



# **Greatest need for transparency, sustainability and stronger ownership**

**Civil Society's Views on Funding in Tanzania**



**KEPA'S WORKING PAPERS 43, 2015**

**ISBN (PDF)**

978-952-200-241-9

**ISSN**

1796-6469

**WRITTEN AND EDITED BY**

Kirsi Koivuporras-Masuka  
Asna Mshana

**LAYOUT**

Nicola Lönnberg

**COVER PICTURE**

Kirsi Koivuporras-Masuka, Flickr / Florian Kreitmair  
Collage Nicola Lönnberg

**KEPA RY**

Elimäenkatu 25–27  
00260 Helsinki, Finland  
+358 9 584 233  
info@kepa.fi  
**kepa.fi**

*Supported by official development aid by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Finland.  
Opinions presented herein are personal and may not represent the official position of Kepa.*

# Content

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Overview of Tanzanian civil society and its current funding</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Finland's support for civil society</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4. Foundation for Civil Society grants</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>5. Focus group results: Benefits and challenges</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6. Focus group results: How to improve funding modalities?</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>7. What kind of support would work best for CS?</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>8. Discussion about aid dependency and alternative financial resources</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>9. Conclusion and discussion points</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Annex: CSO's Capacity Gaps: Reflections to earlier findings</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>List of participating organizations</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Sources</b>	<b>28</b>

# 1. Introduction

**THE INITIAL IDEA** for this assessment was born already in 2013 during TACOSODE's seminar where financial sustainability of civil society in Tanzania was discussed. From there the idea started to sprout becoming finally an assessment focusing on civil society organizations' (CSO) views on three funding modalities: Local Cooperation Fund, Foundation for Civil Society grants and project funding channelled through Finnish CSOs to their Tanzanian partner organizations.

Besides these three mentioned funding modalities or mechanisms this study is also focusing on civil society organizations' views on improving their funding situation through developing current funding opportunities in general, but also through finding out alternative sources, and discussing what kind of funding arrangements would be ideal for civil society.

This study has been conducted to be used as a tool for dialogue about the funding for local civil society organizations in Tanzania by bringing together different actors and viewpoints, by informing donors about the opinions on the field, and by collecting practical ideas and recommendations for improving handled funding mechanisms. Additionally with this assessment we wish to trigger self-reflection within the civil society in Tanzania as well as in Finland.

The main focus of this study is in the perspective of Tanzanian civil society organizations, but room has also given to Finnish CSOs to reflect their partnerships with Tanzanian CSOs and as they have de facto dual role. Most of Finnish organizations managing development cooperation projects receive significant share of their funding from Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), but as they channel funding to their Southern partners they are also seen as donors when looking the matter through the eyes of Tanzanian civil society.

Same applies partly to Foundation for Civil Society as technically it is a member of Tanzanian civil society but it is also seen strongly as a donor from the perspective of other Tanzanian civil society organizations. Additionally this relates to the fact that Foundation for CS was established and managed by a group of development partners in order to channel funds to Tanzanian civil society. This makes Foundation's role different as even though Foundation has been naturalised, and it is now considered Tanzanian, it is still finding its place in the Tanzanian civil society.

## Objectives, used approach and methods

The initial objective for the assessment was to compare different funding instruments for CSOs in Tanzania; the Finnish Embassy's Local Cooperation Fund (LCF), the funding provided by the Foundation for Civil Society (FCS), and the development cooperation project funding channelled through Finnish partner CSOs, in order to:

- Finding out local organizations' opinions on benefits and challenges of these different instruments.
- Finding out local organizations' ideas on how funding can be channelled differently and how these instruments could be developed.
- Finding out local organization's opinions on what kind of funding instrument would work better for them and their needs.

When planning further planning the study, it was decided that two additional objectives should be added on top of the original ones to widen the perspective of the study:

- Finding out what kind of alternative sources for funding the Tanzanian organizations are able to identify, and finding out organizations' ideas of ideal funding situation.
- Finding out how Finnish organizations see the benefits and challenges of project funding and partnerships with Tanzanian CSOs, and how they would develop their project funding.

For collecting necessary information five focus group meetings were held, two in Dar es Salaam, and one in Arusha, Zanzibar, and Morogoro. Also two organizations were met individually as they weren't able to attend the focus groups. All participating organizations were mapped, selected and invited to meetings by Kepa. The guiding principles for selecting the organizations were that each of them receive or have received funding through at least one of the handled instruments and that the combination in focus groups would well enough represent the diversity of civil society.

In total of 14 civil society organizations receiving funding from the Foundation for Civil Society (about 4 percent of 2013 grant receivers), 6 civil society organizations receiving Local Cooperation Fund (about 85 percent of the current amount of LCF receivers), and 9 organizations implementing a development cooperation projects with Finnish CSO partner (about 25 percent of all CSO partners) participated in the meetings.

Some of the organizations who participated in the focus group meetings are or were receiving funding through two handled instruments (e.g. LCF and FCS), and were encouraged to estimate both during the meetings. It should also be mentioned that many of the invited organizations sent two or three people to participate in the meetings increasing the total amount of participants; finally in total of 33 Tanzanian civil society actors gave their views for this study.

Focus group meetings were semi-structured and consisted of three parts. First the participants focused on the benefits and challenges of each instrument; in the second part they were identifying means to improve these instruments; and in the third part the focus was on dreaming of an ideal funding for civil society and finding out participants' ideas of alternative funding resources.

Each task was first done in pairs or smaller groups and results were presented to the whole group. Each presentation round was followed by an open discussion. Participants were also able to bring up their ideas and points freely during the sessions. All discussions during each focus group were documented.

Additionally discussions were organized with the Embassy of Finland in Dar es Salaam but despite of several requests we did not manage to agree an appointment with the Foundation for Civil Society. Instead we have utilized the meeting memo from the meeting Keba's Country Director Masud Hossain had with FCS' Director John Ulanga in October 2014. Necessary data has also been collected from several written sources.

The initial results of the Tanzanian focus groups were presented in a separate focus group meeting organized in May 2015 in Finland for Finnish CSOs implementing development cooperation projects in Tanzania. This meeting was started with a customized focus group programme; participating CSOs were asked to evaluate the challenges and benefits of partnerships with Tanzanian CSOs as well as how to develop the funding instrument, to better serve CSOs' needs.

People from 5 different organizations participated in the meeting (about 14 percent of all Finnish CSOs acting in Tanzania). Additionally we had two visitors from Danish umbrella organizations CISU and few Keba's staff members present who all participated in the focus group activities.

## 2. Overview of Tanzanian civil society and its current funding

**IF ONE WORD SHOULD BE SELECTED** to describe the civil society in Tanzania it could be “diverse” or “polarized”. Tanzanian civil society has greatly expanded since the 1980’s. At the same time it has grown to be very diverse consisting of notably different actors starting from small local support groups up to international organizations working in different sectors.

History of the civil society in Tanzania could be traced back to the period before independence. However, the nature, strategies, scope of activities, and the organizational forms adopted by current civil society organisations significantly differ from the earlier ones. The EU Country Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society in Tanzania states that in fact the current civil society reflects governance changes<sup>1</sup>, which have taken place in Tanzania since the mid-1980s. For the reasons mentioned above, it can be argued that the present civil society in Tanzania is actually very new.<sup>2</sup>

These same changes, not to forget the role of international donors increasing their direct support to CSOs, also made the civil society to expand, to move into the mushroom phase. The mushroom phase or stage is a term used in the study of Tanzanian civil society conducted by Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI) already 15 years ago. Despite being old, this study still holds many valid points and observations of Tanzanian civil society.<sup>3</sup>

Let us start by introducing the three stages of civil society development that are in fact very simple. It is stated in the mentioned report that civil societies normally go through three different stages when developing their organizational life. These stages are the mushroom phase, the consolidation phase and the influential phase. The mushroom phase is characterized by the popping up organizations and great expansion of the civil society. The next stage is reached when

organizations develop their consolidation i.e. their organizational and managerial capacities in order to have what it takes to achieve the goals they have set out.<sup>4</sup>

In order to play a significant role however, the study states, the organizations need to be accepted by the government. Only then the third phase, the influential phase, is reached. This takes place by building mutual trust between the CSOs and the government, and reaching some kind of agreement regarding their common existence. The group of consultants who conducted the study: Siri Lange, Hege Wallevik, and Andrew Kiondo, state that if this third stage is achieved, one will ideally have organizations that may influence policies and contribute to development by carrying out activities and governance but at the same time also hold their government accountable.<sup>5</sup>

In 2000 the Tanzanian civil society was estimated to be in the mushroom phase with few organizations developing into strong civic organizations. Lange, Wallevik and Kiondo state that in the development process many of the organizations will die as they are not simply based on the right motivations, or lack a clear activity plan. In 2000 there were many examples of briefcase-NGOs or organizations without popular base, which can be explained through employment creation – people turned into third sector due high unemployment and because available donor funding offered an opportunity to find an alternative source of income.<sup>6</sup>

When looking back now, the number of CSOs has increased with several thousand compared to the figures given in the report. It can be stated that the mushroom phase may not be fully over, but the civil society in general is in the second phase. There is also a relatively limited group of strong civil society organizations that can be called influential. Further, the civil society may now be even more polarized compared to time when Lange, Wallevik and Kiondo were doing their research. We come to this point later in the text.

The current size of the Tanzanian civil society is hard to estimate. The exact number of Tanzanian civil society organizations is unknown, but there are several estimates available which give an overall picture of the situation. The most recent Directory of CSOs (2009–2010), published by

1 There were many reasons for the growth in the number of CSOs in 1980s and 1990s. These included the need to fill the gap left by the state withdrawal from social services delivery, the effects of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) such as social differentiation, the need for certain social groups (including women) to organize and articulate their interests, the move by international aid agencies to encourage civil society organizations as a counterweight to the state, and privatization and retrenchment programs that increased the number of unemployed people, who were able to find alternative employment in CSOs.

2 EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017: [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf).

3 Siri Lange, Hege Wallevik & Andrew Kiondo: Civil Society in Tanzania, CMI R2000:6: <http://www.cmi.no/publications/file/988-civil-society-in-tanzania>.

4 *ibid.*

5 *ibid.*

6 *ibid.*

the Foundation for Civil Society, lists 3000 civil society organizations. However, only few rural based organizations are included in the Directory.<sup>7</sup>

The Civil Society Research Facility estimates that the true number of CSOs is about 10 000 organizations. This estimate is based on combined data from different Ministries and is most likely closest to the truth. Some estimates go even higher, up until 20 000 civil society organizations, but this amount includes most likely organizations that are no longer active, or exist only on paper.<sup>8</sup>

As mentioned before, the civil society is very diverse, but certain groups can be identified. The EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society in Tanzania uses four different levels to group CSO activities:

- ✓ **First level:** grassroots organisations and community-based organisations. They consist of informal groupings or ad-hoc organisations working in the immediate local context.
- ✓ **Second level:** organisations legally registered with appropriated statutes, working for the benefit of the populations or in service delivery, sometimes in collaboration with grass-roots organisations (e.g. NGOs, associations).
- ✓ **Third level:** geographic or thematic networks: national associations, federations and thematic networks mandated to defend a common interest.
- ✓ **Fourth level:** this is the highest level of CSO networking. It is made up of platforms or common dialogue forum for umbrella organisations and networks of the third level.<sup>9</sup>

Alternatively Lange, Wallevik and Kiondo use more simplified grouping into two categories: civil society consists of organizations that are active in service delivery and interest organizations.<sup>10</sup>

Officially CSOs in Tanzania fall into eight categories: trade unions, professional associations, media organizations, cooperative unions, faith based organizations (FBO), farmers groups, community based organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).<sup>11</sup>

These categories follow different legal provisions<sup>12</sup> available for registering civil society organizations. Until very recently Tanzania did not have a law specifically on NGOs. The initial purpose of the National Policy on NGOs of 2001 and the NGO Act of 2002 was to harmonize this legislative framework, decentralise the registration process, and facilitate NGOs' operations, but the described objectives have not been reached.<sup>13</sup>

CIVICUS' civil society profile of Tanzania notes that the country has large civil society compared to other developing countries, as it occupies about 2 percent of the economically active population. Cooperatives, faith-based organisations, community-based organisations and informal grassroots organizations dominate the sector while the urban-based, advocacy oriented and professionally working CSOs form sort of a civil society elite receiving most of the international funding.<sup>14</sup>

There are also more informal CSOs groups than formally registered CSOs. Informal groups are more pronounced in the countryside than in the urban and semi-urban areas. These groups form an important part of civil society as they have high influence directly on people's lives, and even more so in the remoter rural areas. Usually, these smaller organisations operate at grass roots level, particularly with the poor, disadvantaged and marginalized people, in helping to improve their social situation and living conditions.

To summarize, civil society in Tanzania is a strong service provider and is mostly known for it. However the civil society's role influencing social policy issues is growing. Recently, social auditing for government public accountability has become a popular function of CSOs in Tanzania, with CSOs engaged in such activities as budget monitoring, public expenditure tracking surveys, public service delivery assessments and corruption perception surveys, which have provided essential stimulus to CSOs' advocacy activities.<sup>15</sup>

It has been estimated that about 9 percent of CSOs' work concentrates on advocacy, but the trend has been rising for

7 Civil Society Organizations Directory: <http://www.csodirectory.or.tz/>; Assessment of possibilities of Swedish support to promote accountability, transparency and civil society capacity in Tanzania, final report 2014, Alffram, Mod er, and Rehmattullah, Indevelop AB & TANA Copenhagen.

8 *ibid.*

9 EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017: [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf).

10 Siri Lange, Hege Wallevik & Andrew Kiondo: Civil Society in Tanzania, CMI R2000:6: <http://www.cmi.no/publications/file/988-civil-society-in-tanzania>.

11 The Foundation for CSOs: Annual report on the state of CSOs in Tanzania 2011.

12 The main statutes that govern CSOs include the following: Non-Governmental Organisations Act (2002) is currently the national level instrument governing registered NGOs; Trustees' Incorporation Act (2002) which govern trusts; The Companies Act (2002) govern companies limited by guarantees; The law of Contract Act (2002) which govern partnerships; Tanganyika Law Society Act (2002) which governs the Tanganyika Law Society; The Societies Act (1954 R.E 2002) which governs societies; The Cooperative Societies Act (2003) which governs co-operative societies; The National Sports Council of Tanzania Act (2002) govern sports organisation and clubs; The Copyright and Neighbouring Rights Act (2002) which govern copyright societies.

13 EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017: [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf).

14 CIVICUS civil society profile: Tanzania: <http://socs.civicus.org/CountryCivilSocietyProfiles/Tanzania.pdf>.

15 Civil Society Index Project, Tanzania country report 2011, CIVICUS & Fordia: <http://civicus.org/downloads/CSI/Tanzania.pdf>; CIVICUS civil society profile: Tanzania: <http://socs.civicus.org/CountryCivilSocietyProfiles/Tanzania.pdf>.

several years, and many organizations have started to combine service delivery with awareness raising or advocacy activities. It can also be indicated that there's an increasing shift from direct service delivery to advocacy and citizen empowerment. There are also growing opportunities for dialogue between the parliamentarians and the public, with CSOs acting as catalysts on new issues, playing intermediary role, and contributing expert knowledge.<sup>16</sup>

Despite the mentioned raising trend and positive aspects, there are also few existing challenges that Lange, Wallevik and Kiondo pointed out already 15 years ago. They said that despite of the existence of many organizations that do advocacy, most of these organizations are classified as elite-based interest groups that are mainly based in Dar es Salaam. It is acknowledged that these types of organizations have the capacity to influence policies, but they also have some significant weaknesses.<sup>17</sup>

One of the weaknesses is that the elite-based advocacy organizations have many times very weak member basis. There is also a strong tendency to top-down approaches, in other words organizations tend to be established around resource persons who reach out to grassroots and not vice versa. Lange, Wallevik and Kiondo came into conclusion that it seems easier to elite based organizations to work for the grassroot organizations rather than to work with them, and this feature can still be observed even though being careful not to generalize too much.<sup>18</sup>

The EU country roadmap talks about the similar phenomenon mentioning that despite the thousands of non-state actors in Tanzania, it is a relatively small and high profile few, operating mainly at national level, that play an assertive role in accountability. The key national organizations like for example Policy Forum, TGNP, HakiElimu, Leadership Forum, Legal Human Rights Centre and a good number of others have earned their position at the top of the "civil society world" due to motivation of a few strong individuals, by learning quickly and being persistent. These organizations have been crucial for accountability in Tanzania, but they are also very donor dependent and their biggest challenge is to link up to local level dynamics and build critical mass outside Dar es Salaam.<sup>19</sup>

The amount of strong, elite-based organizations has

grown but is still separated from the rest of the civil society. For this reason it can be stated that while the Tanzanian civil society has become stronger it has also become more polarized as said earlier. There is a big gap between national level CSOs and local level CSOs. The local level CSOs are relatively weak which maintains Tanzanian civil society weak in general and the skills and capacity levels between different organizations high.<sup>20</sup>

It should also be noted that advocacy in Tanzania is understood in the local context and differently by individual CSOs. REPOA did a study already in 2007 finding out that advocacy in Tanzania is seen as 'creating awareness' or 'sensitizing' around a given issue by the majority, or 'pressurizing' government and policymakers or 'organizing for action' to bring change or to solve a problem. During interviews, the themes most often cited were 'speaking for' or 'on behalf of others' or 'informing and influencing for change'. In other words advocacy in many occasions is understood as a synonym to awareness raising.<sup>21</sup>

To summarize, some CSOs actively reject the more confrontational approach, seeing constructive citizen engagement as a more productive way of changing mind-sets, policy and practice; and many prefer to work in close collaboration with the national and local authorities. It must be said, however, that the relationship between the CSOs and the authorities is still relatively confused or unsettled, also from the CSOs' side as many seem to try to decide how to engage with decision makers and at the same time play the watchdog role.<sup>22</sup>

Also the fragmented nature of CSOs in Tanzania and the lack of strong coordinating bodies albeit in thematic areas are seen as major weaknesses of the sector. There should be more civil society networking to establish stronger platforms for advocacy, underpinned by a coherent national code of conduct. There's also a wide need for capacity building, especially among the CBOs and informally operating CSOs.<sup>23</sup>

There is however positive development as the establishment of CSO platforms and networks as well as coalitions sharing a common focus area e.g. education, governance,

16 CIVICUS civil society profile: Tanzania: <http://socs.civicus.org/CountryCivilSocietyProfiles/Tanzania.pdf>; Civil society reflection paper, Kepa 2013: [https://www.kepa.fi/tiedostot/cs\\_tanzania\\_2013.pdf](https://www.kepa.fi/tiedostot/cs_tanzania_2013.pdf); Tanzania Non-Governmental Organisations – their perceptions of their relationships with the Government of Tanzania and donors, and their role in poverty reduction and development, REPOA, Special Paper No 07.21, 2007; EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017: [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf).

17 Siri Lange, Hege Wallevik & Andrew Kiondo: Civil Society in Tanzania, CMI R2000:6: <http://www.cmi.no/publications/file/988-civil-society-in-tanzania>.

18 *ibid.*

19 EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017: [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf).

20 EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017: [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf); Assessment of possibilities of Swedish support to promote accountability, transparency and civil society capacity in Tanzania, final report 2014, Alffram, Modéer, and Rehmatullah, Indevlop AB & TANA Copenhagen.

21 Tanzania Non-Governmental Organisations – their perceptions of their relationships with the Government of Tanzania and donors, and their role in poverty reduction and development, REPOA, Special Paper No 07.21, 2007

22 EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017: [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf); Siri Lange, Hege Wallevik & Andrew Kiondo: Civil Society in Tanzania, CMI R2000:6: <http://www.cmi.no/publications/file/988-civil-society-in-tanzania>.

23 Towards Enabling Environment for CSO Participation in Domestication of Busan Agreement – The Legal and Institutional Framework in Tanzania opportunities and Challenges, Reality of Aid Africa Network, 2013: [http://www.ccic.ca/\\_files/en/what\\_we\\_do/2014\\_02\\_20\\_Tanzania\\_Case\\_Study.pdf](http://www.ccic.ca/_files/en/what_we_do/2014_02_20_Tanzania_Case_Study.pdf);

gender, human rights, youth or environment, is becoming increasingly common. Examples of strong national networks are Tanzania Education Network (TENMET), Policy Forum (PF), Tanzania Human Rights Defenders Coalition (THRC), and Tanzania Association for the Deaf (CHAVITA).

Recently networks and coalitions of CSOs have emerged at district level linking CSOs operating in the same region or district in order to enhance cooperation and effective use of resources. These networks, for example Kibaha Network of CSOs (KNC) and Mwanza NGO Network (MNGON), also give CSOs possibilities to have a common and stronger voice on issues they are working for.<sup>24</sup>

In addition to Tanzanian CSOs, there is a relative small but influential group of international NGOs working in the country like for example ActionAid, Plan, Save the Children, and Oxfam. INGOs play an important role as capacity builders of CSOs, channelling also funds to local organizations. Furthermore many INGOs are important players in advocacy work. On the other hand critical discussion about the role of INGOs is rising. Criticism is related especially to INGOs presence in the South and their role in setting agendas as well as acting as programme implementers in the South.

The agendas and priorities of INGOs also have an impact on local organizations when they select their focus areas – it should be acknowledged that many times available funding directs organizations towards certain focus areas, not vice versa. Also INGOs' partner selection tends to strengthen merely the urban elite organizations, and this keeps the civil society weak in general, and actually supports the existing power balance.<sup>25</sup>

The operating environment for civil society in Tanzania has been satisfactory. For example CIVICUS' Enabling Environment Index (EEI) which explores enabling environment through three dimensions: socio-economic, socio-cultural and governance, ranks Tanzania 71st out of 109 countries covered in the index. Worth noting is the fact that Tanzania can be found among the 10 worst countries when looking only the socio-economic dimension.<sup>26</sup>

Also the legal framework withholds some aspects that form a potential threat to civil society. The EU country roadmap document points out that both the Union and Zanzibar constitution guarantee the positive freedom of forming or joining associations or organizations as well as the negative freedom of not being forced to join such associations or organizations. However, the enjoyment of the freedom of association under the Union Constitution is still affected by the omnibus limitation clause which subjects it

to other laws of the land.<sup>27</sup>

Also the NGO Act restricts CSOs in advocacy activities. The status only allows nonpartisan organizations which serve the "public interest" defined as "providing for and improving the standard of living or eradication of poverty of a given group of people or the public at large". Public interest being defined in these terms, referring to economic and social welfare, means that the state can technically oppose all CSO activities branded as "political".<sup>28</sup>

Also CSOs' access to relevant information and free information dissemination can be viewed critically. First and foremost, the existing culture of "every file or document regarding government is secret, unless indicated differently" still reigns, which makes access to information rather complicated.<sup>29</sup>

This year the parliament passed two alarming laws, the Cyber Crime Act and the Statistics Law which were signed by the president. These laws enable the government to control social media as well as production of any critical data. When writing this report the government had opened the floor for proposals of amendments for the mentioned laws, however the CSOs following the development of these laws have not been able to access the last versions of the laws signed by the president.<sup>30</sup>

Positive sign is that in general, despite of the legal framework, it seems that CSOs are getting more daring and confident in advocacy activities. There is also positive development in the government-civil society relations as the government has created informal and formal structures to collaborate with CSO at the national level. Currently there are consultative forums, such as the Public Expenditure Reviews (PER), MKUKUTA Working Groups, and the Parliamentary Public Hearing, where interested CSOs can discuss policy issues with the government.<sup>31</sup>

In recent year the civil society representatives have also been invited by the government to take part in reviewing policy reforms such as the Local Government Reform Programme, Legal Sector Reform Programme, and Public Service Management Reform Programme. CSOs also do participate in monitoring elections and disseminating the election monitoring reports. Additionally human rights NGOs have been able to mobilize fundamental changes in the way the

24 Reflections on the state of civil society Tanzania 2013: [https://www.kepa.fi/tiedostot/cs\\_tanzania\\_2013.pdf](https://www.kepa.fi/tiedostot/cs_tanzania_2013.pdf).

25 Toni Haapanen (ed.): Civil Society in Tanzania, 2007.

26 CIVICUS EEI Report 2013: [http://civicus.org/eei/downloads/Civicus\\_EEI%20REPORT%202013\\_WEB\\_FINAL.pdf](http://civicus.org/eei/downloads/Civicus_EEI%20REPORT%202013_WEB_FINAL.pdf)

27 EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017: [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf).

28 EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017: [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf).

29 *ibid.*

30 The information is based on Kepa's partnership with Media Council Tanzania as well as the analysis of Tanzanian Coalition for Human Rights Defenders and Legal and Human Rights Center.

31 EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017: [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf); Towards Enabling Environment for CSO Participation in Domestication of Busan Agreement – The Legal and Institutional Framework in Tanzania opportunities and Challenges, Reality of Aid Africa, 2013: [http://www.cccic.ca/\\_files/en/what\\_we\\_do/2014\\_02\\_20\\_Tanzania\\_Case\\_Study.pdf](http://www.cccic.ca/_files/en/what_we_do/2014_02_20_Tanzania_Case_Study.pdf).

state operates, for example the enactment of the Land Law had a major impetus from CSOs.<sup>32</sup>

However the major concern by those who participate in the policy formulation and review process is that all these processes are government driven and do not reflect the multi-stakeholder nature of the composition in various structures and processes. CSOs still face challenges to be more involved in the definition of public policies and in their activity of advocacy and accountability due to lack of transparency and access to budget information, public policies, legislation and data. CSOs are normally engaged at a later stage in which they just provide inputs to the draft of the policy that has been developed by the government.<sup>33</sup>

## Funding for CSOs in Tanzania

The field of funding for civil society in Tanzania is relatively complex as there are several, diverse sources for funding. The big development partners like for example DFID, USAID, World Bank or UNDP are best known. On the other hand there are several foreign foundations and independent organizations that are supporting specific sectors or thematic areas that may not be so well known but contribute significant amounts to CSO activities.

What is very evident and problematic is the fact that Tanzanian civil society organizations receive majority of their funding from international donors, and are also highly dependent on external funding. The survey EU did for the country roadmap reveals that in general 42 percent of the non-profit organisations' income comes from external sources.<sup>34</sup>

Additionally a survey conducted by the Foundation for Civil Society in 2008 showed that 81 percent of national networks and 78 percent of regional networks are highly dependent on donors. About 50 percent of CSOs consulted for this survey believed that their resources are inadequate compared to 33 percent who found them adequate.<sup>35</sup>

There are however few civil society organizations that are self-financing with membership income as the most important source of income. For instance, professional associations and faith-based organizations are not as dependent on external funding as are the CSOs working for civil rights, ad-

vocacy and environment. These organizations depend up to 84 percent on external funding. At the same time it becomes evident that one of the biggest sustainability problems that the advocacy organizations have, is that their member base has been traditionally thin.<sup>36</sup>

The most important models or channels currently used for supporting Tanzanian civil society organizations by the development partners were recently summarized by Henrik Alffram, Pontus Modéer and Shamshad Rehmatullah from Indevelop AB and TANA Copenhagen, who conducted a survey for the Embassy of Sweden in Tanzania.<sup>37</sup>

Their summary of findings consists of following instruments or models for funding: direct support to civil society organizations, support through international or foreign NGOs, donor partners promoting international NGO consortia, and donor partners supporting national grant giving NGOs.

**1) Direct support to civil society organizations:** this is the most common modality used by the big development partners: DFID, Danida, Norway, World Bank, Netherlands, USAID, UN Women and UNDP. According to Alffram, Modéer and Rehmatullah direct support is directed fairly at large and well-established Dar es Salaam-based organizations, some of which have substantial financial resources through funding from a wide range of development partners.

Also some embassies are giving direct support to local CSO like does for example the Embassy of Finland through the Local Cooperation Fund. European Delegation to Tanzania is also managing grants that eligible civil society organizations can apply. Grants are direct financial contributions provided to organizations, or to projects carried out by them. Most of the time, the Commission attributes them through calls for proposals.

In Tanzania some organizations, especially the thematic networks at the national level, have ongoing and committed financial support from international donors. These CSOs include the Women's Dignity Project (WDP), HakiElimu, Legal and Human Rights Center (LHRC), HakiKazi Catalyst (HKC), HakiArdhi, Sikika, Policy Forum (PF), Tanzania Gender Networking Programme (TGNP), Tanzania Media Women Association (TAMWA), Media Council of Tanzania (MCT), Tanzania Forest Conservation Group (TFCG), and the Women's Legal Aid Center (WLAC).

**2) Support through international or foreign NGOs:** the model where donors are using European and US based NGOs as intermediaries to channel larger amounts of

32 EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017: [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf).

33 Towards Enabling Environment for CSO Participation in Domestication of Busan Agreement – The Legal and Institutional Framework in Tanzania opportunities and Challenges, Reality of Aid Africa, 2013: [http://www.cccic.ca/\\_files/en/what\\_we\\_do/2014\\_02\\_20\\_Tanzania\\_Case\\_Study.pdf](http://www.cccic.ca/_files/en/what_we_do/2014_02_20_Tanzania_Case_Study.pdf);

EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017: [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf).

34 EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017: [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf).

35 CIVICUS civil society profile: Tanzania: <http://socs.civicus.org/CountryCivilSocietyProfiles/Tanzania.pdf>.

36 EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017: [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf).

37 Assessment of possibilities of Swedish support to promote accountability, transparency and civil society capacity in Tanzania; Alffram, Modéer and Rehmatullah, Indevelop AB & TANA Copenhagen, final report 17.10.2014.

funding to CSOs in the recipient country is not common according to Alffram, Modéer and Rehmatullah. They state that while there are some international and foreign NGOs that have played and still play this role, none of them currently have a prominent donor role in comparison with other funding modalities.

Additionally in comparison with direct support, common advantages with channelling funds through international or foreign NGOs is that these organizations know the local CSO community well, and are in good position to identify suitable partner organizations, can handle comparative large number of contributions, and can provide targeted capacity building.

The Finnish system where MFA has channelled about 14 to 15 percent of ODA through Finnish CSO's implementing development cooperation programmes and projects fits into this group in Alffram's, Modéer's and Rehmatullah's division.

The role of Forum Syd can serve as another, and an interesting example of both direct support and support through Swedish CSOs, as Forum Syd has been managing the Sida project support to Swedish CSOs doing development cooperation as well as fund-allocation-type basket funds for projects or programmes in Tanzania, Nicaragua, and Colombia until 2015. Recently Forum Syd decided to pull out from Tanzania and the office has been closed down. In Africa Forum Syd has now office in Kenya and in Somalia.

**3) Donor partners promoting international NGO consortia:** as an example Alffram, Modéer and Rehmatullah bring up recent and significant consortium that received bilateral funding from development partners, the Oxfam Consortium on Constitutional Reform. The consortium consists of Oxfam, BBC Media Action, Restless Development/VSO and Legal and Human Rights Centre. The initiative for the consortia came from DFID.

**4) Donor partners supporting national grant giving NGOs:** in Tanzania the Foundation for Civil Society is the main national grant giving organization supported by the donor partners. It has been seen as a tool to reach out to smaller and less experienced organizations and to organizations working on remote areas. It has also been viewed as a means of reducing the administrative burden of development partners, and providing capacity building to CSOs.

Another example is the Legal Services Facility (LSF) which manages a basket fund supported by DANIDA and DFID. The organ is created to channel funding for CSOs which are providing legal aid and paralegal services in Tanzania.<sup>38</sup>

38 [www.lftz.org](http://www.lftz.org).

There's also an example of an international grants giving initiative, the Tanzania Media Fund (TMF) managed by Hivos. TMF is established to support quality, diverse and vibrant media in Tanzania by enabling investigative and public interest journalism and facilitating critical reflection and learning. TMF helps journalists to provide evidence-based information and to improve the quality of information. TMF is an initiative of a group of development partners in Tanzania: Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), DFID, Irish Aid and Royal Danish Embassy.<sup>39</sup>

Apart from donor and philanthropy funds, that are approximately 20 percent of CSO funding, some funding is available through Local Government Authorities (LGAs). For example, CSOs involved in the fight against HIV/AIDS often receive funding from the Tanzania Commission for AIDS (TACAIDS) through Council of Multi-sector AIDS Committees (CMACs). FBOs delivering primary healthcare services also receive public funds from the Health Basket Fund jointly managed by the government and donors.<sup>40</sup>

LGAs often invite service delivery organisations to submit work plans for incorporation into District Development Plans (DDPs). Both local and central governments prefer to collaborate with CSOs that complement government delivery rather than with accountability organisations monitoring government. CSOs engaged in monitoring public service delivery nonetheless are invited to participate in Regional Consultative Committees (RCC) and District Consultative Committees (DCC).<sup>41</sup>

The EU country roadmap points out also few other local level funding modalities. One of these measures is the soft loan system under the Prime Minister's Office and Regional Administration and Local Government (PMO-RALG) where district and municipal councils offer such loans to groups of youth and women. Another is a modality under the Ministry of Community Development, Gender and Children (MCDGC) which is used to fund capacity building interventions aimed at CSOs registered under MCDGC. The challenge is that there are no publicly available procedures for qualifying for these capacity building interventions.<sup>42</sup>

As another measure, Tanzania has a Rapid Funding Envelope that funds interventions undertaken by CSOs. This measure is more transparent as procedures for accessing such funding are often announced in time for CSOs to send their applications. Processing of those applications is estimated as efficient by the EU and the process includes a

39 [www.tmf.ortz](http://www.tmf.ortz).

40 Reflections on the state of CSOs in Tanzania, Kepa 2013; CIVICUS civil society profile: Tanzania: <http://socs.civicus.org/CountryCivilSocietyProfiles/Tanzania.pdf>.

41 Reflections on the state of CSOs in Tanzania, Kepa 2013.

42 EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017: [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf)

phone call or a meeting for further discussions regarding the quality of the proposal.<sup>43</sup>

In 2010 Tanzania launched The Public Private Partnership (PPP) Act and policy that provide institutional framework for implementing PPP agreements. In the PPP framework, the registered civil society organizations are classified as private sector. Many CSOs see PPP as an opportunity for resource mobilization in social service provision. A good example of these organizations is Comprehensive Community Based Rehabilitation in Tanzania (CCBRT) which receives funding from government and private sector through PPP arrangement.<sup>44</sup>

---

43 *ibid.*

44 Reflections on the state of CSOs in Tanzania, Kepa 2013.

However it must be added that the private sector engagement in funding CSOs directly is not common in Tanzania although companies do support community based initiatives as part of their corporate social responsibility programmes or PR activities.<sup>45</sup>

So far the income generating and fundraising activities of many CSOs have been quite limited. Based on engagement with local CSOs it can be however stated that some of the national CSOs have started to diversify their funding sources through income-generating activities, including micro-finance, capacity development training, research, hiring meeting halls and entering PPP agreements with government and private sector.

---

45 EU country roadmap for engagement with civil society 2014–2017:

[http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf).

### 3. Finland's support for civil society

**ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL** Guidelines for Civil Society in Development Policy (2010) Finland's general objective is to "support a vibrant, pluralistic civil society based on the rule of law in the target countries of its development cooperation". Further it is seen that the activities of civil society organizations make it possible to achieve results in areas and regions, and among groups of people, that the resources and tools of public development cooperation do not always reach. It is also stated that through participation of Finnish actors and NGOs the public support for development cooperation can be strengthened in Finland.<sup>46</sup>

In the guidelines the civil society actors are seen as an essential and integral element of Finnish development cooperation. The focus of support for civil society is in poverty eradication and promotion of sustainable development within the framework of Millennium Development Goals. It is however also acknowledged that through supporting civil society Finland can also contribute not only to poverty reduction but also to the social inclusion of citizens, thereby strengthening the preconditions for democracy and good governance.<sup>47</sup>

The guidelines list the roles and task of civil society organizations in development cooperation as follows:

- Promotion of human rights, democracy and good governance: civic education, knowledge of rights, learning about local democracy practices, etc.
- Production of basic and welfare services monitoring of the state and other public-sector actors (democratic control)
- Defending the rights of special groups
- Increasing grassroots participation promotion of a pluralistic and multifarious civil dialogue and participation in such civil dialogue
- Mobilization of local resources (including volunteer activities)
- Testing and development of innovative operational models<sup>48</sup>

According to Finland's Development Policy Action Plan which came into force in 2012, Finland promotes a human rights-based approach to development. The objective is to help even the poorest of people to recognise their rights and

to be able to campaign for them. The Policy Action Plan defines four cross-cutting themes or priority areas:

- 1) Democratic and responsible society that promotes human rights
- 2) Socially inclusive and jobs-providing green economy
- 3) Sustainable management and use of natural resources and environmental protection
- 4) Human development<sup>49</sup>

At the moment we live in the transition period as the new government has just started its work and it is not yet clear whether there will be a new Development Policy Action Plan as it used to be or some kind of a new guiding document, and how the Guidelines for Civil Society in Development Policy will be updated.

Also the final decision over the new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and their national implementation will shed light for the future. When writing this the Post 2015 intergovernmental negotiations on the outcome document for the UN summit were just closed and the finalized text for adoption "Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" was agreed on.

However, the new priority areas for Finnish development cooperation are already discussed as the Minister for International Trade and Development Lenita Toivakka has publicly talked about the following priority areas:

- Position of women and girls
- Well-functioning democracy
- Sustainable energy, food and water
- Thriving, responsible business in the developing countries<sup>50</sup>

What comes to funding, Ministry of Foreign Affairs has several funding component or modalities for CSOs: project support, support for partner organisations, support for communications projects and global education, support for conference visits, and support for INGOs. But as the new government of Finland has decided to cut ODA with 43 percent there will be remarkable changes regarding these instruments.

The budget for 2015 contains 114 million Euros in support

46 Guidelines for Civil Society in Development Policy: <http://formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=206482&>.

47 *ibid.*

48 *ibid.*

49 Finland's Development Policy Programme 2012: <http://formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=251855&nodeid=15457&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>.

50 MFA Press Releases, 6/8/2015: <http://formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=328233&nodeid=15145&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>.

for CSOs' development cooperation. The total sum envisaged for 2016 is 65 million Euros. Some application rounds and previous forms of support cannot be implemented as a result of the spending cuts, or their implementation will be postponed. The MFA has announced that the measures with regard to various forms of support:

- This year's annual application round for small and medium-sized organisations' project support has to be interrupted. Existing project support decisions are not subject to cuts. The intention is to initiate a new application round in the spring of 2016.
- The support awarded to organisations receiving programme support and operating grants will be cut equally by about 38 per cent.
- There will be no application round for communications and global education project support in the autumn of 2015. The cuts do not affect the two-year grant decisions made for 2015–2016. The intention is to organise the next application round in 2016, when support can be sought for the year 2017.
- The application round for the municipal sector is interrupted. The aim is to incorporate municipal sector support in the application round for small and medium-sized organisations' project support.
- The general application round for international non-governmental organisations (INGOs) planned for 2016 is cancelled.

It should be however noted that by the time this report is written the final cut figures have not been confirmed as the budget still needs approval from parliament. The budget is debated in September.

MFA also allocates certain amount of development cooperation funds through three special foundations: Siemenpuu, Kios, and Abilis. These foundations have their own partnership programs and they also channel funding to specific projects implemented by CSOs. Additionally MFA has local CSO partners in its own programs; for example in Tanzania the Ministry has supported Mama Misitu campaign on forest governance.<sup>51</sup>

## MFA guidelines for project funding and LCF

In this assessment we have chosen to focus on project support and Local Cooperation Fund (LCF) that are described more in detail in this chapter.

51 Support for Foundations (only in Finnish) <http://www.formin.finland.fi/Public/default.aspx?nodeid=49329>; Embassy of Dar es Salaam, development cooperation: <http://www.finland.ortz/public/default.aspx?nodeid=31648&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>.

A call for project proposals for small and medium sized civil society organisations has previously opened once a year. In the last application round (2014) the amount of funds allocated to CSO projects was 15.9 million Euros. MFA granted funds to 80 different projects that will be implemented in 2015–2017. The most popular countries for CSO projects were Tanzania, Somalia, Kenya, and Nepal.<sup>52</sup>

According to MFA guidelines civil society organisations have the right to choose their mode and field of operation, their partner organization and the country of cooperation. However, the projects have to be in line with Finland's Development Policy Programme and the Guidelines for Civil Society in Development Policy.<sup>53</sup>

The organisation applying for support must be of good repute and registered with the Register of Associations or the Register of Foundations for minimum of two years at the time of filing the application. The organisation must have sufficient capacity and resources to run development cooperation projects; it should have a minimum of 30 members or alternatively demonstrate needed capacity with for example prior projects or expertise.<sup>54</sup>

Particular attention is paid for example on the organization's ability to analyse development issues, to plan and formulate the project objectives, cooperation with other Finnish and international organizations, partner's capacity building in project management and development cooperation themes, and learning and sharing of experiences.<sup>55</sup>

Each project has to have certain amount of self-financing. According to the guidelines the cash value of the self-financing share has to be 15 percent of project's total costs for each year of the implementation. At least 7.5 percent of the self-financing share of the total expenses must be in the form of cash, the rest can be covered through volunteer work, or donations of items or services.<sup>56</sup>

The Finnish CSO applying for the project support must have a local partner that implements the project in the recipient country. Primarily the partner should be a civil society organization in the recipient country or some other specific society or organization which has been operating at least one year. When justified, the partner can also be an international organization operating in the country or an organization representing the local government. The Finnish CSO must also be properly informed of the local partner's background and activities.<sup>57</sup>

Project support is granted for three years at a time, and reporting including audited financial report is required

52 MFA Uutiset, 15.1.2015: <http://www.formin.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=319700&nodeid=15317&contentlan=1&culture=fi-FI>

53 MFA guidelines for project support: <http://formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=50603&nodeid=49327&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>.

54 *ibid.*

55 *ibid.*

56 *ibid.*

57 *ibid.*

annually. The project guidelines also guide the CSOs on acceptable costs. The planned changes of usage of funds, that include all changes that alter the key objectives, activities or personnel expenses, or which change budget lines by more than 15 percent compared to delivered project documents, must be agreed and approved by the Ministry before implemented.<sup>58</sup>

The Local Cooperation Fund (LCF) is managed by the Embassies. The LCF is a part of the implementation of the development policy of the government of Finland and complements other Finnish development efforts, but each Embassy can decide whether they want to use this instruments. They may also set the priority areas and application procedures. For this reason LCF varies in different countries.<sup>59</sup>

The Programme Officer managing LCF in the Embassy of Dar es Salaam, Clara Ruhara tells that CSOs are seen as development partners who work on the grassroots level or are speaking on behalf of the most vulnerable. As an instrument LCF is contributing to Finland's strategic objectives in Tanzania and complementing other programmes.<sup>60</sup>

According to the Country Strategy for Development Cooperation with Tanzania 2014–2017 Finland will contribute towards Tanzanian development by promoting and strengthening: 1) good governance and equitable service delivery; 2) sustainable management of natural resources and access to land; and 3) promotion of inclusive, sustainable and employment enhancing growth.<sup>61</sup>

It is stated that the most important changes done for the current country programme compared to the previous one, are a stronger focus on human rights, democracy, good governance and openness. Emphasis is put on enhanced effectiveness and more sustainable results which are sought through reduction of fragmentation. It is further stated that the number of interventions will be reduced significantly by 2016, programme coherence will be increased and more strategic synergies will be created.<sup>62</sup>

The current country strategy was written before the last Finnish parliament elections and decision to cut ODA. When writing this the actual impact of the cuts on the country level is not yet known. Embassy is also preparing to renew the country strategy.

The current budget reserved annually for LCF is 600 000 Euros. The budget used to be bigger, 1 million per a year, but so was also the number of supported organizations, up to 30–40 CSOs. Now the maximum amount of CSOs supported on annual level is 10. Clara Ruhara tells that the Embassy wants to support both big and small CSOs, and specifies that the funding is not given to government institutions or private companies.<sup>63</sup>

The overall criteria for selection of LCF partners are publicly accessible in the Embassy's website. However the public criteria state only more or less the wanted thematic areas. It is also stated that the Embassy concentrates on few long-term strategic partnerships, which will be expected to have a long-term strategic plan, be democratic within their organization and be prepared to work not only in Dar es Salaam, but in the country as a whole and also at grassroots level. Clara Ruhara explains that it has been intentional not to create more detailed criteria as it gives flexibility to decide case by case of cooperation.<sup>64</sup>

Despite the objective of long-term strategic partners the decision for funding is given for one year at the time. The maximum support period is three years. The Embassy used to open calls for applications but gave up this practice as the amount of applications became too high to handle. Clara Ruhara explains that currently they are also trying to more efficiently map out potential partners themselves.<sup>65</sup>

The payments of LCF are done in two or three installments. Reports must be accepted by the Embassy before the last 10 percent of the budget is released. The Embassy requires a separate progress report and a final report as well as separate audited financial report from the LCF partners.<sup>66</sup>

58 *ibid.*

59 Country Strategy to Development Cooperation with Tanzania 2014–2017: <http://www.finland.ortz/public/default.aspx?nodeid=31648&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>.

60 Meeting with Clara Ruhara 10.12.2014.

61 Country Strategy to Development Cooperation with Tanzania 2014–2017: <http://www.finland.ortz/public/default.aspx?nodeid=31648&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>.

62 *ibid.*

63 Meeting with Clara Ruhara 10.12.2014.

64 Meeting with Clara Ruhara 10.12.2014; Fund for Local Cooperation: <http://www.finland.ortz/public/default.aspx?nodeid=47142&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>.

65 Meeting with Clara Ruhara 10.12.2014.

66 *ibid.*

## 4. Foundation for Civil Society Grants

**THE INITIATIVE TO ESTABLISH** Foundation for Civil Society (FCS) as a funding pool to support the local CSOs came from few like-minded development partners (DP) led by DFID. Initially the development partners were also the owners (trustees) of the Foundation. FCS was registered as a non-profit company in 2002 and started its operations in 2003.<sup>67</sup>

However, in 2007 the DPs decided to hand the Foundation over to Tanzanians. At present Foundation have seven members who are also the highest authority of the organization. Members are selected among prominent Tanzanians from different sectors of the society and represent civil society, academia, private sector and media.<sup>68</sup>

Currently the grants offered by FCS are divided into three categories: small grants, medium grants, and strategic grants. Small grants are typically for small and young organizations to be used for short term projects. These funds do not usually exceed 7.5 million Tanzanian Shillings. At present the dominating majority (60–70 percent) of the FCS fund receivers are small grant receivers.<sup>69</sup>

The medium grant receivers are typically organizations with good track record, relatively long experience in development work, and have already some experience of using FCS funds. The maximum amount of medium grant is 45 million Tanzanian shillings and the duration of the support period is usually from one year up to maximum three years.<sup>70</sup>

According to FCS, the strategic grants are given to well-known and highly experienced CSOs with really good track record and with high organizational capacity. Funding period for a strategic grant is three years and the funding exceeds to 150 million Tanzanian Shillings per a year. There are not many organizations that receive the strategic grant as FCS tries to keep the number below 10.<sup>71</sup>

Additionally FCS is able to provide special grants to support CSO engagement in big national processes like, for example during the constitution making process and general elections in Tanzania. The amounts for special grants are not specified. Further there are no clear public criteria for

an organization to be classified as “highly experienced” or what it requires to have a “high organizational capacity”.<sup>72</sup>

Foundation has however defined clearly three supported thematic areas:

- ✓ **Participation in Policy Development and Implementation:** Under this category FCS supports projects and organizations that enable communities to be involved in developing, sharing and popularizing policies. Also policy monitoring and implementation can be supported. Examples of activities funded under this category include: Participatory poverty monitoring, which compares and contracts information on poverty and disseminate the findings widely; Community planning on how specific policies are affecting local livelihood and how community can respond; Community participation in setting priorities for national policies and raising public awareness on policy issues.
- ✓ **Enhancing Good Governance and Civic Rights:** Under this component, the Foundation supports organizations that raise awareness of peoples’ rights and government responsibilities; strengthen cooperation between organizations working on rights issues and increase access to justice for Tanzanian citizens. Supported projects should contribute to enabling government, public and private institutions to be more transparent, accountable and respect the rule of law and human rights. Specific emphasis is put on projects ensuring citizens’ awareness of their rights and responsibilities, and ability to demand accountability from government and private sector.
- ✓ **Civil Society Capacity Strengthening:** The aim of this grant theme is to ensure that CSOs become effective pillars of change, achieve their intended objectives, play their advocacy role for development priorities, and are able to effectively contribute to making lasting differences in the development in Tanzania. Specific emphasis is put on improved administration and management capacity of CSOs and networks; increased proportion of CSOs with robust financial management system with adequate and sustainable sources of funds; increasing networking among CSOS to ensure easy access and sharing of information and common voice to various development issues; improved CSO engagement in policy processes.<sup>73</sup>

67 Meeting with FCS Director John Ulanga 15.10.2014, memo by Masud Hossain, Country Director of Kepa Tanzania; Foundation of Civil Society website: <http://www.thefoundation.or.tz/index.php/en/aboutus/history>.

68 Meeting with FCS Director John Ulanga 15.10.2014, memo by Masud Hossain, Country Director of Kepa Tanzania.

69 Meeting with FCS Director John Ulanga 15.10.2014, memo by Masud Hossain, Country Director of Kepa Tanzania; Foundation for Civil Society website grant guidelines: <http://www.thefoundation.or.tz/index.php/en/grants>.

70 *ibid.*

71 *ibid.*

72 Foundation for Civil Society website grant guidelines: <http://www.thefoundation.or.tz/index.php/en/grants>.

73 Foundation for Civil Society Grant Application Guide: [http://www.thefoundation.or.tz/images/grants\\_appl\\_guide\\_-\\_2013\\_english.pdf](http://www.thefoundation.or.tz/images/grants_appl_guide_-_2013_english.pdf).

Foundation for CSOS does not fund processional fundraising or consulting firms, individuals, political parties, organization that promote religion or particular ethnic groups, provision of social services, private businesses, or workshop or conferences unless they are part of wider set of activities, or give strategic grants to implement projects on HIVAIDS.<sup>74</sup> To inform CSOs about available grants and to identify potential organizations for the grants, Foundation is organizing information session twice a year in various regions of Tanzania. These workshops are organized especially in rural areas to explain in detail how to apply for FCS funding. Foundation has also produced guidelines informing CSOs of application and selection criteria as well as the complaints handling policy. All organizations who want to apply for funding are required to fill in a special application form available in both Swahili and English.<sup>75</sup>

On annual level the Foundation for Civil Society receives several thousand of applications. In 2013 the amount of received applications was 3307 but only 349 received grants. Total amount disbursed in 2013 was 6.7 million US Dollars. According to FCS all of the applications are separately assessed by two different people from the grants department. The management of the FCS makes the final decision of the grants. It is also stated that all the rejected applicants receive feedback via email.<sup>76</sup>

---

74 *ibid.*

75 Meeting with FCS Director John Ulanga 15.10.2014, memo by Masud Hossain, Country Director of Kupa Tanzania; Foundation for Civil Society Grant Application Guide: [http://www.thefoundation.ortz/images/grants\\_appl\\_guide\\_-\\_2013\\_english.pdf](http://www.thefoundation.ortz/images/grants_appl_guide_-_2013_english.pdf).

76 Foundation for Civil Society Annual Report 2013: <http://www.thefoundation.ortz/index.php/en/reports-publications/annual-reports>; Grant Application Guide: [http://www.thefoundation.ortz/images/grants\\_appl\\_guide\\_-\\_2013\\_english.pdf](http://www.thefoundation.ortz/images/grants_appl_guide_-_2013_english.pdf).

Foundation for Civil Society has also put emphasis on CSOs' capacity building. Its capacity building department arranges mandatory Manage Your Grant training to all new small and medium grant receivers whose applications are approved. The training focuses on the basics of projects and grant management, but also gives room for organizations to further develop their projects. The fund is transferred to organizations only when the grant management training is successfully completed. FCS organizes also tailor made trainings on various aspects of organizational development and project management.<sup>77</sup>

The monitoring and evaluation department of the FCS oversights the use of grants, and usually visits 250 to 300 organizations each year to do the audit. Grant receiving organizations are required to submit quarterly narrative reports and financial statements explaining the usage of funds.<sup>78</sup>

Foundation itself is still dependent on development partners' financial aid. Currently the main donors are UK's Department for International Development (DFID), Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Royal Norwegian Embassy, Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA), Comic Relief, TradeMark East Africa, International Labour Organization (ILO), and International Rescue Committee (IRC).<sup>79</sup>

---

77 Foundation for Civil Society Annual Report 2013: <http://www.thefoundation.ortz/index.php/en/reports-publications/annual-reports>.

78 Grant Application Guide: [http://www.thefoundation.ortz/images/grants\\_appl\\_guide\\_-\\_2013\\_english.pdf](http://www.thefoundation.ortz/images/grants_appl_guide_-_2013_english.pdf).

79 Foundation for Civil Society website: <http://www.thefoundation.ortz/index.php/en/>.

# 5. Focus group results: Benefits and challenges

**DURING THE FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS** the participants were asked to identify benefits and challenges in the assessed funding modalities. Received answers as well as points from open discussions during the meetings are presented in this chapter. The discussion with the Finnish organizations were an adjusted version of the focus groups held in Tanzania, and for this reason the results are presented in a slightly more simplified form as the discussion concentrated on reflecting the preliminary results from Tanzania. What is presented below, are the summarized results from all focus group meetings.<sup>80</sup>

## Benefits

### mFA project support, Finnish CSO as a partner (Tanzanian CSOs' viewpoints):

- ✓ **Access to resources:** The existence of the instrument as such was seen as a benefit as it enables Tanzanian organizations to receive financial and non-financial resources through partnerships.  
Networking, knowledge sharing and learning: Many participants brought up that partnerships with Finnish NGOs offer opportunities for knowledge-sharing and networking both within and across borders, especially the possibility for grassroots level organizations to be linked to national and international level. Also a chance to travel to Finland to share experiences was mentioned. Opportunity to receive volunteers and students from Finnish universities were also seen as a benefit.
- ✓ **Participatory project management:** Participatory project management i.e. doing together, partner's support for implementation, possibility to negotiate and the fact that there's a relationship, like friendship between two organizations, were seen as benefits.
- ✓ **Strengthening partners' capacity:** Quotation: "Teaming up and doing together is the best capacity building", summarizes the point brought up in focus groups. It was also mentioned that the instrument gives room for separate capacity building activities that can be included in the project.

- ✓ **Transparency and clear budget ceiling:** It was seen as a benefit that local NGOs are informed beforehand how much the project should cost, and that within the given financial framework there's also a possibility to negotiate with the partner.
- ✓ **Clear focus in development agenda:** It was stated in one of the workshops, that compared to many other donors Finnish Development Policy offers a clear framework for CSOs' project funding.
- ✓ **Good monitoring and evaluation:** One focus participants summarized the point by saying: "We had a NGO partner and they came to monitor, they visited beneficiaries and after that challenges were discussed – that was fair." It was seen as a benefit that the partner carries the responsibility over the monitoring as well. It was also stated that it makes it easier for the local organization to monitor expenses when the money is released in installments.
- ✓ **Long-term partnership:** Long-term partnerships are valued in general and there were two organizations who praised their own long-term partnership. Through long-term partnerships it is possible to estimate the projects' contribution towards long-term results.

In each focus group all participants were able to choose one benefit they think is the most important. As a result the following benefits were prioritized: participatory, clear focus on development agenda, links to other organizations, simple (easy to manage) source of funds, long term partnership, money is given in instalments which help to follow the project and makes it easy to plan project expenditure, partner helps to reach the goals, and is sharing knowledge.

Many of the participating organizations were also missing Kapa's TAP (Training and Advice Plan) agreements which reflect the expressed need for capacity building.

### MFA project support, Tanzanian CSO as a partner (Finnish CSOs' viewpoints):

Finnish CSOs' brought up many similar benefits that were presented in the Tanzanian focus group meetings. These were: joint learning, exchange of ideas and understandings of each other, and an opportunity to utilize synergies. Partnerships were also seen as a mode of solidarity, and a way of

<sup>80</sup> List of focus group participants can be found at the end of this report.

building real links between two civil society organizations without third party involvement. Cooperation with Tanzanian organization were also seen as an opportunity to collect evidence to be used in North e.g. for advocacy and awareness raising, and influencing public opinion in Finland. It was also mentioned that project support for CSOs is easy to administrate and an important source i.e. access to funding to civil society organizations.

#### Foundation for Civil Society grants:

- ✓ **Strengthening local civil society:** Most of the focus group participants brought up the capacity building as an important benefit of FCS grants. Value was given to opportunities of organizational growth and activity improvement. Also pre-assessment that was done before funding decision was thanked. It was also appreciated that the support is given also to small organizations working in remote areas: “Local NGOs in distant regions don’t feel inferior”, as one participant said.
- ✓ **Funding for awareness raising:** Workshop participants gave special notification to FCS for funding awareness raising within communities.
- ✓ **Transparent and clear procedures:** The focus group participants’ valued detailed funding guidelines, easy reporting and the facts that CSOs are trained how to apply funds. It was also brought up that funding is quite transparent and effective, grants can be applied each year, and there are different categories for funds.
- ✓ **Locality:** It was stated that by being Tanzanian, FCS knows the local operating environment, reaches wider amount of NGOs nationwide, and creates a friendly environment for local organizations as the organization uses both English and Swahili. Also easy access was mentioned as local organizations can approach this donor directly. It was also brought up that FCS has the ability to react quicker when things change in the local context compared to development partners.
- ✓ **Flexibility and good communication:** Few organizations mentioned flexibility; it is possible to negotiate with FCS, the organization is open to feedback, and keeps up good communication with CSOs.
- ✓ **Support for administrative costs:** Possibility to get institutional support was seen as an asset, also available provision for auditing and reporting.

In each focus group all participants were able to choose one benefit they think is the most important. As a result the following benefits were prioritized: capacity building, effective as knows the field being Tanzanian, flexible, transparent, uses both English and Swahili, and supports administrative costs, institutional support.

#### Local cooperation Fund:

- ✓ **Broad but clear thematic priorities:** Focus group participants stated that LCF is beneficial to many groups as the priority areas are wide. It was also said that the scope of funding is clear and feeds into local needs. One participant representing pastoralists strongly pointed the biggest benefit to him – that through LCF also marginalized and minority groups can receive support.
- ✓ **Clear procedures and light administration:** Focus group participants listed benefits as following: administration is reasonable, no complex process for proposal writing or reporting, small amount of paper work, spending and reporting are simplified and not much bureaucratic.
- ✓ **Auditing and administrative cost are funded:** Support for administrative costs and provision for auditing and reporting cost were seen as a benefit. One of the participants mentioned also that they received support for strategic planning.
- ✓ **Capacity building:** Different aspects that fall under capacity building were brought up during the workshops: capacity building on funds management, give room and generate innovations, “benefitted when expanding the organization as we received support for the launching of the strategic plan”, experience sharing and gaining knowledge from the Embassy.
- ✓ **Effective communication:** Focus group participants thanked quick and prompt responses for their inquiries, easy communication and follow-up practices.

In each focus group all participants were able to choose one benefit they think is the most important. As a result the following benefits were prioritized: reasonable, clear and simple administration, take account minorities and marginalized groups, capacity building, feeds into local needs, supporting administrative costs, can also support for example strategic planning, communication with the donor is easy.

## Challenges

#### mFA project support, Finnish CSO as a partner (Tanzanian CSOs’ viewpoints):

- ✓ **Complicated funding procedures and reporting:** It was considered a challenge that application guidelines and procedures e.g. deadlines are not always known by the local partners. Handling period for applications is very long as there’s only one deadline per year, and the decision takes more than six months. It was also stated that monitoring and reporting is heavy as local CSOs are required to provide quarterly reports and the format provided by the Finnish NGOs is considered complicated by some CSOs. There has also been confusion and problems related to project auditing.

- ✓ **Development policy and goals are defined in North:** It was brought up in several discussions that the Northern partners are still dominant actors when the focus areas and goals for the projects are decided for. Also the policy changes in Finland can have a rapid and negative impact on Southern partners which was seen as a challenge.
- ✓ **Project based funding:** Most of funding goes to specific projects and is not for long-term CSO partnerships. For the Tanzanian organizations it is difficult to see expected changes in a short period, and sustainability suffers. Many cases general institutional costs such as salaries etc. are not provided or the amount is not sufficient to maintain the costs.
- ✓ **Funding inconsistency:** It has come as a surprise for some organizations that the level of funding can be lower on the second or third project year and it is not clear what this is based on. Many of the focus group participants have experienced delays in receiving the funding, and many also found it challenging that the money comes in instalments as it is hard to plan in quarters.
- ✓ **Limited networking and cooperation through Finnish organizations:** It was also brought up in the focus group meetings that Finnish organizations seem not to know each other very well, even when working in the same country. This leads to situation where networking opportunities with other CSOs working with Finnish CSOs, or other Finnish CSOs in Tanzania are not utilized. It was also mentioned that local organizations are not linked with their partners' members in Finland that was seen as a missed networking opportunity.
- ✓ **No genuine partnership:** The major weakness spotted by Tanzanian organizations is that many Finnish NGO projects fail to involve their local partners in a meaningful way especially at the planning stage. Unequal donor-recipient relationship seems to be prominent in many projects. Many cases the proposal writing is not done together, but the partner writes the proposal after asking what the needs of the local NGOs are. In many cases the proposal is written in Finnish, and the local partner cannot understand the text.
- ✓ **Lack of transparency and information sharing:** It was also brought up during the focus group meeting that in many cases the costs budgeted for Finnish organization are not communicated with the partner, but only the project related cost in Tanzania are told transparently. The content of the project plan, especially those written in Finnish, are not fully known by the local partners. Many find creating dialogue with their partner challenging. Sometimes communication is dependent on individuals which is not sustainable.

In each focus group all participants were able to choose one challenge they think is the most important. As a result

the following challenges were prioritized: criteria defined in North, limited connection to partners' members, lack of sharing information, delays of getting funds, partners hold more power in decision making, planning, monitoring and evaluation, auditing problems.

#### **MFA project support, Tanzanian CSO as a partner (Finnish CSOs' viewpoint):**

Finnish CSOs that were present in the meeting organized in Helsinki also recognized the problem with ownership. It was brought up that the ownership is not always clear or it is in the North, and donors are hereby defining the agenda. Finnish CSOs found it also challenging that funding is based on short-term projects which creates a problem of sustainability for parties. Also organizations' dependency on donors were brought up.

Finnish CSOs also pointed out challenges in accountability and transparency. The unequal power relationship was discussed, and it was brought up that the dual role is challenging also for the Finnish organizations. Sometimes weak cross-cultural understanding creates challenges.

Most of CSOs have limited resources which creates continuous challenges. It was also brought up that one of the common challenge is that the partner organization in Tanzania doesn't have sufficient capacity to do professional level budgeting and monitoring. Sometimes the same applies also the Finnish CSOs.

One Finnish CSO brought up a question about CS funding in more general level by asking: Why donor money coming from public source is still more acceptable than business money? This participant pointed out that lack of private sector cooperation is a challenge for CSOs. It was also brought up that CSOs may not have sufficient contacts on national level that would support their work.

#### **Foundation for Civil Society grants:**

- ✓ **Stiff competition:** It was brought up in many focus group meetings that it is hard to get support due to high competition. It is very hard to get strategic funding from FCS.
- ✓ **Delays in releasing the funds:** Majority of the focus group participants receiving FCS grants mentioned delays in receiving the granted funds. One focus group participant said: "We signed our contract with Foundation six months ago but funds are not yet in our account, therefore it is very difficult to implement". Another participant told that they have waited granted funds for a full year.
- ✓ **Complicated application forms, heavy reporting and monitoring:** Some of the focus group participants mentioned that application forms are complicated, too long and too detailed. Reporting requirements were seen heavy, and it was said that there's too much monitoring as "it costs more than running the projects".

- ✓ **Communication problems:** Unsatisfactory communication was brought up quite many times during the focus groups. It was said that sometimes it's hard to get attention or receive feedback on submitted reports. It was also mentioned that communication depends on who you know inside the Foundation or varies a lot between different staff members.
- ✓ **Unfair treatment:** There were a handful of participants who have experienced unfair treatment compared to other CSOs. It was brought up that it seems that some CSOs are favoured, rules seem not to be same for all, and there are no clear criteria of how FCS chooses people who are invited to different events. It was also said that sometimes it's hard to get funding unless you have personal ties with some of the staff members. There are also rumours that some particular organizations are neglected in purpose as Foundation may see them as competitors or there are conflict of interest, especially what comes to national umbrella organizations and strong networks.
- ✓ **Suspicious of corruption:** Foundation has suffered some corruption cases in the past and some participants brought up new suspicions of corruption e.g. some individual staff members utilizing their position. One of the stories goes that there have been cases where staff members have demanded 10 percent share of the granted funds against an approved project proposal.
- ✓ **Donor or implementer?** Most of the focus group participants saw Foundation primarily as a donor organization. The fact that Foundation has taken more active role on the field implementing activities e.g. organizing meetings and civil society consultations etc. seems to irritate CSOs, and creates uncertainty of Foundation's role.
- ✓ **Lack of flexibility and competence:** Some of the focus group participants complained about stiffness in Foundation's practices. It was said for example that once the contract is signed, there's no room to change the plans, no room for negotiations. It was also mentioned few times that not all FCS staff members seem to be competent or have the necessary skills for managing the grants.
- ✓ **Sustainability:** Few focus group participants brought up the sustainability issue as also Foundation's support is project-based and there's no provision for further monitoring and evaluation (this was brought up only in one of the focus group meetings, but was selected among the most important challenges).

In each focus group all participants were able to choose one challenge they think is the most important. As a result the following challenges were prioritized: delays in releasing the funds, sustainability, strategic fund hard to secure, changes of staff and communication problems, competition.

#### Local cooperation Fund:

- ✓ **Small and unknown NGOs lose in competition:** Many of the focus group participants expressed their concern that due to high competition it is very hard for smaller and rural based NGOs to secure funding unless if they are known by other donors and have personal links with them. Some CSOs felt that the LCF should also target small CSOs that have growth potential. Critics were also given for Embassy relying too much on other donors' opinion when selecting the CSOs.
- ✓ **Selection criteria and application process unclear:** Some of the focus group participants felt that LCF application process is less transparent and fair than it used to be, as the Embassy has given up the open calls for proposals. There are no clear and public assessment criteria or application deadlines, and it is unclear for applicants why they were not selected as the Embassy doesn't provide feedback for CSOs who do not qualify for funding.
- ✓ **Priorities set by the Embassy:** Some CSOs brought up that the funding mainly targets Embassy's own needs, and CSOs are not consulted when the priority areas are decided.
- ✓ **Unpredictable because of policy changes:** One of the challenges brought up was the fact that policy changes in Finland have a heavy impact on LCF. This makes funding unpredictable and priority areas are often changed.
- ✓ **Budget problems and funds issued in Euros:** Some CSOs find the available budget too limited and inflexible. There were some negative notions of losses due currency exchange rates as Embassy transfers funds in Euros. Few also mentioned that there was a request to adjust budget or some cuts in the middle of the agreed funding period that created challenges for them.

In each focus group all participants were able to choose one challenge they think is the most important. As a result the following challenges were prioritized: high competition, only few are selected, policy changes affect, unpredictable, issuing in euros which may lead to losses in total grants, limited budget, priorities set to benefit the Embassy alone.

## 6. Focus group results: How to improve funding modalities?

**DURING THE FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS** the participants were asked to identify concrete ways to improve the assessed funding modalities. They were allowed to utilize the discussion results of challenges and benefits if they wished, but it wasn't necessary to find solutions only for the challenges that were brought up during the meeting, but to bring in all ideas they were able to identify. The discussion with the Finnish organizations were an adjusted version of the focus groups held in Tanzania, and for this reason the results are presented in a slightly more simplified form as the discussion concentrated on reflecting the preliminary results from Tanzania. These answers as well as points from open discussions during the meetings are presented in this chapter. The summarized results from all focus group meetings are presented below.

### **MFA project funding, Tanzanian CSOs having a Finnish CSO partner:**

- ✓ **Joint project planning:** Joint project planning would be beneficial for the whole project as the local organizations have the best understanding of the local context and operating environment. There should be a clear division of responsibilities and it should be clear to both parties how much will be used, for what and by who? Especially organizations would like to know how much is budgeted for the Finnish partner. It would be best if the project plan is written in the language which both partners can understand.
- ✓ **Work according to the capacity of local CSOs:** Some organizations brought up that the money should be allocated according to the capacity of the local CSOs. This would require a capacity assessment which would tell the strengths and weaknesses of each organization, and would also reveal the aspects that need strengthening – to be then clear for both parties.
- ✓ **More focus for strengthening civil society:** Local organizations were eager to put more emphasis on capacity building. It was also discussed that the local organizations may wish to strengthen different activities or organizational aspects than the partner (e.g. advocacy activities instead of service delivery). Local CSOs were wishing that Finnish organizations would be more sensitive in hearing out local perspectives of what is necessary.

- ✓ **Improving communication and feedback:** Need to improve communication came out in general level. It was also recommended that Finnish CSOs would communicate any changes in policy and/or budget immediately to their local partners to avoid misunderstanding.
- ✓ **Finnish CSOs should be more like advisers rather than decision makers:** Finnish organizations are wished not to impose their own ideas to local partners, but more sensitively listen to the partner who should have the ownership of the development in their own context. In general there was a lot of discussion about the fact that donors should consult the recipients better, to find out how they see the problems and how they would solve the issues.
- ✓ **Fewer installments:** In one of the focus group it was suggested that funding disbursement could be once or twice a year to speed up project implementation and make planning more flexible.

### **MFA project support, Tanzanian CSO as a partner (Finnish CSOs' viewpoint):**

Meeting and discussion in Helsinki with the Finnish CSOs brought up several points of how to improve project support and cooperation with Tanzanian partners. Finnish CSOs said that donor diversity should be enhanced and networking and cooperation with multiple partners, like partnering with students and teachers in universities in Finland and in Tanzania, could be improved. It was also brought up that CSOs should lobby for improvements in current funding instruments.

Additionally Finnish CSOs suggested that better training opportunities for CSOs in Finland and in Tanzania should be developed. Organizations concluded that building strong organizational identity, trust and confidence is important. Keeping an open mind to different cultures when working with partners was also mentioned. Finnish CSOs also acknowledged that they should put more emphasis on pre- and post-planning discussion with their partners. Reporting should be made as easy as possible and common tools should be created and utilized.

Also administrative capacity and systematic assessment of the work was discussed. One suggestion was that licensed administrative capacity should be a requirement to all CSOs. Participants of the meeting brought also up that there should

be both short- and long-term assessments, and continuous assessment of activities. It was also stated that CSOs need to be transparent. One participant also highlighted the need of improving local commitment to development projects.

#### **Foundation for Civil Society grants:**

✓ **Decentralizing the current system:** It was proposed by two focus participants that Foundation could create a decentralized system where funding would be channeled to different zones. In other words, FCS would divide the country into fixed amount of zones and set criteria to determine how much of its funding should go towards each of these different zones. These zones would also have local FCS staff to administer the applications etc. It was also suggested that funds could be allocated based on certain criteria, for example the number of CSOs registered in each zone.

As an alternative option, Foundation could establish a regional basket fund and could use regional networks to manage these funds rather than using a lot of resources sending people to different regions. In this model there could be a fixed number of proposals supported from each region.

- ✓ **Simplified monitoring and reporting:** It was brought up that Foundation should reduce unnecessary reporting and produce more simplified reporting and monitoring procedures. It should also have a clear schedule for monitoring trips, to reduce the amount of trips and limit the number of monitoring team members.
- ✓ **Renewed organizational structure:** Some CSOs proposed renewed organizational structure for Foundation to prevent corruption and to make sure that different CSOs are treated fairly. The proposed changes included for example management rotation, rotation in the governing body and international supervision over the organization.
- ✓ **Longer funding terms:** It was suggested that Foundation could give funds for at least five years that the results could be fully monitored and evaluated. Currently the maximum funding period is three years.
- ✓ **Improved communication and attitude:** It was highlighted that communication is a two-way process and very important for the CSOs. It should be easy to find contact persons, and to get responses, and the treatment should be fair. It was also mentioned that some of the Foundation staff members “tend to be bosses rather than customer servants”. It was wished that this could be changed.

✓ **Foundations role should be clarified:** It was stated during the focus group discussions that Foundation’s role should be clarified. Most of the argumentation preferred clear donor role, and were not fully happy about Foundations current activities on the field. On the other it was also brought up that Tanzania would need a strong umbrella organization as currently there’s a gap in this respect.

✓ **Capacity building should concentrate more on practical skills:** Capacity building services offered by the Foundation were seen quite theoretical, even though capacity building opportunities as such are very valued. It was suggested that the trainings etc. would be developed and more practical approach adopted. Some participants were also suggesting that these funds allocated for capacity building could be channeled through umbrellas like TACOSODE who are competent in capacity building and could serve their networks or members more directly than is possible for Foundation.

#### **Local Cooperation Fund:**

- ✓ **Broader funding modalities for civil society:** Some CSOs suggested that the Embassy could have wider range of funding modalities for CSOs, or at least different provisions to serve actors of different sizes, strengths and interests. It was also brought up that the funding could be more long-term and the ceiling of funding could be higher.
- ✓ **Greater flexibility and adjustment to local environment:** Greater flexibility to adjust the budget when local context changes was requested by the focus group participants, e.g. possibility to allocate ad-hock funding to activities responding to emerging national issues such as general elections.
- ✓ **Improving application procedures and reporting:** It was brought up that the Embassy should give a clear criteria and deadline for applications, and the process should be transparent for CSOs.
- ✓ **Integrating capacity building to LCF:** Some of the focus group participants wished a capacity building component on project and financial management to be integrated with the funding agreement.
- ✓ **Sufficient funding:** Few CSOs stated that the Embassy could increase the ceiling of the funding so that the budget would be sufficient enough to cover all cost, and CSOs would not need to look for alternative donors for the same project.

# 7. What kind of support would work best for CS?

**IN THE FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS** organized in Tanzania the last part of the workshops was used to think of an ideal situation of funding for the local CSOs. First each participant had a task to think of three words that best describe an ideal funding instrument. The results are presented in the table to the right.

## What should be changed or supported?

In each focus group meeting in Tanzania time was also given for an open discussion focusing on what in general should be changed in the current funding landscape for CSOs in Tanzania. What the CSOs would change, or what they think should be supported better or instead of the current funding modalities and policies? The following list summarizes the results of the discussion:

- There should be greater transparency of project management and funding.
- Transformation and long-term change should be the key objective, funding should be sustainable.
- Support for ad-hoc activities among long-term project funding, flexibility is also important.
- Funding should available also for small NGOs and for growing organizations, need for seed funding.
- Funding modalities should be relevant to specific operation environment and local context, ownership in the receiving country.
- Capacity of Southern CSOs should be strengthened, support for self-reflection and learning.
- More funding for awareness raising activities and citizen education.
- Donors' reporting requirements should still more clear and simple and funds could be preferably released in local currency.
- Donors should enhance dialogue with civil society organizations, should be more proactive in informing about funding (modalities, requirements etc.).
- Donors should further coordinate their funding and harmonize regulations and requirements.

Word describing an ideal funding mechanism	Times mentioned
Transparent	9
Timely	4
Equal partnership, cooperative	3
Clear	3
Accessible	3
Inclusive, participatory	3
Sustainable, consistence	3
Simple	3
Clear	3
Well-structured, standard format	2
Flexible	2
Considerate	2
Manageable	2
Fair	2
Commitment	1
Responsive	1
Effective	1
Collective	1
Accountable	1
Immediate	1
Reliable	1
Sensitive to marginalized groups	1
Knowledge-sharing	1

- Good governance within the NGOs; “getting rid of the Mugabe problem” i.e. personalizing CSO activities and administration around individuals, hierarchy and dependency of one very long-term leader refusing to step down.
- Support for strengthening local organizations in fundraising and reducing dependence on donors.
- Basket funding is preferable option for well-established, strong organizations, but smaller CSOs are more critical towards basket funding.

## Ideal situation?

The CSOs participating in the focus group meetings in Tanzania were also challenged to dream of an ideal funding situation. Despite the task being a bit challenging, there were several important features that were brought up. The following bullet points summarize the discussion and present what an ideal situation would consist of:

- “Funding is about partnership and partnership is about trust”, as one focus group participant put it. In an ideal situation there would be trust between the parties, the relationship between the donor and the receiver would be more equal and transparent.
- Donors wouldn’t dominate the development scene; the desirable change would be defined in the local context.
- The donor wouldn’t get involved in implementation too much; on the other hand there are some CSOs that like close cooperation, but all want that the ownership is in the South. Some are also clear that they want to set the agenda and receive funding according to their goals without the need to adjust to or compromise with donors priorities, they want just the funding.
- Donors wouldn’t rely too much on other donors’ perspectives and opinions when looking for new partners.
- Communication would be fluent as “communication is a two-way process”, there would be more feedback to receiving organizations.
- Tanzanian CSOs would be less dependent on donor funding and their partners would support them to develop their fundraising capacity.

## 8. Discussion about aid dependency and alternative financial resources

**THE ISSUE OF BEING DONOR DEPENDANT** was well acknowledged among the focus group participants and there is an evident worry over the civil society sustainability. However it was quite challenging for the CSOs to name alternative sources of funds that would seem realistic to fill the gaps in case of donors pulling out.

Many pay the greatest attention and effort in thinking how the donor system could be more sustainable. The existence of international funders has in other words become an establishment, integrated part of the civil society funding landscape. On the other hand at the same time many CSOs said that they should learn how to be more independent and cut their dependency from the donors.

One issue is that the CSOs do, to some extent, have ideas for building their financial base through investments but they don't have the sufficient capital to do so, and the donors don't normally give funding for investments. There were many suggestions that the donors could or should support local CSOs in income generating activities, and to build their capacity for fundraising.

During the focus group discussions there were some ideas presented what comes to increasing institutional funds, or how to seek funds for investment. One suggestion was that the staff members could contribute for example 10 000 Tanzanian Shillings each month to the organization to be used for investment. Also these kind of volunteer contributions were tested in one organization, where members gave donations to the organization to be used for institutional costs and filling the needs that were not acceptable in the project budget.

Doing business activities to raise funds were most commonly brought up, but there were also described challenges with donors, as they may have regulations that also hinder CSOs to collect investment capital. Organizations registered as NGOs have also tighter legal framework as they are not allowed to do business, and have challenges in explaining business-like fundraising activities to the authorities. Some organizations for example have sold photo copying services for fundraising. There are also examples of selling services like trainings or consultancy.

Some level the cooperation with other CSOs, to team up with other organizations in order to enhance common financial situation was also discussed.

Cooperation with private sector was seen as an opportunity, although great majority of the CSOs who participated in the focus groups didn't have any previous experience of private sector cooperation. It was however mentioned that it is not easy to fundraise from private companies or wealthy business people as "they give funding mainly to certain influential people." It seems that getting private funds requires also good links and networks that are very hard to create for majority of CSOs.

However it was also debated that it is easier to get private sector funding to certain tasks or activities than for institutional support. For example during Christmas time some companies tend to visit communities to give presents and other kind of material aid as part of their PR campaigns. There's also an existing policy that 2 percent of the company's profit should be used for community support, so there's some potential to receive funds on community level activities.

Also some good examples of private companies own projects were brought up. For example TIGO used to have a project where women who had complications during delivery were supported to get help and treatment. On the other hand nobody mentioned any potential of getting private funds for advocacy work.

Discussion of opportunities to get public funding for CSOs' activities was very minimal and was brought up only in one of the focus groups. In this focus group there was a representative from a national network lobbying for local government funding for CSOs, so the trigger for discussion was evident.

It seems that the strong and well-established advocacy oriented organizations are active in this aspect of CSO funding, but in general there seems to be little faith on public funding as an important tool to solve the sustainability issue.

## 9. Conclusion and discussion points

**WHEN SUMMARIZING THE OUTPUTS** of the focus group meetings it can be concluded that the most pressing issues for the Tanzanian CSOs are the need for greater transparency in funding policies, procedures and donor–receiver relationships, and the need to reduce the dependency on external funding and building stronger local ownership over the priorities and focus areas of the development in the South.

Ideally the donors would further develop sensitivity to hear not just the partner governments but also the voices of civil society when making national strategies for development – for example the EU country roadmap process for engagement with the civil society seems to be a positive step to this direction. Despite, most of the development projects are still donor driven which makes CSOs to lose the ownership in the process. A systematic and mutually meaningful engagement with the civil society is a precondition for changing this situation.

Another matter, that is not new but brought up in several surveys and assessment, is that the commitment to certain development objectives, interventions and development financing should be more sustainable and less dependent on national level policy changes in the donor countries.

It would be also important for the local civil society that there would be clear and transparent criteria for different available funding instruments. It would be recommendable that donors would have open calls for proposals and an unbiased, step-by-step system for assessing received applications and a clear system for making decisions. It is also important that all applicants would receive information whether their application was successful or not.

The most crucial issue is the open flow of information. If the donor do not have resources for example to offer feedback on every application, it should be clearly told and explained to CSOs.

Further cooperation and coordination between different donor organizations and institutions would be a needed advancement. Ideally different donors would seek to harmonize their administration and financial management procedures and timeliness and would put effort in finding joint approaches for civil society funding. Additionally donors could combine resources in order to organize joint forums and consider making joint surveys etc. CS related processes in order to enhance their dialogue with the civil society.

One of the issues is that donor funding is mainly directed to well-established, elite-based organizations, coalitions

or networks. For this reason donors also have a role to play what comes to the fact that the civil society in Tanzania is relatively weak and polarized. If we see that a strong and vibrant civil society is a precondition for democracy, there is a challenge in the current funding policies and practices.

Ideally the donors would seek to strengthen the civil society and pay attention to how the elite-based and strong CSOs are linked with the local level CSOs, to reduce the current gap in order to encourage capacity building within the civil society and support advocacy oriented strong organizations to build critical mass and to widen their member base, to introduce more bottom-up approach which would also support the development of democracy in Tanzania.

Donors should also pay much more attention on their role in creating or maintaining the current structures of civil society what comes to questions of financial sustainability. The dependency on external assistance is for its part hindering local initiatives and resource mobilization. There is a need to put more emphasis on building fundraising capacity and supporting, also by providing resources, local CSOs to innovate themselves how to enhance their financial sustainability.

One of the key findings of this assessment was that the local CSOs have a need for capacity building. CSOs' own understanding of capacity building seems to relatively narrow as the needs brought up during the focus group meetings concentrated mainly on technical skills: how to manage projects and budgets. On the other hand this proves that there's still need for this type of basic project management skills.

However, in order to provide more information, or food for thought, of the different needs for capacity building of the Tanzanian civil society, we have attached a summary of capacity gaps borrowed from previous study made by UNDP and TANGO. This list may be found at the end of the report.

Capacity building and mutual learning was also discussed with the Finnish CSOs working in Tanzania. It was also interesting to find out that this specific group who participated in the meeting in Helsinki, found only a limited number of benefits of having a Tanzanian partner. Based on other previous interaction with the Finnish CSOs a questions could be brought up for further discussion: Could this be interpreted so that the partner may be seen more like a tool for running and implementing the project rather than the co-owner of the project? Or could it be so, that the Finnish CSOs also see themselves as donors who support

the activities of the Tanzanian organization, rather than as cooperating partners?

Based on not just this meeting but our interaction with the Finnish CSOs in general, it could be also suggested that there's a need to continuous effort to enhance the dialogue about the ownership, capacity building of the partners, and understanding of the different roles of civil society in the wider development context. How well is it acknowledged that the development cooperation projects managed by the CSOs could (and should) contribute to civil society strengthening in the receiving country?

What comes to Tanzanian CSOs, an interesting detail observed during the focus group meetings was that none of the local CSOs participating in the focus groups brought up any thematical preferences or priority areas they think the donors should focus instead of the current policies. Hence it seems that the question bothering local CSOs might be more about unequal power relationship rather than the actual areas of work.

On the other hand Tanzanian civil society should take much more proactive role in suggesting and making proposals to donors. Maybe it could be also possible for donors

to pilot more concrete methods for encouraging local solutions and innovations through organizing competitions etc.

It would be also recommended that also Tanzanian CSOs would actively seek to widen their understanding of donor practices, policies and priorities. Genuine cooperation and dialogue requires two-way communication and motivation – it cannot be expected that only the other party does the work or brings the solutions on the table. Local attitude environment seems also very problem-oriented rather solution-oriented which creates obstacles what comes to development of the donor relationships.

It also seems that there is a need for a truly national umbrella organization in Tanzania. Foundation for Civil Society could have potential to become one, but its actions should be legitimized by the local CSOs. One key finding of this assessment was that the role of Foundation seems to very unclear and should be defined. We also found it relatively alarming that the CSOs' comments regarding the actions of the Foundation were quite contradictory. It might be recommendable for the Foundation for Civil Society to be sensitive for these messages and to seek means for improving the situation.

# Annex: CSO's Capacity Gaps: Reflections to earlier findings

AS THE NEED FOR CAPACITY BUILDING was highlighted in relation of all assessed funding modalities as well as during the open discussions, it felt relevant to add a reflection of current capacity gaps in the assessment. When EU did the research for its country roadmap it also found out that there's a further need for capacity building. The roadmap report refers to an assessment conducted by UNDP, done in collaboration with TANGO and ALAT, of CSOs capacity gaps in Tanzania. Even though this assessment was published already in 2006, are the findings very much useful in order to shed light in which kind of capacity building would be necessary.

The findings indicate low technical capacity in the following aspects:

- ✓ **Policy Analysis:** Very few CSOs have the skills needed to undertake comprehensive policy analysis and therefore are unable to follow the government's policy-making process.
- ✓ **Research:** Like with policy analysis, most CSOs lack the skills need 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. Moreover, small CSOs have a lot of challenges when it comes to fundraising, programme formulation, definition of results framework, financial management and evaluation. This is partly attributed to lack of highly skilled human resource that can effectively perform the mentioned responsibilities.  
Small CSOs are financially unable to hire such highly qualified personnel to carry out those activities. As a result these CSOs end up having inadequate funding, poor programmes and poor financial management which consequently reduces their credibility of fundraising from donors.
- ✓ **Communication and information:** Many CSOs lack the ICT capacity to access information on government policies and have insufficient hardware or networks for dissemination. Opportunities will be missed if access to information is delayed and deadlines for comment or reaction not reached.
- ✓ **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:

- ✓ **Internal governance:** There are those CSOs with very well founded institutional framework while others have a shaky and fragile leadership base. Poor internal governance in terms of ineffective systems, structures, procedures and staffing are some of the factors affecting the credibility of Tanzanian CSOs.
- ✓ **Programme formulation:** There have been mixed approaches in programme design where some CSOs use their own internal human resources while others do out-source from programme development design experts. Outsourcing is partly due to lack of capacity within organizations or the need to adopt to the new programme design methodologies. For most of CSOs, their programs are still less impactful.
- ✓ **Financial Management:** Well established CSOs have little problem, if any, in managing finances. Partly, those which face challenges have not taken advantage of installing and operating through financial management software which are also costly but also require expertise in their operations.
- ✓ **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 even sometimes to government, than they are to their constituencies who are the reason why the CSO 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.
- ✓ **Mind-set:** There is gross distinct between government and CSOs at all levels national and subnational levels, therefore it is difficult to build effective partnerships.

## **List of Tanzanian CSOs who participated in the focus group meetings or were met individually:**

Union of Non-Governmental Organizations (UNGO)  
Wings Environment and Education Transformation Unit (WEETU)  
Morogoro Environment Conservation Organization (MOECO)  
Services and Development for Pastoralism Community (HIMWA)  
Safina Woman's Association (SAWA)  
Tanzania Natural Resources Forum (TNRF)  
Kilimanjaro Women Information Exchange and Consultancy Organization (KWIECO)  
Tanzania Environmental and Tourism Educational Organization (TETEO)  
Tanzania Pastoralist Community Forum (TPCF)  
Arusha NGO Network (ANGONET)  
Development Concern (DECO)  
Tanzania Association for the Deaf (CHAVITA)  
Tanzania Human Rights Defenders Coalition (THRDC)  
Anti-Corruption Movement  
Tanzania Education Network  
National Council for NGOs (NaCoNGO)  
Jukwaa la Katiba Tanzania  
Reclaim women's space  
Zanzibar Legal Service Centre (ZLSC)  
Zanzibar NGO Cluster (ZANGOC) (FCS)  
Association of NGO in Zanzibar (ANGOZA)  
Zanzibar Association of People Living with HIV/AIDS (ZAPHA)  
Policy Forum

## **Finnish Organizations who participated in the funding assessment meeting in Helsinki:**

Finnish Christian Medical Society  
WMCA Lempäälä  
LiiKe  
Rotary's Doctor Bank  
Finnish Association of Dental Technicians  
Finnish Dental Society

## Written Sources and meeting minutes:

Alffram, Modéer, and Rehmatullah: *Assessment of possibilities of Swedish support to promote accountability, transparency and civil society capacity in Tanzania, final report 2014*. In: *develop AB & TANA Copenhagen*.

CIVICUS: *EEl Report 2013*. [http://civicus.org/eei/downloads/Civicus\\_EEI%20REPORT%202013\\_WEB\\_FINAL.pdf](http://civicus.org/eei/downloads/Civicus_EEI%20REPORT%202013_WEB_FINAL.pdf)

CIVICUS & Fordia: *Civil Society Index Project, Tanzania country report 2011*. <http://civicus.org/downloads/CSI/Tanzania.pdf>

CIVICUS *Civil society profile: Tanzania*. <http://socs.civicus.org/CountryCivilSocietyProfiles/Tanzania.pdf>

EU Country Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society 2014–2017. [http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu\\_roadmap\\_tanzania.pdf](http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/system/files/.../eu_roadmap_tanzania.pdf)

Finland's Development Policy Programme 2012. <http://formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=251855&nodeid=15457&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>

Foundation for Civil Society Annual Report 2013. <http://www.thefoundation.or.tz/index.php/en/reports-publications/annual-reports>

Foundation for Civil Society grant guidelines. <http://www.thefoundation.or.tz/index.php/en/grants>

Kepa: *Civil society reflection paper 2013*. [https://www.kepa.fi/tiedostot/cs\\_tanzania\\_2013.pdf](https://www.kepa.fi/tiedostot/cs_tanzania_2013.pdf)

Meeting memo: Meeting with Clara Ruhara 10.12.2014 .

Meeting memo: Meeting of Masud Hossain (Country Director of Kepa Tanzania) with FCS' Director John Ulanga 15.10.2014.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs: *Country Strategy to Development Cooperation with Tanzania 2014–2017*. <http://www.finland.or.tz/public/default.aspx?nodeid=31648&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>

Ministry of Foreign Affairs Finland: *Guidelines for Civil Society in Development Policy*. <http://formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=206482&>

Ministry of Foreign Affairs: *Guidelines for project support*. <http://formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=50603&nodeid=49327&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>

Ministry of Foreign Affairs News, 6/30/2015. <http://www.formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=329282&nodeid=49322&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>

Ministry of Foreign Affairs Finland: Press Releases, 6/8/2015. <http://formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=328233&nodeid=15145&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>

Ministry of Foreign Affairs Uutiset, 15.1.2015. <http://www.formin.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=319700&nodeid=15317&contentlan=1&culture=fi-FI>

Reality of Aid Africa Network: *Towards Enabling Environment for CSO Participation in Domestication of Busan Agreement – The Legal and Institutional Framework in Tanzania opportunities and Challenges*. 2013. [http://www.ccic.ca/\\_files/en/what\\_we\\_do/2014\\_02\\_20\\_Tanzania\\_Case\\_Study.pdf](http://www.ccic.ca/_files/en/what_we_do/2014_02_20_Tanzania_Case_Study.pdf)

REPOA: *Tanzania Non-Governmental Organisations – 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*. 2007.

Siri Lange: *Hege Wallevik & Andrew Kiondo: Civil Society in Tanzania*. CMI R2000:6 <http://www.cmi.no/publications/file/988-civil-society-in-tanzania>

The Foundation for CSOs: *Annual report on the state of CSOs in Tanzania 2011*

Toni Haapanen (ed.): *Civil Society in Tanzania*. 2007.

# Kepa Current Issues Report

The Kepa Current Issues Report series tackles current topics related to development. The reports give background information and new viewpoints on topics that have garnered public debate. The reports also present recommendations on political solutions for decreasing poverty and strengthening human rights. The reports cover topics such as development cooperation, global economic issues, and climate policies.

The reports can be found on Kepa's website at:  
[www.kepa.fi/ajankohtaiskatsaukset](http://www.kepa.fi/ajankohtaiskatsaukset)