

Jon Naustdalslid
Joseph A. Kuzilwa

Review of PITRO III

**Review of the Programme for Institutional
Transformation and Outreach (PITRO III) and its
Administrative Model Including the UiO-UDSM
University Partnership**

Title: **Review of PITRO III**
Review of the Programme for Institutional Transformation and Outreach (PITRO III) and its Administrative Model Including the UiO-UDSM University Partnership

Author: Jon Naustdalslid and Joseph A. Kuzilwa

NIBR Working Paper: 2012:103

ISSN: 0801-1702
ISBN: 978-82-7071-930-3

Project number: O-3026
Project name: PITRO III

Financial supporter Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education (SIU)

Head of project: Jon Naustdalslid

Abstract: The report presents the results of NIBR's review of the Programme for Institutional Transformation and Outreach (PITRO III) at the University of Dar es Salaam and its administrative model, including the partnership between University of Dar es Salaam and University of Oslo.

Summary: English

Date: 18th April 2012

Pages: 44

Publisher: Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research
Guastadalléen 21,
N-0349 OSLO

Telephone (+47) 22 95 88 00
Telefax (+47) 22 60 77 74
E-mail: nibr@nibr.no
<http://www.nibr.no>

Org. nr. NO 970205284 MVA

© NIBR 2012

Preface

This report presents the results of a review of the Programme for Institutional Transformation and Outreach (PITRO III) at the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) and its administrative model, including the partnership between UDSM and University of Oslo (UiO). The review was commissioned by Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education (SIU).

The purpose of the review was to assess the progress of the programme at the University of Dar es Salaam, to assess the role of University of Oslo as a partner in the programme, and assess the administrative model of the programme.

The review has been carried out by a team consisting of Senior Researcher Jon Naustdalslid (NIBR) as team leader and Professor Joseph A. Kuzilwa (Mzumbe University). The review has been based on documentary material such as programme documents, reports and minutes from meetings in addition to interviews with key personnel both in Norway and Tanzania. As part of the review exercise the team spent one week in Tanzania visiting the University of Dar es Salaam and carried out interviews with a number of people involved in the programme.

The review team would like to thank the staff at SiU for good support and for providing all relevant documentary material for the review, staff in Norad, University of Oslo and University of Dar es Salaam for willingly responding to requests for interviews.

Oslo, April 2012

Trine Myrvold

Research Director

Table of Contents

Preface	1
Table of Contents	2
Acronyms	3
Summary.....	4
1 Introduction.....	7
1.1 Background	7
1.2 Terms of Reference.....	8
1.3 Project team and methodology	8
2 Progress and goals achievement	10
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 Overall implementation status in relation to budget.....	11
2.3 The research component.....	12
2.3.1 Programme goals	12
2.3.2 Content, progress and goal achievement	12
2.3.3 Timeliness.....	16
2.3.4 Cross-cutting comments on the research component	16
2.4 The institutional transformation and capacity building component.....	18
2.4.1 Introduction	18
2.4.2 Content	18
2.4.3 Activities and progress.....	19
2.4.4 Brief assessment of the Institutional intervention component	20
3 The partnership between UDSM and UiO.....	22
3.1 Background and objectives	22
3.2 The establishment and development of the cooperation.....	22
3.3 Experiences from both sides	23
3.4 Effects of the cooperation	25
4 Administrative model and SIU's role.....	27
4.1 The administrative model.....	27
4.2 Financial management system	27
4.2.1 Issue of Concern	28
4.3 The actors' satisfaction with the model – and with SIU's role.....	28
4.4 Assessment of the administrative model and SIU's role	29
5 Overall assessments and recommendations.....	32
5.1.1 Assessments	32
5.1.2 Recommendations.....	33
Appendix 1 Terms of Reference.....	35
Appendix 2 People interviewed	42

Acronyms

AC	Assessment Committee
CEES	Centre for Ecological and Evolutionary Synthesis
ICT	Information and communication technology
IRA	Institute of Resource Assessment
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NIBR	Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research
NTNU	Norwegian Technical University
NUFU	Norwegian Programme for Development, Research and Education
PITRO	Programme for Institutional Transformation and Outreach
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
RNE	Royal Norwegian Embassy
SIU	Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation and Higher Education
SUM	Centre for Development and Environment
ToR	Terms of Reference
UDSM	University of Dar es Salaam
UiO	University of Oslo

Summary

Jon Naustdalslid and Joseph A. Kuzilwa

Review of PITRO III

Review of the Programme for Institutional Transformation and Outreach (PITRO III) and its Administrative Model Including the UiO-UDSM University Partnership
NIBR Working Paper: 2012:103

This report presents the results of a review of the Programme for Institutional Transformation and Outreach (PITRO III) at the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) and its administrative model, including the partnership between UDSM and University of Oslo (UiO). The review was commissioned by Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education (SIU).

The review was carried out by a team consisting of Senior Researcher Jon Naustdalslid (NIBR) and Professor Joseph A. Kuzilwa (Mzumbe University) and is based on documentary sources and interviews with involved stakeholders both in Norway and in Tanzania.

The PITRO III programme is a continuation of earlier programmes for Norwegian support to UDSM. The new element in PITRO III is the involvement of UiO as a partner to support UDSM in implementing the programme.

The programme consists of two main components:

1. Research, development and outreach with a focus on demand driven and basic research with a particular emphasis on three areas: education, environment and good governance
2. Institutional transformation and capacity building aiming at strengthening the capacity of UDSM in terms of human resources physical infrastructure, strategic interventions, institutional transformation, improved employability of graduates and enhanced performance of staff.

The purpose of the review was to:

- Assess the progress of the programme at UDSM in light of the programme document.
- Assess whether the inclusion of a Norwegian partner institution has facilitated the realization of the programme goals.
- Assess whether the administrative model involving SIU-UDSM-UiO is efficient and cost effective.

In assessing the progress and goals achievement of the programme, the review team has concluded that as an overall assessment PITRO III has been fairly successful in reaching its goals. The project portfolio of the research and outreach component is seen as being well within the thematic fields for the programme, even though the three fields of *education, environment* and *good governance* are somewhat unevenly covered with most of the projects within the field of environment. Some of the projects are delayed. The main reason for this seems to be problems related to the start-up phase of the programme and some other more specific reasons related to the individual projects. Due to the delay in the start-up of the research projects the actual and effective project period will be two years rather than three. The review remarks that this may be a too short period to receive the wanted results, and concern is expressed that particularly the publication phase of the projects may suffer. It is proposed that the programme should be given a six months no cost extension, and during the review it has been clarified that such an extension will be granted.

The Institutional transformation and capacity building component of the programme has progressed well and activities have been in line with the objectives of the programme. By taking advantage of exchange gains due to depreciation of Tanzanian Shillings during the programme, also projects outside the initial scope of the programme have been funded. The financial management of the programme has been transparent and in accordance with the financial regulations of UDSM.

The partnership between UDSM and UiO was not initiated by the universities themselves, but came about as an initiative of the Norwegian Embassy and Norad in the process of negotiating the terms for the PITRO III programme. It also led to certain delays in the start-up of the programme, particularly the research and outreach component. As judged on this background, the review concludes that the cooperation has turned out to become remarkably successful. Both sides expressed satisfaction with the cooperation. Some practical and communication problems were noted and are discussed in the review, but generally the cooperation should be seen as a success. The review also concludes that the cooperation has contributed positively to UDSM reaching the goals of the programme.

The review was also to assess the administrative model of PITRO III and SIU's role in the management of the programme. The programme is funded through Norad and the practical administration is outsourced to SIU. The running of the programme is then again based on a tripartite agreement between SIU, UDSM and UiO. The two universities expressed some mixed feelings about the administrative model and SIU's role. Particularly the start-up phase was seen as problematic. The review notes that it took about six months to organize the process of establishing joint research projects, and the participants in the process also felt that too little time was given for establishing contact between researchers and for developing joint projects. Once the research projects were in place, fewer problems are noted, and stakeholders on the Tanzanian side also commended SIU for being flexible and understanding in the way management of the programme has been handled. However, change of personnel and delays in releasing the last batch of funding raised serious concerns.

The overall assessment is that PITRO III has been fairly successful in reaching its goals in spite of some delays, particularly in the implementation of the research projects. The administrative model has some problems, but seems to have

functioned reasonably well once the start-up problems were overcome. The cost-effectiveness of the administrative arrangement is more questionable. It had probably been more cost-effective – and required less bureaucracy and simpler reporting – if Norad or the Norwegian Embassy had managed the programme directly.

The review recommends that in the case of a new phase of PITRO, the programme should concentrate on the research and outreach component and develop further the cooperation between UDSM and UiO. This element of the current programme is also seen as the most sustainable. In this case the administrative model may be simplified, leaving more of the administration to the two universities within a contractual framework monitored by the Embassy or Norad.

1 Introduction

This report presents the results of our review of the Programme for Institutional Transformation and Outreach (PITRO III) at the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) and its administrative model, including the partnership between UDSM and University of Oslo (UiO). The review is commissioned by Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education (SIU).

1.1 Background

In 2008 The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and Tanzania entered into a bridging agreement for launch of a research and capacity building programme for support to the University of Dar es Salaam in the areas of institutional transformation, research and outreach (PITRO III). MFA also requested Norad to establish an agreement with Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education (SIU) for the channelling and follow up of support to the programme, and to establish an agreement with a Norwegian University to support SIU in following up the implementation of the PITRO-programme. After a tender process the University of Oslo was selected as the partner university for implementation of the programme and a Tripartite Contract for carrying out the programme was signed between SIU, UDSM and UiO in July 2009. According to the contract the programme should run for three years and be finalized by June 2012.

The main objective of the PITRO programme is to ‘increase the contribution of the University of Dar es Salaam to Tanzania’s efforts to economic growth, reduced poverty and improved social well-being of Tanzanians through transformation of the education, science and technology sectors.’ For this purpose the programme was set up with two main components to be assessed in the review:

1. Research, development and outreach with a focus on demand driven and basic research with a particular emphasis on three areas: education, environment and good governance.
2. Institutional transformation and capacity building aiming at strengthening the capacity of UDSM in terms of human resources physical infrastructure, strategic interventions, institutional transformation, improved employability of graduates and enhanced performance of staff.

1.2 Terms of Reference

According to the Terms of Reference¹ the purpose of the review is to:

- Assess the progress of the programme at UDSM in light of the programme documents.
- Assess whether the inclusion of a Norwegian partner institution has facilitated the realization of the programme goals.
- Assess whether the administrative model involving SIU-UDSM-UiO is efficient and cost effective.

1.3 Project team and methodology

Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research has been responsible for the review which has been carried out by a team consisting of Senior Researcher Jon Naustdalslid (NIBR) as team leader and Professor Joseph A. Kuzilwa, Mzumbe University as team member.

The review is based on reading documentary sources, such as contracts, minutes of meetings and programme plans, together with interviews with a number of people both in Norway and in Tanzania. The list of people met is attached as Annex 2.

Concerning the progress of the programme, this has been assessed in light of two main criteria:

- *Timeliness*: The programme is running somewhat behind schedule. The task for the review was therefore to gain a better understand of the reasons for the delay and point at possible lessons to be learned.
- *Goal achievement*: Irrespective of whether the programme has progressed according to its timeline, the more fundamental question is if the activities that are being carried out are in line with the objectives of the overarching and more specific goals *of the programme*? Has the programme covered all the components and tasks it is supposed to cover and how well do the activities that are being carried out reflect the programme objectives?

The two main components of the programme; research development and outreach and institutional transformation are closely linked. Nevertheless the two main components have been assessed separately, keeping in mind the links between them.

Concerning the involvement of UiO as a partner for UDSM, this was again reviewed in the light of the main objectives of the programme, and particularly in light of the ToR for UiO as a partner institution: To what extent has the involvement of UiO as a partner enhanced quality and performance of research and education at UDSM in the priority areas of education, environment and good governance?

The tripartite administrative model was assessed with a view to creating a good understanding of the effectiveness of this arrangement and with a special emphasis

¹ The Terms of Reference are attached as Annex 1

of the role of SIU. To what extent has the way in which SIU has run the programme contributed to a good implementation of the programme in light of the programme objectives?

2 Progress and goals achievement

2.1 Introduction

The PITRO III programme consists of two main components: A research, development and outreach component and an institutional transformation component. The programme is described, and goals, administration model and financial frames are explained in the Tripartite Contract between SIU, UiO and UDSM as signed in July 2009. However, the evaluation of the implementation of the programme has been somewhat hampered by the fact that two of the announced annexes to this contract were not attached at the time of signing, and it seems that they were never produced. This is annex II “Work plan and tentative budget for the programme period” which should have been worked out by UDSM; and annex II which is a similar document for the programme partner. None of these documents can be traced, and on request to SIU/UDSM we have been informed that the initial programme document for the programme should be taken to serve the purpose. In addition, and particularly for the purpose of the research and outreach component, the team has also made use of specific joint UDSM/UiO research project documents. These documents contain both the rephrased (2010 -2012) planned activities for the entire project period and respective budgets.

The two main components of the programme have therefore followed two different timelines: The planning document for PITRO III was worked out by UDSM during the last phases of PITRO II. It is dated June 2008 and describes a four years programme with a funding need of NOK 60 million, and with no inclusion of an external partner. The agreement with the Royal Norwegian Embassy (RNA) that PITRO III should include a twinning relationship with a Norwegian university came in later, but on the condition that the goals and main programme activities of the programme document of 2008 should be retained. Hence, as far as the activities of the institutional transformation component is concerned, PITRO III could continue fairly smoothly linking up from PITRO II and bring in UiO support as it went along. The research and outreach component, however, was halted in order to develop joint research projects, and could not start effectively till the second half of 2009.

A major problem with the implementation of the PITRO III programme seems to have been that not sufficient time was allowed for a smooth and well structured transition from PITRO II to PITRO III. The original plans for a new PITRO phase had no thoughts for including an external partner in the project. The inclusion of UiO as such partner would, under normal circumstance, have required more planning and time for the two institutions to develop joint strategies and harmonize

plans for implementation. Since the research component required more by the way of individual contacts and joint planning², this component seems to have suffered more than the institutional transformation component.

2.2 Overall implementation status in relation to budget

The 2010/11 Annual Institutional report (the first annual report under PITRO III) submitted by UDSM in November 2011, indicates that during the first year of the programme a total of NOK 15 million was disbursement as per the budget agreement. While this would translate to Tsh. 3.15 million at the time of request, the actual amount received in local currency was Tsh. 3.565 million, representing an exchange rate gain of Tsh. 415,343,256. This enabled actual implementation of projects to start in mid 2010.

The team was informed that the agreed budgetary allocation between the three major components should be at least 30% for Research, 30% for capacity building and 33% for institutional support and 7% for remuneration. During the first year, however, actual expenditures by components were: Research: 25.5%, capacity building 35.4%, infrastructure 25.3%, project administration 10.8% and strategic intervention 3.1%. (See Institutional Annual Report 2010/11). The variance (under-performance) in the research component, with almost all projects failing to spend the allocated funds, has been attributed by a number of factors.³

Some of the research projects reported problems with transfer of funds as explanations for delays. The basic problem seems actually to be that the projects (and the whole programme), were delayed from the start and that hence the implementation of the individual projects (and reporting from the institutions) came out of tune with the reporting and disbursement cycle of the programme. The main problem (as far as the disbursement of funds is concerned) seems therefore to have been at the very beginning of the programme. For most of 2009/2010 the actual fact was, as transpires from the 2010/2011 Annual Report, that *“most of the research projects failed to spend all the money allocated and it was unanimously agreed in the final Steering committee that PITRO III – 10033 spend the money (...) and that in the next year, those projects whose money was spent by PITRO III – 10033 be reimbursed from its next year allocations.”*

In a comment by SIU they also point out that there have been several cases of internal delays of distribution of funds from the central administration at UDSM to the projects. As for the delayed transfer of funds for the second half of the year 2011, this was, according to SIU; due to administrative problems at SIU

Implementation of capacity building and infrastructure components against the budget was very good. Construction and rehabilitation of buildings benefitted from the reported exchange rate gain. On the human resources and capacity building component, a total of 15 masters and 6 Ph.D. scholarships have been offered to both academic and administrative staff at a cost effective manner, with all of them tenable at the University of Dar-es-Salaam. The good performance of these components is

² Development and selection of joint research projects (see below).

³ See chapter 2.3

attributed to the fact that they involved only the UDSM on the one hand, but also the in-built flexibility within the programme.

With only six months of the project period remaining, only 50% of the total budget has been spent. Disbursement of the last instalment of NOK 7,500,000 for the final year (2012) was received by the University of Dar es Salaam on February 3, 2012. While other components may have no problems spending the money, with the challenges already observed in undertaking the joint researches (See also Section 2.3), it would seem practical to extend the project to end of December 2012 to allow for completion of this component⁴.

2.3 The research component

2.3.1 Programme goals

The component on “research, development and outreach” is supposed to focus on demand-driven and basic research, ”in order to empower and provide solutions to community challenges.”⁵ The condition was that the research projects should cover the three broad fields of *education*, including Kiswahili in schools, equity in learning and assessment of Tanzanian higher education; *environment*, including fields such as genetically modified crops, climate change and geological hazards; *and good governance*, including themes such as financial management, good governance and community-based education interventions.

2.3.2 Content, progress and goal achievement

The research component consists of six joint research projects:

- Environment geology and ground water dynamics in parts of semi-arid areas of Central Tanzania. Total allocation: NOK 1,25 mill.
- Biodiversity and humans in a fragmented world: towards a sound conservation program for the Pare mountains. Total allocation: NOK 2,45 mill.
- Climate change and variability in Tanzania: assessment of impacts, vulnerability and adaptive capacity of natural and social systems. Total allocation: NOK 3,0 mill.
- A sustainable energy system for the provision of rural electrification services. Total allocation: NOK 2,8 mill.
- Education for learners with disabilities. Total allocation: NOK 2,5 mill
- Legal issues related to the implementation of the International Environmental and Climate Law in Tanzania in order to mitigate biodiversity loss and climate change, with focus on implementation of national REDD+ strategy. Total allocation: NOK 2,2 mill.

⁴ SIU has later confirmed that such an extension has been agreed upon.

⁵ Tripartite agreement, article 1.2.1.

Out of the six projects one is in the field of *education*. This is the project on *Education for learners with disabilities*. The project consists of two main components: a component on “inclusive education” and one component on “deaf education”. These two components were initially submitted as separate project proposals from UDSM. In the case of inclusive education there was no cooperation or contacts between the researchers prior to the call for proposals. In the case of deaf education such contacts existed. The two components were then merged into one project during the project evaluation phase. The two components seem to have progressed more or less in parallel. The project may be seen to fit in very well with the programme goals. The “deaf part” aims at developing an electronic (CD-based) Kiswahili sign language dictionary. The component on inclusive education is a more traditional research project aiming at improving knowledge about education for disabled children. Both components should be seen as highly relevant given the objectives of this particular programme component and more generally for the Tanzanian society. Both components obviously meet a demand in society. The project seems to have progressed fairly well given the time constraints and the fact that there had been little prior contact between the participants. The main constraints are reported to be delayed disbursement of funds and the fact that the “deaf component” lacks a Norwegian partner⁶. The paper-writing workshop was reported to have been exceptionally successful. Altogether nine papers are reported to be in the pipeline, five of these jointly with Norwegian partner. Four master students are involved in the project.

The *good governance* theme is covered by the project titled *Legal issues related to international and climate law in Tanzania, with a focus on the implementation of the REDD+ strategy*. This is a cross-disciplinary project linking the good governance theme to the theme on environment. The project aims at building legal capacity in Tanzania through teaching and research, related to the protection of biodiversity and climate change. A secondary aim is to increase knowledge and understanding among Norwegian legal scholars and decision-makers about environmental law and challenges related to implementing the REDD+ strategy in Tanzania. The initiative to this project seems to have emanated from the Norwegian side, but to be based on a long standing contact between the Tanzanian and the Norwegian project leader. The project is strongly concerned with teaching and capacity building in the field of environmental law. Research aims at improving the knowledge about challenges for implementing REDD at the local level in villages, especially in the context of complementarities or otherwise discrepancies between legal frameworks at various levels. One PhD candidate (Norwegian side) and two master students are involved in the project. The contribution of Professor Bugge, the Norwegian project leader to teaching, seminars and training of trainers workshops, was mentioned as particularly positive and successful. The project is about 6 months (at least) delayed. This was said to be due, partly to the fact that a key Norwegian project participant has had maternity leave during the project period, and that the Tanzania project leader got heavily involved in the planning and management of UDSM’s 50th Anniversary celebration in 2011. The project should generally be seen as fitting in well with the objectives of the programme. It straddles the two thematic fields of good governance and environment/climate. It is certainly filling an urgent need for legal capacity

⁶ The Norwegian partner left UiO during the project

building. We also note that the outreach component and dissemination objective has been given particular attention as the project has organized an open capacity building workshop for all institutions teaching law in Tanzania.

The thematic field of *environment* is the most broadly covered. As already observed, the law project also links to environment, and in addition four projects in one way or another address this thematic field:

The project *Biodiversity and humans in a fragmented world: towards a sound conservation program for the Pare Mountains* covers the fields of zoology and botany. The objective is to identify biodiversity distribution patterns in the Pare Mountains and to provide recommendations for conservation. It is based on cooperation between the Department of Zoology and Wildlife conservation, UDSM and the Natural History Museum, UiO. Contact between project partners was established in 2009 when a delegation from UDSM visited UiO, and the project proposal was later developed by keeping up contact by e-mail. The project contains research based on data collection in Pare Mountains also involving master students. Problems concerning implementation on the Tanzanian side were reported mainly to be due to delays in disbursement of funds⁷ and problems with matching fieldwork with the cycle of teaching responsibilities in the universities. Hence fewer master students were able to participate in field work than was initially planned. However, the aim is still to produce 12 masters. Staff exchange between Tanzania and Norway has been carried out as well as student visits to UiO. Five papers are reported to be in the pipeline, and the Tanzanian project team was very much looking forward to the writers workshop to be arranged in February 2012. The project should generally be seen as well in line with the objectives of the programme, and in spite of some delays it seems that most of the components planned for are in place.

The project *Climate change and variability in Tanzania; assessment of impacts, vulnerability and adaptive capacity of natural and social systems*, is on the Tanzanian side a cooperation between Institute of Resource Assessment (IRA) of UDSM and Institute of Development Studies (IDS). On the Norwegian side it involves the Centre for Ecological and Evolutionary Synthesis (CEES) at UiO. The latter is one of the specially established Norwegian Centres of Excellence. The aim of the project is to assess the impact of climate change and variability on the natural environment and on socio-economic attributes as reflected in rural people's livelihood in Tanzania. The project is then again subdivided into four sub-modules, and it is noted that two of these modules (on adaptation of wild food plants and plant genetics) are carried out by CEES without participation from the Tanzanian side. The two other sub-modules (on social networks and rural-urban linkages as coping and adaptive strategies in relation to climate change and sustainability of coping strategies in dealing with climate-related stresses) are carried out jointly by the Tanzania and Norwegian partners, also including Centre for Development and Environment (SUM) at UiO. This is a research project not having any master or PhD students on the Tanzania side. On the Norwegian side one master student is reported to be involved. The Tanzanian side of the project calls for more co-operation with the team from Oslo. Little joint field work seems to have taken place and the project

⁷ The Tanzanian participants reported that in spite of problems with transfer of project funds the project had been able to keep up a certain momentum by borrowing money from the department.

(Tanzanian side) reported problems with transfer of funds and problems with coordinating UDSM and UiO semester and teaching cycles. As far as thematic orientation is concerned the project is very well in line with the programme objectives on environment. The critical part may seem to be problems with operating the project as a genuinely joint project. Two modules do not include Tanzanian partners. On the other hand this project was highly praised by a representative from Vice President's – Office – Department of Environment, for excellent outreach by researchers from both IRA and IDS. The researchers from both institutions seem to be very active in participating and disseminating information on climate change at all levels, including the local/village level.

The project on *Environmental geology and ground water dynamics in parts of semi-arid area of Central Tanzania* aims at studying patterns of ground water distribution in the study area including studying distribution and accumulation of toxic matters, including uranium (which is found in the area) may influence water quality. The project builds on a long standing co-operation with the lead researcher on the Norwegian side (dating back to 1993), and the call of project proposals provided an opportunity to continue the co-operation. Hence also this project managed to get a good start, and the project seems to be running more or less according to plan. Delays in transfer of funds were also in this case reported to have been remedied by the project borrowing from the department. The project involves four master students, two from UDSM and two from UiO. The master programme includes student exchange. Cooperation between the UDSM and UiO side seems generally to be good and well integrated. The project is obviously relevant for the environment module, not least as getting a better understanding of ground water dynamics, including insight into possible uranium contamination, should be seen as being of great importance for local communities. The Tanzanian team said to be ready to disseminate results locally, but at the same time they expressed a certain concern that result could cause local uneasiness. It should be emphasised that a project like this that might be of importance to public health, should not be restrained in disseminating its results to the public for fear of public reactions. In any case it has been indicated that the ample data collected will be jointly analysed in Oslo in May 2012 and subsequently joint scientific papers shall be written.

The project on *A sustainable energy system for the provision of rural electrification services* is also a cross-disciplinary project including on the one hand an engineering component to try out a scheme for solar energy in a remote village cut off from the national grid, and on the other hand a social science component to follow up the socio-economic aspects of implementing such a technological in the village context. The idea for the engineering component emanated from UDSM and the researchers were linked up with their Norwegian partners in UiO/SUM during the project formulation phase. The project has run into problems of implementation, mainly due to need for the project to involve local communities and partly due to delays related to procurement of technical equipment. The project has involved one master student from UDSM and one PhD student from UiO. The project report as of October 2011 makes it clear that due to the above mentioned delays the fulfilment of the project will require an extension of the project period to the end of 2012. Putting aside the implementation problems, this is clearly a highly relevant project and a project very well in line with the objectives of the programme and the ambitions to contribute to

local development. It is also highly commendable that the project design combines an engineering effort at the local level with a social science component to create a better understanding of the conditions for successful implementation. Too many technological improvement efforts in Tanzania and in other developing countries have failed to be sustainable due to lack of understanding of the cultural and socio-economic conditions for their implementation and sustainability. Also; the implementation problems themselves should actually invite to systematic learning.

2.3.3 Timeliness

The different projects have to a varying degree managed to keep up with their original time schedule. The situation seems to be most serious for the project on sustainable energy. These problems are, on the other hand, quite understandable, and as far as we can judge, more or less outside the control of the project team. A project that depends on active involvement of Tanzanian local authorities and on Tanzania procurement regulations for capital investment exposes itself to a considerable risk. The question is rather whether it was at all feasible to aim at carrying out such a project within a timeframe of only two years.

The tight time limit for the projects is also a more general problem. Even though PITRO III is a three years programme, the actual projects are running for only two effective years. After the tripartite agreement was signed in July 2009 it took six months till a call for project ideas/applications was issued jointly by UDSM and UiO with an initial deadline for submitting proposals to SIU set to 26th March. This deadline was later extended, first to 30th April, and then to 5th May. The basic condition was that all projects should have partners both from UDSM and UiO, and in the case of UiO this was an absolute condition. For some of the projects that were finally approved, personal contacts and prior research cooperation existed before (as in the Law project and the geology project). In other cases contacts were established only during the project formulation process.

The tender for research projects was issued without any prior systematic contact between UDSM and UiO researchers. In most cases this contact had to be developed during the tender period. The scope for identifying relevant projects was also restricted by the thematic framework adopted for PITRO III, excluding some of the UDSM researchers who had had projects under PITRO II, and also excluding researchers both at UDSM and at UiO who might have had research contacts and cooperation already.

It is in fact very optimistic to think that researchers who do not at all know each other in advance, who may in addition have no experience with working together over cultural and institutional borders, shall be able to design and successfully carry out an ambitious research project, including also students and in some cases also demanding field work, within a tight two years time limit. Seen in this context most projects may actually be seen to have progressed remarkably well.

2.3.4 Cross-cutting comments on the research component

In summing up these observations a few summary and cross-cutting points should be recorded:

-
- Most projects are running behind schedule; mainly because of delays in the start-up phase of the programme, and linked to this the perceived delays in transfer of funds from SIU⁸. At the Norwegian side the disbursement issue is seen as less of a problem because project activities can run more or less continuously based on forward payments from UiO. Hence the actual project activity is less vulnerable to delays in disbursement. However, also some of the Tanzanian project managers reported that they had been able to keep up activities based on “loans” from their departments.
 - Another cause for concern, mentioned by some of the Tanzanian partners, is problems caused by incongruence between the Tanzanian and the Norwegian academic calendars. Teaching periods, exams and holidays do not match, making it sometimes difficult to find time for joint activities, such as fieldwork and seminars. For some projects, like the geology one, field work can only be done in specific weather periods when roads are accessible. These problems may be exacerbated if there are delays in transfer of funds, since planned for activities may have to be rescheduled.
 - Both the Norwegian and the Tanzanian side reported that projects were carried out in a good and positive atmosphere. Generally, projects which were able to take advantage of prior cooperation seemed to function best. We observed some frustration on the Norwegian side that getting in contact with partners at UDSM through email and/or phone could be a problem at times, and that follow up between meetings was sometimes difficult.
 - All projects should be seen as clearly within the framework of the programme and in various ways responding to the overarching goals of the programme. As should be obvious from the short account of each project recorded above, if successful, all the projects should clearly be relevant for such goals as reduction of poverty, social well-being and economic growth.
 - Assessing the total project portfolio, one will see that the three main thematic areas are quite unevenly covered. Four of the projects are in the field of environment. In addition the one project which is in the field of good governance is on environmental law. Hence the thematic field of environment is very well covered. A plus for some of those projects is that they are cross disciplinary, including both natural and social sciences. The theme on good governance is covered only by the law projects. Mentioned priorities such as fiscal management and community-based education intervention are not covered. There is also only one project covering education, and the project fits in well. What may be seen not to be covered is a project activity on assessment of Tanzanian higher education.
 - In the account above we have not commented particularly on the gender balance for each project, and it has been difficult also to undertake an accurate quantitative assessment. It is, however, clear that a goal of full gender balance is not reached. There is a clear overbalance of men, both in the research staff (only the education project has female project leaders (on both sides)) and among the master students. One explanation that was underscored is that the

⁸ However, this claim should be seen in light of the observation (see section 2.2) that most projects actually failed to spend all their allocated funds during 2010/2011.

projects are in fields where there generally is an overrepresentation of male researchers as well as students. It was also emphasised that systematic and active search had been undertaken in order to stimulate more female students to go for masters in the projects offered.

2.4 The institutional transformation and capacity building component

2.4.1 Introduction

The review of this component was also made difficult by the fact that operational work plan and budget seem not to have been provided at the beginning of the programme period. Hence, the “baseline” for the assessment of this main component of the programme has to be the original programme document from 2008, outlining a four years project. Here therefore, there are obviously overlaps between PITRO II and PITRO III and some misunderstanding as to what activity should actually be counted under the one or the other phase of PITRO. One example is the establishment of a gymnasium at UDSM. This is mentioned both in the tripartite contract and specially mentioned in our ToR⁹. During our field visit to UDSM it was, however, repeatedly explained that this activity was finalized already under PITRO II, and hence not an activity under PITRO III.

In the absence of a baseline project document and budget, the assessment under this section was based on the interviews on both the Norwegian and the Tanzanian side, the progress reports for the period 2010/11, together with the thematic overview of programme activities under this heading in the programme document from 2008 and the ToR for the tender for a Norwegian partner issued by SIU.

2.4.2 Content

The institutional transformation and capacity building component of the programme has four main components with sub-activities:

- Human resources development with a capacity building and scholarship programme.
- A component for improvement of physical facilities including construction of seminar rooms and rehabilitation of laboratories, equipment and vehicle procurement, support for physical education unit and design of graduate school building.
- Improvement of teaching and learning, including activities such as centre for continuing education, English skills development, support to the library, strengthening the quality assurance function, purchase of ICT equipment, support for fine and performing arts and support to physical sciences.

⁹ In SIU's comments on the draft report it was clarified that this point should not have been included in the ToR.

- Strategic intervention, including gender activities support and support to HIV/AIDS intervention.

2.4.3 Activities and progress

It has not been possible during a short visit to UDSM to undertake any auditor-like review of the implementation of the various activities in relation to budget and more specific goals for each component. What can be done is to comment briefly on activities and progress based on our interviews with selected key people. The contribution and involvement of UiO will be commented on more specifically in chapter 3.

Unlike the activities under the programme component on research, development and outreach, the introduction of UiO as an external partner did not lead to a halt in project activities and an extra round with calls for proposals for joint activities. Hence there seems not to have been the same delay and start-up problems that were experienced in the research component.

Human resources development with a capacity building and scholarship programme

This component of PITRO III, extending from previous programmes, covers mainly Ph.D. training for academic staff, masters training for academic and administrative staff and short course for support staff. At the time of this assessment 6 academic staff were on Ph.D. while 10 academic staff and 6 administrative staff were recruited for masters degrees, and 44 other junior administrative staff were on short term training. The enrolment of the staff for Ph.D. and masters training have been highly applauded as a cost-effective way to building the capacity of the University, especially at the time when there is large cohorts of senior staff who are retiring. While progress in this activity is good, there are, however, a number of challenges that need to be addressed and we focus in two. Ph.D. degree programmes take longer than the two years PITRO III is running. It is for this reason that many of the research projects did not provide for Ph.D.s Secondly, even though at a low level, there have been cancellations of sponsorship by some recipients after receiving scholarships tenable abroad. While replacements can be found, this may further delay completion.

Physical facilities

A number of these activities were ongoing activities, and activities that in any case have not involved UiO. These include for example building of classrooms and vehicle procurement and more generally improvement of physical infrastructure. We shall therefore assume that these activities have been accounted for in the routine reporting to the annual and biannual meetings. It was also explained to us that for most of these activities, PITRO funds serves as strategic development and investment programmes at the University. Hence, PITRO funds were not the only source of funding.

Some of the infrastructure improvements were, however, mentioned as being financed particularly under PITRO III. Those include construction of new seminar

rooms¹⁰, buying of chairs and procurement of vehicles. It was also pointed out to us that the University had managed to implement projects from PITRO funds beyond what was included in the programme. This included new paving of the main footpath from Nkruma Hall to the Administration Building. According to the Annual Institutional Report 2010/11, the buildings benefitted from the exchange rate gain of more than Tsh. 400 million which were allowed by the Steering Committee to be used this way. In our opinion, this transparency and in built flexibility in managing finances is a positive thing. This may at least be taken as an indication that as far as the institutional intervention component is concerned, delays in the transfer of funds can not have been a problem. However, an issue of concern that has to be picked up by the UDSM management is that all major construction contracts involve retention of funds from each certificate to be paid after one year of defect liability period. Since this period will be after the project has expired, UDSM has to provide for this in its budget.

Teaching and learning

In addition to the training of masters and PhDs as mentioned above, the programme to improve teaching and learning at UDSM seems to have progressed well during PITRO III. We were informed about systematic efforts to improve the quality assurance functions of the University. The efforts to improve the quality assurance system was also said to have benefited well from the cooperation with UiO. One of the celebrated achievements was development of the Student Course Evaluation System that has been developed by the Quality Assurance Bureau and UDSM was eager to learn how similar systems worked at UiO. The same was said to be true concerning the development of the library, where amongst others UiO Library offered courses that assisted in the digitization of the East African materials in the UDSM Library.

Other strategic interventions

Also the development of the UDSM Gender Centre was said to have benefited well from the cooperation with UiO. The activities emanating from the Gender Centre seem to be on a positive track. One major effort is an activity to establish a Women Academic Network aiming at strengthening the capacity of women academic staff to contribute to leadership and publishing.

During PITRO III also the work to strengthen information and knowledge about HIV/AIDS was reported to have progressed well, including *inter alia* workshops and training for medical doctors.

2.4.4 Brief assessment of the Institutional intervention component

As far as we can judge the Institutional transformation component of the project has been running fairly smoothly and covered the activities that have been expected. By taking advantage of the depreciation of Tanzanian Shillings during the programme period, UDSM has also managed to fund projects not initially included in the programme. This main component has been less hampered by time constraint due to the inclusion of an external partner than has been the case with the research and

¹⁰ Through vertical extension of so called quadrangular building and the School of Law Building.

outreach component. Nevertheless it seems that UiO has come in and contributed in relevant ways also to this part of the programme. Amongst the areas involved are contribution in the Gender mainstreaming at UDSM where one lecturer from IDS UDSM attended a summer school on Gender Equality in Nordic Countries at IDS. Also UiO through its Centre for Gender Research have made some inputs in the development of MA in Gender Studied at the IDS UDSM.

3 The partnership between UDSM and UiO

3.1 Background and objectives

The partnership between UDSM and UiO came about as an initiative of RNE/Norad in the process of negotiating PITRO III. The Norwegian side wanted a Norwegian university to be taken in as partner in the programme in order to support UDSM in reaching the goals of the programme, particularly in the Research Programme priority areas of education, environment and good governance. The question of bringing in a Norwegian partner university came up only after the programme document for the new phase of the programme had been worked out. Hence UiO was not a partner in developing the programme for PITRO III or taking part in any discussion of its scope or objectives.

UiO was chosen as a partner after a limited tendering process administered by SIU, where invitation to tender was issued to three Norwegian universities: Norwegian Technical University (NTNU), University of Bergen and University of Oslo. Only UiO responded to the tender and submitted an application. In its evaluation of the proposal from UiO, SIU concludes that *“the University of Oslo is highly suitable as the Norwegian partner institution to the University of Dar es Salaam for the PITRO III programme.”* Having decided on the Norwegian partner, the three parties were ready to sign the tripartite agreement and start up the PITRO III programme in July 2009.

3.2 The establishment and development of the cooperation

Once the tripartite agreement had been signed the cooperation could begin. However, as has already been observed, it seems that the first six months (second half of 2009) were needed to get the cooperation started. The critical component in this regard is the “Research, development and outreach” component. Here is where the existing programme, as it had been developed during 2007/2008 had to undergo the most important changes. The partner arrangement required that a number of joint research projects be developed. A call for proposals was issued jointly by the two universities in January 2010 and after a couple of extensions of deadline for submission of proposals, a final deadline was set at 5th May 2010. This was no doubt a very demanding process. The basic idea was that the researchers should (if no contact existed already) establish contact, exchange ideas and come up with joint project proposals.

The submitted proposals were to be evaluated by an Assessment Committee (AC) with six members, three from UDSM and three from UiO. In addition, SIU should appoint a peer review group of three persons to secure an external assessment of the proposals. As it turned out, only one external reviewer participated in the exercise.

As we understand it, contact between researchers during this process came about in various ways. Some contacts had been established during the UiO tendering process when a delegation from UiO visited UDSM and a delegation from UDSM visited Oslo in March 2010. Some contacts were followed up from prior research cooperation, and early in the process a delegation from UDSM visited Oslo. Otherwise contact was by e-mail, which at times was hampered by technical problems.

During the mutual visits early 2010 also contacts for cooperation on the institutional transformation components were established.

The final portfolio of six projects (see chapter 2) was decided on in June after a meeting of the AC and approval by Norad.

3.3 Experiences from both sides

Provided the way in which this cooperation came into being, it had all chances of actually becoming a failure:

- The cooperation did not come about at the initiative of the cooperating partners. UDSM had worked out its plan for PITRO III as a four years programme to run from 2008 without any thought of (or expressed need for) bringing in an external partner. Bringing in an external partner would also mean sharing of the funds for PITRO III.
- Even though some researchers in the two institutions had prior experiences with cooperating, for example based on NUFU-funded projects, most of the research cooperation had to be established from scratch.
- The thematic fields, within which research projects had to fit, were not developed jointly by the two universities. Hence many prior research contacts between the two universities turned out to be outside the prioritised fields.
- Taking into consideration that much of the research cooperation had to be developed from scratch, by researchers who did not know each other in advance, and who in some cases lacked the experience of cooperating across cultural divides, the time allowed for developing and assessing joint projects was also extremely short.
- In addition, establishment of the cooperation had to take place within a tripartite framework with SIU as the outside coordinator formulating the rules and routines within which the cooperation had to fit. Even though having broad experience with managing the NUFU programme, managing this type of broad institutional research and development programme was a new experience also to SIU.

In spite of these challenges, the evaluation team found that the cooperation between the two universities have developed surprisingly well. Both sides expressed great

satisfaction with the way in which the cooperation had developed after the first bottle necks of actually making the operational process started were overcome.

There would have been all reasons to expect that given the way in which this cooperation came into being, researchers and staff at UDSM would feel that this cooperation is something that has been forced on them. We are not in a position to tell how this was felt in the beginning; it seems however clear that at the time of this review UDSM staff and researchers saw great value in the cooperation. We in fact met nobody who at this stage expressed any misgivings about the relationships between the two partners. This is of course the result of flexibility, good will and positive attitudes at both sides. Nevertheless, it may perhaps be said that the biggest challenge was for UiO. It was UiO that came in as an (in principle) “uninvited” partner. It seems that this role has been tackled very well. Among the reaction that we met during the review exercise were such as

- “The cooperation has been felt as a partnership in knowledge creation”
- “The ToT workshop (in environmental law) has been very useful” This workshop was an open workshop for all Tanzanian learning institution.
- “They respect others. They are never intrusive.”
- The cooperation with the Norwegian partner is very good. We did everything together. We were very well received in Norway and the students are very happy.”
- “They push us in positive ways and for us to think”
- Some also mentioned a positive attitude by visiting professors who had demonstrated an open and inclusive attitude towards students.
- The most common, and immediate answer when we asked about the cooperation with UiO was: “No problem at all”

It may of course be that our respondents were reluctant to express negative feelings. In that case they were very successful in hiding them. On being challenged on possible problems and bottle necks, some mentioned the problems related to different academic calendars. This had at times made it difficult to find time for fieldwork and visits that would fit for both parties. On the other hand, UiO partners were commended for being flexible.

Also the project leaders at the Norwegian side, who we contacted, reported generally positive experiences. Some called for somewhat more committed follow up and timeliness between project meetings. A general impression seems to be that the Tanzanian partners are too busy and have too many commitments to always be able to follow up.

Among the more critical comments on the Tanzanian side was the observation that even though UDSM and UiO have many research areas and academic fields in common there are some discrepancies. UDSM particularly mentioned the lack of engineering and technical expertise at UiO, this being an important field for UDSM. The respondents who we talked to obviously were not aware of the clause in the contract with UiO that UiO should also serve as a focal point between the wider university sector in Norway and UDSM. This is a point in the ToR for UiO involvement that UiO has obviously not taken seriously.

Also the Norwegian side expressed mainly positive experiences with the cooperation as such. They emphasised the positive attitudes and openness for cooperation with which they were met once the cooperation was established. True, they expressed a certain concern for problems with timing and the fact that things sometimes may take more time than they were used to. It was also emphasised that this cooperation was seen as very important for the University as such. UDSM was one of very few international partners that were specially invited for celebration of UiO's 200th Anniversary.

3.4 Effects of the cooperation

We should therefore conclude that as far as the spirit of cooperation is concerned, this is very positive. Both parties are seeing the cooperation as useful and of mutual benefit. The question is then to what extent the cooperation has, as it is formulated in our ToR, “enhanced quality and performance of research and education at UDSM, in the programme priority areas of education, environment and good governance”?

First it may be noted, as already observed above, that these three areas are very unevenly covered by the six research projects. Four of the projects are in environment/climate, only one in good governance (also overlapping with environment), and one in education. Ideally a better balance should have been achieved. Provided the modalities of the open tendering process for projects, probably little could have been done to design the project portfolio more actively.

Secondly, the time frame has to be taken into consideration. At the point of this review the projects have been running effectively for about one and a half year. Actually, as shall be returned to, by mid February the projects were waiting for the release of the funds for the first six months of 2012, i.e. for the remaining half year of the programme period. The assessment of effects shall therefore have to be done on the basis of observing the direction of ongoing activities and the commitment that we can observe at UDSM. Referring also to the brief descriptive assessment of progress and goal achievement in the previous chapter, the following summary points may be made:

- The feedback we get indicates that the training activities, the exchange of students, training of trainers, etc are seen as enhancing the academic capacity of UDSM. Norwegian visiting professors and lecturers are seen as highly competent and professional.
- Some of the projects include visits and scholarship to master students to visit cooperating institutes in Norway. Feedback is positive, and we shall assume that this will help to build future capacity and help promote internationalisation of UDSM.
- More generally, staff development seems to be stimulated by the programme, and to be well organized by UDSM.
- Some of the projects report active outreach, either already carried out or in the pipeline. One example is the “climate change project” that is praised also by external actors for active outreach. On the other hand this same project seems to be sort of divided, where some of the project research modules e.g. Role of

Seed System and Plant Genetics Resources for Adaptation to Climatic Change Stress” seem to have been conceived out of UiO research interest without involving Tanzanian partners. Another positive example is the Law project. Here UDSM has taken on its role as the “national mother university” and organised a Training of Trainers workshop for all institutions teaching law in Tanzania. Such activities should indeed be encouraged also for other projects.

- We were not able to see that the cooperation has so far led to changes in curricula. It was claimed by UDSM staff members that this could come in gradually. We do think, however, that this should be more actively encouraged, and that UiO could have a lot to contribute concerning revisions of curricula, revision and renewal of reading material, etc.
- Perhaps the most important improvement would be in publishing performance. This has two aspects: publishing from the six research projects under the programme and more general improvement in academic publishing, particularly in international refereed journals. In their last annual reports as per November 2011 only one project reports publications and firm plans for further publishing¹¹. The institutional annual report mentions two papers submitted for publication by the “learning for disabled project”. On the other hand actually all projects report ambitious plans for articles to be written and published. At this stage it is not possible to have a firm opinion about the realism in these plans.
- What may make one somewhat optimistic is that one of the most successful and popular activities under the programme, seems to be the writers workshops. Previously such workshop had been organized under the “disabilities project”, seemingly with positive outcome. At the time of our visit to UDSM a writers workshop open to all staff was about to be organized and great expectations were expressed. In order to secure and consolidate the positive achievement of the programme at this stage more such workshops could have been organised so as to follow papers more closely through the writing and publication process.

All in all it is our judgement that the programme activities are well in line with the programme objectives and that UiO involvement has so far served positively towards the achievement of the goals of the programme. Above we have pointed at some possibilities to even strengthen this function:

- More systematic emphasis on the outreach functions for all projects.
- A clearer policy that project activities and publishing should be really joint activities. This programme is not for Norwegian researchers to be used as an opportunity for research funding if it does not take place in active cooperation with Tanzanian partners.
- UiO should have taken more seriously its obligation according to its terms of reference to serve as a focal point for wider Norwegian involvement in the activities of the programme.

¹¹ This is the “biodiversity project” On the other hand what is reported are two articles written by the Norwegian project leader without UDSM co-authorship.

4 Administrative model and SIU's role

4.1 The administrative model

The administration of the PITRO III programme is based on the "Tripartite Contract" between SIU, UDSM and UiO signed by the parties in July 2009 and with an amendment revising the reporting and disbursement regulations, signed in November 2011.

According to this contract the overall responsibility for implementing the programme, and for coordinating the collaboration between UDSM and UiO, lies with UDSM as the *Programme Owner*. UiO, as the *Programme Partner*, is responsible for supporting UDSM in implementing the programme. The more specific academic and practical fields in which UiO is seen as having a particular role is described in the preceding chapters. The programme is funded through Norad, and the overall responsibility for managing the programme lies with SIU. This responsibility is regulated by an Agreement between Norad and SIU signed in June 2009. SIU's responsibilities according to this Agreement includes, inter alia, such as the responsibility to identify a Norwegian partner to UDSM and the responsibility to develop the Tripartite Agreement between the parties and the follow up on the implementation of the programme within the framework of the agreement. This follow up implies a responsibility on the part of SIU to administer the Programme Grant and to see to it that the money is properly accounted for and used according to approved work plans and budgets. The Agreement also commits SIU to submit a number of formal reports and documentation to Norad within stated deadlines. Hence annual financial statements shall be submitted to Norad by 31th March every year. SIU is also responsible for the under way reviewing and final reporting from the Programme.

In sum, the Programme is funded by Norad and managed through a tripartite administrative arrangement where SIU has the overall responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the programme activities as carried out by the two partner institutions, UDSM and UiO, and to manage the necessary planning, reporting and disbursement routines necessary to carry out this coordinating function.

4.2 Financial management system

Apart from adhering to the PITRO III financial reporting, PITRO III funds are treated as public funds and hence its management has to adhere to the Financial Regulations of UDSM as well. The University wide budget reflects PITRO financing.

This is good demonstration of transparency and provides for resource use coordination and harmonisation. The University wide quarterly financial reports processed through the University Council, as well the Annual Accounts to be externally audited also reflects PITRO financing. This enhances accountability at all levels. Procurement of contractors, goods and services were done in accordance with the Public Procurement Act 2004 and its regulations, even though this has had delaying effects in the implementation of some research as well as construction projects.

4.2.1 Issue of Concern

While construction of infrastructure in PITRO has been completed as per schedule, using excess funds from foreign exchange gains, it is necessary for the University to make provision for retained defects liability period. As per law, the liability period is one year after construction completion, following which and if no serious defects are detected, final accounts are prepared and retention fund spent.

4.3 The actors' satisfaction with the model – and with SIU's role

The overall summary to be made on this point, and after having talked with a large number of involved stakeholders, is that the satisfaction with the administrative model in general and the role of SIU is particular, is somewhat mixed. It has been difficult to get neither very strongly positive nor very strongly negative reactions as to the functioning of the operation and management of the Programme. Among the reactions and opinions registered may be summarised some few points:

- There was expressed the opinion that SIU does not have sufficient experience with this kind of research cooperation (twinning arrangement) to serve as a coordinator of research. The point being that SIU is more an administrator and with less insight into research.
- A concern that the start-up of the research cooperation was not handled well enough: Too little time was given for writing of proposals. The deadline for submission was also extended a couple of times.
- The review process was not handled well. The idea was to recruit three external reviewers to assess research proposals. Only one turned out to be effective.
- Some concern was expressed on both sides regarding the reporting procedures. Researchers with experience from NUFU projects wondered why the “NUFU model” for reporting and budgeting could not be used. Some problems with the templates for reporting and at times problems with e-mail communication. However, as far as we can judge this has probably been more or less outside the control of SIU and more due to problems with e-mail and internet connections to Tanzania.

- The annual reporting is mainly concerned with SIU’s own activities and follows up, and that it gives less insight into what actually has happened in the universities and in the research projects.¹²
- There was some concern that the reporting has been of little value to the institutions. Hence, on the Tanzanian side it was claimed that there was a need to prepare two sets of reports: One internal and one to SIU. This may be related to the point above: An emphasis on formalities and less on content.
- Some of the research projects on the Tanzanian side complained that their delays in progress were caused by delayed disbursement of funds from SIU¹³.
- Other reactions were quite positive, commending SIU for being flexible and understanding in the way they managed the Programme. Hence the willingness of SIU to change the reporting routines by the Amendment to the Tripartite Contract was seen as an expression of this flexibility.
- On the other hand, at the time of the review there was a deep concern at UDSM that in spite of the amendment of the Tripartite Contract which should have committed SIU to release funds for 2012 by November 2011, those funds were only transferred by the end of January 2012, with the result that the money at the time of our review was still not available in Tanzanian Shillings.
- It was also mentioned as a concern that the change of personnel and shifting contact persons at SIU during the time of the Programme was experienced as problematic and causing unnecessary communication problems.

4.4 Assessment of the administrative model and SIU’s role

To administer a programme like PITRO III between two national universities; involving a large number of activities and sub-activities, with a budget divided between two institutions, with tight time schedules and limits, and involving two countries with different cultures and institutional traditions, is indeed a challenging task. The degree to which SIU has actually succeeded in its role as coordinator should be assessed against this background. And judged in this perspective, it is our overall assessment that SIU has filled its role reasonably well. We shall expand on this briefly in the following and add some additional comments and reflections on the administrative model for the Programme.

Even though the summarized points above may appear to be rather critical, we did not interpret these criticisms as in any way fundamental, or to imply that SIU doing a poor job. SIU’s role is, as we would interpret it, to be both an inspirer, stimulating and pushing activities and cooperation, and a controller with a responsibility to make sure progress is according to schedule and that at funds are well spent and as planned. It may be that SIU is better equipped and feel more at home in the second of these roles, and that they by pressing for reporting and adherence to bureaucratic rules and regulations, has sometimes created tensions in the relations to the universities.

¹² In a comment SIU points out that this is according to the format for SIU’s report to Norad.

¹³ See, however, chapter 2.2.

It may at times also be easy for participants in a project to blame the administrator when there are problems with implementation. It seems to us that this may partly have been the case when some of the projects claim that their problems with progress have been related to delayed disbursement of funds from SIU. As has been clarified above with reference to the 2010/2011 Annual Report, the key to these problems seems to be the late start-up of the research projects, and hence that the project activities and the disbursement cycle did not match. At the same Annual meeting the planning and disbursement routines were agreed changed in order to cater for more flexibility. Generally, we find this to reflect quite a substantial flexibility on the part of SIU as programme coordinator. On the other hand, this flexibility also implies risks. As it has turned out, funds that should have been made available in November 2011 to be spent this year, were still not available for the projects at the time of this review. In this case the delay in disbursement is a real problem. If added that research projects (even with an extension of the programme period) may fail to implement their delayed activities and utilize the money that they have “lent” to other activities, the risk is that money at the end of the programme period will have to be returned; and as a consequence, the balance between the main components of the programme will be affected.

The most fundamental problem related to PITRO III seems to be related to the actual start-up of the programme – and particularly the Research, development and outreach component. It may be that SIU could have handled this more effectively, particularly to have pushed more for getting the application process started earlier (i.e. immediately after the signing of the Tripartite Contract). But once the project portfolio was in place, the follow up and management seem to have run fairly smoothly.

However, particularly during our talks with key people in UDSM, even though there was little direct criticism of SIU, the problem was raised “if involvement of SIU is really necessary.” What here is actually referred to is the situation under the earlier phases of PITRO when the programme was run from the Embassy. It was clearly expressed by some that at UDSM that they had preferred this administrative model to continue. The closer links direct to the donor was obviously appreciated, and personal contact to a dedicated programme officer available in Dar es Salaam seen as an advantage compared to a programme officer far away in Bergen¹⁴.

In this context one may question the wisdom of actually commissioning an external agent to coordinate the programme, i.e. the “wisdom” of the whole tripartite arrangement. The arrangement may appear complicated: The funds generate from RNE’s allocation of funds to various causes in Tanzania. The responsibility for this programme is then given to Norad that again commissions SIU as the agent for coordinating the programme as described above. This creates extra links of control and reporting, and even though SIU has managed the programme fairly well, the question actually remains if it would not have been more efficient and cost effective if the programme had been administered directly, either by the Embassy or by Norad.

¹⁴ Respondents at UDSM (as well as the review team) were fully aware that the Embassy had decided against extending the old administrative model whereby the programme was administered from the Embassy.

Hence, if it is decided to take the programme into a new phase beyond 2012, it is the view of the review team that the administrative model could be simplified and with fewer levels of reporting. The best alternative as viewed by the review team would be to manage the programme directly from the Embassy. This would be the simplest and most cost effective alternative. As this seems not to be a realistic possibility, we would recommend that the programme be administered directly by Norad. Since Norad nevertheless is responsible, we can see little reason why Norad should outsource the actual administration and hence create the need for an extra level of reporting. Elsewhere in this report it is recommended that a possible extension of the programme should focus on the academic components and the UiO-UDSM partnership¹⁵. This would call for an administrative model with stronger emphasis on academic support and less need for follow up of building activities and institutional improvement activities. More of the actual coordination could then be left with the two universities monitored by Norad.

¹⁵ See chapter 5.1.1.

5 Overall assessments and recommendations

Assessment of the various components of the programme has been summarized under each chapter above. These assessments and recommendations shall not be repeated here. Here we shall only summarize a few cross cutting evaluative points and recommendations, referring particularly to the questions raised in chapter 5 of the ToR.

5.1.1 Assessments

The main conclusion to be drawn is that the PITRO III programme generally has been fairly successful in reaching its overall goals. Some of the research projects are clearly running behind schedule. Most of these delays seem to be caused by the problems related to the start-up of the research and outreach component. This taken into consideration, implementation of most projects is acceptable by January 2012. However, the finalization of all projects in time is threatened by the fact that funds for 2012 were still not available for the projects by the time of this review¹⁶.

The follow up in terms of academic publications is a critical point. All projects have ambitious plans, but the actual writing of papers seems not really to have started.

The institutional transformation and capacity building component of the programme has been carried out well, and as far as can be judged according to plans.

The review team found few signs of the programme having so far led to changes in curricula. Also outreach and community contact were activities that so far were reported to be more in the pipeline.

However, most projects have functioned effectively for only one and a half year. Such impacts should be expected to take more time, and on this background performance and progress should be seen as acceptable. Cooperation with UiO has worked better than should have been expected provided the way in which this cooperation came into being. On one point UiO seems not to have followed up its ToR: UiO has failed to serve as a national contact point to other universities and academic institutions in Norway.

The administrative model has some problems, but seems to have functioned reasonably well once the start-up problems were overcome. The cost-effectiveness of the tripartite administrative arrangement is more questionable. It had probably been

¹⁶ The funds were transferred from SIU on 26th January.

more cost effective – and required less bureaucracy and fewer levels of reporting - if the RNE or Norad had managed the programme directly. However, if it is given as a condition that the administration of the programme is to be outsourced, SIU seems to have managed it fairly well and with reasonable flexibility. As judged by the review team, transparency in decision making has been acceptable and financial management carried out in accordance with the current rules and regulations at UDSM.

As judged by the review team, the academic activities of the programme should generally be seen as sustainable. Building research capacity and improving staff competencies should generally be seen as sustainable. If (and when) such a programme comes to an end, such activities will help the institution to perform better in the future. The sustainability of some of the other activities, like investments and support of ordinary functions of the University, may on the other hand be more disputable. A programme like this should probably not support ordinary activities which may make the University dependent on continued support beyond the lifetime of the programme.

5.1.2 Recommendations

Following up the last point above, a possible continuation of the programme should focus on the academic and capacity building activities of PITRO and follow up the co-operation between UDSM and UiO. This co-operation has been successful – and given the circumstances, more successful than could have been expected. However; a three years project is too short to actually harvest the fruits of the co-operation that has been established. If the co-operation is allowed to continue, one should be less concerned with thematic fields for joint research and more concerned with composing good research teams where the two universities have common research strengths. The obligation of UiO to serve as contact point to other universities should either be removed or made more explicit. The possible establishment of new research projects should be allowed more time for testing out ideas and for planning. One possibility would be to start up new activities through an announcement of pilot projects. Systematic follow up of publishing and more systematic use of writing workshops is recommended so that the workshops could follow paper-writers through phases in the writing process.

The sustainability of the research and outreach component would be strengthened even more if more systematic emphasis be put on linking research to curriculum reform and systematic outreach activities in all projects.

As far as the implementation of the last phase of PITRO III is concerned, the review team finds it necessary to accept a no cost extension of the programme to the end of 2012. The most critical thing now is to make sure that all research projects result in publication. The most serious risk is that the projects end with little or no tangible published results. Therefore the writing of papers should, if possible, be followed up with special activities also beyond 2012 to support the writing and publishing process.

It is recommended that if PITRO is granted a new phase beyond 2012, the main emphasis should be on the academic components and on the UDSM-UiO partnership. In this case the administrative model may be simplified, leaving more of

the actual coordination to the two universities within a contractual framework followed up and monitored by the Embassy or by Norad.

Appendix 1

Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference

Limited Competitive Tendering

Review of the Programme for Institutional Transformation and Outreach (PITRO III) and its Administrative model including the UiO-UDSM University partnership

1. Background

The Government of the Kingdom of Norway (Norway) and the government of the United Republic of Tanzania (Tanzania) entered into an agreement regarding Cooperation for Promotion of the Economic and Social Development of the United Republic of Tanzania, dated 13 June 1988 and prolonged by addenda of which the latest is 1 November 2007 (the Main Agreement).

Norway has supported University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) continuously since 1997 through various agreements, of which the latest is the Frame agreement dated 2 December 2002, which was extended until 31 August, 2007.

The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and Tanzania entered into a bridging agreement dated 28 March 2008 with addendum dated 12 November 2008 for support until end June 2009 to UDSM for launch of the research and capacity building programme described in the Programme Document for Institutional Transformation, Research and Outreach (PITRO III) 2007-2010, extended to 2008-2011, with addendum for the Period January 2008-June 2008 dated November 2007 (the PITRO III Programme)

1.1 Partnership Programme - New model of organisation of support to UDSM

The new element in the cooperation between Norway and the UDSM is the introduction of a Norwegian university as a partner institution. MFA requested Norad in 2008, to establish an agreement with the Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Higher Education (SIU) for the channelling and follow up of support to the PITRO III Programme at UDSM, including entering into a contract with a selected Norwegian University to support SIU's follow up and the implementation of the PITRO III Programme at UDSM in the planned period from 1 July 2009 till 30 June 2012. Norad

and SIU entered into an agreement regarding the administration of support to UDSM in June 2009.

Call for tenders by invitation, in consultation with the Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions (UHR), was made by SIU in March 2009 to three selected universities; the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), the University of Oslo (UiO) and the University of Bergen (UiB). The University of Oslo was selected in collaboration with UDSM and with the approval of Norad, as a Partner University for the implementation of the PITRO III programme. The objective of Norwegian institutional collaboration with UDSM is to fulfil the realisation of PITRO programme goals as specified in the PITRO programme document. SIU on behalf of Norad, entered into a Tripartite Contract in July 2009 with the University of Dar es Salaam and University of Oslo for the administration and implementation of the PITRO III programme.

The period July to October 2009 has been mainly used by the partners for the preparation of the administrative programme and procedures for the implementation of PITRO III, the completion of activities and final reporting by UDSM for PITRO II and for preparing ground for the new research collaboration. Programme activities started in November 2009.

With reference to Clause 6 of the Norad-SIU Agreement of 2009 regarding the administration of support to UDSM, a Mid Term Review of the PITRO III Programme including its administrative model, should be conducted in the first part of 2011. However, due to a delayed implementation of the tender process for the review, the review shall be conducted during the period January to March 2012.

2. PITRO III Programme: Goals and Objectives

The overall goal of the PITRO-programme is to increase the contribution of the University of Dar es Salaam to Tanzania's efforts to economic growth, reduced poverty and improved social well-being of Tanzanians through transformation of the education, science and technology sectors.

The immediate objective is to ensure that qualifying candidates have equitable access to high quality education, knowledge and skills for increasing productivity and reducing poverty. The PITRO-programme has two main components:

2.1 Research, development and outreach

The first component, research, development and outreach, focuses on demand-driven and basic research in order to empower and provide solutions to community challenges. An important part of the programme is research projects in the areas of education, environment and good governance. The research projects in the field of education focus on the use of Kiswahili in schools, equity in learning and assessment of Tanzanian higher education. In the environmental field, the research projects focus on genetically modified crops, climate change and geological hazards, while research on governance includes projects on financial management, good governance and community-based education interventions.

In 2009 it was decided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norad and SIU to further strengthen the academic and administrative elements of the programme by including a Norwegian university for the remaining period 1 July 2009 – 30 June 2012 as a supporting partner to UDSM to assist in fulfilling agreed upon PITRO programme goals and obligations. A partnership model between Norway and Tanzania in higher education and research was thus proposed in the PITRO programme. ¹Under the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Dar es Salaam and SIU's agreement 2006-2010 about management of support to higher education and research in Tanzania, SIU initiated a limited tendering process for the selection of a Norwegian Partner University in order to support UDSM's follow up and implementation of the PITRO III programme.

¹ Experience from a similar model of cooperation with University of Life Sciences, Norway in the Programme for Agricultural and Natural Resources Transformation for Improved Livelihoods (PANTIL) at Sokoine Agricultural University had shown positive results ⁹

The criteria for selection were institutional capacity, competence and relevance for participation in the programme.² It was necessary for the Norwegian university to meet the following requirements:

² For details see Tender Document Part 2 ToR, SIU

³ The list of tasks are specified under point 4.3 in the ToR (Tender Document Part 2)

⁴ Under the agreement, UiO has no responsibilities regarding physical infrastructure improvements at UDSM.

Should have a history of cooperation with UDSM and/or ongoing agreement(s) of student exchange, research and/or other activities contributing to the institutional development of UDSM

Should document a diverse academic portfolio that should include research programmes relevant for **at least two** of the following areas: a) environment/conservation, b) education and c) good governance/accountability. These are the three focus areas of the research, development and outreach component in the PITRO Programme*, areas where a Norwegian partner should play an important role.

The Norwegian partner institution should refer to the PITRO programme document and state how they see their contributions and roles in the various components in the programme.³

In addition to being an active partner for UDSM in the PITRO Programme, the selected Norwegian partner is expected to be the main contact point between the university sector in Norway and UDSM. The technical proposal should include a description of how the Norwegian institution intends to practise this role. Relevant suggestions might be description of procedures for information sharing and potential joint activities with other Norwegian institutions that cooperate with UDSM within one or more relevant areas.

Finally, the Norwegian institution should describe the strategic importance an extended cooperation with UDSM will have for their institution. To ensure that the Norwegian

institution will be an active and engaged partner in the agreement, it is important that the agreement is known and actively used in several parts of the institution.

2.2 Institutional transformation and capacity building

The second component, institutional transformation and capacity building, aims at improving capacity of UDSM in terms of human resources, physical infrastructure,⁴ strategic interventions, institutional transformation, improved employability of graduates and enhanced performance of staff.

The component focuses on training on PhD and Master's degree level; and administrative and technical staff participation in short courses, locally and internationally to enhance their performance in the core mission and administrative functions of UDSM.

Part of the improvement of the physical infrastructure at UDSM includes the establishment of a gymnasium and fitness centre. The major aim of the project is to provide the institution with a basic gymnasium for teaching, training, testing and research by students and staff in Physical Education. However, the gym should also be open for staff and students for recreation purposes and health promotion. 10

3. Purpose of the Review

The purpose of the review is:

To assess progress of the PITRO III Programme at UDSM in the light of the aims and objectives of the purpose of the agreement and the PITRO programme document

To assess whether the inclusion of a Norwegian partner institution has facilitated the realisation of PITRO programme goals as specified in the PITRO programme document in an effective and cost efficient manner

To assess whether the administrative model involving SIU-UDSM-UiO (concretised in the Tripartite Contract between the partners) is efficient and cost effective in the follow up and implementation of the PITRO III according to the requirements of the Norad-SIU Agreement (2009-2012)

4. Scope

The review shall cover the period from initiation of the PITRO III agreement in July 2009 until the start of the review, and assess:

1. Whether project activities and progress at UDSM is on the course towards realisation of the goals and objectives of the PITRO Programme. If not, what are the challenges and what recommendations can be made with regards to the remaining programme period? In addition to research activities, attention should be paid to strategic interventions and the development of relevant programmes and curricula with regard to gender, students with disabilities and HIV/Aids, human resource capacity building and infrastructure development at UDSM
2. Whether the Norwegian partner institution's (UiO) work has enhanced quality and performance of research and education at UDSM, in the Programme priority areas of education, environment and good governance. What are the risks and challenges in cooperation and how can these be mitigated. The team shall make concrete proposals for improvement for further cooperation in the remaining period. Enhanced quality and performance shall be measured according to aims in the PITRO Programme Document
3. Whether the administration of SIU is efficient and cost effective by reviewing the tasks facilitated by SIU so far, and by reviewing the level of satisfaction of Norad and of key personnel at the two partner universities.
4. The review shall further describe and assess the administrative model of the programme, and SIU, UiO and UDSMs role in the management of the programme. This includes planning, follow-up, reporting, and flow of information between the actors, as well as financial regulations and control.

11

5. Expected outcomes

The review should provide:

- An assessment of the implementation of the PITRO programme components: research, development and outreach and institutional transformation and capacity building at UDSM.

The potential for sustainability in terms of lasting effects of the capacity building activities, incorporation of established education programmes into regular curricula of the institutions and employment plans for graduated students and lastly, outreach efforts to meet community challenges

- An assessment of the adequacy of institutional arrangements, including steering mechanism, communications and working relations between implementing partners UDSM and UiO. Strengths and weaknesses of the programme in terms of overall design, practicability, cost effectiveness and probable success and recommend concrete proposals for adjustments.

- An assessment of the quality of financial and administrative organization and oversight functions in the SIU-UDSM-UiO partnership, bottlenecks, if any, arising from differences in research administration and human resource management rules and regulations and relevant recommendation on these issues. What administrative measures have been taken at UDSM to ensure transparency in decision-making and anti-corruption measures in programme implementation and suggestions on further improvement?

- An assessment shall also be made, of the management of the programme to secure a professional, sound, impartial and efficient implementation of the PITRO III and to recommend adjustments if necessary, with regard to possible future support to the programme.

6. Implementation

6.1 The Review team

The review team shall consist of 2 members with at least one member from Tanzania. The members should be well informed about the role of higher education in development in general, and of Tanzanian society, development policies and the tertiary education system. The consultants should have experience with evaluation/review work. Proficiency in English is required and skills in Kiswahili are an asset. Gender balance in the team is encouraged.

6.2 Methodology

The consultants shall study adequate documents, in particular agreements, reports and background documents mentioned in the ToR as well as reports about programme activities and financial expenditures from the institutions.

Interview key personnel at UDSM, UiO, SIU and Norad. It is important to interview academic coordinators/institutional contact persons and the researchers who have participated in the programmes at the two universities. 12

All sources of information used in the review should be documented appropriately in the text.

6.3 Timetable and budget

	Deadline	Responsible
The review is budgeted with a maximum input of a total of four person weeks (20 days), including travel. Start up primo January 2012. The total budget frame for the review is up to NOK 270 000 inc. VAT and shall be covered by the PITRO III SIU administration grant. Action		
Call for tenders	9 November 2011	SIU
Tender bids received by	6 December 2011	SIU
Signing of contract between SIU and review team	22 December 2011	SIU/Review team
Desk study, field visits, interviews, draft report	1 January – 19 February 2012	Review team
Submission of draft report by the Review team	20 February 2012	Review team
Feedback from Norad, SIU and stakeholders	1 March 2012	Norad/SIU
Submission of final report	16 March 2012	Review team

Appendix 2

People interviewed

University of Oslo

Professor Desmond McNeill, Programme coordinator, SUM
Ingrid Sogner, Section Manager, Programme coordinator

Norad

Anne Wetlesen, Senior Adviser

SIU

Section Manager Gro Tjore
Senior Adviser Veena Gill
Senior Adviser Benedicte Solheim

University Top Management

Prof. Makenya Maboko –	Deputy Vice Chancellor Academic; Acting Vice Chancellor at time of our visit
Prof. Yunus Mgaya	Deputy Vice Chancellor – Administration and Finance
Prof. Sylvia Temu	Director of Planning and Finance

Project

Prof. Shukurani Many	Institutional Contact Person
----------------------	------------------------------

Research Coordination

Prof Bakari Mwinyiwiwa	Acting Director of Research
Dr. Senyagi -	Principal Human Resource Officer
Mr. Bundala	Project Accountant

Research Projects

Education for Learners with Disabilities PITRO-III/10048

Prof Frida Tungaraza	- Project Coordinator
Dr. Kitila Mkumbo	- Senior Researcher
Prof R.T. Muzale	- Senior Researcher
Prof Josephat Rugemalira	- Senior Researcher
Professor Siri Wormnæs	University of Oslo

*Biodiversity and Humans in Fragmented World PITRO-III/10038**Senior Researchers*

Dr. Bruno Nyundo - Project Coordinator
 Dr. Mkuwa Manoko – Senior Researcher
 Dr. Flora Maige Senior Researcher
 Dr. Marcelian Njau Senior Researcher

Mr. Mniwako Obasanjo - M.Sc. Student - Entomology
 Ms Hawa Mwechanga M.Sc. Student - Botany
 Mr. Peter Lorri M.Sc. Student - Botany
 Mr. Mnyabi Juna M.Sc. Student - Entomology
 Mr. Kipondya Bujiku M.Sc. Student - Entomology

A Sustainable Energy System for Rural Electrification Services PITRO III/10033

Prof. Bakari Mwinyiwiwa – Project Coordinator

Legal Issues Related to the Implementation of International Environmental and Climate Law in Tanzania PITRO-III/10107

Prof. Kabudi Palagamanda – Dean, School of Law and Project Coordinator
 Dr. Kenny Gaston Senior Researcher
 Mr. Evarist Longopa Ph.D. student
 Professor Hans Christian Bugge University of Oslo

Climate Change and Variability in Tanzania PITRO-III/10040

Prof. James Ngana IRA
 Dr. Stephen Maluka – IDS
 Prof. Athanas S. Kauzeni
 Dr. Esther W. Dugumaro

Environmental Geology and Ground Water Dynamics PITRO-III/10093

Dr. Nelson Boniface – Project Coordinator
 Dr. Charles Kaaya
 Dr. Jean Majumba
 Professor Hening Dypvik University of Oslo

Directorate of Postgraduate

Prof. Bakari Mwinyiwiwa

Quality Assurance Board

Dr. Masoud H. Muruke – Director Quality Assurance Board
 Mr. Navua Wamunza – Deputy Director

Buildings and Estate

Mr. H. Jumanne Deputy Estates Manager
 Mr. M. Mwashihara Head, Planning Unit – Estates Department

Tanzanian Government

Prof. Wilbrod Abeli Director of Higher Education – Ministry of Education and Vocational Training

Ms. Blandina Cheche Project Coordinator- Environment and Poverty, Vice Presidents Office – Environment.