

EVALUATING

TASAF II

a nation-wide social fund in  
Tanzania

# History

- Phase I – 2000 – 2005
- Phase II – 2005 – 2009
- Objectives of Phase II:
  - Empowerment of Communities to demand, implement and monitor services and access to opportunities that contribute to improved livelihood. The target population is either service poor, vulnerable or food insecure.

# Components

- Capacity Enhancement –  
aim: improvement of skills for project implementation
- National Village Fund  
aim: supporting community projects

# National Village Fund has 3 parts

- Public Works Programme (PWP) – cash transfers through short-term employment for public works at a wage rate set at 20% below the market casual labour rate. E.g. rehabilitating a part of the road
- Community Development Initiatives (CDI) – Supporting the implementation of sub-projects to improve social services. E.g. Building of school; improving water sources
- Social Support Programme (SSP) – Grants to vulnerable groups such as disabled, aged, etc... E.g. Training physically disabled people in bee keeping, poultry farming and financial and business management skills

# Application Process

- Community applies through district council for a grant of 5,000 – 30,000 dollars
- District Council decides on
  - Whether to grant the request or not
  - Food Insecure Community: CDI, SSP, PWP
  - Service Poor Community: CDI, SSP

# Scope – Nationwide Coverage

- Communities in *a//* Local Government Authorities in Tanzania are allowed to send in applications

# Objective of the Evaluation

- Did TASAF improve welfare?
- Which socio-economic groups benefited and is this the targeted population?
- For each of these groups, to what extent?

# Treatment and Comparison in TASAF as a nation-wide project

## TREATMENT:

Those whose application was accepted

## COMPARISON (ordered according to suitability):

1. Those who did not send in an application
2. Those whose application was rejected
  - a. Rejected by the district council (e.g. considered not poor, or receiving too much other assistance)
  - b. Rejected because of non-compliance to sector rules
  - c. Deferred
  - d. Rationed (funds depleted)

# Set-up of the Survey

1. Base-line Survey covering a large number of communities/villages
2. Once applications are submitted, all application villages in our sample are matched to non-application villages in our sample.
3. Each application village is matched to 2 non-application villages.

- From then onwards we follow only the sample of matched villages:
  - application accepted (treatment)
  - application rejected (comparison 1)
  - did not apply (comparison 2)
- Over time our comparison group will shrink
- We want to know (i) who benefitted and (ii) by how much
- Double differencing gives us (ii), but not (i)
- To get at (i) we use the baseline to see look at inclusion/exclusion

# Sample Size

- 12,000 villages in Tanzania
- 5,000 are likely to be beneficiaries in a 5 year period
- In a random sample, we expect just under half of the villages to participate in a period of 5 years time; or 10% per year.

# RISKS

- What if no-one's application is refused?
- Can we exclude the possibility that refusal is correlated with unobservables?
- What if there are not enough applicants in our sample?