

Rhetoric and Reality of Result-based Monitoring and Evaluation in Tanzania: An Experience from the Public Sector

*Zabron Kengera**

Abstract

As part of efforts to make its plans and development interventions more responsive to poverty alleviation and economic growth, Tanzania has in the last ten years adopted result-based monitoring and evaluation (RBME). This paper assesses the status of RBME practices in Tanzania. Specifically, it assesses the forces that triggered the adoption of result-based evaluation practices in the public sector, while noting key factors constraining the implementation of RBME in the country. Data were collected through a rigorous review of literature with particular focus on papers, documents and reports about result-based management, result-based monitoring and evaluation, and the theory of change. These were complemented with input from key informants, including monitoring and evaluation officials within the public sector, NGOs and the business sector. Data analysis followed the traditional qualitative inductive approach, which categorizes and discusses information based on thematic areas as they emerge from the study results. Obtained results suggest that the adoption of RBME within the public sector is limited by low result-based culture among government officials. There is also inadequate capacity to implement different forms of M&E at the different levels of the government system, poor coherence, and incomprehensive guidelines of M&E in the public sector. The paper concludes and recommends that, to improve the RBME practices in the country, the government, in collaboration with other stakeholders, should cultivate and promote a result-based and accountability culture by making M&E an integral part of the entire government functioning; and institutionalizing and professionalizing the M&E sector by establishing independent M&E units with clear reporting mechanisms, mandates and capacity to execute plans.

Keywords: *monitoring and evaluation, results based evaluation, performance and public-sector*

1. Introduction

In the last two decades there has been a growing interest among development practitioners, particularly donors and governments, to refocus their evaluation locus from evaluating project activities and outputs (implementation-based evaluation) towards results-based evaluation (UNDP, 2009, 2002). Evaluation exercises have in the last decade shifted their focus from evaluating the success of a project manager (efficiency), towards assessing project effectiveness or success; which focuses more on short- and long-term outcomes of a development

* Department of Geography, University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

Zabron Kengera

intervention (Tarsilla, 2014; OECD/DAC, 2008; UNDP, 2009, 2002). Arguments over the need for, and the evolution of, result based monitoring and evaluation (RBME) practices differ among writers and commentators. However, most literature seem to suggest that RBME is an approach and philosophy for development evaluation, stemming out of increased concerns over the practicability and relevance of the traditional implementation-based evaluation of around the 1990s.

Observers such as the World Bank (2014) and Jacob et al. (2010) attributed the emergence of RBME philosophy to several reforms and change of management philosophies in development corporations, and public and business sector. On the other hand, the UNDP (2002) ascribed the concept of RBME to the emergence and applications of management by objectives, Result-based management, management for results (development cooperation), new public management (public sector) and strategic planning (corporate sector) are the founding pillars that underpin result-based monitoring and evaluation around the globe. At a more practical level, the RBME philosophy was popularized through the introduction and implementation of several international frameworks and conventions, such as the Paris declarations on aid effectiveness (2005), and the Accra Agenda of Action (2008). As strategies for enhancing the implementation of the Paris declarations, these frameworks emphasized the need to make development intervention more impactful, inclusive and relevant to key stakeholders and beneficiaries (UNDP, 2002).

Similarly, efforts to embrace the result-based evaluation approach was intended to remind project managers and policy makers that good policies, acquiring huge financial sources, and implementing big projects only are useless unless they create positive changes to people's lives (Picciotto, 2009; UNDP, 2002). This calls for policy makers and project managers to focus their energy and resources towards the needed 'development', and not merely on operational results; which are a common feature in many compliance- or implementation-based initiatives. The World Bank (2014) and Jacob et al. (2010) observed that effective implementation of RBME as a part of a bigger results-based management framework may requires development practitioners to develop a clear picture of realistic and expected results; have a good grasp of the problem under question; identify stakeholders and beneficiaries; monitor and manage the potential and actual project risks; and reports and evaluate the results.

Barber (2008) noted that effective implementation of results-based evaluation needs to be backed up by strong, result-oriented and visionary leadership at different levels of government entities who will be able to demand results and make their subordinates and themselves more accountable to their decisions

Mining Legislations, Resource Nationalism and Community Benefits in Tanzania

and actions. On their part, Engela and Ajam (2010) and Picciotto (2009) were of the view that result-based evaluation is a methodological and philosophical approach to M&E that can only be implemented if the demand and need for accountability will be pushed and enforced by forces and actors from within an organization. In line with the above two suppositions, the World Bank (20014) and Chen (2005) suggested that results-based evaluation can only be effectively done in organizations and institutions where there is a results culture, capacity, and the need for evidence-based decisions. This paper, therefore, seeks to evaluate the practice of the RBME concept by assessing the evolution, trends and factors influencing the adoption and implementation of the RBME concept within the public sector in Tanzania.

2. Theoretical and Empirical Review

2.1 The Foundation of Result Based Evaluation

In most literature, RBME is often discussed and defined in conjunction with the result-based management framework (Tarsilla, 2014; Gorgen & Kusek, 2009; UNDP, 2002). This makes it a bit difficult to have an independent definition of RBME. OM (2011) described RBME as a systematic approach to track results and performance in a transparent, reflective and logical way to measure high level project impacts. As noted by DAC (2011) and Kumar (2002), the best way to describe or explain RBME is to treat it as a methodological approach; rather than an independent type of monitoring and evaluation. This implies that RBME is not a replacement, but rather a complement of the previous traditional ‘compliance’ M&E as foundation of all approaches. For example, there is a general agreement among the proponents of both result-based management (RBM) and RBME that the two concepts need to be conceived more of a change of mindset than an independent evaluation method given the reality that a project cannot achieve higher-level results (outcome and impacts) without first achieving lower-level results (inputs, activities output).

2.2 The Evolution, Status and Challenges of Result Based Evaluation in Africa

Result-based monitoring and evaluation as a new approach to M&E has its roots in the RBM philosophy. As an attempt to link RBME to RBM, the UNDP (2009, 2002) emphasized that evaluation should not only be seen as an integral part of a bigger result-based management framework, but also as a system required to enhance its implementation. As compared to other parts of the world, the implementation of RBME as a philosophical and methodological approach in Africa is still at its infancy stage. Based on the observation by Tarsilla (2014), Picciotto (2009), Kumar (2002) and OECD/ DAC (2008), this trend can be attributed to a combination of several factors, including—but not limited to – the lack of champions and strong institutional leadership, lack of results culture, low level of policy demand for M&E products, lack of

Zabron Kengera

centralized M&E frameworks, low organizational and individual capacity to implement M&E activities, and the lack of comprehensive policies and nation-wide frameworks to guide effective implementation of M&E systems.

The report from the African Monitoring and Evaluation System Workshop (2013), for example, indicated that despite the increasing realization of the need for evidence-based decisions and government accountability to various stakeholders, many African countries—with the exception of South Africa—were to a large extent lacking both the demand for M&E and a comprehensive framework to make it operational. This agrees with other observations, such as by Tarsilla (2014) and OECD/DAC (2008), who noted that most M&E systems at project level in many African countries were mainly donor-driven. Such a trend has been responsible for weakening not only the evaluation capacity among African countries, but also in creating over-dependence on donors for the designing of evaluation and funding. As the result, as noted by Tarsilla (2014), this has tended to make most of the evaluation to become more irrelevant within the context of recipient countries.

According to Mayne (2016), the low M&E culture in many African countries is a result of long-term effects of the lack of accountability culture, together with the lack of experienced monitoring and evaluation officials, especially in government sectors, due to either the lack of rigorous training in strategic and resulted-based management professions (particularly in M&E); or the lack of harmonized M&E frameworks within and between countries (Tarsilla, 2014; OECD, 2006). While Kilagura (2018) identified the lack of budget and quality personnel as the major problems infringing the performance of M&E in local government projects in Tanzania, other M&E related studies such as by Malumla (2007), for example, observed that the majority evaluation exercises in local government projects employed donor standardized tools and templates. This made such evaluations less responsive to key evaluation questions and issues within local and national contexts.

2.3 Strategies for Implementing Result-based M&E in Africa

Strategies to improve both result-based evaluation culture and the functioning of M&E in many less developed countries, and Africa in particular, have been identified and suggested (Abraham, 2015, Toscano, 2013). While Toscano (2013) called for the need of improving harmonization of M&E methodologies and methods through a more collaborative and coordinated efforts at national level, other observers such Tarsilla (2014) and Gorgen and Kusek (2009) called for efforts to increase the capacity building of M&E officials in both government and business sectors to make M&E strategies more relevant and adaptable to local contexts. Such an argument is also supported by Kilagura (2018) and Malumla (2007) who called for governments to improve both technical and financial capacities of M&E units at local governments systems in Tanzania.

Mining Legislations, Resource Nationalism and Community Benefits in Tanzania

Other observers—such as Mayne (2016), and Gorgen and Kusek (2009)—have also pointed out the need for promoting result-based management and M&E culture, together with making M&E units more independent.

2.4 Theoretical and Analytical Framework

Discussions and issues raised in this paper are informed by two closely related monitoring and evaluation theories: the theory of change, and the system theory (UNDP, 2017; Abraham, 2015; Mayne & Johns, 2015). The UNDP (2017) describe the theory of change as a process of change that outlines causal linkages in interventions (outputs, intermediate and long-term outcomes), including indicators and the necessary conditions for the required change. Simply put, building on the work by Mayne (2016), and the popular definition by Weis (1995), the theory of change can simply be defined as a process that explains how and why an intervention is likely to work towards a desired change. As a change or result-oriented model, the theory of change often identifies the needed change, outcomes, sequences of activities and conditions required to realize the needed change (Mayne, 2016; Patton, 2008). For example, the UNDP (2017), Breuer et al. (2016), Mayne and Johnson (2015), and Abraham (2015) observed that although the theory of change is often developed during the designing of a programme, in the recent past it is increasingly being used as tool for assessing the impact, effectiveness, efficiency and relevance and sustainability of the interventions.

When applied in conjunction or as part of the system theory, the theory of change can be used to explain the complex system of interlinked and interconnected elements required to make a functional system, in this regard the M&E system (Breuer et al., 2016; Hummelbrunner, 2000; Senge, 1990). Thus, the theory of change and the system theory can be used in integration to identify and assess key components required for developing effective RBME systems at different scale of the evaluation of ecosystems. Thus, a functional M&E framework need to be supported with a robust system capable of capturing performance data; and analysing and providing a reflection and communication supporting the implementation process of a project (Leconte, 2020; Mackay (2007). In line with this, Gorgens and Kusek (2009) noted that a result-based Monitoring and evaluation can only be achieved in organizations with defined M&E units and M&E capacity: the results and M&E culture.

3. Data Collection Methods

Data for this paper were gathered through a critical and systematic review of literature and key informant interviews between May to November 2021. While the review of literature involved a systematic reading of journal articles and relevant government documents and reports within the field of M&E, key informant interviews (KIIs) employed a mixture of face-to-face and telephone interviews with selected government officials from key government departments

in policy, planning and M&E departments at the ministry level. Interviews were also conducted to other participants, particularly national coordinators and project managers of donor-funded projects at the national level; project managers from international corporations operating in Tanzania; and project officials working with international and local organizations in Tanzania. The paper is also enriched with views and comments from various project management and M&E consultants with the knowledge and experience in implementing donor- and public-funded projects and M&E systems.

4. Results

4.1 Foundation of Result-based Monitoring and Evaluation in Tanzania

There are no agreements among different observers and respondents over the timing, origin and factors that might have influenced the adoption of RBME in Tanzania. Yet, several reports from different development partners—particularly the UNDP and the World Bank—seem to suggest that RBME—also known as outcome mapping—was introduced within the government systems as part of bigger strategies and collaborative efforts by development partners and the government of Tanzania; mainly through the Ministry of Finance and Planning at different capacities. One respondent from the former Planning Commission, for example, noted that result-based and conventional evaluation were introduced as part of a bigger government framework and strategies to restore donor confidence in Tanzania; following poor trust on the donor side, to continue funding various programmes in the country:

You may recall that at one-point the donor community was threatening to withdraw and stop their funding in Tanzania following poor financial management systems, corruption and the lack of accountability within the government systems. Thus, as part of the conditions to continue receiving donor funding, we were required to implement several reforms, including putting in place proper systems for monitoring and reporting of various indicators; particularly on poverty reduction strategies (An interview to an official from the previous planning commission, October, 2020).

To a big extent, the above statement agrees with the (2007) Medium Term Strategic Planning and Budgeting Manual (MTSPBM), which states:

The government of Tanzania has been undertaking various structural and institutional reforms, revising policies and strategies and establishing a number of processes aimed at improving service delivery and the general welfare of its citizens. These included amongst others: Public Sector Reforms, Decentralization by Devolution (D-by-D), Long Term Perspective Plan - LTTP, Five Year Development Plan - FYDP. These initiatives accentuated in Ruling Party Manifesto affected planning and budgeting as well as monitoring and evaluation taking place within institutions in various ways, to address this the Medium-Term Strategic Planning and Budgeting Manual (MTSPBM) was developed in 2007 (URT, 2015: 12).

Mining Legislations, Resource Nationalism and Community Benefits in Tanzania

The above quote is supported by other informants from the former Planning Commission in Tanzania. However, slightly different from the previous informant, the latter attributed much of the emphasis of RBME and other forms of development assessments in the country to a number of reforms, which were undertaken during the first part of the third-phase government:

When President Mkapa got into office, there was a concern that many government systems were not working properly. A number of reforms were made in several government sectors. All these initiatives were supposed to be supported with proper systems to effectively track the implementation of the reforms. So, for me, I think apart from other efforts and demand from development partners, these reforms had a big influence towards the implementation of various forms of monitoring and evaluation; and probably what you are referring to as result-based monitoring and evaluation (Interview with the an official from the Ministry of Finance in Dodoma, October 2021)

The two statements above reveal two key messages. One, as it has been the case of several less developed countries, the implementation of result-based monitoring and evaluation—and probably other forms of evaluation—was mainly donor-driven. Two, to some of the respondents—and probably to many novice M&E practitioners within the Tanzanian environment—there is no clear demarcation between result-based and the conventional M&E. As explained earlier, RBME and RBM are new management tools and philosophies to many officials within the government systems.

The majority of the study participants—particularly those who happened to work and interact with the World Bank, UNDP and the Ministry of Finance—attributed the adoption and further implementation of RBME in Tanzania largely to international donor communities; and specifically the World Bank, UNDP and the USAID. As indicated in the following narrative, one common observation and discourse among government officials in the Ministry of Finance was that the RBME philosophy, like the conventional M&E interventions, was introduced and adopted to implement and improve different poverty alleviation programmes, particularly the poverty reduction strategies known as MKUKUTA (Tanzania Mainland) and MKUZA (Zanzibar):

Between 2005 and 2015, the UNDP in collaboration with the government of Tanzania, implemented MKUKUTA and MKUZA II in Tanzania Mainland and Zanzibar. Unfortunately, the two interventions were not very successful in reducing poverty at household level despite of a few indicators of growth at the macro level. Thus, UNDP Tanzania later thought it was important to come up with frameworks to track poverty reduction indicators before the implementation of MKUKUTA and MKUZA II. It was from this understanding that the UNDP funded several monitoring and evaluation capacity-building programmes, which were being implemented through the Ministry of Finances in both parts of the Union. Projects like result-based monitoring and evaluation and auditing, and poverty monitoring

Zabron Kengera

systems were oriented towards improving the result-based philosophy during the implementation of the second MKUKUTA and MKUZA (Personal communication with a senior official in the former Planning Commission, April 2020).

To a large extent, the above narrative reflects several key issues presented in the capacity Development for Result-based Monitoring and Auditing project document, which was implemented collaboratively between the UNDP and the government of Tanzania in several government ministries and departments (URT, 2015). According to this document, to promote and enhance the result-based culture within the government systems, the project sought to review and improve the existing public finance management systems, strengthen procurement and auditing units in various ministries and departments; and improve the financial reporting capacity of MDAs and LGAs. To achieve the above outcomes, the project specifically intended to enable the Poverty M&E system to produce timely statistics; enhance the functioning of local government databases and reporting systems; enable the National Auditing Unit to produce highly quality and timely services; and ensure the functioning of the government information portal.

Interestingly, other informants—particularly those who happened to work in World Bank funded projects at Ministry level—attributed the adoption and application of result-based evaluation to what they referred to as a new World Bank funding philosophy in many African countries, including Tanzania. One respondent from the then Ministry of Education and Local Governments had the following to say:

Following poor performance and mismanagement of funding in many World Bank funded projects in Tanzania, recently the Bank decided to introduce a new approach of funding disbursement. For example, unlike in the past system of funding, currently funds are being released phase-by-phase. After the first disbursement you will be required to implement and accomplish all activities outlined under that package, without which you will never get the second disbursement. In the beginning we found this approach very complicated and cumbersome, but with time people are getting used to it; and I think in my view it has made many project managers more focused to the intended deliverables and outcomes. If you promised to build, let us say so and so laboratories and classes, train a certain number of teachers, etc., they will have to assess and ensure that you have accomplished those packages before you receive additional funding. Comparatively, this system has contributed significantly to the construction of so many education infrastructures in the country. It is difficult to tamper with or redirect this funding for other uses (Personal communication with a Coordinator of a previous World Bank Funded Project in the Ministry of Education, May 2021).

The above view is shared by another official who observed:

Mining Legislations, Resource Nationalism and Community Benefits in Tanzania

Approaches and systems of funding have changed very significantly. In the past we were just given money to implement a project to the end. Nowadays, money is released based on performance. Project assessments and evaluations are based on the philosophy of value for money. Funders and the government are insisting that project managers should prove the value of their activities. For example, many funders would like to see the results and impact of your work before releasing the next disbursement. In the worst scenario, a project can be dismissed altogether where it has no satisfactory results. The World Bank people have become very strict with their money. They want the documentation of real results beyond project processes and meetings, which dominated the previous funding approaches (Personal communication with Assistant World Bank Project Coordinator, 2021).

The above two narratives support the two closely related discourses of RBME. One, as noted by Kilagura (2018), Jacob et al. (2010), and Abraham (2015), was that result-based evaluation and management philosophies in Tanzania—and probably in many less developed countries—are more project- and donor-driven. Two, as reflected in the above two statements, the M&E accountability and results culture are particularly still inadequate among many government officials.

This finding is supported by one Member of the Parliament (MP), who is also a members of the Association of Parliamentary Monitoring and Evaluation in Tanzania. Apart from acknowledging the efforts of the government to institute M&E in its key governance and legal frameworks, he also pointed out the general weaknesses that hinder accountability, results-based culture, M&E functioning, and performance-based management systems:

It is not true that we don't have supportive frameworks for M&E. In Tanzania, we have about seven Acts which recognize the need for M&E and support M&E activities. These include the Budget Act, Cap 439 (2005), which states clearly on the need for effective monitoring and evaluation of the government budget. Other Acts such as the Public Procurement Act, 2011, and its amendments of 2021, the Auditing Act and Public Finance (2018), and the PCCB: all are geared towards addressing value for money in many public projects. Despite a few weaknesses in implementation and focus, for me I think all these actually promote M&E activities in the country (Interview with one of the MP, October 2021).

The author of this paper basically agrees with the above observations, especially on the aspect of supportive frameworks as highlighted above. Yet, as pointed out by another MP, one of the major pitfall of the above mentioned Acts and other government frameworks is that most are geared towards making the project implementers comply to the agreed financial and other arrangements highlighted in project documents:

Zabron Kengera

The only problem I see is that most of the supportive Acts focus more on monitoring and compliance. There is nothing or very few elements of evaluation. Evaluation needs to address strategic issues at outcome and impact levels. This is not what is being done. It is very easy for the implementers to comply with procedures as required by these Acts. Given the lack of results-based and evaluation culture in the country, we probably need more serious and comprehensive framework guidelines in terms of policies and Acts (Interview with one MP in Dodoma, October, 2021).

4.2 Perceptions on the Status of Result-based Monitoring and Evaluation

One of the key objectives of this study was to assess the status and extent to which the result-based evaluation philosophy has been adopted and implemented within Tanzania's government systems. There were divided opinions among the study participants over the existence and operations of RBME either as an evaluation philosophy or framework. Surprisingly, with the exception of a few officials, particularly those who were working closely with the UNDP during the implementation of MKUKUTA and MKUZA in Tanzania Mainland and Zanzibar, the majority of the study participants in many government institutions—including ministries, departments and organizations—were not aware of the RBME philosophy. In fact, one key informant from a key government ministry was pessimistic on the possibility of implementing the result-based evaluation culture in the public sector:

Thinking of result-based monitoring and evaluation in Tanzania, especially in the government sector, is to become too ambitious. At least this is can be visible in the private sector because of their result-based management culture. Within the government sector, which is dominated by the business-as-usual tradition, it is difficult to adopt the result-based or even the traditional M&E approaches. You can't have a result-based evaluation or management system where even the budget is not flowing regularly. Besides, you can only measure and make assessment if activities are implemented according to prior plans. For me, it does not make any sense to make any type of evaluation if activities are not implemented as planned. In my view, in the future we may need to adopt the key performance indicators approach just like what is happening in the private sector. We can only speak of result-based evaluation if everybody will be striving to create a certain legacy in whatever s/he is doing; and this has to be preceded with cultivating a results-based management culture. It is unfortunate that this kind of thinking has moved beyond government policies and frameworks (Interview with one official, Ministry of Finance, Dares Salaam, January, 2022).

The above view agrees with that of other observers such as Kilagura (2018), and URT (2015). The following extract, with a slight difference from the above comment, ascribe the problem of the lack of both result-based management and evaluation culture within the public sector with capacity issues: the lack of accountability; poor understanding and perceptions, especially on the role of monitoring and evaluation; and bureaucratic tendencies that are dominant at different levels of government systems:

Mining Legislations, Resource Nationalism and Community Benefits in Tanzania

Despite of a few observed successes, many Districts-wide managed projects in Kinondoni Municipal have been suffering from many performance challenges. Such challenges range from lack of resources and ineffective M&E activities since the M&E practice was not undertaken at the desired level. The so-called M&E is basically a part of project implementation, inspection and supervision. There is a serious problem of lack capacity in terms manpower and budget. There is lot to be done if we are to improve M&E within the local government systems (Kilagura, 2018: 52).

On the other hand, URT (2015) in Table 1 summarizes the weaknesses and recommendations as a part of the study to review the whole government Monitoring and Evaluation System for the Ministry of Finance and local government called for national M&E capacity to embark on a long-term and specialized trainings. This was also intended to promote mechanisms for sharing and ensuring that M&E findings becomes at the core of government decisions and plans.

Table 1: Weakness and Recommendation for Improving RBME Within the Government System

Weaknesses and limitations	Recommendation Made
The current M&E system is not fully operational, it is missing guidelines and a lead ministry to coordinate the M&E in the country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The government has to establish a ministry or a dedicated agent within or under the President Office to coordinate all monitoring, evaluation and research functions in the country. There should be a minister, permanent secretary and in each of component there should be a Director. ➤ Operationalization of these documents (guidelines, circulars and protocols for M&E) by putting actionable operating procedures for these policies, standard guidelines and protocols. ➤ Developing, disseminating and implementing a clear M&E with inclusive issues of sound good M&E governance. ➤ Update planning and budget manual to include or remove an M&E chapter; then develop updated national M&E strategies that align issues related to national and development frameworks, e.g., SDGs, Five Year Development Plans (FYDPs) and Long-Term Perspective Plans (LTTPs). ➤ Put in place policy and legal instrument that require the legislator to monitor progress made on priorities of government outcomes and educate about the functioning of RBM systems.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Advocate for and institutional impact assessment through academic institutions and other potential organization including individuals.➤ A Lead Ministry has to put a place a capacity building plan for M&E at different professional (Research, Monitoring and evaluation independently).
There are contradictory guidelines and operational procedures regarding the use of planning and reporting M&E forms at MDAs and LGAs as indicated in the Planning, Budgeting and Reporting Manual	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ There is a need to harmonize guideline and procedures that hinder effective use of the dedicated forms within M&E systems. The new M&E strategy and policy to be developed for the wide government M&E should advocate for the recorded ambiguity especially considering effective utilization that will facilitate reporting results.
Inadequate coordination of M&E partners working at various levels of government systems in the country	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ There is a need to harmonize and coordinate efforts of implementing partners' working and supporting on M&E that takes the lead at different levels of implementation.
Lack of Results and M&E culture leading to underutilization of existing strategies in strategic plan and medium-term expenditure framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Capacity building programmes should emphasize and advocate for the Results Based Management and M&E culture to different levels of staffs and ensure that they are used as part of management and governance system.

Source: URT, (2015) a final draft whole government M&E System report for the Ministry of Finance and Local Government.

Furthermore, the results in Table 1 support various discourses and narratives presented in this paper. Of more interest to this discussion, the results have provided a comprehensive list of issues, problems and strategies required to make both the result-based and conventional M&E a practical reality in Tanzania's public sector.

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

The results have generally demonstrated that the concept and philosophy of RBME in Tanzania is both new, underdeveloped, and more so donor-driven. Thus, like the conventional evaluation approach, the study has established that building a result-based evaluation culture in Tanzania, particularly in the public sector, needs to be backed with high commitments and mindset change from different actors of the public evaluation ecosystem. At the practical level, measures to promote result-based evaluation culture should be geared towards institutionalizing M&E, including making M&E units more independent.

Mining Legislations, Resource Nationalism and Community Benefits in Tanzania

Developing results-based monitoring and evaluation may also need to be supported with comprehensive and harmonized frameworks at the national level, building accountability culture among government leaders and officials, building a national M&E capacity through long-term and specialized trainings as deemed important, and last—but not least—preparing mechanisms for sharing and ensuring that M&E findings become at the core of government decisions and plans.

References

- Abrahams, M. (2015). A Review of the Growth of Monitoring and Evaluation in South Africa: Monitoring and Evaluation as a Profession, an Industry and a Governance Tool: Evaluation and Democracy.
- Breuer, E., Lee, L., Silva D, M. & Lund, C. (2016). Using Theory of Change to Design and Evaluate Public Health Interventions: A Systematic Review.
- Connell, J. P. & Kubisch, A. C. (1998). Applying a Theory of Change Approach to the Evaluation of Comprehensive Community Initiatives: *Progress, Prospects and Problems*.
- Hummelbrunner, R (2000). *A system Approach to Evaluation: An Application of System Theory and Thinking to Evaluation*. Paper prepared for the 4th EES Conference, October 12–14: 2000.
- IOM Project Handbook1st Edition (2011) via https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/iom_project_handbook_6feb2012.pdf 2nd Edition (2017).
- Jacob, A, Barnet, C. & Ponsford, R. (2010). Three Approaches to Monitoring: Feedback systems, Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation and Logical Frameworks. *IDS Bulletin* 41(6), November, 2010.
- Kilagura (2018). The Role of Monitoring and Evaluation in Promoting the Performance of District-wide Development Projects in Kinondoni Municipality, Tanzania. Masters dissertation, University of Dares Salaam.
- Kumar, S. (2002). *Methods for Community Participation. A Complete Guide for Practitioners*. London: ITDG Publishers.
- Leconte, P. (2020). What is a Monitoring. & Evaluation System? <https://www.clearpointstrategy.com/monitoring-and-evaluation-system/>.
- Mackay, K. (2007). *How to Build M&E Systems to Support Better Government*. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Migira, A. (2021). The Role of Monitoring and Evaluation on the Performance of National Housing Corporation. Unpublished Masters Dissertation submitted at the University of Dares Salaam.
- OECD-DAC. (2008). *Emerging Good Practices for Development Results (MfDR) Source Book*. 3rd Edition. Paris: <http://www.mfdorg/sourcebook>.

Zabron Kengera

- Tarsilla, M. (2014). Evaluation Capacity Development in Africa: Current Landscape of International Partners' Initiatives, Lessons Learned and the Way Forward. *African Evaluation Journal* 2(1): Art. #89: 13 pages. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/aej.v2i1.89>.
- Toscano, S. (2013). Exploring the History and Challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation in International Nongovernmental Organizations: Complemented by Intern Experience at Save the Children USA.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2006). Who are the Question-Makers? A Participatory Evaluation Handbook, Office of the Evaluation and Strategic Planning.
- UNDP. (2009). *Handbook on Planning Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*. New York, USA: United Nations Development Program.
- UNDP. (2010). *Results-Oriented Monitoring and Evaluation: A Handbook for Program Managers*. UNDP.
- United Nations Development Group (UNDG). (2011). Results-based Management. <https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/undg-rbm-handbook-2012.pdf>.
- United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (2015). The Review of the Whole Government Monitoring and Evaluation System in Tanzania. A Draft Final Report for the Ministry of Finance and Local Government and Regional Administration.