

**GOODBYE TO PROJECTS?
THE INSTITUTIONAL IMPACTS OF A LIVELIHOOD APPROACH ON
DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTIONS**

RESEARCH PROJECT NO. R7908

DEPARTMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

WORKING PAPER SERIES

Paper No 5

**A livelihoods-grounded audit of
participatory planning for district
development within Capacity 21
programme (Tanzakesho) in
Tanzania**

By Anna Toner and Faustin Kamuzora
August 2003

ISBN: 1 898828 52 0
Published by: Bradford Centre for International Development, University of Bradford,
Pemberton Building, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD7 1DP
Tel: +44-1274 233980 Fax: +44-1274 235280
www.brad.ac.uk/acad/bcid

BACKGROUND TO PROJECT AND WORKING PAPER SERIES

This paper is one in a series of working papers prepared under a research project entitled *Goodbye to Projects? The Institutional Impacts of a Livelihood Approach on development interventions*.

This is a collaborative project between the Bradford Centre for International Centre for Development¹ (BCID) with the Economic and Policy Research Centre (EPRC), Uganda; Khanya – managing rural change, South Africa; and, Mzumbe University (formerly the Institute for Development Management (IDM)), Tanzania. The project is supported by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) under their Economic and Social Research Programme (ESCOR).

Approaches to projects and development have undergone considerable change in the last decade with significant policy shifts on governance, gender, poverty eradication, and environmental issues. Most recently this has led to the adoption and promotion of the sustainable livelihood (SL) approach. The adoption of the SL approach presents challenges to development interventions including: the future of projects and programmes, and sector wide approaches (SWAPs) and direct budgetary support.

This project intends to undertake an innovative review of these issues. Central to this will be to question how a livelihood approach is actually being used in a range of development interventions. This will be used to identify and clarify the challenges to the design, appraisal and implementation of development interventions and changes required from the adoption of a livelihoods approach.

The research was conducted in two phases. The first phase consisted of general and country reviews on SL and development interventions. The second phase of the research involved the compilation of ten detailed case studies of development interventions in Uganda, Tanzania and South Africa. These case studies compare and contrast the implementation of a range of sector wide approaches, programmes and projects all developed with a livelihoods-orientation.

Each case study intervention was examined through what might be termed as a ‘sustainable livelihoods (SL)-grounded audit’, which uses sustainable livelihoods ‘principles’ as the basis. The results of this analysis offer useful guidance on the opportunities and challenges faced by development practitioners in operationalizing sustainable livelihoods approaches.

This paper ‘A livelihoods-grounded audit of Participatory Planning for District Development within Capacity 21 (Tanzakesho) in Tanzania’ is the fifth in the series of project working papers.

¹ Formerly Development and Project Planning Centre (DPPC)

This research is funded by the Department for International Development of the United Kingdom. However, the findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed in this paper are entirely those of the author(s) and should not be attributed to the Department for International Development, which does not guarantee their accuracy and can accept no responsibility for any consequences of their use.

THE AUTHORS

Anna Toner is a Researcher in Sustainable Livelihoods at the Bradford Centre for International Development, University of Bradford.

Faustin Kamuzora is a Lecturer and Researcher at Mzumbe University, Tanzania.

PROJECT WORKING PAPERS TO DATE

- 1. Annotated bibliography on livelihood approaches and development interventions.**
- 2. Appraisal of the use of livelihoods approaches in South Africa.**
- 3. Review of approaches to development interventions in Tanzania: From projects to livelihoods approaches.**
- 4. Review of development interventions and livelihoods approaches in Uganda**
- 5. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Participatory Planning for District Development within Capacity 21 programme (Tanzakesho) in Tanzania**
- 6. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Community-Based Planning (CBP) action research project in South Africa.**
- 7. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Agricultural Sector Programme Support (ASPS) in Tanzania.**
- 8. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Sustainable Management of the Usangu Wetland and its Catchment (SMUWC) project in Tanzania.**
- 9. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Magu District Livelihoods and Food Security Project (MDLFSP) in Tanzania.**
- 10. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Sexual Health and Rights Programme (SHARP!) in Lesotho and South Africa.**
- 11. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Training for Environmental and Agricultural Management (TEAM) project in Lesotho.**

12. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Sustainable Coastal Livelihoods Programme (SCLP) in South Africa.

13. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture (PMA) in Uganda

14. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the AIDS/STD programme in Uganda.

For more details on the project, this paper, and others in the series, please contact the UK or African co-ordinators:

Tom Franks or Anna Toner, BCID, University of Bradford, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD1 7DP, UK Tel: +44 (0) 1274 235286; Fax: +44 (0) 1274 235280; email: t.r.franks@bradford.ac.uk or a.l.toner@bradford.ac.uk ; www.brad.ac.uk/acad/bcid

Ian Goldman or Tsiliso Tamasane, Khanya – managing rural change, 17 James Scott Street, Brandwag, Bloemfontein 9301, Free State, South Africa. Tel +27 (0)51 430 8314; Fax: 27 (0)51 430 8322; email: goldman@khanya-mrc.co.za or tsiliso@khanya-mrc.co.za www.khanya-mrc.co.za

Fred Muhumuza, EPRC, Makerere University Campus, 51 Pool Road, PO Box 7841, Kampala, Uganda. Tel: +256 (0)41 541023; Fax: +256 (0)41 541022; email: muhuma@hotmail.com

Faustin Kamuzora, Mzumbe University, P.O. Box 397, Morogoro, Tanzania. Tel: +255 (0)23 604380; Fax: +255 (0)23 4382; email: frkamuzora@yahoo.co.uk

For more details on the project and copies of recent publications please consult the project's web site:

<http://www.brad.ac.uk/acad/dppc/GTP/goodbye/html>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. An SL-grounded audit approach	7
2. Tanzakesho- the case study	10
2.1 Description of the intervention	10
2.2 Impact	13
2.3 Poor people as focus	14
2.4 Participation	14
2.5 Partnership	15
2.6 Holistic approach	16
2.7 Policy and institutional links	16
2.8 Building on strengths	17
2.9 Dynamic and flexible	17
2.10 Accountability/responsiveness	17
2.11 Sustainability	18
2.12 Critical factors	19
Appendix 2.1 People interviewed	21
Appendix 2.2 References and bibliography	22

1. The SL-grounded audit of development interventions

The cases studies in this research were chosen for inclusion following a first phase review of the use of livelihoods approaches in Tanzania, Uganda and Southern Africa. Data was collected using a number of methods including questionnaires, semi-structured individual and focus group interviews, collection and review of process documentation and workshop activity.

All ten case studies have been analysed according to what we term a ‘SL-grounded audit’ described below so that the emerging lessons can be compared. Each study is divided into two sections: the first a general introduction to the intervention; and the second, a structured response to a series of questions adapted from the SL-principles as defined by Carney (2002) in Box 1. SL principles are one element of sustainable livelihoods approaches. This research adopts these principles as a structuring tool and as means of pinpointing the practical implications of adopting a sustainable livelihoods approach to development.

Box 1. SLA principles defined by Carney (2002)

Sustainable livelihoods approaches: Progress and possibilities for change, p14-15, London: Department for International Development

Normative principles:

People-centred: sustainable poverty elimination requires respect for human freedom and choice. People- rather than the resources, facilities or services they use- are the priority concern. This may mean supporting resource management or good governance, for example but the underlying motivation of supporting livelihoods should determine the shape and purpose of action.

Empowering: change should result in an amplified voice opportunities and well-being for the poor.

Responsive and participatory: poor people must be key actors in identifying and addressing livelihood priorities. Outsiders need processes that enable them to listen and respond to the poor.

Sustainable: there are four key dimensions to sustainability-economic, institutional, social and environmental sustainability. All are important-a balance must be found between them.

Operational principles:

Multi-level and holistic: micro-level activity and outcomes should inform the development of policy and an effective governance environment. Macro- and meso-level structures should support people to build on their strengths.

Conducted in partnership: partnerships can be formed with poor people and their organisations, as well as with public and private sector. Partnerships should be transparent agreements based upon shared goals.

Disaggregated: it is vital to understand how assets, vulnerabilities, voice and livelihood strategies differ between disadvantaged groups as well as between men and women in these groups. Stakeholder and gender analysis are key tools.

Long-term and flexible: poverty reduction requires long-term commitment and a flexible approach to providing support.

Each case study follows the structure detailed below:

Description of the intervention: this includes a chronological description of the evolution of the particular intervention and details the main stakeholders and activities undertaken in implementation. Original logframes and planning documents have been reviewed where possible.

Impact: Assessment of the impact of interventions relates to the success or failure of an intervention to achieve the outputs or outcomes that were the main focus of the intervention. The effect of this is that our understanding of impact is somewhat limited and partial. The methodology used in this research project did not allow for significant impact assessment with intervention beneficiaries at the micro-level (although this was done on a small-scale in most of the case studies). This section also includes some assessment of the costs of the intervention balanced against the number of people who benefit from it.

Poor People as focus

Do, or did, the objectives of the intervention include a mention of people and their livelihoods?

How central is this to the intervention's objectives?

How much were household livelihoods a focus during implementation?

Participation

What type of participation was used at each stage of design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?

How and when did this participation occur?

What incentives were there for people to participate?

Partnerships

What was the type of partnership and collaboration between these organisations at micro-meso-macro?

Who owned the project?

Holistic approach

How holistic was the analysis used in design?

How does the plan for the intervention fit into the broader development plan?

How does the intervention coordinate with other development interventions in the area?

Policy and institutional links

How integrated was the intervention with existing institutional structures?

What evidence is there that the intervention addressed linkages between policy at micro, meso and macro levels and across sectors?

Building on strengths

Does the intervention build on existing strengths at the different levels?

Dynamic and flexible

Did the objectives and activities of the intervention change to respond to a changing environment and/or demands?

What further interventions have arisen from the intervention? How did this take place?

Accountability/ responsiveness

How were those implementing the intervention accountable to the public and intervention's beneficiaries?

Who reports to who and what about?

Do beneficiaries (micro) or partners (meso) have an influence on the intervention and how?

Sustainability

Economic

Is the system able to be sustained financially?

Are the "technologies/services" economically viable for beneficiaries?

Social

Are vulnerable groups able to access and use effectively the systems of the intervention?

Are the institutions created/used by the intervention able to sustain themselves beyond the life of the intervention?

Environmental

Are the technologies/services environmentally beneficial?

Are the systems (meso level) beneficial/neutral?

Institutionally

Are the capacities and systems established in such a way so that the system will continue (beyond the life of the intervention)?

Will they continue to generate the outcomes envisaged?

Critical factors

What were critical factors affecting the performance of this intervention?

Comparing Cases

Each case study can be read as a stand-alone document as the SL-grounded audit is in itself a useful means of understanding the strengths and weaknesses of an intervention. However, the broader aim of this research is to compare lessons across all ten case studies in order to identify more generally the challenges and opportunities faced by development practitioners in operationalising a sustainable livelihoods approach.

2.0 PARTICIPATORY PLANNING FOR DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT WITHIN CAPACITY 21 (TANZAKESHO) PROGRAMME IN TANZANIA

2.1 Description of the intervention

The origins of the Tanzakesho² programme lie in Capacity 21, a commitment by UNDP to assist developing countries in building their capacity for the incorporation of Agenda 21 (the outcome of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit) into their national development agendas. Tanzakesho is operating as a pilot project in two districts (Mbozi and Sengerema).

This case study is based on data collected in Mbozi district in March 2002 and in Sengerema in September 2002. Primary data was collected by interviewing various stakeholders at different levels using semi-structured interviews. Interviews were either conducted individually or in groups. Secondary information was collected by reviewing various documents related to the programme. Details of persons interviewed and documents reviewed can be found in the annexes to this report.

The main component of Tanzakesho is the advocacy of participatory planning processes as a means for achieving sustainable development. In both districts this meant improving the existing ‘Mpango Kata’ or Ward³ Planning Programme, which was a community-based programme aimed at addressing poverty alleviation at ward level. However it was felt that ‘Mpango Kata’ was largely implemented in a ‘top-down’- fashion and so could be strengthened by making it more participatory and therefore reflective of local needs.

The latest documentary output from the programme emphasises that although, the implementation of Tanzakesho has covered a small geographical area (29 village out of 170 in Mbozi District and 22 out of 125 in Sengerema), the lessons revealed by the exercise have influenced the planning process across the district. The District Executive Director (DED) in Mbozi noted that Tanzakesho has revived a spirit of community self-help and improved community creativity for solving local problems. He also noted the strong interdepartmental collaboration that exists within the Mbozi District Council (MDC) core implementation team. The core implementation team comprises the district heads of department and district Tanzakesho staff (i.e. Programme District Advisor and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) Expert) and acts as a technical committee that oversees the development of work plans and budgets, and the implementation of the village plans.

At district and village levels it appears that Tanzakesho is a popular intervention. Interviewees emphasised that it had given them ‘ownership’ and responsibility of their problems and hence their solutions. It was even attributed, by villagers and the core team, to have effected social transformation with respect to gender and witchcraft.

Tanzakesho’s activities have evolved from five overarching programme objectives, which are outlined below as:

² Tanzakesho literally means Tanzania of tomorrow.

³ Ward is an administrative area in the district. A district is composed of several wards. Mbozi district has 26 wards.

- Strengthening the decentralisation process through capacity building in planning for sustainable development at district and village levels.
- Piloting of participatory implementation strategies for initiatives on sustainable use of natural resources.
- Support to operationalisation of Tanzanian Development Vision 2025
- Review of the planning framework to incorporate principles of sustainable development
- Advocacy for sustainable development through environmental education and awareness raising.

Implementation of Tanzakesho began in 1999 with the establishment of district core implementation teams, selection of pilot villages and a review of current best practice. The programme was launched at a workshop in January 2000 with a SWOT analysis of *Mpango Kata* involving UNDP staff, villagers from pilot wards, NGOs, District Councillors, Representatives from the Vice Presidents office, Planning Commission and National Environment Management Council (Kitundu, Kikula & Pflieger 2000). Throughout 2000 district, ward and village officials were variously involved in study tours, the development of an environmental education and awareness strategy, PRA and good governance training.

From March 2001 PRA planning exercises were conducted in pilot villages and an exchange between the two pilot districts was organised. From May 2001 Village Councils began to implement their new plans and submit proposals for the funding of microprojects. Examples of action taken include: the passing of new by-laws to minimise fouling of water sources, construction of classrooms, and training in income-generating activities.

In 2002 a Tanzakesho manual was written, involving personnel from the core district teams, in order to disseminate the key learnings from the programme to other districts.

Activities

The main activities under the Tanzakesho programme have included: a country-wide best practice survey on participatory planning, study tours to view best practice in other districts, SWOT analysis of the existing 'mpango kata' planning system, the training of trainers on PRA, environmental awareness and good governance, the construction of participatory village plans and a consolidated district plan. Monitoring and evaluation, and training for the enhancement of information management systems at district and village levels followed.

Planning activities were followed by the implementation of micro-projects as prioritised during the village planning process and their monitoring by the villagers. Micro-projects have included: classroom construction, Village office construction, tree planting and the creation of by-laws to prevent cattle and people fouling water sources.

Additionally, District staff reviewed the National Development Vision 2025 document, which aims to halve poverty in the country by 2025, and generated strategies on how the

district could operationalise it. Facilitation of a ‘village vision 2025’ was incorporated during the village planning process.

The experiences from the districts—both best practice reports and activities of the Tanzakesho programme—are fed back to the national level through civil servants exposed to district level activities.

Various environmental education and awareness measures have been tailor-made to the needs of the respective district, such as the experimentation with fuel-efficient cooking stoves and soil brick-making in Sengerema. Local consultants were used to advise on their construction, and on other environmental technologies and income generation activities.

Stakeholders

UNDP’s primary role in Tanzakesho has been as funding body and as facilitator of the overall intervention. The Ministry of Regional Administration and Local Government (MRALG) was responsible for overseeing the implementation of Tanzakesho and for more widely circulating the lessons learnt in ongoing reform of local government. Core teams within Mbozi and Sengerema District Councils were the main implementing agencies, and in some cases formed partnerships with NGOs in order to implement micro-projects identified through village PRA exercises.

Beneficiaries

The main beneficiaries of the intervention are the implementing district councils, who received capital equipment, staff training and resources to implement projects in pilot villages.

Ward and Village Councils are also beneficiaries of Tanzakesho, again benefiting through training and increased access to resources to implement development activity, as were residents of the pilot villages through their inclusion into the planning process and through the resources accessed to fund micro-projects, identified and prioritized by themselves.

Costs

It is not possible to identify a total cost for the Tanzakesho programme, as it is part of a wider UNDP process aimed at increasing the capacity of developing countries to implement Agenda 21.

Limited illustrative figures are available at the district level. For instance, Sengerema District Council reports that they received \$46,403 from UNDP and contributed \$350 of council funds for Tanzakesho activities from 1st January – 31st December 2001. The main expenses were training of trainers and study tours.

In this district this works out as \$2000 per village for the year. This figure does not represent the costs involved in extending the system across the district, and incorporates the costs of establishing the system from scratch.

2.2 Impact

People interviewed in Mbozi and Sengerema, who were directly involved in Tanzakesho were positive about the impact made by it. Although, as the intervention has only been in operation since 2000, it is impossible to tell whether or not it will make an impact on the overall sustainability of people's livelihoods.

It is probably most instructive to consider the limited amount that we know about the impacts in relation to the major groups of stakeholders discussed above.

Mbozi and Sengerema District Council reports speak of a revival of a spirit of community self help and of the importance of their ownership of the programme. Members of the core teams obviously felt professionally empowered by the training that they had received through Tanzakesho. Officials of both district councils were pleased to be the implementing agency for the programme as they had been bypassed by previous interventions.

Villagers also spoke of the extent of ownership of the programme, and some stated that certain social transformation had taken place, in the form of increased awareness and openness about gender equality, HIV/AIDS and witchcraft. However, people were not then able to offer specific evidence for such transformations.

Tangible evidence of a reawaking of community spirit is to some extent evidenced by the decreased tax evasion and increased attendance at public meetings.

It is obvious that the impact of Tanzakesho has been limited to pilot villages, but even within those villages people said that there was no evidence that the intervention would actually reduce poverty in the longer term.

The good working relationships and the positive regard in which the Tanzakesho approach was held locally is undoubtedly due to the efforts made to avoid the creation of parallel structures and to maximise participatory involvement, ownership, and capacity-building within the intervention.

According to the latest reports, the Tanzakesho process has been useful with respect to national moves to increase participation in planning processes. However, the extent of that usefulness might have been increased had the intervention been piloted on a district-wide level, as both districts recognized that the Tanzakesho planning process could not be rolled out in its present form due to resource limitations.

Tanzakesho has built good capacity at micro and meso levels in relation to participatory planning and environmental issues. This applies particularly to the 'core' teams within both district councils, as their increased capacity has the potential to be useful across the entire district and not just in pilot villages.

Tanzakesho documents show clear linkages to action at the macro level and both core teams and UNDP staff have been working with the Ministry of Regional and Local

Government (MRALG) to increase capacity so that the lessons from Tanzakesho can be institutionalised.

Those district, ward and village official who had been trained in PRA techniques and who had attended study visits expressed confidence and pride in their new skills. They emphasised their ownership of the programme and were keen for more training, particularly with respect to data management and computer skills.

2.3 Poor People as focus

Tanzakesho is not an explicitly 'sustainable livelihoods approach' intervention, although it is formulated around the need for local government to plan to improve the sustainability of people's livelihoods.

Poor people were of key concern in the Tanzakesho planning methodology and efforts were made to adapt the process in order to allow as many people as possible to participate.

The basis of the participatory planning was environmental sustainability and as plans were formulated through a collective PRA process, implementation of micro-projects tended to be concentrated in capital projects (construction of village offices, classrooms) and environmental protection measures, directed at the whole community, rather than at improving specific household livelihoods. Although, it might be argued that such activities would indeed impact positively on household livelihoods.

Some of the activities stimulated through Tanzakesho were aimed at improving the sustainability of people's livelihoods through income-generating activities such as bee keeping and soil brick-making. However, up to the present, uptake in Sengerema has been very low. For instance, in Sima village, a soil brick-making machine had been purchased but was unused due to the social stigma attached to using such bricks for construction.

2.4 Participation

Participation as empowerment is the key principle behind Tanzakesho. In practice, this has led to the drawing up of Village plans according to problems identified during PRA exercises. Figures given in project documents indicate that a high proportion of villagers attended the PRA exercises and efforts were made to enable the access of various groups. Tanzakesho aims at delivering self-mobilisation through the ownership of local problems and empowerment to find solutions. Early implementation problems, particularly in Sengerema, were attributed to earlier interventions, which utilised incentivised participation.

However, it is possible that the priority problems appear to reflect the content of the training that the 'Trainers of Trainers' received (Emphasis being placed on environmental pollution and gender awareness).

The District Councils in both areas were very satisfied with the progress of the PRA planning. Villagers were also very satisfied and were keen to receive further training. It was mentioned that participation had been weak at first but due to flexibility with the times of meetings, attendance had grown considerably. The DED in Mbozi indicated that they are trying to extend the participatory planning system to non-pilot wards, those new villages were not receiving the attention and resources available to the pilot wards. He expressed the fear that this would lead to very 'lop-sided' development across the district as a whole. The same reservations concerning the replicability of the programme were raised in Sengerema.

The key issue here is whether the PRA planning exercise gives a legitimate 'voice' to all villagers. It is not possible to conclude on this from our brief visits to Mbozi and Sengerema. Certainly, efforts were made to make the PRA process accessible to groups who might have been excluded such as women and children. Villagers in both districts emphasised that the PRA planning had begun to reawaken an ideal of community self-reliance and ownership of development initiatives. They also attributed increased participation of women in local government to the PRA process.

2.5 Partnerships

Good partnerships appear to operate at district and village government levels. In Mbozi the core team seems to be working effectively and trying to build partnerships with NGOs, to avoid the parallel structures that have existed in the past. One major success of the core team has been the opportunity to work more cross-sectorally and to build a real partnership of professional working within the MDC. Some members admitted that they had been sceptical at the start of the intervention but the training that they had received as a team had been very important in bring people together.

In Sengerema the strengthening of a core team had been slower to get off the ground, but at the time of our visit members of the team were expressing similar sentiments to those recorded in Mbozi.

The partnership between UNDP and the District Councils is essentially a funding relationship (vertically from UNDP to District Councils). There is some flexibility for district councils to control the scope of activities, but the design of the programme did not include the district councils until implementation. From this perspective the district councils are implementing the framework designed by UNDP.

The programme documents also stress the importance of forming partnerships with local consultants and experts. They found these to be much more efficient and useful than bringing in assistance from outside (even from neighbouring African countries). It is also noted that the use of UN volunteers was not effective as they took a long time to learn about the local situation.

2.6 Holistic approach

The design phase of Tanzakesho covered a long period of time (1996-1999) and involved consultation with practitioners and policy-makers on best practice with regards to planning for sustainability.

The Tanzakesho documentation admits that despite this extensive build-up, no approval for plans was sought from the district council until implementation was about to begin (Kikula and Pfliegner, 2003). This brings two key points to the fore: by its nature as a planning project, Tanzakesho is holistic and brings together key staff from across the sectors in district government; but the early planning stages were not holistic in terms of macro-micro consultation.

Rather than creating a parallel structure, Tanzakesho operates through the district government, and therefore it was envisaged that plans from pilot villages could easily be integrated with the larger district development plans. As noted elsewhere the DED from Mbozi noted that in practice this was quite a difficult task, as the intervention was not being implemented across the whole district.

Village plans show some integration with other development interventions, particularly in the resourcing of micro-projects. In Mbozi, NGOs already working in the district jointly financed some micro-projects.

Our visit to Sengerema revealed a possible weakness in the policy linkages of the programme. As part of their Tanzakesho planning the village of Ishimalo began construction of two new classrooms. However, they now remain unfinished, as the national universal primary education strategy (PDEP) has begun to be implemented. Under this if a villagers undertake to build the foundations for a classroom the government will offer 3 million Tsh to complete the construction. This has made the opportunity cost of completing the Tanzakesho classrooms too great for the village to bear.

2.7 Policy and institutional links

The decision to work within local government structures ensured that the intervention was integrated with existing institutional structures. However, UNDP appears to have retained some control over the implementation of the intervention. In some senses, Tanzakesho does create a parallel structure but located within local government – had the intervention operated in all wards in the districts this would be less of a cause for concern.

There is a commitment within the documentation to feed lessons from Tanzakesho into local government reform currently being implemented in the country and MRALG is a key part in this. To this extent, micro-macro linkages are good. Progress reports are made to the Minister for Local Government and officials make visits to the area. Having said that, at the district level it was not possible to get any sense of the extent of involvement in the programme from the national level.

The MDC DED expressed concern about micro to meso links. At this level, he was finding a difficulty in reporting the village plans in a meaningful way to district council and regional secretariat.

2.8 Building on strengths

The starting point of the planning exercise was the identification of problems for the villagers, and in this sense the intervention does not begin by 'building on strengths'. However, in the design of micro-projects in order to address the problems identified, the strengths and resources available to villagers are drawn on. For instance, the intervention is attributed with raising awareness amongst villagers about the possibility of using byelaws to regulate environmentally damaging farming and livestock practices. Villagers also contribute labour for projects such as the construction of classrooms.

SLAs talk about using people's strengths and capacities as a starting point for intervention. Tanzakesho begins with an analysis of people's needs. However, in addressing these needs local strengths and resources are then recognised and mobilised.

Tanzakesho built on strengths at the meso-level through use of district core team as main implementing body.

2.9 Dynamic and flexible

Great flexibility was demonstrated in the timing of the PRA exercises. In some respects, the bottom-up approach used in Tanzakesho necessitates that change and feedback is a continuous process.

The PRA methodology used meant that activities evolved from structured community participation. Additional, study visits made by the core team allowed new ideas and activities to emerge.

The Core team felt they were involved in the monitoring and evaluation of the programme, and the Village and Ward Councils are required to produce reports, although they felt that they would like to receive more feedback.

The lessons from Tanzakesho are currently being written up and disseminated. However, on the ground the future evolution of the programme is not very clear, under the present resourcing arrangements it cannot be scaled up across the whole district. Mbozi District Council is experimenting with how it might extend some of the methods to non-pilot villages, but was experiencing difficulties with personnel time and resources to fund micro-projects.

2.10 Accountability/ responsiveness

Village and ward councils report to the core team who in turn report to UNDP programme staff about budgeting and activities. Members of the core teams have been involved in producing training manuals and in evaluating progress. Although, some core teams members also expressed a wish for more intervention documentation to be available in Swahili.

Again, the participatory methods used ensured that district officials were fully engaged and accessible to villagers. Micro-projects are implemented on a collaborative basis with inputs from the Villagers and the district councils (using funds channelled from UNDP). They appear to be fully open and accountable in financial terms (financial flows to micro projects are provided in reports). Questions do arise about the accountability of Village councils to villagers (particularly those who may have been unable to attend PRA sessions). Reports on the programme seem to be readily available at the district level (although not at ward and village level).

Project documents state that Tanzakesho aims to put in place a participatory monitoring and evaluation system. To date an internal evaluation has been carried out, which involved public meetings in all pilot villages. Some beneficiaries expressed the wish to have more feedback on the progress of micro-projects and plans.

2.11 Sustainability

Economic

Tanzakesho is seen to be effective in pilot wards and has been extended to non-pilot villages. The local PRA expert admits that the same support has not been available to these villages. PRA has been expensive and the financial inputs from Tanzakesho have been significant. Questions must be asked about how such a system could be extended without attendant increases in resource availability. To this extent, the intervention does not address the financial sustainability of the intervention.

Social

The intervention has also raised awareness of issues relating to gender and other social factors. However, a coherent treatment of these elements is not very clear either from interviews or from documentary evidence. Claims made for social transformation would need to be verified through longer-term study. Although, it might be argued that the participatory design of the programme means that aspects of social sustainability are an intrinsic element. Some concern must be raised about the treatment of witchcraft within the intervention. Whilst it is positive that villagers felt able to raise witchcraft as an issue, it is stated that identified witches were 'repatriated' (Sosovele 2001). This is both a controversial and questionable statement. How were these witches identified, by whom and in what context? To where were they repatriated?

Environmental

In terms of environmental sustainability, which is enshrined in the objectives of Tanzakesho, the programme performs well. It appears to have raised environmental awareness, and Villagers have taken action based on this in terms of planting hedges, protecting water sources and passing new by-laws relating to environmental protection. Experimentation and training on improved technologies has been initiated, although a small proportion of villagers have been able to put them into practice in their own homes (48 reduced fuel stoves have been built in Igamba ward). Villagers said that as soon as

the rains were over they would have more time to continue work on their micro-projects. The take-up of low cost building methods (soil bricks) and environmentally friendly income generating activities such as beekeeping has been low in Sengerema District.

Institutional

Officials of the District and Village Councils emphasise the fact that UNDP uses and supports existing local government mechanisms. The perception is that Tanzakesho is owned by the district and so inherently builds on the capacity of pre-existing institutions rather than creating new ones. In theory, should sufficient resources be available this would mean that the Tanzakesho system could be continued and extended across the districts.

One potential problem in the institutional relationship is in the nature of the partnership established for implementation. As mentioned above, the district councils were not brought on board until after the programme was prepared and ready to go. Institutional sustainability might be better enhanced had the district councils been treated as full partners, shaping and designing the intervention. Whilst both councils have obviously been empowered, their role does appear to have been as implementers directed by their funders.

2.12 Critical factors

The most positive aspect of Tanzakesho, mentioned by all those interviewed in Mbozi and Sengerema Districts, was the use of the district councils as the central implementing agency. This has led to what seems to be, very genuine local participation in the intervention. District, Ward and Village Council Officials felt empowered by Tanzakesho, and also that their skills has been enhanced and developed by the programme.

The critical limiting factor relates to the sustainability of the intervention. Pilot Villages have received significant inputs in terms of time and resources. It is very hard to see how this can be extended across the district (or the country) unless district resource levels are substantially increased. The lessons from Tanzakesho would have been more useful had district councils been full partners, leading and directing implementation across the district as a whole. There is a key trade-off to be resolved here between the intensity and depth of participatory planning and the number of communities that can be reached when resources are limited.

Additionally, without more intensive research in the districts it is impossible to say if or how the intervention has altered livelihoods. Improvement in natural resource use were alluded to by respondents, as were cases of social transformation, but it is hard to assess the extent of these changes in this research.

With respect to the aims of ‘Goodbye to Projects’, the conclusions we can draw depend on whether or not we classify Tanzakesho as a sustainable livelihoods intervention. Certainly, Tanzakesho does not explicitly take on an SL mantle, it does, however, fulfil many of SL principles. Tanzakesho’s central principle is concerned with the development

of empowering participatory local planning mechanisms. It appears to have worked flexibly and has evolved as an intervention as the practical experience of participatory planning has thrown up lessons and required responses. It has successfully drawn together a cross-sectoral team, who work in partnership with each other and with external stakeholders.

Tanzakesho demonstrates support for the idea that SL principles are actually a distillation of current thinking on best development practice. It is not a self-consciously SL programme but it does embody many of the principles that are defined as necessary for a SLA.

Whilst Tanzakesho did recognise the need to integrate with existing institutional structures, it appears to be limited by lack of integration with existing resource streams. This is vital in order to extend effectively the lessons learnt in the implementation of Tanzakesho.

Appendix 2.1 People interviewed:

Mbozi

- District Commissioner
- District Executive Director
- District Planning Officer- Mr Nyarubamba
- Planning Officer - Mr Mwakibombaki
- MDC Tanzakesho core implementation team
- Local PRA Expert Mrs. Mwanyika (Mbozi)
- Igamba Ward- Ward Executive Officer (WEO), Educational Officer, Divisional Secretary, 3 farmers (2 male, 1 female)
- Mbozi Mission - Mr Amelikawenga Village Executive Officer, School teacher and Village Council member
- Isandula Ward WEO Mr Siame, Ag. Extension Officer Mr. Mapunda, VC-Chimbuya, Group of villagers at mill (mixed gender)

Sengerema

- District Executive Director
- Community Health Officer
- Community Development Officer - Mrs Mabura
- Local PRA Expert
- Agricultural Extension Officer- Mr Nyungwe
- Lands Officer- Mr Twambi
- Villagers and teachers of Ijinga, Sima and Ishimalo
- District Trade Officer

Dar-es-Salaam

- UNDP (Tanzania) Staff—Kerstin Pflieger and Gema Aliti
- University of Dar es Salaam—Prof. Idris S. Kikula

Appendix 2.2 Documents reviewed:

.DED, Mbozi District Feb 2002 'Implementation Experience of Capacity 21 Tanzakesho Programme in Tanzania

Mbozi District Council July 2001 'Village Development Plans of Tanzakesho Pilot Wards Derived Through PRA Technique'

Mbozi District Council (2001b) 'Capacity 21 (Tanzakesho) Progress Report Jan 2000-July 2001

Kikula, I., Krook, M. & Aliti, G. August 2001 'Capacity 21 (Tanzakesho) Mission to Mbozi District

Kitundu, Kikula, I. & Pfliegner, K. (Feb 2000) A SWOT analysis and strategic orientation of the 'mpango kata' planning system in Mbozi district'.

Kikula, I.S. and Pleigner, K. 'Some reflections on the Capacity 21 (Tanzakesho) Programme in Tanzania'

Mlay, S. & Mwesiga, P. (2000) PRA trainers notes for core team Sengerema District Council

MRALG Annual Programme Report Jan-Nov 2000

Sosovele, H. (2001) Evaluation Report- Capacity 21 (Tanzakesho) Programme in Tanzania, University of Dar-es-Salaam: Institute of Resource Assessment

Sengerema District Council (2000a) Programme action plan for year 2001, Sengerema, Mwanza Region, Tanzania

Sengerema District Council (2000b) Nyehunge ward action plan for year 2001, Sengerema, Mwanza Region, Tanzania

PRA Trainers notes for core team

Sengerema District Council (2001) Financial report 1st January-31st December 2000 Sengerema, Mwanza Region, Tanzania

Sengerema District Council (2002) The experiences of participatory planning in Sengerema through capacity 21 Tanzakesho programme, Sengerema, Mwanza Region, Tanzania

UNDP (1999). Programme Support Document: Capacity 21 Tanzania (Tanzakesho)
UNDP (2001) Back to office report – mission to Sengerema 18-25 February 2001