



ASSESSMENT OF CSOs PROGRAMMES AND THEIR IMPLICATION TO POVERTY REDUCTION IN ZANZIBAR

Salum Rashid MOHAMED

University of Kocaeli, Turkey
salumshid@yahoo.co.uk

KeyWords

Social Protection, poverty reduction, CSOs, NGOs, FBOs, Zanzibar

ABSTRACT

The aim of the research was to assess whether CSOs programmes were of good quality and had adequate coverage so as to be considered in poverty reduction efforts in Zanzibar. The in-depth comparative case studies approach was used as principal research method where four case study organisations (2 from FBOs and 2 from NGOs categories) were investigated using three data collection techniques: participant observation, semi-structured interviews and document review. The analysis was qualitative and comparatively done using thematic approach to arrive to the objective. The findings show that the case study organisations carry out programmes/projects of three nature - charity programmes, business programmes and mixed ones on the side of FBOs, and advocacy, capacity building and service delivery on the side of NGOs. FBOs have more, bigger and longer lasting programmes than NGOs. FBOs programmes designs are simpler and more flexible, indicating inefficiencies while NGOs projects designs are more thorough, indicating good use of their donors and efficiencies in programmes. There is inequality between poor and non-poor areas in the distribution of benefits, where the non-poor areas (urban areas) receive more benefits. Coverage of programmes is generally low, but lower among NGOs than FBOs. All of these may indicate limited impact of these programmes on poverty reduction at national level.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Zanzibar is an archipelago in the Indian Ocean, some 30km east of the African mainland. It consists of the islands of Unguja & Pemba and several islets. The Union between Zanzibar and Tanganyika formed the United Republic of Tanzania, which came into being on 26th April 1964. Tanganyika merged its government into the Union government, while Zanzibar retained with its own, with autonomy in non-Union matters. Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), poverty and social protection are among sectors that Zanzibar enjoys its complete independence.

Like in many African countries, poverty still remains the biggest challenge in Tanzania, Zanzibar included. About 30.4% of people in Zanzibar are living below basic need poverty line and 10.8% below food poverty line (OCGS, 2016). Zanzibar is known to have dual system of laws giving importance of both universal and religious (Sheria) laws. This means that the influence of religion in Zanzibar is significantly high and so social welfare and poverty reduction strategies should acknowledge the contribution of both universal and religious organizations in providing social welfare and protection services to the poor and vulnerable population in Zanzibar. CSOs which include FBOs and NGOs are assessed with the view to identify their role and contribution to the aforementioned task.

This article presents part of the findings of the research carried out in Zanzibar regarding the role of CSOs on financing social protection and reducing poverty in Zanzibar. This role was looked at in terms of the quality and coverage of programmes and interventions by CSOs so as to establish their relationship with poverty reduction. The aim of the research was to assess whether programmes by these CSOs were of good quality and had adequate coverage so as to be considered in poverty reduction efforts in Zanzibar.

After this introduction the brief description of the context of CSOs in Zanzibar will be highlighted before presenting the research methodology used and the characteristics of case study organisations and their surroundings which may affect their operations. Then, the research findings will be presented, detailing the description of programmes and their coverage which helps highlighting

key elements in relation to poverty reduction. Finally, the relevance of programmes to poverty reduction is presented in a more comparative approach to see the similarities and differences among the FBO and NGO categories and among the case study organisations themselves.

2.0 THE CONTEXT

Growth and development of CSOs in Zanzibar and Tanzania at large was the result of economic policy changes occurred in 1980s under the Structural Adjustment Programmes put forward by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in order to restore the economy. These changes led to increased funding for CSOs as foreign donors' funding strategies emphasized on strengthening the third sector instead of government institutions, which were seen as inefficient and corrupt (Abdalla and Uki, 2018). These changes, together with the introduction of multi-party democracy in early 1990s, CSOs were given new space and seen as an important agent for community development (Abdalla and Uki, 2018). Since then the number of CSOs started to rise (at national and community levels) to the extent of forming networks of organisations with structured offices and organisations, and acquiring better recognition by the state. Based on this development, in 1995 the Zanzibar Parliament enacted the first law to regulate affairs and behaviors of CSOs in Zanzibar.

CSOs have been well known for their work to communities. Their power lies in providing services for people. For instance, many FBOs run orphanages and dispensaries, and their role in providing health and education services remains especially strong (Babeiya, 2011). CSOs also engage in providing direct support to orphans and most vulnerable children and their households (RGoZ and UNICEF, 2018). However, it is argued that this important role of CSOs is now diminishing due to decreasing donor funding to CSOs and increasing demands to show the impacts of their work (Babeiya, 2011). This justifies the fact that CSOs are highly donor dependent, and this is not very healthy for the sustainability of the non-profit sector. This study was carried out to reevaluate CSOs by looking at their programmes and the way they support poverty reduction in the country.

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research used the in-depth comparative case studies approach as principal research method that guided the entire processes. This approach involves an in-depth investigation of certain units, situations or phenomena over a period of time (Hartley, 2004). Four case study organisations, including 2 from FBO and 2 from NGO categories, were selected and investigated. The criteria used to select these organisations were: the size of the organization – must be working at national level; must be working on service delivery (in cash or in-kind) to the poor and most vulnerable; must have regular activities directed to the society; and must be willing to participate, including granting the researcher access to data sources, reports and according permission to participate in activities and meetings. The case study organisations investigated were Muzdalifa Islamic Charitable Organisation (MICO), Al-noor Charitable Agency (ACA), Zanzibar AIDS Association and Support of Orphans (ZASO) and Zanzibar Association for Children's Advancement (ZACA). Description of each case study organization is provided the section 3.1 below.

Data collection exercise was carried out from 13th January to 16th May 2020 in Zanzibar Tanzania. In each case study organization the researcher spend 4 to 5 weeks to collect all the required data for the study. Three different data collection methods were used: participant observation which involved participating in all key activities carried out in each organization; Semi-structure and informal interviews which involved carrying out interviews in formal and informal settings with staff, beneficiaries, volunteers, government officials and other stakeholders; and document review which included reviewing administrative reports of each organization together with government documents. All data was recorded in hand-written notes and computerized soon after their gathering. The semi-structured interview transcripts were then categorized into five groups (one for each case study organisation and the fifth category for the key informants from government offices) and coded accordingly, using letters and numbers. For example, letter A referred to the first case study organisation and letter E to the government respondents' category. Each interviewee in each category was given a number, from 1 representing the first interviewee, to the last depending on the number of interviews in each case study or category. The data gathered from the field observation and informal interviews/discussions with informants was recorded based on the date and place of occurrence.

The analysis was more of qualitative, using thematic approach, which involved disintegrating the data into themes and sub-themes. The themes and subthemes were the product of a thorough reading and rereading of the transcripts and field notes that made up the data.

3.1 Presentation of Case Study Organisations

Muzdalifa Islamic Charitable Organisation (MICO) is a non-profit, non-governmental and faith-based organization established in 1999 and registered in August 2001 under the Societies Act No. 6 of 1995, with official registration number 157. It is located at Sebleni Shehia in Amani area within the Urban District of Zanzibar. The organization holds its headquarters in a rented building occupying two floors (first and second floors). The office is located within an area where concentration of economic activities such as timber industries and shops are moderate and is next to Amani – Mwembeladu main road. The social environment was very good

due to high frequency of people. Most of people who visited the office were prospective beneficiaries, i.e. people who came to ask for different kinds of support from the organization. There were also people who came for business purposes since the office also holds some business activities. MICO is believed to be one of the most known CSOs with many charity interventions in Zanzibar (Interviews A20, E9).

Al-noor Charitable Agency for the needy (ACA) was officially registered in September 2003 by the Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar as a charity organization with certificate registration number 253, under the Societies Act No. 6 of 1995. ACA is located at Mtoni Kidatu shehia in the West "A" district. Its headquarters is situated on the upper floor of the Swahaba Mosque, close to Amani – Mtoni main road. The mosque was built by ACA as a charity and so extended to one floor to enable the organization set its own offices. The mosque is also considered as being the biggest and most famous in the area. Socially, the office is located at a place where there is high frequency of people, partly because of its existence on a mosque building but also because of holding several other activities that stimulate interaction with people, such as running of school in the neighboring building, running of several other training programmes such as computer and foreign language courses etc. All these factors contribute to making the office environment very busy and more sociable.

Zanzibar AIDS Association and Support of Orphans (ZASO) was established in 1995 and got registered on 19th September 1996 under the Zanzibar Societies Act No. 6 of 1995 with registration number 24. ZASO is located at Mwanakwerekwe Shehia close to Mwanakwerekwe Cemetery in the West B District. The organization's offices are situated in a rented house with three rooms and a reception venue. The social environment at ZASO was calm and had less movement of people. This may be because of 1) ZASO's office being frequently closed; 2) the office being found interior part of the areas away from the main road; and 3) the office having no many activities that requires beneficiaries to come and follow the services from the office. However, during the distribution of in-kind support, which occurred at the office, the high frequency of people (mostly beneficiaries and their next of kin) was witnessed. At the meantime, the organisation held another office (also rented) within the same district, at Kwarara area where one of the programme was being implemented.

Zanzibar Association for Children's Advancement (ZACA) is a non-profit, non-governmental organization established on June 1, 1997 and registered on May 26, 1998 under the Societies Act No. 6 of 1995, with registration number 63. It is located at Jangombe area within Urban district of Zanzibar. The organization possesses its own office building, comprising of three office rooms and one conference room. The building was still new and had one commercial room rented to a business man in order to generate income for the organization. The building is surrounded by residential houses as well as commercial ones. The area however, is known to have relatively high crime rate and drug abuse. During construction of the office building, for example, there occurred several incidences of stealing some construction materials (Interview D3, D4, D5). The social environment of the organization was limited. Few people visited the office, either for the purpose of making follow-ups of their programme with the organization or for greetings (these are mainly former beneficiaries or friends and family members of the staff). It was said that before COVID 19 outbreak in the country the office was very busy because of the regular trainings and meeting sessions with beneficiaries and or their volunteers (Interview D1, D5).

It should be noted that although the four case study organisations were located in three different districts, they are all situated in the urban area of Zanzibar, with relatively small distance from one another. Regionally, they are all in the same region - Urban-West region.

4.0 PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

This section highlights the findings of the study focusing on the programmes of each case study organization and their coverage.

4.1 Programmes and their coverage

The findings show that the case study organizations had different activities ranging from service delivery to advocacy and capacity building. This can easily be seen from the vision, mission and objectives of some organizations as well as from the programmes implemented in the same. However, there is clear similarities on the nature of interventions between the two institutions within each category of our case study organizations (FBOs and NGOs). Short presentation of each case study organisation's programmes will help understand the kind and nature of interventions and whether those programmes can be considered in poverty reduction efforts, based on the way they are designed and coverage. The kind of programmes implemented by each case study organization have been elaborated below.

4.1.1 MICO Programmes and Their Coverage

MICO ran at least 9 programmes, within which several projects and activities were carried out to fulfil each programme objectives. In general, programmes available at this organization were of three nature: pure charity programmes; business programmes and mixed programmes, i.e. programmes with both elements of charity and business. The description below will help differentiate between them, and provide more information regarding whether they had any linkage with poverty reduction.

Firstly, the Orphans Care Programme: this programme involves provision of both cash and in-kind support and other activities to orphans. MICO believes that children suffer a lot when they lose their parents and especially so when fathers are gone. MICO uses Islamic definition of who is an orphan. Islam defines Orphan as being anyone below the age of 15 who lost his/her father (Interview

A1, A18, A20). MICO established this programme in order to cater for the needs of orphans. Every year MICO undertakes a number of activities in relation to relieving orphans and their households. It has its own database (however developed and administered by donor) of registering orphans. Other interventions included in this package are distribution of in-kind gifts such as meat and clothing materials and commemoration of the Orphan's Day. This celebration usually involves get together of different stakeholders including orphans themselves and their families, MICO staff, government officials and donor organisations (usually from abroad). The events carry different themes every year to advocate for care and support of orphans, and are often held at an environment where children can feel safe and enjoy (MICO, 2017; A1; A22). The programme covers all districts of Zanzibar with a total of 1167 beneficiaries, but of course with different number of beneficiaries across districts. However, not all of them get the opportunity to participate some of the interventions mentioned earlier. For example, the orphans get together event usually involves orphans living in Unguja Island and mostly in urban areas, those from other places such as Pemba Island cannot participate these events due to distance barrier. The Orphans Care Programme is an excellent example of the types of instruments that can be used to combat poverty and vulnerability. This is specially so when programme and targeting are well designed to meet and maximize impact on poverty reduction. This programme offers benefits to all registered orphans, irrespective of their poverty status.

Secondly, the Kurban Programme: this programme involves slaughtering animals and distributing meat to different groups and communities. MICO established this programme some years ago following the inflow of donors who required to offer animals to slaughter for various purposes. In most cases animals are slaughtered to fulfil spiritual desires such as sacrifice of Eid El Hajj and child well-bringing offerings. Based on the explanation from the staff, the programmes covers all areas in both Unguja and Pemba, and the distribution is usually made in rural and or peri-urban areas based on poverty levels and where access to food support is limited (Interview A3; A16). During my field work at the case study organisation it occurred once to implement this programme in Unguja Island, where 34 cows were slaughtered and meat distributed to two communities and to over 30 MICO staff. The two communities benefited were Kinuni Shehia located in the West "B" district within Urban-West Region and Mkwajuni village in North "A" district within North region of Unguja Island. About 140 households received 2 to 3 kilograms of meat in each area. This coverage is too small considering the number of villages which could be potential beneficiaries of the programme. However, during the high season for this programme (usually during Eid Al Hajj when muslims are required to implement Sunna of the Prophet Muhammad by slaughtering animals) MICO slaughters hundreds of cattle and distributes to all villages in Unguja and some villages in Pemba (Interview A16, A18, A22). For example, in 2019 high season, 480 animals were slaughtered, including 400 cows and 80 goats (Interview 16). This number is very big to be offered at one time in Zanzibar, however, the question whether the meat reaches the right people is a matter that need further discussion. However, what is known from the field is that once the area for distribution is identified, the meat was provided to everyone in the village (or at least to those present at the distribution point). The programme represents an example of the types of interventions that could contribute to reducing food poverty in the country.

Thirdly, Ramadhan Programme: this programme involves feeding people during the holy month of Ramadhan. There are two ways through which this program is implemented: Iftar - feeding people in group with cooked food and giving people food packages. In the former MICO prepares cooked food and put together a number of people, usually in one location or a village to offer them food during the breaking of the fasting in Ramadhan. The programme is designed in such a way that it serves more male believers in a given area than female. Since the programme is tied up with specific month, I did not have a chance to witness it during the field work as the month of Ramadhan was not yet to arrive. However, reports confirms the existence of such a programme in the previous years. For example in 2019, Iftar programme was implemented in 8 day during the month of Ramadhan (Interview A16; MICO 2019 Annual Report). The programme is implemented on area-wise basis and each covers between 300 - 500 participants. However, for 2020 it is obvious that the Iftar programme could not be implemented due to Covid 19 outbreak. In the second option MICO prepares packages comprised of food items such as rice, sugar, cooking oil, dates etc. and distributes them to specific groups in communities, such as the poor, orphans, widows and older people. In 2020, the food packages were distributed in North "A" district, among other places and benefited over 1000 beneficiaries in the region (Interview E9; ZBC TV News Hour on the 7th May 2020). In general, the Ramadhan programme can be a good examples of programmes that can better support people and help to reduce food poverty. However, proper design has to be put in place to make sure that the benefit goes to those in great need. This is particularly important because during this month prices of both food items consumed during Ramadhan and clothing are very high and so making the life expenses unaffordable for the poor and those close to poverty line.

Fourthly, Water Supply Programme: this is the one concerning about drilling wells and building water system in communities. It was established before 2018 but was strengthened after the coming of new drilling machine in 2018. The purpose of this programme is to enable MICO execute charity water supply projects on its own and provide the service to individuals and communities on business bases. The programme is therefore sub-divided into two kinds: those water wells under charity to communities and those for business to private individuals or communities. The former is carried out following the existence of a donor who wished to support such a project, and so communities do not pay for its costs. Initially, this type of wells used to be completely free for the community members in terms of the construction cost. All they had to do was purchasing the water tank that is placed on the top for water storage. However, from the year 2019/2020, MICO introduced a new policy that required benefiting community to contribute in some of the activities such as accommodation of technicians and their allowances and participating (volunteering) in the construction of towers for the tank. The reason behind this new policy was to reduce the burden of cost on the side of donors and create a more convincing environment for more donors to donate (Interview A19). Despite all that, the programme still is beneficial to communities where availability of clean and safe water is a challenge since it reduces significant portion of the costs should one do it entirely pri-

vately. On the side of business projects MICO executes projects following the payment of all required fees. However, this component cannot be considered for poverty reduction assessment.

Fifthly, Women Economic Empowerment Programme: this is a new programme established in 2019 with the aim of providing capitals (cash and in-kind) to women for creating income generating activities and enable them better manage their lives (Interview A17). The programme was established following demands from many people in the past and the existence of donor willing to support. The programme was designed in such a way that beneficiaries reimburse certain percentage of the amount they received. The aim was to create a programme that will revolve and benefit many more people in the future. However, this aim could not be achieved because beneficiaries did not keep their promises to repay their expected share. In addition, some beneficiaries did not use the support for the business as expected. This was particularly the case for those who received certain percentage of cash in their support for the purpose of establishing business, instead they spent the money for nonbusiness purposes (Interview A17). This can be considered the biggest failure of the programme from both beneficiaries' side and organization side. In terms of coverage the first implementation covered a total of 25 beneficiaries, most of them from Urban West region and West "A" district in particular. There is no clear explanation as to why such a concentration within the same region but we can only assume that the office being in the region gave an advantage for people around it to benefit more than others. On the other hand, the continuation of the programme is dependent upon the success of the previous implementation (Interview A17), however, based on the explanation above the actual implementation puts in question the possibility of implementing it in the near future. Indeed the motive of the programme is good and coincided with poverty reduction strategies, but then the coverage, design issues and actual implementation may require further investigation to qualify it for effective poverty reduction.

Sixthly, In-kind Gifts Programme: this programme offers in-kind benefits to different groups. The programme was established following the existence of donors who were willing to provide material support to different groups in communities, including women, children, older people and people with disabilities. Materials provided includes clothes, soaps, food packages (but different from the ones offered during the month of Ramadhan), school materials, furniture, etc. I was lucky enough to witness distribution of in-kind support under this programme during my field work at the organization. In this exercise donor representatives from Dar es Salaam, Nairobi and USA came to join MICO in the distribution of items. At least 7 communities/shehias and 3 institutions benefited from soap and clothes provided in the initial phase. During COVID 19 outbreak, MICO also distributed soap to Kidimni village, in the Central district, to support community members to prevent themselves from Corona Virus (ZBC TV News hour 24th March 2020). This programme represents one of the ways that can help to reduce material poverty in communities, however, improvements on areas related to the quality of materials and the environment in which programme is implemented have to be made, so that beneficiaries can really benefit and enjoy the support provided (Observational note taken at Bumbwisudi and Sebleni distribution points on 21st January 2020).

Seventhly, Schools and Mosques Construction Programme: the programme concerns about construction of mosques, schools and even madrasas for communities. In this programme MICO receives money from donors who wish to create such assets for a community and then engage constructors for the execution. All the assets produced in this programme are handed over to the communities where they are located, some times to the government and some buildings are taken by MICO itself to run as business investments. There are number of construction projects implemented under this programme, many of them in Unguja. In 2019 for example a total of 2 mosques were constructed (MICO, 2020). During my field work at the case study organization there was no such an activity going on but an initiative to implement such a project in Pemba and Dar es Salaam was under way (Interview 21). Based on MICO's view this programme helps reduce social and spiritual vulnerability and indirectly promote social development among people around the assets (Interview A15; A21).

Finally, MICO implement other programmes which based on their design and implementation they are more of business than charity and so their details here are not provided. (Interview A22; A12). These programmes include: health program which concerns about provision of health care services to people through running of private dispensaries or health care centres; and Education program which provide education to children through running of private schools.

4.1.2 ACA programmes and their coverage

On its side, ACA runs at least 11 programmes implemented under four separate departments. But most of them implemented under charity department (those related to charity). These programmes also appeared in three forms outlined earlier: charity programmes; business programmes and mixed programmes. There is more less clear separation between these departments but with single coordination point/ secretariat. Description of each programme and the activities carried out in each is provided bellow. However, it should be noted that there is clear resemblance in some of programmes between ACA and MICO. So some elaboration will be skipped here to avoid repetition.

Firstly, Orphans Programme: this programme resembles with the one in MICO, except it has got some more components in its design and implementation. The programme was established following the existence of individuals who were willing to support a number of children in need of support. ACA was charged to identify and collect all necessary information on the prospective beneficiaries and later manage the programme on the field. In this programme ACA makes cash transfers and Eid clothes to registered orphans every year. Like MICO, ACA uses Islamic definition of who is an orphan and so no difference between their conceptualization. They also offer meals for the same category of orphans under their support through their madrasas. The aim of the meal is to improve nutrition and health of orphans, increase social integration among themselves and build psychological profiles of the children. The

meal is provided every week or at least twice a month in circulation basis around the areas where their beneficiaries are located. These children also receives several gifts such as Eid gifts (in the form of cash), meat, and food packages, especially during the month of Ramadhan. In terms of coverage, a total of 481 orphans currently receive the benefits from this programme. However not all of them receive all kinds of gifts provided, since the number include orphans from both Unguja and Pemba. For example, the meal provided in Unguja is not provided in Pemba because orphans supported there are not in institutions (madrassas). This will make the meal provision exercise difficult. Also, the get together of all beneficiaries during Eid days does not include beneficiaries from Pemba. This also means that there is divergence between the way the programme is implemented in Unguja and Pemba. It was unfortunate that since the cash payment occur only once a year only one components of this programme was implemented during my field work: meal for the orphans, implemented on different dates at Ndagaa, Kinuni, Nyarugusu and Chuini. However, interviews with some beneficiaries and their guardians confirmed the existence of the remaining components (Interview B22; B23; B24 etc.).

Secondly, Community Support Cash Transfer Programme: this programme is about provision of cash benefits to the entire community at Kizimbani Village/shehia. Since 2011 ACA has been implementing this programme following the desire of donor to support that particular community after visiting it and see poverty situation of its members. Through her own efforts, the donor identified all residents of the village and sent the list to ACA for final verification and payment. Since then, ACA has been implementing the programme with the money from the same donor. The aim is to provide some relief for this poor community during the days when expenditures are very high so that they can cope with it. The programme covers 700 beneficiaries in over 140 households, all from the same village. Originally, the programme intended to cover all residents of the targeted village, but because of poor understanding of some community members, some refused to be registered. However, after the first payment, many went back to the office for registration. During my time at the case study organization I went with the team to the village to identify additional candidates to be added to the programme. The donor wanted to add some 50 more beneficiaries to the programme and so ACA had to go to the village for identification. No payments was made because it only happens once a year. However, it was confirmed that benefits were provided regularly to all beneficiaries. This is a good example of poverty related programme, however, this does not mean that it has no shortcomings. Issues related to targeting are most common in such kind of programmes, but this is separate subject which needs further analysis.

Thirdly, Ramadhan Programme: this is a programme implemented in the form of food packages during the month of Ramadhan. Originally, this programme was provided in the form of cooked meal to group of people in mosques during the month of Ramadhan, but because of Cholera outbreak in 2002 the programme had to change to food packaging. Due to high efficiency in the provision of packages the organization then decided to continue with this arrangement since then. Based on this new arrangement, the food is not provided to every one present at the distribution point but instead to the household. So, each house receives the package and is provided to every household in the area. The programme is being implemented in all districts in Unguja and Pemba, however, the number of packages offered is always not enough to cover everyone. In 2020 for example, when I was at the case study organization initiatives for the packages to be distributed during the then coming Ramadhan was already underway, since the month was approaching. Over 8,000 packages were getting prepared by the sellers and some more were expected following the availability of verbal promises from individual donors (Interview B7; B13). The programme provides a lot of support to many people, particularly in rural areas where mostly implemented (Interview B22; B23). As mentioned early, this is an example of the instrument that can be used to reduce poverty as it helps people to meet their needs during the time of high expenditure. The question of how efficient the instrument is in supporting the poor and hence reducing poverty however, requires a proper analysis of how the targeting is made and its efficiency, but this is not the topic here. However, the fact that the benefit is provided to everyone in a selected location is already an indication of targeting inefficiency given the inadequate number of packages available for distribution.

Fourthly, Udh-hiya Programme: this is the same as Kurban programme at MICO, the difference may be in the way they designed their programmes and the size. ACA's perspective attaches the programme with business in it and it's small in size. They slaughter goats instead of cows and distribute the meat to people in communities. The reason behind the preference of goats over cows is rooted from the kind of donor they have. ACA receives orders of slaughtering from individual donors and not institutions which can mobilize more resources to finance bigger projects. It is therefore easier and cheaper for the donors to sponsor one or two goats than cows which appear to be over five times more expensive. This programme involves purchasing goats and sell them in a higher prices to donors who are willing to slaughter. The buyers of goats give the responsibility of slaughtering and distributing the meat to ACA on their behalf, ACA on its part perform the responsibility as required by the donor without additional administration costs for slaughtering and meat distribution. This is to say that the amount donor pay to buy the animals are inclusive of everything. Therefore, double benefit are obtained by ACA; that of realizing business profit for the organization and that of feeding their beneficiaries (recipients of meat). In terms of coverage, the programme is implemented in both islands but the size of coverage is different where Unguja receives more than Pemba. I was lucky enough to witness implementation of this activity during my field work at the organization. A total of 9 goats were slaughtered and the meat distributed to over 40 poor households at Ndagaa village in the Central district of Zanzibar, each received 2 to 3 kilograms of meat.

Fifthly, Small Business Programme: this programme concerns about provision of entrepreneurship skills and capitals necessary to enable individuals and groups establish business and income generating activities. Both, capital in cash and working tools are provided by the programme depending on the nature of business activity engaged by the recipient. In some cases, the programme first offers training for those who what to engage themselves in activities that requires skills development, such as opening of workshop, electricity technician etc. The programme was still very new, as was established in early 2019 and has been implemented only in Un-

guja Island. Only 7 beneficiaries benefited from the programme. From its nature, the programme is an excellent example of an instrument which could have significant impact on poverty reduction should the programme increase its coverage. Beneficiaries believe that the support received from these programme helps them a lot to stand up on their own feet and enabled them better manage their lives (interview B29; B38; B39). However, most of businesses established under this programme are still very young and so may be a little bit early to count for sufficient benefits.

Sixthly, Water Drill Programme: this is one of the busiest units in the organization. The description on this programme is similar to the one provided at MICO on the same, except the details may be different. At ACA this programme has gained its celebrity as a business programme in which individuals and communities contract ACA to drill and build water system in their respective areas with agreed fee. Many water well projects implemented there were of this type and so realized the business purpose of the programme. However, there happened to have some few projects implemented under charity in which individual donors (mostly from abroad) pay ACA to drill a well or a series of well and their systems. In these kinds of projects ACA is able to meet both charity objective, through the benefits acquired by benefiting communities, and business objective, since the money for the construction of wells circulates within the organization and realize profit. During the field work at the organization I witnessed many clients coming to the office to ask for information and submit orders for the construction of wells in private bases.

Seventhly, Madrasa and Mosques Construction Programme: like the one described above this programme is the same. In this programme, ACA finds the money from donors to build mosques and or madrasas for communities whose need is clear and justifiable. ACA has its own construction company to execute these kinds of projects, even though this section looks a bit isolated and independent from the organization. The charity division usually receives and mobilizes funds from donors, who are mostly in abroad, and initiates the projects. Once the construction project is well defined and approved the project then is forwarded to the engineers for practical implementation. Some of these madrassas and mosques remain under the supervision of the organization while others are offered to their respective communities. The programme covers all districts in Zanzibar, but the proportion of coverage is higher in Unguja compared to Pemba. During the field works I got an opportunity to visit one of the sites where a mosque and madrasa together were constructed at Kisauni in the West "B" district. The programme was established in the efforts to create public assets that will help bring Islam and Islamic knowledge and behavior forward. This purpose is also complemented by the distribution of Mas-haf (Quran book) to public institutions and communities across the isles. In Mas-haf and other books distribution exercise carried out on the 27th February 2020 at Makunduchi, over 750 Mas-haf and 1280 Quran teaching books were distributed to all mosques, madrasas and schools in the South district of Unguja. From its nature, programmes of his kind do not seem to have direct connection with poverty reduction since they do not directly target poor people materially. However, taking in to account the role these institutions play in forming people (like the case of madrasas for example) and the social economic role within the surroundings, they can still be discussed under our subject. Of course this is also dependent upon the way these particular institutions fulfil those roles. This require further investigation, but initial indicators qualify their roles. The fact that some of mosques and madrasas are constructed in communities where poverty is high is an indicators of acceptability. Even those constructed in other areas where community members are not very poor offers significant opportunity for poor people to establish their income generating activities (e.g. selling coffee or tea after prayers and evenings) taking advantage of the existence of these assets, particularly the mosques.

Other programmes implemented by ACA but categorized as purely business without charity elements include: education programme, which involves running of school and conducting short trainings; Radio programme which involves running and managing Annoor Radio station; and Hajj Trust Programme which involves coordination of Pilgrimage trips to Makka. There was also a mention of health project which once implemented and still exists in the organisation's plan, but this only occurs occasionally.

4.1.3 ZASO Programmes and Their Coverage

Based on ZASO's programmes description, activities can be categorized into three categories: advocacy, capacity building and service delivery. The first one involved programmes that aim to influence decision on matters pertaining to orphans and most vulnerable children and HIV/AIDS. The second category concerns about programmes that focus on providing knowledge, skills, tools, equipment and other resources necessary to enable beneficiaries and their households to establish and or develop their social and economic activity more competently. These activities gave beneficiaries a change to combat poverty and better manage their livelihoods. However, there were no interventions implemented under any of these two categories during my field work at the organization. However, memories were still in the heads of some beneficiaries visited (Interview C19; C20; C21). The final category (service delivery) existed and is what will be presented here under and consist of two majour programmes.

Firstly, Material Support to Orphans Programme: this programme involves provision of different material to beneficiaries. Based on the explanation given (interview C1) it is sub divided into three major components: food relief project which provides food packages to beneficiaries. The relief project aims at improving the health and wellbeing of children infected by HIV through improved nutrition. This project started in December 2018 and has been evaluated and re implemented every after 6 months. The food items provided are rice, wheat flour, sugar, milk flour, nutrition flour, 10 eggs, cooking oil and soap. The project covers a total of 100 beneficiaries with over 50 percent coming from Urban-West region where poverty rate is low. With that small number of beneficiaries, the programme was being implemented in Unguja Island alone. I was lucky enough to witness practical implementation of this programme. A part from the materials, beneficiaries from far areas were provided with transport allowances to cover the transport cost. The second component of material support programme is the provision of Eid clothes to children, where new clothes are given to

beneficiaries to help them meet their clothing need during these special days when all people, particularly children dress new clothes. This component, however, has no specified donor and so its implementation is conditional to availability of funder (Interview C3). Both food packages and provision of clothes were implemented in April 2020 during my field work at the case study organization and were supported by the same donor. This is to say that both components had the same beneficiaries. The last component of this programme is about provision of school materials to children every year. The programme provided significant support to some beneficiaries in a number of Shehias across all districts in Unguja. Over 80 children (HIV+ and MVC) from over 13 Shehias in Unguja benefited from this support. However, there was no trace of this programme during the field visit. Based on the explanation from beneficiaries and the staff, the programme (in the form of regular provision) ended in 2017, and since then only ad-hoc provision is made when irregular donors occur to support children (Interview C1; C17, C22).

Secondly, Running the Orphanage Centre: this programme is still under development and has not yet secured complete registration from responsible authority. The centre provides a home for over 28 children who are HIV+ and benefit from almost all necessary services that a child must have to grow up well, including: (1) education: all school age children go to school. The centre has its own bus to take them to and from school every day. It also has special teacher who offer additional classes and Quran classes to children after school hours; (2) Health care: children receive better health care than the one they received back home (Interview C25; C26; C27). There was a doctor who looked after the health of the children at the centre. The doctor is supposed to spend at least two hours a day to examine and take care of the health issues of the children. Also, out of 28 children who were being cared at the centre 10 had health insurance and the remaining were on the way to getting theirs. (3) Birth certificate: ZASO struggled to make sure that all children had their birth certificates. This was particularly necessary considering that most of children had no birth certificates when they entered the centre and so issuing health insurance was not possible. It is because of the same reason that till the time of this study ZASO could not provide insurance to the majority of children in the centre; and (4) clothing etc. Most of these children suffered from multiple vulnerabilities; that of being poor, being orphan (of one or both parents) and that of being HIV+, which means being socially isolated and stigmatized (Interview C25; C26; C27). Also observation made during field visits to some beneficiaries' homes confirmed this situation. The programme represents a good example of social welfare programmes that can meet both social welfare and poverty reduction objectives, however, the coverage should be extended to maximize its impact.

Other programmes implemented in the past include Social Reality Tour Programme which involved exposing visitors from outside the country to visit poor households in their residences and offer them support and long term ties with individual donors for more support in the future; Income generating activities (IGA) programme which provided trainings on entrepreneurial skills and capitals (in cash and in-kind) to children in clubs, youths and parents/guardians so as to engage in the production of income to support their livelihoods; and Home based care programme which involved provision of healthcare services to patients and victims of HIV/AIDS in their homes. All programmes are no longer implemented but were part of the previous projects and earned great impact in supporting people and communities and certainly reducing poverty of beneficiaries.

4.1.4 ZACA Programmes and Their Coverage

Like the case of ZASO, across ZACA's projects history, activities could also be categorized into three: advocacy, capacity building and service delivery. This is basically because ZACA and ZASO are of the same nature, both belonging to NGOs category. The difference could be seen from the types of projects implemented and the way they were designed. By the time of this study, both capacity building and service delivery were implemented by ZACA under one project, each forming separate component of the same project. Advocacy component can only be traced in the activity history of the organization but did not exist during the study.

The only project implemented by ZACA was Psychosocial Support Project. The main objectives of this project is to: increase community awareness on support for the most vulnerable children (MVC); increase community psychosocial support provision to the children with psychological problems; improve economic conditions of the orphans and most vulnerable children and their households; provide maternal health education to young children and most vulnerable children (ZACA 2018 report). Our main focus in this programme was all elements related to improving economic conditions of the children and/or their households and other community members. The project started in 2016 as a pilot and was initially agreed to be implemented in nearest districts only. Later, scaling up was made in terms of the number of activities to be carried out in the project but not in terms of the coverage of more areas. There are three interesting areas under this: entrepreneurial skills development trainings and the subsequent cash benefits provided to children's clubs; the entrepreneurial skills development trainings, equipment/tools provision to graduates and its multiply effect; and cash benefits provided to parents' saving groups created and their associated impact on both members and community at large. Each of the three subcomponents of the programme is detailed bellow.

The first component is the capacity strengthening to children's clubs. Under this component the project first established children's clubs in all areas they operate. The clubs consist of most vulnerable children (MVC), particularly orphans and those from poor households in the area. The club was established following the acceptance of the respective Shehia authority and the sensitization session to both shehia committee and the parents as well. Also few volunteers are found amongst community members and get trained on the various activities to be carried out and the overall management of the club. In the letter stage, the clubs through their representatives receive entrepreneurial skills for two purposes: to enable them create and manage income generating activities that will generate regular income to the club; and to enable them train other members of the club who did not receive the training so that everyone can acquire the skills and fully participate in the production activities. Through this way the multiply effect of the project was

also maximized. The basic capital, in the form of cash and or tools was provided by the project so that barriers could be eliminated. ZACA established 4 children clubs in four different shehias, all within the Urban-West region. Each club consisted of 60 to 250 children of between 6 to 18 years of age. This number was even higher during the startup of clubs but tended to diminish as days went along because of absenteeism and self-removal from the clubs (Interviews D4; D14; D19). I was lucky enough to visit three of the four clubs during my field work at the case study organization.

The second component of the project was on the provision of entrepreneurial skills and equipment to young people graduated from children's clubs. This component takes graduates from children's clubs (those above the age of 18) and register them in vocational training schools on courses of their choice. The project covers all the costs including all payable to the collage and transport costs. In addition, the project also provides capital in the form of tools and equipment based on their areas of specialization. The most common specializations where most people engaged in were computer technician, electricity technician, tailoring, decoration skills and hotel and hospitality courses. Graduates of such courses received things like computers, electricity tool box, sewing machines, decorators and ovens and other kitchen utensils respectively. The recipients of this project were also required to train at least four children from the children's clubs or amongst the graduates of the club who did not receive training. The purpose of this was to multiply the impact of the project across the key beneficiaries. Over 20 young people from the four areas where project was implemented benefited from this component. However, not all of them managed to stand up and proceed with the business activities they engaged in. In an interview with one of beneficiaries of this project he outlined that one of the challenge of this project was that there was no follow up of graduates after leaving schools. Some completed their studies and did nothing after wards. This reduces the efficiency in the attainment of project objectives (interview D9).

The last component of this project was on capacity building of parents and service delivery to MVC themselves. This component involved provision of entrepreneurial skill to parents of MVC and later organized in groups of 30 members to form what they called Village Savings Loans Associations (VSLA). The costs for the entrepreneurial skills were fully covered by the project, and the VSLA is the bridge that link between the skills developed and the practical implementation. It offers a mechanism for the parents to acquire loans that can be used to create or improve their income generating activities of their choice. The VSLAs are designed in such a way that everybody can afford to pay the number of credits required in a week or month. They also received additional amount of money from ZACA to enrich their groups' funds so that they can create better income generating activities. They are also designed to incorporate service delivery to MVC. This was fulfilled from the number of MVC each member of VSLA has to register for service. This is to say that there is special money, from the return on investment, allocated to supporting MVC of the area where the VSLA is located. The children each member carries have to be MVC and so if the member is a bit well off (since non poor also included in the later stage) must register a child from poor households even though they are not related. In this way, they successfully ensured that service delivery to MVC remained at the centre of this component as well. Across the four shehias where project was implemented there were 14 VSLAs established, all carrying the same design and following similar guidelines from ZACA. Of course success of these groups varies but many VSLA members speak of it very positively (Interviews D5; D11; D12; D15).

If we take a close look of the project described above we can see that the project had a lot of creativity in its design. It managed to put in place structures and system that can last longer and hence maximize its impact on poverty reduction. However, the very low coverage, in terms of number of areas the project is implemented and even the number of beneficiaries in some components may still remain a challenge in the attainment of poverty reduction at national level.

A part from that ongoing project, ZACA has also implemented a number of projects in recent years, some of which had significant impact on supporting communities, though not necessarily directly linked to poverty reduction. Some of these projects include: capacity building of organization (2014) which involved building capacity of ZACA staff in terms of knowledge and skills development in different areas; Zanzibar Malaria Elimination Programme – Sealing up Impact of Malaria Elimination in Zanzibar (2010 – 2014) which involved provision of mosquito nets and sensitize communities on malaria prevention and control; Urban childhood consultation in Stone Town (2011 -2012) which investigated childhood situation in the central town of Zanzibar, etc. (ZACA Profile).

5.1 PROGRAMMES AND THEIR IMPLICATION TO POVERTY REDUCTION

Looking at the programmes, their designs, coverage and the way they were implemented we can see some of the indicators that highlight the role the programmes can play on poverty reduction in the country. We can also identify the existing difference between CSOs themselves and between FBO and NGO categories.

First of all, it is clear that FBOs run more and bigger programmes than NGOs. Both MICO and ACA had more than 9 active programmes each, some of which could be categorized as charity (poverty focusing) while others were not (business oriented). Their programmes were also long term and, except for the new ones, all had existed for more than 5 years. Contrary to this, NGOs had fewer active programmes and were all under project bases, i.e. had start and end time based on the projects life cycles. While ZASO held 1 project subjected to evaluation every 6 months and 1 programme which had not yet secured registration, ZACA had only one project with 4 components and which required annual reapplication for its continuation. Although this situation increased efficiency within the two organisations it reduced visibility and their impact on poverty reduction. Both size and number of programmes have implication on poverty reduction, where bigger and many integrated programmes help reduce poverty better.

In terms of programme designs, there seems to be clear difference between the case study organisations, particularly between the FBO and NGO categories. Both MICO and ACA have programmes with more or less similar design. Their designs are simple and

reflect relatively high degree of flexibility. This is partly because of their capacities in designing such programmes but also because of under estimation of local environment. Too simple and high level of flexibility in programmes imply lack of seriousness in targeting the poor and during implementation, and reduces efficiency of programmes. Based on the local context these organisations were operating, they were supposed to design more strict programmes with more strict mechanisms in order to achieve better outcome of their programmes (Interview E3; E5 & E6). The fact that the orphans care programme at MICO and ACA consider orphanhood alone as the only criterion for selection indicates failure in targeting of beneficiaries. In order for the programme to be pro poor, additional criteria such as consideration of poverty levels had to be added to insure that the programme address poverty and orphanhood instead of orphanhood alone. The national guidelines for the identification of most vulnerable children and their households, who are eligible of social assistances, identify orphanhood as one of the criteria but which needs to be tested for other poverty indicators (RGoZ, 2010). This was indeed observed during field work where many of the visited programme beneficiaries in both organisations could be judged as not eligible should the national criteria applied. Other programmes can fall under the same explanation given that most of them follow universal approach. In this way outcome of programmes on poverty reduction seems to be very minimal considering that significant portion of the benefits goes to non-poor.

Unlike FBOs ZASO's and ZACA's projects are well designed to reflect the desired impact on poverty. This design, however, does not necessarily reflect capacities of these institutions but of their donors. Both programmes are proposed and designed by donors and the implementing CSOs had no influence over them. ZACA for example implemented Psychosocial Support Project supported by WeSee Hope. This same project was being implemented in more than three countries with similar design (Interviews D2 & D3). The project is small but has got the best design of all other CSOs under study. Similarly, ZASO's Food Relief Project was designed and supported by ComfortAid through Nyota Foundation. Donor domination in these projects, however, highlights lack of control of the implementing organization over the projects. In terms of the impact on poverty reduction these programme are likely to have bigger impact, if they were of the same size as those of FBOs, since the bigger portion of the benefits is directed to the right beneficiaries. For example, it was explain that the situation of many children before joining ZASO's care centre was characterized by high viral load (some up to 100,000 while the optimum level for children is supposed to be below 20,000), many other diseases and health problems while others required operations to fix their health problems (Interviews C6; C25; C26; C27). This very risky situation was reduced once children got into the centre. Currently, all children living at the centre are in good health with bellow the optimum viral load level (Interviews C23; C27).

In terms of coverage of programmes MICO and ACA respectively have higher coverage compared to ZASO and ZACA, in terms of number of individuals supported in each programme. The trend is still the same if considered in terms of geographical are covered. While ZASO and ZACA is limited in few districts and regions of Unguja Island, MICO and ACA extended their programmes to all districts in both Unguja and Pemba islands. MICO has got a sub office which deals with all operations in Pemba. However, despite this coverage across districts there is inequality in the distribution of benefits across districts in all case study organisations. Some districts receive less proportion of benefits compared to others. More importantly, there is no relation between poverty levels of districts and the amount of benefits allocated to them. Data shows that by both measures poverty is higher in Pemba (55.4%) than in Unguja (18.4%) and all 4 districts in Pemba hold the highest poverty rates. A poverty targeting programme has to allocate more resources to the poorest areas first. This means that more resources have to be allocated to Pemba for poverty reduction. However, this is not the case. At MICO, for examples, out of 1167 beneficiaries of Orphans care programme only 149 (12.77%) were from Pemba, and less than 10 percent is allocated to Pemba for the in-kind programmes (Interview A16). At ACA only 35 (7.28%) orphans out of 481 were from Pemba. At ZASO over 50 percent of Food Relief project beneficiaries were from Urban and West districts where poverty rates are low (19.2% and 14.6% respectively). At ZACA the project covered only 4 shehias out of over 384 available in Zanzibar and all located in Unban and West districts only. This over concentration of poverty interventions in rich districts may be one of the contributing factor of increased poverty in Pemba.

6.0 CONCLUSION

For long time, there have been debates on the role of CSOs in supporting society to address poverty and vulnerability. Yet, CSOs continue their existence in Zanzibar (and elsewhere) with increased challenges on funding their programmes and sustainability. Generally, it can be seen from the discussion that CSOs continue to perform their historic role of delivering services to the society but with decreasing efficiency on poverty reduction. CSOs, run many programmes but poor design and very low coverage still limit their impact on poverty reduction. However, this is not equal to saying that there is no need of having CSOs, instead we need to have them improved in terms of capacity to design good poverty targeting programmes and ensure financial support that will enable them extend their coverage and sustain their programmes.

Case study organisations have confirmed that there are also differences between FBOs and NGOs in the way they design and number of programmes. FBOs tend to have bigger and longer lasting programmes but more poorly designed, while NGOs take advantage of the skills and capacities of their donors to design better projects but with smaller life span and very low coverage in terms of number of beneficiaries. Both situations imply poor performance in the share of poverty reduction at national level. Also, FBOs tend to have more programmes compared to NGOs. Very few and small programmes within an organisation negatively affect visibility of that organisation which in turn affect the entire civil society sector.

For a better understanding of the role of CSOs on poverty reduction, a need of investigating targeting of beneficiaries of these

CSOs programmes is paramount. The study will have to clarify whether the case study organizations use proper targeting mechanisms and criteria in the selection of their beneficiaries so that we can establish whether their programmes and interventions are really poverty targeting.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abdallah Hashil T. and Uki Ali Ahmed, (2018), "A Compendium of Laws, Regulations and Policies Governing Civil Society Organizations in Zanzibar" Tanzania Human Rights Defenders Coalition (THRDC);
- [2] ACA profile
- [3] ACA, (2019), "2015 – 2019 Activity implementation Report" Al-noor Charitable Agency for the Needy, Zanzibar, Tanzania;
- [4] Babeiya Edwin, (2011), "Trade Unions and Democratization in Tanzania: End of an Era?", Journal of Politics and Law Vol. 4, No. 1; March 2011;
- [5] Hartley, Jean, ed. (2004) "Case Study Research." 323-333 in Cassell, Catherine and Gillian Simon. Essential Guide to Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research. London: Sage;
- [6] MICO, (2016), "2015/16 Activity Report" Muzdalifa Islamic Charitable Organisation, Humanitarian Relief Services for the Helpless, Zanzibar – Tanzania
- [7] MICO, (2017), "Annual Activity Report" Muzdalifa Islamic Charitable Organisation, Humanitarian Relief Services for the Helpless, Zanzibar – Tanzania
- [8] MICO, (2020), "2019 Activity Report" Muzdalifa Islamic Charitable Organisation, Humanitarian relief Services for the Helpless, Zanzibar – Tanzania;
- [9] OCGS (Office of Chief Government Statistician, Zanzibar), (2016) "2015/16 Household Budget Survey. Zanzibar: OCGS;
- [10] OCGS (Office of Chief Government Statistician, Zanzibar), (2016) "2015/16 Household Budget Survey. Zanzibar: OCGS;
- [11] RGoZ & UNICEF, (2018), "Zanzibar: Social Protection Budget Analysis", Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar and United Nations Children's Fund, Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania;
- [12] RGoZ & UNICEF, (2018), "Zanzibar: Social Protection Budget Analysis", Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar and United Nations Children's Fund, Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania;
- [13] RGoZ (Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar), (2014) "Zanzibar Social Protection Policy (ZSPP)" Ministry of Empowerment, Social Welfare, Youth, Women and Children, Zanzibar, Tanzania;
- [14] RGoZ, (2010), "Zanzibar Costed Plan of Action for Most Vulnerable Children 2010 – 2015" Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, Department of Social Welfare, Zanzibar;
- [15] RGoZ, (2017), "Magharibi "A" District Profile" Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar, Zanzibar, Tanzania;
- [16] RGoZ, (2017), "Magharibi "B" District Profile", Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar, Zanzibar, Tanzania;
- [17] ZACA Profile document
- [18] ZACA, (2018), "Annual Activity Report" Zanzibar Association for Children's Advancement to We See Hope, Zanzibar – Tanzania;
- [19] ZASO Profile document.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: Interviews Detailed Information

CASE STUDY 1: MUZDALIFA ISLAMIC CHARITABLE ORGANISATION (MICO)				
Code	Name	Position	Date	Place
A1	Jokha	Head of Orphan Department	13/01/2020	MICO Office
A2	Aisha	Orphan department	14/01/2020	MICO office
A3	Salama	Project department	14/01/2020	MICO office
A4	Mohamed	Program Officer	15/01/2020	MICO Office
A5	Ustadh Makame	Volunteer	16/01/2020	MICO school
A6	Sauda	Finance Coordinator	17/01/2020	MICO Office
A7	Batuli	Beneficiary	17/01/2020	Her house
A8	Bi Khadija	Beneficiary	18/01/2020	Her house
A9	Bi Maryam	Beneficiary	18/01/2020	Her house
A10	Mohamed	Project Officer	20/01/2020	MICO Office
A11	Idrisa	Monitoring officer	23/01/2020	MICO Office
A12	Sauda	finance Coordinator	24/01/2020	MICO Office
A13	Intisar	Orphan Department	25/01/2020	MICO Office

A14	Shikh Abdalla	Chair person	25/01/2020	MICO Office
A15	Sheikh Haji	Chief of Staff	27/01/2020	MICO Office
A16	Pirika	Head of Projects	28/01/2020	MICO Office
A17	Mohamed	Project Officer	28/01/2020	MICO Office
A18	Abdulrahman	Ass Accountant	29/01/2020	MICO Office
A19	Omar	Project Officer	30/01/2020	MICO Office
A20	Siti	Mother of beneficiary	31/01/2020	Her house
A21	Farouk	Director	01/02/2020	MICO Office
A22	Salama	Project department	03/02/2020	MICO Office
A23	Pirika	Head of Projects	03/02/2020	MICO Office
A24	Issa	ZDFA	05/02/2020	Slaughter place
A25	Talib	Beneficiary	05/02/2020	Distribution point
A26	Zakia	Beneficiary	05/02/2020	Amani pay point
A27	Pirika	Head of Projects	07/02/2020	MICO Office
A28	Asma	Beneficiary	08/02/2020	Amani pay point
A29	Lailat	Beneficiary	08/02/2020	Amani pay point
A30	Abdulaziz	Beneficiary	08/02/2020	Amani pay point
A31	Suleiman	Beneficiary	08/02/2020	Amani pay point
A32	Najma	Beneficiary	08/02/2020	Amani pay point
A33	Ziada	Beneficiary	08/02/2020	Amani pay point
A34	Salma	Beneficiary	08/02/2020	Amani pay point
A35	Bi Zuwen	Beneficiary	08/02/2020	Amani pay point
A36	Ali	Beneficiary	09/02/2020	Amani pay point
A37	Habib	Beneficiary	09/02/2020	Amani pay point
A38	Hanifa	Beneficiary	09/02/2020	Amani pay point
A39	Wardat	Beneficiary	09/02/2020	Amani pay point
A40	Hidaya	Beneficiary	09/02/2020	Amani pay point
A41	Subira	Beneficiary	09/02/2020	Amani pay point

CASE STUDY 2: AL-NOOR CHARITABLE AGENCY FOR THE NEEDY (ACA)

Code	Name	Position	Date	Place
B1	Sheikh Rashid	Project executive	10/02/2020	ACA Office
B2	Sheikh Nadir	General Director	10/02/2020	ACA Office
B3	Mr. Mohamed	Head teacher	11/02/2020	ACA Office
B4	Sheikh Rashid	Project executive	12/02/2020	ACA Office
B5	Ukht Asha	Beneficiary	13/02/2020	Her Office
B6	Mr. Duaza	Beneficiary	14/02/2020	His Office
B7	Sheikh Rashid	Project executive	17/02/2020	ACA Office
B8	Mwalim Bakar	Beneficiary	18/02/2020	His Office
B8	Fatma	Secretary	19/02/2020	ACA Office
B10	Mr. Ali	Cashier	21/02/2020	ACA Office
B12	Ms Halima	Beneficiary	21/02/2020	Her house
B13	Mr. Ali	Ass. Accountant	24/02/2020	ACA office
B14	Ukht Batuli	Beneficiary	25/02/2020	Her Office
B15	Mr. Ali	Head of Programmes	26 /02/2020	ACA Office
B16	Shikh Rashid	Project executive	27/02/2020	ACA Office

B17	Fatma	Secretary	28/02/2020	ACA Office
B9	Sheikh Muazini	Volunteer	29/02/2020	Distribution point
B18	Sheikh Mohamed	Security	02/03/2020	ACA Office
B19	Suleiman	Store keeper	03/03/2020	ACA Office
B20	Dr. Ali Ame	Beneficiary	03/03/2020	ACA Office
B21	Muhunzi	Beneficiary	04/03/2020	His house
B22	Salum Abdalla	Beneficiary	04/03/2020	His house
B23	Mafunda Khatib	Beneficiary	04/03/2020	Her house
B24	Rehema Khator	Beneficiary	04/03/2020	Her house
B25	Salma Massoud	Beneficiary	05/03/2020	Her house
B26	Zainab Kambi	Beneficiary	05/03/2020	Her house
B27	Raudhat	Beneficiary	05/03/2020	Her house
B28	Muswaibat	Beneficiary	05/03/2020	Her house
B29	Asha Hamad	Beneficiary	06/03/2020	Her house
B30	Alia Rashid	Beneficiary	06/03/2020	Her house
B31	Sabah	Beneficiary	09/03/2020	Her house
B32	Nahya	Beneficiary	09/03/2020	Her house
B33	Bimkubwa Mohamed	Beneficiary	09/03/2020	Her house
B34	Maryam	Beneficiary	09/03/2020	Her house
B35	Muzdalifat	Beneficiary	10/03/2020	Her house
B36	Siti Seif	Beneficiary	10/03/2020	Her house
B37	Seif	Cleaner	11/03/2020	In the car
B38	Maalim Bakar	Beneficiary	11/03/2020	His house
B39	Wasila Mbaraka	Beneficiary	11/03/2020	Her house
B40	Massoud Othman	Beneficiary	11/03/2020	His house
B41	Fatma Othman	Beneficiary	11/03/2020	Her house
B42	Yunus Omar	Beneficiary	12/03/2020	His house
B43	Fatma Said	Beneficiary	12/03/2020	Her house
B44	Mwanaharus Yussuf	Beneficiary	12/03/2020	Her house

CASE STUDY 3: ZANZIBAR ASSOCIATION AND SUPPORT OF ORPHANS (ZASO)

Code	Name	Position	Date	Place
C1	Shaaban	Acting prog manager	16/03/2020	ZASO Office
C2	Hamida	Programme officer	16/03/2020	ZASO Office
C3	Shaaban	Acting prog manager	18/03/2020	ZASO Office
C4	Maka Massoud	Social worker	19/03/2020	Her house
C5	Alayna	Beneficiary	19/03/2020	Her house
C6	Halima Ngwali	Beneficiary's mother	19/03/2020	Her house
C7	Mr. Sijui	Beneficiary	20/03/2020	Matemwe Market
C8	Bi Kesha	Club guardian	20/03/2020	Her house
C9	Mzee Ali	Cashier	23/03/2020	ZASO Office
C10	Zulkhudhaifa	Social worker	23/03/2020	ZASO office
C11	Bi Amina Khalfan	Beneficiary	24/03/2020	Her house
C12	Mr. Amour	Member	24/03/2020	Mini Foro garden
C13	Mwanamsa Maulid	Head Teacher - Jendele	25/03/2020	Her house
C14	Mashavu Ramadhan	Volunteer	25/03/2020	Her house

C15	Mwanaidi Abdalla	Beneficiary	25/03/2020	Uzini
C16	Nassra Khamis	Beneficiary	25/03/2020	Uzini
C17	Mwanakheri	Beneficiary	25/03/2020	Uzini
C18	Zidi Suleiman	Volunteer	26/03/2020	Jendele
C19	Shaaban	Acting prog manager	27/03/2020	ZASO Office
C20	Mzee Mrisho Iddi	Volunteer	30/03/2020	His house
C21	Juma C	Member	31/03/2020	His office
C22	Saaban	Supervisor	01/04/2020	His office
C23	Maryam	Desk officer	01/04/2020	her office
C24	Hamida	Accountant	01/04/2020	Her office
C25	Mustafa	Member	05/04/2020	ZASO office
C26	Nyamizi	Beneficiary	06/04/2020	ZASO Office
C27	Shaaban	Acting prog manager	10/04/2020	ZASO Office
C28	Rukia Mussa	Beneficiary	11/04/2020	Distribution point
C29	Fatma Abdalla	Beneficiary	11/04/2020	Distribution point
C30	Lailat	Peer Educator	11/04/2020	Distribution point
C31	Mbarouk Yussuf	Beneficiary	11/04/2020	Distribution point
C32	Hamida	Programme Officer	11/04/2020	Distribution point

CASE STUDY 4: ZANZIBAR ASSOCIATION FOR CHILDREN'S ADVANCEMENT (ZACA)

Code	Name	Position	Date	Place
D1	Bi Mwaka	Program Manager	13/04/2020	ZACA Office
D2	Bi Mwaka	Program Manager	14/04/2020	ZACA office
D3	Bi Kidawa	Executive Secretary	15/04/2020	ZACA Office
D4	Bi Mwaka	Program Manager	15/04/2020	ZACA Office
D5	Mr. Said	Accountant	16/04/2020	ZACA Office
D5	Shemsa Janu	Volunteer	16/04/2020	ZACA Office
D6	Ms. Khadija	Office Secretary	16/04/2020	ZACA Office
D7	Bi Kidawa	Executive Secretary	20/04/2020	ZACA Office
D8	Mr. said	Accountant	21/04/2020	ZACA office
D9	Mbarouk Is-hak	Beneficiary	23/04/2020	His house
D10	Sheikha Mohamed	Beneficiary	23/04/2020	Her house
D11	Khamis Mcha	Volunteer	24/04/2020	His house
D12	Rehema Khamis	Volunteer	27/04/2020	Her house
D13	Zainab Maulid	Beneficiary	29/04/2020	Her store
D14	Raudhat M	Beneficiary	29/04/2020	Her store
D15	Salum S	Sheha & beneficiary	29/04/2020	Her house
D16	Ali Khamis	Volunteer	01/05/2020	His house
D17	Mwanahila Abdalla	Volunteer	01/05/2020	Her house
D18	Husna Chande	Beneficiary	01/05/2020	Shakani
D19	Shemsa	Volunteer	01/05/2020	Shakani
D20	Ilyas Joseph	Beneficiary	01/05/2020	Shakani
D21	Subira Amour	Beneficiary	01/05/2020	Shakani
D22	Said Abdalla	Beneficiary	02/05/2020	Karakana
D23	Bakar Makame	Sheha	02/05/2020	Karakana
D24	Halima Hator	Volunteer	02/05/2020	Karakana

D25	Fathia Shaame	Stakeholder	03/05/2020	Karakana
D26	Ahmada Said	Volunteer	03/05/2020	Karakana
D27	Ali Tano	Volunteer	03/05/2020	Karakana
D28	Ibrahim Mohamed	Child Club member	03/05/2020	Karakana
D29	Hafidh Saleh	Club member	04/05/2020	Karakana
D30	Hassan Mohamed	Club member	04/05/2020	Karakana
D31	Halima Makame	Club member	04/20/2020	Karakana
D32	Mr. Said	Accountant	04/05/2020	ZACA Office
D33	Mr. Mzee	Deputy Chair Person	12/05/2020	His office
D34	Fatma	Beneficiary	13/05/2020	ZACA office
D35	Husna	Beneficiary	13/05/2020	ZACA office
D36	Bi Bay	Chair Person	14/05/2020	Her office

GOVERNMENT AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Code	Name	Organization	Date	Place
E1	Dr. Ali Ame	Stakeholder	12/03/2020	ACA Office
E2	Ms. Biubwa	DESW	20/04/2020	Her office
E3	Mr. Ahmed Khalid	Registrar	22/04/2020	His office
E4	Ms. Mwanabaraka	Registrar's office	22/04/2020	Her office
E5	Ms. Safina	Registrar's office	22/04/2020	Her office
E6	Selwa	SPU	27/04/2020	Her office
E7	Sofia	DESW	27/04/2020	Her office
E8	Dhamir K	ZBPRA	28/04/2020	His office
E9	Sheikh Hassan	WTC	07/05/2020	His office
E10	Sofia	DESW	11/05/2020	Her office
E11	Rukia	SPU	16/05/2020	Her office