EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The first Assessment of Development Results (ADR) in Tanzania was conducted by the Independent Evaluation Office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 2014. The objectives of the ADR were to:

- Support UNDP's accountability to national stakeholders and partners in the programme country
- Strengthen its accountability to the Executive Board
- Support the development of the new country programme document for UNDP Tanzania.

The ADR was carried out in collaboration with the Government of Tanzania, the UNDP Tanzania country office and the Regional Bureau for Africa. The ADR examined the country programme for the two programme cycles, 2007–2010/2011 and 2011–2015/2016. It addressed two main issues. First, UNDP's contribution to development results by programme outcome examined the performance of each of the programme portfolios with respect to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Second, UNDP's strategic position in the country was examined from three aspects: UNDP's overall responsiveness and relevance to meeting the development priorities of the country; its use of comparative strengths and partnerships; and its contribution to promoting UN values such as gender equity, human rights, capacity building and South-South cooperation.

KEY FINDINGS

UNDP had 10 programme outcomes in the previous cycle and 14 in the current cycle in the areas of democratic governance, capacity development, private sector development and trade, HIV/AIDS, crisis prevention and recovery, environment and natural resource management, and energy and climate change. The programme budget and expenditures fluctuated significantly during the periods under review. The overall budget of $25 million in 2007 more than doubled in 2009 as the country prepared for its 2010 general elections. It peaked at nearly $69 million in 2010, due in particular to an increase in external non-core funds supporting election-related projects. By 2014 the budget was about $39 million. Between 2007 and 2013, governance-related efforts received the largest share of the budget (33 percent).

UNDP has served as a critical member of the UN team in Tanzania, which has collectively supported the Government in achieving its development objectives. The UNDP programmes for the two periods, 2007–2010/2011 and 2011–2015/2016, were based on the overall UN system strategies, the UNDAF and UNDAP, which were directly aligned with Tanzania's national development framework, articulated in Vision 2025 (mainland) and Vision 2020 (Zanzibar), MKUZA/MKUKUTA I and II, and corresponding sector-specific policies and strategies.

In all cluster areas reviewed, the programmes reflected the aspirations set out in those documents as well as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). UNDP responded to the emerging needs of the Government when required. For example, this was demonstrated by its support to Big Results Now, which was developed to fill gaps in the existing strategies and has facilitated the focus on growth. UNDP's strong leadership was shown by, among others, its role as managing agent for 5 of the 11 joint programmes in the previous cycle (Joint Programmes 3, 4, 5, 6.1 and 11) and as lead agency for 2 of the 10 UNDAP programme working groups (Governance and Environment).

Through its strong relationship with the Government, UNDP has established a solid founda-

tion for supporting the country in achieving its national development objectives and the MDGs, and promoting values that support human development. This relationship was essential in navigating discussions of sensitive issues among policymakers, such as on human rights principles and establishment of appropriate policies (e.g. the National Human Rights Action Plan); ensuring representation of people living with HIV in decision-making fora; strengthening anti-corruption efforts; and accelerating achievements of the MDGs by supporting gender and human rights.

UNDP was uniquely recognized for its contributions to strengthening institutional capacity in the context of Tanzania's complex development architecture. Given the institutional weaknesses, the use of the national implementation modality in many of the projects reviewed was appropriate, particularly in Zanzibar, where both financial and human resources were limited in all clusters. Through careful identification of sectoral 'catalysts', the national implementing partners were in the driver's seat, which promoted their ownership of the process and results.

UNDP particularly helped to strengthen national partners' ability to formulate sector-specific policies (e.g. National Anti-Corruption Strategy and Action Plan II, and policies on climate change, disaster management and trade integration) and development plans as required by the Government (e.g. Big Results Now, Five-Year Development Plan); better handle organizational mandates (e.g. National Electoral Commission and Zanzibar Electoral Commission in delivering successful elections; Prevention and Combatting of Corruption Bureau in addressing anti-corruption initiatives; Ministry of Industry and Trade in managing trade integration initiatives; Attorney General's Chamber in negotiating and regulating investment contracts in extractive industries; and Ministry of Finance in improving aid coordination and management of the aid management platform); and strengthen national response (on climate change, environmental degradation and HIV and AIDS). New institutional frameworks were put in place to meet needs identified by the Government, such as on anti-corruption efforts in Zanzibar and on coordination of agricultural service delivery.

Capacity building was embedded in all programme areas. This involved individual skills and knowledge building through training and workshops; training of trainers; and financial support to place UN Volunteers in important positions with partner institutions. It also involved provision of equipment. UNDP's support was extended to both national executive offices and regional and local authorities. This often took place in collaboration with other UN agencies participating in sector-specific work, as well as with non-State actors such as civil society organizations (CSOs) and the media. While these elements of institutional capacity have been put in place, they are a means more than an end. These efforts need to be continued and scaled up.

Programmes most likely to be sustainable were those that had a well-thought-out design; involved as partners the institutions and individuals likely to be drivers of change and emphasized their capacity development; and engaged CSOs and other non-State actors as key players in project delivery. But sustainability remained a concern in many programme areas reviewed. The reasons included structural weakness of institutions, such as a lack of financial and human resources in key positions at central and local level; competing mandates and strategies; a project design that lacked strategies for following up and scaling up activities after project completion; and uncertainty about how positions staffed by UN Volunteers would be filled in the long term. The projects reviewed generally lacked clear means for assessing the degree of accomplishment among the target groups, as evidenced by a lack of measurable indicators in the results framework and insufficient approaches for measuring the level of knowledge and skills gained.

Projects were efficient when thorough preparatory efforts were made before they were designed (e.g. they were based on needs assessment missions

with full stakeholder participation) and when there were synergies between projects under a programme (e.g. Governance and Environment, based on robust conceptualization of project design) or across programmes (e.g. Environment and Energy, and Energy and Crisis Prevention, based on structural proximity in oversight functions). This led to mutual reinforcement of the objectives and means of implementation. Critical efficiency issues were timeliness of project start-up; project oversight and reporting; stakeholder communication and transparency; and both sufficiency and timeliness of funds disbursements.

UNDP has contributed to gender equality and women's empowerment issues through the work of the inter-agency group on gender, which was reported as having made the issues more visible at UN level. Development of specific tools, such as the checklist for gender mainstreaming prepared for all thematic programme working groups under the UNDAP, helped raise awareness among programme staff about the need for consciously reflecting gender issues in their programmes.

Internally, the UNDP country office actively worked to promote gender. This was reflected in its Transformation Plan and the Gender Equality Seal exercise, through which the office was recognized as having shown transformative results. Strong leadership by senior management helped to drive these initiatives forward. At programme level, attention to gender was prominent in the programmes on Governance (e.g. women's political participation; gender-based violence awareness) and HIV and AIDS. However, the degree to which the reviewed projects incorporated gender in their project design was generally limited. More attention was needed in the project appraisal process; setting of gender-responsive indicators and strategies in project documents; and ensuring equal project participation and benefit sharing of women and men.

Under the current UNDAP, multiple agencies are meant to contribute to achievement of all the outcomes and outputs, and agency-specific work is defined only at the 'key action' level. For this reason, it is challenging to measure UNDP's results at the outcome level. Also, while each UN programme working group is expected to report outcome-level results, very few reports were available at the time of the ADR. Commonly reported project monitoring mechanisms consisted of, for example, project steering committees, quarterly project progress reports and joint supervision missions to project sites. In some programmes (e.g. Environment) routine midterm evaluations were conducted at project level. But overall, there was limited availability of reports that systematically documented UNDP's progress and achievements and assessed its specific contribution to the outcome-level objectives.

Other challenges also prevented the ADR from assessing the results. First, there was lack of consistency in the descriptions of outcomes, outputs and indicators across programmatic documents and lack of clarity in the assignment of projects to each of the outcomes. Second, many project documents and related reports from the previous cycle were lost in a flood in December 2011 and had not been recovered at the time of the ADR, although some were available at the offices of implementing partners. With high staff turnover at the country office during its Transformation Plan, limited data were available from the previous programme cycle.

UNDP has leveraged its networks with external partners to meet its needs and to implement programmes. It has effectively used its partnerships with: (i) professional networks in specific sectors, for example, for technical inputs to projects and programmes in the Private Sector Development cluster; (ii) the private sector and donors to strengthen its financial resource base in Governance (election) and Capacity Development (the agricultural sector); and with (iii) non-State actors such as CSOs and academic institutions for implementation of projects in the HIV/AIDS and Environment and Climate Change areas. Some collaboration with CSOs and other non-State actors did not fully materialize. For example, engagement with the

media during elections yielded favourable results, but efforts to involve CSOs and the media in anti-corruption efforts fell short.

Overall, consultation with development partners during project design appeared limited. The level and quality of discussions with partners, including donors, was often described as insufficient, particularly during the design phase. This resulted in a missed opportunity for engagement by partners interested in jointly contributing to specific projects, such as those covering elections and trade facilitation, and to other country-level initiatives, such as the post-MDG discussions.

Exchange programmes and joint studies were prominent in some programmes and helped in producing tangible results. South-South cooperation through the Capacity Development portfolio supported preparation of the Five-year Development Plan and integration of a budget system in the aid management platform. In Governance it was helpful with legal reform for anti-corruption; in Climate Change with developing financing mechanisms; and with HIV and AIDS through mayors' visits and a joint study in major cities. However, the use of such practices was limited in other programmes. The selection of countries that can offer lessons should be made carefully to ensure effective use of this mechanism.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusion 1. In the two periods under review, UNDP programmes were strongly anchored in the development priorities of the country, articulated in Tanzania's long-term and medium-term national development frameworks, as well as in emerging needs of the Government.

Conclusion 2. By leveraging its strong relationship with the Government, UNDP played an important role in navigating policy discussions to support the country's development based on the human development perspective.

Conclusion 3. UNDP addressed the country's widely recognized weakness in institutional capacity in its programmes and made important contributions, such as by aiding formulation of relevant policies; establishing necessary institutions and frameworks; building the skills of personnel; and strengthening national coordination in sector work. These efforts require continuous follow-up to ensure lasting institutional capacity.

Conclusion 4. The prospect of sustaining programme benefits was fragile in some programmes. Moreover, programme efficiency could be further strengthened.

Conclusion 5. UNDP has contributed to promotion of gender equality and women's empowerment in the country, with leadership demonstrated by senior management. However, its systematic integration of the concept in project design remains limited.

Conclusion 6. There were challenges in measuring UNDP's programme effectiveness, including inconsistency in programme descriptions across documents and limited availability of project information and results from the period 2007–2010/2011. Knowledge management practices were relatively weak.

Conclusion 7. UNDP effectively established numerous partnerships with external partners during programme implementation and in mobilizing resources. However, consultation with development partners was relatively limited in the early phases of programme conceptualization.

Conclusion 8. South-South cooperation — the practice of seeking out lessons and best practices from other countries, and sharing Tanzania's lessons with others — took place in many programmes and had tangible results.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1. UNDP, with its strong partnership with the Government, is in a unique position to galvanize development efforts in Tanzania. UNDP should leverage this strength to continue

developing its programmes based on national development needs and on its own mandates.

Management Response. *The country office will provide support to: (i) the Government and stakeholders to review national development frameworks (e.g. Five Year Development Plan and MKUKUTA II); (ii) the Government and stakeholders to integrate Sustainable Development Goals in national development framework and their localization; and (iii) strengthen capacity of the Government for implementation of the Five Year Development Plan and monitoring and evaluation systems.*

Recommendation 2. To fully exercise Delivering as One, UNDP should strengthen its engagement with other development partners, including donors and UN agencies.

Management Response. *UNDP will strengthen the role of the Development Partners Group Secretariat it hosts; actively participate in dialogue processes as per development partners and government structures; and scale up its role in the next UNDAP.*

Recommendation 3. While results of the UNDAP outcomes are collectively reported at UN level, UNDP should also strengthen its internal practice of clearly demonstrating its programme performance and results.

Management Response. *The country office will recruit M&E/Gender Specialist to strengthen the M&E function of the country office and a Communication and Knowledge Management Specialist to strengthen advocacy and knowledge sharing. The office will continue to refine its programmes to align with the Strategic Plan 2014-2017.*

Recommendation 4. Following the favourable results achieved in the internal gender exercise, the country office should continue with gender mainstreaming efforts and ensure full integration of gender equality and women's empowerment components in all its programmes.

Management Response. *The country office will complete the assessment of gender baselines, and develop and implement its gender action plan as part of the Gender Seal exercise. New programmes that have explicit gender outcomes and outputs in line with the Strategic Plan will be developed. It will also further enhance partnership with UN-Women and other UN agencies for the inter-agency work and the development partner's working group.*

Recommendation 5. For current and future projects, UNDP should work urgently to resolve the key efficiency issues identified in this evaluation and to establish a sustainability plan for projects implemented through the national implementation modality.

Management Response. *The country office will: (i) ensure active use of evaluation reports, baseline studies and capacity needs assessments of implementing partners during the project formulation process; (ii) integrate measures of scaling up interventions during project formulation, as opposed to ex-post; and (iii) integrate exit strategies in projects.*