

***EVALUATION OF THE EUROPEAN
COMMISSION'S SUPPORT TO THE UNITED
REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA***

Technical and financial proposal
(launch note)

March 8th 2005

Evaluation for the European Commission



This evaluation is commissioned by:

the Evaluation Unit common to:

EuropeAid Co-operation Office,
Directorate General for Development and
External Relations Directorate-General

This evaluation is carried out by: EGEval EEIG

Jacques TOULEMONDE is the contact person in EGEval (toulemonde@eureval.fr)

The evaluation is managed by the evaluation unit who also chaired the reference group composed by members of the services (EuropeAid, DG Dev, DG Budget and the EC Delegation in Tanzania) and the Embassy of Tanzania in Belgium.

The opinions expressed in this document represent the authors' points of view which are not necessarily shared by the European Commission or by the authorities of the countries concerned.

Status and versions of the document

<i>Vers.</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Feedback /</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Reference</i>

Table of content

INTRODUCTION	1
1. OUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE KEY POINTS OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE	3
1.1 BACKGROUND ELEMENTS OF RELEVANCE FOR THIS EVALUATION.....	3
1.2 PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	4
1.2 SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION.....	4
1.3 EVALUATION QUESTIONS.....	5
1.4 EVALUATION DESIGN	5
2. OUR PROPOSAL.....	7
2.1 EVALUATION PROCESS.....	7
2.2 TIME SCHEDULE	8
2.3 CORE EVALUATION TEAM.....	9
2.4 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND OVERALL MANAGEMENT.....	11

Introduction

EGEVAL is in charge of carrying out country level evaluations of EC support within a multi-annual service contract¹. In this framework the Evaluation Unit² that manages the contract has issued Terms of Reference for the 'Evaluation of the European Commission's Support to the United Republic of Tanzania'.

This Technical and Financial Proposal (launch note) have been prepared in response to the Terms of Reference. It is structured as follows:

- Our understanding of the Terms of Reference (section 1)
- Our proposal (section 2) including:
 - Evaluation process
 - Time schedule
 - Evaluation team
 - Budget

The contractor acknowledges the whole range of requests included in the Terms of Reference, even if these are not repeated in this proposal systematically. The contractor is open to correct any misinterpretation in either another version of this proposal or in the inception report.

¹ EVA/79-276

² EuropeAid Co-operation office, General Affairs, Evaluation Unit

1. Our understanding of the key points of the terms of reference

1.1 Background elements of relevance for this evaluation

Tanzania is one of the most supported countries as regards EC co-operation. In 2003 it was the second largest non-European recipient country after Afghanistan in terms of disbursements³. The European Union, including EC and Member States is the first bigger donor in Tanzania. These facts call for the evaluation to contribute to EC's accountability towards the European Parliament and the European Council. The EC is accountable for the regularity of its expenditures through audit and inspection processes⁴. Accountability for results and impacts is ensured by evaluations, together with the newly established 'result oriented monitoring' system.

For the development aid community, Tanzania is an interesting case. It has high poverty incidence levels yet receives more than average international aid funding, is one of the most politically stable countries in Africa, has undergone many institutional, sector and other reforms and has shown good economic growth figures in recent years. (the best economic growth figures in 2004 within the East African Region with 6.3% increase in GDP.) This calls for a better understanding of how far international aid and other factors contribute to the development and the reduction of poverty. The importance of international aid in proportion to national resources also raises the issue of aid dependency⁵.

This evaluation is one among the first opportunities to learn from a case of full implementation of the new principles governing EC co-operation, i.e. supporting areas identified within the partner country's poverty reduction strategy, deconcentration ... It further provides a good opportunity to evaluate and learn from the country's own innovative management and governance of International Aid through the 'Tanzania Assistance Strategy'. These facts call for the evaluation to validate these innovative mechanisms as 'good practices' and to consider any limitation to transferability.

International aid to Tanzania has been subject to an exceptionally high amount of evaluations and studies which need to be fully taken on board in order to avoid duplication and to save informants' time.

³ Annual report 2004, Financial tables

⁴ It must be kept in mind that an audit of the EC support to Tanzania is due to occur a few months after this evaluation. This calls for deeply discussing the boundaries and complementarity of both exercises with the audit team leader as soon as possible

⁵ Tanzania's dependence to international aid has been the focus of a recent evaluation by SIDA.

1.2 Purpose of the evaluation

We understand that this evaluation will be used in three contrasting ways as follows:

- Use for accounting for results and impacts to the European Institutions. In this respect, a major issue is to present an overall judgement of the extent to which the Commission's support has contributed to reduce poverty.
- Feedback into the decision-making processes at the level of Tanzania. In this respect, a major issue is to provide decision-makers with evidence based evaluative information which they do not already know explicitly, and with operational recommendations which pertain to their needs. The evaluation should be a valuable aid for both the implementation of the current Strategy and Indicative Programme, and future programming. The feedback may concern: desk officers in headquarters, EC Delegation, National authorities, Member States' development agencies and other donors that are active in Tanzania. Some key dates on the decision-making agenda include the national elections in November 2005 (when the incumbent president's second and final term will end), renewal of the Technical Assistance Strategy in 2006, next EC Strategy Paper for Tanzania to be designed before 2008.
- Learning transferable lessons that might be used by the EC in its co-operation with other countries. In this respect, a major issue is to validate innovative good practices and to provide detailed comments on Tanzania specific factors which could restrict transferability.

1.2 Scope of the evaluation

The central scope consists of all EC support related to the time period 2000-2005 (first semester), i.e:

- The strategy paper designed in 2001 and its implementation over the evaluated time period
- The 9th EDF National Indicative Programme (NIP) launched in 2001 and the implementation of funded actions over the evaluated time period
- All actions referred to previous strategy documents and funded under previous programmes, provided that they started and/or⁶ were completed during the evaluated time period
- All non-programmable assistance in addition to EDF and related to the evaluated time period. These actions are either funded by the European Investment Bank or via mechanisms such as STABEX, structural adjustment, emergency aid and community budget lines.

⁶ The Terms of Reference need clarification on this « and/or » point

The actions under evaluation are to be studied in relation to other connected actions when appropriate (extended scope) and particularly to:

- Tanzania Poverty Reduction Strategy
- Relevant regional initiatives affecting Tanzania (ESA/IO, EAC and SADC)
- All-ACP programmes for which Tanzania was eligible during the period under review
- Other international donor support actions including Basket-Funding Support

The evaluated actions cover sectors and themes like: transport infrastructure, primary education, food aid/food security, environment and forests, agriculture, mineral resources, tourism, human rights and democracy, governance, health. They rely on various instruments including: project support, programmes, sector and general budget support, sector wide approach, NGO co-financing.

1.3 Evaluation questions

We will propose a set of evaluation questions during the inception meeting. Our proposals will be discussed during the meeting and complemented/modified on the basis of Reference Group members' comments and interviews.

We will then propose a selection of no more than 10 questions in the first version of our inception report. Our proposal will have to be agreed upon by Reference Group members and validated by the Evaluation Unit.

We will concentrate our resources on answering the evaluation questions as sharply and credibly as possible. This does not mean that other issues will not be addressed in the evaluation report. In particular, we will report on significant unintended effect which we would uncover during the evaluation process.

When proposing evaluation our first set of questions, we will focus on objectives, priorities and principles as stated in official documents. When developing the final set of questions, we will pay attention to:

- Expectations expressed by Reference Group members and other informants
- Potential use of the conclusions by the addressees of the evaluation, in line with the purpose of this evaluation (see sections 1.1 and 1.2)
- Need to avoid the rediscovery of existing knowledge
- Need to pay due attention to difficult criteria like efficiency or sustainability

1.4 Evaluation design

The evaluation method will depend on the questions to be addressed, which means that it will be developed progressively as shown in Table 1.

At the current stage, two methodological issues are worth mentioning:

- The Terms of Reference require the evaluation team to present an overall judgement of the Commission support in the perspective of poverty reduction. We will build this judgement upon a review of available evaluation reports and upon our in-depth studies into a limited number of actions. In order to get a broader picture, we intend to undertake a systematic and light review of the whole range of EC supported actions. This will start with an extract of the monitoring databases. We will continue with documentary analyses with an aim to cover the central scope of the evaluation as comprehensively as possible. Extracts of documents will be appended to the database records. Then we will identify an accessible informant for as many actions as possible and contact him/her through the most convenient channel (face to face interview, telephone interview or email). The informants' opinions will be appended to the database records. The resulting database will be analysed in a mixed quantitative and qualitative way. The overall assessment will combine our answers to all evaluation questions, plus this analysis.
- We intend to derive our answers to the evaluation questions from information sources that are independent enough from the management of the EC support. For all questions we will strive to rely upon a balanced proportion of informants involved and not involved in the delivery of EC support. Outsiders' views will be provided by informants such as end users, NGOs, local authorities, experts. They will be contacted through appropriate data collection techniques like case studies, focus groups and/or questionnaire surveys. We intend to develop and test these tools during the so-called 'desk' stage.

Table 1 - Evaluation design

Phases / stages	Design of following steps	Tasks
This proposal	Main principles	
Inception	Detailed work plan for the desk phase Choice of data collection tools for the Field phase	Analysing the logic of EU support to Tanzania Proposing and selecting questions and criteria
Desk	Detailed work plan for the field phase Development and test of data collection tools for the field phase	Proposing indicators Analysing management and monitoring data Mobilising expert's knowledge Carrying interviews within EC services and Delegation
Field	Deriving early findings and conclusions from collected data	Data collection out of EC services and Delegation Self assessment of the reliability of collected data
Synthesis		Confirming findings and conclusions Answering questions Overall assessment
Final		Self assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of conclusions

2. Our proposal

2.1 Evaluation process

As suggested by the terms of reference we propose to set up a two-sided evaluation team with two strong components, based respectively in Europe and in Tanzania (see section 2.3).

In parallel, we suggest that a two-sided approach be also adopted by the Commission as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 – A two-sided process

	<i>Europe</i>	<i>Tanzania</i>
External evaluation team		
Team leader	Co-leader (EU)	Co-leader (TZ)
Sector experts	Experts (EU)	Experts (TZ)
Commission		
Evaluation management	Evaluation manager in the Evaluation Unit	Contact person in the Delegation
Advisory group	Reference Group	Local group ⁷

⁷ We propose to gather such a group in an informal way, with the authorisation of the Delegation at all key stages of the evaluation process. The Tanzanian co-leader of the external evaluation team would moderate the meetings. The Delegation and the National Authorising Officer would be invited.

2.2 Time schedule

The time schedule hereafter is in line with the ToR. It is very constraining for both the external evaluation team and the Commission during the first stages.

Table 2 – Proposed calendar

Phases and stages	Start	End	Activities/reports	Deliveries	Time since launch	Validation of
Launch	27/01/2005	27/01/2005	Final ToR	Proposal (launch note) v1	launch	Core evaluation team, budget, timing
	04/02/2005	04/02/2005	Finalising core evaluation team, budget, timing			
	14/02/2005	14/02/2005	Comments from the Reference Group members	Proposal (launch note) v2		
	04/03/2005	08/03/2005	Adjusting proposal Accepted Proposal			
Inception	08/03/2005	30/03/2005	Analysing the intervention logic and proposing questions	Slides Slides completed	0,9	Questions, criteria, work plan of desk stage
		30/03/2005	Presentation to Local Group			
	04/04/2005	04/04/2005	Presentation to Reference Group	Inception report v1	1,3	
	11/04/2005	11/04/2005	Finalising and validating questions			
	11/04/2005	Developing criteria and work plan	Inception report v2			
25/04/2005	25/04/2005	Comments from reference group members on inception report				
25/04/2005	02/05/2005	Integrating comments, finalising and validating inception report				
Desk	02/05/2005	16/05/2005	Interviews and data collection in Delegation	First Phase Report v1	2,5	Indicators, work plan of field phase
	16/05/2005	24/05/2005	Preparing criteria and indicators, advanced answers and assumptions, approach to overview, workplan of field phase			
		31/05/2005	Presentation to Reference Group	First Phase Report v2		
	07/06/2005	07/06/2005	Presentation to Local Group			
	07/06/2005	Comments from Group Members				
	07/06/2005	Integrating comments, finalising and validating first phase report				
Field	13/06/2005	13/07/2005	Field missions (4 weeks - carried out by Tanzania based consultants - very low pressure on the EC Delegation)	Slides		
		13/07/2005	Debriefing with reference Group			
		18/07/2005	Debriefing with local Group			
Synthesis	18/07/2005	06/09/2005	Analysing data, preparing conclusions, drafting final report	Final Report v1	6,0	Quality of report
	06/09/2005	16/09/2005	Quality assessment	Final report v2		
		23/09/2005	Presentation to Local Group			
		26/09/2005	Presentation to Reference Group			
	03/10/2005	03/10/2005	Comments from Group Members			
	03/10/2005	Improving quality of report, finalising recommendations				
13/10/2005	20/10/2005	Validating report v2				
Final		31/10/2005	Discussion Seminar in Partner Country	Final Report v3 + CDROM	8,5	Quality of report
	07/11/2005	07/11/2005	Comments from Participants			
		14/11/2005	Improving quality of report, finalising CDROM			
		21/11/2005	Validating Final Report			

2.3 Core Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will include two Tanzania based core members: H.Amani, L.Barnett and one EU based member: J.Toulemonde. A series of experts will be called to assist the core team in the following domains: macro-economics, transports, basic education, good governance, regional integration and trade. As far as possible, two experts are proposed for major sectors/themes

- a Tanzania based expert playing the main role
- an EU based expert making an input on all sector related draft documents

Table 3 shows the names of the experts and the sharing of roles. CVs are appended and declarations of absence of conflict of interest are joined in separate documents.

Table 3 - Evaluation team

	Europe	Tanzania	Role
Core team			
J.Toulemonde	Co-leader		Evaluation design, report writing, meetings in Brussels and Dar Es Salaam, interviews
H.Amani		Co-leader	Report writing, meetings in Brussels and Dar Es Salaam interviews
L.Barnett		Senior consultant	Management of data collection process, meetings in Dar Es Salaam report writing
Experts			
P.Chaussepied	Expert		Expertise (macro-economics)
H.Mwinyimvua		Main expert	Expertise (macro-economics), interviews in Dar Es Salaam
W.Bervliet	Expert		Expertise (education)
D. Mushi		Main expert	Expertise (education), interviews in Dar Es Salaam
J.Clifton	Expert		Expertise (transport)
I.Kimambo		Main expert	Expertise (transport) interviews in Dar Es Salaam
K.Tambila		Main expert	Expertise (governance), interviews in Dar Es Salaam
Consultants			
N.Subileau	Junior consultant		Assistance to EU team leader, documentary analysis, interviews in Brussels
M.Quinlivan	Junior consultant		Database
Other TZ consultants		Several consultants	Assistance to TZ team leader, documentary analysis, interviews in Dar Es Salaam visits and field work out of Dar Es Salaam

In agreement with the Commission we might add or withdraw experts during the structuring phase with a view to better address the selected evaluation questions.

The areas of expertise covered by the team are shown in Table 4. For each domain of expertise, the lead person is highlighted.

Table 4 Areas of expertise

	Domain of expertise									Experience		
	Transport	Education	Macro-economics	Governance	Regional integration and trade	Water and sanitation	Agriculture	Environment	HIV	Country level evaluation	Evaluation field work	Tanzania
Core team												
J.Toulemonde										XXX	XXX	
H.Amani						X	XX			X		XXX
L.Barnett								X	X		XXX	XXX
Experts												
J.Clifton	XXX											
I.Kimambo	XXX											XXX
W.Bervliet		XXX										X
D. Mushi		XXX									X	XXX
P.Chaussepied			XXX									X
H.Mwinyimvua			XXX		XX						XX	XXX
K.Tambila				XXX								XXX

According to our current assumptions, an important share of the works will be undertaken in Tanzania by Tanzania based experts and consultants, in the framework of a subcontract to EDI, a Tanzanian company. All Tanzania based consultants and experts will be employed by EDI at local cost. About 50% of the resources will be spent in Tanzania.

2.4 Quality assurance and overall management

Quality assurance

Following the quality assurance guidelines applying to the service contract, we will appoint François Mouterde as internal quality assessor. As can be seen from his appended CV, François Mouterde has led a number of large evaluation assignments. He has carried quality assessments within Eureval and for Eureval's clients along with the nine quality criteria quoted in the Terms of Reference. He will not have any responsibility or input in the assessed evaluation other than quality assurance. François Mouterde will carry four quality assessments at the stage of inception report, first phase report, final report version 1 and final report last version. The resources allocated to the quality assessor are part of the budget devoted to the management of the multi-annual service contract. The time needed to respond to the quality assessor is integrated in the evaluation budget.

At the stage of the draft final report, a second external assessor will be used, especially for checking issues that are highly sector-specific or when conclusions are controversial. The Commission will be kept informed.

As regards this evaluation, a problem arises from the fact that Jacques Toulemonde is proposed as team leader whilst being also the expert in charge of supervising the quality assurance process at the level of the service contract as a whole. In order to manage with this conflict of interest it is proposed that François Mouterde play the role of both quality assessor and supervisor in the case of Tanzania, which will remain an exception.

Contract management

As stated in EGEval's tender, the management of each evaluation is decentralised and placed under the responsibility of the firm employing the team leader. As a consequence, Jacques Toulemonde will be the contact person of the Commission for all operational issues and Eureval will be responsible for all technical and logistical arrangements including the subcontract with EDI.

Dr. Georg Ladj is responsible for overall contract management. He will be kept informed on all major arrangements through copies of documents, faxes and emails and through periodic phone co-ordination meetings.