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Executive Summary

This assessment was carried out with an end view to contribute to enhanced delivery and effectiveness of Tanzania’s Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN) - Public Works Program (PWP), and strengthen its social protection impact in the country by applying the Inter-Agency Social Protection Assessment-Social Protection Public Works Programmes (ISPA-PWP) Tool. The tool is a product of a multi-agency collaboration, to provide options for countries to assess performance of public works and help them improve their social protection system.

PSSN is a key strategy to operationalize social protection in the country. The PWP component under PSSN aims to contribute to the objective of ensuring timely and predictable transfers to the enrolled 1.1 million poor and vulnerable households to smooth consumption and at the same time to achieve an enabling environment for development through creation of community assets and enhancement of beneficiaries’ skills.

The assessment was made possible through collaborative work among development partners under the Inter-Agency Social Protection Assessment (ISPA) and government through TASAF. The field mission was carried out from 13-23 September 2016, by a team of consultants, and supported by partners from the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, the Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare through the EU-Social Protection Systems Programme, the International Labour Organization in Dar Es Salaam, and ILO-Employment Intensive Investment Programme (EIIP) in Pretoria and Geneva (HQ).

The assessment has revealed positive results of the first year of implementation of PWP under PSSN in eight Project Areas Authorities (districts in mainland Tanzania plus the two main islands of Zanzibar), and reached a total of 52,325 households. The public works program supported 549 subprojects, and has contributed to creation of assets by improving access, increasing agriculture productivity, creating social and education facilities, protecting the environment and building resilience against climate change. Program capacity is supported with adequate policy framework, capitalizes on common administrative tool to deliver the targets.

Clearly, the program has achieved considerable milestones, and these gains have to be sustained by ensuring quality, employability, and sustainability of interventions, through the combined and interlinked efforts of the public works and livelihood components. The plan to scale-up will benefit from the lessons learned in the first year of implementation, to enrich existing program strategy, by: i) ensuring timely and predictable flow of program benefits, ii) ensuring quality and sustainability of community assets in terms of design, implementation, operation and maintenance, and adhering to norms and standards, iii) expanding program strategy to include an organized path for skills acquisition alongside creation of assets, and a formal link to livelihood-enhancing and income-generating potentials, iv) enhancing capacity of implementers, and service providers to appreciate technical and social knowledge about public works implementation and for them to provide adequate technical inputs and supervision, v) including metrics to measure quality of assets, skills acquisition, economic and employability potentials, in results monitoring, and vi) ensuring enforcement of adequate working conditions and labor standards compatible with program context.
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1 Background

The report presents the findings of an assessment conducted, using the ISPA-Social Protection PWP Tool, of Tanzania’s Productive Social Safety Nets through its public works component. Prior to the assessment, an earlier study using another ISPA tool was done, to assess the payments delivery of Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) Component of PSSN.

The ISPA-Social Protection PWP tool is a product of a multi-agency collaboration, supported by more than 20 development partners, to provide options for countries to assessing the impact of public works and help them improve their social protection system. The tool was piloted in Liberia and El Salvador, and applied in Senegal and now in Tanzania.

The assessment was a collaborative undertaking between the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development and the Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare in the context of the EU Social Protection Systems Programme, the International Labour Organization through the Employment Intensive Investment Programme, the World Bank Group (WBG), The UK’s Department for International Development (DFID), the Government of Tanzania (GOT) through TASAF, and other development partners involved in TASAF program. The EU-SPS through OECD provided financial support to engage a team of consultants for the assessment. The ILO Office in Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania, with support from the EIIP technical experts in Pretoria and Geneva (HQ), took the lead in coordinating the assessment process.

Underpinning the work is a set of core principles to guide the process, including the following:

- **Recognize that public works programs can be an integral part of national social protection system.** The tool recognizes that PWP programs should enrich and be part of an existing social protection system of a country.

- **Ensure country, community, and individual ownership.** The tool promotes inclusiveness among stakeholders.

- **Set out a common systems-oriented platform.** The tool can highlight performance on different aspects of public works, promote efficiency of linkages, and enhance sharing of knowledge, opportunities and challenges among actors, and identify areas for possible further improvement and collaboration.

- **Promote dynamic and collaborative learning.** The tool is a product of a multi-agency collaboration among development partners.

- **Provide a simple, practical, and rapid assessment.** The tool is meant to offer user-friendly approach that can be applied within 7-10 days of desk review and field work, and subsequently updated in future reviews as necessary.

- **Be context sensitive.** The tool recognizes both national and local context that affect a given program setting, including in terms of the factors and constraint that affect design, implementation and performance.

- **Do not reinvent the wheel.** The tool does not attempt to duplicate efforts rather seek to offer a simple system to organize and synthesize large volume of information on both processes and performance to optimize resources and capacity.

The report is organized into four (4) parts. Section 1 sets the national context including discussion on the major social protection programs in the country. Section 2 explains how the assessment was conducted. Section 3 explains the findings and emerging trends from the application of the tool, and Section 4 presents the recommendations and policy options. Three sets of documents comprised the annexes.
2 Context

2.1 Trends and Figures

Over the past decade, Tanzania has experienced steady high growth rates at an average of 7% per year, brought about by its dynamic construction industry, services and manufacturing sectors. The solid economic performance has enabled upturn in public expenditures, increase of social services which impacted on health and education. Despite the rosy economic outlook, reduction in poverty level has been marginal and the number of the poor has increased. According to the World Bank (2011), the impact of economic growth on consumption has been relatively equal, but the lowest 10% of the population did not benefit from the economic gains.

While 84% of the country’s poor households are found in rural areas, they remain highly dependent on agriculture for their subsistence and income, and the number of poor in urban areas has increased. Also, rising unemployment in urban areas was due to rapid urbanization and rapid expansion of labor force.

While enrollment rate in primary education has increased, the enrollment rate in secondary level has lagged. Also, the government is still beset with high malnutrition rate, approximately 38% of children stunted, with 13% severely stunted.

To exacerbate the condition of food insecurity being experienced by households, particularly in rural areas, the presence of extreme weather conditions did not offer favorable options to those who are depending on agriculture activities for their food consumption and livelihood. The recurrence of climatic shocks and other environmental degradation push households to resort to negative coping mechanisms which further erode their capacity to benefit from the economic gains of the country. An estimated 2 million persons are experiencing food insecurity in the country.

To address the gaps, the government has committed to installing a comprehensive safety net for assisting the poor and vulnerable households, to have access to income, health and education. Social Protection was adopted as one of key strategy to address poverty.

The Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF) was set-up by the GOT in 2000, to pursue collaborative efforts on poverty reduction programs. TASAF I (2000-2005) was for providing social services delivery, capacity enhancement and assisted food insecure households, in rural and peri-urban areas. TASAF II (2005-2010) built on earlier program results, tried to catch-up the lack or shortage of social services and income poverty in rural and urban households – to address the targets of MKUKUTA by 2010 and the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) by 2015. TASAF III (2013 - present) endeavours to consolidate the gains of previous programs and introduce social protection through PSSN, still targeting poor and vulnerable households in both urban and rural areas.

PSSN was set-up as key strategy to operationalize social protection in the country. The objective is to increase income security for the enrolled 1.1 million poor and vulnerable households, while improving consumption. To attain this, a set of concerted actions has been recommended, as follows: i) Establishment of a safety net with transfers linked to participation in public works and adherence to co-responsibilities under Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT); ii) Support to community-driven for livelihood enhancement and increase incomes; iii) Targeted infrastructure development focusing on education, health and water to enable service poor communities to realize the objectives of the safety net; and iv) Capacity-building to ensure adequate program implementation by actors and stakeholders at national, regional, local government and community levels.
The PWP component under PSSN aims to contribute to the objective of ensuring timely and predictable transfers to poor and vulnerable households to smooth consumption and at the same time to achieve an enabling environment for development through creation of community assets and enhancement of beneficiaries’ skills.

Subprojects to be supported by the public works program should adhere to design principles, as follows:

- **Labour-based** - activities should have high labor content and use simple tools.
- **Community driven** – priority is given to the communities to determine their needs and priorities
- ** Appropriately timed** – activities should be scheduled within pre-determined schedule, during the lean seasons, where demand for labor is low.
- **Wage rate** - beneficiaries will be offered a guaranteed 15 days of paid work per month for four (4) months. The daily wage rate is the equivalent of US$1.35.
- **Eligibility** – only households enrolled in the CCT are allowed to participate in the program and must comply with minimum working age.
- **Proximity** - activities should be within reach to avoid beneficiaries to travel long distances
- **Integration** – activities should consider other priorities of the community
- **Gender Sensitivity** – The program gives priority to both men and women who are interested and eligible to participate.
- **Creation of community assets** – activities should contribute to asset building of the community
- **Compliance to safeguards policy framework** – subprojects should adhere to environmental and social standards.

Eligible households adhering to co-responsibilities under CCT shall receive cash transfers to increase the household income on a permanent basis and a seasonal and predictable transfer linked to participation in labour-intensive Public Works (PW) to increase and sustain household’s assets and smooth consumption during lean season.

The public works component was implemented initially in eight (8) districts on pilot basis, with plans to scale-up coverage up to 44 districts by December 2016. Actual program implementation begun in 2014 and the last batch of subprojects were completed last May 2015. To date, the program has covered a total 52,325 households or approximately 90% out of the targeted 58,336 households, with plans to reach additional 261,215 households by March 2017.

Out of 549 subprojects implemented in year one of implementation, only 5.5% were implemented in urban area (Lindi Municipal Council and Mtwara MC) and 94.5% in rural area. The rest of urban PAAs will be covered at full scale. The reason for selection was that these were Wave 1 (first round of targeting) PAAs. These subprojects were implemented in the following sectors: roads 37%, agriculture and natural resources 33%, waste and sanitation 23%, and social infrastructure 7%.
2.2 Overview of Key Social Protection Programs

To achieve the national poverty reduction objectives, the government has prepared a draft National Social Protection Framework (NSPF), under the Prime Minister’s Office (PMO), which seeks to contribute to the country’s vision - to protect the poor and vulnerable, promote inclusive growth and provide minimum acceptable standard of living for all Tanzanians.

Since currently there is no single agency that holds responsibility for leading social protection programs, the NSPF seeks to provide an institutional platform which capitalizes on existing administrative structures and mandates while optimizing harmonization and coordination among stakeholders.

The following are the key social protection programs currently existent in Tanzania to support the national poverty reduction objective:

2.1.1 Non-contributory Social Protection Programs

**Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN)**, is being managed by TASAF under the President’s Office, the program targets all extreme poor and food-insecure households and include public works, livelihood enhancement and Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) component, which is conditioned upon children visiting a health facility and enrolling and attending school regularly. Targeted villages are also supported with targeted infrastructure development projects on health, education and water. A total 1.3 million poor and food insecure households is targeted to be covered, and to-date about 1.1 million households have been reached by the program. Overall PSSN budget is USD 682 million. PSSN is funded through a combination of sources such as government, loans and grants from external sources. The long-term aim is to provide 100% government funding after 10-year period following the available additional funding from external sources.

- **Most Vulnerable Children Response System (MVCRS)**, under the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (MHSW), provides institutionalized and non-institutionalized care, such as food and non-food support, shelter, healthcare, legal support, education and vocational training, and psychosocial support to orphans and most vulnerable children. Out of 2M target MVCs, about 897,913 are currently receiving support. Information on budget?

- **Destitute Maintenance and Empowerment Program (DMEP)**, under the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, provides institutionalized and non-institutionalized care, including food, clothing and health services to destitute persons, such as older people, people with disabilities, leprosy, poor widows and people living with Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) in 17 care homes. Self-help groups are organized to train people on rehabilitation, entrepreneurial skills and income generation and small grants are provided.

---

1 Non-contributory social protection programs are interventions that provide direct, regular and predictable cash or in-kind transfers to poor and vulnerable individuals or households. Usually financed fully by the government or other institutional actors without the need for contributions from recipients (NSPF, Oct 2015).

- **Government funded Universal Pension for elders in Zanzibar.** Anyone over the age of 70 receives a monthly non-contributory pension of TZS 20,000 (approximately USD9). The program started implementation in April 2016, and an estimated 60,000 elders are expected to benefit from the program.

### 2.1.2 Contributory Social Protection Programs

- **Community Health Fund (CHF),** operates under Community Health Fund Act of 2001, under Ministry of Health, Community development, Gender, Elderly and Children (MoHCGEC) and regulated by the Social Security Regulatory Authority (SSRA), targets the rural informal sector, based on voluntary contributions, covering household heads, their spouse and maximum of 4 dependents aged 18 years or younger with health insurance coverage. Coverage is approximately 7.4 percent of the population.

- **National Health Insurance Fund (NHIF),** also under the MoHCGEC and being supervised and regulated by SSRA, provides mandatory health coverage to all public formal sector employees, and their spouse and up to 4 legal dependents 18 years and younger. Private membership is possible. Coverage is approximately 6.6 percent of the population.

- **Government Employee Provident Fund, Local Authority Provident Fund, National Social Security Fund, Public Service Pension Fund and Parastatal Pension Fund,** also under the SSRA, provide both long-term benefits such as old age pensions, invalidity allowances and survivor allowances and short term benefits, such as employment injury protection, maternity benefits, funeral benefits, health insurance benefits and education benefits. Coverage is approximately 1.95 million people, equal to 8.1 percent of the labor force, and almost fully consists of formal sector employees and their spouses and dependents. To date, the Universal Pension Fund is not yet implemented.

- **Workers Compensation Fund (WCF).** The program is a social security scheme established under the Workers Compensation Act No. 20 of 2008. The Fund is responsible for compensating workers who suffer occupational injuries or contract occupational diseases arising out of and in the course of their employment. In case of death of workers, the Fund is responsible for compensating dependents as per set criteria. The Scheme is operated under social security and insurance principles. All employees in the public and private sectors in Mainland Tanzania are covered and hence employers are required by Law to contribute to the Fund. To-date, the program has registered 5,900 employers, on behalf of their employees.

### 2.1.3 Productive Inclusion

- **National Agricultural Input Voucher Scheme (NAIVS),** under the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives (MAFSC), provides small-scale farmers with market smart agriculture

---

3 Contributory social protection programs where participants make regular payments to a scheme that will cover costs related to selected events, for example, illness, retirement, unemployment and maternity. Most policies and programs related to unemployment insurance, health insurance and private pension funds can all be considered as contributory programs (NSPF, Oct. 2015).

4 Productive inclusion social protection programs aim to facilitate the participation of vulnerable or previously excluded households and individuals in the various facets of the economy. Policies such as guaranteed work programs, agricultural input subsidies, programs to improve the employment and education possibilities for women,
inputs subsidy (fertilizer and maize or rice seeds) for one acre of land. More than 2.5 million smallholder farmers have benefited from the program. Currently, the program is put on hold due to lack of funds.

- **Relief Food**, under the Prime Minister’s Office, provides bi-annual food to food insecure populations.

- **Disaster Management Relief Fund & Emergency Preparedness and Response**, under the Prime Minister’s Office, extends assistance to districts affected by disasters with cash and in-kind benefits to compensate them and their population for food transportation cost, reconstruction and rehabilitation.

- **Strengthening Community Capacity for Disaster Risk Reduction Interventions in Drought Prone Areas**, still under the Prime Minister’s Office, covers vulnerable populations in drought prone areas are eligible for in-kind benefits, including seeds, goats, chicken and trees. Wells are constructed under this program.

### 2.1.4 Social Services

- **Free healthcare for pregnant women, children under the age of 5 and the elderly**, lodged under the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare. Healthcare is provided free to pregnant women, children under the age of 5 and to the elderly.

- **Free Basic Education/Universal Primary Education, under the Ministry of Education**, higher learning, science, technology and Vocational Training pre-primary, primary education and lower secondary education are free.

- **Water, Sanitation and Hygiene program**, under the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training, Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, Ministry of Water and Irrigation, targets 40,000 poor and vulnerable children in underserved areas benefit from the provision of clean water and sanitation services at their schools.

---

programs for the disabled and vulnerable children and programs that help increase household investments can all be considered under this type (NSFP, Oct 2015).

Social Services are provided by the government or other institutional actors to the population in order to provide a baseline standard of provision and equality of access. Services could include, but are not limited to, education, medical care, housing, and sanitation (NSFP, Oct. 2015).
3 Methodology

The assessment aimed to enhance delivery and effectiveness of TASAF’s PSSN Public Works Component and strengthens its social protection impact in the country by applying the ISPA-Social Protection PWP Tool. The assessment generated evidence on the implementation of TASAF’s public works program, offered lessons and ways forward for the scaling-up to a total of 44 PAAs and beyond. Furthermore, the interaction with TASAF, development partners, key government policy makers, public works sector experts and communities/beneficiaries during the field visits was also an opportunity to generate feedbacks for enhancing the ISPA-SP PWP Tool.

The ISPA-SP PWP tool is comprised by: the Guidance Note (“What Matters”) that provides the conceptual foundation for the assessment based on real experiences and illustrations, the Questionnaire that collects quantitative and qualitative information about the program, and the Assessment Matrix that helps to organize the findings from the questionnaire using a color-coded system, to guide the analysis and interpretation of findings. Detailed discussion of the tool itself and its application are presented in the Inception Report, prepared taking into consideration the ISPA PWP Implementation Guidelines (Draft 12.03.2015).

The sites covered in the assessment were selected from the initial eight (8) Project Areas Authority (PAAs), with completed subprojects, and additional sites from a few of the 44 PAAs which had just commenced implementation of the public works component.

The assessment was carried out in the country from September 13-23th, 2016, through a combination of activities that included: coordination meetings with government and development partners, desk review, selection of sites and subprojects (SP), selection of respondents, focus group discussions, bilateral meetings, site validation visits, and validation meetings. In particular the assessment included the following steps:

- **Consultation with government.** Coordination meetings with TASAF, the lead government social assistance program implementation agency implementing PSSN, to decide on: field mission schedule, selection of sites and subprojects, and selection of respondents. Selection based on these key considerations: i) select enough samples to represent the study population; ii) select typical areas that capture common characteristics of the study population; and iii) agree on number of sites and subprojects to cover.

- **Selection of sites, subprojects, and respondents.** Bearing in mind some operational challenges, the assessment team and TASAF Management agreed to select representative study sites using sound judgement rather than do total enumeration, to ensure adequate time allotted to the selected sites and have adequate discussion between the team and respondents. Two levels of selection were done firstly, selection of sites or PAAs and second, selection of subprojects to be included in the assessment. The exercise was guided by these key points: i) geographical location in terms of region/zones, and rural and urban setting; ii) on-going and/or completed subprojects; iii) accessibility; iv) presence of variety of subprojects in agriculture and natural resources management, road infrastructure, construction and maintenance, waste and sanitation management, social services, and social infrastructure; and v) inclusion of Zanzibar.

- **Selection of respondents were guided by these key points:** i) direct or indirect participation in policy formulation, program implementation, design, budget, quality control, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), at national, regional or district level, ii) Sector experts at national and district...
level, iii) Local Service Providers at subproject level, iv) Village Council (VC) Leaders, v) Community Management Committee (CMC), and vi) Beneficiaries – ensure participation of women, youth, elderly, persons with disabilities or disadvantaged communities.

- **Number of sites and subproject coverage.** Four PAAs were covered in the assessment namely: Chamwino DC, Lindi MC and Lindi (DC) and Pemba Island in Zanzibar. Fifteen (15) subprojects were represented, in the following sectors: roads, agriculture, and social services. Table 1 is a summary of selected sites and subprojects.

**Table 3.1: List of public works subprojects covered in the study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>PAA</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Name of sub-project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chamwino</td>
<td>1. Sorowu</td>
<td>1. Rehabilitation of Mkalama wa Wadala charco dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rehabilitation of Magadi charco dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Handali</td>
<td>3. Road rehabilitation from Sokoni – Ukalanza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Mgung</td>
<td>4. Rehabilitation of Chilsolya charco dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Chinangali II</td>
<td>5. Rehabilitation of road vilesi kona-chisolya charco dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lindi DC</td>
<td>5. Linoha</td>
<td>6. Planting of tree fence along cattle tracking route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Mikongi</td>
<td>7. Rehabilitation of football playground at Mgunga primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lindi MC</td>
<td>7. Mkwaya</td>
<td>8. Rehabilitation of Mgunga charco dam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Shidi</td>
<td>10. School football playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Jombwe</td>
<td>11. Rehabilitation of feeder road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Construction of fish pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 Construction of sea control bund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 Mangrove rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Tree nursery establishment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Desk review to pre-populate the questionnaire.** This involved review of relevant secondary information from available documents, to have an understanding of the situation, and to identify potential issues that require further elaboration and collect missing information, during actual field visits. To facilitate the task, the questions related to system, program and delivery were grouped into national and district level, which served as guide during field work.

- **Field visits (bilateral meetings, focus group discussions, and site validation).** The assessment started with a meeting with TASAF Management to revisit the objectives of the exercise, assessment criteria, inter-agency framework, the methodology and expected results. Also the discussions with TASAF Management and other members of Sectoral Expert Team (SET) gathered perspective of program implementation at national level. In the field visit, focus groups discussions with implementers at PAA level and local service providers, and focus group discussions with village council, community leaders, CMC, and beneficiaries, gathered qualitative information, actual experiences and challenges. Site visits were done to validate the responses and to ascertain the result of public works in the area.

- **Data Analysis and Validation.** The data collected from the discussions were organized in the questionnaire. Triangulation of data was done to validate previous responses and to strengthen data reliability. The assessment matrix, which accompanied the ISPA PWP tool facilitated in organizing the data into color-coded system classified into a four (4) color scale. “Latent”
highlights that significant attention needs to be paid to a dimension. “Emerging” conveys that a dimension requires vigilance. Elements for effective performance are in place. “Moderate” indicates moderate satisfactory performance, with most of the elements showing effective and efficient parameters. “Advanced” indicates a well-performing practice with broad-based success in the examined elements. The initial findings were presented to TASAF and other stakeholders, to confirm the validity of the results and the accurate and objective interpretation of available information” ¹.

The assessment was organized at a time to assess the strengths and weaknesses, and gaps with the intention of informing TASAF and the World Bank Joint Review in the scale-up of their program. Due to time constraint, the ISPA PW assessment team did not manage to present the findings during the Joint Review Mission however, the feedback with recommendations from the ISPA PW Mission was shared with the Government and the inter-agency partners at both local and global level, to promote and encourage policy dialogue among partners

¹ Ibid.
4 Emerging Trends

This section describes the findings of the study, organized in eight (8) key areas. Section 4.1 presents the key performance indicators (KPI) in terms of incidence, coverage, duration, and expenditures. Section 4.2 analyses emerging trends each key area in terms of: eligibility and targeting, nature of benefits, timing and duration, creation of assets, coordination, integration and financing, monitoring and evaluation, harmonization across programs, skills and employability, and conditions of work and labour practices. The findings are summarized and color-coded in 4.3

4.1 Key Performance Indicators

- Total number of beneficiaries (households): 52,325 households (or approximately 250,000 persons)
- Total number of person days provided: 3,139,500
- Program duration (number of months of work per year, number of year): 15 days per month for 4 months during lean season (Sept-Dec or Dec-March)
- Total of hours per day worked: 3-4 hours/day
- Women participation (percent): 70 %
- Coverage as a percentage of the working age population: 0.19 %
- Coverage as a percentage of the poor (national poverty line): 0.33 % percent of the households
- Transfers as a share of monthly income of beneficiaries: 43.64 %
- Annual budget of the PSSN PW component (average per year): USD 55M or TZS 118.70 Billion (As of Sept 2016)
- Total PW component expenditure as percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP): 0.0125% (in 2015).
- Total PW component expenditure as percent of public expenditures in social protections: 1.85% (in 2015).

4.2 Key Areas

4.2.1 Eligibility and Targeting

A set of eligibility criteria within program manual is in place, and applied to determine eligible households in the program. In order to be eligible, households must comply with the following conditions: i) poor and vulnerable households under the common targeting system, both unconditional (UCT) and conditional cash transfer (CCT); ii) from enrolled beneficiaries those households with able-bodied member for physical activities, ages 18 and above, can participate in the program; and iii) in the event of shock,
drought, or flood, other households in the severely affected areas will also be provided with opportunity to participate in a scaled-up program.

Out of 1.33 million targeted households, about 1.1 million or 78.5% are enrolled in the PSSN program. For the initial eight (8) PAAs that have implemented PWP in the first year of implementation, 52,325 households or approximately 90% out of the targeted 58,336 households were reached.

Targeting of beneficiaries for PSSN was done at the community level, applying these methods:

- **Geographical targeting** is done using a poverty index to select areas of intervention. Combining the poverty index with information about poverty levels and population of the village will determine number of beneficiary household in each village. The list will be validated by the correspondent PAA.

- **Community targeting** helps to identify extremely poor and vulnerable households in selected villages, using a pre-determined criteria. Once the list of potential beneficiaries is determined, key information will be collected, and entered into the Unified Registry of Beneficiaries (URB), being maintained at PAA level.

- **Proxy Means Test (PMT)** is applied to verify and minimize inclusion errors. Once names of potential beneficiary households are entered into the URB, a welfare score based on the PMT rating system will be given to each household. Those households with scores that fall below the poverty line are considered eligible, and a corresponding list is provided to the PAA and village council where it will be ratified at a village assembly.

- **Community Validation**, to ascertain the results of the Proxy Means Test and Community Targeting.

There is a grievance mechanism within program manuals to deal with households that are not included. Once the resulting list is resolved and ratified, the URB is updated and eligible households are invited to voluntarily enrol in the public works program.

While the team had limited time to probe further this dimension during the field visits, the findings of the randomized study conducted recently by the program found that the targeting system outperforms other similar programs and that the program is pro-poor. The study has established that the eligibility criteria and targeting methods are adequate and inclusive.

The Hadzabe, one of disadvantaged communities who live in the bushes as hunters and gatherers, were included since the beginning but additional people were included as a result of retargeting done by the program. Eventually, over 2,400 households were covered, that had impact on health and education.

As for inclusiveness, both program implementers and Focus Group Discussion (FGD), participants confirmed all interested eligible beneficiaries had a chance to participate in the PW program, they were satisfied with adjustment of work schedule, where they reported to have rendered work for an average 3-4 hours per day (program prescribes 4 hours per day). Travel time was included in the adjusted time schedule, in consideration of the location of the houses far from the actual work sites. Flexible work arrangements especially for elderly and lactating mothers were adopted. Those who can’t undertake required tasks and loads were assigned to lighter tasks such as watch the small children. In Chamwino, they were given lighter tasks such as ferrying and spreading the excavated soils. At the work sites, temporary structures, for lactating mothers and those with small children, were installed during implementation.
During implementation, women participation rate was more than 70%, mostly married women. The task on public work allocated to the household therefore either women or men can work on the task, however men would have preferred to work on the PW task but since women in the household are the ones receiving the benefits, the task is left for the women to participate. Therefore, it is possible that the high women participation rate might mean more burden to women who already are carrying greater responsibility in the household with men idling. FGD participants shared that household members agree among themselves how to manage household responsibilities while a member is away 3-4 hour maximum per day, during the schedule of PW in the community. Also, more than one household member may participate so, they split-up the number of days to complete the scheduled cycle.

Although there is no specific number on the minimum ceiling, women participation in the design and implementation influenced the selection of type of sub-projects. In Chamwino, during the FGD female participated fully and were more vocal unlike men, this is evidence that they participated in the design. This was also substantiated by the type of subprojects identified mostly as its women who fetch water hence they selected subprojects to solve their problem. In Pemba, the female participants took pro-active role in pre, during, and post-project activities, including formation of informal community savings group. They demonstrated good understanding of the rationale for selecting the subprojects, work processes done, and benefits derived from the subproject.

4.2.2 Nature of Benefits, Timing and Duration

Program benefit includes a wage provided in cash, to smooth consumption of eligible households, and to encourage them to set aside portion of payment received for savings. The program wage is on top of benefit received from the CCT.
Each participating household is entitled to receive a wage rate of TZS 2,300 (or equivalent to USD1.35) for a maximum of 4-hour work per day or half day, for 15 days per month, for a period of 4 months, during lean season (September to December or December to March). The rate is equivalent to 90% of prevailing hourly wage rate, to encourage self-selection among target beneficiaries. The rate is higher than for the World Food Program (WFP) which pays in-kind equivalent of TZS 3,500 for a 8-hour. The wage rate is applied across both men and women as well as in urban and rural areas. Since it is task-based work, beneficiaries worked for certain number of hours per day and substitution for another eligible person in the family is allowed. The FGD participants welcomed this substitution arrangement as it allowed them to attend to important personal schedules without incurring absences at work. Likewise, the beneficiaries were happy to work for the assets as it will be beneficial to the entire community as well.

The program wage is nor linked to fluctuations in food prices and inflation, it was determined as an average figure from a result of an earlier study, done by the program. The wage rate is different from market wage to introduce the self-targeting aspect i.e. to attract the most needy and who have no alternative source of income. A uniform wage rate is applied across areas in the pilot phase. Wages are paid on working days and are delivered manually, at the work site. Payments are delivered every 21 days after completion of each 15-day work cycle.

The first payment during the pilot period was delayed brought about by technical issues with the MIS however, adjustments were done by the program based on lessons, to ensure next payments are made on schedule. An earlier assessment was done using another ISPA tool, looked into the payments delivery of the CCT Component. One of the recommendations of the assessment is to consider moving towards e-payment system, which would also benefit the delivery of payments of public works component.

While the program benefit is perceived by the participants to be accurate and appropriate with the local context, the actual timing of benefit could be improved by providing complete information on its predictability to allow beneficiaries to budget their resources during the lean months. While the program explicitly targeted PW activities during lean season (September to December), the actual implementation did not start until Dec 2014 and completed in May 2015. It was assumed initially the lean season was uniform throughout the country. Now, it has been realized that there are two lean seasons depending on the PAA location or zone. There are those with bimodal rainfall from December to March for the coastal zone and those with unimodal rainfall from September to December for the rest of the country. Except for Chamwino DC the roll-out of the next batch of subprojects for the initial 8 districts in the pilot phase is yet to be implemented as their lean season is due in December to March. While the delays encountered were due to unforeseen circumstances during implementation, complete information on the next schedule of PW activities should have been communicated promptly and widely to beneficiaries to give them flexibility to plan their budget.

The FGD participants said that they have not observed yet any impact of on the local food and agricultural market, this could be due to the seasonal nature of transfers, and it was just the pilot period. The cash injection of public works wages to the community is expected to create impact on local economy due to the circulation of the injected cash, however this requires a specific study, the project Impact Evaluation is also looking at such impact level.

4.2.3 Creation of Assets and Services

Subprojects are selected from the menu of labour intensive public works listed in the Public Works Technical Manual. Activities in there have an unskilled labour costs which make up an average 75%, and 25% for materials and tools, of public works in each sub-project. However, some beneficiaries like in
Chamwino have their choice of subprojects in line with their agricultural activities like grape farming which are not included in the TASAF PW Technical Manual. TASAF management said that community choices of subprojects are accepted as long as they are labour intensive.

Selection/identification and planning of subprojects applied community participatory tools. The subprojects should embody community priority needs, at the same time contribute to creation of assets including skills. Some subprojects were selected to mitigate impact of environmental issues such as soil erosion, sea or storm surges and drought.

The program expected the subprojects to adhere to environmental safeguards and where necessary mitigation measures are to be taken to comply with environmental plan. The subprojects in Pemba were designed based on these safeguards. The sea control bund in Pemba was implemented to control flooding of farms, and slope protection was installed along the sides of the control bund. Also other measures included tree planting around charco dams, in Chamwino to reduce water evaporation rate, and gully treatment measures to reduce storm water erosion rate. The fishpond in Lindi MC lacked adoption similar measures which caused the collapse of embankment during high tide - most of the fish have escaped. There is no provision for assessment of carbon footprint of a subproject in the program.

The Community Management Committee(CMC), composed of village members selected to oversee PSSN implementation, including the PW component, managed the subprojects at the village level, in terms of the following responsibilities:

- Participate in sensitization and micro planning of PW activities
- Procurement of goods and services for subprojects at community level
- Mobilizing beneficiaries attendance as per schedule requirement
- Prepare beneficiaries daily attendance sheet
- Confirm daily completed tasks together with the Site Supervisor
- Maintain sub project stores
- Prepare and submit implementation reports to the Village Council/Shehia Advisory Council/Mttaa Committee
- Payment of wages

However, the responsibility to ensure quality subprojects according to technical specifications and standards as well provide guidance and supervision to workers is the responsibility of the Local Service Provider, and the Sector Expert Team at PAA level.

The programme is designed to allocate 75% of costs to wage costs and 25% to non-wage costs. However, the labour intensity falls to 66%, 22% for inputs including tools and materials and 12% administration cost including delivery of wages.

With available data, average cost of implementing subprojects was determined, for the four sectors. The tables below show the average cost of implementing subprojects. The total cost include the wages, materials and hand-tools, and administrative support.
Table 4.1: Average cost of implementing subprojects in Agriculture and Natural Resources Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Subproject</th>
<th># of SPs</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Total Cost Tzs</th>
<th>Average Unit Cost Tzs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of nursery</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11,450 sqm.</td>
<td>202,833,522.35</td>
<td>17,714.72 / sqm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of water source</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42,052 cu.m</td>
<td>115,857,310.61</td>
<td>2,755.10 / cu.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangrove rehabilitation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69.65 hec.</td>
<td>290,563,484.83</td>
<td>4,171,765.75 / hec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea water control bund</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3050 cu.m</td>
<td>51,697,727.27</td>
<td>16,950.07 / cu.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charco dams</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>398,306.30 cu.m</td>
<td>1,533,252,287.87</td>
<td>3,849.43 / cu.m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Average cost of implementing subprojects in Roads sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Subproject</th>
<th># of SPs</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total Cost Tzs</th>
<th>Average Unit Cost Tzs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth roads</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52.61 km.</td>
<td>509,025,979.17</td>
<td>9,675,460.54 / km.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine maintenance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6 km</td>
<td>52,272,727.27</td>
<td>20,104,895.10 / km.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General maintenance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40 km</td>
<td>479,029,278.79</td>
<td>11,975,731.97 / km.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab of roads</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>388.1 km</td>
<td>3,116,829,620.45</td>
<td>8,030,996.1 / km.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Average cost of implementing subprojects in Waste and Sanitation Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Subproject</th>
<th># of SPs</th>
<th>Total Labour Cost Tzs</th>
<th>% Labour Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost Tzs</th>
<th>Ave Cost per SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary garbage collection</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>555,001,800.00</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>837,698,801.14</td>
<td>19,481,367.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary collection from site to landfills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>135,412,100.00</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>200,357,320.08</td>
<td>18,214,301.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental cleanliness</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>282,599,596.00</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>430,765,338.64</td>
<td>12,307,581.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning of side/storm drains/desilting</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>286,545,724.00</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>430,958,604.92</td>
<td>17,956,608.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Average cost of implementing subprojects in Social Infrastructure Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Subproject</th>
<th># of SPs</th>
<th>Total Labour Cost Tzs</th>
<th>% Labour Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost Tzs</th>
<th>Ave Cost per SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,856,600.00</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6,111,477.27</td>
<td>6,111,477.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab of playgrounds</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>99,840,950.00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>291,807,237.13</td>
<td>16,211,513.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of playgrounds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38,740,300.00</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56,363,295.45</td>
<td>14,090,823.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected multiplier effects of the subprojects are as follows: increased incomes, demand in local markets, increased household asset, savings and investment. Initial benefits from the subprojects reported by FGD participants and communities are as follows: i) improved access, ii) entry of motorized vehicles, water supply for agricultural and domestic purpose, iii) crop rotation, iv) increased agriculture production, v)
income to buy farm inputs and animals, vi) savings, vii) sports recreation for school children, viii) recognition by the community that the poor can do that is beneficial to the entire community, and ix) skills acquisition.

Figure 4.2: The rehabilitated charco dam in Wadala (Chamwino) provides a source of water to small farmers engaged in horticulture gardening.

Figure 4.3: The sea control bund in Ndagoni (Pemba) has reduced the incidence of flooding in the farm fields which allowed the community to engage in crop rotation and plant more crops.
Figure 4.4: The improved access in Mkongi (Lindi DC) has resulted to entry of more goods and services, reduced travel time, and increased social and economic activities to the community.

While it is clear the program supported creation of assets in the community, there are critical issues that need to be addressed that have impact in the long run. In the field visits, the assessment team noted the quality of assets created needs improvement in the design, implementation and operation and maintenance. Some of the subprojects did not adhere to sector standards.

- Charco dams visited were implemented below technical standards. For instance, the photo below is showing an earth dam, under construction, and designed to store water for livestock and domestic use. The excavation to create the water reservoir seems to be too tough for beneficiaries. This activity might have been done by a bulldozer if co-funded by the district of other programmes. No measures were seen to compact the embankment by a pedestrian roller or other labour-based methods. Excavation activities involved widening the dam rather than deepening it to reduce water evaporation. The spillway was planned to be implemented as last activity rather than being implemented simultaneously with the dam activities. Beneficiaries explained that the final activities will include planting grass to protect the embankment and spillway from water erosion. They will also plant trees around the dam to reduce evaporation due to wind and plant grass in the waterway feeding the dam to reduce siltation. During the field visit and FGD, the workers were advised by the Assessment Team to concentrate in deepening the dam rather than widening it, an action which will reduce evaporation of stored water.
Figure 4.5: Actual rehabilitation works of charco dam in Chinangali II village (Chamwino)

The other dam like at Chinoya (see photo 4.6) charco dam, is a rehabilitation work. It was noted that guidance was not given to beneficiaries to avoid widening the dam. Plans for providing the spillway by allowing a free board of about one meter to avoid overtopping of the dam were not in place and spillways though critical were provided in round two instead of round one implementation.
The 3,330 square meters Mkwaya earthen fish pond, in Lindi MC (see figure 4.7) was constructed over a year ago to provide additional income to the community, showed signs of neglect and deterioration. Portions of embankment have collapsed, and operation was discontinued by the village council because the embankments have collapsed during high tide and most of the fish have escaped. Although the program duration was not sufficient to complete the construction of the fish pond and 15 days more were required, the village council who took over the ownership should have organized completion of the same. The income generated from the last operation was TZS45,000 from TZS 375,000 during first harvest. According to the Village Council, the income from the last harvest was not enough to cover the cost of operation which include wages of the watchmen, gasoline for the water pump, and repair of the broken pump. The village council officers mentioned some costs have to be shouldered by them in order to get things done. Also, it appears the Village Council has limited capacity to operate an income-generating subproject, and to maintain it as well.
The rehabilitation of the 5-kilometre Mkongi feeder road in Lindi DC (see photo below) was completed a year ago, was already showing signs of deterioration—with presence of potholes, absence of side ditches and mitre drains. The type of soil needs covering by gravel or lime stabilization to protect it from early deterioration by adverse weather conditions like storm water. During FGD, the village council said the improved road brought positive benefits to the community. A local company has started clearing a vast portion of the land located along the new road for planting of cassava. With good prospects of economic activities in the area the council has expressed a need for additional soil cover, which was not provided during the first round, to prolong the life of the road. While the council mentioned that maintenance work was done, during rainy season (this is contrary to established schedule of maintenance work - before the rain season), it was clear the village does not have capacity and resources to undertake the prescribed maintenance. Had it was integrated in district plans, co-funding by the district or other programs might have helped to fund maintenance of the road.
Figure 4.8: 5-km feeder road constructed in Mkongi, Lindi D.C.

The road (see photo below) in Chamwino was still intact for the duration of one year after the rehabilitation. This is a village access road, initially constructed using a motor grader using rule of thumb. It used to ferry agricultural products, access to a nearby water dam and to the village dispensary. Maintenance is absent due to lack of funds and or mobilizing communities to do maintenance on self-help basis.

Figure 4.9: The rehabilitated road in Sokoni – Ukalianza in Chamwino
One water cross point was eroded on the Sokoni Ukalanza road but efforts were being made by the community to repair the same. However, mitre drains are missing and technical input is still required to guide the community accordingly.

- The Linoha football playground in Lindi DC was not properly levelled. Surface not covered with grass which could easily be washed out by rain water, creating uneven surfaces which can pose harm to school children.

Poor quality of assets was a result of inadequate technical support and supervision from Local Service Providers and PAA experts during the construction stage. The Sector Expert Team member at the local level is tasked to provide technical support during implementation. Due to limited manpower at the local level to cover the subprojects the presence of LSP is viewed as the extension arm of the sector expert. Despite availability of LSP on site and PAA technicians who once in a while visit the subprojects, it could not be seen that technical support was availed to ensure subprojects are implemented to sector standards and expected quality. For the feeder road in Lindi DC, the LSP claimed he was present at the worksite (tick job cards) but was not trained how to monitor quality of work. While in Pemba, sector experts or technicians were utilized instead of LSPs since the subprojects are part of the mandates of sectoral agencies.

As for the selection of LSPs, the process is a follows: once a subproject to work on is selected, the Village Council posts on public notice-board an advertisement for the post. The District Council sector expert assist in the interview. These are currently paid lowly (TZS 5,000 per day) and cannot attract diploma holders who are suitable for the job. Only artisans apply and are used anyway.

The responsibility for operating and maintaining the assets is clear – the Village Council assumes ownership upon completion. However, lack of budget support and know-how remains a challenge. Also, there was neither Operation & Maintenance (O&M) plan nor by-laws in place for guiding the communities during implementation of O&M. There is limited evidence to support the PAA sectoral agencies, except in Pemba where they have included the subprojects in their subsequent annual budget plans.

Pre-project capacity training, including adequate manuals within the program, was provided to implementers including CMC and LSP. The plan was for sector experts to provide required technical support and guidance which did not happen. Since the presence and technical guidance of sector experts at local level is limited, LSPs should be trained to provide supervision and implement the subprojects as per sector standards. They were mostly trained on allocation of task rates. Since the LSPs work daily with beneficiaries they should have been given enough technical training and skills to enable supervision of scattered subprojects in the area. Currently, TASAF has provided user-friendly handbooks in the local language to guide implementation. Orientation on this handbook is required.

4.2.4 Institutions, Coordination, and Financing

Policy framework to guide implementation is in place. The National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction provides an overarching framework for all poverty alleviation and growth related strategies in Tanzania. To operationalize the poverty reduction objectives of government, a social protection framework under the Office of the Prime Minister had been prepared to improve coordination and enforcement of pro-poor policies that ensure improved livelihoods of extreme poor and vulnerable households. The NSPF however needs to be passed by Parliament for legislative purposes.
Actors, institutional arrangements and responsibilities are defined, from national, regional and local level. At national level, the National Steering Committee (NSC) composed of representatives from the public and private sectors is responsible for setting policy, clearing annual plans and budget and monitoring overall progress. The TASAF Management Unit (TMU) is responsible for day-to-day operation ensuring implementation is according to agreed timelines and procedures. The Sector Experts Team (SET) provides technical assistance during planning, implementation and quality control both at national and district level. At regional level, the Regional Administrative Secretary (RAS) through a TASAF focal person is responsible for establishing liaison with concerned PAAs to consolidate implementation reports from the ground before submitting these to TMU.

At the district level, the office of the PAA Director oversees implementation and operations in local government agencies (LGAs). A PAA Coordinator for TASAF is appointed to oversee the day-to-day activities including working with Council Management Team (CMT), to provide technical support in the implementation relevant to the sectors. The Local Service Provider (LSP) is tasked to provide support in program operation such as targeting and monitoring.

At the village level, the Village Council (VC) provides advisory role, while the Community Management Committees (CMC) is responsible for day-to-day operations including supervision and monitoring during actual activities of public works.

In Zanzibar, program implementation is lodged with the Office of the Second Vice-President. The office appoints coordinators for Pemba and Unguja islands to manage the activities in the areas, and working with SET, whose functions are similar to their counterparts in the Mainland.

There are coordination and oversight mechanisms to facilitate vertical and horizontal linkages among stakeholders. The SET, composed of sector experts from different ministries, meets quarterly for reviewing sampled community subprojects applications at the PAA level and monitoring purposes.

The government has created TASAF to manage the program, its role is to manage the allocated funds, detail the access criteria, fund and coordinate capacity-building where needed and through the National Sector Expert Team ensure sector norms and standards are adhered to in implementation of supported activities.

There is also the Regional Secretariat with oversight functions on the district councils, they also report to TASAF directly. Since inception, coordination and oversight mechanisms have not been redesigned.

The subproject activities are supervised by the Community Management Committee who reports directly to the Village Council/Sheria Advisory council/Mtaa committee. The VC reports to the PAA and the latter reports to TASAF. Again, TASAF reports to the NSC, the government and donor community.

The CMC and the Village Council Leaders, supported by the PAA staff were involved in sensitizing communities on the salient features of PW and carry out micro-planning using participatory development planning tools. The PAA also conducts sensitization through community assembly meetings at the village level, including distribution of brochures about the program.

Procurement guidelines are in place. Selected and implemented subprojects are small projects which procure simple tools hence, these cannot exceed the threshold.

Obviously, there is pre-project capacity, supported with manuals within the program and policy directives. The missing link rests with ensuring the coordination and collaboration among stakeholders contribute to synergy of benefits and impact of assets created and skills acquired by the beneficiaries. The
shortcoming can be improved to include technical knowledge on public works implementation for the Ministries, Local Governments and the LSPs.

So far, there are three (3) South - South learning activities that have been conducted from 2010 to 2016, where management and staff benefitted from knowledge sharing and interaction with other practitioners from the region and other countries. A big conference entitled “Face-to-Face Meeting of the Africa Community of Practice of Cash and Conditional Cash Transfers (CoP)” was held in May 2016 in Arusha, Tanzania, which brought together experts implementing Safety Net programs from South African countries and other contingents. Another conference, organized by the Poverty Eradication Department in the Ministry of Finance of GoT, and supported by UNICEF, ILO, and the Economic Policy Research Institute (EPRI), was held last 15-17 December 2014 in Arusha. The conference was a gathering of policymakers, researchers and practitioners involved in social protection programs. Also, the event aimed to harness the learnings and to use these to support TASAF’s program implementation, by strengthening the social protection systems including strong engagement of key actors. Lastly, a conference with a theme on public works was hosted by TASAF in 2010.

Overall PSSN budget is USD 682M and annual budget USD 200M. The funds were sourced from: World Bank Group USD420M (61.7%), DFID USD170M (25%), SIDA (Sweden) USD70M (10.2%), UN System USD4M (0.5%), Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation USD 4.2M (0.5%) and GoT USD 14M (2.0%). The WBG is the main financier whose funds is cross cutting directed towards: Cash transfers (CCT), PW wages and non-wages, Livelihood enhancement which includes one-time seed money for performing groups, the rest of the WBG funds is for administrative support, operating costs, system building including URB, MIS/ICT M&E system, targeting, payment system, GRM, and others. DFID funds are not specified but currently used in Cash Transfers (CT); SIDA funds are initially for cash transfer, UN System funds is for Capacity building, Bill and Melinda Gates funds are for developing the e-payment system and livelihoods. The entire budget is enough to cover 70% of villages at the district level hence, the funds are not sufficient.

While financial support to local government agencies is available there is a need to revisit to address emerging operational gaps. While this support was allocated based on the number of beneficiaries it is proposed to allocate based on the number of villages. This is because despite the number of beneficiaries each subproject has to be visited. The earlier allocation denied some PAAs sufficient funds for supervision due to the large number of villages without significant number of beneficiaries.

While flexibility to scale-up hinges on existing capacity at various levels supported with structures, mandates and resources, the remaining challenge is how to ensure quality and sustainability of assets created and skills link to concrete graduation trajectory.

4.2.5 Monitoring and Evaluation

The findings are mostly generated through review of secondary sources supported with findings from field visits and discussions with M&E officials.

There is an existing M&E plan detailing how to track progress and measure performance of the over-all program. The prescribed tools to carry out the plan are as follows: Management Information System (MIS), Impact Evaluations, Community feedback, and financial audits (external and internal conducted annually on a sample basis). The M&E Handbook was prepared in June 2012, it needs updating to include recent revisions on the module of beneficiary capture in the MIS.
The PSSN MIS was still in development during pilot phase of PWP component. For public works MIS, initially there was a plan to develop an IT-based system to track progress, resolve bottlenecks during implementation, and for easy and faster dissemination of information for decision-making. However, the plan did not push through. Instead a new module was added in the existing MIS. Enhancements include registration of public works beneficiaries since during the pilot phase, there were entries not recognized by the system due to inconsistent data entries – this was the cause of the delay in payment of wages. The new module is still being tested to ensure it is well functioning and to resolve connectivity issues. The enhanced version is expected to be applied during the scale-up phase.

There is a protocol, in the Results Framework and Monitoring (RFM), established to guide the collection of data for monitoring. However, due to challenges encountered during implementation the recommended schedule was not followed. Program performance information were generated as input to preparation of progress reports which included physical progress however, the information generated was not adequate and timely which could have contributed to alert potential problematic aspects of implementation during the pilot phase.

From the RFM, indicators on budget, project costs, benefits, staffing cost, participants are collected and can be shared to stakeholders. The program also ensures privacy of information of beneficiaries. The program enforces sanctions against fraud and corruption. Interview with beneficiaries in Chamwino revealed that the 3 CMCs which were not faithful were removed from the program and taken to the court of law.

The program also has mechanism for grievances, both community or project management depending on where it has been generated. For example, at the community level the procedure is as follows:

- Any person living in a PAA where the PSSN is operational may make a complaint about any aspect of program implementation. The Village Council is the main complaints receiving body at village level. Complainants can lodge their grievance either directly with the council, or through any of the Community Management Committees who then forward them to the Village Council. The Village Council resolves those disputes it can, depending on the nature of the complaint and where the mandate lies for the issue concerned. Unresolved disputes, or issues beyond their mandate are referred for adjudication at PAA or national level. The Village Council keeps records of all complaints received; whether and how the Village Council resolved them; and, which complaints were forwarded to the PAA Coordinator. The FGD participants felt there were minor issues during implementation that can be resolved amongst themselves or through the CMC.

- There are also audits both internal and external being done annually on sample basis. An external audit and evaluations are being carried out, including community score card. The program informs about program performance through progress reports and the media, and eligibility through electronic and print media and community sensitization sessions.

A recent review on the implementation of public works program from 2000-2015 found that under the M&E framework, “the PWP M&E system consists of collecting data on work progress and budget utilization” \(^2\). It is concerned with physical progress rather than also collecting information on expected

---

results and challenges encountered at field level during implementation. These findings support the observations in the field visits with regards to the poor quality of subprojects as a result of absence or lack of information from the field level.

The same review noted that monitoring and evaluation of subprojects by PAA is inadequate. The monitoring was “for the purpose of effecting payments for the beneficiaries but missed on the project itself”.

There was a randomized Impact Evaluation Baseline Survey conducted in June 2015, which covered 16 PAAs, including the first 8, from the Mainland and all the PAAs from Zanzibar.

4.2.6 Coherence and Integration across Programs

Policy framework for harmonization is in place. The National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction II guides the harmonization of social protection programs, including public works programs. Existing structures at national down to local level, with defined roles and responsibilities, to operationalize the harmonization.

The Public Works component is linked with other components of PSSN – the Conditional Cash Transfer component and the Livelihood Enhancement component (LEP) which has started being implemented in PAAs covered by PW. The idea is for eligible beneficiaries of public works to be linked to LEP and microfinance for performing livelihood groups. There is also the presence of Donor Coordination Meeting being convened monthly which serves as potential venue for harmonization with other agencies. Initial discussions with other public works programs e.g. WFP were made but actual link is yet to happen probably to the fact that WFP offers in kind while TASAF offers benefits in cash.

As observed at the local level, efforts to integrate and harmonize PW subproject with other programs/agencies is not fully established, except in Pemba. The absence of an O&M plan for the subprojects in Lindi and Chamwino tell lack of integration with local sectoral plans and budget. The fish pond subproject in Lindi MC could have benefited from follow-through support (technical and financial) had the income-generation aspect was given adequate attention. While subprojects have been identified by the community, harmonizing these with local agenda to ensure synergy of benefits and impacts has not been given serious consideration. Sector experts partly participate in the design - the team found subproject drawings on site however, they were not fully involved in monitoring of implementation as reported in previous sections particularly in ensuring quality of assets created. While in Pemba, this dimension is established through the involvement of sector experts from planning up to post-project activities. Their idea is to maximize available resources to enrich existing and future plans.

Aside from potentials at local level for integration there are also existing programs and structures that are potentials to be linked with the program.

- WFP is using the unified registry of beneficiaries.
- Skills development can benefit from existing resources and competencies of the Vocational Education Training Authority (VETA), Folk Development Colleges, other NGOs working on skills and livelihood
- There is also donor coordination meetings for sharing results and experiences of the program
- At National level, there is a quarterly Sector Experts Team meeting
4.2.7  Skills and Employability

There is pre-project capacity installed for implementers focused on subproject selection, management, and monitoring. Training related to sector standards and linked to longer term graduation potentials which was expected to be imparted to LSP and beneficiaries was inadequate. For instance, technical skills given to LSPs were limited to task rates knowledge and measurements. According to FGD participants, training is limited to safety issues at the worksite, and there was no need to train since the tasks mostly relied on their existing skills. Actual hands-on skills acquisition of participants not uniform across subprojects.

Sensitization sessions and implementation strategy are shifted towards building assets through public works activities over establishing organized pathways for skills acquisition. In Pemba though, as part of their long-term vision, hands-on acquisition of relevant skills was done during actual construction stage, and beneficiaries expressed willingness to be trained for new skills which they can use to pursue productive endeavors, and also can be tapped as resource persons in future similar undertakings.

There is institutional and technical capacity for skills development in the country\(^3\) this needs to be explored further by TASAF to determine how existing expertise could enrich or support the skills development aspect of the program. One lesson that emerged during the FGDs was the value of providing skills that are relevant to the local community in question relative to more general skills provision that participants – mostly women – might not be able to put to good use.

4.2.8  Conditions of Work and Labour Practices

The program was designed following a Presidential directive and supported with existing policy frameworks such as the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 2003 and the Employment and Labour Law, amendment in 2015. Therefore, conditions of work such as minimum age, minimum wage, worker’s rights, occupational safety and health (OSH) and workers compensation have been covered by existing guidelines.

---

\(^3\) VETA is a government agency in-charge of vocational education and training, which implements the Integrated Training for Entrepreneurship Promotion (INTEP) which is employment-oriented, integrated vocational education and training for people who are unemployed or underemployed, or those in the informal economy in both rural and urban setting. Another relevant government agency is Appropriate Technology Training Institute (ATTI), which started its activities in 1993 with the objective of developing and carrying out appropriate technology methods in road construction, rehabilitation and maintenance through Labour-Based Technology (LBT).
While policy instructions are in place actual enforcement of these standards is limited. The following were instances to support earlier statements:

- Provision of personal protective equipment/gear (PPE) is not uniform across subprojects
- Pit latrines installed on site.
- Appropriate working hours observed
- Minimum working age observed.
- Training on safety focused on first-aid administration, and safety kits provided.
- Beneficiaries are provided with small hand-tools, however, sufficient hand-tools cannot be provided as identified beneficiaries are too many and cannot work on shifts.

Grievances can be settled through the CMC intervention and Village Council. There was no reported major incidence which hampered flow of work.

Currently TASAF has prepared a flyer/leaflet termed a “client charter” indicating terms and conditions, rights and responsibilities of the participating beneficiaries and the PAA. The plan is to distribute the leaflets to the PAAs, and to be posted on visible notice boards for the beneficiaries’ attention.

While there are existing policies on rights to collective bargaining and to form associations, these were not given full emphasis during project implementation. According to FGD participants, briefing before the subproject implementation did not touch on the subject matter.
There was absence of contract for a specific public works, signed between the beneficiary-worker and PAA but, the workers understood the work to be done, wage rate, safety issues and grievance mechanism is in place.

### 4.3 Color-coded Status

The pilot period of public works component, covering 8 PAAs, begun actual implementation of subprojects only last December 2014 up to May 2015, and the roll-out to reach up to the target 44 PAAs started only last September 2016. There was a slight delay in the implementation due to MIS being developed however, this has been addressed based on lessons in the pilot period. The data collected was processed, consolidated, and organized into the assessment matrix, in a color-coded system, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latent</td>
<td>Indicates that significant attention needs to be paid to a particular dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Indicates that a dimension requires vigilance. Elements for effective performance are in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Indicates moderate satisfactory performance, with most of the elements showing effective and efficient parameters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Indicates a well-performing practice with broad-based success in the examined elements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instead of indicating only the color of a particular key area, the assessment team included the key findings to substantiate the rating. Out of 8 key result areas, there are 5 KRAs that fall between Emerging to Moderate ratings, meaning there are certain aspects that showed effective and efficient performance while there are still issues that require attention.

**Table 4.6 Summary of key assessment results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Proposed Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility and Targeting</td>
<td>Functioning targeting mechanisms and clear eligibility criteria. Proxy mean test may be inadequate to reduce exclusion errors. Measures of inclusiveness is adequate. Recent Impact Evaluation study found the targeting system outperforms other similar programs and that the program is pro-poor. May need to conduct periodic review of the system to capture emerging trends and issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Benefits, Timing and Duration</td>
<td>Program benefit is adequate, appropriate and compatible with local context. A study to determine the impact of wages and cash injection into the local economy, prices and agricultural market, is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Creation and Services</td>
<td>Subproject rationale is clear. Quality of assets in terms of design and sustainability is an area of concern. Pre-project and follow-up training on supervision and monitoring may be inadequate. Not clear link of subprojects to skills and other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subprojects are defined, aligned to community needs and program objectives, and followed safeguards. Implementation arrangements are clear but adequate technical supervision and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Proposed Color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2 - EMERGING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - EMERGING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>longer-term economic and income-generating potentials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions, Coordination and Financing</td>
<td>Financial support to LGAs is available, and needs to be reviewed to address operational gaps. Funding allocation can cover 70% of targeted poor households. Flexibility to respond to scale-up may be restricted by quality &amp; sustainability issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>PW MIS not well established yet Input-output indicators on public works are collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence and Integration Across Programs</td>
<td>Integration efforts at local level is limited as demonstrated by poor quality of assets. There is limited evidence of multi-year plans that are linked to PAA investment and budget plans. No clear O&amp;M plans and how districts will support these in their annual plan and budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills and Employability</td>
<td>Sensitization sessions and implementation strategy are shifted towards building assets through public works activities over establishing organized pathways for skills acquisition. Institutional and technical capacity for skills development is available in the country – this needs to be fully exploited by the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions of work and Labour Practices</td>
<td>While guidelines on working conditions and labor standards are not in the manual of operation, these concerns have been included, on a limited application e.g. first-aid kits, safety training, and personal protective equipment (PPEs).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Options for Consideration

In the pilot stage of implementation, while there are challenges encountered, the program has good milestones such as completed 549 subprojects (15 are covered in the assessment), effected cash transfers to more than 52,000 households, created community assets, and initial gains from these assets are being felt by the beneficiaries and communities. During the review, several areas of concern such as quality, employability and sustainability, have emerged that have impact on program delivery. Bearing in mind these milestones, the assessment team has offered some recommendations below, to address the gaps identified.

While program benefits are perceived by beneficiaries as adequate and compatible with local context, there is a need to ensure timely and predictable flow of benefit, of any social protection program, as this would allow households flexibility to plan their resources during the lean months.

Cash transfer programs could also have an important impact but other complimentary programs like public works can further enhance impact, by creating assets in the community and/or improving skills for potential productive undertaking in the future. Quality and sustainable assets can be achieved during:

- Selection/Identification and Planning - to integrate and harmonize proposed asset into village or district development plan & budget
- Design- to ensure adequate technical capacity (LSP, PAAs sector experts)
- Construction: ensure adequate technical supervision and monitoring
- Maintenance: VC and PAA are aware of their ownership and responsibilities, O&M Committees be timely formed, equipped with O&M plans, their roles & responsibilities and community by-laws for management of assets created.
- Strengthening linkage with sectoral agencies and other programs through existing administrative tools (TASAF should not be seen as a project per se rather an opportunity to mobilize capital to augment limited resources of sectoral agencies and enrich their existing programs and interventions)

Improve program capacity on technical and social knowledge about public works implementation at the same time improve technical knowledge of LSP on PW implementation through mentoring arrangement.

Include clear link of subprojects to food security, climate change, longer-term economic and employability/income-generation activities, in district annual and budget plans.

Consider expanding program strategy to include organized pathways for skills acquisition to provide value-added to the creation of assets of the community.

Consider including the Vocational Education and Training Authority (VETA) or Appropriate Training Technology Institute (ATTI) as member of Sector Experts Team, and pursue collaborations with other like-minded organizations for synergy of impacts and benefits.

Enhance capacity of program implementers on standards, and include a section on safety & health at work in Public Works Handbook, and enforce consistent standards across areas of coverage.
Consider expanding public works portfolio to include subprojects in the field of social protection/health services. Related skills acquired could then be continuously used in the communities and might improve the employability of women other than e.g. road-building skills.

Finally, the above recommendations from the assessment team were shared with TASAF and the World Bank following the field mission (even though not presented during the Joint Review Mission) and that these lessons from the pilot may have been considered or addressed in the scale-up plan. It would be good for government to consider to apply the ISPA PWP assessment themselves at a later date to ensure that the feedback from beneficiaries is in line and that impacts are being achieved from the recommendations of the review.
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