SPANISH IMPACT EVALUATION FUND (SIEF)
CLUSTER FUND: CALL FOR PROPOSALS

PROPOSAL COVER SHEET

Name of Impact Evaluation: **Impact Evaluation of TASAF II**

Country: **Tanzania**

Proposed by:
(Name): **Berk Özler**   **Department/Division: DECRG-PO**

Name of Project TTL: **Ida Manjolo**   **Department/Division: AFTH1**

Other impact evaluation collaborators (Name/Department): Johannes Hoogeveen (AFTP2), Mishael Fariji (TASAF), Sarah Baird, Craig McIntosh (University of California, San Diego)

Total Amount of Funding Requested from SIEF (US$): $295,000

I. CLUSTER INFORMATION

1. **List the sector under which this impact evaluation falls (note that only evaluations in SIEF eligible sectors will be considered):** *Primary Sector*: **Social Protection and Labor;** *Secondary Sector*: **Poverty and Hunger**

2. **Indicate below if the impact evaluation falls under one of the following clusters of impact evaluations. If no pre-existing clusters apply, please indicate a new cluster in question 3. Note that the identification of new clusters is encouraged by SIEF.**

☐ Conditional Cash Transfers

☐ Basic Education: School Based Management

☐ Basic Education: Information for Accountability

☐ Basic Education: Teacher Incentives and Contracting

☐ Early Childhood Development

☐ HIV/AIDS Prevention

☐ Malaria Control

☐ Youth Employment and School to Work Transition

☒ Decentralized Delivery of Social Services/ Community Driven Development

☐ Urban Upgrading to improve HD outcomes

☐ Water and Sanitation to improve HD outcomes

3. **In addition to pre-existing clusters, SIEF expects to fund new clusters. SIEF Program Management will aggregate similar proposed evaluations into new clusters. Would you like to propose a new cluster?** Yes ☐ No ☒

Name of new cluster: _____

4. **Would you like to nominate yourself as SIEF Cluster Leader for the pre-existing or new cluster indicated above?** Selected cluster leaders will prepare cluster briefs and assume responsibility for managing the SIEF cluster. Yes ☐ No ☒

II IMPACT EVALUATION INFORMATION

1. **Is the impact evaluation of a World Bank funded intervention?**
   Yes ☒
   No ☐   Please list primary intervention funding source _____

2. **Is randomization feasible for this impact evaluation?**
   Yes ☒
   No ☐   Please indicate identification strategy_____

3. **What is the proposed unit of randomization or assignment of treatment (household/community/school/etc)? Community** _____

4. **What sample sizes are proposed for the impact evaluation?**
    2,500 households in 100 communities.

5. **Timeline: Enter proposed dates for the following milestones**

Country Case	Concept Note	Base-Line Data	Follow-up Data Round 1	Follow-up Data Round 2	Remaining Data Rounds	Anticipated Completion Date
Tanzania	*September 2006*	*Nov. 2007-March 2008*	*May-September 2008*	*Nov. 2008-March 2009*	*4*	*June 2010*

6. **Funding Summary**

Country Case	Total Evaluation Budget	Current Funding Received	Other Funding Pending	Total Funding GAP	Funding Request from SIEF
Tanzania	*$1,350,000*	*$1,055,000 TASAF, TFESSD, GAP, SIEF*	*none*	*$295,000*	*$295,000*

III. CLUSTER DETAILS
Maximum 1 page (12 font single spaced)

I.   Background – Rationale for knowledge generation in this cluster.

This cluster focuses on projects that support the transfer of decision-making responsibility to the local level. The idea that local citizens and institutions are best placed to address and resolve development challenges is one that has acquired tremendous force in recent times. It is the unifying theme which underlies many different approaches towards reforms in service delivery, whether in the form of community based/driven approaches, decentralization of government decision making or a more general emphasis on participation and the strengthening of local institutions.

It is generally expected that the transfer of responsibilities to the local level will help build demand for inclusive and effective local governance, empower poor and vulnerable groups, improve the delivery of public services, and create local livelihood opportunities. In line with this, both governments and donors have invested very substantial resources in programs and projects which support this type of approaches. This general trend is of special importance in the human development sectors as social services tend to be at the forefront of both decentralization and community participation schemes. Despite this, however, we have relatively little by way of reliable evidence on the effectiveness of such efforts in engendering more accountable and inclusive governance for improved developmental outcomes. In particular, there are significant knowledge gaps in terms of the local conditions under which the transfer of power and responsibilities to the local level are conducive to improved social outcomes particularly for the poorest and most vulnerable groups.

II.   Description of cluster and other country cases of similar interventions (2 paragraphs)

A cluster of 'local development' impact evaluations has been started including both HD and non-HD projects. Regardless of the 'sector' of the specific intervention, which more often than not is multi-sectoral, the cluster focuses on a common set of questions regarding the functioning of local institutions that are of critical importance to all HD sectors. Specifically, the evaluations in this cluster not only focus on impacts on final HD outcomes but also on how these are linked to broader institutional outcomes (e.g. social capital, participation, governance) and local conditions (e.g. local inequality or degree of local elite capture).

The cluster currently includes evaluations in a number of countries, some of which are applying for funds under the SIEF Cluster Fund window: Morocco, Philippines, Senegal, Tanzania and Uganda. The projects involve social/poverty funds and various decentralization initiatives. This area of research figures prominently in the work agenda for DECRG, PREM and SDV in close collaboration with HD units.

III.   Cluster Research Questions and Primary Outcome Indicators (2 paragraphs)

A series of Bank-led impact evaluations of local development projects intend to provide robust inter-regional and inter-sectoral evidence on a number of questions that are directly related with important outcomes – human development and otherwise. These research questions include:

- What is the impact of community based approaches to development on household welfare?
- What is the relationship between decentralization/CDD and service delivery?
- Do local development projects have a positive (and lasting) impact on the health, education, and nutrition of beneficiaries, and if so, which types of projects and beneficiaries enjoy the highest impacts?
- Is there heterogeneity of impacts or inequality in the distribution of impacts?

The main outcome indicators of interest are anthropometrics, health (morbidity, mortality, HIV/AIDS incidence, health clinic attendance, etc.), education (enrollment, attendance, learning outcomes, etc.), governance, social capital, and elite capture.

IV IMPACT EVALUATION DETAILS
Maximum 2 pages (12 font single spaced)
I. Description of the Intervention (1-2 paragraphs)

TASAF, Tanzania's Social Action Fund, is a community driven development project being implemented throughout Tanzania. Under its second phase (TASAF II) worth $150 million, up to one third of all Tanzanian villages are expected to receive a TASAF sub-project by 2010. Sub-projects target three main beneficiary groups (intervention types): service poor communities (improvement of social services and infrastructure), food insecure households (public works programs where beneficiaries receive cash for work) and vulnerable groups, such as the elderly, people with disabilities, widows, orphans, and those living with HIV/AIDS (income generation projects such as animal husbandry, tailoring, milling, vegetable growing, etc.). The types of projects available for the first two beneficiary groups of TASAF have been evaluated before and are, as such, less interesting from a policy and evaluation standpoint. The proposed investigation therefore focuses on evaluating the impact of providing income generating projects to vulnerable groups in a decentralized and (in principle) demand driven manner on various outcomes, including health, nutrition, education, poverty, consumption, insurance, and social capital.

In order to answer these questions a team that consists of World Bank staff and TASAF officials has designed a randomized evaluation of the income generating activities under the TASAF II umbrella. The study includes a random assignment of villages into treatment and control groups, where the villages in the control group receive their projects with a delay of 12 months. The study will collect panel information on 2500 households (half treatment and half control) in 100 villages in five districts for three years. Along with the randomization, the study also involves a detailed listing of each household in all 100 study villages to examine targeting, benefit incidence, effects of social networks in decision making, and elite capture. Moreover, a stratification of the sampled households in each village into five different groups (please see Section III below for the definitions of these groups), allows the study to look at what types of people benefit the most from the TASAF program. Finally, the study will track some individual outcomes (anthropometric, health, education) to examine whether the targeted vulnerable individuals (orphans, elderly, those living with HIV) benefit from the interventions as opposed to their households as a whole.

II. Primary Research Questions and Outcome Indicators (1-2 paragraphs)

Four questions are of central importance in the evaluation of impact in a context of local development projects:

1. Given the ground-up, decentralized nature of project development, how are the projects targeted, and which steps in the process promote or undermine pro-poor targeting?
2. Do these local development projects have a positive (and lasting) impact on the consumption, health, education, and nutrition of beneficiaries, and if so, which types of projects and beneficiaries enjoy the highest impacts?
3. Are these local development projects prone to elite capture, and which types of projects are most resistant to it?
4. To what extent does the group nature of these projects create real, lasting social capital?

The main outcome indicators of interest are:

- Household health, education, nutrition, consumption, and poverty
- Sustainability and profitability of group investment projects
- Divergence in outcomes between group/village leaders and other beneficiaries
- Sustained investment, cohesion, and mutual insurance among group members

III. Evaluation Design/ Identification Strategy (2-3 paragraphs)

Identification of the impacts of TASAF will come from a randomized implementation of the program within districts. Five districts, each of which has 20 participating villages, will make up the

study group. From the 20 study villages in each district, 10 will be randomly sampled to be treatment villages and 10 to be control villages. This gives us 50 treatment and 50 control villages, and from each of these villages we will randomly sample two approved TASAF projects for in-depth study (out of an average of four). We will therefore have detailed data on 100 treatment groups and 100 control groups, phased into the study in groups of 40 over the course of five months.

Prior to conducting the randomization, study villages will go through a listing exercise that gives us a census of individuals, from which we will randomly sample approximately 25 individuals from the following five strata (total number of individuals for each stratum in parentheses): (A) three members of the leadership of each sampled TASAF group, who have access to the group account (6); (B) four non-leadership members of each group (8); (C) three village members who are eligible for the TASAF group but don't participate (6); (D) three representative non-eligible village members (3); (E) the Village Head and the Village Executive Officer (2). Using this structure, we can address the following impacts:

1. <u>Impact of TASAF on beneficiaries, communities, and CDD groups:</u> Direct comparison of the experimental groups A and B between the treatment and control give impacts on beneficiaries and groups, and using weights calculated from the listing exercise we can measure village-level impacts.

2. <u>Determinants of Impact:</u> Interaction of control variables at the individual, group, or village level with a treatment dummy allows us to measure heterogeneity of impacts.

3. <u>Spillover effects:</u> Comparison of group C across treatment and control gives spillovers to 'eligible' groups, and group D gives us spillovers on the average community member.

4. <u>Group capture:</u> The triple-difference comparison of the excess benefits experienced by group leaders over other members between treatment and control, particularly in the absence of any benefits for non-leader group members, will allow us to measure group capture.

5. <u>Enterprise and Group sustainability:</u> Using heterogeneity within treated projects, we can analyze the determinants of groups that continue to function collectively over long periods and that reinvest capital (thereby creating durable enterprises).

6. <u>Targeting:</u> Using data from all 121 districts and 11,000 villages in Tanzania, we can examine the determinants of the decision to submit an application for a TASAF project, and then the selection exerted at each of the two distinct bureaucratic layers of selection imposed by the government.

IV.   Evaluation Team (1 paragraph)

The principal investigators of the evaluation team are Sarah Baird, Craig McIntosh (University of California, San Diego), and Berk Özler (World Bank). The project enjoys the full collaboration (and financial contribution to the evaluation – please see Section V below) of the Tanzanian Government, spearheaded by Mishael Fariji, Director of the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of TASAF, and from the World Bank's country team (Johannes G. Hoogeveen).

V.   Detailed Description of Funding Request Justification and Timeline (2 paragraphs)

The randomized evaluation of TASAF II is a complete collaboration between TASAF and the World Bank. The total cost of the evaluation over the three-year period September 2007- September 2010 is expected to cost approximately US$1,350,000. However, due to initial setup costs and the costly listing exercise (which is necessary for the stratified sampling of households, as well as to get a solid handle on targeting questions within and between villages), close to half of the total cost of the evaluation is expected to be spent in Round 1, with the follow-up rounds of data collection being significantly cheaper.

For the three districts for which we are responsible (TASAF is procuring the field work in the other two study districts and contributing $400,000 to the evaluation), we expect to spend $600,000 in FY08 (baseline data collection **plus** a rapid resurvey of income generating projects after 6 months), $190,000 in FY09 and $190,000 in FY10. We have raised $380,000 from TFESSD ($150,000 for FY09), $170,000 from SIEF Quick Wins window, and $105,000 from GAP, for a total of $655,000. **We are requesting $295,000 from SIEF – $105,000 in FY08 and $190,000 in FY09.**