departure from the previous approach in which grants were issued across the country to a wide array of beneficiaries to one where grantees are clustered based on thematic programming and geographic consideration. As a cluster leader in agriculture sector ANSAF facilitates reflection and learning events, where the cluster members (18 organizations) participate. The main purpose of such reflection meetings is to share experiences and knowledge on SAM/PETS project implementation. The meeting intends to identify and aggregate key issues affecting small holder farmers realize their goals and to document cases and success stories that emanated from interventions that focus on accountability and transparency on public resources management for improved services delivery in agriculture. Such cluster efforts also strengthen the local-to-national programme linkages since the aggregated analysis from the reflection meeting are presented to the Parliamentary Committee for Agriculture, Livestock and Water. In the same vein, Policy Forum has in 2020 hosted zonal reflection meetings virtually with the view of promoting learning among social accountability practitioners. The agenda revolves around how to strategically engage with the government when working in the Social Accountability arena and improving coordination of social accountability initiatives at national and sub-national levels.

Finally, ANSAF has effectively linked local level research carried out by its members to national level policy discussions. Through its analysis, ANSAF members found that the agriculture sector contributes with 70-80% of the total Own Source Revenue generated by Local Government Authorities, yet less than 10% of the revenue is reinvested into the sector. Based on this research and in accordance with the Maputo Declaration new local government regulations have now come into force to assure that 10% of OSR shall be spent on agriculture. In terms of strengthening local-to-national interventions, PF has noticed an increase in the capacity of members to analyse national policies and using findings from SAM and PETS to influence policy makers. 98% of surveyed members find the PF network useful for them to influence and monitor policies related to public resources. At the same time though PF recognizes that encouraging member participation in different national policy engagements, without regular updates and feedbacks on the progress, has hampered the joint advocacy efforts of the PF network. So, PF is continuously strengthening its Participatory Monitoring Evaluation and Learning system to systematize mutual feedback from members engagements related to policy and public resource accountability interventions to better trace when the Forum are achieving genuine policy outcomes instead of only policy outputs. The effect of PF's PMEL improvement is however yet to be fully translated into the narrative annual reports which still appear to mainly report at output level. Very interestingly, Twaweza's organisational strategy distinguishes between the policy sphere and the public debate sphere: In the public debate sphere, many CSOs in Tanzania master the art and craft of advocacy and communication which is used to amplify the lessons, ideas and challenges that arise from local interventions at national level, driving a wider democratic agenda. Whereas the less crowded policy sphere is more outcome orientated where targeted engagement with regulatory entities and policy makers shapes laws and policy and encourages leadership that builds social norms that protect civic space.

3.3. Effectiveness

Regards effectiveness, the main question for this criterion is: *Do the results contribute to overall goals as planned?* In other words, the effectiveness criterion assesses to what extent SAP III has achieved or is expected to achieve its objectives and results. In order to generate a comprehensive assessment of the SAP III system for Results Monitoring and Evaluation, the effectiveness section also offers a closer analysis of five key RBM features: (i) type and nature of the MEL system; (ii) the quality of the Management Information System; (iii) available human resources for MEL; (iv) quality of indicators; and (v) ability to undertake adaptive management. The underlying questions for this DAC evaluation criterion contribute to the following analytical areas: **Strategic Steering; and Results Monitoring and Evaluation.**

Halfway through SAP III, there are good indications that the CSO partners will collectively achieve the impact and outcome level results indicators by 2022. However, there are several outstanding logframe deficiencies including missing baselines, targets and consolidation of partner's progress reports data which compromises the MEAL system's ability to extensively measure the progress and outcome level. At output level only 14 of 23 indicators have some limited data for 2020 which makes it difficult to make an accurate assessment of the output level progress. The table below uses a traffic light system (green, yellow, red) to assess the progress at outcome and impact level.

Table 2: SAP III Traffic light progress as per impact and outcome indicators

Impact (overall goal)	Impact indicator baseline 2019	Impact target 2022	Impact progress 2020
Enhanced responsiveness and accountability of public authorities, both at national and local levels, lead to inclusive and equitable public policies and services for women and men in Tanzania.	People's perception of public officials' responsiveness at local level (gender and age disaggregated) **Baseline:** 63% rate it as good or very good (2018)	**Target:** Perception improves by 20percentage points (5 annually)	Around 81% of citizens perceive the responsiveness of local government leaders as good (74%) or very good (7%). Slightly more women (82.8%) perceive it as good or very good compared to men (78.6%).
	CSOs are increasingly viewed as influencing allocation of public funds at local and national level. **Baseline:** 4.7% of respondents say yes (2018)	**Target:** Perception improves to 10% by 2022.	26% of the citizens perceive CSOs and CBOs as influential while 31% do not know. Men perceive better CSO influence (at 26.1%) compared to women (25.7%)

Outcome	Outcome indicator baseline 2019	Outcome target 2022	Outcome progress 2020
1. Citizens' voice, including women and youth in influencing decision-making processes on issues that concern them, is increased	Citizens' perception regarding their influence on allocation and spending of public funds. **Baseline:** 7% of citizens perceive that they have any influence on allocation and spending of public funds (Source: SDC perception survey 2018)	**Target:** 20% (improves by 13 percentage points)	Around 38% of citizens perceive that they have any influence on allocation and spending of public funds in both health and agricultural sectors. More men feel that they have an influence (43.1%) compared to women (33.5%)
	Percentage of citizens acting together in demanding for better services (land issues, health, education, agriculture, and public accountability issues) **Baseline:** 44% acted together in bringing public officials to account (2018)	**Target:** 64% (improves by 20 percentage points)	Sauti za wananchi survey remained banned
	CSOs perception of *(Members/ Grantees/Implementing Partners)* their influence in allocation of public funds **Baseline:** Local Level: 22.2% very influential,62.9% fairly influential National Level: 45% influential(9% very Influential	No Target	Local Level: 23% very influential and 52.6% fairly influential National level: 20% very influential, 38% fairly influential
2. Partner CSOs are more effectively influencing policies regarding public resources management both at the national and local level	People's perception regarding CSOs representation of their concerns (gender and age disaggregated) No Baseline	**Target** Perception improves	The perception survey did not take up this question
	Documented evidence of key national policy changes integrating CSO Partner advocacy agendas. **Baseline:** 4	**Target:** CSO partners contribute to 10 substantial <u>policy</u> changes over the 4year period	Changes in statistics Act (2019) and political parties act and Local election regulations Changes in Finance Act including loans to people with disabilities
	No. of national and local authorities that conducted (one or more elements of) a gender budgeting process No Baseline	**Target:** 40% increase over the phase period	No Gender Budget Analysis carried out at local level. Gender related issues taken up by parliamentary women group. findings of study on marginalization and gender

			inequalities within tax regimes disseminated
3. Civic space is preserved and dialogue between public officials and CSOs improves.	CSOs expressing satisfaction on the cooperation provided by public officials **Baseline** 79% feel cooperation is good, 13% very good, and 6.6% bad, 1% very bad (2019	**Target:** Satisfaction improves by 5% annually	71.6% feel cooperation is good, 23.7% very good, and 0.7% bad, 0.7% very bad
	Citizens state that they are more able to say what they want about political matters compared to three years ago. (Disaggregated by gender and age) **Baseline:** 18%	**Target**: 30%	No data available by October 2019 due to stoppage of SzW. It did not resume in 2020
	Laws / amendments are passed that increase / decrease the ability of citizens to engage in political process at national or local level. **Baseline:** 0	**Target:** 1 per year	The (2019) amendment in the statistics act will enhance CSOs to carry out research and share findings freely In 2020 the miscellaneous laws passed under certificate of urgency did not take up CSO inputs

Achieving the expected SAP III results effectively does not only rely on good partnerships and coherent programming. It also depends on having in place a robust results-based management framework and -system both for SDC and partners. In its International Cooperation Strategy for Tanzania SDC states, that a "comprehensive monitoring system contributes to professional documentation and communication, including annual reporting on the efficiency and effectiveness of Swiss development cooperation. It demonstrates accountability and allows for evidence-based corrective measures".

The key findings for the effectiveness of the SAP III Results Monitoring and Evaluation Framework are as follows: SAP III has an applaudable ambition to provide basket funding to CSOs to achieve social accountability outcome at local and national level and for both SDC and CSOs to have MEL systems in place that facilitate coordinated learning and knowledge management around policy influencing. In other words, a MEL system that both enables SDC to harvest outcomes from annual partner reports and to collectively achieve systemic change. However, the SAP III ambition is somewhat sandwiched between a) its own efforts to strengthen MEL systems and cultivate improved outcome reporting from partners and b) aggregating these outcome (and eventually impact) results in to a global SDC system of Aggregated Reference Indicators (ARI 1,2) and Thematic Reference Indicators (TRI 4,5) that are rather quantitative in nature. Concurrent to the review mission, SDC and Swiss based partners 25th March 2021 undertook a review of ARI and TRI which will hopefully lead to new indicators that are more geared towards measuring qualitative and process-oriented governance and policy outcomes and impacts.

The SAP III orientation towards SDC's "guidelines for designing and monitoring social accountability interventions" has effectively informed the process of strengthening MEL systems of partners and enabled them to articulate Theories of Change and Theories of Action for their organisational strategies and thereby implicitly their social accountability work. This is clear from reading the MEL sections of their strategies as well as e.g. the Participatory MEL strategy of Policy Forum. The MEL systems of partners can be described as a blend of classic Results Based Management (Logframe approach) and Outcome Mapping which is designed to monitor results of

a change process, measured in terms of the changes in behaviour, actions or relationships that can be influenced by a certain programme and its implementing partners.

Through outcome harvesting, the improved MEL framework of SAP III is able to capture the changes achieved by its interventions by use of partners' outcome reports. The use of perception indexes, e.g. Sauti za Mwananchi and SDC Perception Survey from 2018 are appropriate means of verification for social accountability programmes. However, they should preferably be triangulated with data from other barometers, polls, and surveys to show a more reliable picture. Also, the "influence indicators" may be prompting slightly biased results as they are self-assessment based with 75% positive answer options. The SAP III logframe assumptions (questionably) imply that tighter government control improves CSO responsiveness to communities. Another assumption is that Government officials understand and accept the role CSOs play in scrutinizing the use of public resources. However, this may vary according to which Government level and the amount of resources under scrutiny. At this mid-term juncture and in view of the change of the political context, it is a good time for SAP III to review and validate its assumptions and risks management framework.

Although the overall MEL framework can capture outcomes, the newly introduced partner monitoring and reporting template is however quite comprehensive as it contains 2 impact indicators, 9 outcome indicators and 23 output indicators. Also, SDC has introduced gender and age disaggregated data reports which is appreciated by partners, but their MEL systems were not adequately prepared to capture this data when the reporting requirement was introduced. It is noteworthy that development partners like Danida, SIDA and Hewlett Foundation do not have additional reporting requirements besides what is harvested from the partners' outcome reports. The detailed indicator reporting (especially at output level) may enable SDC to better report against ARI and TRI, but it contrasts the philosophy behind the CSO core contribution and the principles of easing and unifying partners' reporting to multiple donors as reflected in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

The partners' outcome reports display abundant local level outcomes that bear witness of enhanced citizens voice, influencing public resource management and preserving the civic space to dialogue with public officials. The main question to achieved local (mtaa and ward level) outcomes is if the collective impact is considerable enough or if interventions should be elevated to higher local government levels i.e. district or regional. Also, while it is fully understood and appreciated by the consultancy team that national level policy processes takes much time to produce outcome results, there is a concern that partners' outcome reports often report on a lot of outputs such a participation in numerous policy reviews and consultations where public officials and elected leaders make commitments and promises, that are however not always converted into actual outcomes – what Twaweza labels the *policy sphere* which is more outcome orientated where targeted engagement with regulatory entities and policy makers proactively shapes laws and policies – as opposed to the *public debate sphere.*

Commendable partner efforts have been made to set up Management Information Systems and hiring capable MEL staff which can also add value to evidence-based policy making. With new approaches and commitment to MEL and MIS, CSO partners are now in a position to generate local level evidence through stories of change, most significant change, and shared learning. What is however important in regards to generating policy outcomes is to ensure that the new Management Information Systems of partners not only help them to collect and organise stories of change, lessons learned and aggregate data for results monitoring, but that they are also able to trace when or if policy outputs are translated into outcomes. When this is not the case, partners

should take time to reflect if their tactics for policy engagement should be revised. As a good example, Policy Forum reports that their improved PMEL system has e.g. made PF better at following up on the action points agreed during breakfast debates with policy makers. The effect of this improvement is however yet to be fully translated into the annual reporting.

Within the MEL community, attention is increasingly focused on results management frameworks and approaches that are not only robust enough to capture complex policy results and systemic change but also accommodative to adaptive and agile management. Central to this approach is to have strong leadership and staff with capacities that can perform political economy and power analyses that should continually (not only end of phase) be used to test theories of change logframe assumptions, inform strategic planning and ongoing programme implementation. In a volatile political and socio-economic context like in Tanzania adaptive and agile management has most recently shown its relevance in the wake of the 2020 elections, unexpected change from 5th to 6th administration as well as the Covid-19 pandemic. Through the CSO interviews it was evident that each of the CSOs have shown adequate leadership and ability to timely analyse contextual changes and adapt their programmes accordingly. As an example, PF reports that Covid-19 initially affected their advocacy engagements as most of them were designed as physical meetings. It was noted that the adaptation to virtual engagements/meetings actually enhanced the quality of discussions and likelihood of achieving policy outcomes.

3.4. Efficiency

On the Efficiency criterion the main question posed in the ToR is: "*Were the results achieved in a (cost) efficient way"?* A Cost-efficiency analysis is typically more challenging to conduct in reviews and evaluations of rights- based governance programmes compared to service delivery (needs based) oriented programmes. Since the SAP III is basket funding arrangement of core contributions to CSO partners, it is difficult to conduct an accurate cost-effectiveness analysis comparing the relative costs and outcomes of SAPs different courses of action. Instead the consultants have opted to assess the cost efficiency consciousness of partners and respective granting mechanisms. The efficiency criterion also assesses to what extent the mix of SAP partners is the most appropriate for attainment of SAP outcomes. The underlying questions for this efficiency criterion contribute to the following analytical areas: **Strategic Steering; and Results Monitoring and Evaluation.**

The **mix of CSO partners** in SAP III generally covers the needed expertise for local level social accountability interventions and national level policy engagement on public resource management and civic space. It is however clear that the programme at present does not have a lead partner that can further strengthen the integration of SAP approaches and tools in the employment & income as well as in the health domains (after SIKIKA was phased out).

ANSAF is a member–led national advocacy platform of national and international non-governmental organisations, farmers' umbrella groups and commercial companies dealing with agricultural policies. Over the years ANSAF has increased their capacities in social accountability monitoring and evidence-based advocacy and is a relevant partner in terms of strengthening accountability and conducive policy making in the agriculture sector. Through its policy work, ANSAF also contributes to improved income generating opportunities for youth in the agribusiness. However, there may be other CSO partners, incl. private sector actors, that could more comprehensively contribute to the E+I domain which goes beyond the agriculture sector. The **Foundation for Civil Society** is a grant making and capacity building organization, supporting CSOs across the country. FCS has proven itself as an effective grant facility manager which is

crucial for supporting and sustaining a vibrant civil society, particularly at grassroots level. However, there is a risk that such grant facilities, without strong steering and coordination can lead to aforementioned programmatic asymmetries instead of fostering synergies and collective impact of its grantees. **Policy Forum** is a national policy advocacy network with a membership of 79 CSOs focusing on an accountable use of public resources in multiple sectors. PF is well positioned to achieve systemic change since it is renewing its MoU with the Po-RALG to advise them more formally on policy implementation. Another MoU has been signed with the Local Government Training Institute to institutionalise trainings of local councillors. Both PF and ANSAF are seen as strong member-based fora with sound outreach structures and ability to link local level interventions, good practices, and stories of change to national level policy and advocacy dialogue. When reading their annual outcome reports, the question that comes to mind though is, if ANSAF and PF's policy agendas are too broad and focussed enough to achieve policy outcomes effectively and efficiently and eventually bring about systemic change. **Twaweza** has received wide recognition for its Sauti za Mwananchi mobile phone survey while bringing in a regional dimension to SAP III on civic space due to its operations in Uganda and Kenya. It is also a critically thinking and progressive CSO which adds value to SAP policy outcomes, especially when strategically distinguishing between the *public debate and policy sphere*.

The budgets of the four CSO partners are mainly composed of core contributions from bilateral donors and Foundations which have committed themselves to provide support towards the implementation of 4-years strategic plans. Some partners like ANSAF and FCS also receive vertical funding from "non-basket development partners" in addition to their core funding support. Whereas ANSAF expressed preference towards such a mixed modality, Twaweza and Policy Forum are clear that core contribution through basket arrangements is preferred.

SDC contracts with CSO partners are aligned to the strategic plan which implies that new contracts are being drawn up for FCS and PF 2021-2024 strategies. The strategies for Twaweza and ANSAF continue until 2022. Overall, the CSO partners have good financial management systems in place and implement their interventions cost effectively with approximate administrative cost at 20-25%. It should however be noted that these percentages mainly cover cost of support staff and non-program staff whereas program staff cost are embedded in the programmatic budget lines.

Amongst the CSO partners, FCS has the biggest annual budget in tune of approximately USD 8 mio. About 56% of this budget is grant disbursements. 16% is used for grant management and communication cost, 9% on capacity strengthening of CSOs and 19% is utilised for staff and administrative cost. In its strategic plan, FCS exhibits strong orientation towards "value for money" by maximizing impact on the use of its available resources to achieve the intended outcomes. Consequently, FCS has adopted the 4Es framework of Value for Money: Economy, Efficiency, Effectiveness and Equity in delivery of all interventions. *Economy* to ensure that FCS and Grantees are buying inputs such as staff, consultants, raw materials, etc with appropriate quality at the right price. *Efficiency* to ensure that FCS and grantees interventions are producing results and the contribution of FCS in the results is well recognized. *Effectiveness* to ensure FCS and CSOs are making progress in achieving desired outcomes, attribution of FCS and CSOs is well documented. To uphold principles of *Equity* in ensuring that grants reach the intended recipients, and no one is left behind in the process. The FCS grant mechanism is clear on allowed overhead cost of grantees and is careful to ensure that grantees undergo grant management trainings to ensure compliance with best practices in financial management and project management and that whistle-blower mechanisms are in place. In risk management, FCS has increased scrutiny, oversight, and management of grantees to ensure early identification of risks and take mitigation measures on time. A number of interventions have been taken to grantees including capacity building before

start of projects, technical backstopping during support visits by both programs and finance teams, as well as peer learning among grantees in cluster sessions. 43% of CSO grants are channelled into the social accountability monitoring cluster. Lastly, FCS has over the past strategy period moved towards more targeted support to fewer grantees. This should lead to more funding predictability and durability of sub-grantees and sub-contractors and thereby avoid a situation like the one encountered by e.g. MIICO in Mbarali district which over the past 10 years have implemented social accountability programs with 6-7 different funding partners but in different wards and for different public sectors. Such shifting and short-term funding arrangements reduce the impact potential of SAM interventions and challenges the financial sustainability and retainment of qualified staff for district level CSOs.

The annual budget of Twaweza on average amounts to approximately USD 3.5 mio. Based on previous years' experience, having challenges matching their income and spending patterns, their financial management manual allows for over/under budget deviations of not greater than 15% margin. To stay withing this margin and to effectively and efficiently carry out its activities Twaweza now plans for more realistic and predictable budgets and they perform both real-time budget utilisation reviews through an online accounting system which during the mid-year review enables Twaweza to re-allocate underspent budget lines. From its total budget Twaweza spends approximately 20% on staff and administrative costs.

Policy Forum's annual budget on average totals USD 1.1 mio. annually of which approximately 19% is spent on staff and administrative cost. From a recently concluded risk assessment in 2020 one of the challenges that face PF include acquiring strategic plan commitments from donors and competition from its own members for limited resources. During its new strategy period Policy Forum will therefore pursue new stream of funds and put further attention on areas that will attract further support (e.g. infrastructure contracting,). Policy Forum does not engage in sub granting and has preference for a basket-funding approach in which donors and members contribute to the Policy Forum Strategic Plan.

Lastly, the annual budget of **ANSAF** on average totals approximately USD 2.5 mio. with some 25% spent on staff and administrative cost. For the current strategy period ANSAF maintain a ratio of 65% - 80% from the core contribution funding and 20%-35% for additional vertical project funding. Like the other partners, ANSAF is developing a financial sustainability strategy indicating resource mobilization and funding diversification mechanisms.

3.5. Impact

On the Impact criterion, the overall question was: *How are we contributing to the overall goal? Accordingly,* the review report assesses the extent to which the interventions have significant positive or negative higher-level effects. In other words, the impact criterion addresses the ultimate significance and potentially transformative effects of the interventions which are broader in scope than those already captured under the effectiveness criterion. The underlying questions for the Impact criterion contribute to the following scoping areas: **Impact & Sustainability.**

The expected impact of SAP III is that *enhanced responsiveness and accountability of public authorities, both at national and local levels, lead to inclusive and equitable public policies and services for women and men in Tanzania*. The two target indicators and for measuring this are:

(i) *People's perception of public officials' responsiveness at local level improves by 5% annually (63% baseline).* Already by 2020 the citizens satisfaction rate has increased to 81% which means the 4-year target has almost been reached mid-way through

(ii) *CSOs are increasingly viewed as influencing allocation of public funds at local and national level (10% increase over phase III compared to 4.7% baseline).* By 2020 26% of the citizens perceive CSOs and CBOs as influential which means the target indicator of 10% increase to a total of 14.7% has easily been reached.

Having attained the impact indicator targets mid-term poses two M&E questions for further reflection: a) to what extent where the targets set sufficiently high?; and b) to what extent can the positive perceptions of public authority responsiveness and influence of CSOs be attributed to SAP III and/or other programmes and contextual changes in Tanzania? The positive impact of SAP III was also confirmed during the interactions with SAM/PETS committees where the consultants adopted a citizen's report card methodology to assess SAP III progress and beneficiaries' satisfaction level with the results and impacts prompted by the social accountability interventions they have been involved in. The following sample of average community scores covers 7 committees[6] and 38 members

Table 3: Synthesis of Citizens Report Cards from SAM/PETS Committee members

Question	Score 1-5
1. What are the main results of SAM/PETS/Animation in this community? On a scale from 1-5, how satisfied are you with these results?	4
2. How would you describe the responsiveness of public officials? On a scale from 1-5, how satisfied are you with their responsiveness?	4
3. How do you influence allocation and spending of public funds? On a scale from 1-5, how satisfied are you with the results?	3.25
4. To what extent does your LG disclose its expenditures and income to the public/ committees? On a scale from 1-5, how satisfied are you with the efforts to disclose this information?	3
5. How do you collectively demand for better quality services? (land issues, health, education, water, agriculture, public accountability issues) On a scale from 1-5 what is your level of satisfaction with how services have improved?	5
6. How are these services addressing the needs of women, youth, and other disadvantaged groups? On a scale from 1-5 how responsive are services to women & youth?	3.75
7. How are CSOs in your community mobilising and including women and other disadvantaged groups? On a scale from 1-5, how satisfied are you with the efforts to include women and other disadvantaged groups?	4.75
8. To what extent are your free to say what you want about local governance issues compared to three years ago? On a scale from 1-5, how satisfied are you with the progress?	4.5
9. If SAP III was to end, how would you sustain your committee / work? On a scale from 1-5, how sustainable is your committee work beyond SAP?	4
10. How do CSOs represent your concerns at local and national level? On a scale from 1-5, how satisfied are you with their representation of your voice and interest?	4.75

---

[6] Masararas & Kigurusima village (Pangani District); Lugelele ward (Mbarali District); Kiwere, Masaka & Maboga ward (Iringa district)

The CRC exercises unearthed multiple local level outcomes that are also captured in CSO partner reports, just to mention a few such as improved water fee collection resulting in construction of new water points in Pangani district; improved responsiveness of district medical officer resulting in reduced shortage of medicine and medical equipment in Mbarali district; and improved agriculture extension services in Iringa district. However, these good examples may be considered as somewhat "granular and isolated islands of happiness" at village and ward level whereas there is less evidence how district councils, as a whole, have changed legislations, attitudes, and practices towards enhancing citizens' voice in influencing decision-making and more effective influencing policies on public resources management at local level.

It is particularly noteworthy that access to information to public expenditure remains a challenge. Although public notice board are set up in most localities, this information is quite generic and does not provide sufficiently detailed budget income and expenditure information. Also, most PETS and SAM activities revolve around own source revenues and public services financed through OSR which typically only accounts for 10-15% of the total LGA budget. This means that the main portion of LGA budgets for larger strategic investment projects are not under scrutiny.

The citizen's report card exercise showed encouraging indications that communities are well mobilised for village level bottom-up planning and budgeting exercises and that women and youth increasingly feel confident in voicing out their needs, priorities, and opinions. However, the consultants are critical to what extent such bottom-up processes are effective in a context where local authorities are struggling to generate adequate resources and where the real decision making power during the 5th administration has gradually been concentrated to the regional and national level. The improved guidelines for O&OD in the same vein conclude: *"..the government aspirations to realise bottom-up planning and budgeting with maximum community participation failed to be materialised due to several shortfalls"*. These include:

➢ **Consultation fatigue**: "since most of the identified needs by communities remained unaccomplished, people got tired and bored to repeatedly participate in the planning process in following fiscal year"

➢ **Lack of people's ownership**: "even though LGAs facilitated communities to come up with their priorities which later were aggregated in the overall Council's plan and budget, which were only managed by LGAs as the implementer and communities were left aside without control of the plan""

➢ **People's dependency on Government support:** "the process made communities believe that after identifying their priorities the government will satisfy their needs. This made them reluctant to play a role as the main actor of their own development and just wait for the government to implement such projects for them even when these are within their capacity to undertake.

During the field visits, talking to PETS/SAM Committees and consulting independent journalists, it became evident that the media elements of local level social accountability mechanisms is highly relevant, has high impact potential and is appreciated as it contributes to increased awareness of the general public. It has also led to enhanced responsiveness and accountability of public officials and elected leaders when they participate or feature in talks shows, radio programs, news articles, call-in sessions, citizen panels, live community broadcasts, social media, etc. The output target indicator 1.3.2 has by far been reached already by 2020 with 1,049 programs (baseline 477

programs with 10% increase per year). Despite these remarkable results, independent journalists still encounter limited freedom of expression, facing intimidation and threats from public officials.

The CSO partners have over the first two years of SAP III also achieved sound results from their engagement in national policy processes and consultations. As examples, partners have successfully engaged in reviewing and commenting on the draft Decentralization Policy, Improved O&OD guidelines, Statistics Act and Cybercrime Act. As good practices, Twaweza has exhibited adept approaches to engaging with individual MPs and they worked with 90 local CSOs from over 20 regions during the zonal consultation process to develop the first draft of the new National Decentralization Policy. Meanwhile, while Policy Forum has worked closely with decision makers and technocrats through formal MoUs and informal engagements.

The output level target of SAP III is that partners contribute to 10 substantial policy changes over the 4-year period. For 2019-2020 partners have participated in 65 national level meetings which have led to some concrete changes in the statistics Act, Political Parties Act and Local election regulations, and the Finance Act which now provides for loans to people with disabilities. Indeed, the outputs reported from formal policy processes are multiple, but the consultants still question whether partners should be more selective in their lobby and advocacy interventions and instead focus on fewer strategic policy outcomes. Critical reflection is also needed to analyse whether invited spaces for government consultations should be complemented with more interventions where civil society claim the space e.g. through coordinated alliance and coalition campaigns. While recognising the difficult CSO environment during the 5th administration and that lobby & advocacy efforts take time, it is critical to avoid that CSOs get stuck in the "public debate sphere" and thereby do not generate sufficient outcomes in the actual "policy sphere".

3.6. Sustainability

To what extent will the effects be maintained when the SDC's support ends? This is the main question for the assessment of SAP III sustainability. The sustainability criterion is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of SAP III are likely to continue after multi-donor funding may have been withdrawn. The underlying questions for this DAC evaluation criterion contribute to the following analytical areas stipulated in the ToR: **Impact & Sustainability**.

With the overall CSO environment in Tanzania where it remains challenging to generate own resources and be self-reliant, it can only be expected that the majority of social accountability interventions would discontinue or be reduced without continued financial donor and philanthropy support. Even before answering the question on financial sustainability one encounters the fact that changing laws and policies negatively affect the sustainability of CSO interventions. For example, with the current Non-Governmental Organisations Act, the registrar of NGOs can de-register an organisation when he/she concludes that this organisation is working against the interests of the country. Also, the introduction of the Cybercrime Act and Media Services Act has put CSOs in a precarious position.

Although CSO fora and networks do generate members' subscription fee and contributions, it is too minimal to substantively support the implementation of strategic plans. It is furthermore questionable if ongoing commitments to increased resource mobilization will bear fruit such as private sector and community contributions, social enterprise plans, purchasing land, leveraging government funding. However, partners are also taking more promising and progressive steps towards becoming self-reliant such as the Civil Society Foundation which now provides external consultancy services and have established a new CSO resource centre. The uncertainty about

sustainability is confirmed by the consolidated partners reporting on output target indicator 2.3.2: "Partners have sustainability strategies in place with financing models that enhance diversification to minimize donor dependency". The expectation is that all partners by 2022 have a feasible sustainability strategy in place. While FCS as mentioned is in the process of developing a commercial wing and has officially registered a subsidiary trust, the other 3 have not yet developed any concrete strategies. In its annual reporting Twaweza exhibits harsh realism as it states it has no plans to be donor independent as they think it is not feasible and from all partners the overall comment is that some form of donor support will always be needed by CSOs especially under the new NGO Act.

From the conversation with CSO partners, SAM/PETS committees and CSO grantees, there is high level of optimism that the knowledge, positive attitudes, and good practices of SAP III can be sustained beyond the duration of the programme. It was encouraging to learn that PETS and SAM committees, due to their low operational cost, were expectant to continue their work. However, the consultants remain doubtful that the drive and commitment of community members – who do have many other daily tasks including income generating – can truly sustain their efforts without CSO funding support and capacity development for social accountability interventions. One key motivational factor would be the continued responsiveness of public officials to improve public services and for additional public resources to be ploughed into community development. However, if the duty bearers gradually lessen their commitment and responsiveness to SAM/PETS committees the chances of sustainability and impact reduces proportionally.

As already mentioned in section 4.2. it may therefore be considered for future SAP programming to not only work through "parallel" off-system PETS/SAM committees but to gradually work more with on-system committees like the Health Facility Government Committees, or through council structures like mtaa, ward development, district development committees which are part of the formal governance system. Whereas such committees do comprise both elected leaders and public officials, it is however crucial that such structures are opened up for more public engagement and scrutiny since these would likely become unaccountable to communities (downwards) and to the District Council (upwards), unless , unless given more capacity development support and stronger checks and balances as well as public accountability platforms are established.

Working more on-system to enhance the sustainability potential of SAP III is also a viable option for national level policy and capacity development interventions. CSO partners will however have to be very careful not to be "co-opted" by the Government apparatus. As examples of closer, yet critical Government engagement PF has, with the view to ensure sustainability of SAM interventions, been strategizing on the best way to collaborate with PO-RALG and the Local Government Training Institute. This has culminated with a MoU where the aim for collaboration is to integrate SAM into their long and short course programmes to allow many key stakeholders like councillors and other Local Government officials to enhance their social accountability monitoring capacities.

3.7. Gender & Social Inclusion

The gender and social inclusion element of the review report has been analysed separately although it is not an official DAC criterion. Overall, CSO partners are very committed to mainstream gender and social inclusion into their SAP interventions and over the past years, most of them have drafted organisation-wide gender strategies in order to guide their gender-based interventions.

The SAP III results framework presents gender sensitive indicators as well as disaggregated data which enables partners and SDC to measure progress on social accountability interventions aimed at benefitting women and youth. At outcome level, indicator 2.3.measures the number of national and local authorities that have conducted (one or more elements of) a gender budgeting process. At output level (2.2.3) there is an indicator to measure the number of CSOs trained on gender based and social inclusive budgeting. However, so far SAP III did not conduct gender budget analysis neither in 2019 nor 2020 both for authorities and CSOs. During the interviews the consultants however identified a strong need for CSO partners, grantees, local authorities and PETS/SAM committees to be more aware and attentive to socially inclusive and gender responsive budgeting (SIGRB) which is the process of constructing and implementing public budgets that consider the different needs of (young) women and men and prevailing gender (and other forms of) inequalities. It is a common misconception amongst practitioners that Gender Responsive Budgeting only looks at the needs of women and that a gender responsive budget equals separate budget lines for women's priorities. This was confirmed during the interviews when most stakeholders referred to the 4-2-2 % allocation of Own Source Revenues to women, youth and differently abled. This in effect means that gender responsive budgeting revolves only around 4% of the 15% of the total income of LGAs. On gender analysis it should however be amplified that Policy Forum in its 2020 report narrates about conducting trainings to deepen gender analysis skills to enable members to draft budget position statement for the 2020/2021 national budget and producing policy briefs which bring into focus the existing gender dimensions in e.g. the agriculture sector. Two members of the Local Government Working Group are subsequently working on producing policy briefs on a) women's access to extension services and b) women and youth opportunities for leadership and decision making in the economic and political arena.

At output level indicators 1.1.2. focuses on the share of youth & women participating in local government planning and budgeting processes. For 2020 118,136 citizens in total participated in 592 villages of which 29.54 % were women, and 39.82% young women and men participated in local government planning and budgeting processes in 592 villages. In the same vein, output indicator 1.2.1 is meant to measure the number of people participating in platforms/groups for minority or marginalized populations. However, there is no data available for this indicator. Still, the consultants confirm from the qualitative findings that women and youth indeed are actively and vocally participating in planning and budgeting processes. However, the evidence of more socially inclusive and gender responsive budgeting, as well as gender and youth responsive public services is harder to come by.

Output indicator 1.2.3. measures the number of persons (m/f) sensitized on Sexual and Gender Based Violence. The target number is 500,000 annually. In the 2018 FCS annual report 618,552 (F: 336,802; M: 281,750) were reported to have been trained. However, since then, no data has been available. It should however be noted that the FCS 2019 report captures the numbers of grants (66-13) and district interventions (88-25) within the clusters for Harmful Traditional Practices and Social Inclusion and Women's Land Rights.

Lastly, output indicator 2.2.4. measures the number of gender issues raised and followed up by CSO partners. Although there is also no consistent and consolidated data available from previous years of SAP III the "Teleza case" of Twaweza deserves a highlight (RE: Annex 5.3).

4.   Conclusions & Recommendations

4.1. Strategic Steering

In a context where the civic space has gradually been shrinking over the past decade it is more relevant than ever to foster an enabling environment for civil society and to retain a critical, yet constructive policy dialogue between public officials and CSOs, particularly related to public resources management and enhanced accountability mechanisms at both at the national and local level. SAP III is therefore not only appropriate to the Tanzanian context, it also contributes to attaining strategic objectives of GoT, SDC and other development partners. The recent political changes and inauguration of President Samia Hassan and her 6th Administration presents a window of opportunity which potentially provides an avenue to deepen and increase the impact potential of social accountability interventions and towards protecting and expanding the civic space; promoting rights of women and youth; and to generally improve the performance of Local Government Authorities.

SDC in Tanzania has taken critical steps towards transitioning from a domain-based approach to a cross-sectoral approach with enhanced integrated planning, programming, implementation, monitoring and financing. With this integrated and cross sectoral approach, there is a sound foundation to foster stronger domain synergies and through coordinated efforts achieve higher impact and systemic change through the implementation of its International Cooperation Strategy. SDC, through the core contribution to CSO partners and basket funding arrangement for social accountability interventions, is in line with the Paris Declaration for Development Effectiveness and is an indication of an equal strategic partnership approach. The general coordination and information sharing among international development partners is working fairly well. Although CSO partners contribute to the same overall goal and outcomes of SAP II, there are indications that they differ in SAM/PETS approaches; work at different local government levels; work in same districts, but in different wards and sectors. So, in accordance with the recommendations below, it may still be considered to introduce a stronger programmatic steering mechanism in order to further enhance SAPs (and basket funding arrangement) effectiveness and efficiency and accelerate its collective impact

The CSO partners cover well the expertise for local level social accountability and national level policy engagement. It is however clear that the programme at present does not have a lead partner that can further strengthen the integration of SAP approaches and tools in the employment & income as well as in the health domains.

4.1.1. Main recommendations – strategic steering

✓ **Consider identifying alternative programme steering modality for SAP IV**, e.g.
  a. Increasing the number of events where SAP CSO partners meet with SDC COOF to share lessons learned, align SAM approaches, coordinate geographical coverage of SAM interventions, coordinating national level advocacy interventions etc.
  b. Tender SAP backstopping mandate to international consultancy/INGO
  c. Tender SAP management mandate to international consultancy/INGO
  d. Set up pooled social accountability/democratic governance programme implementation facility/unit with other international development partners

✓ **Consider mixed funding modalities for CSO partners for SAP VI**, e.g.
  a. Pure core contribution funding to CSOs with strong capacities and elaborate MEAL system in place
  b. Hybrid of core contribution funding and earmarked (vertical) funding to CSOs with medium capacities and adequate MEAL system in place
  c. Hybrid of core contribution funding and competitive performance grant mechanism for CSO partners
  d. Hybrid of core contribution funding Catalyst/Bridge funding to additionally provide shorter-term funding for collective and coordinated Campaign, Advocacy, Lobby interventions of CSO networks and alliances

✓ **Review and revise partner portfolio for respectively SAP III and IV** to identify:
  a. CSO partners that in SAP III can accelerate the social accountability elements in the health and employment + income domains
  b. CSO partners that in SAP IV that can facilitate social accountability /governance interventions in themes that cut across SDC domains thus fostering a stronger sector-wide approach, e.g. social protection, climate finance, local economic development, urban governance

4.2. Results Monitoring and Evaluation

The SAP III results framework outlines a coherent set of 9 outputs that contributes to the 3 outcomes focused on: enhancing citizens' voice in influencing decision-making processes; supporting CSOs to more effectively influencing policies regarding public resources management; and preserving civic space and improving dialogue between public officials and CSOs. It is also likely that the 4 CSO partners will collectively achieve the impact and outcome level results indicators by end-of-phase.

However, there are a number of unresolved logframe deficiencies that have to be addressed such as completing all baselines and target indicators. During SAP III definite advances have been made towards refining partners' MEL systems and capacities. Furthermore, all partners have clear – and SAP III aligned - Theories of Change and Theories of Action anchored in the 4-years strategies. The MEL systems of partners are a hybrid between classic Results Based Management (Logframe approach) and Outcome Mapping. The collective MEL framework is therefore adequate to capture outcomes harvested from annual progress reports. It also facilitates gender responsive target indicators and disaggregated data for women, men, and youth. Yet, the newly introduced partner monitoring and reporting template is quite comprehensive and contrasts the approach of

international development partners like Danida, SIDA and Hewlett Foundation who do not have additional reporting requirements besides what can be harvested from partners' outcome reports.

During SAP III partners are setting up excel based and online Management Information Systems that improves data management and reporting but also adds value to evidence-based policy making. Partners are now in a better position to generate, systematise and document local level evidence through stories of change, most significant change, and shared learning. Equally important is the ability of MIS to trace when or if policy outputs are translated into outcomes. Whilst the senior management teams of FCS, PF, Twaweza and ANSAF exhibit leadership and commitment towards improving MEL and MIS they have also timely analysed contextual changes and adapted their programmes accordingly, e.g. in connection to the 2020 elections and Covid-19.

4.2.1. Main recommendations – results monitoring and evaluation

- ✓ **Revise MEL framework for SAP III** i.e.
  - o Eliminate or replace outcome level indicators that mid-way through do not yet have adequate baselines, means of verification, targets, or available partner data

- ✓ **Consider eliminating core contribution partners' output level reporting for SAP III-IV** thereby aligning MEL framework to pure outcome/impact reporting of other bilateral donors
  - o maintain output level reporting in SAP IV if hybrid financing models are introduced (e.g. mix of core contribution and earmarked funding)

- ✓ **Consider introducing Policy Results Verification** to critically analyse and verify with relevant government institutions to what extent CSO partners policy results indeed can be attributed to their advocacy efforts

- ✓ **Consider complementing outcome reporting with contribution analysis for SAP** to assess to what extent reported outcome results are prompted by programme activities rather than other (external) factors?

- ✓ **Facilitate CSO partner MEL event** (incl. basket funding partners) to
  - o share experiences and good practices setting up Management Information- and improving MEL systems
  - o take stock of ongoing MEL gaps in SAP III and make necessary changes for the remaining 2 years (considering recommendations of this review report)

4.3. Impact and Sustainability

The expected impact of SAP III is that enhanced responsiveness and accountability of public authorities, both at national and local levels, leads to inclusive and equitable public policies and services for women and men in Tanzania. Having attained the impact indicator halfway through, SAP III has proven effective and efficient. However, it should be considered to what extent the targets are set sufficiently high and to which degree the success in positively changing perceptions of public authority responsiveness and influence of CSOs can be attributed to SAP III and/or other programmes – or other external factors? The positive impacts of SAP III were nevertheless

confirmed during the interactions with SAM/PETS committees where the citizen's report card methodology confirmed beneficiaries' positive assessment of social accountability interventions.

Whilst the CRC exercise and partner reports showcase multiple local level outcomes these are somewhat "granular and isolated islands of happiness" at village and ward level. There is less evidence on how district level public officials and elected leaders have changed policies, legislations, attitudes, and practices towards enhancing citizens' voice in influencing decision-making and more effective influencing policies on public resources management at local level. The consultants also question whether bottom-up planning and budgeting processes, starting at village level, are genuine and effective in a context where the real decision-making power during the 5th administration has gradually been concentrated to the regional and national level.

In terms of national level policy processes, partners have successfully engaged in reviewing and commenting on the draft Decentralization Policy, Improved O&OD guidelines, Statistics Act and Cybercrime Act. During 2019-2020 alone, partners have participated in not less than 65 national level meetings Although the outputs reported from such policy processes are multiple and encouraging, it is cardinal to avoid that CSOs get stuck in the "public debate sphere" and thereby do not generate sufficient high level outcomes and impacts through the actual "policy sphere" which leads to polices that are not only cosmetically altered but can lead to transformative and systemic changes.

Due to a legislative framework that hampers the full potential and societal contribution of civil society, it remains challenging for CSOs to generate own resources, diversify incomes and be self-reliant. So, despite commendable capacity development efforts and social accountability interventions at local level, it is likely that these would reduce or evaporate without continued financial donor and philanthropy support. Enabling financing for civil society is a huge sustainability challenge and CSOs remain donor dependent. There is an additional risk that well profiled NGOs with high capacity absorb most donor funding, ultimately financially strangling local CSO (incl. CBOs, informal groups, associations etc.). There is a genuine concern among smaller, lesser-known organizations that current donor-CSO collaborations fuel a monopolization of resources. Unless funds are deliberately designed to reach smaller organizations, concerns about squeezing out valuable community voices persist. Although grant facilities, like FCS, does temporarily sustain smaller organisations, financial stability, fostering long-term partnerships and achieving collective impact remains an enormous challenge

4.3.1. Main recommendations – impact and sustainability

- ✓ **Consider re-orientating SAP III-IV to gradually work more on-system** e.g.
  - o Prompting CSO partners to enhance collaboration with key system actors such as PO-RALG, PCCB, Tanzania National Audit Office, Parliamentary Committees
  - o Re-orientation of local level SAM interventions (if continued) to concentrate more on enhancing accountabilities and processes of formal governance structures

- ✓ **Consider reducing / abandoning lower level Government interventions** (village / ward level) and gradually increase higher level Government interventions (District, Regional, National)

- ✓ **Elevate public expenditure and social accountability focus towards**
  - o Financial flows and accountability gaps from Central to Government level
  - o Analysing implementation and expenditures of district level strategic investment projects (as opposed to small projects funded through Own Source Revenues)

- ✓ **Support CSO partners to critically analyse outcomes and impact of national level policy engagements**, e.g.
  - o Identifying more focused policy goals and strategies to more effectively, and efficiently, achieve impact and systemic change
  - o Ensure that CSO partners' Management Information Systems are adept to track when and how policy outputs are converted into genuine policy outcomes

- ✓ **Foster CSO alliances (e.g. through catalyst funding) that collectively and more efficiently generate policy outcomes with hight impact potential**

- ✓ **Reinforce SAP III commitment to develop CSO partner strategies for diversification of incomes and self-reliant growth**

- ✓ **Take proactive role with other bilateral and multilateral donors to engage GoT in dialogue on how to create a more enabling and sustainable financing environment for CSOs**

4.4. Social Inclusion

SAP III has undoubtedly empowered women & youth in decision making and monitoring financing of public services that address their needs. Also, the SAP III results framework presents gender sensitive indicators as well as disaggregated data which enables partners and SDC to measure progress on social accountability interventions aimed at benefitting women and youth. Still, the degree to which SAP III offers transformational and systemic change remains a question. Through local level SAM interventions, a foundation has been built for more gender and youth responsive policies and public policies. So far though, SAP III has not facilitated gender budget analysis neither in 2019 nor 2020 yet the consultants have identified a strong need for CSO partners, grantees, local authorities and PETS/SAM committees to be more aware and attentive to socially inclusive and gender responsive budgeting. It is still a common misconception amongst

practitioners that Gender Responsive Budgeting only looks at the needs of women and that a gender responsive budget equals separate budget lines for women's priorities. This was confirmed during the interviews when most stakeholders referred to the 4-2-2 % allocation of Own Source Revenues to women, youth and differently abled. This in effect means that gender responsive budgeting revolves only around 4% of the 15% of the total income of LGAs.

SAP III has successfully sensitized communities on Sexual and Gender Based Violence and within the FCS clusters for Harmful Traditional Practices and Social Inclusion and Women's Land rights. 65 grants were allocated in 2019 alone. In terms of good practices the "Teleza case" of Twaweza was consistently mentioned by respondents as an example of how SAP III has brough to light the issue of SGBV both in terms of protecting women and voicing out the challenges that remain in a patriarchal society where women's rights, freedoms, security and quality of life is still being violated.

4.4.1. Main recommendations – social inclusion

✓ **Nudge remaining partners to develop GESI strategies**

✓ **Develop common understanding, approach, and facilitate commensurate capacity and knowledge development for SAP III partners** to engage in e.g.
   o Gender & Youth budget analysis
   o Gender & Youth financial flow analysis
   o Socially Inclusive and Gender Responsive Budgeting
   o Unpaid Care Work

✓ **Consider identifying expert GESI CSO partner for SAP IV**

✓ **Make use of available GESI resources developed by the SDCs Networks for Gender Equality and Democratisation, Decentralisation, Local Governance**

5.   Annexes

5.1. Terms of Reference

Federal Department of Foreign Affairs FDFA **Embassy of Switzerland to Tanzania**

Terms of Reference
For the Mid-term External Evaluation of the third phase of the Swiss Development Cooperation's
Social Accountability Programme in Tanzania (2019-2022) Dar es salaam, October 2020

1.0 Purpose of this Document
This document sets out the requirements relating to the mandate and describes the tender procedure
for the **Mid-Term External Evaluation of the third phase of the Swiss Development Cooperation's
4 Year Social Accountability Programme (SAP3) - 2019-2022.** It serves as a guideline for the bidder
to submit their offer.

2.0 Background information and context of the evaluation
Switzerland's Cooperation Strategy for Tanzania
The Embassy of Switzerland through the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC) is working through its
various programs to contribute towards poverty reduction in Tanzania. SDC's cur-rent country program
ends in December 2020. A new four-year country program will commence in January 2021 with the
overall objective to empower young people, especially poor young women, to advance socially and
economically, thus enabling them to be a main driver of Tanzania's move to an equitable and stable
middle-income country, and contributing to regional stability and prosperity. One of the three outcomes
the SDC aims to achieve is to ensure that: "Civic space is protected and enables all citizens and
especially young women to influence local and national policy making and implementation and protects
their human rights". The social accountability program (SAP), currently in its 3rd phase which ends on
October 2022, is the flagship programme to achieve this outcome. Previous phases have been
evaluated either internally or through the program implementing partners.

Context
Accountability and transparency have been on the decline in Tanzania and the space for citizens to
participate in political decision making is shrinking. Parliamentary oversight is weakening as many laws
are prepared by the Executive and subsequently passed by Parliament under a certificate of urgency,
without substantial discussions. The 2020 Presidential and parliamentary elections have handed the
long-ruling CCM party a decisive victory, essentially ending multi-party democracy in the country and a
similar (if not worse) way of doing business is highly anticipated. Re-centralization which has altered
accountability processes is expected to continue and given an almost one-party parliament, other formal
accountability institutions will only partially independent if at all. The already limited transparency and
accountability in government spending which puts the sustainability of the ambitious industrialization
agenda at risk will most likely continue. The government has however, instilled more discipline among
civil servants and cut administrative costs. Improvements in local government revenue collection and
management have also been reported. Policymaking of the government has often been unpredictable
and recent changes in laws governing Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) have put CSOs under
scrutiny and in-creased administrative and financial aggravation as these laws get more operational.
However, improved internal governance and adapted strategies – focusing mostly on non-
confrontational, evidence-based approaches – allow them to remain effective agents of change.

3.0 Objective, scope and focus of the evaluation
3.1 Evaluation object

The evaluation object consists of a **mid-term evaluation of the social accountability pro-gramme (SAP) 2019-2022**.

SAP supports four key national accountability Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in the country. It aims to enhance transparency and accountability of public resource management at national and local level and to empower citizens – including youth and women - and local organizations to engage effectively in public oversight, decision making and advocacy on social issues of concern.

Specifically, the main envisaged outcomes of the SAP are:

a) Citizens' voice, including women and youth in influencing decision-making pro-cesses on issues that concern them, is increased.

b) Partner CSOs are more effectively influencing policies regarding public resources management both at the national and local level.

c) Civic space is preserved and dialogue between public officials and CSOs improves

SDC supports 4 national partners – all of which base their advocacy initiatives on their close collaboration with local CSOs and citizens including women and youth – which engage with relevant government counterparts on key policy issues at the national level and key service delivery concerns at the local level. SDC is supporting their CSO partners through multi-year core contributions in support of their respective strategic plans. All CSOs are co-funded by other Development Partners. The share of SDC's contribution to each partner ranges from 20% to 50%.

3.2 Purpose and objectives

The programme evaluation will be guided by the **OECD/DAC Criteria** of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. The relevant evaluation criteria are to be selected in order to formulate pertinent evaluation questions that will be presented in the bid. SDC wishes to carry out this mid-term evaluation of the SAP to help inform thinking beyond the current phase. The objectives of this evaluation are fourfold:

i. **Strategic steering:** To look into the progress of the SAP towards achieving its envisaged outcomes as stipulated in the above section and detailed in the program's results logic and identifying major successes and challenges and advising on ways for improvement. This should include an assessment of the extent to which the SAP program was able to build synergies with other SDC programs (media program; health systems strengthening program; among others).

ii. **Results monitoring and evaluation:** Review key monitoring and evaluation approaches used by both SDC and SAP partners to monitor and harvest both qualitative and quantitative results, establish main strengths and bottlenecks both on the partner side and SDC side and advise on how best to consolidate the M & E frame-work of the different partners.

iii. **Impact and sustainability:** To enhance our understanding of what and how change is happening through social accountability activities both at local and national levels and provide concrete recommendations on the sustainability of the approaches used and on how the changes can be sustained over time. This will also include an assessment of how accountability processes can be anchored within existing (formal) systems and structures.

iv. **Social Inclusion:**
- Gender Mainstreaming: To assess the extent to which engagement on issues such as the reduction of Gender Based Violence (GBV) and the engagement of women in peace and land rights initiatives has been successful as well as establish the women issues that are being advocated by each partner.

- Youth empowerment: Assess the extent to which youth are engaged/empowered to participate in accountability and policy influence (such as support to youth platforms, etc.)and make recommendations

3.3 Scope
The breadth and depth of the evaluation will be informed by the indicative evaluation questions that the evaluation seeks to answer (see chapter below). The evaluation will assess the activities implemented during the previous two years of implementation of the program through its implementing partners although it could build - or refer to - the two previous phases of the program. The timeframe of the evaluation is from **January 15 to April 15 2021.**

Geographically, the focus should be on areas of partners' work both at the national level and local level in Tanzania mainland and Zanzibar. This will be finally agreed upon between the reviewers and the respective partners.

3.4 Indicative evaluation questions / key focus area

OECD DAC-Criteria	Questions
Relevance	*Are we doing the right things?* ☐ To what extent are the SAP program's objectives responding to national needs and priorities? ☐ To what extent are the SAP program's objectives contributing to the achievement of SDC's goals in Tanzania? ☐ Is the approach behind SAP 3 appropriate to the problems to be solved? ☐ To what extent is the SAP 3 programs' design adequate to obtain the de-sired outcomes? ☐ Is the mix of partners supported by SAP3 adequate to achieve the desired outputs and outcomes?
Coherence	*How well does the intervention fit?* ☐ Internal coherence: to what extent is SAP 3 compatible with other pro-grams supported by the Governance Domain in Tanzania? Other activities of SDC in the country? ☐ External coherence: to what extent is SAP 3 compatible with interventions of other actors (bilateral and multilateral donors, private sector, UN, NGOs, etc.) in Tanzania?
Effective-ness	*Do the results contribute to overall goals as planned?* ☐ How did SAP 3 contribute to the results of Swiss Development Cooperation in Tanzania? ☐ To what extent have the planned results been achieved? ☐ To what extent were the intended results of SAP 3 achieved (or are likely to be achieved) at the levels of output, outcome, and the overall goals of the intervention? ☐ Is the M+E framework of SAP3 appropriate in capturing change achieved by SAP3 activities? ☐ Which major factors have influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the expected results? an[i]
Efficiency	*Were the results achieved in a cost-effective way?* ☐ To what extent is SAP 3 implemented cost-effectively and in a timely manner? Which alternative approaches might have led to similar results at lower costs? ☐ Is SAP 3 implemented on the basis of a results-oriented approach? Is the monitoring system in place to track the impact of SAP 3 suitable in terms of its objective?

☐ How do project management as well as steering and decision-making pro-cesses function? Are problems identified in good time and are practical, feasible solutions proposed?

Impact	*How are we contributing to the overall goal?*
	☐ *Which positive, lasting effects and behavioural changes can be identified as a result of SAP 3?*
	☐ *Which unexpected and unintended positive and negative (side) effects have occurred?*
	☐ *Did a specific part of the intervention have a greater impact than another?*
	☐ *Were there unintended (positive or negative) effects for the target groups and in society?*
Sustaina-bility	*To what extent will the effects be maintained when the SDC's support ends?*
	☐ *What evidence is there that the achieved effects will continue after the completion of the project?*
	☐ *Which major factors might enhance the effects achieved or prevent them from continuing?*
	☐ *Can the partner institutions and involved stakeholders (target group) continue their activities independently (existence of financial resources) and adjust their strategies to changing conditions? Do they have their own problem-solving capacities (technical capacity)?*
Steering	☐ *What changes to the project could enhance its impact at mid-term?*
	☐ *What are possibly future avenues to achieve the goals of SAP3 beyond the current project phase?*
Intervention Logic / Results Framework	☐ *What are the differences between the results framework depicted in the intervention logic and the actual logic behind the project intervention?*
	☐ *Which assumptions in the intervention logic held true and which mitigation measures work?*
	☐ *Are there any adaptations to the M+E System / Results Framework that would improve the steering of the project in the future?*

4.0 Evaluation process and methods

4.1 Evaluation methodology
SDC is looking for a Review Team that will be able to apply the standard OECD/DAC approach applied in reviewing programmes (namely relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability). The successful bidder is expected to propose an appropriate methodological approach applying both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. The evaluation is expected to include literature review, key informant interviews, analysis of monitoring data by SDC and its SAP partners; as well as triangulate this, to the extent possible, with socio-economic data for Mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar.

4.2 Roles and responsibilities of the evaluator(s)
The evaluation will be conducted by a team composed of one international (senior) consultant accompanied by a local one. The overall responsibility will lie with the international consultant who will be the team leader. The international consultant will have a contract with the Embassy of Switzerland and in the capacity of team leader, will sub-contract the local consultant. The international consultant will report to the Embassy of Switzerland in Dar es salaam. The consultants will independently carry out the field visits in select areas to implementing partners and their beneficiaries. SDC responsible program staff will support the consultants with administrative and logistical arrangements that will include: co-ordination and planning of initial meetings with SAP partners, writing cover letters for data collection, co-ordinating through implementing partners site-visits and interviews, making accessible all required documentation, commenting and inputting in both the inception and draft review report.

4.3 Evaluation process and timeframe

The work plan below provides suggested dates, and responsibilities for the various activities of the evaluation process. This will be adapted by the evaluator(s) according to their needs, in consultation with the SDC, during the inception phase. Timeframe to be discussed with consultant(s), but the work will be undertaken over a timeline of approximately three (3) months. Bidders will propose the number of days they would need to carry out this evaluation.

Modified (Covid) Timeline Activity	Date	Responsibility
Commencing of contract	8th February2021	SDC
An inception report setting out the evaluation de-sign, methodology, tools, and work plan that includes description of tasks for the individual consultants	22nd February 2021	Consultants (Evaluators)
Field mission with data collection, interviews, evaluation workshops, etc.	15th March-20th April2021	Consultants (Evaluators)
Debriefing on evaluation findings (Either physically at the Swiss Embassy in Dar es salaam or virtually)	By 30th April2021	Consultants
Draft report with initial recommendations	15th May2021	Consultants and SDC
Final report Submission	31st May2021	Consultants

5.0. Deliverables

The evaluator(s) will prepare and submit the following key deliverables:

1. An inception report detailing a review work plan, methodological approach including key evaluation questions, an outline of the final evaluation report and the tools that will be deployed

2. A debriefing workshop after the field mission, to share first findings and to discuss and receive comments from the project stakeholders. This will help to draft the report.

3. A draft evaluation report which should include the evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations. SDC and other key stakeholders will comment and give feedback to the evaluator(s). The evaluator(s) will finalise the report in view of the comments shared.

4. A final evaluation report in English (maximum 30pages excluding annexes); which will include an abstract/executive summary, a main report informing of the implementation of the social accountability program, Conclusions from the review, Lessons Learned and Recommendations for future program design. Any additional information will be attached as annexes. The report will be submitted to the Swiss Embassy electronically in draft for comments and final draft will be submitted in both soft and hardcopy formats (2 copies) by 31st March 2021

Additional deliverables will include:
- Lists of people interviewed
- Case studies if any
- Slides for debriefing

6.0 Reference Documents

After signing the contract, the evaluation manager (SDC) will share the following documents with the evaluator(s) for the evaluator's first desk review:
☐ SAP Project Documents

□ Swiss Country program documents
□ SDC Guidance document on Social Accountability
□ Implementing partners' strategic plans and annual reports
□ Proposed list of key interviewees

7.0 Competency profile of the evaluator(s)

The evaluator(s) is/are expected to bring along the following evaluation and thematic expertise and experience.

Essential qualities are:

□ Combined extensive demonstrable professional experience in conducting evaluations of donor-funded programmes and offering high quality results

□ Profound knowledge in the areas of social accountability, advocacy and citizen voice enhancing initiatives.

□ Excellent knowledge of the common social accountability approaches (tools) used by civil society organizations (CSOs).

□ Acquaintance with gender mainstreaming in development programs.

Desired qualities are:

□ Fluency in English and at least one of the reviewers should have excellent fluency in Swahili.
□ Experience in the governance and the CSO sectors in the Tanzania context.

8.0. Application Procedure

The Technical and financial proposal/ offer should be sent **until 10th January 2021** by **e-mail** to: Jacquiline: jacquiline-gatera.ngoma@eda.admin.ch

And **must be copied by e-mail to:**

Luca Etter: luca.etter@eda.admin.ch

The technical proposal should not exceed 15 pages and should outline the service provider's:

1. Understanding of the assignment;
2. Approach to and methodology for the assignment];
3. Experience with similar assignments (incl. CVs);
4. Draft evaluation work plan;
5. Draft report outline;
6. Financial proposals
7. Any other relevant information.

The financial proposal should be no more than one page (SDC Template will be provided) and should clearly outline the daily rates in US Dollars or Swiss Francs (CHF).

9.0 Contracting

The contract will be awarded by the Embassy of Switzerland in Tanzania following an analysis of technical and financial proposals received in response to these terms of reference.

A contract will be entered with the lead consultant. Payments will be done in 2instalments basing on the number of days worked at the time of payment. Triggers for payment shall be set in the Contract according to due deliverables stipulated above.

5.2. Lists of institutions, organisations and people interviewed

	Name of Participant	Position	Contact email/cell phone
SDC			
1	Jacquiline Ngoma	Programme Officer, Governance	jacquiline-gatera.ngoma@eda.admin.ch
2	Philippo Marloes	Senior Program Officer Employment & Income	marloes.philippo@eda.admin.ch
3	Clara Minja Melchior	Programme Officer	clara.minja@eda.admin.ch
5	Jacqueline Matoro	Senior Program Officer - Health Domain	jacqueline.matoro@eda.admin.ch
6	Peter Sidler	Head of Domain: Employment and Income	peter.sidler@eda.admin.ch
7	Dr. Thomas Teuscher	Head of Domain: Health	thomas.teuscher@eda.admin.ch
8.	Luca Etter	Head of Domain: Governance	luca.etter@eda.admin.ch
Policy Forum			
9	Semkae Kilonzo	Executive Director	Mobile: +255 782 317434 Email: skilonzo@policyforum.or.tz coordinator@policyforum.or.tz
10	Prisca Kowa	Senior Officer, Strategic Partnerships	pkowa@policyforum.or.tz
11	Richard Angelo	Manager, Local Governance	rangelo@policyforum.or.tz
12	Haitham Kichwabuta	Program Officer, M&E	hkichwabuta@policyforum.or.tz
Twaweza			
13	Aidan Eyakuze	Executive Director	
14	Risha Chande	Director Advocacy & Engagement	
15	Buruani Mshale	Director of Learning and Strategy	0712 455 701
16	Entesh Melaisho	Programme Officer, Governance	
Foundation for civil Society			
17	Francis Uhadi	Program Manager	0755 831 152/ 0782 101 152
18	Guesturd Haule	Head of M&E, Research and Learning	0754 005 708
ANSAF			
19	Honest Mseri	Head of Operations	+255 689 895 744 / 717 403 032 Email: agribuse@ansaf.or.tz
20	Audax	Executive Director	director@ansaf.or.tz
21	Monica	M&E	
22	Stella Msami	Communication	
PANGANI COASTAL PARALEGAL ASSOCIATION - PACOPA			

23	Aisha M. Shabani	PET Committee - Secretary Msalaza Village	0656 132 014
24	Nuru U. Chengula	PET Committee - member Msalaza Village	0673 110 767
25	Richard H. Mtausi	Water Board - Member Msalaza Village	0653 486 896
26	Hassan H. Bakari	PET Committee – Chairperson Msalaza	0672 143 225
27	Bakari Abdallah	PET Committee - member Msalaza Village	0654 015 530
28	Upendo Aseli	PET Committee – Chairperson Kigurusimba V	
29	Hamisi Nafasi	PET Committee – V Chair-Kigurusimba Village	0656 182 696
30	Christina Sanga	PET Committee – members	0657 692 676
31	Mwanakuzi Abdallah	PET Committee - member	0656 963 046
32	Mwanaisha J. Shabani	PET Committee - member	0711 280 723
33	Aisha M. Shaaban	PET Committee - Member	0656132014
34	Thadei K. Khamis	M&E Officer PACOPA	0657 672 570
35	Bakari Abdillah Burhan	Executive Director - PACOPA	Pacopapralegal11@gmail.com
PANGANI DISTRICT COUNCIL			
36	Elias E. Msuya	District Community Dev. Officer Pangani DC	msuyaelias@hotmail.com 0787 195 242
37	Simon Herman Mkumbwa	Ag. District Human Resource Officer	0713 685 594
38	Anna V. Mizambwa	Community Dev. Officer - RUWASA	Janelikem360@gmail.com 0713 876 358
39	Thadei Kasssim	District Planning Officer	thadeikamiss@gmail.com 0657 672 570
IRINGA – MJUMIKI			
40	Wislay Ngalutila	Program Manager - MJUMIKI	0767 096 035
41	Thomas Naftary Mtelega	M&E Officer - MJUMIKI	0758 398 323
42	Felix Waya	PET Committee	0769 629 382
43	Magdalena Mkwawi	PET Committee	0759 012 500
44	Ahazi Sibale	PET Committee	0764 717 181

45	Augustino Kihombo	Journalist	0759 513 935
46	Francis Edwin	Journalist	0754 026 294
47	Ebrania Mlimbila	PET Committee	0763 995 703
48	Siriacus Mpoma	PET Committee	0754 392 079
49	Bahati S. Mgao	PET Committee	0754 257 970
50	Mashaka Kulanga	PET Committee	0766 481 749
51	Bokassa Kihongo	PET Committee	0755 465 368
52	Karista Udessi	PET Committee	0757 149 221
53	Vekael Mkuye	PET Committee	0757 794 596
54	Zaria Mpululu	PET Committee	0762 025 385
55	Bahati Kamilongo	PET Committee	0623 566 623
MBARALI WATER, SANITAION & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION (MWECO)			
56	Asifiwe Patrick	PET Committee - member	0758 168 450
57	Jeremana renald	PET Committee - member	0756 734 860
58	Mpese Peter	PET Committee	0766 009 915
59	Sadiki Kanomaly	PET Committee	0658 699 576
69	Ashura Peter	PET Committee	0742 442 472
61	Zera Kyombo	PET Committee	0742 366 280
62	Ezekeil Samwel	MWECO ME& and Accountant	0753 484 666
63	Terdey A. Mhagama	Executive Director - MWECO	0754/0784 327 520
65	Festo S. Kwakasege	Journalist	0756 852 428
MBARALI DISTRICT COUNCIL			
66	Stephen Toto Bitta	NGO Coordinator	0755 565 629
67	Dismas F. Kinunda	Ag. DPLO	0754 872 254
68	Anyubatile Seme	District Community Development Officer	0754 081 847
69	Dr. Godfrey Mwakalila	District Medical Officer	0767 481 436
70	Dr. Shukuru M. Nyenyeme	Medical Officer 1/C MoH	0755 192 031
ANSAF CSO Members			

71	Elisha E. Mwanikawaga	ANSAF member	0768 167 975
72	Francis F. Mwombeki	NSAF Member	0755 497 383
POLICY FORUM MEMBERS - MIICO			
73	Dalali Venge	Project Officer	0753 073 131
74	Daniel Palingo	Project Officer	0744 728 102
75	Simon Kuwanga	Volunteer	0714 207 612
76	Neema Swai	Accountant	0763 224 184
77	Felista Wiston	Project Coordinator	0756 176 866
78	Vaileth Omary	Field Officer	0758 065 106
79	Esther Sanga	Volunteer	0714 429 744
80	Wisity Simfukwe	Volunteer	0717 814 052
81	Magreth Mwakyoma	Assistant Project Officer	0676 221 903
82	Juster Emilian	Project Officer	0764 843 901
83	Jane Charles	Monitoring & Evaluation	0753 902 328
84	Anna Minja	Volunteer	0782 450 559
85	Anderson Fungo	Head of Finance & Administration	0763 685 770
86	Gloria Mdindile	Advocacy Officer	0766 065 889
MBEYA CITY COUNCIL			
87	Amede Ng'wanidako	City Executive Officer	Elias.amede@mbeyacc.go.tz
88	Erick Mvati	City Agricultural, Irrigation and Cooperative Officer	
89	Agnes	Ag. City Community Development Officer	
90	Adon Celestine	City Planning and Development Officer	
91	Elice Luwondo	City Horticultural Specialist	
92	Osward Kasambala	City Engineer	
PREVENTION AND COMBATING OF CORRUPTION BUREAU (PCCB)			
93	Ms. Tunu	Director of Communications and Relations	0782 229 642
MINISTRY OF HEALTH, COMMUNITY DEV. GENDER, ELDERLY & CHILDREN (MHCDGEC)			
94	Neema Ndoboka	Ag. Director of Community Development	0754 768 433
95	Mussa Sang'anya	Assistant NGO Registrar, Tanzania	0784 487 496

96	Charles Mpaka	Advocate and Lawyer - Registrar NGO Office	
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE			
97	Ravelian Ngaiza	Policy Advisor & national Coord. Youth Involvement in Agriculture	raveliann@yahoo.co.uk 0782 669 383
98	Dactari Hango	Director of Policy and Planning	
99	Albert Silayo	Planning Officer	
PRESIDENT'S OFFICE REGIONAL ADMINISTRATION & LOCAL GOVERNMENT (PORALG)			
100	Mr. Enock Nyanda	Ag. Director - Sector Coordination	beenyanda@gmail.com 0789 496 202
101	Anicetus Mramba	Coordinator - Opportunities and Obstacles for Development	mrambawho@gmail.com>
EMBASSY OF DENMARK IN TANZANIA			
102	Jamila Hoka Lugembe	Program Officer Good Governance & Human Rights	jamlug@um.dk
EMBASSY OF SWEDEN IN TANZANIA			
103	Stephen Chimalo	Programme Officer, Civil Society & Education	stephen.chimalo@gov.se
KPGM – DFID implementer AcT programme			
104	Amani Manyelezi	Former Manager - Accountability Tanzania Program	amanyelezi@kpmg.co.tz
Hewlett Foundation			
105	David Sasaki	Programme Officer, Global Development & Population	DSasaki@hewlett.org

5.3. Case studies

The Teleza case – Twaweza

In April of 2019, Twaweza and our partners heard about a gruesome phenomenon in Kigoma Urban, dubbed *Teleza.* Gangs of young men roam neighbourhoods, covered in grease or 'dirty oil'. They break into women's houses and rape them on threat of injury, often from machetes, if they resist. There is no discrimination or sympathy: pregnant women, those fresh from giving birth, older women, children, all are potential victims. The main criterion is to be living without a man in the house. The women are subject to horrific violence. Then when they report these incidents, they are mocked and belittled by police, forced to part with money for fake charges by hospital and police alike. This issue was raised as part of the animation process in Kigoma-Ujiji. The process requires young women, young men, older women, and older men to first identify issues in their own groups before coming together to agree shared priorities. Women in Mwanga Kusini ward raised the issue of *Teleza* as a major problem that had been going on for a number of years, at least as far back as 2014/15. Although from the outset, there seemed to be attempts to downplay the issue, to talk of it as past or to blame the women themselves, our partner Tamasha were not to be deterred. In three days of investigation, they uncovered 45 cases spanning from 2016 to this year. Although other actors have attempted to address Teleza, they have met with little success. Even from early on, it was as if there was strong resistance from the local authorities. One of the core hypotheses of Twaweza's 2019-2022 strategy is that these types of localised issues, raised in our work to demonstrate citizen agency, can provide fodder for national action and change: to address unresolved long-term local problems; to identify issues that might be more widely felt; and to use locally identified issues with widespread resonance to push for systemic changes in policies, laws or practice. Our first step was to write a letter to and meet with the Minister of Home Affairs. The letter was copied to regional and local authorities in Kigoma as well as other relevant national government institutions. While giving the government time to respond, we organised our documentation of the cases including video and audio testimonials and photos. We also identified a survivor, Ramla Issa, who was willing to tell her story. Two weeks after the letter was sent, we held a press conference where she shared her story and we shared our specific calls to action. Ramla continued to press leaders and engage with the media. In this way we also amplified citizen's voices into national spaces as per Twaweza's second mission area. The story began to take up a life of its own. Other organisations and individuals began demanding action, moved by the suffering these women had endured for so long and the lack of action from government. International media were following up alongside national media. Perhaps the strongest reaction came on social media: individual citizens added their powerful voices to the calls for a response. And government machinery began to respond. A first there was denial, anger at the 'noise-makers'. But we persisted. The issue was raised in parliament: an irate minister was calmly told by the chair of parliament to give the issue the attention it deserved. Meanwhile in Kigoma, a high-level local leader was initially sceptical but conducted some house visits. After holding community meetings with women survivors, he became a champion for the cause, emphasising the need for perpetrators to be caught, the zero-tolerance policy of authorities to these crimes. National leaders acted too: they visited the area and emphasised the need for local action. The women themselves, and community mobilisers continued to play important roles, galvanising local support. Ultimately, nine perpetrators including a ringleader were arrested, and prosecuted. Religious leaders became engaged and took the issue up. There were months with no cases. But almost one year later, the situation remains fragile. Cases are beginning to occur again. The ringleader who was arrested was released for lack of evidence. The local authorities are angry and want no mention of *Teleza*, all local organisations and researchers working on the issue have been told not to do so. We continue to plan new ways of supporting these women and reviewing our work.

5.4. Slides for debriefing

DAC findings: Impact & Sustainability

- Twaweza perception index and MtR Citizen Report Cards confirm that SAP III contributes to local level service improvements; more responsive LGAs; more empowered women & youth; and more transparent and accountable use of public resources

- Whilst SAP III undoubtedly leads to positive outcomes at local (mtaa level) the higher local governance level impact and systemic change can be questioned

- PETS and SAM interventions mainly revolve around Own Source Revenues (15% of LGA Budget) and accountability efforts mostly happen at mtaa and (sometimes) ward level

- The effectiveness and outcomes of bottom-up planning and budgeting processes must also be questioned in a (still) rather centralized governance PFM system

- Large scale strategic investments are not under scrutiny and accountability mechanisms for such – especially at ward and district level - are weakened in "Improved" Guidelines for Opportunities and Obstacles

DAC findings: Impact & Sustainability

- CSO partners effectively engage in policy processes with high impact potential and are aware that invited spaces for CSO consultations are not sufficient strategies for policy influence

- The outputs reported from formal policy processes are multiple but could possibly be even more focused around selected strategic policy outcomes of partners – and (as Twaweza recognize that there is a difference between a public debate sphere and policy sphere

- Some policy results :
  - Partners engagement in Decentralization Policy, Statistics Act, Cyber Act articulation is applaudable
  - PF engaged in improved Opportunities and Obstacle guidelines (focus on self-reliance and self-help through Community Initiatives, and lack of accountability mechanisms above mtaa level)
  - ANSAF engaged in Own Source Revenue recommendations to have fixed sub-sector (Agriculture) expenditure target which limits autonomy of LGAs, but does after all hold them more accountable for spending more on development sectors
  - Also the 4-4-2% allocation of OSR to women, youth and vulnerable is at face value a step forward, but not transformative (see social inclusion)

DAC findings: Impact & Sustainability

- Working off-system, through parallel structures (PETS/SAM committees) carries risks of having both limited impact and sustainability

- Even working on-system would have sustainability challenges since decentralised bottom-um up and local governance structures and elected leaders have low capacity

- Primary focus on mtaa and ward level interventions makes it difficult to reach impact, scalability and foster systemic change

- CSO partners policy engagement, incl. "trojan horse approach" – "insider route" within Ministries and Parliament, has good impact potential and is complementary to invited spaces for policy dialogue and consultations

- The NGO legislation and role of NGO registrar remains a challenge for an enabling CSO environment, especially enabling financing for self-reliance and financial sustainability

- Evidently, local level CSO and communities have been empowered and are motivated. Yet, absence of consistent and enabling financing for local CSOs would jeopardise sustainability and impact of interventions

DAC findings: Gender & Social Inclusion

- Women and youth have effectively been participating in SAP III interventions and do have more voice than before related to participatory planning and budgeting and holding LGAs to account for public resource allocations and quality of services

- Wide-spread perception amongst most CSO partners and LGAs that the 4-4-2% allocation of own source revenue is an important step towards addressing needs of women, youth and differently abled

- However, OSR is 10-15% of LGA budgets and genuine SIGRB is about analysing, planning and budgeting for public services and economic empowerment opportunities 100% through the perspectives of disadvantaged groups

- SAP III contribution to youth livelihood e.g., promoting innovative private sector initiatives to facilitate the creation of decent jobs is currently not evident (apart from the 4%)

- Enhanced partner emphasis on gender (PF/Twaweza has new Gender strategies)

Conclusions: Strategic Steering

- SAP III undoubtedly is relevant to the context, contributes to strategic objectives of GoT, SDC and other development partners. The integrated link to E+I domain should however be strengthened

- Although, the mix of partners cover well the expertise for local level social accountability and national level policy engagement, there is currently no lead partner on Health. Also a partner with more expertise on Youth Employment & Income (beyond Agriculture) would add value

- The core contribution approach becomes challenging when 4 different strategic CSO partners receive funding for attaining the same SDC aligned goals and outcomes, but they may not use similar approaches, work at same intervention level, in same district but in different wards and sectors

- The philosophy behind core contribution is an indication of an equal strategic partnership approach. In practice though, it may be considered to introduce a stronger programmatic steering facility or backstopping – beyond annual shared learning events

- For SDC COOF it may overall be considered to reflect on the future support modality, .e.g. a hybrid model of core contribution and earmarked funding – possibly even performance based model? (risking to rock the boat)

Conclusions: Sustainability & Impact

- Working more on-system, incl. supporting key institutions like PO-RALG, PCCB, Parliamentary Committees, etc. is necessary to enhance impact and sustainability of local governance interventions and strengthening multi-level accountability
  - PF has been strategizing on the best way to collaborate with PO-RALG especially under Local Government Training Institute (LGTI) and this effort has culminated with a proposed MoU

- National Decentralisation Policy and Regional and Local Government strategy programme could be an entry point: 10 years, 2 phases, 1.5 billion Tsh earmarked from GoT

- The 6th administration gives hope towards enhancing women's rights, more focus on right oriented social services, deepened local governance and reclaim of the civic space and freedom of press

- Enabling financing for civil society is a huge sustainability challenge and CSOs remain donor dependent. There is an additional risk that well profiled NGOs absorb most donor funding as they have enhanced capacity to raise and diversity own resources – ultimately financially strangling local CSO (incl. CBOs, informal groups, associations etc.)

- FCS has established its own advisory services and capacity building centre. Such a business model is very interesting, but needs careful monitoring and evaluation to avoid financial collapse, especially amidst global pandemic and stiff regional global consultancy competition

Conclusions: Social Inclusion and other transversal topics

- SAP III has empowered women & youth in decision making and financing of public services that address their needs but the transformational GSE aspect and systemic change from SAP III remains a question. SAP III has potential to strengthen transformative interventions for social inclusion though e.g. genuine inclusive and gender responsive budgeting (SIGRB); Un-paid care work interventions; and explicitly strategic direction on political and economic empowerment

- There are good signs of applying conflict sensitive approaches, harmful practices and addressing women's land rights in local grantee interventions through FCS cluster 2-4. . However a more systematic approach to this related to scarce financial resources and natural resources like land and water may be considered in the Social Accountability Cluster 1.

- Climate financing may very well become an opportunity for improved livelihoods but at the same time a challenge for accountable and transparent financing

- Urbanisation is a reality and could be addresses more explicitly in SAP III - and strengthening the link to outcome 3 related to e.g.: employment creation, decent working conditions and service provision for rural youth migrating to peri urban and city areas

- Arts & Culture and independent media as transversal approach has much potential: civic space; social accountability; conflict transformation

Conclusions: Results Monitoring & Evaluation

- Clear improvements in partners' leadership commitment to setting up better MEL and Management Information Systems and create staff awareness. Well reflected in strategic plans.

- It may consider to simplify the partner monitoring and reporting template and to a higher extent rely on the outcome reports (including harvesting unexpected outcomes) - which is also more in the spirit of strategic core contribution support.

- It would be interesting to conduct Results Verification w. Govt. Institutions which is a mix of process tracing and contribution analysis

- The perception based influence indicators are appropriate for governance (accountability programs) but may be triangulated with other perception indexes and barometers – as well as be re-designed to be less positively biased (75% positive answer options).

- It may be considered to triangulate self assessment indicator results with other relevant barometers

- Partners and SDCs ToCs are valid and well aligned, but could be validated on a biannual basis, incl. assumptions, e.g. through a formalised PEPA reflection process

- Proven ability to adapt programmes amidst Covid-19 and to some extent 2020 elections. Also good partners awareness of political economy and power aspects

5.5. Covid-19 Measures

It is the consultant's responsibilities to ensure that all activities conducted during the mid-term evaluation will have in place strict Covid-19 prevention measures. One or more of the below guides will be applied to help prevent the spread of the virus and keep people safe:

✓ Meet as few people as possible. Workshops, FGDs, KII and other physical meetings will have no more than 10 people in attendance.

✓ For any gathering, the consultants will provide clear guidance on social distancing and hygiene to people on arrival. This will include sharing on the recommended DO's and DONT's to minimize spread of viruses - No shaking hands; Avoid touching the nose, mouth, and eyes if you have not washed your hands; Dispose of used tissues properly, and wash your hands immediately after you cough or sneeze. When Cough and sneeze use inside the elbow.

✓ Air extraction and ventilation measures to a meeting: Ventilation into the meeting buildings will be optimized to ensure a fresh air supply is provided to all areas of the facility and increased wherever possible. Make the use of fans, leave windows opened before and during meeting time. Meeting with community representatives will be organized in an open space whenever possible.

✓ Organize and run online meetings and, possibly, share self-administered questionnaires. Phone calls can be applied especially with respondents without computers and/or challenging internet connection

✓ Hygiene measures: Wash hands often and make use of alcohol-based hand sanitizers that contain at least 60% of alcohol. Meetings and interviews will be done in places where hand washing facilities are available. Hand sanitizers will be made available for use by all people involved in evaluation activities throughout.

✓ Observe Distance: keep 2 meters away from others. This will be maintained throughout a survey period. If there are situations that it is difficult to implement, changing the plan will be recommended

✓ Personal Protective equipment and face covering. All people engaged in any contact meeting will have to wear a nose and mouth mask. Consultants will always keep some pieces for any participant without a mask or in case the meeting time is beyond the recommended time for mask wearing.

✓ Politely, turn people with virus symptoms away. In case it comes into consultant's understanding or in case there are such suspects.