

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

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

Milfrid Tonheim(SIK)

Kåre Kristensen (SIK)

Agnes Regina Murei Abuom (TAABCO)

June 2010



Senter for interkulturell kommunikasjon

Centre for Intercultural Communication

Centre pour la Communication Interculturelle



Senter for Interkulturell Kommunikasjon

Misjonsmarka 12, 4024 Stavanger, Norway

P.O.Box 226, 4001 Stavanger, Norway

Phone (+47) 51 51 62 74

Homepage: <http://www.sik.no>

ISBN: 978-82-7721-119-0	Title: Review of the Tanzania-Norway NUFU Programme (2007-2011) Submitted to the Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education (SIU)
ISSN: 1500-1474	Authors : Milfrid Tonheim, Kåre Kristensen, Agnes Regina Murei Abuom
Project number: 285158	Editor : Center for Intercultural Communication (SIK)
Completion date: June 2010	Publisher: Misjonshøgskolens forlag

Abstract:

The scope of the 'The Tanzania - Norway NUFU Programme 2007 - 2011' is to support academic cooperation in the area of management of natural resources, forestry, fisheries and/or wildlife, with a focus on good governance and a reliable public administration. The focus of the review has been on its efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, and sustainability. The evaluators reviewed the Programme's gender approach, risk management, and anti-corruption measures. A special emphasis was also given to 'policy dialogue' with relevant policy makers, as this dialogue is viewed as an important tool for achieving impact of development. Finally, the review sought to provide recommendations to guide the further implementation of the Programme.

All in all, the review concludes that the 'The Tanzania - Norway NUFU Programme 2007 - 2011' has to a large extent been successfully implemented from its start and until spring 2010. The academic cooperation between SUA and UDSM and their Norwegian counterpart, UMB, seems to function relatively smoothly.

The Programme has succeeded in recruiting PhD candidates and Master students, and in total reached 50% female participation among students. The Programme has significantly contributed to capacity building at SUA and UDSM. Its thematic focus is of relevance to national policies both in Tanzania and in Norway, and our findings show that the thematic approach of the four projects supported is of central value to the institutions involved. The review finds that project coordinators at both sides are actively involved in decision-making.

The potential of impacting on development in Tanzania will clearly increase if the Programme performs well in relation to the number of scientific publications, dissemination and policy-dialogue, as well as the development of study programmes. The Programme should moreover enhance its gender mainstreaming efforts, and better integrate gender issues into the projects' thematic focus.

Key words: Tanzania, NUFU Programme, academic cooperation, good governance, natural resources, forestry, fisheries, wildlife, anti-corruption, policy dialogue

Content

Content.....	0
Executive summary.....	2
Abbreviations.....	4
1. Introduction.....	5
1.1 Objectives of the review	5
1.2 The Programme.....	5
1.2.1. Organisation.....	5
1.2.2 Expected outcomes	6
1.3. National policies	6
1.3.1. Relevant Tanzanian national policies	6
1.3.2. Relevant Norwegian national policies	6
1.4. Methodology.....	7
1.5. Ethical considerations	7
1.6. Verification of the report	7
2. Findings.....	8
2.1. Efficiency.....	8
2.1.1. Management model.....	8
2.1.2. Decision-making process	11
2.1.3. Risk management.....	12
2.1.4. Anti-corruption measures.....	12
2.2. Effectiveness.....	13
2.2.1. Identification and selection of projects	13
2.2.2. Educational achievements.....	14
2.2.3. Scientific achievements	15
2.2.4. Impact for development	17
2.2.5. Capacity building in the South.....	17
2.2.6. Gender approach	18
2.3. Relevance and policy dialogue	20
2.3.1. Relevance for national policies of Tanzania and Norway	20
2.3.2. Institutional relevance	20
2.3.3. Policy dialogue.....	21
2.4. Sustainability.....	22
3. Conclusions and recommendations.....	22
References.....	25
Appendix 1.....	26
Appendix 2.....	31
Appendix 3.....	32

Executive summary

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

The evaluation draws primarily on qualitative research strategies, employing methods like document analyses, informal conversations, focus groups, and individual semi-structured interviews. The evaluation team consulted with all stakeholders in ‘The Tanzania – Norway NUFU Programme 2007 - 2011’: Master students, PhD candidates, project coordinators at SUA, UDSM and UMB, representatives from the Norwegian Embassy, one representative from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT), and administrative staff at SIU. Interviews were also carried out with institutional contacts at UDSM and UMB,¹ two head of departments and one acting Dean at SUA, and the Chair of the Coordinating Committee of NUFU projects at SUA.

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

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

However, the review has shown that some weak points remain to be addressed. The most critical task is to ensure that the set targets related to the number of scientific publications,

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

dissemination and policy-dialogue, as well as the development of study programmes are reached. The potential of impacting on development in Tanzania will clearly increase if the Programme performs well in relation to these aspects. The Programme should moreover enhance its gender mainstreaming efforts, and better integrate gender issues into the projects' thematic focus.

Our main recommendations are the following:

Educational achievements

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

Scientific achievements

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

Gender approach

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

Policy dialogue

- The evaluation team recommends the organising of seminars aiming at presenting and discussing findings with policy-makers and other relevant actors in the remaining Programme period. We suggest that RNE plays a more active part in organising such seminars as well as in establishing contact between the relevant ministries and the researchers in the Programme. The evaluators recommend that RNE and/or the universities communicate with relevant policy-makers before determining the dates for future seminars, and that RNE is the institution responsible for inviting relevant departments and organisations.

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

Abbreviations

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

1. Introduction

1.1 Objectives of the review

The evaluation aimed to assess ‘The Tanzania - Norway NUFU Programme 2007 - 2011’ (hereafter referred to as the Programme) covering the period from the initiation of the programme in 2007 until the start of the review in April 2010. The focus has been on its efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, and sustainability. The evaluators reviewed the Programme’s gender approach, risk management, and anti-corruption measures. A special emphasis was also given to ‘policy dialogue’ with relevant policy makers, as this dialogue is viewed as an important tool for achieving impact of development. Finally, the review sought to provide recommendations to guide the further implementation of the Programme.³

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

1.2 The Programme

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

The scope of the Programme is to support academic cooperation in the area of management of natural resources, forestry, fisheries and/or wildlife, with a focus on good governance and a reliable public administration. The Programme is hence earmarked projects directed towards research and education activities within the thematic area ‘natural resource management in Tanzania’. Four projects have been selected for funding through ‘The Tanzania - Norway NUFU Programme 2007 – 2011’: three at Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA) and one at the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM). The Norwegian partner in all four projects is The Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB).⁴

1.2.1. Organisation

The NORAD-SIU agreement stipulates the rules and regulations of the administration of the general NUFU programme,⁵ of which ‘The Tanzania – Norway NUFU Programme 2007 - 2011’ is a part. The management and administration of each project is specified in Tripartite Contracts between SIU, the Norwegian university and the university in the South.

³ TOR is enclosed as Appendix 1.

⁴ A list of the four projects is enclosed as Appendix 2.

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

In the NUFU management model the involved universities in both Tanzania and Norway are expected to plan, implement and report on their activities to SIU who is the main administrator of the Programme. SIU organizes annual meetings with the RNE where Annual Plans and Reports are presented and discussed. In addition to being the funding partner, RNE attends meetings with SIU and partner universities in Tanzania. Otherwise the Embassy has no direct role in implementing the Programme.

1.2.2 Expected outcomes

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

1.3. National policies

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

1.3.1. Relevant Tanzanian national policies

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

1.3.2. Relevant Norwegian national policies

The Norwegian Development Policy is based upon the same understanding of development as the one forming the basis of the Millennium Declaration (2000). Report No. 13 to the Storting states that the Norwegian Development Policy is designed to strengthen the position of the poor, to promote sustainable development, to safeguard global public goods and strengthen global rules, to ensure links between national policy and development objectives, and to provide aid in areas where Norwegian expertise is in demand. Relevant sectors where Norway has recognized expertise are mentioned: climate change and environment,

sustainable development, peace building, human rights and humanitarian assistance, oil and clean energy, women's rights and gender equality⁶, good governance and the fight against corruption. Environment and climate change is the sector where funding will increase most in the future. The report underlines that "Norwegian support must be requested by, and provide added value for, the partner country."⁷ Norway's development cooperation is furthermore guided by the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness principles, including national ownership, alignment with recipient countries' systems, results-based management and mutual accountability.

1.4. Methodology

The evaluation draws primarily on qualitative research strategies, employing methods like document analyses, informal conversations, focus groups, and individual semi-structured interviews. The evaluation team consulted with all stakeholders in 'The Tanzania – Norway NUFU Programme 2007 - 2011': Master students, PhD candidates, project coordinators at SUA, UDSM and UMB, representatives from the Norwegian Embassy, one representative from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT), and administrative staff at SIU. Interviews were also carried out with institutional contacts at UDSM and UMB,⁸ two head of departments and one acting Dean at SUA, and the Chair of the Coordinating Committee of NUFU projects at SUA.⁹

All the Master students and PhD candidates engaged in the Programme were invited to participate in focus group discussions, however, not all invited were available and able to participate. All in all, 26 Master students and 11 PhD candidates participated in the focus groups. The discussions focused positive and negative aspects with regards to the implementation of the Programme, their work experience and current employment status, the choice of thematic approach etc. In addition, the evaluation team reviewed relevant documents such as project documents, annual reports, and national policy documents from the two countries.

1.5. Ethical considerations

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

1.6. Verification of the report

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

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

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

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

⁹ See Appendix 3 for a complete list of interviewees.

2. Findings

2.1. Efficiency

The Programme's efficiency has been reviewed firstly by focusing on its overall management model as well as the management of each project supported by the Programme. A specific attention has been given its reporting system and its financial management. Secondly, the evaluation has assessed the efficiency of established decision-making processes, particularly focusing on the involvement of different stakeholders. Thirdly, possible risk factors to a successful implementation of the Programme were identified. The review also assessed how the Programme handles possible risk factors, particularly if any anti-corruption measures are implemented.

2.1.1. Management model

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

Reporting

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

Financial management

The transfer of funds has a rather complex organisation. The funds derive from the RNE and are transferred to SIU. Thereafter funds are transferred by SIU to the UMB, where each project coordinator is responsible for the transfer to the Tanzanian partners. Due to this lengthy process it often takes too long time before funding is made available to the intended target groups. The delayed remittance of funds from Norway is one key challenge reported from Tanzania. Project coordinators express that several months may pass before the first transfer arrives. They find such delays unnecessary in a project that has been accepted for five years. Familiar with this problem, SIU recommends that the institutions overestimate the budget, leaving them with funds not spent last year in the beginning of a new one. SIU has moreover made improvements in their financial system and payouts will in the future happen automatically without receiving payout requests from institutions in Norway. This development will prevent delays in one of the funding levels.

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

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

Transfer of funds are, thus, delayed both in Norway and in Tanzania, a finding which is consistent with conclusions of the evaluation of the NUFU and the NOMA programme conducted in 2009.¹⁰ The evaluators appreciate SIU's attempt to reduce the delays from their part, but in order to secure progression in the Programme we recommend that the challenge with regards to transfer of funds should be address at each financial level.

North-South relations

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

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

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

One challenge brought forward by the PhD candidates pointed to lack of complete information provided by UMB relating possible PhD courses available to the candidates during their stay at UMB. Some of them had discovered other very interesting courses after having made their selection. Another challenge mentioned by the PhD candidates was the lengthy process of getting papers in order while arriving in Norway. Also Norwegian project coordinators find this process complicated and time-consuming. It takes several weeks before the PhD candidates get their personal number, working permit, tax papers and bank card. Some got their bank card shortly before leaving Norway. UMB should look into the possibility to speed up this process and provide rapid and accurate assistance to the visiting researchers.

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

South-South relations

There appears to be little contact between the two universities in Tanzania. Even the contact between the three projects at SUA seems limited. This is confirmed by SIU which expresses that even internally at each universities interaction and collaborative encounters between researchers are rare. They continue to say that external initiative seems therefore necessary in order to create arenas for them to meet. In 2008 SIU organised a seminar at SUA where the three projects in the Tanzania – Norway NUFU Programme (2007-2011) took part, as did participants in two ordinary NUFU projects, as well as participants in the PANTIL Programme¹¹. Yet another seminar initiated from SIU took place in 2009. Participants were this time limited to only members of the research teams in the four projects in the Programme in question, as well as representatives from the Embassy, ministries and other relevant organisations. These initiatives are viewed as highly important in gathering participants in different projects and at different institutions, and are vital tools in order to increase interaction and collaboration among the Programme's participants. The evaluators recommend that similar seminars are organised for the remaining programme period.

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

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

Some Master students and PhD candidates report that they hardly know other students in the Programme. For the Master students at UDSM this even applies among the Master students themselves. An explaining factor is that as the Department of Fisheries does not currently offer a Master programme, students are therefore linked to various other natural science departments at UDSM. However, recently workshops have been organised or are planned to happen in the projects supported by the Programme. Such workshops will clearly have a positive impact on the interaction among senior researchers, PhD candidates and Master students, and are therefore recommended to be repeated at regular intervals.

2.1.2. Decision-making process

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

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

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

One project coordinator emphasises that one of the strengths of the NUFU programmes is that they do not require a lot of administration by the involved scientific and institutional staff. Another important aspect with the NUFU programmes is that they generate low economic returns for the Departments at the Norwegian side. Thus, top management, at least at the Norwegian side, may not prioritize NUFU programmes and allow staff to use time on its administration, compared to projects originating from other funding sources.

2.1.3. Risk management

The fact that the institutions involved in the Programme are highly experienced institutions reduces the number as well as the intensity of potential risk factors. SIU is of the opinion that these are stable institutions that will ensure the continuation of the Programme despite possible future leadership changes or changes within the project coordination. In case of one project coordinator leaving his position, consequences will potentially be higher at project level. However, as the collaboration between the partner institutions has been ongoing over many years there is qualified staff to continue the coordination and maintain the good climate of cooperation.

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

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

The question about HIV and AIDS has over the last years been a cross-cutting issue in project financed by Norway. However, the Programme does not at all address this issue. As the four projects send students out to conduct fieldwork in different villages and remote areas, precaution should be taken and training should be offered before students make such fieldtrips.

2.1.4. Anti-corruption measures

There is a zero-tolerance of corruption within the Programme. UMB, as the North partner institution, has the main responsibility to ensure the inexistence of corrupt behaviour among participants. The amounts of money are relatively small, and this is seen as limiting the chances of money disappearing in someone's pockets. No suspicion has so far been reported.

This was also confirmed in interviews and focus group discussions with participants in the Programme.

Both SUA and UDSM have an anti-corruption committee that is charged with the responsibility to investigate any staff suspected of malpractice. At SUA a Code of Ethics to guide the behaviour of university staff is in process of being updated and will be ready in some months. The Tanzanian universities are subject to public audit system and seem to adhere to national regulations related to anti-corruption. Anti-corruption is also specified in the NUFU agreements. No specific anti-corruption measures have been implemented in the four projects in the Programme.

2.2. Effectiveness

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

2.2.1. Identification and selection of projects

The 27th April 2007 SIU sent out a letter – “Early warning about additional call for proposals to the NUFU programme” – to all the institutions already involved in the NUFU programme in Tanzania and in Norway. According to interview with SIU representatives, 5 institutions in Tanzania and 10-12 Norwegian institutions did receive written information about the forthcoming call for proposal. The official call for proposal was announced the 25th of May, and information about the call for proposal was also made available at SIU's website. The evaluators note that the official call for proposal had a rather short deadline (3rd July), making it difficult for institutions new to the NUFU programme to prepare a proposal. All the eleven proposals received by the application deadline derived from those institutions receiving the early warning. The selection process seems to have been narrowed down to include only certain institutions. However, at SIU it is underlined that the NUFU programme, instead of having a very wide approach, seeks to concentrate its activities. The evaluators find that such a narrow approach may increase the programme's potential of capacity-building at the institutional level.

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

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

2.2.2. Educational achievements

Master students and PhD candidates

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

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

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

The recruitment of Master students shows better results than what was set as targets. The Biodiversity project has clearly overachieved in its recruitment goals, and is supporting three additional Master students through the Programme and has involved yet five additional students with external funding in 2009. The Fisheries project at UDSM has involved one additional Master student. Also the Forestland project was aiming at including one additional Master student, but due to a recent increase in fees for graduate studies at SUA they had to abandon their plan. As with the PhD candidates, most Master students are progressing according to plan although a few had to postpone the completion of their degree from 2009 until 2010. All Master students are likely to finish during the project period.

Some Master and PhD students complain saying that limited fieldwork funding makes it difficult for them to reach distant research areas. As addressed above, some also complain that delayed transfer of funds forces them to delay their fieldwork and hence hamper their work progression. Other challenges mentioned by some Masters students and PhD candidates are delayed feedback from project coordinators and supervisors and the availability of academic literature at UDSM and SUA.

Development of education courses and programmes

The Tanzania – Norway NUFU programme is expected to produce three PhD programmes and one Master programme. The development of Master courses is also included as activities in the Programme. According to annual progress reports and interviews with project coordinators, it becomes clear that the establishments of study programmes are among the Programme's major challenges. So far no study programme has been fully developed and

implemented. However, the evaluators found that efforts are made in all projects apart from the Biodiversity project which did not apply for funds to develop courses or study programmes.

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

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

Training of technical and administrative staff

For the most part the projects have delivered the planned for technical training and some have even provided training beyond actual plans (for example the Biodiversity project). According to plans, eleven technical staff should receive training through the Programme. So far seven technical staff members have received training. The Programme did not plan to train administrative staff, however, needs for such training were discovered and the Programme has so far also provided training of seven administrative staff.

2.2.3. Scientific achievements

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

Publications

None of the four projects had planned any publications in 2008, however, one article in a scientific journal was published by the Forestland project at SUA. The results from 2009 show a higher activity relating to publications but goals set in the projects' work plans are not fully achieved, and several projects report postponement of such activities until 2010. By the end of 2009 the Programme was far behind the progress necessary in order to reach its goals within the Programme period. In total six scientific articles have been published and only five public lectures were reported.¹²

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

There are several explanations to why not more scientific achievements have been made. The late allocation of funds to the projects, making it impossible for the projects to start before 2008, is one explanatory factor. Second, PhD candidates following the PhD programme at SUA are expected to produce monographs and these PhD candidates have so far prioritised finalising their thesis-work at the expense of writing journal articles. Third, it is a time-consuming process to publish articles in scientific journals. In some international journals it may take around two years from the submission of an article to the actual publication. It is also common that publications are developed even several years after a project is finished, particularly in research projects involving vast data collection. Hence, the projects may come close to or even succeed in reaching their publication goal, however, this should not be expected to take place within the Programme period.

Despite the fact that most project coordinators anticipate to more or less reach the set targets, the evaluation team is of the opinion that the expected scientific achievements are somewhat unrealistic and believes it is unlikely for the Programme to fully reach the set goals. We therefore recommend the set targets to be discussed and possibly revised, or that it is made explicit that the expected scientific achievements will follow a timeframe which goes beyond the actual Programme period.

Dissemination activities

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

A challenge that some PhD candidates face is limited or lack of funding covering participation in national and international scientific conferences where they can present their

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

research findings and get valuable inputs. The evaluators recommend that the Programme looks into this matter either through allocating extra funding to cover such expenses or through assisting the PhD candidates in applying for additional funding elsewhere.

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

2.2.4. Impact for development

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

In addition to publications and dissemination of results, the project at UDSM has also attempted to directly impact on people's development through providing target groups of the research with research findings as well as to empower and supporting them to advocate their rights. This is taking place in the Mafia Islands.

2.2.5. Capacity building in the South

Individual capacity building

To date the Programme has in total contributed to the enrolment of 12 PhD candidates and 29 Master students. The study programmes they attend have provide them with new and valuable knowledge and experience which will better equip them for future work tasks. Focus groups with the PhD candidates and the Master students reveal a satisfaction with the individual capacity-building gained through their participation in the Programme.

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

Institutional capacity building

Several rules and regulations in the NUFU programme contribute to ensuring institutional capacity-building. The NUFU Guidelines for applicants (2007-2011) stipulates clearly that project coordinators and other researchers participating in the activities should be employed and paid by the respective partner institution. More or less the same applies related to the recruitment of students. NUFU Master Degree scholarships should not used for general education of Master's candidates, but are earmarked to selected students that have a potential for continuing into PhD education and hence contribute to strengthening the institution's capacity for research and research based education. Moreover, candidates recruited for PhD education should be staff or prospective staff of the home institution. The evaluation finds that the Tanzania – Norway NUFU programme is to a large extent in line with the general NUFU Guidelines regarding recruitment of Master students and PhD candidates. However, a recruitment ban decided by the Tanzanian Government has until recently made hiring new staff difficult and thus narrowed the possibilities of employing prospective staff among PhD candidates. At present most of the Master and PhD students are working at the two universities or for government departments.

To provide PhD degrees for universities staff will build competence at the institution, provided that the PhD candidates stay with the university. The capacity building will take place through the newly acquired knowledge, through future research and the development of new courses and study programmes. A higher number of staff with PhD degrees will also provide the institution with better chances of gaining research funding and entering into international research collaborations. Additionally, the Programme also contributes with capacity enhancement of SUA and UDSM through providing infrastructure such as technical equipment, vehicles, boats etc.

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

Capacity building in the field of natural resources management

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

2.2.6. Gender approach

The NUFU programme 2007 – 2011 has a renewed focus on gender, not only as gender balance among project participants but also by promoting gender mainstreaming in programme activities. The renewed gender focus is manifested by including gender mainstreaming as a main topic during the NUFU Programme Conference in Malawi and the NUFU annual project coordinator's seminar in Norway in 2009. Moreover, a study on gender mainstreaming in the NUFU programme was conducted in 2009.¹³

Gender balance

A concrete measure, rewarding projects able to recruit at least 40% female PhD candidates, has been put into practice to encourage female participation. The measure appears to have the desired effect, and three out of four projects in the Programme reached the set target. These three projects were granted a bonus of NOK 50.000. The projects have made good efforts to fill the quota asked for and the Programme in total has achieved 50% female PhD candidates. The project coordinators report that the female candidates are as likely as the male candidates to finish in time. They have long experience of supervising both female and male postgraduate students and express that there is no significant difference in terms of completion time. However, during the fieldwork difficult aspects with regards to participation

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

of women become evident. Complications are especially evident among pregnant students and female students with young children. It seems to the evaluators that at times the price these women pay to participate in the Programme is rather high. Two of the PhD candidates left children who were 6 and 7 months old in Tanzania to do the required stay at UMB. One of these women lost her baby while being in Norway. Discussions with project coordinators and students confirmed that it is difficult for women with small children to join PhD studies. The evaluators are of the opinion that the NUFU programme requires greater sacrifices of female students in the South than what is normally required among Norwegian women studying in Norway. Alongside the goal of gender balance should follow measures and support that facilitates female participation. The evaluators recommend that the Programme considers the possibility to finance bringing babies (and possibly also babysitters) during the female PhD candidates' stay at UMB. Moreover, support and specific measures should also be available for those women who give birth during the project period.

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

Around 40% of the Master students in the Programme are females, which bode well for future intake of PhD candidates as well as future hiring of academic staff at the natural science departments. The three projects at SUA have been much more successful than the project at UDSM which only had managed to recruit one female out of six Master students (16,7%) by the end of 2009.

Gender mainstreaming

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

According to the institutional annual reports from 2009 only one project, the Forestland project at SUA, aims at developing a course which in particular will address gender issues (Forest Resource Governance Course). The Fisheries project notes that gender issues will be integrated into programmes and courses. Gender mainstreaming is evident in a few publications and sub-themes addressed, but none of the main titles of individual projects and theses show a particular attention to gender issues even though a gender perspective would be highly valuable to and complement the current research. Differentiated knowledge on for example how females and males make use of the natural resources in their community, whether bad/good governance of natural resources may differently impact on poverty reduction for women-headed and men-headed households, and how to provide poor women with greater opportunities to benefit from natural resources are some themes expected to be of scientific value to a research programme focusing on the management of natural resources and development impact. These should be better integrated into the projects' thematic focus,

and bring about more knowledge specifically addressing gender issues related to natural resources and livelihoods.

Project coordinators expressed that the annual report layout should provide more room for elaborating on gender related issues. They also expressed a wish to be supported on how they could perform better on gender mainstreaming their project activities.

2.3. Relevance and policy dialogue

2.3.1. Relevance for national policies of Tanzania and Norway

The Programme is placed right in the centre of Norwegian development aid to Tanzania. Its funding derives directly from Norwegian development aid aiming at improving Tanzanian management of natural resources. The funding is provided Tanzania through the RNE. Moreover, the Norwegian Embassy wants to ensure the Programme a ‘Tanzanian flavour’ through making the Programme’s goals in line with national as well as institutional priorities in Tanzania.

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

2.3.2. Institutional relevance

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

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

The thematic approaches in the four projects are also considered important to and in line with UMB’s strategic plans and priorities. This was unanimously confirmed in interviews with the project coordinators and the institutional contact at UMB. However, at the faculty level there is a certain degree of dissatisfaction with all NUFU programmes as the compensation to Norwegian staff involved is insufficient.

2.3.3. Policy dialogue

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

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

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

In September 2009 SIU organized a seminar focusing specifically on policy dialogue. This effort is a positive contribution both to make researchers in the Programme meet and to disseminate preliminary results to policy makers and other key persons. Invitations were sent out to many relevant actors. However, the participation from the ministries was rather disappointing. The evaluation team recommends the organising of several seminars aiming at presenting and discussing findings with policy-makers and other relevant actors in the remaining Programme period, and suggests that RNE plays a more active part in organising such seminars. As Norway's political representative in Tanzania, the Embassy carries more weight and may therefore to a greater extent sway policy-makers to participate in seminars where findings are presented and debated. The evaluators recommend that RNE and/or the universities communicate with relevant policy-makers before determining the dates for future seminars, and that RNE is the institution responsible for inviting relevant departments and organisations.

Due to the short period of programme implementation, the evaluators may not assess the actual effect of the policy dialogue already carried out.

2.4. Sustainability

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

The Programme's chances to produce sustainable effects will increase through establishing international networks and through obtaining additional funding and research collaborations. The four projects' in the Programme is continually increasing their research competence as well as gaining valuable project administration experience, which in turn will strengthen their application for new research funding.

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

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

3. Conclusions and recommendations

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

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

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

Based on the findings presented above the evaluation team makes the following recommendations:

Efficiency

Management model

Report

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

Financial management

- To ensure a sufficient progression in research activities, we recommend that the challenge with regards to transfer of funds is addressed and minimized at each financial level.

North-South relations

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

South-South relations

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

Effectiveness

Educational achievements

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

Scientific achievements

- We recommend the set targets to be discussed and possibly revised, or that it should be made explicit that the expected scientific achievements will follow a timeframe which goes beyond the actual Programme period.

- As the four projects supported by the Programme already have produced important research findings, the evaluators see it as important to immediately increase the dissemination activities both through writing of articles and policy briefs, and establishing network and arenas for presentations of findings.
- The evaluators recommend that the Programme looks into how to financially support PhD candidates' participation in national and international scientific conferences where they can present their research findings and get valuable inputs. This could be done through allocating extra funding to cover such expenses or through assisting the PhD candidates in applying for additional funding elsewhere.

Capacity building

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

Gender approach

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

Policy dialogue

- The evaluation team recommends the organising of seminars aiming at presenting and discussing findings with policy-makers and other relevant actors in the remaining Programme period. We suggest that RNE plays a more active part in organising such seminars as well as in establishing contact between the relevant ministries and the researchers in the Programme. The evaluators recommend that RNE and/or the universities communicate with relevant policy-makers before determining the dates for future seminars, and that RNE is the institution responsible for inviting relevant departments and organisations.

¹⁴ See examples of such themes at page 19 of this report.

References

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

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

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

NUFU Guidelines for applicants (2007-2011)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix 1

Terms of Reference (ToR) Review of the Tanzania – Norway NUFU Programme

1.0 Background

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

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

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

The NUFU Programme Board selected on 5 September 2007 four projects to be funded. The total grant for the Programme shall not exceed NOK 25 million. (Please see appendix for an overview of the projects).

2.0 Description of the Programme

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

Objective

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

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

Outputs

- Education programmes developed and established within the area of management of natural resources, forestry, fisheries and/or wildlife
- Master and PhD degrees completed within the area of management of natural resources, forestry, fisheries and/or wildlife
- Publications and dissemination of research results within the area of management of natural resources, forestry, fisheries and/or wildlife

- Capacity building at the South partner institution, i.e. education of staff members at both PhD and Master level
- Training of Technical and administrative staff

Main indicators:

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

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

3.0. Scope of work

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

3.1 Efficiency

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

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

The review shall also look into the efficiency of the management model for the program, the MFA – SIU agreement under NUFU § 2.2.

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

3.2 Effectiveness

An assessment shall be made of the effectiveness of the programme in general, and with respect to gender in particular.

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

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

Gender;

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

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

3.3 Relevance

The review shall look into whether the projects are of relevance to and are integrated into:

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

3.4 'Policy dialogue'

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

- i) What are the different stakeholders (participating institutions, RNE and SIU) understanding of 'policy dialogue'?
- ii) which knowledge is generated through the projects that is relevant for 'policy dialogue'?
- iii) how, and to what extent have the projects undertaken 'policy dialogue' activities?
- iv) what are the effects of the 'policy dialogue' carried out?

3.5 Sustainability

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

- i) The probability for the capacity building activities to have lasting effects?
- ii) whether the different master programs are established/strengthened and incorporated into regular curricula of the institutions?
- iii) whether there are any employment plans for the graduated master and PhD candidates?

- iv) economical sustainability – will the structures established allow for a continuation of the activities after the finalisation of the programme?

3.6 Risk management

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

3.7 Anti-corruption

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

4.0 Implementation of the review

4.1 Methodology

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

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

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

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

Interviews with leadership, administration and project coordinators at the Norwegian partner institution, the Norwegian University of Life Sciences, shall be conducted. In addition the reviewers shall conduct interviews with relevant personnel at RNE, Norad and SIU.

4.2. The review team

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

4.3 Budget and responsibilities:

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

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

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

4.4 Timelines, reporting and outputs

The review shall provide a draft report and a final report with an executive summary. A total of 30 working days is allocated to the review - to be conducted between 15 March and 31 May 2010.

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

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

5.0 Relevant documentation

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

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

NUFU Programme document 2007 – 2011

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

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

Project documents for the NUFUTZ –projects

Tripartite Contracts for the NUFUTZ –projects

All applications for the earmarked funds for Tanzania

NUFU Annual Report 2007 and 2008

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

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

Minutes from the Annual Consultative Meeting, 2008 and 2009

Appendix 2

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

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

Appendix 3

Individual interviews were conducted with the following respondents:

Sokoine University of Agriculture

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

University of Dar Es Salaam

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

From UMB

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

The Norwegian embassy

Malin Liljert
Ivar Jørgensen

Department of Natural Resources and Tourism in Tanzania

Mr. Juma Mgoo