RESEARCH ON POVERTY
ALLEVIATION

REPOA

RESEARCH ON POVERTY
ALLEVIATION

REPOA

Special Paper No. 07.22

Local Governance in Tanzania: Observations from Six Councils 2002-2003

Amon Chaligha,

Florida Henjewele,

Ambrose Kessy and

Geoffrey Mwambe

RESEARCH ON POVERTY
ALLEVIATION

Local Governance in Tanzania:

Observations from Six Councils 2002-2003

Local Governance in Tanzania:
Observations from Six Councils 2002-2003

Special Paper 07.22

Amon Chaligha

with

Florida Henjewele, Ambrose Kessy and Geoffrey Mwambe

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List Of Tables

Abbreviations

ALAT	Association of Local Authorities in Tanzania
CAG	Controller and Auditor General
CC	City Council
CCM	Chama Cha Mapinduzi
CD	Council Director
CDO	Community Development Officer
CIS	Community Initiative Support
CMI	Chr. Michelsen Institute
CMT	Council Management Team
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DAS	District Administrative Secretary
DC	District Commissioner
DC	District Council
DED	District Executive Director
DPLO	District Planning Officers
HIV/AIDS	Human Immuno-deficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
HQ	Head Quarter
LA	Local Authorities
LAAC	Local Authorities Accounting Committee
LG	Local Government
LGR	Local Government Reform
LGRP	Local Government Reform **Programme**
LGRT	Local Government Reform Team
MC	Municipal Council
MD	Municipal Director
MEMA	Sustainable Development of Rural Water Supply and Sanitation
MPs	Members of Parliament
MT	Municipal Treasury
NGOs	Non Governmental Organizations
NIBR	**Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research**
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for **Development Co-operation**
O & OD	Opportunities and Obstacles to Development
PORALG	President's Office Regional Administration and Local Government
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
RC	Regional Commissioner
TASAF	Tanzania Social Action Fund
UN	United Nations

UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
URT	United Republic of Tanzania
VEO	Village Executive officer
WDC	Ward Development Committees
WEO	Ward Executive Officer

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)

An approach to planning applied in rural areas whereby local communities fully participate in the development process by identifying their developmental needs, prioritising them, setting strategies to solve problems and identifying opportunities to contribute money and or labour.

Community Initiative Support (CIS)

An approach to development where communities participate in project designs and implementation process by identifying their needs and contributing the resources they have to solve community problems.

Opportunities and Obstacles to Development (O & OD)

This is a planning approach introduced by the President's Office Regional Administration and Local Government. It is an instrument used to determine the balance of efforts people put into seeking the opportunities available and coping with obstacles at work. It is this degree of balance within individuals, teams and organisations that influences issues such as conflict resolution, resource access, work allocation, team performance and organisational vision.

Governance

A complex ensemble of mechanisms processes and institutions through which citizens and social groupings manage their interests and conflicts.

Local Government Autonomy

The degree of freedom local authorities have in making political, economic and administrative decisions within their areas of jurisdiction.

Bottom-Up Planning

A planning process whereby plans and decisions regarding peoples' needs and priorities are made in a participatory way from the village and ward levels up to the council.

Trust Relations

The level of trust between citizens and their grassroots leaders, and between grassroots leaders and local bureaucracy, which enables citizens to seek assistance from their leaders.

Citizens' Rights

The presence of a conducive environment whereby citizens enjoy political, social and economic rights including the right to participate in the governance of their affairs at the grassroots' level.

Gender Mainstreaming in Local Government Reform

The incorporation of gender equality perspective in all policies at all levels and at all stages by actors normally involved in policy making.

Elected Local Leaders

Means, all grassroots elected leaders such as, councilors, village chairpersons, neighborhood (mtaa) chairpersons, hamlet (kitongoji) chairpersons, and members of the village assembly.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dar es Salaam

October, 2005

ABSTRACT

Governance entails participation, transparency, efficiency and equity in the management of people and their economy in a given country. Governance comprises the mechanisms, processes and institutions, through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences. Local governance refers to the way a local authority fulfils its responsibilities towards the citizens in their areas of jurisdiction. It covers relationships between local authority leaders and the citizens, as well as political parties and non-governmental organisations, and the central government in all phases of formulating policies that affect people in carrying out their daily activities.

In this study, several political and administrative dimensions of governance are discussed. First is the issue of Local Government Autonomy. Here, an attempt was made to answer the question: To what extent are the local authorities free to make political decisions within the Tanzanian polity? It is recognised that the local government reforms has opened the way for multi-level planning systems and new, non-hierarchical forms of inter-ministerial coordination. However, while the decentralisation reform has set the stage for participatory local planning practices, it is by no means guaranteeing them. Improved trust relations, citizens' rights, reduced corruption, participation in local elections and gender mainstreaming are important governance issues that are also discussed in this study.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Formative Research Project has made efforts to produce a baseline for the research linked to indicators for the following three broad dimensions of local government reform:

(1) Governance:

- Local autonomy and citizen participation;

(2) Finances and financial management:

- Accountability, efficiency and local resource mobilization, and

(3) Service delivery and poverty alleviation:

- Criteria of success and operational constraints.

This report analyses data from governance in six councils: Bagamoyo District Council (DC), Ilala Municipal Council (MC), Iringa DC, Kilosa DC, Moshi DC and Mwanza City Council (CC). These councils were selected for in-depth studies for the Formative Process Research Project on Local Government Reform in Tanzania. These councils were selected on the basis of variations in resource bases, rural - urban variations, degree of inclusion in the Local Government Reform Programme (LGRP), degree of donor presence or support, and composition of political parties.

Political and administrative governance is the main focus of this report. Seven dimensions of governance are discussed: local government autonomy, bottom-up planning, improved trust relations, improved citizen's rights, reduced corruption, gender mainstreaming in local government reform and participation in local elections.

This report provides a baseline for various dimensions of governance in the six case councils, 2000-2003. Data collection is closely linked to indicators of change induced by the LGR (see Appendix 1). Three methods of data collection have been used:

- Secondary data from local contact persons in the six councils;
- Primary data through in-depth semi-structured interviews in 2002 and 2003, and
- Citizens' Survey (1,260 respondents, randomly selected – 210 from each council) conducted in October 2003.

The in-depth interviews involved key informants (actors in central and local government, civil organisations, etc).

2.   THE CONCEPT OF GOVERNANCE

The UNDP[1] defines governance as *"the complex ensemble of mechanisms, processes, and institutions through which citizens and social groupings manage their interests and conflicts".* In addition, the UNDP perceives governance as the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs at all levels[2]. Furthermore, the UN generally emphasizes that governance should entail participation, transparency, efficiency and equity in the application of laws in any given country[3].

From this perspective, governance comprises the mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations and mediate their differences. Local governance refers to the way a local authority fulfils its responsibilities towards the citizens resident in their areas of jurisdiction. It covers relationships between local authority leaders and the citizens, as well as political parties and non-governmental organisations, and the central government in all phases of formulating policies that affect people in their localities.

The concept of governance has three pillars: economic, political, and administrative. Economic governance includes decision-making processes that influence a country's economic activities and its relationships with other economies. Political governance is the process of decision-making to formulate policy. Administrative governance is the system of policy implementation. Political and administrative governance are the main focus of this report.

Seven dimensions of governance are discussed:

1. Local government autonomy;
2. Bottom-up planning;
3. Improved trust relations;
4. Improved citizens' rights;
5. Reduced corruption;
6. Gender mainstreaming in local government reform, and
7. Participation in local elections.

[1]   1996

[2]   UNDP, 1997:2-3

[3]   Beausang, 2002

3.   LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTONOMY

To what extent are the local authorities free to make political decisions within the Tanzanian State and political environment? This question may be answered from various perspectives. Some scholars tend to use the longitudinal approach, which asks whether the degree of self-rule has been reduced or increased. Others prefer using the normative ideas with respect to the proper role of local self-rule, i.e. local authorities' deliberations. The first perspective is more useful in the analysis of governance in local authorities in Tanzania due to the ongoing reforms that aims to enhance local autonomy in policy formulation and decision making.

The question of local autonomy raises a number of issues with regard to measurement and validity. It may appear inappropriate to talk of local autonomy in a polity in which parliamentary sovereignty is the main pillar of the constitution and as a result the status of the local government is determined by laws passed by parliament. Hence, "local authorities have no powers except such as defined by the statute"[4]. That is, local governments are perceived to operate under laws made by the central government. The legal status of local governments in Tanzania, as it is stated in the constitution, implies a highly pervasive influence by central government.

3.1   Devolution of Control from Central Government

Local governments have general powers which indicate that they, in principle, are allowed to do 'anything', unless this is forbidden through legislation or reserved for the central government. Central government approves most of the deliberations of the local governments through their representative bodies such as the office of the District Commissioner (DC), the Regional Commissioner (RC), and later passed to the Ministry responsible for local government. The Policy Paper on Local Government Reform (1998) elaborates further that the local government is based on political devolution and decentralization of functions and finances within the framework of a unitary state.

Information from the six case councils indicates that local authorities do not yet have sufficient capacity to effectively perform their functions and discharge their obligations. There are still a number of policy and legal requirements that prevent local authorities from becoming accountable to local people. For example, most councillors and council staff interviewed in 2002 and 2003 responded that there is a considerable control over local government decision making through such mechanisms as the fiscal grant system, which sets minimum national standards that require local authorities to frame their budgets in accordance with guidelines and procedures spelt out by central government. This applies across all six case councils

According to the District Administrative Secretaries (DAS) interviewed, central government regulations, structures and directives have to be followed by the local authorities. One central government officer said:

> "…if we give them (local government) more autonomy, they would not work properly…there is a need to educate the councillors much …more and more time is needed before the central government can withdraw…."

The power of the local councils to hire and fire their own senior staff is also limited. Vacancies for senior positions must be advertised through the Local Government Service Commission which conducts the interviews and carries out the selection process on behalf of the councils.

---

[4]   Goldsmith and Edward, 1987:71

The Local Government Reform Agenda (1996) mentions that local autonomy will require the presence of strong and effective institutions through sufficient numbers of qualified and motivated staff recruited and promoted on the basis of merit. However, it does not stipulate clearly those powers of the local authorities.

Furthermore, according to the councillors interviewed, they still have limited powers to discipline heads of departments, as they were not recruited by the councillors. The only thing they can do is to air their dissatisfaction about their performance. But the final decision making power comes from the central government, which may decide to transfer a head of department to another council.

3.2   Revenue Matters

With respect to revenue generation, collection and spending, local authorities have limited autonomy. This is reflected by the abolition in July 2003 of the so-called "nuisance taxes", including development levy, by the central government. Consequently, councillors and council officials in four rural councils perceived an uncertain future due to limited reliable sources of revenue. For a detailed account on local government finances, see Fjeldstad et al (2004).

Most of the councils surveyed have financial problems. For example, one district council could not train its staff because of a lack of financial resources. Most of the staff members who wish to undertake further training either privately fund their study, or find their own external sponsors. The council has no training programme in its budget. The same also applies to the five other councils, which in practice do not have effective training practices.

3.3   Service Delivery

According to the council staff interviewed, local authorities are only empowered at the local level in terms of the delivery of social services such as education, health, water, etc. Nevertheless, according to a senior council official, the central government still sets priorities for social services to be provided by the councils. Moreover, councillors and council employees reported that they have to follow central government's wishes because they finance most of the public services provided by their council.

Both the devolution of the central power and the sharing of service delivery are important elements of local governance. However, there is a need to remove the current state arrangements that constrain local authorities to enhance democratic processes that will enable entrepreneurial performance. The Local Government Reform Programme has to some extent brought changes in the six case councils with respect to local autonomy. Some new forms of relationship between the central government and the local authorities have been established in terms of tax collection, human resources development and service delivery. However, still local authorities still have limited powers to fully discharge their functions. Despite these limitations, there has been a substantial development in the process of decision making especially with the attempts made to include more citizens in the planning process.

4.   BOTTOM-UP PLANNING

The local government reform opens the way for multi-level planning systems and new, non-hierarchical forms of inter-ministerial coordination. Moreover, decentralisation aims to increase the accountability of the local government to its local constituencies. However, while the decentralisation reform may set the stage for participatory local planning practices, it is by no means guaranteeing them. Difficulties are always encountered in the changing of attitudes rather than teaching techniques, particularly where the local planners are selected from the technical staff.

Generally, a decentralised planning or a bottom up planning is expected to:

(i)   Increase popular participation in planning and development;
(ii)   Make plans more relevant to local needs;
(iii)   Facilitate co-ordinated or integrated (multi-sector) planning;
(iv)   Increase the speed and flexibility of decision-making and implementation, and
(iv)   Generate additional citizen contributions and encourage more efficient use of existing resources.

4.1   Participation Approaches Used for Planning and Development

The participatory or bottom-up planning has been tried out within the case councils. However, the depth of the popular participation varies from one council to another. In relatively poor councils such as Kilosa and Bagamoyo, many of the plans identified have not been implemented due to a lack of resources. In contrast, urban councils like Ilala MC and Mwanza CC are in a better position to implement their plans.

Table 1: Participatory Approaches Applied within the Six Case Councils

Council	Participatory Rural Appraisal [PRA]	Community Initiative Support [CIS]	Opportunities & Obstacles to Development [O&OD]
Bagamoyo	Applies	Doesn't apply	Applies
Ilala	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	Applies
Iringa	Applies	Doesn't apply	Applies
Kilosa	Applies	Applies	Applies
Moshi	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply	Doesn't apply
Mwanza	Applies	Doesn't apply	Applies

Source: Councils' contact persons

Nevertheless, for all six councils, the Participatory Rural Assessment (PRA) had been implemented, with some success for some councils such as Bagamoyo DC, Iringa DC, Kilosa DC, and Mwanza CC (Table 1). Success here means the popularity and acceptability of the approach; the extent to which the approach is fairly understood and accepted in the council. Villagers through their village leaders made priorities, which they included in Ward Plans approved in Ward Development Committees.

Community Initiative Support (CIS) had been applied in Kilosa only, while Opportunities and Obstacles to Development (O&OD) had been applied in Bagamoyo DC, Ilala MC, Iringa DC, Kilosa DC and

Mwanza CC. Sometimes council bureaucrats felt confused when the donors who were financing projects demanded the council to apply a particular approach. Some councils faced capacity problems when they were compelled to use all three approaches. The Local Government Reform Team (LGRT) should come out with clear guidelines on which approach should be used to ensure effective participation.

Nevertheless, according to some respondents, bottom-up planning was an ad hoc exercise, which was carried out by few experts that did not reach the people in the councils. Thus, the practice is still more of a top-down planning system than the intended bottom up approach. According to council officials interviewed in 2003, bottom-up planning is only possible if grassroots governments have money and the expertise. However, currently, some council bureaucrats consider bottom-up planning as an opportunity for villagers to prepare a 'shopping list' to be forwarded to the council, which also lacks financial resources to implement village plans.

The local government reform programme has, however, brought a number of changes to the planning system. A system of participatory planning and budgeting was designed and the Presidents' Office-Regional Administration and Local Governments (PO-RALG), has tried to implement this system in all local authorities. For example, about 40,000 elected grassroots leaders from 13 regions have been given training on good governance[5]). However, according to officials interviewed in the six councils, seminars have been held mainly for the District Officials with few councillors receiving training on the participatory techniques. A number of seminars on good governance were organised by the Ministry responsible for local governments for all the six councils. The seminars emphasised on the importance of citizen involvement in the council decision making process.

Furthermore, the Opportunities and Obstacles to Development (O & OD) planning model, which is practiced by TASAF in its projects, seemed to be the major approach that citizens have really come to understand and probably the most accepted in the councils implementing TASAF projects (Iringa DC, Ilala MC, Mwanza CC and Bagamoyo DC). Kilosa applies O & OD but it had no TASAF projects during the time of this study. Rather it inherited the practice from the then Irish projects that applied the step-by-step approach, similar to the TASAF approach, for involving local communities in project design and implementation. The legitimacy of this approach comes from the fact that the project is geared towards poverty eradication and the councils received resources from the central government to implement local development priorities.

4.2   Awareness of Local Government Reform

The people who attended the seminars to become trainers of others have not been applying this knowledge due to the lack of resources to reach the people. Knowledge of the LGR is an influencing factor in participation. According to the Citizens' Survey more people in Mwanza CC (about 64%) had heard about the LGR, compared to Kilosa, where only 41% of the respondents have heard about the LGR (Table 2). Mwanza CC is included in the reforming councils while Kilosa is not.

---

[5]   URT, 2002

Table 2: Heard About Local Government Reform (% of respondents from each council)

	Heard	Not Heard
Ilala	45.2	54.8
Bagamoyo	46.2	53.8
Kilosa	41.4	58.6
Iringa	41.9	58.1
Moshi	44.3	55.7
Mwanza	63.8	36.2
	47.1	52.9

Source: Citizens' Survey (2003)

Furthermore, the survey data shows that a larger share of respondents who had heard about the local government reform programme also participated in village meetings and ward meetings. Table 3 shows that those who had heard about the local government reforms were also more likely to participate in community meetings.

Table 3:   Attendance at Meetings Compared to Whether They Had Heard about Local Government Reform (% of all respondents)

Description	Attended Meeting	Did Not Attend Meeting	Don't Know
Heard about the LGR	49.2	50.3	0.5
Not heard about LGR	35.7	62.9	1.4

Source: Citizens' Survey (2003)

Thus, where as nearly half (49.2%) of all those who heard about the reforms participated in meetings, only 36% of those who had not heard about the reforms attended meetings where policy issues were discussed. However, it is not certain whether those who went to meetings became more aware of the LGR or if the knowledge of LGR urged them to participate[6] .

4.3   Attendance at Meetings

Citizens' participation in community meetings varied across the case councils. Table 4 shows that Mwanza CC had more people attending community meetings (67%) having heard about the local government reform, followed by Iringa DC (59%), and Bagamoyo DC (55%). 54% of the people attending community meetings in Kilosa DC and Ilala MC (53%) also had heard about the LGR. Furthermore, in Moshi DC more people (51%) attended community meetings although they had not heard about the reforms, compared to Mwanza CC (33. %), and Ilala MC (47%).

---

[6]   Nygaard and Fjeldstad, 2003:10

Table 4: Respondents Who Participated in Village and Ward Meetings (in % of the respondents from each council)

Council	Yes		No		Don't Know	
	Heard About LGR	Not Heard	Heard About LGR	Not Heard	Heard About LGR	Not Heard
Ilala	53.4	46.6	40.4	59.6	100	-
Bagamoyo	55.2	44.8	40.8	59.2	-	100
Kilosa	54.3	45.7	31.3	68.7	33.3	66.7
Iringa	59.3	40.7	36.4	63.6	20	80
Moshi	41.5	50.5	47.1	52.9	-	-
Mwanza	66.9	33.1	59.8	40.2	-	-
Average	55.1	44.9	41.6	58.4	25	75

Source: Citizens' Survey (2003)

4.4 The Planning Process

Many people interviewed from the case councils also expressed their good faith with the proposed bottom-up approach, especially in places where the Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) system had been practiced. PRA requires villagers to discuss and identify their development needs and prioritise them. It also requires villagers to own any project identified as a priority by contributing money and labour before seeking assistance from other financiers such as councils, central government, donors, and others. According to one council official, prior to the PRA the council had not been effectively communicating with the villagers. Council officials also commented that the PRA was an eye-catching practical approach that involves local people to solve some of their problems.

The PRA system was practiced more in rural councils such as Iringa DC, Kilosa DC and Bagamoyo DC than in urban councils such as Ilala MC and Mwanza CC. One reason for explaining this variation might be geographical proximity of the villages from the council headquarters. For example, it is difficult to plan in areas where inhabitants come from different backgrounds and have different priorities, as is the case in urban areas.

On the question of participation of citizens in the planning process, this process was brief and limited. Council officials in all the six case councils reported the presence of village plans. However, for some councils, many respondents also expressed the presence of village plans, which did not come from the grassroots. The Citizens' Survey showed that few respondents participated in the preparation of village plans (see Table 5). Only 24% of the respondents in Moshi DC said they took part in preparing village plans, followed by Bagamoyo DC (21%) and Mwanza CC (21%). The majority did not take part in preparing village plans i.e. nearly 85% of the respondents in Ilala MC, 82% in Kilosa DC, and 81% in Iringa DC said they did not take part in preparing village plans.

**Table 5: Citizens' Participation in the Preparation of Village/Ward Plans
             (in % of the respondents from each council)**

Council	Yes	No
Ilala	15.2	84.8
Bagamoyo	21	79
Kilosa	18.1	81.9
Iringa	19	81
Moshi	23.8	76.2
Mwanza	21	79
Average	19.7	80.3

Source: Citizens' Survey (2003)

Council officials also said that the village plans were drawn by the local leaders on behalf of the people and then sent to the ward development committees (WDC). A good example is drawn from a district council where some informants in the field alleged that at one point some village leaders wrote up minutes from village meetings that never took place and sent the minutes to the district council. This may indicate that local people are not always involved in the planning or decision-making processes, even though this is officially claimed to be so.

The lack of involvement in the preparation of village plans is also confirmed by a feeling by respondents in the citizens' survey. With the exception of Iringa DC (56%) and Kilosa DC (51%), Table 6 below shows that the respondents felt that they had no influence in setting village plans. Iringa DC has a number of TASAF and other projects, which require the involvement of villagers as a condition for donor support.

**Table 6: Individual's Perceived Influence in the New Planning System
             (% of the respondents in each council)**

Council	Yes	No	Average	Don't Know
Ilala	34.8	42.4	13.8	9
Bagamoyo	43.8	33.3	11.4	11.4
Kilosa	51	26.2	14.8	8.1
Iringa	55.7	30	10.5	3.8
Moshi	35.2	40	13.8	11
Mwanza	47.1	29.5	14.3	9
Average	**44.6**	**33.6**	**13.1**	**8.7**

Source: Citizen's Survey (2003)

Nevertheless, local government reform may increase participation in programmes initiated from below. For example, Table 7 indicates that the majority of those who have heard about the reforms (54%) believe they have more influence in the planning system proposed by the reforms than those who have not (37%).

Table 7: Individual's Perceived Influences in the New Local Government Planning System (% of all respondents who have heard about LGR)

	Do You Think You Have Influence And Your Views Can Get Through In The New Planning System?			
	Yes	No	50-50	Don't Know
Heard about LGR	53.5	26.8	13.3	6.4
Not heard about LGR	36.6	39.6	13	10.8

Source: Citizens Survey (2003)

Perceptions vary among councils on whether the reforms will lead to more popular participation in the planning process. Almost nine in ten (88%) of those interviewed from Mwanza City Council who had heard about the reforms, thought that the reforms would lead to more popular participation in the planning process. However, those who had not heard about the reforms did not make a big difference, given that almost eight in ten (78.9%) of those interviewed also believed that the reforms would lead to more popular participation in the planning process.

On the other hand, almost 80% of those who had heard about the reforms in Moshi DC also believe that the reforms would lead to more popular participation in the planning process. Furthermore, 63% of those who had not heard about the LGR in Moshi DC also believed that the reform would lead to more citizen participation in the planning process.

This difference of opinion varies substantially between those who had heard and those who have not heard about the reforms in Iringa DC. While almost 72% of those who had heard about the LGR in Iringa DC believed that the reform would lead to more citizen participation in the planning process, only 59% of those who had not heard about it thought the reform would lead to more citizen participation in the planning process. Therefore, more effort is required to inform the residents of Iringa DC on the importance of the reform and how it could improve citizen participation. For a comparison among the six case councils, see Table 8.

Table 8: Percentage of the Respondents Who Think that the Local Government Reform Will Lead to More Popular Participation in the Planning Process

Council	Heard about LG Reform (% who think LGR will lead to more participation)			Not heard about LG reform (% who think LGR will lead to more participation)		
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Yes	No	Don't Know
Ilala MC	67.4	17.9	14.7	60.9	21.7	17.4
Bagamoyo DC	76.3	11.3	12.4	60.2	14.2	25.7
Kilosa DC	72.4	17.2	10.3	65.0	21.1	13.8
Iringa DC	71.6	22.7	5.7	59	23.8	17.2
Moshi DC	78.5	15.1	6.5	63.2	8.5	28.2
Mwanza CC	88.1	4.5	7.5	78.9	6.6	14.5

Source: Citizens' Survey (2003)

4.5   Implementation of the Plans

A number of problems facing the bottom-up approach in some of the case councils surveyed were observed. First, there was a lack of real commitment on the part of the local implementers, including the Village Chairpersons, Village Executive Officers (VEO's), Ward Executive Officers (WEO's) and the councillors. Local level planning had not been a broad-based participation, as it involved mainly the technocrats from the regional level and the local councils to supervise and co-ordinate the planning process. In practice, the local people were often sidelined in this process by bureaucrats who wrongly thought that local people did not have the ability to identify and prioritise their problems.

Second, there was a lack of clearly defined and legally provided and binding guidelines for planning, i.e. involving popular participation in local-level planning. Council officials from all the six councils said villagers have to prepare their development plans and submit them to the council. However, according to Ward and Village Officials interviewed in all the case councils no guidelines were issued by their councils on how to prepare their village plan. They also complained that villagers became discouraged when the plans submitted to the councils were not implemented.

Third, there was a lack of financial resources to cover the cost of organising and implementing participation (workshops, meetings, travel, etc.). This was often compounded by poor access to and between communities in sparsely populated rural areas. There were differences between urban and rural councils in this respect in that urban councils had better resources and seemed to be able to implement more village plans than their rural counterparts.

4.6   Funding to Implement the Plans

Efforts to develop bottom up-planning often take place within the framework of externally funded projects (TASAF funded by the World Bank/Government, MEMA funded by DANIDA, etc). Such programmes are therefore often isolated from the strategic planning of local authorities. For example, when funding is available in one council, local priorities are re-directed to take advantage of the available funding without specifically taking into consideration the local priorities. Not surprisingly, people are more willing to participate in well funded projects that produce immediate visible results. In spite of these challenges, many people have shown their interest to participate whenever mobilised to do so by local council officials.

5.   THE LEVEL OF TRUST BETWEEN CITIZENS AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Good governance envisages improved trust between citizens and their leaders. Trusting citizens work better with their leaders to plan and execute programmes that would improve their well-being. This can be cultivated through enhanced grassroots communication. Furthermore, enhanced trust between local authorities and their citizens demand that village councils and ward level officials to be linked to the district level decision making process. This can be executed through mechanism such as:

- Village Development Committees at the village level
- Ward Development Committees at the ward level
- District staff visits and meetings with the local people.

The decision making bodies above are channels of communication through which citizens can communicate with their leaders. The Citizens' Survey found that when people have problems they seek assistance from their grassroots leaders, namely the mtaa/kitongoji leader, village chairpersons, or the ward councillor. However, having heard about local government reforms did not make much difference where people went to seek assistance when they have problems. Thus, 40% of those who had heard about the local government reform reported that they sought assistance from their mtaa/kitongoji leader. Similarly, 46% of those who have not heard about the LGR also sought assistance from the same leaders.

Furthermore, while almost 20% of those who have heard about LGR sought assistance from their village chairpersons, 21% of those who have not heard about the LGR also sought assistance from the same leaders. Furthermore, almost 12% of those who have heard about the reforms sought assistance from their ward councillor, compared to almost 10% of those who have not heard about the LGR who also sought assistance from the ward councillor. Therefore only minor differences between these groups can be observed (see Table 9).

The level of seeking assistance from grassroots leaders is an indication of more trust (or less distrust) in the local leadership. However, the study indicates that some case councils such as Moshi DC and Bagamoyo DC, found it more difficult to establish fruitful contacts and communication between citizens and the local government, and also between the elected local leaders and the local bureaucracy. For example, according to the Citizens' Survey only 5% of the respondents in Moshi DC who had heard about LGR contacted the Ward Councillor, while 34% contacted their kitongoji leader and 29% contacted their Village Chairperson in case of problems (see Table 9).

In the city of Mwanza CC among those who had heard about the reforms, 17% contacted their Ward Councillor, about 46% contacted their mtaa leader and 10% contacted their Village Chair. Similarly, in Ilala MC about 15% contacted their Ward Councillor, while 40% contacted their mtaa leader and 7% their village chairperson. Many people interviewed said they did not feel able to hold their representatives accountable for their actions except during elections when they can vote them out of office. This may perhaps explain the lack of readiness by the citizens to contact these leaders when they have problems.

Table 9: Where Do Citizens Seek Assistance in Case of Any Difficulty?
(% of the respondents from each council and total sample)

Council	Village Chair-person	Mtaa/ Kitongoji Leader	Ward Councillor	DED MD CDO	Religious Leaders	Other Citizens in Neighbourhood	Family	Others	Don't Know
Heard About LG Reform									
Ilala MC	7.4	40	14.7	5.3	1.1	2.1	-	22	7.4
Bagamoyo DC	23.7	36.1	11.3	6.2	1.0	1.0	1.0	14.4	5.2
Kilosa DC	31.0	41.4	8.0	9.2	-	1.1	-	5.7	3.4
Iringa DC	20.5	42.0	11.4	2.3	1.1	2.3	-	13.6	6.8
Moshi DC	29.0	34.4	5.4	-	1.1	-	-	21.5	8.6
Mwanza CC	10.4	45.5	17.2	-	-	0.7	-	22.4	3.7
Not Heard About LG Reform									
Ilala MC	12.2	42.6	14.8	0.9	-	1.7	0.9	12.2	14.8
Bagamoyo DC	31.9	37.2	8	3.5	-	0.9	-	11.5	7.1
Kilosa DC	25.2	51.2	8.9	3.3	0.8	1.6	-	5.7	3.3
Iringa DC	25.4	52.5	3.3	0.8	1.6	2.5	0.8	6.6	6.6
Moshi DC	18.8	41.0	9.4	1.7	-	-	0.9	20.5	7.7
Mwanza CC	6.6	53.9	11.8	-	1.3	-	-	23.7	2.6

Source: Citizens' Survey 2003

There seems to be a sense of distrust between citizens and their local non-elected leaders. For example, the citizens' survey revealed that people rarely contacted their DED, MD or even CDO. Among those who have heard about the reforms, none contacted these officials in Mwanza CC and in Moshi DC. The highest contact rate was 9% recorded in Kilosa DC.

There appears to be a deep concern about the relationship between the councillors and the council officers. In some councils, e.g. Kilosa, Moshi DC and Bagamoyo, this relationship was tense before the introduction of the LGR and the workshops on governance. According to the various elected and non-elected officials, interviewed during field visits, these workshops have helped to ease tensions. In Moshi DC it was particularly pointed out by both council officials and councillors interviewed that the workshops have helped councillors to understand their roles and responsibilities and boundaries of power between elected officials and the council bureaucrats. Hence, the workshops seemed to have helped to improve trust and working relations between councillors and council staff. The same was also noted for the other case councils.

Democratic local governance as envisaged by the LGR has not been successful in removing the mindset of centralism of the local and central government officers. Given the long period of the one

party centralistic system and the short time span since the LGR was introduced, this is not surprising. It is vital to enhance the trust relations between all key stakeholders in the local government reform programme. This is addressed by the reforms by such measures as bottom-up planning and various accountability enhancing mechanisms. Hence, councils are required to publish their accounts and consult citizens before making decisions that affect them. However, the perceptions of most officials (both politicians and council bureaucrats in the case councils) indicate that citizen participation and trust is inadequate, despite the LGR.

6.   IMPROVED CITIZENS' RIGHTS

The policy paper on the local government reform[7] in Tanzania emphasises the need to create a new local government administration answerable to the local councils and also allowing people to participate in government affairs at the grassroots level. Reassuringly, the majority of the respondents in the citizens' survey believe government officials do a good job (see Table 10). However, whether the respondents had heard about the local government reform or not, did not seem to have made much difference to the ordinary citizen. Many of the interviewees had not heard about the local government reform programme, yet they appeared to have strong faith in the performance of their council's staff. According to the Citizens' Survey, about 55% of those who have heard about LGR feel that the council does a good job, against about 54% of those that have not heard about LGR who hold the same opinion.

Table 10: Views on Government Officials (% of all respondents)

Views on Local Government Officials	VEO	WEO	Council Staff	Councillor	Village Chairman /Mtaa leader	Members of Parliament
They Do as Best as They Can	54.7	65.2	54.8	61.9	76.6	56.4
They Harass People	4.3	3.3	5.3	2.3	2.6	1.0
They Are Corrupt	3.4	3.3	7.8	1.4	1.8	0.7
They Are Lazy	8.0	8.0	10.6	20.3	8.5	21.0

Source: Citizens' S urvey (2003)

Field interviews carried out in August 2003 show that despite policy statements and attempts to involve people in the management of local government institutions, citizen participation in the decision making process of their local government remains a big challenge. Participation in this sense means that people take part in the planning and decision making processes that determine their well being. However, council officials interviewed appear to perceive citizens as incapable of planning their own affairs. Some officials in the case councils even treated planned activities from village councils as mere wishful thinking particularly because village governments and the councils lacked adequate funds to meet all the requests from the villages.

The Citizens' Survey indicates that very few categories of council officials do harass people, as shown in Table 10. Table shows that only 4% of VEO, 3% of WEO, 5% of council staff and 2% of councillors are perceived to harass people. In most cases, the survey indicated that their leaders do a good job and for the majority of the respondents' views have remained unchanged for the last two years. However, there was a general complaint during the interviews that councillors and council officials only visit their constituencies just before the elections.

It can also be discerned from Table 10 that grassroots officials are highly rated by citizens. Thus, over two thirds of those interviewed in the citizens' survey (76.6%) are of the view that the village chairperson/*mtaa* leader do as best as they can.

---

[7] URT, 1998

Among the elected officials, the councillors came second, with 61% of the respondents saying they do the best they can, compared to 56% saying that members of parliament do the best they can.

The Ward Executive Officer (WEO) is ranked first in the category of non-elected officials, with 65% of the respondents saying they do they best they can. Then follow the perceptions of citizens of their VEO and council staff, with nearly 55% of the respondents saying that these officials do the best they can.

Perceptions of grass roots leaders differ from council to council. Table 11 for example shows that 76.7% of the citizens of Bagamoyo District Council think that their VEOs are doing as best as they can, compared to only 23.8% of the citizens of Mwanza CC. The low perception rates of VEOs in Mwanza CC (23.8%) and Ilala MC (35.7%) can also be explained by the urban factor of the two councils, which have few villages with less VEOs. Furthermore, the Member of Parliament for Mwanza CC appears to enjoy a high confidence rate from respondents (70.5%) compared to the Member of Parliament for Ilala with a confidence rate of 41.9%.

Table 11: Percentage of Respondents with the Opinion that Local Elected and Non-Elected Leaders Do the Best they Can (% of all respondents)

Council	VEO	WEO	Council Staff	Councillor	Village Chair/ Mtaa Leader	Member of Parliament
Ilala MC	35.7	61.4	50.0	59.3	72.4	41.9
Bagamoyo DC	76.7	72.4	57.6	64.3	83.3	62.9
Kilosa DC	55.2	64.3	64.3	51.9	80.5	44.3
Iringa DC	71.9	67.6	73.8	66.7	79.5	71.4
Moshi DC	64.8	55.2	40.5	56.2	61.4	47.6
Mwanza CC	23.8	70.5	42.4	72.9	82.4	70.5

Source: Citizens' Survey (2003)

WEOs in Bagamoyo District (72.4%) and Mwanza CC (70.5%) are positively perceived to do the best they can, compared to their counterparts in Moshi DC where only 55.2 % of those interviewed think they do the best they can. Perhaps among the council staff in Iringa DC has the highest support among the population with 73.8% of those interviewed saying their council staffs are doing the best they can. Furthermore, less than half of those interviewed (40.5% in Moshi DC and 42.4% in Mwanza CC) think that their council staff are doing the best they can. The differences in opinion expressed by the respondents can perhaps be explained by the existence of different political forces in these councils.

Respondents in Mwanza CC show the highest confidence on their councillors with 72.9% saying councillors do the best as they can compared to Kilosa DC where only 51.9% of those interviewed saying their councillors do the best they can.

When it comes to confidence in the village chairperson/ mtaa leader, Bagamoyo DC (83.3%), Mwanza CC (82.4%) and Kilosa DC (80.5%) exhibited the highest confidence, with those interviewed saying they do the best they can. The citizens of Iringa DC (71.4%) and Mwanza CC (70.5%) think their members of parliament are doing as best as they can, compared to only 41.9% in Ilala MC. For comparison of citizens' perceptions of elected and non-elected officials, see Table 11.

Although many people said that they have good faith in their councillors and council officers, they could not mention the means by which they can hold their leaders accountable. For example, there are no clear procedures on how people were participating in the council affairs apart from through their elected councillors who attend the council meetings. Instruments and procedures that ordinary people are supposed to use in case they want to hold council officials accountable for their actions are not in place. Nevertheless there are differences of opinion between the case councils.

7. REDUCED CORRUPTION

According to *"The Report on the Commission of Corruption"*[8], popularly known in Tanzania as the 'Warioba Report', corruption in local government authorities occurs mostly in the following areas of operation:

- Councillors and council staff receive bribes to facilitate recruitment, promotion, land allocating and issuing of business trading licenses for otherwise unauthorised areas, and
- Local council leaders receive bribes to award tenders for the provision of goods and services to the council.

7.1 Perceptions of Corruption

Corruption is still prevalent in local authorities, though there are big differences in citizen's perceptions of the level of corruption across councils (see Table 12). Hence, in Kilosa DC only 40% of the respondents viewed corruption as a serious problem, compared to over two thirds of the respondents (72%) in Moshi DC who viewed it as a major problem. Moreover, slightly over half of the respondents in Moshi DC (53%) said the level of corruption was worse now compared to 2 years ago. Table 12 shows that only 29% of the respondents in Kilosa DC said corruption was now worse compared to two years ago.

Table 12: Importance of Fighting Corruption (in % of the respondents by council)

Description		Council						Total
		Ilala MC	Bagamoyo DC	Kilosa DC	Iringa DC	Moshi DC	Mwanza CC	
Is corruption a serious problem in this council?	Yes	64.3	61.4	40.0	48.6	71.9	69.5	59.3
	Average	12.9	10.0	22.9	16.7	8.1	7.1	12.9
	No	14.8	16.7	18.6	21.0	8.1	10.5	14.9
	Don't know	8.1	11.9	18.6	13.8	11.9	12.9	12.9
Level of corruption in the council compared to two years ago	Worse	44.8	39,0	28.6	29.5	52.9	40.0	39.1
	No Change	23.8	17.6	7.6	4.8	19.0	19.5	15.4
	Less	21.4	28.1	39.5	38.6	12.4	23.8	27.3
	Don't Know	10.0	15.2	24.3	27.1	15.7	16.7	18.2
Corruption is a natural occurrence; there is no need to denounce it?	Agree	7.6	8.1	5.7	5.7	3.3	1.0	5.2
	To some degree	8.6	5.7	6.2	3.8	3.3	2.9	5.1
	Disagree	81.9	80.0	82.4	85.2	90.0	93.8	85.6
	Don't know	1.9	6.2	5.7	5.2	3.3	2.4	4.1
Corruption is a disease; it should be denounced in every case	Agree	94.3	94.3	94.3	93.8	92.4	95.2	94.0
	To some degree	4.3	-	1.9	3.8	1.0	0.5	1.9
	Disagree	0.5	1.9	2.4	1.4	3.8	1.9	2.0
	Don't know	1.0	3.8	1.4	1.0	2.9	2.4	2.1

Source: Citizens' Survey (2003)

---

[8] URT, 1996

(This table is also found in the REPOA Special Paper 16 *"Local Government Finances and Financial Management in Tanzania"*).

Discussions with elected and non-elected council officials in the case councils supported citizens' perceptions that corruption was a problem, particularly for the tendering system operating in some councils. In other councils, the procurement of goods and services such as the supplies of materials, the processing of tender bids, and the awarding of works contracts, particularly in roads, was frequently mentioned as areas with extensive corruption. In one district council district agents are accused to have colluded with road contractors to flout tender regulations for personal benefits.

7.2   Who is Perceived as Most Likely to Take Part in Corruption?

The police force is perceived by citizens as the institution most likely to perpetuate corruption, followed by ordinary citizens. Perceptions of who is most responsible for perpetuating corruption vary among the six case councils (Table 13). Thus, while 35% of the respondents in Ilala MC said the police are corrupt, only 19% in Kilosa gave this answer. This response might reflect less citizen contact with the police in rural Kilosa compared to urban Ilala.

Table 13: Who is Most Responsible for Perpetuating Corruption?

        (in % of all respondents by council)

Description	Council						Average
	Ilala MC	Bagamoyo DC	Kilosa DC	Iringa DC	Moshi DC	Mwanza CC	
Ordinary Citizens	13.3	20.0	20.0	23.3	24.3	15.2	19.4
Business People	11.0	5.7	2.4	7.1	4.8	3.8	5.8
Local Government Officials	8.1	7.1	7.1	12.9	17.6	19.5	12.1
The Police	34.8	30.5	19.0	21.4	21.9	21.9	24.9
Teachers	-	-	0.5	-	-	0.5	0.2
Health Workers	15.7	11.9	19.0	7.6	4.8	10.5	11.6
Councillors	-	0.5	1.9	0.5	0.5	-	0.6
Village leaders	1.0	0.5	6.2	5.2	1.0	2.9	2.8
Others	16.2	23.8	23.8	21.9	25.2	25,7	22.8

Source: Citizens' Survey (2003)

As many as 19% of the respondents in Kilosa said that health workers were also perpetuating corruption compare to 15% of the respondents in Ilala MC and 11% in Bagamoyo DC.

Some councillors complained during field visits that senior council employees were not being fired due to corruption, but were simply transferred to other councils, without making the reason for this transfer public. This was seen as legitimising corruption and undermining the credibility of anti-corruption measures.

The Local Government Reform Programme provides a good avenue for combating corruption. This can be done through improving the working conditions of council staff through offering improved remuneration, training and other incentives. From the field interviews, it was also noted that poor salaries compelled people into corruption in order to make ends meet. However, the emphasis on accountability and transparency by the Local Government Reform attempts to address the scourge of corruption in local governance. Indeed, the reform process has helped to reduce some of the corrupt practices in local authorities through holding workshops and seminars on good governance that have encouraged officials to be more transparent in their actions, as compared to the past. In Iringa DC, discussions with various people indicated that villagers are now more aware of the procedures to be followed by council officials.

There is a ray of hope in the war against corruption with citizens overwhelmingly denouncing corruption. When asked "Is corruption a natural occurrence; no need to denounce it?" 80% of the respondents in Bagamoyo DC and 94% in Mwanza CC denounced corruption. This indicated that people are fed up with corruption. Hence, over 90% of the respondents in all six case councils are of the opinion that corruption is a disease that should be denounced in every case. For many people it was the various seminars organised by the Local Government Reform Programme that made it easier for them to have the courage to denounce corrupt practices.

8. GENDER MAINSTREAMING IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORMS

According to the Council of Europe, *"Gender mainstreaming is the (re)organization, improvement, development and evaluation of policy processes, so that a gender equality perspective is incorporated in all policies, at all levels and at all stages, by actors normally involved in policy-making"*[9]. Mainstreaming is therefore seen as a strategy for mobilising administrators, politicians, elected leaders and to include equality in their everyday practices. It is therefore important to include gender perspectives in all sectors of public affairs. There is a need to recognise the importance of women's participation in developing government policies and programmes. The representation of women in many aspects of formally organised life in Tanzania is however, very low. It can be observed from the field interviews that in urban councils such as Mwanza and Ilala, women were more represented in the council administration as compared to rural councils.

Discussions with various council officials indicated that the issue of gender mainstreaming had not been an important aspect when developing the council plans. Although some of the council planning officers insisted that gender mainstreaming has been introduced to every sector, there had not been concrete measures to implement this. Only a few women leaders were in place at the time of this study, including the DED in Kilosa and some Community Development and Education Officers. In Mwanza CC the Deputy Mayor was a woman. Furthermore, in Ilala MC, women leaders constituted almost 63% of men leaders compared to Moshi DC where women leaders constituted only 13% of men in the council (Table 14).

Table 14: Elected and Non-Elected Council Officials

		Ilala	Bagamoyo	Kilosa	Iringa	Moshi	Mwanza
Council Management Team (CMT)	Males	8	11	11	11	15	8
	Females	5	4	2	4	2	3
Politicians	Males	22 2 MPs	18 2 MPs	38 3 MPs	36 2 MPs	33 2 MPs	19 2 MPs
	Females	15 2 MPs	6	14	11 1 MP	12 1 MP	11

Source: Councils' contact persons

The case councils lacked gender units in which some council budgets could be allocated. The process of gender mainstreaming including appropriate training, (regular workshops on gender related issues) and the development of gender sensitive monitoring and evaluation systems, were all absent or poorly implemented in most of the case councils visited.

Women were also said to be afraid to run for elections because of cultural and social reasons. Data from the National Electoral Commission[10] summarised in Table 15 shows that Ilala MC had the highest number of women candidates (18.6% of all candidates).

---

[9]   Horelli, 2001

[10]   National Electoral Commission, 2001

It was further observed in Bagamoyo District Council that, women were not elected in regular elections because they did not have funds, were shy, afraid of witchcraft, lacked self-confidence and would rather remain with their children. Table 15 also shows that there were no women candidates in Bagamoyo District in the 2000 Councillor Elections. Mwanza CC had the highest percentage of women elected councillors (15% followed by Ilala MC (13.6%).

Table 15: Percentage of Women Candidates and Elected Councillors

2000 Councillor Elections		Ilala	Bagamoyo	Kilosa	Iringa	Moshi	Mwanza
Candidates	Males	70 81.4%	39 100%	89 96%	5 95%	84 96.6%	71 92.2%
	Females	16 18.6%	-	4 4%	3 5%	3 3.4%	6 7.8%
	Total	86	39	93	59	87	77
Elected Councillors	Males	19 86.4%	16 100%	35 94.6%	31 97%	31 100%	17 85%
	Females	3 3.6%	-	2 5.4%	1 3%	-	3 15%
	Total	22	16	37	32	31	20

Source: National Electoral Commission, Local Government Election Results 2000

Some efforts have been made by the government to increase the proportion of women in decision making processes such as the introduction of a quota system of preferential or reserved seats in local councils. The local government election laws also provide that women affirmative action seats have to be not less than 30% of all elected councillors. Table 15 shows that Ilala MC Council has the highest representation of women councillors among the case councils with about 41% women councillors, compared to Bagamoyo with only 27%. Iringa DC council appears to have a lower share of women councillors (23%) than that provided by the affirmative action legislations. Also in some councils e.g. in Bagamoyo, about 10% of the budget is allocated to cover programmes deemed sensitive to women's concerns such as water, health and small loans to women groups.

9.   PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL ELECTIONS

Through elections leaders are put into office by their citizens, according to the Governance Study (2003)[11], non-elected members of local councils (women's special seats)comprise, on average, 30% of the locally elected leaders. The introduction of multi-party politics has expanded the democratic space for more effective popular participation. A large turnout for voter registration and voting in the 1995 and 2000 general elections suggests that Tanzanians no longer regard voting as a formality.

Table 16: Reasons for Not Voting in the Last Village and Ward Elections

Description		Reason for Not Voting in the Last Ward Election							Number of Respondents
		Voted	Not Interested	Not Aware	Political Justification	Vote Does Not Matter	Below Age 18	Other	
Reason for Not Voting in the Last Village Election	Voted	1,023 81%	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,023
	Not Interested	-	22 1.7%	-	-	3 0.2%	1 0.1%	13 1.0%	40
	Not Aware	-	-	22 1.7%	-	-	-	-	22
	Impeded from Voting	-	1 0.0%	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Political Justification	-	-	-	4 0.3%		-	-	4
	Vote Does Not Matter	-	-	-	-	-	20 1.6%	-	20
	Below Age 18	-	-	-	-	-	43 3.4%	-	43
	Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	107 8.5%	107
Total		1,075	21	14	3	18	45	84	1,260

Source: Citizens' Survey (2003)

In the 2000 local government elections 9,642,372 citizens registered for voting[12]. The number of citizens who actually turned out on the polling day was 6,877,152 equivalent to about 71% of the registered voters, which can be regarded as a high turnout. This is also reflected in the Citizens' Survey, where 81% of the respondents said they did participate in both the last village and ward elections (Table 16). Hence, only 16% of the respondents said they were not interested in grassroots elections, while only 11% of the respondents said they were not aware of the grassroots elections.

According to the Citizens' Survey most of the respondents participated in the 1999 local government elections (Table 16). Reasons for not voting included not interested in elections; political justifications; vote does not matter etc.; but these reasons scored low. This indicates that people have started to see the importance of practicing their democratic rights.

---

[11]   Governance Study conducted by the Department of Political Science and Public Administration of the University of Dar es Salaam, 2003.

[12]   National Election Commission 2000

Table 17: Respondents Who Participated in the Last Local Election
(% of all respondents by councils)

Council	Voted	Not Voted						
		Reasons for Not Voting in the Last Village/Ward Election						
		Not Interested	Not Informed About Election	Impeded From Voting	Had a Political Justification for Not Voting	My Vote Does Not Matter Anyway	Was Not Old Enough	Other
Ilala MC	**69.5**	3.8	4.8	-	1.0	3.8	2.9	14.3
Bagamoyo DC	**82.4**	2.4	1.4	0.5	0.5	1.9	4.8	6.2
Kilosa DC	**91.4**	-	1.4	-	-	0.5	1.4	5.2
Iringa DC	**89.0**	0.5	1.0	-	0.5	1.4	3.3	4.3
Moshi DC	**81.9**	1.4	1.0	-	-	0.5	5.7	9.5
Mwanza CC	**81.9**	1.9	1.0	-	-	1.4	2.4	11.4
Total	**82.7**	1.7	1.7	0.1	0.3	1.6	3.4	8.5

Source: Citizens' Survey (2003)

Participation in local elections varies among the case councils. Table 17 shows that Kilosa has the highest voting rate (91%) in local elections, while Ilala MC had the lowest rate (70%). In Ilala MC almost 5% said they were not aware or not informed about grassroots elections, compared to only 1% in Iringa DC, Moshi DC and Mwanza CC. Voter apathy is, however, relatively low ranging from almost 4% in Ilala MC to 0.5% of all respondents in Iringa DC and Moshi DC respectively, who said they did not vote because they considered that vote did not matter. There is thus need for more concerted efforts to ensure increased voter and civic education. Citizens must be made aware that in a democracy every single vote matters.

10.   CONCLUSIONS

One of the objectives of local government reform is to increase citizens' participation in the planning and implementation of development activities. This is based on the assumption that local government authorities are more responsive to local needs than the central government.

The current local government reform has not been in operation long enough to promote local autonomy at the grassroots level. Thus, for most of the case councils, participation in local matters beyond the village level had not been well established. Hence, the accountability of the local government was fairly low. This was exacerbated by the continued inability of the councils to hire and fire council staff, including senior employees. Hence, councillors who represented citizens in their localities still lacked the power to instil discipline and productivity among senior council bureaucrats. The most they could do is to complain and request the central government authority to remove non-performing or corrupt officers.

Moreover, the bottom-up planning which is supposed to start at the village level was not well practiced. Few citizens at the grassroots levels had participated in the planning process. Many had not even heard about the local government reform programme. Furthermore, most of the councils visited had no long term planning, i.e. no clear council plans to meet the future challenges that may face their councils in the developmental process. This might have been due to limited fiscal autonomy in most of the case councils. Planning requires adequate financial resources, which were inadequate for all the case councils, this is a problem particularly for rural councils.

Most respondents in the Citizens' Survey believed that local leaders did a good job and this view has remained unchanged over the last two years. However, as some citizens indicated, they do not have mechanisms in place to hold their local leaders accountable. Moreover, citizens do not have the power to recall non-performing representatives, as there is no provision in the local government system. Periodic elections could be the best strategy to discipline local elected officers. Five years between elections is a long period to tolerate unaccountable and sometimes incompetent local leaders. Furthermore, corruption in local government authorities is perceived to be a serious problem.

The decentralization process geared through the local government reform programme has not yet managed to integrate the sectoral ministries at the local levels. One of the major objectives of the LGR is to integrate all sector ministries' departments under the co-ordination of the directors of the councils and the full councils. This form of integration will allow each head of department to be the technical head of his or her department. In the six councils surveyed, the only sector which had achieved almost full integration into the council management was the health sector. On the contrary, the education sector still appeared to be run by the central line ministry.

In order to have real participatory planning at the local levels, the central government needs to devolve the decision-making power to the elected councillors. Furthermore, the concept of local government autonomy will only make sense when the local authorities have independent and reliable sources of income. The current local government reform has many good provisions for self-governance that are yet to be fully integrated and operational in the village, ward and council levels. Nevertheless, we are aware that citizens' trust in the council authorities was not very high, perhaps because they have not yet seen the positive outcomes promised under the LGR programme.

Furthermore, the legal status of the local governments, as it is given in the constitution and the various legislations establishing local authorities, still implies a highly pervasive influence by the central government. Thus, there is a weakness in the setup of local governments as well as in the implementation of the LGR. This will need more time and resources, especially to changing the mindsets of both local and central actors towards a common goal of good governance at the grassroots levels.

APPENDIX: INDICATORS OF CHANGE IN GOVERNANCE

Inputs	Changes in Governance		
	Objectives	Indicators of Change	Methodology/Data Sources
LGRP -Focus on training and capacity building -New administrative procedures	1. Participatory Planning	• Citizens' perceptions of their involvement in the planning process • NGOs'/CSOs' perceptions of their involvement in the planning process • Council staffs' perceptions of citizens' involvement in planning • Elected leaders'/councillors' perceptions of citizen involvement • Implementation of village plans (if village plans exists) • Available guidelines on bottom-up planning at all levels of government	• Citizens' Survey • Interviews with NGO/CSO representatives • Interviews with LA staff (DED/MD/CD;DPLO) • Interviews with elected officials (hamlet, village, ward) • Interviews with stakeholders at the central level (ALAT, LGRT) • Data from the LAs on how many villages/wards have been covered by bottom-up planning seminars and workshops • Share of LA budget allocated according to village/ward plans • Review the village, ward and council plans • Council documents commenting/discussing village/ward plans and priorities
	2. Gender Mainstreaming	• Gender balance in council staff/heads of departments • Gender balance in the council • Gender balance in the village government	• Proportion of women in the councils staff (heads of departments, WEOs, VEOs) • Proportion of women councillors • Proportion of women in the village government (such data can be collected by the internal contact persons in the case councils)
Other Reforms/ Programmes	3. Improved Trust Between Citizens and Council Staff	• Perceptions of the relations between citizens and their council • Perceptions of private-public relationship • Increased tax compliance	• Citizens' Survey • Interviews with council municipal treasury • Interviews with councillors • Data from the LA's treasury

Other Factors	Indicators	Data Sources
4. Improved Trust Between Council Staff and Councillors	• Perceptions of the relations between council staff and councillors	• Staff survey • Councillor survey • Interviews with council municipal treasury • Interviews with staff and councillors
5. Improved Citizens' Rights	• Perceptions on accountability and transparency in council affairs vis-à-vis the citizens • Citizens' understanding of their rights • Less coercion and harassment used for tax collection etc.	• Citizens' Survey • Interviews of council staff, councillors and elected leaders at village/hamlet levels
6. Reduced Corruption	• Perceptions on the corruption level in the LA • Reported cases of corruption in the LA • Implementation of anti-corruption action plans	• Citizens' Survey • Interviews with council MT, councillors and elected leaders at village/hamlet level • LA's reports Internal Audit Reports • CAG's reports • Councils' responses to CAG-reports • Councils' responses to the Local Authority • Local Authorities Accounting Committee (LAAC) on CAG reports. (LAAC is a standing committee of the Parliament of Tanzania
7. Increased Participation in Local Elections	• Increased number of voters taking part in the elections • Voters' perceptions of the transparency of the elections	• Statistics from DED's/MD's/CD's office • Citizens' Survey
8. Devolved Human Resource Management	• New staff regulations and their implementation • Data on hiring and firing of staff • Perceptions on nepotism	• Documentation from the LGRT and the councils • Interviews with council staff at all levels • Interviews with councillors • Surveys of council staff and councillors
9. Increased HIV/ AIDS Awareness	• The number of people tested for HIV/AIDS in the LA • Number of HIV infected council staff	• Data from the LA • Data from the Ministry of Health

33

11.   REFERENCES

Fjeldstad, Odd-Helge et al (2004) Local Government Finances and Financial Management in Tanzania: Observations from six councils 2002 – 2003. REPOA Special Paper No. 16, 2004

Formative Process Research on the Local Government Reform in Tanzania. Citizen Survey, October 2003 by Knut Nygaard, supervised by Odd-Helge Fjeldstad, Chr. Michelsen Institute, 27 November 2003

Governance Study conducted by the Department of Political Science and Public Administration of the University of Dar es Salaam, 2003

Inception Report: Formative Process Research on the Local Government Reform Programme in Tanzania, 30th October 2002

Interviews with the District Chairman for CCM, (Bagamoyo) Mohammed Ali Mbagulwa, 21/2/2003 by Tor Halvolsen and Amon Chaligha Bagamoyo District Council interviews Series

Interview with the Council Chairperson of Kilosa District Council, Mr. Isoore Makarius on 20th August 2003 by Odd-Helge Fjeldstad, Ambrose Kessy and Florida Henjewele

Michael J. Goldsmith and Edward C. Central and Local Government Relations in Britain. SAGE Modern Politics Series Vol.13 London, 1987 p.71

National Electoral Commission (2001), Local Government Elections 2000 Election Results (Parties), Government Printer, Dar es Salaam

President's Office-Regional Administration and Local Government: Progress Report on the Implementation of the Local Government Reform Programme, November 2002

Turner, M. and D. Hulme (1997), Governance, Administration and Development, making the state work, London: MacMillan Press Ltd

United Nations Development Programme Report (1997)

United Republic of Tanzania [URT] 1996. Report of the Commission on Corruption (The Warioba Report), Dar es Salaam

United Republic of Tanzania [URT], 1996. Local Government Reform Agenda

United Republic of Tanzania [URT] 1998. Policy Paper on Local Government Reform, Government Printer, Dar es Salaam

United Republic of Tanzania [URT], 2002. Progress Report on the Implementation of the Local Government Reform Programme

OTHER PUBLICATIONS BY REPOA

Books

"Researching Poverty in Tanzania: problems, policies and perspectives."
    Edited by Idris Kikula, Jonas Kipokola, Issa Shivji, Joseph Semboja and Ben Tarimo

"Local Perspectives on Globalisation: The African Case."
    Edited by Joseph Semboja, Juma Mwapachu and Eduard Jansen

"Poverty Alleviation in Tanzania: Recent Research Issues."
    Edited by M.S.D. Bagachwa

Research Reports

07.2   *"Financing Public Heath Care: Insurance, User Fees or Taxes? Welfare Comparisons in Tanzania."*
          Deograsias P. Mushi

07.1   *"Rice Production in the Maswa District, Tanzania and its Contribution to Poverty Alleviation."*
          Jerry A. Ngailo, Abiud L. Kaswamila and Catherine J. Senkoro

06.3   *"The Contribution of Microfinance Institutions to Poverty Reduction in Tanzania."*
          Severine S. A. Kessy and Fratern M. Urio

06.2   *"The Role of Indigenous Knowledge in Combating Soil Infertility and Poverty in the Usambara Mountains, Tanzania."*
          Juma M. Wickama and Stephen T. Mwihomeke

06.1   *"Assessing Market Distortions Affecting Poverty Reduction Efforts on Smallholder Tobacco Production in Tanzania."*
          Dennis Rweyemamu and Monica Kimaro

05.1   *"Changes in the Upland Irrigation System and Implications for Rural Poverty Alleviation. A Case of the Ndiwa Irrigation System, West Usambara Mountains, Tanzania."*
          Cosmas H. Sokoni and Tamilwai C. Shechambo

04.3   *"The Role of Traditional Irrigation Systems in Poverty Alleviation in Semi-Arid Areas: The Case of Chamazi in Lushoto District, Tanzania."*
          Abiud L. Kaswamila and Baker M. Masuruli

04.2   *"Assessing the Relative Poverty of Clients and Non-clients of Non-bank Micro-finance Institutions. The case of the Dar es Salaam and Coast Regions."*
          Hugh K. Fraser and Vivian Kazi

04.1   *"The Use of Sustainable Irrigation for Poverty Alleviation in Tanzania. The Case of Smallholder Irrigation Schemes in Igurusi, Mbarali District."*
          Shadrack Mwakalila and Christine Noe

03.7   *"Poverty and Environment: Impact analysis of Sustainable Dar es Salaam Project on "Sustainable Livelihoods" of Urban Poor."*
          M.A.M. Victor and A.M.P. Makalle

03.6   *"Access to Formal and Quasi-Formal Credit by Smallholder Farmers and Artisanal Fishermen: A Case of Zanzibar."*
Khalid Mohamed

03.5   *"Poverty and Changing Livelihoods of Migrant Maasai Pastoralists in Morogoro and Kilosa Districts."*
C. Mung'ong'o and D. Mwamfupe

03.4   *"The Role of Tourism in Poverty Alleviation in Tanzania."*
Nathanael Luvanga and Joseph Shitundu

03.3   *"Natural Resources Use Patterns and Poverty Alleviation Strategies in the Highlands and Lowlands of Karatu and Monduli Districts – A Study on Linkages and Environmental Implications."*
Pius Zebbe Yanda and Ndalahwa Faustin Madulu

03.2   *"Shortcomings of Linkages Between Environmental Conservation and Poverty Alleviation in Tanzania."*
Idris S. Kikula, E.Z. Mnzava and Claude Mung'ong'o

03.1   *"School Enrolment, Performance, Gender and Poverty (Access to Education) in Mainland Tanzania."*
A.V.Y. Mbelle and J. Katabaro

02.3   *"Poverty and Deforestation around the Gazetted Forests of the Coastal Belt of Tanzania."*
Godius Kahyarara, Wilfred Mbowe and Omari Kimweri

02.2   *"The Role of Privatisation in Providing the Urban Poor Access to Social Services: the Case of Solid Waste Collection Services in Dar es Salaam."*
Suma Kaare

02.1   *"Economic Policy and Rural Poverty in Tanzania: A Survey of Three Regions."*
Longinus Rutasitara

01.5   *"Demographic Factors, Household Composition, Employment and Household Welfare."*
S.T. Mwisomba and B.H.R. Kiilu

01.4   *"Assessment of Village Level Sugar Processing Technology in Tanzania."*
A.S. Chungu, C.Z.M. Kimambo and T.A.L. Bali

01.3   *"Poverty and Family Size Patterns: Comparison Across African Countries."*
C. Lwechungura Kamuzora

01.2   *"The Role of Traditional Irrigation Systems (Vinyungu) in Alleviating Poverty in Iringa Rural District."*
Tenge Mkavidanda and Abiud Kaswamila

01.1   *"Improving Farm Management Skills for Poverty Alleviation: The Case of Njombe District."*
Aida Isinika and Ntengua Mdoe

00.5   *"Conservation and Poverty: The Case of Amani Nature Reserve."*
George Jambiya and Hussein Sosovele

00.4   *"Poverty and Family Size in Tanzania: Multiple Responses to Population Pressure?"*
C.L. Kamuzora and W. Mkanta

00.3   "*Survival and Accumulation Strategies at the Rural-Urban Interface: A Study of Ifakara Town, Tanzania."*
Anthony Chamwali

00.2 *"Poverty, Environment and Livelihood along the Gradients of the Usambaras on Tanzania."*
Adolfo Mascarenhas

00.1 *"Foreign Aid, Grassroots Participation and Poverty Alleviation in Tanzania: The HESAWA Fiasco."*
S. Rugumamu

99.1 *"Credit Schemes and Women's Empowerment for Poverty Alleviation: The Case of Tanga Region, Tanzania."*
I.A.M. Makombe, E.I. Temba and A.R.M. Kihombo

98.5 *"Youth Migration and Poverty Alleviation: A Case Study of Petty Traders (Wamachinga) in Dar es Salaam."*
A.J. Liviga and R.D.K Mekacha

98.4 *"Labour Constraints, Population Dynamics and the AIDS Epidemic: The Case of Rural Bukoba District, Tanzania."*
C.L. Kamuzora and S. Gwalema

98.3 *"The Use of Labour-Intensive Irrigation Technologies in Alleviating Poverty in Majengo, Mbeya Rural District."*
J. Shitundu and N. Luvanga

98.2 *"Poverty and Diffusion of Technological Innovations to Rural Women: The Role of Entrepreneurship."*
B.D. Diyamett, R.S. Mabala and R. Mandara

98.1 *"The Role of Informal and Semi-Formal Finance in Poverty Alleviation in Tanzania: Results of a Field Study in Two Regions."*
A.K. Kashuliza, J.P. Hella, F.T. Magayane and Z.S.K. Mvena

97.3 *"Educational Background, Training and Their Influence on Female-Operated Informal Sector Enterprises."*
J. O'Riordan. F. Swai and A. Rugumyamheto

97.2 *"The Impact of Technology on Poverty Alleviation: The Case of Artisanal Mining in Tanzania."*
B W. Mutagwaba, R. Mwaipopo Ako and A. Mlaki

97.1 *"Poverty and the Environment: The Case of Informal Sandmining, Quarrying and Lime-Making Activities in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania."*
George Jambiya, Kassim Kulindwa and Hussein Sosovele

Special Papers

07.22 *"Local Governance in Tanzania: Observations From Six Councils 2002-2003."*
Amon Chaligha, Florida Henjewele, Ambrose Kessy and Geoffrey Mwambe

07.21 *"Tanzanian Non-Governmental Organisations – Their Perceptions of Their Relationship with the Government of Tanzania and Donors, and Their Role and Impact on Poverty Reduction and Development."*

06.20 *"Service Delivery in Tanzania: Findings from Six Councils 2002-2003."*
Einar Braathen and Geoffrey Mwambe

06.19 *"Developing Social Protection in Tanzania Within a Context of Generalised Insecurity."*
Marc Wuyts

Project Briefs

Brief 6   Local Government Reform in Tanzania 2002 - 2005: Summary of Research Findings on Governance, Finance and Service Delivery

Brief 5   Children Participating in Research

Brief 4   Changes in Household Non-Income Welfare Indicators - Can poverty mapping be used to predict a change in per capita consumption over time?

Brief 3   Participatory Approaches to Local Government Planning in Tanzania, the Limits to Local Participation

Brief 2   Improving Transparency of Financial Affairs at the Local Government Level in Tanzania

Brief 1   Governance Indicators on the Tanzania Governance Noticeboard Website

TGN1   What is the Tanzania Governance Noticeboard?

LGR 12   Trust in Public Finance: Citizens' Views on taxation by Local Authorities in Tanzania

LGR 11   Domestic Water Supply: The Need for a Big Push

LGR10   Is the community health fund better than user fees for financing public health care?

LGR 9   Are fees the major barrier to accessing public health care?

LGR 8   Primary education since the introduction of the Primary Education Development Plan

LGR 7   Citizens' access to information on local government finances

LGR 6   Low awareness amongst citizens of local government reforms

LGR 5   Fees at the dispensary level: Is universal access being compromised?

LGR 4   TASAF – a support or an obstacle to local government reform

LGR 3   Councillors and community leaders – partnership or conflict of interest? Lessons from the Sustainable Mwanza Project

LGR 2   New challenges for local government revenue enhancement

LGR 1   About the Local Government Reform project