

REVIEW OF THE TANZANIA-NORWAY NUFU PROGRAMME (2007-2011)

**Submitted to the Norwegian Centre for International
Cooperation in Higher Education (SIU)**

Milfrid Tonheim(SIK)

Kåre Kristensen (SIK)

Agnes Regina Murei Abuom (TAABCO)

June 2010



Senter for interkulturell kommunikasjon

Centre for Intercultural Communication

Centre pour la Communication Interculturelle

Contents

Executive summary.....	3
Abbreviations.....	6
1. Introduction.....	7
1.1 Objectives of the review	7
1.2 The Programme	7
1.2.1. Organisation	7
1.2.2 Expected outcomes	8
1.3. National policies.....	8
1.3.1. Relevant Tanzanian national policies	8
1.3.2. Relevant Norwegian national policies	8
1.4. Methodology	9
1.5. Ethical considerations.....	9
1.6. Verification of the report	9
2. Findings	10
2.1. Efficiency.....	10
2.1.1. Management model	10
2.1.2. Decision making process	13
2.1.3. Risk management	14
2.1.4. Anti-corruption measures.....	14
2.2. Effectiveness	15
2.2.1. Identification and selection of projects	15
2.2.2. Educational achievements	16
2.2.3. Scientific achievements	17
2.2.4. Impact for development	19
2.2.5. Capacity building in the South	19
2.2.6. Gender approach.....	20
2.3. Relevance and policy dialogue.....	22
2.3.1. Relevance for national policies of Tanzania and Norway	22
2.3.2. Institutional relevance	22
2.3.3. Policy dialogue	23
2.4. Sustainability.....	24
3. Conclusions and recommendations.....	24
References	27
Appendix 1	28
Appendix 2	34
Appendix 3	35

Executive summary

The evaluation aimed to assess ‘The Tanzania - Norway NUFU Programme 2007 - 2011’ (hereafter referred to as the Programme) covering the period from the start of the programme in 2007 until the start of the review in April 2010. The scope of the ‘The Tanzania - Norway NUFU Programme 2007 - 2011’ is to support academic cooperation in the area of natural resources management, forestry, fisheries and wildlife, with a focus on good governance and a reliable public administration. The focus of the review has been on the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the Programme. The evaluators reviewed the Programme’s gender approach, risk management and anti-corruption measures. Particular emphasis was also placed on ‘policy dialogue’ with relevant policy makers, as such a dialogue is viewed as an important tool for having an impact of development. Finally, the review sought to provide recommendations to guide the future implementation of the Programme.

The evaluation draws primarily on qualitative research strategies, employing methods such as document analyses, informal conversations, focus groups, and individual semi-structured interviews. The evaluation team consulted with all stakeholders in the Programme: Master’s degree students, PhD candidates, project coordinators at Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA), University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) and Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB), representatives of the Norwegian Embassy, a representative from the Tanzanian Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT), and administrative staff at SIU. Interviews were also carried out with institutional contacts at UDSM and UMB,¹ two heads of departments and one acting Dean at SUA, and the Chair of the Coordinating Committee of NUFU projects at SUA.

All in all, the review concludes that ‘The Tanzania - Norway NUFU Programme 2007 - 2011’ has largely been successfully implemented from its start and until spring 2010. The academic cooperation between SUA and UDSM and their Norwegian counterpart, UMB, seems to function relatively smoothly. The complex management model does not seem to make any particular difficulties for or frustration among the partners involved, the only exception being some frustration because of delays in the transfer of funds. The two partner institutions in Tanzania are involved in several research programmes financed by Norway through SIU, Norad and directly through the Embassy, and are familiar with the Norwegian system in terms of both its requirements and benefits. From the Norwegian side, however, it is emphasized that the NUFU programmes provide insufficient financial compensation to the institutions in Norway, making it less attractive for universities in Norway to be involved in such programmes.

The Programme has succeeded in recruiting PhD and Master’s students, and reached and overall 50% rate of female student participation. Some of the projects have even recruited more students than the target number, and included yet other students with external funding. The Programme has significantly contributed to capacity building at SUA and UDSM. Its thematic focus is of relevance to national policies both in Tanzania and in Norway, and our findings make the point that the thematic approach of the four projects supported is of central value to the institutions involved. The review finds that project coordinators at both sides are actively involved in decision making.

¹ The institutional contact at SUA was not present at the time of the fieldwork.

However, the review has shown that some weak points remain to be addressed. The most critical task is to ensure that the set targets related to the number of scientific publications, dissemination and policy-dialogue, as well as the development of study programmes, are reached. The potential of having an impact on development in Tanzania will clearly increase if the Programme performs well in relation to these aspects. The Programme should also enhance its gender mainstreaming efforts, and better integrate gender issues into the projects' thematic focus.

Our main recommendations are the following:

Educational achievements

- The evaluators emphasize the need to immediately address the development of educational programmes. This is particularly urgent with regards to the three PhD programmes as no progress has been reported to date.

Scientific achievements

- We recommend that the set targets should be discussed and possibly revised, or that it should be made explicit that the expected scientific achievements will follow a timeframe which will continue beyond the actual Programme period.
- As the four projects supported by the Programme have already produced important research findings, the evaluators regard it as important to immediately expand dissemination activities, both through writing articles and policy briefs, and by establishing a network and arenas for presentations of findings.
- The evaluators recommend that the Programme should look into how to financially support PhD candidates' participation in national and international scientific conferences, at which they can present their research findings and obtain valuable inputs. This could be done through allocating extra funding to cover such expenses or by assisting the PhD candidates to apply for additional funding elsewhere.

Gender approach

- In order to ensure female participation and completion of their degrees, the Programme should provide gender sensitive support to female PhD candidates or Master's students. Sufficient maternity leave is one such measure. The opportunity to bring along small babies on their required stay in Norway should also be looked into.
- There is a need to encourage female participation at all levels of the project. One possibility would be to establish, based on the real context in which the projects are found, a standard of a minimum portion female participants.
- Gender issues should be better integrated into the projects' thematic focus. The Programme should encourage bringing about more publications specifically addressing gender issues related to natural resources and livelihoods.²

Policy dialogue

- The evaluation team recommends the organising of seminars aiming at presenting and discussing findings with policy makers and other relevant actors in the remainder of the Programme period. We suggest that RNE should play a more active part in organising such seminars, as well as in establishing contact between the relevant ministries and the researchers involved in the Programme. The evaluators recommend that RNE and/or the universities should communicate with relevant policy makers

² See examples of such themes on page 19 of this report.

before determining dates for future seminars, and that RNE should be the institution responsible for inviting relevant departments and organisations.

Abbreviations

GIS	Geographic information system
MDG 1	Millennium Development Goals 1
MF	Ministry of Fisheries
MFA	Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MNRT	The Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism
NOK	Norwegian currency
NUFU	The Norwegian Programme for Development, Research and Education
RNE	The Royal Norwegian Embassy in Tanzania
SIU	Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education
SUA	Sokoine University of Agriculture
UDSM	University of Dar es Salaam, Department of Fisheries
UMB	Norwegian University of Life Sciences
Forestland	NUFUTZ – 2007/10226: Assessing the impact of forestland tenure changes on forest resources and rural livelihoods in Tanzania.
EKOSIASA	NUFUTZ – 2007/10228. EKOSIASA: The political ecology of wildlife and forest governance in Tanzania
Biodiversity	NUFUTZ – 2007/10229: Integrating livelihoods and multiple biodiversity values in wetlands management in Tanzania.
Fisheries	NUFUTZ – 2007/10227: Coastal fisheries in Tanzania: the challenges of globalisation to resource management, livelihoods and governance.

1. Introduction

1.1 Objectives of the review

The evaluation aimed to assess 'The Tanzania - Norway NUFU Programme 2007 - 2011' (hereafter referred to as the Programme) covering the period from the start of the programme in 2007 until the review began in April 2010. The focus has been on the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the Programme. The evaluators reviewed the Programme's gender approach, risk management and anti-corruption measures. Particular emphasis was also placed on 'policy dialogue' with relevant policy makers, as such a dialogue is regarded as an important tool for making an impact on development. Finally, the review sought to provide recommendations to guide the future implementation of the Programme.³

The review was conducted by the Centre for Intercultural Communication (SIK), Norway, in partnership with TAABCO, Kenya.

1.2 The Programme

The Programme was initiated by the Norwegian Embassy in Tanzania in 2007. The total grant is NOK 25 million. With reference to §2.2 in the NUFU agreement, which permits the NUFU framework to be utilised in the management of programmes with separate funding, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), represented by the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Tanzania (RNE) and the Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education (SIU), signed a contract concerning 'The Tanzania – Norway NUFU Programme 2007 - 2011' 28 June 2007.

The scope of the Programme is to support academic cooperation in the area of management of natural resources, forestry, fisheries and wildlife, with a focus on good governance and reliable public administration. The Programme hence earmarked projects directed at research and education within the field of 'natural resource management in Tanzania'. Four projects were been selected for: three at Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA) and one at the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM). The Norwegian partner in all four projects is the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB).⁴

1.2.1. Organisation

The Norad-SIU agreement sets out the rules and regulations for the administration of the general NUFU programme,⁵ of the Programme forms part. The management and administration of each project are specified in tripartite contracts between SIU, the Norwegian university and the university in the South.

In the NUFU management model the universities in Tanzania and Norway are expected to plan, implement and report on their activities to SIU, which is the main administrator of the Programme. SIU organises annual meetings with RNE, at which annual plans and reports are

³ The Terms of Reference are enclosed as Appendix 1.

⁴ The four projects are listed in Appendix 2.

⁵ Norad (2006) *Samarbeidsavtale mellom Direktoratet for Utviklingssamarbeid (Norad) and Senter for internasjonalisering av høyere utdanning (SIU) om Forskning og utdanningssamarbeid mellom institusjoner i Sør og institusjoner i Nord gjennom Nasjonalt program for utvikling, forskning og utdanning (NUFU)*

presented and discussed. In addition to being the funding partner, RNE attends meetings with SIU and partner universities in Tanzania. Otherwise the Embassy plays no direct role in implementing the Programme.

1.2.2 Expected outcomes

The Programme is expected to develop and establish education programmes within the area of natural resources management, forestry, fisheries and wildlife, and provide higher education at Master's and PhD level within this field. The Programme is expected to contribute publications and dissemination of research results and aims to have an impact on development in the field of natural resources management in Tanzania. This is particularly expected to take place through policy dialogue and via links and communication with Tanzanian authorities and relevant organisations.

1.3. National policies

The Programme should be in line with and should support relevant national policies in Norway and Tanzania.

1.3.1. Relevant Tanzanian national policies

Tanzanian policies are first and foremost based on their understanding of self-reliance as stipulated in the Arusha Declaration of 1967. The country's National Environmental Policy states that a proactive policy objective of natural resource conservation oriented towards the reduction of the vulnerability of the poor will be pursued. Policies and programmes aimed at addressing poverty eradication should take due account of the need for sustainable exploitation of natural resources. Moreover, the Tanzanian policy framework on anti-corruption also emphasises good governance as a key factor in ensuring better utilization of natural resources, and regards it as a key factor in poverty reduction. This approach is confirmed in Tanzania's National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty 2005-2010, which has an emphasis on poverty reduction. The government of Tanzania reviewed and developed its Higher Education Policy in February 1999. Among other aims, the policy seeks to bridge the challenges related to low student enrolment, an imbalance between science and liberal studies, gender issues and poor financing for higher education. The policy argues that there is a need to provide more higher education possibilities in science and technology in order to promote good governance and the socio-economic development of the country.

1.3.2. Relevant Norwegian national policies

Norwegian development policy is based upon the same understanding of development as that forming the basis of the Millennium Declaration (2000). Report No. 13 to the Storting states that the Norwegian development policy is designed to strengthen the position of the poor, to promote sustainable development, to safeguard global public goods and strengthen global rules, to ensure links between national policy and development objectives, and to provide aid in areas where Norwegian expertise is in demand. Relevant sectors in which Norway has well-recognized expertise are mentioned: climate change and environment, sustainable development, peace-building, human rights and humanitarian assistance, petroleum and clean energy, women's rights and gender equality⁶, good governance and the fight against

⁶ See also Report No. 11 (2007-2008) to the Storting, *On equal terms: Women's rights and gender equality in development policy*.

corruption. Environment and climate change is the sector whose funding will increase most in the future. The report underlines that “Norwegian support must be requested by, and provide added value for, the partner country.”⁷ Norway’s development cooperation programme is furthermore guided by the principles of the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, including national ownership, alignment with recipient countries’ systems, results-based management and mutual accountability.

1.4. Methodology

The evaluation draws primarily on qualitative research strategies, employing such methods as document analyses, informal conversations, focus groups, and individual semi-structured interviews. The evaluation team consulted all stakeholders in the Programme: Master’s students, PhD candidates, project coordinators at SUA, UDSM and UMB, representatives from the Norwegian Embassy, one representative from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT), and administrative staff at SIU. Interviews were also carried out with institutional contacts at UDSM and UMB,⁸ two heads of departments and one acting dean at SUA, and the chair of the Coordinating Committee of NUFU projects at SUA.⁹

All the Master’s students and PhD candidates involved in the Programme were invited to participate in focus group discussions. However, not all those invited were available and able to participate. All in all, 26 Master’s students and 11 PhD candidates participated in the focus groups. The discussions focused on positive and negative aspects of the implementation of the Programme, their work experience and current employment status, choice of topics, etc. The evaluation team also reviewed relevant material such as project documents, annual reports, and national policy documents from the two countries.

1.5. Ethical considerations

The data collection was carried out in line with research ethics guidelines developed by the National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities (NESH) in Norway, and was approved by the Norwegian Social Science Data Services.

1.6. Verification of the report

A draft was passed on to SIU and RNE in Tanzania to allow them to comment and verify facts referred to in the report. This took place without any prejudice to the content or the assessment of the evaluation team which has carried out its work in complete independence.

⁷ Report No. 13 (2008-2009) to the Storting, *Climate, Conflict and Capital: Norwegian development policy adapting to change*, page 8.

⁸ The institutional contact at SUA was not present at the time of the fieldwork.

⁹ See Appendix 3 for a complete list of interviewees.

2. Findings

2.1. Efficiency

The efficiency of the Programme was reviewed first by focusing on its overall management model as well as the management of each project. Particular attention was paid to the reporting system and financial management. Secondly, the evaluation assessed the efficiency of established decision-making processes, particularly focusing on the involvement of the individual stakeholders. Thirdly, risk factors to successful implementation of the Programme were identified. The review also assessed how the Programme handles risk factors, particularly if any anti-corruption measures need to be implemented.

2.1.1. Management model

The NUFU management model is rather complex, and at first glance it may appear relatively cumbersome. However, the three universities forming part of the Programme are all established institutions that are experienced in administration of programmes of this type. The complex management model does not seem to pose any particular difficulties to or frustration among the partners involved, the only exception being financial aspects such as the transfer of funds from Norwegian to Tanzanian partners (see *Financial management*).

Reporting

The Programme uses an interactive online reporting system, and the partners express satisfaction with how the system works. At first, partners were worried that problems of access to the Internet and stable electricity supply would make this difficult. For SUA's part it was a prerequisite that additional financial support for updating its Internet connection would be provided. The RNE decided to allocate the necessary funds that made the online reporting system possible. The project coordinators both in Norway and Tanzania are pleased with the new reporting format, saying that the form is well linked to actual project activities. Despite the general contentment with the reporting format, a few respondents mentioned that the form at times provided little space for comments on additional and interesting spin-offs from the research. Some also wished that the report would include more general comments, for example on gender issues. The evaluators propose that the report format could include more qualitative information as well as each project's own assessment of its performance.

Financial management

The transfer of funds is rather complex. The funds derive from the RNE and are transferred to SIU, which passes them to UMB, where each project coordinator is responsible for the transfer to the Tanzanian partners. This lengthy process means that it often takes too long before funding is made available to the intended target groups. The delay in remitting funds from Norway is an important problem as reported by Tanzania. Project coordinators say that several months may pass before the first transfer arrives. They find such delays unnecessary in a project that has been accepted for a five-year period. Recognising the problem, SIU now recommends that institutions overestimate their budgets, leaving them with unspent funds from the previous year at the beginning of a new one. SIU has also made improvements in its financial system and in the future payments will be made automatically without receiving payout requests from institutions in Norway. This development will at least prevent delays at one of the funding levels.

The transfer of funds from SIU to UMB for 2010 had not taken place at the time of the fieldwork (mid-May). However, UMB can advance funds to partners in the South. So far, one project obtained an advance from UMB at the beginning of April and another at the beginning of May, while two others had not yet received an advance. The evaluators had the impression that some project coordinators in Tanzania hesitate to ask for funds. The delay also makes a lot of extra work for the project coordinators and finally hampers the research and the scheduled project results. Due to delays in payments, some students were delayed in their fieldwork and had not yet started at the time of the evaluation.

SUA has a financial department that is also used by the NUFU projects. This is positive as it facilitates and controls project financing. Every transfer from the North partner arrives to a specific NUFU project account. However, no information is automatically given to the project coordinator, who has to find out the precise amount sent for his project from UMB. This is an unnecessary bureaucratic delaying factor. The utilization of funds requires several steps, but according to the rules explained by the Bursar at SUA, a request for money should only take three days to process. However, the evaluators found that the process usually took about 10 days. Apparently some request forms stop somewhere in the process without any information being given the sender. Some students mentioned that it could take weeks before they receive the money requested. At UDSM, funding is dealt with by a service office at department level and this is said to function quite well by both the project coordinator and the students.

Transfers are thus delayed in both Norway and in Tanzania, as was also found by the 2009 evaluation of NUFU and the NOMA programme.¹⁰ The evaluators appreciate SIU's efforts to reduce the delays, but in order to ensure progress in the Programme we recommend that the problems of transferring funds should be addressed at each financial stage.

North-South relations

Both SUA and UDSM are involved in several research programmes financed by Norway through SIU, Norad and directly through the Embassy. The two Tanzanian institutions are familiar with the Norwegian system in terms of both its requirements and its benefits. The fact that collaboration has continued over quite some time indicates that the relations between the partners are good.

SUA and UMB have a long tradition of academic cooperation, and the relationship between the two universities is well spoken of by project participants at both institutions. About 70-80% of the academic staff at SUA have obtained their higher degrees at UMB, and many of them now, through the Programme, collaborate with their former supervisors. The project at UDSM forms part of a new cooperation. It is connected to the Department of Fisheries Science and Aquaculture (FAST) at UDSM, which is a recently established department. No PhD programme is yet available for students at FAST, so all the PhD candidates will graduate from UMB. Even though the cooperation is relatively new the evaluators were not made aware of any particular problems. The fact that the project coordinator at UMB is a Tanzanian may be a positive aspect with regards to communication and interaction.

¹⁰ Norad (2009) *Evaluation of the Norwegian Programme for Development, Research and Education (NUFU) and of Norad's Programme for Master Studies (NOMA)*, Evaluation Report 7/2009

One challenge identified by the PhD candidates was the lack of complete information provided by UMB relating possible PhD courses available to the candidates during their stay at UMB. Some of them had discovered other very interesting courses only after they had already made their choice. Another was the lengthy process of getting their papers in order when they arrive in Norway. The Norwegian project coordinators also find this process complicated and time-consuming. It takes several weeks before the PhD candidates obtain their personal number, working permit, tax papers and bank card. Some did not obtain a bank card until shortly before they left Norway. UMB should look into the possibility of speeding up this process and of providing rapid and accurate assistance to the visiting researchers.

Contact with SIU is regarded as positive by all the partner universities. However, some project coordinators, particularly the least experienced, point to the fact that no feedback on reports is provided by SIU. Such feedback would help project coordinators to improve their report writing and better address each topic in the report form. The seminars organised by SIU are welcomed and have given those involved a good opportunity to learn more about project administration in general, SIU, the Norwegian way of funding, etc. Some respondents have been asked to make presentations in these fora, and enjoyed the experience.

South-South relations

There appears to be little contact between the two universities in Tanzania. Even the contact between the three projects at SUA seems limited. This is confirmed by SIU, which point out that even within universities, interaction and collaborative encounters between researchers are rare, going on to say that an external initiative appears to be necessary to create arenas for them to meet. In 2008 SIU organised a seminar at SUA in which the three projects in the Programme took part, as did participants in two ordinary NUFU projects, as well as participants in the PANTIL Programme¹¹. Yet another seminar initiated by SIU took place in 2009, in which participants were restricted to members of the research teams in the four projects in the Programme, as well as representatives from the Embassy, ministries and other relevant organisations. These initiatives are regarded as very important in bringing together participants in different projects and at different institutions, and are vital tools for increasing interaction and collaboration among the Programme's participants. The evaluators recommend organising similar seminars for the remainder of the programme period.

However, there are some recent and positive developments which may lead the way for further collaboration. Students from both SUA and UDSM recently attended the short course in Political Ecology developed by the EKOSIASA project at SUA. SUA has also made efforts to ensure a certain level of cooperation across the three projects, through the establishment of a coordination committee chaired by Dr. Lazaro. A couple of weeks before reports are due, project coordinators meet with the committee to discuss and comment on the draft report of each project. The coordination committee has helped to make the projects better known and more integrated at the university. At UDSM the Fisheries project is currently collaborating with the School of Business Studies at the same university to develop a Master's degree course in Aqua-Business.

Some PhD and Master's students report that they hardly know other students in the Programme. For the Master's students at UDSM this is even the case among the students themselves. This may be explained by the fact that since the Department of Fisheries does not

¹¹ Programme for Agricultural and Natural Resources Transformation for Improved Livelihoods (PANTIL). Under this agreement, which is funded by the Norwegian Embassy, SUA collaborates with UMB and the [Norwegian School of Veterinary Science](#).

currently offer a Master's programme, students are therefore linked to various other natural science departments at UDSM. However, some workshops have either been recently organised or are planned to take place in the projects supported by the Programme. These will obviously have a positive impact on interactions among senior researchers, PhD candidates and Master's degree students, and are therefore recommended to be repeated at regular intervals.

2.1.2. Decision making process

The NUFU programme (2007-2011) is based on the principle of equality between the partners involved. However, neither the Norwegian nor the Tanzanian institutions were involved in the decision making related to the thematic focus before the call for proposals was announced. This can be explained by the fact that the funding was channelled differently from that of most NUFU programmes, and that there was not much room for discussions as thematic priorities had already been made by the Norwegian Government.

According to project coordinators in Tanzania, the top management groups at SUA and UDSM seem to be involved in the Programme's decision-making process through various committees and directorates. At SUA, the project coordinators mentioned the Directorate of Research and Postgraduate Studies, to whom coordinators submit annual progress reports, the Senate Research and Publications Committee, where reports are discussed, and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Bursar who approve or reject financial requests. At UDSM the Directorate of Postgraduate Studies, the Directorate of Planning and Finance, the Directorate of Research and Publication and the Central Coordinating Unit are mentioned as being involved in the Programme. Apart from approving financial transactions, the evaluators are of the opinion that the role of these entities are mainly to oversee project activities and progress, rather than actual participation in decision-making processes. At UMB most of the project coordinators said that top management is not greatly involved in decision-making within the project. According to interviews, the role of the head of departments and other higher levels of the institution is to facilitate and monitor the projects. Most project coordinators at UMB are of the opinion that it is an advantage that decision making takes place at the project level.

At project level we found active participation in all three institutions. SIU has an online interactive system for proposal and report writing, which facilitates involvement and collaboration among project coordinators in Tanzania and Norway with regards to writing both applications and reports. Moreover, project coordinators make academic and financial decisions with their Norwegian counterparts based on agreed plans and budgets, select PhD candidates and Master's students and decide on project activities.

One project coordinator emphasised that one of the strengths of the NUFU programmes is that they do not require a lot of administration by scientific and institutional staff. Another important aspect of the programmes is that they generate little financial return for the departments on the Norwegian side. Thus, top management, at least on the Norwegian side, may not prioritize NUFU programmes and allow staff to use time on administration, compared to projects originating from other funding sources.

2.1.3. Risk management

The fact that the institutions involved in the Programme are highly experienced institutions reduces both the number and potential seriousness of risk factors. SIU finds that these are stable institutions that will ensure the continuation of the Programme in spite of potential leadership changes or changes in the project coordination system. In the event of a project coordinator leaving his position, the consequences may be more serious at project level. However, since collaboration between the partner institutions has been in effect for many years there are qualified staff to maintain coordination and the good climate of cooperation.

One major risk factor at institutional level derives from the consequences of changing resource allocations to universities in Norway. The evaluators will return to this under *Sustainability*. Another risk factor facing the institutional level in Tanzania is brain drain, for example through PhD candidates leaving the universities upon the completion of their degree. However, brain drain was a more serious risk factor a few years ago, at a time when universities in Tanzania were not allowed to hire new academic staff. The recruitment ban has since been abolished, improving the recruitment prospects for Master students and PhD candidates seeking employment at academic institutions. Most researchers engaged in the Programme say that they are happy to work in Tanzania and in the academic milieu. Some have been abroad for several years but returned home to work. PhD candidates and Master's students sponsored by the Programme have jobs either at SUA or UDSM, or are employed in government departments. The fact that some students are employed outside the universities does not constitute a major risk in the Programme, due to its focus on governance and policy dialogue. Researchers in Tanzania point to future government funding of the national universities as one risk factor.

Despite potential risk factor at the institutional level, the evaluators are of the opinion that the main risk factors are found at the individual level, for example the academic qualifications of PhD candidates and Master's students, their work progress and their completion rate. Some aspects of the implementation of the Programme seem to negatively influence students' progress, most importantly the delayed start of activities and delays in the transfer of funds. Female PhD candidates may also experience pregnancy during their studies, which hampers their progress and possibly also their completion rate. It is therefore of the utmost importance that measures such as adequate maternity leave are decided on and implemented whenever necessary.

In the course of the past few years, the question of HIV and AIDS has been a cross-cutting issue in projects financed by Norway. However, the Programme does not at all address this issue. As the four projects send students out to do their fieldwork in different villages and remote areas, precautions should be taken and training should be offered before students make such field trips.

2.1.4. Anti-corruption measures

There is a zero-tolerance of corruption within the Programme. UMB, as the North partner institution, has the primary responsibility to ensure that corruption does not occur. The amounts of money involved are relatively small, and this is seen as limiting the chances of money disappearing into someone's pockets. No suspicion has so far been reported. This was also confirmed in interviews and focus group discussions with participants in the Programme.

Both SUA and UDSM have an anti-corruption committee that is responsible for investigating any staff suspected of malpractice. At SUA a Code of Ethics to guide the behaviour of

university staff is in the process of being updated and will be ready within a few months. The Tanzanian universities are subject to a public auditing system and seem to adhere to national anti-corruption regulations. Anti-corruption measures are also specified in the NUFU agreements. No specific anti-corruption measures have been implemented in the four projects in the Programme.

2.2. Effectiveness

The effects and the realization of the overall objective of the Programme - to contribute to improved governance in the management of natural resources sectors in Tanzania - are closely linked to the projects and activities selected. In addition to focusing on the Programme's outcomes; its educational achievements, scientific achievements and impact on development, therefore the review also assessed how projects were identified and selected. The review also addressed the Programme's contribution to individual and institutional capacity building in the South, as well as gender balance and gender mainstreaming within the Programme.

2.2.1. Identification and selection of projects

On April 27 2007, SIU sent a letter: "Early warning of additional call for proposals to the NUFU programme" to all the institutions already involved in the NUFU programme in Tanzania and in Norway. According to interview with SIU representatives, five institutions in Tanzania and 10-12 Norwegian institutions received written information about the forthcoming call for proposals. The official call for proposals was announced on May 25th, and information about the call was also published on SIU's website. The evaluators note that the official call for proposal had a rather short deadline (3rd July), making it difficult for institutions new to the NUFU programme to draw up a proposal. All the eleven proposals received by the application deadline derived from institutions that had received the early warning. The selection process seems to have been narrowed down to include only certain institutions. However, SIU emphasises that the NUFU programme, rather than adopting a very wide approach, actually seeks to concentrate its activities. The evaluators believe that such a narrow approach may increase the Programme's capacity-building ability at institutional level.

The assessment of the applications involved several actors: external evaluators (one from the South and one from the North), the universities, the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Tanzania, the SIU administration and finally the NUFU Programme Board. The RNE's assessment was in some cases different from the universities' own ranking of the projects. SIU points out that, as the assessment of the RNE was more closely linked to the contract and the call for proposals, the final selection laid more weight on the RNE's ranking than that of the institutions. As the institutions' ranking did not completely correspond with the call for proposals, the evaluators are of the impression that better and clearer information on how to assess and rank project proposals could have been provided to the applying institutions.

The evaluation team finds that the four selected projects cover various and important areas of the natural resource management sector (forestland, wildlife, livelihoods and biodiversity and coastal fisheries) and that they are appropriate to support the goals of the Programme.

2.2.2. Educational achievements

Master's students and PhD candidates

As of May 2010 the Programme has recruited the following numbers of PhD candidates and Master's students:

Project	Forestland	EKOSIASA	Biodiversity	Fisheries
PhD	4 (as planned)	2 (as planned)	4 (as planned)	2 (as planned)
External funding PhD			1 Quota-fund PhD	
Master's degree	9 (as planned)	8 (as planned)	6 (3 more than planned)	6 (as planned)
External funding Master's degree			5 (additional)	1 (additional)

The Programme has succeeded in recruiting the planned number of PhD candidates. The Biodiversity project at SUA has also linked an additional PhD candidate with Quota funding to its research team. Most of the PhD candidates are making progress according to plan. However, the PhD candidates in Fisheries (UDSM) may have difficulty in completing their degrees by 2011, due to late recruitment.

The recruitment of Master's students has surpassed its targets. The Biodiversity project has clearly overachieved in its recruitment goals, and is supporting three additional Master's students through the Programme and has involved a further five students with external funding in 2009. The Fisheries project at UDSM has recruited an additional Master's student. The Forestland project also aimed to include an additional Master's student, but due to a recent increase in fees for graduate studies at SUA this plan has had to be abandoned. Like the PhD candidates, most Master's students are progressing according to plan, although a few have had to postpone the completion of their degree from 2009 until 2010. All of the Master's students are expected to finish within the project period.

Some Master's and PhD students complain that limited fieldwork funding makes it difficult for them to reach distant research areas. As mentioned above, some of them also complain that delays in the transfer of funds forces them to delay their fieldwork and hence hampers the progress of their work. Other challenges mentioned by some Master's and PhD students are delayed feedback from project coordinators and supervisors and the lack of academic literature at UDSM and SUA.

Development of education courses and programmes

The Tanzania – Norway NUFU programme is expected to produce three PhD programmes and one Master's programme. The development of Master's courses is also included as an activity of the Programme. According to annual progress reports and interviews with project coordinators, it is clear that the establishment of study programmes is one of the Programme's major challenges. So far, no study programme has been fully developed and implemented. However, the evaluators found that efforts are being made in all projects apart from the Biodiversity project, which did not apply for funds to develop courses or study programmes.

According to interviews with participants in the Forestland project, the project has developed the curriculum for four courses at Master's level and aims to offer a Master's programme in Forest Resources Assessment and Management in 2010. Interviews also reveal a degree of cooperation with the two other SUA projects, which are aiming at establishing a Master's programme on Governance of Natural Resources. However, neither the Master's courses nor the Master's programmes are yet available to students. The Fisheries project is in the process of developing two Master's courses, one on its own and one in collaboration with the School of Business, also at UDSM. The development of the latter has been delayed for almost a year due to its counterpart's workload and lack of capacity to follow up its responsibilities regarding the development of the course. However, efforts have recently been made to further involve the top management of UDSM in ensuring that the School of Business Studies performs its part in this process. It is expected that both Master's courses will be approved by the University before the beginning of the next academic year. The EKOSIASA project has already developed and run a short course in Political Ecology, and students from both UDSM and SUA have attended the course. However, whether the course will be repeated is still uncertain. As political ecology is a relatively new approach there is a need for further competence building. Moreover, interviews have also suggested that the project appears to face challenges regarding obtaining academic recognition of political ecology by scholars at the two Tanzanian universities.

To summarise, the Programme demonstrates relatively good results in terms of the development of Master's courses. However, the evaluators emphasize the need to immediately address the development of educational programmes. This is particularly urgent with regards to the three PhD programmes, as no progress has been reported so far. The development and approval of both courses and study programmes is a lengthy process involving several levels of the university hierarchy. Although this process must obviously take its course, it is important to follow up unnecessary delays at each level. When the process is delayed, requests for information about the progress of the assessment should be made. The development and the implementation of study programmes are also very capacity-intensive, and the evaluators have the impression that project coordinators and other senior researchers involved in the Programme have many additional obligations and commitments at their respective universities. Their total workload may therefore negatively impact on the progress of the development of study programmes.

Training technical and administrative staff

For the most part, the projects have delivered the planned technical training, and some have even provided training beyond current plans (for example the Biodiversity project). According to the plans, eleven technical staff members are to receive training through the Programme. So far seven technical staff members have received such training. Although the Programme did not plan to train administrative staff, the need for such training has been identified, and the Programme has already provided training of seven administrative staff members.

2.2.3. Scientific achievements

The Programme has set high goals and ambitions related to publications and dissemination. The expected results are 79 scientific articles, two scientific books, 56 scientific reports, 53 presentations, and 65 public lectures (disseminations).

Publications

None of the four projects had planned any publications in 2008. However, one article in a scientific journal was published by the Forestland project at SUA. The results from 2009 show a higher level of publication activity, but goals set out in the projects' work plans have not been fully achieved, and several projects report that such activities will be postponed until 2010. By the end of 2009 the Programme was well behind the progress necessary to attain its goals within the Programme period. A total of six scientific articles have been published and only five public lectures were reported.¹²

With three articles presented at international workshops, the Biodiversity project at SUA is the most successful project of the four in publishing articles in 2009. However, it is still far from attaining the 31 scientific articles and 17 scientific reports planned. According to fieldwork data, the Forestland project had published two scientific articles by May 2010. The Fisheries project at UDSM did not report any publications in 2009. This might be partly explained by delays in the actual research activities and fieldwork. However, all projects have presented papers at international workshops and conferences during 2009 and the first half of 2010, which bodes well for some scientific publications in 2010 and 2011.

There are several explanations of why not more scientific achievements have been made. The late allocation of funds to the projects, making it impossible for the projects to start before 2008, is one factor. Secondly, candidates following the PhD programme at SUA are expected to produce monographs, and these candidates have so far prioritised finalising their theses at the expense of writing journal articles. Thirdly, it is a time-consuming process to publish articles in scientific journals. Some international journals may take around two years from the submission of an article to publication. It is also typical for publications to be developed even several years after a project is finished, particularly in research projects that involve large amounts of data. The projects may therefore come close to or even succeed in reaching their publication goal; however, this should not be expected to happen within the Programme period.

Despite the fact that most project coordinators anticipate more or less reaching the set targets, the evaluation team regards the expected scientific achievements as rather unrealistic and believes it is unlikely that the Programme will fully reach the set goals. We therefore recommend that the targets should be discussed and possibly revised, or that it is made explicit that the expected scientific achievements will follow a timetable that extends beyond the Programme period itself.

Dissemination activities

By the end of 2009, only five out of 65 dissemination activities had taken place. Most of these activities are scheduled for the last two years of the Programme period, which still leaves the project some time to attain the expected result. However, as the four projects supported by the Programme already have produced important research findings, the evaluators see it as important to commence the dissemination activities as soon as possible, both through writing and identifying or establishing networks and arenas for presentations of findings.

¹² SIU (2010) The Tanzania – Norway NUFU Programme 2007-2011: Annual Progress Report 2009

A challenge that some PhD candidates face is limited or lack of funding covering participation in national and international scientific conferences at which they can present their research findings and obtain valuable inputs. The evaluators recommend that the Programme should deal with this problem, either through allocating extra funding to cover such expenses or through assisting PhD candidates to apply for additional funding elsewhere.

See *Policy dialogue* for more information on dissemination activities.

2.2.4. Impact for development

Impact for development is closely linked to the Programme's success in terms of policy dialogue. The three projects at SUA in particular state that the development impact of these projects is mainly related to the production of new knowledge, publications and dissemination activities. As only a limited number of publications have appeared at the time of the evaluation, achievements in this area will become more apparent in the remainder of the Programme period.

In addition to publications and dissemination of results, the project at UDSM has also attempted to directly impact personal development through providing target groups for the research findings, as well as empowering and supporting them to claim their rights. This is taking place in the Mafia Islands.

2.2.5. Capacity building in the South

Individual capacity building

To date, the Programme has contributed to the enrolment of a total 12 PhD and 29 Master's students. The study programmes they attend have given them new and valuable knowledge and experience that will better equip them for their future careers. Focus groups held with the PhD and Master's students revealed that they were largely satisfied with the individual capacity building acquired through their participation in the Programme.

Individual capacity building has also been provided to technical and administrative staff at SUA and UDSM.

Institutional capacity building

Various regulations of the NUFU programme contribute to institutional capacity building. The NUFU Guidelines for applicants (2007-2011) stipulates clearly that project coordinators and other researchers participating in the activities should be employed and paid by the respective partner institution. More or less the same applies to student recruitment. NUFU Master's degree scholarships are not to be used for the general training of Master's students, but are earmarked to selected students who have a potential for continuing into PhD education and hence contribute to strengthening their institution's capacity for research and research-based education. Moreover, PhD candidates should be staff or prospective staff members of the home institution. The evaluation finds that the Tanzania – Norway NUFU programme is largely in line with the general NUFU Guidelines regarding the recruitment of Master's and PhD students. However, a recruitment ban imposed by the Tanzanian Government has until recently made hiring new staff difficult and thus narrowed the possibilities of including prospective staff among the PhD candidates. At present, most of the

Master's and PhD students are working at the two universities or for government departments.

In order to provide PhD degrees for universities, staff will build competence at the institution, provided that the PhD candidates stay with the university. The capacity building will take place through the newly acquired knowledge, through future research and the development of new courses and study programmes. A larger number of staff with PhD degrees will also provide the institution with better chances of gaining research funding and joining international research collaborations. Furthermore, the Programme also enhances the capacity of SUA and UDSM by providing infrastructure such as technical equipment, vehicles, boats, etc.

In our view the implementation of programme activities has so far contributed successfully to institutional capacity building. However, the evaluators wish to emphasize the need to maximize this effect through constant reflections on how to strengthen the link between individual and institutional capacity building, for example on how to include young researchers in research groups and similar networks at the universities.

Capacity building in the field of natural resources management

Other evaluations of the NUFU programme, for example the 2009 evaluation of NUFU and NOMA, point out that the programmes primarily support the education of individual students and researchers and only to a limited extent the wider research environment. However, the evaluators of the Tanzania – Norway NUFU programme are of the opinion that through providing personal development opportunities to individual students and researchers, the Programme contributes to establishing a pool of skilled professionals who will be highly qualified to assume future tasks and projects in the field of natural resources management. Improved natural resources management in Tanzania is more likely to be achieved when relevant ministries in Tanzania and future bilateral projects financed by for example the Norwegian Government can call on such a pool of qualified professionals. The evaluation team finds therefore both individual and institutional capacity building in the Programme to be of great value.

2.2.6. Gender approach

The Tanzania - Norway NUFU Programme 2007 - 2011 has a renewed focus on gender, not only in terms of gender balance among project participants but also by promoting gender mainstreaming in programme activities. The renewed focus on gender was reaffirmed by the inclusion of gender mainstreaming as a main topic of the NUFU Programme Conference in Malawi and the NUFU annual project coordinator's seminar in Norway in 2009. A study on gender mainstreaming in the NUFU programme was performed in 2009.¹³

Gender balance

A concrete measure, rewarding projects that managed to recruit at least 40% female PhD candidates, has been put into practice to encourage female participation. The measure appears to have the desired effect, and three out of four projects in the Programme reached the set target. These three projects were given a bonus of NOK 50,000. The projects have made good efforts to fill the quota asked for and the Programme as a whole has recruited 50% female PhD candidates. The project coordinators report that female candidates are as likely as male

¹³ Manuh, T.(2009) *Gender mainstreaming in the NUFU Programme*

candidates to finish in time. They have long experience of supervising both female and male postgraduate students and they say that there is no significant difference in terms of completion time. However, during the fieldwork difficult aspects with regards to participation of women become evident. Complications are especially evident among pregnant students and female students with young children. The evaluators feel that the price these women pay to participate in the Programme can be rather high. Two of the PhD candidates left children who were only six and seven months old in Tanzania to do the required stay at UMB. One of these women lost her baby while in Norway. Discussions with project coordinators and students confirmed that it is difficult for women with small children to join PhD programmes. The evaluators believe that the NUFU programme requires greater sacrifices of female students in the South than are normally required of Norwegian women studying in Norway. The goal of gender balance needs to be followed up by measures and support for female participation. The evaluators recommend that the Programme considers the possibility to finance bringing babies (and possibly also babysitters) during the female PhD candidates' stay at UMB. Moreover, support and specific measures should also be available for those women who give birth during the project period.

Although the Programme has a successful gender balance at the PhD level, the picture is very different with regard to other researchers participating in the four projects, where the proportion of females is very low. At SUA there are no female researchers. UDSM and UMB each have two female researchers. All the project coordinators in the Programme, both in Norway and in Tanzania, are male. Among the Programme's institutional contacts there are two females and one male. The lack of female senior researchers can partly be explained by the fact that natural science in general is a male-dominated field. There is, however, a need to encourage female participation at all levels of the project. One possibility would be to establish, based on the real context in which the projects are found, a standard of a minimum proportion of female participants.

Around 40% of the Master's students in the Programme are females, which bodes well for future intakes of PhD candidates as well as future hiring of academic staff in natural science departments. The three projects at SUA have been much more successful than the project at UDSM, which had only managed to recruit one woman out of six Master's students (16.7%) by the end of 2009.

Gender mainstreaming

In general, attention to gender is paid by all four projects. However, the evaluators do not see implementation of concrete measures relating gender mainstreaming in research and educational activities. Although the NUFU goal of gender mainstreaming in all research activities is set out in the Programme Document, it is not mentioned in the call for proposals.

According to the institutional annual reports from 2009, only one project, the Forestland project at SUA, aims at developing a course which will specifically address gender issues (Forest Resource Governance Course). The Fisheries project notes that gender issues will be integrated into programmes and courses. Gender mainstreaming is evident in a few publications and sub-topics, but none of the main titles of individual projects and theses specifically pay attention to gender issues, even though a gender perspective would be highly valuable to, and would complement, the current research. Differentiated knowledge on for example how females and males make use of the natural resources in their community, whether bad/good natural resources management may differentially impact poverty reduction for households headed by women and men, and how to provide poor women with greater

opportunities to benefit from natural resources, are topics that might be expected to be of scientific value to a research programme focusing on the management of natural resources and development impact. These should be better integrated into the projects' focus, and lead to more knowledge specifically addressing gender issues related to natural resources and livelihoods.

Project coordinators suggested that the annual report layout should provide more space for discussing gender-related issues. They also expressed a wish for support in performing better on gender mainstreaming their project activities.

2.3. Relevance and policy dialogue

2.3.1. Relevance for national policies of Tanzania and Norway

The Programme is placed at the centre of Norwegian development aid to Tanzania. Its funding derives directly from Norwegian development aid aiming at improving Tanzanian management of natural resources. The funding is provided to Tanzania through the RNE. Moreover, the Norwegian Embassy wishes to ensure the Programme has a 'Tanzanian flavour' by identifying the Programme's goals with both national and institutional priorities in Tanzania.

Tanzania is currently about to revise a number of national policy documents on poverty reduction and management of natural resources. Several researchers in the Programme have been asked to contribute to this development with papers and policy briefings. This clearly demonstrates that the knowledge produced in the Programme is both relevant and appreciated by Tanzanian policy makers.

2.3.2. Institutional relevance

The evaluation team requested institutional strategy documents from the two universities in Tanzania. Unfortunately, such documents were not made available to us within the timeframe of the evaluation. However, in interviews, project coordinators and institutional contacts unanimously expressed their opinion that the Programme is of central value to their departments and that the projects fit well into the strategies of the two universities. They emphasized that the subject-oriented approach taken by the projects enables them to better contribute with policy inputs, makes them better qualified to apply for additional research funding and to continue research and capacity building in the field of natural resource management in Tanzania.

The Programme equips the relevant departments at UDSM and SUA with a reserve of prospective staff with doctoral degrees. Both universities have a number of professors who will soon be reaching retirement and will therefore, in the near future, need qualified replacements. The training of technical staff and the enhancement of equipment provided by the Programme are relevant and valuable to the institutions in Tanzania. However, the institutional relevance of the Programme would further improve if the Programme succeeds in establishing sustainable educational programmes at the two universities in Tanzania.

The thematic approaches in the four projects are also regarded as important to and in line with UMB's strategic plans and priorities. This was unanimously confirmed in interviews with the project coordinators and the institutional contact at UMB. However, at staff level

there is a certain degree of dissatisfaction with all NUFU programmes, as the compensation to the Norwegian faculty involved is insufficient.

2.3.3. Policy dialogue

All the stakeholders interviewed appear to share the same understanding of what policy dialogue means, and define it as communication with policy makers responsible for the management of natural resources as well as with other relevant organizations. This communication ought to disseminate research findings and provide advice regarding the development and implementation of policies. Ideally, policy dialogue should commence at the outset of the projects. However, this cannot take place without the right connections with relevant authorities. According to SIU, it is the universities in Tanzania that are responsible for the actual implementation of the policy dialogue.

The Fisheries project at UDSM is clearly the project that so far has best realized the Programme's goal of establishing policy dialogue. At the request of the Tanzanian Division of Fisheries and the Norwegian Embassy, two of the team members assisted in the planning of the new Programme of Cooperation on Management of Natural Resources in 2008. The team members also had a briefing about the research project with Tanzania's Director of Fisheries, the MP for Mafia district and the district commissioners. In 2009 two members were requested by the Director of Fisheries to prepare and present a state-of-the-art keynote paper on fisheries development to a national conference attended by the Prime Minister. The discussions at this conference have been central in the formulation of Tanzania's new approaches to fisheries management.

The Forestland, Biodiversity and EKOSIASA projects at SUA seem to be having a harder struggle to create opportunities and arenas for dialogue with relevant policy makers. To the best of the evaluators' knowledge, and according to annual progress reports for 2008 and 2009, there was no actual communication with policy makers before 2010. This is largely in accordance with the work plan, where the publication and dissemination of policy briefings are not scheduled until 2011. SUA's location in Morogoro, far from the ministries in Dar-es-Salaam, may partly explain SUA's lack of network and dialogue opportunities with those in charge of policy-making. However, interviews confirmed that as part of developing new policies, in 2010 the MNRT invited the project coordinators of the Forestland and Biodiversity projects to present papers on their respective academic fields. Researchers from Fisheries at UDSM have been asked to make similar presentations. The Programme has also organized several stakeholder inception workshops, and a few policy briefings have been produced. These are promising signs indicating progress with regards to attaining the set targets of policy dialogue.

In September 2009, SIU organized a seminar that focused specifically on policy dialogue. This effort made a positive contribution both to bringing researchers in the Programme together and to disseminating preliminary results to policy makers and other key persons. Invitations were sent out to many relevant actors. However, participation from the ministries was rather disappointing. The evaluation team recommends organising a number of seminars that would aim to present and discuss findings with policy makers and other relevant actors in the remaining Programme period, and suggests that RNE might play a more active part in organising such seminars. As Norway's political representative in Tanzania, the Embassy carries more weight, and may therefore to a greater extent persuade policy makers to participate in seminars where findings are presented and debated. The evaluators recommend

that RNE and/or the universities communicate with relevant policy makers before deciding on the dates for future seminars, and that RNE should be the institution responsible for inviting relevant departments and organisations.

Due to the short period covered by the Programme, the evaluators are unable to assess the actual effect of the policy dialogue already under way.

2.4. Sustainability

The support of the Norwegian Embassy in Tanzania for higher education in the field of natural resources management has continued over a long period of time. The Programme is thus part of a wider focus on natural resources, climate and environment supported by the Norwegian Government. This may be important as a means of ensuring the sustainability of the Programme's activities. The RNE has recently received new major grants related to climate measures in Tanzania and the Programme is educating and building the capacity of individual professionals and academic institutions, which may be very useful in the development and implementation of these new bilateral projects.

The Programme's chances of producing sustainable effects will increase through the establishment of international networks and by obtaining additional funding and collaborative research projects. The four projects in the Programme continue to increase their research competence and to gain valuable project administration experience, which in turn will strengthen their applications for new research funding.

The new financing framework for the Norwegian universities is increasing pressure on staff to produce work which is financially compensated. Project coordinators at UMB express their frustration regarding the consequences of this system. If the Programme's PhD candidates are not admitted to UMB, there is little compensation for the work done by researchers at UMB involved in the Programme. It therefore becomes less acceptable for staff at Norwegian universities to use their working hours in the NUFU Programme. In line with the recent evaluation of the NUFU and the NOMA programme (2009), we argue that this is one of the major threats to the continuation of the Programme.

At the time of the evaluation the recently established collaboration between UMB and UDSM seems to depend to a larger degree on particular individuals than is the case with the UMB/SUA collaboration. This project is therefore potentially more vulnerable. However, the evaluators find no worrying signs in the actual implementation of the project.

3. Conclusions and recommendations

All in all, the review concludes that the 'The Tanzania - Norway NUFU Programme 2007 - 2011' has largely been successfully implemented since its start and until spring 2010. The academic cooperation between SUA and UDSM and their Norwegian counterpart, UMB, seems to function relatively smoothly. The complex management model does not seem to pose any particular difficulties for, or frustration among, the partners involved, the only exception being some frustration because of delays in the transfer of funds. The two partner institutions in Tanzania are involved in several research programmes financed by Norway through SIU, Norad and directly through the Embassy, and are familiar with the Norwegian system, in terms of both its requirements and its benefits. From the Norwegian side, however,

it is emphasized that the NUFU programmes provide insufficient financial compensation to Norwegian institution, making it less attractive for universities in Norway to be involved in such programmes.

The Programme has succeeded in recruiting Master's and PhD students, and has achieved an overall 50% female participation rate. Some of the projects have even recruited more students than the number set as target, and included yet other students with external funding. The Programme has significantly contributed to capacity building at SUA and UDSM. Its thematic focus is of relevance to national policies in both Tanzania and Norway, and our findings indicate that the thematic approach of the four projects supported is of central value to the institutions involved. The review finds that project coordinators at both sides are actively involved in decision making.

However, the review has also shown that some weak points remain to be addressed. The most critical task is to ensure that the set targets related to the number of scientific publications, dissemination and policy dialogue, as well as the development of study programmes, are reached. The potential to have an impact on development in Tanzania will clearly increase if the Programme performs well in relation to these aspects. The Programme should moreover enhance its gender mainstreaming efforts, and better integrate gender issues into the projects' thematic focus.

On the basis of the findings presented above, the evaluation team therefore makes the following recommendations:

Efficiency

Management model

Report

- The evaluators suggest that the report format could include more qualitative information (for example relating to gender issues) and the project's assessment of its own performance.

Financial management

- In order to ensure adequate progress in research activities, we recommend that the problem of transferring funds is addressed and minimized at each financial level.

North-South relations

- UMB should provide rapid and accurate assistance to visiting researchers and students (necessary papers, bank account, information on courses, etc.)

South-South relations

- Seminars and workshops with participants from the four different projects as well as with all categories of researchers (senior researchers, PhD candidates and Master's students) should be organised at regular intervals for the remaining Programme period.

Effectiveness

Educational achievements

- The evaluators emphasize the need to immediately address the development of educational programmes. This is particularly urgent with regards to the three PhD programmes, as no progress has so far been reported.

Scientific achievements

- We recommend that the set targets should be discussed and possibly revised, or that it should be made explicit that the expected scientific achievements will follow a timeframe that extends beyond the actual Programme period.
- As the four projects supported by the Programme already have produced important research findings, the evaluators see it as important to immediately increase dissemination both through writing of articles and policy briefings, and by establishing network and arenas for presentations of findings.
- The evaluators recommend that the Programme should look into how to financially support the participation of PhD candidates in national and international scientific conferences at which they can present their research findings and obtain valuable feedback. This could be done through allocating extra funding to cover such expenses or through helping them to apply for additional funding elsewhere.

Capacity building

- The evaluators stress the need to maximize the Programme's capacity-building effect through strengthening the link between individual and institutional capacity building. For example, it might be valuable to include young researchers in research groups and similar networks at the universities.

Gender approach

- In order to ensure female participation and completion of their degrees, the Programme should provide gender-sensitive support to female PhD and Master's students. Adequate maternity leave is one such measure. The opportunity to bring along small babies on their required stay in Norway should also be looked into.
- There is a need to encourage female participation at all levels of the project. One possibility would be to establish, based on the real context in which the projects are found, a minimum proportion female participants.
- Gender issues should be better integrated into the projects' subject focus. The Programme should encourage more publications specifically addressing gender issues related to natural resources and livelihoods.¹⁴

Policy dialogue

- The evaluation team recommends organising seminars that aim to present and discuss findings with policy makers and other relevant actors during the remainder of the Programme period. We suggest that RNE should play a more active part in organising such seminars as well as in establishing contact between the relevant ministries and the researchers in the Programme. The evaluators recommend that RNE and/or the universities communicate with relevant policy makers before determining the dates for future seminars, and that RNE should be the institution responsible for inviting relevant departments and organisations.

¹⁴

See examples of such themes at page 21 of this report.

References

Manuh, T.(2009) *Gender mainstreaming in the NUFU Programme*

Norad (2009) *Evaluation of the Norwegian Programme for Development, Research and Education (NUFU) and of Norad's Programme for Master Studies (NOMA), Evaluation Report 7/2009*

Norad (2006) *Samarbeidsavtale mellom Direktoratet for Utviklingssamarbeid (Norad) and Senter for internasjonalisering av høyere utdanning (SIU) om Forskning og utdanningssamarbeid mellom institusjoner i Sør og institusjoner i Nord gjennom Nasjonalt program for utvikling, forskning og utdanning (NUFU)*

NUFU Guidelines for applicants (2007-2011)

Report No. 11 (2007-2008) to the Storting (Stortingsmelding nr. 11), *On equal terms: Women's rights and gender equality in development policy.*

Report No. 13 (2008-2009) to the Storting (Stortingsmelding nr. 13), *Climate, Conflict and Capital: Norwegian development policy adapting to change*

SIU (2009) *The Tanzania – Norway NUFU Programme 2007-2011: Annual Progress Report 2008*

SIU (2010) *The Tanzania – Norway NUFU Programme 2007-2011: Annual Progress Report 2009*

United Republic of Tanzania, Vice President's Office (2005), *National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP)*

United Republic of Tanzania, Vice President's Office (1997) *National Environmental Policy*

Appendix 1

Terms of Reference (ToR)

Review of the Tanzania – Norway NUFU Programme

1.0 Background

The Norwegian Embassy in Tanzania launched the 'The Tanzania-Norway NUFU Programme' in 2007. The aim of the programme is to support five-year bilateral cooperation projects (2007-2011) between Tanzanian and Norwegian institutions of higher education and research.

The programme is earmarked for projects directed towards research and education activities in the thematic area of 'natural resources management in Tanzania'. The objective of the academic co-operation is to contribute to improved management of natural resource sectors in Tanzania.

With reference to § 2.2 in the NUFU agreement, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), represented by the Royal Norwegian Embassy (RNE) in Tanzania, and the Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education (SIU) entered into a contract concerning 'The Tanzania – Norway NUFU Programme' 28 June 2007.

On September 5 2007, the NUFU Programme Board selected four projects for funding. The total grant for the Programme will not exceed NOK 25 million. (Please see appendix for an overview of the projects).

2.0 Description of the Programme

The scope of the Tanzania-Norway NUFU Programme is to support academic co-operation in the area of management of natural resources, forestry, fisheries and/or wildlife, with a focus on good governance and a reliable public administration.

Objective

The objective of the academic cooperation is to contribute to improved governance in the management of natural resources sectors in Tanzania, in line with the Call for Proposals for this Programme and the NUFU Programme document.

The objective of the contract between the MFA and SIU is to secure a sound, impartial and efficient implementation of the Programme in accordance with the good practices already established in the NUFU Programme.

Outputs

- Education programmes developed and established in the area of management of natural resources, forestry, fisheries and/or wildlife
- Master's and PhD degrees completed within the area of management of natural resources, forestry, fisheries and/or wildlife

- Publications and dissemination of research results within the area of management of natural resources, forestry, fisheries and/or wildlife
- Capacity-building at the South partner institution, i.e. education of staff members at both PhD and Master's level
- Training of technical and administrative staff

Main indicators:

- Educational achievements
 - o Number of Master and PhD candidates completed
 - o Education programmes established
- Scientific achievements
 - o Publications
 - o Dissemination of results
- Impact for development
 - o Policy dialogue
 - o Links and communication with Tanzanian authorities and relevant organisations

According to paragraph 6.2 of the contract between MFA and SIU for the administration of the programme¹⁵, the programme should be reviewed at least once during the Programme period (2007-2011). The review should be planned and approved by MFA (i.e. RNE) and SIU in cooperation. The conclusions and recommendations from the review will “inform the further implementation of the programme based on the contract” (Annual Plan 2010).

3.0. Scope of work

The review is to cover the period from the initiation of the programme in 2007 until the start of the review, and assess the following aspects:

3.1 Efficiency

The review shall assess the efficiency of the projects supported by the programme as well as the overall management model.

The review is to examine each project supported by the Programme, with a focus on efficiency and possible deviations between the activities planned for and the activities that have taken place so far. Challenges faced by both the institution in the South and Norway in putting the planned activities into practice, should be identified.

¹⁵ Contract between The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and The Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education (SIU) regarding the Tanzania-Norway NUFU Programme

The review should also look into the efficiency of the management model for the Programme, i.e. the MFA – SIU agreement under NUFU § 2.2.

3.2 Effectiveness

The effectiveness of the programme in general, particularly with respect to gender, will be assessed.

Programme effectiveness refers to the selection of projects and the activities undertaken in the projects supporting the goal achievement for the programme (output – outcomes)

- i) Is the project portfolio consistent with the goals of the programme, i.e. will the selection of projects lead to achievements of the goals of the programme, or should other projects have been selected?
- ii) are the activities in the individual projects leading to achievement of the programme goals?

Gender

The programme encourages female participation in particular, and rewards any project that is able to recruit at least 40 % female PhD candidates. The review shall reflect on the effects of this policy, including any unintended consequences and possible sustainability issues.

The review should also consider the degree to which the projects have integrated the gender dimension into their research, education and dissemination activities.

3.3 Relevance

The review should examine whether the projects are of relevance to, and are integrated into:

- i) institutional strategies at the partner institutions in Tanzania and Norway
- ii) national policies and plans regarding natural resource management and higher education/research
- iii) developmental challenges of Tanzania (including poverty reduction)
- iv) Norwegian policy for development cooperation with Tanzania

3.4 'Policy dialogue'

The review is to look into the issue of 'policy dialogue' that is central in disseminating the results obtained by the projects, and is an important tool for achieving impact of development.

- i) How do the individual stakeholders (participating institutions, RNE and SIU) understand the term 'policy dialogue'?
- ii) What knowledge has been generated through the projects that is relevant for 'policy dialogue'?
- iii) How, and to what extent, have the projects undertaken 'policy dialogue' activities?
- iv) What are the effects of the 'policy dialogue' carried out?

3.5 Sustainability

The review should look into the potential for institutional and economical sustainability in the programme, with a special focus on:

- i) The probability for the capacity building activities to have lasting effects?
- ii) Whether the individual Master's programmes are established/strengthened and incorporated into regular curricula of the institutions?
- iii) Whether there are any employment plans for the Master's and PhD candidates once they have qualified?
- iv) Financial sustainability – will the structures established allow for a continuation of the activities after the finalisation of the programme?

3.6 Risk management

The review shall identify risk factors to successful implementation of the Programme and assess how the projects are handling these.

3.7 Anti-corruption

The review shall establish whether anti-corruption measures have been implemented and if so, if these are effective.

4.0 Implementation of the review

4.1 Methodology

In undertaking the tasks listed above, the review shall employ the following methodology, to which they are invited to add complementary elements that might be of interest:

- Desk study of relevant background documents
- Field visits to the projects
- Interviews with key personnel.

The desk study will require familiarisation with relevant agreements and correspondence between the RNE/SIU, Annual Reports, minutes of meetings, calls for proposals, etc. The documentation required to carry out the review shall be provided by SIU. In addition, it will require a review of relevant policy documents from the governments of Tanzania and Norway.

The field visit to Tanzania will include in-depth interviews with the leadership and administrators at the universities cooperating under the agreement, the co-ordinators and organisers of projects, Master's and PhD candidates supported by the programme and relevant staff from policy-making institutions.

Interviews with the leadership, administration and project coordinators at the Norwegian partner institution, the Norwegian University of Life Sciences, should be held. The reviewers should also

interview relevant personnel at RNE, Norad and SIU.

4.2. The review team

The review team shall consist of two members, at least one of them from Tanzania or East Africa. The team must possess wide-ranging knowledge of the higher education sector and natural resource management issues in Tanzania, as well as knowledge of the principles underlying Norwegian development policies. The team members need to have experience with evaluation/review work. Proficiency in English is essential and skills in Swahili would be an asset. The consultants will divide the work between them in the most suitable way within the given timeframe and budget, but one of the team members will act as the team leader and be responsible for delivering the review report. Gender balance in the team is encouraged.

4.3 Budget and responsibilities:

The cost for the review will be borne by SIU. Maximum budget: 250, 000 NOK.

The time frame for the total assignment should not exceed 30 working days (divided between the two team members), including travel.

SIU/RNE will assist the review team with regards to providing relevant programme documents, contact details and if relevant, appointments/meetings.

4.4 Timelines, reporting and outputs

The review is to provide a draft report and a final report with an executive summary. The review will be carried out between 15 March and 31 May 2010.

The final report should cover all issues identified in the ToR and be oriented to providing practical knowledge useful to the implementation of the programmes. Adjustments that the review team finds necessary and appropriate should be communicated to and discussed with SIU. The report will be written in English and include an executive summary, conclusions and recommendations. The final report should not exceed 20 pages including the summary, plus relevant annexes. The draft report shall be submitted to SIU by 1 June 2010. The final report must be finalized and submitted to SIU, electronically, by 25 June 2010 (within two weeks of receiving comments from RNE and SIU on the draft).

The review team members should be available for presentations of the review at seminars in Norway and Tanzania in September 2010. Travel costs related to the presentations will be covered separately by SIU.

5.0 Relevant documentation

Call for proposals to the NUFU Programme - earmarked funds for Tanzania

Contract between The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and The Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education (SIU) regarding the Tanzania-Norway NUFU Programme

NUFU Programme document 2007 – 2011

NUFU 2007 – 2011 - Annual Progress Report 2007 and 2008 for the NUFUTZ projects

NUFU 2007 – 2011 – Annual Institutional Report 2007 and 2008 from partner institutions

Project documents for the NUFUTZ projects

Tripartite Contracts for the NUFUTZ projects

All applications for the earmarked funds for Tanzania

NUFU Annual Report 2007 and 2008

Annual Plan for the Tanzania – Norway NUFU Programme 2008, 2009, 2010

Annual Report for the Tanzania - Norway NUFU Programme 2007 and 2008

Minutes from the Annual Consultative Meeting, 2008 and 2009

Appendix 2

Projects supported by “The Tanzania – Norway NUFU Programme 2007-2011”

Project title	Partner institution in Tanzania	Partner institution in Norway	Project ID
Assessing the impact of forestland tenure changes on forest resources and rural livelihoods in Tanzania	Sokoine Agricultural University	Norwegian University of Life Sciences	NUFUTZ-2007/10226
EKOSIASA: The political ecology of wildlife and forest governance in Tanzania	Sokoine Agricultural University	Norwegian University of Life Sciences	NUFUTZ-2007/10228
Integrating livelihoods and multiple biodiversity values into wetlands management in Tanzania	Sokoine Agricultural University	Norwegian University of Life Sciences	NUFUTZ-2007/10229
Coastal fisheries of Tanzania: the challenges of globalisation to resource management, livelihoods and governance	University of Dar es Salaam	Norwegian University of Life Sciences	NUFUTZ-2007/10227

Appendix 3

Individual interviews were held with the following respondents:

Sokoine University of Agriculture

Prof. Kajembe, George, project coordinator, Forestland
Dr. Jumanne Moshi Abdallah, project coordinator, EKOSIASA
Prof. Peter Gillah, Acting Dean of the Faculty of Forestry and Natural Conservation
Dr. Evelyn Lazarus, Chair of the Coordinating Committee of NUFU projects at Sokoine
Prof. Kessy, Fransis, Head of the Department of Forest Economics
Prof. Luoga Emmanuel, Head of Department Forest Mensuration and Management
Prof. L.L.L Lulandala, member of Biodiversity research team
Prof. Munishi, Pantaleo, project coordinator, Biodiversity
Bursar at SUA Mr. Peter Raphael
One accountant

University of Dar Es Salaam

Dr. King'ori, Judica, institutional contact
Kamukuru, Albogast, project coordinator

UMB

Trond Eid, project coordinator Forestland
Stein Moe, project coordinator Biodiversity
Tor A. Benjaminsen coordinator EKOSIASA
Joanna Boddens Hosang, institutional contact
Ian Bryceson, project coordinator Fisheries (telephone interview)

The Norwegian Embassy

Malin Liljert
Ivar Jørgensen

Department of Natural Resources and Tourism in Tanzania

Mr. Juma Mgoo