



# Support Models for CSOs at Country Level

Tanzania Country Report




# **Support Models for CSOs at Country Level**

## Tanzania Country Report

---

**Project:** Support Models for CSOs at Country Level  
**Client:** Norad, on behalf of Nordic+ Donor Agencies  
**Period:** April-August 2007

**Task Team:**

Ms. Riselia Bezerra (team leader)

Mr. Kimani Njoroge (national consultant)

**Quality Assurance:**

Mr. Arne Disch

Ms. Liv Moberg

## **Foreword to the country reports**

This report on country level support modalities to civil society is one of a total of six similar studies conducted in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe between April and July 2007.

The study was carried out by Scanteam, a Norwegian consulting company, on behalf of a donor group consisting of Canada, Finland, Ireland, Sweden, the UK and Norway. The findings were later elaborated and merged into a synthesis report, describing general trends and challenges in current direct support to Civil Society Organisations in the South, through various modalities. The synthesis report is published together with the country studies.

Specific views and arguments in this report are attributed to Scanteam and not to the donors.

December 2007

Jan-Petter Holtedahl and Ivar Evensmo

Senior Advisers, Civil Society Department  
Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

# Contents

<b>Acronyms and Abbreviations .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>1 Background and Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Study Coverage and Methodology.....	4
1.2 Acknowledgements and Disclaimer .....	5
<b>2 Civil Society and the National Context.....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 The Legal Framework.....	6
2.2 CSOs Participation in Tanzania’s Development Process .....	7
2.3 Capacities of CSOs in Playing Their Roles.....	8
2.4 Challenges to Strengthening CSOs .....	9
2.5 The CSO context of Zanzibar .....	10
<b>3 Support Models in Tanzania.....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 Canada .....	11
3.2 Finland .....	12
3.3 Ireland .....	12
3.4 Norway.....	13
3.5 Sweden .....	13
3.6 The United Kingdom .....	14
3.7 The Nordic+ donors .....	14
3.8 Joint Funds for CSO Support.....	16
3.8.1 The Foundation for Civil Society (FCS).....	16
3.8.2 The Rapid Envelope Fund for HIV/AIDS (RFE) .....	17
3.8.3 The BEST Advocacy .....	18
3.8.4 Financial Sector Deepening Trust .....	18
3.8.5 Other Fund: The Ford Foundation.....	18
3.9 Nordic+ Views on CSOs and CSO Views on Nordic+ Donors.....	18
3.10 Relations between Nordic+ Donors and CSOs.....	19
<b>4 Assessment of Support Models in Tanzania .....</b>	<b>21</b>
4.1 Assessment of Support Models by CSOs .....	21
4.1.1 Unilateral Direct Core Support Model.....	21
4.1.2 Joint Support Models (Direct Core Support and through Intermediaries) .....	21
4.1.3 Direct Support to CSO Project/Programme.....	21
4.2 Assessment of Support Models by Donors.....	22
4.2.1 Unilateral Direct Support to CSO Project/Programme .....	22
4.2.2 Unilateral Direct Core Support.....	22
4.2.3 Joint Support Models (Direct Core and Intermediary).....	23
4.3 Assessment of CSOs supported through Different Models.....	23

4.3.1	Unilateral Direct Project/Programme Support .....	23
4.3.2	Unilateral Direct Core Support.....	24
4.3.3	Joint Support (Core and Intermediaries) .....	24
4.4	Assessment of Funding Modalities .....	24
4.5	Tendencies in Support .....	27
<b>5</b>	<b>Main Findings and Conclusions .....</b>	<b>29</b>
	<b>Annex A: Data Matrix, Nordic+ Donor in Tanzania.....</b>	<b>30</b>
	<b>Annex B: List of Informants .....</b>	<b>33</b>
	<b>Annex C: Documents Reviewed .....</b>	<b>35</b>

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

ASC	Civil Society Assembly
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CBO	Community-Based Organisations
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
EU	Euros
FCS	Foundation for Civil Society
HQ	Head Quarters (Development Partners)
INGO	International Non-governmental Organisations
NGO	Non-governmental Organisations
NOK	Norwegian Kroner (EUR 1 = NOK 8 approx)
RFE	Rapid Fund Envelope
SEK	Swedish Kroner (EUR 1 = SEK 9 approx)
Sida	Swedish International Development Agency
TZS	Tanzania Shilling
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme



## 1 Background and Introduction

Norad, Norway's Development Cooperation Agency, contracted Scanteam on behalf of "Nordic+" donors Canada, Finland, Ireland, Norway, Sweden and the UK, to review the experiences in six countries of different models for supporting civil society.

The *purpose* is to contribute to the development of a strategic policy framework for Nordic+ support to a vibrant, pluralistic and democratic civil society. The *aim* is to identify and analyze different support models, while the *objectives* are to (i) review possibilities for improving direct support to NGOs/CSOs through country level support models; (ii) shed light on constraints and possibilities of different types of support models, and (iii) increase outreach to a wider range of civil society organisations and reduce transaction costs.

This Country Study Report on Tanzania is thus one of the six separate studies that will form the empirical foundations for the overall report.

### 1.1 Study Coverage and Methodology

The methodology applied for the study is described in detail in the overall Synthesis Report for this study. There the final summary of quantitative trends in the selection of support models and some of the key features will also be presented.

Some of the main issues concerning the data collection are the following:

- Methodology used in the field studies include: in-depth interviews with key donor personell and CSOs. Those with first hand knowledge of the support models in question were prioritised. For this reason, few government representatives have been interviewed. Questionnaires were sent out by email, and a follow-up survey was distributed after the drafting of the country reports. In addition there have been meetings for debriefing at the end of the field work as well as seminars and focus group discussions held. Emerging findings were presented and commented on at the final debrief and comments included in the country report. The study team (minus national consultants) has conducted three internal workshops during the study to discuss methodology and findings.
- An important part of this study is to review and further develop terminology and categorization of support to civil society. The data collection instruments have been simplified and adapted as the study progressed. Comprehensive questionnaires and Conversation guides were developed prior to the field work, based on a desk study of key documents. The existing categories of support models were not sufficiently clear. Terminology has been further developed during the course of this study. Based on lessons learned in the field and the need for simplification and reduction in scope, a final matrix with a few key features linked to civil society support models was sent out to the Nordic + embassies in the six countries. The response from the embassies to the quantitative part of the data collection has been low for all countries involved.
- This study only looked at support models at country level and does not include funding of NGOs/CSOs from the donor head offices. Nor did it cover funding which is channelled through international NGOs (INGOs), unless the Embassy used an INGO locally as an intermediary channel.

- Furthermore, the study did not attempt to measure the effectiveness of the CSOs in relation to the chosen support model – that is, it did not look at results at community or target group level. The assessment of the quality and impact of the respective support models relied on information from CSO staff and donors.
- Finally, the CSO perspectives included in the study is limited to the organisations receiving support from Nordic+ countries, since the main focus is on experiences with the different support models. The scope of the study did not allow for a comprehensive analysis of the CSO community at large and the views of those not receiving Nordic+ funding.
- The donor perspective on support models is dominant in all country studies as per the Terms of Reference and early meetings with the Nordic+ donor group in Oslo. There are a number of other studies dealing thoroughly with the CSO perspective on civil society ↔ donor relations in general<sup>1</sup>, but the team agrees with comments made to the draft reports that the study would have benefited from a more thorough analysis of the CSO perspectives on the different support models<sup>2</sup>.

## 1.2 Acknowledgements and Disclaimer

The Tanzania country visit was carried out 10-26 May in Dar Es Salaam and Zanzibar. The Norwegian Embassy was the focal point in Tanzania, and their staff provided support for preliminary collection of information from all Nordic+ donors, the preparations of the program for the mission. The briefing and debriefing meetings were also organized by and held at the Norwegian Embassy.

The team met with all Nordic+ countries/embassies, other donors, government officials, UNDP, the World Bank and 24 civil society organizations, of which 20 receive financial support from one or more Nordic+ donors. One constraint to the field mission was the delay of some Nordic+ donors in providing information requested prior to and during the country-study regarding their funding support. While only a few Nordic+ embassies provided complete CSO matrices, the team collected additional information throughout the mission. Corrections provided by some donors have led to new findings. The data matrix reflecting these corrections and updates can be found in Annex A.

We would like to thank officials from the Nordic+ countries, other donors, CSOs, government officials, the UN, the World Bank and other informants who willingly gave us their time and shared their experience and knowledge with us. A special note of gratitude goes to Amina Lwasye and Dolorosa at the Norwegian Embassy for their support to our mission. Nonetheless, this country report and its findings are the sole responsibility of the consultants, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the embassies, cooperation agencies, CSOs, government officials or other informants met.

---

<sup>1</sup> See synthesis report for further discussion and references.

<sup>2</sup> CSOs interviewed were asked about their views on support models, but in general their responses were of a more general character than directly linked to the comparative strengths and weaknesses of the different models.

## 2 Civil Society and the National Context

Tanzania has a population of about 38 million, of whom one million on the islands of Zanzibar. Population growth is about 3% a year. Economic growth in Tanzania has been strong since 2000 with annual GDP growth of 5% to 7%. During the past five years, Tanzania has received USD 6 billion in aid. Nonetheless, Tanzania remains one of the poorest countries in Africa. According to the National Bureau of Statistics, 36% of the population lived below the national poverty line in 2001. Progress is being made in health and education, but infant and maternal mortality rates are still among the highest in the world - one in 10 children dies before their fifth birthday, although this rate has fallen by a quarter in the last five years. HIV/Aids is a challenge, and more than one third of children under five are malnourished. Poverty is largely a rural phenomenon, with 87% of the poor living in rural areas, and there are significant differences between different parts of the country.

Tanzania is an emerging multiparty democracy, but power remains skewed to the executive branch of Government. Executive power rests with the president and the ruling party *Chama Cha Mapinduzi*, which has dominated Tanzanian politics since independence. Donor-government relationships became problematic during the early 1990s, but from 1995 members of the Nordic+ group assisted in rebuilding aid relationships, thereby also strengthening Tanzanian ownership of the country's development programme.

The donor community has responded to the government's reforms by changing funding arrangements from project and programme support to budget support. Fourteen donors currently allocate funding via general and sectoral budget support programmes. Tanzania also receives funds from the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative because it complies with international donor requirements on poverty reduction policies. Nonetheless, the government budget remains highly aid dependent, with 30-40% funded by aid.

MKUKUTA (The United Republic of Tanzania National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty 2005-2010) is the national framework for economic growth and poverty reduction committed by the Government in consultation with civil society. In it the Government emphasises the importance of the private sector and CSOs, and their contribution to Tanzania development. CSOs have actively been involved in MKUKUTA processes.

### 2.1 The Legal Framework

In 2002 the government of Tanzania issued a national policy on NGOs intended to provide for a new institutional and legislative framework. In general NGOs welcomed the legislation, but protested the absence of meaningful consultation with civil society actors regarding the specificities of the policy. The Policy is seen by some NGOs as threatening their freedom of expression, especially in governance, policy and advocacy related matters. The act enables government to deny registration or to de-register any seen to be against the 'public interest', and to exert control or restriction of political activities.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The case of Baraza la Wanawake Tanzania/BAWATA (National Women Council) is an illustration of government attempt to deregister an NGO. For more information on this case see <http://www.lead.or.tz>.

CSOs may be registered under three different government organs: the Ministry of Home Affairs, Business Registration and Licensing Agency (BRELA, mainly companies), and presently under the NGO Coordination Department in the Ministry of Children, Women, Gender and Social Welfare. The mandate of the NGO Coordination Department is to register all CSOs and co-ordinate the CSOs activities through the NGO Council, which has come into existence as per the NGO Act. The department requires all CSOs already registered with other government organs and doing NGO-type of work to be registered for compliance with the NGO Act. However, the department has exercised a regulatory role although it is supposed to take on some co-ordinating role. It is, for example, supposed to have a database of all registered NGOs and provide as well as collect and disseminate NGO-related information; but, up to date the department has not been able to provide any of these functions.

Although the relationship between the Government and civil society organizations in Tanzania has been characterized by some mistrust and suspicion, government-NGO relations has expanded and improved. Consultations during the process for the MKUKUTA provided a positive thrust in government-CSO relationship. The Government is increasingly engaging with CSOs as partners in poverty reduction. The number of civil society organisations has increased substantially in the last decade. In the early 1990s, it is estimated that some 200 CSOs were registered<sup>4</sup> while currently the number is estimated at 4500 in the mainland. Furthermore, improvement in Civil Society in Tanzania is diverse with the urban-based organisations leading in advocacy, while rural based organisations are more into service delivery. Studies show the somewhat unexpected finding that rural CSOs are often "owned" by the urban elite or branches of urban CSOs (Dublin City University/REPOA, 2007). Popular participation that is self-invigorating from the grassroots seems to be lacking given the current urban-rural CSO relationship and ownership of the CSOs. Operational areas and geographical coverage of the CSOs are mainly determined by the donors and more so the INGOs zoning of Regions/districts as their areas of focus and interest.

## 2.2 CSOs Participation in Tanzania's Development Process

On the web-portal "Tanzania Development Gateway", [www.tanzaniagateway.org/](http://www.tanzaniagateway.org/), a civil society database is available in which CSOs are classified according to 28 sectors and areas.

The formal organisations can be divided in social service delivery organisations, like district development trusts and faith based organisations (which are the most common types of CSOs in Tanzania), and interest based organisations, like community development organisations, rights-based organisations and advocacy groups. The rights-based organisations and advocacy groups are often linked to informal networks of organisations at lower levels and can mobilise these for various occasions to act as a group.

The creation of NGO networks and coalitions is a fairly new development in the Tanzanian civil society and has arisen as a response from the CSOs to strengthen their legitimacy and efficiency. Most networks and coalitions are still at an early stage. There are 16 national

---

<sup>4</sup> *Civil Society in Tanzania*, Christian Michelsen Institute (2000)

networks in the field of environment, gender, HIV/Aids, human rights, disabled people's rights, youth and children. There is only one network each for agriculture, pastoralism and education, while there is no network on health.

The current debate on the challenges facing CSOs in Tanzania includes mainly their integrity and governance in relation to the people they seek to serve. Transparency and accountability have been key issues about CSOs performance at community level. The government equally laments and questions whether CSOs have the moral authority to question others on good governance and accountability. The CSOs of Tanzania are seen as requiring greater capacity building in advocacy and good governance<sup>5</sup> for them to engage effectively and constructively in the policy dialogue with both government and the donors.

According to recent research, NGOs perceive their contribution to poverty reduction and development in Tanzania to be strong (Dublin City University/REPOA 2007). NGOs feel they have had a positive impact on policy and legislative change, despite of ongoing implementation problems. However, most NGOs do not employ formal monitoring and evaluation procedures to measure their effectiveness. Thus aggregate result of NGOs' activities and impact in Tanzania development is difficult to assess.

## 2.3 Capacities of CSOs in Playing Their Roles

Studies point to the capacity gaps in the civil society sector. In 2006 UNDP, in collaboration with TANGO and ALAT, carried out an assessment of CSOs capacity gaps in Tanzania. Their findings indicate low technical capacity in the following aspects:

**Policy analysis:** Very few CSOS have the skills needed to undertaken comprehensive policy analysis and therefore are unable to follow the government's policy making process.

**Research:** Like the issues of policy analysis, most CSOs lack the skills needed for undertaking research that is seen as credible by government and other development actors.

**Programming and Planning:** Most CSOs in Tanzania do not have well defined strategic plans and therefore undertake *ad hoc* advocacy activities that are not well rooted.

**Communication and information:** Most CSO have poor information and communication systems and therefore fail to reach their constituencies in time when soliciting information or giving feedback on the development process.

**Advocacy skills:** Even when they have an issue to put across , Tanzanian CSOs do not have the skills needed for effective advocacy.

**Documentation:** CSOs in Tanzania engage in a number of development processes; however their impact is not felt due to poor documentation and information packaging.

Regarding the issue of *functional capacities* the following was observed:

---

<sup>5</sup> Working Paper no. 04.9/Reflections on NGOs in Tanzania, what we are, what we are not and what we ought to be/Hakielimu/Shivji



**Vision and Mission:** It was noted that most CSOs do not have very clear visions and missions, which means that the community or people they are to serve do not identify with the work the CSOs are doing, or the CSO fails to lead by its vision and mission.

**Relationship:** Despite the recent increase in the number of NGO networks, the CSOs are still seen as working too much in isolation, not benefiting from these networks.

**Accountability:** The accountability of CSOs in Tanzania is lopsided in that they are more accountable to the donors and sometimes to government, than they are to their constituencies who are the reason why the CSOs exist.

**Human and financial resources:** Most CSOs do not have either sufficient number or quality of staff. The study also noted that very few CSOs have sustainable funding.

**Mindset:** There is gross distrust between government and CSOs at all levels national and sub-national levels therefore it is difficult to build effective partnerships.

Other studies support the findings from the UNDP study: most CSOs lack adequate skills, information-base, and knowledge to carry out research and analytical work in order to define and perform effective policy/advocacy work. Furthermore, CSOs lack the necessary network to create legitimacy and impact in their policy/advocacy work. Most CSOs are financially-dependent on external funds to maintain their organisations and thus too vulnerable to funding availability and change in funding. Most CSOs are unable to generate an organizational mission, focus on achieving its mission, and operate accordingly <sup>6</sup>.

The CSOs themselves noted some of these same capacity issues during interviews. However, it should be noted that there are a number of CSOs with good capacities, and these serve as a model for others aspiring to achieve greater effectiveness and impact. The effectiveness of some of these CSOs is not the result of long-term capacity investment by donors as they are young organisations. Their success comes rather from establishing an organization based on clear missions, keeping focus on the organisation's goals, the application of sound management principles and leadership, which include attracting and maintaining a good human resource base. They were also active in providing prospective donors with evidence of their capacities to achieve what they set to out do, which gave them leverage regarding negotiating/changing funding modality and predictability.

## 2.4 Challenges to Strengthening CSOs

Capacity development requires both an environment conducive to organizational strengthening, and the existence of basic core capacities. Currently steps are being taken to aid CSOs and donors to think more strategically about capacity development.

One such initiative is the preparation of Codes of Conducts for Civil Society. Codes of Conduct for ethical behaviour have recently been developed by the NGO Policy Forum (a network of over 50 NGOs) and the Foundation of Civil Society. Another initiative that can enhance the environment for organizational strengthening is the emerging dialogue between

---

<sup>6</sup> Building the capacity of civil society organisations for evidenced-based advocacy and policy influencing in Tanzania (J. Makongo, 2006), Making advocacy Work: Funding for effective social change (G. Mugizi).

CSOs and donors regarding aid modalities and the need to align aid to civil society with the Paris Agenda. As a result of this nascent dialogue, initiated by the NGO Policy Forum, donors commissioned a consultancy to prepare Guidelines for civil society support (Ingelstad and Karlsen, 2007), which proposes common principles for Development Partners support to civil society organizations. The impact of these initiatives depends on the commitment of both donors and civil society organizations to follow up on the recommended steps.

As pointed out in the draft Guidelines referred to above, the existing capacity building institutes and projects in Tanzania are insufficient to meet needs and demand. Funding for capacity development, especially for smaller CSOs, is also short in supply. The most relevant source of capacity building funding for smaller CSOs is the Foundation for Civil Society. The report suggests that one way to proceed may be to increase the numbers of intermediary institutions that provide support to capacity building such as the FCS: “maybe with sectoral or thematic focuses or at regional levels. One idea being tried is to support the node of networks and coalitions to assume *both* a capacity building and a forward funding role where they would take such a sectoral/thematic responsibility”.

## 2.5 The CSO context of Zanzibar

The CSO context of Zanzibar is different from that of the mainland Tanzania. Because of the contested presidential election in 2000, many donors stopped providing development assistance to Zanzibar, including support to CSOs. Assistance resumed in 2003. With the assistance of UNDP, Zanzibar launched MKUZA, its Poverty reduction Program, in the beginning of 2007.

Until now, there has been no regulatory framework for CSOs in Zanzibar. Under Tanzania law, NGO matters are not Union matters, and discussions on a proposed NGO Policy for Zanzibar have been ongoing since 2002. This process has been supported by the NGO Resource Center (NGORC), a project of the Aga Khan Foundation, together with ANGOZA, the principal NGO umbrella group in Zanzibar. NGORC has also been supporting the newly established Directorate of NGOs in Zanzibar, located within the Ministry of Good Governance, which is responsible for co-ordinating all the NGOs and CBOs on the Island. The Directorate is a government initiative that aims to enhance the environment for CSOs in Zanzibar. According to the director, Zanzibar is now finalizing its NGO Policy, which is likely to be ready by the end of 2007. The Director sees the role of the Directorate beyond a regulative function; it intends to provide support and enhance the relationship between Government and the non-profit sector. At the moment, the Directorate is still in the very formative stage.

The per capita number of CSOs in Zanzibar is estimated to be greater than on the mainland. This is perhaps due to the high percentage of funding channelled through non-profit organizations instead of via government. Nevertheless, with few exceptions, Zanzibar CSOs have capacities remarkably lower than that of the mainland, as attested to by all informants in Zanzibar. Currently there are about 330 registered NGOs and CBOs in Zanzibar.

### 3 Support Models in Tanzania

The Nordic+ donors use a number of different support modalities in Tanzania. Based on the information provided by them, the support models can be structured according to the following dimensions<sup>7</sup>: (i) whether funding was unilateral (by one donor) or joint (two or more donors together, basket); (ii) whether it was provided directly or through an intermediary, and in the latter, what kind of intermediary, and finally (iii) whether the funding was for core activities and/or projects. The terminology used to describe the funding models are based on these three dimensions.

#### 3.1 Canada

Canada's support to CSOs in Tanzania includes support from country level and from headquarters (HQ) through diverse mechanisms such as Canadian and international NGOs and the Canadian Fund for Local Initiatives. At the Mission level, support is mainly unilateral direct support to CSOs engaged in service delivery and in servicing the CSO community. All are NGOs located outside Dar, in Zanzibar and Dodoma. Funding for intermediary organisations in Tanzania, such as the Foundation for Civil Society (FCS), and the Rapid Fund Envelope (RFE) and for CSO core support is provided from head office.

Canadian criteria for selection are alignment with priorities of the home office strategy, legitimacy of organization, and the CSO must be in existence for at least two years. Preference is given to registered CSOs, but Canada can and has funded non-registered CSOs, such as Parent-Teacher Committees, as long as the organization is recognized by the district and the community.

At Mission level, funds, funding priorities, and criteria for selection are described and disseminated through a brochure. Possible CSO partners are identified through the Canadian Fund for Local Initiatives publications and through contacts initiated by CSOs.

Country-level funding for CSOs has decreased due to increase in funding to Government budget support. However, slight increase in Mission-level funding for CSOs is expected for service delivery (specifically for infrastructure and equipment), small scale-enterprises development and environment development. Funding is expected to remain the same for all other areas. At head office, funding for CSOs engaged in advocacy is expected to increase.

While Canada intends to retain a small portfolio of direct project funding, the Mission is currently looking into pooled mechanisms which would enable co-ordination with the Joint Assistance Strategy at the thematic or sectoral levels. Support to CSOs through pooled funding, administered by an intermediary organization such as the Foundation for Civil Society, FCS, is regarded as the most innovative model. However, the Mission notes that while this and other pooled models are best for donor harmonization, they increase demand on co-ordination.

---

<sup>7</sup> This categorisation of support models builds on the desk study of relevant key documents and it has been further revised during the course of this study based on findings in the six case countries. The Synthesis Report presents a comprehensive overview of this methodological development.



## 3.2 Finland

Finland has been supporting civil society organisations in Tanzania through head office and embassy level, most funding coming from the head office. There are around 30 Finnish NGOs working in Tanzania, engaged in various social development projects such as health and education. Finnish INGOs have established an umbrella organization “Uhusiano” that works closely with its sister organization, the Union of Non-governmental organisations Morogoro. Finland also provides assistance to UN agencies via the head office.

Finnish support to CSOs at embassy level has been channelled through unilateral, direct project/programme support as well as through joint models for core support of CSO and intermediary organisations. The embassy funds civil society organisations with headquarters in Dar, Zanzibar and Dodoma. At country-level, Finnish funding supports mostly CSOs working in advocacy or a mix of service delivery and advocacy.

Finland's support at country-level is aligned with the embassy's country strategy for supporting civil society. There are no set criteria; the embassy support activities which leads to strengthening of civil society. The Mission identifies prospective CSO partners through two application rounds a year, and occasionally through networking and contacts initiated by CSOs. The embassy is considering increasing support through pooled mechanisms.

Changes in funding at embassy level is expected to increase for advocacy and for small-scale enterprise development, while funding for servicing the CSO Community is expected to remain at the same level. The embassy considers basket funding channelled through intermediary organisations an innovative model for funding CSOs, particularly attractive for supporting rural areas. According to the embassy's experience, pooled funding such as basket funding to support an NGO's core budget is the best way to promote donor harmonization.

## 3.3 Ireland

Ireland supports civil society in Tanzania through Irish Aid in-country Mission and through INGOs. At Mission-level, support to CSOs is approximately 70% advocacy and 30% service delivery. Allocations for 2007 total EURO 4.275 million, with a distribution of EU 2.050 million for Joint funds and 1.675 million for Unilateral support.

Assistance is provided through joint core and intermediary models as well as unilaterally through direct support to CSO project/programme and support to an intermediary organization.. The majority of Irish CSO funding is channelled via Dar based organizations, which is then re-channelled to local levels via intermediary and network organizations.

Irish criteria for selecting CSOs are alignment with country strategic plan MKUKUTA. Priority is given to CSOs with wide outreach to rural areas. Identification of perspective partners is through network within the priority sectors.

Overall funding level is expected to increase to advocacy. Joint support models channelled through intermediaries such as the RFE, the FCS and the upcoming Media Trust Fund are regarded by the Mission as innovative models for CSO support. Joint funding has become an attractive support model for the Mission.

### 3.4 Norway

Tanzania is one of Norway's main partner countries. Norway's largest support to civil society in Tanzania is channelled from head office through INGOs and bilateral agreements such as Civil society Support to Women and Gender with the Tanzania Gender Networking Programme. At country-level, the Embassy provides support to CSOs through diverse mechanisms: unilateral direct project/programme as well as core funding (unilateral and joint), support through intermediary INGO, basket funding to umbrella CSOs and to Foundations. At Mission level support is provided for organisations working in service delivery, servicing the CSOs community, mobilisation for democratic participation, but most to advocacy. The Embassy allocated NOK 7 million to unilateral direct support and NOK 10.7 million to joint models, both core activities and through intermediaries.

In providing support to CSOs, the embassy follows guidelines from head office and country strategy, giving priority to organisations working with Norwegian priority development areas: governance, including democratic developments; poverty reduction; build capacity and empower communities; work towards promoting equal rights and opportunities for women and men; and environment, especially sustainable energy development. Important criteria for selection are CSO governance, roots in communities and outreach at regional, district and local levels. The Mission identifies prospective CSO partners based on networking with other donors and at sector coordination committees and through contacts initiated by CSOs.

Funding at Embassy level is expected to remain the same with a slight increase for advocacy. Basket funding is increasingly the preferred modality as it enables more coordinated efforts and is supportive of donor harmonization, which reduces transaction costs for both CSOs and donors. The Mission regards the FCS as an innovative support model.

### 3.5 Sweden

Tanzania has been the main recipient of development cooperation from Sweden in recent years. Sweden has in 2007 a preliminary allocation of SEK 685 million with a distribution of SEK 350 million to budget support and the rest to various programmes in the prioritized sectors. Resources outside of the country allocation are foreseen to cover concessionary credits, research co-operation, NGO funds, regional programmes and the International Training Programme.

The objective for the Swedish embassy's support to civil society during the country strategy period is to support a number of civil society organizations working on regional and/or national levels with various aspects related to the implementation of the MKUKUTA, strengthening democracy, and the increased respect for human rights. Support by the Swedish mission totals SEK 93.8 million, with a distribution of SEK 65.3 million for joint funds and SEK 28.5 million for direct support through the embassy's CSO funds, which include unilateral direct support to CSO projects/programmes, direct support through earmarked CSO fund, and unilateral support to INGO intermediaries. Most of Sweden's country-level support is for CSOs engaged in advocacy/policy work. It is expected that overall funding level will remain the same, with some funding increase for member-based advocacy CSOs.

Criteria for support are according to guidelines developed and decided by the Embassy and general conditions, posted on Sida's website. The guidelines note that support to CSOs be given as core funding to a limited number of strategically selected organisations operating in the sectors prioritised in the country strategy. Each organisation shall be supported for a longer period in order to provide funding predictability to recipient CSOs. Furthermore, support shall be tied to the implementation of each organisation's strategic plan. Basket funding with other donors based on the strategic plan are encouraged.

The major change in Swedish country-level funding is shifting from service delivery to advocacy. Joint Core funding is becoming increasingly more important as like-minded donors have been able to co-ordinate.

### 3.6 The United Kingdom

DFID has provided wide support to civil society in Tanzania, from DFID's Trust Funds such as Civil Society Challenge Fund, in addition to Partnership Programme Agreements with UK INGOs. DFID head office also provides support to numerous micro-credit schemes, small businesses, and private-sector trust funds such as BEST Programme. CSO funding is also channelled through the UN and the World Bank from head office.

The major change in country-level support to civil society has been a shift in support from service delivery to advocacy. This shift was a means to complement DFID's shift from bilateral to budget support to Government; it intends to support civil society's demand for accountability and transparency. Country-level support is provided mostly through joint funding to intermediary organisations, but also through unilateral direct support to CSOs and through core funding and direct earmarked CSO fund. Most support at Mission level goes to advocacy CSOs.

Head office strategy for support to civil society guides the country-level support. Good governance, democratization and poverty alleviation are priority areas. The Mission identifies potential partners based on networking and other donors, and through contacts initiated by CSOs.

Overall funding level and support areas are expected to remain the same, but increase in funding for media (investigative journalism), advocacy and servicing the CSO community (e.i capacity development, research, networking) is expected. The Mission is considering increase in support to be channelled through pooled mechanisms funding intermediary organisations. The Mission considers this model best for donor harmonization and coordination.

### 3.7 The Nordic+ donors

The Nordic+ Missions in Tanzania provide support to 42 CSOs: 34 with head offices in Dar, six in Zanzibar, two in Dodoma. The support models used at country level are shown in Table 3.1 below. Although the number of organizations funded through the Unilateral Direct model is higher than any other single model (18 organisations at the moment), in aggregate Nordic+ donors in Tanzania are currently providing most of their support through Unilateral or Joint Core and Intermediaries support models (24 organisations). Core

and Intermediary models also seem to channel higher funding volume than unilateral direct models.

**Table 3.1 Models used by Nordic+ at country-level**

Support Models	CSOs Supported through Model
Unilateral Direct Project Support	18 *
Unilateral Direct Core Support	4
Unilateral Support through Intermediary	8
Joint Direct Support to Core Activities	3
Joint Intermediary Project Support	3
Joint Intermediary Core + Project Support	6

\*: Number is expected to increase over the current year as funds budgeted for direct project support have not yet been allocated.

Of the 18 CSOs financed through direct support to programme/project funding, one receives support from more than one Nordic+ donor. All four CSOs financed through joint direct support covering core and project funding receives support from Nordic+ donors. Two of the three organizations receiving joint direct core support are financed by more than one Nordic+ donor as shown in Table 3.2 below.

**Table 3.2: CSOs supported by more than one Nordic+ donor**

	CIDA	SIDA	Norway	UK	Finland	Ireland
Hakielimu:		X	X			X
Foundation for Civil Society	HQ		X	X		HQ
FEMINA		X	X			
REPOA		X	X	X	X	
Rapid Funding Envelope	HQ		X	X	X	X
Legal and Human Rights Centre		X	X		X	
Media Council of Tanzania Fund				X		X
Save the Children		X Zanz		X TZ		
TGNP		X	X			
Tanzania Culture Trust Fund			X		X	

## 3.8 Joint Funds for CSO Support

Some of the various joint funds for CSO support in Tanzania are described below.

### 3.8.1 *The Foundation for Civil Society (FCS)*

The FCS is a Tanzanian non-profit company, designed and funded by a group of like-minded development partners. Registered in September 2002, the FCS started operations in January 2003. The FCS is operated by a Secretariat and governed by an independent Board and its Council Members.

The aim of the FCS is to enable effective CSO engagement in poverty reduction efforts as set out in government policies. The Foundation is an intermediary support mechanism, providing grants and other capacity building support to civil society organisations to: (a) access information and understand policies, laws and their rights, (b) engage effectively in policy formulation and monitoring on poverty reduction, and (c) contribute to social development and to constructively hold the government and private sectors to account.

Organizations eligible for funding from the FCS are NGOs, Community Based Organizations, Trade Unions, Media Organizations. In order to encourage and support networking among CSOs, the FCS can provide support to consortia or groups of organisations. The FCS can also finance contributions to multi-donor funded programs (partial funding). The FCS discourages funding applications from INGOs.

In four years, up to February 2007, the FCS has provided grants to 735 CSOs, amounting to TZS 15 billion. 50% of the FCS grants are for small CSOs. According to the FCS management, the comparative advantage of the Foundation is outreach and access. Although the FCS supports grants in all regions of Tanzania, it prioritizes support to the four areas identified by the MKUKUTA as the poorest regions in the country. The FCS has customized its lending instruments and most of its information materials in both Swahili and English, thus enabling access by non-English speaking Tanzanians.

The organization is also designed to function as a demand-driven organization. CSOs must be registered to receive funds from the FCS. However, recognizing the constraints of small, rural CSOs to afford registration fees and knowledge on how to register, the foundation can provide a registration grant, along with information on registration procedures. Thus far the FCS has funded 230 registration grants. While the Foundation holds tightly to some ground-rules, criteria for support (posted in the FCS website) can also be used flexibly. An organizational assessment is made as part of the evaluation of grant applicants. This assessment is based on checking CSOs references instead of performing a full due diligence. Thus legitimacy within the community and organization's history carries great weight.

Administration costs for the FCS is 20%, of which 16% covers secretariat expenses and 4% committee costs. The management plans to request a rise in administration cost to 25%. According to the FCS management, an important lesson learned has been achieving a proper balance between access and CBO financial management capacity. While criteria for support should be flexible to enable fund access by small and/or younger CSOs, a more robust organizational assessment, a simpler due diligence procedure, is necessary to ascertain proper use of funding.

### **3.8.2 The Rapid Envelope Fund for HIV/AIDS (RFE)**

The RFE is a Tanzanian grant mechanism funded by a group of bilateral donors. It was established in 2002 as an interim grant mechanism to support innovative interventions by CSOs in response to dealing with HIV/Aids in Tanzania. RFE was created to provide funding to CSOs while the World Bank sponsored Tanzania Multi-sectoral Aids Program Community HIV/Aids Response Fund and the Global Fund were being established.

It is managed by Deloitte & Touche as grant manager and Management Sciences for Health for technical oversight, and monitoring and evaluation. The RFE is governed by a Steering Committee comprising representatives from TACAIDS, the Zanzibar AIDS Commission, and representatives from donor agencies. RFE has been funded by CIDA, DFID, Denmark, Finland, Norway, Ireland, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the Bernard van Leer Foundation, and USAID. The Tanzania Government also contributes to RFE. The administrative cost of RFE varies between 12 to 15% of total funding.

Since its inception the RFE has conducted seven grant making rounds and has approved over USD 11.2 million of grants for 78 projects. Projects are funded with a grant of between USD 50,000 and USD 200,000 for up to a maximum of 12 months. To receive funding through the RFE, proposed projects and activities must be aligned with the National Policy on HIV/Aids and the National Multi-sectoral Strategic Framework.

The concept of the RFE application, review and notification process is to provide a quick and efficient service with use of e-mail and a two-stage application process. Currently there is one round per year, in the past there were two rounds per year because there were fewer CSO applications. In order to promote transparency, open rounds and the call for concept letters are published in local and national newspapers, on the radio and via the RFE website. Publicity workshops are conducted in more remote regions in order to explain the application processes involved.

At the initial stage, most grants were approved to Dar-based, larger organizations. However, by 2007 RFE has reached all regions of the country apart from Rukwa. According to RFE management, RFE criteria for support were designed for larger organizations (which in the case of Tanzania were urban), while the fund aimed also at reaching out to rural, smaller organizations. RFE management stated that a lesson learned is that close attention should be paid during fund design to ensure coherence between criteria for support and target population.

The concept of RFE has proven to be an efficient model as assessed by two of RFE's evaluations, and especially since RFE was conceived as an interim funding mechanism. Nevertheless, RFE management regards that the effectiveness of the model can be improved, and especially since RFE continued to exist far beyond its originally intended lifespan. According to RFE management, a lesson learned is that fund administration within the field of development requires more than strong financial management and appraisal skills and knowledge by the administrator. Understanding of the needs and context on the ground, experience with development and their actors on the ground as well as partnership-building with target population are highly relevant.



### **3.8.3 The BEST Advocacy**

The BEST programme supports the empowering of private sector membership organisations to advocate sensibly and knowledgeably for a better investment climate. It provides grants for initiative aiming at (a) simplifying and speeding up business licensing and land administration; (b) modernising labour laws for more flexible labour markets; and (c) simplifying and speeding up commercial dispute resolution. It receives financial support from Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden, the UK, and the World Bank.

### **3.8.4 Financial Sector Deepening Trust**

Financial Sector Deepening Trust started operating in 2005 and receives funding from Canada, Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden, the UK and the World Bank. Its objective is to increase access to financial services by providing grants and other funding for initiatives aimed at (a) providing training, education, and related activities for developing the human resources and organizational capacity to enable financial institutions to serve low income groups; (b) developing new financial products that address the needs of poor households and micro and small enterprises; (c) improving the policy, legislative, and regulatory framework affecting delivery of financial services; (d) improving financial market integration and access to wholesale forms of finance by financial service providers addressing poor households and micro and small enterprises; (e) enhancing the supply of appropriate business services to financial service providers in Tanzania; and (f) providing research and information dissemination to increase the understanding, across the financial sector, in the Government of Tanzania, and among donors, of best practice in the Tanzanian context.

### **3.8.5 Other Fund: The Ford Foundation**

Though not a donor-funded CSO fund, the Ford Foundation provides another approach. From 2000 to 2005, it provided support to capacity building of CSOs in Zanzibar. The fund was provided through Zanzibar ActionAid, which served as an intermediary organization, to strengthen local civil society organizations and develop networks, coalitions and umbrella organizations to strengthen the sector as a whole. According to programme management, the main criterion for support was based not on existing CSO capacities, but CSO engagement on poverty reduction. The priority areas were education, HIV/Aids, women's rights, and agriculture and food security.

The first assessment of needs in CSOs to reduce poverty was carried out with the programme support. The programme provided grants for both the CSO capacity building plan and project implementation. According to an informant recipient of Ford Foundation/ActionAid's grant and capacity building support, the organization received support for grant writing, fund management and reporting procedures. Subsequently the organization was able to receive funding from the Global Malaria Fund, from the Food and Agriculture Organization, and from CARE International.

## **3.9 Nordic+ Views on CSOs and CSO Views on Nordic+ Donors**

CSOs as well as Nordic+ donors were asked their views about each other and the CSO-donor environment. Unless otherwise stated, views expressed here apply both to the mainland and Zanzibar.

CSOs see the major changes to donor-CSO environment in recent years to be the tendency of donors to pool funding, providing support through intermediary organizations, and more willingness to support CSO core funding. The general perception is also that donors are increasingly coordinating among themselves and shifting funding from service delivery to advocacy. This shift is understood within the context of increased donor support to Government budget. Donors' appreciation of changes is similar to those of CSOs.

CSOs consider non-financial support to be important. According to them, only on rare occasions do donors provide opportunity for exchange of experiences directly with them or between CSOs. According to most CSOs, there is no thought-through non-financial support being provided by Nordic+ donors. Examples of donors who provide non-financial support more systematically were USAID and the Dutch Novib. Both of them have invested in institutional capacities in their own organization to provide non-financial support to CSOs they support financially. Non-financial support from these donors come in the form of technical and administrative advice, and occasionally training.

Most donors also consider non-financial support important and recognize that their provision of such support has not been systematic, mostly due to lack of resources (time, financial). However, donors also note that ideological and political support is given to CSOs.

For CSOs, donors are not transparent regarding their criteria for support. Many believe donors mostly fund CSOs with good capacities and credibility and that donors own priority areas possibly play a part on the selection. Donors noted that their support criteria are publicly available through brochure or webpages (Mission or head office), but donor assessment of their own criteria are largely in line with the CSO view.

CSOs see the single largest change over the last three years to be increased support to larger CSOs through basket funding as well as support to intermediary organizations. Donors agree with this view.

For CSOs, there is not much consistency between the various models donors are using to support CSOs and donors provision of budget support to the Government. Many consider there are adequate funds for CSOs in Tanzania. For many donors, increase in budget support triggered the shift in funding from service delivery to advocacy. Donor intention is to increase civil society capacity to demand public accountability and transparency.

Most CSOs are not familiar with donors' strategies or objectives to support civil society in Tanzania. On the other hand, donors are familiar with the strategies of the NGOs they provide assistance, when they do have a strategy. Most donors, however, do not have a written strategy for country-level support to CSOs.

CSO perception is that donors do not want to invest in capacity development, yet they are rightly averse of risk. This is perceived as a contradiction. Donors believe that NGOs have weak capacities and that funding to build civil society capacity has increased recently.

### 3.10 Relations between Nordic+ Donors and CSOs

Informants from both donor and CSO communities stated that opportunities for direct engagement between NGOs and donors in Tanzania have been limited, but in recent years opportunities have increased. Most engagement between donors and CSOs take place during funding proposals, discussion of concept papers, and reporting. CSOs feel they have



been insufficiently consulted over key strategic policies or operations at a country level. CSOs and donors recognize that Government prioritizes dialogue with the donor community while priority should be dialogue with the people and with CSOs.

Many CSOs do not want donors to fund CSOs to do advocacy. When they do so, donors define what advocacy is, and in which areas advocacy is and is not needed. CSOs want instead that donors finance their organizations on the basis that they are able to work strategically with advocacy and implement programmes well. However, most CSOs are reluctant to engage directly in a frank dialogue with donors for fear of retaliation. Donors, on the other hand, are open to work towards CSO demand for a relationship that emphasizes more partnership and request for donors to further support CSO dialogue with Government. They are, however, frustrated with CSO demands and lack of follow up on their own proposals and initiatives.

## 4 Assessment of Support Models in Tanzania

Nordic+ donors and CSOs were asked to assess some characteristics of support models through which funding is provided, which is provided below.

### 4.1 Assessment of Support Models by CSOs

#### 4.1.1 *Unilateral Direct Core Support Model*

Only one CSO receiving direct core support assessed the model. The CSO believes that the Core Support Model scores adequately regarding transparency in the selection and monitoring process. It considers the model strong for enabling reporting of the results of the activities funded (accountability), adequate for transaction costs and on strategic direction, and strong in nourishing the quality of dialogue between embassy and CSOs. The CSO regarded the model weak for diversification (types of activities/ sectors).

#### 4.1.2 *Joint Support Models (Direct Core Support and through Intermediaries)*

33% of the CSOs believe that the Pooled Funding Model scores strongly regarding transparency in the selection and monitoring process while half regard it to be adequate. Half of the CSOs consider the model adequate, and the other half strong, for enabling them to document results of activities funded (accountability). Most CSOs (83%) consider the model strong in reducing time-use (transaction costs), and 17% adequate. The majority (83%) also agree that the model enable stronger focus on strategic direction of the assistance, and 33% adequate in this regard. Half of the CSOs regard the model strong, and half adequate, for enhancing the quality of dialogue between embassy and CSOs. Most of the CSOs (83%) consider the model strong for outreach, and 17% adequate. Regarding harmonization, all CSOs think the model is strong. Half of them assess the strength of the model to enable diversification of assistance (types of activities/ sectors) to be strong and 33% adequate. Most CSOs consider this model stronger for reaching their own objectives.

#### 4.1.3 *Direct Support to CSO Project/Programme*

Half of the CSOs felt that the Direct funding for CSO Project/Programme Model scores strongly regarding transparency in the selection and monitoring process while 33% regard it to be adequate. Most of them (67%) consider the model adequate, and 33% weak, for enabling them to report on results of the activities funded (accountability). Concerning the strength of the model in reducing time-use (transaction costs), half think it is weak, 17% adequate and 33% strong. Two-thirds of the CSOs agree this model is strong enabling stronger focus on the strategic direction of the assistance while the remainder one-third regard it to be weak. 67% consider the model strong for enhancing the quality of dialogue between embassy and CSOs, 33% adequate. Half of the CSOs regard the model for outreach to be adequate; 33% think it is strong. Regarding harmonization, half of the CSOs think the model is adequate, 17% weak and 33% strong. Half of them think the model is strong for diversification of assistance (types of activities/ sectors), 33% weak and 17% adequate. The majority of CSOs (67%) assess the strength of the model to enable them to reach their objectives to be strong, and 33% adequate

**Table 4.1: CSO Funding against Selection Criteria by type of Funding Modality**

Ratings *	Direct Core			Pooled Funding			Direct Project/ Prog		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Transparency in the selection and monitoring process		1		1	3	2	2	4	
Accountability: to what extent do you assess and report results of the activities funded?			1		3	3		2	4
Time-use (transaction costs – compared to other types of support)		1			1	5	3	2	1
Strategic direction/ decision – how do you fit in with donor policy?		1			2	4	2		4
Quality of dialogue between embassy and CSOs			1		3	3		2	4
Outreach (e.g. limited to urban-based professional – or wider outreach to non-traditional, non-professional)	1				1	5	1	3	2
Harmonisation/opportunities for ..		1				6	3	1	2
Diversity – activities, sectors	1			1	2	3	2	1	3
Effectiveness, reaching own Obj)		1			1	5		2	4

Ratings: 1: weak // 2: adequate // 3: strong

## 4.2 Assessment of Support Models by Donors

### 4.2.1 Unilateral Direct Support to CSO Project/Programme

Nordic+ donors consider the Unilateral Direct funding for CSO Project/Programme Model satisfactory regarding transparency in the selection and monitoring process. They believe the model is adequate for enabling them to assess results of the activities funded (accountability). However, some donors noted that monitoring of projects is resource consuming, and while they can closely verify reports, their ability to actually verify implementation on the ground is limited. Donors have mixed feelings about the strength of the model in reducing time-use (transaction costs) and the ability of the model to enable stronger focus on the strategic direction of the assistance. Unilateral Direct Support enables diversification of assistance and is adequate for enhancing the quality of dialogue between embassy and CSOs. Donors, however, regard the model less effective regarding the adequacy of the model for outreach. The model is assessed weak regarding harmonization.

### 4.2.2 Unilateral Direct Core Support

All Nordic+ donors regard that the Unilateral Direct Core Support Model is well designed for strong monitoring process but offer no added value to transparency in the selection process. Donors consider the model well adopted to for assessing results (accountability), for diversifying (types of activities/ sectors) as well as to reduce time-use (transaction costs) compared to other types of support. All donors agree that the model enables stronger focus on strategic direction of the assistance, opportunities for harmonization, outreach, and it is stronger in nourishing the quality of dialogue between embassy and CSOs.

### 4.2.3 Joint Support Models (Direct Core and Intermediary)

Most Nordic+ donors regard the Joint Support Model well equipped regarding transparency in selection and monitoring. They also consider the model adequate for enabling them to assess results of the activities funded (accountability). Joint models enable reduction in transaction costs and stronger focus on strategic direction of the assistance. The model and especially joint support to intermediary organizations is strong for outreach purposes. Donors have mixed assessments regarding the model enhancing the quality of dialogue between embassy and CSOs. Joint models promote harmonization, but the level of harmonization depends on the willingness of the donors to really harmonize their procedures. A number of donors noted that some donors ask that the model be adopted to fit their own need (e.g. when preparing an MoU), which undermines the harmonization potential of the model. Donors assess the strength of the model to enable diversification of assistance (types of activities/ sectors) to be adequate, noting that assessment on diversification was based on the existing models, some of which are sector- or area-specific (e.g. HIV/Aids, education, and advocacy).

**Table 4.2: Nordic+ donors Assessment of characteristics of support models used**

Quality indicators	Pooled			Direct Core			Direct Project/Programme		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Ratings									
Transparency in selection, monitoring		3	4			2	1	1	2
Accountability(of results)		5	2		1	1		2	2
Time-use versus other support types	3	1	3		1	1	2	2	
Strategic direction	2	1	4			2		2	2
Dialogue with CSOs	2	3	2			2		3	1
Outreach		2	5			2	1	2	1
Harmonis'ion	2	2	3			2	3	1	
Diversity	3	3	1		1	1	3	1	

Ratings: 1: weak // 2: adequate // 3: strong

## 4.3 Assessment of CSOs supported through Different Models

Nordic+ donors were asked to assess the CSOs they fund according to support models.

### 4.3.1 Unilateral Direct Project/Programme Support

The general management of CSOs funded through direct project/programme is seen as weak by some donors and strong by others. On most other criteria the view was on average weaker than for other funding modalities. This either means that donors select to use this support model because these CSOs are weak and in need of support to build strength, or that they see more clearly the weaknesses in these various dimensions because they are more directly engaged with the CSOs and thus have more information on each individual CSO. This issue is addressed more in the next section.

### 4.3.2 Unilateral Direct Core Support

Nordic+ donors regard the general management as well as results reporting and quality assurance of the CSOs they fund through unilateral core funding model to be of good quality. They also consider the financial management of the CSOs to be adequate to strong. All donors assess the technical skills of the CSOs to be adequate and CSOs' coordination with other actors to be strong. All the donors assess that CSOs they fund have strong access to relevant networks, but not all adequate in their regional outreach.

### 4.3.3 Joint Support (Core and Intermediaries)

Most Nordic+ donors regard the general and the financial management as well as the technical skills of the CSOs they fund through joint support models to be strong. Most also regard the results reporting and quality assurance of these CSOs to be adequate to strong. Donors see some room for improvement regarding coordination of the CSOs they fund with other actors. All of the donors believe that CSOs they fund through joint models have access to relevant networks, and their regional outreach to be satisfactory.

**Table 4.3: Nordic+ donor assessments of CSOs they fund**

Rating	Core Funding .			Pooled Funding			Direct Project/Programme		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
General management		1	1		1	3	2		1
Financial management,		1	1		1	3	1	1	1
Technical skills,		2			1	3	1	1	1
Results reporting, QA		1	1		2	2	1	1	1
Coordination with other actors			2		2	2	2	1	
CSO outreach	1		1	1	1	2		2	1
Access to relevant networks,			2	1		3	2		1

Ratings: 1: weak // 2: adequate // 3: strong

## 4.4 Assessment of Funding Modalities

Table 4.4 below provides a summary of strengths and weaknesses of the most frequently used support models by Nordic+ donors.

Overall, CSOs assessment of the support models shows that the Direct Core Funding Model, both unilateral and joint, is regarded as the strongest regarding certain key characteristics, followed by joint support model through intermediaries. Some of the CSOs met have received unilateral direct support for projects, and are now receiving assistance through unilateral or joint *core* funding. They were articulate in comparing the models and in pinpointing to the strengths of core support. Like all CSOs met, they also noted the advantage of joint mechanisms channelled through intermediary organizations. Most of them, however, called attention to the need for intermediary mechanisms to simplify application and reporting procedures if targeting small rural CSOs, and CSOs in Zanzibar. Direct support is seen as too imposing on CBOs' mandate, since support is more tied to donors' needs than the organisations' perceived priorities and organizational and human resource capacities. Most CSOs interviewed noted that because direct project models only

finance project activity, they promote a culture of “creative reporting”, meaning covering up the diversion of funds actually allocated to cover some of the organisation’s core expenses.

**Table 4.4: Strengths and Weaknesses of Funding Modalities**

	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
Unilateral Direct Support to CSO Project/ Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given donor capacity, high accountability and monitoring</li> <li>• Enable CSOs build experience, capacities</li> <li>• Fit for quick-wins/short-term needs</li> <li>• Can support large &amp; small, rural &amp; urban CSOs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher transaction costs for CSOs</li> <li>• Higher Admin time for donor</li> <li>• Enable duplications:</li> <li>• Double/triple accounting</li> <li>• Activities</li> <li>• Less coordination btw donors</li> </ul>
Unilateral Direct Core Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower transaction costs for CSOs</li> <li>• Lower admin time for donors</li> <li>• Flexibility for CSOs to adjust to changes</li> <li>• Nourish CSO capacity</li> <li>• Long term relationships are possible</li> <li>• Promote dialogue on strategic issues</li> <li>• Nourish CSO-donor relation &amp; partnership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived by some as higher risk when trust is breached by CSOs</li> <li>• Not transparent in selection process</li> <li>• Prone to privilege urban, large CSOs</li> <li>• Enable duplications:</li> <li>• Double/triple accounting</li> <li>• Activities</li> <li>• Less coordination btw donors</li> </ul>
Joint Core Funding Model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower admin time for donors</li> <li>• Strengthening monitoring through the role of lead donors</li> <li>• Increase support to capacity building</li> <li>• Boost overall capacity around a organization, theme &amp; sector</li> <li>• Nurture successful models for smaller CSOs (dissemination of lessons learned)</li> <li>• Build critical mass of credible, stronger CSOs</li> <li>• Enhance coordination, harmonization</li> <li>• Focus on dialogue on strategic issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater donor time spent on coordination</li> <li>• Can create “islands of excellence” culture</li> </ul>
Joint Funding through Intermediary Organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transparency in governance</li> <li>• Lower admin time for donors</li> <li>• Seen as more transparent in selection by CSOs &amp; donors</li> <li>• Greater outreach: regional, types &amp; size of CSOs</li> <li>• Increase demand for collection and dissemination of lessons learned</li> <li>• Provide formal platform for national resource mobilization &amp; dialogue with national/regional bodies</li> <li>• Enhance coordination, harmonization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-transparency in governance when managed by INGOs</li> <li>• More donor time spent on coordination</li> <li>• Prone to creating a bureaucracy</li> <li>• Greater the flexibility higher risk</li> <li>• Lost relationship CSOs-donors</li> <li>• “Mushroom” effect (if funds are spread too thin)</li> <li>• Donors exercise less monitoring (can be weaker on accountability)</li> </ul>

The above assessment by the team and the Nordic+ donors are in line with CSOs’ assessment of support models. It shows that donors as well as CSOs regard the Core Funding Model, both unilateral and joint, and Joint funding model through intermediaries as the strongest regarding certain key characteristics. The model regarded weakest in terms of key characteristics is the Unilateral Direct support to CSO project/programme funding. Yet, in terms of number of organisations funded through a single model, Unilateral Direct support to CSO project/programme is the model most frequently used by donors to channel assistance to CSO in Tanzania. Donors give several reasons for this.

Most Embassy staff stated that they want to maintain a small portfolio of direct support projects because it provides them with the opportunity to directly interact with a number of CSOs. Moreover, they want to ensure that strategic focus areas at their head offices are covered at mission level. Direct project/programme support gives them more control on



selection of support themes and thus enables them to cover specific areas. Most Nordic+ donors at Mission level stated that coverage at mission level of HQs' strategic priority areas is not a demand *per se*, but they feel pressured to do so.

Nordic+ donors at Mission level are not questioned from HQs regarding the prevalence of Unilateral Direct Support to CSO project/programme in their portfolio in relation to whether this is the best support model. Dialogue rather focuses on reducing transaction costs, enhancing coordination while securing coverage of and reporting on HQs' strategic priority areas. In a way, Missions feel in a squeeze between greater demands from HQs and from CSOs in Tanzania, and increasing pressure for cost reduction at Mission level through the increased portfolio and tightening financial and results-based monitoring while retaining the same number of staff.

Unilateral Core Support Model and Joint mechanisms (basket/core funding and intermediaries) are attractive support models to Nordic+ donors at Mission level for various reasons. However, their time demand at the initial stage is considerable, especially for intermediary mechanisms where donors have taken the lead in establishing them. In this regard, donors have designed the mechanism (e.g. RFE, FCS, MCT), secured support from their HQs and funding from a pool of donors, and commissioned the intermediaries' management through international procurement bidding (RFE) or other procedures (e.g. FCS was initially set up as a share-holding company, funds managed by CARE International). Donors are also active in the Steering Committees of some intermediary mechanisms and closely support and monitor the operational set up of the mechanisms.

In the case of joint core support, donors normally select a lead donor. Thus for the lead donor especially, time demand in the initial stage can be significant as Memorandum of Understandings with CSOs are put together. Different demands from donor agencies have to be accommodated. Time is also required for operational and financial monitoring of the support.

Once joint core support and intermediary mechanisms begin to operate smoothly, time needed for monitoring is reduced. This is so because donors tend to provide core support to CSOs that have good levels of management and financial capabilities. On the one hand donors feel safer supporting these organizations and on the other the CSOs have higher visibility and thus higher stakes if accountability problems occur. Nevertheless, time for managing joint mechanisms remains high for lead donors, who have to continuously monitor and report to the other donors.

The question is how time demand for donors to monitor unilateral (direct project/programme funding and core support) and joint support (core and intermediary) mechanisms compare. If the joint support is to one CSO, for the lead donor the time use appears to be greater due to the additional reporting to the other donors, while for the "sleeping partners" it should be lower. If the joint support is through an intermediary, the time use per CSO reached is clearly lower, both because much of the management time cost is what the intermediary is paid for, but also because of economies of scale: the information asked for and the issues being raised tend to be standardised for all CSOs covered under that one intermediary arrangement. The time use for the lead donor is still great, however, though overall most transaction costs are pushed onto the intermediary. Furthermore, the kinds of standardisation of information demands on the CSOs themselves is expected to

reduce their transaction costs as well. According to the Nordic+ donors' assessment above, direct support to CSO project/programme is considered a weak model regarding transaction cost reduction. However, donors tend to assess time demand for projects in terms of portfolio and location. Since for some donors their project portfolio are larger in number, and including direct support to CSOs outside the capital Dar, time demand is high.

In Tanzania, provision of core funding to CSOs have been used to build up the strength of organizations considered by Nordic+ donors to have good leadership and credibility, hence capable of absorbing the assistance to further build their management and administrative systems while incrementing activities in their core areas. All CSOs receiving core funding by Nordic+ donors mainly work within the area of advocacy (e.g. NGO Policy Forum, Hakielimu, REPOA, Women Legal Aid Centre, TEMET). These organizations are Dar based, but working in various regions of the country, some with established networks with smaller organisations. Through funding the core budget of a number of CSOs, donors aim at creating and supporting a critical mass of organisations with the capacity to produce greater impact in their assistance to advocacy.

By providing access to funding for smaller CSOs through intermediaries, the donors get the "mushrooming" effect of supporting more CSOs in different regions of the country. Some of these instruments, such as FCS and Save the Children Zanzibar, have been designed with sufficient flexibility in criteria for support to enable outreach in urban and rural access as well as in terms of size of CSOs. They also provide support to some capacity building activities of the beneficiaries. Since there seems to be sufficient (or even excess!) funding to civil society organization in Tanzania, there does not seem to be a danger that funding may be spread too thinly because it is spread widely. By funding intermediary mechanisms to support CSOs, donors also aim at achieving greater impact when it comes to their assistance to advocacy, though there is realism about this happening more over the medium term. Intermediaries are also instruments through which donors can substantially increase funding volume (disbursements) to civil society in a way that is manageable to the Embassies.

Nordic+ donors at Mission level finance the greater number of CSOs through Unilateral Core Funding Model and Joint mechanisms channelled to single organizations (core funding) and through intermediary organizations. Although the number of organizations funded through the Unilateral Direct model is high, more CSOs are being reached through the other models, and especially taking into account the number of CSOs receiving support through intermediary organizations. Nordic+ donors in Tanzania are thus using a mix of funding models that enable them to manage a portfolio within the resources capabilities at Mission level and to balance possible results of their assistance in the shorter and longer-run. The current mix of funding models also points to a considerable degree of Nordic+ harmonization in support to civil society in Tanzania.

## 4.5 Tendencies in Support

The trends in civil society support in Tanzania at country level seem to be characterized by a shift in support from service delivery to advocacy as well as greater support to Core Budget Support Models, both through direct and joint funding, and through Intermediary organizations. Donors intend to maintain the diversity of models used, but increase the



number and diversity of intermediary organizations. The recently created joint fund to the Media Council of Tanzania is an illustrative case. Some Nordic+ donors will also increase support to intermediary mechanisms through INGOs. Expected shifts in funding by specific areas is listed in table 4.5 below.

**Table 4.5: Trend in funding level to CSOs in Tanzania, Nordic+ donors .**

Type of activity:	Professional NGO, usually not member based	CBO, based, member interest groups	From Head-Quarter (HQ)
<b>Service Delivery:</b>			
Health services	Same	Same	
HIV/Aids	Same	Same	
Education	Same	Same	
Water and sanitation		Decrease	
Rural development and agriculture			
Small-scale enterprise development	Increase	Same	
Microfinance			
Media, information dissemination	Increase	Increase	
Environmental management		Increase	
Other (list separately)			
<b>Advocacy:</b>			
Human rights, general	Increasing	Increase	Increase HQ
Poverty monitoring	Increasing	Increase	Increase HQ
Gender and children's rights	Increasing	Increase	Increase HQ
Good governance, anti-corruption	Increasing	Increase	Increase HQ
Conflict resolution	Same		
<b>Servicing the CSO Community</b>			
Capacity development, training	Increase		Increase HQ
Research, knowledge management	Increasing		Increase HQ
Networking, sector coordination	Increase		
Funding channel, umbrella manager	Increase		
Regional focal point	Increase		
<b>Promoting membership or group interest</b>			
Labour unions, peasant associations	Same		Increase HQ
Cooperatives	Same		Increase HQ
Employers' ass'ns, chambers of commerce	Same		Increase HQ
Professional associations (teachers' etc)	Same		Increase HQ
Faith-based (focus on faith-based actions)	Same		Increase HQ
Ethnic based	Same		Increase HQ

Source: Nordic+ donors in Tanzania Missions

## 5 Main Findings and Conclusions

The great majority of CSOs supported by the Nordic+ donors in Tanzania work in the area of advocacy or a mix of advocacy and service delivery.

Relations between Nordic+ donors and CSOs in Tanzania are overall good, but there is room for improving the dialogue in order to establish a more partnership-based relationship. In this regard, CSOs could improve their networking to enable them to move the dialogue with donors forward as more coherent partners instead of relations between individual recipients and funders. On the other hand, donors could also consider increasing their interactions with civil society organisations and thus support the efforts of existing networks.

Nordic+ donors at Mission level finance CSOs through Unilateral Core Funding and Joint mechanisms channelled to single organizations for core funding or through intermediary organizations. The donors are thus using a mix of funding models that enable them to manage a diversified portfolio in terms of objectives and different kinds of CSOs – including different capacities on the side of CSOs to provide quality financial and performance reporting.

In selecting support models, Nordic+ donors seem more to be driven primarily by their overall capacities to manage the CSO support portfolio and with the objectives that they have for their support. At the same time, there does not seem to have been any concerted attempt at reducing the overall transaction costs of the individual support models.

Through funding the core budget of a number of CSOs, Nordic+ donors aim at creating and supporting a critical mass of organisations with the capacity to produce greater impact, in particular in the field of advocacy on behalf of civil society stakeholders.

Intermediaries are also instruments through which donors can substantially increase funding volume (disbursements) to civil society in a way that is manageable to the Embassies. Donors interviewed explicitly stated this to be one of the purposes for choosing the intermediary model.

Nordic+ donors have put a lot of effort into developing joint models in Tanzania. Joint core support models have mostly developed once donors felt CSOs both had clear visions and programmes they wanted to carry out, and the capacities to implement them.

There are well established joint intermediary mechanisms that other countries could learn from, such as the FCS and the Media Council of Tanzania Fund. Although donors developed joint intermediary mechanisms for various reasons, many of the donors are explicitly concerned with outreach. Donors are also deliberate about using intermediaries for increasing their support to civil society in terms of increasing the funding volume.

## Annex A: Data Matrix, Nordic+ Donor in Tanzania

Donor	CSO or Intermediary Organisation	Support Model	Type of Intermediary	2006 Exp, EUR	Outreach: type of "end-CSO"
CAN	Chama cha Viziwi Zanzibar (CHAVIZA)	U-D			SSU
CAN	Global Network of Religions for Children (GNRC), Zanzibar	U-D			SSU
CAN	Missionary Sisters of Our Lady of Africa (MSOLA)	U-D			SSU
CAN	Hands Across Borders Society - Zanzibar	U-D			SSU
UK	Best Advocacy	J-I-C/P	Umbrella		PRO
UK	Foundation for Civil Society	J-I-C/P	Foundation/Board		PRO
UK	Rapid Funding Envelop	J-I-C/P	Board		PRO
UK	REPOA (Research Institute)	J-C-P	Research		PRO
UK	Women's dignity programme	U-D-S			SSU
UK	Policy Forum	U-D-C	Network		PRO
UK	SUNY	J-I-P	Umbrella		PRO
UK	Save the Children Fund	U-I-P	INGO		PRO
UK	UNDP	U-I-P	UN Agency		UN
UK	Financial Sector Deepening Trust	J-I-P	Trust Fund, Bank of TZ		PRO
UK	Tanzania Media Fund	J-I-C/P	Board		PRO
UK	Water Aid	U-I	INGO		PRO
FIN	Legal and Human Rights Centre	J-I-C		50.000	PRO
FIN	REPOA	J-C		100.000	PRO
FIN	Zanzibar Association of the Disabled	J-C		89.000	PRO
					Zanzibar
FIN	Zanzibar Legal Service Centre	U-D			SSU
FIN	NGO Network for Dodoma Region	U-D			PRC
FIN	Tanzania Eco Development Trust Limited	U-D-P			PRO
FIN	Institute of Journalism and Mass Communication	U-D-P			PRO

FIN	Tanzania Culture Trust Fund	J-I-C/P	Board	50,000	PRO
FIN	Tanzania Youth Alliance	U-D			SSU
FIN	Development Concern	U-D			SSU
FIN	Campaign for Good Governance	U-D			
IRE	Haki Elimu	J-C-P		250,000	PRO
IRE	Foundation for Civil Society	J-I-C/P	Foundation/Board	700,000	PRO
IRE	UNDP-Deepening Democracy Programme	U-I-P	UN Agency	550,000	UN
IRE	Tanzania Media Fund	J-I-C/P	Board	100,000	PRO
IRE	RFE – Rapid Funding Envelope for HIV/AIDS	J-I-C/P	Board	1,000,000	PRO
IRE	AMREF - MKV	U-I-P	Research	500,000	PRO
IRE	CARE International - Pastoralist Civil Society groups	U-D-P		400,000	PRO
IRE	Health Civil Society (Funding to a number of CSO's and name of the organisations are not known yet)	U-D-?		600,000	
IRE	Other small projects (Name of the organisations are not known yet)	U-D-?		175,000	
NOR	Tanzania Cultural Trust Fund	J-I-C/P	Board	190 000	PRO
NOR	Rapid Funding Envelop	J-I-C/P	Board	440 000	PRO
NOR	Foundation for Civil society	J-I-C/P	Foundation/Board	190 000	PRO
NOR	HakiElimu	J-C		250 000	PRO
NOR	Rapid Funding Envelop	J-I-C/P	Board		PRO
NOR	Legal and Human Rights Centre	J-I-C/P	Board	125 000	PRO
NOR	Women Legal Aid Centre	U-D-C		150 000	PRO
NOR	Legal and Human Rights Centre	U-D-C			PRO
NOR	Women Legal Aid Centre	U-D-C			PRO
NOR	FEMINA	U-D-P			PRO
NOR	Norwegian Church Aid	U-I-P	INGO	565 000	PRO
NOR	Nowegian peoples's Aid	U-I-P	INGO	325 000	PRO
SWE	FEMINA	J-C			PRO
SWE	HakiElimu	J-C		3 175 00	PRO

SWE	Media Center Tanzania	J-I-C	Board	75 000	PRO
SWE	Legal & Human Rights Centre	J-I-C			PRO
SWE	REPOA (Research Institute)	J-C			PRO
SWE	TEN/MET	U-D-C	Network		PRO
SWE	SPW-Student Partnership WorldWide	U-D-P			
SWE	Mfuko wa Utamaduni	U-D-P			SSU
SWE	PINGO' Forum-Pastoralists Indigenous NGO's Forum	U-D-P			SRC
SWE	Save the Children (NGO) in Zanzibar for HIV/AIDS	U-I-P	INGO		PRO Zanzibar
SWE	TGNP				PRO

## Annex B: List of Informants

### **NGO INFORMANTS – TANZANIA MAINLAND:**

Mr. Pili Mambalike, Media Council of Tanzania

Ms. Katharina Haberli Harker, SDC

Mr. Rakesh R. Rajani, HakiElimu

Mr. Minou Fuglesang, FEMINA

Mr. Ezekiel Masanja, LHRC

Ms. Rhoda Mshana, Rapid Fund Envelop

Mr. Svein Olsen, Norwegian People's Aid

Mr. Mugishagwe, Tanzania Eco. Develop. Trust

Mr. Joseph Kisanji, TENMET

Mr. Achim Chiaji, Agha Khan Foundation

Ms. Getrude Mugizi, NGO Policy Forum

Mr. Ben Taylor, Water Aid

Mr. Marcel Katemba, NGO Coordination Unit

Ms. Elisabeth Hårleman, Forum Syd

Ms. Rose Sayore, Mfuko wa Utamaduni

Ms. Sonja Tiscenko, REPOA

Mr. Joseph Semboja, REPOA

Mr. John Ulanga, Foundation for Civil Society

### **ZANZIBAR:**

Prof. H. Othman, Zanzibar Legal Service Centre

Mr. Achim A. Chiaji, NGO Resource Centre

Ms. Caroline Naude, Save the Children

Mr. Khalfan H. Khalfan, Zanzibar Association of the Disabled

Mr. Sahim Rehani, ZACPO & ZAFIDE

Ms. Bi Maimuna, ActionAid

### **GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS:**

Mr. Hamed Hikmany, PRSP/UNDP, Ministry of Finance

Mr. M. Lissan, CSO – Government Coordination Office

**DEVELOPMENT PARTNER OFFICIALS:**

Ms. Saana Halinen, Embassy of Finland

Mr. Paul Sherlock, Ireland Embassy

Ms. Clara Ruhara, Embassy of Finland

Mary Mgaya, Embassy of Canada

Mr. Zabdiel Kimambo, DFID

Ms. Amina Lwasye, Norwegian Embassy

Mr. Tobjørn Pettersson, Embassy of Sweden

Ms. Lena Ingelstam, Embassy of Sweden

Ms. Henny-de-vries, Netherlands Dutch Embassy

Ms. Katharina Haeberli Harker, Swiss Development Cooperation

Ms. Rest Lasway, World Bank

Ms. Munira Humand, UNDP

**OTHER INFORMANTS:**

Ms. Cecilia Karlstedt, Consultant, Karlstedt Consulting

Mr. Anders Ingelstam, Consultant, ACUMENA

## Annex C: Documents Reviewed

"Tanzania Non-Government Organizations – Their Perceptions of their Relationships with the Government of Tanzania and Donors, and Their Role in Poverty Reduction and Development". Special Paper No. 07.21. Dublin City University and REPOA, 2007.

Ingelstad and Karlsen: "Position Paper: Guidelines for Civil Society Support", and "Guidelines for Civil Society Support", May 2007

Elling Tjønneland: "Trends and Impacts of Shifting Financial Flows and Aid Effectiveness to CSOs in Southern Africa", Christian Michelsen Institute, February 2007.

"Evaluation of Citizens' Voice and Accountability: Evaluation Design and Framework Development", DAC partners, October 2006.

J. Makongo: "Building the Capacity of Civil Society Organisations for Evidenced-based Advocacy and Policy Influencing in Tanzania", 2006.

"The Political Economy and Accountability Structures of Tanzania: Perspectives", Seminar Report, organised by the Development Partner Governance Working Group, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, 14-15 September 2005.

"Civil Society in Tanzania", Christian Michelsen Institute, 2000.



The country reports constitute the basis for the synthesis report and its findings, conclusions and recommendations. Therefore, while each country report can be read separately, it could usefully be read in conjunction with the synthesis report and other relevant country reports.

**Support Models for CSOs at Country Level  
Synthesis Report**  
Norad Report 1/2008 Discussion

**Support Models for CSOs at Country Level  
Bangladesh Country Report**  
Norad Report 2/2008 Discussion

**Support Models for CSOs at Country Level  
Ethiopia Country Report**  
Norad Report 3/2008 Discussion

**Support Models for CSOs at Country Level  
Guatemala Country Report**  
Norad Report 4/2008 Discussion

**Support Models for CSOs at Country Level  
Tanzania Country Report**  
Norad Report 5/2008 Discussion

**Support Models for CSOs at Country Level  
Zambia Country Report**  
Norad Report 6/2008 Discussion

**Support Models for CSOs at Country Level  
Zimbabwe Country Report**  
Norad Report 7/2008 Discussion

**Norad**

Norwegian Agency for  
Development Cooperation

P.O. Box 8034 Dep, NO-0030 OSLO  
Visiting adress:  
Ruseløkkveien 26, Oslo, Norway

Telephone: +47 22 24 20 30  
Fax: +47 22 24 20 31  
postmottak@norad.no  
www.norad.no

No of copies: 250  
ISBN 978-82-7548-260-8

