

SUSTAINING THE IMPACT OF THE SAY TANZANIA INITIATIVE:



Analysis of interviews and focus groups

Research analysis

May 2020

Research analysis completed by Lina Gonzalez-Piñeros (April 2020)

Research interviews by Maurits Rade (November 2019)

Integrity Action has recently embarked on a “learning initiative” asking how social accountability approaches can be made more sustainable, while still having an impact, particularly for the most marginalised. During 2020, consultant researchers will be carrying out interviews, a literature review, and sharing findings periodically to provoke further inputs.

In late 2019, Integrity Action performed a series of research interviews in Tanzania with a similar focus. In this case, the interviews concerned the SAY (Social Accountability through Youth) programme in Tanzania. In this programme, led by Raleigh Tanzania, approximately 350 young people are monitoring the performance of a range of development interventions. They are using Integrity Action’s approach and digital tool (DevelopmentCheck) to do this. The programme runs from April 2018 – March 2022.

Both Raleigh Tanzania and Integrity Action recognised that we needed a better understanding of how this SAY could be sustained, and what factors might promote or inhibit sustainability for this particular programme. This means the focus of this research is much tighter than the wider sustainability research, but also aims to provide useful insights towards it.

The consultant was requested:

- To produce recommendations on how the SAY programme could be sustained, which could be actioned by the programme implementers (some of these actions might require additional funds, others may not).
- To contribute to answering the research questions within Integrity Action’s broader sustainability learning initiative (attached to this ToR).

The analysis of the data was done using Atlas TI tool, and on the basis of the ToR’s four main research questions. The resulting analysis is provided in full below and is divided in accordance with those key questions. This report also includes an Executive Summary and a presentation aimed at facilitating the use of the report. The research on each of the areas requested has been left in full in order to be used by the members of Raleigh/Integrity Action that have a specific interest in the area.

Finally, quotations from the primary research transcriptions are included in the report, in order to be used by Raleigh/Integrity Action to consolidate case studies/stories.

Further reading: For additional information and to read the research findings on sustaining the impact of social accountability initiatives, which this analysis fed into, please see: <https://integrityaction.org/what-we-do/initiatives/sustainability-research/>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the analysis was to better understand how the Tanzania Social Accountability and Youth programme could be sustained well beyond the closure of the initiative, and what factors might promote or inhibit sustainability. In specific, the research aimed to:

- Produce specific recommendations for SAY, which could be actioned by the programme implementers,
- Contribute to answering the research questions within Integrity Action's broader sustainability learning initiative,
- Draw recommendations for other programmes and wider Integrity Action approach.

The analysis of the information was done taking into account four main areas of interest:

1. Motivation: how can the different stakeholders in Tanzania continue to be motivated to "demand accountability" and respond to those demands

There are four key motivators according to the information collected:

- the possibility of accessing training opportunities that can increase chances of employability and leadership within the communities,
- the possibility for young participants to be useful to their communities, enabling them to achieve a higher "status" within the community, changing social norms regarding how they are perceived, and allowing them to be taken into account in the community decision-making process (this should also be set as an unintended impact of the project),
- In the long term, motivation is related to the possibility of being paid for it or receiving some compensation for the services provided. Lack of payment can be seen as disempowering and a symbol that the activity is not considered important by the donor, but also can mean that community monitors at some point will need to leave these activities to support their families.
- vulnerable populations with less economic or decision-making opportunities, will thus be the type of stakeholder with a greater incentive to remain part of the programme, even when there are no other incentives.

From the duty bearers and partners side, a key motivator would be if the new systems developed are compatible with their model of implementation or current monitoring model. The easiest and compatible, the system is, the most likely it will be used.

Finally, the research found that *motivation and ownership are clearly linked aspects*. The communities are unlikely to continue "demanding accountability" and own the process when the programme ends, if they don't cannot see concrete evidence that doing so creates change.

2. Ownership: what are people's expectations about ownership of an accountability mechanism in which citizens make demands

Ownership can be defined in different ways, and thus the answer to this question depends on what aspect of ownership is being analysed. The main aspects that define accountability are who provides the funding, who does data collection, who manages the data collected and who reports the data/acts on the data collected. In terms of data collection and in some cases data analysis, most actors interviewed agree that future ownership should rest in the beneficiary communities. Yet, this is unlikely to happen without facilitation from local and regional authorities, and some leadership from community leaders/elders.

The role of facilitator comes across all aspects of ownership described above, thus findings point out to the fact that facilitation from local leaders and authorities is unlikely unless they have some motivation to do it. As mentioned before, ownership and motivation are linked aspects, and in this specific case the best motivation for elected and unelected leaders is that the community demands for these mechanisms to be functioning to the point that it becomes a non-negotiable need.

Community Monitors (CM), Youth Cluster Coordinators (YCCs), partners and community leaders agree that there are risks with government intervention within citizen/community-led accountability programmes. Nonetheless, they also recognize that the government will need to have a role within the programme, otherwise their efforts will be curtailed once the programme funding and supervision from donors and partners disappear. Risks mentioned during the research include information is used for political means, information against political or personal interest is erased and those reporting it are more susceptible to harm.

Ways to protect a community-led accountability programme against these risks include:

- Use the project to highlight both failures and successes. Lack of independence in accountability processes is not only an issue relevant to government stakeholders, but also for the CMs and YCCs. CMs and YCCs are also likely to act out of political interests, as mechanisms to ensure positions of leadership within the community. Thus, it is important that a principle of neutrality is maintained, which may be shown by using the project to highlight also good examples of project implementation/service provision, and not only the bad practices.
- Keep the community (and particularly leaders/elders) informed of what is being done. Accountability that is demanded from the community and its leaders (instead of a person), can act as a buffer to protect the CMs and YCCs from possible security risks.
- Diversity - the number of mechanisms in which information collected is analysed and reported and finding champions across a wide variety of sectors including higher levels of government, media, civil society or international community.
- Create mechanisms in which CMs and YCCs can support each other by either sharing best practices on how they successfully navigated bureaucratic issues, or where participant communities can support each other to demand accountability.
- Considering the possibility for IA/Raleigh to maintain some support for the network of CMs and YCCs after the project ends, even if it is not economic.

Finally, national, regional and local governments have already an established set of mechanisms to allow for communities to demand accountability, which could be complementary to the programme, many of which also use technology. Analysing and reviewing ways to create complementarity to those tools will create a better chance for a community-led model to be sustained in the future.

3. Technology: what is the role technology plays in this particular project, should this element be sustained, if so how and in what form

It is not impossible to do community-based monitoring without using technology or an app like DevCheck, but technology does increase its sustainability by:

- allowing easy collection of material evidence regarding the issue being reported,
- easier and faster information sharing,
- creates a database of information available for future community monitors operating in the same area, in order to avoid duplication of efforts,

- simplifies the process of data collection/reporting and helps to save time, and avoid information getting lost,
- having a tool creates “legitimacy” in the process as it ensures that information is collected using a standardized methodology which has been created from people with expertise,

There were concerns about how useful a tool like DevCheck will be used on its own, without training and follow up. Some of the issues highlighted were:

- The tool is easy to use but use is limited to a population with literacy skills, access to internet connection, a phone and access to training.
- The tool still has a lot of room for technical improvements: CMs highlighted problems when taking pictures or using the offline version.
- If the programme ends, there are concerns about who will take the lead on solving technical issues or how to report them when the project ends.
- Many CMs and YCCs are unsure about what is being done with the information collected, and who will take the lead in consolidating it and sharing it when the project ends. There were also concerns about who is ultimately responsible to check the accuracy and quality of the reports in the tool. Accuracy and quality are necessary in order to ensure that programme collected is believable and useful.

As in ownership, previous accountability programmes have left a variety of technological tools in Tanzania, with which DevCheck might be complimentary. A list of other tools listed in the research and others found by the researcher or offered as a first contribution to analyse possible compatibilities.

4. Are there other models or factors to consider?

There are other models of social accountability or government-led accountability either using technology as a tool, or not. Most of these models are complementary to the SAY model, and some examples of complementarity are given. A wider research might nonetheless be needed, including exploring lessons from previous Governance and Accountability programmes implemented in Tanzania over the last 15 years (mainly with funding from DFID, EU and USAID).

Besides the above there are two aspects of sustainability which are transversal to the areas of motivation, ownership and technology: these are the usefulness and adaptability of the model. As mentioned by one of the CMs interviewed, “sustainability will also depend on having a system to assess, communicate, take decisions and send feedback”, if the model/programme does not create results visible to the communities that it benefits, it will be unlikely that the community will take any step to sustain its activities. So far, according to the information collected in the research, the project is not doing enough to show success, or is not doing it on a way that is being downstreamed to the communities they work in, and the local and regional government authorities.

Finally, a cross-cutting issue found by the researcher during the review of the information provided, was that the project needs to be able to adapt to the different contexts it works with some key questions for adaptability being:

- Are you adapting training to ensure inclusion of vulnerable populations (women, people with disability)? Are you measuring the efficiency of this gender/vulnerability approach?
- Have you done a review of power dynamics for the specific communities? Are assessments of power dynamics being done on a regular basis, in order to determine the validity of the original

assessment? Are you analysing whether the project is contributing to positive or negative changes in power dynamics? How is the project responding to changes in power dynamics?

- How is the project adapting in areas where service provision is already using online tools? Can DevCheck adapt to offer these projects better ways to monitor and provide feedback? Can you learn something from those tools?

General recommendations:

1. **Communities and government officials need to be more involved in the programme and better understand its benefits.** Sustainability is only possible if beneficiary communities, their leaders and local/regional government officials are also motivated to allow the continuation of the programme. The programme could do more to show the benefits of the programme to the government authorities, community leaders/elders and community in general.
2. **As training is a key motivator and a tool necessary to increase ownership and be able to use its technological tools, a mechanism that allows additional people within the community to receive training for the use of these monitoring systems is required in the short term.** In the medium term, using the CMs and YCCs to train other members of the community might suffice, but the incentives to “pass on the torch” will diminish overtime either because of fear of new young leadership to arrive and compete with them, or because there are no economic benefits to do so. Suggestions on how to provide this additional training are given within the report for Part A.
3. **Some kind of economic incentive is necessary for the programme to continue indefinitely.** In the medium term, additional training might be sufficient to keep a large proportion of the CMs and YCCs involved, but that will change with time, especially as they need to find jobs to sustain their families. In the short term a revision of what is the most adequate level of economic incentives is necessary, as CMs and YCCs in some areas are already mentioning that amount provided is not sufficient to cover transport costs.
4. **The programme can create linkages with existing government-led mechanisms to increase transparency and accountability.** Given the shortage of economic resources for monitoring and evaluation in local areas, the SAY model can become a complementary way for local and regional governments to do M&E in communities in a sustainable way.
5. **Diversification in the funding, and technical/technological support of the programme (between public/private, national/international institutions), is the best way to mitigate against the risks of strong government intervention in any future model.** Examples of systems in which this diversification were achieved have been provided, but additional in-house research might be useful. The model can be offered to service providers/duty-bearers as a mechanism to increase their transparency, showcasing good results and improving their customer service.
6. **Using DFID’s leverage, the model could be introduced to other donors and partners operating on the ground, so they can make use of the platform and its CMs. This might be particularly useful in the current situation as COVID-19 will likely have an impact in the possibility of monitoring projects using external contractors.**
7. **Beyond the tool there are other areas of the model that seem equally important for sustainability, for example the way that Joint Working Groups are created and used.** Both SAY teams, duty bearers and government officials said that the Joint Working Groups created by the programme have worked better than previous mechanisms to bring communities within the decision-making process, and particularly empowering vulnerable populations (women, population with disabilities).

PART A. Motivation

Guiding questions were: How can the different stakeholders in Tanzania continue to be motivated to “demand accountability” and respond to those demands? How can we maximise the chances that motivation levels remain high? To what extent does there need to be a prevailing norm, or culture, of “demanding accountability”? What other norms might influence citizens’ motivation to keep using the system?

There are four key motivators according to the information collected:

1. Additional training:

- A majority of the stakeholders interviewed (84% of them) mentioned that additional training for the wider communities, the CMs and the YCC is a key element of sustainability. These is articulated through three main justifications:
 - CMs and YCCs which are not paid for their job see training as a reward for their efforts and a way to gain competencies that could lead them to future job opportunities.
 - “Training diplomas help CMs and YCCs achieve status within their communities”¹, which in turn creates ownership of the programme and motivates them to stay committed.
 - “It is unavoidable that the CMs and YCCs leave their monitoring activities at some point”². The programme will need to train the wider community (either directly or through the current CMs and YCCs) to guarantee that others have the skillset and confidence to continue the monitoring process. “By default, citizens are not very comfortable or confident to engage with duty bearers... training is needed to give them confidence, and support in their leadership to make them known (...) they have to be empowered to understand that they can talk to their leaders and demand their rights”³.

2. Keeping the community informed:

- The programme is seen as an opportunity for young people to achieve a higher “status” within the community, changing social norms regarding how they are perceived, particularly allowing them to be taken into account in the community decision-making process: “one of the things is the opportunity to be working close with the local leaders, either WEOs, Ward Executive Officers, like informing them what you want to do to their wards which is a very good way to create a good and positive relationship”⁴. Morogoro SAY leads mentioned: “over time we have seen this change and the community monitors themselves are saying this that they feel that they have been taken more seriously”, “they have even been taken seriously to take positions in the government, imagine, leadership positions”.
- A big motivation for YCCs and SAY Campaign Coordinators (SCCs)(Dodoma) is the possibility of being able to solve a problem within a community, the sense of accomplishment is in itself a motivation: “everybody wants to see changes in the community, but no-one wants to champion for the changes, so that is what makes me feel like I have left a good legacy”. But this motivation is not likely to last if community members are not aware that this has been achieved by them.
- CMs, YCCs and SAY teams all agreed that the programme needs to do more to make sure the wider community know the benefits of the programme and how the teams are responsible for it. Government officials from the three locations intervened also highlighted that despite

¹ Mufindi CMs.

² Dodoma CMs.

³ SwM_DevAgency

⁴ Morogoro YCCs.

having been informed about the programme, they have not received the reports of what has been achieved or good stories which they can share amongst the communities.

- CMs in Dodoma and Morogoro, and partners in Care and Shahidi wa Maji (SwM) agree that the wider community could be motivated to continue with the programme (or demand that government authorities do it) if there is evidence that projects that are monitored are more likely to last and benefit the community. “(We need) public awareness of the communities we are working in, specifically on why they should be part of driving change in their communities. Everyone has the responsibility, and we have few people who are trained who are equipped with knowledge for, you know, to take part in driving change in their areas, but they probably, alone, cannot make sure that the entire community is somehow aware of their rights and responsibility of solving their challenges”.

3. Economic incentives:

- 90% of the stakeholders mentioned economic incentives as a key to motivation in the long run: “a good motivation comes from training and status gained within the community because of the work they are doing. But in the long-term motivation is related to the possibility of being paid for it or receiving some compensation”⁵.
- Involving members of the community to continue the monitoring process might be a challenge without an economic motivation: “Some people think that we are paid a salary, a lot of money... a possible female monitor refused to join because of lack of payment. Even when monitors tried to train her, she was uninterested without some funding behind”⁶. Furthermore, many youths will not be able to do it for a long time if they are not paid, because they will need to find a job to sustain their families.
- “Even status in the community is diminished when they know we don’t get paid (...) there is resistance to discuss with us or believe our recommendations”⁷.
 - YCCs report that CMs “do not believe that you are volunteering as they are volunteering, the community has the same feeling”. That creates competition and sometimes disincentivizes work between them. “They work more than the people in the joint working group, but they get the equal share, they keep wondering why. They want to be paid more than the joint working group”.

4. Involving particularly vulnerable populations as community monitors:

- Monitors in Dodoma and Mufindi agreed that particularly vulnerable populations (elderly, disabled and women) might have a stronger motivation to remain within the programme after funding and support ends, because the opportunity cost for them is low. For them the programme will be the only mechanism that can ensure that services that directly benefit them are kept. “You have motivation if it is something that has importance to your personal life”⁸.
- Female YCCs seem particularly more empowered and motivated, because their role helps them to achieve changes for other women. A female YCC in Morogoro said: “I’ve never thought that one day I will be interacting with the government officials like the CDOs [community development organisations], sometimes I even get a chance to communicate with the manager discussing what we are going through. Even get to know about different cultures, like now I understand Hehe culture because I’ve been interacting with them”.

⁵ Mufindi government representatives.

⁶ Morogoro YCCs.

⁷ Dodomo YCCs.

⁸ Mufindi CMs.

- Beyond social norms, context issues like having meetings in hot weather and outside discourage the participation of women and people with disability⁹.

5. From the duty bearers and partners side, a key motivator would be if the new systems developed is compatible with theirs, or at least has a high level of compatibility with other existing systems Economic incentives:

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with CARE mentioned that “CARE already has specific mechanisms to get beneficiary feedback (Community scorecards) and is implementing some online apps to follow implementation in real time (for socio-economic programmes)”.

Key findings:

1. *Motivation and ownership are clearly linked aspects.* The communities are unlikely to continue “demanding accountability” and own the process when the programme ends, if they don’t cannot see concrete evidence that doing so creates change. Informing the community about these success stories is also key in ensuring that the YCCs and CMs are taken into account in the community decision making process, thus changing their “status” within the community. The possibility of becoming leaders in the community, is one of the key reasons they remain motivated within the programme in absence of any economic benefit.
2. *Some kind of economic incentive is necessary,* even if it is only funds to pay transportation and food expenses. In the medium term, *additional training might be sufficient to keep a large proportion of the CMs and YCCs involved,* but that will change with time, especially as they need to find jobs to sustain their families.
3. *A mechanism that allows additional people within the community to receive training on the programme is required in the short term.* In the medium term, using the CMs and YCCs to train other members of the community might suffice, but the incentives to “pass on the torch” will diminish overtime either because of fear of new young leadership to arrive and compete with them, or because there are no economic benefits to do so. More on whether technology is a mechanism to do this, will be explored in the section on technology.
4. *A part of the population that is likely to remain motivated without economic benefits, and which will have higher incentives to “pass the torch” are particularly vulnerable groups, like women and people with disabilities.* This population is the one that has more to win from community monitoring and given the lack of potential economic opportunities available for them, are more likely to continue in the long term. This will also have additional benefits around equality and gender empowerment. Section on technology will explore whether there are specific challenges from the technological framework used, to their participation.

Main recommendations:

1. **Review how to extend the training to the wider community.** Suggestions that arose from the review include:
 - a. Provide additional capacity to CMs and YCCs to become trainers and support them (economically, by attending training events and with the possibility of giving diplomas) during the training process. This will also increase those CMs and YCCs status within the community but can generate risks of commercialisation of the training which will need to be monitored.
 - b. Diplomas are important. The respect and legitimacy that comes from the training is only obtained if there is a mechanism to prove that the training was received.
 - c. Create clear criteria of what are the ‘minimum requirements’ to become CMs. Government officials and duty bearers argue that “indiscriminate training might not be efficient as in

⁹ Morogoro SAY.

many cases people will only attend for a diploma". There are also risks that new trainees might use the diploma as a way to exert resources/deceive the local communities.

- d. Concentrate training on vulnerable communities, which have an inherent higher motivation to request accountability for the public and private services they are provided with.
 - e. CMs suggested providing training to YCC in "sector specialisms", as there have been some cases in which the observations from YCCs are inaccurate because they don't know enough about the project they are monitoring and how it should be working. Inaccuracies result in communities losing confidence in the monitors and the project. An alternative approach suggested by the researcher is that in projects for which some technical knowledge is required, YCCs are suggested to communicate any doubt first with CMs or with the local authorities responsible for the project, before submitting their report on DevCheck.
2. **Sustainability is only possible if beneficiary communities, their leaders and local/regional government officials are also motivated to allow the continuation of the programme. The programme could do more to show the benefits of the programme to the government authorities, community leaders/elders and community in general.** Some suggestions include:
 - a. Trimestral meetings with the communities and government officials to show cases of success, with participation of the Raleigh or IA team.
 - b. Banners, posters or sending these stories to local and national media (radio, printed).
 - c. Create case stories that can be shared by monitors via WhatsApp, and which include video stories or some visual evidence.
 3. **Review possible avenues in which the monitoring process can be paid by external actors (local/federal governments, donors) or the community, once the programme is finished.** Also review the possibility (and risks) to increase some of the current economic incentives given to CMs and YCCs as part of the programme, based on experience in other programmes (minimum requests include providing bicycles/motorcycles, paying for moto taxis and fuel, covering lunch/food during the visits).
 4. **Ensure compatibility between DevCheck and other MEL/BFM models.** An initial review of how to ensure compatibility between this programme and MEL/Beneficiary Feedback Mechanisms (BF) which are in place for other partners (CARE, SwM) is a potential research/pilot in the short term.

Other recommendations from researcher:

Many of the most experienced partners and participants in the SAY programme, mentioned having participated in previous transparency and accountability programmes. In all cases they mentioned that a large decrease in motivation was unavoidable at the end of the programme, as seen by years of previous top-down and bottom-up approaches to transparency and accountability. As a consequence, the consultant reviewed programme reports from three previous programmes supported by DFID and USAID¹⁰ as well as previous research on the subject of accountability in country¹¹. Five additional recommendations arose:

5. It is likely that a majority of the current CMs and YCC will not continue to engage in monitoring activities after the end of the project. Most of them will likely emigrate to look for additional work or educational opportunities. **This assumption should be part of the project's Theory of Change and log frame.** The consultant did not find in this light-touch documentary research, any studies showing a quantitative measure of this potential loss, but the programme can consolidate this kind of evidence-base by keeping track of the number of CMs and YCC that

¹⁰ AcT and AcT2, Institutions of Democratic Empowerment and Accountability (IDEA) and Public Service Reform Programme – Performance Results and Accountability Programme (PRAP).

¹¹ OPM (2005) Understanding Patterns of Accountability in Tanzania. <http://www.gsdr.org/docs/open/doc98.pdf>

were trained, **against the number of active ones by the end of each year or do a more in-depth research of this specific area.**

6. As a consequence of the last point, and in line with recommendation 1, the more people that are engaged, trained and receive information about the benefits of the programme, the more likely to have larger cohorts of remaining motivators. **Possible mechanisms to increase training, while maintaining quality in the provision is:**
 - a. Make use of the best CMs and YCCs (based on quality of reports and results obtained), your trainers, and ask them to develop criteria for the selection of new monitors based on their experience.
 - b. Create online application mechanisms, based on the above criteria. An online written assessment could be included in order to assess the ability of the applicants to use the DevCheck tool and present monitoring information in a clear and concise manner.
 - c. Creation of a CM/YCC network using social media. Encourage sharing of best practices, learning resources and case studies using social media. Programmes implemented by Coffey/Crown Agents/OPM have been using WhatsApp and Facebook groups for this, and the biggest lesson learned is the need to establish clear rules for information sharing and selection group administrators.
7. Evaluations for programmes implemented by Coffey and OPM, both found that accountability systems will be more sustainable "if there was a higher level of transparency over decision-making processes and better flows of information in relation to resources available and results achieved". For the programme, and as stated in recommendation 2, is necessary to increase the level of reporting back to the community and community leaders (so they can see the benefits of monitoring and encourage others to become part of the system in the future), and government officials. These reports should be done in a non-confrontational manner focusing on positive results and stories, and the benefits of a joint approach between community and government officials.

PART B. Ownership

Guiding questions were: What are people's expectations about ownership of an accountability mechanism in which citizens make demands? What are the risks of citizen-led accountability systems being adopted by the institutions providing the services? How do these risks vary across contexts, and how can they be mitigated – for example, through independent oversight? Do citizens and other stakeholders view the benefits of independence in the same way we do?

1. Who and how? Communities, with facilitation from local/regional and national government authorities.

- Ownership can be defined in different ways, and thus the answer to this question depends on what aspect of ownership is being analysed. The main aspects that define accountability are who provides the funding, who does data collection, who manages the data collected and who reports the data/acts on the data collected. In terms of data collection and in some cases data analysis, most actors interviewed agree that future ownership should rest in the beneficiary communities. Yet, this is unlikely to happen without facilitation from local and regional authorities, and some leadership from community leaders/elders.
- The role of facilitator comes across all aspects of ownership described above, thus findings point out to the fact that facilitation from local leaders and authorities is unlikely unless they have some motivation to do it. As mentioned before, ownership and motivation are linked aspects, and in this specific case the best motivation for elected and unelected leaders is that the community demands for these mechanisms to be functioning to the point that it becomes a non-negotiable need.
- *A challenge is how to compensate for the time/effort communities will need to put to own and sustain these accountability processes.* YCCs and CMs mentioned that the request for information sometimes “annoys” community members and leaders. “People should be educated that we are not the enemy who just want to scoop into their personal stuff, but we want to help them solve their challenges and make the project sustainable”.
- *As with motivation, the suggestions from the stakeholders centered in providing the community with reasons to demand the continuation of this programme: “Go back to the community and work with them on the feedback that they have given, like practically showing what has changed on what has been talked (...) if there has been a complaint that things should happen like this and if it is a constructive one and feasible then we go back and implement it and work on it, (...) if they want more engagement then they would see more engagement”¹².* Teaching people to question the information they are being given by authorities, what their rights are and how long a project should last is key.
- *There is evidence that involving communities is already happening within the project but might be happening in better ways in some communities than others (e.g., Dodoma stakeholders showed higher levels of involvement) “Before people have no sense of ownership, they feel like this project is for them. Nowadays people have it and there is no need any more that if something happens now there will be someone who will be responsible for that but instead everyone will be responsible for it. We conduct meetings where people will be contributing their own views and come up with their own arguments concerning the project, and everything is being transparent so that people know what is going on. (...) Ownership depends*

¹² Mufindi CMs.

on the benefit (especially economic) that the project brings to the community. If the benefit is great, people are more likely to care and thus own it"¹³.

2. What should be the role of government institutions?

- CM, YCC, partners and community leaders agree that there are risks with government intervention within citizen/community-led accountability programmes (more below). Nonetheless, they also recognize that the government will need to have a role within the programme, otherwise their efforts will be curtailed once the programme funding and supervision from donors and partners disappear. *The main role they highlight the government authorities should have is facilitators.*
- *Government Officials interviews have some general notion of the project, but in all cases, they requested to be more involved, getting reports from achievements, or recommendations on how they could facilitate processes. "Sometimes it makes it difficult for us to evaluate the project, it would be easier if we could be involved in one way or another. It may not be very involved but at least they can tell us that they are going to a certain area and when they come back, they give feedback for the challenges they had so we also can give our views on how to solve those challenges".*
- *The national, regional and local governments have already an established set of mechanisms to allow for communities to demand accountability, which could be complementary to the programme. Those systems have components of "community-led activity" since there are committees responsible to speak on behalf of them. Briefly the process works as follows:*
 - *"The government has village leaders, ward leaders and district leaders. Bringing all that together there is a CMT (Council Management Team) who are responsible in decision making. This is from the District level. There is another body known as FC (Full Council) – this is composed of politicians, head of department sectors in the district. The Full Council is the high-level decision maker at the district level".*
 - *"The Government has Social Audits in each sector under a team, which comprises social audits/Inspectors in the district levels. The community level challenges are solved within the community level by village leaders. Social Audits visit the communities through their routine weeks, quarterly and annual audits, and it is composed of experts".*
 - *"Social Audits depend on the community to gather information, attend meetings and feedback from the community. There are committees in each district responsible for gathering all data and progress of services and infrastructures. Once there is any challenge, they feed the information back to the District level once there are any challenges".*
- *Government officials and duty bearers recommended the use of these established SOPs in order to ensure that findings from the community-led accountability process lead to results. "Engaging with the wrong person within the government, can lead to further delays or inaction (...) when you go to the village you have to inform the relevant people who can help you, like the agricultural officer, chief executive officer and others. That means that when you engage those people, they will be familiar with what is going to happen and so if some new people will come and ask about it, they will provide the clear information".*
- *There are already examples of community-led accountability initiatives, which are facilitated or supported by local/regional governments. "In Bwakila Chini for instance, children are now eating at schools, they have constructed classes and offices through the involvement of the citizens (...) The government hands over the project to the school head teacher who now*

¹³ Dodoma CMs.

supervises its sustainability and makes sure that the classes are in good condition on behalf of the government”.

3. What are the risks of government intervention in community-led accountability processes?

- There are three main risks reported in the KIIs and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) regarding government involvement in these processes:
 - *Government officers engaged in corruption practices will have incentives (and the means) to stop these processes or harm community monitors. “There are people within the system who benefit from the malfunction of the system and the government officials will be on their side”, “some people are now conscious and asking, but still, they fear like if I keep on asking much what is going to happen to me”¹⁴. CMs and YCCs reported cases in which this has happened before: “We have seen in Dar es Salaam, someone took a photo, and it was an issue... as monitoring will go against some peoples' interest, that will generate risks”¹⁵.*
 - *Government processes are difficult to navigate, and sometimes are designed to avoid results from accountability processes. There are also issues with hierarchies (and lines of communication) that will need to be respected and that will impact ability to transmit information. “The difficult thing about the government is whenever you try to do something that is related to them, you need like a lot of follow-ups, letters, permissions, maybe sometimes even if you want to go to the site areas you will need like someone in charge of that particular area to be there to supervise you what kind of pictures and anything”¹⁶.*
 - *If Government authorities take ownership of the project, they can modify their internal processes in order to maintain a “façade” of accountability while allowing corruption practices to continue. “If the system is taken by the government, teams are likely to be changed in order to demonstrate results”¹⁷. “During election time, systems will be highly politicized or will be suspended”¹⁸.*

4. Are there any mitigations for these risks? Is independence important? What is an “independent accountability programme”?

- An interesting discussion was held in the FGD groups with community members of Dodoma and CM in Mufindi. In both cases, they highlighted that *despite the risks, government intervention within these projects was unavoidable, and thus the best way to protect against the risks was to involve them and create positive incentives for them to allow the project to continue, and possibly fund part of it*. Mitigation mechanisms for the above risks include:
 - *Use the project to highlight both failures and successes. Lack of independence in accountability processes is not only an issue relevant to government stakeholders, but also for the CMs and YCCs. CMs and YCCs are also likely to act out of political interests, as mechanisms to ensure positions of leadership within the community. Thus, it is important that a principle of neutrality is maintained, which may be shown by using the project to highlight also good examples of project implementation/service provision, and not only the bad practices.*

¹⁴ Dodoma citizens.

¹⁵ Morogoro YCCs.

¹⁶ Mufindi CMs.

¹⁷ Morogoro CMs.

¹⁸ Dodoma CMs.

- *Keep the community (and particularly leaders/elders) informed of what is being done.* Demanding accountability from the community and its leaders, can act as a buffer to protect the CMs and YCCs from possible security risks. Also, if elected government officers see that acting on community request can help them to continue being elected, they are more likely to promote and facilitate the continuation of the programme.
- Besides the above point, it is important to *teach communities as a whole to question the information they are giving, what their rights are and how long a project should last is key.* As highlighted in the section on motivation, the more members of the community that are involved in the programme, the more likely that it will be sustained.
- *Have various mechanisms in which findings could be reported from the bottom up.* CMs and YCCs need to be trained on how to make use of government-led mechanisms/tools for accountability, and how to “navigate the bureaucratic process”. But besides this, the programme can teach CMs and YCCs what other means they can use to bring their reports to the ears of higher-level government officials or larger members of their constituencies. For example:
 1. *Find “champions” within higher levels of government, media or civil society.* “For sustainability through the government, more high-level advocacy is needed, from the minister or from the permanent secretary or from the lobbying from the MP... could be regular meetings with them or bringing them to project areas to see things for themselves or through direct phone calls”¹⁹.
 2. *Create mechanisms in which CMs and YCCs can support each other by either sharing best practices on how they successfully navigated bureaucratic issues, or where participant communities can support each other to demand accountability.*
- *IA/Raleigh should maintain some support for the network of CMs and YCCs after the project ends.* “If you stop completely and you leave them on the out for example, nothing will happen.... So there has to be some way of following up on some sort of a support and showing that we are still here in case you need any - not necessarily material support but moral support, motivating them to take action; ensuring that their action plans have been fulfilled or reminding them of what shouldn’t have happened or what should have happened”²⁰.

5. Key findings and recommendations:

Many recommendations have been already provided above. Below the Consultant will summarize the main ones, including some new ones from her own experience and secondary research on results/challenges from previous accountability programmes in Tanzania:

1. **Community needs to be the main owner of these programmes in the future**, but that can only be obtained by **increasing the level of involvement, information and training available to them.**
2. The programme needs to **do more to measure and share results, case studies and best practices amongst the beneficiary communities, their local leaders and government authorities.** CMs and YCCs might need to be trained on how to calculate the monetary benefits of their results, so communities can have clear evidence of the returns of this accountability model.
3. **Train CMs and YCCs on how to make use of government-led mechanisms/tools for accountability, and how to “navigate the bureaucratic processes”.**

¹⁹ KII SwM DevAgency

²⁰ KII SwM DevAgency

4. **Find “champions” within higher levels of government, media, civil society or international actors**, which can act as secondary recipients of findings on which no action has been taken, or as “protectors” of the CM, YCCs and communities demanding accountability.
5. **Integrity Action can set itself as one of these “champions”**. This could involve:
 - a. **The creation of a tool/mechanisms in which the network CMs and YCCs can support each other**, by either sharing best practices on how they successfully navigated bureaucratic issues or ask their communities to support each other to demand accountability. Potential tools include Facebook Groups moderated by IA, but also bespoke tools as its own chat rooms and case study publications, integrated within DevCheck and easily accessible to the CMs and YCCs. A key risk here is how to ensure the safety, moderation and data protection within these groups (to be explored in the Technology section).
 - b. Given the big amount of previously “successful” accountability programmes funded by DFID, USAID and other donors, **Integrity Action could incorporate within their Sustainability research the review of previous programmes successes and promote a scheme for other sectoral experts within the country and/or region (DAI, Coffey, OPM, Transparency International, donors) to join forces, in a pro-accountability international alliance** offering the possibility for cross-country and cross-programming learning, including sharing of best practices and learning-from-failure stories which can be shared with local implementers and monitors.

PART C. Technology

Guiding questions were: What is the role technology plays in this particular project, should this element be sustained, if so how and in what form? How essential is it? What is it about the technology that adds value? Does our idea of added value equate with reality? – the ability to generate real-time feedback – which in turn can lead to faster resolution of problems, thus building trust between citizens and duty bearers; the ability to easily draw insights from the data produced. Should the tool be open source, which could make it easier to sustain if a separate organisation or public authority will be “owning” it in the long term?

1. The role of technology: it is not impossible to do community-based monitoring without an app like DevCheck, but technology does increase its sustainability.

- There is a wider consensus amongst all stakeholders consulted that technology and specifically the DevCheck tool is useful, and alongside the main areas in which the programme had assumed it would add value. The main reasons cited are:
 - *Creates evidence that what you are saying and requesting exists, “It will be more difficult to call the joint working group to solve the challenge if you have not gone to the community to analyse the challenge and have the evidence”²¹.*
 - *It allows better and faster information sharing. “I can share the information with my colleague like Nuru, to see what has been done or not in real time”²²*
 - *It creates a database of information available for future community monitors operating in the same area, in order to avoid duplication of efforts, and assess how successful the programme has been at obtaining solutions for the problems reported.*
 - *It has simplified the process and helps to save time. “It is important because it has simplified the whole process of collecting information. If we had to come up with our own questions, it would have been more difficult. This has simplified”²³. “When you analyse the time used to write, store and analyse the data, there is an alternative to do all these at once”²⁴.*
 - *Having a tool creates “legitimacy” in the process as it ensures that information is collected using a standardized methodology which has been created from people with expertise. “When you are using a phone, it will be easy to convince a person that you are not going to take much of their time and that you are serious”²⁵. “I go around with Ahazi asking questions without any tool to help us keep the record, people would not take us seriously” (...) But as I said before, the community will not take us seriously. They will even start avoiding us. There is a huge difference if you go with the tools and without tools”²⁶.*
 - *It is a safer mechanism for data collection. “Paper/documents can get lost, wet or damaged”. “Without technology, they will depend on paperwork and forms which are difficult to understand and send. Graphic evidence will be also lost. Paperwork is also likely to be stored somewhere and just forgot about it”²⁷. “When you are out with papers,*

²¹ CMs Morogoro.

²² CMs Dodoma.

²³ CMs Mufindi.

²⁴ CMs Dodoma.

²⁵ YCC Morogoro

²⁶ CMs Dodoma.

²⁷ CMs Mufindi.

you might be stopped or linked with the case, technology gives you a chance of not being known (anonymity)".

2. DevCheck as an Open Monitoring Resource (OMR): need for simplification, more effective cross-sharing learning processes and online training.

- Those interviewed were largely unaware of what an "open resource" was but agreed that making DevCheck available for everyone to be used would be positive. Particularly, *government officials showed interest in using the tool, "Government will respond positively since having Community Monitors helps in coordinating activities, District officers cannot travel around all villages but having a number of Community Monitors will help and reduce costs. The Government wants to have Monitors in every community which will save Social Auditors from moving from one place to another"*²⁸.
- Yet there were concerns about how useful DevCheck will be on its own, without training and follow up. Some of the issues highlighted were:
 - The tool is easy to use but still requires training: in general, CMs and YCCs say the tool is easy to use, as long as you have good training and meet certain minimum requirements (being literate, have a good internet connection and a smartphone). *The question for sustainability is who is to provide the training on the use of the tool when the project ends, training might also be available as an OER [open education resource], but CMs and YCCs will need to be empowered to complete the training.*
 - The tool still has a lot of room for technical improvements: issues when taking pictures²⁹ ³⁰ or regarding the possibility of using the tool when there is no internet connection³¹ were reported by CMs. There are also concerns about who will take the lead on solving technical issues or how to report them when the project ends. Finally, there are some additional recommendations on other services this app could offer, such as a mechanism to share information between CMs and YCCs from different communities, or a log of cases reported, solved and in-process.
 - How is information being used and who will take the lead in consolidating it and sharing it when the project ends: as mentioned in previous sections, government officials, implementing partners such as CARE or SwM, community leaders and even some CMs and YCCs are unaware of who is consolidating and managing the information reported, and what is being done with it. The project needs to produce "quantifiable indicators and infographics to convince duty communities and other stakeholders to use it"³².
 - Who is taking responsibility to check the accuracy and quality of the reports in the tool? SAY Team members and YCCs reported that they are having some problems using the information provided by CMs, because it is incomplete or confusing. In some cases, they are able to solve these issues by calling the CMs and asking them for additional information, but there are concerns about how and who will take on this

²⁸ Government officials Morogoro.

²⁹ Some YCCs take pictures too close or too far away, submit blurry pictures or with their fingers in.

³⁰ For example, Morogoro SAY: "you know that in the section of the access to information, there is no an option for taking pictures, so you may find that community monitors fail to use that, because they need to take pictures before start using the DevCheck, different from other sections, where problems are fixed where they can just go and take pictures, so some of them are not aware of this knowledge, like renaming the documents, and when they go there they attach".

³¹ Most CMs said DevCheck allows it to be used when there is no internet connection, but YCCs in areas a Morogoro and Mufindi reported that they did not know this was possible. CMs mentioned that as a consequence some YCCs provide incomplete reports or provide pictures which do not serve as documentary evidence, as they don't meet the quality expected.

³² Morogoro SAY members.

“quality assurance” role once the project closes as it requires almost complete dedication. This goes back to the issue of ownership as this is a role that will need to be owned by a stakeholder with economic resources to pay for it.

3. What other tools/models exist in Tanzania? Are they complementary? Should the duty providers design their own?

- *Social Auditors are the institutionalized way in which monitoring of projects in the field is done in Tanzania. “(They) who do not use any form of technology in collecting data, apart from forms/papers with checklists, that are provided and filled with information. Data which is collected goes through the right channel of decision makers, especially the Head of Department who are responsible in approving/ making the right decision for any concern raised”. Also, the national and regional governments have “experts for Monitoring and Evaluation (From the Planning Department) in every district for example in my department I work alongside Monitoring and Evaluation experts who conduct their activities quarterly in the communities”.*
- *Nonetheless, local, national and regional governments are already making use of technology for community monitoring. According to government officials interviewed, every department in most of the districts have an email address where stakeholders and community members can send emails of concerns and inquiries. Also, there is a website owned by the district where community members can provide feedback and comments. Unfortunately, websites and addresses were not provided or found.*
- *Nonetheless, funds allocated for monitoring projects are very low in the districts, so introducing a system that needs a lot of economic resources will not work, or “be the main priority for the Government when it comes to Accountability and Monitoring”³³.*
- *Many examples of the use of technology and online apps to monitor service provision in Tanzania were given during the FGDs and KIs (the consultant added additional information from primary research). In some cases, these models have already been developed by duty bearers:*
 - *The RITA: Registration Insolvency and Trusteeship Agency, provided iPads to the ward level, which they use for entering data reports of number of birth and death in the particular ward. In addition, there is a coordinator who is responsible for registering children under 5 years’ old using smartphones, as well as in dispensaries. When there are errors due to poor internet, the coordinator will later on use data from the book and enter it in the database system.*
 - *WaterAid is an electronic system to pay for water services. Each water point has an electronic mechanism attached, and each community member receives a chip to access water. In order to access water, you need to recharge your chip with money through M-pesa or Tigo pesa, as a pre-paid service. It is sustainable because “it allows the system to self-generate resources; and creates an economic incentive for the district to come and repair when it is not working (...) It is also transparent because the revenue generated with the borehole can be reviewed online.”*
 - *Also, other INGOs have their own monitoring services: “most of the projects that are funded by the USAID have technology in whether reporting or information sharing”. Some examples provided were:*
 - *SwM provides training on how to write letters to elected MPs, to demand accountability. “We conduct research so that once we go at the national level or even*

³³ Morogoro government official.

the regional level to present our cases to the policy makers and the decision-makers we have evidence that is evidence-based endorsement”.

- SwM Dev also uses Akvo Real Simple Reporting System, which offers standardized pricing systems for organisations in the development field. According to SwM, it is not very simple to use, and the organisation gave its local partners “smartphones and training on how to use them but very small percent of them were able to do it”. ARSRS provides different packages, but in its most simple way, provides an app for local partners to collect information. It requires specialised training, and ARSRS offers packages with and without information analysis. As the system has not proven easy to use, they are using other mechanisms: “we have a WhatsApp number, and if our local agents (Mashahidi) have any information or feedback from the field they can send us, and we can have it uploaded into the Akvo system”.
 - The Tanzania Forest Conservation Group, TFCG, has an online system which is called the ODK covering on forest patrol issues, “if the area is being encroached and then they find somebody has encroached the forest for farm or for any other activity, they do take the coordinates and the photo and then they do share. We have stored on the phone; we have distributed one phone for each Village Natural Resource Committee, so they do share those information through that system”.
 - Also, other INGOs have their own monitoring services: “most of the projects that are funded by the USAID have technology in whether reporting or information sharing”. Some use Kobo, others Akvo, other contract national enumerators or research companies.
- Complementary exists with some of the above examples, and in other cases the models are in direct competition”. Some of the complementarities will be explored below in the recommendations section.

Key findings and recommendations:

1. Technology and apps such as DevCheck are not essential for community-based development but have the potential to make it more sustainable by making the process easier and more cost efficient.
2. IA could use projects as SAY to continue to improve DevCheck and develop online training programmes as OERs. The idea of making DevCheck an open resource is good, but some aspects need to be in place to ensure its sustainability, particularly funding to allow technical oversight over the tool and assistance in data management to the local/national teams.
3. In line with the recommendations on ownership, there are opportunities to make the model something that the Tanzanian government can use. For example:
 - a. **The programme can create linkages between Social Auditors, M&E government experts, and CMs/YCCs.** Given the shortage of economic resources for monitoring and evaluation in local areas, the SAY model can become a complementary way for local and regional governments to do M&E in communities in a sustainable way. In order to maintain independence in the model, the Government can give a set contribution to an independent local organisation providing training and a minimum set of funding (for transportation costs) to CMs and YCCs, but the organisation should also request funding from local communities or donations from other private/public donors.

Consultant suggested model: A similar model known by the researcher is the one of Veedores Ciudadanos in Colombia. The Veedores Ciudadanos have very similar characteristics to CMs or YCCs. They are a group of community-based monitors that were trained during the 80s

and 90s, by various donor groups. The CMs/Veedores organised themselves within a national umbrella organisation which receives funding from the national and regional governments, private sector (including private companies providing public services -water, electricity), public and private media (that helps them to showcase some findings) and the international sector. The Veedores have regional and national conferences and workshops, and have developed their own apps, models and SOPs. The organisation under which they currently work was given legislative protection in 2003, which also ensured a minimum funding from the national government and has specific rules regarding the level of support/protection that its members are given.

- b. While SAY exists, efforts can focus on providing training for the communities and expanding the CM model to more localities, as well as introducing local government officials and social auditors to DevCheck and the general model under which SAY works. Joint training with Social Auditors and district M&E experts can be set, in order to agree procedures in which reports from the project can better reach decision makers.
4. There are also complementarities with models being implemented by other INGOs in country, as well as with duty bearers:
- a. Using DFID's leverage, the model could be introduced to other donors and partners operating on the ground, so they can make use of the platform and its CMs. The consultant believes this has already been done, but there might be additional space to do so, given that some of the models applied in the moment are not as simple and/or cost efficient (Akvo).
 - b. The same can be done with duty bearers/service providers (including public and private companies). The model can be offered to these companies as a mechanism to increase their transparency, showcasing good results and improving their customer service. Some of the duty bearers interviewed proposed "a system, to re-communicate directly with the duty bearers, for example, (...) a centralized system where citizens can really raise their issues show that they track changes, you know, track the responsive system, how they have been responded if they have been resolved, if they have not been resolved, there is a high potential, we can go and improve accountability(...) with an anonymous system for reporting issues if the citizens are not comfortable in engagement with their duty bearers".

Several of these models exist under the knowledge of the consultant. Recently she has been working with a Portuguese model now looking to expand to Mozambique, called PortalDaQueixa. This portal works as a free downloadable app which any citizen can use to communicate to around 20 service providers (including gas, electricity, water, phone and internet providers) and/or government institutions. The app allows any citizen or customer to report issues in the provision of their services, including the possibility to upload documents or pictures to increase the evidence-base of their reports. The app is free to use, but requests users to support them voluntarily once their request has been responded to and allows customers to rate on how useful the app was. The app also receives funding from the government organisations and service providers that are part of, but limits participation/funding to 10% of the total budget for the organisation.

5. Beyond the tool there are other areas of the model that seem equally important for sustainability, for example the way that Joint Working Groups are created and used. Both SAY teams, duty bearers and government officials said that the Joint Working Groups created by the programme have worked better than previous mechanisms to bring communities within the decision-making process. "Joint Working Group shows the sustainability of the project. They will continue to work within their community even after the project ends"³⁴.

³⁴ Dodoma Government Officials.

Suggestions from the Morogoro SAY team included the creation of a control group “in other 30 communities when we train communities on how to do when monitoring and helping them to create JWG [joint working group], and then see if that works by itself. You could have a second control group with JWG and DevCheck but without additional support in the last year”. These control groups can help to better understand how essential technology is and review various paths of sustainability.

PART D. Other aspects of sustainability

Guiding questions were: Are there any other factors to consider, e.g. external factors that enable sustainability? Are they specific for the Tanzanian context? Are there other wider insights into IA sustainability research questions, that are not specifically about the SAY programme but can feed into the overall research or the implementation of the project.

- **Accountability projects also need to be accountable: As mentioned by a CM in Dodoma: “sustainability will also depend on having a system to assess, communicate, take decisions and send feedback, if this does not exist the project will die”.**
 - In around 74% of the KIs and FGDs, YCCs, government officials, partners and even CMs disclosed that they did not know the specific mechanisms in which the information that was being reported through DevCheck was being used or said that after various months of being part of the project they had not provided feedback back to the joint working groups or community.
 - YCCs in Dodoma were also unsure about why or how some of the projects they monitor were selected, and some did not agree with the decision.
 - This was mentioned both in the area of ownership and motivation, but it deserves a standalone recommendation as another aspect of sustainability for this project, given the number of comments that generated. This recommendation is also applicable to all accountability programmes, and one of the most commonly cited recommendations in a great part of the DFID’s annual review and project completion reports for accountability programmes in sub-Saharan Africa (see Annexed table).
 - DevCheck includes great graphic mechanisms showing fix rates, problems reported and community reviews. Nonetheless this seems not to be known by the communities or even some of the programme participants.
 - **Recommendations:**
 1. Ensure that CMs know how these feedback processes work and where the information is being collected and request them to train the YCCs, joint working groups and other relevant stakeholders (government officials, community leaders/elders).
 2. If not already planned, do a more in-depth assessment of why some issues/problems reported achieve solutions while others not, and use this “success and failure criteria” to produce new trainings and case studies.
 3. Case stories are already being reported in the programme website, but are you producing short scripts with pictures that can be transmitted back to the CMs and YCCs for them to transmit to their communities?
- **Size of the issues detected, and the geographical areas being monitored:**
 - Two participants of the research mentioned that this accountability model might be sustainable to monitor and solve small projects, as the solution might be “in the hands of the local authorities” or the community itself “could contribute a small amount of money to solve it”. Nonetheless if programmes are larger, the ownership of the solution will be in institutions which be far away and removed from communities, and which without the support of a larger organisation (either national or international) will not be likely to listen or respond to the recommendations.

- Various CMs and YCCs mentioned that the selection of the project being monitored depended on how close the project sites were to the villages, and requests to pay for transportation expenses (or provision of bicycles/motorcycles) were common.
- **Recommendation:**
 4. Within the proposed recommendation #2 include a specific assessment of whether the size of the project, the area being monitored, or the issue detected has an effect in the possibility for it to be solved, and review cases in which the issue was solved to determine success factors.

● **Adaptability:**

- A cross-cutting issue found by the researcher during the review of the information provided, was that even within projects being implemented in small geographical areas, the possibility of adapting training methodologies and SOPs was required. Some adaptability needs and recommendations for further assessment are:
 - Are you adapting training to ensure inclusion of vulnerable populations (women, people with disability)? Are you measuring the efficiency of this gender/vulnerability approach?
 - Have you done a review of power dynamics for the specific communities³⁵ ? Are assessments of power dynamics being done on a regular basis, in order to determine the validity of the original assessment? Are you analysing whether the project is contributing to positive or negative changes in power dynamics? How is the project responding to changes in power dynamics?
 - How is the project adapting in areas where service provision is already using online tools? Can DevCheck adapt to offer these projects better ways to monitor and provide feedback? Can you learn something from those tools?
 - An additional question for the wider sustainability review could also include: what should be IA/Raleigh's role at the end of the project cycle? Are there areas in which their role needs to continue?

Other programme recommendations

- CMs, Government officials, partners and duty bearers mentioned numerous examples of accountability programmes that had been already implemented in the area, including by the same donors. **Are IA and Raleigh you doing enough to learn from previous successes/failures, are you taking advantage of the accountability mechanisms set before? How?**
- "Before the project phases out, the local government and the joint working group should be trained on how to reach the most vulnerable groups, so they feel part of the community. After the project, the local government and the joint working group will still use the techniques they were trained into, to include the three groups in the community projects. The monitors should take the task of including the three groups as part of their daily task to ensure that these people are given equal opportunities"³⁶.
- A suggestion given by some CMs and government officials was whether the same **training provided to YCC could not be set up as a leadership programme in secondary schools**. Given possible issues in terms of duty of care and consent, the researcher suggested reviewing the possibility of providing the training but as a dummy or pilot, that allows the students to provide

³⁵ In Morogoro, YCCs said that "the power and interest tool was useful in order to achieve full representation", but Mufindi CMs were unsure about how these tools worked and its benefit.

³⁶ Dodoma CMs.

feedback regarding school services to the school directors. Many of the CMs and YCCs that were interviewed mentioned that their commitment with volunteering programmes like this came from the school, as they saw the benefits of volunteering (e.g., leadership, empowerment).

- The SAY programme seems to have had issues within its timetable and timing of tasks/activities. YCCs and CMs in Dodoma, Morogoro and Mufindi reported having “spend a lot of time just being idle” at the beginning of the programme (after the selection and training process), and then being given unrealistic deadlines to deliver tasks, with not sufficient time in advance to be able to plan properly. They also reported that timelines were set and a mechanism to “negotiate” these timetables was not available. **Does IA/Raleigh understand the reasons behind this issue? Are there mechanisms to ensure this is not repeated?**
- **Community leaders and even YCCs were confused about what project they were actually delivering.** Many YCCs in Dodoma and Morogoro seemed to think that they were part of water/infrastructure projects, and thus when asked the questions about sustainability, provided recommendations for the project they monitored and not for the SAY programme. Even after corrections from the field research team, the confusion persisted in some cases. **Can this be requested in order to ensure higher ownership of the programme?**
- Related to the above issue, the CMs monitoring the “Shahidi wa Maji”³⁷ project, were unsure about whether monitoring a monitoring project was not just a duplication of efforts, and even enquired then who was monitoring the SAY programme. **Is there any reason to monitor a water monitoring programme? Is SAY looking for specific complementarities with this project? In this case should not this be explained to the CMs.**

³⁷ **Shahidi wa Maji** is a Tanzanian Civil Society Organisation dedicated to sustainability, equity and accountability in water resource management.