

# EVALUATION REPORT

UHSIANO-UNGO COOPERATION PROJECT:

CAPACITY BUILDING OF NGOs WORKING IN  
MOROGORO REGION 2004-2013

Evaluation team: Oona Timonen and Wulystan Mtega

## ABSTRACT in English

This report presents an evaluation results for the nine-year *Capacity Building* project for the NGOs working in Morogoro region. The project was funded by the Finish Foreign Ministry under the UNGO-Uhusiano partnership. The objective of the project was to strengthen the Tanzanian civil society and the quality of NGO work in Morogoro region thus contributing to reduction of poverty. Specifically, the project built capacity and improved the quality of performance of NGOs in Morogoro region, UNGO, Uhusiano and Uhusiano's member organizations. The project aimed at increasing the cooperation, networking and information flow between different stakeholders in Tanzania, in Finland and between the two countries as well as to establish functioning Information Resource Centre for NGOs in Morogoro. Qualitative approaches were used to assess the impacts of the project to beneficiaries. Findings show that despite the several challenges, the nine-year project has been successfully implemented. District networks and the IRC have been developed; and the level of information sharing and networking has increased. NGOs in Morogoro region have been empowered in areas of bookkeeping, ICTs, project planning and fundraising. Poor communication, lack of commitment among some few member organizations and staff, incompetence and financial problems has been limiting the realization of the intended outcomes. Limited mutual understanding of social cultural aspects surrounding the partners also affected the level of achievement. Generally, the capacity building of UNGO and her member NGOs has been successful. UNGO today is very different to what it was in 2004 in terms of capacity, number of members and recognisability. Beneficiaries of the project have nowadays more information about organizations and more knowledge capacity to run them. It seems that the project has also had a general impact on how the NGO's and civil society is seen in Morogoro. Information sharing about important topics concerning civil society has also increased general awareness within the public. The project has on its own part contributed to a possible change in Tanzanian society, even though the effects on such long term big changes as poverty reduction, the impact of an individual project is difficult to define. The only major challenge of UNGO is how to transform the plans and ideas into tangible outputs, that is, to implement. It is recommended that the level of international networking should be increased as currently it is very low and limited mostly only Uhusiano-UNGO relationship. District networks are still weak, they need capacity building in terms of training and financial support that they may acquire premises for offices and reduce rent costs. Networks which were not included in the UHUSIANO – UNGO project need more support; they can hardly empower their member NGOs as they do not have capacity to do so. For improved empowerment, small-scale resource centers should be established at district networks. The IRC need to have fund raising strategies and most of all ensure that they are implemented. In transforming the IRC into a full income generating centre it is important to analysis the needs of the society before embarking on providing some services. UNGO offices need to shift to the newly acquired building. The building can accommodate most UNGO executives as some of the IRC services may be provided in town. Instead of hiring offices for UNGO, they should hire rooms for the IRC income generating activities. This will sustain both UNGO and the IRC. Uhusiano should consider possibilities of serving all the Finnish NGOs doing cooperation in Tanzania, not limited to Morogoro region.

## ABSTRACT in Finnish

Tämä raportti esittää yhdeksänvuotisen, *Kansalaisjärjestöjen Kapasiteetin vahvistaminen Morogoron alueella* –hankkeen loppuarvioinnin tulokset. Hanke suunniteltiin ja implementoitiin Tansanialaisen UNGO:n ja suomalaisen Uhusianon yhteistyönä. Hanke oli Suomen Ulkoministeriön tukema. Hankkeen tavoite oli vahvistaa tansanialaista kansalaisyhteiskuntaa ja kansalaisjärjestöjen työtä Morogoron alueella ja tukea tätä kautta köyhyyden vähentämistä. Hanke pyrki vahvistamaan UNGO:n, UNGO:n jäsenjärjestöjen sekä Uhusianon ja Uhusianon jäsenjärjestöjen kapasiteettia. Hanke pyrki lisäämään yhteistyötä, verkottumista ja tiedon jakoa eri hyödynsaajien välillä Tansaniassa, Suomessa ja näiden maiden välillä. Lisäksi hanke pyrki perustamaan toimivan Morogoron alueen kansalaisjärjestöjä palvelevan resurssikeskuksen. Hankkeen vaikutuksia hyödynsaajille arvioitiin kvalitatiivisen lähestymistavan kautta. Evaluaation tulokset osoittavat että huolimatta useista haasteista, yhdeksänvuotinen hanke on toteutettu pääosin onnistuneesti. Alueverkostot ja informaatio- ja resurssikeskus on perustettu, informaation jakaminen ja verkottuminen on lisääntynyt. Kansalaisjärjestöt Morogoron alueella ovat voimaantuneet ja uusia taitoja kirjanpidossa, hankesuunnittelussa sekä varainkeruussa on omaksuttu. Yleisesti ottaen, UNGO:n ja UNGO:n jäsenten kapasiteetin vahvistaminen on onnistunut. UNGO:n kapasiteetti, jäsenten määrä sekä tunnettavuus ovat kasvaneet vuodesta 2004. Hankkeen hyödynsaajilla on nykyään enemmän ymmärrystä järjestöistä ja tietotaitoa hallita ja johtaa niitä. Hankkeen yleinen saavutus on, että se on osaltaan mahdollistanut kansalaisaktiivisuuden Morogoron alueella. Informaation jakaminen tärkeistä kansalaisyhteiskuntaa koskevista aiheista on myös kasvattanut yleistä tietoisuutta sidosryhmien keskuudessa. Voidaan sanoa, että hanke on omalta osaltaan vaikuttanut mahdolliseen muutokseen Tansaniassa, vaikkakin hankkeen vaikutukset suuriin pitkänajan muutoksiin kuten köyhyyden vähentämiseen on vaikea määrittää. Hanke kohtasi kuitenkin myös monia haasteita ja monet hankkeen suunnitellut vaikutukset jäivät toteutumatta. Heikko yhteydenpito ja tiedonvälitys, sitoutuneisuuden puute sekä epäpätevyys henkilökunnan sekä joidenkin jäsenjärjestöjen osalta sekä viivästykset ja rahalliset haasteet ovat rajoittaneet joidenkin tulosten saavuttamista. Molempipuolinen rajallinen kulttuurinen ja yhteiskunnallinen ymmärrys on myös omalta osaltaan vaikuttanut hankkeen saavutuksiin. UNGO:n suurin haaste on varsinainen implementointi, eli kuinka muuttaa hyvät suunnitelmat ja ideat konkreettisiksi toimiksi. Evaluaatioraportti suosittelee, että verkottumista Suomen ja Tansanian välillä tulisi laajentaa, sillä tällä hetkellä se on rajoittunut lähinnä Uhusiano-UNGO suhteeseen. Alueverkostot ovat yhä heikkoja ja tarvitsevat kapasiteetin vahvistusta koulutusten ja rahoituksen muodossa, jotta he voivat saada omat toimistotilat ja vähentää tilavuokrien kustannuksia. Verkostot, jotka eivät olleet mukana UNGO-Uhusiano hankkeen piirissä tarvitsevat tukea koska heillä ei nykyisillä resursseilla ole kapasiteettia voimaannuttaa jäseniään. Pienien resurssikeskusten perustamista aluekeskuksiin tulisi harkita. Informaatio- ja resurssikeskuksen tulisi päivittää varainkeruusuunnitelmansa jäsenten esittämien ehdotusten perusteella ja varmistaa suunnitelmien implementointi. Ympäröivän yhteisön tarpeita IRC:n suhteen tulisi kuunnella tarkemmin ennen palveluiden tarjoamisen aloittamista. UNGO:n toimiston tulisi muuttaa projektin hankkimiin toimistotiloihin IRC-rakennukseen. IRC-rakennuksessa on tilaa UNGO:n johdolle, kun osa IRC:n palveluista siirretään kaupungin keskusta. Sen sijaan, että toimistotiloja vuokrataan UNGO:lle, niitä tulisi vuokrata IRC:n tulonhankintaa varten. Nämä ratkaisut parantavat sekä UNGO:n että IRC:n kestävyttä. Uhusianon tulisi harkita laajenemista palvelemaan kaikkia suomalaisia Tansaniassa toimivia kansalaisjärjestöjä, ei vain Morogoron alueelle keskittyviä.

# CONTENTS

<b>ABSTRACT IN ENGLISH</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>ABSTRACT IN FINNISH</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. THE EVALUATED DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTION</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 PARTNERS	7
2.2 THE PROJECT	9
2.3 LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROJECT	10
<b>3. BACKGROUND TO THE EVALUATION</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1 PURPOSE AND AIMS	12
3.2 METHODOLOGY	13
3.3 LIMITATIONS	13
<b>4. KEY FINDINGS</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1 EVALUATION ISSUES STUDIED	14
4.2 SPECIFIC ISSUES STUDIED	22
<b>5. COMPATIBILITY AND COHERENCE</b>	<b>29</b>
5.1 GENDER EQUALITY	30
5.2 REDUCING INEQUALITY	30
5.3 SOCIO-CULTURAL ASPECTS	30
5.4 ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE SUSTAINABILITY	31
5.5 GOOD GOVERNANCE, DEMOCRACY AND HUMAN RIGHTS	31
5.6 FINNISH VALUE ADDED	31
5.7 POVERTY ALLEVIATION	32
<b>6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>32</b>
6.1 CONCLUSIONS	32
6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	34
6.3 LESSONS LEARNED	36
<b>ANNEXES</b>	<b>38</b>
ANNEX 1 LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED	38
ANNEX 2 QUESTIONNAIRE	40
ANNEX 3 TERMS OF REFERENCE	42
ANNEX 4 REALISED TIMETABLE OF EVALUATION WORK	48
ANNEX 5 FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE EVALUATION	53

## ABBREVIATIONS

BOCAR – Building Organisational Capacity and Results  
CSO – Civil Society Organisation  
KIUNGONET – Kilombero district network  
MFA - Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland  
MORNGONET - Morogoro Rural Network  
MOC - Mvomero Organizations Coalition  
MKUKUTA- National Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy  
NGO - Non-governmental organizations  
SNV – Netherlands Development Organization  
UNGOKI – Kilosa district network  
UNGOU - Ulanga district network

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report investigates the nine-year project *Capacity Building of NGOs working in Morogoro region* that is done in cooperation with Uhusiano from Finland and UNGO from Tanzania. The objective of the project is to strengthen the Tanzanian civil society and the quality of NGO work in Morogoro region. In the long run the projects overall objective is expected to broaden also to reduction of poverty.

Specifically the purpose of the project was to build capacity and improve the quality of performance of NGOs in Morogoro region, UNGO, Uhusiano and Uhusiano's member organizations. Other objectives were increased cooperation, networking and information flow between different stakeholders in Tanzania, in Finland and between the two countries as well as to establish functioning information and resource centre for NGOs in Morogoro. Through these actions the project aimed for sustainable, high quality development cooperation projects in the region of Morogoro. The project received funding from the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs first for six years starting from 2004 and additional funding for three more years in 2011-2013.

Evaluation commissioner was Uhusiano in partnership with UNGO. Evaluation process took place mainly in Morogoro, Tanzania on September-November 2013. The evaluation team consisted of a Tanzanian and a Finnish member. It was based on interviews and focused group discussion with the member NGOs of UNGO, current and former executives of UNGO and Uhusiano, IRC staff, District network representatives and other key stakeholders such as representatives from Local Government, Steering Committee and KEPAT Tanzania. The approach used was qualitative, descriptive analysis and not academic study as such. The findings and recommendations should work as an instrument for further learning for both of the partners as well as the other stakeholders.

The project *Capacity Building of NGOs working in Morogoro region* is in line with the Finnish as well as the Tanzanian Development Policies. The project is also compatible with the crosscutting issues of Finnish Development cooperation, such as gender equality, poverty alleviation, environment and climate sustainability, socio-cultural aspects as well as Good Governance, democracy and Human Rights.

The Information and Resource Centre component of the project faced many challenges on the way, including delayed construction work, staff turnover, challenges in fundraising and changed

demand of IT services, among others. These challenges decreased to some extent project's efficiency. A lot of energy and resources were put to IRC, without the full potential of the fundraising actualizing which the centre was meant to work for in the first place. Also the main beneficiary group, that of the NGO members, has not really found the centre and its services. With current level of income generated by the IRC, the sustainability of the centre without outside support is questionable. However, the demand for IRC is still there and the members as well as other stakeholder's need for functioning IRC do exists.

A recommended future approach for the IRC is to: a. listen carefully the needs of the members b. involve members more to the fundraising of the centre c. turn the centre to a central information sharing unit between CSOs and government d. move UNGO to the same premises with IRC f. distribute some of its activities closer to potential users.

Improved capacity of the local partner is a valuable end in itself and it seems that in this the project has succeeded. Since the start of the project in 2004, UNGO has been growing in memberships and has gained broad recognition. The effect of the project in this is plausible although difficult to measure in exact terms.

The establishment of UNGO's district networks is the credit of the project, and since then districts have received trainings that got mostly positive feedback. However, the access to information of the districts should be greatly enhanced.

In general, training and networking component of the project has been very relevant and also sustainable, since the skills and contacts once obtained will more or less remain. There was also a general mind-set change observed in some of the beneficiaries towards more volunteerism spirit and understanding the meaning of networking and sharing in the civil society sector as well as appreciating capacity building in other means than monetary wise.

The cooperation between the partners has been fruitful in the light of the above mentioned outputs. However, it has also faced some challenges, which mainly culminated in some communication issues. The lesson learned from this is that partnership need not only time to develop in the beginning but it should be fostered strongly throughout the cooperation, especially when the staff changes take place.

Both UNGO and Uhusiano have plenty of strengths and they need to take into careful consideration on how to make the most of them, while at the same time finding ways to diminish their weaknesses. Both organisations need to find ways to support their valuable volunteering efforts with employed staff to make the organisations run efficiently and attract more resources. They also need to scrutinize their necessity to run own projects as umbrella organisations.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The evaluation of all development projects is important in terms of accountability to the beneficiaries as well as organizations, institutions and funders involved. Keeping this general goal in mind, the purpose of this final evaluation is to evaluate the UNGO-Uhusiano project since the beginning of the project in 2004 until the final year 2013. The aim is to assess what has been achieved and how effectively the resources have been used as well as to comment on the lessons learned throughout the project years. The evaluation assesses specific evaluation issues such as relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact of the project to beneficiaries as well as specific questions concerning the activities of the project such as Information and Resource Centre, support to UNGOs district networks and training and networking in Tanzania as well as in Finland. Projects compatibility with the different crosscutting issues of Finnish Foreign Ministry's development policy is also assessed.

Special emphasis is put on the sustainability and recommendations concerning the future of IRC as was indicated in the Terms of Reference. This includes assessing the past performance in fundraising activities and services to members as well as scrutinizing the future potentiality of the centre in fundraising and service provision. Outside from the evaluation ToR, the evaluators found the issue of communication to be relevant to be included to the analysis as well as to give brief considerations of the both partners organizational development and future.

The aims and efforts as well as successes and failures are analyzed by the best ability of the evaluation team. It is the hope of the evaluation team that this evaluation report will provide useful information and function as a practical tool in the future planning of the partners in question and gives suggestions and ideas also to other stakeholders.

The end users of the evaluation will be UNGO with its members, Uhusiano with its members, NGO liaison unit of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Embassy of Finland in Dar es Salaam.

Respectively, it should be freely distributed to supporters and members of the partner organizations as well as to taxpayers in Finland and public in Tanzania. The proper distribution of the report is a responsibility of each partner organization, Uhusiano and UNGO.

As methods of analysis the evaluation team used document review of project documents, which they had an access to; such as project plans, annual plans, quarterly reports, budgets and plan of actions. Participative interviews and focused group discussions were used as important source of information. Questionnaires were sent to key stakeholders and interviewees who were harder to reach by other means or because of time limits. The evaluators made also use of a general method of participative observation in meetings and seminar that were taken place at the time of the fieldwork.

## 2. THE EVALUATED DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTION

### 2.1 Partners

#### *Uhusiano*

Uhusiano is a Finnish NGO that was established in 1990 as a result of Finnish-Tanzanian workshop held in Finland in 1989. Its original purpose as an umbrella organization was to coordinate its member organizations development projects in Tanzania, particularly in Morogoro region. By the time of its establishment, the Tanzanian civil society sector was still in its birth suite and the Tanzanian partners for Uhusiano were mainly villages, churches and even single persons because there were no Tanzanian NGOs.

In the years 1989-1995 Uhusiano's projects concerned vocational training, such as supporting Tanzanian students in Finnish vocational schools and planning Tushikamane vocational training centre project. In 1991-1993 Uhusiano was also concerned on health care and established a dispensary in Tangeni, Morogoro rural.

In 1995 Uhusiano started a project named, *Education and Evaluation*. The first three years of the project concerned training courses for health workers and during this time the project also employed a Tanzanian coordinator. Coming to 1990s, the project environment in Tanzania had

changed significantly, since the number of Tanzanian NGO's had grown enormously. Because of this, Uhusiano made an initiative to establish Finnish organization KEPA and its field office in Tanzania and started to target its training to NGO members. KEPA took over much of the coordinating work done by Uhusiano until then.

UNGO took gradually the responsibility of organising NGO trainings funded by the *Education and evaluation* -project. In 2004 Uhusiano and UNGO started together a project named *Capacity building of NGO's in Morogoro region*, which is the focus of this evaluation.

Today Uhusiano has 80 individual members and 8 member associations. As part of the project activities in Finland, Uhusiano has been arranging trainings for its Finnish members. These so called Uhusiano seminars are arranged annually. Uhusiano has also been publishing a newsletter, which purpose is to disseminate information of Tanzanian and Finnish development cooperation, projects of the member NGOs and about Tanzania and it's socio-cultural aspects in general.

UNGO is Uhusiano's only partner organization in Tanzania and their joint project is Uhusiano's only own project in Tanzania.

## **UNGO**

UNGO (Union of Non-governmental organizations in Morogoro), Uhusiano's Tanzanian partner organization was established in 1998. UNGO provides services, information and networking possibilities for the NGOs in Morogoro region. Uhusiano and UNGO signed their first cooperation agreement in 2000.

Today UNGO is a known umbrella organization in Morogoro and has an acknowledged role also nationally. It has 210 member organizations and 5 district networks (Morogoro Rural (MORNGONET), Mvomero (Mvomero Organizations Coalition-MOC), Kilosa (UNGOKI), Kilombero (KIUNGONET) AND Ulanga (UNGOU). UNGOs member organizations vary from small rural CBOs to big, organised and registered NGOs placed in Morogoro town. Areas the member NGOs work with are varied, including HIV/AIDS; environmental issues; education; the rights of disabled, women and orphans; culture; and community beekeeping among others. Few UNGO members have projects with Finnish NGOs.

UNGO has also other national and international cooperation partners including KEPA Tanzania, SNV (Netherlands Development Organization), FCS (Foundation of Civil Society), University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM), Research and Poverty Alleviation (REPOA), WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature) and Pact Tanzania/ USAID.

### ***Roles of the partners***

Uhusiano and UNGO have a memorandum of cooperation, which clarifies the roles of each party. These cooperation agreements have been renewed after every three years and a new agreement has been made for every three years sub-project.

Since the first phase of the project (2004-06), UNGO has been responsible for implementing the project activities in Tanzania. Planning of the activities and project has been made jointly. Uhusiano has been responsible for implementing the project activities in Finland. UNGO Executive Committee has taken the overall responsibility of the project implementation and monitoring in Tanzania. The projects everyday activities and preparing the monthly, quarterly and annual reports has been the responsibility of an project officer; IT- training, maintenance and technical support and services have been the responsibility of an IT technician. Both of these positions are employed and paid by the project.

The IRC has also had a Steering committee, which has had an advisory role. It has been consisting of the representatives of UNGO, Kupa Tanzania, local government authorities, UNGO member organizations and resource team, Uhusiano representatives and sometimes also other UNGO partner organization representatives.

The financial management and bookkeeping for activities in Tanzania has been the responsibility of UNGO for several years. Monthly financial reports and quarterly narrative reports were sent to Uhusiano. Uhusiano has been responsible for financial management for project activities in Finland and for monitoring the project proceedings in Tanzania.

## 2.2 The project

The project *Capacity building of NGO's working in Morogoro region* arose from previous cooperation between UNGO and Uhusiano during Education and Evaluation project.

The project overall objective was to strengthen the Tanzanian civil society and the quality of NGO work in Morogoro region. In the long run the projects overall objective was also to contribute to reduction of poverty.

The immediate objective was to strengthen the capacity of UNGO and its member NGOs in Morogoro town as well as the district networks in Morogoro region. The project had as its aim to increase cooperation, networking and information flow and to have high quality development cooperation projects in Morogoro region with sustainable results. UNGO and Uhusiano mutually planned to do this by improving information dissemination from North to South as well as between Southern organizations and between Northern organizations, strengthening the partnership and networking between Northern and Southern NGOs, training of trainers (in the first and second phase), improving fundraising and establishing functioning information and resource centre for NGOs in Morogoro.

In addition to actions in Tanzania, the project was also to build the capacity and improve the quality of performance of Uhusiano and Uhusiano's member organizations in Finland. This was done in order to achieve synergy and good quality development cooperation projects in Tanzania, especially Morogoro.

The project was funded by Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs first for six years and there after it received additional funding for three more years.

The project has had three phases that took place in years 2004-2006, 2007-2009 and 2011-2013. In a year 2010 the project hold still because Uhusiano did not receive funding it had applied from Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The main activities during these phases have been the following:

**Phase 1.** During the first three-year period of the project **2004-2006**, Information and Resource Centre (IRC) was established. It functioned in same offices with Kupa Tanzania and received also support from it. Other activities included information sharing and training through seminars (in Morogoro and Finland), training of trainers (IT skills, project management and fundraising). Also equipment for IRC was purchased and the salary of project officer, IT expert and receptionist was paid from the project funds.

**Phase 2.** During **2007-2009** the training of trainers continued (bookkeeping, fund raising, project planning) and more office materials, equipment and furniture was purchased. IT class was improved and used for fundraising (IT courses, internet and secretarial services) as was the small kiosk as well. The salary of project officer, IT assistant and receptionist was paid and car and

motorbike were purchased to make it easier for UNGO to reach all its members of whom some are situated far from the Morogoro municipality. During this phase three of the UNGO district networks were established to help spread information to small local organizations in districts. These district networks were supported from the project several ways including paying their office rents, purchasing office equipment, furniture and bicycles for transport. They were also provided mobile phones and one network (MORGONET) received a solar power system. In 2008 a plot and a building were purchased for IRC to better its sustainability. The premises needed renovation that took place in 2009.

**Phase 3.** Activities of the last years **2011-2013** have included finishing the renovation of the IRC premises and moving IRC activities there. Salaries of the project officer, IT assistant and receptionist have been paid and visitations and discussion forums in District networks have been supported. There have also been annual NGO seminars in both Morogoro and Finland and Uhusianos newsletter has been published. Because these last three years aim at Uhusianos phasing out and handing the project over to UNGO, the project budget has been smaller than earlier.

## **2.3 Legal framework for the project**

### ***2.31 Tanzanian NGO policy***

#### **National policies of Tanzania**

Tanzania's vision (Development Vision 2025) is to become a middle-income country of diversified and semi-industrialised economy with substantial industrial sector comparable to typical middle-income countries and little dependence on external funding. Tanzania's national development plan is based on two frameworks. Firstly, the National Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy II 2010–2015 (MKUKUTA II) and the Zanzibar Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty II 2010–2015 (MKUZA II), and secondly, the Five Year Development Plan (FYDP 2011/12–2015/16). The main challenge is how to make growth more inclusive and environmentally and socially sustainable. It is at this point the Tanzanian government has decided to incorporate the Private Public Sector Partnership where the NGOs are considered to be very important development partners.

#### **NGO- policies**

According to the National NGO Policy of Tanzania (2002), Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) are recognized by government as potent forces for social and economic development; important partners in nation building and national development; valuable forces in promoting the qualitative and quantitative development of democracy and not least, important contributors to GNP. The Government of Tanzania recognizes the need to work together with NGOs and the need for such cooperation to extend to other key players, including funders, disadvantaged people themselves, other sectors of civil society and the wider public. NGOs have themselves been re-examining and evaluating their work, re-defining their roles, whom they serve and are accountable to, and endeavouring to function more effectively and efficiently. The Government and other stakeholders recognize the fact that at this point of our development process, NGOs are partners in development and that an enabling environment be put in place for them to operate and thrive.

According to the National NGO Policy of Tanzania (2002), Tanzania has both local and international NGOs; they deal with gender, human rights, environment, advocacy, participatory development etc. All of them have been assisting in strengthening the civil society through

informing and educating the public on various issues, for example, their legal rights or entitlements to services or by helping attune to Government Policies.

In Morogoro region the number of NGOs has gone beyond 500. These NGOs support the government through working directly with the grass root community by addressing diverse issues ranging from lobbying, advocacy and human rights to service provision thus contributing towards transforming the livelihoods of local communities in Morogoro, particularly those who are disadvantaged. According to the Tanzanian NGO ACT of 2002, each Non Governmental Organization shall have the duty to respect the laws governing its operations and respect the culture and traditions of the people and communities in which it operates unless such culture and traditions are contrary to any other written law. NGOs under UNGO have been adhering to these restrictions too.

### ***2.32 Finnish Development Cooperation and Civil Society support***

All the development interventions supported by Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFA) should be in line with the principles of Finnish development cooperation. Currently, the main guidelines that should be considered in the development interventions of the NGOs are based on Development Policy Action Plan, Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA), a country strategy of the intervention country and Guidelines for Civil Society in Development Policy.

In general, Finland's development cooperation emphasises commitment to poverty reduction, combating global threats to environment and to promoting social equality, democracy and human rights as elements of sustainable development. The cross-cutting issues (see chapter 5) are considered as essential for safeguarding sustainability of all other development efforts.

The guiding principle in Finland's development cooperation is that external assistance cannot be a substitute for the partner country's own national resources. Instead, development assistance is meant to serve as catalyst for development, where government, private sector, communities and individuals take the lead into their own hands.

Finland's **Development Policy Action Plan** that entered into force in 2012 has at its primary goal to eradicate poverty in accordance with the UN Millennium Development Goals. Activities for poverty eradication focus on 1) a democratic and responsible society that promotes human rights, 2) a socially inclusive and jobs-providing green economy, 3) sustainable management and use of natural resources and environmental protection, as well as 4) human development.

In 2003 Finland adopted the **Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA)** for the development, which is confirmed in the government resolution of 2004 on official development policy. The rights based approach was adopted as a basic principle of Finland's development policy and should be the guideline in all the development interventions. HRBA is closely linked to the crosscutting themes that will be discussed in Chapter 5 in this report.

Finland has a specific **Country strategy** for each main development cooperation partner country. Tanzania is Finland's longest standing partner country in development cooperation and biggest receiver of development cooperation funds. Finland's new (2013-2016) main goals for the development partnership with Tanzania specifically are good governance and equally distributed public services, sustainable management of natural resources and participative, sustainable and employment enhancing growth.

Country Strategy (CS) for Development cooperation with Tanzania approaches the promotion of human rights from a broad perspective. It aims to promote the rights and access of people to land, natural resources, food, decent livelihoods, employment as well as basic services. Equity and

climate change are dealt with as strongly interconnected issues since the poorest are also the most vulnerable to suffer from climatic changes.

CS calls for openness in natural resources management to be able to increase people's awareness and rights. It also aims to enhance particularly the rights and status of women and youth, minorities, people with disabilities and other marginalised groups through dialogue and targeted interventions. Special attention is paid to gender equality and the status of women. Simultaneously, Good governance, the rule of law and participatory development will be promoted by means of political dialogue and designated interventions.

In addition to above mentioned development cooperation guidelines, MFA has also principles and **guidelines for civil society organizations doing development cooperation**. The work of the CSOs is supposed to strengthen the basic structures of democracy by supporting local free and independent civil society activities in developing countries.

Grassroots-level cooperation and small-scale projects are encouraged by MFA due to their potentiality in involving the poorest population groups.

One meaning of locating MFAs funds through civil society actors is also to expand contacts at the civil society-level in developing countries beyond the official channels and to foster and support volunteer civic action and cultural exchange.

MFA has certain requirements for Finnish NGOs receiving development cooperation funds directed through civil society organizations. They have to have adequate expertise for implementing projects and clear organizational objectives. The implementation has to be realistic and fit to both Finnish and foreign partners capacity. Project support for CSOs should be based on local initiative and the Finnish NGO is expected to have a partner NGO from the target country that is in charge for the implementation of the project. In addition, the local initiatives should be aimed at improving the rights of the most marginalized parts of the population and to increase their possibilities for participation.

### 3. BACKGROUND TO THE EVALUATION

#### 3.1 Purpose and Aims

As an evaluation type, this is a *final project evaluation*. The evaluation's purpose is to function on the other hand as a learning tool to the partners and other stakeholders and on the other hand it works as basis for accountability.

The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project *Capacity Building of NGOs working in Morogoro region 2004-2013*.

The evaluation process strived for independence and impartiality. The evaluation team believes that information collected for this report is credible and objective and hopes it will be useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both partners and beneficiaries. The evaluation team has the final responsibility of the content. The views and conclusions are those of the evaluators and not those of the MFA.

The evaluation team consisted of two persons with different thematic knowledge, the team was gender balanced and it had representatives from both Finland and Tanzania.

The contractors (Uhusiano and UNGO) are responsible for sharing and disseminating the evaluation report for all the stakeholders concerned.

### 3.2 Methodology

The evaluation was based on a qualitative analysis of achievements made throughout the nine years project lifetime. Descriptive reviews of documented impacts, problems and short comings were analysed to determine the current status of the project. The Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) approach was used determine the effectiveness and efficiency of both UNGO and the IRC. In-depth interviews, focus group discussions, documentary reviews and observation were used for collecting data. The approach used was qualitative, descriptive analysis and not academic study as such, as indicated by the ToR.

The evaluation involved several groups of respondents including the present and retired UNGO and UHUSIANO executives, IRC staff (Current and retired), three district networks, UNGO resource team member, government official, and representatives from NGOs. Emails, phone calls and face to face communication were used for contacting respondents. Uhusiano representatives were mainly interviewed through questionnaire from Tanzania.

The evaluation involved the review of corporate plans, fundraising plans, action plans, strategic plan, annual general meeting reports and steering committee meeting reports. Others reviewed were the project plan, budgets, financial reports, IRC reports and Agreements.

Both UNGO and UHUSIANO helped to identify people to be involved interviews. The rate of response was affected by unwillingness among some people to attend in the interview and poor cooperation from some of the district networks. The questionnaire was sent through email or personally handed to 36 people (KEPA personnel, UNGO member NGO representatives and Uhusiano members) of whom 18 returned the questionnaire filled. A total of **44 people** were interviewed either by questionnaire or through interviews.

### 3.3 Limitations

Like all evaluations, also this evaluation process had some limitations that deserve to be acknowledged.

An evaluation of a project as broad as this would have needed more time to pursue thoroughly. In addition, the actual time reserved for the evaluation process was unclear and changed also when the evaluation fieldwork was already in process. This made the planning and scheduling of the evaluation process challenging.

The lack of communication between partners brought about delays and uncertainty and due to this all stakeholders were not informed early enough and jointly agreed contracts were missing while the fieldwork was already supposed to be on its way. There were also some different perceptions of the responsibilities of each stakeholder in the evaluation process and different perceptions or non-awareness from the side of the local partner of the budget available for evaluation, which led to some misunderstandings. Due to delays and changed schedule, in the end the teams other responsibilities made evaluation planning and implementation of activities together as a team challenging. That is why several parts of the activities were to be divided with only one member of the team implementing and later briefing the other one.

Also due to time limits and delays on the way, the team had to rely much on questionnaire form while interviewing. However, perhaps more informative information would have been gathered through using more such methods as group interviews.

Reaching all the informants was time-consuming and some potential interviewees were unavailable or not cooperative for interviews, which is why some perhaps relevant insights from them were not included in this evaluation report. Evaluation team was also compelled to use relatively much time on secondary activities and logistics.

Some essential information, especially from UNGO's actions during previous years was unable to be gathered for evaluation purposes, due to unfortunate computer distortions and limited organizational record keeping. Certain background material such as Baseline information and monitoring material would have helped to make a more profound analysis. This is especially so, because the planned mid-term evaluation of the project could not take place in year 2010 which would have been an important tool to review the achievements of the project up till then.

A lack of certain indicators further limited the evaluation process. Indeed, set indicators for the project, formed in the beginning of the project that would describe project objectives in a more operational and measurable terms would have made the evaluation more reliable. For example, that IRC exists is a result achieved by the project but what are the user rates that the project needs in order to achieve the objective of increased information sharing and networking, were not set in the beginning of the project, or those documents were unavailable to evaluation team. The same lack of set indicators concerns the immediate objective of the project, that of the strengthening of the capacity of UNGO and its member NGOs.

## 4. KEY FINDINGS

### 4.1 Evaluation issues studied

#### *4.1.1 Relevance*

During the three phases of cooperation the main agenda was to strengthen the capacity of NGOs working in Morogoro region and those under the UHUSIANO. This was done through improving the institutional capacity and organizational development of UNGO, its member organizations and district networks and increasing the cooperation, networking and information flow (north-south, south-south, north-north) among partners. It was also done through establishing a functioning information and resource centre for NGOs in Morogoro. The projects enhanced quality development cooperation projects with sustainable results in Morogoro region.

The first phase of this project implemented between the year 2004 and 2006 involved the establishment of the Information Resource Centre (IRC). During this phase capacity building through training workshops and seminars was conducted. This aimed at strengthening institutional and individual capacity towards poverty reduction and social well being which are the main agendas of NGOs in Tanzania. To facilitate capacity building, the IRC was equipped with equipment needed for information sharing and Information and Communication Technology literacy training. For increased multiplier effect, training of trainers on IT skills, bookkeeping, project management and fundraising were conducted. Skills acquired through trainings were important for day-to-day activities of the local communities.

Through this project the district networks have been established, supported and strengthened. This has also been through training of trainers on fundraising, bookkeeping and project planning. The support was through paying rent for office and acquiring more office materials, equipment and furniture. The project supported discussion forums, seminars and dialogues on various topical issues. To reduce office renting costs, a premise was acquired through UHUSIANO support.

Generally, project activities implemented through the UNGO-UHUSIANO partnership aimed at improving the livelihoods of local communities. This is in line with the Tanzania's poverty eradication strategies which are implemented in both rural and urban areas. The project is also in line with the development policies of Finland in that ultimately it strives to strengthen democracy and poverty reduction and it is strongly supporting local Tanzanian civil society. The project is relevant to the Tanzanian beneficiaries, considering their needs in capacity development especially in the projects starting from the early years when the NGO sector was growing fast but with limited skills and knowledge.

The project's focus in Finland in coordinating the Finnish NGOs work in Morogoro is also very relevant to Finnish beneficiaries (Uhusiano member NGOs) of the project. Coordination and increased cooperation of the civil society actors is supported by MFA guidelines for civil society organizations doing development cooperation.

#### **4.12 Efficiency**

Comparing the resources committed and the tangible and intangible outputs, the project has been satisfactory. Moreover, basing on the fact that most of the activities were conducted on volunteer basis, the outcome of the nine years project is good. The project has had an effect on the livelihoods of local communities and contributed positively towards poverty reduction and social wellbeing.

Among the major outcomes of the project is the **IRC**. The centre is functional in terms of facilities, despite being still donor dependent. The renovation of the IRC building has been successful though it still needs some more financial resources for further renovation. The types of services offered at the centre were promoted but still at the time of the evaluation, not known by people living even around the centre. The location of the centre has to some extent affected its income generating role as it is located out of the centre of the town thus making its reach somehow difficult among potential customers. Moreover, the internet service provided by the centre is no longer viable due to technological changes. Furthermore, the size of the building is relatively small to accommodate both UNGO and the IRC. All in all, the IRC activity in terms of technical preparations, increased renovation costs, changing staff, delays and turn downs on moving to new premises took comparatively too much resources and time altogether. The resources put to IRC have not yet turned into intended outputs, especially in terms of NGO members using the centre for special NGO activities and information sharing as it was meant to be.

The UNGO executives moving to new premises would make the centre more known and active but their moving has been delayed because of the delays in renovation and in reality is unlikely to happen due to aforementioned small size of the building.

UNGO and UHUSIANO executives have been volunteering and some of them working on daily basis. This has contributed a lot to the success of the partnership. In Morogoro, the 2011 – 2013 UNGO executives have managed to build a high level of volunteerism and entrepreneurial spirit among members, this has equally contributed the current success UNGO and UHUSIANO are celebrating for. Despite this strong success, poor working relationship and misunderstandings has to a certain extent affected the efficiency of the project and sometimes increased the level of staff turnover.

**The flow of information** has increased, technological development has facilitated that. Despite the increase in level of information flow there are some barriers to information sharing which have been affecting the efficiency of the projects being implemented. Executives from UNGO reported that communication with UHUSIANO has sometimes been difficult, UHUSIANO and district networks also commented that communication with UNGO has been challenging

sometimes. Since the entire work is based on volunteerism, each part should commit enough time for communication that the work can get going.

**Trainings** have been very efficient and most district networks in Morogoro have reported to benefit much from them. However, the continuity of trainings has been reported to be a problem. Some courses were reported to be incomplete thus making it difficult for beneficiaries to pass the intended skills to fellow district network members who did not have opportunities to attend.

UHUSIANO has supported UNGO financially throughout the project lifetime. This has increased the level of achieving the intended outcomes. UNGO on the other hand has tried to use the funds as planned. This has increased UNGO's and UHUSIANO's credibility to the Finnish Foreign Ministry and the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania.

#### **4.13 Effectiveness**

##### **A. Strengths**

###### **The Information Resource Centre (IRC)**

Through the partnership a premise has been acquired. The building hosts the IRC: a library (which requires further development), a computer laboratory and a small conference room. The building has other two rooms one of which being the project manager's office. The IRC has managed to employ permanent staff; the project manager, the Information Technology Technician and the Office Attendant are permanently employed by the centre. The staff have been managing the centre and conducting the activities taking place at IRC. Training, conference services, library and information sharing have been the major activities taking place at IRC.

###### **UNGO's effectiveness**

Through the UNGO-UHUSIANO partnership UNGO's reputation locally and internationally has increased. Some international organizations consider UNGO as the model umbrella network in Tanzania that other umbrella networks come to UNGO for learning. This has enabled UNGO to attract more local and international partners. It is through this partnership UNGO has managed to conduct trainings aiming at empowering member networks and member NGOs. It is through the partnership UNGO has managed to obtain some tools; a motorbike and a vehicle have been useful tools for facilitating some activities. Computers have been important tools for report preparation and linking district networks, UNGO and UHUSIANO.

Through the partnership, UNGO has managed to establish districts for strengthening networking, capacity building and contributing poverty reduction at grass root level. When UNGO was established it had only 28 members; by 2013 it has 230 NGO members.

The government has understood the roles of UNGO; this has been much due to the UNGO – UHUSIANO project activities being implemented through the partnership. Various governmental representatives from regional to district levels have been members of the UNGO board. They have been a link between UNGO and the government in Morogoro region.

###### **Trainings**

Through the partnership UNGO through the IRC has managed to conduct several trainings aiming at empowering member NGOs in different capacities. Trainings were about "Good records keeping" which involved treasurers, computer training which aimed at enhancing computer literacy skills and facilitating communication among members. Members were trained on project proposal development. District networks and member NGO representatives involved in the evaluation mentioned to have directly or indirectly benefited from these trainings. To a great

extent these trainings have strengthened civil societies by improving the institutional capacity and organizational development of UNGO, its member organizations and district networks. The trainings have equally increased cooperation, networking and information flow (north-south, south-south, and north-north).

#### **Thematic discussions held in district networks**

To increase the multiplier effects of the benefits attained through trainings, UNGO has been arranging some discussions at ward levels in district networks. Local communities have been invited to participate in these discussions. Discussions held have been on “Education; Environmental conservation; Civics; and Agriculture”. One of the district network the Ulanga District Network (UNGOU) has gone to the extent of using paid radio air time for broadcasting discussions held thus reaching more local communities. To a great extent the thematic discussions have raised the level of understanding and knowledge among local community members in districts.

### **B. Weaknesses**

Despite the success made there are a number of challenges being faced which in one way or the other have slowed down the developmental efforts being put forward:

#### **Staff turnover**

Staff turnover can be mentioned as one of the limitation to meeting UNGO-UHUSIANO set objectives. Staff turnover is associated with movement of potential knowledge and skills out of the organization. This was explained by some of the interviewees to be due to the poor working relationship between some of the UNGO executives and some employees and incompetence among some of the employees.

#### **Financial support for UNGO executives**

The executives of UNGO were unpaid staff; despite the fact that NGO work is based on volunteerism spirit, it is somehow difficult to work on full time basis while you are not paid. Payment is sometimes a motivator and sometimes was important to cover for some daily costs incurred by executives (eg. Fare to and from the office).

#### **Mindset among some NGO members**

Some of the member NGOs have wrongly understood the partnership between UNGO and UHUSIANO. Some expected direct material/financial support for their projects through the partnership. It is for this reason the number of active UNGO members has been decreasing from time to time. Others failed to attend meetings and forums due to lack allowances. The newly introduced entrepreneurial concept among NGOs was slowly being assimilated by members and it is expected to change members' mindset.

#### **Limited space at the IRC to accommodate UNGO management**

The newly acquired premise hosted the IRC; it had limited space to accommodate the whole UNGO management. The plan to erect a new building at the site will solve the problem and limit unnecessary costs associated with renting offices at the CCM building.

#### **Relationship between LGA and NGOs**

The relationship with local government has not been good all the time. Representatives from the government reported that poor communication between NGOs and the government resulted into misunderstandings on several occasions. It was reported that due to poor communication duplication of efforts has been very common (e.g. similar projects being implemented in the same area at the same time). NGOs on the other hand reported that some government officials prevented them from performing/implementing some activities and that sometimes the government had some bureaucratic procedures needed to be followed.

#### **District networks**

Most of the district networks are still weak; they still need some support on how to mobilize member NGOs, networking strategies and conduct capacity building to members. This will increase the number of NGOs joining the networks.

#### **Poor communication**

The communication among important partners in the partnership has not been flowing smoothly all the time. Both partners have reported on slow responding to whatever is being communicated to them and sometimes formal communication channels have not been followed, or there was a different idea about them among partners. The representative from the Tanzanian Government also reports that there is a poor communication between UNGO and local governments. The communication barrier has created a misunderstanding among partners. Breaking this barrier requires a mutual understanding among partners and following the agreed communication strategies.

#### **Mutual understanding between the two members in the partnership**

Partners have yet managed to understand each other. This has been a major source of misunderstanding. The difference in policies and culture has contributed to some misunderstandings. The employment policy (hiring and terminating, salaries etc.) in Tanzania is different from that of Finland; the two countries also differ in terms of level of bureaucracy in official operations. Despite the many years in partnership the partners have not managed to understand each other fully. This has retarded the speed at which objectives were supposed to be met.

#### **Financial problems**

Among the main challenges being faced is the limited funding for UNGO and the IRC. Funds are needed for paying salaries and for the various project activities. The IRC cannot generate funds needed for paying annual salaries of even one employee. It can hardly sustain itself that donor support is inevitable.

UHUSIANO has been supporting financially the IRC and UNGO for years now; however the instability of the Tanzanian shilling in the international currency market has been declining. This has affected the implementation of some planned project activities.

#### **Transport problems at UNGO and district networks**

Among the problems limiting the efficiency of the UNGO-UHUSIANO partnership is the transport problem. The UNGO vehicle is very old and almost unsafe to use it, some district networks have bicycles which are unsuitable for longer trips keeping in mind of the sizes of the districts under UNGO. To increase efficiency each district network needs at least a motorbike.

#### **Volunteerism spirit among NGO members**

The volunteerism spirit is still low among many NGO members. Few people may be willing to attend meetings and seminars without a pay. The UNGO executives have been addressing this on several occasions. The level of volunteerism is increasing slowly.

### ***4.14 Impact***

Although the project lacked in achieving some of its goals especially in terms of the IRC service provision and running by its own funds in the end of the project, it can still be claimed that it had impacts.

Keeping in mind the overall object of the project that is strengthening of the role of civil society and reduction of poverty in Morogoro region, the project has produced some change towards this.

When comparing what UNGO was in the beginning of the project and now towards the end of it, one can see that UNGO's role has strengthened and it has gained visibility that it did not have before. UNGO has had an increasing member base and various activities which all have contributed for it to become a very well known umbrella in Morogoro region, and even nationally. Especially through the capacity building and trainings to members by UNGO and the project, the civil society in Morogoro can be said to have now a stronger role in development than it used to have.

Intended consequences of the project for the beneficiaries in Tanzania has been their strengthened capacity to run NGO projects, increased awareness to develop their communities as well as sharing experience, information and views among civil society actors. Also respect for regulations and finance management in NGOs who attended the training has improved.

In the short term, these changes have produced increased capacity to access resources for some member NGOs. In the long term, these consequences will supposedly work as to strengthen the whole civil society sector and through that and the individually strengthened capacities of the grass-roots organization, also poverty reduction can be expected.

In Finland, the project had such intended consequences as sharing experiences, information and views about development cooperation and civil society work in Tanzania and networking with likeminded organizations.

The project did not have any significant unintended consequences in terms of the overall objective and impacts.

Perhaps more than direct measurable impacts however, the projects impacts come from the attitude change it has produced and the civic activism it has enabled. Through UNGOs work on coordinating civil society discussions, it has enabled civic activism in a meaning of freedom of association, assembly and freedom of expression. This means that the civil society in Morogoro region is existing and active and this has been partly enabled by the project.

In terms of attitude change, some civil society actors who were involved with the project have understood and learned the importance of networking and capacity building, which in the beginning of the project was not so obvious to many. Especially from the district networks evaluation team received the feedback that a major attitude change has happened in terms of understanding the meaning of capacity building. Nowadays the training in capacity building is thought of as something even more valuable than monetary aid.

General increase in understanding the possibility and responsibility to demand rights from the government have taken place. It seems that also the possible prejudices towards using new technology has been replaced by a more active attitude, especially among stakeholders who were offered IT trainings and districts which were equipped with computers. If UNGO was in the beginning seen as a funding agency and its proper role was not understood, currently that attitude seems to have been changed. UNGOs role as a capacity builder and adviser is nowadays respected and understood among members.

However, the project also lacked in some intended impacts. The role of the IRC is not that clear to many UNGO members as it was intended to be and currently it is not serving as actively as it was supposed to. Specifically, it is not serving the member NGOs with specific NGO related information but the activities are centred on and used by mainly the general public.

#### **4.15 Sustainability**

The sustainability of the project was considered since the beginning because whole **IRC** was established for a long-term fundraising tool for UNGO and the project. There were also fundraising plans and income generation proposal for IRC done by an external economic consultant in later project phases, which proves that the sustainability has been the concern of the parties.

In practice, the fundraising did not take off the way it was planned. To the actual sustainability of the project influences that the IRC centre in a meaning of offering internet café services was lacking behind the development in Tanzania, where internet cafes are being largely replaced by internet usage at home and through mobile technology. However, the plans to replace this were done and the internet café turned more into computer training centre. However, as described above, the trainings were not managed to put in such a scale that their income generation potential would have really actualised.

It seems unlikely that the project is able to continue all of its services, especially those of the IRC without external support. The plans of UNGO in terms of sustaining the centre are to foster the volunteer spirit of the employees so that the centre can stand on its own. The personnel of IRC have also planned new income raising activities. Due to many challenges in sustaining the personnel employed and delays in construction work of IRC, the real income generation potential of the centre remains still to be seen.

The strength of the project is that it has been able to employ full-time and part-time employees for the IRC. Employed personnel is indeed crucial for sustaining the IRC activities after project phases out and it would be important to have at least one paid person working at IRC on daily basis so that the centre could be open for visitors. The other major advancement for the sustainability is that UNGO has an own office, something that many other NGOs do not have.

From the responses from informants as well as from the members themselves, their involvement to the sustainability of IRC was emphasized. Many member NGOs raised the possibility of donation and contribution from the members for the sustainability of IRC. Before starting to collect contribution from members however, UNGO should make sure the meaning and services provided by IRC is clear to all members. UNGO should work closely with the members on deciding the future way forward for the centre so that it serves the actual need of the members and is considered accessible by them.

New suggestions for the fundraising put up were to form different charity activities such as charity dinner, charity walk, donations from members, active usage of the meeting hall as both fund-raising method and member service, creating partnership with other local and foreign organisations and private firms, cooperation with an institute that has right to give certificates for students, creating advertisement possibilities for companies during seminars, among others.

A challenge to the fundraising is the visibility of the IRC current premises. UNGO should find ways to make IRC more visible, either by moving it back to the central situation in CCM-building and moving UNGO to current IRC premises or to find ways for them to be in the same building by externalising part of IRC services closer to customers, for example. Best situation would be if UNGO would not be run from two different offices, as it is done currently.

The sustainability of **District networks** is somewhat insecure. The aim was that they would sustain themselves when the projects third part phases out. The districts do have essential equipments and offices but in some of the district centres they are not in use in some of them due to lack of funds for maintaining and technical problems with the solar power system, among

others. Their activeness in fundraising and thus funding their own activities is still lacking behind for being sustainable.

However, even though the income generation did not materialize the way it was planned, the project still has development impacts that will continue after the project ends. These are especially the impacts of **capacity building** and **training** given to member NGOs both in **Tanzania and Finland**. Since the effects produced by these activities are mostly attitude and mind-set changes the effects of these trainings have and will continue after the external support ends. Also organisational skills once learned cannot be taken away and their effects will continue and multiply also in the future. The same applies to networking. In future, certain updates to the trainings based on the current policy and other project environment can be considered.

Fortunately for sustainability, UNGO has also other sources for funds and a stronger role compared to previous years, which means that according to UNGO's decision, it can be able to sustain some of the activities of the project. An indication of this is that UNGO has been able to conduct several activities without Uhusiano's support during the years and it has also covered some of the IRC expenses by its own funding. The role of Uhusiano has been diminishing since the beginning of the project but it has not hindered UNGO as being quite active in different discussions and trainings such as PETS for example.

To increase the sustainability of project activities in Finland, Uhusiano **newsletter** should find more up-to-date and less time-, and resource consuming ways to perform (see 4.23).

#### ***4.16 Participation and ownership***

The project activities are in the hands of the Tanzanian partner UNGO, while Finnish partner Uhusiano is in charge of the monitoring and funding and activities in Finland. Planning and decisions of the project have been done mainly in cooperation with the partners. The initiative for the whole idea of IRC originated from UNGO, which is a proof of that the project ownership lies in Tanzania. Also in situations of disagreement, UNGO has shown it is not under the funding partner but was able to express its differing opinion. Nevertheless, sometimes a lack of dedication to the project from the side of UNGO was observed, especially in terms of moving to the acquired premises.

More involvement and openness from Uhusiano to UNGO in terms of monitoring and especially the results of the monitoring trips was hoped for. Monitoring reports are often done in Finnish and shared only between Uhusiano board and members, even though some of the monitoring findings are apparently discussed during monitoring visits with both partners. These reports would be important learning instruments for both partners and should be shared accordingly.

The two partners cannot be said to be completely equal partners because of the role of Uhusiano as a funder and Uhusiano as a link to projects' main funder MFA. However, during the years they have become more equal and UNGO has become less dependent on Uhusiano. UNGO is also a lot bigger organization in terms of member base than Uhusiano, which balances the differences in access to funding.

Although UNGO has had a strong member base that was increasing especially in the first project phases, **members** felt often excluded from the project activities and UNGO activities in general. Some members expressed the feeling of project happening too much between UNGO and Uhusiano, while the benefits should be more directly concentrated to members. Since UNGO members are the beneficiaries of the project, their commitment to the project is very relevant and efforts to increase their involvement to planning and implementation should be done.

The members' ownership of the project could be increased through involving them more to the IRC actions. For example, member NGOs could offer to the IRC library their own documents, lessons learned etc and have stronger input to IRC in general.

The partners should also find ways how to involve the district networks more. One challenge of district networks is their distance from the headquarters of UNGO and IRC. The participation of the networks and their members could be enhanced through offering the district networks a better chance to use the services of IRC. In practice, this would probably mean forming local IRC centres. Also information sharing between UNGO and districts should be improved and make sure information is not one-way only and limited to annual reports.

The participation of the **local government** and other than member stakeholders has been considered in the project. Actions to listen opinions and ideas from different external stakeholders have been implemented through such mechanisms as Steering committee and Resource team. These meetings have offered valuable exchange of information and also made possible active involvement to the project from the local government. In general, the activities fit well to Tanzanian society (see 2.3) and project's approach has been supported by local government, NGOs and communities.

However, challenges with government authorities were observed, which on the other hand is no surprise to civil society actors who try to work both as a partner and a watchdog of the government. Challenges with the local government representatives were faced especially while trying to implement the project activities in the districts. In the districts, cooperation with local government was good in the Ulanga district network, which had even received a certificate from USAID of their good cooperation with LGA, while the other two networks faced more challenges. Perhaps, Kilosa and Morogoro rural could increase their information sharing with Ulanga to distribute and share the best practices in this area.

**Uhusiano's** member organisations can have their representatives in Uhusiano's board and participate in planning and implementation in Finland. The main project activities such as Uhusiano seminar and newsletter in Finland are relying on Uhusiano's members contributions.

## **4.2 Specific issues studied**

### **4.21 IRC**

The IRC was established in the first three-year of the project through the UHUSIANO support. The IRC was established for enhancing information sharing and capacity building to UNGO member NGOs. Since its establishment the centre has been used for training member district networks and NGOs on various topical issues which are important for empowering local communities. The centre conducted the training of trainers in IT skills, project management, bookkeeping and fundraising. For conducting day to day activities, the centre has the project officer who is the overseer of the centre, the IT expert who manages the computer room and the receptionist who manages the office. For the nine years period UHUSIANO has been funding the centre and paying salaries for the three IRC staff.

UHUSIANO through the Finnish Foreign Ministry equipped the centre with office materials, equipment, furniture and IT facilities. The centre has 7 computers, 6 Uninterrupted Power Supply, printer, scanner, a television set and other ICT equipment for information sharing. The IRC has also a standby generator used as a power backup. The centre has a computer room used for IT courses, and internet services; a library used by UNGO's members for reference purposes and the conference facility.

The IRC has been generating some funds through the various activities the centre involves itself in. When firstly introduced the centre offered IT courses, internet and secretarial services. The services were offered when the centre was in the Morogoro Regional CCM building where the UNGO offices were. However, due to technological advancements internet services had to stop, the introduction of modems and smart phones affected the market for the service. The IT courses, car hire and conference services have remained to be the income generating activities at the IRC.

Despite being important, the number of customers for the IT courses has been very small. This has reduced the income the centre generated through trainings. The number of institutions offering IT courses has increased competition; the place of the centre was not known by many; and the limited promotion of the centre resulted to poor enrolment of students in the IT course offered. For example, by the time the evaluation was being conducted, the centre had only eight students taking IT courses. The conference facility and car hiring had been generating some funds; NGOs in Morogoro town had been the major customers of the two services. The library was not meant for fund generation rather used as a reference room to NGO members.

### **Challenges facing the IRC:**

#### **Limited fund generating capacity**

IRC's capacity to generate funds was very limited thus being donor dependent. Funds generated by the centre were not enough for a single monthly salary of the three staff employed. The services offered were also accessed from other intuitions/individuals in Morogoro town that IRC could not compete. This made it difficult for IRC to compete thus losing its income generation capacity. The IRC also offered few services (mainly information services, conference services, car rent and computer training). Among the services: the conference services, car rent and computer training were the fund generating services. The centre did not offer internet services by October 2013. It was found that the limited ability to generate funds was partly due to:

- i. The miss location of the IRC, the centre was surrounded by local communities who were not motivated to use the services offered. The location was far away from the potential customers.
- ii. The types of services offered were provided by other service providers at a better quality and level of customer care. For example, a conference service was a common and highly competitive business in Morogoro. Computer training and car hire were competitive business too. Other institutions offering computer trainings in Morogoro were registered and recognised certificates were given after completion of the course which was not the case for the IRC training programmes.
- iii. The vehicle which was hired to generate funds was in a very bad shape. It needed adequate funds for renovation before attracting more customers
- iv. Some of the staff employed at the centre during some years were not competent enough to do the work
- v. The too short contracts (six months) given to IRC staff expired while the staff learn the work environment and just before implementing what one intended to contribute to the centre
- vi. The centre was not known by even some prominent members of UNGO district networks, it could be more difficult for ordinary community members to know it. This was most due to poor IRC marketing strategies and limited awareness creation on its existence.

#### **The library**

IRC had a library used for reference purposes to member NGOs. The library had very limited resources. IRC library should be strongly directed to an information sharing unit between government and NGOs who work in the common fields. Documents and Policy papers from lessons learned, past projects and success stories could be shared there. IRC should acquire some relevant resources and documents from UNGO members and activate them more to the development of the library.

### **Providing services to district networks**

The other challenge the IRC faces is how meet the needs of members located in district networks away from Morogoro Municipal. Morogoro is one of the largest regions in Tanzania thus IRC's ability to meet the needs of members is affected by the size of the region. Currently all services are offered at the IRC in Morogoro Municipal. It is important to have strategies to easily meet the needs of users residing away from Morogoro Municipality.

## ***4.22 District Networks***

Through the UNGO-UHUSIANO partnership district networks have been formed and strengthened. By October 2013, UNGO has the Morogoro Municipal, Morogoro Rural, Ulanga, Kilosa, Kilombero and the Mvomero registered and full operational district networks. Through the partnership, three former district networks (Morogoro Rural, Kilosa and Ulanga) were supported; each was given a computer, scanner and printer; office rent was also paid by UHUSIANO. The Morogoro Rural Networks was given solar power as a source of power to computers. The three district networks were also given bicycles to facilitate meeting member NGOs.

### **Strengths**

#### **Dialogues**

Districts networks have been holding several dialogues on different topical issues. Discussions have been on education, environment, agriculture, civic issues and human rights. These discussions have been very successful as local communities have been attending and participating in discussions.

#### **Networking**

Capacity building increased the level of networking among members within and beyond the district networks. This increased the level of cooperation among NGOs in Morogoro.

#### **Capacity building**

District networks members who attended training workshops funded through the partnership had trained NGO member in the networks. This empowered more local community members in Morogoro region.

#### **Assisting members in developing proposals**

District networks had been assisting and advising NGO members in proposal development and looking for funders. This has helped more NGOs in Morogoro to win various grants.

#### **Local government support**

District networks have been supported effectively by the district government and local governments whenever and wherever they implement activities.

### **Weaknesses**

#### **Poor communication**

District networks complained about the poor communication with UNGO. This has been limiting the effectiveness of some activities being implemented.

#### **Financial limitations**

District networks suffered much from financial problems as they much depended on member annual fees which were not reliable and very insufficient to cover the various day to day office operations.

**Distance to IRC**

Most district networks in Morogoro region were not in a position to use the IRC as it was very far from them. This limited them from benefiting from the services offered by the centre.

**Most of the ICT tools given not functioning**

ICT tools donated by the UHUSIANO at district networks were not functional by the time the evaluation was conducted. At Ulanga the computer had some faults and needed some major repairs/disposal while at Morogoro rural the power problem due to solar power faults. Similarly, at Ulanga the computer was used less even before the faults because of the limited skills due to incomplete IT training.

**Difficulties in attending UNGO meeting at Morogoro**

Members from distant districts mentioned that it was difficult for them to attend meetings and seminars in Morogoro due to distance and sometimes being unable to fund for their trips. This equally limited them from being informed on several issues.

**Poor support from some governmental officials**

It was noted that there were some governmental officials particularly in wards and villages who provided very limited support to NGO activities. Some few expected a pay whenever they were involved. This also limited the effectiveness in implementation of the activities planned.

***4.23 Training and networking*****In Tanzania**

Training activities were appreciated by the beneficiaries and mainly the limited time for them or the need for more of them received criticism and feedback. The expectations for more training concerned especially last years of the project; some members have not received any training or invitation to trainings whatsoever. Demand for more training indicates however that they are indeed relevant for the stakeholders. In early project years phases the trainings were concentrated on IT and training of the trainers, later relevant skills for running NGOs and Organizational Development (OD) were emphasized more. The members mentioned that they benefited from the trainings through such learned skills as capacity building, management skills and other thematic information such as MKUKUTA, nutrition and LGB (Local Government Barometer). More training was hoped for from such areas especially as fundraising strategies, resource mobilisation and proposal writings as well as monitoring and evaluation skills.

An issue that was noted in the previous evaluation done from UNGO-Uhusiano cooperation from 1995-2003 of information sharing seems to be still relevant. That is, more attention needs to be put on how the information from the trainings is distributed to other stakeholders, so that the information will not stay as a property of the person who attended the trainings but would be used for the benefit of the whole organization. This implies to UNGO as an organization as well as to UNGO members and their activeness in distributing the information inside their organization.

**NGO seminars** were planned to be arranged annually. However in 2007, 2008, and 2009 they failed to be implemented mainly because of insufficient incomes from own sources. Since 2011 onwards they annual seminars were arranged however, with participant rates from 53 to 66 participants. The subjects in these seminars were Public Private Partnership, climate change, Human Rights Based Approach, food and nutrition, natural resource management, NGO sustainability and Good Governance, organisational learning and networking and East-African integration among others. Perhaps in the future the focus in the seminars could be more focused on to more practical skills that were wished for by the participants such as successful fundraising strategies, away from the thematic areas and PPP that has been covered now already quite extensively. However, evaluation of the seminars and trainings would have been more precise if feedbacks from the participants could have been available to evaluation team.

**Networking** of UNGO to different stakeholders in Tanzania seemed to be active. What is unique and deserves a special praise for the way the project has included different outside stakeholders. For example, SNV, Pact Tanzania and KEPA Tanzania were directly involved on supporting to the project activities and other supporters such as WWF and Foundation for Civil Society and BOCAR were supporting the project more indirectly.

Especially in the early years of the project it emphasized as one of the expected project results more increased development cooperation projects between Uhusiano and UNGO members. It seems that that sort of emphasis would have been relevant also in later project phases. This is based on the members suggestions and to the fact that very few member NGOs had actually found a partner through the project.

In the future, the partners could compile a detailed list of the NGOs in their area, UNGO the ones working in Tanzania (Morogoro) and Uhusiano of the Finnish organizations having (or willing to have) cooperation in Tanzania. This list should indicate the thematic area where the organization works, background information and number of active members or employees and it would be used for partners to get in touch to each other's. This sort of information would make the beginning of potential cooperation between Finnish and Tanzanian NGOs easier. It would also make both partners, UNGO and Uhusiano more attractive and prone to more contacts and networking also inside their countries.

Although hard to evaluate on concrete terms the exact input of the project, it is however evident that UNGO has gained recognisability and contacts to different donors, projects and supporters through the support given by IRC project. Through a spilling over effect these contacts then in effect have produced other contacts and other trainings which have increased the capacity of UNGO, one of the results aimed for with this particular project.

## **In Finland**

**Uhusiano seminars** held in Finland are unique discussion forums for changing experiences and information between government officials, KEPA representatives and NGO people. The speakers in the seminars have been experts in NGOs and development issues, representatives from MFA and KEPA as well as Tanzanian experts and visitors. Uhusiano seminars in addition to Uhusiano newsletter are according to the members the most important functions of Uhusiano. Seminars have been useful and meaningful way for members to share information and they should be fostered in the future as well. Especially beneficial they have been in sharing information on issues dealing with Tanzanian culture and for networking purposes.

Uhusiano **newsletter** is being published two times a year and offers Uhusiano members and other interested people a chance to read articles of the ongoing projects of the members, different opinions, expert insights, reviews etc.

The newsletter has been published since 1995 and through the long history has become to function almost as a symbol of Uhusiano and its work. However, one thing to consider for future is that is it justifiable and cost-effective to publish the newsletter as a printed form. Nowadays electronic newsletter are read widely and taking over the printed ones due to their cost-effectiveness and relative easiness in producing. They can also attract wider audience compared to the printed ones.

## **4.24 Communication**

Due to the nature of this cooperation between two umbrella organizations striving for stronger civil society, some of the issues, challenges and opportunities of the project are the same as in Finnish-Tanzanian NGO cooperation in a broader sense. One of the challenges faced in

cooperation throughout the years was communication. This issue deserves a separate chapter due to its consistency in coming up through different sources.

Generally, different ways of understanding and interpreting things between Finns and Tanzanians was raised as challenge since the beginning of the cooperation. Discussion and dialogue helped to overcome these issues and most likely also strengthened the partnership in the beginning when the partners were looking for ways to cooperate with each other's.

One of the communication challenges is that at times there has been inadequate information exchange on both sides, which has resulted in delays. At times there was also different opinions about what should be actually informed to the partner and when. For both partners the fact that the communication relies on volunteer workers, who have other commitments, is surely one reason for delays.

There have been also different views on between whom the communication should happen and different cultures have also affected to it. Sometimes Uhusiano has communicated directly to employed project staff which is the usual way in Finland but at the same time in Tanzania it was seen as bypassing UNGO board. On the other hand, sometimes transparency suffered and communication has been happening too much between persons and not between organisations as it should be. The situation of poor record keeping especially in UNGO further worsens the situation if a key person leaves the position; the information that he possesses has also been lost.

The cooperation between UNGO and Uhusiano was nurtured especially in the first phases of the project with mutual visits from Tanzania to Finland and Finland to Tanzania, common seminars etc. This sort of cooperation seemed to decrease significantly in later project phases. However, due to changing personnel, the interaction and partnership might have needed more effort in later years also.

Language wise Uhusiano has a big advantage currently because of Swahili speaking people in the board. This is rare for a Finnish NGO and the benefits of that could be used even more effectively through communicating directly to districts and other remote areas where English skills are not as prominent as in town.

On the other hand, in early years there was a lack of English in Uhusiano, which resulted on some of the essential project documents being composed only in Finnish. This in effect decreased transparency and joint understanding between Uhusiano and UNGO.

The cooperation between the organizations is based on the interaction between people (although it should not be restricted to that). The time given for this relationship to develop is especially important in this sort of cooperation between different cultures, in order to build trust and long-term commitment. Despite challenges in communication, the parties made efforts on enhancing communication and finding solutions together. For future purposes, the meaning of transparent and frequent communication should be emphasized even more. Information from both partners' activities should be shared even more openly and responsibilities and ways of communications should be agreed upon more precisely. Communication practices could be agreed on literally, since currently when the project personnel changes also the communication practices have to be revised every time.

#### ***4.25 Organizational Development and future***

##### **UNGO**

UNGO as an umbrella NGO in Morogoro region has been guided by corporate plans throughout the nine years of project implementation. The plans described the roles, reviewed performance of UNGO, defined the constraints and problems and structure the future objectives and means to

achieve them. The current and future UNGO organizational development is described below in terms of strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats:

### **Strengths**

- UNGO has a corporate plan
- UNGO has a fundraising plan, action plan and a strategic plan
- UNGO has a new constitution
- UNGO has attracted local and international partners
- UNGO has managed to develop a good public image
- UNGO has a resource team used for training members
- UNGO has managed to maintain a good working relationship with the Tanzanian government and UHUSIANO
- UNGO has active members

### **Weaknesses**

- UNGO lacks full time executives
- UNGO faces financial problems limiting to meet its objectives set
- UNGO has no formal Information and Communication Management Strategy thus leading to poor communication
- Limited volunteerism spirit
- Limited NGOs in Morogoro have joined UNGO
- Declining number of active UNGO members
- Incompetency among some staff
- Lack of commitment to project
- Limited organization record keeping
- No one within UNGO is expert in capacity development
- Too much donor dependency

### **Opportunities**

- UNGO has potential donors
- Good Tanzanian government support to NGOs
- Partners are ready to network with UNGO
- Many institutions in Morogoro can support UNGO

### **Threats**

- Global economic crisis affecting funding
- Instability of the Tanzanian shilling affecting budgeting in foreign currency
- Rapid technological advancement affecting the IRC in offering some services

## **UHUSIANO**

Uhusiano has working groups for project activities in Tanzania, newsletter and seminar. It is based solely on the work of volunteering individuals and is run by a board of 9 members and 6 vice members. It has 80 individual members and 8 member organizations whose projects are mainly based in Morogoro. The development of member base from year 2004 has happened so that the number of member organisations has gone down (from 12) and the number of individual members has gone up (from 50).

Uhusianos strengths are its profound and long-time knowledge of development cooperation in Tanzania and deeply committed volunteers from different professional backgrounds. It has also people who have the knowhow and experience of such project management that is needed in NGO development cooperation. It has a special benefit from Swahili speaking people in the

board. Because of the member NGOs having representatives in the board, information flow from meetings reaches members directly.

The Finnish organization has been open to search into its possibilities and learn about its strengths and challenges since it has made some organizational assessments, one of them by a Tanzanian consultation company. In addition, it has showed transparency and willingness to increase synergy between the organization and its members by combining their monitoring and evaluation activities by sending one person to do the monitoring work in Tanzania of different member NGOs and Uhusiano itself. Other innovative ideas like this where both cost effectiveness and synergy are to be achieved would be welcomed in the organisation.

As its weaknesses, organisation is still very small with no paid employees or office facilities. Implementation is often relying on few people only, even if in the planning phase more members have been active. The other side of the coin of having long experience is that sometimes changes to practices and new innovations have proved to be difficult to compose and implement. New active members have proved to be difficult to find. Uhusiano board members, member NGOs and members are scattered all around Finland, which is a good thing, but it causes logistical difficulties for arranging meetings and seminars.

Both UNGO and Uhusiano should consider what is their need for running projects themselves, while at the same time working as an umbrella and serving their members. Especially in the case of UNGO, the support giving umbrella role of the organization was sometimes suffering because it had also own project that was seen by some as competing from the same resources with the member organizations. In Uhusiano's case, focusing on the tasks has proved to be challenging sometimes and it seems that serving of the members has sometimes suffered from concentrating so much on the project activities.

Uhusianos skills in fundraising should be strongly increased. Through improved fundraising perhaps in the future there would be possibility to have at least one part-time employed person in the organization, so as to make the information flow smoothly, decrease the workload of the volunteers and make the organization work more efficiently in general.

Uhusiano should seriously consider of broadening its scope to consider all the stakeholders in Finland who have development cooperation in Tanzania, not only in Morogoro. Through its long-time experience, it could serve also the organisations working outside Morogoro. It could start by compiling the list of Finnish organisations doing development cooperation in Tanzania and perhaps make an investigation on which kind of services would they hope from an organisation such as Uhusiano. This list could then be used to further increase the partnerships between Tanzanian and Finnish organisations (see 4.23 Networking).

## 5. COMPATIBILITY AND COHERENCE

The reduction of poverty, protection of environment and promotion of social equality, democracy and human rights are the aims of Finland's development cooperation policy. They should be taken into account throughout the lifespan of the project intervention that is funded by the MFA, from identification through planning, implementation and monitoring up until the final evaluation. During the nine-year period of the project, these MFA guidelines changed somewhat, though having the general aims invariant. The evaluation efforts aimed to consider both the older and newer aspects of the guidelines.

## **5.1 Gender equality**

Many of the crosscutting issues are complementary and overlapping such as gender equality, that is also a human rights question.

In training activities of the project the number of women was considered - although sometimes difficult to carry out in practice - and also both organisation boards have had women in them. Majority of Uhusiano board is women (11 out of 15) and current UNGO board has two women out of 13 board members. Also UNGO Steering Committee had women members.

The evaluators found no indicators for considering gender in the planning or in the implementation however, and it seems that the significance of gender becomes mainly through increasing the capacity of the member NGOs who are dealing more closely with gender.

Some of the UNGO member organizations are run by women and many of the member NGOs work directly with gender issues and vulnerable women such as widows and single parents. Also some of Uhusiano member's projects focus on gender issues. Thus, the effects on the project towards gender equality becomes mainly in a more indirect manner, through supporting members who are directly working with gender issues.

## **5.2 Reducing inequality**

In general, there are no objections to any group to participate in project activities, and the project is not discriminating any group. Although not also emphasizing or making special arrangements for certain particularly vulnerable groups to be included in the project activities.

However, it has included also disabled people to its trainings, seminars and UNGO meetings. Nevertheless, also here the main effect of reducing inequality comes through the increased capacity of the member NGOS of both Uhusiano and UNGO who are dealing with disabled and other vulnerable groups such as widows and orphans directly, not from UNGO or Uhusiano per se.

## **5.3 Socio-Cultural aspects**

Cultural issues are in some way in the heart of the cooperation between Uhusiano and UNGO since these are the factors effecting everyday communication and decision making. Uhusiano through its long history of cooperation in Tanzania has been open to learn the cultural issues and also deals with these issues and shares the information to members in its newsletters and seminars. Nonetheless, while running the project in practice, some socio-cultural issues are still sometimes overlooked by Uhusiano (see 4.24 Communication). More and better communication on these issues for both partners is recommended.

Perhaps the partners should also discuss more in the planning phase of the project that is there certain socio-cultural issues such as subcultures, religions, gender roles or beliefs that might have an effect on the participation to the project of some groups. A thorough baseline study on these issues would be highly recommendable, especially concentrated outside the town area that is in the districts. These considerations have an impact on if the project is supported or rejected by certain groups, which then again affect the sustainability and impact of the project.

Language is also important determinant in socio-cultural issues and Uhusiano has a benefit on that it has also Swahili speaking people in the board. This way the voices from the grass roots have better possibilities to reach better to all away to Finland. This benefit should be used more

and possibilities to direct communication between Uhusiano and district networks and other members should be examined.

## **5.4 Environment and Climate sustainability**

According to evaluation team's knowledge, a specific environmental impact assessment was not done in this project. However, the project is not working on a very environmentally sensitive sector and due to the relatively small size of the project, the environmentally adverse effects have staid to minimum.

The project beneficiaries especially the member NGOs of UNGO, are many local environmental organizations, who received training and capacity building and through their increased capacity, also environmental conservation and climate sustainability are positively effected. UNGO has been also working closely with WWF in deforestation issues and included in its trainings some climate change and natural resource management themes.

An idea for the future is to consider how could environment be taken into account in the everyday work of the organisations and in their office premises to increase ecological sustainability. Starting already when purchasing the equipment through considering their ecological footprint and continuing to saving activities in the everyday actions (as an example, printing on both sides of the paper). A good start for minimising the projects own climate impacts was seen in the planning phase when recycled material was to be used in project equipment instead of buying new ones. Also the IRC offices premises were renovated and not build as totally new structures.

## **5.5 Good governance, Democracy and Human Rights**

This sort of capacity building support to non-governmental organizations conducted by the project increases the potentiality for democratic society. Possibilities for participation to society and getting voice heard even from the distant and remote communities were enhanced through this project. The NGOs capacity building through the project has increased possibility to openness, accountability and responsibility. This has resulted into more democratic and transparent governance of NGOs in Morogoro region. Through stronger civil society the project has also had an effect on enabling democracy and good governance on a national level, although the impact of one single project in this is difficult to estimate.

UNGO has also such programmes as PETS (Public Expenditure Tracking System) which are dealing directly with the public accountability issue relevant to good governance. Through supporting UNGO, also PETS trainings have been strengthened.

UNGO through this project has also contributed directly to the capacity building of small grass-root human rights organizations.

## **5.6 Finnish value added**

Finnish value added is not a clearly defined concept. Nevertheless, by it is meant an attempt to bring to the cooperation something extra beyond the monetary support. From the interviews, reports and observations, one gets the impression that the volunteering spirit and attitude among Finnish civil society actors has been acknowledged and to some extend embraced by Tanzanian counterparts.

Volunteering is more challenging in Tanzanian environment, where poverty and peoples need to constantly strive for income results in little time and motivation for volunteering civic action. Consequently, many people still use NGOs primarily as potential income source.

Despite of these challenges, an attitude change in some of the people who are actively involved in UNGO or members who have Finnish partners was observed. Cooperating closely with Finnish NGO people who work only on volunteer basis, has had an impact to this attitude change according to the respondents. Commitment to development by Finns on a voluntary basis seemed to commit some Tanzanian stakeholders to their own development also.

The friendliness, openness, transparency, accountability and trustfulness of the Finnish people were mentioned as something positive that has come through working with Finns in either this project or other projects with Uhusiano or UNGO members. Some informants expressed that especially they have learned the importance of networking through working with Finnish people. Also a certain kind of effectiveness and work attitude and the way to look at budgetary issues was mentioned as learnings gained through cooperating with Finns.

These experiences have not been one-way, however. Partnership and interaction between Tanzanians and Finns has been a both-way learning process. Especially Uhusiano has learned a lot from Tanzanian culture and makes use of those experiences in its work as an organization. Thought patterns and approaches that might differ from the ones that a person is used to, have been learned and embraced on both sides on individual level also.

## 5.7 Poverty alleviation

Indicators to measure the actual effect on poverty reduction were missing in the project plans. The aim of reducing poverty was however a more indirectly induced to the project framework. The projects assumption was that through strengthening the civil society also poverty would be reduced in the long run.

The assumption is based on the fact that empowerment of the vulnerable contributes to poverty reduction through more equal distribution of wealth. Indeed, many of UNGOs member NGOs are directly dealing with poverty reduction efforts and through strengthening and empowering them, poverty will be reduced in the long run. Many of the member organisations especially in the three district networks have special beneficiary groups who are very vulnerable to poverty. Thus especially project's efforts in the districts have an indirect impact on poverty reduction.

However, the effects of such will be only seen after many years and the actual share of the project in this is difficult to measure.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 6.1 Conclusions

In general, the project *Capacity Building of NGOs working in Morogoro region* is very **relevant** to its beneficiaries in Tanzania. The aim of improving the livelihoods of local communities through capacity building of local civil society and through increased capacity to have an effect on poverty reduction are both very relevant to beneficiaries as well as in line with both partner countries development policies. The project is also compatible with different objectives of development cooperation.

The project's focus in Finland in coordinating and creating contacts between the Finnish NGOs work in Morogoro is also very relevant to Finnish beneficiaries (Uhusiano member NGOs) of the project and supported by MFA.

The main focus of the project - that of building the capacity of a Tanzanian umbrella organization for civil society actors - has been successful. UNGO today is very different to what it was in 2004 in terms of capacity, number of members and recognisability. Beneficiaries of the project have nowadays more information about organizations and more knowledge capacity to run them. It seems that the project has also had a general **impact** on how the NGOs and civil society is seen in Morogoro. Information sharing about important topics concerning civil society has also increased general awareness within the public. The project has on its own part contributed to a possible change in Tanzanian society, even though the effects on such long term big changes as poverty reduction, the impact of an individual project is difficult to define.

The attitude changes and **learning** was not restricted only to UNGO but also Uhusiano has learned a lot through this cooperation. Both organizations have been learning from each other's through nine years of intensive cooperation in the form of cultural knowledge, mindset changes, voluntarism attitude, participativeness, different communication customs and problem-based learning. This does not mean that the mutual learning had been exhausted however. In stead, the building of cooperation and partnership might have needed even more efforts on later years. The cooperation in the early years seemed to be much based on that between persons and with the staff changes later on, some of the benefits gained in partnership were lost. These resulted in some challenges in **communication**, which sometimes delayed or complicated project activities.

Both UNGO and Uhusiano should consider what is their need for running projects themselves, while at the same time working as an umbrella and serving the members. Especially in the case of UNGO, the support giving umbrella role of the organization was sometimes suffering because it had also own project that was seen by some as competing from the same resources with the member organizations. In Uhusiano's case, serving of the members has also suffered from concentrating so much on the project activities. Uhusiano's biggest challenge in the future is how to make the organization attractive enough for new active members.

The challenge of UNGO is how to produce all the plans and ideas into tangible outputs, that is, to implement. This weakness covers both the shortages in fundraising of IRC, as well as shortcomings in working actively on serving members and sharing information. Active and dedicated new leadership might be one solution since poor working relationships and misunderstandings in UNGO has to a certain extent affected the efficiency of the project and sometimes increased the level of staff turnover.

The benefits and effects of the project activities, such as new skills from the trainings, information sharing and attitude change are somewhat **sustainable** and will remain even after the project phases out. The sustainability of the main project activity, that of the Information and Resource Centre after the external support ends proved to be a lot less than expected and depends on the decisions of UNGO and its new leaders in terms of will they or will they not move to same premises with IRC, how will the fundraising of the centre be improved and services to member NGOs increased.

What comes to **efficiency**, through comparing the resources committed and the tangible and intangible outputs, the project has been somewhat satisfactory. Trainings conducted by the project have been relevant and many member NGOs throughout the project years have reported to benefit much from them. The trainings received criticism from participants mainly on only that the need for them is much larger than the supply and that sometimes they were not completed as was planned. The **District networks** benefited from the project a lot, starting from their existence in the first place going up till improved skill in project management and IT especially. The support

to districts and their small scale grass-root organizations is very relevant and could have had even more emphasis in the project.

**IRC** has not been really found let alone in active use by the general public, neither members and is still very much donor dependent. The IRC activity in terms of technical preparations, increased renovation costs, changing staff, delays and turn downs on moving to new premises took comparatively too much resources and time altogether if efficiency is considered. IRC activities suffer from poor implementation that makes **effectiveness** of the IRC part of the project questionable.

The **ownership** of the project is in UNGO, which is good, but the more active inclusion of members to the project and UNGO activities in general should be improved. This means increasing the information sharing about broad issues concerning civil society actors as well as including members more to IRC activities.

Improved capacity of the local partner is a valuable end in itself and it seems that in this the project has succeeded. Because the project has as a main target capacity building (and not a more concrete area such as improved health, for example) and the cooperation includes several organizations from both Finland and Tanzania, the effects of the project are more comprehensive and on some parts less tangible than in some other NGO development projects. However, the lack of tangible results on some parts should not work as discouragement to partners or policy makers alike, instead the ways to increase and improve this kind of cooperation should be considered. Recommendations offered in the next chapter especially, can work as an aiding tool in such efforts.

## 6.2 Recommendations

- The level of international networking in the project has been very low and limited mostly only Uhusiano-UNGO relationship. To improve the situation, Uhusiano should list the Finnish organizations having (or willing to have) cooperation in Tanzania. This list should indicate the thematic area where the organization works, background information and number of active members or employees and it would be used for partners to get in touch to each other. This sort of information would make the beginning of potential cooperation between Finnish and Tanzanian NGOs easier. It would also make both partners, UNGO and Uhusiano more attractive and prone to more members, contacts and networking possibilities also inside their countries.
- District networks are still weak, they need capacity building in terms of training and financial support that they may acquire premises for offices and reduce rent costs. Networks which were not included in the UHUSIANO – UNGO project need more support; they can hardly empower their member NGOs as they do not have capacity to do so.
- For improved empowerment, small-scale resource centers should be established at district networks. The centers will be able to provide services at grass root levels thus benefiting more local communities. This is important because the IRC services can hardly be used by potential users away from Morogoro town. This would also increase the level of participation and ownership from the grass roots.
- The IRC need to have fund raising strategies that it can sustain itself, and most of all, attention should be paid that the strategies are implemented. The centre should try to open up and have more services that are customer oriented. For attracting more customers some of IRC services could be offered at Morogoro town where the

accessibility is greater rather than trying to offer every service at the current location. This will help to transform the centre into a full self-sustained centre.

- In transforming the IRC into a full income-generating centre it is important to analyze the needs of the society before embarking on providing some services. Due to stiff competition, it is important to improve the quality of services offered and broaden the number of the services offered. The emphasis of serving NGOs specifically should be kept in mind.
- Since the IRC provides some training programmes, it is important to register it that beneficiaries of the courses offered may be recognized after completion of the courses. Alternatively, it should cooperate closely with some institution that is registered and can provide certificates.
- Sometimes some IRC training sessions were not completed leading to incomplete knowledge among beneficiaries. Such knowledge/skills can hardly improve performance of the target population and accomplishment of the started trainings should be taken care of.
- UNGO offices need to shift to the newly acquired building. The building can accommodate most UNGO executives as some of the IRC services may be provided in town. Instead of hiring offices for UNGO, they should hire rooms for the IRC income generating activities. This will sustain both UNGO and the IRC.
- The need for NGOs in Morogoro to increase significantly the level of cooperation with the government came to the fore through interviews. Since UNGO is a central actor in coordinating and uniting NGOs in Morogoro, it should take strong action and responsibility from this. IRC should work as a central place for different actors on the NGO relevant fields from government, private and civil society actors to share their information on best practices and lessons learned. Especially important is to coordinate different actor's efforts so to avoid duplication on implementing similar projects in to the same community. This operation would require functioning IRC library with government policy and action plans in place and monitoring and evaluation reports from all these different stakeholders. In this way the centre would work also to increase transparency.
- The project/UNGO should distribute a regular electronic newsletter. IRC as an active centre for sharing information and lessons learned between government-, private- and NGO-sector would mean regular communication to different stakeholders. A best way to do this would be through regular newsletter. In fact, a strong wish presented by members towards UNGO and current project was a monthly or every second monthly newsletter for members being aware of what is happening in UNGO and in the NGO sector nationally. Since newsletters can be shared through e-mail in a very cost-effective way, this should be applied to UNGO practices promptly.
- The ownership of the project by beneficiaries could be increased through involving UNGO members more to the IRC actions. Members could build the library together by offering their own documents, lessons learned etc. from their respective organizations to involve them more effectively.
- It is important to have an **Information and Communication Management strategy** to limit the common communication problems in the partnership. The strategy should spell out how partners will communicate thus limiting the unnecessary delays of information. This would also ensure that the communication practices would sustain when the staff changes. This communication strategy should cover also member

needs. It is essential to search into what is the real need of the members and how could the partners provide that.

- Archives of UNGO should be collected and stored in a more systematic manner, not only for evaluation purposes but to ensure the presence of organizational memory and transparency. UNGO has suffered twice from a computer brake down that destroyed documents and with changing staff, much organisational memory has been lost. The printed versions should be available from all the important documents.
- UNGO and IRC web pages and blog should be made active and known to members. The possibilities for using social media and other Internet based services also more broadly in project negotiations between Finnish and Tanzanian NGOs should be scrutinized (for example in the form of project planning tools found online). Uhusiano's and UNGO's possible future cooperation could be innovative in this.
- Uhusiano should consider possibilities of serving all the Finnish NGOs doing cooperation in Tanzania, not limited to Morogoro region. In addition, through expansion and employing at least one person to work in the organization would make communication easier, decrease the workload of few volunteers, as well as would increase the level of attractiveness of the organization to new active members.
- Before the inception of any project, it is important to have a baseline study with clearly placed indicators which will be used to measure the impacts of the project. Without baseline surveys evaluations done particularly on impacts to local communities, can hardly reflect the reality. Also monitoring material more available to both for the local partner as well for the purposes of evaluations should be provided. The results of such material could be used as learning instruments while the project is on-going and the results should be discussed more in cooperation with partners.

### **Suggestions for future cooperation:**

Most of the respondents involved in the evaluation mentioned that the UNGO – UHUSIANO partnership should not be ended. It was suggested that after the end of the IRC project other projects should be thought of and a stronger partnership be established. It was suggested that future cooperation could be in areas of good governance, environmental conservation, strengthening district networks and capacity building at grass root level through establishment of resources centers at district levels.

## **6.3 Lessons Learned**

Due to the nature of this cooperation between two umbrella organizations striving for stronger civil society, some of the issues, challenges and opportunities of the project are similar to all the Finnish-Tanzanian NGO cooperation in general or even any North-South development initiative in a broader sense.

**Cultural understanding.** Giving time for knowing each other well as organisations before entering to a large-scale project is important for real partnership to develop. This was done patiently in the beginning of the project under evaluation, when also visits from Tanzania to Finland were held annually. It could have had more emphasis on later years when personnel

changes altered the organisations and previously held strong personal contacts were in some extent lost.

For an effective and efficient partnership, the partners should try their level best to understand the objectives governing the cooperation and roles of each partner. This could increase responsibility, accountability and efficiency. It will also improve the openness and reduce misunderstandings. Better and more open communication between the parties especially on challenges and possibilities on changing the direction of the project if that is needed should be fostered. Mutual learning and giving sufficiently time for it is especially important in a project which concentrates on capacity development.

**Volunteering.** The spirit and attitude of volunteerism is challenging to incorporate to Tanzania in a similar way that it is taken place in Finland. This is due to somewhat different ideas of civil society sector and also due to socio-economic aspects. In Tanzania, scarce resources make civil society actors more competitors to each other's while in Finland they are seen more as cooperating and working for the common good, without eating each other's resources. In this sense, cooperation and sharing of best practices and lessons learned between Finnish NGOs is easier in Finland than in Tanzania. However, the project did seem to achieve a some sort of attitude change in beneficiaries. UNGO was not seen as a fund provider as strongly as it used to be and the meaning of UNGO as providing training and capacity building was valued even more than sole funding. Dedicated volunteerism and the meaning of networking were understood partly by an example from the Finns. Model examples from respected Tanzanians, who have been influential in developing their communities through volunteering efforts could be used more to get the Tanzanian younger generation to assimilate volunteering attitude.

**Challenges as an umbrella organization.** Both partners shared the common challenge of an umbrella organization, the challenge of serving the members and at the same time trying to run own projects. Both UNGO and Uhusiano should seriously consider the necessity of running own projects. If they are to be continued, the possibilities for involving members more to the project activities and transparency should be strongly enhanced, especially in the case of UNGO.

**Support to remote areas.** Many Northern NGOs doing cooperation in the South have a tendency to concentrate project activities in cities and towns, where accessibility and infrastructure is better and skilled manpower available. However, the most vulnerable communities live in the remote areas and as such the most potential target groups for poverty reduction efforts. On the side of the local partners, sometimes complicated project procedures like forming successful project proposals is especially challenging in the rural areas due to lack of facilities, infrastructure and educated members. This is why the support and capacity building to district networks in this particular project was so important and the results achieved encouraging. However, more concentration to the rural areas is needed in the future to be able to tackle the most marginalized groups and have a stronger impact on poverty reduction.

## ANNEXES

### **Annex 1 List of persons interviewed**

#### ***UNGO***

Anthony Fuime	- Chairman
Idd Mdanku	- Executive Secretary
Masud Makullah	- Treasurer
Bilhida Maliyaga	- Member of executive committee
Esther Mganga	- Member of executive committee, Treasurer of Ulanga District network
Mary Paul Komba	- Member of executive committee, Member of Kilosa District network

#### ***IRC personnel***

Elibariki Kweka	- IRC coordinator from 2013
Joseph Askeri	- IT technician from 2013
Rose Anthony	- Receptionist/Office attendant

#### ***Ex- UNGO actives***

Venance Mlali	- Ex coordinator, current member
Joseph Saqware	- Ex Executive Secretary, current member

#### ***UNGO member organizations***

Stephen Ditenya	- FIE (Foundation for Indigenous Education)
Rubern Fumito	- WEETU (Wings Environment and Education Transformation Unity)
Ndumey M. Mukama	- Tesco
Jonas L. Joker	- Kipado
Mwadhini Myanza	- IRTECO (Irrigation Training and Economic Empowerment)
David Raphael	- SWAAMO (Society for Women and AIDS in Morogoro)
Helen Ndemasi Mbezi	- SWAAMO
Helen Ngalangalo	- Member of the Steering Committee, SAWA (Safina Women's Association)

#### ***Members of the Steering Committee/Resource Team***

Stanford Kalala Coalition	- Member of executive committee, Executive of Mvomero Organization
Dr Didas Mrina	- Resource team member
Gebo Mlangwa	- Morogoro District Council representative

#### ***Members of District networks***

##### ***Kilosa:***

David Semwenda	- Secretary and treasurer
Hawa Hatibu	- Monitoring and evaluation officer
W. L. Sumari	- UNGO Board member

##### ***Morogoro rural:***

Mensiana Paulo	- Chairperson
Shabani Chande	- Treasurer
Melesiana Mbomo	- Member of MORGONET executive committee
Velestini Chinghuswa	- Juhudi Agricultural Group
Yovin Banghala	- Mtamba Disabled Group
Juma Mambo	- Twanduse Agricultural Group
Musa Karatenga	- MECO (Mtamba Enviro Care Organization)
Valentin Martin	- Twahamne and Jihudi Agricultural Group
Yovi Bangala	- Mtamba Disabled group

***Ulanga:***

Mohammed Nguku	- Assistant Secretary
Esther Jeremia Mganga	- Treasurer, UNGO executive committee member
Agusta M. Ngazenga	- Office Attendant

***Uhusiano in Finland***

Pia Mäkelä	- Chairperson
Emma Simon Palonen	- Vice-chairperson
Erkki Andersson	- Treasurer
Elina Puhto	- Member of the board
Matti Cantell	- Member, Finnish Federation for Settlements

***KEPA Personnel***

Jenna Kettunen	- Programme Officer
Antti Turakka	- Previous KEPA Tanzania Project Advisor (2009-2011)

## Annex 2 Questionnaire

### EVALUATION OF UHUSIANO-UNGO PROJECT CAPACITY BUILDING OF NGOs WORKING IN MOROGORO REGION 2004-2013

In answering these questions, please remember to consider past starting from 2004 as well as present and use that experience to come up with suggestions for future.

Recall that the main components of UNGO-Uhusiano project have been the Information and Resource Centre in Morogoro, support to UNGO's district networks as well as training and networking (both in Finland and Tanzania).

Information that you will provide will be treated as strictly confidential.

Please continue the answer to the backside of the paper when needed.

#### 1. Background

- 1.1 Name.....
- 1.2 Organization and current position.....
- 1.3 Phone number and email .....
- 1.4 Since when and how are you familiar with Uhusiano-UNGO project? What position did you have during that time?

#### 2. General

- 2.1 What do you think in general about Uhusiano? What is its most important role? How about UNGOs?
- 2.2 Who do you think are the main beneficiaries of the project?
- 2.3 Have the beneficiaries had an opportunity to participate in the planning and implementation of the project (both in Finland and Tanzania)?
- 2.4 Has the project had an impact in Tanzania?
  - If yes, what kind of?.....
  - If no, why not?.....
- 2.5 If you are representing some member NGOs of Uhusiano or UNGO, which way has your organization benefited from this project
- 2.6 What do you think UNGO Information and Resource Centre (IRC) stands for? Have you used its services?
  - Have you visited UNGO websites?.....
- 2.7 Has the IRC achieved its goals set in the beginning?

2.8 What kind of benefits have the District networks (Kilosa, Morogoro rural, Ulanga districts) received from the cooperation?

2.9 What do you consider as the strengths and weaknesses of the project in question?

### **3. Sustainability**

3.1 What do you think happens when the support from Finnish Foreign Ministry and Uhusiano ends? Will the project be able to sustain itself?

3.2 What are your suggestions for the sustainability and future of IRC?

Which way should the fundraising be done?.....

What services could it offer to NGOs?.....

3.3 What do you suggest as the best approach towards the future for these two partners?

### **4. Cooperation and Information**

4.1 What do you think of the cooperation between UNGO and Uhusiano?

4.2 Has the information between the Uhusiano and UNGO been exchanging smoothly? If not, what could be done better? How about between UNGO/Uhusiano and members?

4.3 Do you think UNGO and Uhusiano are equal partners?

If yes, why?.....

If no, why?.....

### **5. Training and networking**

5.1 Have you attended UNGOs or Uhusianos trainings? How did you/your organization benefit from them? To how many? Which subjects were they dealing with?

5.2 What kind of skills, contacts or information have you acquired from the trainings? How did you/your organization use the new information, skills or contacts acquired from the trainings? Have you taught others?

5.3 Has your organization found a partner or project through Uhusiano or UNGO?

5.4 What kind of trainings or other services would you hope from UNGO or Uhusiano?

5.5 What do you think are the practical tools and skills that would be useful in the project negotiations between Finnish and Tanzanian NGOs?

### **6. Organizational development**

6.1 What do you think are the strengths and weaknesses of UNGO? Reflect in your answer the identity, values, culture and implementation of the organization.

6.2 How about that of Uhusiano?

## **7. Conclusions and recommendations**

7.1 What are the impacts brought by the project in terms of:

- Capacity building of Tanzanian NGOs
- Information sharing between NGOs
- Reducing inequality
- Environment and climate
- Gender equality
- Poverty alleviation

7.2 Please give any additional information or comments in areas that were not covered here adequately.....

## **Annex 3 Terms of Reference**

### **Uhusiano-UNGO cooperation project: Capacity building of NGOs working in Morogoro Region**

#### **Evaluation Terms of Reference**

Content:

1. Background: Uhusiano, UNGO, the project, roles of the partners
2. Purpose and objective of the evaluation:
3. Evaluation issues to be studied
4. Methodology
5. Conclusions and recommendations
6. Evaluation team

### **1. Background**

#### **Uhusiano**

Uhusiano is a Finnish NGO which was registered in 1990 originally for the purpose of co-ordinating its member organizations development projects in Tanzania, particularly in Morogoro region. In early 1990's Uhusiano had projects concerning vocational training (supporting tanzanian students in Finnish vocational schools, planning Tushikamane vocational training centre project) and health care (establishing dispensary in Tangeni).

In 1995 Uhusiano started a project named, Education and Evaluation and employed a tanzanian coordinator. First three years of the project concerned training courses for health workers. Since 1998, after the

mushrooming of Tanzanian NGO's, the training was targeted for NGO members. During that time Finnish organization Kepa established its field office in Tanzania on Uhusianos initiative, and took over much of the coordinating work done by Uhusiano until then.

UNGO took gradually the responsibility of organising NGO trainings funded by the 'Education and evaluation'-project. Since 2004 Uhusiano and UNGO started together a project named Capacity building of NGO's in Morogoro region.

Today Uhusiano has 80 individual members and 8 member associations. Also in Finland Uhusiano has been arranging trainings for members as a part of the project in so called Uhusiano seminars, which are arranged once a year. Uhusiano has also been publishing a newsletter which serves information dissemination

## **UNGO**

Uhusianos Tanzanian partner organization UNGO (Union of Non-governmental organizations in Morogoro) was established in 1998 and Uhusiano and UNGO signed their first cooperation agreement in 2000. Today UNGO has 210 member organizations and 5 district networks (Morogoro Rural (MORNGONET) , Mvomero (Mvomero Organizations Coalition-MOC), Kilosa (UNGOKI) , Kilombero (KIUNGONET) AND Ulanga (UNGOU).

2/7

Since its registration UNGO has grown to a rather strong regional umbrella organization, which has an acknowledged role also nationally. UNGO has also other cooperation partners and other projects.

## **Project**

Uhusianos and UNGO's project 'Capacity building of NGO's working in Morogoro region' arose from previous cooperation during 'Education and Evaluation' project and was jointly planned. The purpose and scope of the project was to build the capacity and improve the quality of performance of NGOs in Morogoro region, UNGO, Uhusiano and Uhusiano's member organizations. The overall objective of the project has been to strengthen the role of the civil society in development and reduction of poverty in Morogoro Region. The project received funding from Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs first for six years and then additional funding for three more years.

The objectives of the project have been the following:

- ▲ Strengthening civil society by improving insitutional capacity and organizational development of UNGO, its member organizations and district networks
- ▲ Increased cooperation, networking and information flow (north-south, south-south, north-north)
- ▲ Establishing functioning information and resource centre for NGOs in Morogoro
- ▲ High quality development cooperation projects with sustainable results in Morogoro region

The project has had three phases (2004-2006, 2007-2009 and 2011-2013). The main activities during these sub-projects have been the following:

**2004-2006:** Information and resource Centre (IRC) was established and supported by the. It functioned in same offices with Kepa Tanzania and received also support from it. Other activities included information sharing and training through seminars (in Morogoro and Finland), training of trainers (IT skills, project management and fundraising) Also equipment for IRC was purchased and the salary of project officer, IT expert and receptionist was paid from the project funds.

**2007-2009:** During these three years the training of trainers continued (bookkeeping, fund raising, project planning) and more office materials, equipment and furniture was purchased. IT class was improved and used for fundraising (IT courses, internet and secretarial services) as was the small kiosk as well. The salary of project officer, IT assistant and receptionist was paid and car and motor bike were purchased to make it easier fro UNGO to reach all its members of whom some are situated far from the Morogoro municipality. During this sub-project three of the UNGO district networks were established to help spread information to small local organizations in distircts. These district networks were supported from the project several ways including

paying their office rents, purchasing office equipment, furniture and bicycles for transport. They were also provided mobile phones and one network (MORGONET) received a solar power system. In 2008 a plot and a building were purchased for IRC to better its sustainability. The premises needed renovation which took place in 2009.

2010 the project hold still because Uhusiano did not receive funding it had applied from Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. However the application of funding for the last three years of the project was approved. Because these three years aim at Uhusianos phasing out and handing the

3/7

project over to UNGO, the project budget has been smaller than earlier. Activities of the years

**2011-2013** have included finishing the renovation of the IRC premises and moving IRC activities there. Salaries of the project officer, IT assistant and receptionist have been paid and visitations and discussion forums in District networks have been supported. There have also been annual NGO seminars in both Morogoro and Finland and Uhusianos newsletter has been published.

### **Roles of the partners**

Uhusiano and UNGO have a memorandum of cooperation which clarifies the roles of each party. These cooperation agreements have been renewed after every three years and a new agreement has been made for every three years sub-project.

Since the first phase of the project (2004-06) UNGO has been responsible for implementing the project activities in Tanzania. Planning of the activities and project has been made jointly. Uhusiano has been responsible for implementing the project activities in Finland. UNGO Executive Committee has taken the overall responsibility of the project implementation and monitoring in Tanzania.

The IRC has also had a Steering committee which has an advisory role. It has been consisting of the representatives of UNGO, Kepa Tanzania, local government authorities, UNGO member organizations and resource team, Uhusiano representatives and sometimes also other UNGO partner organization representatives.

The financial management and bookkeeping for activities in Tanzania has been the responsibility of UNGO for several years. Monthly financial reports and quarterly narrative reports were sent to Uhusiano. Uhusiano has been responsible for financial management for project activities in Finland and for monitoring the project proceedings in Tanzania.

## **2. Purpose and objectives of the evaluation**

The purpose of this evaluation is to produce conclusions of the past performance and lessons learned. It should also provide recommendations for the future for both UNGO and Uhusiano. The evaluation team should assess carefully the aims and efforts as well as successes and failures of the project and provide a report which can be used as a practical tool for future planning and decision making for Uhusiano and UNGO.

The assessment should cover all nine project years (2004-06, 2007-09 and 2011-13). The main components of the project have been the Information and Resource Centre in Morogoro municipality, support to UNGO's district networks, training and networking (both in Finland and Tanzania). The evaluation should focus on all the components. A special emphasis should be put on recommendations concerning the future of the IRC after Uhusianos support ends. This includes an assesment of the past and potential fundraising activities and past and potential services to UNGO member NGO's. The review should also provide tools for Uhusiano to plan the future of its activities (seminar, newsletter) and possible projects.

The end users of this evaluation will be Uhusiano and its member organizations, UNGO and its member organizations, NGO liaison unit at the Ministry of Foreign affairs and the Embassy of

4/7

Finland in Dar es salaam.

### **3. Evaluation issues to be studied**

The main issues (IRC, district networks, training, networking) should be studied against the following criteria:

#### **Relevance**

Have the results, purpose and overall objectives of the project been in line with the needs and aspirations of the beneficiaries? Have the activities been relevant in terms of the respective development policies of Finland and Tanzania? Has the situation changed during the project?

#### **Efficiency**

Relationship between quality and quantity of results achieved compared to the resources, means and time used. How well the various activities have transformed the available resources into the intended outputs, in terms of quantity, quality and time? Can the costs of the project be justified by the results achieved?

#### **Effectiveness**

Has the project been effectively planned and implemented? Have the set targets been achieved or will it happen in the future? If not, have the aims been overly optimistic, wrongly focused or otherwise ill suited?

#### **Impact**

Has progress been made towards achieving the overall objective of the project? Has the project have impacts? What are the intended and unintended consequences, impacts on beneficiaries, long term and short term, positive and negative? Has the project created changes in attitudes concerning civil society in Morogoro, role of UNGO and its member NGO's, practices in NGO and project management etc. Have the impacts been foreseen during planning or have they appeared during the implementation? May the project have added some value to the civil society in both countries even if direct impacts cannot be seen?

#### **Sustainability**

Will the benefits and effects produced by the project continue and be maintained after the termination of external support? Apart from the financial sustainability, could the activities have had some other kind of sustainable results (changes in attitudes/practices, tools for future action etc). What kind of skills have been passed to beneficiaries during the project.

#### **Participation and ownership**

Have the activities fit well in the Tanzanian society? Has the project been accepted and supported by the local government, NGO's and communities? Has the project been directed from top-down or bottom-up; have the beneficiaries participated and has there been possibilities for participation? Do beneficiaries have access to project information and to its results?

#### **Coherence**

The evaluation should take into account the main national policy documents, guidelines and priorities for development cooperation in general and for NGO's in particular, that both countries might have.

#### **Finnish value added**

What is the added value provided by the Finnish support?

#### **Cross-cutting issues**

According to the Finnish development cooperation policy the following aspects should be incorporated in all projects as sc. cross-cutting issues :

▲ promoting gender equality: Are gender related issues recognised in the project framework? How

effectively have gender issues been incorporated in the planning and implementation of the project

- ⤴ reducing inequality: Has the project been also promoting equality in other aspects than gender? Are the issues like democracy, human rights, participation and good governance mainstreamed? Do beneficiaries have equal opportunities to participate?
- ⤴ strengthening climate sustainability: Have the issues related to environment and climate been taken into account?

The evaluation should also take into consideration the previous cross-cutting issues of Finnish development policy guidelines:

- ⤴ Poverty alleviation; Have the actions reached the poor and have the poverty issues been acknowledged through the planning and implementation of the project?
- ⤴ Gender; have gender related issues been recognized and taken into account in the project?
- ⤴ Environment; Have the issues relating environment been taken into account?
- ⤴ Socio-cultural aspects; have these aspects been considered as factors affecting the success and acceptability of the project.
- ⤴ Good governance, democracy, human rights; are these issues mainstreamed?

#### **4. Methodology**

The evaluation team members should familiarize themselves with the relevant written documents and background information, including project documents (project plans and annual reports, quarterly narrative reports, action plans and budgets), other written material (cooperation agreements, steering committee minutes, project staff responsibilities etc) and Finnish Development co-operation policies and Tanzanian NGO policy. The task of the Finnish evaluation team member is to find out relevant information from the Finnish written documents (Uhusiano seminar documentation and Uhusiano newsletter) and the task of the Tanzanian evaluator to

6/7

familiarize with the Tanzanian laws concerning NGO's and development projects and possible project documents in swahili.

The focus of this evaluation is not academic review but rather a more qualitative, descriptive analysis. This mode of work relies a lot to the structured interviews, meetings, group discussions etc. If relevant information can be gathered by using a questionnaire, the evaluators can prepare it and use it as one method of information collection. The list about people and groups to be interviewed from Tanzanian NGO's, should be prepared by UNGO and evaluation team. However, the interviewees should include representatives from the following groups:

- ⤴ UNGO board members (since 2004)
- ⤴ IRC staff (present and previous)
- ⤴ District network representatives from all networks that have been supported by the project
- ⤴ Local government representatives (e.g. Steering committee members)
- ⤴ UNGO member organizations
- ⤴ Kepe Tanzania representatives

The Finnish evaluation team member should also interview (by email if needed) the Finnish stakeholders. Uhusiano will prepare a list of Finnish persons to be interviewed. They should include

- ▲ Uhusiano board members
- ▲ Uhusiano member NGO's
- ▲ Kepa Finland representatives

## **5. Conclusions and recommendations**

The main focus of the evaluation is to arrive at clear and justified conclusions and recommendations. On the basis of the collected information the team should produce a coherent view and clear, action-oriented conclusions and recommendations.

As the main end-users of this evaluation are Uhusiano and UNGO as well as officials responsible for the administration of the NGO development cooperation between Finland and Tanzania, recommendations should be action-oriented. The conclusions and recommendations should provide UNGO ideas how to further develop IRC and Uhusiano how to go about with the NGO cooperation and possible projects in the future. The recommendations should express true Tanzanian views as well as true Finnish views. The evaluators should not feel hindered by the fact that conclusions reached during the analysis may differ from the official Tanzanian or Finnish policy.

## **6. Evaluation team**

The evaluation team consists of one Finnish evaluator and one Tanzanian evaluator, Ms Oona Timonen and Mr Wylustan Mtega.

The evaluation work is estimated to take 30 days (Finnish evaluator) and 25 days (Tanzanian evaluator). The evaluation team is paid for the work according to separate agreements for each team member. Half of the payment is paid in the beginning of the work and the second half after the final report has been submitted to Uhusiano and UNGO.

7/7

## **7. Work plan, time schedule and reporting**

The evaluation field mission takes place in Tanzania, in Morogoro municipality and districts and in Dar es salaam if needed. The Finnish evaluation team member should also interview (by email if needed) the Uhusiano and Uhusiano member NGO representatives. These interviews can also be conducted after the Tanzania field mission.

The schedule of the evaluation work is as follows:

- ▲ September 2013: planning evaluation work and lists of persons to be interviewed, scheduling interviews, familiarizing with the documents, starting field work (interviews, collecting data)
- ▲ October: continuing field work, analysing data and preparing draft report.
- ▲ November: Finnish evaluation team member evaluates the project activities in Finland (seminar, newsletter). Evaluation team submits the draft report to Uhusiano and UNGO for comment 11.11.2013. Deadline for final report to be sent to Uhusiano and UNGO is 29.11.2013.

The report should be written in english and be submitted in word-format. The report should contain a list of people who have been interviewed during the evaluation. Also the questionnaire or any other types of practical tools should be annexed. Also the realized schedule of the evaluation mission should be annexed as well as the financial report of the evaluation.

The draft report should be provided to UNGO and Uhusiano for comments 11.11.2013. The final report should be submitted to both UNGO and Uhusiano latest 29.11.2013. It is then the responsibility of both organizations to disseminate the copies of the report to their respective members, cooperation partners and stakeholders.

## **Annex 4 Realised timetable of evaluation work**

Evaluation team: Ms Oona Timonen and Mr Wulystan Mtega

7.8.2013

Document review.

Communication to Uhusiano and UNGO about evaluation activities and schedules.

2.9 Morogoro, Mr Mtega's office at SUA

Meeting of the evaluation team members in Morogoro, SUA. Discussion and planning the timetable for the evaluation. Disbursing and sharing essential project documents.

4.9

Planning of the questionnaire and other tools to be used in the evaluation work.  
Copying the receipts, other practical issues.

5.9 UNGO office, Mazimbu

Meeting Mr Mdanku, the executive secretary and Mr Kweka, the project coordinator. Discussions of several practical issues such as payments, allowances, timetables and contracts for the evaluation work.

Arranging interviews.

6.9 UNGO office, Mazimbu and IRC Sabasaba

Meeting of the evaluation team, observing at the IRC premises and meeting and talking with the project employees.

Preparing the checklist and questionnaires for the evaluation.

9.9 IRC and town centre, office of Mafiga

Interview of Venance Mlali, (ex- IRC coordinator) in his office.

Testing the tools and reviewing the documents. Planning the evaluation process, contacting Uhusiano. Arranging next interviews.

10.9 IRC at Sabasaba

Going through and modifying the work plan. Contacting UNGO and Uhusiano for several issues concerning the evaluation. Reviewing the documents and files of UNGO. Modifying interview questions for IRC personnel.

11.9 WEETU premises, Tushikamane

Interview of Mr Sakware (UNGO Ex- Executive Secretary) in the WEETU premises at Tushikamane, Kilakala.

Discussions of current data obtained among evaluation team. Contacting other potential people for interview.

12.9

Document review and note taking, communication of evaluation practices.

13.9

One evaluation team member taking part in the Steering committee meeting klo 9.30 - 15.00. Getting contacts and arranging interviews for Steering committee members.

The other team member going through documents from different project years.

New work plan modification and additions made. Communication to Uhusiano of evaluation practices.

14.9

One evaluation team member taking part in the UNGO NGO forum.

The other team member going through project documents.

16.9

Finalizing the questionnaire.

Contacting Jenna Kettunen from KEPA. Contacting other possible interviewees. Addings and modifications to the list of the interviewees.

17.9

Interview of Dr Didas Mrima (Steering committee member, resource team member and a board member of UNGO). Preparing and modifying a detailed work plan.

Forming a questionnaire for KEPA and Uhusiano.

20.9

Interview of current UNGO board, Idd Mdanku (Ex.Secretary) and Masoud Makullah (Treasurer). Compiling the final list of interviewees, receiving their contact addresses. Copying and preparing the questionnaire sheets to KEPA, Uhusiano and UNGO member NGOs.

Interviewing the representatives of member NGOs. Preparations for the coming fieldwork in Matombo Morogoro rural.

Contacting to districts to schedule interviews.

23.9

Fieldwork to Morogoro rural district network. Focused group discussions. Communication to contractors and compiling documents received from Uhusiano.

24.9

Document review of the Finnish Foreign Ministry's policies and guidelines.  
Arranging interviews with District network executives.  
Distributing the Questionnaire to testing purposes.  
Starting to Write the Draft report.

25.9

Document review.  
Counting, disbursement of funds, administrative issues and other logistics of the evaluation work.

26.9

Document review.  
Counting, disbursement of funds, administrative issues and other logistics of the evaluation work.

Writing the Draft report.

Questionnaire final modification and distribution to Uhusiano board.

28.9

Part-taking and observation to UNGO Annual General Meeting.

Printing questionnaires at IRC, Distributing questionnaires, arranging their collection.  
Arranging interviews. Making arrangements for the next field trip, making sure the vehicle maintenance.

30.9 IRC, Sabasaba

Data analysis and compilation.  
Requesting the remaining filled questionnaires.

1.10

Data analysis and compilation from the questionnaires and from the interviews conducted up to now.  
Requesting questionnaires.

2.10

Data analysis and compilation.

Car maintenance, (the tire broke down on a trip to Morogoro rural). Receiving, collecting and disbursing money to team members, driver etc.

3.10

Other team member leaving to Ulanga. Overnight in Ifakara because of car problems.  
The other one compiling information from interviews, contacting interviewees.

4.10

Fieldwork to Ulanga district networks. Focused group discussions.

Returning from Ulanga.

The other one doing document review of Uhusiano documents.  
Starting to write the Draft report.

7.10

Interviews at UNGO office of the Executive Secretary (the second part of interview) Mr Mdanku and Treasurer Mr Makullah. Collecting and handing out the borrowed evaluation funds from UNGO.

Collecting part of the questionnaires.

Document review.

8.10

Debriefing of Ulanga visit between team members, collecting part of the receipts.  
Document review.

Reaching for the members who still have the questionnaire unanswered.  
Collecting and compiling questionnaires.

9.10

Data analysis. Document review. Compiling data from questionnaires.

10.10

Writing the Draft report. Compiling data from questionnaires, documents and other sources.

11.10

Compiling data from questionnaires, documents and other sources. Document review. Requesting missing documents. Team members planning the remaining activities and interviews.

18.10

Compiling information from the received questionnaire answers. Document review.  
Phone interview of Gebo Mlangwa from Morogoro DC.

21.10

Reviewing the documents, writing the draft report. Arranging Kilosa visit.

22.10

Reviewing the documents, writing the draft report. Communicating to Uhusiano, trying to arrange Kilosa visit but car has problems, can not be used for future visit as was planned.

23.10.

Reviewing the documents, writing the draft report. Communicating to Uhusiano and UNGO about documents that are still lacking and to some informants who haven't replied to questionnaire.

24.10

Writing the draft report.

25.10

Writing the draft report. Collecting of questionnaires, communicating to Finland about financial issues and final arrangements.

28.10

Writing the draft report. Receiving last questionnaires. Compiling evaluators work together.

29.10

Writing the draft report. Compiling evaluators work together. Receiving some last documents and information that was lacking.

30.10

Interview of Rose Anthony (Office Attendant). Compiling evaluation work together, finalising the draft report. Last arrangements, collecting of questionnaires.

Final meeting of evaluation team and discussions.

1.10

Kilosa fieldwork. Focused group discussions. Briefing of the interviews within evaluation team. Incorporating them to the report. Debriefing with stakeholders. Goodbyes and feedbacks.

4.11

Finnish member of evaluation team travels to Dar es Salaam.

5.11

Finnish member of evaluation team departures from Dar es Salaam.

6.11

Finnish member of evaluation team arriving in Finland.

11.11-21.11

Compiling the final report and incorporating the corrections.

22.11

Submission of the final report.

**Annex 5 Financial report of the evaluation**  
**Modified work plan for the project evaluation activities**

Item	Time												Cost item		
	September				October				November						
<i>Developing and testing the evaluation tools</i>															
Documentary review (reports, proposals, evaluations etc) at UNGO													-		
Local transport in Morogoro town													Lump sum		

Preparation of evaluation tools and modalities for conducting the evaluation																		Stationery (flip charts, note books, pens, printing, photocopying, marker pens)
<b>Sub-total</b> <b>426,000/=</b>																		
<b><i>Field work to Kilosa district network</i></b>																		
Fuel for the UNGO vehicle																		Litres (135 km x 2 trips /9 km per litre
Vehicle servicing and maintenance																		Vehicle servicing
Meals and accommodation for the driver																		2 days

Accommodation for the two evaluation team members													4 days		
Allowance for one district network executive													2 days		
Soda/water and bites during focus group discussions													13 soda/water		
Communication during field work													Communication		
<b>Sub-total</b>															
775,500/=															
<i>Field work to Morogoro rural district network</i>															

Fuel for the UNGO vehicle												Litres (135 km x 2 trips /9 km per litre)		
Meals and accommodation for the driver												2 days		
Accommodation for the evaluation team members												4 days		
Allowance for one district network executive												2 days		





Interviewing member NGO representatives																	
Interviewing LGA																	
Interviewing steering committee members																	
<b>Sub-total</b>																	<b>40,500/=</b>
Data analysis, interpretation and compilation																	-
Sub-total																	00.00
Report writing and submission of draft report																	-
Corrections incorporation																	-

