

# Independent Evaluation of the Accountability in Tanzania Programme

## Management Response

June 2015

### Introduction

The Accountability in Tanzania (AcT) programme started in 2009, 'whose purpose is to increase the responsiveness and accountability of Government in Tanzania, through a strengthened civil society.'<sup>1</sup> AcT awarded its first grants in March 2010. It has evolved from being a 5-year £20 million to a 6-year £31 million programme incorporating a dedicated Climate Change and Environment (CCE) grant window of £4.2 million in 2012.

The main **purpose** of this independent evaluation (as defined in the Terms of Reference) was to explore whether the AcT model can and should be replicated, and what lessons should inform civil society work in Tanzania and elsewhere in future.

The **objectives** of the evaluation were as follows:

*Demonstrate outcomes:* Identify the results of the investments made (positive and negative, intended and unintended) on the various stakeholders involved including (a) access to information (b) citizens taking action (c) strengthening the capacity of CSOs in Tanzania; (b) increased accountability and responsiveness of government.

*Understand the conditions for success:* Identify the conditions for success, the appropriateness and replicability of the theory of change, and whether the model is more effective at delivering results in some areas of empowerment and accountability than in others – in particular comparing the 'mainstream' and the 'climate change and environment' elements of the programme.

*Test the AcT model:* Assess the sustainability, effectiveness, and additional benefits of the AcT model in comparison to alternative models of support. The evaluation should identify lessons that can be used to improve the effectiveness of the existing model.<sup>2</sup>

The following are the recommendations from the evaluation report. Since part of the purpose of the evaluation was to feed into the design of a further phase of AcT, not all of them are relevant to the management of the final year of the current programme.

Recommendation	Management Response
<b>1: Improve Local-National Linkages to better capitalise on local level results.</b> AcT, working with partners and also taking a	Overall, our sense was that the evaluation team underestimated the level of local national linkages that are going on – and which are

<sup>1</sup> [www.accountability.or.tz](http://www.accountability.or.tz)

<sup>2</sup> TOR, pp4-6

<p>more proactive approach, should look at how results and data from local projects can be more effectively consolidated and channelled to national level. This will involve identifying the points of national level advocacy influence where such local data can be effectively utilised.</p>	<p>documented in this report sections 3.1.4 and 3.2, and the AcT-2 strategic case and AcT-1 Lessons and Context Mapping document<sup>3</sup>. The recommendation also could give more cognisance of the current constraining factors in the broader political economy as outlined in section 2.2 above.</p> <p>However, achieving change at national level is clearly central to sustainability and scale. We have been working with partners to ensure their plans for 2015 consider the Referendum and the elections (including eliciting of commitments for subsequent follow-up) and the possibility that any incoming government will be more interested in technical input towards achieving their election commitments.</p>
<p><b>2: Improve Synergies with Other DFID Accountability Programmes.</b> Identifying the different organisations' key skills and attributes and what the opportunities are for these to be most effectively combined and leveraged. This will only be in specific, limited areas, such as in shared issues in A&amp;R or at key moments, but offers opportunity for significant additional influence and impact.</p>	<p>We fully agree on the value of this. A formal learning partnership has been proposed to the new director of Twaweza, in March 2015, and initial learning topics identified – there is particular interest around theory of change and use of outcome mapping.</p> <p>The PMT has always contributed to discussions about new DFID programmes as they emerge, for example providing advice on the Land Programme. We particularly look forward to learning more about the replacement for the Deepening Democracy Programme and seeing how to develop synergies with it.</p>
<p><b>3: Review and Extend the TOC Assumptions.</b> AcT's results data should be used to explore the current assumptions in the TOC and demonstrate if, how and to what extent the assumed causal pathways held true, as well as showing differences in different contexts. Then extending the assumptions to the</p>	<p>We fully agree. During this quarter we plan to do a provisional analysis of the evidence we have for the different assumptions behind the current ToC, with a view to producing an 'Evidence Book' for contribution to the detailed design of AcT2.</p> <p>It will also be very useful later in the</p>

<sup>3</sup> DFID (2015) Draft TOR, AcT2 Business Case, Design and Implement, Annex One, Approved Strategic Case and Annex 4, AcT-First Stage of Design (October 2014)

<p>level of transformational change – also defining and setting expectations for this – will enable the next phase of the programme to be more ambitious and tell a stronger results story, and improve how ACT and its partners understand changes in the wider governance landscape, their role within this, and thus how to better plan and implement with this in mind.</p>	<p>year to involve partners in deepening the analysis as part of thinking through how programmes to be supported by Act2 can intentionally contribute to transformative change.</p> <p>Linked to this, we propose to work with partners on how to assess the wider significance of their results – prompting them to do more to follow up on promising immediate or intermediate outcome level results, in order to translate them into final outcomes and then to assess if there is further scope to increase the significance and scope of what they have achieved.</p>
<p><b>4: Review and Revise the Log-frame so that it better captures a deeper understanding of transformational change (building on recommendation 3).</b> This is no longer an adequate representation of the programme. Over-disaggregated indicators can be re-aggregated, and new indicators included that will allow for a wider and deeper understanding of Act’s change. This also requires careful assessment of how the ICF/CCE indicators and projects are factored in, which must be aligned when addressing common areas.</p>	<p>The first draft of the evaluation suggested that separating out elected representatives from civil servants at local level had no purpose. We demonstrated the value this had had for the programme to date, and in response the evaluators have a more general reference to ‘over disaggregated indicators’ but no specifics as to what they mean. Hence we are uncertain about the specific implications of this recommendation</p> <p>However, we agree that reviewing and revising the log-frame is an absolutely essential component of the design and implementation of Act2. On the other hand, it would have relatively limited value in the final year of the programme as it stands: there would be no baseline against which to assess overall trends, and there is an opportunity cost for the amount of time to be spent in such an exercise – when Act is already committed to new work including contributions to DFID’s anti-corruption work, and to the scaling up of EFG.</p>
<p><b>5: Review and Revise the PMP Tool to better support partner capacities over time.</b> This is a tool that could present clear data tracked over time</p>	<p>The first part of this recommendation has already been put underway. The PMT produced a proposal for how the work could be done with consultancy</p>

<p>of how partners' capacities have changes. A methodology and process, including 'scoring', needs developing that allows a combination of qualitative and quantitative assessment will be a stronger, and more accessible learning tool as well as better presenting a key part of AcT's value externally. Closer involvement of partners in the development and ongoing usage and review will ensure the tool is more fit for purpose, and that it and its results have stronger ownership.</p>	<p>support to produce an automated tool which would capture individual REMs observations on partner performance, with a view to generating overall 'snap-shot' scores and trends over time. It would also link to the risk register and the Grant Disbursement Form. This was approved by DFID on 20 April 2015.</p> <p>In order to keep consistency in the definitions and use of PMPs over the life of this AcT Programme, we propose to carry on using the tool with partners as it stands – though with the refinements planned in the paragraph above - through to the end of the year. However, a tool, such as PMPs to record qualitative and quantitative data about partner performance will be required for the next phase of AcT, and it is our clear experience to date that close involvement of the partners in the development and use of PMPs does strengthen its value.</p>
<p><b>6: Review and Revise the Results Database</b> to better capture the extent and depth of AcT's contribution to governance impacts. An investment in a review of the current results data will help to consolidate this and present AcT's current results narrative. A new database or results management system needs designing prior to the next phase of AcT. This should facilitate both data entry and access, based on the clear identification of the needs of key stakeholders.</p>	<p>This recommendation was adopted by the evaluators from the study of options undertaken in 2014<sup>4</sup>. To undertake the work now, without a commitment that the database would be continued into the second phase of AcT potentially represents poor value for money. Hence a clear indication from DFID about how they would like to proceed would be helpful.</p>
<p><b>7: Recognise and Reflect Where and How AcT's Value is Best Realised.</b> This is relevant to the addition of new programme focus areas, to any expansion of the programme (though this is unlikely), or to a replication in another country.</p>	<p>Again, it would seem that this is a recommendation best suited to the design of AcT 2.</p> <p>Some of the issues the recommendation seeks to have explored are answered in the findings</p>

<sup>4</sup> Kornelia Rassman and Richard D Smith (2014) Scoping Study – AcT Qualitative Data Management

<p>Included is what the AcT model is; where its benefit is most clearly realised; how it relates to achieving results in accountability and responsiveness; and the limits of efficiency that managing in this way implies. It also needs to clearly recognise that the fundamental success of AcT comes not from the systems or processes, but the individuals who manage the programme, their understanding of contexts and relationships with partners, and dedication to making the programme work.</p>	<p>of evaluation study itself, cited above.</p>
---	---