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# Evaluation process at a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Inception</th>
<th>Desk</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Synthesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions criteria</td>
<td>Documents Interviews EC</td>
<td>Interviews GoT and donors Focus groups Findings</td>
<td>Conclusions Recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Meetings

1. Brussels, 8/11/05, reference group
2. Dar es Salaam, 30/11/05, large seminar

## Reports

1. Brussels, 8/11/05, reference group
2. Dar es Salaam, 30/11/05, large seminar
Sources of information

Documents and interviews with insiders

• EC database and management tables
• International indicators and statistics
• Available documents (#100)
• Interviews in EC headquarters and EC Delegation (#20)
• Interviews within GoT (#30)

Interviews and focus groups with outsiders

• Interviews with other donors (#5)
• Four focus groups with lay beneficiaries (#120)
1 - Coherent strategy (C)

To what extent did the design of the EC support strategy take due account of the Tanzanian strategic priorities and of other EU policies?

• Compared time frames
• Design and implementation
• Stated intentions and *de facto* strategy
Compared time frames

- **1999**
- **2000**
- **2001**
- **2002**
- **2003**
- **2004**
- **2005**
- **2006**
- **2007**

**Poverty Reduction Strategy**

**Tanzania Assistance Strategy**

**Tanzania Country Strategy**

**Regional Strategy**

**NSGRP.MKUKUTA**

**Joint AS**

**Partnership, parallelism**

**GoT**

**GoT and DPs**

**EC**

?
Design and implementation

Past cycles

Current cycle

Six years time lag!

Next cycle

Design
Strategy cycles
Commitments
Stated intentions and *de facto* strategy (C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>GoT PRSP</th>
<th>EC CSP (and RSP)</th>
<th>Actual efforts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macro-economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Stated intentions* → *Actual efforts* → *RSP*
To what extent and how has the EC's choice of funding modalities allowed progress towards the achievement of Tanzanian Poverty Reduction Strategy’s objectives?

• Achievement of PRS objectives
• Comparing funding modalities
• Policy dialogue
• Learning from results
## Achievement of PRS objectives (P)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Overall change</th>
<th>Current trend</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income poverty</strong></td>
<td>1992-2001</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>🤝 Faster decrease in Dar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inequality</strong></td>
<td>1992-2002</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>🤝 Low compared to other countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrolment educ.</strong></td>
<td>2000-2005</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>🤝 Removal of fees in 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pupils / teacher</strong></td>
<td>2000-2005</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls in educ. (%)</strong></td>
<td>1995-2005</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child mortality</strong></td>
<td>1999-2004</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>🤝</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIV prevalence</strong></td>
<td>2001-2003</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>🤝 After continuous raise until 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to water</strong></td>
<td>2000-2004</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>🤝</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From DFID, September 2005*
### Comparison of modalities (P)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Projects EDF STABEX</th>
<th>Projects Budget lines</th>
<th>Pooled funds</th>
<th>GBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds’ allocation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction costs EC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction costs GoT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible implementation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leakage risks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from results</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparison of modalities (P)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Projects EDF STABEX</th>
<th>Projects Budget lines</th>
<th>Pooled funds</th>
<th>GBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country ownership</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity building</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective policy dialogue</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Democratic accountability</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsive to civil society</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private sector involvement</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decentralisation</strong></td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Effective policy dialogue (P)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects (EDF, STABEX)</th>
<th>Achievements</th>
<th>Policy reversal(s)</th>
<th>Progress-tied funding gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non State Actors</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of corruption</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local governments</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pooled fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GBS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td>Var. tranche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Learning from results (P)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators, studies monitoring, evaluations</th>
<th>Effective feedback mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Timely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **GBS**
  - Quality: XX
  - Timely: X
  - Aligned: XXX
  - Feedback: XX

- **Pooled fund**
  - Quality: XXX
  - Timely: XXX
  - Aligned: XXX
  - Feedback: XX

- **Projects**
  - EDF-STABEX
    - Quality: XXX
    - Timely: XXX
    - Aligned: XX
    - Feedback: X

- **Projects**
  - Budget lines
    - Quality: XXX
    - Timely: XXX
    - Aligned: X
    - Feedback: X
3 -DP coordination and complementarity (D)

To what extent has the EC contributed to harmonised dialogue with the Tanzanian Government and all development partners that effectively and efficiently address Tanzanian priorities and strategies?
Recognized coordination efforts (D)

- GoT PRSP
- EC CSP (and RSP)

- Macro-economy
- Education
- Health
- Governance
- Transport
- Agriculture
- Environment
- Trade

Diagram showing coordination efforts across various sectors.
4 - Success conditions (S)

Considering reputedly successful actions in various supported areas, what impacts have been seen, how have these impacts been achieved, what were the conditions of success and to what extent are the lessons transferable?
Success conditions (S)

Evidence basis

• Focus groups
• Project evaluations (?)

Successful projects are

• Integrated into markets
• Private sector led support
• Locally owned
• Designed to ensure sustainability
• In a proper policy environment
• Removing major development constraints
To what extent has the EC support in the road sector contributed to Tanzania’s goal to establish an affordable and sustainable road transport infrastructure and efficient services for the benefit of the Tanzanian economy and people?

- Support to trunk and district / feeder roads
- Who does benefit from the road network?
Support / trunk and district roads (T)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trunk</th>
<th>District and feeder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC support</td>
<td>Large projects</td>
<td>RUSIRM project GBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical difficulty</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building local capacity</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors’ support</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits for people</td>
<td>Only from effective network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benefits from road network (T)

• Economic actors
  o External trade
  o Local producers > Internal trade > Income
  o Internal trade > Lower prices

• Social services
  o Access to services, e.g. hospital
  o Better functioning of services, e.g. health centres
  o Capacity to attract qualified staff, e.g. teachers (?)
6 - Basic education for all (E)

How far has EC support assisted in improving the equitable access to quality basic education for all?
Access to primary education (E)

- Progress in quantity
  - Enrolment (+)
  - Distance to school (-)
- Decrease in quality
  - Pupil per teacher ratio (+)
  - Proportion of qualified teachers (-)
- Mixed records in terms of equity
  - Gender equality (=)
  - Geographical (in)equity (=)
  - Disadvantaged children (=)
- Increased involvement of communities
To what extent has EC assistance promoted agricultural development and supported the stabilization of farmer incomes in tea and coffee growing areas?
Farmer’s income (A)

- Increase in income
  - Productivity (+)
  - Quality and price (+)
  - Cost of inputs (-)
- Sustainability by design
  - Simple technology (+)
  - Farmers’ involvement (+)
  - Market integration (+/-)
- Not yet a critical mass

TACRI probably the best achieving project in Agriculture, but others are also considered as good.
How far have EC interventions in the field of trade and regional integration addressed Tanzania’s needs and priorities and shown coherence with other national actions?
Policy dialogue without large funding (R)

• Top down strategy
  o From region to country
  o the right option

• There is an opportunity which has neither been identified nor seized, i.e. mixing:
  o Trade (EC active in policy dialogue and TA)
  o Private sector development (EIB active in funding)
  o Foreign investment (no action)
9 – Promotion of good governance (G)

How successful has the EC been in contributing to the promotion of good governance within the areas it has supported?
Achievements with respect to governance (G)

• Non State Actors
  o Project just started
  o Process of organizing NSAs advanced
  o EC’s analysis of NSAs already used by GoT

• Electoral process in Zanzibar
  o Voters register
  o Move towards involvement of all political parties

• Project ‘Prevention of Corruption Bureau’
  o Questionable achievement
  o Stagnating dialogue

• Local government
  o Difficult adjustments
  o Successful influence in policy dialogue
To what extent have EC interventions in Tanzania, where relevant, successfully addressed gender and environmental issues and ensured the involvement of Non State Actors?
### Cross-cutting issues (X)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>NSA’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>-/+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and RI</td>
<td>+/-?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relevance from little** to **much**

*a/b*  
*a = mainstreaming, b = achievement*
Outline of our overall assessment

• By and large a good alignment with GoT’s priorities
• Overall the majority of expected impacts have been achieved
• Movement towards sector wide approaches has been generally slow
• Policy dialogue has been impeded by lack of donors’ coherent approach to it and weak institutional situations within GoT
• EC’s positive contribution to policy dialogue is acknowledged
• Because of slow progress in policy dialogue, a part of the support has been delayed. So have been achievements
• In this context, GBS and the variable *tranche* appears to have been a relatively effective funding modality