

# **SOCIAL POLICY IN THE CONTEXT OF ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION**

## **A CONCEPT NOTE FOR TANZANIA HUMAN DEVELOPMENT REPORT 2017**

**By Dr. Tausi Kida & Prof. Marc Wuyts**



September 2015



# **SOCIAL POLICY IN THE CONTEXT OF ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION**

## **A CONCEPT NOTE FOR TANZANIA HUMAN DEVELOPMENT REPORT 2017**

**By  
Dr. Tausi Kida & Prof. Marc Wuyts**



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*



*Government of the  
United Republic of Tanzania*



*Implementing Partner*

**September 2015**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. JUSTIFICATION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. SITUATING SOCIAL POLICY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1 Defining social policy .....	3
3.2 Constitutive versus Additive Relationship .....	4
3.3 Interaction between economic and social policies .....	5
3.4 Space of social policy in macro policy: a historical perspective .....	7
3.5 Some concluding remarks .....	7
<b>4. TENTATIVE OUTLINE OF THDR 2017 REPORT .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Chapter 1: Status and Progress of Human Development in Tanzania .....	8
Chapter 2: The Space of Social Policy in Socioeconomic Transformation .....	8
Chapter 3: Integrating Social and Economic Policies: the Changing Emphases in National Policy Frameworks .....	8
Chapter 4: Social Policy as a Means and End of Economic Transformation for Human Development .....	8
Statistical Annex .....	9
<b>5. PROPOSAL FOR BACKGROUND PAPERS .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6. Activity schedule/timelines for production of THDR 2017 .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>7. Activity schedule/timelines for production of Statistical Annex for THDR 2017 .....</b>	<b>14</b>

# 1. INTRODUCTION

The basic design of the new THDR series was that each successive report should always feature a first chapter on 'The State and Progress of Human Development in Tanzania', while the remaining chapters of each report would deal with a specific theme, followed by a Statistical Annex that updates the data from report to report. THDR 2014, the first report in this series, dealt with the theme of *Economic Transformation for Human Development*.

In developing THDR 2014, the following principles were adopted to underscore the choice of the theme and the mode of its development:

- The theme of the report should address a policy issue that is topical within the context of ongoing policy discourses in Tanzania.
- The theme should furthermore be developed from the explicit perspective of human development;
- The development of the theme should provide an innovative viewpoint on the policy issue in question, rooted in sound theoretical reflections on and concrete empirical analysis of the Tanzanian context (as reflected in the background papers), taking into account (where appropriate) a comparative perspective with respect to other country experiences.
- Finally, the report itself, while analytical in its content, should be written in an accessible language to render it relevant to the broader public of stakeholders in development policies and practices.

In developing THDR 2017 we further propose to adopt the following additional principle to guide the choice of its theme and the mode of its development:

- The new theme should provide for both *continuity and change in focus* with respect to the earlier theme, thus creating cumulative synergy between both successive reports.

The basic idea behind this principle is that THDR 2017 should build upon what has been achieved with THDR 2014 by adopting a theme that is distinctive in its focus, but nevertheless interconnected with the ideas put forward in THDR 2014. In other words, it should take THDR 2014 as its point of departure, not by repeating its arguments, but by developing them further in ways that provide a novel but mutually reinforcing perspective. More specifically, we propose that the theme of THDR 2017 should focus on the *space* for social policy – and, more specifically, for social provisioning – in the context of the ongoing challenge of economic transformation and development.

## 2. JUSTIFICATION

The central argument of THDR 2014 was that the literature and the empirical evidence, both in terms of comparative country experiences and of the historical phases of the Tanzanian experience, show that economic transformation does not involve a unique unidirectional process, but can involve quite different trajectories, some of which, but not all, leading to growth-induced human development. What matters, therefore, is not just that economic transformation takes place, but also the content and nature of such transformation. More specifically, the THDR 2014 argued that what matters is not just the growth of output and its changing composition across economic sectors, but also that the dynamics of employment and output should go hand in hand, thus leading to cumulative convergences between productivities and labour incomes across and within sectors. In developing this argument, THDR 2014 further called for greater attention to the importance of social provisioning in the context of the process of economic transformation without, however, developing this dimension further, analytically and empirically.

This concept note proposes that THDR 2017 should squarely develop this point further by putting the role and the space of social provisioning – or, more generally, of social policy – at the centre of the stage. The reasons for choosing this theme are twofold:

- It provides a theme for THDR 2017 that is both distinctive in its focus, yet interconnected with the theme of THDR 2014;
- And, more importantly, the shift in emphasis in recent policy discourses in Tanzania towards economic transformation has effectively relegated the question of the role and space of social policy in the process of economic and social transformation to the backburner.
- In contrast, we would argue that social policy in general – and the transformative role of social policy in particular – needs to be giving greater attention than is usually accorded in recent policy debates that focus on economic transformation.

## 3. SITUATING SOCIAL POLICY

### 3.1 Defining social policy

For purpose of this concept note it is best to adopt the following broad definition of social policy:

Social policy is collective interventions in the economy to influence the access to and the incidence of adequate and secure livelihoods and income. As such, social policy has always played redistributive, protective and transformative or developmental roles. Although these different roles always work in tandem and synergistically, the weight given to each of these elements of social policy has varied widely across and, within countries, over time. In the context of development, there can be no doubt that the transformative role of social policy needs to receive greater attention than it is usually accorded in the developed countries and much more than it does in the current focus on 'safety nets'. (Mkandawire, 2004: p. 1).

This definition has the advantage that it does *not* immediately confine nor collapse social policy to the so-called 'social sectors' (like, for example, health and education along with a variety of safety nets and transfer payments in cash or kind). Indeed, such reduction of social policy to social sectors tends to lead to the compartmentalisation of macro policy into two distinct domains: economic policy, on the one hand, which is meant to deal with the 'economic sectors', and social policy, on the other hand, to deal with the 'social sectors'. In the context of policy discussions in Tanzania, for example, this bifurcation of the economic and the social into two separate sectors was already very apparent in the layout of the MKUKUTA policy framework and the subsequent reports on monitoring of outcomes, in which sectors (which further include governance as a separate block) feature side by side, each with its own set of policies and indicators. But this separation into distinct sectors, and the tensions to which it gives rise, becomes even more apparent in the recent policy discussion concerning the outline of FYDP II, which aims "to align and integrate the MKUKUTA and FYDP frameworks and rationale for Aligned Planning Framework" into a single macro policy framework to foster socioeconomic development (Outline of FYDP II, Dodoma, 15 June 2015: p. 1).

In contrast, the definition put forward by Mkandawire suggests that economic and social policy may be mutually constitutive rather than additive in nature in the ways in which they jointly shape economic and social development. It follows that making a sharp distinction between economic and social sectors and treating them as separate domains obscures this constitutive nature of social and economic policy.

This distinction between these two opposing views of how economic and social policies relate or interact with one another – either in an additive or in a constitutive fashion – matters a great deal for framing macro policies. More specifically, it matters for how the role and the space for social policy is conceptualised in framing policy strategies and tactics and for what this implies for the sequencing of policies over time in the process of socioeconomic transformation. This issue – we propose – should be the central focus that THDR 2017 should address.

A caveat is necessary here. The two views depicted here can best be seen as the two extremes of a spectrum rather than constituting a simple dichotomy. Indeed, in practice, the range of actually contending policy stances are not located at either one of these extremes, but are situated somewhere continuum that stretches between these two extremes, leaning either towards one or the other of

both extremes. In other words, it is not our contention to argue that some see the relation between social and economic policy as purely additive, while others see it as purely constitutive in all its aspects. Our point is, however, that making this sharp contrast between these two opposing stances is a useful device to see which end of the spectrum a particular view on macro policy tends to favour in practice.

### 3.2 Constitutive versus Additive Relationship

This distinction matters because if the relation between the social and the economic is seen as additive and, hence, consisting of two sectors, each with its own set of policies, but both laying claims on scarce resources, the key policy question boils down to how to prioritize between sectors. In other words, the relation between economic policy, on the one hand, and social policy, on the other hand, is then essentially seen as a trade-off between competing claims on scarce available resources from two distinctive sectors – the economic and the social. In contrast, if the relation is seen as constitutive nature, a trade-off will still need to be made, given the scarcity of available resources, but not between the social sector, on the one hand, and the economic sector, on the other, but rather between different ways (= combinations of policies) in which synergy can be constructed between social and economic policies to propel the process of socioeconomic transformation and development (Mkandawire, 2004: pp. 1-4).

Mkandawire further argued that, while the notion of the mutually constitutive nature of social and economic policy was quite prevalent among many of the early development economists (with Gunnar Myrdal, in particular, as its strongest proponent), these insights have subsequently been rejected, downplayed or ignored over time and, essentially constituted the ‘road not taken’ (2004: p. 2). This – Mkandawire argued – has given rise to the ‘mistaken view of social policy in the developed countries as being largely an aspect of the end-state of development – the welfare state – and therefore not relevant to developing countries’ (2004: p. 5). There is, moreover, an interesting and not unrelated parallel between this mistaken view on social policy as relevant only to the end-state of development and, as Townsend pointed out, the view held by many economists that Keynesian theory of effective demand – multiplier analysis, in particular – is largely irrelevant for developing countries since ‘Keynesian employment policies are relevant only in circumstances in which the means of production exist, but goods are not being produced because there is too little effective demand’ (2004: p. 41-42). This view on the irrelevance of effective demand analysis for developing countries was summarised by Stewart as follows:

More expenditures by government or consumers would not raise output and employment – it merely raises prices and imports, for it is not effective demand that is lacking, but factors on the supply side. People are idle because ‘there are no machines for them to work with, few managers to organise them and few skills or basic educational qualifications to be employed’ (Stewart 1972, as quoted in Townsend 2004: p. 42).

A prominent reason for this is the argument that wealth has to be created *first* before it can be spent on social welfare, and, hence, in the earlier stages of economic development and transformation, wealth creation should take precedence over consumption in general and social expenditure in particular. Economic policy, therefore, is thus seen to be more fundamental than social policy, particularly in the earlier stages of economic transformation, thus reducing the latter to the status of the latter to a ‘residual’ category (Tendler, 2004).

It is not our intention however, to argue that social policy is ignored altogether or even that its linkages

with economic policy are always overlooked. Indeed, THDR 2014 raised this issue as follows with respect to the design and implementation of FFYP I:

The third issue is that the human development aspect as included in the five priorities – human capital and skill development – is only sought so a person can become a more objective object in the process of pursuing growth. This is different from, for example, prioritizing the reduction on maternal and infant mortality, the provision of education or strategies for increasing life expectancy. (THDR, 2014: p. 57)

### **3.3 Interaction between economic and social policies**

Indeed, under the impulse of new-growth theories in economics, the role of social investment – education (but also health), in particular – in fostering the development of ‘human capital’ has come to be recognised more explicitly as an important ingredient for successful economic transformation and growth. But merely subordinating social policy for the purposes of economic transformation can have negative implications e.g. the role of gendered social policies in East Asia that promoted rapid growth in manufacturing by segmenting the labour market and ensuring a flow of low wage female labour. This again goes back to the point that it is not economic transformation that matters per se but the nature and content of this transformation. Whether the primary focus is on economic transformation or social provisioning the point is that there is need to be much more explicit about the ‘ends’ of development e.g. human freedom.

Moreover, the unhelpful dichotomy in policy is not just between the social and the economic but it is further important to point out how the social also contains hierarchies that can be intentionally or unintentionally exacerbated by forms of social policy. For example, the dramatic decline in the quality standards of broad-based basic education in Tanzania (Sumra and Katabaro, 2014; THDR 2014), witnessed in the recent decade, not only constitutes an important impediment for the intended drive towards the expansion of manufacturing production, but also further propels social polarization in access to education and jobs as parents who can afford it send their children to private schools or abroad to secure quality of education. Conversely, jobless growth within formal manufacturing and services combined with increased labour flows (absorption) into informal sector activities that rely on intensifying the use of labour rather than raising productivity limit the scope for education and skill development in fostering productive capabilities. These examples illustrate that social policy and expenditures – and social investment in particular – not only creates opportunities but can also impose constraints on the process of economic and social development and transformation.

Conversely, economic policy can be an important vehicle to attain social objective. It can be argued, for example, that ‘an economic strategy that generates more and better paying employment in good conditions may be the best ‘cash transfer’ programme of all, since it would give the poor access to jobs that provide more income and more dignity’ (Ghosh, 2011: p. 855)..This example should not be seen, however, as an argument to downplay the importance of cash transfers as instruments of social policy pure and simple, but rather to illustrate that economic policy is an important instrument for social development in its own right. In contrast, an economic strategy that propels economic growth and transformation of GDP, but generates jobless growth outside agriculture and informal production and, hence, leads to labour moving in the opposite direction of output, is likely to engender a process of ‘persistent redistributive failure’ that cannot easily be corrected through greater reliance on social safety nets. This was essentially the argument put forward in THDR 2014. What these contrastive examples show is that what matters in terms of achieving social objectives is not only whether an

economy is undergoing transformative growth, but also what kind of social development economic transformation propels (or fails to propel).

To recapitulate, our argument so far has been that the reductionism implied in defining the space of the 'social' largely in terms of taking care of the 'social sectors' as distinct from the 'economic sectors' not only implies that policy making becomes fragmented, but also that important dimensions of the constitutive nature of the economic and the social become blindsided. This neglect of the constitutive nature of both these dimensions of policy is further amplified by the fact that, as Tendler argued, there is 'a tendency in the international donor community to conceive of social policies in ways that allow them to 'projectize' and 'micro-ize' it – a tendency that, remarkably, shows little variation from left to right across the donor spectrum' (2004: p. 119). This matters for Tanzania, in particular, where donor funding continues to account for a significant share in financing public expenditure, particularly in the social sectors. A major consequence of this tendency to projectize and micro-ize social provisioning is that it tends to ignore the constitutive nature of social and economic policy in shaping macro processes and outcomes. For example, issues like employment and environmental concerns typically fall by the wayside.

Moreover, since macroeconomic policies tend to focus on the supply side and ignore the demand side, the interphase with economic and social policy tends to be only perceived in terms of whether or not social policy contributes to the development of productive capabilities, for example, by investing in education for the development of human capital. More specifically, in dealing with issues concerning economic growth and transformation, including the place of innovation in propelling production, 'the emphasis has been on building technological capabilities through satisfaction of demand, without much probing of the choice of demand to satisfy' (Srinivas, 2012: p. 80). In other words, this neglect of the demand side of the equation tends to lead to ignoring the role of social policy in structuring effective demand, not only in terms of the overall level of effective demand, but also, and importantly, in terms of shaping the processes that convert (or fail to convert) needs into effective demand' (*ibid*: p. 78).

As pointed out earlier, at macro policy level, for example, there is a tendency to view consumption – and, more specifically, social expenditures (social consumption in particular) – as a problem in the process of economic transformation since it diverts resources away from investing in the expansion of productive capacities. But, as Srinivas argued:

It is thus particularly important to understand the nature of demand in industrialising economies, where markets are especially various, complex, and uncertain while technological capabilities on the supply side are being rapidly built. While these economies may well be compared internationally on the supply side, their demand sides are diverse and sectorally distinct. In the seminal 'catch-up' literature, the emphasis has been on building technological capabilities through satisfaction of demand, without too much probing of the choice of the 'demand' to satisfy. But there have been traditions deeply concerned that industrial policies were tilted towards promoting export growth and the satisfaction of domestic demand for elites, and not the lower-income groups. This can lead, as the Latin Americans (and leaders such as Gandhi too) worried about, to deep inequalities skewed to emulating consumers of industrialised economies. (2015: 80).

This question of how social policy in its interaction with economic policy shapes the ways demand and needs are connected becomes particularly important in a context – as prevails in Tanzania today

– where policy seeks to prioritize rapid industrialisation as a driving force of economic transformation. At present, however, the role and the space of social policy within this endeavour is as yet poorly understood or articulated.

### **3.4 Space of social policy in macro policy: a historical perspective**

Historically, during the heyday of the Ujamaa period under President Nyerere, social policy occupied a central place within macro policy making. But, under the impulse of the economic reforms of the 1980s, structural adjustment policies in particular, one of the most important changes has of course been in the arena of macroeconomic policy and the changing role of the place of social policy therein. Subsequently, social policy has been shaped in Tanzania by the processes of global integration that have removed some of the levers of macroeconomic management as well as given rise to continued donor influence within the traditionally defined social sectors. These changes in the policy environment under the impulse of economic reforms also reflected themselves in the changing nature of employment generation and in the issue of the falling rate of growth of consumption in GDP that was raised in THDR 14. Under the impulse of the HIPC initiative, however, social policies became more prominent, albeit within a perspective of bifurcation of economic policies confined to economic sectors, on the one hand, and social policies confined to social sectors, on the other.

It is our argument that the present emphasis on propelling a process of industrialisation cannot be viewed independently from the context in which economic and social policies are seen as constitutive rather than additive in nature, not only for reason of supply-side factors, as mentioned above, but also because the character of industrialisation – that is, the type of productive and technological capabilities it fosters – depends on the prevailing patterns of effective demand. Indeed, within a market economy, production does not respond to need, but to need backed by cash. Consequently, social policy cannot just be put on the backburner or viewed as a residual category until economic transformation comes to fruition since, in conjunction with economic policy, it plays an essential role in shaping the direction and content of such transformation in terms of who it is for and how it permeates the transforming economy and society (*ibid*).

### **3.5 Some concluding remarks**

In this concept note, then, we have argued that the concept of the transformative role of social policy would be an important theme for the next THDR. Not only because this is an area of work that has increasing traction in international institutions and the development community, but also because its theoretical and empirical foundations are still quite new and as yet poorly understood. It also has strong resonances with Tanzania's previous developmental visions although it is a challenge to find this articulated in policy documents today. For these reasons, we argued, the question of how to define the role and the space of social policy in the process of socioeconomic transformation should be a key concern of THDR 2017.

## 4. OUTLINE OF THDR 2017 REPORT

The first step in the process of laying the foundations for THDR 2017 is to produce the broad outline of the structure of the report, and particularly the chapters to be included pertaining to this theme of the role and space of social policy in the process of socioeconomic transformation.

Tentatively, using the same structure as used in THDR 2014, we propose the following overall outline of contents:

### **Chapter 1: *Status and Progress of Human Development in Tanzania***

This chapter, which will be similar to chapter 1 in THDR 2014, will review the evolution of HDI, MPI and GNP per capita since 2014, followed by a discussion of the evolution of the constituent components of these indicators and of the driving forces that underlie such changes. This chapter should also look at the interaction between population dynamics – growth, composition and momentum – and the changing nature of social provisioning over the planning horizon for socioeconomic transformation.

### **Chapter 2: *The Space of Social Policy in Socioeconomic Transformation***

This chapter will review the meaning of social policy, not only in its redistributive and protective role, but also in its transformative and developmental role in the process of socioeconomic transformation. More specifically, this chapter should make the argument – both conceptually and by drawing on concrete empirical examples taken from Tanzania's own experiences (and elsewhere) - that social and economic policies are essentially constitutive rather than additive in nature inasmuch as social policies not only achieve social but also economic ends and, similarly, economic policies not only achieve economic but also social ends. What matters, therefore, is not to pitch social sectors against economic sectors as separate spheres of policy in the making of national policy frameworks, but rather to look at how they combine in achieving specific socioeconomic outcomes.

### **Chapter 3: *Integrating Social and Economic Policies: the Changing Emphases in National Policy Frameworks***

This chapter reviews how the role and space for social policy and its relation to economic policy has changed over time with changing policy regimes in Tanzania since independence. It thus should seek to locate present debates on the role of social policy within the light of the lessons that can be drawn from past successes, failures and silences of defining the role and the space of social policy in socioeconomic transformation.

### **Chapter 4: *Social Policy as a Means and End of Economic Transformation for Human Development***

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the challenges that need to be confronted to make social policy not only an hypothesized end stage of the process of economic transformation, but also a

means to achieve the type of transformation that makes economic transformation work for human development.

***Statistical Annex***

Routine data tables + special tables concerning theme of THDR 2017

## 5. PROPOSAL FOR BACKGROUND PAPERS

The next step is to set out the portfolio of background papers to be produced. One issue that may emerge as a result of this will be the challenge of finding researchers for the background papers who understand that this is a significantly different way of thinking about social policy. The background papers will have to address why in recent years social policies have had a limited transformative role in Tanzania – so looking at the ideological, institutional and political roots of particular policy approaches as well as potential alternatives.

NO	TOPIC	AUTHORS
1.	The Status and Progress of Human Development in Tanzania (mainland).	(i) Prof. Haidari Amani - Principal Research Associate, ESRF. (ii) Dr. Tausi Kida - Executive Director, ESRF. (iii) Mr. Danford Sango - Research Fellow, ESRF; and Administrative Manager, THDR Project.
2.	The Status and Progress of Human Development in Zanzibar.	(i) Prof. Flora Kessy - Professor of Development Studies, Mzumbe University, Dar es Salaam Campus. (ii) Ms. Mashavu Omar - Commissioner for Monitoring and Evaluation, Zanzibar Planning Commission.
3.	Population Dynamics and Social Policy.	(i) Prof. Alfred Otieno Agwanda - Associate Professor, Population Studies and Research Institute, University of Nairobi. (ii) Prof. Haidari Amani - Principal Research Associate, ESRF. (iii) Mr. Ahmed Makbel - Assistant Director, Department of Labour Market Information, Ministry of Labour and Employment.
4.	Situating Social Policy in Socioeconomic Transformation: A Conceptual Framework.	(i) Prof. Marc Wuyts - Professor of Economics, International Institute of Social Studies (ISS); and Technical Advisor, THDR Project, ESRF. (ii) Dr. Hazel Gray - Research Fellow, London School of Economics.
5.	Financing the Space for Social Provisioning: A Macro Perspective.	(i) Prof. Marc Wuyts - Professor of Economics, International Institute of Social Studies (ISS); and Technical Advisor, THDR Project, ESRF. (ii) Dr. Tausi Kida - Executive Director, ESRF. (iii) Dr. Kenneth Mdadila - Lecturer, Department of Economics, University of Dar es Salaam.
6.	Social Policy in Historical Perspective in Tanzania: Shifting Approaches to Social Provisioning.	(i) Dr. Jehovaness Aikaeli - Senior Lecturer and Head, Department of Economics, University of Dar es Salaam. (ii) Prof. Humphrey Moshi - Professor of Economics, Department of Economics, University of Dar es Salaam.

7.	Social Policy, Gender and Labour.	(i) Prof. Godius Kahyrara - Principal, College of Social Sciences, University of Dar es Salaam. (ii) Dr. Joyce Nyoni - Senior Lecturer, Department of Sociology and Cultural Anthropology, University of Dar es Salaam.
8.	Health as a Productive Sector	(i) Prof. Maureen Mackintosh – Professor of Economics, The Open University UK (ii) Dr. Paula Tibandebage – Senior Research Associate, REPOA
9.	Social Protection: Safety Net or Vehicle for Transformation?	(i) Dr. Flora Myamba - Director of Research on Social Protection, REPOA. (ii) Dr. Sheshangai Kaniki - Research Associate, ESRF.
10.	Education Foundations of the Development of Skills and Productive Capabilities.	(i) Prof. Suleman Sumra - Freelance Consultant and Former Director of TENMET/UWEZO. (ii) Dr. Joviter Katabaro - Senior Lecturer, School of Education, University of Dar es Salaam.
11.	Water Provisioning in Tanzania: Access, Financing and Policy Trend.	(i) Dr. Kenneth Mdadila - Lecturer, Department of Economics, University of Dar es Salaam. (ii) Hon. Joseph Kakunda – Member of Parliament and Former Director of Policy and Planning, Ministry of Water.

## 6. Activity schedule/timelines for production of THDR 2017

S/#	ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE PERSON	TIMELINE/TIMEFRAME
<b>(i) Commissioning process for background papers</b>			
1.	Identification of Background Papers & consultants	CT <sup>1</sup> (based on the concept note for THDR 2017)	1 <sup>st</sup> week of August 2015
2.	Development of Terms of Reference	Dr. Hazel Gray	3 <sup>rd</sup> week of August 2015
3.	Recruitment of consultants (recruitment includes commissioning i.e. signing of contracts)	Project Manager & Secretariat	1 <sup>st</sup> week of September 2015
<b>(ii) Review process of background papers</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each paper shall have at least two reviewers to guide its development</li> <li>• Four submissions will be expected from each background paper</li> </ul>			
4.	Submission of Inception Report detailing key questions and issues for analysis	Consultants	3 <sup>rd</sup> week of September 2015
5.	Providing guidance & go ahead for starting of analysis	CT	4 <sup>th</sup> week of September 2015
6.	Submission of 1 <sup>st</sup> Draft Report	Consultants	4 <sup>th</sup> Week of December 2015
7.	Workshop of THDR WG to review 1 <sup>st</sup> drafts of BPs	WG <sup>2</sup> /Reviewers	1 <sup>st</sup> week of February 2016
8.	Submission of 2 <sup>nd</sup> Draft Report	Consultants	2 <sup>nd</sup> week of March 2016
9.	Review of 2 <sup>nd</sup> Draft Report	CT/Reviewers	4 <sup>th</sup> week of March 2016
10.	Submission of Final Report	Consultants	2 <sup>nd</sup> week of May 2016
11.	Editing and publishing	CT	2 <sup>nd</sup> Week of July 2016

<b>(iii) Drafting process of THDR 2017 report</b>			
12.	Recruitment of consultants & start of assignment	CG/secretariat	3 <sup>rd</sup> week of February 2016
13.	Submission of Inception Reports	Drafting Team	3 <sup>rd</sup> week of March 2016
14.	Providing guidance & go ahead for starting analysis	CG	4 <sup>th</sup> week of March 2016
15.	Submission of 1 <sup>st</sup> Draft Report	Drafting Team	4 <sup>th</sup> week of June 2016
16.	Review of 1 <sup>st</sup> Draft Report	CT/Reviewers	1 <sup>st</sup> week of July 2016
17.	Submission of 2 <sup>nd</sup> Draft Reports	Consultants	2 <sup>nd</sup> week of August 2016
18.	Review of 2 <sup>nd</sup> Draft Report	CT/Reviewers	3 <sup>rd</sup> week of August 2016
19.	Submission of Final Report	Drafting Team	2 <sup>nd</sup> week of October 2016
20.	Preparation of Executive Summary & Preface	Consultants	4 <sup>th</sup> week of December 2016
<b>(iv) Editing, printing and launching</b>			
21.	Professional editing of the report	Professional Editor/ Project Manager/ Secretariat	2 <sup>nd</sup> week of January – 2 <sup>nd</sup> week of April 2017
22.	Printing	Printer, ESRF	1 <sup>st</sup> week of May – 1 <sup>st</sup> week of July 2016
23.	Launch	WG	4 <sup>th</sup> week of July 2017

**(Footnotes)**

- 1 Core Team for THDR project
- 2 THDR Working Group

## 7. Activity schedule/timelines for production of Statistical Annex for THDR 2017

S/#	Activity	Responsible Person(s)	Timeline/Timeframe
1.	Data collection	(i) Mr. Sango Simba (NBS <sup>1</sup> ) (ii) Dr. Kenneth Mdadila (DoE, UDSM <sup>2</sup> ) (iii) Mr. Ahmed Makbel (MoL & E3) (iv) Mr. Ali Shamte (OCGS <sup>4</sup> ) (v) Mr. Danford Sango (ESRF <sup>5</sup> )	1 <sup>st</sup> week of November 2015 to 4 <sup>th</sup> week of March 2016
2.	Preparation of Statistical Annex	(i) Dr. John Mduma (DoE, UDSM) (ii) Dr. Kenneth Mdadila (DoE, UDSM)	1 <sup>st</sup> week of April, 2016 – 4 <sup>th</sup> Week of September 2016
3.	Review and revisions	(i) Prof. Adolf Mkenda (ii) THDR core team	1 <sup>st</sup> week of July 2016 – 4 <sup>th</sup> week of September 2016

### (Footnotes)

- 1 National Bureau of Statistics
- 2 Department of Economics, University of Dar es Salaam
- 3 Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of Tanzania
- 4 Office of Chief Government Statistician, Zanzibar
- 5 Economic and Social Research Foundation





*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*



*Government of the  
United Republic of Tanzania*



*Implementing Partner*