



Findings

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.

Multi-dimensional results measurement in CDD projects

Experiences from the Malawi, Tanzania, and Uganda Social Action Funds

by Krishna Pidatala & Nginya Mungai Lenneiye

What results?

In the last decade, Malawi, Tanzania, and Uganda have used the Community-Driven Development (CDD) approach¹ to implement projects that exhibit multi-sectoral linkages, complex institutional structures and implementation processes, creative tension between the supply and demand sides, and convergence at the Local Government Authority (LGA) level in environments compounded by the pace of decentralization.

The projects have broadened the issue of *results focus* from the measurement of a few input-output indicators to include intermediate outcomes (which measure beneficiaries potentially reached by outputs produced by the projects).

In the process, these projects have been able to scale up from 'isolated boutique-type projects' to a mass production of outputs through participatory decision-making, local capacity development, and community control of resources.

At the national level, the projects have contributed to (a) poverty

reduction, (b) improved social welfare, and (c) improved transparency and accountability.

Evolution of the social funds mechanism

Social funds generally transfer resources to communities, allowing them to prioritize, implement, and manage sub-projects that lead to community empowerment, increased social capital, improved access to basic social services, and ultimately improved livelihoods. Direct financing of communities leaves local government authorities with the power to oversee how communities are using the resources.

Social funds continue to evolve, requiring that the activities to improve and measure results keep pace with changes. First-generation social funds such as MASAF I and II (1995–2003) and TASAF I (2000–04) focused on the creation of infrastructure (schools, health centers, water points, etc.); second-generation social funds include vulnerable groups, and addressed cash transfer mechanisms to food insecure

¹ In the Africa Region, the CDD approach promotes (i) community empowerment; (ii) empowerment of local governments; (iii) realignment with the center; (iv) improving transparency; and (v) capacity development.

households through innovative public works programs (PWPs).

Experiences from a post conflict situation in Northern Uganda led to transitional social funds, such as NUSAF (2003–08), to experiment with power-sharing between communities and local governments, accountability and conflict resolution. Lessons learned from MASAF I/II, TASAF I, and NUSAF were incorporated into third generation social funds, and components were abolished, and a single National Village Fund was created with clear access and approval criteria.

Approvals are done at the community and local authority level,

focusing on the big picture, especially the Millennium Development Goals, (b) developing sector norms and standards, (c) fostering quality assurance, and (d) implementing an overall framework for the implementation of M&E and MIS.

Community contributions to MDGs

The three social action funds (MASAF-3, NUSAF and TASAF-II) have adopted a practice of linking outputs to sector norms and standards, as well as to country concerns when calculating intermediate outcomes, capturing

the MDGs to which the project activities would contribute; and (b) identify and categorize community participation contribution to some of the sub-indicators of the MDGs (Table 1). This exercise finally drills down to those community participation activities that contribute to specific aspects of some of the MDGs.

Nature of outcomes

From the work in the three social funds, a *general hierarchy* of development and intermediate outcomes for social funds using the CDD approach has been developed

Table 1: MDGs, Tanzania PRS and community participation (TASAF II contribution)

MDG (in PRS)	Community participation contributing to MDG
Halve the proportion of people living below the poverty line	Wages from Public Works, income from projects for the vulnerable and incomes from investments funded from own savings, etc
Achieve Universal Education	Improved learning environment through provision of infrastructure and training of communities, etc
Promote Gender Equality	Social mobilization to increase girls in schools, toilets for girls, train school committees, etc
Halve the proportion of people without access to safe water	Community water projects, water harvesting , training water maintenance committees, improved sanitation, etc
Reduce Under-five Mortality by two thirds	Community food production projects, immunization promotion and improved health service delivery, etc
Reduce Maternal Mortality by three quarters	Awareness on risks, Family Planning promotion, train Village Assembly , supply of FP kits
Halt and Reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS	Vulnerable group support, Youth skills training, Community Health Funds, Community health awareness, etc

with the national level being relegated to ensuring that sub-project activities are in compliance with national sector norms. Ring-fenced funds were included to ensure that community priorities do not leave the most vulnerable behind and resources are appropriately targeted.

Implementation of the CDD approach through social action funds entails a multi-sectoral team to be effective. This requires support by sector technical staff at all levels — mainly at the central and local government level. The role of the center is important as it helps with (a)

contribution rather than *attribution* when it comes to impact indicators in the context of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This has been a useful way to engage sector specialists in identifying bottlenecks in the attainment of MDGs while improving the results framework beyond mere input-output measurement.

In Tanzania, the results focus approach under TASAF II makes it possible to (a) align project activities with higher level goals in the context of MDGs and the PRSP, and select

(Table 2). In this respect, social funds have adopted a “learning by doing” approach and have countered the centralist assumption of decreasing efficiency as one proceeds downwards from the center to the community level. In that context, it is a work-in-progress and should be construed as such.

The use of intermediate outcomes makes it possible for the projects to measure progress towards the achievement of each type of Development Outcomes. On the basis of this framework, efforts are

Table 2: Hierarchy of outcomes under projects with a CDD approach

Type of development outcomes	Intermediate outcomes
(1) Empowerment	(a) improved local organization (b) increased participation (c) improved local governance (d) increased transparency, and (e) increased accountability
(2) Increased Social capital	(a) increased inclusion (b) increased trust and (c) increased collective action
(3) Expanded social services delivery	(a) access to improved learning environment (b) access to improved health facilities or essential health packages (c) access to improved water sources, and (d) access to improved sanitation
(4) improved livelihoods	Increased incomes from (a) income-generating activities (b) conditional cash transfer programs, and (c) non-conditional cash transfer programs..

underway to review specific indicators in a number of CDD operations to ensure that they (a) measure progress towards outcomes, and (b) are in compliance with IDA requirements. Table 3 shows improved potential access to basic services delivery in the three projects.

Improving results measurement

In the course of supporting the implementation of the three social funds, various innovations have been tried in order to improve the measurement of results (Table 4). These have taken place at the three

levels of implementation (community, local government, and overall program). Some lessons for practitioners include (a) focus on results monitoring at the project level; (b) look for contribution and clear linkages to MDGs at impact level; (c) introduce social accountability

Table 3: Contributions to intermediate outcomes (improved potential access)

Indicator	Output Measure	Populations with improved potential access ¹			
		MASAF	TASAF	NUSAF	TOTAL
<u>Population with improved access to:-</u>					
Health	OPD	1,560,000 ²	600,000	460,325	16,660,327
Safe water	Water-point	161,750	62,250	281,400	508,400
Irrigation	Irrigation scheme	22,000	18,000		40,000
Markets	Community market	48,000	81,000	45,000	174,000
Roads	Road	612,000	918,000	210,000	1,740,000
natural resources	Projects	29,000	225,000	162,000 ¹	416,000
HIV/AIDS prevention	Projects	30,000	19,926	20,740	70,666
<u>Households with improved access to:-</u>					
water for livestock	Earth dam	82,000	96,000	10,000	188,000
food storage facilities	Storages	3,000	35,000	50,000	88,000
<u>Children with improved access to:-</u>					
Learning environment	Classroom	116,370	136,150	129,000	381,520
Sanitation	VIP	23,775	9,475	23,700	56,950
Teachers with improved accommodation	House	670	1,166	1,150	2,986
Health staff with improved accommodation	House	1,533	222		1,840
				85	
Orphans reached with support	Projects	1,260	21,275	52,230	74,765
Widows with access to higher incomes	Projects	864	14,700	72,755	88,319
Elderly with access to support	Projects	468	58,795	12,356	71,619
Disabled reached with support	Projects	106	27,893	7,547	35,546
Under-fives reached with support	ECD centre	57	135	810 ²	1,002
Others (eg IDPs)				420,000	420,000
Totals		16,732,855	2,327,987	1,959,098	21,019,940

¹ Potential based on sector norms and outputs.

² This figure can be reduced to 1 million due to the large number of understaffed and undersupplied facilities.

Table 4: Types of results measurement innovations

Level	Area of innovation	Progress
Community	<i>Community monitoring & feedback</i>	Social Accountability approaches & instruments such as Community Score Cards, Citizen Report Cards and annual poverty reports introduced
	<i>Community Statistics day</i>	Specific day is set aside on a periodic basis when community statistics are collected, stored and reported on. This encourages empowerment, transparency and helps in results measurement, analysis and decision making at the community level to improve results.
	<i>Local level Accountability</i>	Project Management committees made more accountable to elected local structures at the village level
Local Government	<i>Alignment with the centre</i>	Work with district planning process to align the supply side programs to capture community demand driven priorities
	<i>Demand-driven capacity enhancement</i>	Allow local governments to plan and request specific capacity development and training within a funding envelope that is both well defined and transparent
Program	<i>Delivery benchmarks developed</i>	The Community Sub-Project Cycle (CSPC) is an important instrument in the distribution of power, activities and accountabilities. Appropriate delivery benchmarks have been developed in this context to measure results, processing efficiencies, service gaps and capacities of different stakeholders.
	<i>Community Service Packages (CSP)</i>	These service packages , defined by the respective sector ministries, comprise a minimum set of interventions that (a) are affordable and suited to community level management and maintenance (b) are within national sector norms and standards , and (c) contribute to specific MDG indicator targets.– to ensure that the investment is functional and sustainable
	<i>Harmonization of systems & procedures</i>	Work to harmonize procedures and systems (MIS, financial management procedures) with other initiatives at the local government level in the context of decentralization and MTEF.
	<i>Knowledge & Information Sharing System (KISS)</i>	Introduced KISS systems to share knowledge, increase transparency, reduce transaction costs and preserve institutional memory
	<i>Performance Management culture</i>	Experience from private sector used to introduce the culture of performance management, albeit with varying degrees of success

approaches; (d) incorporate MIS and M&E into project work processes; (e) encourage bottom-up priorities using PRA techniques into district planning processes to strengthen the *local government-community space*; and (f) use South-South learning and experience sharing for intra-project learning, intra-regional learning, and cross-regional learning.

Conclusion

While social action funds result in an expanded service delivery, empowered communities, increased social capital and improved livelihoods, sectors play an important role in ensuring quality and sustainability by their contributions to ensuring better development outcomes. Therefore, a multi-dimensional, multi-sectoral approach

is essential to attain results in these operations; and the challenge is how to overcome sectoral-resistance on the part of implementers and Bank teams while improving on reporting systems. Impact evaluations are urgently needed in these operations to assess how much of the ‘potential’ has been translated into ‘actual’ service access.