

---

# Impact Evaluation of TASAF II

---

---

A joint learning activity conducted by  
TASAF and the World Bank  
September 25, 2008

---

# Outline

- About TASAF
- Motivation for this study.
- Scope of the study and our sample.
- Main study issues:
  - Targeting
  - Impact
- Preliminary evidence on targeting using baseline data.
- Conclusions.

---

# ABOUT TASAF II

- The Government of the United Republic of Tanzania is implementing the Tanzania Second Social Action Fund (TASAF II) through financing (Credit & Grant) from the World Bank
- TASAF II is a follow up Project, following the successful implementation of TASAF I that was implemented between November 2000 and June 2005.

---

# Project's Development Objective

- The objective of TASAF II is to empower communities to access opportunities so that they can request, implement, and monitor sub projects that contribute to improved livelihoods linked to MDG indicators targets in the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty.

---

# TASAF II Coverage

- TASAF II operations cover the entire country (Mainland and Zanzibar).
- TASAF II project comprises two major components:
  - The National Village Fund (NVF) as a financing instrument for community level sub-projects, targeting communities that:
    - lack access to basic social and market services;
    - have able-bodied but food insecure households; and
    - have household with vulnerable individuals (i.e. orphaned, disabled, elderly, affected/infected by HIV/AIDS, etc).

# Components Cont...

- Capacity Enhancement (CE).

Beneficiaries are:

- agencies (public and private) that support communities to make the best use of resources made available under the NVF and
- poor individuals participating in groups savings and taking advantage of investment opportunities created by various private-public partnerships

---

# Policy issues:

- Two major concerns:
  - Targeting effectiveness given the past history that most support interventions targeted to needy communities were not accessed by intended beneficiaries (e.g. Women, youths, people with disabilities etc.)
  - Impact resulting from the vulnerable support interventions

---

# Motivation

- The preparations for the impact evaluation of TASAF II began in early 2006.
  - Initially, the idea was to evaluate all components
    - Service Poor (SP) - financed from Credit,
    - Food Insecure (FI) – both credit & grant and
    - Vulnerable Groups (VG) – grant only



# Motivation (Cont...)

- In mid-2006, it was decided that the rigorous impact evaluation should focus on the VG component of TASAF II. There were various reasons for this:
  - ❑ Existing (ex-post) evaluation for TASAF I
  - ❑ Knowledge generation for Tanzania and other countries
  - ❑ Importance for the Social Protection agenda.

---

# Scope and the sample of the study

- The study is taking place in 5 (out of 121) districts:
- In each of these districts, all VG groups in 20 villages are being evaluated (with funding pending at baseline)
  - There is at least one group in each village, with some villages having 2 or more.
- In each of these villages, we conduct a small census, as well as detailed surveys for 15-20 HHs.

# Census and sample selection

- Survey teams list the entire village, recording VG status (elderly, orphan, handicapped, and widow) for each household.
  - Most of these HHs then receive a long listing Questionnaire.
- Then survey strata & sample for extensive household survey was defined as follows:
  - Village elites -Village Executive Officers (VEO) & Village Council (VC) – **Group 1**
  - HHs with *no* vulnerable members - **Group 2**
  - HHs with vulnerable members (not in any TASAF group) - **Group 3**
  - TASAF group members (leaders) - **Group 4**
  - TASAF group members (other) - **Group 5**

---

# Study Question 1: Targeting Effectiveness

1. Geographic targeting (*across* villages, wards, and districts for *all* types of projects)
2. Household targeting (*within* villages for *VG* interventions only)

---

# 1.1. Geographic targeting

- Identify the determinants of receiving funding for projects (Ward level analysis-third level of governance structure).
- Identify the steps that are *pro-poor* and not so pro-poor.
- If there are any bottlenecks lowering targeting efficiency, are they at the *application* stage or the *award* stage?

## 1.2. Household targeting

- The listing data provide us with information on each HH in the study villages. Using these data (along with HH Survey data), we can answer the following questions:
  1. Is vulnerability status (as defined by TASAF) a good targeting tool? If so, are some groups needier than others?
  2. How do TASAF group members compare to the average community member?
  3. How do they compare to other households with similarly vulnerable individuals?
  4. How do group leaders compare to other group members?
  5. Are some sub-villages more likely to receive VG projects?

---

## Study Question 2: Impact

- The impacts can be examined at the village, group, HH, or individual level.
- The most important question is whether the intervention has (sustainable) impact on the health, education, and nutrition of the beneficiaries (average and distribution).
- If there is variation in impact, what explains it: type of group, type of project, training, prime movers, other?

---

## Study Question 2: Impact (cont'd)

- To what extent do these interventions create new small enterprises (or make existing ones more viable/profitable)
- To what extent does the group nature of these sub-projects create lasting social capital and/or mutual insurance?
- Are there any spillover effects for the rest of the households in the study villages?



# Impact Evaluation Research Design:

Frame of projects in research: 160 groups in 100 villages.

randomization at village level:

TASAF research  
design:



TASAF Treatment: 80 groups, 50 villages.

# Preliminary evidence on targeting efficiency

- Using listing data, we can answer two important questions for TASAF:

On targeting:

1. Is vulnerability a good targeting tool?
  1. Is it easy to apply?
  2. Is it targeting the right people

On Impact:

1. How do group members (*beneficiaries*) compare with other vulnerable households (and other HHs) in their villages?

# Preliminary findings, next steps

## On Targeting:

- Using TASAF's definition of vulnerability, approximately 1 in 5 HHs are vulnerable.
  - TASAF VG projects in the study villages support approximately 10% of these vulnerable HHs.
- This criterion, which is easily observable, is an effective targeting tool:
  - Vulnerable households are worse off than others in their villages in a variety of diverse dimensions (education, assets ownership, access to services, connectedness, etc.)

# Preliminary findings, next steps (cont'd)

Hapa ndo tulikofikia bado round zinaendelea ili kupata impact

- Finding out about impacts-Questions for further analysis:
  - What will this targeting performance mean in terms of average impacts, their distribution among group members, sustainability of the group enterprises, etc.?
  - What kinds of groups will succeed?
- Will training on entrepreneurship make any difference?
  - TASAF has introduced business skills training as part and parcel of TASAF interventions.