

# **THE EXPERIENCE AND DESIGN OF THE TANZANIAN APRM PROCESS**

**BY DAUDI R. MUKANGARA**

**EXECUTIVE SECRETARY – APRM Tanzania**

**13<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2008**

## **(1) Autonomy of APRM Tanzania structures**

### **Appointment and Selection of Council Members**

- Appointed and others endorsed
- No Minister in the Council
- Inclusion of parliamentarians of both political divides but limiting the number of politicians to avoid politicising it or swaying it in favour of one side
- Denying membership to Focal Point while obligating it to work closely with and support APRM Tanzania
- Composition ensuring voice for civil society at least in numbers by limiting government representation to 4 of 20 members.

## **(2) Capacity Building in the NGC and the Secretariat**

- Adequate modern premises provided
- Adequate modern means of transport provided
- Adequate modern means of communication provided
- Adequate staffing of the Secretariat made
- Recruitment by public advertising; selection by merit
- Adequate remuneration assured
- Extensive APRM ToT provided to senior staff resulting in trainer self-sufficiency for sensitization seminars
- Extensive in-house training on organising seminars provided to all staff.
- Have provided some international travel and exposure to NGC and secretariat members, but more opportunities and funding sought.
- APRM Tanzania received facilitative funding for APRM activities even though it did not always get it on time or in adequate amounts
- NGC has had two exclusive induction and sensitization seminars lasting four full days.
- Individual NGC members usually attend sensitization seminars relevant to their representations
- NGC has held 9 formal and regular meetings in the last 15 months

- NGC is fully empowered to take policy and other decisions on APRM Tanzania and on the assessment process

### **(3) Integrity of the Assessment Process**

- Respecting the APRM principles that both the NGC and the Secretariat only oversee; they do not conduct the assessment
- Ensuring four technical assessment teams (TATs), one in each APRM thematic area.
- Ensuring that the job of technical assessment is publicity and widely advertised.
- Ensuring that professional evaluation based on merit and competitiveness guides the selection of TATs.
- Providing TATs with clear Terms of Reference, all APRM base documents, assistance with other probable sources of material.
- Subjecting draft technical reports to scrutiny, debate and endorsement or correction by competent representatives of key stakeholders.

### **(4) Legitimacy of Assessment Methods**

- (a) Desk research and the common questionnaire as a mandatory check list
- (b) Perception surveys - Household Opinion Survey
  - Expert Panel Opinion Survey
- (c) Special group discussions
- (d) Public submission of the common questionnaire

### **(5) Participation**

- a. The composition of the NGC – broadly representative and heavily favouring civil society.
- b. The choice of key stakeholders: Legislators, Media, Party leaders, Civil Society Organizations, Central Government Officers, Local Government Officers, Regional and District stakeholders, women, youth and CSO leaders, academia, the disabled, judges, trade unions and cooperatives.
- c. The choice of participants in key contact seminars such as the landmark March 2006 Bagamoyo seminar and regional seminars reflecting the above representation and including farmers, livestock keepers and traders in the latter.

- d. The composition of review seminars on TAT progress: Built on the principle of 30%. 30%, 30% and 10%, representing TAT and academia, CSO representatives, government representatives, and NGC and Secretariat respectively.
- e. The special place of Civil Society in public sensitization: NGO facilitators are the principal grassroots facilitators. Media teams accompany some grassroots facilitation teams and prepare talk shows, documentaries and role-plays in films.
- f. Encouragement of public submissions, though with little success.
- g. Actively seeking the views of key opinion groups, with success, since a consortium of NGOs that initially intended to mount a parallel assessment have submitted their views to APRM Tanzania.

There are, of course, complaints about the composition of the NGC. Some are about its size, that perhaps it is too small, although there has always been the consideration of the danger of inefficiency and high costs if the NGC is too large. Others question whether the NGC is adequately inclusive when considered in terms of individual key groups in politics and social organization, though there has been the reply that not all groups must be in the NGC, and that other groups can participate in other ways.

## **(6) Engaging the Legislators in the Union and Zanzibar**

Ensuring understanding and participation

- (a) Sensitization seminars for Parliament in Feb. 2005, right at the beginning of APRM Tanzania
- (b) Demand by the Parliamentary Committee on Foreign Affairs to be briefed by the Secretariat on progress – October 2007
- (c) There have been six parliamentary questions on APRM in the 2007 – 2008 period, two during the regular question time; and four during the 2008-09 budget debate, showing concern.
- (d) In both the 2007-08 and 2008-09 budget several MPs spoke fully in support of increased APRM funding, showing commitment.

- (e) Sensitization seminar for Members of House of Representatives in February 2008 very well attended and generated a very lively debate, demonstrating great interest in matters of assessing governance.
- (f) 2<sup>nd</sup> sensitization seminar for MPs in August 2008 of adequate attendance and interest.

Generally, therefore, legislators in Tanzania have been engaged in the APRM process and they have shown interest in it. In more recent times they have had very engaging debates about and even “crusades” against such bad governance incidences as corruption, fraudulent international investment agreements and banking malpractices, including money laundering. These are high on the list of APRM areas of assessment, and it may well be that the legislators have had APRM inspiration. It is for others to judge whether this engagement of legislators in APRM is adequate overall, but we think that there is room for them to join the workshops discussing drafts, so that they are aware of the developing CSAR and even CRR throughout, like other key stakeholders.

## **(7) Conclusion**

- a. If you look at this planning of the APRM Tanzania process you realise that you win and lose some things at the same time. You probably get marks for deliberate inclusiveness and thoroughness, but probably lose them in terms of the speed with which the APRM assessment is accomplished, though this has not been the reason for Tanzania to be where it is on the review timetable.
- b. Also, as some have said, the desire to have the correct and accurate assessment may result in a technicist process and complex results that do not immediately make sense to the common people, though this depends a lot on the final presentation and subsequent programmes, such as the need for providing popular versions of the CSAR and CRR as Kenya is about to do now.
- c. Autonomy for NGC and Secretariat are good for decisions, operations and the minimisation of government interference, but decision-makers who are in key corridors of influence may then relate poorly to the autonomy and remove their support, unless ways are always found to keep them positively engaged and interested.

- d. Keeping membership of politicians in the Council, such as MPs, to the minimum may also be useful for guarding against political influence and disruption, but it may also keep key players at bay to the detriment of effective participation in the APRM process.

So, some of the positives that emerge from the Tanzania experience are also fraught with danger. They have to be handled carefully.