

FINAL EVALUATION OF THE 10TH EDF SUPPORT TO CULTURE IN TANZANIA

Framework Contract SIEA 2018 – Lot 4

Letter of Contract No. 2019/406621

Final Report

Prepared by:

Marta CARRASCOSA

Judith STAINES

August 2019 (revised in September 2019)



The project is funded by
the European Union



The project is implemented by
International Consulting Expertise EEIG

ICE - International Consulting Expertise

150, Chaussée de La Hulpe

1170 Bruxelles, Belgique

Tél: +32.2.792.49.05

Fax : +32.2.792.49.06

www.ice-org.eu



The content of this publication is the sole responsibility of ICE EEIG and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union

Table of Contents

Glossary of acronyms	4
Executive Summary.....	5
Chapter 1: Introduction	8
Chapter 2: Evaluation Methodology.....	25
Chapter 3: Main results of the Programme	32
Chapter 4: Conclusions, Lessons Learned and Recommendations.....	63
Annexes	74

Glossary of acronyms

ACP	Africa Caribbean Pacific
EDF	European Development Fund
EU	European Commission
EUD	European Union Delegation
EUNIC	European Union National Institutes for Culture
FA/FD	Financing Agreement/ Financing Decision
FWC	Framework contracts
GoT	Government of Tanzania
LF	Logical Framework
MTE	Mid-term evaluation
NAO	National Authorising Officer
SMART	Specific Measurable Achievable Relevant Time-bound
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
WB	World Bank

Executive Summary

The final evaluation of the 10th EDF Support to Culture in Tanzania Programme was conducted from the 31st of March until the 15th of August 2019 (from inception phase to draft report submission). The draft report has been revised in September 2019 to integrate the reactions and comments from the EU Delegation and the relevant governmental bodies.

This evaluation has assessed the Programme using the five standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The conclusions and recommendations are oriented to guide possible entry points for future EU Actions in Tanzania.

The Programme had a total budget of €10 million. The Financing Agreement was signed in 14 April 2012 for an initial execution period of 72 months. Three consecutive addendums to the Financing Agreement extended the execution period to 90 months (closure in September 2019), and proceeded to reallocations between the budget lines.

The Programme has two components/purposes:

- To support the preservation and promotion of cultural heritage in Tanzania (CH).
- To support the capacity of the cultural and creative industries (CCI).

The first CH component has been implemented via 6 grant contracts managed by the NAO as the Contracting Authority, with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (Antiquities Division) acting as project supervisor. An additional Contribution Agreement signed directly between the EU Delegation and UNESCO complemented the CH portfolio of projects.

As for the CCI component, 11 grant contracts directly managed by the EU Delegation, including a second Contribution Agreement with UNESCO, have been implemented under the Programme.

In terms of **Relevance**, the evaluation highlights both the alignment of the Programme with EU approaches to cultural development, as well as to the national development policy frameworks.

The adequacy between the Programme and the priority needs of the sector, the realities on the ground, the capacities of the operators and institutions of the culture sector is also confirmed by this report. Taking into account the very modest public and private investment/financing for culture and heritage available in the country, the EU intervention has been supportive on the emergence and strengthening of civil society structures operating in culture.

Nevertheless, considering the weak capacity of the State in promoting reforms towards the development of the cultural sector and the evident urgency to support a better enabling environment, the Programme has not been sufficiently coherent in the areas of policy dialogue and review to ensure a more solid institutional and political sustainability.

On the other hand, the project approach common in the majority of EU interventions in the field of culture replicated in this Programme is proven to be inadequate for longer term development. The rationale

behind this Programme was to support projects with an economic growth perspective, which could contribute to a structural change and long-term impact. A 36-month “activity-based” project is in most cases unrealistic to deliver structural change and optimal impact.

As regards to **Efficiency**, the final execution of the Financing Agreement shows full adequacy between the resources allocated and the objectives set. An optimal level of consumption of the budget of 91% for the CH and 92% for the CCI components is registered, with only 7% of non-engaged budget for the entire Financing Agreement.

Splitting the intervention in two separate Calls for Proposals and supporting the Evaluation Committees with inputs from external assessors has proven to be an adequate and fruitful approach, in light of the quality of the projects chosen for funding and of the respect of the indicative timeframe of the Calls.

However, the Financing Agreement omitted a provision (financial and operational) for a Steering Committee or any other sort of governing/monitoring body. The consequence of this can be summarised to insufficient coordination and complementarity between the two components of the Programme, as well as limited participation of the relevant stakeholders (line ministries and public bodies, together with target beneficiaries) in piloting and globally reviewing the programme’s achievements.

Furthermore, the coexistence of three different types of contracting arrangements (EU direct management for CCI and UNESCO projects, and partially decentralised management by the NAO for the CH projects) created de facto different levels of supervision and follow up-requirements that should have been coordinated better to maximise efficiency.

The analysis of the **Effectiveness** evaluation criteria under this report shows better results for the CH component of the Programme, which can be influenced by two major factors: a better formulation of the Call for Proposals and the involvement of a technical line-Ministry (Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism - Antiquities Division) acting as project supervisor.

Preservation, promotion and access to local culture are observed fairly consistently across the portfolio of large-scale CH projects and the Programme has been an effective vector to achieve this. Good results are registered for projects with solid local partnerships, increasing the level of local ownership/appropriation and planting the seed for better dynamics on public/private partnerships and collaborations. Furthermore, the Programme has been very effective in promoting access to cultural heritage for local residents, with some strong growth in numbers of visitors and school outreach groups in recent years.

As for the CCI component that had as purpose to enhance the capacity of the cultural and creative industries in Tanzania, improvements to facilities and equipment has been an effective way to build capacity, but very limitative. The more structural capacity building actions (training) undertaken in many CCI projects and several CH projects are largely unproven in terms of effectiveness, mainly due to the ad hoc nature, lack of certification or involvement of officially trained education providers and inadequate evaluation of results.

There are however very encouraging results for effective income generation and cultural entrepreneurship development, particularly for the craft sector, showing the great potential of culture and craft-based businesses through production and marketing support. Skills and capacity in promotion and marketing of cultural heritage and cultural tourism need however to be improved.

As for **Impact**, the overall effects of the projects are positive in terms of their contribution to economic and social development and have potential to promote very positive narratives about culture and culture tourism development in Tanzania, as well as the multi-dimensional impact of culture development in society. Lack of understanding among policy makers and political authorities of the value of culture as a development factor is however of concern at this final stage of the Programme, as the emerging positive results might be seriously challenged by insufficient supportive strategies and newly appeared administrative constraints.

Concerning **Sustainability**, the Programme has been a catalyst for change, introducing the financial sustainability aspect at the centre of its objectives under the two Calls for proposals.

As a result, the majority of projects have ensured continuity of the activities initiated with the EU support, and in some cases have secured funds to multiply their scope or to enlarge their portfolio of activities. Some projects have achieved very impressive results in terms of self-generated income and in some other cases, the EU grant contract has helped gain credibility and visibility among other donors and facilitated access to other major funds.

But although progress has been registered, financial sustainability is far from secured in most projects and access to funding represents an important challenge for most of the organisations supported by the Programme. Four projects (out of 18) encountered important difficulties in ensuring continuity, leading to the closure of the organisations after EU funds ended.

The “project-based” approach of the Programme has reinforced planning activities by the beneficiary organisations on a yearly basis and with short-term visions, leading to limited structural change. Only a few projects have worked to formulate a more strategic vision and work on a multi-annual planning basis.

In terms of **Recommendations**, we develop at the end of this report the following main guiding principles for future EU Actions in Tanzania in the field of culture sector:

- **Capitalisation:** Continuity of the support to the culture sector capitalising on cumulative experience and knowledge.
- **New orientation:** culture as a productive sector with economic potential structurally supported inside other major thematic programmes (e.g. trade development, urban/local development, youth and employment).
- **Knowledge building and Inter-ministerial coordinated approach:** Informed quality formulation and shared common visions to ensure complementarity and public ownership.
- **EU coordination and added value:** Re-dynamization of the EUNIC cluster possibilities for strategically planning/implementing an intervention with greater EU added value.
- **Implementation mechanisms:** alternative options to direct management ensuring strategic planning, qualified staff and sufficient resources for implementation and promotion of the interventions.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background and objective of the Evaluation

The Terms of Reference (ToR) of the evaluation define its objectives in the following terms: *“The primary purpose of the evaluation is to provide the relevant services of the European Union and the interested stakeholders with an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the 10th EDF Support to Culture in Tanzania, paying particular attention to its results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results”.*

To achieve this purpose, the evaluation should assess the Action using the five standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

In addition, the evaluation will assess two EU specific evaluation criteria:

- the EU added value (the extent to which the Action brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only).
- the coherence of the Action itself, with the EU strategy in support to Culture in Tanzania and with other EU policies and Member State Actions.

They further indicate that: *“evaluators are invited to consider evaluation questions that could analyze possible entry points for future EU Actions in Tanzania”.*

The evaluation encompasses two distinct but complementary approaches, to take into account the fact that the Programme's Intervention Logic set up different objectives and indicators for two major intervention areas in the cultural sector:

- Cultural Heritage Protection and Promotion (CHPP).
- Cultural and Creative Industries (CCI).

The evaluation will cover these two major components of the Programme, with their different administrative, management and implementation specificities: Cultural Heritage Protection and Promotion (partially decentralised management - 7 contracts) and Creative and Cultural Industries (direct management - 11 grant contracts).

With regards to previous evaluation exercises, a sizeable amount of work has already been carried out. The findings and analysis of that work have been taken into account by the evaluation team, particularly with regard to the outcomes and recommendations of the Mid-term Evaluation of the Programme (January 2016, ref: 2015/364190) and the 2016 ROM mission report and all other available documentation, as listed in the ToR.

In particular, this final evaluation will serve to understand the performance of the Action, its enabling factors and those hampering proper delivery of results in order to inform the planning of future EU interventions and Actions. More particularly, the core of the evaluation will be an assessment of the issues addressed by the evaluation questions.

The evaluation thus aims to serve the policy-making and sectoral decision-making functions as well as project management purposes. The main direct target users include:

- **Government of Tanzania:** National Authorizing Office for the European Development Fund of the Ministry and Finance and Planning, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism and the Ministry of Information, Culture, Arts and Sports, as well as the local authorities where the projects took place.
- **European Union:** the EU Delegations in Tanzania and other headquarters' services (DGs DEV, RELEX, AIDCO) concerned by the evaluation.
- **Development Partners:** EU Member State agencies present and active in Tanzania, other Development partners and UNESCO.
- **Grant Beneficiaries** and partners, together with other civil society organisations active in the areas of cultural heritage and the creative industries.

1.2 Context

1.2.1 EU Development policy in the culture sector

A number of initiatives and multiple successive strategic documents have contributed to shaping the EU policy agenda on the role of culture in EU external relations, representing the global framework and guidance for this Programme since its identification. This is a non-exhaustive list of documents and milestones:

- **European Consensus on Development** - 2006 (joint statement by the Council of the EU, the European Parliament and the European Commission), recognising culture as an important aspect of human development and a tool for poverty eradication.
- In 2007, the Commission proposed a **“European Agenda for Culture in a globalising world”**, which included the promotion of culture in the Union's international relations. Since then, the EU has further taken a number of actions in the area of culture and development, acknowledging its role as a factor for employment and growth.
- With the 2014 Communication **“Towards an integrated approach to cultural heritage for Europe”**, the EU reaffirmed its commitment to protect cultural heritage, in cooperation with organisations such as the Council of Europe and UNESCO. This communication sets out the tools available at EU level, complementing national and regional programmes, to help protect and enhance the intrinsic and social value of heritage, to strengthen its contribution to economic growth and job creation, and develop its potential for the EU's public diplomacy.
- 2014: Final report and country reports of the **“EU Preparatory Action for Culture in EU External Relations”**.
- **Joint Communication “Towards an EU strategy for international cultural relations”**, the first ever joint policy document launched in June 2016 by the European Commission DGEAC and the European External Action Service (EEAS), establishing a framework for cultural cooperation with partner countries. This Joint Communication puts culture at the heart of EU international relations and proposed three pillars to advance work towards an EU Strategy for international cultural relations:
 - First, the proposed guiding principles for EU action aim to ensure that EU action in this area promotes human rights, diversity and inter-cultural dialogue while respecting subsidiarity and complementarity and retains policy coherence by promoting culture within existing partnership frameworks.
 - The second pillar proposed three main strands to provide a focus for advancing cultural cooperation with partner countries, including: i) supporting culture as an engine for

sustainable social and economic development; ii) promoting culture and intercultural dialogue for peaceful inter-community relations; iii) reinforcing cooperation on cultural heritage.

- The third pillar proposes a strategic EU approach to cultural diplomacy: including enhanced European cooperation (notably between EU Member States and EU Delegations) and intercultural exchanges to promote the diverse cultures of the EU.
- This Joint policy has been reaffirmed in the “**New European Agenda for Culture**” of May 2018, which emphasises strengthening cooperation in the cultural field. The Agenda states this in section 4.3 *External dimension: strengthening international cultural relations*, the objectives of which are to:
 - Support culture as a driver of sustainable social and economic development;
 - Promote intercultural culture and dialogue for peaceful relations between communities;
 - Strengthen cooperation in the field of cultural heritage.
- In April 2019, the European Council adopted the “**conclusions on an EU strategic approach to international cultural relations**”, establishing a framework for action by the member states and the EU institutions¹.
- In June 2019, the European Commission organised an International Colloquium in Brussels - "Culture for the Future"² - to **promote culture, creativity, innovation and dialogue as key drivers of inclusive development and peace**. The event supported the cultural dimension of development and international cooperation as a strategic dimension in the policies of the European Union and its Member States. The final Manifesto sets out 10 Recommendations, each with associated actions addressed to artists, private sector, civil society, financial institutions, governments, international organisations and donors, including the European Union institutions and the EU Member States.

1.2.2 UNESCO and Creative Economy reports

An important step forward in raising the profile of the creative sector in developing countries has been the ratification of the 2005 **UNESCO Convention on the protection and the promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions**, which emphasises the need to incorporate culture as a strategic element in development policies. This treaty draws particular attention to the role of the creative industries as a source of economic and cultural empowerment, particularly in the developing world and encourages countries to give greater prominence to policy-making in this area. Tanzania ratified the 2005 Convention in 2011.

From there, the understanding of the relations between culture and development has followed several stages and bodies of research in the past.

¹ <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2019/04/08/international-cultural-relations-council-adopts-conclusions/>

² <https://culture4future.eu/>

The **Creative Economy Reports Series (2008, 2010, 2013)** is the result of an initiative put forward by a partnership between five relevant United Nations bodies: UNCTAD, UNDP, UNESCO, WIPO and ITC, initiated under the project “Strengthening the Creative Economy in Developing Countries”.

The first “Creative Economy Report 2008 — The challenge of assessing the creative economy: Towards informed policymaking” was a very successful attempt to present a broader perspective on the potential of the creative economy and to assist developing countries to support new high growth creative sectors. It attracted a lot of interest from governments and the international community and served as a base for the formulation of a new generation of development programmes in which emphasis was placed on ways to optimise the potential of the creative economy to generate socio-economic growth, job creation and export earnings, while at the same time promoting social inclusion, cultural diversity and human development.

The Creative Economy Reports 2010 and 2013 incorporated new reflections, additional research and more in-depth analysis of the key issues.

The development dimension of the creative economy recognised in these reports has been the guiding principle of the 10th EDF Programme Support to Culture in Tanzania.

1.2.3 ACP Interventions and EU Thematic programmes

The overall global framework for the EU support to cultural and creative sectors in ACP countries includes the **Cotonou Partnership Agreement** signed in June 2000 with African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries, providing the EU and its member states with a strong mandate to support culture, Article 27 of the Cotonou creates a comprehensive framework for the cultural cooperation ranging from promoting intercultural dialogue, the preservation of cultural heritage to support to cultural and creative industries.

The 9th EDF funded projects (ACPCultures and ACPFilms) to strengthen the technical, financial and managerial capacities of creative industries in ACP countries and more specifically to develop and structure the cinema and audiovisual industries (EUR 14 million) in ACP states. Thereafter, the **ACP Cultures+** (EUR 30 million under the 10th EDF) contributed to the fight against poverty by fostering sustainable cultural industries. The current Intra ACP Programme continues to support the cultural and creative industries (EUR 40 million under the 11th EDF in the period 2014-2020).

On a more general level, the Commission has tabled multi-annual thematic programmes in order to support interventions in developing countries. The thematic programmes **Investing in People, Non-state Actors and Local Authorities in Development** and **Global Public Goods and Challenges ‘Intercultural Dialogue and Culture’** have been available to Tanzanian organisations and have been complementing geographical cooperation through the country strategy papers in the field of culture.

1.2.4 National development strategies: MKUKUTA II and FYDP II

The overall framework for the cooperation to Tanzania is given by the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP/*MKUKUTA II*, 2010/2011-2014/2015) further extended to 2015/2016).

The **MKUKUTA II**, implemented by the first Five-Year Development Plan (FYDP I, 2011-2016), recognised the importance of culture for development both in terms of cultural heritage and its importance for tourism and in terms of entrepreneurship in the cultural industry. The results targeted under Goal 5 were:

"Social cohesion, belonging, and national identity promoted and enhanced", "Attitude toward hardworking, self-confidence, and self-esteem, creativity, innovation and moral integrity promoted and enhanced", "Culture and heritage of the country preserved and promoted" and "Principles of cultural diversity and inter-cultural dialogue upheld". The Zanzibar Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (2010 – 2015), or MKUZA II, also acknowledged the role of culture in sustainable development.

The Second ongoing Five-Year Development Plan (**FYDP II**), 2016/17 – 2020/21, has moved to a dual focus of growth and transformation and poverty reduction and thus includes both (i) growth-focused interventions geared towards transforming Tanzania into a middle-income country through industrialisation and (ii) human development-focused interventions, which target poverty alleviation.

In Chapter 4 dedicated to *Strategic interventions for industrialisation and human development*, the document covers two sectors that are particularly relevant to this evaluation, providing the performance indicators and targets for development and announcing areas of intervention.

- **Creative Industry**

Key targets by 2020: Real growth 13.2%; Share of GDP, 0.7%; share of total employment, 0.2%.

The document recognises the industry as *one of the rapidly growing tertiary economic activities in Tanzania, attracting massive youth labour force in particular*, and it makes a projection that the sector will expand by 12.5% annually over the Plan period.

It also recognises that the industry is however still in its infancy stage and that *it needs careful nurturing to reach its fullest potential*. That requires strategic interventions in two areas:

- Promoting investments in creative industries (establishment, maintenance, sponsorship etc.);
- Protecting works of art (IPRs, patents, copyright, etc.).

However, it develops the strategic intervention very poorly, with just a series of uncoherent flagship projects reduced to the construction of culture and sports complexes and the rehabilitation of Bagamoyo College of Arts.

• **Tourism**

Key targets by 2020: Real growth rate, 6.2 %; GDP share, 18.3%; share of total exports, 21.4%; and share of total employment, 12%

The FYDP II document shows that Tanzania's tourism industry, which accounts for about 24% of exports of goods and services, continues to be one of the key sectors in GDP contribution (17.2%) and in generating foreign exchange. The industry continued to grow, as exhibited by the increase in the number of international tourist arrivals from 782,699 (2010) to 1,140,156 (2014/15). FYDP II makes projections for visitor arrivals: 1,759,750 (2020/21) and 2,468,141 (2025/26). For reference, the latest published statistics for international visitor arrivals are 1,327,143 (in 2017), according to the Ministry of Tourism and Natural Resources *2017 Tourism Statistical Bulletin*³, and a 2019 parliament presentation stated that the visitor statistics for 2018 had risen to 1.49m⁴.

³ <http://hat-tz.org/hattzorg/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Statistical-Bulletin-Booklet.pdf>

⁴ <https://www.tanzaniainvest.com/tourism/tanzania-tourism-revenues-and-arrivals-up-in-2018>

The document also recognises the challenges facing the tourism sector as follows: *lack of qualified personnel, infrastructure development, lack of diversification of tourism products, inadequate promotion and marketing, lack of specified areas for tourism investment, poor quality of services and low state of technology*. It proposes specific actions in relation to cultural tourism promotion, and more strategic interventions such as:

- Aggressive promotion and marketing of Tanzania as a unique tourist destination;
- Diversification of tourism products (southern circuit, identification of new areas, heritage tourism);
- Infrastructure improvement (roads, airports, sea ports);
- Improving training and skills development;
- Encouraging local tourism; and
- Improving an enabling environment for the tourism sector.

1.2.5 National Indicative Programme - NIP

In this context, the National Indicative Programme (NIP 2008-2013) for the 10th EDF dedicated €606 million to programmes in Tanzania, with a main focus on infrastructure, communications and transport, trade promotion and regional integration, in order to strengthen competition within the Tanzanian economy and to better exploit opportunities from regional and international trade liberalisation. Additionally, macroeconomic support has been provided to implement the national development strategy, and support to non-state actors (NSAs) as a non-focal sector, including in the area of environmental management and culture. The NIP states that: *'traditional cultural forms of expression are an important tool for communication in Tanzania and, given the potential contribution of cultural industries to growth, trade and regional integration, some support to the culture sector NSAs will be considered.'*

Three actions were then formulated in the 2011 Annual Action Programme: the Trade and Agriculture Support Programme Phase II (TASP II, EUR 15,000,000), the Support to NSA programme – Environment Component (EUR 10 000 000) and the Support to Culture in Tanzania Programme (EUR 10,000,000). The Programming document foresaw the need for strong complementarities and shared results between these three components of the 10th EDF.

The next EDF cycle (2014-2020), the period in which the programme was implemented, amounts to €626 million. It promotes pro-poor and sustainable growth, and focuses on good governance, in particular in public finance and domestic accountability, as well as increasing energy access and security, and sustainable agriculture to improve food and nutrition security and better management of natural resources and ecosystems. It also finances actions to support gender, civil society, business and employment. Culture was not included as a specific sector of intervention.

The next joint programming exercise for the Post-2020 Development Strategy should start in the coming months.

1.2.6 EU Country Roadmap for engagement with civil society

The analysis provided by the *EU Country Roadmap for engagement with civil society (2014-2017)* points out a strong capacity gap between, on the one hand, key national organisations which receive substantial financial support from the donor community and, on the other, the vast majority of small and medium size organisations struggling to secure funding.

It has been clearly identified that there is a *"shortage of skills amongst many civil society actors (whether branches of business membership organizations, small businesses, trade union branches, CBOs or NGOs), both in running their organizations (financial management, strategic planning, monitoring etc) and in*

understanding the context within which they operate (whether that is government policy or the dynamics of globalization or poverty)."

Programming and planning, which is essential for the sustainability sought by the Programme, is not well rooted in most cultural sector organisations in Tanzania.

The Roadmap highlights that *"Most CBOs in Tanzania do not have well defined strategic plans and therefore undertake ad hoc advocacy activities that are not well rooted. Moreover, small CSOs have a lot of challenges when it comes to fundraising, programme formulation, definition of results framework, financial management and evaluation. This is partly attributed to a lack of highly skilled human resources that can effectively perform the mentioned responsibilities. Small CSOs are financially unable to hire such highly qualified personnel to carry out those activities. As a result, these CSOs end up having inadequate funding, poor programs and poor financial management which consequently reduces their credibility of fundraising from donors"*.

The Roadmap provided a strategic framework for EU engagement with civil society in Tanzania over the period 2014-2017 and is now in the process of being updated.

1.3 Overview of interventions in the culture sector (Tanzania)

As detailed above, the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty for Tanzania, MKUKUTA II, recognised the importance of culture in the national development strategy.

1.3.1 Culture & Arts

Culture was explicitly introduced as a public governmental policy in Tanzania in 1997 with the elaboration of the Tanzania National Culture Policy⁵, which covers heritage, arts and craft and other cultural sectors of activity. The Ministry of Information, Culture, Arts and Sports is responsible for arts and culture and operates according to a 5-year Strategic Plan⁶ (2016/17 – 2020/21).

Research has been initiated to support the reform of the National Cultural Policy. UNESCO Tanzania commissioned a report in 2012: *Culture and Creative Industries in Tanzania – a Plan for Strategic Action*⁷ which states that "it is generally agreed that the Cultural Policy document of 1997 is inadequate and in need of revision". A 2009 draft Culture Development Master Plan made a start on the process. There were ministry press announcements on the forthcoming new cultural policy in 2016. A ministry presentation of the proposed new cultural policy was made to the Development Partners DPG Culture in early 2018. However, at the time of this final evaluation, a new cultural policy was not in place.

There are no known ministry/Arts Council grant programmes at national or regional level for funding arts and culture organisations in Tanzania, with open application and guidelines as in most other countries. In general, to date, there has been no expectation or custom of public financing for culture in Tanzania. To a large extent, culture and arts activities are associated at government and policy level with the entertainment business; seen as a sector which generates income for the government, from various special fees, permits and registration requirements, as well as the normal taxes applied to business profits.

⁵ <http://www.tzonline.org/pdf/culturalpolicy.pdf>

⁶ <https://www.habari.go.tz/uploads/publications/en1548235487-MPANGO%20MKAKATI%20WA%20WIZARA.pdf>

⁷ <http://www.unescodar.or.tz/unescodar/publications/Culture%20and%20Creative%20Industries%20in%20Tanzania.pdf>

The National Arts Council (BASATA) is an institution under the Ministry with the duty to: “assume responsibility for the revival and to promote the development and production of artistic works in the country including the production and use of indigenous and traditional artistic works, with a view of reviving and promoting Tanzania Culture”. While BASATA has a comprehensive mandate⁸, it is mostly acknowledged by Tanzanian cultural operators for its role in the registration of artists and cultural organisations, the collection of various fees, issuing permits for cultural activities and for the regular information sessions involving cultural sector associations (Jukwaa la sanaa).

The Goethe-Institut supported a project with BASATA in 2018 for government regional Culture Officers to undertake stakeholder mapping, with a view to capturing data on cultural sector organisations from 5 Tanzania regions, and to teach the participants how to organise a monthly meeting of artists, creators of culture and cultural actors in their respective places. However, over the course of the project, staff managed to map only 2 of the 5 target regions. As a result, the Goethe-Institut decided the project was not able to achieve the full objectives and has ended the funding agreement with BASATA.

In the field of copyright, COSOTA is an institution under the Ministry for Industry and Trade. It collects income through annual registration fees for producers of cultural goods (musicians, artists, production companies, publishers etc.), plus individual fees for each artistic work (song, book, artwork, film, advertising etc.). Another collection system exists for rights (to public performance, licensing, online performance, reprographic rights). A further registration fee is payable for music works to BASATA, which must be cleared for the content to be approved for public dissemination. COSOTA is trying to join up the registration systems through the online TRA (Tanzanian Revenue Authority) but this has not yet been achieved. Small distribution of income to rights holders through the international WIPO-COS/WIPO-CONNECT system has taken place in Dar. So far, efforts to collect income in the regions have been marred by corruption and a re-set of the regional collection/distribution system is in process. The sister organisation COSOZA in Zanzibar has a similar structure and functions. A brief overview of the rather complex processes seems to indicate that, to date, cultural producers and distributors in Tanzania are not able to make any significant income from copyright and distribution rights.

1.3.2 Tourism & Cultural Heritage

The Ministry of Natural Resources & Tourism is responsible for the management of natural resources and cultural resources and for the development of the tourism industry. There is a National Tourism Policy dated 1999.

A recent international study, *The Report: Tanzania 2018*, by Oxford Business Group focuses on tourism potential and challenges⁹. It noted that, as of August 2017, the government was in the process of drawing up a new National Tourism Policy to update the existing strategy, published in 1999. The report states “While the policy is widely considered to be sound, the changes in the global tourism sector since its publication in 1999 make updating it a priority. One of the challenges the new document will seek to address is the fragmented nature of the oversight of the sector between different parts of the MNRT.”

Cultural heritage management comes under the Division of Antiquities, a division within the MNRT

⁸ <http://www.basata.go.tz/english/aboutus.php>

⁹ <https://oxfordbusinessgroup.com/overview/achieving-potential-taking-steps-diversify-offerings-and-address-remaining-challenges-growth>

ministry, and operates according to the Antiquities Act 1979, supplemented by the more updated and specific Cultural Heritage Policy 2008. The Cultural Heritage Policy pays attention to Cultural Heritage and its integration with Development, Education and Tourism, inter alia. There is a policy statement on community participation in the development and management of cultural heritage; and a policy statement on investment in cultural tourism, although the latter does not foresee government investment by MNRT in cultural tourism.

A new organisation, Tanzania Wildlife Management Authority (TAWA), was established in recent times under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. TAWA is tasked with various management duties and locations, including the cultural heritage sites of Kilwa, for which it is developing a strategic plan.

As noted in the UNESCO 2017 report *Mapping of the Status of Cultural Indicators and Statistics in East Africa*¹⁰: “Tourism constitutes a major economic sector in Tanzania (13% of GDP and 11% of employment), but the links with the culture sector for now are not very strong. Tourism is mostly nature based, as are Tanzania’s World Heritage sites and tourism and culture are under separate ministries.”

The World Bank published an influential report on tourism in Tanzania in 2014, *The Elephant in the Room: Unlocking the Potential of the Tourism Industry for Tanzania*¹¹, which set out tourism challenges, highlighting the need for diversification of circuits and tourist segments, amongst others.

The 10th EDF Support to Culture in Tanzania operated within this context of separate ministry responsibilities and policy. The Cultural Heritage component supported interventions in the fields of cultural heritage preservation and cultural tourism operation, and delegated management from the contracting authority, the NAO, with the oversight of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (Antiquities Division).

As well as the two ministries with respective responsibilities for Arts/Culture and Tourism/Cultural Heritage, several other Tanzanian ministries and government institutions are involved in the management of diverse aspects of the cultural sector. For example, any organisation that is trading must be registered under BRELA, an Executive Agency under the Ministry of Industry and Trade. The 2019 change in the registration law which abolished the ‘non-profit company’ status has affected several of the EU-funded cultural sector actions with a social enterprise dimension. Not-for-profit NGOs and CSOs are now required to register under the Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender, the Elderly and Children¹². The copyright association COSOTA, responsible for intellectual property registration of works and producers, is under the Ministry for Industry and Trade (although BASATA also has a duty to register music works and approve the content). Other ministries and government services are involved in export regulations for cultural goods, registration of foreign employees, registration of websites, amongst others.

1.3.3 Tanzania and East Africa mapping and interventions

¹⁰ <http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/FIELD/Nairobi/unescoculturalstatistics.pdf>

¹¹ <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/tanzania/publication/tanzania-economic-update-increasing-tourism-for-economic-growth>

¹² <https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/news/NGOs--CSOs-re-registration-process-takes-effect-today/1840340-5190950-85asw8z/index.html>

An overview of the cultural and creative industries and creative economy in Tanzania can be located, to some extent, in various mapping studies. However, these are dispersed among various initiatives over many years, some of which have achieved publication.

An important study which focuses solely on Tanzania is the **Country Analysis – Arts & Culture, United Republic of Tanzania**¹³, published in 2014 for the Danish Center for Culture and Development (CKU). This in-depth report aimed to be a comprehensive country analysis of the art and culture sector in Tanzania, and was an identification study to inform the CKU cultural programme 2014-2018. The report takes a particular interest in policy areas of interest to the Danish CKU programme (e.g. freedom of expression, human rights), placed within the context of a full country overview of arts and culture activities and stakeholders. Although there is only partial reporting of the EU-funded projects, the 2014 CKU study is the most comprehensive and up to date analysis of the CCI sector in Tanzania, with important observations on which organisations had capacity for delegated responsibilities in eventual programme management.

Apart from this, the most consistent work done on the mapping of Tanzania has taken place within research focused on East African Community/countries.

The East African Community (EAC) takes a position on Culture¹⁴ as set out in its statement: *“The EAC Partner States recognise the role that Culture and Sports play in the existence and survival of our communities, particularly for social cohesion, solidarity, stability, identity, promoting unity and economic development and as tools for effective sustainable development, maintenance of peace, security and healthy societies.”* The institutional framework for action is the inter-ministerial meeting - EAC Sectoral Council on Education, Science and Technology, Culture and Sports¹⁵ (15th Council in June 2019).

The EAC Partner States run a biennial Jamafest Festival rotated among EAC countries, with different themes. The 2019 Jamafest¹⁶ takes place in Dar es Salaam, entitled *“Cultural Diversity: A Key Driver to Regional Integration, Economic Growth and Promotion of Tourism”*.

Research was undertaken in order to formulate the 10th EDF Programme. In June 2008 a team of combined UNESCO and EU experts was recruited under the Framework contract to develop a draft project document to strengthen cultural industries in Tanzania, with a budgeted work plan and log-frame. The final report was considered below-standards by the EU Delegation as it did not provide quality information on the situation of the sector allowing the justification of the proposed intervention.

The British Council undertook a mapping survey of ‘creative industries’ in Tanzania in 2008-2009, as part of a joint exercise with Kenya. To supplement the insubstantial information for Tanzania, a further study was undertaken by the British Council in 2009: *Creative Tanzania – A Tanzania for Creatives: Opportunities and Challenges for Tanzania’s Creative Industries*, with a final 2009 report entitled **Creative Industries – A Tanzanian Future**, which further informed the identification/formulation phase of the 10th EDF Support to Culture in Tanzania. The overall objective of this mapping was to assess how important the creative sector

¹³ <https://www.slideshare.net/AmandaLichtenstein1/cku-country-analysis-tanzania-lichtenstein-sorensen-2942014-final-62274881>

¹⁴ <https://www.eac.int/culture>

¹⁵ <https://www.eac.int/press-releases/139-culture-sports-news/1467-15th-sectoral-council-on-education,-science-and-technology,-culture-and-sports-concluded-in-arusha-culture>

¹⁶ <https://www.eac.int/jamafest>

is to Tanzania from an economic perspective, facilitating communication between the different stakeholders and organisations working in the creative sector.

In 2013, the British Council undertook a broad-brush study, **Scoping the Creative Economy in East Africa**¹⁷, supplemented by sector-specific reports for the East Africa Music Sector¹⁸ and EA Visual Arts Scene¹⁹. A 2018 report from the British Council: **Cultural Skills research summary – Sub-Saharan Africa**²⁰ contains useful analysis but did not include Tanzania in the countries surveyed.

Research was undertaken in Tanzania in 2014 for a Mapping Study on Culture and Creative Industry in Tanzania; this was carried out by the Ministry of Information, Youth, Culture and Sports, as the national contribution to an initiative of the East Africa Community. At that time, the study aimed to provide baseline information to facilitate regional culture policy formulation, planning and future studies in the field of culture, through a sample of data collected in six TZ regions. A draft report was provided for the mid-term evaluation, when the TZ study was scheduled to be finalised and published in 2016 as part of the EAC regional study. The final EAC report **Mapping of Culture and Creative Industries in the East African Community (2019)**²¹ was published in 2019, but it has limited research value.

In 2016, Hivos published the Ubunifu series report **The Status of the Creative Economy in East Africa**²², based on research conducted in 2015 involving government advisors, independent cultural hubs and cultural policy researchers in East Africa. The report concludes that “the creative and cultural sectors face challenges at four different levels that include little or inconsistent engagement between sector players and the relevant government institutions hence apparent unbalanced development of the creative and cultural sector; disorganized, mismanaged, fragmented or non-existent associations and guilds in creative and cultural industries; underdeveloped artist hubs and communities that are facing sustainability and relevance challenges; and low artistic entrepreneurship leading to revenue loss as a result of weak business models.” The “fast shrinking space for freedom of expression in East Africa” was noted. It is also stated that the East Africa Culture and Sports Council (EACC) had created an East African Film Network, “expected to champion the development of film culture and the arts” but online information in 2019 for EAFN is not updated to indicate that this mission has been accomplished.

Hivos Southern Africa conducted a baseline study²³ in 2017 to look at the state of creative hub spaces in Southern Africa (Malawi, South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe). The main aim was to better understand the operations and challenges of creative hubs. Some useful findings on creative hubs and spaces as an important emerging trend for young changemakers are published in the report, and are also relevant for Tanzania.

At the point of this final evaluation, it is observed that several new studies have emerged in recent years, particularly in the East Africa region, allowing comparisons with relevant countries. However, the conclusion of the 2015 mid-term evaluation findings on research and cultural policy still stands. To reiterate this: no comprehensive figures have been published to evaluate the economic impact of culture

¹⁷ <https://www.britishcouncil.org/east-africa-arts/research/creative-economy>

¹⁸ <https://www.britishcouncil.org/east-africa-arts/research/music-scoping-report>

¹⁹ <https://www.britishcouncil.org/east-africa-arts/research/visual-arts-scoping-report>

²⁰ https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/cultural_skills_sub-saharan_africa.pdf

²¹ <https://www.eac.int/documents/category/culture-and-sports>

²² <https://east-africa.hivos.org/news/tapping-into-east-africas-creative-economy-the-ubunifu-report/>

²³ <https://southern-africa.hivos.org/blog/emerging-trends-for-creative-hubs-in-southern-africa/>

and the cultural heritage sectors in Tanzania, but international studies in developed and developing countries show that this sector, including cultural heritage, can contribute significantly to economic activity, directly and indirectly.

1.3.4 Development partner interventions

As part of the Final Evaluation, several meetings took place with stakeholders among development partners in Tanzania, complemented with online research. The aim was to identify key players, past actions, current trends and perspectives for donor support of the cultural sector. All development partners are aware of the lack of government financial support for culture, areas of potential, capacity building needs, and the slow process to develop a robust cultural policy in Tanzania to recognise the contribution a strong cultural sector can make to the development of the country.

Up to 2018, there were occasional meetings, usually twice a year, of DPG Culture (a Development Partner Group focused on Culture within the DPG structure meetings on various thematic areas). The group was chaired by UNESCO and France and included European, US, Japanese, Canadian and other development partners. This group has now stopped meeting.

During the Final Evaluation, the EU hosted a meeting of European cultural sector national institutes, embassy representatives and development partners to discuss the establishment of a European Union National Institutes for Culture / EUNIC Cluster Tanzania. An earlier EUNIC Tanzania cluster was no longer operational. A meeting took place on 27 June 2019 and was attended by representatives from Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France (Alliance Française), Germany (Goethe-Institut & German Embassy), Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom (British Council). The process of setting up a EUNIC Cluster and eventual membership is being examined as a result.

From the stakeholder interviews and research (time available only permitted a small snapshot and cannot be considered a full mapping), the following main findings are observed in development partner support for the cultural sector in Tanzania:

DENMARK: with the closure in 2016 of the global CKU Danish Center for Culture and Development, a significant dedicated fund which supported several organisations in Tanzania was lost. The Danish Embassy's Tanzania Culture and Development Programme 2014-2017 continued the work of CKU in the handover phase (support among others to Nafasi, SOMA Book Café, TaSUBa, National Museum, CDEA, Tanzania Youth Cultural Exchange Network). That programme is now discontinued, final closure being in June 2018. To some extent, Danida Danish development aid is now available to deliver thematic development programme objectives in the cultural sector in Tanzania, but the availability of Danida funds to the cultural field is minimal compared to the CKU programme. Danida (with SDC, SIDA and UK Aid) contributes to the basket fund Foundation for Civil Society, an independent Tanzanian non-profit organisation that provides grants and capacity building services to civil society organisations, with a small profile in funding culture and development projects.

FINLAND: although Finland does not have a dedicated cultural support programme, grants for some expertise exchanges have supported the Cordaid WOW weaving project in recent years. Finland's development aid includes the thematic priority of reinforcing developing countries' economies (jobs, innovation, sustainable business development).

FRANCE: has a number of smaller culture support projects focusing mainly on the promotion of French culture. They are positive towards cooperating on a EUNIC common strategy. Alliance Française (Dar and

Arusha) represents a key partner for many local culture operators as a platform for exhibitions and performances.

GERMANY: cooperation support in the Tanzania cultural sector comes from the Goethe-Institut, GIZ German Development Cooperation and some direct funds from the German Embassy:

- a) Goethe-Institut: small strategic grants for cultural projects; focus on capacity building in CCIs, including specific cluster activities (animation, gaming) in partnership with 15 G-Is in Sub-Saharan Africa; plans for a training programme for key cultural sector staff who are multipliers (not yet elaborated); supported BASATA mapping of stakeholders across Tanzania described above;
- b) GIZ: funds the IIDEA²⁴ programme - Incubator for Integration and Development in East Africa, initiated in 2016 under the EAC Secretariat. Grants allocated on open calls to projects, including cultural economy incubator hubs etc., as partnerships across EAC (includes: CDEA, East Africa Biennial, Danceteam Africa);
- c) German Embassy: a small direct budget has supported Sauti Za Busara and some German cultural heritage projects (DARCH café roof, German church restoration, mapping of German colonial heritage buildings in Tanzania with conservation needs assessments).

There is a central German government programme concerned with restitution actions to former colonial period countries. A proposal for development of the military Boma in Iringa will be decided by the German Parliament in 2019. Research was undertaken by the Sub-Saharan Africa Goethe-Instituts in 2018 to produce a collaborative report, *German Colonial Heritage in Africa – Artistic and Cultural Perspectives*²⁵.

NETHERLANDS: HIVOS research on EAC creative economy described above; grant programme developed since has supported CDEA and Nafasi. DOEN Foundation is working with the British Council on a cultural mobility programme in EAC.

NORWAY: The Royal Norwegian Embassy has been a key actor for core support in the culture sector in Tanzania in the last 5 years, providing multi-annual support (3 years) to a restricted number of projects proven to have a coherent long-term strategic plan and the necessary management capacity and experience. Culture is covered under the human rights component and gender/girls/women's rights of their development strategy. Volume of funds to support culture depends on their internal annual programming exercise as justified with their Headquarters. The continuity over the coming years is not ensured at the time of this report.

Projects are selected by a process of direct negotiations according to the Embassy's own criteria (a variety of geographical areas and sectors) and influenced by the visibility and perception they get from other donors/stakeholders on organisations/project with good potential for development success. In this sense, the 10th EDF Support to Culture Programme has been essential in building their portfolio of cultural projects that receive their support (Nafasi, Muda Africa 2018/2021). Their portfolio is completed with two rounds of strategic support to Busara Promotions, now renewed to the 2019/2022 period. CAC and Dhow Music Academy are currently prospects for future support.

SWEDEN: SIDA has a well elaborated development cooperation in Tanzania, following its overarching development priorities. In addition, support for copyright and intellectual property capacity building has come from a SIDA-funded programme set up in 2004 addressing such needs across 25 developing countries (PRV Advanced Training and Advisory Programme on Intellectual Property Rights in the Global

²⁴ <https://www.eaciidea.net/>

²⁵ https://www.goethe.de/resources/files/pdf173/german-colonial-heritage_artistic-and-cultural-perspectives.pdf

Economy for the Least Developed Countries).

SIDA (with SDC, DANIDA and UK Aid) contributes to the basket fund for the Foundation for Civil Society, an independent Tanzanian non-profit organisation that provides grants and capacity building services to civil society organisations, with a small profile in funding culture and development projects.

SWITZERLAND: Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC) in the field of culture has a dedicated budget from the national policy of allocating 1% of the country's development aid budget to culture. It operates on a 4-year Cultural Programme Tanzania, currently in Phase VI (2016-2019). This programme has included:

- a) multi-annual core grants (3-year funding to Dhow Countries Music Academy and Busara Promotions, around 900,000 USD in total grants);
- b) annual small grant calls (around 5 thematic projects per year, around 20,000 USD each);
- c) some 'small actions' including a publication on Contemporary Art in Tanzania, support for other selected projects.

In the next phase (2020-2023), the multi-annual core grants will be discontinued; the annual call will be maintained, possibly with larger grants; a skills building programme in creative arts management is being planned, with the coordination potentially to be outsourced to a cultural organisation in Dar es Salaam. In addition, some organisations (e.g. Nafasi) are supported through Pro Helvetia (Swiss Arts Council) international actions, via the Pro Helvetia Johannesburg office.

SDC (with SIDA, DANIDA and UK Aid) contributes to the basket fund Foundation for Civil Society, an independent Tanzanian non-profit organisation that provides grants and capacity building services to civil society organisations, with some funding for culture and development projects.

UNESCO: Tanzania ratified the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions in 2011. It would therefore be eligible for the Expert Facility capacity building expertise on cultural policy and other related issues, but has to date not availed of this (there is one Tanzanian expert on the Expert Facility). Tanzanian organisations are also eligible to apply for the International Fund for Cultural Diversity, which allocates around 6-8 grants annually worldwide to cultural projects in developing countries, but no projects have been funded in Tanzania to date.

The national portfolio of activities they support is funded with UNESCO "extra budget" resources, coming from other international donors.

UNITED KINGDOM: the British Council has been active in the creative economy/cultural industries fields and research in East Africa for many years. Current East Africa Arts programmes include an East Africa cultural mobility fund launched in 2019, with co-financing from the Netherlands DOEN Foundation; the EA mobility fund management/distribution has been delegated to CDEA in Tanzania; an EAC Creative Entrepreneurship programme supports TZ operators to attend short capacity building programme in East Africa. The New Arts New Audiences programme (grants up to £30,000) operates between the UK and Sub-Saharan Africa regions, fostering cross-regional collaboration in Africa.

UK AID (with SDC, SIDA, DANIDA) contributes to the basket fund Foundation for Civil Society, an independent Tanzanian non-profit organisation that provides grants and capacity building services to civil society organisations, with a small profile in funding culture and development projects.

WORLD BANK: The World Bank is not specifically active in CCIs but has financed several major interventions in cultural heritage integrated with urban development in Zanzibar. In tourism, WB has a \$150m REGROW programme which aims to rebalance the tourism flows in Tanzania by supporting infrastructure and capacity on the Southern Circuit. An urban programme is in development where the WB will support development in 10 major secondary cities in Tanzania.

Observed trends in development partner support:

- A very limited number of cultural organisations have received core funding support through multi-annual contracts; the Swiss SDC plans to discontinue this form of support; Norway's current 4-year contracts run to 2021.
- A larger number of cultural organisations/projects, including Tanzanian national institutions, have received small grants (c. 10,000-20,000 EUR) for short projects, including capacity building; this is much appreciated in the sector; it allows donors to take some risks with smaller organisations and grow the pipeline of cultural sector organisations, however, most donors acknowledge that many of the same names recur in project grant lists over recent years.
- Donor cultural sector programmes are conscious of the skills deficits in cultural management, often from limited earlier grant results and the quality of projects and budget planning received; SDC and Goethe-Institut plan training programmes in Tanzania; the British Council has an EAC-wide cultural entrepreneurship action.
- Delegation and sub-contracting of programme management is a growing trend, with British Council East Africa Mobility Fund management delegated to a TZ organisation; SDC is planning a similar process for a new cultural management training programme.
- The Swiss Development Cooperation programme has a unique mechanism, under Swiss law, which allocates 1% of any country's development aid budget to culture.

1.4 Description of the Programme

The 10th EDF Support to Culture in Tanzania is the first of its kind in the country to be financed entirely by the EU. Its Financing agreement (TZ/FED/022-707) was signed in 14 April 2012 for an amount of €10 million.

As a reminder, the Programme's **overall objective** is:

- The promotion of access to local culture and cultural diversity and to develop the potential contribution of cultural heritage and the creative industries to economic development and economic growth.

The Programme has a **twofold purpose**:

- To support the preservation and promotion of cultural heritage in Tanzania (CH).
- To support the capacity of the cultural and creative industries (CCI).

This is further developed by specific reference to environmental sustainability for the first component, and to gender equality issues in the creative industries for the second component.

The Programme's Logical Framework sets out the relevant objectives, indicators and expected results. An important reference point for the consultants engaged in the present Final Evaluation is the list of expected results.

The **Intervention Logic for the Cultural Heritage (CH) component** sets out the following expected results with associated indicators:

- Selected cultural heritage sites in Tanzania (including Zanzibar) protected and preserved;
- Environmental sustainability of preservation and exploitation of the sites in terms of tourism ensured;
- Access to local culture both for commercial/tourist purposes but also for the Tanzanian population promoted;

- Documentation centres or museum around these sites for educational or research purposes established;
- Knowledge and awareness of the cultural heritage in Tanzania increased.

The **Intervention Logic for the Cultural and Creative Industries (CCI) component** sets out the following expected results with associated indicators:

- A stronger and more self-reliant creative industry developed;
- Developed capacity of the creative entrepreneurs to be economically self-reliant and contribute to the economy;
- Promoted cultural diversity;
- Promoted access to creative spaces;
- Improved capacity of the professional creative practitioners;
- Strong regional, south-south and north-south cooperation;
- Improved networks of exchange of expertise;
- Support for training and professionalisation of the creative industries provided;
- Cultural and creative facilities improved.

The Financing Agreement set out the **expected results** as follows (in brief):

- The **first and major component** of the programme will support the protection, preservation and promotion of a selected number of cultural heritages in Tanzania, which are key to Tanzanian cultural identity. A key issue is that it should contribute to the **growth of the tourism** sector with a focus on **environmentally sustainable tourism**. The projects should include a strong educational element to target the population at large, and have an element of capacity building in order to be sustainable. The ideal number of projects foreseen was two or three major, comprehensive and sustainable projects, aiming for a deeper impact on a few sites rather than spreading the support too thinly.
- The **second component** will support the cultural and creative industries with a view to promoting and strengthening the capacity of the Tanzanian cultural sector. It seeks to promote an **enabling environment** for creativity, cooperation and exchange through support to organisations that carry out various activities in the areas of music, theatre, dance and visual arts, with a long-term goal of **strengthening capacity** in the sector. The expectation was that funded projects would progress on the front of **financial sustainability** over a 3-5-year timeframe. Grants should promote the **regional outreach** of the organisations. Capacity building must focus on skills development and management, strengthening marketing and improvement of related facilities.

The execution period of the Agreement was initially 72 months and increased to 90 months by **Addendum One** to the Financing Agreement of 29 January 2013. The execution period then comprised 2 phases:

- Operational implementation phase that starts from the entry into force of the Financing Agreement and will have a duration of 66 months: from 14 April 2012 to 13 October 2017.
- Closure phase of a duration of 24 months that starts from the expiry date of the operational implementation phase: from 13 October 2017 to 12 September 2019.

Two additional addendums were made to the Action. For Addendum Two, EUR 80,000 of the contingency reserve was allocated to Component 1 in order to award a grant to a project on the reserve list.

For Addendum Three, EUR 270,000 was reallocated from the contingency reserve into the monitoring, external evaluation, audit and visibility budget, to ensure adequate funds were available for a coaching service contract and to carry out an independent mid-term evaluation of the Action. The final budget of the Financing Agreement after Addendums is reflected in this table:

CATEGORIES	EU CONTRIBUTION	ADDENDUM	TOTAL
Activity 1 (Cultural Heritage) – Grants	7.000.000	+80.000	7.080.000
Activity 2 (Creative & Cultural Industry) – Grants	2.500.000	0	2.500.000
Monitoring, External Evaluation and Audit – FWC service contract	150.000	+270.000	420.000
Contingencies	350.000	-350.000	0
TOTAL (EUR)	10.000.000	0	10.000.000

Within the Financing Agreement, provision was made for external evaluation, including a mid-term evaluation and a final ex-post evaluation (the present FWC mission).

Chapter 2: Evaluation Methodology

2.1 Proposed methodology

In line with the ToR, the evaluation was divided into three phases: inception, collection of data and synthesis. The final mission calendar is presented in Annex to this report.

PHASE I: Inception Phase

Objective: Clarify all the different aspects of the mission (scope, expectations, limitations, key issues to be addressed), structuring the evaluation methodology and agreeing with the Reference Group on a final evaluation calendar, tools and methods, in line with the ToR.	
Main tasks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Initial background study in relation to the political, institutional and technical cooperation framework of the cultural sector in Tanzania.• Stakeholders' mapping exercise: preparing the list of people/organisations to be consulted.• Initial document review covering the Financing Agreement, the Mid-term evaluation report, ROM mission report, and other relevant implementation reports.• Teleconference kick-off session to meet and exchange with the Reference Group (EU Delegation, NAO) about the scope of the evaluation, methods and plans.• Drafting the Inception Report containing the Evaluation Design Matrix, a list of people to be consulted, a proposal of projects to be visited and the Survey method and a precise workplan for both experts.• Teleconference session to present the Report (Slide presentation).

PHASE II – Step I: Desk Phase

Objective: In-depth documentation analysis that will allow the evaluation team to start responding to the evaluation questions with information from secondary sources, to identify information gaps that need to be addressed and the hypotheses to be tested during the field phase.	
Main tasks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Research and source additional literature in relation to: the culture and creative industries in Tanzania and East Africa, other EU culture and creative industries development programmes in different geographic regions (e.g. Maghreb or Asia), new approaches to donor culture funding, EUNIC experience and potential.• Project documents review covering all related information, the contracts and their final reports/evaluations for each project.• Recruitment of backstopping support and preparation of the Survey addressed to the projects and their partners/stakeholders.• Organisation of the field phase by setting up meetings and logistical arrangements for international and internal travel.

PHASE II – Step II: Field Phase

Objective: Gather direct evidence of achievements and collect additional primary data, allowing a response to the evaluation questions.	
Tasks	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Initial briefing meeting with the Reference Group and consultation with the relevant institutional stakeholders of the Programme.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field trips to visit grant projects, according to the approved workplan. • Further stakeholders' consultations (line Ministries, Development Partners, EU Member States Embassies). • Launching the Survey, reminders and follow-up for optimal data collection. • Debriefing preliminary findings to the Reference Group.
--	---

PHASE III: Synthesis Phase

Objective: Analyse data and findings in order to respond to the EQ, making an overall assessment synthesized into a comprehensive report with credible conclusions and useful recommendations.	
Tasks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinated joint analysis of information and formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations. • Draft Evaluation Report according to the requirements specified in the ToR. • Preparing a Survey Report to be part of the annexes to the report. • Drafting a separate Executive Summary. • Comments by the Reference Group and finalising/submitting the Final Evaluation Report and annexes.

The home-based Inception and Desk phases were carried out the first two weeks of June 2019, and were mainly devoted to a preliminary assessment, structuring the evaluation approach, data collection and desk research, development of instruments for the collection of information, planning logistics for the field mission.

The fact-finding stage started by travelling to Tanzania on the 15th of June to visit all the projects and conduct stakeholders' meetings and interviews. This phase lasted until the 5th of July and was followed by several days of joint analysis and assessment by the experts to prepare the first major conclusions for the debriefing session. Further analysis and report writing from home took place from the 29th of July.

2.2 Evaluation questions

The methodology for the evaluation is based on addressing Evaluation Questions by means of judgement criteria linked to indicators. During the preparatory phase, therefore, each Question was analysed to identify the most appropriate criteria and indicators.

The Programme will be evaluated using the five standard DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact), plus the two EU specific evaluation criteria (EU added value, coherence of the action within the strategic policy framework). Furthermore, the evaluation team shall consider whether gender and environment were mainstreamed and reflected during implementation.

Following the indications of the ToR, we proposed to concentrate on a maximum of 12 evaluation questions. In essence, the process will follow the **Evaluation Design Matrix** (in Annex), to address the major purposes of this evaluation.

The focus will be to measure achievements, their quality and the results at the end of implementation, providing an understanding of the cause and effect links between: inputs, activities and outputs, outcomes and impacts, all measured against what was initially expected.

2.3 Collection of information

The Final Evaluation involved an in-depth documentation analysis, short field visits to all available projects, meetings and consultations with stakeholders and an online survey.

2.3.1 Field missions

To obtain a full overview of the project results, in order to assess their contribution to the Programme objectives and expected results, it was essential to visit the projects.

The experts set up meetings with all available project managers and travelled to the most important sites developed as a result of the Programme. In most cases, the CH projects required 1-2 days and the CCI projects 1-day meetings. Where possible, meetings took place with local partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries. The time available for the field missions was very short and did not permit visits to the outreach sites in many CH projects. Nevertheless, a broad overview was obtained, focused on the overall results against the Programme intentions rather than the detail of individual project elements delivered.

Field visits with direct meetings took place at 15 projects (7 CH projects and 8 CCI projects) as per the mission calendar in Annex. One organisation (KFI) was closed, former staff only available for phone interviews. Two (Music Mayday and Parapanda) had closed down at the end of EU grant phase and no-one made themselves available.

There was considerable value in the field missions taking place 2-3 years after the end of the EU-grant phase. This enabled the evaluation team to assess the real sustainability and impact of the projects, to see what partnerships have endured, meet local stakeholders and review future plans. In most cases, while the Final Narrative Report is taken as an accurate end-of-project assessment, the results seen 2-3 years on indicate many new, unexpected and positive elements in terms of sustainability and impact. The departure of EU-based project managers, for some, has been the make-or-break period for the supported actions to achieve genuine local ownership and management. All this has been extremely useful to analyse, and to contextualise the legacy of the funded culture and development projects.

Several projects which showed poor overall results at project end, and may have been consigned to the 'less successful' label, are in fact flourishing in 2019. In most cases, due to an inadequate implementation period, the CH built museums and visitor centres only opened to the public at the very end of the EU project phase (e.g. WMF, Iringa, CAC). Therefore, the final EU project report could not indicate how well the new facilities were managed and promoted. The final evaluation visits were extremely valuable to gain an overview of visitor statistics, assess the reliability of the final report's projections, the balance of resident and foreign visitors, marketing and promotion, diversification of income sources etc.

Among the CCI projects, the longer perspective has been useful to see how the EU project contributed to capacity building and the credibility of the organisations with other donors (e.g. Nafasi, MUDA). In the case of the Goethe project, the longer-term expectations of sustainable self-employment resulting from the training could not be reported on in the 2016 Final Narrative Report. By 2019, with sufficient time for mature results, an impressive tally of 13 acrobats are working on long contracts abroad and return earnings to their families, demonstrating solid economic impacts.

In contrast, a small number of projects, signed off as completed and relatively satisfactorily, have disappeared from sight, with around 3 organisations closed down and several institution-led projects leaving few discernible traces.

2.3.2 Stakeholder meetings and consultations

As part of the Final Evaluation, several meetings took place with stakeholders among development partners in Tanzania, complemented with online research. The aim was to identify key players, past actions, current trends and perspectives for donor support to the cultural sector.

During the Final Evaluation, the EU hosted a meeting of European cultural sector national institutes, embassy representatives and development partners to discuss the establishment of a European Union National Institutes for Culture / EUNIC Cluster Tanzania.

All development partners are aware of the lack of government financial support for culture, areas of potential, capacity building needs, and the slow process to develop a robust cultural policy in Tanzania to recognise the contribution a strong cultural sector can make to the development of the country.

The stakeholders consulted are listed in Annex, with an analysis of findings in section 1.3.4.

2.3.3 Survey

An online survey was created by the evaluation team. It aimed to collect qualitative and quantitative data mapping the sector needs and trends in terms of fundraising donors for culture and development projects in Tanzania, alongside best practices and lessons learned from working with EU and other donors. The survey was designed as part of the prospective mapping work to gather primary evidence to inform on lessons learned and to make recommendations for entry points on future EU Actions in Tanzania.

An independent cultural researcher, Lara Bourdin, was sub-contracted to coordinate the survey, under the team supervision. It was sent out via Google Forms and Word on 25 June, with several follow-up e-mails and reminders. The survey was closed on 15 July, with analysis completed by late July.

The mailing lists of contacts compiled for the survey comprised:

- 18 EU-funded projects and relevant partners (55 organisations/applicants & partners – 51 emails).
- Non-successful applicants: 10th EDF Support to Culture in Tanzania (70 organisations – 80 emails).
- Other important cultural sector organisations in Tanzania (65 organisations – 71 emails).

In total, 190 organisations were contacted via the survey (total: 202 emails) and 36 responses were received, a good response rate from 19% of the organisations surveyed. This included five international/European organisations (2 based in Europe, 3 based in Tanzania) and 31 Tanzanian organisations.

The project applicants and their partners were the most motivated to respond to the survey. Twenty responses were received from project applicants and partners (36% of the contacted organisations),

representing 14 of the 18 projects (78%). No responses were received from applicants or partners of the following EU funded projects: British Council, Music Mayday, Parapanda and NCAA.

Just 6 responses were received from non-successful applicants (9%) and 10 responses came from the other cultural sector contacts (15% of organisations surveyed).

As might be expected, there was a high bounce rate for the emails sent to the 2012 contacts for non-successful applicants to the 10th EDF Support to Culture in Tanzania. Over all categories of survey contacts, 54 emails bounced (30%) but, with multiple emails for some contacts, the survey reached most targets.

Overall, many useful comments were received and respondents completed the survey diligently. The key findings and conclusions from the base of 36 survey responses were:

- **Success rates with EU and other funding:**

- The majority (69%) of survey respondents had had at least one experience of EU funding in the past, and 55% were beneficiaries of the 10th EDF Support to Culture funding programme. 67% have received funding from other donors.
- The donors are mainly European, with German international cooperation institutes being the lead funders reported.
- There is significant variety in the other private, public and non-governmental funding organisations that have supported cultural organisations in Tanzania.

- **Experience of applying to EU funding vs. other funds:**

- A quarter of respondent organisations (one European, seven Tanzanian) have been unsuccessful in their applications for EU funding at least once in the past. When asked for the reason for refusal, half of those who chose to respond (3) stated that no reason had been given.
- While 35% of respondents stated that they had found the EU funding application process “straightforward”, a slightly larger number (38%) found it “very complicated”. The most commonly cited challenges were bureaucratic in nature (length of the proposal, documentation requirements).
- In contrast, 55% of respondents who received other donor funding stated that the processes (contracts and payments, reporting) had been “fairly straightforward,” even though they were, by and large, formal application processes (73%) rather than informal processes (45%).
- In light of these results and the comments provided, it is apparent that EU funding application processes are comparatively more complex and demanding than application processes for other funds.

- **Experience with running and reporting on EU projects vs. other funds:**

- The majority of respondents who had been beneficiaries of EU funds reported generally positive experiences with the implementation process. Comparatively strong positive responses were provided about the support provided by EU staff during the implementation phase as well as during evaluation and monitoring. However, several negative comments were submitted as well. These concerned mainly: the difficulty of reporting to several (changing) EU officers; the payment schedule, particularly for the final instalment; and the discrepancy between the EU regulations and the reality of the arts sector in Tanzania.

- 74% of respondents stated that the funding provided by other donors “responded to the needs of their organisations” (74%). Detailed questions were not provided; as such, it is difficult to draw a solid comparison between the processes of running and reporting of the EU vs. other funds.
- It follows from the above results that respondents are generally more positive about the experience of running and reporting on EU projects than about the application process, which is considered to be complex and demanding.
- **Finances: current situation and vision:**
 - Most organisations describe situations of financial precarity, characterised by project-based rather than programmatic funding, relatively low rates of income from activities and annual rather than long-term planning.
 - Funding for projects is the main financial challenge shared by respondents, followed by funding for expertise for long-term planning (61%).
 - The majority of respondents would like to move toward longer-term agreements (3-5 years) for core funding to cover organisational costs (65%). There is also a strong desire (38%) for the possibility to apply for larger-scale, complex funding programmes (3/5-year grants for multi-partner actions).
- **Vision and strategic development:**
 - In terms of thematic areas for potential future EU funds, the most in demand are cultural heritage (61%), entrepreneurship development and cultural creative industries (53%), and training and skills development (42%).
 - Rates of collaboration with international partners are relatively low (18% regularly; 18% occasionally).
 - A majority hope to move toward increased budgets, long-term programming rather than project-based funding schemes and long-term sustainability.

2.4 Constraints and limitations of the analysis

The Final Evaluation has proceeded at speed, with a short desk research period, followed by the 24 days on mission in Tanzania. The planning period was very tight, with continuous stakeholder research and meeting organisation throughout the field phase. Although more time would have been beneficial, in several of the evaluation phases, there has been an efficient use of resources.

As anticipated by the EU DEL, several organisations had closed down and were not available for interview, but it would have been beneficial to have had more time allocated overall for the field visits. This would have particularly benefitted the larger budget/scale CH projects where there was more outreach activity and distant sites to be visited. The long-term results, as perceived by final beneficiaries, could only be lightly observed in most projects.

Some EU-based project managers were reached through the survey, but there was insufficient time to also contact them for direct interviews about the project results. Nevertheless, given some discrepancies between current project realities and expectations set out in Final Narrative (e.g. local partner commitments to job creations which did not materialise), this was not a serious limitation for final analysis.

A considerable amount of additional documentation (mappings of the Tanzania cultural sector by diverse donors and inter-government initiatives, government policy reports) has been published since the mid-term evaluation. The experts have allocated substantial extra time for desk research to analyse this.

Given that the government ministry and some institutional stakeholders are based in Dodoma, there was no time or budget foreseen for Dodoma government stakeholder consultations. This would have been beneficial. However, it was much appreciated that several representatives of the Line Ministries (Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, NAO, Ministry of Information, Culture, Arts and Sports) attended meetings at the EU DEL as part of the Final Evaluation.

Chapter 3: Main results of the Programme

This chapter follows the sequence of evaluation questions agreed during the Inception phase in the Evaluation Design Matrix. The 12 evaluation questions are in some cases complemented with other points of concern addressed during the evaluation.

3.1 Relevance

3.1.1 The extent to which the Call for Proposals objectives correctly addressed the identified problems and needs. Relevance of the Programme/Call for Proposals with regard to the problems and needs of the target groups.

This is the only Evaluation Question addressed in the Evaluation Design Matrix and concerns the adequacy between the projects and the priority needs of the sector, the realities on the ground, the capacities of the operators and institutions of the targeted sectors. It also looks at the adequacy between the activities of funded projects and the objectives of the Programme.

The Programme, through its grant component, is fully relevant to the need in terms of supporting the emergence and strengthening of civil society structures operating in culture, taking into account the very modest public and private investment/financing for culture and heritage promotion available in the country (no credit lines, absence of sustainable public funding mechanisms, scarce resources from other international donors).

Some weakness can be pointed out in relation to the content of the Calls for Proposals. A brief reminder of the Guidelines of both Calls for Proposals is in annex to this report.

The **CCI Guidelines** were drafted internally on the basis of the Action Fiche for the programme, and launched in April 2012 just after the signature of the Financing Agreement. Despite the success in terms of proposals received, it must be said that the identification studies carried out did not include a reliable analysis of the **economic contribution** of the creative industries, nor a **value-chain mapping** specific to Tanzania, leading to poor identification of strategic needs to be targeted.

An analysis of the Guidelines in light of this final ex-post evaluation confirms that the content of the Call had various major contradictions in terms of the Programme's objective of reinforcing the capacity of the cultural and creative industries in a sustainable way.

First of all, the CCI Call was addressed to all culture sectors and areas, with little differentiation, as well as to a broad spectrum of possible beneficiaries: Non-State Actors or international (inter-governmental) organisations. A minimum level of experience was not an eligibility criterion. These selection criteria led to three completely different categories of project beneficiaries 1) Local organisations with little experience; 2) Bigger European organisations or Cultural Institutions working with local partners; 3) International organisations like UNESCO.

The different levels of **experience and capacities** of the beneficiaries of the grants, as well as the variety of the projects' portfolio, although rich in thematic and geographical content, was not the best approach to achieve coherent and structural change.

It is however important to mention here that the experience/size of the organisations that finally received a grant does not automatically relate to a successful implementation of the projects. As an example, projects implemented by international organisations like UNESCO or the British Council have recorded less success and continuity than some newly created interventions like MUDA Africa or CAC.

Secondly, the Call was addressed to non-profit making organisations, although the ultimate objective was to support organisations seeking self-financial sustainability.

On the other hand, concepts of **a culture of entrepreneurship** and the value chain are not properly addressed in the Call for Proposals, and therefore the Programme did not directly respond in a structural way to the needs of the private sector (enterprises) operating in culture.

This is particularly obvious for the **art and craft sector**. The funded projects dealing with craft have proven to be a very effective tool for economic development and reduction of rural poverty in Tanzania but have been exposed to major constraints in terms of trade development (restrictions on exports and access to markets) not directly addressed by the Programme. Greater complementarity with the 10th EDF Trade and Agriculture Support Programme (TASP II) could have provided more structural support.

As a reminder, the overall objective of TASP II was to increase agricultural production, development and trade for five selected subsectors (horticulture, fisheries, cotton, coffee, and tea) in view of economic development and reduction of rural poverty in Tanzania. The specific objective was to increase smallholder farmers' income through better access to markets (national, regional and international markets) by undertaking the following interventions: 1) support to capacity development for better compliance with market demand in terms of quality and standards and 2) strengthening of the value chain linking the smallholder farmers to the markets, in view of increased productivity, competitiveness and income. The craft subsector could have been integrated under these objectives.

Same applies for the 10th EDF Environment Component of the support to NSA Programme. The overall objective being to alleviate poverty of rural communities (villages) in Tanzania by empowering communities as owner (or co-owner) – managers of their natural resources (forests, fisheries and wildlife) through sustainable land use planning and participatory / community-based natural resources management activities, as such increasing their resilience to external changes (including to climate change). The culture tourism development foreseen by the 10th EDF Support to Culture in Tanzania has a strong linkage with these objectifs.

Lastly, in light of the results recorded by projects dealing with **vocational training**, we can judge the approach to training and capacity building as inconsistent, defined without a proper needs assessment and supporting ad hoc training institutions rather than intervening in the formal education sector. The Programme did partially respond to professionalization needs, but not in a structural way. It was covered mainly by unofficial non-certified training courses, which have proven to be unsustainable in most cases.

The **CH Call** took longer to be launched (June 2012) as the formulation of the Guidelines was done on the basis of the consultation of all relevant stakeholders carried out by the experts recruited for this purpose under the TCF Facility. This was an adequate approach for a better definition of the targets and guidelines of this Call.

It was chosen to include Local Authorities and public institutions among potential beneficiaries in the eligibility criteria. This choice aimed to encourage building the private-public partnerships necessary for an effective cultural heritage sector development. A minimum of 2 years of formal existence was required to ensure greater operational and financial capacity. The relevance of this choice is reflected in the final positive results accomplished by the majority of CH projects, with greater financial and institutional sustainability being achieved in most cases.

Timeframe of the Calls:

The timeframe defined in the Calls for Proposals (maximum project duration of 36 months) was not adequate in relation to the expected results and objectives of the programme.

The rationale behind both Calls was to support projects with an economic growth perspective, which could contribute to a structural change and long-term impact. Sustainability and the creation of an enabling environment to transform cultural assets into a vector of economic development for the community was also a leading principle of both Calls.

To respect this rationale, a 36 month project approach has proven inadequate and unrealistic in both Calls for Proposals. The majority of projects required an addendum to prolong the implementation period to be able to deliver the expected results.

For CH projects, this final evaluation confirms that it was unrealistic to have foreseen an optimal outcome in only 3 years for projects involving works (construction or rehabilitation), for consolidating the subsequent planning and management of the culture infrastructures built by the projects.

The majority of CH projects (including the UNESCO project) incurred major delays, placing the project results at risk. The complexity of the operating environment (administrative processes, government permissions etc.) was underestimated. Although the construction aspect of the projects could be launched on time, the subsequent programming and management plans were not secured in an optimal way before the EU funds stepped away.

For CCI, we consider it unrealistic to have foreseen a business/fund-raising model that would lead to financial autonomy in only 3 years. Financial sustainability, as we will see later, continues to be a major challenge for all the projects, even the most successful ones.

This has been confirmed in our exchanges with all the projects, which consider the EU support crucial to initiate new things, but insufficient to consolidate them.

Funding was enough to initiate the project with just a few months of operations before funding was exhausted. Even with planned sustainability initiatives and projects to assure longevity - in the case of DARCH we collect revenue from tours and exhibition entrance fees - it has been almost impossible to keep up with the running costs. Ideally upon completion, the project should have a minimum of 3 years to operate with subsidies or full funding so that it can garner enough savings to sustain itself in the long term.

Aida Mukolozzi, DARCH

The EU funding was the catalyst for our Centre to come into existence. We have made excellent progress and expect to be sustainable by the end of this year [2019]. It is more than challenging in a developing country to go from nothing to sustainable within a 3-year EU grant.

Randall Stubbs, Tumaini University Makumira, Cultural Arts Centre

3.1.2 Relevance to the policy framework and the development strategy in Tanzania

As presented in the previous chapters the programme is consistent with, and supportive of the EU/Tanzania country development strategy.

It is in line with the global EU framework on support to culture and specifically contributes to the implementation of the joint **EU strategy for international cultural relations** and the **European Agenda for Culture**, emphasising that culture should be a vital element in international relations, that culture is a resource in its own right and access to culture should be considered a priority in development policies. The content of this Programme contributes to the specific objective of the European Agenda for Culture through providing financial support for the preservation of and access to cultural heritage on one hand and, on the other hand, active encouragement and promotion of cultural activities across the world.

The objectives of the Programme and its expected results are also fully in line with the **2005 UNESCO Convention** on the Protection and the Promotion of Diversity of Cultural Expressions, ratified by the EU in 2006, and by the Government of Tanzania in 2011.

The programme is inserted in the 10th EDF National Indicative Programme (NIP 2008-2013) for Tanzania. Specifically, paragraph 4.3.2, page 78, describes the support to non-state actors (NSAs), including in the area of culture, in view of their potential contribution to growth, trade and regional integration.

As described in the previous chapter, the overall development policy framework at national level during programme implementation was given by the **MKUKUTA II**, the Tanzanian Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP 2010-2015/2016). The development of the agriculture sector is central to the MKUKUTA II, but it also recognizes the importance of culture in development, both in terms of cultural heritage and its importance for tourism and in terms of entrepreneurship in the cultural industry.

As for the Government's sector policies, Tanzania has a very general **Cultural Policy** dating back to 1997, which governs the area of culture, covering both heritage, arts and craft and other areas of the cultural and creative industries. The programme is supportive to this policy. Nevertheless, the policy is considered not comprehensive, up to date nor to international standards and has been long under revision without success.

Other policies to which the Programme is supportive are, as explained in the previous chapters, the **Cultural Heritage Policy** of 2008, and the **Tourism Policy** of 1999, both under discussion and revision by their relevant Ministries since 2009 without substantial achievements so far.

3.1.3 Relevance of the Programme with regard to the needs of the culture sector

With regard specifically to the priority needs of the cultural sector, the information consulted for the evaluation mission comes from studies carried out for the identification and formulation of the Programme. We have also analysed other studies concerning related sectors such as civil society/non-state actors, tourism, crafts and trade. On the other hand, the grant applications under the calls for proposals are also very illustrative of the sector needs.

Although fragmented, the analysis of these sources serves to broadly identify the coherence of the programme with the cultural sector needs. A very brief list of **structural constraints** to the cultural sector can be summarised as follows:

- Inadequate and out-dated comprehensive policies.

- Public focus on cultural heritage and preservation, whereas public interventions are less supportive of arts promotion and development (mainly undertaken by the private sector and civil society).
- Ineffective legal and regulatory provisions to facilitate economic growth.
- Poor institutional framework, sectoral governance and coordination and inadequate understanding of concepts and strategies dealing with cultural tourism, the creative economy and the value chain.
- Weakness of the decentralisation process, with no interaction between central government and the regional and district authorities.

The weak capacity of the State in promoting reforms towards the development of the cultural sector confirms the relevance of working directly with NSA support. However, taking into consideration the need to create an **enabling environment** and admitting the weak capacity of the Government in finalising policy reforms, the Programme has not been sufficiently coherent in the areas of policy dialogue and review. The action foreseen in this Programme could have been complemented by other 10th EDF support to NSA on policy advocacy and accountability to contribute to revising policies and legislation.

The Programme, while meeting the real needs of the culture organisations, was not of the nature or a policy/strategy such as would be likely to ensure sustainable development of the cultural sector. This situation calls into question less the relevance of the interventions to the needs and problems of target groups than the impact and sustainability of its outputs.

3.1.4 Conclusions on Relevance

Strengths:

- The Programme has been fully in line with the development strategy established by Tanzania and the EU.
- The Programme design incorporated the need to contribute to the country's socio-economic development by boosting non-traditional growth sectors.
- The Programme was relevant to the capacity needs of the beneficiary organisations (NSAs), both in terms of financial support and technical guidance.
- The Calls for Proposals partially addressed the needs of the targeted beneficiaries, with better targets and guidelines in the case of the CH Call, where external international expertise assisted in its formulation.

Weaknesses:

- The choice to work exclusively supporting NSA (civil society and private operators) is relevant but the Programme should have included a component dedicated to public sector dialogue/support/reform, allowing it to meet strategic requirements (policy and legislative reforms).
- Results related to developing the capacity of creative entrepreneurs to be economically self-reliant and contribute to the economy have not been backed-up by a structural approach to training or to trade development, weakening the relevance of the Programme's architecture.
- The timeframe defined in the Calls for proposals (maximum project duration of 36 months) was not adequate in relation to the expected results and objectives of the programme (sustainability and impact).

3.2 Efficiency

The Evaluation Design Matrix retains under Efficiency questions relating to cost-effectiveness, governance and management arrangements for the Programme.

3.2.1 The extent to which the costs of the Programme have been appropriate to achieve the expected change in comparison with similar projects or known alternative approaches, taking contextual differences into account.

The final execution of the Financing Agreement shows full adequacy between the resources allocated and the objectives set, taking into account the size of the country, the diversity of sectors, the sectoral situation and needs and the management arrangements for the Programme.

The Financing Agreement made a clear distinction between what was expected from both components with regard to the allocation of funds, with 70% allocated to high investment CH projects and 25% to emerging CCI activities.

The CH component included the support to rehabilitation of historical buildings, the construction of museums or information centres, and therefore required higher financial resources. This component was targeting a limited number of major comprehensive and sustainable projects requiring costly capital investments. The Call established the size of grants between €500,000 and €2,000,000.

As for the CCI component, the Call targeted small projects (between 15 and 20 projects), with grants of minimum €100,000 and maximum €250,000.

If we take into account the results of the evaluations for both Calls for Proposals, we could question whether the resources were sufficient to respond to the financial needs and demands of the cultural sector, which were initially much higher in the light of the number of proposals received.

The following figures are however not always representative of quality projects, nor of the absorption capacity of the target beneficiaries:

- The CH Call received 67 projects and 41 were evaluated for a total of €21,848,330 (€7,000,000 available). Only 7 projects (out of 13 Full Proposals received in the second phase) could be funded for a total of €6,195,892, covering just 32% of the total demand.
- With only €2,500,000 available, the CCI Call received a total of 76 projects from which 67 were evaluated for a total of €13,664,410. Only 11 projects (out of 19 Full Proposals received in the second phase) were awarded a grant for €2,272,053, covering only 18% of the initial financial demand/proposals received at the first phase.

At the end of the programme, with a portfolio of 18 projects, the level of expenditure is reflected as follows:

CATEGORIES	PLANNED AMOUNT	USED AMOUNT	NON-ENGAGED
------------	----------------	-------------	-------------

CATEGORIES	PLANNED AMOUNT	USED AMOUNT	NON-ENGAGED
Activity 1 (Cultural Heritage) – Grants	7,080,000	6,489,598	590,402
Activity 2 (Creative & cultural industry) – Grants	2,500,000	2,317,385	182,615
Monitoring, External Evaluation and Audit – FWC service contract	420,000	404,059	15,941
Contingencies	0	0	0
TOTAL (EUR)	10,000,000	9,211,042	788,958

This shows an optimal level of consumption of the budget of 91% for the CH and 92% for the CCI components, and only 7% of non-engaged budget for the entire Financing Agreement. It also shows appropriate financial planning.

Cost-effectiveness is very positively balanced for this Programme. A brief analysis of the budgets of the 18 projects shows good financial estimations. Only one project with an expatriate-led organisation (CRAterre) can be questioned for the imbalances in the budget (proportion of expatriate expenditures), particularly in line with the continuity of the action and sustainability issues arising.

As for the Programme’s global management, the budgeted management cost is almost zero, as there has been no external assistance for the daily management of the grant contracts, being directly under the supervision of the NAO and the EU Delegation. Only 4% has been allocated to monitoring, evaluation and audits (external services).

A more structural, consistent nationwide geographical coverage of the needs of the sector would have required not only more funds but, more importantly, a different management mechanism as we will see in the next question.

3.2.2 The extent to which the implementation mechanisms of the Programme have been conducive to achieving the expected results. Whether the effects of the funded projects have been facilitated / constrained by Programme management, by co-ordination arrangements, by the participation of relevant stakeholders.

This evaluation question analyses the adequacy of the financing procedures in relation to the specificities of the cultural sectors, the realities on the ground and the capacities of the operators/institutions of the sectors and regions concerned.

Evaluation of proposals under the Calls:

The programme has been implemented through grants following two separate Calls for Proposals and the Evaluation Committee for both Calls was supported with inputs from external assessors recruited with the Framework Contract. This was an adequate procedure taking into account the number of proposals received and the technical knowledge required to specifically assess culture proposals. It was also a very

fruitful approach in the light of how the Programme was able to respect the indicative timeframe of the Calls.

The provisional calendar announced with the Guidelines for the CCI Call was fully respected. A notification of award was foreseen by 12 December 2012, and the final evaluation was concluded on 5 December 2012. The signing of contracts was foreseen for March 2013. Most proposals were contracted between 15 February and 1 April 2013, except those on the reserve list and with additional eligibility checks contracted in May and June 2013.

For the CH Call (as per corrigendum) the notification of award was foreseen by 28 February 2013. The final evaluation was concluded on 16 May 2013, over 2 months behind schedule. The high number of Concept Notes received for this Call for Proposals was put forward as a reason for modifying the indicative timetable and subsequent delays. The signing of contracts also took longer than expected and happened progressively between May 2013 and May 2014.

Grant contractual arrangements and supervision:

For the **CH Component**, the projects were implemented by partially decentralised management with the NAO as the Contracting Authority. The Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (Antiquities Division) acted as project supervisor. The reason for this was to ensure a Government sense of ownership and to ensure greater cooperation with the local government authorities in the areas where the actions were to be implemented. This is also linked to coherence and complementarity with sectoral policies.

This adequate implementation mechanism is most probably the reason for better institutional sustainability results for the CH projects, although the relationship between the projects and public authorities (i.e. local authorities and relevant ministries) has been in most cases reported by the projects as insufficient and not proactive, the managers having to build and work the communications channels toward the public administrations by themselves.

For the **CCI Component**, the projects were implemented by direct management with the EU Delegation as the Contracting Authority, without any line Ministry supervising contractual follow-up.

Addendum One to the FA allowed for the conclusion of Contribution Agreements for the two grants awarded to UNESCO following the CH and CCI Call for proposals. Standard UNESCO Contribution Agreements have been concluded directly by the Commission.

The three different types of contracting arrangements created de facto different levels of supervision and follow up-requirements. The CH projects were scrutinised at three levels (NAO, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism and the EU Delegation) and were exposed, in some cases, to discrepancies of perceptions among them, the NAO approving financial reports then questioned and rejected by the EU Delegation (the case of NCAA audits has been a clear example of such discrepancies in approach).

As far as the two UNESCO Contribution Agreements were concerned, the prevalence of UNESCO management and accounting regulations/rules somehow led to a greater degree of flexibility in the implementation process for these two projects. However, both UNESCO-led projects were the source of important alerts during the Mid-term Evaluation, for management weaknesses and low performance. The same flexible standards also seemed to be applied during the implementation phase to projects led by EU Culture Institutes (e.g. British Council). Diplomacy has prevailed even in cases where mismanagement by the implementing partners was made evident by audit (UNESCO - CAS Loliondo).

It is also important to stress here that the EU Delegation has been very supportive of the low management skills of some of the CCI projects implemented by smaller organisations, dedicating a lot of time and extending the implementation periods.

All this together has influenced the long delays needed for the closure of the contracts and some projects waited for over a year to get their final payment request approved.

Challenges of the EU Delegation direct management:

For regular follow-up, a high turnover of staff managing the programme at the EUDEL has been a challenge for the projects, reported during the evaluation interviews and survey as a negative aspect of the Programme's contractual arrangements.

Direct management by the EU Delegation of the CCI contracts and the UNESCO Contribution Agreements has also turned out to be a big burden for the EU staff (operations and finance), particularly in the light of the weak management capacities of the grant beneficiaries and lack of responsiveness among some of them.

By the end of the Programme implementation, the evaluation team were advised that the EU Delegation staff had some criticisms of the implementation modalities of the programme. While recognising successes that resulted from the programme, EUDEL staff felt that the implementation method could have been done differently and more efficiently.

There is certainly a correlation between some of the successful projects and the fact that they are the ones that did not need an extension and their audits/final payment raised no particular questions, but some of the projects perceived by the EU Delegation as administratively and/or contractually problematic have been very successful in contributing to the Financing Agreement objectives, despite their relative management difficulties.

Coaching, Monitoring and Audits:

- **External Coaching:** Following the recommendation from the assessors of the CCI Call, a request for services was launched in February 2014 under the Framework Contract, entitled "Capacity Building of Culture Programme Grantees in Results Oriented Management, and Financial and Contractual Procedures". The specific objective of this assignment was to address the little experience in project management and EU grants identified for almost all the grantees, and assist them on result-oriented management and operational reporting. A Framework Contract was awarded to IBF International Consulting in March 2014.

Feedback from the projects shows a good level of satisfaction with this intervention, although criticised as not in line with project needs and taking place too late.

- **Audits:** A final audit was compulsory following the PRAG rules and regulations for all the projects. Some projects faced important challenges in project management and were flagged by the mid-term evaluation for possible external audit.

Independent audits and expenditure verifications were, in consequence, launched by the EU Delegation to verify eligibility of expenses for 4 projects (NCAA, Masaai Pastoralist, Iringa University, Makumira University and Parapanda). Final findings had some minor financial consequences for some projects, the case of NCAA being of the most particular concern since an important amount of salaries/allowances was declared non-eligible.

Some projects (DARCH and Masaai Pastoralists) were also selected under the EU/OLAF audits system for an external Court of Auditors check.

- **Regular Monitoring by contracting authorities:** The EUDEL and NAO were regularly active in monitoring the projects. However, in some cases these missions did not serve for efficient Risk Assessment. Some of the negative audit results could have been avoided in due time, since the problems were identified during these missions (i.e. NCAA project with the ineligibility of staff allowances flagged from the first coaching mission).

The Financing Agreement omitted any financial provision for **joint monitoring missions** with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism as stipulated in the CH MoU and therefore their participation in field monitoring has been very limited. A solution was explored with them under the TCF Facility, which was however never approved.

- **Mid-term evaluation:** a mid-term evaluation was completed in January 2016 with a full-scale evaluation and visits to all 18 projects to review their results against Logical Framework matrices and their planned activities. Although rich in useful information and recommendations about each individual project, the ToR asked for a “project-focused” approach and did not give priority to an evaluation of the overarching Financing Agreement. This exercise is now covered under this final evaluation to complement those previous findings.

A 2 day stakeholder Forum entitled “Networking for Sustainability” was also organised with the aim to network the 10th EDF Support to Culture in Tanzania funded projects in order to develop synergies and enhance sustainability.

- **External ROM:** The Programme was the object of an external EU/ROM mission in February 2016, scoring Relevance and Effectiveness as Good/Very Good, and Efficiency and Sustainability as problematic.

3.2.3 The extent to which Tanzanian government participation in the design and in the management/monitoring of the Programme and the level of local ownership has been as planned and appropriate.

This evaluation question relates to the effectiveness of the Programme's steering methods in relation to the characteristics of the Programme and the specificities of the targeted sectors, and represents one of the major insufficiencies of the Programme design.

The Financing Agreement was very brief in its definition of the organisational set-up and particularly inadequate for the definition of supervisory responsibilities, placing the continuous technical and financial monitoring under the government's (beneficiary) responsibility, without further precision.

As for the Evaluation Committees for the Call for Proposals, the approach differs for each Call. The CCI Call was evaluated by the EU Delegation, without any technical input from the Ministry of Information, Culture, Arts and Sports. This preserved the decision from any political interference, but had the negative consequence of minimal public ownership. The Ministry of Information, Culture, Arts and Sports is responsible for arts and culture but did not have any delegated role in the management and monitoring of the 10th EDF Support to Culture in Tanzania, although it attended EU meetings for the Final Evaluation.

As for the CH Call, the Composition of the Evaluation Committee was more appropriate to generate closer involvement/monitoring by the relevant public authorities in the following stages. It also resulted in the selection of more relevant projects in terms of sectorial policy. The EU Delegation was just an observer and the whole evaluation was in the hands of the NAO and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. This

contributed to better knowledge/ownership of the funded projects by the Ministry, and facilitated its role in monitoring them.

At a more global level, the Financing Agreement does not make any provisions for a **Steering Committee** or any other sort of governing body. The consequence of this is summarised in insufficient coordination and complementarity between the two components of the Programme, as well as limited participation of the relevant stakeholders (line ministries and public bodies, together with target beneficiaries) in piloting and globally reviewing the programme's achievements.

It also limited any constructive political dialogue to guide and redirect the intervention according to the reality of the projects and their needs and to identify technical problems and adapt decisions.

For the CH component, after the selection of projects a **MoU** was signed between the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, the NAO (Contracting Authority) and the EU Delegation to clearly specify roles and responsibilities. The Ministry was identified as a key actor for technical expertise, to ensure alignment of project implementation with public policies and strategies and facilitate sustainability, which is particularly relevant as the other parties to the MoU (NAO and EUDEL) did not have the technical knowledge and skills necessary for cultural heritage management, particularly for the three CH projects related to UNESCO World Heritage Sites (Kilwa, Stone Town and Ngorongoro) within very complex institutional and managerial frameworks.

However, meetings of this CH Steering Committee never took place officially and the responsibilities set up in the MoU have been only partially fulfilled. Some of these are important to recall here:

The Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism shall undertake the following activities during the duration of the MOU term:

- i. Continuous technical monitoring to ensure the Programme actions are implemented in line with its respective Financing Agreement, the individual grant contracts as well as Government's policies/strategies and plans;*
- ii. Bring the necessary official support to the projects when they require information or clarifications on policies, laws and regulations with regards to the protection and promotion of Cultural Heritage in Tanzania;*
- iii. Contribute to the sustainability of project results and objectives by playing the role of key stakeholder to the projects and advocating for the projects in local and national development plans;*
- iv. Participate in monitoring and evaluation of the programme;*
- v. Contribute to rendering the programme visible through high-level engagement in project events when necessary.*

It is important to recall here that the Financing Agreement did not foresee this body and therefore did not set aside funds to facilitate the Committee meetings, nor for the joint visits for monitoring and evaluation of the projects. This could have been also considered in the Financing agreement as a contribution from the Government to the Programme.

An **integrated approach** towards enhancing the creative economy would have required a more effective institutional coordination mechanism, with also a broader spectrum of participants (other relevant ministries like Education, Trade and Tourism) relevant to the culture sector.

Coordination between the different **administration levels** (national, regional, district and local) has also been neglected, taking into account the geographical interventions supported by the Programme and the current poor level of administrative decentralisation of the cultural sector.

3.2.4 Conclusions on Efficiency

Strengths:

- The Programme financial resources were adequate to the absorption capacity of the sector, and efficient implementation mechanisms respected the overall calendar foreseen in the Call for Proposals.
- Good decision to separate CH and CCI into two distinct calls/content/implementation mechanisms with greater financial attention for CH component willing to concentrate on just a few projects.
- Good decision to expand the portfolio of CH projects beyond the initial plan to fund just one or two very large budget projects.
- For CH: Better definition of the targets and guidelines. More adequate implementation mechanism defined with a closer involvement/monitoring of the relevant public authorities = relevance of the selected projects, better institutional ownership, better final results

Weaknesses:

- The absence of a Steering Committee for coordination and communication between relevant Ministries has been unfavourable for optimal monitoring and facilitation of project implementation, limiting a more supportive approach and impact. Other Ministries like Education, Trade and Tourism should have been involved at some key stages.
- Fragility of the sector in terms of management capacities should have required additional supporting measures (intermediate technical support body).
- 36 month project cycle approach not adequate/realistic in both Calls for Proposals, as confirmed by major delays in the CH component and addendums for extensions in the majority of the projects.
- Poor definition of the CCI Guidelines, with various major contradictions:
 - Addressed to non-profit making organisations but seeking self-financial sustainability. The absence of references to cultural entrepreneurship and private sector development restricted the Programme's potential of intervention.
 - No coherent structural (cluster) approach: all sectors/all areas indistinctly = scattered interventions.
 - Inconsistent approach to training and capacity building (no proper previous needs assessment), supporting ad hoc training institutions rather than intervening in the formal education sector. Sustainability of this approach has proven to be a failure.
- Some projects were the object of external audits launched by EU Delegation due to management uncertainties. This led to major delays in the final payments.

3.3 Effectiveness

Following the Evaluation Design Matrix devised for the Inception Report, two Evaluation Questions are considered under Effectiveness. These questions relate to the separate Specific Objectives for the CH and CCI programme components and the effectiveness is analysed according to the results found for the projects funded under each strand.

3.3.1 The extent to which the funded projects have directly or indirectly contributed to the preservation, promotion and access to local culture as planned in the specific objectives.

The Support to Cultural Heritage Protection and Promotion Projects set the following Specific Objective: *To protect, preserve and promote cultural heritage in Tanzania, in order to enhance its contribution to economic, social and human development.*

Preservation, promotion and access to local culture are observed fairly consistently across the portfolio of CH projects and the programme has been an effective vector to achieve this. Definitions of 'local culture' and cultural heritage have been widely interpreted (the Anglican cathedral in Stone Town, East African slave trade history, rural cultural artefacts and intangible cultural heritage in Arusha and Iringa, natural local heritage in Kilwa, 20th century African Liberation Heritage archives, German colonial era buildings, prehistory in Ngorongoro, for example).

An open approach to defining the cultural heritages to be preserved and promoted (i.e. not restricted to graded or world status cultural heritages) has been an effective mechanism for inclusiveness. Adapted to the context of Tanzania, this has enabled a diverse and representative series of interventions in CH sector through the programme.

Good results are registered for projects with solid local partnerships, which built knowledge networks across the local cultural context and were able to integrate relevant content (e.g. Iringa, CAC). In such contexts, a level of local ownership/appropriation has been obtained (with observations of enduring partnerships 2-3 years after the EU project ended). This creates better perspectives for public/private partnerships and collaborations. While not fully realised across the board, a long-term seed has been planted.

The three actions (preservation, promotion and access) have been most effective where the design of the project integrated mechanisms for mutual reinforcement across the three areas, and some observations can be made on successes and needs for improvement:

Preservation: work of high quality has been undertaken to preserve several important monuments in Tanzania (e.g. Anglican Cathedral Zanzibar, Iringa Boma, DARCH Dar es Salaam Boma), with results intended to conserve heritage monuments in the long-term. Work of good quality has been undertaken in the preservation of intangible cultural heritage (e.g. CAC), although some projects only achieved partial results (e.g. UNESCO ALH archives).

Promotion: across the board (CH and CCI fields), there is a professional deficit in marketing and promotion skills in Tanzania, as observed in the implementation and results of the funded projects. In many cases, this was considered as a late phase extra activity, rather than being fully integrated into the action. One advantage of the Final Evaluation taking place 2-3 years after projects ended has been to observe the results from this late or inconsistent promotion/marketing of the cultural heritages preserved. Further work is required to upgrade skills and improve project planning to achieve the full potential of many of the funded projects, in promoting the results. In the case of the cultural tourism projects, the success in terms of visitor numbers is to a large extent dependent on external factors (e.g. the heritage sites of Zanzibar Stone Town benefit from a high numbers of tourists, while Iringa and Kilwa await better integration into tourism circuits). The need for ongoing attention to promotion, through social media and other tools, is emphasized.

Access: in general, access for local populations to the cultural heritages preserved has been well considered and good results have been obtained. Ticketed access is designed with differentiated pricing (foreign visitors, children/students, local residents). In most cases, a balanced number of foreign tourists/expats and local Tanzanians is observed – with precise statistics recorded per project in the Annexes. For example, visitors to Iringa Boma are around 50/50 locals and foreign tourists/expats; audiences at Nafasi Art Space vary according to the activity and are majority local Tanzanians, around 60-90%; and even in the tourism-focus areas such as Zanzibar, local residents and school groups constituted 34% of visitors to the WMF project site in 2016-2018. The government’s domestic tourism policy (Utalii wa ndani) was mentioned in several contexts and support from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism to promote local tourism (e.g. school groups funded to visit cultural and natural heritage sites) is to be commended. Several projects show increased resident visitors in 2018. While much-reduced ticket income from a higher proportion of domestic visitors may result, the programme has been an effective vector to support local access to Tanzanian cultural heritage and this is a growing trend.

Positive narrative #1 CAC audiences

*CAC audience trends are very impressive, well tracked and reflect a very positive outcome. Since the inception of the EU funded project, CAC has managed to welcome into their premises and interact with **84,000 people** that have benefited from events generated by this project. The figures show how continuity is ensured and is on a good path:*

- *EU PROJECT 2014-2017/36 months = 388 events – 45,000 visitors.*
- *POST PROJECT/NOW 22 months after the end of project = 346 events – 38,000 visitors.*

*Moreover, between 60 and 70% of this attendance are Tanzanians, showing an important prioritization of the project to **local community** outreach and enjoyment of their cultural assets*

3.3.2 The extent to which the funded projects have directly or indirectly contributed to capacity building as planned in the specific objectives reflected as:

- **the emergence of new cultural activities.**
- **the structuring of cultural sectors in Tanzania.**
- **the professionalisation and durability of cultural operators in Tanzania.**
- **the emergence of cultural entrepreneurship.**

The Support to Non-State-Actors in the Cultural and Creative Industries component set the following Specific Objective: *To enhance the capacity of the cultural and creative industries in Tanzania.*

Overall, most projects integrated training sessions, which were justified as a capacity-building measure in the CCI sector. There is a lack of cultural management skills and training in Tanzania; successful projects are often reliant on project managers who come from, or have acquired their skills and experience, elsewhere. Projects were often challenged to recruit experienced staff.

Much capacity building action was funded but it is not certain how much capacity/capability was enhanced in the CCIs as a result, since the training results were rarely evaluated adequately.

Nevertheless, the final evaluation confirmed that programme has delivered many of the expected results:

New activities: good results are observed in terms of the effective contribution to the emergence of new cultural activities (e.g. Nafasi, MUDA Africa and Fit for Life/Goethe projects). Visual arts, contemporary dance and circus skills have been reinforced through these projects, which demonstrate the effectiveness of a focus on sectoral cluster.

Structuring cultural sector: this expected result includes improvements in cultural and creative facilities and improved networks of exchange of expertise. Some projects invested in facilities (e.g. substantial structural improvements at Nafasi) and equipment, and there have been some beneficial artistic exchanges which proved effective. However, much remains to be done to structure the CCI cultural sector in Tanzania, involving higher level policy and strategic action which was not undertaken as part of the programme.

Positive narrative #2 NAFASI Internship programme

Nafasi Art Space's confidence and profile has grown considerably due to the enhanced workspace facilities and international connections developed through the EU project. Now working to a 5-year strategic plan, Nafasi has built a diverse portfolio of donor support. Among the initiatives developed since the EU project ended in 2016, is an internship programme. Around 12-18 interns are recruited from universities each year, acquiring experience and hands-on capacity building in cultural management skills through 3-month placements at Nafasi. Some have gone on to employment as a result, and many former interns provide extra volunteer resources for large events.

Professionalisation of cultural operators: as mentioned under Relevance, most of the actions funded were for ad hoc, non-certified training, delivered by unofficial education providers and the effectiveness is not proven, either in terms of learning or durability. This was the case for the many training actions organised in Tanzania (short courses, often 1-5 days duration, e.g. Parapanda, British Council, KFI), and also for the 'study tours' in Europe organised under several projects (e.g. British Council, WMF). As pointed out in the mid-term evaluation, there was a duplication of effort with similar courses and possibly the same participants for training under different projects. Nevertheless, in one case (Fit for Life/Goethe), the training was long term and consistent, with weekly classes over several years, interspersed with intensive 3-week workshops and, although non-certificated, excellent results have been obtained, demonstrating the effectiveness of longer-term capacity building. A small number of projects funded studies at recognised academic institutions, with good results, although this was seen more in the CH projects (e.g. heritage studies courses), cultural management training not being well developed in universities in Tanzania.

Cultural entrepreneurship: very encouraging results for effective income generation (particularly for the crafts and tourism related projects, e.g. WomenCraft, Cordaid to some extent). The two crafts development projects have created/consolidated a successful mid-scale basket products company and a small-scale weaving company. Both need to grow their businesses through international marketing but this has been challenging due to the complexity of export trade regulations in Tanzania.

Positive narrative #3 WOMENCRAFT Social culture entrepreneurship

With EU support, WomenCraft has achieved tremendous progress through product sales. WomenCraft is now a competitive social enterprise with access to international markets and a growing portfolio of clients (domestic and international), and is expanding its production capacity. It has gained the capacity to serve clients all over the world and to perform export orders amounting annually to around USD 150,000. Far from being enough to sustain core operations (high-cost operations in rural settings), it is securing a regular fair income for over 650 women weavers in Northern Tanzania. The standing of these women in family and society has been reinforced and they feel empowered. Gender equality is in this case a side product of improved access to creative work/income.

3.3.3 Conclusions on Effectiveness

Strengths:

- The Action has been effective in the Cultural Heritage component through several large-scale, durable preservation, promotion and access interventions on important cultural heritage monuments; and to some extent in protecting, promoting and providing access to intangible heritage and archives content.
- The Programme has been very effective in promoting access to cultural heritage for local residents, with some strong growth in numbers of visitors and school outreach groups in recent years.
- The effectiveness of the Programme was amplified for Cultural Heritage and for Cultural and Creative Industries by its inclusive approach to cultural heritages and the CCI sectors, creating a diverse and representative portfolio of actions across Tanzania.
- Within the CCI component, improvement to facilities and equipment has been an effective way to structure and build capacity; positive results have emerged in crafts entrepreneurship projects.

Weaknesses:

- The capacity building actions (training) undertaken in many CCI projects and several CH projects are largely unproven in terms of effectiveness, mainly due to the ad hoc nature, lack of certification or involvement of officially trained education providers and inadequate evaluation of results.
- Further work is required to structure the CCI sector at a policy and strategic level in order to consolidate the effectiveness of the programme.
- Marketing and promotion skills were generally weak across CCI and CH projects during implementation, as reported in the mid-term evaluation, and this was still observed in many of the projects. However, the longer term perspective of the final evaluation does indicate some improvements in this area. There are still marketing and promotion skills shortages but better results are emerging as the projects have matured and gained experience.

3.4 Impact

Following the Evaluation Design Matrix devised for the Inception Report, two Evaluation Questions are considered under Impact. These questions relate to Specific Objectives and Expected Results for the CH and CCI programme components.

3.4.1 Whether the effects of the funded projects have contributed to economic and social development via:

- **Job creation and self-employment options.**
- **Activities generating revenue.**
- **Social inclusion activities.**

The overall impacts of the projects, assessed 2-3 years after the EU-funded phase ended, are positive in terms of their contribution to economic and social development. Some interesting new dynamics of public/private collaborations with Local Authorities are being explored through several CH projects. The EU has the potential to promote very positive narratives about the impact of successful projects in Tanzania.

The projects evaluated reveal that cultural interventions have a multi-dimensional impact in society. Most projects have had impact (actual or potential) in more than one area. Many of them contribute significantly to more than one of the objectives of the programme, even if the project was not conceived or implemented for that purpose.

Job creation/self-employment: The expectation of the Action, in terms of impact, is for jobs to be created under the grant-aided period; with solutions found by project-end to maintain the relevant local jobs; and that new activities created demand ongoing management supported by income generation and other sources. In reality, the 3 year duration allocated by the Programme to the EU-funded projects was mostly too short to build an adequate earned income or local partnership to sustain many jobs on a permanent basis. In this context, the positive results seen in job creation are extremely encouraging, particularly where they have endured 2-3 years after the project end.

In many situations, those jobs which were created to manage the interventions and were funded by the EU grant have been maintained (e.g. Fit for Life/Babawatoto staff and instructors, Cordaid business management staff, Iringa project directors). In several organisations, job numbers have increased as a result (e.g. Nafasi team, Cordaid weavers, ADZ Zanzibar tour guides). New activities have generated jobs (e.g. Museum Curator at Iringa Boma, Museum Manager at ADZ, Zanzibar).

Positive narrative #4 CORDAID Employment

Stichting Cordaid project, which created the small business World of Weaving (WOW) in Dar es Salaam, visited weaving and crafts businesses in Tanzania under the EU project to source production capacity and bench-mark their outputs. In an Arusha project, they noted that weavers were paid a monthly salary and were not dependent on variable income from a piecework payment system. WOW managers set their intention to move their trained weavers from piecework to salary system. Three years after the EU project ended, WOW has 6 full-time salaried

weavers and continues to work with outreach piecework weavers, with a view to bringing them into salaried employment as the business grows.

Some projects are now positioned to plan expansions which will create further jobs (e.g. Cordaid plans to move to a new site and open a shop, creating 2 new jobs; ADZ/WMF project Zanzibar plans to open a café, creating new jobs).

However, in some contexts, assurances were provided to the EU-based project managers by local authorities and partners about continuity of employment, but have not been honoured (e.g. CRAterre support to tourism development in Kilwa, WMF/ADZ Education Officer job). Two funded organisations closed at the end of the EU project grant (Music Mayday and Parapanda), no staff was maintained and it is not known whether a positive impact on self-employment endures. Where projects were conceptualised as a self-contained institution-led action, it has been difficult to locate any tangible legacy of created jobs (e.g. British Council, UNESCO Archives project).

In terms of self-employment, there are some very positive impacts. The WomenCraft project has generated substantial work opportunities for self-employed basket-weavers. At the Babawatoto Centre (Goethe/Fit for Life project), 13 acrobats trained by the project have been engaged by performance troupes on multiple long contracts abroad since 2014 (in India, Turkey, Israel, China, UK, France, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Japan). In total, 30 contracts amounting to 29.5 years of paid artistic work abroad have resulted and young acrobats, most with little or no formal education, can now support their families, and provide a positive role model to the next generations being trained.

Activities generating revenue: Many CH projects have been successful in revenue generation, particularly those projects where a durable cultural infrastructure output such as a museum, visitor centre or performance venue has been created. For example, the Anglican Cathedral and Slave Trade Exhibit site in Stone Town is considerably enhanced through the dual action (restoration of cathedral + creation of exhibition centre), numbers of visitors have increased substantially, improving ticket income; the site now has the incentive to develop a café/restaurant which could create further jobs and earnings.

Where income generation is slow to materialise due to external factors (e.g. low tourism in Iringa), better impacts are seen from a focus on diversification of income sources.

Positive narrative #5 IRINGA Diversification of income sources

In Iringa, the wide-ranging programme undertaken through the EU project to develop cultural heritage conservation, tourism and sustainable development culminated in the opening of the Iringa Boma. A good quality restoration intervention has returned this important colonial heritage in the town centre from its former government offices function into a much-appreciated new cultural heritage space. Local authority partners are very proud of the achievement, making it the first stop for any visitors. Iringa Boma staff work hard to diversify income sources. This is needed as tourism flows to the town are still rather low, and dependent on external factors. A museum, café, shop and meeting facilities are in place, with a growing cultural events programme.

As noted under Effectiveness, marketing and promotion skills need to be reinforced across all projects to support income generation and budget planning in the longer term.

The revenue generation anticipated by the cultural tourism infrastructure created in Kilwa has largely not materialised. This is due to a number of factors: flaws in expatriate project conceptualisation based on EU/French tourism models imported to rural Tanzania, lack of ownership by local authorities, inadequate empowerment of the most operational body in Kilwa – local tour guides association, and overall low tourism flows to Kilwa (lack of promotion, no tourism officer, additional costs to visit distant sites etc).

There have been very positive results in relation to improved market access for Tanzania-produced cultural goods and income generation/poverty reduction for the craft-related projects, notably those working with women (e.g. WomenCraft's sales success in national and international markets).

In a wider perspective, it must also be emphasised that the culture and heritage sector job creation, self-employment, sales of cultural goods and services, ticket income, earnings from associated indirect sources such as transport and catering, which have resulted from the EU-funded programme, make an overall contribution to the tax revenues and economic prosperity of Tanzania.

Social inclusion activities: several projects focused on gender issues (women's economic empowerment in WomenCraft); the Fit for Life project beneficiary was the Babawatoto Centre which develops meaningful activities and life pathways for economically and educationally disadvantaged young people; disadvantaged rural communities were the focus of social inclusion components in some outreach projects.

Positive narrative #6 FIT FOR LIFE Opportunities for marginalised people

13 acrobats trained by Fit for Life project have been engaged by performance troupes on multiple contracts abroad since 2014 (in India, Turkey, Israel, China, UK, France, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Japan). Contracts have varied from 2 weeks to 2 years, most being 1-2 years long. In total, 30 contracts amounting to 29.5 years of paid artistic work abroad have resulted from the project for 12 young men and 1 young woman. All of these supported their families with remittances while working abroad; 6 of them have either built houses or purchased land back home; 5 have rented living space for their families and/or bought furniture; 5 have supported their parents with business capital/finance; 5 are still working abroad in 2019.

School outreach activities: very positive results from education outreach work, with the CH projects in particular having created new cultural infrastructures which attract growing numbers of school groups.

In Stone Town, the WMF project anticipated the education potential for the slave trade history museum exhibit (the slave trade history is inaccurately narrated in many contexts and is on the school curriculum). Due to the quality of the exhibit, the provision of an Education Room with a dedicated programme, and largely word of mouth promotion (no Education Officer post was created, contrary to the project end assurances), large numbers of school groups and teachers visit, on a special free entry booked package

(23,299 in Y1; 27,356 in Y2; 47,256 in Y3). An unexpected knock-on effect is that those schoolchildren promote the exhibition visit to their families, and off-season domestic tourism to Stone Town has grown.

In Iringa, there are more modest, but promising results from the special package for school groups. They pay a reduced entry fee and visits are organised by Municipal cultural services and encouraged by the domestic tourism policy, with funding through the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism.

CAC and Olduvai Museum have both put in place regular activities addressed to students in coordination with the District Education Officers and are receiving regular visits, more importantly from schools but with great potential for university students, scientists and researchers.

3.4.2 With a long-term perspective in terms of support for cultural sectors in Tanzania, to what extent has the Programme contributed to promoting culture as a development factor for the country among:

- **Policy makers and political authorities.**
- **Institutions.**

There has been limited impact from the Programme in its contribution to promoting culture as a development factor among policy makers and political authorities in Tanzania. As noted under Relevance, this aspect was not addressed by the Programme through any complementary dialogue or advocacy actions. It is also noteworthy that, unlike other EU programmes (e.g. ACP Cultures+), cultural policy dialogue and advocacy actions were not the focus of any funded projects. In terms of quantitative indicators foreseen in the Evaluation Design Matrix, there is no specific information that there has been any evolution of the budget devoted to culture in Tanzania over the Programme period.

A better impact is observed for those CH projects where the NAO / Ministry representative undertook regular monitoring action, and has maintained a role in the project continuation (e.g. involvement of Division of Antiquities in the Steering Committee for Iringa Boma).

Some projects have reported specific challenges due to the lack of understanding among policy makers and political authorities of the value of culture as a development factor (e.g. specific costs and administrative processes associated with permits for ticketed performances, film screenings, international mobility of cultural operators in Tanzania, compared to other countries in EAC/elsewhere; high costs and administrative burden of export regulations for craft products).

Several international institutions in Tanzania were project beneficiaries (e.g. UNESCO, British Council and Goethe-Institut led projects, and Alliance Française was a partner to several). With such organisations already active in promoting culture as a development factor across their work internationally, the observed impacts and benefits for Tanzania were limited.

3.4.3 Whether the effects of the funded projects have contributed to the growth of the tourism sector

As expected by the Financing Agreement, this additional evaluation question explores the contribution of the funded projects to the promotion and growth of the tourism sector, particularly for the CH projects.

The funded projects under the CH component have all (apart from the UNESCO archives project) had a focus on the growth of the tourism sector. The objective has mainly been to attract visitors to the newly created cultural infrastructures.

Overall tourist numbers to Tanzania have grown in recent years, according to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism's *2017 Tourism Statistical Bulletin*²⁶. The growth of the tourism sector in Tanzania, and how it is distributed across the country, is dependent on many factors, as noted in several influential reports (World Bank: *The Elephant in the Room*, Oxford Business Group: *The Report – Tanzania 2018*²⁷). This last report, the most recent external study sourced for this evaluation, points to a number of factors:

“As of August 2017, the government was in the process of drawing up a new National Tourism Policy to update the existing strategy, which was published in 1999. While the policy is widely considered to be sound, the changes in the global tourism sector since its publication in 1999 make updating it a priority. One of the challenges the new document will seek to address is the fragmented nature of the oversight of the sector between different parts of the MNRT.

In August 2017 Aloyce Nzuki, acting permanent secretary of the MNRT, told a meeting of sector stakeholders that in drafting the new policy the ministry would place an emphasis on diversification. Segments on which the ministry is considering focusing on include ecotourism; meetings, incentives, conferences and events; historical and cultural tourism; and beach tourism, while it is also considering means of strengthening the local tourism supply chain.”

The portfolio of CH projects funded under the Programme can, in some ways, be seen as a test bed for the promotion of the segment mentioned for 'historical and cultural tourism'. By shifting the focus from the known World Heritage sites (NCAA) to less prominent, albeit high-quality cultural heritage monuments (Zanzibar Anglican Cathedral, Iringa Boma, DARCH Boma), and to the intangible and local cultural heritage promoted through several projects (CAC, Iringa, Kilwa), valuable lessons are learned in a range of contexts.

Positive narrative #7 WMF Stone Town third tourist attraction

The new visitor resources at the site of the Anglican Cathedral and Former Slave Market in Stone Town, Zanzibar, created through the EU project, are drawing large numbers of tourists and locals. The East Africa Slave Trade Exhibit, a high-quality exhibition documenting the complex and dark history in a respectful, authoritative and accessible way, is the most commented on. Over half a million visitors have seen it since it opened in 2016 and the site is now Trip Advisor #3 Stone Town attraction. A special Education Programme is particularly successful, with substantial growth in numbers of school groups on organised visits. Local tourism is also on a strong upward trend, with groups of residents on self-organised tours to the site in the low tourist season.

²⁶ <http://hat-tz.org/hattzorg/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Statistical-Bulletin-Booklet.pdf>

²⁷ <https://oxfordbusinessgroup.com/tanzania-2018/tourism>

The main findings of the final evaluation on this point are that tourism flows have a profound impact on the success of a project, in terms of ability to attract sufficient visitor numbers to generate income and encourage creation of diversified services for tourists (catering, cultural product sales, transport etc.). While the Stone Town project records impressive and growing visitor numbers, these are largely based on the overall growth in tourism to Zanzibar and the absence of other museum exhibits for visitors open at present. Tourism numbers have increased in Tanzania, but they continue to be very unevenly distributed. A World Bank REGROW programme (\$150m) aims to develop tourism across the Southern Circuit, with the main objective being to boost numbers visiting the southern National Parks. More tourists into the country have not yet had an impact on Kilwa and Iringa, two project sites with a new cultural tourism infrastructure created through the EU projects, which continue to await the improved tourism flows to meet their projections and generate sufficient income to maintain the created infrastructures.

As noted above, there has been a deficit in many projects in skills and management attention to the marketing and promotion required to plan, monitor and deliver on this. This continues to be a concern, even where projects are recording successes with no apparent marketing plan (e.g. WMF). Specialist skills in marketing and promotion need to be developed in the cultural tourism sector, which needs better integration into the existing tourism sector capacity building, largely focused on hospitality skills.

A cultural tourism programme operator network TACTO²⁸ has been set up by the Tanzania Tourist Board, with a tour guide from Kilwa invited to participate in 2019. While this has potential as a promotional tool, as far as is known, none of the other funded EU cultural tourism projects are involved. As reported, the TACTO network looks to external donors to fund some limited capacity building actions.

3.4.4 Conclusions on Impact

Strengths

- The Action has generated multiple positive impacts in terms of job creation across many projects, and this is particularly encouraging given the short project duration. Management jobs have been maintained; new jobs created to manage facilities set up under the projects; jobs created by additional donor funding; piecework contracts converted to annual salaries; new jobs in prospect with forthcoming expansions.
- The Action has generated some very impressive results from self-employment, particularly in the projects which focused on skills development in identified promising CCIs sectors/clusters (e.g. acrobatics training and craft skills production and marketing).
- Revenue-generating activities have been positive for the CH projects which created a tangible visitor attraction, performance centre, museum exhibit; some have been very successful to date, others show promise and are working to diversify income sources.

²⁸ <http://www.tactotz.org/>

- The Cultural Heritage and Cultural and Creative Industries projects supported under the EU Programme have contributed to economic and social development through direct and indirect impact on the tax revenues and economic prosperity of Tanzania.
- Positive impacts are observed for CH cultural tourism projects, in terms of attracting visitors (both national and international), although the results are largely dependent on external factors (tourism flows).

Weaknesses:

- There is limited evidence of job creation/revenue generation impacts from several skills-development and institutional capacity building projects which ended after EU funding finished.
- Where projects were led by external EU project managers, several assurances made by local partners and authorities about job maintenance/creation have not been honoured; with no project manager to negotiate the implementation of these, some promises highlighted as positive impacts in the final narrative reports have not materialised.
- Limited impact is seen in terms of the contribution to promoting culture as a development factor for the country among policy makers and political authorities, due to the lack of inclusion of advocacy/policy dialogue as part of the Programme; better impact where the NAO/Ministry representatives maintain their involvement in CH projects.
- Skills and capacity in promotion and marketing of cultural heritage and cultural tourism need to be improved, along with a better understanding of how to plan campaigns and monitor the results.

3.5 Sustainability

3.5.1 The extent to which the projects appear likely to be capable of continuing the flow of benefits, technically, financially and managerially. Whether the projects have secured enough funds to cover all costs (including recurrent costs) after funding ended with self-income generation, donor or government support.

This evaluation question explores the capacity of the funded projects to generate new sources of funding after the EU grant for the continuity of their activities, and it is important to recall here the expectations of the Programme in terms of sustainability.

The CCI Call targeted projects that could contribute to a structural change with long-term impact as opposed to projects with just an immediate improvement for a limited group of beneficiaries. The possibilities of multiplier effects and replication of outcomes was also sought by the Call. As for CH, the Call gave clear guidance on sustainability by recommending the projects to consider a number of crucial issues, particularly setting the management structure and operating plans that could guarantee the project's continuity beyond its period of implementation for at least 3 years.

The mid-term evaluation found mixed evidence of sustainability within projects and pointed out weak understanding of sustainability by most of them. However, during this final evaluation we have observed very positive developments towards the continuity of activities.

The majority of projects have ensured continuity of the activities initiated with the EU support, and in some cases have secured funds to multiply their scope or to enlarge their portfolio of activities.

Some projects have achieved very impressive results in terms of self-generated income. CAC, for instance, now manages to secure yearly around €50,000 from the services and cultural performances the centre is providing, which is enough to cover their annual basic running costs and allows them to approach donors only for operational support. In the case of WomenCraft, the project has progressed to secure regular sales accounting up to €150,000 last year. Although still not sufficient to secure financial independence (social enterprise with high costs of its intensive operations in a rural setting), it gives very positive signs of what can be achieved by facilitating better market access.

In some other cases, the EU grant contract has helped gain credibility and visibility among other donors and facilitated access to other major funds, as it has been the case for MUDA Africa, Nafasi and Babawatoto Centre (Goethe project beneficiary). MUDA Africa has been awarded 4-year core support (2017-2021) from the Norwegian Embassy amounting annually to €100,000. Babawatoto enjoys greater credibility with donors and is named as a “strategic partner in the area of youth engagement through performing arts”, in a Foundation for Civil Society award, one of the rare FCS grants for a cultural project.

Only a few of them (CAC, MUDA Africa, Nafasi) have worked to formulate a strategic long-term vision and have started working on a multi-annual planning basis. Nafasi, MUDA Africa and CAC have a 5-year Strategic Plan. The EU Programme has made an important contribution to the progress registered in these projects towards ensuring better structural continuity. In the case of NCAA, the activities of the Geopark have been fully integrated into the NCAA Strategic plans and financial projections, the team recruited by the project being also now fully incorporated into the NCAA organigram.

It is important to note that some projects are not yet able to act on this timescale due to the buildings they occupy being on time-limited lease arrangements with local authorities (e.g. Iringa Boma, Kilwa Info Centre, DARCH Boma). In these projects, the unresolved issues of ownership and sustainability were raised during mid-term evaluation. Negotiations on leasehold agreements took up a lot of time in the project management and most seem to have been concluded at a very late stage, after the EU funding had been used for the rehabilitation/building work without legal guarantees on continuity. This calls for a revision at the level of public ownership, as well as with the public-private partnership arrangements established under the programme, initially being conceived to facilitate better sustainability of the projects.

Four projects (out of 18) encountered important difficulties in ensuring continuity, leading to the closure of the projects after EU funds ended. This is the case for KFI, Parapanda, Maasai Pastoralists Foundation and Music Mayday, which could in some cases run additional activities for an extra year after EU support, and had to close due to financial difficulties, disappearing from the culture scene. In the case of the CCI skills development project managed by the British Council, the planned output (online skills recruitment and networking hub) was closed at project end and therefore leaves no visible legacy.

Serious weaknesses also affected the training component. Private schools/centres supported by the programme (Music Mayday and KFI) showed very unrealistic business plans. These projects did not have a sufficiently demand-based approach to ensure income from paying trainees for continuity.

Although progress has been registered, financial sustainability is far from secured in most projects.

In spite of some exceptions mentioned earlier, funding represents an important challenge for most of the cultural organisations supported by the programme. The resources secured by the projects fall short of the basic needs and are planned on a yearly activity-based approach, requiring enormous efforts to identify and approach international donors that are also progressively less numerous in the culture scene. The “project-based” approach is still very predominant in the way the organisations foresee their financial needs. The reason behind might be both weak capacity on strategic planning or lack of long-term vision, but also a response to the predominant trend of international donors, structural or operational support being still an exception in the international development community.

This has been confirmed by the Survey, whose results indicate that most organisations are looking to secure longer-term funding (38%) as opposed to project-based funds (26%).

Several comments received from Survey respondents point to sustainability challenges:

The project-based financing makes it really difficult to implement a long-term strategy.

Laura Bassini, ACRA

Most of the monitoring systems are interested in project outputs and outcomes, but are not interested in enhancing the sustainability of the organisation. Only Hivos gave us funding to develop our strategic plan 2015-2018.

Ayeta Anne Wangusa, CDEA

We have sustained the organisation by going through short term projects now and then, but have not been able to expand or maintain consistency due to existence of few projects.

Brian Oloo, Ibuka Dance

Ensuring financial sustainability in the cultural sector implies that enough resources are available from public support mechanisms or philanthropic organisations, which is far from being the case in Tanzania.

While the financing of cultural organisations is likely to continue to depend on foreign donors for a long time, the EU Programme has been a catalyst for change, introducing the financial sustainability aspect at the centre of its objectives. At the same time, as we saw in the Relevance chapter, the Programme paid marginal attention to private sector development, which is actually the missing link as regards culture and creative industries interventions.

3.5.2 Whether the relevant authorities have taken the necessary measures to facilitate and support the continuation of the funded projects. The extent to which the partnerships promoted by the Program (with the local authorities and with other organisations) appears likely to continue.

This evaluation question explores the level of government ownership and the adequacy of project results in relation to the sustainability of the partnerships (private and public-private partnerships) encouraged under both Calls for Proposals.

Private partnerships:

Although the partnership under the CCI Call was optional, the majority of the projects (with the exception of WomenCraft and Parapanda) submitted a proposal as a consortium of partners, and many projects implemented **Partnership Agreements or MOUs**, with varying degrees of success in adhering to these.

With some exceptions found in projects that worked in partnership with European institutes (Goethe-Institut and Alliance Française), initial partnerships were not sustained.

Some pilot experiences were tested by some projects to work with other organisations from the East African region, but without representing any major outcome or added value to report on. Effective networking and exchanges, if implemented in the right way, require resources to be nourished and maintained. In light of the final situation of the partnerships encouraged by the Call, it seems that regional cooperation is still not a priority area for Tanzanian organisations. One exception is Nafasi, which sustains its East African funded visual arts residencies programme with partners in Uganda and Kenya.

It is also worth noting that Tanzanian artists and cultural operators have unequal access to mobility in the East African Community, with the visa-free travel permitted to other EAC nationals not available to Tanzanians. Special permits/substantial fees are payable to BASATA by Tanzanian cultural organisations to receive EAC artists and cultural operators visiting Tanzania on professional cultural engagements. This is a serious barrier to cultural mobility and regional cooperation and, with even higher fees payable for artists and cultural operators visiting Tanzania from other countries worldwide, represents a governmental penalty and strong disincentive for international cultural mobility and exchanges. As found elsewhere, Tanzanian cultural organisations work in a sphere of administrative ambiguity; fee waivers are granted in some contexts but other organisations must budget for them.

There were no specific survey comments on partnerships with local authorities or private sector. A common pattern noted in several final evaluation interviews was that assurances provided on continuity of partnerships in the projects' Final Narrative Reports had failed to materialise 2-3 years later. For example, a commitment was made by the local authority in Kilwa in the closing ceremony speeches to ensure continuity of employment of the local project manager and develop other tourism development measures; this was taken in good faith by the European project manager and reported in the Final Narrative Report but it did not happen. Similarly, in Zanzibar, the local partner's end of project commitment to create an Education Manager post has not been honoured.

Public-private partnerships:

Following the eligibility criteria defined by the Calls, public bodies are only present in the portfolio of CH projects.

In the case of NCAA, a parastatal body, the public organisation is the leading beneficiary of the grant contract, the grant representing financial support to a public institution. For this particular case, sustainability should be considered beyond the concept of financial viability, as the financial aspect is backed up by the general budget of the public institution. **Institutional sustainability** is however crucial for this intervention, where the project and the management unit (team and activities) funded by the EU has finally been fully integrated into the plans, budgets and organigram of the parastatal body.

In most other cases, the partnership with public institutions represents a facilitation role for project implementation. This is the case of projects that have included the District or the Municipal Councils as partners (Iringa and Kilwa projects) in order to insert the project activities into the **local/regional development policies** and to create ownership to facilitate continuity and support after EU funds expired and the beneficiary of the contract hands over the project. Very positive results have been encountered in some cases, e.g. Iringa, where there is a demonstrable pride in the cultural infrastructure created among the three local authorities (Municipal, District, Regional), although security of tenure of the Iringa Boma is still under the supervision of a Steering Committee with local and national partners.

In other situations, the outcome of the partnership is still uncertain, like CRAterre, where the Kilwa sustainable tourism offer project has languished, somewhat predictably, after the very hands-on, mission-oriented EU project managers left. An impressive closing ceremony was held in Kilwa, with budgets for the attendance of several professionals and political representatives from France. Assurances were made by local authorities on future employment, tourism promotion budgets etc., none of which have materialised. With no empowered, respected local project management in place after the project end, lacking budgets to promote the funded cultural tourism inventory created, and with limited tourism numbers, the results are disappointing. The project continuity is ensured, to some extent, by the local tour guide association but they lack agency, financial and management capacity, and are the weakest link in the value chain required to promote cultural tourism.

The same situation applies to Loliondo UNESCO-CAS project, although in principle with no official public partner (CCI Call), which in the end decided to officially hand-over the premises built with the EU support to the Loliondo District Council to ensure better/wider institutional ownership and supervision. The stepping away from the project was too fast, without securing continuity of proper management, ownership and strategy.

The same strategy of a late-stage institutional project handover was implemented by the other UNESCO-led project, to the African Liberation Heritage Programme (under the Ministry of Information, Culture, Arts and Sports). ALHP is an AU-wide programme which pre-existed the UNESCO archives project and, although not a designated partner of the action, was operational in the same fields and might indeed have been well placed to lead the project in the first place. Finally, ALHP and other partners acquired a somewhat scattered collection of partially collected and part-digitised archive materials. They now take ownership for eventual systematisation, dissemination and access, as was foreseen for the EU project.

Some projects that had no official public partner have built very positive private-public partnerships in the course of project implementation. This is the case for CAC that has developed a very close and fruitful collaboration with the community leaders and with the culture and tourism District Authorities.

Positive narrative #8 CAC community leader involvement and pride

The interviews during the evaluation with 3 leaders from different communities (Maasai, Meru, and Chaga) showed a high level of appreciation of the project intervention and approach, pointing out its importance for creating awareness among the youth and new generations on traditional dance and music, particularly with the less visible activities about school outreach and community participation. They have highlighted that this intervention is not limited to a touristic project but has a more complex and important mission of culture preservation.

We are thankful to Mr. Zebedayo Kitomari, Mr. James Lukumay and Mr. Peter Macha (Community leaders) for their contributions to the evaluation mission.

As for DARCH, the initial partnership submitted for the proposal, which included the University for the pedagogical aspects of the project, turned out to be less strategic than needed. For practical reasons, the project had to establish a close relationship with the City Council, which retains the ownership of the building, although it was not an official partner of the project. The signature of a Memorandum of Understanding for the co-use of the centre took longer than expected and is subject to major weakness from a conservation point of view, as the Antiquities Division (under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism), having the technical knowledge required, is not adequately involved in monitoring the building

usage and to give guidance. This is a good example, confirming the importance of appropriate private-public partnerships in the case of CH projects.

Other good examples of the facilitation that quality private-public partnership involves are recorded for projects that have an education institutional status (MUDA Africa, CAC), where BASATA supports them by applying exemptions to some of their fees/taxes.

In projects of this nature, other effective partnerships have been initiated during the project intervention with education public bodies in order to develop schools outreach activities. This new unexpected element of the projects merits close attention and follow-up as it shows an enormous potential for future interventions. Schools outreach activities have permitted very positive results in terms of community access to culture and knowledge and awareness creation and will require additional engagement from the public authorities (Ministry of Education) to reach an optimal institutional support/sustainability.

Disabling business environment:

It is important to highlight here that the majority of the projects have reported concerns about the newly announced administrative procedures for the registration of NSAs. Most of the projects are affected by these measures and will have to revise their registration status, either becoming an NGO or an Enterprise with full for-profit status. The intermediate status of Non-profit Enterprise, which was chosen by most of the 'social enterprise' type projects, is scheduled to disappear. Other projects expressed concern about newly introduced business taxation practices.

Some results achieved by the Programme could be jeopardised with the uncertainty that new rules and regulations always implies.

Among cultural tourism projects, the additional costs for operators of transport services for tourists were mentioned. The cost of visitor permits for World Heritage sites in Kilwa has increased very substantially. All of this provides uncertainty on tourist flows and additional costs which may reduce tourist spending.

This unfriendly business environment is confirmed in the recently published **BLUEPRINT Action Plan (Ministry of Industry and Trade - April 2019)** aiming to address/reform the existing regulatory challenges to the business sector. The underlying examples of regulatory issues mentioned in the document include:

“The existence of high compliance costs (in terms of money and time); cumbersome pre-approval business procedures thereby causing rent-seeking behaviour; and existence of legal and regulatory loopholes. Others include: prevalence of high costs in enforcing implementation at both, the central and local government levels; conflicting objectives of revenue and regulatory motives; and inadequate integration of available electronic systems across regulatory authorities.

“Challenges manifest themselves in long and complicated procedures of obtaining business licensing and permit, as well as unnecessary delays and red tapes, which may lead to corruption. These regulatory challenges obstruct seamless flow of investments thus causing erratic trade performance, and ultimately inhibit the desired pace of industrialization and social transformation in Tanzania.”

The strategic regulatory reforms announced in the document should be followed with respect to the cultural sector and the culture and creative industries in order to address their specific challenges.

3.5.3 Conclusions on Sustainability

Strengths

- Emerging development promoted and achieved. The large majority of projects have ensured continuity and are on track to consolidate their actions.
- Very promising results encountered for CH projects in terms of public-private partnerships, in most cases generated by the nature of the activities themselves (school outreach, culture tourism components) or by the proactiveness of the management team in getting closer to the public bodies.
- Interesting results as regards self-generated income for some projects, and of better strategic planning allowing for continuity of other major donor support (Norwegian core funding).

Weaknesses:

- Three of the eighteen projects have completely stopped their activities, closing the organisation and are unable to ensure the continuity of their existence.
- Fragile results in terms of financial sustainability: Although progress has been registered, financial sustainability is far from secured in most projects.
- The training institutions created/supported have turned out to be non-viable and were closed. This points directly to the question of the relevance of the support defined/provided under the CCI Call.
- For most CCI projects, partnership continuity has not been sustained and the added value of working in partnership has proven to be not in accordance to the priorities of the Tanzanian organisations, questioning the relevance of the choices made under the CCI Call.
- Most of the projects continue to have a “project/activity approach” and have no strategic planning or longer-term vision (3 years at least).
- Some projects have finalised the heavy investments/works with serious delays, just before the end of the contractual period and still need to consolidate management and planning mechanisms. With no additional/consistent external support on time, the continuity of the benefits is at risk. The public authorities could do much more to take ownership of the positive results of the projects and provide support (financial or facilitation) to increase their impact.
- Evidences of a very unfriendly and limiting general business regulatory environment, particularly negative for emerging cultural enterprises supported by this Programme.

3.6 Complementarity, EU added value and cross-cutting issues

Following the Evaluation Design Matrix devised for the Inception Report, two Evaluation Questions are considered under Complementarity, EU Added Value and Cross-cutting issues. These questions relate to Specific Objectives and Expected Results for the CH and CCI programme components.

3.6.1 The extent to which the Programme had a coordination mechanism to address complementarity and optimise synergy among current/ongoing initiatives in the culture sector at national or regional level.

No coordination mechanism was identified which addressed complementarity and might optimise synergy among current/ongoing initiatives in the culture sector. During the mid-term evaluation, several relevant initiatives funded through other EU and regional programmes were identified and networked to the Tanzania projects to support synergies (e.g. ACP Cultures+ and Investing in People projects).

The Culture Forum – Networking for Sustainability, organised as part of the mid-term evaluation, made a good contribution to optimising synergies between projects. It was the first structured opportunity for all the projects to meet and exchange information on their activities. However, by that point at least half the projects had finished or were about to finish. Therefore, the synergies with each other, and with Forum presenters from Tanzania, South and East Africa, mainly benefited the follow-on phase. Some projects have reported support to integrate into tourism initiatives as a result (e.g. CRAterre Kilwa tour guides invited by TTB to participate in TACTO cultural tourism network).

The most relevant indicator to report on is that there were no other programmes of this scale over the same period targeting the same beneficiaries. Therefore, although not by specific design, there was no apparent duplication of effort. Donor projects in the cultural sector in Tanzania continued over the same period, largely for annual projects and in a range of €10,000-30,000. A very small number of multi-annual donor contributions to core costs for cultural sector organisations have been implemented in Tanzania since the end of the EU grant phase.

3.6.2 Whether the effects of the funded projects have made a difference in terms of cross-cutting issues like gender equality, environment, freedom of expression etc.

Cross-cutting issues were emphasised in the Programme Guidelines and the contributions of the projects to these were evaluated thoroughly by the mid-term evaluation.

One project was dedicated to women (WomenCraft), and presents significant results in the economic empowerment of rural and disadvantaged women. A small number of other projects had gender related components, with mixed results. Overall, the cross-cutting issues were not a defining feature of the submitted projects and were not strongly implemented through the selected projects. Environmental sustainability was addressed to some extent through the conservation/preservation cultural heritage projects (e.g. DARCH, Iringa Boma, Anglican Cathedral Stone Town). Freedom of expression did not feature as a core element of any selected project.

3.6.3 Conclusions on Complementarity and EU Added Value and Cross-cutting issues

Strengths:

- Some benefits for networking/synergies between projects from the Culture Forum in early 2015 (albeit, rather late to benefit most of the projects);
- Cross-cutting issues received some attention, notably from one project dedicated to women's empowerment through crafts production;

Weaknesses:

- No designated coordination mechanism to address complementarity and optimise synergy;

- Cross-cutting issues were not a strong feature of the submitted projects and the final selection did not integrate projects designed to make a major contribution overall.

Chapter 4: Conclusions, Lessons Learned and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

As a reminder, the Programme's global objective placed a focus on cultural accessibility and diversity, as well as on culture for economic development, via two parallel interventions addressed to support the preservation and promotion of cultural heritages and to support the capacity of the cultural and creative industries.

At the end of the Programme, we can conclude that the intervention for the **Cultural Heritage component registers important progress against the following expected results:**

- Selected cultural heritage sites in Tanzania and Zanzibar, which are key to Tanzanian cultural identity, have been protected and preserved by means of high quality/international standard renovation or construction works and equipment: Oldupai Museum in Ngorongoro, Old Boma in Dar es Salaam, CAC Culture Centre in Arusha, Iringa Boma, Stone Town Anglican Cathedral.
- The operation of these sites in terms of cultural tourism purposes is well assured with good trends and progress. Additional marketing and promotion interventions could amplify impact.
- Access to local culture has been promoted both for international tourist purposes but also for the Tanzanian population, with very impressive results in terms of national audiences/visitors and local communities' participation.
- The documentation centres and educational/research activities around these sites have opened new promising linkages with the public education system (University and schools).
- By all these means, knowledge and awareness of the cultural heritage in Tanzania has increased.

The intervention for the **Cultural and Creative Industries component registers progress towards the consolidation of some interventions** but still needs support to secure longevity in most projects.

- Some important capacity has been developed for creative entrepreneurs to be economically self-reliant and contribute to the economy, particularly relevant in the art and crafts sub-sectors.
- As a result, there has been an initial contribution for stronger and more self-reliant contemporary dance, circus arts and crafts creative industries.
- Cultural diversity has been promoted, particularly in projects that have an intra-regional or international approach.
- Access to creative spaces has been promoted and cultural and creative facilities have been improved: Nafasi, CAS Loliondo.
- South-south and north-south cooperation and networks of exchange of expertise have been limited by the administrative and regulatory environment.
- Support for training and professionalisation of the creative industries has been provided but with no substantial improvements in terms of building capacity of the professional creative practitioners.

Some success factors that have been identified as good practices are:

- * Globally, projects evaluated demonstrate that an **economy can be generated**, consolidated and increased using tangible and intangible cultural heritage as a valuable resource.

- * Culture-related activities contribute to **inclusive growth** by creating income generating activities and employment for marginal social categories without many opportunities in traditional economic sectors, offering them the possibility to have a valorising activity, in music, crafts, performing arts (**Fit for Life**).
- * Traditional skills in arts and crafts can contribute towards **poverty alleviation** and **social inclusion**. This has been achieved in rural, economically depressed areas, which have few alternative means and resources for development (**WomenCraft, Cordaid**).
- * **Local development** can be generated by culture-related activities via:
 - The development of the tourism industry and related economic activities, driven by a significant cultural heritage site (**Kilwa**).
 - Urban renovation and the improvement local dynamics around heritage buildings (**DARCH, Iringa**).
- * In regions, areas or sectors with few resources and little **economic potential**, culture-related activities are an important alternative driver for development, by using cultural resources, cultural heritage, traditional knowledge and cultural expressions and artistic creativity (**NCAA**).
- * Some projects are strongly funded on the knowledge, collection and promotion of intangible cultural heritage, which is carried by **local communities**. Full involvement of these communities at all levels of project leads to success, appropriation and sustainability (**CAC**).
- * Traditional cultural heritage can be promoted through a well-organised cultural event, leading to the appreciation, recognition and promotion of cultural heritage. A well-managed project in this domain, ensuring visibility and the dissemination of **high-quality** cultural expressions can have a strong impact in promoting the use of cultural heritage in contemporary life by incorporating traditional elements in modern culture (**CAC**).
- * Cultural events are effective ways to unite people, stimulate participation and discussion because they provide a friendly environment and they attract large, **diverse audiences** (**Nafasi**).
- * Projects supporting cultural and culture-related education create the conditions for cultural sectors to improve, grow and generate socio-economic development (**MUDA Africa**).

Some factors that have been identified as lessons learned are:

- * A **coherent long-term approach** to cooperation in the domain of culture needs a more structural approach to be able to contribute to developing a whole economic sector/industry and generating significant economic impact. The Programme was not strategically conceived to reinforce the sector. The long-term structuring approach would have required policies and regulations revisions as well as a higher implication/ownership by several relevant ministries.
- * **Proper feasibility studies and quality research** prior to the formulation of any intervention is vital for a coherent needs assessment that will lead to a programme grounded in the reality of the context and targets. The conception, implementation, sustainability and replication should be undertaken involving all categories of players. The implication of local communities, relevant social categories and relevant stakeholders/line ministries at all stages of a project phase is a key element of success in projects.

- * Culture Programmes must be managed and implemented by teams that have experience, vision and adequate availability. Cultural development projects need **specific know-how and competences** in terms of the cultural dimension and require a high degree of commitment.
- * Human resources with the right competences and skills are the essential component for a cultural sector of activity to develop and this requires specialised education. Projects aiming to support and consolidate **educational and professional training** in the cultural sector need professional planning and implementation, within a long-term perspective, to ensure sustainability and quality standards (capacity building developed by the British Council, Parapanda, Music Mayday, Kilimanjaro Film Institute did not meet these criteria – poor and largely unsubstantiated results, projects closing after EU grant end).
Full success in terms of employment is reached when the school has a well-established procedure and means to help graduate students find permanent jobs or initiate individual businesses (transition to work support structures).
- * Some less successful stories (CAS Loliondo, UNESCO Archives) are explained because project components lacked coherence in the initial proposal, not responding to any local strategy, nor inspired by real local needs. **Local appropriation**, local governance traditions and the community's identification with the development approach and the managerial structure used in the process would have been crucial to ensure the success of these interventions. In the case of the Archives project, a better understanding of existing government engagements and cooperation modalities might have improved the pace and quality of results achieved.
- * **Government ownership** goes beyond the signature of a MoU or approval of activities. It requires a more proactive interpretation of partnerships by which public and private collaborations leads to real facilitation of the project implementation and its continuity. An **enabling business regulatory environment** is crucial for culture and creative industries development.
- * Multiplying effects and amplifying the impact of successful development projects requires good **communication, marketing and visibility**. This is a key element for any project or any business development strategy, and has been neglected by most of the projects (due to lack of skills), but also by the whole programme itself. The EU Delegation, the NAO and the relevant line Ministries still have the potential to embrace greater visibility or supportive communication about the successful stories highlighted in this report.

4.2 Recommendations for future interventions

Recommendations are summarised in the following key messages that we develop further in this chapter:

- Continuity of the support to the culture sector capitalising on cumulative experience and knowledge.
- New orientation: culture as a productive sector with economic potential structurally supported inside other major thematic programmes (e.g. trade development, urban/local development, youth and employment).
- Informed formulation and shared common visions to ensure complementarity and public ownership.
- Re-dynamisation of the EUNIC cluster possibilities for strategically planning/implementing an intervention with greater EU added value.

- Implementation mechanisms: alternative options to direct management ensuring strategic planning, qualified staff and sufficient resources.

Capitalisation of experience

Ensure that there is a full capitalisation of the experience and knowledge accumulated by the Programme and, based on this evidence, continue to support the sector. Among the 18 projects, there are several that demonstrate how a Programme can enhance the volume of production and income generated directly by cultural operators in a given sector of activity.

Work on capitalisation of the good practices and lessons learned from the projects would serve to identify new possible interventions. The funded projects must be seen not as isolated initiatives, but as living labs that store valuable information and learning about opportunities and difficulties with respect to the sector.

We hope the findings of the Final Evaluation could serve to nourish future interventions and we propose that the results of this evaluation be shared with the main stakeholders in the cultural sector, as well as with the beneficiaries and partners of the 18 funded projects.

It is also recommended that the EU Delegation and the NAO make use of the positive narratives about successful development initiatives highlighted by the report, for information and communication purposes, in Tanzania and at EU headquarters level.

New orientations for continuity of culture support – a parallel angle on thematic areas

With the EDF cycle of 2014-2020 in the final phase, any consideration for continuation should be addressed from the early stages of the joint programming exercise for the next Post-2020 Development Strategy. Normally, this should start in the coming months and will last until the first semester of 2020.

As with the 11th EDF, in principle it is not expected to place culture as a focal sector of EU/Tanzania cooperation, and other development areas are announced as being at the core of the negotiations with the Government of Tanzania. These might include Energy, Urban Development, Youth and Gender.

These thematic areas, however, give enough scope to integrate the cultural dimension in the next programming exercise, and offer an opportunity to include culture from a parallel angle, contributing to the delivery of other sectoral cooperation objectives.

In the case of any future **Economic Development** programmes, they could integrate culture-related sectors as full development potentials. These should foresee:

- Assessing which cultural sectors of activity have potential to become a fully-fledged industry. Crafts and Cultural tourism show signs of great development potential.
- Explicitly integrating these sectors in private sector or SME-related support programmes.
- Tourism-related support programmes should systematically incorporate a cultural dimension and include cultural expressions and cultural heritage.
- Cultural heritage is to be considered an economic resource and thus integrated into socio-economic development-oriented programmes.
- Employment-related micro projects in the culture and craft domains can be funded through Non-State Actor support programmes, provided that specific provisions are included to attract and promote cultural operators.

- Providing support to innovative actions for women's economic empowerment and entrepreneurship, also in rural areas, considering the enormous potential of the craft sector for income generation activities.
- Financial support schemes should be available, targeting specific value chains in the cultural sector with a high potential for young people to generate economic growth.

As for **Local Development or Urban Development programmes**, they could incorporate a cultural dimension by:

- Providing funds for local development or urban revitalisation projects based on local cultural resources or local heritage.
- Explicitly including cultural operators in eligibility provisions in guidelines and formal programme documents.
- Integrating the cultural dimension as an integral part of all local development projects.
- Mainstreaming cultural dimensions, in particular, local cultural heritage protection, taking into account local traditions and traditional means of governance.
- Cultural and natural resources should be integrated to local tourism development strategies with a view to economic development, especially in poor communities and peripheral regions.
- Local Authorities can be specifically targeted to implement local development projects using cultural resources and cultural operators.
- Ensuring collaboration among civil society, local communities and local authorities is a requirement for a well-performing and effective tourism development plan at local level, as it involves many different stakeholder categories.
- Local entrepreneurial competences have to be reinforced in order to stimulate the creation and consolidation of micro and small businesses that can respond to tourism-related demand.
- Positive experiences on school-outreach activities in collaboration with the education institutions and authorities should be capitalised and replicated.

As for future **Youth/Employment interventions**, a direct link with the culture sector can be foreseen in terms of the opportunities for skills development and job creation:

- Strengthening formal training opportunities for young people in the cultural field (vocational training).
- Developing existing informal professionalisation opportunities integrating culture into the ongoing professional training.
- Supporting youth entrepreneurship in the cultural field and promoting young people's creativity.
- Financial support to young entrepreneurs (e.g. creative hubs or labs) and for income generating opportunities.

If there is a continuation of **NSA support programmes** under the new Road Map for engagement with civil society in Tanzania (2019 – 2021, under preparation), cultural operators/organisations should be explicitly incorporated as beneficiaries in order to:

- Add value to their potential as economic development vectors.
- Reinforce their capacity to carry out collective actions in human rights and governance.
- Maximise their potential as a lever for other organisations.
- Reinforce their capacities to stimulate citizen participation and diversify access, particularly through audience outreach and education work.
- Encourage projects contributing to achieve results in other domains of development (health, environment, education, social inclusion and gender equality).

Vocational training interventions

Future EU support should build on the learning from the Programme, and from other development actions in Tanzania, and ensure a focused and strategic approach to capacity building through interventions such as:

- A cluster approach, as recommended above, can identify priority areas. They may be based on sector needs (e.g. arts management, marketing and promotion); lack of availability in Tanzania (culture entrepreneurship, cultural project management); areas of potential for growth (e.g. crafts, cultural tourism).
- Interventions should be complementary to any past or present training undertaken by donors in the region (e.g. targeted cultural management/entrepreneurship programmes are underway or in planning by DE, UK and CH development partners).
- Where possible, interventions should make use of existing, high quality education providers in Tanzania and EAC, to manage the training and/or provide trainers; this might be in the vocational or higher education sector, according to the specific intervention.
- Prioritised interventions would integrate a training needs analysis, certified training according to the standards of recognised education providers, open and transparent recruitment procedures, no ad hoc payments to motivate participation, a short and longer-term evaluation of results.
- In general, a longer planning cycle is required to deliver such training. Most successful training models take place over a sustained period of several months. Some innovative, results-driven cultural sector training models integrate different phases (e.g. intensive workshop period, time to develop a project or test the learning in work context, structured mentoring, follow-up training/shared peer learning workshop).
- The use of relevant expertise gained in several of the 10th EDF cultural projects might be considered for mentoring or case study work, as an added value element.
- Training that supports the development of networks of peers/alumni structures, to reinforce the learning and support longer-term benefits, should be encouraged.
- A portfolio of supported training and capacity building in the cultural sector should be complemented by a strategic dialogue with the relevant government authorities, to ensure that awareness is built “that training is the first essential step towards structuring better development of the resources that culture has to offer for the economy and for the development of society”²⁹.

In general, it is recommended that most training should take place in Tanzania, with East and Southern Africa as the priority regions for any external actions, to enable trainees to learn in relevant contexts, preferably from local or regional trainers rather than foreign experts.

An open-door approach to capacity-building proposals should be avoided, to ensure that short, ad hoc, non-certified training by unofficial providers is not supported, whether locally organised or in the form of EU ‘study tours’, neither of which delivered verifiable positive results, according to the Final Evaluation.

²⁹ From Conclusions to the *Study into cultural training courses in ACP countries*, Françoise de Moor, 2015 (Technical assistance to the ACP Secretariat for the management of the EU-ACP support programme for the cultural sector) <http://www.acp.int/content/new-study-cultural-training-courses-african-caribbean-and-pacific-countries>

Culture heritage

Cooperation on cultural heritage plays an important role in international relations and in development policies. However, little precise guidance is given by the 2016 Joint Communication “Towards an EU Strategy for International Cultural Relations” and the 2018 “New European Agenda for culture” in terms of reinforcing international cooperation with African countries on cultural heritage.

Although mainly focused on European heritage, the 2018 “European Year of Cultural Heritage”³⁰ represents a good reference for inspiration. This EU initiative represents a large-scale mobilisation to improve the way cultural heritage is protected, from developing quality principles for interventions in cultural heritage, to enhancing cooperation in risk management.

And important EC Staff Working Document “European Framework for Action on Cultural Heritage (2018)”³¹ builds on the results of the European Year of Cultural Heritage and ensures its legacy by developing further concrete actions. It also identifies three clusters of actions aiming at strengthening international cooperation on cultural heritage that should guide any future intervention on cultural heritage in Tanzania. Two innovative and comprehensive concrete actions recently initiated (2019) are to be followed:

- The **new EUR 45 million European programme in Tunisia**. This will support the diversification of tourism, the development of crafts, design value chains and the enhancement of cultural heritage.
- The Horizon 2020³² programme will allow for the establishment of an **international network for cultural heritage innovation and diplomacy**. This will capitalise on EU expertise in the field of cultural heritage to provide assistance in third countries, particularly where cultural heritage is at risk. This network will provide trainings, mobilise knowledge and foster innovative, tailored solutions in the different areas where it will operate (EU Neighbourhood countries, Latin America, Africa, Asia).

Support to structural development

Any future EU support should ensure added value and additionality with national development strategies. Policy dialogue addressing the regulatory framework is an essential component for any development programme, and it should also be included for the culture sector itself, taking into account the little progress encountered in recent years in this respect.

In other countries where the EU has intervened in the culture sector, the government insufficiencies have not only been properly identified and acknowledged during formulation, but also integrated as part of the intervention rationale. In Ethiopia, Mali and Algeria (as an example), the EU support was addressed both directly to culture NSA, but also with a parallel and complementary institutional support to relevant line-Ministries for policy formulation, regulatory reforms, strategic planning and capacity building allowing for a more structural change and sectoral development. These EU Programmes, with different levels of success and challenges, represent a good base of lessons learnt to nourish future possible interventions.

³⁰ https://europa.eu/cultural-heritage/news/european-year-cultural-heritage-what-are-outcomes_en

³¹ https://ec.europa.eu/culture/library/commission-swd-european-framework-action-cultural-heritage_en

³² <https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en>

In this sense, we particularly recommend revisiting the commitment of the Government to a conducive, enabling environment for culture development. A holistic approach would include a review of the related policies (Culture, Tourism, Business) and their regulatory agencies (BASATA, COSOTA etc) as well as streamlining and rationalising licenses, permits, taxes and levies to ensure inclusive participation of the cultural sector in economic development (and to respect the principles of the UNESCO 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions). The feedback from project beneficiaries has revealed unclear and constraining administrative procedures or regulations that are not adapted to the cultural sector. This calls for strategic reforms in the current policy and regulatory framework in order to address challenges for arts and culture operators.

Coordinated inter-ministerial approach

The cross-cutting nature of the creative economy means that policy development for the creative industries/cultural entrepreneurship cannot be confined to a single ministry, but requires co-ordinated action across a range of ministerial responsibilities (Culture, Trade, Information, Tourism, Education).

In this respect, we recommend involving the different relevant ministries early in the formulation process of any future intervention. It is crucial to ensure a high level of public ownership, commitment and support, not only at the technical level but also with higher political authorities.

For this reason, the creation of an official Working Group / Steering Committee or any other form of coordination mechanism is recommended to guarantee proper involvement of the national authorities of the sector in the formulation process, and in the definition of the main orientations of any future programme.

Shared future strategic vision – a partnership with EUNIC cluster

A shared strategic vision between the EUNIC members and the EU Delegation allows the identification of common goals and priority actions for culture development, to translate them into a joint strategy, and work together to achieve them through the pooling of their resources.

In Tanzania, there is good potential for the EU Cultural Counsellors group to meet regularly and constitute a EUNIC Cluster. Discussions about the shared strategic vision can lead to a coordinated approach (as is the case for NSA Roadmap exercises). This was confirmed during the EUNIC stakeholder meeting organised by the EU Delegation during this final evaluation.

Further work is now ongoing among the potential members of a new EUNIC Cluster Tanzania, inspired by the strategy developed for the EUNIC Cluster South Africa, and by the experiences of several of the cultural counsellors who have seen the benefit of collaborative EUNIC approaches in other postings.

It is also important to note that the recently approved Council conclusions on an **EU strategic approach to international cultural relations and establishing a framework for action** by the member states and the EU institutions, make several references to EUNIC and EUNIC Clusters and their role in implementation of the strategy. For instance, it makes recommendations to Member States to “strengthen their participation in the preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of common local cultural strategies and projects in third countries. EUNIC and the cooperation between diplomatic and consular representations could contribute to the achievement of this objective.”

In this context, the creation of an operational EUNIC Cluster Tanzania is all the more essential, to ensure that the country's ongoing cultural development can be positioned within the EU strategic framework for international cultural relations.

Enhance the efficiency of future interventions

We recommend the exploration of three alternatives to direct management by the EU Delegation or the NAO as contracting authority for any future intervention (specific to culture or mainstreamed in other thematic programmes).

- **Contribution Agreement – formerly known as EUNIC PAGODA:**

There are different contracting formulas allowing the EU Delegation to enter into partnership and delegate resources to EUNIC Clusters.

As EUNIC Clusters have no legal status of their own, this involves one member of the cluster signing the contract on behalf of the cluster, i.e. taking the legal responsibility and financial risk for the action, and then implementing it in partnership with the cluster.

These Contribution Agreements are signed with organisations that have been thoroughly assessed by the EC in terms of their financial and operational capacity to implement actions on its behalf.

CONTRIBUTION AGREEMENT projects present the added value of:

- Being jointly designed with the EU Delegation.
- Being awarded without a competitive procedure.
- Allowing support to third parties (i.e. sub-granting).
- Placing EUNIC members into a different role, moving from a “grant beneficiary” position to more strategic players.
- Actions can be adapted during implementation.

For the EU Delegations, added value is that using Contribution Agreements involves the verification of expenditure being carried out by the contractor. On the other hand, the limitation of Contribution Agreements is that only three EUNIC members have such a status: **British Council, Camoes IP and AECID.**

Case study of Contribution Agreements contract: Tunisia³³

Tfanen is fully financed by the EU (European Neighbourhood Instrument): the total budget of the programme amounts to EUR 4M, out of which EUR 2.4M are disbursed to the local sector in the form of grants. The remaining EUR 1.6M cover the technical assistance provided by Tfanen to local actors to support them in the application and implementation processes, the staff costs related to the project, indirect costs and the communication, research and evaluation actions.

The contract, the first of its kind, was signed by the British Council using its Contribution Agreements pillar assessed status which allows co-creation of the project, sub-granting to third parties, and management of the grant according to EU rules, but without verification of expenditure on the EU Delegation side. The implementation of the project is then carried out by the signatory (which assumes the legal and financial risk for its delivery) in collaboration with the EUNIC Cluster.

³³ <http://www.tfanen.org>

Tfanen – Tunisie Créative is a development project to build an independent cultural sector in Tunisia through sub-granting and technical assistance to local stakeholders. The EU Delegation provides the financial means for it to be delivered – the project is fully funded by it – whilst the EUNIC Cluster’s contribution is vital in terms of expertise and relationships both during design and implementation:

- Strategic decisions are made as a group and are stronger: they are the result of complementary expertise and a joint political effort.
- A change in donor image: the cluster being a trusted partner for local civil society, it is perceived as a donor of proximity, as a more reliable donor than EU Institutions.
- More flexibility and tailored solutions to gaps identified: the cluster’s relationship with local civil society allows it to identify shortcomings during the implementation and adapt actions accordingly. For instance, it was observed that local private companies were relevant actors to target through the calls, and that the co-funding required by Tfanen grants awarded represented a difficulty for beneficiaries. Both aspects were addressed to better respond to local needs.
- Delivery in the local language and daily close technical support allow the project to reach more and new beneficiaries and to build better capacities: this would not have been possible if managed by the EU Delegation.

- **A National Culture Fund for Tanzania?**

One model has been developed in other countries in the region – the creation of a National Culture Fund, comprised of a basket fund of donor contributions, which is distributed through thematic programmes and open project calls. This aims to consolidate donor contributions into a larger and more ambitious programme, avoid duplication and foster a coherent strategy. A brief overview of this is provided, although there was no scope to obtain further information on the current programmes, trends and budgets.

The **Zimbabwe Culture Fund**³⁴ was set up in 2006. The Fund now acknowledges partnerships with UNDP, the EU, and development donors from Denmark, Sweden, US and others. It is run by a Foundation with a board of local trustees. A recent press release describes its achievements: *“The Culture Fund is a non-profit organization ... it has played an active change agent role for over 1,000 creative projects within Zimbabwe; shifted many mindsets, strengthen CBOs capacities, empowered women and helped improve livelihoods and rights awareness. A unique enabler within society, it has enhanced Zimbabwe’s creative capacities by investing in actions that infuse creativity and innovation into community and national development strategies.”*

This model inspired the **Cultural Fund of Malawi (CFM)**, launched in 2016 as a partnership between Hivos Southern Africa and the Embassy of Norway, aimed at stimulating the arts and culture sector in Malawi. It was built on long-standing cultural sector support funded by the Embassy of Norway, which was delegated to management by the local copyright society COSOMA. Although limited in financial resources, the launch of the EUR 481,313 CFM cultural fund was announced³⁵ to mark the beginning of a new era in the funding of arts and culture activities in Malawi. However, the current status of the fund is uncertain – a 2018

³⁴ <https://www.culturefund.org.zw/>

³⁵ <https://www.hivos.org/news/hivos-norway-launch-malawi-cultural-fund/>

report³⁶ suggests that the Norwegian funds were not assured for the 2nd phase. An independent evaluation has been undertaken in 2019, as yet unpublished. In the first three years, the CFM supported 21 arts and cultural organisations with grants to film, theatre, music and dance, creative writing and publishing.

Where such a fund exists, it builds on the mutual interests of two or more existing donors, willing to join together in a collaborative effort. However, it is also subject to the fragility of a continuity of shared donor perspectives and funding priorities, as can be seen in Malawi.

Another risk to avoid is that priority policies and themes of the funds turn to be too shaped by donor development interests and agendas other than culture development (Zimbabwe Fund has a focus on HIV/AIDS; CFM centres on values of freedom of expression and cultural rights). While these may intersect with the needs and priorities of the cultural sector, some cultural actions are likely to be excluded or have low priority as a result.

The two models observed do not integrate an advocacy or policy action, to build awareness and responsibility among ministry and government institutions, and to foresee a handover to more consistent national funding mechanisms by ministries and arts councils.

In a different context, a National Culture Fund³⁷ was set up in India in 1996 by the government, as a funding mechanism to be distinct from the existing sources and patterns of funding for the arts and culture in India. This operates as a channel for patronage and sponsorship, enabling institutions and individuals to support arts and culture directly as partners with the government. It is mainly concerned with preservation of national cultural heritage and has a portfolio of large-scale projects.

- **Project Management Units (PMUs):**

In order to manage the implementation of a large number of projects and also to eventually strengthen the capacity of government agencies, PMU are regularly put in place under the supervision of a government body, assisted by technical assistants and sometimes staffed by civil servants seconded for this purpose.

Theoretically, in addition to managing EU funded projects, PMUs are assumed to ensure a transfer of knowledge and experience from the experts to their local counterparts. They are also an important tool for capacity building addressed to contract beneficiaries.

However, if there is insufficient government ownership of the programme's objectives, there is always the risk that the PMUs will behave like parallel institutions and work independently from the public bodies they are expected to serve.

Although in most cases exposing to Programme to high management costs, PMUs are however useful at least from an efficiency point of view, discharging the NAO and the EU Delegation from contract management and follow-up.

[Next working phases for a culture intervention formulation](#)

³⁶ <https://mwnation.com/uncertainty-hovers-around-cultural-fund-malawi/>

³⁷ <http://ncf.nic.in/index-2.html>

At this stage, there does not seem to be enough updated information and prospective material to formulate any well-articulated programme identification fiche targeting culture and heritage as a thematic area of intervention.

It will be necessary to consider for the next **programming stage**:

- Review, assess and update the findings of available literature (national, regional and international) on the contribution of cultural industries to growth, employment and trade relevant to Tanzania.
- Thorough market structure analysis for key sub-sectors, such as: music (recorded and live), audio-visual and broadcasting, design arts and craft, and cultural tourism (festival and heritage).
- Consult all main stakeholders not yet consulted to inform the identification/formulation process: education and training structures in the fields related to art and culture, youth programmes and associations operating in the country, other development programmes (international or national) and initiatives covering these other sectors, etc.
- Usefully coordinate the programme with public policies in the field.
- Usefully coordinate the programme with existing donor strategies and policy in the field. For example, GIZ (German development cooperation) currently funds the IIDEA East Africa programme, supporting some creative economy projects/cultural hubs; the CH/DK/SE/UK donor basket fund Foundation for Civil Society, gives grants to CSO projects, including some cultural sector.

These steps, which require specific technical knowledge both on culture economy and on heritage management, should allow the EU Delegation and the NAO to assess whether activities targeting operators of culture related activities or the regulatory environment in which they operate should be included in the next National Indicative Programme/Strategy document.

Annexes

-
1. Brief reminder of the Guidelines for the Calls for proposals.
 2. Evaluation of the 18 grant projects - Synthetic tables:
 - Analytical tables on contribution to the FA objectives.
 3. Projects' "Interview feed-back".
 4. Survey reporting:
 - Results of the survey.
 - Survey Report.
 - List of survey recipients.
 5. Lists of people/organisations consulted.
 - People for projects' visits.
 - Additional stakeholders' meetings.
 6. Final calendar of the mission.
 7. Documentation consulted.
 8. Evaluation Design Matrix.
 9. Terms of Reference.
 10. Evaluators' profile.