

Intervention	Corrective/adaptive measures taken during the course of your intervention	Date(s)	Analysis
DESCRIBE YOUR INTERVENTION IN DETAIL, LISTING ALL ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN (What exactly did you do? With Whom? What was the intended outcome of the intervention? How does this intervention contribute to your overall SAM objectives?)	Have you made any changes to your original intervention during its implementation? What were you hoping to achieve by making these changes?	When did the intervention/corrective measure/adaptation occur and when did/will it end?)	Here list the government documents you obtain and the main findings of your analysis. Also state the file number where your detailed analysis and any calculations can be obtained. If no analysis was undertaken during this quarter, you must say so. If your analysis is still in progress, list the documents obtained, any documents that are pending, and state that your analysis is still in progress noting when completion is expected.
Community Development for All (CODEFA) chose Mzenga division found in Kisarawe district to implement Public Expenditure Trucking System (PETS) through scorecards. Sectors selected for implementation were Agriculture sector including Livestock Extension services and Agriculture inputs, another sector was Infrastructure which included Roads, bridges, wells, classrooms, silos construction, student's desks, dispensaries, school laboratories, teacher's houses, markets and offices. Overall Goal of PETS • To enhance community to implement PETS inline/accordance with scorecards so that they document achievements and collect information/data. These include; resource allocated to various villages, how resources were (are) spent and the outcome of services provided in the village. Objectives of PETS • To enhance the capacity of the community to have a voice during the planning, identify challenges and ensure resources allocated for them results into sustainable development	The community of Mzenga agreeing on participating in implementing PETS, seeing the community questioning the authorities on their rights. Confidence among the villagers, being responsible in preparing questions and claiming explanations from the authorities without fear	2007/08 February 2008	District Agricultural Development Program (DADPs)-2007/08 In the analysis of DADPs documents it was found on the part of working facilities, expenses and different services there were the plan of buying 20 motorcycle for extensional services in 2007/2008 financial year and the money allocated for that was 126,000,000/=Tsh, the money spent was 114,000,000/= Tsh remaining with 12,000,000/= Tsh. And it was seen that the extensional officers were given the motorcycle in 2009/2010 financial year. The questions rose were, are the motorcycle operating now are the same as those of 2007/2008 FY and if so why there were delays in buying them also the remained balance of 12,000,000 Tshs where has been allocated? This brought doubts and therefore it was agreed that there should be closely follow up on this matter and the districts planning and financial documents should be crosschecked. It was as well found that in projects which were implemented by TASAF, there was information which needed more clarifications as there were 12,000,000 Tshs. which was deposited to the sesame farmers group account, the group only spent 4,092,000/= Tsh. and the remaining amount was withdrawn from the account. Therefore, it was agreed that the committees will do follow up to the bank slips so as to know the truth. Also during the analysis of DADPs document on the District Agricultural Inputs

• Village to establish committees that will track resources allocated in their respective villages • To capacitate “PIMA committee” so that they are able to follow the implementation and get feedback thereafter. • Build confidence to community so as to be able to follow the resolution after the results or findings presented. Also be able to question service providers so that they respond and take corrective measures upon their conducts. There were a number of activities carried out during the implementation and they are: Meeting with Mzenga A and Mitengwe community members to discuss with them on their needs and problems concerning social service delivery in their villages. Here is where they said that as their villages are in a very remote place, they are being deprived with the right of receiving important services easily. They say that most of the developmental projects done by Civil Society Organizations reaches up to Sungwi, Maneromango and Cholesa mvule divisions. With this Mzenga continues to be poorer and even lagging behind in accessibility to the information. Government has been allocating resources there, but the implementation continues to be poor, services are not satisfactorily even the plans done through O&OD which were supposed to be implemented in 2003/2004-2005/2006 were not seen to be implemented according to the plans. Sending documents to the Kisarawe District council on our aim of implementing PETS in Mzenga division		January 2009 April 2009 April 2009 2007/08	Fund there were findings which needs more clarification as it was answered by the council that (following the question from the farmers regarding the fund) the fund works no more in the district as it had no members and it officially died in 2008,with this therefore the farmers needed more explanations on the money which the farmers contributed in 2007 cropping season as there were no any agricultural inputs given to them regardless of their contributions. Furthermore, in the analysis, it was found that in 2007/2008 cropping season the money for Sulphur sold was sent to DADPs fund, farmers needed more explanation on the following: • Receipts used in sending the money to DADPs fund were not mentioned therefore they need to see that. • The amount sent back was not shown; they need to know the exact amount. • All documents used in the process of providing Sulphur need to be unclosed. Report on the Revenue and Expenditure Infrastructure sector-2007/08, 2008/09,2009/2010-first quarter On the side of Infrastructure and its components there were no any response from the council and therefore the questions rose from the villagers are still pending. With this CODEFA has partner with NACSAP II (<i>National Anti-Corruption Strategy and Action Plan</i>) and CORNNET for further follow up.
---	--	--	--

With the permission of implementing PETS on the division we then send a request to the District Executive Director (DED) requesting financial documents which will be used in implementing PETS Following the above activity, we then held a meeting which involved District Executive Director and his officials; Council Audit Committee, Mzenga ward Councilor, Different stakeholders and Civil Society Organization (CORNNET) and Mzenga Community members- (Representatives and Division secretary) as well as National Anti-Corruption Strategy and Action Plan (NACSAP II) - Prevention and Combating of Corruption Bureau (PCCB). Note: The meeting was to introduce the participants on how PETS is implemented, it involved 18 participants and covered the following; • Financial and legal principles of PETS • Scorecards analysis • Stakeholders' Responsibilities; Opportunities and Obstacles in implementing PETS • Group works –agreement on combating identified obstacle Village meetings were conducted on four villages of Mzenga ward, the villages were; Chakenge, Vilabwa, Mitengwe and Mzenga A. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce PETS and to form Village implementation Committees. Major topics discussed in each meeting were: • Tanzania developmental phases from independence to date • Tanzania Vision 2025 • MKUKUTA 2005-2006 and its three clusters			
--	--	--	--

• Importance of public expenditure tracking and obtained information from designed scorecards Each village formed its implementation committee comprised of seven people basing on the criteria formed during the meeting with district officials and other stakeholders. Vilabwa village agreed on tracking the infrastructure sector which will also include every developmental project found in that particular village Capacity building training was conducted to the formed committees so as to equip them with the skills on how Public Expenditure Tracking is done including how to fill the scorecards. Topic covered in this training were; • Financial and legal principles of PETS • The right to acquire financial information • Capacity building on budgets and local government • The process of planning and budgets formulation from village level to national level • Community and permanent village council committees' responsibilities, on matters concerning village resources and development. • Training was done in two days; the first day was the theoretical training and the second day was practical where by the committees were introduced on how to interview the villages using the scorecards as well as on how to fill the collected information/data on the scorecards. Note: the practical was done at Mzenga A village. • After the above activities the committees were then handled to the Village Executive Officer (VEO) of each village.		20thApril 2009-20th May 2009 01st May-04th May 2009	
---	--	---	--

The committees started collecting the data as per scorecards needs from farmers and villagers. Age group interviewed was 18 years and above (both sexes). The interviewee was allowed to give information in all selected sectors for PETS implementation given the fact that he has understanding on those sectors Every person interviewed wrote his/her name, the date of the interview and the place where the interview was conducted. This process of collecting information/data for analysis in all villages of Mzenga A, Vilabwa, Chakenge and Mitengwe was done for 30 days. The total amount of interviews done was 1210 in all chosen sectors. Among them women were 632 and men 453 and 125 their sex was not displayed in scorecards. The following activity was to correct all the mistakes found in scorecards as well as obstacles rose during the process of collecting the information. Among the obstacles rose was lack of all information concerning the sectors selected for PETS per one interviewee this resulted to the shortage of the scorecards as the forms were half filled but the resolution was to print other scorecards and the process continued. When the process of gathering the information (scorecards) end, The process of analyzing them began and this was done by the formed village committees in each village and the CODEFA staffs. The PETS implementation program focused on tracking service delivery and developmental projects of 2007/28 financial year but according to the information given by the community members there were developmental projects implemented in 2007/08 which were overlapping with those of 2008/09, these made CODEFA to track the documents of 2007/08, 2008/09 and those of		10th -15th May 2009 21st -27th May 2009 10th-17th October 2009	
--	--	--	--

2009/10 for the first quarter of July-September for analysis. Getting the documents was not easy and therefore CODEFA wrote a letter to DED requesting to be given the expenditure report of 2007/08 and 2008/09 for the second time as the first request was sent but they were not yet given the reports. With this letter DED wrote to all head of the departments at the council to give the needed reports to CODEFA so as to be able to finish the analysis process. The following activity was to document all the findings/information from the villagers and farmers from all four villages(draft) which were collected by the village committees then the information were sent back to the villagers for correction meaning to remove any information which was not relevant ie not correct and to add missing information which is relevant for analysis. Each village put questions, comments, recommendations and reconciliations to the final report (findings report) which was sent to DED for him to respond to the questions, comments and recommendations of the villagers so as to get explanations/answers which will help in conducting reconciliation meeting at the district level. In the process of doing follow-ups to the response of the DED we found that the DED we were working with had gone to the retirement leave. The acting DED who was in the office needed the reports and we had to give the reports for the second time. The reports sent were volume 1 and volume 2. In volume 1, the report was about the information/data given by community members in the scorecards. And volume 2 report was about the questions, comments and recommendation arose from scorecards, report on the forensic			
--	--	--	--

auditing, report on the DADPs projects implementations-2007/08 - 2008/09 in Kisarawe district and developmental projects of infrastructure sector at Mzenga division of 2007/08, 2008/09 and 2009/10-first quarter. With this therefore, the concerned departments in the council were supposed to respond on the issues rose in the 2 volumes by answering and explaining the questions and comments so as to give the room for the meeting to be done at the district level which will involve all 4 villages ,the council and other stakeholders in order to reach into the reconciliation and measures to be taken to address the problems or to corrects the shortcoming found in the implementation of developmental projects and service delivery in Mzenga division. Though there were delays on the response from the council, but on 17th January 2011 we got the respond and we scheduled for the meeting on 3rd May 2011 but DED suggested the meeting to be on 10th May 2011. And the meeting was held on that day.			
SIGNIFICANT CHANGES: (Have there been any developments in service delivery as a result of your intervention? Have there been any changes in the reasoning – or how they justify what they do; the behavior; and or the capacity of those you sought to influence as a direct or indirect result of your intervention? Those you seek to influence may be communities, CSOs. Media, Government Officials, Councilors, MPs, the general public. It is best to identify them when designing your intervention. Have there been any systemic changes in public resource management as a result of your intervention? – record both intentional and unintentional changes.) NOTE: It is usually difficult to attribute such changes entirely to your intervention, so do not worry if you only have anecdotal evidence here, provided that you acknowledge that this is what it is.			
Description of change (Here list the change that occurred and which specific activity/activities within your intervention caused the change.)	Evidence to support your claim (How do you know that the changes listed in this section are the result of your intervention? Make reference to any supporting documentation/media cuttings record of conversation/observations noted.)		

• “The Extension Worker who was acting as a Ward Executive Officer (WEO), Mr. Enzimali has reinstated his position as extensional worker this year”. A statement given out by the representative from the Council Agriculture Department during the feedback meeting with Kisarawe Council as a result of the question which was sent to the council by Mzenga community asking why should an Extension Worker act as Ward Executive Officer?	• A statement by the representative from Council Agriculture Department during the feedback meeting between Kisarawe council and Mzenga community conducted on 10th May 2011.
---	---

Lessons Learnt: List all the lessons learnt this Quarter from the implementation of SAM in this district.

Major lesson learnt include;

- Community empowerment is key in demanding accountability and transparency from the duty bearers.
- Lack of transparency amongst local government officials was cited as a major problem. CODEFA and the community at large continue to experience difficulties in accessing government documents e.g. documents needed for analysing the infrastructure sector and its components were not given to us and those we were able to access their financial information’s were not well elaborated
- Poor response amongst local government officials as they were delays in responding to the questions from the villagers and even worse the department concerns with infrastructure did not respond at all.