



Review of Pakistan - Norway Institutional Cooperation Framework



Mr Petter Bauck, Senior Advisor, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad) – petter.bauck@norad.no
Ms Aaliya Tahirkheli, Independent Pakistani Consultant - aaliyayk@gmail.com

Photo: Marianne Rønnevig

Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

P.O. Box 8034 Dep, NO-0030 OSLO
Ruseløkkveien 26, Oslo, Norway
Phone: +47 23 98 00 00
Fax: +47 23 98 00 99

ISBN 978-82-7548-674-3
ISSN 1502-2528

**PAK 3004 PAK-NORWAY INSTITUTIONAL
COOPERATION FRAMEWORK
END REVIEW OF PHASE-1
AND
MID-TERM REVIEW OF PHASE-2**

Conducted by:

**Mr Petter Bauck, Senior Advisor, Norwegian Agency for Development
Cooperation (Norad)**

&

Ms Aaliya Tahirkheli, Independent Pakistani Consultant

Oslo/Islamabad 6th December 2012

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
List of Abbreviation:	5
Acknowledgement.....	6
Executive Summary	7
1. Background.....	10
2. The Review	13
2.1. The purpose of the review:	13
2.2.Themes to be discussed:	13
2.3. How the review was conducted:.....	14
3. Findings.....	16
3.1. Background/initiation of cooperation.....	16
3.2. Criteria for selection.....	17
3.3. Sectors of cooperation	17
3.3.1. Public – Public partnership.....	17
3.3.2. Public - Private partnership	18
3.4. Setting purposes and goals for the cooperation and expected outcomes and results.....	18
3.5. Exit strategy	19
3.6. Implementation of the collaboration.....	19
3.7. Reporting.....	20
3.8. Immediate outcomes and long term results of the cooperation.....	21
3.9. Relation to National Development Frameworks.....	21
3.10. Sustainability of the outcomes and results of the cooperation.....	21
3.11. The role of the Project Secretariat	21
3.11.1. During implementation	22

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

3.11.2. Monitoring and evaluation.....	22
3.11.3. Dissemination of information.....	22
3.12. The role of the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Islamabad	23
3.13. Information about the projects.....	23
3.14. Differences between Phase 1 and Phase 2	24
3.15. Particular projects:	24
3.15.1. Education Department, Baluchistan – IDP-Norway	24
3.15.2. Institutional cooperation between Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan (SECP) and The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway (Finanstilsynet).....	25
3.15.3. Institutional cooperation between National Archives of Pakistan and Norwegian Archives	26
3.15.4. Institutional cooperation between Geological Survey of Pakistan (GSP) and Norwegian Geotechnical Institute (NGI).....	26
4. Assessment.....	28
4.1. Establishment of contact.....	28
4.2. Information and guidelines	28
4.3. Design	29
4.4. Implementation.....	29
4.5. Reporting.....	29
4.6. Financial management	29
4.7. Financial risk	30
4.8. Gender	31
4.9. Capacities of the parties.....	31
4.10. Efficiency of the projects.....	32
4.11. Cost effectiveness.....	33
4.12. Qualitative and quantitative outputs	34
4.13. The relevance of outputs to reach overall goals	34

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

4.14. Relevance of the projects for national development plans	34
4.15. The role of the Project Secretariat	35
4.16. The role of the Royal Norwegian Embassy.....	35
4.17. The Project Steering Committee	36
4.18. The political will within the GoP to sustain the initiative.....	36
4.19. Lessons to be learned.....	37
4.20. Moving from Phase 1 to Phase 2 and a possible Phase 3	37
4.21. Particular projects:	38
5. Conclusions and Recommendations	39
Attachment 1: Terms of Reference	42
Attachment 2: Interview Guide	48
Attachment 3: Persons Interviewed.....	55
In Norway:	55
In Pakistan:	56
Attachment 4: Documents Consulted	60
Attachment 5: An Overview of The Different Cooperation Projects Initiated Under The Program	65
Attachment 6: Proposed Guidelines	73

List of Abbreviation:

ADB	Asian Development Bank
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of Discriminatory laws against Women
EAD	Economic Affairs Division, Ministry of Finance
EFA	Education for All
FAO	Food & Agriculture Organization
FDE	Federal Directorate of Education
GoP	Government of Pakistan
GRAP	Gender Reform Action Plan
GRP	Gender Reform Program
GSP	Geological Survey of Pakistan
HEC	Higher Education Commission
IED	Institute for Education Development, The Aga Khan University
IER	Institute of Education & Research, University of Peshawar
IMR	Institute of Marine Research, Bergen
LINS	International Service of Department of International Studies, Faculty of Education and International Studies (LUI), Oslo University College (OUC)
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MFD	Marine Fisheries Department
MTDF	Medium-Term Development Framework
NAA	Norwegian Accreditation Agency
NED	Nadirshaw Edulji Dinshaw University, Karachi
NGI	Norwegian Geotechnical Institute
Norad	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
OUC	Oslo University College
GSP	Geological Survey of Pakistan
PIP	Public Investment Programming
PMD	Pakistan Meteorological Department
PNAC	Pakistan National Accreditation Council
PSC	Program Steering Committee
PPP	Public-Private Partnerships
PSDP	Public Sector Development Program
P&D	Planning & Development Division, GoP
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
SECP	Securities & Exchange Commission of Pakistan
UMB	Norwegian University of Life Sciences
UPE	Universal Primary Education

Acknowledgement

The Review Team will use this opportunity to express its gratitude to the Government of Pakistan, Planning & Development Division, the Project Secretariat and the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Islamabad for all assistance in making this Review possible.

We will also express our gratitude to all the institutions in Pakistan and Norway that have given their time and experience to enlighten us on their experiences in relation to the program and the different collaborations conducted under this umbrella. We have been presented an impressive knowledge and professionalism in a wide range of very different fields.

We hope that this report treats the different stakeholders fairly. Any mistakes are solely our responsibility. Certain information is still missing in Attachment 5, giving an overview of the different collaborations being conducted under the program. This is due to the unavailability of some project documents. One of the planned interviews in Norway, with a person earlier engaged with LINS in the collaboration with Aga Khan University and Peshawar University has not been possible to conduct.

Executive Summary

The Institutional Cooperation Framework (The Program) signed between Pakistan and Norway 11th April 2005 for Phase 1 and then 9th December 2009 for Phase 2 has become the umbrella covering a number of very diverse collaborations/projects between Pakistani and Norwegian Institutions. An overview is presented in Attachment no. 5.

In the Agreements signed, an End Review of Phase 1 and a Midterm Review of Phase 2, is envisaged. As Phase 2 was supposed to be terminated by the end of 2012, the Royal Norwegian Embassy and the Government of Pakistan (GoP), Planning & Development Division, agreed to commission and treat the two reviews as one. Apart from assessing a wide spectre of issues relating to the implementation of the program, the review will be part of the documentation available as basis for a decision on a non-cost extension of Phase 2 (since substantial funds are still unspent), and a decision on a possible Phase 3.

The review team, Senior Advisor Petter Bauck from Norad and Ms Aaliya Tahirkheli, consultant from Pakistan, have conducted a number of interviews in Norway (done by Petter Bauck) and in Pakistan with institutions engaged in the program. Furthermore the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Islamabad, Economic Affairs Division and Planning & Development Division in the Government of Pakistan have been interviewed. Finally the Auditor General of Pakistan, responsible for presenting an audit report annually for the program, has been interviewed.

The general impression from the Review is that the program and all its sub-components give value for money. It is relevant in line with the main goals set in the agreement between the Government of Pakistan and the Government of Norway, in the Annual Development Plans of Pakistan as well as the overarching goals in the Norwegian development policy. The program appears to be very simplistic in the way it is organized, but by further scrutiny the complexity and differentiations of the collaborations established under the program become obvious. The program opens up for an innovative approach by the different institutions participating. They experience a flexible mechanism giving room for substantial creativity. The team at the same time observed that the monitoring of the different collaborations was very limited.

In all its simplicity, the program appears to be guided by few and rudimentary formal documents. Apart from the Agreement between Pakistan and Norway on the program, the different partners sign an Agreement or a Memorandum of Understanding with each other outlining the purpose of their cooperation and a limited number of formal requirements. The Project Secretariat has no formal agreement with any of the institutions receiving funds from the program apart from the approval of the agreement between the parties entering into collaboration and the approved Project Document. The Review Team is of the opinion that improving the formalization of the different relations, including requirements for reporting, financial reporting and audits will support a more efficient planning and implementation of the program. This should also strengthen efforts to avoid mismanagement of funds or corrupts practises within the different collaboration. Included here should be at least annual formalization of any changes in activity plans, time lines and budget, which should be forwarded to the Project Secretariat for information by respective partner institutions. For

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

the Auditor General of Pakistan, set to audit the finances of the program, lack of timely input from the Project Secretariat of financial reports and often lack of underlying documentation duly certified on the funds spent by each of the sub-recipients, makes an audit according to the agreement between Pakistan and Norway difficult or even impossible. Since Pakistan and Norway follow different budgets cycles, the Review Team will propose that instead of relating only to the Pakistani budget year, ending 30 June each year, one should relate to the budget cycles of both countries, and postpone the audit report from the Auditor General till the end of first quarter each calendar year, a solution an institution like the World Bank has chosen.

A common impression from both Pakistani and Norwegian institutions is that the information available ahead of initiating a preparatory dialogue is very limited. Apart from the available guidelines developed for the program, the partners are not furnished with information neither about other institutions already involved, important issues included in the Agreement between Pakistan and Norway, like gender, environment, corporate social responsibility and sustainability nor about reporting requirements. More focus on the content of the information given to potential partners at the initiation of collaboration would enhance the formalization process and do away with a number of uncertainties observed.

The identification of relevant partners in Norway for Pakistani institutions interested to develop an institutional cooperation occurs in a number of different ways, from initial contact during an international conference, through the international engagement after the earthquake in Muzaffarabad in 2005, as a result of cooperation back in the 1970s and 80s in the fishery sector, by active engagement from the Norwegian Embassy and sometimes also through the engagement of Norad.

According to the agreement for the program, the Planning & Development Division is the owner of the program and houses the Project Secretariat. A Steering Committee is approving the proposed Project Documents and budgets. Members are the Planning & Development Division, Economic Affairs Division and the Royal Norwegian Embassy; it is headed by the Secretary Planning & Development Division, GoP. The Pakistani institutions are supposed to be responsible for interacting with the Project Secretariat as well as the maintaining of relationship with the Norwegian collaborating institutions. The Royal Norwegian Embassy should play its active role in the Steering Committee. The Review Team has observed limited understanding of the actual set up among the engaged institutions. For several Norwegian institutions, an active dialogue with the Norwegian Embassy is viewed as important to cope with obstacles and disputes during implementation. A clarification of the roles, both in providing information to the potential institutions, but also within the Planning & Development Division and at the Norwegian Embassy should be encouraged to strengthen the efficacy of the program modalities.

As far as the review team could observe, most of the collaborations were based on an understanding of mutual benefits for the two institutions. Only in a few collaborations, our impression was that a one-way transfer of knowledge was the focus. Likewise most partnerships were anchored in institutions on both sides. Only in a couple of incidents, we registered what was labelled as “one-man show” or “two-men show”, something the Pakistani partners to some extent saw as a weakness. For

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

the review team it seems obvious that an institutional anchoring on both sides and a clear understanding of the mutual benefits of the collaboration is supportive to the sustainability of the outcomes and paves the way for a continued collaboration, even without external support.

Monitoring of the different collaborations is very limited. As a consequence the Project Secretariat and the Steering Committee are stuck with contradictory information without proper tools to clarify. The review team is of the opinion that monitoring should be far more systematic through the life time of each collaboration, either by the Project Secretariat, the Steering Committee or, if feasible, a hired third party. The Government of Pakistan and Norway should assure that the percentage set aside for administration is sufficient to cover an increasing emphasis on monitoring.

The financial flow in the program as a general rule is from the Planning & Development Division as the owner to the approved Pakistani institution and the Norwegian institution in parallel. The review team observed that some of the collaborations have chosen a different pattern, channelling all the funds to the Norwegian institution, which in turn refund the Pakistani institution for its expenses. The review team views this as an expression of the flexibility of the program and recommends leaving it up to the parties to decide what is most convenient also in the future.

To be able to cope with the need for some more formalization of the collaborations, there is need for developing some additional guidelines and increased dissemination of information about the program and the partners, and to secure a more systematic monitoring of the projects. The two governments should look into possibilities to strengthen the Project Secretariat to be able to cope with this additional workload.

On request from the Project Secretariat and the Norwegian Embassy, the Review Team has conducted certain investigations in relation to particular collaborations to clarify why they have been terminated or if agreed activities have been implemented. Likewise the Team has looked into a couple of intended collaborations that have not managed to get started. Where the last payment has been withheld, the Team recommend payment to be carried out.

The review team is of the view that two challenges should be kept in mind in the development of the program:

HOW TO KEEP THE SIMPLICITY AND AT THE SAME TIME MAKE THE COMPLEXITY LESS UNPREDICTABLE?

HOW TO KEEP THE SIMPLICITY AND AT THE SAME TIME INCREASE THE EFFICIENCY AND VALUE FOR MONEY?

1. Background

The Pak-Norway Institutional Cooperation Framework was initiated in April 2005 with the intention to facilitate collaboration between matching public and private sector institutions of the two countries. The program aimed at enhancing the technical competence of Pakistani institutions by implementing jointly developed projects with their respective Norwegian partner institutions.

The first Phase had a budget frame of NOK 15 million and lasted from 2005 till the end of 2009. The total disbursement under the agreement PAK-04/313 was NOK 14.805.806 and was done from 2005 till end 2008. This agreement has been concluded by 1st September 2009.¹

The second Phase, still on-going, has a budget of NOK 25 million, and started at the end of 2009. It was supposed to be completed by the end of 2012. In the second phase under agreement PAK-07/015 NOK 7.827.763 has been disbursed so far.²

In addition a separate agreement was signed in 2010, PAK-10/0020 to cover some of the costs related to the fisheries survey. Under this agreement NOK 3.800.000 was disbursed. The agreement has been concluded.³

With substantial funds still available under the program, it is envisaged that the parties will agree on a no-cost extension of the second phase. A possible third Phase is being discussed, but will probably first be concluded when most of the funds already allocated to the program have been disbursed.

During Phase 1, the program supported 9 different institutional collaborations in a wide range of fields from fisheries and earthquakes and landslides to education and accreditation. Two of the projects supported in Phase 1 have also got support for a second Phase. Additional projects from the first Phase are preparing to apply for a second Phase. In addition 4 new collaborations have been approved under Phase 2 and several are in the initial stage preparing joint project proposals to put forward for approval.

The Planning & Development Division (P&D Division), Government of Pakistan (GoP) is the program owner, and the program operates within the standard governmental structures, i.e., a project secretariat, housed in Public Investment Programming (PIP) section of the P&D Division and managed by the P&D staff. The Project Director has the official title as Chief Planning & Coordination. The overall running of the program is the responsibility of a Program Steering Committee (PSC), which is headed by the Secretary, P&D Division, with Royal Norwegian Embassy and Economic Affairs Division (EAD), GoP as its members. The Secretariat is responsible for managing day to day project management.

¹ The information is based on the Norwegian financial management system PTA.

² Two additional allocations, in total NOK 4.531.414 to cover phase 2 was registered for disbursement by the Embassy in October 2012 according the PTA primo December 2012.

³ The information is based on the Norwegian financial management system PTA.

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

The goal of the Program is to make Pakistan better equipped for meeting its international commitments and contributing in poverty alleviation, and to strengthen relations between Pakistan and Norway.

The purpose of the Program is to improve capacity, competence, and competitiveness in relevant Pakistani and Norwegian institutions.

It is envisaged that the collaboration will have an emphasis on mutual co-operation and institutional strengthening, i.e. transfer of know-how and competence, rather than infrastructure support.

Its outputs should contribute to the overall agenda of promoting quality standards in various fields that are important for enhancing value of Pakistani products and services in the world market.

The Norwegian Government in its cooperation with Pakistan wants to promote good governance and support eradication of poverty. A main part of the cooperation is focused on education and reduced child mortality, the latter through the PPI program in Sindh, in addition to good governance, women, gender equality and human rights.

Pakistan is today in a situation where the economic indicators are developing in a negative direction. The security situation in substantial parts of the country is serious. Foreign investments are limited, due to security, political instability and energy crisis. A particular challenge is the fact that the social contract between the population of Pakistan and the State is very limited and weak, with very limited accountability and ability of control⁴.

There are a number of challenges confronting Pakistan. It has developed certain key policies with respect to development needs and priorities in line with international commitments and conventions, like the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The crux of developmental policies and planning has incorporated thematic areas like education, health, wellbeing and access to opportunities for children and women. Pakistan is also a signatory to the Education for All (EFA). As per Article 25-A of the constitution, the state is responsible for providing 'free and compulsory' education. In the past and even currently, measures are being undertaken with the support of donor community to meet the objectives of EFA and Universal Primary Education (UPE). One of the challenges in this endeavour is the process to 'control drop outs', 'retention and provision of quality education' at the primary years of schooling.

Moreover, Pakistan is adhering to follow in letter and spirit CEDAW convention for the promotion of rights of women in all facets of life. As a follow up, government of Pakistan approached Asian Development Bank (ADB) to technically assist in preparing Gender Reforms Program (GRP) to improve the gender framework at the federal, provincial and district levels in public sector policies, programmes and projects. As a consequence, GRP was launched in August 2002. Women's employment in the public sector was one of the four proposed reforms under Gender Reform Action

⁴ Bauck, P., Strand, A. and Gul, S., Review of and Recommendations for Norwegian Support to Good Governance in Pakistan, Norad, Oslo, 2011 - http://www.norad.no/no/resultater/publikasjoner/norads-rapportserie/publikasjon/_attachment/372094?_download=true&_ts=13021aee9d0

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

Plan (GRAP) to sensitize the government functionaries on gender issues, proactively contribute towards gender mainstreaming and where possible to create spaces for women's representation as decision makers.

In addition, in the formulation of macro-economic policies, there has been an equal focus in the form of an integrated developmental approach through Mid-term Development Framework (MTDF). One of the objectives of the MTDF (2005-2010) is to 'establish a just and sustainable economic system for reducing poverty and achieving MDGs. This required a paradigm shift through higher investments in the development of infrastructure, human resource development and upgrading technology within the broader parameters of macroeconomic framework through a focus upon building local strengths for increasing the competitive advantage in various sectors of the economy.

2. The Review

2.1. The purpose of the review:

The overall purpose of the review:

- capturing lessons learnt
- devising an improved implementation mechanism of the on-going phase-2 of the program

Sub-purpose of the review:

- assessments of financial and operational efficacy of the Project Secretariat as well as individual projects completed under phase-1
- capture major achievements
- areas for improvement
- lessons learnt
- all relevant and pertinent aspects of the project, both its design and implementation, with emphasis on the results and achievements of the project.

The review should:

- provide all parties to the project with an understanding of the project's achievements, successes and failures.
- gain an understanding as to whether the project was optimally implemented with regards to effective use of available resources.
- assess the project's contribution towards creating and maintaining gender balance;
- assess the Project Secretariat's capacity, its monitoring mechanism and orientation on applying a result-based approach as well as its ability to documenting the results;

2.2. Themes to be discussed:

Efficiency and effectiveness:

- consider whether the design from the outset could have offered more in terms of efficiency and effectiveness for project
- consider whether the project outputs presented in the original project proposal were successfully and effectively produced
- whether all parties involved in project implementation had the necessary professional prerequisites, experience, expertise and attitudes to produce planned results in an effective and timely manner
- present a measured opinion on whether the results obtained justified the costs incurred
- give a considered opinion of the total scope of work was as could be expected in view of the inputs and whether the project has produce high quality results and outputs.

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

The relevance of the project:

- whether the project's intended outputs have practical relevance to the overall goals as set out in the project document
- what lessons could be drawn
- whether the project strategy is in support of national development policies
- whether the Secretariat has a clear understanding as to how to harmonize support with the national development framework

Sustainability:

- political will on part of GOP to provide human and financial resources to sustain such an initiative

Other related concerns:

- whether the project(s) has dealt effectively with all matters related to implementation as well as financial risk management
- whether all matters related to financial management, including procurement procedures for goods and services, have been appropriately handled
- whether all aspects of Norwegian policy relating to gender issues in development projects have been adequately handled in various sub-projects
- whether alternative implementing methods could have been applied to increase the cost effectiveness and efficiency
- strengths and weaknesses in Project Secretariat's management routines and administrative procedures for implementing the project effectively
- whether the Secretariat has networked and consulted sufficiently with other relevant agencies in the process of project formulation and implementation
- the efficacy of Project Secretariat as well as Project Steering Committee, its role and mandate.

For additional information, see Attachment no. 1 – Terms of Reference.

2.3. How the review was conducted:

To establish an understanding of the program and the different underlying institutional collaborations, the review team has interviewed a great number of Pakistani (14) and Norwegian institutions (10) engaged. In addition the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Norwegian Embassy in Islamabad, the Project Secretariat in the P&D Division, the Economic Affairs Division, Government of Pakistan, and the Auditor General in Pakistan have been interviewed (Attachment no. 3).

A good sample of Project Documents, agreements or Memorandum of Understandings between the collaborating institutions, reports, financial reports and publications produced as a result of some of the collaborations have been consulted (Attachment no. 4).

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

The institutions interviewed were at different stages in the process of collaboration. Some had collaborated for more than 5 years and were now in their 2nd Phase, while others were still in the 1st Phase. Several institutions had just formalized or were soon to formalize their collaboration. And a few institutions had so far not succeeded in identifying a Norwegian partner.

The review team got a number of presentations of different collaborations with focus on purpose and actual outcomes and achievements.

In all the interviews, the interview guideline developed served as a frame, often communicated to the institutions ahead of the interview (Attachment no. 2).

Due to security reasons, the Pakistani consultant had to go to Peshawar and Abbottabad. The non-availability of contact details at the time of scheduling a visit to Quetta and the safety and security risks led later to reliance on telephonic interviews to learn from the experiences of project implementers and beneficiaries in Baluchistan. For practical and economic reasons, the Norwegian team member conducted all the interviews in Norway, before and after the field visit to Pakistan.

3. Findings

The task given in the Terms of Reference (Attachment no. 1) for the review was to conduct an End Review of Phase 1 and a Mid Term Review of Phase 2 of the Institutional Cooperation between Pakistan and Norway. The review team has chosen to use the same format for all interviews, regardless of the institutions being in Phase 1 or 2. To the extent relevant, the differences in observations and assessments regarding the two phases will be outlined in the report. If nothing particular is said, the observations, assessments and recommendations presented are relevant for both phases and the program as a whole.

In presenting the main findings, the review team has chosen to follow the timeline of the projects, focusing on the initiation of collaboration, formulation of goals, implementation, results and impact, reporting, sustainability, gender, risk and monitoring. The findings will be related to the existing guidelines, when relevant. Any differences observed between Phase 1 and Phase 2 will be outlined.

A general observation by the Review team is that the program framework is very simplistic in its modality and opens for substantial creativity and innovation. The subsidiary institutional collaborations have, with some exceptions, resulted in timely achievement of set outputs in the different agreements or memorandum of understandings. Certain delays have been observed, both related to initiation of a collaboration, implementation, reporting and transfer of funds. One of the collaborations came to a standstill without concluding agreed activities. Lack of proper information about the program modalities and other institutions engaged in collaboration seems to be a commonly observed weakness.

3.1. Background/initiation of cooperation

A number of public and private institutions from Norway and Pakistan have been able to establish collaboration in various sectors. The cooperation was undertaken within the sectors of inclusive education, higher education, seismic surveys, geological surveys, accreditation and fisheries.

The beauty of this cooperation lies in its simplicity regarding organization and negligible amount of administrative cost incurred in the form of Project Secretariat housed within the P&D Division, GoP.

The background for initiating the different collaborations between the institutions was diverse and interesting. It was observed that a letter circulated from the Project Secretariat to a number of government institutions across the country led the prospective Pakistani organizations to start identifying a Norwegian organization, with the aim of improving the competency and capacity of the personnel and professionalize the institution. In some instances, an individual has been the catalyst to establish the contact for initiating partnership between two institutions leading to the bilateral cooperation. In one instance the earthquake in Muzaffarabad in 2005, led to an institutional cooperation on seismic surveys.

The goal of the program is to make Pakistan better equipped for meeting its international commitments, contributing to poverty alleviation, and to strengthen the relations between Norway and Pakistan. Poverty alleviation has not been the direct focus of the collaborations, but could be

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

inferred to be addressed indirectly. As it has been observed, the hub of activities was tailored around improving the competency and capacity of the personnel and the performance of the Pakistani institutions. A number of institutions play an important role in sectors vital for economic development in Pakistan.

A unique feature has been that a wide range of sectors collaborations could be developed in under this program. This has led to a range of partnerships across the board between public-private and public-public institutions as well as collaboration between three public and private institutions.

In most of the partnerships under this program, the point of initiation has been from Pakistan. It was mandatory for the Pakistani institution to identify a Norwegian partner and to create consensus on the purpose for collaboration through developing a Joint Project Document and formalizing it by signing a mutual agreement or Memorandum of Understanding. In most collaboration, it was observed that the interest of the Norwegian institution was also catered for. The project proposal would be submitted for review and approval to the Program Steering Committee.

3.2. Criteria for selection

It was left to the discretion of the Pakistani partner to identify and choose a Norwegian partner. As there were no clear guidelines for the selection of a partner, the route to identification, to reach mutual consensus and submission of a joint project proposal has been found to be time consuming. The only criterion left for the potential partner in identification was the need to improve the capacity and competency as well as the consensus of the concerned Norwegian organization/ institution to collaborate.

There are merits and de-merits of leaving it open to an organization to identify and select a partner.

The merit for leaving the criteria for selection to an organization brings in a lot of commitment, ownership and has brought in room for creativity and innovation in the design as well as in the implementation of the project. An observed weak point is the lack of assuring the institutional anchoring of the collaboration in both institutions.

The Review team learned that two Pakistani institutions had been waiting for more than a year for the potential Norwegian Partner to respond to their request to enter into a partnership. Lack of clarity concerning the modalities of the program and concerns related to the security situation are stated as reasons for delay from the Norwegian institution.

3.3. Sectors of cooperation

3.3.1. Public – Public partnership

In the guidelines for financing feasibility studies, it is said that that Norwegian bilateral cooperation with Pakistan focuses on good governance and primary education in addition to cultural cooperation. These areas will be prioritized, but the program will not be limited to these areas. Projects strategically important for Pakistan in terms of fulfilling its international obligations will also be

included. It is encouraged to address cross cutting issues like gender, environment and, corporate social responsibility.

Within the Education Sector, cooperation to improve capacity and competency of primary education teachers to achieve the goals of EFA through inclusive education approach at the Federal and a Provincial level was focused. Furthermore two different projects were implemented at the Higher Education level aiming to improve academic research and teaching standards of faculties and students. Moreover, two projects have been initiated in phase 2 with respect to higher technical education.

Pakistan Meteorological Department on seismic, Geological Survey of Pakistan on landslides, Pakistan National Accreditation Agency on accreditation standards and Marine Fisheries Department are among the public institutions which have benefitted from the institutional cooperation to improve their credentials as per international standards. The outputs are according to plans, except for the fisheries, where unforeseen delays have occurred.

3.3.2. Public - Private partnership

In the higher education sector, cooperation between public and private institutions took place. In one instance, a tripartite public-private partnership, including a private Pakistani university took place. The key to its success is attributed to the retention of key personnel, leadership and consistent sharing of knowledge, optimum utilization of resources and trust making it possible for the partners to reflect and revise the work plan and budgetary requirements as per the needs and incorporating an activity that was not part of the proposal.

Two collaborations were between a private Norwegian company and Educational Authorities at Federal and Provincial level. The main purpose was to introduce inclusive education aiming at developing the school system to cater for children with disabilities. Several positive achievements were reached, but interlocutors indicated that the ability to sustain the increased competence and enhance the application of the new skills would be a challenge given the low priority of education in general in Pakistan.

3.4. Setting purposes and goals for the cooperation and expected outcomes and results

The individual project goals of phase 1 and 2 were geared towards improving the capacity and competency of their respective partner institutions. This would in turn lead to improvement in the delivery of quality services to their respective clients. The Review Team is of the view that this was in accordance with the purpose of the program.

For public sector organizations, limitation in financial resources was found to be an impediment to take steps that could contribute towards institutional strengthening. The limited resources made available by the program gave an opportunity to provide external resources for training purposes, improving the skill levels in line with international standards.

3.5. Exit strategy

There has been no request in the guidelines for an exit strategy included in the project planning. In all the projects this was missing.

For the program an exit at this stage didn't seem to be anticipated. Both from the Pakistani and the Norwegian side the Review Team received the message that a continuation into a Third phase was what both sides wanted.

3.6. Implementation of the collaboration

As a consequence of the flexibility and creativity in the program, different institutional collaborations are implemented in different ways. For some institutions more or less all the activity is focused on training at the partner institution in Pakistan. For others, training in Pakistan is combined with training and formal education in and study visits to Norway. Some of the collaborations focus on “on the job training” in Pakistan, collecting data related to landslides, earthquakes or fish resources and afterwards conducting relevant analysis and preparing documents/reports. For some purchasing of modern equipment with relevant training is also included. The Review Team has the impression that organising of the collaboration is closely related to the field of cooperation.

For the majority of the collaborations, the team observed that the two (or three) partners had a clear view how each of them might benefit from the cooperation. For a few we observe that a one-way transfer of knowledge from Norway was prominent. Expressions like “one-man show” or “two-persons show” were used among the Pakistani beneficiaries. The mutual benefit for both sides seems to have been less focused. The institutional anchoring on the Norwegian side has been less prominent.

The flow of funds in the program is supposed to be from the P&D Division, as owner of the project, direct to the Pakistani institution, based on their financial statements, and to the Norwegian institution based on their financial statements, certified by their Pakistani partner.

The review team observed that this flow of funds was commonly used with some exceptions. In one agreement, funds were transferred from the P&D Division to the Norwegian partner, which then refunded to the Pakistani partner. The reasons given for this was to avoid bureaucratic hurdles by channelling funds through the responsible ministry in Pakistan to the institution.

It was observed among the partner institutions an uncertainty if the budget should be divided between the collaborating institutions with a particular ratio or not. Likewise information about what could be covered by the budget was requested by several of the institutions, in particular among at the initial phase of collaboration. The Review Team observed that the different institutions have chosen different solutions to these questions. Most commonly the distribution of funds between the institutions has come as a result of the agreed activity plan for the cooperation. Expenses related to Norwegian personnel in most cases are included in the budget, while expenses for Pakistani personnel have been financed over institutional budgets. The Review Team came across only one

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

agreement not including any personnel cost for either of the two institutions. The budgets are made in accordance with the purpose and expected activities outlined in the approved project document.

When asked, the institutions said that the issue of corruption and mismanagement of funds was something they were aware of, but none gave any indication that this could be a problem.

In most of the collaborations, there are annual or semi-annual meetings between the two parties to assess progress and agree on work-plan for the coming period.

Projects approved during the first phase as a main rule were implemented according to agreed timeline and activity plan. For a few, delays occurred. The reasons vary, from additional time needed to charter a fishing survey vessel to security situation and availability of relevant staff. Two projects are still on-going, 6 years after they were approved. One project came to a standstill, either because the contractual timeframe expired or because of security. One project was finalized without final payments made due to lack of proper information if the planned activities had been duly implemented.

The Review Team has observed that changes in activity plan, timeline and budget sometimes are included in Minutes, but never that revised plans and budgets are developed and forwarded to the Project Secretariat for information.

If disagreement should occur in the cooperation, most parties are aware that after trying to solve the dispute bilaterally, they should contact the Project Secretariat for assistance. Several of the Norwegian institutions indicated that they would rather contact the Norwegian Embassy for advice than the Project Secretariat if a conflict should emerge.

3.7. Reporting

According to the guidelines for the program, there is request for a joint biannual and an annual Progress Report from the different collaborations, submitted to the Project Secretariat within 2 months after the end of the implementation period. In addition, a final report is to be submitted when the project is completed. Attached to the Progress Report there should be a joint financial report. On an annual basis, audit reports should be forwarded for the actual expenses under the program for each institution. No detailed guidelines are developed for the content of the progress reporting.

The Review Team has only seen a limited number of Progress Reports and Financial Reports and Audits. The Progress Reports are mainly activity focused, informing on what has been implemented compared to the approved activity plan. Since the Project Documents rarely touch upon qualitative indicators for measuring the achievements, this aspect is also absent in the reporting. There is no focus on long-term impact. Particular concerns like gender, environment, corporate social responsibility, sustainability and risks are not focused. Where unexpected delays occur or where experiences gained during implementation results in changes in activity plan, time schedule or budget allocation, there is no systematic reporting on this with agreed revised plans, schedules or allocations.

3.8. Immediate outcomes and long term results of the cooperation

The Review Team found that the immediate results have been achieved according to plans by the project partners, with some few exceptions when unexpected delays have occurred. The competency and capacity levels have been improved. In the context of long-term sustainability of these results, a coordinated and consistent policy framework in terms of sustainability plans of the project partners were missing. The sustainability plans could have provided the Review Team a base to comment and assess. At the appraisal stage, the partners should have been requested to come up with such a plan.

3.9. Relation to National Development Frameworks

The Review Team found a clear connection between the individual project achievements and outputs, and several national development plans and the MTFD 2005-2010. The commonality of objectives with several national plans is due to the fact that the projects are of multi-sectorial nature – education, research and upgrading and transfer of scientific knowledge with respect to the fisheries, seismic studies and petroleum, all vital sectors for the economic development of Pakistan.

3.10. Sustainability of the outcomes and results of the cooperation

Sustainability is a concern shared by most institutions engaged under the program. A number of the Norwegian institutions have a clear understanding about what is needed to sustain and what has been achieved in the cooperation. This is to a very limited extent discussed in the Project Documents or in the reporting.

An external factor often mentioned is the readiness of the Government of Pakistan or the cooperating institution to allocate the necessary human/financial resources or to make efforts to retain essential and trained staff. Some institutions have introduced obligatory years of work after training. Others are working systematically to step by step transfer the activities financed under the program to the regular budget of the institution.

Where there is a clear understanding among the parties of their mutual benefits of the cooperation, the impression is that there is a readiness and wish to continue relationship after the completion of the project. In collaborations, where the mutual benefits are less prominent or totally absent, the sustainability of the institutional relationship seems much weaker.

3.11. The role of the Project Secretariat

The Project Secretariat is supposed to be the nerve centre, informing all the public and private sector institutions. It has initiated and paved the road for creating opportunities by circulating a letter to a large number of Pakistani institutions. This letter informed about the opportunities under the Institutional Cooperation Framework. In some cases, however, expatriate Pakistanis or participation in an international conference has been the catalyst for the heads of the counterpart institutions of the two countries to explore how they could work to strengthen technical expertise. Some institutions have experienced severe delays and challenges in the communication during the identification process.

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

The PS is also responsible for arranging PSC meetings and submitting narrative/financial reporting vis-à-vis the Norwegian Embassy.

3.11.1. During implementation

The Review Team found that during implementation, the role of the PS is limited only to issuance of notification for submission of annual reports, audit reports and holding of annual review meetings. Even the formats of the annual reports were left to the discretion of the project partners.

3.11.2. Monitoring and evaluation

The Director and the Deputy Director of the PS are 'overworked' in the sense that the responsibility for running the PS is an 'additional duty'. The draft guidelines for the project formulation under the institutional cooperation framework (Phase 1) states that one should: "undertake monitoring visits to review progress of projects and keep in constant contact with the implementing agencies". This was followed up in an unsystematic way, often limiting the contact to telephone calls, receiving annual and audit reports and the annual meetings. As a consequence of this, the Project Secretariat said they remained without sufficient verification that planned activities under a particular cooperation had actually been implemented.

3.11.3. Dissemination of information

Referring back to the draft guidelines for the project formulation under the institutional cooperation program (Phase 1) under the sub-heading of 'Dissemination of Findings/ Results/ Experiences, the following has been clearly spelled out:

The participating institutions would be expected and encouraged to disseminate both internally and externally the knowledge/benefits received by them through the projects, subject to the legal provision in this regard. Creation of websites and holding of workshops/seminars/conferences could be considered for achieving these objectives. Study visits by other individuals/ institutions to the participating institutions could also be organized for disseminating to others the experience that a participating institution gained from the project.

The above clearly establishes the fact that dissemination of information was given due weight. It was left to the discretion of the implementing partners. The Review Team is of the opinion that there is scope for substantial improvements. Through a website or any other social media, one could show the collage of outcomes and significant achievements for a wider public. This could be a permanent source of knowledge repository, including contact details for the project partners. This would have added value to the variety and richness of partners that have been engaged and their respective contributions to the overall goal and purpose of the agreement. In this domain, the PS could have contributed by consistent updates on the PC's official website to the benefit of the implementing project partners of both countries and to prospective partners. This, in turn, would also have given the Norwegian partners a better understanding of the role of the PS and knowledge of other engaged institutions.

3.12. The role of the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Islamabad

The Royal Norwegian Embassy in Islamabad is a key player in the institutional cooperation between Pakistan and Norway, both as agreement partner with the Pakistani Government and the sole funder for the program, as member of the Steering Committee, as well as an important contact point for Norwegian institutions engaged. Due to the prevailing security situation in Pakistan, the Embassy is somehow seen as an important point of reference for Norwegians travelling to Pakistan as part of the institutional collaboration.

In initiating project cooperation, the Norwegian Embassy plays a diversified role. Sometimes the Embassy actively promotes a particular collaboration by facilitating invitations to international conferences in Norway or by facilitating contact with Pakistani institutions for Norwegian partners visiting Pakistan for other reasons. On a few occasions, the Embassy has forwarded requests for identification of relevant institutions in Norway to Norad. Relevant response from Norad to the Embassy has at least at one occasion not been forwarded to the institution concerned.

During implementation, the Royal Norwegian Embassy seems to have chosen different approaches to the different collaborations. Some collaborating institutions experienced to be seen as “a pet” of the Embassy, attending more or less all meetings arranged, while others experienced limited engagement. Several Norwegian institutions indicated that if any problems occurred in the collaboration, they would contact the Norwegian Embassy to get things sorted out. This is contrary to the guidelines given, where the parties are tasked with trying to find a solution themselves before a dispute is referred to the Project Secretariat and the Steering Committee. At the same time, it is easy to understand given that many Norwegian institutions actively engaged in development cooperation in other countries, have experienced the Norwegian Embassies as the one making the final decisions.

Monitoring and evaluation is observed in general as a weak point of the follow up of the institutional collaborations. As indicated above certain collaborations seem to have got more attention from the Embassy than the others, sometimes resulting in a somehow closer follow up.

As member of Steering Committee, the Norwegian Embassy is supposed to play an advisory role in the program, to the P&D Division and Economic Affairs Division. The impression of the review team is that the Embassy at some occasions has chosen a somehow passive role in these meetings. There is no evidence that key concerns highlighted in the Program Agreement between Pakistan and Norway, like gender, environment, corporate social responsibility, risk and sustainability, are being raised. Since potential institutions often will be present in the meetings, it might seem as if disagreements are more difficult to voice. The systematic use of preparatory meetings for the members of the Steering Committee ahead of the meeting with external participation might ease this situation and strengthen the quality of the final decisions made.

3.13. Information about the projects

The general impression is that the information about the different projects initiated under the Institutional Cooperation Framework has been very limited, if any, both to engaged and potential institutions in Pakistan and Norway, and to the public in the two countries. The webpage run by the

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

Planning Commission only informs about the guidelines for the cooperation and give some contact details.

Institutions both on the Pakistani and Norwegian side expressed lack of information about other institutions engaged under the Program, their experiences and achievements. The review team gets a unanimous message from the institutions that better information dissemination about the program and its partners would enhance quality of their own work, be it in the initial phase identifying and formalizing cooperation or during the implementation.

Due to the different ways of initiating collaborations, the different institutions have chosen different sources of information. Some of the Norwegian institutions have contacted the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Oslo, others the Norwegian Embassy in Islamabad. On the Pakistani side, the institutions have contacted the Project Secretariat; also as a consequence of their approach to a large number of Pakistani institutions about the possibility of collaborating with Norwegian institutions.

The diversified ways of contact established have to some extent resulted in a variety of attitudes as to with whom to related when problems arise or issues should be sorted out.

3.14. Differences between Phase 1 and Phase 2

In general the differences between the 1st and the 2nd phase of the program are limited and difficult to relate to one particular phase.

A main difference is that additional institutions have joined or intend to join developing institutional collaborations under the program in phase 2. With more institutions in additional fields, it should be expected that additional questions are raised, related to modalities of the program, information and security.

In the second phase, some projects from the 1st phase have continued, due to unforeseen delays in implementation, and/or continuation of their project into a second phase. While the 1st phase appears to have been concluded with success and completion of projects within time frames and budgets approved, the second phase have inherited those collaborations from the 1st phase that did not manage to follow approved plans. These delays are well accounted for.

3.15. Particular projects:

3.15.1. Education Department, Baluchistan – IDP-Norway

The Review Team was requested to assess to what extent the agreed activities under this project had been implemented. The Project Secretariat had decided to withhold the last payment due to uncertainty about the actual outcomes. According to the Project Secretariat, they had tried to establish contact and inform the concerned stakeholder about the possibility of Review Team's visit without success. The Project Secretariat facilitated the Team with contact details of representatives from the Provincial Department of Education, Quetta and teachers from the four model schools where the project was implemented. Simultaneously, support was solicited from personal contacts to have first-hand direct access to the project stakeholders.

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

It was possible for the Review Team to hold telephonic conversations with the Secretary Higher & Secondary Education, Senior Research Officer of the Curriculum Wing, Chairperson Textbook Board (who previously worked as focal person for the IDP Norway project) and the Assistant District Education Officer (who was kind enough to share telephonic contact details of the teachers). The sense of ownership and value attached to the project was found to be strong. One of the outcomes had been to focus on improving professional competence of the teachers, to improve the retention of girls in primary education and to address the learning needs of children with minor disabilities. Reference was given to the articles that were co-authored for an electronic journal together with a representative of IDP Norway. There was an interest to revive the cooperation with IDP Norway to continue support in the modification of curriculum keeping in perspective the local socio-cultural needs of the province and to support improving the infrastructure (missing facilities) so that the retention of girls can be guaranteed. Responding to a query regarding the nature of relations with the PS, the Secretary Education stated that: *“We would not be informed on time to be part of annual review meetings. Our project activities would be affected due to the imposition of bureaucratic structures that delayed the transfer of funds”*. The teachers, the Review Team managed to reach by phone, unanimously expressed satisfaction of the training. *“It made us understand that the learning needs vary from child to child. Our role as teachers is to motivate each child to learn at its own pace”*.

3.15.2. Institutional cooperation between Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan (SECP) and The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway (Finanstilsynet)

Through the interview with the Director General of SECP in Islamabad, the Review Team was informed that during some months from May 2010, there was a certain exchange of emails between the two institutions. In addition, SECP sent a mail to Norad’s Evaluation Department. What seems to have come out of this exchange of emails was that The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway should look into the request from SECP for institutional cooperation. No final answer seems to have been sent from Norway in 2010.

At the end of 2011, on request from the Norwegian Embassy, Norad contacted The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway to enquire about their interest to engage in such an institutional cooperation. The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway responded by phone that they did not have the capacity to enter into such cooperation and that SECP rather should develop cooperation with the European institution working in this field. This was communicated back to the Embassy. There seems to have been no communication from the Embassy back to SECP.

SECP expressed to the Review Team that their interest to establish an institutional cooperation with The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway remains valid.

Based on this, the Review-team has been in contact with the head of International Department in The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway by phone. They confirm their position in relation to capacity. They also underline that they are a self-financed governmental institution focusing on tasks related to those institutions paying for their services in Norway. They would need a request from the Ministry of Finance, as their superior, to prioritize entering into a dialogue with SECP about a possible

institutional cooperation.

The way forward could be that the Embassy requests MFA in Oslo to request the Ministry of Finance to ask The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway to enter into a dialogue with SECP about a possible cooperation. The alternative is to inform SECP that cooperation with The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway is not possible due to capacity constraints.

3.15.3. Institutional cooperation between National Archives of Pakistan and Norwegian Archives

In the dialogue with the National Archives of Pakistan in Islamabad, it was made clear that they wanted to enter into an institutional cooperation with Norwegian Archives. The contact was initiated through an international conference in Oslo in 2010, where the Embassy in Islamabad mobilized and financed participation of the Director General of the National Archives of Pakistan.

The National Archives of Pakistan developed a project proposal (PC-1) and forwarded this to the Project Secretariat. The proposal was returned with the message that a joint proposal should be developed.

The contact between the two institutions has remained, but the dialogue on the concrete cooperation, including developing a joint project proposal has come to a standstill, partly due to capacity constraints in Norwegian Archives, lack of information about the modalities of the program and the security concerns.

In the dialogue with Norwegian Archives after the field visit, the PC-1 developed by the National Archives of Pakistan was handed over. Norwegian Archives indicated that the matter would be discussed with the top leadership to reach a conclusion if to engage in cooperation with Pakistan and if so, where the responsibility for such cooperation should be in the organization. The Director General of the National Archives of Pakistan has been informed by the Review Team about the outcome of the discussion.

3.15.4. Institutional cooperation between Geological Survey of Pakistan (GSP) and Norwegian Geotechnical Institute (NGI)

In the interview with the Director General of GSP, it was clearly stated that due to security reasons in the areas where field work involving NGI would be relevant, a continuation at an earlier stage was not defensible. In their view the cooperation had not ended. Their hope was in a few months to be able to restart if the situation normalized.

In the interview with NGI in Oslo, the Review Team was presented with a slightly different understanding. NGI had concluded that the cooperation had come to an end since the contract period ended ultimo 2009. The remaining work under the agreement with GSP would take place in Islamabad and was quite important in securing the sustainability of the outcomes. They were ready to resume cooperation.

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

The Review Team proposed NGI to resume contact with GSP to develop a revised activity schedule, timeline and a no-cost extension, since substantial funds are still unused, and forwarded it to the Project Secretariat for approval by the Steering Committee.

4. Assessment

In the assessment, the Review Team has chosen to focus on what we see as major observations relevant for the effect, the cost efficiency and the relevance of the program.

4.1. Establishment of contact

The proactive role of the PS in cultivating, promoting and capturing the attention of public and private sector institutions is praise worthy.

4.2. Information and guidelines

Information to potential partners for cooperation under the program is limited. This does not facilitate the initial identification of a partner and the formulation of a joint project document. The available guidelines is experienced to be very limited, even if they clearly outline flow of funds, program organization, obligations of the parties, reporting and auditing. For some of the institutions, this does not make particular problems, since they are well experienced in international cooperation. Others with less experience would benefit a lot from having some more detailed guidelines and being able to contact other institutions already engaged under the program.

It is striking that according to the institutions interviewed neither the Project Secretariat nor the Norwegian Embassy seem to ever raise key concerns laid down in the program agreement and guidelines about gender, environment, corporate social responsibility, sustainability and risk with the different institutions. However, the Norwegian Embassy has raised these issues in the last Annual Meeting and the last Steering Committee Meeting. These issues have not been focused when Project Documents are approved in the Steering Committee either. Available information and assessments on gender aspects, environment, corporate social responsibility, sustainability or changed risk assessments are not included in reporting.

The Project Secretariat confirms that they have no formal agreement with the different institutions engaged under the program apart from the approved Project Document, the endorsement of the Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding between the collaborating institutions. A formalization of these relations would give an opportunity to enforce existing or revised guidelines and assure the focus on major concerns voiced by the two governments. It would also give each institution a better understanding of the requirements of the program. A particular concern to be voiced is the risk for mismanagement of funds or corrupt practises, where the different institutions in the Project Document should be requested to elaborate on this including mitigating measures. Uncertainties and misunderstandings should as a consequence be reduced.

The Review Team has drawn up an outline for an Agreement or a Memorandum of Understanding between the Program owner and each institution indicating what issues need to be covered (Attachment 6). A proposed outline for the progress report is also included and should be attached to the Agreement or MOU.

4.3. Design

The simplicity and flexibility of the program allows for a great deal of creativity and makes adaption of the design of the collaboration to the realities of the partners and their particular field of work possible. The institutions have used this opportunity with good results. One could argue that more developed guidelines, as the team proposes, will undermine this flexibility. We are of the opinion that the weak guidelines available today undermine the efficiency of the projects. Major concerns important for the two Governments are not addressed. The focus on activities is not supplemented by a focus on qualitative changes, sustainability and long term impact.

4.4. Implementation

The Review Team found that the pace of implementing activities varies. In some cases, the external environment was beyond the control of the institutions and it was not possible to undertake the activities as per the stipulated timelines. In case of Marine Fisheries Department and Geological Survey of Pakistan, it was external factors that contributed to delay in implementation.

In line with the flexibility pervading the program, a flexible approach should be attained with regard to the time frame of each project. Based on well documented revised time schedules, activity plans and budgets, the collaborating institutions should be granted the possibility to a non-cost extension of the project.

Based on project documents and meetings with various institutions, the Project Team conclude that the consistent commitment, creativity and innovative spirit of the key drivers establish the foundation for a possible greater momentum and it also paves the way for further collaboration. One can safely deduce that there has been no standstill but a leap forward even in projects where the external environment affected the pace of activities.

4.5. Reporting

A number of different reports are produced, be it requested progress reports or thematic reports related to specific activities within the collaboration. The general impression of the Review Team is that the reporting tells a lot about the activities implemented, while the outcome or long term impact to a far lesser degree is addressed. Crosscutting issues are seldom covered.

4.6. Financial management

Financial management within the different institutions is based on each institution's established systems. If funds flow to both or just one institution in a project, one or several financial managements systems might be in place. All institutions interviewed seem to have a proper financial management and audit system.

As a consequence of lack of systematic monitoring in the program, there is lack of knowledge if the financial report gives a picture in line with what has been implemented on the ground. Proper financial reports and audits will not reveal any discrepancy. Systematic monitoring by the Project Secretariat or a third party will give necessary additional information. A combination of proper

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

financial reporting from both partner-institutions combined with systematic monitoring is one way to reveal any misuse of funds or corrupt practises.

The involvement of several institutions creates a challenge in relation to timely reporting to the Embassy. Without all institutions adhering strict to the time given for reporting, a joint report for the program might be delayed, and subsequent the annual audit of the program from the Auditor General of Pakistan is delayed. A formal agreement between the Project Secretariat and each institution will, in our view, give a stronger base for enforcing a timely reporting from all institutions, including the annual audit report. Furthermore the agreed time for presenting the audit report for the program should be revisited with the aim of establishing a timing comprehending the financial years of both countries.

4.7. Financial risk

The complexity of the program with a large number of different institutions in Pakistan and Norway engaged easily undermines the overview by the Project Secretariat and the Steering Committee. That most institutions involved are governmental or semi-governmental should cater for the existence of established systems for financial management. All the institutions seem to have proper systems of audit in place, either through the Auditor General of Pakistan or Norway or through external audit.

The fact that two institutions based in two different countries collaborate, should give an additional assurance, as they will somehow control each other. This presupposes that each institution produce their financial reports, covering the whole institution, and where the funds from the Program are made visible.

The size of each project is limited and the planned activities to be implemented are clearly outlined. The impression is that together the cooperating institutions assure that funds are used according to the approved Project Document.

To work in an unsecure environment as Pakistan today in itself creates a situation with no certainty that all investments will pay off and that activities initiated will be properly concluded. There will always be a risk that any cooperation might be terminated without reaching the foreseen results. The Review Team is, however, of the impression that most institutions have managed to cope with the security challenges not harmful to the progress in the collaboration.

Financial risk is very often linked to corruption. As far as the Review Team could observe, there are no indications of corruption in the projects, but this could only be verified through an extensive audit. More systematic financial reporting, covering the whole institution, with the funds from the Program clearly visible will strengthen the control. The Review Team sees no reason at this stage to recommend an extensive audit. The Team would recommend that the financial reporting from the institutions is improved.

Risk assessment, including financial risk and risk mitigation is to a varying degree addressed in the project documents. It is not included in the reporting. A regular update of these assessments would give a better understanding within the institutions of possible risks and how to mitigate them.

4.8. Gender

Gender was supposed to be an important consideration under the institutional cooperation framework. However, the Review Team found from the discussions with the project partners that at the time of the initial presentation to the PSC for possible approval of the project, queries on gender concerns were not raised. Gender is not an agenda point in the Minutes of the Annual Meetings. It was left to the discretion of the project implementers how to incorporate it. As a result, gender was in general not included and reported on.

The understanding of what gender concern implies differed from partner to partner. Some associated it with having 'women' in the work force, while for others it implied measures undertaken for both men and women. A few even stated that their respective field of work is not conducive for women, so how could gender be applied.

The issue of gender should be raised with the prospective institutions and raised when project documents are to be approved and progress reports scrutinized. It will be important to develop a broad focus on gender catering both for gender balance and gender equality.

4.9. Capacities of the parties

One of the core purposes of the institutional cooperation framework between the two countries was to improve the capacity of the Pakistani institutions. The project partners interviewed were confident about the improvement in their personnel's capacity levels. The question is if the capacity has been raised to the optimum level? The Review Team is of the opinion that there is scope for improvement. A number of the proposals put forward in this report will assist in optimize the outcomes.

A critical assessment illustrates that there was no uniformity in the application of tools to improve the capacity issues of the various project partner institutions. The Review Team found the conventional approach to capacity building of 'trainings', short courses, exchange visits and hands on support in the utilization of new skills. This was an interesting feature as it indicates that there was no standard procedure, but was left to the partners. However, a compilation/ documentation of various measures for improving the capacity could have provided a base for future food for thought to develop future collaborations.

It is equally important to note what measures were undertaken by the respective partnering institutions for the acquired competency and capacity to be optimally applied. In some cases, one finds visible signs of application. In other cases, the appliance of the improved capacity and competency has proven difficult. This is with particular reference to the teachers training in inclusive education. The teachers of both Federal Directorate of Education and of the Provincial Department of Education, Quetta pointed to the fact that the current system of education is not conducive to apply what they had learned.

An additional concern voiced by the teachers to be able and motivated to apply the acquired skills was the lack of monetary incentives, absence of performance based criteria for promotion and the emphasis on 'completion of subject courses'. However, these issues will have to be addressed within

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

the Pakistani institutions. The Review Team observed that this was a concern shared by many institutions.

The situation can be improved, as stated by the teachers in Quetta;

“If the management from the curriculum and teachers training wing of the Education Department participated more actively in the training sessions, they would get more motivated to assist making the situation more conducive for the application of skills for promoting inclusive education. If members of the inspection teams, visiting schools on annual basis were part of these trainings, and the monitoring also assessed the application of skills gained from the trainings, additional focus on applying skills would be achieved. Otherwise, mere participation of teachers in such trainings cannot ensure that the intended beneficiaries could be reached on a longer term.”

It is interesting to note that the Federal Directorate of Education has been active in nominating focal persons and conducting cluster meetings initially at fortnightly basis in relation to the project and the selected model schools. This initiative has not been incorporated in the entire system. A Compendium was developed and printed as a tool to create awareness among public and private stakeholders and to sensitize that it is the moral responsibility of all concerned to fulfil their responsibilities towards children to enable them to achieve their academic, social, emotional and physical potential. The circulation and actual impact have been impossible to assess.

4.10. Efficiency of the projects

No doubt the efficiency of the different project varies. Both internal and external factors play a role.

Lack of dissemination of information about other institutions engaged, lack of formalization of the relationship between the project owner and each institution and weak guidelines result in unnecessary delays in initiation and implementation. As a consequence, lack of timely reporting including audits, has been observed as a problem, resulting in delays in auditing of the program. When progress reporting is focused on activities implemented, and to a very limited extent on what has been achieved in qualitative terms, the focus on expected long term impact is absent.

Institutional cooperation in itself is a challenge. Two institutions with different cultures and experiences shall find ways of conducting common activities. Being situated in two different countries as Pakistan and Norway adds to the challenge. The general impression is that the institutions have managed in a very constructive way to establish a common platform for the cooperation and a positive communication. That the cooperation is anchored in an institution and not only with one or two individuals within an institution or company seems important. Likewise lack of regular and frequent meeting venues between the two institutions weakens the continuity and dynamism in the cooperation.

The security situation has been and is a concern for several of the Norwegian and Pakistani institutions. This has resulted in postponement of agreed activities as well as difficulties in mobilizing relevant staff to participate in trainings in Pakistan. To secure a proper handling of this issue by the Norwegian institutions, also towards their own staff, Norwegian authorities represented by the

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

Embassy should give uniform and up to date information on the security situation, and also give proper advice on what preventive measures the institutions should take⁵.

Other external factors have played a role for the efficiency of some of the projects. Lack of mapping of other stakeholders engaged in a sector and clarification of how different activities might interact positively or negatively, easily results in unforeseen obstacles and delays. The introduction of a UN-FAO survey project in the fisheries sector resulted in severe delays for the projects involving Institute of Marine Research.

The efficiency of the projects can be strengthened to some extent. The external factors, like security, will continue to play a major role creating unpredictability. Regular revision of activity plans and time schedules, and a more flexible approach to the expected duration (set to 3 years) of the collaborations should be adhered to.

4.11. Cost effectiveness

Given the variety in design of projects and what their budgets are supposed to cover, an assessment of the cost effectiveness becomes rather difficult. Projects cannot be compared.

No doubt the delays in identifying partners and establishing collaboration, in particular during Phase 2, have had an impact on the cost effectiveness. Better guidelines and information available for the possible partners would ease and speed up the process.

One major difference is to what extent the project has main focus on training activities in Pakistan or on studies and training in Norway. The impression is that the projects in general have come to a constructive balance here, limiting the training in Norway both in frequency and number of people. The experience conveyed to the Review Team indicates that the benefit of training is higher when conducted in the environment where the skills are to be applied. Security concerns could result in a stronger focus on training in Norway, which obviously would reduce the cost effectiveness.

Another important issue is to what extent the actual cost for staff from Norway is included in the budget or not. The guidelines do not exclude this possibility and for most Norwegian institutions coverage of such expenses is a condition for engaging in international collaboration. At the same time, actual cost of staff from the Pakistani institutions is not included in the budgets with the argument that their cost is covered by the institution's budget. In one instance, a small economic benefit has been introduced to retain staff in the project. It seems all institutions are satisfied with this way of covering expenses. The Review Team is of the opinion that no changes are needed, except better information as part of the guidelines.

⁵ The promotion of institutional cooperation between Pakistani and Norwegian institutions, implying Norwegian professionals travelling to Pakistan to conduct training and assessments, could be seen as contradictory to the general travel advice given by Norwegian authorities. To reach the goals of the Institutional Cooperation Framework through a number of different institutional collaborations, a balance has to be reached between proper care for the security and the ability to conduct training in Pakistan. The alternative would be for all collaborations to focus on training and education in Norway.

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

Cost effectiveness should also be seen in relation to sustainability of the project and the outcomes achieved. A collaboration that promotes long term impact will be far more cost effective than a collaboration ending up with a list of implemented activities, but no clear plan for sustaining the outcomes. Here the Review Team sees important scope for improvement, both through securing that all partners are institutions and not acting as one-person or two-person shows, and through the planning process also focusing on long term sustainability.

One component that might sometimes be a major part of the budget is purchase of equipment. Some of the projects have this component. The impression is that the institutions have managed to focus on equipment directly relevant and necessary for the capacity building and training agreed upon and in direct relation to the professionalization of the institution according to international standards. There are guidelines to follow for purchases based on Pakistani rules. It could, however, be questioned if they are good enough. The invitation to tenders should clarify criteria for selection. A common understanding between Norway and Pakistan on corrupt practices, possible to base a legal case on, should be developed. These issues should be included in a formal Agreement between the institutions and the P&D Division.

Weak monitoring of all the projects leaves the project owner and the Steering Committee with limited knowledge of particular challenges influencing the cost effectiveness.

4.12. Qualitative and quantitative outputs

The focus in the different projects has been on quantitative achievements. Given the short time horizon of the project (3 years), a quantitative approach is the most realistic. A stronger focus on qualitative achievements would enforce sustainability and the long term impact, something that ought to be emphasized, even if this will first be achieved after the termination of the collaboration. When institutions apply for support for a new phase in their collaboration, these issues should be addressed.

4.13. The relevance of outputs to reach overall goals

The outputs achieved are relevant in view of the overall goals set for the cooperation. Focusing on the long term impact to be achieved would enhance the sustaining of the immediate outputs and hopefully influence the cooperation partners to pay due attention to these challenges.

4.14. Relevance of the projects for national development plans

The projects scrutinized are all relevant for the national development plans of Pakistan. Again sustainability of the achievements is decisive to manage to reach the long term impact envisaged.

In the context of Pakistan being signatory to a number of international conventions, a number of significant national policies have been designed, planned, announced and are being implemented. A comparative review of these national policies and the analysis of the bi-lateral agreement between the Governments of Norway and Pakistan on institutional cooperation, the objectives of these national policies and developmental needs of the country have been incorporated in the program. The number of institutional cooperation programs and the various partnerships evolved to strive for

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

making Pakistan better equipped for meeting its international commitments and contributing in poverty alleviation, make a significant difference. This, in turn, would enhance the competency and capacity of the personnel, leading to the strengthening of the institutions.

Through the collaboration in multiple sectors, people to people contact has taken place. It has brought the people closer to understand each other's societies as there is a difference in the cultural norms of both the countries. This has also strengthened the cooperation and mutual respect of the Governments of Norway and Pakistan which through these collaborations for developmental purposes has provided a base for common interests.

The Review Team is of the view that the Institutional Cooperation Framework has provided and indirectly supported both the promotion of good governance and eradication of poverty. Moreover, it has developed a foundation for exploring further areas of collaboration. Improved competence and capacity within Pakistani institutions has enabled them to better serve the nation in fields of interest to the general public, something that will strengthen the legitimacy of the government. Institutions with commitment to national and international policies and conventions will promote transparency, accountability and good governance.

However, it has been observed that a conscious attention to incorporate the elements of gender, environment, corporate social responsibility, risk and sustainability as well as cross-sectorial linkages and sharing have been absent. A stronger focus could be attained through better guidelines, systematic monitoring and the formulation of an exit strategy at the initiation of projects.

4.15. The role of the Project Secretariat

The national development frameworks are laid out as a foundation for the program. In the dialogue related to the initiation of collaboration and in relation to progress reporting, relevant questions related to these frameworks are not raised. An example is the lack of attention to the gender aspects highlighted both in the national frameworks and in the agreement on the program.

The Project Secretariat is the core of the program, supposed to keep track of all the collaborations from their initial phase to termination. It should be the main body to ascertain the adherence to basic concerns outlined by the two governments as well as important goals set in the national development frameworks. A continuous monitoring of the projects should be conducted. Due to very limited resources, combined with an ambition to keep the administrative cost at a minimum, the follow up of these tasks remain limited compared to the observed needs. A strengthening of the Project Secretariat, including the possibility to hire a third party for some of the monitoring, would strengthen the implementation of the program, ease the situation for the different cooperating institutions and ascertain stronger focus on long term impact and sustainability.

4.16. The role of the Royal Norwegian Embassy

The Embassy has been an active promoter of the program and has facilitated the identification of and the establishment of contact between numbers of institutions. In the Steering Committee, the Embassy has played a varying role, sometimes rather passive. There seems to have been a tendency

to pay particular interest to some of the projects, while others have been less focused. Particular concerns like gender, environment, cooperate social responsibility and sustainability have not been raised with the different institutions.

The Embassy could play a more active role in the Steering Committee, ensuring the quality of the institutions involved and the quality of the project document. In addition, the Embassy has an important role, in dialogue with MFA and Norad in Oslo, to assist when needed in identifying relevant institutions. The Embassy should also stay in contact with all engaged Norwegian institutions to update them on the security situation as well as to be updated on the progress of the different collaborations.

4.17. The Project Steering Committee

The Project Steering Committee is a vital body for approval of projects and the follow up of implementation and results. It is the body where the authorities of Pakistan and Norway together coordinate the program and agree on future developments. The Review Team is of the opinion that the Steering Committee could improve the quality of its work through different measures. A preparatory meeting between the Embassy, the P&D Division (Program Secretariat) and Economic Affairs Division before the meeting where different institutions are presenting their projects would allow for a more open discussion on any reservations that might be. By instructing the Project Secretariat to more systematically monitor the collaborations, the Steering Committee would get a better base for assessing the progress and the output and impact of the projects and the program.

4.18. The political will within the GoP to sustain the initiative

One main goal with the program is to strengthen capacity and competence of different Pakistani institutions, to bring them up to an internationally approved standard. For several of the institutions, this implies over time additional costs for upgrading of equipment and measures to retain staff trained through the institutional collaboration. Some of the institutions obviously had a conscious approach to these challenges and continuously included the new activities and additional costs in their regular budgets.

An improvement in capacity and competency level does neither in itself lead to institutional strengthening nor does it guarantee that Pakistan will be able to meet its international obligations and commitments and contribute in poverty alleviation. To accomplish these goals, the GoP and its concerned institutions have to develop systems to retain trained personnel and competence. No doubt trained personnel in several of these sectors will be able to get lucrative offers from the private sector. A number of trained personnel from the PNAC had left the institution after a short passage of time upon receiving the training under the institutional cooperation program.

This will remain a challenge for the Government of Pakistan, not the least in view of the negative economic development in the country. The program is viewed as very important by Pakistan. At the same time there are at present no clear policy developed catering for the additional expenses that will occur if the long term impact of the collaborations shall be maintained. A dialogue between the

different Pakistani institutions, their superior Ministry, the P&D Division and the Ministry of Finance could be initiated to cater for the financial sustainability of the achievements of the collaborations.

4.19. Lessons to be learned

The individual institution's specific goal and purpose focus on capacity and competency for institutional strengthening. An additional focus on the overarching goals set for the program, with poverty alleviation and good governance, and in addition gender, environment and corporate social responsibility could lead to a better understanding of the relationship between the institution-based purposes and the national goals, and represent an important motivation to focus properly on how to sustain and further develop the achievements.

Information dissemination through showcasing of the best practices and networking among the project partners within a sector and between sectors can bring the outcomes of the institutional agreements as a source of knowledge repository and a source of inspiration.

The beauty lies in the provision of window of opportunity for a multi-sectorial project partnerships and the space for innovation and improvement in the project activities during implementation. The simplicity and creativity and the freedom for the aspiring institutions to make the optimum utilization for bringing home enhanced capacity and competency for the personnel for strengthening of the institution under the institutional cooperation program between Norway and Pakistan. The importance for mutual benefits for all institutions involved should be underlined as crucial.

The simplicity of the program modalities and the room for creativity give the institutions ample chance to make optimal utilization of capacity and competence building. A stronger focus on the long term impact, a more systematic monitoring and an increased dissemination of information about the different collaborations and their achievements, might strengthen each institution's ambition to make optimal benefits from the program.

4.20. Moving from Phase 1 to Phase 2 and a possible Phase 3

The program is at present in its phase 2, with a number of institutional collaborations under phase 1 not finalized yet. The Review Team will propose that remaining funds and not finalized projects under phase 1 are transferred to phase 2. This will make it possible for the Embassy to complete phase 1.

With the remaining funds under phase 2 and the substantial number of collaborations on-going, it is proposed that the two Governments agree on a non-cost extension of phase 2, at least for one year.

The indications given from the two Governments are that a continuation of the program into a third phase is the preferred option. The Review Team agrees to this given that a number of measures discussed in this report is introduced.

It should be expected that as this program evolves, more and more institutions joining will have limited experiences in international cooperation. This should not be seen as an unwanted development as long as the main criteria of the program are followed. But it will demand a closer

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

follow up, not the least in the initial phase to secure that the modalities and the expectations are understood and duly followed up. The proposed formalisation of the relationship between the Project Secretariat and each institution, in addition to the approved Project Document and the Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding between the institutions, will support new institutions in an appropriate follow up of their obligations. A more robust set of guidelines and rules for follow up are needed for the future.

It should not be forgotten that the continuous deteriorating security situation in Pakistan also adds to the complexity of the program. Difficulties in identifying relevant professionals from Norwegian institutions willing to go to Pakistan are already a fact that several institutions are striving with.

These concerns should be taken into consideration when discussing the possibility of extending the program into a third Phase.

4.21. Particular projects:

The telephonic interviews with personnel of the Department of Education, Baluchistan and teachers of three schools (out of the 4 model schools) testified that the representatives of the IDP Norway have conducted trainings as planned for the teachers. They have also been visiting the 4 Model schools to assess the prevailing conditions in relation to inclusive education. The interest and commitment of the concerned stakeholders was high and they were looking forward for a continued support. The current situation of mistrust between the PS and the Provincial Department of Education could have been avoided, had there been an in-built monitoring visit by the PS when the trainings were conducted. As one of the recipients rightly pointed out:

"Seeing is believing".

Frequent transfer of Education Department officials is said to have resulted in lack of verification. The teachers of the four model schools, for which the trainings were intended and conducted, stated:

"Our philosophy and attitude towards children with disabilities changed. We were able to convince parents of children with minor disabilities that they can also learn if given proper guidance and attention. Ideas were given how to sensitize and seek cooperation of normal children for the children with minor disabilities to create an enabling environment for learning."

Their experienced outcomes from the actual training are a clear indication that the intended project activities have been implemented.

Regarding the envisaged cooperation between the National Archives of Pakistan and Norwegian Archives, and the resumption of the stalled cooperation between the Geological Survey of Pakistan and Norwegian Geotechnical Institute, the institutions will have to follow up. Regarding the possibility of collaboration between the Securities & Exchange Commission of Pakistan and The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway, the Embassy will have to clarify what measures one is ready to take to facilitate this.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

- The Review Team concludes that the Institutional Cooperation Framework between Pakistan and Norway is an innovative and flexible program, addressing the purpose agreed by the two Governments. The program gives value for money. The observed outputs in general support the overall goal of the program and are in accordance with the purpose outlined in the different project documents. Certain deviations have been observed, but these have been agreed between the institutions and are well argued for.
- The program is in line with the overarching development plans of Pakistan and the political guidelines given for Norway's development cooperation vis-à-vis Pakistan. Particular concerns included in the agreement between Pakistan and Norway, like gender, risk management and sustainability are neither addressed in the dialogue with the institutions nor requested in the reporting. Most of the institutions involved under the program have the necessary professional prerequisites, experience and expertise. The Review Team is of the impression that additional scrutiny should be introduced to ascertain that the institutions under the program act as institutions and not individually based entities. To improve the sustainability, an assessment of the mutual benefits of both the Pakistani and the Norwegian institution seems to be important, since this is a precondition for a possible continuation of the collaboration, either in a next phase under the program or outside the program.
- The outputs produced seem in general to be of high quality and great need within the different fields of collaboration. An important condition is that the sustainability of the different achievements is secured within each institution. Mechanisms to retain trained staff in the institutions should be addressed. A system of compulsory stay in the same organisation for a certain number of years could be introduced, as already done by one of the institutions. A dialogue with the relevant ministries within GoP could be initiated with this purpose in mind.
- The Review reveals ample room for improvements to strengthen the efficacy and efficiency of the program. Both through formalizing the relations to the different institutions, developing more detailed guidelines for reporting, more systematic monitoring and improved information sharing, a number of weaknesses observed can be eliminated or reduced. A clarification of roles of the different partners to the Steering Committee should be addressed.
- Due to the fact that Pakistan and Norway follow diverging financial years, and auditing for the whole program is supposed to be done by the Auditor General of Pakistan, the deadlines for financial reporting and audits from the Pakistani and Norwegian institutions, and the deadline for financial reporting from the Project Secretariat should be revisited. The Review Team is of the opinion that changing the timing of the audit report for the program till end of 1st quarter in the Norwegian financial year will ease the process of having the necessary

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

documents from the different institutions available in time. These requirements should be included in the agreements signed with the different institutions. This will strengthen the financial management of the program.

- The Review Team has not scrutinized accounts and procurements related to the different collaborations. The impression is though that the institutions in general have in place proper systems for financial management, including procurement procedures. Requesting the financial reports for the whole institution with the funds from the Program clearly visible would strengthen the possibility of control. Given the Norwegian zero tolerance for corruption policy, it is worth noting that the understanding of this position obviously will differ between a Pakistani and a Norwegian court. Since the Agreement bases itself on Pakistani procurement rules, an adherence to the Norwegian policy cannot be guaranteed.
- Without undermining the flexibility and room for innovation, the Review Team concludes that the P&D Division as the project owner should introduce a formal agreement with each of the institutions engaged under the program, outlining important requirements related to planning, implementation and reporting. An outline for such an agreement can be found in attachment no. 6. An outline of the progress report should be attached as optional.
- The outputs achieved are relevant for the overall goals of the program as well as Pakistan's development plans. The Review Team did not possess qualification within the wider field of collaboration to assess the quality of the outcomes produced. The Team is, however, of the opinion that the outcomes should be made publicly known. Several of the reports made on, for example earthquake hazard, are available on the internet. The Project Secretariat should develop a particular web page for the program, both to inform about the program modalities and relevant guidelines, but also to inform about institutions already engaged under the program, the purpose of the different collaborations and relevant outcomes and impact. The overview presented in attachment 5 could serve as an example.
- The Review Team is of the opinion that it is very important to uphold the flexibility and room for innovation observed in the program. However, the Steering Committee and the Project Secretariat should clarify that on what conditions deviation from the set timeframe of 3 years can be accepted, given available funds within the agreed budget. At present this is relevant for the collaboration between the Marine Fisheries Department and Institute of Marine Research, and between Geological Survey of Pakistan (GSP) and the Norwegian Geotechnical Institute (NGI).
- The capacity of the Project Secretariat needs to be strengthened, both to strengthen the follow up and monitoring of the different collaborations, but also to manage a more proactive information strategy. The indication that both Pakistan and Norway would like to extend the program to a third phase and possibly increase the total budget frame will also increase the pressure on the Project Secretariat.

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

- Systematic monitoring of all the collaborations under the program should be conducted. When needed, external resources should be hired. Reports should be presented to the Steering Committee and to the institutions concerned. If needed, the percentage allocated for administrative purposes should be adjusted.
- The Review Team is of the view that the role of the External Publicity Wing of the Ministry of Information & Broadcasting can help the Project Secretariat to formulate an information strategy. Bringing on board the said Ministry could also open up room for developing and producing 'radio talk shows, documentaries through the support of corporate arms of Pakistan Broadcasting Corporation and Pakistan State Television Corporation. This will further expand the scope of projection of the bilateral agreement between the Governments of Norway and Pakistan for institutional cooperation.
- The role of the Norwegian Embassy, the P&D Division and the Economic Affairs Division, all members of the Steering Committee, should be further be clarified. A preparatory meeting of these stakeholders ahead of Project Steering Committee meetings with different institutions present would allow for a more open and constructive discussion on the project documents or reports put forward for approval. The responsibility for the follow up of the collaborations should remain with the Project Secretariat, with the Steering Committee, only involved in monitoring when agreed upon.
- Regarding the collaboration between the Education Department, Baluchistan and IDP-Norway, the Review Team is of the opinion that sufficient evidence has been collected through contact with involved stakeholders in the provincial administration and with some of the engaged schools to conclude that agreed activities have been implemented. Remaining funds should, therefore, be released.
- Regarding the envisaged collaboration between the Securities & Exchange Commission of Pakistan and The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway (Finanstilsynet), the Norwegian Embassy should clarify a convenient follow-up.
- The Review Team recommends the Review Report to be shared with all the involved and potentially involved institutions as part of an increased focus on information sharing within the program.
- The Review Team recommends that an approval of a Phase 3 under the institutional cooperation framework should be conditioned on measures outlined in this report being implemented. Furthermore there is a need to bring on board the various provincial departments. As a consequence of the 18th Constitutional Amendment, a number of sectors are delegated to the provinces. The role of the provincial governments cannot be ignored.

Attachment 1: Terms of Reference

Background

Norway and Pakistan institutional cooperation started in April 2005 with a view to facilitate collaboration between matching public and private sector institutions of the two countries. The Pak-Norway Institutional Cooperation Framework (“the framework”), aimed at enhancing the technical competence of Pakistani institutions by implementing jointly developed projects with their respective Norwegian partner institutions. The Planning & Development Division is the formal project partner, and the project operates within the standard government structures, i.e., a project secretariat, housed in Public Investment Programming (PIP) section of the P&D Division and managed by the P&D staff. The head of PIP section also acts as the Project Director. The overall program administration is the responsibility of a Programme Steering Committee (PSC), which is headed by the Secretary, P&D Division, with Norwegian Embassy and Economic Affairs Division as its members. The Secretariat is responsible for managing day to day project management. The Secretariat consists of about four staff, and it is physically housed in the P&D Division.

Total budget of the project for a 3-year period, 2005 – 2008, was NOK 15 million. The project was scheduled for completion in 2008, but was extended to December 2009 for a variety of reasons.

The Framework provided financial support to implement a wide range of cooperation/ collaboration projects between Norwegian and Pakistani institutions. The projects represent a wide array of themes, including education, quality standards, seismic studies and research on earthquake hazards in Pakistan. The Framework is open to joint proposals focusing on any area with strong justification that the proposed cooperation would contribute to strengthening Pakistani partner institution perform up to international standards through transfer of knowledge and technology.

The projects being implemented under the Framework are spread across Pakistan, including Islamabad, Peshawar, Karachi and Quetta.

The Framework, though designed and implemented as a stand-alone project, is reflected in the GOP's Public Sector Development Programme (PSDP). Its outputs contribute to the overall agenda of promoting quality standards in various fields that are important for enhancing value of Pakistani products and services in the world market.

In view of the importance attached to this Framework from both sides, the Embassy agreed to continue support to the second phase, which started from 1 January 2010 and will go on up to 31.12.2012. Only three new projects have so far been approved under the new phase.

Goal Hierarchy and Target Groups

The **goal** of the Program is to make Pakistan better equipped for meeting its international commitments and contributing in poverty alleviation, and to strengthen relations between Pakistan and Norway.

The **purpose** of the Program is to improve capacity, competence, and competitiveness in relevant Pakistani and Norwegian institutions.

It is envisaged that the collaboration will have an emphasis on mutual co-operation and institutional strengthening, i.e. transfer of know-how and competence, rather than infrastructure support. A project will not be limited to, but could typically consist of the following elements:

- Exchange of technical, managerial and intellectual know-how;
- Joint Research and Training Programs;
- Fellowships (short/long-term);
- Exchange visits of relevant staff members;
- Joint Workshops/ Seminars/ Study Visits;
- Acquiring Relevant Equipment.

Purpose of Review

The overall purpose of the review is related to closing phase-1 of the Framework and conducting MTR of the phase-2, capturing lessons learnt and use them for devising an improved implementation mechanism of the ongoing phase-2 of the project.

Sub-purpose of the review include assessments of financial and operational efficacy of the Project Secretariat as well as individual projects completed under phase-1, capture major achievements, area for improvement, lessons learnt besides all relevant and pertinent aspects of the project, both its design and implementation, with emphasis on the results and achievements of the project, with a view:

- ✓ To provide all parties to the project with an understanding of the project's achievements, successes and failures.
- ✓ To gain an understanding as to whether the project was optimally implemented with regards to effective use of available resources.
- ✓ To assess the project's contribution towards creating and maintaining gender balance;
- ✓ To assess the Project Secretariat's capacity, its monitoring mechanism and orientation on applying a result-based approach as well as ability to documenting results;

Scope of Work

Efficiency and effectiveness:

The review will:

- ✓ Assess the project design as outlined in original documents and in view of the experience with implementation to consider whether the design from the outset could have offered more in terms of efficiency and effectiveness for project.
- ✓ Assess the implementation as experienced in practical terms to see if the methods applied worked as intended. Special emphasis will be given to considering whether the project outputs presented in the original project proposal were successfully and effectively produced.
- ✓ Examine whether all parties involved in project implementation had the necessary professional prerequisites, experience, expertise and attitudes to produce planned results in an effective and timely manner.
- ✓ Assess the efficiency of the project by comparing to the allocated resources with results obtained. The review should present a measured opinion on whether the results obtained justified the costs incurred.
- ✓ Examine delivery of project outputs in terms of quality and quantity. The review will give a considered opinion of the total scope of work was as could be expected in view of the inputs and whether the project has produce high quality results and outputs.

The relevance of the project:

The review will:

- ✓ Consider the project's intended outputs and form an opinion on whether these have practical relevance to the overall goals as set out in the project document. If so, specify what this relevance is and, if so, how this can be presented to a larger audience.
- ✓ Consider what lessons could be drawn from the experience with this project.
- ✓ Evaluate the strategies used in this project in light of national development policies to document whether the project is in support of these. For example, National Economic Growth Framework and others, if any.
- ✓ Assess whether the Secretariat has a clear understanding as to how to harmonize support with the national development framework.

Sustainability:

The review will:

- ✓ Assess political will on part of GOP to provide human and financial resources to sustain such an initiative (ref. FoDP Institutional Capacity Building Initiative).

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

Other related concerns:

The review will:

- ✓ Give a measured opinion on whether the project(s) has dealt effectively with all matters related to implementation as well as financial risk management.
- ✓ Consider whether all matters related to financial management, including procurement procedures for goods and services, have been appropriately handled in light of the embassy's zero tolerance to corruption policy.
- ✓ View the project through a gender lens and consider whether all aspects of Norwegian policy relating to gender issues in development projects have been adequately handled in various sub-projects.
- ✓ Consider all aspects related to the project's cost effectiveness and evaluate whether alternative implementing methods could have been applied to increase the cost effectiveness.
- ✓ Give an opinion on possible strengths and weaknesses in Project Secretariat's management routines and administrative procedures for implementing the project effectively.
- ✓ Consider whether the Secretariat has networked and consulted sufficiently with other relevant agencies in the process of project formulation and implementation.
- ✓ Comment on the efficacy of Project Secretariat as well as Project Steering Committee, its role and mandate.

Implementation, Methodology and Practical Considerations

Composition of the Review Team: The team shall consist of two consultants: one international consultant, to be identified and hired by Norad Oslo; and one national consultant, to be identified and hired by the Embassy. Both consultants should have diverse experience in conducting reviews/evaluations. Experience in evaluating similar projects would be an added advantage. The team members will arrange for division of labor between themselves, though the international consultant will be the lead with responsibility for compiling input from the national consultant and submitting the draft and final reports to the Embassy. The team shall work in close cooperation with the Embassy and the Project Secretariat, P&D Division, which will assist with working out a programme for the consulting team, including field visits.

The consultants should hold the following qualifications:

- ✓ Experience in reviewing similar projects, risk analysis and impact assessment.
- ✓ Good knowledge of Norwegian development cooperation policy and instruments.
- ✓ Background knowledge and expertise regarding Pakistan socio political and economic development context.

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

- ✓ The team leader should have ample experience in team leadership.
- ✓ Ability to work independently and in adverse conditions.

The embassy appreciates that some qualified candidates may be lacking in one or two of the above areas and still be able to carry out the assignment well.

Terms and Conditions: Norad will settle all aspects relating to terms and conditions for the international consultant. The Embassy will offer a daily consultant fee commensurate with the background of the national consultant. There will be no per diem payments, but the national consultant will have all expenses related to travel and incidentals reimbursed upon presentation of bills. Travel arrangements will be made in an economical fashion.

Working Conditions: The team will both work in Islamabad and travel to the project areas. The team will need to arrange for independent office facilities and work independently on its own premises. The team will need to make all arrangements for travel, meetings and other practical matters related to logistics and working contacts on their own and with minimal external assistance. The team members will be using their own personal computers and other relevant equipment for the assignment.

On the basis of mutually agreed division of labour, the international consultant is also expected to do part of the work in Norway vis-à-vis Norwegian partner institutions.

The Embassy, in collaboration with the Project Secretariat, will provide relevant documentation for desk review, e.g. project agreement, progress reports, financial statements, etc. The Embassy may draw upon the Project Secretariat for provision of more documents, if need be, besides providing verbal information to the Team.

Deliverables: The team will present the Embassy with an inception report three days into the consultancy. This report will give (1) an outline of the information the Embassy can expect to receive in the final report, (2) a schedule for the remainder of the consultancy, and (3) a list of contacts that will be consulted during the assignment. The report will be presented in a meeting with the project secretariat and other relevant stakeholders. The final review report will contain a two page executive summary and a main report of about 25 pages. Additional information may be presented in annexes.

Main findings of the final report will be presented to Project Secretariat in P&D Division, Economic Affairs Division and the Embassy, who will read the report and discuss its findings with the team in a debriefing session. The team will thereafter provide 5 copies of the final review complete with front and back cover to give the report an appealing appearance. The team should also arrange for the Embassy to receive a soft copy of the report.

Duration of Assignment: Fifteen (15) working days including field trips and report writing from the start date of assignment. The team leader will then have two additional working days to finalize the report in light of possible comments to the draft report from the Embassy and Project Secretariat in P&D Division.

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

2 days for desk review, preparation

7 days in the field and meetings,

1 day for debriefing

5 days for report writing, seeking comments and report finalization

Proposed Stakeholders to Meet / Visit:

Islamabad

- ✓ Royal Norwegian Embassy
- ✓ Economic Affairs Division
- ✓ Federal Directorate of Education; Islamabad
- ✓ Geological Survey of Pakistan
- ✓ Pakistan Metrological Department
- ✓ Pakistan National Accreditation Council
- ✓ Auditor General of Pakistan

Peshawar

- ✓ IER, University of Peshawar

Karachi

- ✓ Institute for Educational Development, Aga Khan University
- ✓ Pakistan Marine Fisheries Department

Norway (*as agreed between the team*)

- ✓ Norad
- ✓ UD
- ✓ NA
- ✓ NORSAR

Islamabad, 21 September 2011

Drafted by:

Abdul Aziz Usmani

Programme Officer

Finalized and approved by:

Lise Albrechtsen

Second Secretary

Attachment 2: Interview Guide

END OF PROJECT REVIEW
PAK 3004 PAK-NORWAY INSTITUTIONAL
COOPERATION FRAMEWORK (“THE FRAMEWORK”), PHASE-1
AND MID-TERM REVIEW OF PHASE-2

Background

Norway and Pakistan institutional cooperation started in April 2005 with a view to facilitate collaboration between matching public and private sector institutions of the two countries. The Pak-Norway Institutional Cooperation Framework (“the framework”), aimed at enhancing the technical competence of Pakistani institutions by implementing jointly developed projects with their respective Norwegian partner institutions. The Planning & Development Division is the formal project partner, and the project operates within the standard government structures, i.e., a project secretariat, housed in Public Investment Programming (PIP) section of the P&D Division and managed by the P&D staff. The head of PIP section also acts as the Project Director. The overall program administration is the responsibility of a Program Steering Committee (PSC), which is headed by the Secretary, P&D Division, with Norwegian Embassy and Economic Affairs Division as its members. The Secretariat is responsible for managing day to day project management.

The goal of the Program is to make Pakistan better equipped for meeting its international commitments and contributing in poverty alleviation, and to strengthen relations between Pakistan and Norway.

The purpose of the Program is to improve capacity, competence, and competitiveness in relevant Pakistani and Norwegian institutions.

It is envisaged that the collaboration will have an emphasis on mutual co-operation and institutional strengthening, i.e. transfer of know-how and competence, rather than infrastructure support.

Its outputs should contribute to the overall agenda of promoting quality standards in various fields that are important for enhancing value of Pakistani products and services in the world market.

The purpose of the review:

The overall purpose of the review:

- Capturing lessons learnt
- Devising an improved implementation mechanism of the ongoing phase-2 of the project

Sub-purpose of the review:

- Assessments of financial and operational efficacy of the Project Secretariat as well as individual projects completed under phase-1

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

- Capture major achievements
- Area for improvement
- Lessons learnt
- All relevant and pertinent aspects of the project, both its design and implementation, with emphasis on the results and achievements of the project

The review should:

- provide all parties to the project with an understanding of the project's achievements, successes and failures.
- gain an understanding as to whether the project was optimally implemented with regards to effective use of available resources.
- assess the project's contribution towards creating and maintaining gender balance;
- assess the Project Secretariat's capacity, its monitoring mechanism and orientation on applying a result-based approach as well as ability to documenting results;

Themes to be discussed:

Efficiency and effectiveness:

- Consider whether the design from the outset could have offered more in terms of efficiency and effectiveness for project
- Considering whether the project outputs presented in the original project proposal were successfully and effectively produced
- Whether all parties involved in project implementation had the necessary professional prerequisites, experience, expertise and attitudes to produce planned results in an effective and timely manner
- Present a measured opinion on whether the results obtained justified the costs incurred
- Give a considered opinion of the total scope of work was as could be expected in view of the inputs and whether the project has produce high quality results and outputs.

The relevance of the project:

- Whether the project's intended outputs have practical relevance to the overall goals as set out in the project document
- What lessons could be drawn?
- Whether the project strategy is in support of national development policies
- Whether the Secretariat has a clear understanding as to how to harmonize support with the national development framework

Sustainability:

- Political will on part of GOP to provide human and financial resources to sustain such an initiative

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

Other related concerns:

- Whether the project(s) has dealt effectively with all matters related to implementation as well as financial risk management
- Whether all matters related to financial management, including procurement procedures for goods and services, have been appropriately handled
- Whether all aspects of Norwegian policy relating to gender issues in development projects have been adequately handled in various sub-projects
- Whether alternative implementing methods could have been applied to increase the cost effectiveness
- Strengths and weaknesses in Project Secretariat's management routines and administrative procedures for implementing the project effectively
- Whether the Secretariat has networked and consulted sufficiently with other relevant agencies in the process of project formulation and implementation
- The efficacy of Project Secretariat as well as Project Steering Committee, its role and mandate

STRUCTURING THE INTERVIEWS

The questionnaire is developed with the cooperation partners in mind. Several of the questions will though be relevant also for the Project Secretariat and for the Norwegian Embassy. These are marked with a *.

Background/initiation of cooperation

- How and from where did the idea to search for an institutional cooperation with a Norwegian institution come up?*
- What role did the project secretariat play at this stage?*
- What were your expectations regarding facilitation of the initial phase and how were they followed up?*
- How was the dialogue with the potential Norwegian partner? Were there particular challenges raised from your side or the Norwegian side at this stage in relation to a possible cooperation, and if so, which ones?*
- How do you see the dialogue with the Norwegian partner on the purpose of a possible cooperation, how a cooperation should be organized and what should come out from the cooperation for your benefit and the benefit of the Norwegian partner?
- What role did the Norwegian embassy play at this state? If any, how did you find their input to the process?*
- To what extent were Norwegian policies on gender communicated to the partners in the initial phase?
- To what extent and how was the issue of gender balance and gender equality discussed and included in the preparation of the project cooperation? What options do you see to strengthen gender focus in the cooperation, both in relation to the immediate outcomes, but also in relation to the long term impact?

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

- What kind of risk analysis was conducted in the preparatory phase of the cooperation? To what extent was possible negative impact of the project addressed? What mitigating measures were identified?
- How was financial risk management addressed in the preparatory phase? What mitigation measures were identified?
- What role did the Project Secretariat play in the preparatory phase promoting the importance of a strengthened gender balance as one outcome, to secure a proper risk analysis and proper addressing financial risk management?*
- Did you encounter any particular challenges/problems in the initial phase worth mentioning? If so, please elaborate.*
- What lessons would you communicate from the initial phase to help developing the program in the future?*

Setting purposes and goals for the cooperation and expected outcomes and results

- How were the purposes and goals for an eventual cooperation set? How were outcomes and expected results developed?*
- What was supposed to be important quality improvements related to your institution's activities?
- How was the gender balance supposed to be improved through the project cooperation?
- How was the gender equality supposed to be strengthened as a long term impact through the project cooperation?
- How did you in this process address the risk analysis conducted?
- How did you work on the financial risk management?
- Who participated in this process?*
- What was the role of the Project Secretariat in setting of purposes and goals?*
- How did you in this process relate to the development plans of Pakistan?*
- How did you relate to the development plans of your institution (Pakistani as well as Norwegian)?

Implementation of the cooperation (when relevant)

- How do you see your role in the implementation of the cooperation?*
- How do you see the role of the partner in the implementation?*
- What has been the role of the Project Secretariat?*
- What has been the role of the Norwegian Embassy?*
- How would you characterize the implementation of the cooperation?*
- What would you say has been the success with the implementation?*
- What could be improved with the implementation?*
- How did the implementation proceed in view of the time frame and budget allocation agreed upon?
- How did the implementation proceed in view of the risk analysis and mitigation measures identified?

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

- How did the implementation proceed in relation to the goals set regarding gender balance and gender equality?
- How would you characterize the financial management of the project?
- Have you identified weaknesses in your risk analysis and mitigation measures?*
- Have you identified weaknesses in your financial management, and what measures have been taken to correct these weaknesses?
- What do you see as your lessons learned from the implementation, organizational, in relation to time and budget?*
- What implications have these lessons learned had on the continued cooperation?*
- What implications have these lessons learned had on the overall work of the institution or the Project Secretariat?*
- What is your assessment of financial and operational efficacy of the Project Secretariat?*
- What is your assessment of financial and operational efficacy of the management of the project cooperation you have been engaged in?

Reporting

- What is your general experience regarding reporting requirements set in the Agreement and how this is followed up?
- To what extent are progress reports, financial reports and auditing statements produced in time?
- To what extent is gender disaggregated data used in the reporting?
- Do you see the reports as useful for the continued implementation of the project? To what extent have reports initiated changes in the project outline or implementation?

Immediate outcomes and long term results of the cooperation

- What do you view as the main success criteria for the project?
- What was you expected outcomes from the cooperation?*
- To what extent did the cooperation live up to your expectations?*
- Elaborate on quality achievements resulting from the cooperation, in particular the relevance of the outcomes in view of the overall goals of the cooperation.
- Elaborate on how gender balance has been strengthened.
- Elaborate on how the project has supported a long term strengthening of gender equality?
- What are the major strengths related to outcomes?*
- What are the major weaknesses related to outcomes?*
- How did the risks identified have implications for the achieved outcomes?
- What have been your expected long term results of the cooperation?*
- To what extent can you say that these long term results have been achieved?*
- What are in your view the major reasons for achieving these long term results?*
- What are in your view the major reasons for not achieving these long term results?*
- What could be done differently to strengthen the achievement of the long term results?*

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

- Based on the experiences so far, do you see any need for reformulating the immediate outcomes and/or long term results, and if so, how?
- Based on the experiences so far, do you see any need for adjustment of time frame and/or budget allocation? If so, why?

Sustainability of the outcomes and results of the cooperation

- How would you characterize the sustainability of the outcomes and the results?
- What would you say are the key issues to secure and strengthen sustainability?
- Relate the issue of sustainability to each of the set quality achievements. What is needed to secure the achievements in quality of your work and/or products in a one year and five year perspective?
- How would you secure sustainability of achievements related to gender balance and gender equality?
- What are in your view factors undermining the sustainability?
- What are in your view factors undermining the sustainability of strengthened gender balance and gender equality?
- What changes do you see needed (if any) to secure and strengthen sustainability?
- What has your institution done to secure and strengthen sustainability?
- What has your partner done to secure and strengthen sustainability?
- What have you raised with the Project Secretariat to secure and strengthen sustainability?
- What have you raised with your superiors (outside the institution) to secure and strengthen sustainability?

The role of the Project Secretariat:*

- According to your experiences, how would you characterize the capacity of the Project Secretariat? Exemplify.
- What is your assessment of the monitoring mechanisms applied by the Project Secretariat? Exemplify.
- How do the monitoring mechanisms applied by the Project Secretariat support a result-based approach?
- How do the monitoring mechanisms applied by the Project Secretariat document actual outcomes of the project cooperation?
- How do the monitoring mechanisms applied by the Project Secretariat address the issue of financial management of the project?
- How do the monitoring mechanisms applied by the Project Secretariat address the issue of strengthening gender balance and gender equality?
- How do the monitoring mechanisms applied by the Project Secretariat address the issue of risk analysis and risk management in the project?
- What advice would you convey to the Project Secretariat to improve their monitoring role and mechanisms?

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

- What is your experience regarding the Secretariat's networking and consultations with other relevant agencies in the process of project formulation and implementation? How would you characterize the efficacy of Project Secretariat as well as Project Steering Committee, its role and mandate?

Attachment 3: Persons Interviewed

In Norway:

University of Life Sciences (UMB), Ås:

Ms Ingrid Nyborg, Professor

Norwegian Accreditation, Kjeller:

Technical Director Ms Anne Grænsen

Norwegian Archives, Oslo:

Mr Tor Breivik, Director

Ms Anne Mette Dørum, Director

Norwegian Mapping Authority, Oslo:

Mr Helge Onsrud, Director

Ms Ewa Schage, Senior Engineer

IDP-Norway, Oslo:

Mr Terje Magnussønn Watterdal, Senior Partner

Institute of Marine Research, Bergen:

Mr Erling Bakken, first Project Leader (Rtd)

Mr Espen Johnsen, former Project Leader

Mr Njård Gudbrandsen, Project Leader

NORSAR

Mr Conrad Lindholm (dr. philos), Program Manager

Bioforsk

Mr Adam Paruch, Senior Research Scientist, (Dr. Ing.)

Mr Udaya Sekhar Nagothu, Ph.D., Professor and Coordinator, Asia Projects

Mr Stefanos Xenarios, Economist (Phd)

The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway

Ms Lisbeth Strand, Head of International Department

Norwegian Geotechnical Institute

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

Mr Roger Olsson, Head of Department

In Pakistan:

Royal Norwegian Embassy, Islamabad:

Mr Terje Barstad, Minister Counsellor
Ms Nanna Thue, Counsellor Development
Mr Joon Grane Hetland, Second Secretary
Mr Abdul Aziz Usmani, Project Officer

Planning Commission, Islamabad:

Mr Muhammad Asif Sheikh, Advisor/former Program Director

Ministry of Capital Administration and Development, Islamabad:

Mr Muhammad Rafique Tahir, Joint Secretary/ Education Advisor

Economic Affairs Division, Ministry of Finance, Islamabad:

Mr Zafar Iqbal, Section Officer

P&D Division, Project Secretariat, Islamabad:

Mr Qureshi, Project Director
Mr Riaz Hussain, Deputy Project Director

Pakistan National Accreditation Council, Islamabad:

Mr Najeeb Khawer Awan, Acting Director General, Additional Secretary
Engr. Najamuddin, Deputy Director General, Gp. Capt. (R)
Mr Ateeq-ur-Rehman Memon, Director (ML)

Securities & Exchange Commission of Pakistan, Islamabad:

Ms Khalida Habib, Director

Survey of Pakistan, Islamabad:

Maj[®] Tanweer Kayani, Director Training Wing, Survey of Pakistan
Mr Muhammad Ilyas Ch., Deputy Surveyor General, Maj (R)

Pakistan Meteorological Department, Islamabad:

Mr Arif Mahmood, Director General
Mr Zahid Rafi, Director (Seismic)

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

Mr Najeeb Ahmed
Mr Shafiq-ur-Rehman

Federal Directorate of Education, Islamabad:

Mr Abdul Waheed, Director Teachers Training Wing
Ms Amna Tariq, Assistant Director
Ms Rahila Owais
Mr Muhammad Luqman

Teachers of the Federal Directorate of Education, Islamabad:

Ms Aalia
Ms Shabana Maqsood
Ms Ambreen Kanwal
Ms Maimoona
Ms Saiqa Mukhtar
Ms Munazzah Shahzad
Mr Asif Parvaiz Khan

University of Peshawar, Institute of Education and Research, Peshawar:

Dr Arbab Khan Afridi, Former Director, IER, University of Peshawar
Dr Noman, Acting Director
Mr Muhammad Rauf
Dr Arshad Ali
Dr Amjad Ali
Dr Hafiz Inam

COMSATS University, Development Studies Department, Abbottabad:

Dr Bahadur Nawab, Head of Development Studies
Mr Awais Arifeen
Syeda Rida-e-Zaineb

National Archives of Pakistan, Islamabad:

Mr Habib Ahmad Khan, Director General
Mr Zahir Gul, Deputy Director
Mr Mian Azam Jan, Architect
Mr Mohsin Khan, Microfilming & Photostatting Officer

Marine Fisheries Department, Karachi:

Mr Shaukat Hussain, Director General, Marine fisheries Department

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

Mr Muhammad Wasim Khan, Project Director, Stock Assessment Survey Programme
Mr L. Paul Fanning, Chief Technical Advisor, Fisheries Resource Appraisal Project (FAO)

Institute for Educational Development, Aga Khan University, Karachi:

Dr Muhammad Memon, Ph.D., Professor and Director
Dr Mir Afzal Tajik, Assistant Professor, Head Outreach & PDCC
Ms Ayesha Bashiruddin, Ph.D., Assistant Professor
Mr Dilshad Ashraf, Ph.D., Assistant Professor and Head, Research and Policy Studies
Dr Sadrudin Pardhan, Chief Executive Officer
Mr Manzoor Hussain Changazi, Program Officer (Outreach)
Mr Qammer Naveed, M.Sc., Head Librarian

Nadirshaw Eduljee Dinshaw University of Engineering and Technology (NED University), Department of Earthquake Engineering & Technology, Karachi:

Mr Sarosh Hashmat Lodi, Ph.D., Professor

Nadirshaw Eduljee Dinshaw University of Engineering and Technology (NED University), Department of Petroleum Engineering, Karachi:

Dr Abid Murtaza Khan, Professor, Chairman

Geological Survey of Pakistan, Islamabad:

Dr Imran Khan, Director General
Mr Rasheed Ahmad
Mr Syed Hamid Hussain Rizvi
Mr Simon Sadiq

Auditor General of Pakistan, Federal Office, Islamabad:

Mr Muhammad Raza Shah, Director Audit & D.G Audit (Federal Court)

Provincial Ministry of Education, Baluchistan, Quetta:

Mr Munir Badini, Secretary Secondary Education
Mr Saeedullah Tokhi, Chairman Textbook Board of Secondary & Intermediate Education, Baluchistan
Mr Daroo Khan, Professor & Senior Research Officer, Bureau of Curriculum, Quetta
Mr Noor Muhammad, Assistant District Education Officer, Quetta

Teachers of Government Schools, Baluchistan, Quetta:

Ms Yasmeen Habibullah
Ms Sheeren Saba

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

Ms Saeeda Kakar

Ms Suraya

Ms Asma Khan

Mr Iftikhar Ahmed

Mr Muhammad Anwar Adil

Attachment 4: Documents Consulted

- Addendum No. 1 to Agreement between the Kingdom of Norway and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan regarding PAK 3004-04/ 313 Framework for Institutional Cooperation Programme.
- Agreement between The Government of the Kingdom of Norway and the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan regarding Framework for PAK- NORWAY Institutional Co-operation Programme (Phase-II), Dec. 2009
- Guidelines for Financing of Feasibility Studies under PAK 3004 PAK-NORWAY Institutional Cooperation Programme (18 November 2009)
- Minutes of Annual Meeting of Steering Committee on PAK 3004- Institutional Cooperation Programme held on March 2006, in the P&D Division
- Minutes of the 2nd Annual Meeting of the Steering Committee on PAK- 3004- PAK-NORWAY Institutional Cooperation Programme (June 20, 2007)
- Minutes of the Steering Committee on PAK 3004 Framework for Institutional Cooperation Programme – Phase II (Norway assisted), 27th October 2010
- Minutes of the Steering Committee on PAK 3004 Framework for Institutional Cooperation Programme (Norway Grant), 27th June 2011
- Minutes of the Steering Committee on PAK 3004 Framework for Institutional Cooperation Programme – Phase II (Norway assisted), 26th June 2012
- PAK-NORWAY Institutional Cooperation Programme Partners' Assembly Seminar, Oslo, 27th - 28th August 2008
- Annual Report 2012 on PAK 3004 PAK-Norway Institutional Cooperation Programme – II, dated September 2012
- Letter from Norwegian Embassy to Program Director, dated 4th May 2011
- Response from Government of Pakistan, Planning and Development Division to letter dated 4th May 2011
- Office Memorandum of Project Secretariat : List of Federal Government Secretaries, Provincial Governments Secretaries, Departments/ Organizations, Private Sector approached to disseminate information about the PAK- 3004 Framework Agreement for Institutional Agreement between the Government of Pakistan and Royal Norwegian Government, Phase II (September 27, 2011)
- The MTFD 2005-2010: An overview
- Pakistan Gender Reform Action Plan (2002)
- Pakistan National Education Policy 2009
- Full Text of 18th Amendment in the Constitution of Pakistan
www.infopak.gov.pk/Constitution/Full%20text%20of%2018th
- Office Memorandum from GoP, Planning Commission on PAK 3004 Frame Agreement for Institutional Cooperation Program, dated March 2010, sent to 23 governmental institutions

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

- Feasibility Study Report on Institutional Cooperation Programme (PAK 3004-06 LINS-Oslo University College) by Titus Tenga, LINS & Roald Skoelv, LINS), April 2006
- Joint Project Proposal between University of Peshawar, Aga Khan University and Center of International Education, Oslo University College, dated march 2007
- Annual Audit Report from Aga Khan University for Institutional Cooperation Program, dated December 2011
- Completion Report of The Aga Khan University, Institute for Educational Development (July 2007- July 2011)
- Draft Report to the Royal Norwegian Embassy (Fact Finding Mission on the Possibility of Development co-operation between fisheries institutions in Pakistan and Norway, November 2005) from the Norwegian partners.
- Letter to the Minister Counsellor Royal Norwegian Embassy for a Financial Assistance for Stock Assessment Survey with R N DR. Fridtjof Nansen under "Support to the Fishery Resources Appraisal in Pakistan (from EAD, dated 21st May , 2010)
- Competence Strengthening in Fishery Institutions in Pakistan (Feb 2006), Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock, Government of Pakistan.
- Contract between Government of Norway, Centre for Development Cooperation in Fisheries, Bergen and Government of Pakistan, Marine Fisheries Department, Karachi regarding Joint Implementation of Fisheries Development Projects in Pakistan" (signed on March 17, 2007)
- Fisheries Resources Appraisal in Pakistan Project, Project Coordinating Unit Meeting No.3, 15 February 2012), Field Document No.2, Fisheries Resources Appraisal in Pakistan Project, UTF/PAK/ 108/ PAK
- Letter to D.G. Marine Fisheries Department, Government of Pakistan by Head of Finances and Economic Planning, Institute of Marine Research, Bergen (dated : 15/1/ 2010)
- Competence Strengthening in Fishery Institutions in Pakistan, A Review of Structure and Functioning of Public Institutions in the Fishing Sector of Pakistan. (4- 17 December, 2011). It was compiled by a team: Moazzam Khan, Kamran Jahangir and Kjartan Høydal
- Report to CDCF on participation in the "Meeting of the Fisheries Sector Participatory Working Group, FSPWG", 2 May 2012, Beach Luxury Hotel, Karachi Pakistan by Kjartan Hoydal
- NORSAR and Pakistan Meteorological Department, Seismic Hazars Analysis for the cities of Islamabad and Rawalpindi, February 2006
- NORSAR and Pakistan Meteorological Department, Seismic Hazard Analysis and Zonation of Azad Kashmir and Northern Areas of Pakistan, August 2006
- NORSAR and Pakistan Meteorological Department, Seismic Hazard Analysis and Zonation for Pakistan, Azad Jammu and Kashmir, July 2007
- NORSAR and Pakistan Meteorological Department, Probabilistic seismic hazard analysis for the city of Quetta, Pakistan, January 2012
- Pakistan Meteorological Department and Norwegian Geotechnical Institute (NGI), Mapping of Tsunami Hazard along Makran Coast of Pakistan, February 2012
- NORSAR and Pakistan Meteorological Department, Earthquake Hazard and Risk Assessment in Pakistan, Earthquake Risk Assessment of Quetta, September 2012

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

- NORSAR and Pakistan Meteorological Department Earth Quake Hazard in Pakistan (Phase II), Project Planning and Travel Report, dated April 2011
- Strengthening Applied Research and Capacity CIIT Abbottabad, Pakistan in Livelihood, Security and Development in Post Conflict Swat through Institutional Collaboration with the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB), Norway, April 2012
- CIIT Abbottabad and UMB Norway, Brief Progress Report, dated August 2012
- Overhead presentation on Strengthening Applied Research and Capacity at CIIT Abbottabad, Pakistan
- Contract between Geological Survey of Pakistan (GSP) and Norwegian Geotechnical Institute (NGI) regarding Institutional cooperation between Pakistan and Norway on Landslide Risk assessment & Mitigation measures, signed June 2006
- Joint Project Proposal, Institutional cooperation between Pakistan and Norway on Landslide Risk assessment & Mitigation measures , June 2006
- Institutional cooperation between Pakistan and Norway on Landslide Risk assessment & Mitigation measures, Task definitions and schedule for November 2006 – April 2007, dated November 2006
- Brief Review on Technical Activities between GSP and NGI, (undated)
- Landslide Risk Assessment & Mitigation Measures between Geological Survey of Pakistan (GSP) & Norwegian Geotechnical Institute (NGI), 2006-2009
- Letter of Agreement between Norwegian Accreditation and Pakistan National Accreditation Council (Phase 2)
- Support to capacity building of Pakistan Accreditation Council (PNAC), Achievements Phase 1
- Support to capacity building of Pakistan Accreditation Council (PNAC), Activities/ Achievements Phase II
- Minutes of meeting between NA and PNAC in Islamabad, February 2010
- Minutes of meeting between Royal Norwegian Embassy and PNAC in Islamabad, February 2012
- Report from Assessor Training Course ISO 15189, Islamabad December 2011
- Report from Training course ISO 17043, Islamabad April 2012
- Report from Assessor Training Course ISO 17020, Islamabad April 2012
- Overview of status of agreed activities during phase II of cooperation between NA and PNAC up till May 2012
- Invoice from Norwegian Accreditation dated 22th November 2011
- A number of letters from Securities and Exchange Commission of Pakistan (SECP) to Program Secretariat regarding Institutional Cooperation Program, dated 2010 and 2011
- Several letters from the Program Secretariat in response to letters from SECP
- Mails from SECP to Finanstilsynet dated May, July and August 2010
- Mails from SECP to Norad, Evaluation Department, dated June and July 2010

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

- Joint project Proposal between NED University, Pakistan and Norwegian University of Science & Technology, on Expertise Development in Petroleum Sector Through Institutional Strengthening at NED University, Pakistan, dated May 2012
- Concept Paper from National Archives of Pakistan regarding a wanted institutional cooperation with the National Archives of Norway
- Letters from the National Archives of Norway to national Archives of Pakistan, dated April, June and October 2011 and May 2012
- Power Point presentation on the National Archives of Pakistan, given in October 2012
- Islamabad Declaration on Inclusive Education (27 April, 2005)
- Education Sector Reform, EFA and Equal Opportunities for Quality Education in Balochistan <http://www.idp-europe.org/eenet-asia/eenet-asia-4-EN/page12.php>
- Feasibility Study on Education for All in an Inclusive Setting in Pakistan (dated 25 September – 8 October 2003) by Ministry of Education, Ministry of Women Development, Social Welfare and Special Education in co-operation with IDP International Development Partners and Braillo Norway
- School Mapping on Nutrition and Health in Balochistan (Wajid Iqbal & Terje Magnusson Watterdal: <http://www.idp-europe.org/eenet-asia/eenet-asia-7-EN/page18.php/>)
- Balochistan Focus Group on Inclusive Education, Department of Education
- <http://www.idp-europe.org/eenet-asia/eenet-asia-6-EN/page16.php>
- Compendium: Conventions, Agreements and Laws Guaranteeing All Children Equal Right to Quality Education in an Inclusive Setting Pakistan, published in English and Urdu with the joint collaboration of Federal Directorate of Education, UNESCO Islamabad and IDP Norway (August 2007)
- Report Action Research on the Introduction and Implementation of Innovation within the Education Sector in Balochistan (2006-2009) by IDP Norway 2010, Terje Magnussønn Watterdal
- Education for All in an inclusive Setting in Islamabad- Pakistan-Part 2, Terje Watterdal and Prof.M.Rafique Tahir, EENET Asia Newsletter Issue 5, 4th Quarter 2007/ 1st Quarter 2008
- What is the Purpose of Education? Balochistan Focus Group on Inclusive Education, EENET Asia Newsletter Issue 6, 2nd and 3rd Quarter 2008
- Why Should Do We have a separate Special Education System, Zakia Minaas (a teacher in a pilot school for special education in Islamabad),EENET Asia Newsletter Issue 6, 2nd and 3rd Quarter 2008
- Letter from Deputy Secretary Education Baluchistan to Deputy Project Director P& D (dated : 25 November, 2010)
- Educators' Perceptions about Resources Needed for Effective School Health in Government Schools in Pakistan, Parvez Pirzado (Aga Khan University-Institute for Educational Development; IED-PDC; 1-5/B, VII F.B.Area; Karimabad; Karachi; Pakistan), EENET Asia Newsletter Issue 6, 2nd and 3rd Quarter 2008
- Presentation on: Education for All- In an Inclusive and Child-Friendly Setting in Balochistan by Terje Magnusson Watterdal (March 2007, Quetta)

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

- Presentation on: Inclusion = Child Friendly Schools (2007), IDP Norway by Terje Magnusson Watterdal
- Watterdal, EENET Asia Newsletter Issue 6, 2nd and 3rd Quarter 2008
- Inclusion- The only way forward for achieving the EFA Goals in Pakistan, Prof. Muhammad Rafique Tahir, EENET Asia Newsletter Issue 6, 2nd and 3rd Quarter 2008
- Glossary on Terminologies- Inclusive Education Child- Friendly Schools (CFS) Disabilities, Edited by Terje M. Watterdal, Alexander T. Hauschild & Mohammad Rafique Tahir, published by the collaboration of Federal Directorate of Education, Sight savers and IDP Norway (August 18, 2008)
- Sample Presentation on: Inclusive and Child-Friendly Teaching methodologies by Professor Miriam Donath Skjorten (2007/ 2008)
- Program Activities – Baluchistan, Provincial Department of Education and IDP Norway (2008-2009)
- Letter to the Ambassador Ms Cecilie Landsverk from Terje Magnusson Watterdal ,Senior Partner IDP (dated: 3 September 2012)
- List of Government Officers who benefited from/ participated in the Awareness/ Training Programme (between 2006- 2011)
- List of Teachers in Baluchistan who benefited from the Training Programme

Attachment 5: An Overview of The Different Cooperation Projects Initiated Under The Program

Pakistan Meteorological Department – NORSAR

- Phase 1: Seismic Hazard Study for Islamabad and Rawalpindi, approved 2005, PKR 2.004.597 (completed)

Purpose:

Achievements:

1. Providing base line information for the new building code.
2. Initial training on seismic hazard assessment conducted.
3. Results provided in term of Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA).
4. PGA calculated for ten micro-zones in Islamabad and Rawalpindi.

- Phase 1: Earthquake Hazard in Pakistan, approved 2006, PKR 20.995.029 (completed)

Purpose:

Achievements:

1. Seismic hazard study for Northern Areas of Pakistan conducted 2006.
2. Seismic hazard study for Pakistan and Kashmir completed 2007.
3. Pakistan divided into 25 seismic zones and zone hazard calculated.
4. For engineering purposes PGA computed for eight frequencies and five different return periods.
5. Special emphasis given to major cities like Islamabad, Peshawar, Karachi, Gwadar and Muzaffarabad.
6. Seismic zoning maps prepared for different return periods.

- Phase 2: Competence Building in Seismic Monitoring Network Handling and Tsunami Modelling, approved 2010, budget NOK 2.117 mill., spent PKR 11.652.697 (on-going)

Purpose:

1. Based on the experience on earthquake hazard development during the first phase, the purpose for the second phase is to use these and enhance into specific hazard assessment for the city of Quetta.
2. Conduct an earthquake risk for Quetta.
3. Modelling tsunami activity with two sources; earthquake and slides, for the Makran coast.

Achievements:

1. Probabilistic seismic hazard analysis for the city of Quetta 2012.

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

2. Mapping of Tsunami Hazard along Makran Coast of Pakistan 2012 (done by NGI).
3. Earthquake Risk Assessment of Quetta 2012.

Pakistan National Accreditation Council – Norwegian Accreditation

- Phase 1: Capacity building of PNAC, approved 2005, PRS 30.384.250 (Completed)

Purpose:

Provide assistance for further strengthening of PNAC so that the organization can meet the future need of the society by satisfying the demand of export oriented industry and regulators.

Achievements:

1. PNAC management systems developed and implemented, complying with ISO/IEC 17011-2004.
 2. Staff of PNAC trained in Norway and Pakistan in theoretical and practical fields of accreditation.
 3. PNAC staff trained to organize, conduct and report Proficiency Testing Scheme in the field of General Testing.
 4. Approx. 100 technical assessors trained with regards to accreditation standard ISO/IEC 17025 for testing and Calibration labs and ISO 15189 for medical labs.
 5. Two assessor training courses on ISO/IEC 17025 and one assessor course on ISO 15189 conducted for medical laboratories.
 6. Support to PNAC to conduct surveillance visits to certification bodies, also used to qualify lead assessor for certification bodies.
 7. Technical support provided in terms of provision of technical assessors for the assessment of NPLS (National Metrology Institute).
 8. Pre-peer evaluation of PNAC conducted.
 9. Training courses for lab personnel interpreting various technical clauses of the standard ISO/IEC 17025 organized.
- Phase 2: Strengthening the cooperation between NA and PNAC, approved 2010, budget NOK 2.550 mill., spent PKR 28.981.302 (ongoing)

Purpose:

Provide assistance for further strengthening of PNAC so that the organization can meet the future need of the society by satisfying the demand of export oriented industry and regulators.

Achievements:

1. Assessors course on Accreditation of Personnel Certification according to ISO 17024.
2. 2 days training course on Accreditation of Personnel Certification according to ISO 17024.
3. Assessors course on Accreditation of Medical Labs based on ISO 15189.

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

4. Technical course on Measurement Uncertainty & Method Validation for Medical Labs based on ISO 15189.
5. Assessors course on ISO 17020 for Inspection Bodies.
6. Participation of Director (ML) as an observer in the assessment of Medical labs.

Education Department, Baluchistan – IDP-Norway

- Phase 1: Action Research, Introduction and Implementation of Innovation within the Educational Sector of Baluchistan, approved 2006, PKR 11.360.687 (Completed?) (Final payment withheld)

Purpose:

1. Awareness program with introduction to Inclusive and Child-friendly Education and selection of 4 Pilot Schools for Inclusive Education.
2. Capacity Building for Education Planners.
3. Training of Headmasters and Teachers.
4. Conduct School and Child Mapping.
5. Development and distribution of materials.

Achievements:

Federal Directorate of Education – IDP-Norway

- Phase 1: Introduction of Education for All in an Inclusive setting, approved 2006, PKR 33.884.109 (Completed)

Purpose:

Achievements:

Aga Khan University – Peshawar University - University College of Oslo/LINS

- Phase 1: Institutional Cooperation Program, approved 2007, PKR 26.736.215 (completed)

Purpose:

To provide technical assistance to IER, University of Peshawar in developing competence and resources to:

1. Support the planning and implementation of education programs; and
2. Strengthen teachers' education as a basis for quality education.

Achievements:

Geological Survey of Pakistan (GSP) – Norwegian Geotechnical Institute (NGI)

- Phase 1: Landslide Risk Assessment and Mitigation Measures, approved 2006, PKR 21.465.590 (Not completed)

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

Purpose:

1. Assist GSP in strengthening their capacity in the field of assessment, prevention, mitigation and management of the risk caused by landslide hazard.
2. Implement state of the art approaches for risk identification and mitigation measures at two selected areas where the conditions are supposed to be critical during heavy rain or new earthquakes. The purpose is to jointly execute pilot demonstration projects that can serve as basis for GSP and other relevant Pakistani organizations for their further work in other areas of the country.
3. Assist GSP in building an inventory of historical landslides and give support for carrying out a national landslide hazard zonation and landslide risk assessment.
4. Assist in preparation of a strategic plan on how Pakistan should set priorities for handling the risk caused by landslides in a long term prospective.

Achievements:

1. Landslides have been mapped in Jhelum Valley using GIS and Remote Sensing techniques.
2. Two hazardous sites selected for more detailed investigation.
3. Soil and rock samples and other relevant data collected for detailed analysis of two sites.
4. Training related to slope stability analysis and GIS methods related to landslide mapping and terrain analysis.
5. Information Technology Lab established in GSP Islamabad office.
6. Geo-hazard zonation map of Karli Basin, Hattian Bala prepared.
7. International workshop arranged in Bangkok 2008 on “Experience of Geotechnical Investigations and Mitigation for Landslides”. As a consequence GSP established a regional network.

Marine Fisheries Department – Institute of Marine Research

- Phase 1: Assistance Planning & Implementing a Marine Fisheries Resource Survey, approved 2006, budget NOK 2.859.140

Purpose:

1. To support the update assessment of fishery resources in the waters of Pakistan available for management aiming at sustainable development.
2. To facilitate a series of assessment surveys conducted and observations data compiled, analyzed and used for advice in fishery management.
3. Strengthened competence and capacity in the then Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock and the Marine Fisheries Department.

Achievements:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

- Phase 1: Competence Strengthening in Fisheries in Pakistan, approved 2006, budget NOK 3.177.873

Purpose:

1. Study and recommend organizational improvements available.
2. Providing scholarship to two MFD staff for Master degree in Norway.
3. Training of two instructors in modern fish processing.
4. Training of two biochemists qualified for advanced analysis.

Achievements:

1. Two staff of MFD working in quality control section and providing quality assurance services to the processing establishment has visited Norway for the training course on “Fish handling and Quality.
2. Three members team (including one Norwegian and two Pakistanis) has re-visited the “Public Sector Fisheries Institutions” in the light of changes taken place after the implementation of 18th Amendment of Constitution of the country.
3. A two day workshop organized in May 2012 to discuss the Review of the Public Sector Institution in fisheries and the three member team has presented their finding on the review of public sector fisheries institutions in Pakistan.
4. Project activities reviewed in connection with linked project under UTF project. Norwegian delegation also participated in PCU (for FAO project) meeting.

NED University, Department of Petroleum Engineering – Norwegian University of Science and Technology

- Institutional Strengthening at NED University, approved 2012, budget NOK 2.917 mill.

Purpose:

The main objective is to develop expertise in upstream petroleum sector through strengthening of teaching and research competence of Petroleum Engineering Department at NED University in conformity with the international standards and need of the petroleum sector both at national and regional level.

Achievements: The collaboration has not started.

NED University, Department of Earthquake Engineering – NORSAR

- Earthquake Hazard and Risk in Karachi, approved 2012, budget NOK 3.0 mill.

Purpose:

1. Regional seism tectonic analysis including field survey, including identification of dominant fault typology.
2. Calculate the earthquake hazard for the region of Karachi.

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

3. Compute likely earthquake scenarios and produce string ground motion shaking maps for urban Karachi.

Achievements: The collaboration has not started.

National University of Science and Technology (NUST) - Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)

- CO2 capture from Natural and Flue gases by using polymeric membranes, approved 2012, budget NOK 3.008 mill.

Purpose:

1. The proposed research will help in developing new polymeric membranes and establish new experimental facility to investigate membrane based gas separation processes.
2. Different polymeric materials (CA, PA, PVA, PVAm) will be investigated to identify the suitable material / compositions / additives for gas separation membranes.
3. The successful completion of this work will persuade the process industry to employ membrane based CO2 capture technology to reduce the CO2 emissions. The ICI Pakistan has already shown its interest in the proposed research.
4. School of Chemical and Material Engineering, National University of Science and Technology, Islamabad will have a dedicated experimental facility on membrane base gas separation.

Achievements: The collaboration has not started.

COMSATS University – Norwegian University of Life Sciences

- Strengthening Applied Research at CIIT, Abbottabad in Livelihood, Security & Development in Post Conflict Swat, approved pilot project 2010, budget NOK 0,35 mill, spent NOK 0,237 mill. (ongoing)

Purpose:

Achievements:

1. The faculty and students of COMSAT Abbottabad and UMB, Norway participated in the field research in three villages purposely selected from three different Union Councils in Swat. Through this joint research, one policy paper entitled “Rural Development in Swat, Pakistan” has been published. Another publication of acquired data from the field as research article is in process.
2. Three workshops were conducted during the project period.
3. Four students of MS at the Department of Development Studies were trained in the field research and they completed their research thesis which will be published in referees’ journal to share it with wider group of stakeholders.
4. One young faculty got three weeks intensive training course work on governance and development at the partner institute, Norwegian University of Life Sciences.

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

National Archives of Pakistan – National Archives of Norway

A preliminary dialogue has been going on since 2010. The National Archive of Norway will clarify if they have the capacity to engage in an institutional collaboration with the National Archives of Pakistan.

Purpose (as defined by the National Archives of Pakistan):

1. Capacity building of officers and staff of National Archives through fellowships and practical trainings in Records Management and Conservation of Archival Material.
2. Training workshops in Pakistan in various fields such as Archives Administration, Records Management, Digitalization and Conservation of Archival Material.
3. Help to salvage the flood affected and water soaked stuck up records of various districts of Pakistan.
4. Supply of latest equipment for conservation and digitalization.
5. Attachments for senior officers to enhance their professional capabilities.

Survey of Pakistan – Norwegian Mapping Authority

The Norwegian Mapping Authority visits Pakistan in November 2012 to engage with the Survey of Pakistan on a proposed institutional collaboration.

University of Gujrat – University of Stavanger (In dialogue)

Water Resources Research Institute (WRI) and Agriculture Policy Institute (API) - Norwegian Institute for Agricultural and Environmental Research Bioforsk

A common Project Document is being finalized and will be forwarded to the Project Secretariat for approval by the Steering Committee.

Goal and Purpose (as outlined by Bioforsk):

1. The main goal of the project is to develop an integrated framework for improving the adaptive capacity of farming community in a selected area of Pakistan by emphasizing on efficient use of land and water to address future food security.
2. The purpose of the project is to study the water and agricultural nexus under predicted climate change conditions in a selected area in Pakistan for the development of suitable adaptation measures.

Securities & Exchange Commission of Pakistan - The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway (Finanstilsynet)

A preliminary dialogue started in 2010 without any conclusion to proceed developing a common Project Document for an institutional collaboration. Further clarifications are needed.

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

Purpose (as outlined by The Security Exchange Commission of Pakistan in mail to The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway (Finanstilsynet) dated 26th May 2010):

1. Provide both regulators an insight and knowledge on each other's markets by establishing forum for discussion on financial issues and reform in operational and supervision of the markets in both countries.
2. Exchange of staff of both regulators giving an opportunity to learn supervisory techniques, exchange experiences; especially in monitoring of conglomerates, product development, money laundering and forensic investigations etc.
3. Review the regulatory structure followed by The Financial Supervisory Authority of Norway and SECP and find ways to improve the operational and supervisory model for financial and capital markets.
4. Establish systems to adopt appropriate approaches for risk based supervision of market intermediaries and tools to identify risks.

Allama Iqbal Open University (to be identified)

The Network for Consumer Protection (to be identified)

Attachment 6: Proposed Guidelines

Agreement or a Memorandum of Understanding

The Review Team proposes the introduction of an Agreement or a Memorandum of Understanding between the Planning Commission as “program owner” and the collaborating Pakistani and Norwegian institutions.

This Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding should as a minimum include:

- Main and relevant issues from the Agreement between Pakistan and Norway, including:
 - Sustainability
 - Gender
 - Risk and risk mitigation, including possible negative consequences of the project.
- Reference to the approved Project Document.
- Reference to the at any time valid guidelines for the program.
- An outline of the flow of funds.
- An outline of important management guidelines to be followed:
 - Rules for procurements
 - Documentation on revisions of activity plans, time line and budgets by the collaborating institutions agreed upon in Annual or Bi-annual meetings.
 - Rules on zero acceptance of mismanagement of funds.
- A clear outline of reporting requirements:
 - Progress Reports (annually or bi-annually)
 - Financial Reports (annually within end January)
 - Audited statements from each institution (annually within end January)
- An attached outline of a Progress Report (to be used for those institutions that don't have an established system of such reporting).

Outline of a Progress Report:

If an Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding between the Planning Commission and the collaborating institutions is introduced, an optional outline of a Progress Report should be the only additional guideline to develop. If no formalization of the relation between the Planning Commission and the collaborating institutions is introduced, major points from the outline of an agreement referred to above should be entered into the existing guidelines and in the format for the project Document.

With reference to the approved Project Document and agreed Activity Plan, Time Line and Budget, the Progress Report should as a minimum cover:

Review of PAK 3004 – Institutional Cooperation Framework

- An assessment of the activities implemented compared to the agreed Activity Plan, explaining major deviations and delays.
- Information on any agreed revisions of Activity Plans, Time lines and Budgets.
- An assessment of how the implemented activities should support the overarching goal of the collaboration and what kind of impact might be experienced in due course. Any vital conditions for achieving the overarching goal should be discussed. The benefits for the Pakistani as well as the Norwegian institution should be included.
- A particular focus should be on the gender related issues.
- The issue of sustainability should be addressed.
- The risk assessment in the Project Document should be assessed and updated, if needed.
- Other issues of relevance for the continued implementation of the project should be addressed, like other relevant partners or programs/projects in the same field to strengthen cooperation or coordination with, or possible consequences of important changes in the political or legal framework for the collaboration, like the introduction of the 18th Amendment to the Constitution.

Norad

Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

Postal address:

P.O. Box 8034 Dep, NO-0030 OSLO

Office address:

Ruseløkkveien 26, Oslo, Norway

Tel: +47 23 98 00 00

Fax: +47 23 98 00 99

postmottak@norad.no

www.norad.no

