

Findings reports on ongoing operational, economic, and sector work carried out by the World Bank and its member governments in the Africa Region. It is published periodically by the Operations Results and Learning Unit on behalf of the Region. The views expressed in Findings are those of the author/s and should not be attributed to the World Bank Group.

The Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF): owning the process of measuring impact¹ and achieving results

Social funds seek to protect the poor, not through relief or welfare hand-outs, but through investments people chose in order to guard or improve their well-being.

Origins and design of the Tanzania Social Action Fund

When the President of Tanzania visited Malawi in 1998, the Malawian President took him to see communities supported by the Malawi Social Action Fund (MASAF). This resulted in the Government of Tanzania (GOT) requesting the World Bank to send the same team to help it create a similar social fund to help communities contribute to their own development.

At the time TASAF was designed, about half of all Tanzanians were living on less than \$1 a day, with limited access to basic health, education, water, and other social services. As a result TASAF had two financing windows: (i) a Community Development Initiative to improve public social service infrastructure; and (ii) a Public Works Program for Local Governments to target food-insecure areas with cash-for work² in creation of productive assets-creation. TASAF was targeted to the poorest 40 districts (plus the two Islands compris-

ing Zanzibar). A Community Needs Assessment had found that communities had low trust in existing institutions. This caused the authorities to create a new institution to manage the Social Fund. Implementation started in November 2000³. To jump start the process, the Tanzanian authorities had secured a \$1.5 million preparation facility from the World Bank to pilot \$5,000 equivalent projects at the community level. The results were impressive: within six months, communities had already built simple classrooms, water points, dispensaries, and other works. In 2003, the President of Tanzania described TASAF as a mechanism to 'deliver tangible benefits to communities while awaiting longer-term benefits from macro-economic reforms'.

1 Intermediate outcomes are those, for example, where people benefit from a health centre that is closer by; impact outcomes where health improves as a result of improved access. Intermediate outcomes measure 'potential' and impact outcomes measure 'realized' benefits.

2 The cash-for-work wage rate was set 20% below the market wage for casual work, to ensure only the very poor without other employment were attracted to such work, giving rise to a wage that was self-targeting to the very poor.

3 TASAF I financing included \$8.6 million community contribution, \$3.1 million from GOT, and \$60 million from the International Development Association (IDA).



Findings

TASAF was also designed to assist communities cope with the consequences of HIV/AIDS. Orphans, especially, were expected to benefit indirectly from the safety nets elements. However, it gradually became clear that neither the two financing windows was able to respond in any significant way to the needs of those affected by HIV/AIDS. It was also assumed that many NGOs would respond, by preparing proposals for community work – this did not materialize, as few NGOs operated in the targeted areas. It also became clear that communities were not so keen to engage NGOs whose administrative overheads consumed a large share of the projects – as the project size was a maximum of T.sh.20 million, equivalent to about US\$20,000. It also became clear that Local Governments did not have the appropriate mechanisms to engage NGOs. Accordingly, it was decided to pilot a Social Support Program in four districts where communities had made many requests to be funded on account of the large number of households affected by HIV/AIDS. These districts were selected in consultation with the Tanzania Commission for AIDS (TACAIDS), who contributed resources for the mobilization of communities to use the TASAF.

Results: Beans, full bellies, and productivity

In programs such as TASAF, financial inputs (cash) and physical outputs (e.g. schools, water pumps, health clinics) are the traditional measures of results. TASAF inputs and outputs were tracked, monitored and evaluated in two ways – how physical outputs were pro-

cured, and how they were spent. Metaphorically, this was like counting the numbers of meals of beans (inputs) and the number of people with full bellies (outputs). The ability to measure was itself an achievement, given past difficulties with measuring outputs at the village level in Tanzania.

During TASAF preparation, communities had demonstrated their ability to manage and account for results: ‘beans and full bellies’. It was also revealed that assets needed to be grouped to have maximum impact, e.g. classrooms needed a water point, desks, teacher’s house, toilets, to enhance functionality and maintain a higher level of productivity.

Results: My six grandchildren and a cow* named Furaha (extract from TASAF News, June 2005)

Majala Miwana (75) is one of 45 widows of Vikawe Village in Kibaha Districts who currently earns \$2 a day from the sale of milk. In her words, handling such money in the past was a mere dream, and she is now able “to provide enough food for her household and for buying clothes and school requirements for her six grandchildren under her care”. She explained that the women chose dairy farming because they had seen other people earning good income from sale of milk and they wanted to have milk for their household and at the same time get manure for improving their agricultural land in order to boost crop production. “We started our project in April 2004 whereby each household got one dairy cow. My cow, which I named FURAHA (happiness) got a calf two months ago and gives me an average of 10 litres of milk per day. Eight litres are for sale and household use while two litres are left for baby cow. “Coming from the Wazaramo tribe, we traditionally fear cows and run away when we see one. But right now members of my group have got used to handling the animals and we are now at par with tribesmen in up-country livestock areas”.

*The practice adopted by these projects is to feed animals in a shed rather than open grazing.

In the four years of implementation, TASAF resources have allowed communities to construct over 1,704 sub-projects (Table 1). While sector targets would have been inappropriate to set in advance, given the demand-driven approach, between 2 and 2.7 million people benefited from ‘potentially improved access’ to services. In order to establish whether this potential has been realized, follow-up surveys document the current status of these assets. Education received the largest share, followed by health, water, and roads. Investments under the Social Support Program were smaller and targeted at those whose vulnerability reduced their chances of making full use of assets created under either the Public Works or Community Development financing windows. The Social Support window accounted for 4.6% of the CDI total outputs, but 2.9% of the budget.

Table 1. Sector breakdown of TASAF I sub-projects

Sector	Total	%
Education ¹	782	45.9
Health ²	328	19.2
Water	254	14.9
Road	204	12.0
Economic infrastructure ³	46	2.7
Environment protection	29	1.7
Widows	27	1.6
Orphans	15	0.9
HIV/AIDS sensitization	10	0.6
Elderly	6	0.4
Disabled	2	0.1
Early Childhood Dev.	1	0.1
Total	1704	100.0

¹ Classrooms; some have teachers’ houses, offices, VIPs, water points, etc.

² Out-Patient Departments, staff houses, incinerators, toilets, etc

³ Markets, bridges, bus stops, etc

Early survey results indicate that most water points are functioning with effective community operation and maintenance arrangements. However, of the 328 health

facilities built under TASAF I, nearly half were not fully staffed, owing to chronic shortages of health care personnel throughout Tanzania, most notably in the poorer areas. As a result the authorities decided not to build new health facilities under TASAF II until the existing ones were fully staffed and supplied with drugs. In education, outcomes range from improved school enrolment numbers to better pass-rates. Of course, these outcomes cannot be wholly attributed to classroom or other infrastructure. School attendance is the product of many elements – e.g. food availability, presence of a care-giver at home, additional school services covered by additional charges, distance, household status and exogenous shocks. The Ministry of Education is discussing these issues with various Government departments to make sure that more children get access to the range of support services that encourage school attendance. Investments under the social support program window remain in use. According to the evaluation report (reference), the main challenge remains finding market outlets. Investments under the Public Works window also remain in use, and some are being used to increase agricultural production, notwithstanding problems of market access. While TASAF has contributed to ‘intermediate outcomes’ and impacts (Table 2), the situation could be improved.

Table 2. Intermediate outcomes (potentially improved access)

Indicator	Population
Population with improved access to:-	
health OPDs	1,560,000

domestic water points	161,750
Irrigation schemes	22,000
community markets	48,000
Roads	612,000
natural resources projects	29,000
HIV/AIDS prevention	30,000
Households with improved access to:-	
water for livestock from earth dams	82,000
food storage facilities	3,000
Children with improved access to:-	
Learning environment (classrooms)	116,370
Sanitation (VIPs)	23,775
Teachers with improved housing	670
Health staff with Improved housing	1,533
Orphans reached with support	1,260
Widows with access to higher incomes	864
Elderly with access to support	468
Disabled reached with support	106
Under-fives reached with ECD centre	57
Totals	2,692,853

Note: Intermediate outcomes calculated using sector population norms.

Accountability and decentralization

TASAF requires that the recipient communities establish Community Management Committees to manage the funds and be accountable to the community. The Tanzanian decentralization of functions to local government level requires their elected and em-

ployed personnel to be accountable to the electorate. TASAF II has fused these two processes by making Local Government personnel accountable to the beneficiary communities through their role in facilitation and appraisal of community programs; public monitoring is carried out by Local Government elected representatives.

Local Government capacity remains severely hampered by poor funding. This is compounded by the lack of an independent tax-base, as well as insufficient and untimely transfer of central government funds. These factors undermine *effective* accountability at the local government level. TASAF is contributing to improved accountability through a development communication strategy. Under TASAF I, this did not reach its full potential, as two-thirds of the country was not covered. In addition, there was not a clearly-defined role for Village Government leadership (Village Councils). A third challenge was the inadequacy of information on sector strategies (norms and guidelines) in a form that communities could understand and apply.

Notwithstanding these constraints, communities and local institutions (at village and district levels) have been demanding progressively greater accountability from their Management Committees. Some have required either refunds (if committee members were seen to spend too much on bus fares, for example) or evidence that committee members had not spent project funds on personal assets (such as mattresses or other furniture).

National Strategy and Millennium Development Goals

Tanzania's National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP)⁴ of June 2005 has set ambitious targets up to the year 2009/2010. Citizen participation is an underlying theme to foster ownership of strategies, programs, and outcomes.

TASAF is now in its second phase, covering the period 2005-2009. It is focused on giving more voice to citizens at both community and lowest local government levels - village councils⁵. While retaining direct community financing as a key empowering mechanism, it is being implemented through Local Government Authorities. Target beneficiaries are: i) communities with inadequate access to social services; ii) households with able-bodied adults suffering from food insecurity; and iii) individuals living in poor households affected by acute shocks (like HIV/AIDS). These 3 beneficiary groups will access resources from a National Village Fund using procedures that build on the lessons learned regarding accountability, incomes poverty, and improving impact links.

Whose results are these anyway?

Communities have consistently expressed their satisfaction with TASAF I *outputs*. With TASAF II, discussions are moving more to higher order issues of *outcomes*. During a recent training workshop on social accountability, "... *note-worthy outcomes included strong community appreciation for the existing hardware (quality of the school infrastructure) but unacceptable quality of software (learning achievements) - very few children were pass-*

*ing on to the next levels. Importantly, the youth focus group revealed sexual abuse being committed by teachers - this was known but not previously discussed at the community level*⁶"

TASAF provides growing evidence that communities are starting to explicitly own the process of achieving and measuring results and holding their local leaders more accountable. TASAF II has increased the emphasis on incomes poverty, with communities encouraged to engage in creating productive assets that enable participating households to increase their incomes. The provision of additional financing and technical resources under two other projects (Community Forestry, and Marine and Coastal Environment Management⁷) gives extra impetus to income growth in communities whose livelihoods are affected by sustainable environment policies that discourage overexploitation of the forest and marine resources.

4 MKUKUTA (Mpango wa Kukuza Uchumi na Kupunguza Umaskini Tanzania) in Kiswahili, issued by the Vice President's Office, United Republic of Tanzania, Dar es Salaam.

5 Village Councils consist of up to 25 persons elected by all adult residents of a rural village.

6 Sey, Haddy Jatou (2005) report on "Tanzania Workshop on Local Government and Community Collaboration for Accountability and Cohesion" 20-24 June, Dar es Salaam.

7 TASAF II has \$150 million, the Marine and Coastal Environmental Management Project (MACEMP) \$ 51 million, and Tanzania Forestry Conservation and Management Project (TFCMP) \$ 31 million through TASAF to communities for sustainable exploitation of marine and forestry resources. The OPEC Fund has put aside a similar amount for two of the poorest Coastal regions: Lindi and Pwani. The Community HIV/AIDS Initiatives on Zanzibar (ZAC) has a pre-allocated amount of funding. Information on the Marine and Coastal Environmental Management Project can be obtained from Indumathie V. Hewawasam, Sr. Environmental Specialist, lhewawasam@worldbank.org; Jane Kibbassa, Rural Development Specialist: jkibbassa@worldbank.org; that

on the Tanzania Forestry Conservation and Management Project (TFCMP) from Christian Albert Peter, Senior Forestry Specialist : cpeter@worldbank.org, and on the TASAF II from Nginya Mungai Lenneiyee, Sr. Protection Specialist: nlenneiyee@worldbank.org and Ida Manjolo, Social Protection Specialist: imanjolo@worldbank.org.

References:

GoT (2005) *National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP)*, Vice President's Office, Dar-es-Salaam, June

GoT (2005) "Implementation Completion Report for TASAF (2000-2005)," Dar-es-Salaam, June

Kusek, J. and Rist, R. (2004) *Ten steps to a results-based monitoring and evaluation system*, World Bank, Washington, DC.

This article was written by N.M. Lenneiyee, (2005) "Who has the yam, and who has the knife: Social Action Funds and decentralization in Malawi, Tanzania, and Uganda", Social Protection Discussion Paper No. 0518, Social Protection Network, World Bank. TASAF Newsletter, special edition, June 2005, President's Office, Dar-es-Salaam.

For further information on TASAF, please contact:

S. B. Likwelile, Executive Director of TASAF
email address: tasaf@ud.co.tz

World Bank Tanzania Country Office, Dar-es-Salaam:

N.M. Lenneiyee, Sr. Social Protection Specialist (nlenneiyee@worldbank.org)
I. Manjolo, Social Protection Specialist (imanjolo@worldbank.org)