



NIBR Report 2008:6

Jørn Holm-Hansen

Municipal International Co-operation

Kristiansand (Norway) and
Walvis Bay (Namibia)



NIBR

Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research

Municipal International Co-operation

Andre publikasjoner fra NIBR:

NIBR Report 2008:4

Building Neighbourhood
Evaluation of the Barents
Secretariat's grant
programme

NIBR Report 2007:20

**Health and Social Affairs
in Norway and Russia**
The cooperation evaluated

NIBR Report 2005:16

**The Transferbility of
Policy Instrument**
How new environmental
policy instruments strike
roots in Russia and Latvia.

You can order the
publications at the cost of
NOK 250,- + postage
from:
NIBR
P.O.Box 44, Blindern,
N-0313 Oslo
Phone +47 22 95 88 00
Fax +47 22 60 77 74
E-mail nibr@nibr.no

www.nibr.no

Jørn Holm-Hansen

Municipal International Co-operation

NIBR-Report 2008:6

Title: **Municipal International
Co-operation**
Kristiansand (Norway) and
Walvis Bay (Namibia)

Author: Jørn Holm-Hansen

NIBR Report: 2008:6

ISSN: 1502-9794
ISBN: 978-82-7071-721-7

Project number: O-2583
Project name: MIC Walvisbaai

Financial supporter: The Norwegian Association of Local
and Regional Authorities (KS)

Head of project: Jørn Holm-Hansen

Abstract: Municipal International Co-operation
(MIC) has benefitted Walvis Bay, but
far less so Kristiansand. MIC should
focus on purely municipal tasks.
Similarity and equality versus
difference and asymmetry between
MIC municipalities affect the
programme theory fundamentally

Summary: Norwegian and English

Date: April 2008
Pages: 58
Price: NOK 250,-

Publisher:: Norwegian Institute for Urban
and Regional Research
Gaustadalléen 21, Box 44 Blindern
0313 OSLO
Telephone (+47) 22 95 88 00
Telefax (+47) 22 60 77 74
E-mail: nibr@nibr.no
<http://www.nibr.no>

Printed: Nordberg A.S.
Org. no. NO 970205284 MVA

Preface

This report evaluates the Municipal International Co-operation between Walvis Bay and Kristiansand. The evaluation was commissioned by the Norwegian Association for Local and Regional Authorities (KS).

The research was conducted by senior researcher dr. polit. Jørn Holm-Hansen from the Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research (NIBR). Senior researcher at NIBR, dr. polit. Arild Schou, provided advice throughout the process.

The research and reporting was carried out within a framework of 24 man days. A one week field visit was made to Namibia in November 2007. Jan Kruger from Walvis Bay deserves great thanks for his practical arrangements during the field visit and not least his generous sharing of information and knowledge on Namibian realities. Thanks also to the interviewees for sharing their time, information and insights. NIBR secretary Inger Balberg has contributed to the technical editing of the report.

Oslo, April 2008

Marit Haug,
Research Director

Table of Contents

Preface.....	1
Tables	4
Summary	5
Sammendrag.....	8
1 Introduction	12
1.1 The objectives of the evaluation.....	12
1.2 The outline of the report	12
2 Background	13
2.1 The background	13
2.2 The programme theory	14
3 Project organisation and implementation	17
3.1 The formal set-up of MIC	17
3.2 Relations Walvis Bay – Kristiansand.....	18
3.3 Kristiansand-Walvis Bay and other municipalities.....	20
3.4 Internal communication in the municipalities	20
3.5 The relations between KS and the two municipalities.....	21
3.6 The use of programme theory.....	22
4 The sub-projects	25
4.1 The Dialogue Project.....	25
4.1.1 Background.....	25
4.1.2 Interventions and intervention logic	27
4.1.3 Achievements	28
4.1.4 Sustainability	29
4.1.5 Conclusion	30
4.2 The Project on Disabled Children.....	32
4.2.1 Background.....	32
4.2.2 Intervention and intervention logic.....	33
4.2.3 Achievements	34
4.2.4 Sustainability	35
4.2.5 Conclusion	36

4.3	The Emergency Project.....	37
4.3.1	Background.....	37
4.3.2	Intervention and intervention logic.....	37
4.3.3	Achievements	37
4.3.4	Sustainability	38
4.3.5	Conclusion	38
4.4	The Youth Project	38
4.4.1	Background.....	38
4.4.2	Intervention and intervention logic.....	40
4.4.3	Achievements	41
4.4.4	Sustainability	41
4.4.5	Conclusion	42
4.5	Project Lighthouse.....	43
4.5.1	Background.....	43
4.5.2	Intervention and intervention logic.....	44
4.5.3	Achievements	44
4.5.4	Conclusion	44
4.6	Results and achievements from the projects.....	45
5	Conclusions and recommendations.....	47
	Appendix 1 List of interviewees	51
	Appendix 2 Terms-of-reference	53

Tables

Table 4.1	What dialogue is not and what it is	25
Table 4.2	The intervention logic of the Dialogue Project.....	28

Summary

Jørn Holm-Hansen

Municipal International Co-operation: Walvis Bay (Namibia) and Kristiansand (Norway)

NIBR Report: 2008:6

Walvis Bay and Kristiansand are pioneers within the Norad-financed Municipal International Co-operation. They started out in a period when the MIC concept resembled people-to-people co-operation and city twinning. Since then, MIC gradually has developed into focusing on purely municipal tasks and having more precise expectations as to what co-operation could achieve. Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) has been introduced for MIC, and its application is under revision to become more accurate. In short, MIC has become more professional in line with the insight that developmental aid is a knowledge-intensive activity.

In general the projects between Walvis Bay and Kristiansand produce outcomes to the benefit of the local population in Walvis Bay, although far less so in Kristiansand. To a large degree the project has been self-going without KS' assistance. This is good for sustainability and in accordance with the principle of local self-government. On the other hand, the self-sufficiency has its drawbacks when it comes to bringing MIC activities in accordance with the current priorities within Norway's developmental policies. And KS and the two municipalities actually have diverged on what MIC ought to consist in.

Still, there is a clear tendency in the two towns' municipalities to perceive their task as consisting in facilitating contacts and co-operation between various local actors irrespective of these actors being municipal or not. Some of the projects, like the one on

disabled children, would have been more suitable for a co-operation between professional associations or educational institutions than between two municipalities. Others, like the project on emergency services and the project on internal dialogue in the municipality, are clearly within the MIC framework.

In the future there is reason to stick more closely to purely municipal activities as the basis for individual MIC projects. This way the distinctively municipal contribution to developmental assistance can be cultivated. MIC is a niche and should fix its limits to other developmental activities.

The roles of KS within MIC are manifold, conceptual development, co-ordination and quality control in addition to being an intermediate organ between Norad/Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the participating municipalities. One reason why KS' task has been complicated is the vagueness of the early MIC concept. Now, when MIC is more focused – e.g. MIC activities should be municipal in both countries involved – the task will become more manageable. Identifying a limited set of policy sectors to prioritise could be a measure to simplify MIC. With a stricter definition of what MIC projects to finance (i.e. municipal core activities) combined with realistic indicators of success, more freedom could be given to the municipalities in carrying out the activities. After all, MIC is based on the belief in the value that can be added by local self-government.

Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) enables the use of programme theory (linking inputs, through outputs and outcomes to impacts). Less important, but of practical value, is the fact that it helps standardise applications and reports and make MIC communicate conceptually with the mainstream of developmental aid. As it has been applied within MIC until now, however, LFA has not been adapted to the fact that the municipal officers involved are non-professional developmental workers. Moreover, the indicator system should be revised thoroughly to make it possible for activities to influence in “measurable” ways on indicators.

MIC between municipalities in Norway and municipalities in the South will have to confront the unpleasant fact of structural asymmetry. The Norwegian municipality is much more developed and has by far more resources at its disposition, it has far more tasks and is involved in a larger number of policy fields. Moreover

it is far closer to the financing sources than the Southern partner, and is more knowledgeable of and attuned to the Norwegian authorities' competence-building approach to developmental aid. Finally, the Norwegian municipality has the overall responsibility for the project, whereas the Southern partner is responsible for implementation on the ground (according to the MIC Guidelines).

Each MIC could be placed along a continuum between full partnership and total asymmetry. Kristiansand – Walvis Bay is probably closer to full partnership than most other MIC's. As such the cooperation between Kristiansand and Walvis Bay gives evidence to the potentials of co-operation between municipalities that are relatively similar, than to the more typical North-South municipal international co-operation where the similarities between the two partners are few. On the other hand, there a remarkable lack of benefits from the co-operation on the Norwegian side. Apparently, the idea of a mutual municipal benefit does not seem to have occurred. The co-operation has taken place within a "North helps South" way of thinking. In the future MIC should make it a requirement that both involved municipalities explain what they seek to gain and have gained from the co-operation.

The question of similarity and equality versus difference and asymmetry between the involved municipalities should be addressed systematically with the MIC framework because it affects MIC's programme theory in fundamental ways. What is it that makes North-South municipal cooperation bring about change? Are municipalities that do not have much in common able to bring about change through MIC? The structural asymmetry requires a very careful selection of issues to co-operate on. The role of KS in this respect must be strengthened.

Sammendrag

Jørn Holm-Hansen

Municipal International Co-operation: Walvis Bay (Namibia) and Kristiansand (Norway)

NIBR Report 2008:6

Walvis Bay/Walvisbaai og Kristiansand er pionerer innenfor det Norad-finansierte kommune-til-kommunesamarbeidet, som på engelsk går under betegnelsen Municipal International Co-operation (MIC). De to kommunene startet opp i en periode da MIC lignet folk-til-folksamarbeid og vennskapskommunesamarbeid. Siden den gang har MIC gradvis utviklet seg til å fokusere på reint kommunale oppgaver, og forventningene om hva samarbeidet kan føre til er blitt mye klarere. Hjelpemiddelet Logical Framework Analysis har blitt tatt i bruk for MIC-samarbeidet, og anvendelsen av det er i ferd med å revideres slik at det blir mer presist. Oppsummert kan man si at MIC er blitt mer profesjonelt i tråd med innsikten om at utviklingsbistand må være kunnskapsbasert.

Prosjektsamarbeidet mellom de to kommunene Walvis Bay og Kristiansand har ført til positive resultater for befolkningen i Walvis Bay mens virkningene i Kristiansand er langt mer uklare. Stor grad har prosjektene vært selvgående og har i liten grad krevd assistanse fra KS. Dette er bra for prosjektenes "bærekraft" og helt i tråd med prinsippet om lokal selvforvaltning. På den annen side har denne selvhjelpenheten negative effekter når det gjelder samordningen med Norges aktuelle prioriteringer for bistanden. Faktisk har KS og de to kommunene hatt ulike oppfatninger av hva MIC burde bestå i.

Fremdeles er det en klar tendens i de to byenes kommuner til å oppfatte at oppgavene deres består i å tilrettelegge kontakter og samarbeid mellom ulike lokale aktører nokså uavhengig av om disse aktørene er kommunale eller ikke. Noen av prosjektene ville nok ha vært mer velegnet som et samarbeid mellom profesjonsorganisasjoner eller læresteder enn mellom to kommuner. Det gjelder for eksempel prosjektet om funksjonshemmede barn. Andre – slik som prosjektet om brann- og redningstjenestene og det om intern dialog i kommunen – er klart innenfor MIC-rammeverket.

I framtiden er det grunn til å holde seg til de reinte kommunale oppgavene som utgangspunkt for samarbeidet innen de enkelte prosjektene. På denne måten kan det særskilt kommunale bidraget til bistandsarbeidet dyrkes fram. MIC er en nisje og bør avklare grenseoppgangen til andre arbeidsmåter innen bistanden.

KS har mange roller innen MIC, og de er mangslungne i innhold. KS har ansvaret for begrepsutvikling, koordinering og kvalitetskontroll i tillegg til å være et mellomliggende organ mellom Utenriksdepartementet/Norad og de deltakende kommunene. En av årsakene til at KS' roller har vært utfordrende, ligger i den vage definisjonen av MIC i den opprinnelige versjonen. Nå som MIC er mer fokusert – for eksempel ved at aktivitetene må være kommunale i begge landene som deltar – vil KS oppgave bli mer håndterlig.

Det å identifisere et begrenset utvalg av politikkområder for prioritering kunne være ett tiltak for å forenkle MIC. Med en strammere definisjon av hvilke aktiviteter som kan finansieres (for eksempel bare kommunale kjerneoppgaver) kombinert med realistiske suksessindikatorer, kunne kommunene selv ha større frihet til å gjennomføre aktivitetene. Når alt kommer til alt, baserer jo MIC seg på antakelsen om at lokal selvforvaltning gir ”merverdi”.

Logical Framework Analysis legger opp til bruk av begrepet ”programteori”, der det konkrete tiltaket (input) tenkes å føre til en ytelse (output), som igjen fører til et utfall (outcome) og deretter virkning (impact). LFA er til hjelp for prosjektinnehaverne i arbeidet med å skrive standardiserte søknader og rapporter. Ikke minst viktig er det at dette hjelpemiddelet gjør det lettere for de

som er involvert i MIC å kommunisere begrepsmessig med hovedstrømmingene innen bistandsverdenen.

Slik LFA har vært anvendt innenfor MIC hittil, har det ikke vært tilstrekkelig tilpasset det faktum at kommunenes folk som er med i prosjektene ikke er profesjonelle bistandsarbeidere. Det er viktig at indikatorsystemet blir gjennomgått grundig med sikte på å gjøre det mulig for prosjektaktivitetene å innvirke på ”målbart” vis på indikatorene.

MIC mellom kommuner i Norge og kommuner i Sør vil måtte ta inn over seg det ubehagelige faktum at de samarbeider innenfor et system med strukturell asymmetri. Den norske kommunen er langt mer utviklet og har langt flere resurser til rådighet. Den har langt flere oppgaver tillagt seg og er involvert i langt flere politikk-områder. Dessuten står den langt nærmere finansieringskildene enn det partneren gjør. Den norske kommunen har også langt større kjennskap til de norske myndighetenes tilnæringsmåte til bistand, der kompetansebygging spiller en sentral rolle. Sist, men ikke minst, er det den norske kommunen som har det overordnede ansvaret for prosjektene mens partneren i Sør har ansvaret for gjennomføringen lokalt (i følge MIC-retningslinjene).

Hvert MIC-samarbeid kan plasseres langs en linje der fullt partnerskap og total asymmetri utgjør ytterpunktene. Kristiansand – Walvis Bay er sannsynligvis nærmere fullt partnerskap enn de fleste andre MIC'er. Sann sett viser de to kommunene potensialet i samarbeidet mellom kommuner som ikke er alt for forskjellige sammenlignet med den mer typiske situasjonen i kommunesamarbeidet mellom nord og sør, der likhetspunktene mellom partnerne er få.

Det er en påfallende mangel på resultater av samarbeidet på norsk side. Åpenbart har det ikke blitt noe av det forespeilede gjensidige kommunale utbyttet. Samarbeidet har skjedd innenfor en måte å tenke på der ”Nord hjelper Sør”. I framtidig MIC-samarbeid bør det være et krav at begge de involverte kommunene gjør skikkelig rede for hva de ønsker å oppnå for egen del og hva de har oppnådd.

Spørsmålet om likhetstrekk og jevnbyrdighet versus ulikhet og asymmetri mellom de involverte kommunene bør behandles grundig innenfor MIC-samarbeidet i stort ettersom det dreier seg

om MIC's programteori på grunnleggende vis. Hva er det som gjør at kommune-til-kommunesamarbeid mellom Nord og Sør fører til endring? Er kommuner som ikke har særlig til felles i stand til å utvirke endring gjennom MIC? Den strukturelle asymmetrien fordrer at temaene de to kommunene skal samarbeid om, velges med stor omhu. KS' rolle her må styrkes.

1 Introduction

1.1 The objectives of the evaluation

The evaluation was initiated by KS as a part of the organisation's systematic learning. The evaluation of the MIC partnership between the municipalities of Kristiansand and Walvis Bay forms part of the learning process and quality development of the MIC Programme as such, not only the projects between the two above-mentioned towns. Through the evaluation KS wants to identify lessons learned to be shared within the programme and possible recommendations with relevance for the implementation of the other projects in the programme. Issues to be addressed in-depth are: results and achievements; relevance (in relation to good governance processes); effectiveness; sustainability as well as project organisation and implementation. The Terms-of-Reference are rendered in Appendix 2.

1.2 The outline of the report

The report is organised in a simple way. Chapter 2 presents the background of MIC and its *programme theory*, i.e. the assumed links between activities and goals. Chapter 3 gives an overview and analysis of the project organisation and implementation. Chapter four goes through the Dialogue Project, the Project on Disabled Children, the Emergency Project, the Youth project as well as the Lighthouse Project. The projects are analysed in some detail as case studies. Chapter 5 draws the conclusions and offers some recommendations. Appendices present the comprehensive list of interviewees and the Terms-of-Reference.

2 Background

2.1 The background

Since 1999 the Norwegian aid agency – NORAD – has provided funds for municipal international cooperation (MIC) using KS as a coordinator. KS (The Norwegian Association of Local and Regional Authorities) aims to support its members (the Norwegian municipalities) in their international cooperation endeavours. MIC is now a programme including ten partnerships between Norwegian municipalities and municipalities in the South. KS also applies MIC between Norwegian and other European municipalities.

Walvis Bay and Kristiansand are MIC pioneers. Their cooperation came about as a result of a former Kristiansand chief executive's assignment for NORAD in the late 1990's when he was asked to assist Walvis Bay in developing systems for long-term planning. He worked closely with the Chief Executive officer (CEO) of Walvis Bay. In 1999 KS asked Kristiansand if they would like to be counterpart with Walvis Bay within a MIC project. A financing scheme for the co-operation was presented, and Kristiansand accepted the offer. In the initial period of co-operation, the contacts established by the former CEO proved to be useful, and made it possible to get started quickly without too much time spent on getting to know each others' realities.

MIC has undergone two reviews (2002, 2005) and a discussion note has been written on it (2004).

Guidelines for Municipal International Co-Operation have been revised throughout the period. The original Guidelines were revised in 2005 and 2007. The focus has shifted from "getting to

know each others' experiences" and competence-building to more sharply defined objectives linked to municipal core activities. In other words, MIC has developed and has been amended continuously since 1999. It has developed in the direction of a more narrowly defined *municipal* cooperation to make the most out of MIC's distinctive character. Likewise, it now emphasises systemic change more than service delivery as such.

The latest Guidelines (2007) state that the overall strategic goal of the programme is for good governance processes to be included in municipal governance and municipal services as part of the global fight for poverty reduction and sustainable development in line with the Millennium Development Goals.

In the agreement between NORAD and KS for the period 2007-2009 it is stated that KS shall function as a facilitator for the participating municipalities. KS shall arrange for networking and sharing of experiences between the participating partnerships and shall work as an adviser for the Norwegian municipalities regarding the participating South countries. NORAD states that KS shall have a coordinating, advisory and quality assurance role for the programme and shall ensure the quality of plans and reports from the participating partnerships.

The programme goal sets the frame for what to do, while each partnership with its individual projects can include a wide range of activities within the frame set to fit the priorities and conditions in the different countries and in line with the defined needs and capacities of the partnership (how to do it).

Each partnership receives about 400.000 NOK a year. Man hours are not covered by the grant, and there is a request that travel costs are kept low. In several MIC partnerships, about ten to 15 percent of the grant is used to provide physical assets to the Southern partner, for instance a data processing system to make tax collection more efficient.

2.2 The programme theory

In order to structure an assessment of an intervention, it is necessary to have an idea of the theory behind the intervention. Theory in this context should not be understood as an intricate

academic exercise, but be used a practical tool to help bring forth the assumed relations between the interventions (inputs) and their outputs and outcomes, and the relations between the outcomes and the solution of the problems that the intervention seeks to reduce or solve. Evaluations often refer to programme theory. Programme theory, like other theory, suggests links between causes and effects. A definition frequently referred to defines programme theory as "... a *specification of what must be done to achieve the desired goals, what other important impacts may also be anticipated, and how these goals and impacts would be generated*"¹.

The MIC programme theory could be summed up like this:

Causal chain: Capacity-building at local level (intervention/input) → service delivery (output) → poverty reduction (outcome).

Methods: Mutual exchanges of experiences and capacity building.

Target group: Local self-government politicians and administrative staff (not users of municipal services, or local population at large).

Basic assumption: Despite the structural asymmetries, there are similarities between Norwegian and Southern municipalities, which make direct municipal cooperation not only possible, but also potentially fruitful.

The MIC programme has been operating according to an elaborate programme theory systematised as the Sustainable Local Governance Circle (SLGC). The Guidelines have referred to the SLGC as a structuring tool for project owners within MIC.

The SLGC is presented in "MIC Status Report April 2004", "It is assumed that as once councillors and staff has built capacity, they will be able to ensure that services are delivered." Furthermore, the assumption is that increased public trust in improved local government services will increase willingness to pay taxes. Increased integration of the informal sector into the formal economy as well as focus on business development and the private sector will increase the ability of communities to pay taxes. Hence the local council will be able to reduce the poverty of the community it serves.

¹ Chen, Huey-Tsyh (1990), Theory-driven evaluations, Newsbury Park CA, Sage Publications, p. 43.

The causal chain in the SLGC theory is certainly fragile, and it was noted by the 2005 evaluators that the actual relationship between the factors depends very much on contextual factors. The SLGC is a model. When it was developed it made use of what was state-of-the-art within local governance studies. Interlinks and causes between various factors were suggested, like “good governance” (defined as transparency, accountability and participation), municipal income systems (taxes, fees, tariffs), local private sector, and administrative capacity. The 2005 Evaluation found the SLGC to be suited for inspiration and general guidance, but less useful as a management and design tool. Therefore, the evaluators recommended using LFA more actively.

The Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) has formed part of how MIC has been structured since its beginning, but was fully taken into use after the 2005 evaluation. LFA serves the purpose of structuring the programme theory in a way that makes it conform to the language of the mainstream aid institutions. While applying LFA, KS refers to NORAD’s LFA handbook for objective-oriented planning from 1999. LFA’s main merit, however, lies in its potentials for making projects refer to programme theory. KS offers training in LFA for MIC project managers.

In the 2007 Guidelines LFA has been emphasised and its use has been specified. When Kristiansand and Walvis Bay complain about reporting formalities, they refer to LFA. It is elaborate, and may be very time-consuming for relatively small projects, like the individual MIC partnerships.

3 Project organisation and implementation

3.1 The formal set-up of MIC

MIC's organisational set-up is relatively complex, which affects KS in particular. KS's functions within MIC are manifold. The 2005 evaluation recommended that KS have a more clearly specified role in supporting the partners work strategically. The 2005 evaluation still found that neither in the contract with NORAD, nor in the Guidelines the role of KS was clearly defined.

In the 2007 MIC Guidelines KS's role has been specified. According to the new Guidelines KS enters into a programme contract with Norad and functions as a facilitator for the municipalities that participate in MIC. It shall give advice to the Norwegian municipalities on contextual factors in the Southern countries involved. KS shall arrange for networking and sharing of experience between the involved municipalities. Moreover, KS shall ensure that the activities, including plans and reports, are up to standards. KS receives eight percent of the MIC grant to cover its task within the programme.

The mayors and the chief executive officers (CEO's) in both municipalities serve as members of the MIC Walvis Bay – Kristiansand's *steering committee*. Also, the two members of the *project team* sit on the steering committee. The project team is responsible for the operative tasks on a daily basis. The *reference group* has one Namibian and one Norwegian member.

Each sub-project has its own project team with a project leader and project participants. In some of the sub-projects the project

leader comes from Kristiansand, in others from Walvis Bay. In practice, the sub-projects are managed by the project leader and one leading project participant in the other town. The sub-projects relate to the main steering committee and reference group.

3.2 Relations Walvis Bay – Kristiansand

In the MIC programme theory two municipalities enter into cooperation as equal partners. In reality, however, they are not equal, among others because the Norwegian partner:

- is much more developed and has by far more resources at its disposition
- has far more tasks and is involved in more policy fields
- is far closer to the financing sources than the Southern partner
- is more knowledgeable of and attuned to the Norwegian authorities' competence-building approach to developmental aid
- has the overall responsibility for the project, whereas the Southern partner is responsible for implementation on the ground (according to the MIC Guidelines)

Kristiansand – Walvis Bay is probably closer to full partnership than most other MIC's. Nevertheless, a certain asymmetry is present. Throughout the MIC project the division of tasks between the Norwegian and the Southern partners has been somewhat asymmetrical. The Norwegian municipality has been responsible for the overall programme and the Southern municipality for local implementation (including prioritising and planning). This model requires trust and open communication.

Visiting each other's two towns is a core activity within the MIC. Visits within each sub-project take place once, and in some cases, twice a year. The general pattern is that the representatives of Kristiansand go to Walvis Bay to conduct trainings and seminars, whereas the representatives of Walvis Bay go to Kristiansand to study the Norwegian experiences.

The sub-projects that came off ground and lasted for a while, like the Dialogue Project, the Project on Disabled Children and the Project on Emergency Services are characterised by close contacts and open-hearted communication between project participants on both sides. Both sides take responsibility for project implementation and progression of the cooperation. Project activities have been adjusted consecutively. For instance, a project idea that turned out not to be ripe for implementation, like the one on economic development, was winded up swiftly. In a MIC with less open channels of communication a similar liquidation might have been difficult, leading either to lengthy processes or, even worse, no liquidation at all.

Open, trustful communication is a precondition for MIC to work according to its programme theory, in which the effects of *contacts* between municipal workers and officers from two countries are a core element.

Conclusion. Like the other MIC projects funded by the Norwegian Aid Agency Norad the co-operation between Walvis Bay and Kristiansand takes place within a dual framework shaped by the asymmetrical relations between North and South on the one hand and the idea of partnership between equal municipalities on the other. The asymmetry is most clearly visible by the fact that Norwegians train Namibians and not the other way round. Nevertheless, most likely, the duality and tension from it is less prevalent in the Walvis Bay – Kristiansand MIC, than in other MIC's between Norwegian municipalities and municipalities in the South. After all, Walvis Bay is better off than most other African towns, having inherited infrastructure, industries and skilled people from the time Walvis Bay was a heavily subsidised enclave incorporated into the Republic of South Africa. The Bertelsmann test, made in 2001 as a part of the MIC, gave Walvis Bay 334 points out of 700 possible, which places the town close to the average well-run Nordic municipality.

On the one hand, the fact that the two towns are on a relatively similar level is one of the reasons the towns have been able to carry out a successful MIC. On the other hand, for the same reasons it could be questioned whether the Kristiansand – Walvis Bay could serve as a model for other Norwegian – African MIC's. The underlying question is how to cope with asymmetry. Each

MIC could be placed along a continuum between full partnership and total asymmetry.

3.3 Kristiansand-Walvis Bay and other municipalities

The MIC people in the two municipalities report that they appreciate the meeting with other MIC municipalities arranged by KS. A part from that neither of the two municipalities gives priority to coordination with other MIC municipalities. This is explained by scarcity of time. Walvis Bay and Tsumeb, however, have entered into a formalised cooperation.

3.4 Internal communication in the municipalities

In Kristiansand there has been good communication between the local politicians and the administration. Although the cooperation has its origins in the administration, the mayor was involved from the outset. Elected politicians have taken part, primarily in the Dialogue Project.

In Walvis Bay the relations between administration and politicians is delicate. There is little trust, and the conflict between the ideals of expertise on one hand and the ideals of democratic rule by “laymen” is sharp. The mayor has been involved all the time, and for one of them very actively. The Dialogue project has had a seminar for councillors.

Apart from the Dialogue Project, the Kristiansand – Walvis Bay MIC projects have not addressed issues that stand out as being very relevant for councillors to involve themselves in. On the other hand, the projects on youth activities and disabled children could have included politicians sitting on committees covering the fields. Then again, on the Namibian side the degree of specialisation among the politicians does not seem to be high.

3.5 The relations between KS and the two municipalities

The two municipalities have run the MIC activities relatively autonomously from the KS. This may be the result of several factors:

1. The fact that the cooperation is the first in the group of MIC (strategies made before the MIC had found its form)
2. The fact that KS strategies have been reformulated throughout the programme period and on-going activities have not adapted to new schemes
3. The strong partnership that makes the two municipalities self-confident enough to set the agenda themselves

Within the MIC programme concept, there is an inherent conflict between autonomy and co-ordination. Put in another way: Is MIC primarily a Norad activity or is it a municipal activity based on the ideal of local self-government? KS' present MIC Programme Guidelines (April 2007) refers to its agreement with Norad, which states that KS shall ensure that the projects of the supported municipalities follow the priorities of the Norwegian Parliament, the policies of Norad and the conditions in the MIC programme agreement. In other words, MIC is primarily an official state-level activity for which NORAD provides funds and the municipalities implement.

According to the Guidelines, NORAD “uses KS as a coordinator through entering into an agreement for MIC – a programme that includes a number of Norwegian municipalities.” The MIC evaluation from 2005 (Anger and Moberg) called for a stronger position of KS. KS should not only coordinate, according to the recommendations of the evaluation, but manage. The recommendation makes sense from one point of view. It would make the programme more streamlined. On the other hand, centralisation of “power” to a level “above” the individual municipalities might go against the MIC programme theory. A balance point must be found.

The *advisory* role of KS has not been strong enough to make Kristiansand and Walvis Bay redirect their co-operation into one

focusing on purely municipal activities. Likewise, the willingness of the two municipalities to listen to KS' advice has been poorly developed.

Also on a more practical level, there are divergences between Kristiansand and KS. The two cooperating municipalities criticise the reporting system for two main reasons. Firstly, after LFA was introduced as the main reporting framework there are too many indicators and they are too detailed. Secondly, the language in the report template is difficult to understand. At times the same information asked for twice, only with slightly different words. There was also criticism of the use of management indicators. Reporting to what degree each activity contributes towards achieving specific programme objectives would be more effective.

The two municipalities appreciate the introduction of three year project cycles with annual applications and reports. The system with three year cycles is a reflection of the three-year cycles in KS's agreements with NORAD.

3.6 The use of programme theory

As chapter 2.2 shows, MIC operates along a programme theory in which a causal chain links activities to outcomes. One of the links in the chain refers to mental or attitudinal changes (the willingness to pay taxes). Such changes usually take much time to be made tangible, and expectations on when it would be reasonable to measure impacts should be adjusted accordingly.

In addition, it could also be objected that the link between trust in local government and the willingness of the informal sector to join the formal sector might be weak. Under any circumstance, there is a long way to go from the intervention to the final goal, the intervention being *capacity-building* and the outcome *reduced poverty*. (Indicators must be adapted to this fact). Several contextual factors play a role on the way between the two, which means that the effects of the intervention might have been good even if the scores on the indicators at the end of the causal chain are low.

The reason why scores are low may be that other factors beyond control of MIC counterbalance MIC, or simply that effects at the end of the causal chain need time to become manifest. Therefore,

the indicators at *project* level should be chosen among outcomes (not necessarily just outputs) closer to the immediate MIC activities. Then the scores should be checked finally at the end of each three-year project period. For the *programme*, however, there is reason to look for impacts. The effects on the final goal (e.g. reduced poverty) should also be established by way of logical reasoning: Is it reasonable to believe that the outcomes prepare the ground for the objectives to be reached?

Another objection could be made against the way LFA is practiced in the 2007 MIC Guidelines. Here, the MIC activities are linked to the Millennium Development Goals. Accordingly, the programme aims at four objectives. First, it intervenes to make local service delivery more effective and efficient. Secondly, it aims at increasing environmental development in local plans and activities. Thirdly, it seeks to increase democratic trust, participation and representation. Fourthly, it aims at increasing transparency and accountability. Like in the SLGC, the indicators chosen for the LFA are very far from the actual MIC activities and the causal chain has very many intermediary links (that are not indicated). For instance, an increased number of individuals receiving a service and increased satisfaction among them are the indicator of success on MIC activities to improve local service delivery. The activities or the intervention is capacity building and exchange of information. It is doubtful that these are strong enough as interventions to be measured as indicated in the LFA.

On the other hand in the LFA's for the youth project, the disabled children and the dialogue projects attached to the 2007 Annual Report, indicators are close to the activities. But here the indicators are perhaps too close to the activities. In fact, outputs and indicators are confused. Moreover, quite confusingly indicators are divided on "purpose", "output" and "activities". Even more confusing, there does not seem to be any analytical difference between purpose, output and activities. In general, the use of LFA by Kristiansand – Walvis Bay does not make the programme theory easily discernible. Neither is the intervention logic clear from the LFA (which does not mean there is no intervention logic).

Conclusion. KS would like to show not only that "MIC works", but that it contributes to the overall goals of Norwegian development

policies in the South, defined by the Millennium Development Goals. It is, however, questionable whether using these goals as *indicators* for MIC is of much help for the involved municipalities, KS, evaluators and Norwegian development authorities.

There is a need to clarify the causal chain of events that links project activities via outputs and outcome to reaching the objectives of the programme. A better understanding of the concepts used in the LFA as applied within MIC is very much required. Project leaders should be drilled in the contents of and differences between purpose, output, outcome, activity and indicator. As of now the concepts are confused, which makes reports unclear. Moreover, the lack of stringency makes the report writing less of learning and structuring process than it otherwise could have been.

The potentials of LFA have not been fully made use of neither by KS nor the Kristiansand – Walvis Bay partnership. KS should simplify and adapt LFA to the purpose of using it in MIC. Among others it is necessary to make indicators make sense. There must be a plausible and measurable link between the intervention and the indicator (if necessary by logical inference). This means that indicators must be found somewhere between the ones suggested by KS in its 2007 Guidelines and the one used by the two municipalities in their 2007 annual report.

In some cases, municipal expenditures or incomes may be used as indicators on effects of project activities. Also the indicators used by the UNDP may serve as a point of departure for the development of more accurate MIC indicators. Under any circumstance, indicators should be easy to handle, and they should be few in number.

4 The sub-projects

4.1 The Dialogue Project

4.1.1 Background

Objectives. The project’s aim has been to reduce intra-institutional mistrust and racial/tribal divide within the municipal organisation of Walvis Bay by developing human resources capable of conducting *dialogue processes* based on deliberative participation. These processes aim at fostering the following elements of behaviour: readiness to learn; sharing of knowledge; empathetic listening; reflecting back what is heard; exploration of underlying assumption (own and those of others); acknowledgement of emotions as well as ideas and opinions; adjustment to reflect new knowledge and understanding.

At a meeting among the Dialogue project’s core team in Walvis Bay in April the following was drawn up to delineate “dialogue”:

Table 4.1 *What dialogue is not and what it is*

What dialogue is not:	What dialogue is:
Promoting internal debate	A guide to finding common ground through a collaborative and participatory approach
An instant remedy, or “quick fix”, to problems	A process and not an event
A channel of mediation, or a problem solver	A dedicated effort to overcome barriers
A solution to ultimate change	A process that facilitate change

Relevance. Mistrust haunts Namibian municipal affairs. Namibia is, like many other countries, divided by ethnicity and clan, and this has an impact on the working of politics and the administration. The apartheid period might have further strengthened the tendency of looking at the population as being primarily divided in ethnic and clan groups rather than being fellow citizens. Nepotism has been identified as a big problem. In particular, it thwarts fair appointments and also influences disciplinary steps.

The removal of apartheid and the introduction of positive discrimination (in Namibia termed “affirmative action” along US American lines) meant that municipal officers “needed to learn to speak with each others”, as one local Dialogue trainer in Walvis Bay put it. Another put it like this: “We have different cultures, but need to work in the same organisation”.

Moreover, the Namibian municipalities are characterised by strong compartmentalism between sections, divisions and departments. Different branches of the municipality “build their own empires”, as it was put in one project document, in stead of working together.

The rivalry between councillors and the administration is very strong, overt and explicit in Namibia. The fact that “laymen”, like most politicians actually are, have been elected to give guidelines tends to be difficult to accept for the professional administrators, whose educational and professional backgrounds are very different from those of the politicians. On the other hand, many politicians tend to disrespect the professional integrity of the administrators, and treat them as junior assistants. The fact that Namibia has taken over British formal bric-à-brac, like addressing the mayor by “His Worship”, does not make the situation better.

Moreover, the General Managers and other top municipal staff in Walvis Bay used to receive salaries that are sky-high above the average municipal salaries, which may contribute to dissociation from municipal realities. The top level salaries, however, were recently subject to a state regulation that will make the gaps less dramatic in the future.

Consultative processes between the municipality as an employer and the trade unions might have reduced the level of mistrust. In other words, there was a need for measures to overcome distrust

not only due to particular characteristics of the Namibian municipality due to the legacy of apartheid, but also because of general types of tensions within the municipality.

The history. The dialogue method introduced by the Norwegian side has its roots in Sweden, where it was developed for the 1990's reforms of the public sector. It is a methodology to enhance capacity to conduct change processes through deliberative participatory processes. Kristiansand municipality made use of the programme, and as soon as the Norwegian MIC project manager got to know the conflictual situation in the Walvis Bay town hall, he suggested that Kristiansand share their experiences with the Dialogue Programme.

The Dialogue Project in Walvis Bay. Training has been offered to senior administrative level and to the local councillors as well as trade union leaders. A core group of participants has been established (the Dialogue Working Group), which is capable of training others and are supposed to ensure continuation of the Dialogue Project. The Dialogue Working Group has two members from each of Walvis Bay's six municipal departments.

4.1.2 Interventions and intervention logic

The problem to be addressed by the project intervention (dialogue processes) has mistrust and lack of institutional and individual capacity to communicate in an open and respectful way.

Dialogue as used in the project is defined by the International Institute for Sustained Dialogue as "... approaches of genuine interaction through which human beings listen to each other deeply enough to be changed by what they learn. Each makes a serious effort to take others' concerns into her or his own picture, even when disagreement persists. No participant gives up her or his identity, but each recognised enough of the others' valid human claims that he or she will act differently towards the other."

Table 4.2 *The intervention logic of the Dialogue Project*

Problem	Intervention	Objective to be reached
→	→	→
Namibian municipal realities: Ethnic divide, departmentalism, conflict between politicians and administration	Dialogue training	Open and respectful communication based on trust across ethnic, departmental and other dividing lines in the municipality. Capacity to deal with conflicts.

The training consists in a three or four day work shop. During the first day the participants' expectations are made clear. The remaining days consist in work on an individual level, then on a group level and finally on an organisational level. Practical exercises aim at showing what is gained on "thinking together" through dialogue.

In general, there are two work shop leaders from Norway, one special consultant in the Kristiansand municipality and one representative of a trade union.

Scope and type of the activities

About ten workshops have been carried out since 2000. Eight workshops have taken place in Walvis Bay, and three in Kristiansand. The workshops have been held separately for top administrators as well as politicians. The work shops have been very well-structured.

4.1.3 Achievements

Achievement on the Namibian side. The project has resulted in concrete outputs, like the fact that there is a core group in Walvis Bay – the Dialogue Working Group – that is committed to the idea of deliberative participatory processes. In interviews, the members of the Dialogue Working Group found it difficult to pinpoint effects of the project, but as one put it: "We can feel it." The

lack of easily measurable results lies in the very character of the project, which aims at fostering a new culture within the municipality. The behavioural changes aimed at (presented under *Background/Aims* above) are certainly not easily pin-pointed, but nevertheless important.

A Dialogue Plan of Action was approved by the municipal council in October 2006, and in April 2007 a workshop was held (see above) to come up with recommendation as to the introduction of the Action Plan.

At times, when conflicts occur within the municipality (like in one recent case with the municipal street cleaners), the dialogue trainers are called upon to solve them. This is an indicator that the Dialogue Project is being appreciated within the municipal organisation, but the dialogue trainers themselves make some reservations to the confidence they are being shown. They claim the Dialogue Project is not there to *solve* conflicts, but to *forestall* them by boosting a new dialogue-based internal culture in the municipality.

Dissemination. As soon as the dialogue process is regarded as being a reality in Walvis Bay it has been the intention to introduce it in other municipalities of the Erongo Region.

Achievement on the Norwegian side. The two Norwegian work shop leaders have brought some insights back to Kristiansand. Through observing the interaction between white and black work shop participants, the Norwegian project participants tell they have learnt to be more aware of cultural differences. The project leader reports that the enhanced cultural sensitivity has not only been useful for the understanding of non-Western immigrants in Kristiansand, but also for instance variations between working styles in local nursing homes.

4.1.4 Sustainability

At an early stage the project participants agreed to make the activities self-going. The establishment of the Dialogue Working Group (see above) with representatives from all the six municipal departments was an important step in this direction. The model of

“training trainers” further enhances the prospects of continued activities after Kristiansand has pulled out.

Not all key persons in the Walvis Bay municipality endorse the project, however, and its future hinges on a broader acceptance of the ideas behind the project. There are indications that the local councillors prefer projects with more tangible results rather than capacity-building, and therefore do not take as actively part in Dialogue as they could have.

So far, the project has been helped by the fact that it has mainly been financed from outside, but as soon as this comes to an end the project will have to face its litmus test.

Also the project activities on the ground in Walvis Bay seem to be dependent upon “external pressure” from the Norwegian project leader. At each workshop enthusiasm is high, but in between there is a certain fatigue. As one municipal representative put it, “It’s all fine when we sit at the work shops and talk about dialogue, but as soon as we leave the room, we continue to fight.” Another put it like this: “We preach dialogue, but we do not practice it”.

Nevertheless, the participants told they appreciated the Dialogue project.

4.1.5 Conclusion

The Dialogue Project is a typical example of “policy transfer”. A method or programme developed in one national context (Sweden) is transplanted to another context (Walvis Bay). The whole operation has been sensitive to the difficulties in transferring a method from one context to another. The Norwegian project leader put it like this: “We cannot come from Norway and teach others anything, but we can come from Norway and see together with others”. The project is explicitly referring to the Nordic way of doing things (“seek a bottom line were all agree”).

Much emphasis is the project documentation on post-apartheid, but in practice also more general municipal issues like the divide between administration and politicians, between the municipal departments and between the municipality as an employer and the municipal employees. In fact, these latter aspects are probably

more suitable for the Kristiansand – Walvis Bay co-operation project since Kristiansand's competence and experiences in these matters are much more developed than for the ethnic issues (although here, probably a multi-ethnic Northern Norwegian municipality might have been able to contribute).

Although the project has been implemented in a context sensitive way, one could still ask whether dialogue, as defined in the Dialogue Project, is “strong” enough in the Namibian context, where deep-seated cleavages criss-cross the municipal organisation. The shared bottom-line referred to in the project documentation as something that characterises the Nordic way of dealing with conflict does not seem to exist in Namibia. If the problem is that politicians and administrators have completely different ideas about their roles (e.g. administration not accepting directives from lower-educated councillors; or getting indignant when councillors enter into “politics”) is dialogue enough to bridge the gaps? Is the solution to be found in more communicative ways of talking and listening? Or would it be more appropriate with workshops on the division of tasks and roles between politicians and administrators in a modern democracy?

The Dialogue Working Group had a strategy planning session in April 2007, in which inputs to a Dialogue Process Plan of Action were given. The inputs were incorporated into the Plan of Action that was approved by the municipal council in September 2007. The inputs were assembled in a report, which is completely free of wishful thinking and attempts to sweep problems under the carpet. Here, several weaknesses were identified, among them the reliance upon some individuals for the project to progress instead of having the municipality as an organisation behind it. Also, the lack of enthusiasm on the part of some municipal officers was mentioned. Also, it was said that the objectives of dialogue still were vague.

It was recommended that the Plan of Action be straight and simple and not another theoretical document. This recommendation should be seen on the background of the feeling that the objectives of the Dialogue Project are too idealistic.

Contribution to the overall MIC objectives. The Dialogue Project has addressed one of the obstacles for efficiency in the Walvis Bay municipal politico-administrative structures. By improving the

municipality's ability to handle conflict and create internal trust the project has contributed to the efforts within the Walvis Bay municipality to work according to the principles of "good governance".

4.2 The Project on Disabled Children

4.2.1 Background

Objective. The project aims at promoting attitudes and methods in the work with disabled children. These attitudes and methods consist in giving each disabled child the possibility to communicate and to be independent in their daily lives.

Relevance. Care for disabled children with deprived parents hardly exists in Namibia. Only some centres offer assistance. The Sunshine Centre is one of them. It offers day care. The children are picked up by a bus from 7 in the morning, and return at 15 o'clock.

Among the poor, having a disabled child and giving it care is very difficult. Households often have many children and often there is only one parent. For the children to come to the centre, therefore, is a relief. Likewise, for the parents having the children at the centre makes everyday life easier. During holidays the centre offers home-based care, which means they bring out soup and medicines to the children.

The history. The Sunshine Centre was established in 1996 with four children (late 2007 there were 64 children). In the beginning the centre focused on the age group 0-10, but now also includes older children.

The Sunshine Centre is not municipal, and mainly works with the municipality through the MIC activities. The centre is registered as a Welfare Organisation with the Ministry of Health and a non-profit association with the Ministry of Trade. In the beginning, the Centre was fully financed by the Walvis Bay-based Overberg Fishing Company, but is now financed only 50 percent by them. The bus that picks up the children is financed by another company. The links to Kristiansand were established after the

leader of the centre contacted the mayor with a question whether there were similar centres abroad the centre possibly could twin with. As a result of this request, in 2001 the centre entered into contact with Kristiansand and Hellemyr centre for disabled children.

The workers in the centre are without formal education. “Before we got the MIC we did not know anything. Our staff was housewives,” the head of the centre told. In the beginning the centre just kept the children there without any training, it was said.

Links to the municipality. The Centre does not form part of the municipality, and its only link to the municipal administration is through the Namibian MIC coordinator. This fact is problematised neither by the project leader nor by the two involved municipalities.

4.2.2 Intervention and intervention logic

The problem to be mitigated could be summed up by the following statement: “Disabled children in the Sunshine Centre do not receive care that brings forth the potential these children have, and the reason is lack of training among the personnel.” Therefore, the intervention aiming at solving the problem consisted in training the personnel. The training is based on practices in Norwegian kindergartens.

The training consists in a mixture of new methods and new attitudes. Methods were focusing on compensatory measures to overcome some disabled children’s lack of communicative skills. Pictogrammes, mimic and signs plus language were the methods focused upon. The attitudes conveyed could be summed up in “focus on the strength of the children rather than weaknesses.”

The training finds place during the Norwegian project leader’s annual visits to Walvis Bay. The Norwegian project leader applies a well thought-out pedagogical approach oriented towards practice. Moreover, at the outset of the cooperation she chose to take the local realities as the starting point rather than textbook correctness. The Norwegian project leader conducted the training as much as possible “on the floor” working together with the local staff, asking them how they would solve specific problems rather than

telling them how to do it. As she told: “I present an idea, and they adapt it.” This sensitivity to the local situation is appreciated by the care workers at the Sunshine centres and among those from other Namibian centres trained at the Sunshine centre. It is being contrasted to the opposite “*Bessermisser*” approach, allegedly most often applied by Northerners engaged in assistance to child social welfare in Namibia.

Scope and type of the activities

Annual visits made by Norwegian team to Namibia since 2001 (two visits in 2007). In 2002 a Walvis Bay team went to Kristiansand. The visits are used for intensive training.

4.2.3 Achievements

Achievement on the Namibian side. The main achievement of the project is to have introduced new ways of working with the children and related to this, also new attitudes among the staff of the Centre.

Home-based care (Centre staff visiting the children’s families at home during holidays, bringing food and medicine) has been introduced, and children are taken out of the centre for excursion in the local community. All this contributes to the new attitudes gradually being implanted among the parents and the wider community.

Methods applied in Norway have been introduced in the Sunshine Centre, among them the use of pictogrammes, signs plus words and mimic to enable the children to communicate. This is now being applied with the children in the centre with success. People, who saw the children some years ago and today, report that there have been made great progress.

Also, methods of treating the children as individuals have been introduced.

The Sunshine Centre has placed five children in jobs. It is also involved in sport for disabled children, and has participated in competitions abroad.

Just like in the Youth project the project leader in the Project on Disabled Children claims that the project has put a new issue on

the municipal agenda. It is, however, questionable whether agenda-setting is among the MIC programme activities.

Dissemination. The Sunshine Centre has a strategy of information sharing, primarily with the municipalities of the Erongo region in which Walvis Bay forms part. During the training sessions in the Sunshine Centre other, similar centres and kindergartens have been invited. Four kindergartens from Walvis Bay as well as the CHAIN Centre in Swakopmund and guests working with disabled children in Lüderitz and Oshakati have taken part.

Achievement on the Norwegian side. It is somewhat unclear what the Norwegian side has gained (apart from the reward from having contributed to the well-being of a very vulnerable and ignored group of children). The benefits on the Norwegian side are not easily discernible, although the project leader refers to an enhanced reflective capacity. Most often it is referred to the Namibians' skills in getting much out of few resources, although there were not given any concrete suggestions for how this skill could be transferred to Norwegian municipal workers in the field of care for disabled children.

It is also being said (and written in project documentation) that the Norwegians ought to be "more thankful for their own conditions", implicitly that this is what the Norwegian project participants have learnt. If these are the achievements to the benefit of the Norwegian side, that part of the project certainly cannot be said to have been cost-efficient. Getting more aware of Norway's relative wealth and potential for economising could at best be categorised as side-effects, not achievements. On the other hand, the experiences drawn by the Norwegian participants on how to solve problems under very basic circumstances may spur some creativity also while back in Norway.

4.2.4 Sustainability

According to the leader of the Centre, they can now stand on their own feet: "The foundation is made. Now we just need to follow up."

On the Norwegian side an association to support the Sunshine Centre has been established. The association was set up in

accordance with the mayor and chief executive officer of Kristiansand.

The Centre has forged links to the local Rotary club as well as Rotary in Kristiansand.

The original idea of selling products made by the children to Kristiansand has been skipped due to a simple assessment of what people would be willing to buy and the transport costs.

4.2.5 Conclusion

The Project on Disabled Children is an illustrative example of the typical Norwegian development project consisting in transfer of skills and promotion of attitudes rather than physical assets, combining the transfer of new methods and new attitudes. The methods and attitudes are being conveyed by Norwegian practitioners, who apply and like the methods and attitudes in their daily work at home. This is a formula that fits well into the MIC programme theory.

There is no doubt that the project on disabled children in Walvis Bay has been a success. It has reached the objectives that were set at the outset. The target group has improved their living conditions considerably. Skills have been disseminated to other institutions in the Erongo region. However, since 2000 the MIC concept has developed into focusing more narrowly on municipal cooperation *stricto sensu*. In this new perspective the project, although still being a good project, has not been a good *MIC project*. Municipal capacities have not been built on the Namibian side as a result of the project. In the future projects like the one with the Sunshine Centre could rather be designed as a centre-to-centre cooperation, or a co-operation between organisations representing the professions involved (trade union, educational institution or other).

Contribution to the overall MIC objectives. The Project on Disabled Children has contributed to the welfare of the children at the Sunshine Centre, and has raised the capacities of the staff, but has not contributed to municipal capacities.

4.3 The Emergency Project

4.3.1 Background

Objectives. The project aimed at halting the rise in deaths caused by fire and to reduce the cost of material damage with ten percent.

Relevance. Fires are frequent in Walvis Bay, in particular in the deprived city district of Kuisebmond.

The history. The project started in 2000 and was finalised in 2005. The fire brigades in Walvis Bay form part of the Protection Service in which not only fire, but occupational health and safety, security and civil defence are fields of work.

4.3.2 Intervention and intervention logic

The objectives of the project have been pursued through two interventions, training and joint development of a plan of action.

Scope of the activities

Two visits from Walvis Bay to Kristiansand and two visits to Walvis Bay have taken place.

4.3.3 Achievements

Achievement on the Namibian side. The Namibian side has learned how to react to fire alarm by full call-out at once unlike the earlier practice of going there to check whether it was serious or not. Moreover, the fire station in Walvis Bay has introduced a system of having at least ten volunteer fire men stand-by at any time.

Dissemination. Smaller municipalities contact the fire station in Walvis Bay for assistance, and among others the fire station help them set up a more efficient system of volunteer firemen. The fire brigades of Walvis Bay also trained the Army in fire extinguishing based on what they have learnt with the Norwegians.

Achievement on the Norwegian side. The project has given some competence on the Norwegian side in working under basic conditions.

4.3.4 Sustainability

The core elements of the training courses have been integrated into the everyday practices of the Emergency Services in Walvis Bay.

4.3.5 Conclusion

The Emergency Project was and of cooperation between two municipal services. The cooperation was practical and with a clear purpose. The cooperation contributed to the professional update of Walvis Bay's fire brigades. The material update – the construction of a brand new station – was made for Namibian funds.

Contribution to the overall MIC objectives. The Emergency Project involved services that are municipal in both towns. Reliable emergency services may contribute to the trust in the municipality that according to the Sustainable Local Governance Circle will lead to enhanced willingness to pay taxes.

4.4 The Youth Project

4.4.1 Background

Aim. The aim of the project has been to establish facilities that bring “bored and idle young people” (citation from the Project Directive) in Walvis Bay into positive activities. Drop-outs from school, drug and alcohol abuse, as well as crime were among the negative phenomena that the project aimed at reducing through the establishment of a youth centre. Beyond the concrete aim of setting up a centre, the project aimed at a “more intensive involvement from the community (parents, teachers, general public towards the forming and shaping of the young people in Walvis Bay.” In fact, the project envisaged a participative process of all sectors of the community to determine needs.

Relevance. Unemployment in Walvis Bay is estimated at approximately 45 to 50 percent and most likely the rate is higher among young people. School leavers are particularly stricken by

lack of jobs. In addition, unwanted pregnancies and HIV/AIDS are problems that strike young people. The Youth Project aims at counteracting boredom and idleness among youth by directing their energies into positive activities. The project will help young people avoid ending up trouble, or bring them back on course in critical phases of their lives. In a longer run this may contribute to reducing poverty.

The history. During one of the early visits to Kristiansand the delegation from Walvis Bay got acquainted with the Samsen youth cultural centre. The two sides decided to investigate the possibilities of setting up something similar in Walvis Bay. A former catering centre in a black workers compound from the apartheid period, located in what is now one of Walvis Bay's relatively poor town districts (Kuisebmond) was identified as a suitable structure to rebuild into a culture house.

Soon, however, after having assessed the costs of reconverting the slaughter house, the idea was reconsidered. Also the fact that the building was situated in an area of Walvis Bay was allegedly not all young people would feel safe, was taken into consideration. The strategy was changed into "start small" and with what already exists.

In line with this, the youth project has got in touch with an ongoing imitative in the city district of Narraville (former "coloured"). Here, a businessman has set up a youth cultural centre at his own expense. The centre accommodates cultural as well as leisure activities. Also some work places have been created linked to the centre (car wash). Both the Namibian and Norwegian members of the project team find this to be a promising candidate for project activities. The business man in charge of the centre took part in a visits to Kristiansand in December 2007. In addition a home for orphans and vulnerable children has been invited in, and a representative took part in the December 2007 visit to Kristiansand.

Youth policies in Walvis Bay. The fact that youth policies are a well-established municipal policy field in Norway, whereas it is not in Namibia, makes the Youth Project somewhat asymmetric. The Walvis Bay General Manager taking part in the project covers the fields of fire brigades libraries, sport, parks, cemeteries and traffic. His dealings with youth affairs are through sports. "The youth thing is new to us. It came through Kristiansand," told the General

Manager. To illustrate the absence of youth polices at municipal level in Namibia, it could be mentioned that Walvis Bay is the only municipality in Namibia that finances sport facilities. After the December 2007 visit to Kristiansand the intention is to “make things more specific” with the aim of setting up a Youth Development Committee at municipal level in Walvis Bay. Since 2006 the General Manger involved in the project from Walvis Bay has pulled people together who work with youth. If established, the Youth Committee will be one among several committees covering specific policy fields, like the committee of the elderly or the committee for build-together. These committees are not municipal committees in the Norwegian strict sense, but rather community-based committees with members from various organisations, groups and institutions. Local councillors may sit on the committee if they want, but there is no formal requirement that they do.

4.4.2 Intervention and intervention logic

The problem addressed by the project could be summarised as being “youth idleness and delinquency” with their negative consequences for the ability of young people to create a future for themselves. The intervention to reduce the problem consists in a two-fold strategy:

- a) to develop a Youth Centre inspired by Samsen youth centre in Kristiansand, and
- b) to establish a Youth Development Committee along the same lines as already existing municipal/community committees in Walvis Bay as the basis for the development of youth policies at municipal level.

Although the project documentation tends to focus on a) the *Youth Centre*, leaving b) the *Youth Development Committee* as an auxiliary measure to make the centre sustainable, the intervention could also be portrayed the other way round. Then the Centre would be a measure to enable the and promote the establishment of a committee and thereby a municipal youth policy, that hitherto has been non-existent.

Scope and type of the activities

Number of visits made by the Youth Project team. Members of the project team have visited Namibia twice, and Namibian members have visited Kristiansand three times (last time December 2007).

4.4.3 Achievements

As compared to the other projects, the youth project has taken more time to come off ground. This is partly due to the fact that the project was established relatively late (only in 2004), and partly because the basic project idea (build an equivalent to Samsen in Walvis Bay based on the catering centre in Walvis Bay) turned out to be financially prohibitive and not well-founded in Walvis Bay socio-cultural realities. Luckily, this was realised at an early stage before investments had been made.

A second try is ongoing while the evaluation is being written in which Kristiansand and Walvis Bay investigates the possibilities of linking the Youth Services (Fritidsetaten) and Samsen in Kristiansand with the owner of the Walvis Bay-based youth cultural centre. Also the issue of a Youth Development Committee will be addressed anew on the basis of the findings from the Kristiansand visit in December 2007.

4.4.4 Sustainability

A major challenge to sustainability in the Youth Project lies in asymmetrical position of youth policies within the two municipalities. Until now, only one of the two municipalities has a youth policy, and if Walvis Bay develops a youth policy, it will be the only municipality in Namibia having one.

An important move towards long-term sustainability was made by the project participants and their respective municipalities in re-directing the activities from a “big” youth centre that would probably have been financially unfeasible into one that is more realistic. In fact, the centre is already existing and the co-operation can concentrate on exchange of methods and experiences in working with youth and culture. It remains, however, to document the merits of the said centre in working with the vulnerable groups of youth targeted by the project.

The municipal element in this project could easily be omitted and a future co-operation could be based on culture as a common denominator. Then, funds to cover co-operation could be raised through sources that finance culture.

4.4.5 Conclusion

Given the current MIC programme theory, there is reason to question the wisdom of establishing municipality-to-municipality co-operation on policy fields that are municipal only in one of the two municipalities involved. Therefore, it might have been more convenient to set up a bilateral youth-centre-to-youth-centre project of co-operation, not going all the way through the municipalities and MIC. This observation does not only apply for the Kristiansand-Walvis Bay Youth Project, but is relevant also in other cases. The question is whether MIC should accommodate and be an umbrella for good projects that are not strictly municipal, or rather stick to issues and policy fields under municipal competency. The latter is recommended by KS.

On the other hand, youth policies in Kristiansand are not solely municipal. The municipality draws on resources and commitment from non-municipal contributors. Likewise, the municipality of Walvis Bay apparently aims at taking a more active role among the local actors in the field of youth policies. Therefore, although the “mixture ratio” municipality/community/private differ between Kristiansand and Walvis Bay, the two municipalities have much in common when it comes to drawing resources (financial as well as professional) to their youth cultural centres.

Although it is early to point at outcomes from the Youth Project, the fact that the General Manager for fire brigades libraries, sport, parks, cemeteries and traffic takes the initiative to investigate the possibilities of setting up a Youth Development Committee is significant.

Contribution to the overall MIC objectives. As long as youth policies are not a municipal task in Namibia (Walvis Bay) the Youth Project, despite all its potential merits, will not be able to contribute to reaching the MIC objectives.

4.5 Project Lighthouse

4.5.1 Background

Objectives. To disseminate knowledge and skills gained through the Walvis Bay-Kristiansand cooperation to smaller and weaker municipalities Namibia, in particular in the Erongo region.

Relevance. Most of Namibia's municipalities are small and have weak capacity, economically, but not least professionally. Namibia is not a major recipient of foreign assistance, and smaller municipalities do not expect to establish direct links with municipalities abroad. In stead they seek co-operation with stronger and better organised Namibian municipalities, and Walvis Bay in particular.

The history. Namibian municipalities are divided into three groups. Part I-municipalities are Windhoek, Swakopmund and Walvis Bay. 15 towns are classified as Part II-municipalities. The remaining smaller towns and villages are Part III-municipalities, and some areas are communal lands not incorporated into any municipal unit. Part I-municipalities are closest to being municipalities in the European sense of the word. Municipal entities in the other categories have very little leverage. They are poor on financial resources and administrative skills.

The idea of a dissemination project arose during a visit by the Namibian and Norwegian MIC coordinators to the small and remote town of Uys in the Erongo region. There is a tendency among smaller municipalities in Namibia to look up to Walvis Bay as a rich and competent "big brother". Smaller municipalities turn to Walvis Bay for practical help to compensate for their limited resources in terms of skilled personnel, proper equipment and financial constraints. The municipal authorities of Walvis Bay take a positive attitude to the requests and in March 2007 the town council decided that a workshop be organised by the municipality of Walvis Bay for all 17 village councils all over the country.

4.5.2 Intervention and intervention logic

The Lighthouse has an apparently simple intervention logic consisting in sharing skills and capacities transferred to Walvis Bay through the MIC to other Namibian municipalities. This is done partly by inviting representatives of relevant institutions to Walvis Bay for training, partly in going to other municipalities to carry out training.

Scope and type of the activities

The Lighthouse activities form part of the other projects, and are presented under *Dissemination* in the presentation of each project.

4.5.3 Achievements

The various projects under MIC Walvis Bay-Kristiansand have already carried out dissemination activities that form part of the Lighthouse project. Among these are, the training of fire brigades, and capacity-building of child care workers. The Lighthouse project has been integrated in Walvis Bay's municipal strategies. So far, the Lighthouse Project suffers from lack of tangible documentation of results.

4.5.4 Conclusion

The Lighthouse is a kind of meta-project encompassing all the other projects and bringing the experiences to a wider group of municipalities. As such the Lighthouse project is a highly interesting venture to secure and systematise dissemination of skills and capacities developed through cooperation with a municipality in the North. Moreover, the project prepares the way for future inter-municipal cooperation.

Contribution to the overall MIC objectives. The purpose of the Lighthouse project is to disseminate knowledge and skills achieved through the Walvis Bay –Kristiansand MIC projects to other Namibian municipalities. The Lighthouse Project's contribution to the overall MIC objectives, therefore, depends on the individual projects' contribution to these objectives.

4.6 Results and achievements from the projects

According to the Guidelines, the programme output will be measured both in terms of its bearing on the quantity and quality of municipal services and whether they are provided in a responsive manner; i.e. in line with the population's development needs and preferences.

Within the framework described above, the Kristiansand – Walvis Bay has defined its objective as “substantially improving the living conditions of all the inhabitants of Walvis Bay and to ensure its sustainable and balanced development as well as the transfer of positive experiences to other local authorities in Namibia (Project Directive).

There are examples that the project has improved living conditions of certain groups in Walvis Bay (the disabled children). The *disabled children* in the Sunshine Centre clearly have benefited from the new philosophies and professional methods introduced as a result of the project. They are now more able to communicate and help themselves. Also the care workers have benefited from being trained. Now they work more professionally. There are also indirect results from this project. The disabled children are now more respected as individuals in the local community than they would have been without MIC. As an indirect result of the project, the care workers in the centre now have a higher professional self-esteem.

The *Dialogue Project* has been able to introduce elements of deliberative participation in Walvis Bay's municipal affairs although dialogue is demanding under Namibian conditions. A Dialogue Plan of Action has been adopted.

The *Emergency Project* contributed to the professional update of Walvis Bay's fire brigades, not least on the organisational side. The *Youth Project* has not led to much concrete results so far, but it has contributed to the development of an emerging youth policy in the Walvis Bay municipality. It could, however, be questioned whether it is MIC that should put issues on the agenda and make them municipal policy responsibilities.

The *Lighthouse Project* has enabled transfer of Walvis Bay's experiences from the cooperation to smaller and less resourceful municipalities primarily in the Erongo region. The indirect result of the Lighthouse project could be a contribution to the debate on how to make use of regional "engines" to strengthen municipalities that are less well off in terms of administrative and economic capacity. In the Namibian context Walvis Bay is resourceful.

Formally, MIC aims at achieving results on both sides. By working with the Namibian teams some multi-cultural competence has been gained by the Norwegian project leaders. It is, however, impossible to see what substantial improvements the projects have resulted in on the Norwegian side, i.e. in the municipal organisation of Kristiansand. The intention was to enhance the Norwegians' understanding of the situation in the South. Some insight has been gained through the practical project work, but the experiences have not been systematised for use at home. Moreover, it is unclear for what municipal purposes this insight is useful.

As outlined in the 2004 and 2007 MIC Guidelines, the main objective of the MIC programme is to improve service delivery provided by local governments in the South and to integrate good governance processes. **Therefore, projects not involving municipal organs and activities hardly belong to MIC.** Failure to comply with this requirement is the main problem with the Walvis Bay – Kristiansand co-operation.

Although the project has led to the intended results to a large degree, there have been obstacles to full utilisation of the MIC potentials. The main obstacle is the fact that some of the sub-projects focus on issues that do not belong to the municipal field of responsibility on the Namibian side. This makes it difficult to make use of the tight municipality-to-municipality cooperation that forms the core of MIC programme theory, or intervention logic.

The sustainability of the projects that have been realised is high. The projects have been designed to be financially feasible also after the project financing period. Project ideas that were met with low interest were skipped, like the one on Economic Development. This has prevented un-sustainable activities to be embarked upon.

5 Conclusions and recommendations

What Kristiansand and Walvis Bay have done together, has been done professionally. The Kristiansand – Walvis Bay MIC has led to tangible results. Some of the planned sub-projects, however, have not come off ground. The problem, however, is that the two towns fail to limit their activities to municipal tasks.

Slow adaptation to changing MIC Guidelines. KS' and NORAD's general MIC agenda has developed considerably over the last few years, and, in some respects the Kristiansand-Walvis Bay MIC has fallen behind the development of MIC. It is, for instance, not easy to place the Youth Project and the Children's project within the four purposes set in the Agreement between KS and NORAD for the period 2007-2009.

As seen from the point of view of the two involved municipalities, they have suffered the fate of the forerunner. They have been deeply involved carrying out projects that were designed at an early stage when the MIC concept was in its initial stage. Sticking loyally to the priorities and methods of the original project design has been necessary for the projects to achieve their objectives, according to the municipalities.

The role of KS. At times the communication between KS and the involved municipalities has been poor. The role of KS within the MIC framework is a difficult one, and in fact consists in several roles ranging between co-ordination and quality control in addition to being an intermediate organ between Norad/Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the participating municipalities.

One of the major reasons why KS has had a difficult role is that the very MIC concept has changed significantly throughout the

2000's, and at the outset of the period it was relatively vague. Luckily, the concept has developed into becoming more focused and easier to operationalise. It is highly recommendable that for a certain KS applies a strict policy as to the "MIC-ness" the activities it lets through. A minimum requirement should be that activities are municipal in both countries involved.

In the future, it is recommendable that the KS and the municipalities apply a relatively strictly streamlined MIC concept, perhaps even identifying a limited set of policy sectors to prioritise. Having introduced a tight definition of MIC and realistic indicators of success, more leeway could be given to how the municipalities actually carry out the co-operation.

In order to avoid unnecessary disagreement, ideally, the KS should follow each MIC more closely through phone calls and visits. Reading applications and report an meeting with partners at annual meetings may not be enough to really communicate on MIC. Closer following-up, of course, requires more resources.

Logical Framework Analysis. LFA is a good tool for the purpose of defining and making use of the concept of programme theory. Furthermore, it helps standardise applications and reports and it makes MIC communicate conceptually with the mainstream of developmental aid. LFA should, however, be simplified for the use of non-professional developmental workers, like the MIC project managers and leaders. The indicator system should be revised thoroughly to make it possible for activities to influence in "measurable" ways on indicators.

Self-sufficiency. The cooperation has been marked by close contacts between the project managers and leaders on both sides, and to a large degree the project has been self-going without KS' assistance. This is positive from the point of view of sustainability and it conforms well to the principle of local self-government. On the other side, the self-sufficiency has its drawbacks when it comes to bringing MIC activities in accordance with the current priorities within Norway's developmental policies. On this point Kristiansand – Walvis Bay and KS have emphasised differently.

Between partnership and asymmetry. The close contacts between the Namibian and Norwegian sides within the project have enabled good communication. Misunderstandings have been avoided. This

might be the effect of the fact that Walvis Bay in an African context is well-developed with a skilled administrative staff attuned to Northern standards. Each MIC could be placed along a continuum between full partnership and total asymmetry. Kristiansand – Walvis Bay is probably closer to full partnership than most other MIC's. As such the cooperation between Kristiansand and Walvis Bay gives evidence to the potentials of co-operation between municipalities that are relatively similar, than to the more typical North-South municipal international co-operation where the similarities between the two partners are few.

The question of similarity and equality versus difference and asymmetry between the involved municipalities should be addressed systematically with the MIC framework because it affects MIC's programme theory in fundamental ways. What is it that makes North-South municipal cooperation bring about change? Are municipalities that do not have much in common able to bring about change through MIC?

Municipal core activities. Despite the relative similarity between Kristiansand and Walvis Bay the MIC has not been able to find purely municipal tasks to cooperate around. Neither the centre for disabled children nor youth cultural activities belongs to Walvis Bay's municipal responsibilities. It is questionable whether the core idea (and intervention logic/programme theory) of MIC is made use of in cases where the activities are not part of the municipal budget on both sides.

Since its beginning MIC has developed into a narrower definition of municipal cooperation, and Kristiansand – Walvis Bay have not adapted to this. Some of their activities could as well have been institution-to-institution, or profession-to-profession, and not necessarily municipality-to-municipality. In the future there is reason to stick more closely to purely municipal activities as the basis for individual MIC projects. This way the distinctively municipal contribution to developmental aid can be cultivated. MIC is a niche and should fix its limits to other developmental activities.

Mutual benefit. MIC should be to the benefit not only to the Southern municipality, but to the Norwegian partner as well. The benefits on the Norwegian side have been poorly defined within the Kristiansand – Walvis Bay MIC. In fact, as early as June 2001

one of the political parties in Kristiansand's executive committee suggested a report on "what Kristiansand expects to get out of the co-operation with Walvis Bay." The suggestion was rejected. It is somewhat surprising that not more has been made out of the obvious opportunities offered to enhance Kristiansand municipality's multi-cultural sensitivity and competence.

In the future MIC should make it a requirement that both involved municipalities explain what they seek to gain and have gained from the co-operation.

Fundamental questions to be discussed. There is a need to discuss and reach consensus on the fundamental questions identified through this evaluation. First, there is a need to find a balance between the professionalism and municipal enthusiasm. Secondly, balance should be sought between harmonisation of programme priorities versus local autonomy.

Appendix 1

List of interviewees

The following list includes semi-structured individual as well as group interviews and prepared conversations. Some of the interviewees have been contacted for follow-up questions on the phone.

Bjørn Amundsen og Nina Malmgren, Youth Project

Björg Wallevik, former mayor Kristiansand

Jan Ødegaard, municipal international adviser (MIC project manager Kristiansand)

Sigurd Paulsen, Head of the municipal unit for community medicine (Dialogue Project)

Jan Kruger, Human Resources & Corporate Services
Acting General Manager (MIC project manager Walvis Bay)

Derek Klazen, mayor Walvis Bay

Muronga Haingura, acting CEO Walvis Bay

Gert Kruger, manager economic development (Dialogue Project)

Martin Nambuli, clerk market mall (Dialogue Project)

Chandler Plato, building inspector (Dialogue Project)

Wilson Billawer, Town Planning officer (Dialogue Project)

Olavi Makuti, environmental officer (Dialogue Project)

Luke Shindjabuluka, credit controller (Dialogue Project)

Esther Haixwema, communication officer (Dialogue Project)

Nolito Marques, communication officer (Dialogue Project)

Willie van Zyl, chief protection service (Emergency Project)

Piet van Niekerk, manager fire brigades libraries, sport, parks, cemeteries and traffic (Youth Project)

Manfried Likoro, IT manager (Youth Project)

Paula Visser, voluntary worker at orphanage (Youth Project)

Stella Guerguieva, head of private orphanage (Youth Project)

Ivan Marshall, businessman and owner of youth centre (Youth Project)

Elsa Murangi, head of the Sunshine Centre (Project on Disabled Children)

Ursula D. Bruiners, former personal assistant to the mayor

Lea Kotungondokwa, head of the CHAIN centre in Swakopmund (Lighthouse Project)

J.E. Janze, CEO Usakos municipality

Cecile van Loggenberg, town treasurer Omaruru municipality

Engelbrecht Nawtiseb, mayor Tsumeb

Tenda Nashixwa, human resource manager Tsumeb

Linekela Shetekela, Tsumeb

Maria Shailemo, head of Nomtsoub old age home Tsumeb

Catherine Shivuka, head of women and children's centre Tsumeb

Rebecca Kalola, administrative clerk of Tsumeb cultural village

Appendix 2

Terms-of-reference

Terms of Reference - Evaluation of the MIC project Kristiansand – Walvis Bay

Background

KS, (The Norwegian Association of Local and Regional Authorities) as a member association, aims to support the Norwegian municipalities in their international cooperation endeavour. Since 1999 NORAD has provided funds for municipal international cooperation using KS as a coordinator through entering into an agreement for MIC - a program that now includes 10 partnerships between Norwegian and African municipalities².

Through the agreement between NORAD and KS for the period 2007-2009 it is stated that KS shall function as a facilitator for the participating municipalities. KS shall arrange for networking and sharing of experiences between the participating partnerships and shall work as an adviser for the Norwegian municipalities regarding the participating South countries. NORAD states that KS shall have a coordinating, advisory and quality assurance role for the programme and shall ensure the quality of plans and reports from the participating partnerships.

² Eid – Mbala, Zambia, Elverum – Tsumeb, Namibia, Gran-Mukono/Lugazi, Uganda, Flora – Nkotakota, Malawi, Fredrikstad – Lilongwe, Malawi, Førde – Ntchisi, Malawi, Jølster – Mpulungu, Zambia, Kristiansand – Walvis Bay, Namibia, Oslo-Mbombela, Sør Afrika, Stavanger – Antsirabe, Madagaskar,

The overall strategic goal of the programme is for good governance processes to be included in municipal governance and municipal services as part of the global fight for poverty reduction and sustainable development in line with the Millennium Development Goals.

The programme goal sets the frame for what to do, while each partnership with its project can have a wide range of activities within the frame set to fit the priorities and conditions in the different countries and in line with the defined needs and capacities of the partnership (how to do it)³.

Based on this, 4 purposes are set for the programme and each partnership's project must be developed within this frame;

- More effective and efficient local service delivery to the inhabitants
- Increased integration of environmental development in local plans and activities
- Increased democratic trust, participation and representation
- Increased transparency and accountability

It is not expected that the projects can work within *all* of these purposes, but all must set their goals and expected outcomes within at least one of the programme purposes.

It is important to underline that the projects' main focus should not mainly be on the physical results, but on the learning and democratic processes that can be experienced through the work. The concept of municipal cooperation is based on the idea of sharing information and mutual learning.

In 2007 a number of new pilot studies are planned to start in order for more municipalities to join the programme⁴. The programme has been reviewed in 2001 (by NIBR) and 2005 (by IPM &

³ For further information reference is made to the KS MIC guidelines, April 2007

⁴ Krisitansand – Rasjahi, Bangladesh, Flakstad – kystkommune, Bangladesh, Tingvoll – Bunda, Tanzania, Melhus-Taveta, Kenya, Skodje – Voi, Kenya, Sandnes – Tulear, Madagaskar, Aust-Agder fylkeskommune – kommune i Tanzania, Bergen – kommune i Sør Afrika, Ál – Solola, Guatemala

Scanteam). The guidelines for the programme have been revised in April 2007 to cater for advises from these reviews.

The partnership of Kristiansand – Walvis Bay has participated in the programme since its initial phase. When the project is now being phased out of the programme, this is due to the fact that the partners have participated for a long time and the results of the project should ideally be institutionalized in the municipalities and preferably shared with other municipalities in the south.

It is in addition a fact that Namibia is not one of the Norwegian cooperation countries and thus falls outside the scope of the MIC programme.

Purpose of the assignment

KS wants an independent evaluation of the partnership of Kristiansand – Walvis Bay as part of the learning process in the programme and as an element of quality development with value for the whole programme.

It is of special concern to focus on outcomes and lessons learned linked to good governance processes achieved in the project.

Scope of work

Through the evaluation we want to identify lessons learned to be shared within the programme and possible recommendations with relevance for the implementation of the other projects in the programme. At the same time we want too focus on to what extent the project has contributed to the purposes of the MIC programme, the possible relevance of the activities for the local government, the impact and results of the project activities and sustainability for the achieved results.

Based on this the evaluation should focus on (but not be limited to)⁵;

Results and achievements

- a) What are the direct results of the project (outcome)?
- b) What are the indirect results of the project?

⁵ Reference is made to the format for reviews and evaluations in the NORAD Development Cooperation manual (May 2005)

- c) What have been the main activities in the project?
- d) What have been the main obstacles for not achieving the expected results of the project?
- e) Positive and negative side effects in relation to what has been planned?
- f) Sustainable effects reached through the project?
- g) The link (i.e. the causes and effects) between the activities of the project and the objectives of the project?
- h) What is the project-managers (in north & south) perception about the questions above?
- i) What is other stakeholders' perception (the municipality board and staff) as well beneficiaries' perception about the questions above?
- j) What do the project managers and other stakeholders' identify as the most significant change brought about by the project (in very concrete terms)?

Relevance (in relation to good governance processes) and Effectiveness

- ✓ To what extent and in what ways the project's interventions are supporting the overall aim to enhance good governance at municipality level? In what way the project has been *promoting*:
 - a) Accountability among politicians in the municipalities
 - b) Transparency of political and administratively level of the participating municipalities
 - c) Participation among different groups and individuals in the municipalities
 - d) Information and communication between politicians and the public in the municipalities?
 - e) How has the project contributed to the overall purposes of the MIC programme?

Sustainability

In retrospect would the possibilities to reach the goals of the project been different if the

- a) The goals have been set differently
- b) The activities have been formulated differently
- c) The dialogue or/and the division of work and organisational set up has been different?
- d) How the project perceives the organisational capacity and institutional capacity, including administrative and managerial skills and capacity to keep the activities running after phase out of the project?

Project Organisation and Implementation

- ✓ Has the roles and responsibilities between the parties been clear?
- ✓ How has the communication worked between the north and south partners?
- ✓ How has the communication worked within the north/south municipality (e.g. between administration and politicians)?
- ✓ How has the communication worked within the MIC network (the other partners in the programme)?
- ✓ How has the communication worked with neighbouring municipalities and/or with other LG actors in the two countries (regarding MIC topics, activities, etc)?
- ✓ How has the communication worked between KS and the Krisiansand-Walvis Bay MIC?

Timing

The evaluation must be finalised and the report ready before the end of this year (2007).

Methodology

The assignment for the consultant consists of;

1. Desk work to analyse available documents of the project (annual applications, reports and general MIC reviews)
2. Interview with stakeholders in Norway (mainly Kristiansand and KS). A few relatively short interviews will be made with Elverum who has a partnership in Namibia with Tsumeb. This MIC will serve as a contrast case in this evaluation)

3. Fieldwork in Walvis Bay (and short visit to Tsumeb)
4. Report writing to document the findings including an introduction summary with main conclusions, lessons learned (success factors & weaknesses) and recommendations.

© NIBR 2008