



# Technical Annex

## Investing in Tanzania's People

May 2024

### Contents

Introduction	2
Section 1: Taxonomy of U.S. Contributions to Tanzania	2
Section 2: Methodology for counting U.S. contributions	3
Harmonizing U.S. government sector codes to Tanzania's FYDP-III	3
Data collection and analysis	4
U.S. contributions via multilateral agencies and the share of investment guarantees provided by MIGA that can be attributed to the U.S.	4
Contributions from U.S. tourists to the Tanzanian economy	5
Section 3: Methodologies for understanding real and perceived benefits of the U.S.-Tanzania relationship	6
Snap-poll as a tool to assess perceived benefits of U.S. contribution to Tanzania	6
Survey Questionnaire	8

## Introduction

This report uses both quantitative and qualitative research methods to estimate the total value and range of U.S. contributions to Tanzania's growth, prosperity, and stability on a yearly basis. On the quantitative front, we utilize a range of publicly available databases as well as several proprietary databases that capture monetary flows from a range of U.S.-based actors to Tanzanian recipients. To gain insights into the programs and activities these monetary flows are supporting in Tanzania, we rely on qualitative information from publicly available sources.

In addition, we conducted a snap poll of Tanzania's public, private, and civil society leaders to understand how they assess their country's partnership with the United States and examine potential downstream economic, political, and social benefits of U.S. engagement in Tanzania.

This technical annex hopes to provide further information on our approach and methodology for this study and its constituent pieces. The first section provides an overview of the taxonomy of distinct U.S. contribution channels we found to be most relevant and measurable. We also share details on the data sources we used for each channel and the time period for the data.

In the second section, we discuss the methodological aspects of our study. This includes the detailed mapping of the U.S. government's programmatic sectors to the 5 priority areas we identified from our evaluation of Tanzania's Third National Five-Year Development Plan (2021-2026) (FYDP-III). This section also includes details of any statistical techniques that we used to estimate the volume of U.S. contributions through various channels, as well as details on any assumptions we had to make in transforming readily available data into information that was more fit for purpose.

The last section provides details on the data sources and methods we used to explore some of the observed benefits to Tanzania in the three illustrative areas of U.S. government engagement we picked based on a combined consideration of data availability and the volume of contribution. We also provide some details on the snap-poll that we conducted such as the response rate, sampling frame, weighting methodology, and various distributions of respondents by attribute type.

## Section 1: Taxonomy of U.S. Contributions to Tanzania

To capture the universe of direct and indirect contributions that the U.S. makes to Tanzania's economy and prosperity is inherently difficult. We identified 10 distinct channels of contribution that were reliably quantifiable. We classified these channels into two broad categories: U.S. Government-driven and U.S. Society-driven. Table I provides a list of these channels, the associated source of data that we used to quantify the volume of contribution for that channel, and the time period for which the data source provided coverage.

Table I: Taxonomy of U.S. Contributions to Tanzania

Category	Data Source	Time Coverage
U.S. Government driven		
Bilateral Assistance	USAID Foreign Aid Explorer <sup>1</sup>	2012-2022
Multilateral Assistance	OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS)	2012-2022
Trade	World Integrated Trade Solution (WITS), the World Bank	2000-2022
Investment Guarantees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>U.S. Development Finance Corporation</li><li>Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA), the World Bank</li></ul>	2000-2022

<sup>1</sup> Although the Foreign Aid Explorer has data for 2023 and 2024, these data are incomplete. Therefore, we only evaluate data that has been reported up to 2022.

Scholarships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>U.S. Department of State</li> <li>Department of Homeland Security Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS)</li> </ul>	2014-2023
U.S. Society driven		
Remittances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The World Bank's Bilateral Remittance Matrix</li> <li>World Bank World Development Indicators</li> </ul>	2012-2022
Foreign Direct Investments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Times fDi Markets</li> <li>U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2012-2022</li> <li>2010-2023</li> </ul>
Tourism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tourist Arrivals</li> <li>Tourism Revenue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tanzania National Bureau of Statistics</li> <li>World Bank World Development Indicators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2016-2022</li> <li>2000-2019</li> </ul>
Philanthropic Contributions	OECD Creditor Reporting System (CRS)	2012-2022 <sup>2</sup>
Micro Loans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kiva</li> </ul>	2005-2024

## Section 2: Methodology for counting U.S. contributions

### Harmonizing U.S. government sector codes to Tanzania's FYDP-III

To better understand how U.S. contributions support Tanzania's Third National Five-Year Development Plan (2021-2026) (FYDP-III), we first decided to harmonize the sector classifications used by U.S. government agencies for disbursements and budgeting to the thematic priority areas of FYDP-III. Table II provides the crosswalk we developed for this purpose.

Table II: Crosswalk of USG Sector Codes to FYDP--III

<b>Table 2. Crosswalk of Thematic Focus Areas Between USG Priorities and FYDP-III</b>		
<b>USG Project Sector</b>	<b>Tanzania Priority Area</b>	<b>Area Interventions from FYDP-III</b>
Economic Development - General; Economic Opportunity; Private Sector Competitiveness	i) Realizing an Inclusive and Competitive Economy	Competitive Economy
Debt Relief; Macroeconomic Foundation for Growth		Promoting Macroeconomic Stability for a Competitive Economy
Infrastructure		Unlocking Infrastructural Competitiveness
Infrastructure		Energy Sector
Labor Policies and Markets; Monitoring and Evaluation; Policies, Regulations, and Systems; Private		Leveraging Institutions for Competitiveness

<sup>2</sup> OECD CRS' Private Philanthropy for Development (PPFD) data goes back to 2009. However, many philanthropies only started reporting to the CRS in 2017 so these data may under-represent the total contribution by these foundations. .

Sector Competitiveness		
Agriculture	ii) Deepening Industrialization and service provision	Agriculture
Manufacturing		Manufacturing
Mining and Natural Resources		Mining
Infrastructure		Construction
Clean Productive Environment; Environment; Natural Resources and Biodiversity		Environmental and Natural Resources Management
Economic Opportunity		Science, Technology and Innovation
Economic Opportunity; Trade and Investment		Tourism Sector
Economic Opportunity		Information, Sports and Creative Arts
Financial Sector		Financial Services
Natural Resources and Biodiversity		The Blue Economy
Monitoring and Evaluation; Policies, Regulations, and Systems		iii) Investment and Trade Promotion
Trade and Investment	Trade	
[Multisector]	Foreign Relations and Economic Diplomacy	
Basic Education; Education and Social Services - General; Higher Education	iv) Interventions for Human Development	Quality and Relevant Education
Family Planning and Reproductive Health; Health; HIV/AIDS; Malaria; Maternal and Child Health; Other Public Health Threats; Pandemic Influenza and Other Emerging Threats (PIOET); Tuberculosis		Health
Water Supply and Sanitation		Water Supply and Sanitation
Infrastructure		Urban Planning, Housing and Human Settlement Development
Nutrition; Protection Assistance		Food Security and Nutrition

and Solutions		
Protection, Assistance and Solutions; Social Assistance; Social Services		Social Protection
Civil Society; Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance - General; Good Governance; Political Competition and Consensus-Building; Rule of Law and Human Rights; Transnational Crime		Good Governance and Rule of Law
Rule of Law and Human Rights; Transnational Crime		Effective and Efficient Justice Service Delivery System
Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD); Conflict Mitigation and Reconciliation; Counter-Terrorism; Peace and Security - General; Stabilization Operations and Security Sector Reform		Peace, Security and Political stability
[Multisector]		Development of New Capital City of Tanzania – Dodoma
Labor Policies and Markets	v) Interventions for Skills Development	Mainstream and integrate theory and practice in the development of training curricular
Labor Policies and Markets		Improve infrastructure in training and development institutions for special and rare cadres
Higher Education; Labor Policies and Markets		Increase access to post-basic learning opportunities such as workplace-learning programmes, including formal apprenticeships, internships and upgrading informal apprenticeship
Labor Policies and Markets		Mainstream inclusive and user-friendly ICT applicability at all levels of skills training and learning
Labor Policies and Markets		Promote innovation, and transfers of skills and technology
Labor Policies and Markets		Promote employable skills for

		population groups with special needs
[Multisector]		Facilitate implementation of the National Skills Development Programme (2021/22-2025/26)

**Sources:** Tanzania’s FYDP-III, ForeignAssistance.gov. Some USG sectors cover multiple Tanzanian priority sectors; we propose to determine the alignment of these projects via project descriptions and the “International” sector code included in the ForeignAssistance.gov data. Additionally, some of Tanzania’s specified priority areas require inputs across multiple USG sectors.

## Data collection and analysis

Using the crosswalk, all downloaded databases from publicly available sources (see: Table I) were amended to include Tanzania’s FYDP-III Priority Areas sectors for all observations of contribution by channel and year. However, not all our identified contribution channels were readily available from secondary sources in a usable format. U.S. contributions via multilateral agencies, investment guarantees provided by the U.S. via MIGA, remittances, scholarships, and benefits received from U.S. tourists to the Tanzanian economy required some analytical work to extract relevant insights. We provide the details of these analyses below.

## U.S. contributions via multilateral agencies and the share of investment guarantees provided by MIGA that can be attributed to the U.S.

We evaluated the public records of all multilateral organizations active in Tanzania to find the share of U.S. contributions in their overall operations. We used equity held by the U.S. government to determine how much of grants disbursed by development banks and investment funds could be attributed to the United States<sup>3</sup>. When U.S. shareholding changed between 2012-2022, we chose the lowest value to ensure estimates were conservative. When shareholding values were not available, we calculated averages based on the portion of annual core funding attributable to the U.S.G. in available reporting. Table III provides our estimated U.S.G. share for each multilateral organization active in Tanzania and the information source used. These percentages were used with the reported total disbursements by these multilateral institutions in Tanzania to estimate the U.S.G. contribution to Tanzania’s development via multilateral organizations<sup>4</sup>.

**Table III: Estimated U.S.G. Share of Contributions Made by Multilateral Organizations in Tanzania**

Organization	U.S.G. Share	Notes
African Development Bank	6.516%	Based on U.S. subscription/shares in the AfDB and voting powers (stable at around <a href="#">6.65%</a> since 2014, updated to 6.516 based on the <a href="#">2023 report</a> )
Central Emergency Response Fund	1.0%	Based on 2006-2024 average of <a href="#">USG core contributions divided by total core contributions</a> (\$89.5M of \$8.9B).

<sup>3</sup> Among the multilateral contributions to Tanzania were a substantial amount of concessional loans from the World Bank’s International Development Association, the African Development Bank, and the International Fund for Agricultural Development. For these loans, we only reviewed loans that were concessional in character and with terms that are consistent with the IMF Debt Limits Policy and/or the World Bank’s Non-Concessional Borrowing Policy. For more detail, see: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/officialdevelopmentassistance/definitionandcoverage.htm>

<sup>4</sup> We were only able to capture multilateral contributions for those organizations that reported their funding of activities in Tanzania to the OECD CRS database.

Climate Investment Funds	26.53%	Climate Funds, percent from <a href="#">totals since 2008</a>
GAVI	13.5%	While U.S. contributed/pledged 13.0% of GAVI funding 2016-2020, the total <a href="#">2011-2025 period</a> , it contributed 13.5% of the total.
Global Environment Facility	14.75%	U.S. held 14.75% actual shares for 6th GEF Replenishment in 2014, 7th replenishment occurred in 2018 and <a href="#">bumped up to 15%</a>
Global Fund	38.18%	Mean of <a href="#">the annual portion of USG contributions</a> within total Global Fund pledges and contributions, 2001-2020.
IAEA	29.11%	Based on U.S. contributions to IAEA funding in 2017.
IBRD, World Bank	16.4%	IBRD based on <a href="#">subscriptions as of 2023</a> , due to lack of older data.
IDA, World Bank	12.51%	Based on IDA's <a href="#">18th Replenishment (2017-2020)</a> share of donor contributions.
IFC, World Bank	21.932%	IFC Based on percentage of capital stock 2017-21, from annual reports.
IFAD	9.36%	Mean of U.S. contributions to <a href="#">past three IFAD replenishments</a> (IFAD 9-11).
ILO	22%	U.S. Contributes <a href="#">22% of ILO's regular budget</a> each biennium.
MIGA, World Bank	18.36%	U.S. Contributions to MIGA based on <a href="#">2023 Subscription figures</a> .
UNAIDS	36.1%	Mean of U.S. share of <a href="#">annual contributions to UNAIDS</a> , 2017-2021.
UNDP	7.28%	Mean of U.S. share of <a href="#">annual contributions to UNDP</a> , 2017-2021.
UNFPA	3.8%	Mean of U.S. share of <a href="#">annual contributions to UNFPA</a> , 2014-2021. Note: Core contributions were halted from 2017-2020.
UNHCR	39.32%	Mean of U.S. share of total <a href="#">contributions to UNHCR</a> 2017-2021.
UNICEF	12.081%	Mean of US public sector share of <a href="#">total contributions to UNICEF, 2017-2021</a> .
WFP	40.18%	Average of <a href="#">U.S. contributions divided by total contributions 2017-2021</a> .
WHO	14.34%	Average of total (assessed + voluntary) contribution percentage <a href="#">2016-17, 2018-19, and 2020-21 bienniums</a> .

The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) also contributed substantial funding to GAVI, the Global Fund, UNAIDS, and WHO. The same approach was applied to calculate the share of multilateral funding attributable to BMGF, applying the share attributable to the foundation to the total funding by each multilateral disbursed in Tanzania, then adding this sum to the total directly disbursed by the BMGF. Table IV provides our estimated BMGF share for each multilateral organization active in Tanzania and the information source used. These percentages were used with the reported total disbursements by these multilateral institutions in Tanzania to estimate the BMGF contribution to Tanzania's development via multilateral organizations.

**Table IV: Estimated BMGF Share of Contributions Made by Multilateral Organizations in Tanzania**

Organization	BMGF Share	Notes
GAVI	17%	BMGF contributed 17% of <a href="#">GAVI funding from 2016-2020</a> (1.5B).
Global Fund	4.8%	Based on 2001-2019 mean of <a href="#">total BMGF pledges and contributions</a> .
UNAIDS	0.62%	Mean of BMGF annual contributions to <a href="#">UNAIDS 2017-2021</a> .
WHO	10.17%	Average of total (assessed + voluntary) contribution percentage during the <a href="#">2016-17, 2018-19, and 2020-21 bienniums</a> .

## Contributions from U.S. tourists to the Tanzania economy

Information on average expenditures of an American tourist in Tanzania are not directly. However, the total revenues from tourism are recorded in Tanzania's national income accounting and are published annually in the World Development Indicators database of the World Bank. We use this information, along with the total number of tourist arrivals each year to Tanzania to calculate average yearly revenue generated per foreign tourist.

Then, we use Tanzania's annual [International Visitors Exit Surveys](#), openly available from 2016-2022, to identify the share of foreign tourists from the United States. We take the mean of these six values (excluding 2020 due to COVID-19 restrictions), and apply this to estimate receipts attributable to U.S. tourist spending dating back to 2000. Notably, this likely underestimates the total contribution of U.S. citizens, given that American tourists had the highest average expenditure per night during their stays, and stayed more nights than the average visitor.<sup>5</sup> .

---

<sup>5</sup> Tanzania National Bureau of Statistics (2022). The 2022 International Visitors' Exit Survey Report. [https://www.nbs.go.tz/nbs/takwimu/Tourism/2022\\_International\\_Visitors\\_Exit\\_Survey\\_Report.pdf](https://www.nbs.go.tz/nbs/takwimu/Tourism/2022_International_Visitors_Exit_Survey_Report.pdf)



## Section 3: Methodologies for understanding real and perceived benefits of the U.S.-Tanzania relationship

To be able to explore whether the U.S. contributions to Tanzania's development and prosperity have delivered on their intended benefits and anticipated positive spillover effects, we chose to evaluate outcomes due to the U.S. engagements in energy, trade, health, and education. In each of these sectors, the U.S. has contributed extensively with financial and technical support to benefit the people of Tanzania.

We measure these contributions with indicators from diverse sources. Due to their reliability as data sources and coverage, many of these indicators derive data from the World Development Indicators curated by the World Bank. The World Bank DataBank serves as a repository for these indicators and provides additional metadata on each indicator.

In addition to drawing on the World Development Indicators for life expectancy at birth, the report draws on two UN data sources for health information. The AIDSInfo website and dashboard provide data related to HIV/AIDS deaths and deaths averted by the administration of ART to individuals living with HIV. Data on child health comes from the UN Inter-agency Working Group for Child Mortality Estimation. Members of this working group have spent decades leading efforts to measure child health.

Two other data sources provide data for the remaining indicators. The Energy Information Agency, which collects a range of energy production, consumption, trade, and other energy data worldwide, is the source of electricity generation in Tanzania. We gathered data on USG financial support for education from ForeignAssistance.gov, the leading source for data on USG financial assistance.

The timeframe for these indicators generally ranges from 2000 to 2021 or 2022, depending on the most recent data available. The health indicators are the exception, starting in 1990 for most indicators. The 1990 start date better captures the period of the HIV pandemic, during which the USG made large financial, material, and technical contributions to Tanzania's efforts to manage the epidemic. Going farther back in time for child health shows the long-standing U.S., commitment to supporting Tanzania's child health activities.

Indicator	Data Source	Time Coverage
Energy		
Access to electricity	World Development Indicators, the World Bank	2000-2021
Electricity generation by fuel source	Energy Information Agency	2000-2021
Trade		
Textile exports from Tanzania to the U.S.	World Integrated Trade Solution, The World Bank and UNCTAD	2000-2022
Textile imports from the U.S. to Tanzania	World Integrated Trade Solution, The World Bank and UNCTAD	2000-2022
Health		
Life expectancy at birth	World Development Indicators, the World Bank	1990-2021
AIDS-related deaths	AIDSINFO, UNAIDS	1990-2022
AIDs-related deaths averted due to ART	AIDSINFO, UNAIDS	2010-2022
Tanzania's life expectancy at birth	World Development Indicators, the World Bank	1990-2021
Infant mortality	UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation	1990-2021
Neonatal mortality	UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation	1990-2021

Child mortality	UN Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation	1990-2021
Education		
Female youth literacy	World Development Indicators, the World Bank	2000-2022
Male youth literacy	World Development Indicators, the World Bank	2000-2022
USG education support	ForeignAssistance.gov	2000-2022

## Snap-poll as a tool to assess perceived benefits of U.S. contribution to Tanzania

AidData has previously leveraged its [Listening to Leaders](#) sampling frame of 55,000+ public, private, and civil society leaders in 140 low—and middle-income countries (including Tanzania) to field multiple surveys since 2003. These surveys capture feedback on their development priorities and the perceived influence and helpfulness of external partners (including the U.S. Government), among other insights.

Using our in-house survey capabilities, we implemented a short snap-poll of 18 questions to capture elite perceptions of the volume and efficacy of U.S. contributions to Tanzania’s growth and prosperity *vis-a-vis* that of other donors and development partners. We sent this survey to 1137 decision-makers and decision influencers belonging to six broad stakeholder groups: development partner, government agency, parliament, NGO/CSO, private sector, and university/think tank/media. Of those who were sent the survey, 138 responded to the request in part or in full (12.4% response rate). 106 respondents completed the survey with a completion rate of 76.8%.

To assess the representativeness of the survey responses, we compared the distribution of received responses to the distribution of the sampling frame for stakeholder groups and gender. Using these two criteria, we calculated inverse probability weights for each respondent to improve the efficiency of our survey estimations and adjust for non-response bias. The tables below provide descriptive details of the respondent group. In instances where the total number of respondents included in the descriptive tables is below 138, it is because some respondents chose not to self-report those characteristics.

### 1. Distribution of respondents by stakeholder group

Stakeholder group	Freq.	Percent
Development Partner	13	9.42
Government Agency	26	18.84
NGO/CSO	65	47.10
Private Sector	7	5.07
University, Think Tank or Media	27	19.57
Total	138	100

### 2. Distribution of respondents by sector of work (self-reported)

	Freq.	Percent
Agriculture and Food Security	9	6.62
Democracy, Human Rights and Governance	22	16.18
Economic Growth and Trade	14	10.29
Education	24	17.65
Environment	10	7.25
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment	7	5.15

Global Health	16	11.76
Energy	1	0.74
Crises and Conflict	0	0
Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	2	1.47
Social Development	9	6.62
Science and Technology	6	4.41
Tourism	0	0
Industry and Infrastructure	4	2.94
Other	12	8.82
Total	136	100.00

## Survey Questionnaire

1. Please select the type of organization that you worked for the longest period between 2015 and 2024 in Tanzania.
  - a. Government Agency, Ministry or Office
  - b. Parliament
  - c. Development Partner (e.g., World Bank, United Nations)
  - d. Non-Governmental Organization or Civil Society Organization
  - e. Private Sector
  - f. Academia or Media
  - g. I did not work for any of these types of organizations during this time. *[Respondents who selected this option were routed to the end of the survey]*
  - h. I did not work for an organization in Tanzania during this time *[Respondents who selected this option were routed to the end of the survey]*
2. Did you primarily work in continental Tanzania or Zanzibar?
  - a. Continental Tanzania
  - b. Zanzibar
  - c. My work covers both continental Tanzania and Zanzibar
3. Please select the sector in which you have worked for the longest period between 2015 and 2024.
  - a. Agriculture and Food Security
  - b. Democracy, Human Rights and Governance
  - c. Economic Growth and Trade
  - d. Education
  - e. Environment
  - f. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment
  - g. Health
  - h. Energy
  - i. Crises and Conflict
  - j. Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
  - k. Social Development

- l. Science and Technology
  - m. Tourism
  - n. Industry and Infrastructure
  - o. Other (please specify)\_\_\_\_\_
4. To your knowledge, how active are the following external actors in supporting Tanzania's development (e.g., making investments, providing assistance, brokering partnerships)? *Response options were presented in a randomized order*

	Not active at all	Minimally active	Somewhat Active	Very Active	Don't Know / Not sure	Prefer not to say
United States						
China						
World Bank						
United Kingdom						
African Development Bank						
European Union						
South Africa						
Sweden						
United Arab Emirates						
India						
Japan						
Other (please specify) _____						

5. You identified the following external actors as active partners in supporting Tanzania's development. How much do their activities contribute to Tanzania's development progress? *Response options were presented in a randomized order, with only those who were reported as somewhat or very active presented to respondents*

	Not active at all	Minimally active	Somewhat Active	Very Active	Don't Know / Not sure	Prefer not to say
<i>[All organizations identified as somewhat or very active in Q4]</i>						

6. In your opinion, which of the following countries, if any, would be the best model for the future development of Tanzania? *Response options were presented in a randomized order*
  - a. China
  - b. United States
  - c. United Kingdom
  - d. South Africa
  - e. India
  - f. Ethiopia
  - g. Other Country (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
  - h. None of these
  - i. Don't know/not sure
7. How much do you estimate US government agencies (e.g. US embassy, US Agency for International Development) contribute to Tanzania on average annually?
  - a. Below 100 million USD
  - b. 100 million to 500 million USD
  - c. 500 million to 1 billion USD
  - d. Over 1 billion USD
8. You identified the US as an active partner in supporting Tanzania's development. Which types of US organizations are active in making investments, providing assistance, or brokering partnerships in the sector in which you work? (Select all that apply) *This question was only presented to those who identified the United States as somewhat or very active. Response options were randomized.*
  - a. US government agencies (e.g., US embassy, US Agency for International Development)
  - b. US non-governmental, civil society or faith-based organizations
  - c. US private sector companies
  - d. US universities or think tanks
  - e. US-based private foundations
  - f. US individuals (volunteers, individual donors)
  - g. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
9. You identified the following US organizations as active in making investments, providing assistance, or brokering partnerships in the sector in which you work in. How much contribution

do these US organizations make to Tanzania's development progress? *Only those options selected as active in Q8 are presented in Q9*

	No contribution at all	A little contribution	A fair amount of contribution	A lot of contributions	Don't Know / Not Sure
<i>[All Organizations indicated as active in Q8]</i>					

10. You identified that the following US organizations contributed to Tanzania's development progress. What types of activities by these organizations contributed most to Tanzania's development progress? (Please select one activity that makes the most contribution)

	Foreign investment or joint venture partnerships	Development assistance (e.g., grants, loans)	Technical assistance and policy advice	Capacity building and training	In-kind support (e.g., food, raw materials, equipment)	Favorable US foreign policies (e.g., trade agreements)	Other types of activities
<i>[All Organizations indicated as making a contribution (little or more) in Q9]</i>							

11. Why do you think these activities contributed to the development progress in Tanzania? (Select top 3 reasons) *[Only presented to respondents who indicated the US made a fair amount or a lot of contribution in Q9]*

- a. They filled in a gap that Tanzanian agencies are not able to fill on their own.
- b. They are well-aligned with Tanzania's development agenda.
- c. They created an enabling policy or regulatory environment.
- d. They mobilized international support to exert pressure on relevant parties.
- e. They mobilized domestic support to exert pressure on relevant parties.
- f. Other (please specify)\_\_\_\_\_

12. You indicated that the US overall or some US organizations made little or no contribution to Tanzania's development progress between 2015 and 2024. In your opinion, why is this the case?

(Please select up to three reasons) *[Only presented to respondents who indicated the US made little or no contribution in Q9]*

- a. The amount of support provided is insufficient.
- b. The type of support provided does suit Tanzania's needs.
- c. They impose too many restrictions.
- d. Their activities are not well-aligned with Tanzania's development agenda.
- e. Their activities do not align with Tanzanian cultural values and norms.
- f. Their programs are not implemented well.
- g. Their programs are not designed to reflect Tanzanian context.
- h. They duplicate efforts taken by organizations in Tanzania.
- i. Other (please specify)\_\_\_\_\_

13. You identified the following organization types as active in making investments, providing assistance, or brokering partnerships in the sector in which you work. How frequently do you interact with each type of US organization? *[Only presented to respondents who indicated that a US organization made a lot of contribution in Q9.]*

	No interaction at all	Minimally frequently	Somewhat frequently	Very frequently	Don't know/Not sure	Prefer not to say
<i>[All Organizations indicated as making a contribution (fair amount or more) in Q9]</i>						

14. How reliable do you consider the United States when looking at different potential development partners?

- a. Very reliable
- b. Somewhat reliable
- c. Not too reliable
- d. Not at all reliable

15. If you learned a development project was being funded by an organization based in the United States, would you consider the project more, less, or just as credible than if it was run by an organization based in Tanzania?

- a. Much more credible
- b. Somewhat more credible
- c. Just as credible
- d. Somewhat less credible
- e. Much less credible

16. Has US government support to development projects in Tanzania made things better, worse, or had no impact on the economy in the following areas?

	Much Worse	Somewhat worse	Neither Better Nor Worse	Somewhat better	Much better
Jobs for local workers					
Vocational training or education opportunities					
Access to capital to start or grow businesses					
Technology or expertise to enter new sectors					
Trade or tourism revenues					
Standard of living					
Ease of transit for people or goods					

17. Has US government support to development projects in Tanzania made things better, worse, or had no impact on the environment in the following areas?

	Much Worse	Somewhat worse	Neither Better Nor Worse	Somewhat better	Much better
Level of pollution					
Protection of wildlife, forests, and oceans					
Sustainable use of natural resources					
Vulnerability to climate change					



Preparedness for natural disasters					
------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

18. Has US government support to development projects in Tanzania made things better, worse, or had no impact on governance in the following areas?

	Much Worse	Somewhat worse	Neither Better Nor Worse	Somewhat better	Much better
Level of crime					
Level of corruption					
Access to quality public services					
Media freedom					
Access to justice (e.g., a fair trial)					
Ability to register and participate in civic groups					

## Key Informant Interviews as a tool to assess perceived benefits of U.S. contribution to Tanzania

The purpose of the key informant interviews was to evaluate the U.S. contribution to supporting Tanzania's economic growth and development over the past decade, assessing the role of the U.S. public sector, private sector, philanthropic foundations, and civil society actors. The evaluation used a qualitative approach by interviewing key informants from institutions receiving support from the U.S. Such institutions include the government, civil society organizations (CSOs), and private philanthropic foundations in Tanzania. The research team conducted 12 in-person interviews with respondents from 11 institutions. Interviews were either conducted one-on-one or as focus group discussions. All interviewees were senior officials with long-term experience and familiarity with the financial resources of the institution, enabling them to report on the U.S. contributions to their respective institutions in an informed manner.

### Key Informant Interview Questionnaire

#### Section I: Experience with US engagement with Tanzania

19. Please tell us about your role at [insert organization] and how you see your work or research intersecting with this topic?

#### Section II. U.S. Government Engagement in Tanzania:

1. What roles have you observed the U.S. government playing in supporting Tanzania's growth and development over the last decade?
  - a. *Probe: To what extent has this changed over time, and why (e.g., any pivotal events or factors)?*
  - b. *Probe: How does this compare to other bilateral development partners?*
2. In which sectors do you see U.S. government assistance as most or least active in supporting Tanzania's growth and development?
  - a. *Probe: Why do you think that?*
  - a. *Probe: To what extent has U.S. engagement in these sectors stayed relatively steady versus changing over time?*
3. What types of activities do you most often see the U.S. government supporting in these sectors, and how?
  - a. *Probe: Has this changed over time? If so, why do you think that?*
4. What do you see as some of the most and least successful examples of U.S. government support for Tanzania's growth and development?
  - a. *Probe: [For the successful examples] Why were these cases so successful?*
  - b. *Probe: [For the less successful cases] Why were these cases less successful?*
5. To what extent and how do you see the U.S. coordinating with other bilateral donors in supporting Tanzania's growth and development?
  - a. *Probe: How about working through multilateral organizations like the African Development Bank, the World Bank or UN agencies?*

### Section III. U.S. Whole-of-Society Engagement in Tanzania:

1. In your view, what roles do you see the U.S. private sector (e.g., companies, civil society organizations, foundations) playing in supporting Tanzania's growth and development?
  - a. *Probe: How has this changed over time?*
2. Who are some of the most influential private sector players to consider when talking about U.S. support for Tanzania's growth and development?
  - a. *Probe: Why are these players influential, and in what arenas?*
3. To what extent do you see U.S. private sector actors working in similar or different sectors from the U.S. government in supporting Tanzania's growth and development?
  - a. *Probe: Why do you think that?*
4. What types of activities do you most often see the U.S. private sector supporting in these sectors, and how?
  - a. *Probe: Has this changed over time? If so, why do you think that?*
  - b. *Probe: If not mentioned, consider asking specifically about foreign direct investment, trade, and private philanthropic flows.*
  - c. *Probe: Might be worth a specific probe on AGOA if not mentioned.*

5. What do you see as some of the most and least successful examples of U.S. private sector support for Tanzania's growth and development?
  - a. *Probe: [For the successful examples] Why were these cases so successful?*
  - b. *Probe: [For the less successful cases] Why were these cases less successful?*

#### Section IV. Tanzanians in the U.S.

1. What is the preferred destination for students from Tanzania to study abroad—and why?
  - a. *Probe: Does this preference vary across students from certain segments of society (i.e., specific ethnic, religious, or economic class groups) prefer specific study abroad destinations?*
  - b. *Probe: (If not referenced) Where does the U.S. stand as a study-abroad destination in the eyes of Tanzanian students? Has this changed over time?*
2. To what extent do Tanzanians find it easy and appealing to work in the U.S.? Why?
  - a. *Probe: Do these attitudes and experiences vary across workers from certain segments of society (i.e., specific ethnic, religious, or economic class groups)?*
  - b. *Probe: How important are remittances from Tanzanians in the U.S. to communities back home?*

#### Section V. Visibility, Valuation, and Future of U.S.-Tanzania Engagement

1. In what ways do you see the U.S. (both public and private sector actors) helping Tanzania achieve its national development strategy (e.g., Development Vision 2025)?
  - a. *Probe: Be prepared to list out various focus areas of Development Vision 2025 as needed.*
2. Compared to other foreign powers, how is the U.S. best and least well-positioned to support Tanzania's growth and development?
  - a. *Probe: What types of U.S. engagement are most useful to Tanzania? [Financial? Skill and capacity building? Technology transfer? Scholarships? Visas to study, work and travel in the U.S.?.]*
3. How visible are U.S. contributions to growth and development to Tanzanian political or policy elites? How about for the average citizen?
  - a. *Probe: If you could point to 1 or 2 projects that best illustrate the benefits of the U.S. partnership with Tanzania, what would they be and why?*
4. What do you think the U.S. does well and not so well in communicating its contributions to Tanzania's growth and development?
  - a. *Probe: What could the U.S. do better to communicate its engagements with the Tanzanian public? [Use media and social media channels more frequently? Use more visible and recognizable branding? Other?]*
5. What do you see as the main advantages and disadvantages for Tanzania in partnering with the U.S. to advance its national development priorities?
  - a. *Probe: Why do you say that?*

6. If there was one thing that the U.S. could do (or not do) to better support Tanzania's growth and development in the future, what would that be and why?

#### Section VI. Closing

*Interviewer: Thank you very much for your time today and for sharing your thoughts with us. As we close, I wanted to ask you a few final questions to guide our next steps.*

1. Based upon the topics we discussed today, are there any additional people you would recommend we speak with or materials we should read?
2. Is there anything that we didn't ask about but that you think would be relevant to add?