



THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

**EU COUNTRY ROADMAP FOR
ENGAGEMENT WITH CIVIL SOCIETY**

2014 - 2017

Approved by: EU Heads of Mission

Date of approval: 17th

Main References:

- "Third sector in Tanzania – Learning more about civil society organisations, their capabilities and challenges" – Aga Khan Development Network – May 2007.
- "Civil Society Profile: Tanzania" – 2011
- "Civil Society in Tanzania " – EMJee Development Consult for the Embassy of Belgium – 2009
- "Identification and formulation of 10th EDF support to Non State Actors in Tanzania: Scoping / Mapping Study of relevant ongoing and planned interventions in the area of support to NSAs, accountability and policy advocacy in Tanzania and Zanzibar - Opportunities for 10th NSA Support Programme" - HTSPE – 2010
- "The State of Civil Society Organisation in Tanzania" – Annual Report 2009 – The Foundation for Civil Society
- "Country CSO Roadmaps – How EU delegations can strengthen engagement with civil society" – CONCORD – June 2013

Definition Civil Society Organisations:

The concept of civil society (CS) encompasses a wide range of organisations. In a broad sense, it includes all non-market and non-state organisations and structures in which people organise to pursue shared objectives and ideals. In the development field, there is a tendency to think primarily in terms of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) whose missions are explicitly and uniquely developmental in character.

However, civil society also includes farmers' associations, professional associations, community-based organisations, environmental groups, independent research institutes, universities, faith-based organisations, labour unions, and the non-profit media, as well as other groups that do not engage in development work. This broad definition is widely accepted in the world of development practitioners.

Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) operate at four different levels:

- **First level:** grassroots organisations/community-based organisations. They consist of informal groupings or ad-hoc organisations working in the immediate local context.
- **Second level:** organisations legally registered with appropriated statues, working for the benefit of the populations or in service delivery, sometimes in collaboration with grass-roots organisations (e.g. NGOs, associations).
- **Third level:** geographic or thematic networks: national associations, federations and thematic networks mandated to defend a common interest.
- **Fourth level:** this is the highest level of CSO networking. It is made up of platforms or common dialogue fora for umbrella organisations and networks of the third level.

ACRONYMS

AGOA: African Growth and Opportunities Act

ALAT: Association of Local Authorities in Tanzania

ANGONET: Arusha NGO Network

BWG: Budget Working Group

CB: Citizens Budget

CBO: Community Based Organisation

CS: Civil Society

CSOs: Civil Society Organisations

DPs: Development Partners

EAC: East African Community

GoT: Government of Tanzania

ICISO: Iringa Civil Society Organization

KINGONET: Kilwa Non-Governmental Organisation Network

LGAs: Local Government Authorities

LHRC: Legal Human Right Centre

MCDGC: Ministry of Community Development, Gender and Children

MVIWATA: Mtandao wa Vikundi vya W akulima Tanzania (farmers organisation)

NGOs: Non-Governmental Organisations

NSAs: Non-State Actors

PETS: Public Expenditure Tracking Survey

PFM: Public Finance Management

PFMRP: Public Finance Management Reform Programme

PMO-RALG: Prime Minister's Office - Regional Administration and Local Government

PSDA: Participatory Service Delivery Assessment

RANGO: Rukwa Association of NGOs

SADC: Southern African Development Community

SAGCOT: Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania

TACOSODE: Tanzania Council for Social Development

TALA: Tanzania Land Alliance

TANGO: Tanzania Association of NGOs

TEN/MET: Tanzania Education Network

TGNP: Tanzania Gender Networking Programme

The Roadmap process:

Context:

Conceived as a joint initiative between the European Union and its Member States, the EU Country Roadmap has the ambition to improve the consistency of EU cooperation towards civil society, across sectors and instruments, and to progressively promote a better dialogue between EU Delegations, Members States and the Civil Society.

This Roadmap will cover the period 2014-2017 and will be updated each year, or when major changes which impact on the civil society occur.

The process:

End of May 2014, a questionnaire was sent to different key stakeholders: Tanzanian Civil Society Organisations; International NGOs; Member States; Development partners involved in the support of Civil to capture their views, analysis and proposals on how to reinforce the EU/CSOs partnership on a long term perspective. The questionnaire was also available on line on the EU Delegation website.

The percentage of participation was:

mail sent to:	# sent	# Reception	%
EU Member States	11	5	45%
Non-EU Development Partners	5	2	40%
CSOs Mainland	50	6	12%
CSOs Zanzibar	39	1	3%
ALAT	1	0	0%
TOTAL	106	14	13%

On the 25th of June 2014, the EUD invited all MS Governance Officer to participate to a technical meeting to share the result of the analysis and to start the discussion on the priorities and actions we should focus on. Six Member States participated to this meeting.

On the 2nd of July 2014, the EUD organised a workshop with Civil Society Organisations to discuss on the priorities and actions that the European Union, Members States and Civil Society Organisations should undertake together to level up the EU dialogue and cooperation towards Civil Society. The workshop, which was attended by more than 15 stakeholders -ranging from national, local and international NGOs- led to fruitful and interesting reflections. The action plan was updated and completed with the comments and remarks made.

On the 8th of July 2014, the last version of the action plan was sent to all stakeholders asking them to make any further comments before sending it for approval to the Heads of Mission.

On the 22nd of July 2014, the EUD organised a workshop in Zanzibar with Civil Society Organisations to discuss on the priorities and actions that the European Union, Members States and Civil Society Organisations should undertake together to level up the EU dialogue and cooperation towards Civil Society. The workshop, which was attended by 6 stakeholders led to fruitful and interesting reflections. The action plan was updated and completed with the comments and remarks made.

On the 20th of August 2014, the final roadmap and action plan was presented during an EU Head of Cooperation's meeting. The Roadmap was then sent to EU head of Mission for approval.

1 STATE OF CIVIL SOCIETY

1.1 ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

Historical Background:

The history of the civil society in Tanzania could be traced back to the period before independence. However, the nature, strategies, scope of activities, and the organizational forms adopted by current non-profit organisations significantly differ from the early ones. These differences seem to reflect among other factors, the socio-economic and political context of the time.

The current civil society reflects governance changes, which have taken place in Tanzania since the mid-1980s. In this sense, it can be argued that the present civil society in Tanzania is very new. In Tanzania, three major historical phases are important for an understanding of the emergence of civil society. These periods are:

1- The Colonial Period: During this period various associations were formed partly to respond to colonial rule and also as a result of the social and economic changes which took place at that time. For instance, trade unions or welfare and social associations were formed to demand for the improvement of both living and working conditions. Basically these forms of organizations emerged as a response to the social insecurity people encountered. Towards the end of the colonial rule in Tanganyika one witnessed an increasing number of civil society organizations which took different forms and structures. More of these organisations became the nucleus for the anti-colonial movement that led Tanganyika to independence in 1961. The consolidation and institutionalization of the state, under the nation-building project and single-partyism, led to the suppression and forcible affiliation of civil society organisations as a source of factionalism as well as an engine for organized resistance, which could lay the foundation for the formation of a strong opposition. The state justified its direct control over societal organizations and life with the ideology of national building. As a result of this, there were little, if any, room left for the organisation of autonomous civil society organisations.

2- The post- Arusha Declaration Period: The party enhanced its monopoly over societal organizations in all spheres of life. Potential pressure groups such as women, youths, students, workers were co-opted. The party's control over society demobilized the people and discouraged any independent organizations or associations that could act as developmental pressure groups, or lobbies for some specific policies. By the end of 1970s all organizations were under the auspices of the party.

3- Post IMF-Tanzania Agreement: In the mid-1980s Tanzania has started implementing economic liberalization policies. Structural adjustment policies including the move to liberalize the economy gave room for the emergence of a nascent civil society. The development of civil society organisations in the 1980s was not only a response to the changes which were taking place, but also an attempt by those who had the potential, to independently participate in country's development (but who had been marginalized by single party politics), to organize. By the time Tanzania was embarking on multiparty politics, a number of civil society organisations such as NGOs and other local organisations had already been formed. In the 1980s and 1990s most of the NGOs registered were in the areas of human rights, environmental conservation, gender issues and professional organisations. In today times, over 3000 CSOs are registered in Tanzania Mainland and 1000 in Zanzibar.

Legal Context:

The nature of government, constitutional setting and legal system in Tanzania has an impact on civil society particularly in the way non-profit organisations are treated in the laws of the two constituent entities of the Union that is, Tanzania Mainland and Tanzania Zanzibar respectively.

The regulation and control of civil society organisations does not constitute part of the “union matters” mentioned in the Union Constitution. Each constituent part of the Union therefore has its own system of laws concerning non-profit organisations and institutional arrangement for the management of the civil society.

The laws governing non-profit organisations in Tanzania are partly of common law origin and largely of statutory nature¹. Some of the statutes, which deal with non-profit organisations were promulgated during the colonial period but are still in force in the country.

Until very recently, Tanzania did not have a law specifically on NGOs. The **National Policy on NGOs** of 2001 and **the NGO Act** of 2002 were first meant to harmonize this legislative framework, decentralise the registration process, and facilitate NGOs' operations.

However, **the Act did not lead to these evolutions**, since it didn't repeal the other laws. It extended the diversity of statutes with which non-profit organizations can register, and increased the layers of legislation. In practice, there is no law that encompasses all CSOs in Tanzania, given the range of their roles and modes of operation and varied membership. For instance, the NGO Act does not cover trade unions, social clubs, political parties, religious organisations or Community Based Organisations (CBOs), which are governed by laws such as the Societies Act (2002) and Cooperative Acts. This multiplicity of laws is a source of confusion. According to the "Civil Society Profile: Tanzania", 57% of CSOs consulted believe CSO registration is too slow and 42% said that they were subject to unfair restriction by government.

All the different types of non-profit organisations are regulated centrally by national legislation and regulations although at the District level, the power and authority over NGOs operating at that level have now been delegated to the District Administrative Secretary.

Basic Legal Rights:

What is the situation in law and in practice for civil society to exercise the freedoms of expression, assembly and association? This includes rights for CSOs such as formalised, transparent and non-discriminatory registration procedures, free and independent operation and cooperation between citizens and the absence of disproportionate or unwarranted state interference.

Both the 1977 Constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania (The Union Constitution) and the Constitution of Zanzibar of 1984 guarantee human rights and freedom such as freedom of association and of assembly; of free speech; and of worship, all of which impact on non-profit activity. Article 20 of the Union Constitution and similar provision in the Constitution of Zanzibar guarantee the freedom of every person to freely and peaceably assemble, associate and cooperate with others persons, express views and publicly, but subject to the “law of the land”. Both the

¹ Societies Act, The Trustees' Incorporation Act, the Companies Act which governs companies limited by guarantee, the Law of Contract Act, the Building Societies Act, the Tanganyika Law Society Act, the Wakf Commissioners Ordinance, which governs Islamic waqfs (trusts), the National Sports Council of Tanzania Act, and the Copyright and Neighbouring Rights Act.

Union and Zanzibar constitutions guarantee both the positive freedom of forming or joining associations or organisations as well as the negative freedom of not being forced to join such associations or organisations.

However, the enjoyment of the freedom of association under the Union Constitution is still affected by the omnibus limitation clause under Article 30(02) (e) which subjects it to other laws of the land. The Constitution of Zanzibar carries a similar limitation under Article 24(2) (e). The implication of this is that it gives the government a legitimate power to limit the exercise of the guaranteed rights and freedoms by enacting laws or taking reasonable action, which may abridge or even violate such rights or freedom.

Also the NGO Act restricts CSOs in advocacy activities. Indeed, the status only allows non-partisan organizations which serve the "public interest" defined as follows "providing for and improving the standard of living or eradication of poverty of a given group of people or the public at large ". Public interest being defined in these terms, referring to economic and social welfare, the State can oppose all NGO activities branded as "political". A common practice has been for the government to require organizers of meetings to obtain legal permits. But the police force, working under the government's directives, has continued to limit the issuance of permits for public demonstration and assembly on false concerns for public safety or security or on the ground of the permit seeker belonging to an unregistered organization or political party. For example, in 2005, following Haki Elimu's criticism of the government for not keeping its promises regarding primary education, the Minister of Education banned the NGO from undertaking studies and publishing information on the education sector for 18 months, arguing that Haki Elimu had engaged in "political activities". However, because of civil society and media mobilization, the government backed down.

So, in general, it seems that in spite of the legal framework, CSOs are getting more daring and confident in advocacy activities, in part thanks to this Haki Elimu affair and similar ones.

Funding and volunteerism:

What procedures exist for obtaining foreign or domestic funding - in law and in practice? To what extent have the authorities taken positive measures to create provisions for volunteering, public funding for CSOs or (fiscal) incentives to mobilise local funds such as favourable tax rules for private donations, membership fees and philanthropy?

The civil society is highly donor dependent in terms of its revenues. Up to 42 % ² of the non-profit organisations revenue come from outside. This, of course, is not very healthy for the sustainability of the non-profit sector in the country.

This is mainly due to the fact that the Government cannot legally support civil society organisations through subventions from the Treasury coffers. Consequently these organisations are forced to rely on charitable donations, from external sources to fund their various social and development activities, thus making them dependant on donors, which threaten their own sustainability and freedom of action.

² Data from the study "The Third Sector in Tanzania – Learning more about civil society organisations, their capabilities and challenges" (Aga Khan Development Network - May 2007),

There are however, some few civil society organizations in the country that are self-financing with membership income as the most source of financing. For instance, Professional Associations are not as dependent on external funding as CSOs in Civil Rights, Advocacy, Environment, sub sector which depend up to 84% on external funding. Professional Associations and Unions depend on domestic funding to the extent of 87 %, the Religion sub sector, and Culture and Recreation sub sectors both depend on domestic revenue to the extent of 62%. This can partly be explained by the fact that these are the traditional areas of volunteering in Tanzania. CSOs in these subgroups are only ones that can survive with minimum problems without external funding.

According to some NGOs, the authorities have, however, taken positive measures that provide for funding for CSOs. One of these measures is the soft loan scheme under the Prime Minister's Office - Regional Administration and Local Government (PMO-RALG) where district and municipal councils offer such loans to groups of youth and women. Another is funding under the Ministry of Community Development, Gender and Children (MCDGC) where this ministry funds capacity building interventions aimed at CSOs registered under this ministry. But there are no procedures for qualifying for these capacity building interventions. As another measure, Tanzania has a Rapid Funding Envelope that funds interventions undertaken by CSOs. The procedures for accessing such funding are transparent and often announced in time for CSOs to send their applications. Processing of those applications is efficient and includes a phone call or a meeting for further discussions regarding the quality of the proposal.

Private sector engagement in funding CSOs directly is not common although they do support community based initiatives such as a construction of wells etc, as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility. However, there is limited information as to exactly what they do and whether they account for it.

CSOs in Tanzania are not exempted from taxation. Civil Society does not directly and automatically fall under the tax regime philanthropy category, although under special conditions, subject to meeting laid down criteria, some CSOs may qualify for tax exemptions related to philanthropic activities.

Participation in public life:

How open are the authorities to effectively involve civil society in the elaboration of national and sectoral policies? Are there functioning platforms and mechanisms set up by national and local authorities allowing for a result-oriented multistakeholder dialogue? Do authorities guarantee in law and in practice free, clear and accessible flows of information on matters of public interest?

Although MKUKUTA foresees a key role for Non-State-Actors in the reduction of poverty in Tanzania³, the tradition of dialogue and participation is relatively limited: the relationship between Civil Society and government has been characterized for a long time by mistrust and suspicion.

However, the situation is gradually improving with increased space for dialogue, interaction and trust. Broader and deeper engagement of CSO can be observed not only in the provision of those services which have traditionally attracted civil society, but also in a cautious and fragile expansion of CSO engagement in policy formulation, dialogue and advocacy. The Tanzanian Government has created entry points for CSOs to engage in policy across the board, from wards to the national level. There are two main opportunities for the Tanzanian civil society to participate in the process related to Mkukuta for instance. The first is as members of the technical groups for monitoring implementation, while the second involves the budget monitoring process through the public expenditure reviews and the sector working groups.

In the mainland, civil society representatives have also been invited by the government in recent years to take part in reviewing policy reforms such as Local Government Reform Programme, Legal Sector Reform Programme, Public Service Management Reform Programme etc. Some of them, as Policy Forum, have participated to law review between the first and second lecture in Parliament. CSOs also do participate in monitoring elections and disseminating election monitoring reports. Human rights NGOs have been able to mobilize fundamental changes in the way the state operates, for example the enactment of the Land Law had a major impetus from CSOs. Likewise, the Child Act of 2009 was basically an initiative of CSOs.

At last, the government makes the Controller and Auditor General's (CAG's) reports available to CSOs and invites or allows CSOs to participate in Commission of Human Rights and Good Governance's (CHRGG's) report and African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) process.

However, no formal institutional framework to manage and sustain partnership exists. And according to the "Civil Society Profile: Tanzania", in 2011, 41% of CSOs consulted still characterised relations with the state as limited and a further 49% as moderate.

Positive trends can also be observed in Zanzibar, where the Government established a CSOs Unit to strengthen dialogue with CSOs and embarked in a revision of the legal and regulatory

³ Most notably it spells out that: *"The civil society organizations are key actors in poverty reduction. Their roles and responsibility will be to build local capacity and empowering communities, participate in monitoring and evaluation at national and community level, mobilizing and enhancing community participation as well as community resources for poverty reduction. CSOs will advocate for accountability of its members and government to the people. CSOs will work closely with the government ministries and local authorities to ensure that cross-cutting issues are included and implemented in the sectoral and district plans. In order to improve the effectiveness of civil society organizations there is a need to review and strengthen the organizational and management frameworks at national, regional, district and community levels."*

framework applicable to CSOs. Increasing number of points of contact between government agencies and CSOs, particularly through ad hoc sector specific forums that bring together civil servants and the NGO sector and/or business associations have been noticed these last years. Of particular significance is the Civil Societies Exhibition at the House of Representatives which has been held every year since 2007. CSO involvement is also noted during the parliamentary budget session when they are invited to meetings of various budget committees.

There are also growing opportunities for dialogue between parliamentarians and the public, with CSOs acting as catalyst on new issues, playing intermediary role, and contributing expert knowledge.

With regards to information, one can distinguish different critical elements in Tanzania. First and foremost, the existing culture of “every file or document regarding government is secret, unless indicated differently” still reigns, which makes access to information rather complicated. The responsiveness of government as well as NGOs is often dependent on who is asking and what is his/her status⁴. Government officers are often not aware, which documents are to be made public. But even if they would want to provide the required information, the Local Governmental Authorities (LGAs) have difficulties to produce the right documents or information, due to complicated systems and variable skills of the officers in IT. Information is mostly not available in the right language, or written and presented in a very inaccessible way. Another issue is the level of aggregation of the data, the level of analysis and the information derived from it, which is mostly according to the needs of the Ministries at the National level. As a consequence, information loses details that are of importance for the district and sub-district levels. Lower level leaders, and councillors, who are supposed to inform the communities, do not have access to the information themselves.

Lately much attention is given to the generation of evidence-based information that is objective and accessible for all levels of society, including the parliament.

1.2 PARTICIPATION AND ROLES

⁴ REPOA, “Access to Information in Tanzania: still a challenge”, HakiElimu, LHRC, REPOA, 2005

Participation in public policy formulation:

What is the level and quality of CSO participation in political reform processes and elaboration of public policies and budgets at central and local level? This includes also policy areas outside development cooperation such as trade, climate change, and migration policies. To what extent can CSOs exercise an effective leverage through analysing and contributing to these processes?

Tanzania's civil society movement has the potential to play more significant role in national policy processes on account of the weakening of the state's ability to deliver services, and the retreat of the state from one party rule in the 1990s. It is generally perceived as being quite active on social policy issues.

Policy gains due to CSO lobbying activities are evident in the sectors of water supply, education and health provision, legal services and HIV/AIDS related services. National and regional-based organisations, such as the National Coalition for People Living with HIV and AIDS, have been able to advance their needs for incorporation in the 2010 National HIV and AIDS Policy.

A growing number of CSOs have also been devoting their time to governance and accountability programmes, monitoring the realisations of the local and national authorities. There has been some positive examples of CSO/State dialogue, notably the participation of CSOs in the assessment of PFM Reforms in November 2012, the "Citizen's budget" drafted by the CSOs, and the formal role given to CSOs in dialogues involving Government of Tanzania (GoT) and Development Partners (DPs) in January 2012.

However, CSOs still face challenges to be more involved in the definition of public policies and in their activity of advocacy and accountability vis à vis GoT due to the lack of transparency and access to budget information, public policies, legislation and data. For instance, the budget process remains closed and not transparent: most CSOs are not aware that the budget process effectively begins in late February, when the government initiates the review of budget implementation over the previous six months. Ministerial budget ceilings, budget strategies, fiscal and monetary policies, domestic financing and donor financing strategies are all elaborated during this period. Since CSOs lack knowledge about budget, they are unable to adequately prepare themselves to articulate their interests.

CSOs are normally engaged at a later stage in which they just provide inputs to the draft of the policy that has been developed by the government. The initial process of gathering information that informs the development of the policy is not open to the CSOs whom are best placed in terms of gathering data because of their presence at local level.

In addition to this, it must be said that the quality of CSO participation is not always of high level. The quality of participation varies because of the different levels of available skills in respective CSOs especially at the local level. It therefore depends on who has the invitation to represent CSOs in those discussions. The quality of participation is also determined by the extent to which representatives are given time to prepare themselves. Sometimes invitations to attend discussion are sent late with heavy agenda so at such a point participation is not very meaningful. This situation limits CSOs capacity to take part in the policy making.

Transparency and accountability:

How active are CSOs in the field of domestic transparency and accountability (i.e. through

information provision, monitoring effective implementation of laws, monitoring state compliance with international human rights provisions, tracking public revenues and expenditures, etc.)? How effective are these actions at local and central level?

Citizens' participation and participatory monitoring is a recent development in Tanzania, although there has been a joint effort by a number of NGOs⁵ to train CSOs and CBOs in Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys (PETS) and a pilot on Participatory Service Delivery Assessment⁶ (PSDA) has taken place. Even if in these surveys, it is clear that the above-mentioned access to information is a critical factor. Even if PMO-RALG has provided the approval and space to undertake PETS at all levels, the LGAs and LLGAs still do feel uncomfortable in making the required documents available.

It should also be noted that CSOs have been actively involved in direct implementation of the laws especially land laws which involves stages like sensitization and preparation of the village land use plan among others.

Some CSOs have been able to hold the government accountable for its decisions and actions. Quite often, the CSOs have sued the government before the courts of law especially on matters of human rights abuse and misappropriation of public funds. For instance, when Nyamongo people were evicted to pave way for a large scale miner, the LHRC took the government before the Human rights commission and won the case, before the same organization took the government to court protesting against the payment of public funds to a private electricity vendor.

In the last years, Tanzanian CSOs have mobilised an important part of their actions around **tax issues**. An Extractive Industry Working Group has been created gathering together a number of national NGOs under the coordination of Policy Forum.

They also promote efforts to make budgetary process more accessible to the public. A CSO Budget Working Group (BWG) led by Forum Policy prepared, for example, a **Citizens Budget** (CB) for 2010/11, which is supposed to be prepared by government under International Budget Partnership agreement. The Treasury agreed to endorse the CB for 2011/12, which was again prepared by the BWG. The Public Finance Management Reform Programme (PFMRP) subsequently allocated Tshs 100 million for the production of the 2012-2013 CB.

Recent studies⁷ indicate that NSA's effectiveness in advocacy and policy dialogue is hampered by a number of key functional capacity gaps: NSAs are multiple, diverse and by their nature a fragmented group. Despite the recent increase in the number of NGO networks these are organizationally weak and immature, with very few established interfaces or platforms for structured dialogue. This results in varying levels of NSA engagement in different sectors and at different levels, often characterized by open ended, ad hoc consultations.

Studies conducted these last years revealed that Local authorities seem more resistant than central government to CS involvement; policy dialogue is more developed at the macro level than at the

⁵ PACT, HakiKazi, HakiElimu, TGNP ea.

⁶ TANGO and ALAT in Kilosa and Same with UNGO and SANGO.

⁷ Makongo Japhet, Capacity Assessment of Civil Society Organizations in Tanzania, TANGO, UNDP, ALAT, 2007; the Capacity needs Assessment of Networks by the Foundation for Civil Society, 2008; the Assessment by the Royal Embassy of Belgium, May 2009; the EC capititation study on capacity building for NSA, July 2009.

sector level (with exception of the education and agricultural sector where some stronger network⁸ is emerging); Private sector has more informal ways of engaging (often successful) but that does not result in institutional development and there is a clear need to diversify partnerships for policy dialogue and look beyond the government (e.g. with media and the parliament).

Service delivery:

To what extent are CSOs involved in service delivery including humanitarian support where relevant? To what extent is their work in this area embedded in multi-actor partnerships that recognise the primary responsibility of the state (central and local) regarding service provision?

Despite regional variety, the non-governmental sector plays an important role in service delivery all over the country, surpassing even that of the state in most fields.

For instance, **health provision** is a very critical part of the life of Tanzanian society. In the absence of a comprehensive social security system and the pervading poverty of Tanzanians, the provision of this service by CSOs is crucial for many people, especially infants and women -who still die of easily treatable diseases- by providing health facilities, in rural area of Tanzania hitherto not reached by government services. It can be add that the non-governmental sector provides more hospitals than the government. Of people surveyed, 50% believe CSOs are better at providing a service than government, compared to 37% who preferred government.

Support of micro-enterprises is another important area in the lives of Tanzanians. Following the exit of the Tanzanian government in the ownership and control of economic enterprises, many people lost their jobs. At the same time globalisation is marginalizing local medium range enterprises which cannot compete with cheap foreign imports. Micro-enterprises, which are localized, and the informal sector are providing commercial avenues to average Tanzanians. The non-profit sector in this area is again significant as banks are generally ineffective in micro-finance.

Moreover, in times of natural disasters like floods, hunger outbreak and diseases like cholera, some CSOs especially those specializing on human rights and relief services have been actively involved in provision of humanitarian support.

Inclusive and sustainable growth:

To what extent have CSOs become active players in the economic realm, with initiatives having an impact on the (social) economy? This may involve looking at the roles of cooperatives,

⁸ E.g. TANMET on education, ANSAF on agriculture.

foundations and NGOs in promoting entrepreneurship and job creations by mobilising grassroots communities, delivering services and stimulating income generating activities for the poor and marginalised.

CSOs in Tanzania have been an active player in economic aspects especially in uniting communities to deliver economic activities especially for the poor. Some NGOs have built capacities of hundreds of women's groups to undertake economic empowerment and thus social empowerment initiatives. Other CSOs have been part of the international trade agreement negotiations actually aiming at ensuring fair trade terms for African products in the international markets. Such initiatives like AGOA, SAGCOT and even negotiations in regional trading blocs such as EAC and SADC, have taken into account issues, comments and views from the civil society. The work of such NGOs is commendable.

Most CSO have been also active player in the economic realm through supporting rural farmers, to improve their quality of their products through adding value to their produce and marketing, for example, Tanzania Horticulture Associations, Tanzania farmers Associations, Tanzania Trade Association have run many initiatives that support economic growth. Through CSO, many vulnerable populations have been empowered both socially and economically.

However the majority poor have been left out in this aspect. The capacity of CSOs has been very limited in terms of targeting resources to the right issues. Lack of information and intelligence in planning and knowledge is an issue as well as objectives of their actions which are still very output oriented and with limited linkage to international ever economic policies.

Human Rights defenders:

There are a few very prominent Human Right Defenders' organizations. The Legal and Human Rights Centre and the Zanzibar Legal Services Centre produce a yearly Tanzania Human Rights Report that has become a strong reference on reliable human rights statistics in Tanzania. This year's edition was the 12th one. In addition, there are a few prominent organizations offering legal support, such as Tanzania Media Women's Association and Tanzania Female Lawyers' Association. The Tanzania Human Right Defenders' Coalition (THRDC) was established in 2012 and it has very quickly gained prominence in assessing the human right defenders' challenges and needs in the country. It is comprised of both individual and organizational members, totalling 100 this year.

1.3 CAPACITY

Strengths and Weakness

As said previously, the Civil Society in Tanzania is relatively young, but many national level organisations are growing in numbers and in capacity. It has however two main weaknesses:

- Big gap between national level NGOs and local level CSOs.
- Relatively weak civil society.

- The gap between Local and National/Central Levels

The key national organizations like Policy Forum, Foundation of Civil Society, TANGO, TGNP, Hakikazi Catalyst, Haki Elimu, Leadership Forum, Legal Human Rights Centre and a good number of others have earned their position at the top of the "Civil Society world" due to the motivation of a few strong individuals, by learning quickly and being persistent. They are the cornerstones for the creation of a Civil Society in Tanzania, especially Policy Forum, the Foundation for Civil Society, TANGO, Haki Elimu and therefore crucial in the context of accountability. These organizations all receive financial support from a wide range of donors, which allows them to develop and become a stronger sparring partner to the government. However, at the same time, they have become more donor dependant which put their long term sustainability at stake. They are also much solicited for taskforces, working groups, workshops and stakeholder meetings. The "transaction costs" for these organizations are high. Their biggest challenge is to link up to local level dynamics and to build critical mass outside Dar es Salaam

- Relatively Weak Local Civil Society

In Tanzania domestic accountability, particularly at local level, is a missing component in the development of a more responsive state. Despite the thousands of Non-State Actors in Tanzania, it is a relatively small and high profile few -operating mainly at national level- that play an assertive role in demand side accountability. In part, this is because Civil Society is still new and also because it is a product of the liberalization of the 1990s.

In many cases, there is a difference in understanding the role and attitude envisaged for CSOs, especially NGOs, by theorists or observers expecting to see an active role in promoting rights, accountability, participation or transparency. However, some NGOs actively reject the more confrontational approach, seeing constructive citizen engagement as a more productive way of changing mind-sets, policy and practice; and thus prefer to work in close collaboration with the national and/or local authorities.

Other features of civil society include the way that:

- Many NGOs in practice behave more as 'contractors' accountable to donors for delivering certain outputs (safety nets, services, pieces of research or advocacy) than they see themselves as having a role in accountability, let alone seeing themselves as accountable to the poor and marginalized.
- Others model themselves on a different style of development intervention, arguably more like the churches and mission organizations, or more traditionally accountable chiefs, 'bringing development to an area'.

- There is a shortage of skills amongst many civil society actors, both in running their organizations (financial management, strategic planning, monitoring etc) and in understanding the context within which they operate (whether that is government policy or the dynamics of globalization or poverty).

- Having an NGO' is sometimes seen as an (private) income generating opportunity - often in the face of retirement or retrenchment from formal sector employment.

These are issues not just for NGOs. Problems faced by small CSOs (whether branches of business membership organizations, small businesses, trade union branches, CBOs or NGOs) are very similar in terms of low educational levels, low capitalization, lack of clear vision and mission, and this contributes to a lack of understanding of their potential different contributions to governance and accountability mechanisms .

Capacity Gaps:

In 2006 UNDP⁹, in collaboration with TANGO and ALAT, carried out an assessment of CSOs capacity gaps in Tanzania. Their findings indicate low *technical* capacity in the following aspects:

- Policy Analysis:

Very few CSOs have the skills needed to undertake comprehensive policy analysis and therefore are unable to follow the government's policy-making process.

- Research:

Like with policy analysis, most CSOs lack the skills need for undertaking research that is seen as credible by government and other development actors.

- Programming and Planning:

Most CSOs in Tanzania do not have well defined strategic plans and therefore undertake ad hoc advocacy activities that are not well rooted. Moreover, small CSOs have a lot of challenges when it comes to fundraising, programme formulation, definition of results framework, financial management and evaluation. This is partly attributed to lack of highly skilled human resource that can effectively perform the mentioned responsibilities. Small CSOs are financially unable to hire such highly qualified personnel to carry out those activities. As a result these CSOs end up having inadequate funding, poor programmes and poor financial management which consequently reduces their credibility of fundraising from donors.

- Communication and information:

Many CSOs lack the ICT capacity to access information on government policies and have insufficient hardware or networks for dissemination. Opportunities will be missed if access to information is delayed and deadlines for comment or reaction not reached.

⁹ Makongo Japhet, Capacity Assessment of Civil Society Organizations in Tanzania, TANGO, UNDP, ALAT, 2007

- Advocacy skills:

Even when they have an issue to put across, Tanzanian CSOs do not have the skills needed for effective advocacy.

- Documentation:

CSOs in Tanzania engage in a number of development processes; however their impact is not felt due to poor documentation and information packaging.

Regarding the issue of *functional capacities* the following was observed:

- Internal Governance. There are those CSOs with very well founded institutional framework while others have a shaky and fragile leadership base. Poor internal governance in terms of ineffective systems, structures, procedures and staffing are some of the factors affecting the credibility of Tanzanian CSOs.

- Programme formulation: There have been mixed approaches in programme design where some CSOs use their own internal human resources while others do outsource from programme development design experts. Outsourcing is partly due to lack of capacity within organizations or the need to adopt to the new programme design methodologies. For most of CSOs, their programs are still less impactful.

- Financial Management: Well established CSOs have little problem, if any, in managing finances. Partly, those which face challenges have not taken advantage of installing and operating through financial management software which are also costly but also require expertise in their operations.

- Vision and mission. It was noted that most CSOs do not have very clear visions and missions, which means that the community or people they are to serve do not identify with the work the CSOs are doing, or the CSO fails to lead by its vision and mission.

- Relationship: Despite the recent increase in the number of NGO networks, the CSOs are still seen as working too much in isolation, not benefiting from these networks.

- Accountability: The accountability of CSOs in Tanzania is lopsided in that they are more accountable to the donors and even sometimes to government, than they are to their constituencies who are the reason why the CSO exist.

- Human and Financial Resources: Most CSOs do not have either sufficient number or quality of staff. The study also noted that very few CSOs have sustainable funding.

- Mindset: There is gross distinct between government and CSOs at all levels national and sub-national levels, therefore it is difficult to build effective partnerships.

In another study effectuated by the Foundation of Civil Society on capacity assessment of CSO networks in Tanzania in 2008, showed that the CSO networks were formed to undertake a great variety of activities, which were clustered into seven primary functions, as follows:

- advocacy, lobbying, pressurizing function
- resource mobilization function
- service delivery function
- representation function
- empowering function
- educating, counselling and public awareness raising function
- organization synergy-reaping function

In regard to the advocacy, lobbying and pressuring function, the study found the following:

- ✓ Over 45% of the 228 CSO networks studied mentioned these functions as one of their five most important activities they had performed in the past three years
- ✓ The kind of advocacy performed by the networks represent “soft” politics rather than “hot” politics, for the bulk of the networks focused on rights of orphans and other marginalized groups while other rights received little attention. The networks did not seek to change the system which creates marginalized groups but to effect minor changes within the existing system.
- ✓ Apart from rights advocacy, most of the networks engaged in some policy dialogue and lobbying work for their particular areas of activity and developed a number of advocacy strategies, including seeking representation in policy-making bodies.

About 92% of the networks studied mentioned the “empowering” function as one of their most important activities performed during the past three years. However, the networks understand the concept of “empowerment” almost entirely in terms of education, training and economic activities [such as provision of credit facilities]. This happens to be the understanding of the concept in the government empowerment policy, law and programs.

Main Challenges for the CSOs:

The current debate on the challenges facing CSOs in Tanzania includes mainly their integrity and governance in relation to the people they seek to serve. Transparency and accountability have been key issues about CSO performance at community level. The government equally laments and questions whether CSOs have the moral authority to question others on good governance and accountability. The CSOs are seen as requiring greater capacity building in advocacy and good governance for them to engage effectively and constructively in the policy dialogue with both the government and the donors.

CSOs have to deal with many different donors and mechanisms to secure their funding. The development partners tended to be fragmented in their approach to supporting civil society, uncoordinated, short-sighted and often lacking a clear strategic focus.

CSOs lack adequate resources (financial, physical and human) for effective day to day functioning and are dependent on external financial support. CSOs need to change their strategies and programmes to accommodate the funding opportunities available, applying for different project funding to sustain their organisations. Their main resource is competent staff. However, their unstable financial situation means that these people are often absorbed by INGOs and development partners, leaving CSOs constantly understaffed.

Organisation, links with research and international community:¹⁰

To what extent is the local civil society organised in thematic and general platforms and alliances at sub-national and national level? Do links exist with regional and global networks, research communities and platforms?

Umbrella organisations and networks attempt to coordinate their members' service delivery and lobbying activities. While the earliest networks date from the pre-liberalisation era (TACOSODE 1965, TANGO 1988), many new networks were established during the 1990s, including MVIWATA (1993), Feminist Activist Coalition (1996), Tanzania Coalition on Debt and Development (1998), TEN/MET (1999) and Policy Forum (2003).

In today times, there are assessed to be at least 228 networks, 59% defined by specific themes, with the rest more general. At least 170 networks are specific to districts of Tanzania, while there are 25 sub-national and 33 national networks. Almost every district and region has got a network of CSOs the famous of which include RANGO for Rukwa, ANGONET for Arusha, ICISO for Iringa, MONGONET for Morogoro and KINGONET for Kigoma region. As for the districts, the household names include RUNGONET for Rufiji, KISNGONET for Kisarawe and many others. There are quite many national level networks and alliances such as Tanzania Land Alliance – TALA, TANGO, TACOSODE, Policy forum, TNRF etc.

Some of the key networks that have formed have focused on election monitoring and civil education.

Many CSOs take part in African level networks and network beyond the continent. The East Africa Law Society, Federation of East Africa Trade Unions and the East Africa Bribery Index are amongst the significant regional networks.

However, only 24% of CSO representatives consider civil society umbrella bodies as generally effective, while 52% consider them partly effective or ineffective. Only 19% feel that there is a significant level of communication across CSOs.

¹⁰ Data from "Civil Society Profile: Tanzania" – 2011

2 CURRENT EU ENGAGEMENT

2.1 STRUCTURED EU DIALOGUE WITH CIVIL SOCIETY

Structured dialogue

What mechanisms are used for EU consultations and dialogue with local CSOs? What level of information is provided in advance? How inclusive are the consultations? Who participates typically? Who sets the agenda? What are the typical outcomes? And how is follow-up ensured?

Structured Dialogue with Civil Society is mainly done through different ways:

i- During the different stages of programme cycle: CSOs are currently consulted during the programming, identification, formulation phases of development strategies and programmes. For instance, during the formulation of the 11th EDF National Indicative Programme, the CSOs were invited twice to wide consultations to give their views on the ongoing EU programming exercises. At programme level, bilateral and specific meetings are also usually held to involve CSOs in the design of new projects: DFID, for instance, engaged CSOs in their reflections on Water sector and open data partnership, and held brain storming consultations with specific organizations as wateraid and TWaweza.

ii – Through Development Partners Working Group: In the framework of the Joint Assistance Strategy (JAS), which establishes key principles for policy dialogue, Thematic working groups have been created to establish regular dialogue between DP and to enhance efficiency of the discourse between GoT and DPs but also with non-state actors. For instance, in the framework of the accountable governance group of the GWG and the GBS annual review process, Civil Society Organisations are invited by Development Partners on areas of mutual interest to present and discuss specific issues with them.

iii- In the framework of specific programmes: CSOs can be directly involved in the implementation of a specific programme or be the main beneficiaries of a project. In both cases, Inputs from the CSOs on the best way forward are always very valuable. In the framework of its core support on long-term commitments to civil society actors and their strategic plans, Sweden has, for instance, direct agreements with each organisation. Their main direct dialogue takes place in relation to Annual Review Meetings (mostly together with other development partners) and via discussions and approvals of work plans, budgets, annual reports and audits.

iv- Dialogue with supported grantees: Development partners have specific relations and discussions with CSOs they fund and most of them try to develop an effective network between their grantees. For example, France organizes an annual meeting of its network of NGOs (both French and Tanzanian) and their close partners. In the same spirit, Finland also has regular dialogue with the NGOs that receive funding through their Finnish partner NGOs. They arrange an annual seminar with the Finnish NGOs and their Tanzanian partners, thereby supporting the

interaction between civil societies and touching upon key issues relating both to their work content and policy constraints. Some Development partners set up formal mechanisms of dialogue and consultations with CSO partners: they organised, for example, bi-annual CSO-donors' meetings to discuss progress and current issues (including finances) or yearly field visits etc.

v- Dialogue with no "financially dependent" entities: Development partners maintain also close relation and dialogue with CSOs apart from those directly funded or involved in specific development programmes. For instance, Spain holds regular contacts with think tanks, media organizations, culture promoting entities, student associations and local NGOs; attends their callings and invites them to events sponsored by them. As no financial commitments or expectations are involved, this meetings turn out to be a quite constructive way to understand their views and problems.

vi- through specific events as the Poverty Policy week or the PER annual meeting which are important venues for dialogue on key issues, in the framework of the GBS, and in which the civil society organisations participate with others stakeholders.

2.2 POLICY DIALOGUE FOR AN ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

Nature of current engagement

What is the current EU engagement in terms of promoting an enabling environment for CSOs in the country? To what extent has the EU used its political position and leverage to defend the space for the independent action of CSOs? What concrete actions have been undertaken in recent years and how effective were these?

Different initiatives have been undertaken for promoting an enabling environment for CSOs:

i) By encouraging/promoting an enabling framework in and through dialogue with the GoT:

This can be done through encouraging participation in annual reviews; highlighting the importance of role of civil society etc. For example, through the OGP process, the GoT has committed to put in place the Freedom of Information bill and as well as an action plan to make GoT policies and plans more transparent. However, the overall progress is slow.

In Zanzibar, The EU supported the revision of the legal and regulatory framework applicable to CSOs through provision of TA and support to the structured dialogue and consultations with local CSOs in both islands of the Zanzibar Archipelago. The draft bill is set to create an enabling environment for CSOs in Zanzibar.

ii) By providing direct support to civil society actors:

In different areas such as media, human rights, education, sexual and reproductive health and rights and accountability etc. These supports generally included strong elements of capacity building into CSO support in order to make them to grow organically and on firm grounds.

Sweden indicates their commitments have often been long-term and building on mutual respect and trust. This has contributed to the fact that a lot of their long-term partners are now leading agencies in their respective areas.

iii) **By promoting an open dialogue with civil society.**

Development partners try to be a reliable partner for CSOs: Spain, for instance, try to learn more about their policies and programs, to provide them with relevant and actual information about the political, socioeconomic, educational and cultural reality of Spain and facilitate their contact with Spanish Think Tanks and CSOs.

The EU also undertakes a yearly dialogue with the Human Rights Defenders, organized at the Human Rights Defenders' Day on 12th December. In this event, the opportunities for EU engagement and support for Human Rights Defenders as well as the challenges they face are reviewed. This as such promotes open dialogue with civil society.

2.3 MAINSTREAMING CIVIL SOCIETY

Mainstreaming across EU cooperation

To what extent has the local civil society been effectively “mainstreamed” in EU cooperation processes (e.g. programming), sectors and instruments of cooperation (including budget support operations)? To what extent has the EU been able to enhance the complementarity between geographic and thematic instruments in support of civil society? Provide specific examples where relevant.

UK provides a the widest range of support to CS through umbrella programmes such as Accountability in Tanzania Programme (£31m over six years), Foundation for Civil Society (£8m over four years), Tanzania Media Fund (£2m over 3 years) and Twaweza (£3m over 3 years). They have dedicated programmes of support to CSOs in the Education Sector (EQUIP Tanzania), Human Rights (Legal Services Facility). Under the livelihoods sector they also provide support to CS interventions. In many cases they use Accountable Grant as the main instrument. Plans are underway for dedicated support to CSOs in anti-corruption and land.

Sweden, has also supported civil society in its own right, in order for their partners to contribute to more effective watchdog functions in society as well as creating stronger advocates for certain rights.

France used to have a specific funding mechanism for small grant projects supporting CSOs (FSD). The last programme ended in 2013, and will not be renewed. This funding mechanism is to be replaced by a new Fund “Fonds d’Appui aux Sociétés Civiles du Sud”, which will target local CSOs and more specifically human rights and civil society expression/advocacy. There are other cooperation opportunities to involve CSOs with decentralized cooperation with the French Islands La Reunion and Mayotte. The AFD has a special funding window for NGOs: FISONG programme. They launch regular calls for proposals on specific thematic (energy, education, etc.).

Germany: Local CSOs are involved in health service delivery, in advocacy for quality health services and access for all and in governing processes such as planning and budgeting. Therefore, CSOs are involved in these different areas of our work when it comes to improving quality and access of health services.

The strengthening of civil society is also one of the main preoccupations for many development partners: Spain has a Strategic Plan for engagement with local Think Tanks that is updated every year; and they put local CSOs in contact with their Spanish counterparts as a means to strengthen the civil society’s fabric and to foster cooperation.

For the EU Delegations, CSOs mainly access funding through local and global Calls for Proposals. The European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, with its local Call for Proposals, has a specific emphasis on supporting the local civil society actions towards enhancing democracy and human rights in Tanzania. A specific programme to support CS in Zanzibar has been launched in 2014 which will play a strategic role in enabling CSO's environment as well reinforce its capacity.

2.4 COORDINATION

Member States and other key players

Which Member States are active and how many of these have substantial activities with regard to civil society? Are there other potential key players to consider among the international donor community when it comes to civil society?

See Annex 1: Matrix on current supports to Civil Society

Information exchange

To what extent have the EU Delegation and Member States (and other international actors) developed systems and tools to facilitate joint action and coordination (e.g. effective platforms for information exchange on projects funded, partners supported, calendar of events, good practices, studies made, etc.)?

In the framework of the Joint Assistance Strategy (JAS), which establishes key principles for policy dialogue, thematic working groups have been created to establish regular dialogue between DPs. During these meetings, information, strategies, calendars etc. are exchanged between the participants. The EU Delegation and Member States also exchange information during the HOC or HOD meetings.

Mainly all development partners consult all other donors prior to developing a country strategy so as not to duplicate donor efforts and to compliment them when possible.

Joint action

Are there joint initiatives, particularly with Member States: Joint analysis (e.g. mappings), search for complementarity of interventions at geographic and thematic levels? Joint funding schemes for capacity development?

Support via Foundation for Civil Society and Tanzania Media Fund is jointly done by other DPs through basket fund mechanisms. Through the support to UNDP and Elections programming, DPs have pushed for a CSO mapping exercise; but progress has been slow. Sweden indicated that it has also searched for basket funding arrangements when likeminded DP's (also allowed to do core support) at all times and when feasible. Especially successful has the collaboration been between the other Nordic countries and Switzerland in this regard, streamlining dialogue, agreement conditions and other requirements.

Then, in order for their successful partners to broaden their resource base and be less reliable on DPs funds, some DPs have from time to time helped to mobilise other interesting member countries (with cooperation strategies in the same relevant fields) for joint support.

2.5 LESSONS LEARNT

Lessons learnt

What are the main lessons learnt (positive and less positive) with EU engagement towards civil society so far?

Most of the development partners indicate that their approaches towards civil society have allowed them to have close dialogues and relations with their civil society partners and that the dialogue with CSOs is quite transparent and fluent, as they talk openly about policies. Civil society has come a long way in Tanzania in the last 10 years: e.g. gaining credibility and weight with regards to dialogue with the government; gaining in professionalism regarding transparency, management skills etc. However some regret that they often have to initiate the dialogue with civil society to exchanges on general views or topics.

For the EU Delegation, it must be noted that due to the financing modalities, it is difficult to provide strategic long-term support to the CSOs. To ensure a long term support to CSOs, it would be important to reflect on how EU could support directly the action plan of CSOs instead of channelling their priorities towards a project approach dictated by the guidelines of the Calls for Proposals.

Some development partners indicated that Civil Society capacities remain weak. For instance, many proposals received from Tanzanian NGOs on various subjects, are still basic/light and sometimes very opportunistic despite many supports to strengthen their capacities. This lack of capacity doesn't always facilitate the dialogue between development partners and CSO.

From the civil society organisations perspective, they often consider that the dialogue is too irregular, one –way oriented and demand driven. CSOs indicated that they do not receive relevant information on time and rarely received feedback from the outcome of consultations. Some organisations, when the roadmap was presented to them, highlight the fact that it was not the first time that the EU initiates this kind of exercise, and that each time nothing had really changed. Some of them are clearly not keen to be involved again on this kind of discussion and think this roadmap will not lead to a more strategic and sustained dialogue. There is a serious risk of "consultation fatigue".

Some CSOs even have the feeling that most donors are using CSO to push their agenda and tick their boxes, and that CSOs become agents of donor interests not a collection of informed members of society glued by a desire for change.

Some donors also do not cover operating costs but prefer to fund activities which can inhibit CSOs from being able to operate well. Capacity building support for the CSO itself cannot usually feature within grant proposals which then inhibit their ability to develop staff.

At the question "How the EU should define its dialogue with civil society at country level, how this dialogue could be more strategic and become a real structured dialogue", CSOs answered:

1- In the framework of an open dialogue, the EU should let the CSOs to lead the dialogue and other participants including donors and facilitators being listeners and allow them to identify the opportunities and challenges of local CSOs (instead of the DPs doing it themselves).

2- The EU should identify key CSO working in direct sectors. Then identify a lead NGOs in every sector that will be representing others in EU forums/dialogue. Then through led NGOs, EU should work with every sector to identify challenges and strategies to support community. Whenever EU is able to provide financial support, the lead NGOs should manage and monitor the Implementing organisations at ground level.

3 – The dialogue should be strengthening through:

- Supporting CSOs Profiling (and/or Civil Society Index) to generate information on the situation of CSOs in Tanzania; their strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats.
- Capacity building of the CSOs to collect evidences for advocacy and engage effectively with both government and donors.
- Facilitate establishment/strengthening of forums, platforms, networks and alliances for organized in thematic areas at both national and global.

Quarterly dialogues based on members drawn from their thematic constancies could offer the best option. Such themes as land rights, rights of artisan miners, forests rights representatives, human rights, social (education and health) rights representatives could serve the purposes.

Do no harm

What are the most problematic areas in terms of current donor approaches and support modalities towards the local civil society? What practices may have a potential negative impact on the consolidation of civil society as an independent development actor?

According to Paris Declaration, donors are supposed to align behind objectives and strategies of the developing countries for poverty reduction and their efforts to tackle corruptions. However, in practice, this has not been the case because many donors develop priorities which safeguard interest of their own countries and not necessary the needs and priorities of the poor countries.

Through Paris declaration, the donors committed themselves to coordinate, simplify procedures and share information to avoid duplication. However, still donors use different formats for proposals and reports. As a result the aid recipient uses a lot of time to comply with these different systems and procedures. Donor funding operates on speculation basis. There is no clear understanding of how the funding cycles of the different donors work. This has dwarfed the efforts for some good and credible CSOs to attract funding mainly because; information is confined to only a segment of traditional partners to the donor. Some donors find it difficult to open up for new partners even where they have the potential to do so. Basket funding for CSOs could be a good modality as it standardizes reporting requirements and deadlines and would allow CSOs to concentrate on achieving bigger results. So,

- Funding is for short periods of time but expectations is for a demonstration of impact
- Focus is more on the donor-recipient relationship than on equal partnership

In order to address the aforementioned challenges, there is a need to for donors to embrace a long-term, equal partnership perspective than short-term, donor-recipient relationship.

3 PRIORITIES

GENERAL PRIORITY 1. Enhance efforts to promote a conducive environment for CSOs in Tanzania

Specific Priority 1: To support CSOs actions aiming at revising policies and legislations, extending the scope of political and civic rights.

Specific Priority 2: To support CSOs initiatives promoting better transparency through a better access to information.

Indicators:

- EU contribution to support CSOs actions to improve the legislative and regulatory framework to increase their political and civic rights is stable or increasing during the period 2014-2017
- EU contribution to CSOs promoting civic and voters education is stable or increasing during the period 2014-2017
- EU contribution to CSOs initiatives to make the GoT more accountable and transparent towards Tanzanian citizens through better access to information is stable or increasing during the period 2014-2017
- EU contribution to Media institutions to improve the quantity and quality of investigative journalism is stable or increasing during the period 2014-2017

GENERAL PRIORITY 2. - Promote a meaningful and structured participation of CSOs in domestic policies, in EU programming cycle and in international processes

Specific Priority 1: To encourage a systematic participation of CSOs at sectorial and GBS level

Specific Priority 2: To support active CSOs participation to Committees, legislative processes, consultation decided by law, regulations at local, regional and national level

Specific Priority 3: To support CSOs to develop its accountable work in key governance reform programmes at local, regional and national level

Specific Priority 4: To improve DP's accountability toward CSOs

Indicators:

- CSOs participation within the sector and GBS dialogue platform is more systematic during the period 2014-2017
- EU contribution to CSOs publication on key governance reform programmes is stable or increasing during the period 2014-2017

GENERAL PRIORITY 3. Increase local CSOs capacity to perform their roles as independent development actors more effectively

Specific Priority 1: To develop a harmonized DPs support to CSOs in areas related to accountability and democratic governance to avoid fragmentation in funding

Specific Priority 2: To promote the review of DPs Support instruments to ensure more strategic approach with CSOS and more independence of NGOs

Specific Priority 3: To improve CSOs legitimacy and credibility towards key stakeholders

Indicators:

- the number of EU joint actions supporting CSOs is increasing during the period 2014-2017
- EU contribution to support CSO's reinforcement of capacities is stable or increase during the period 2014-2017
- The number of information session organised by EU DPs on their priorities, programmes etc. and the number of exchange of information and documents is increasing during the period 2014-2017