

Institutional cooperation - is it worth it?

Findings and recommendations
(as I see them)

Lasse Vannebo

Senior Adviser, Energy Department



“Institutional cooperation” / “twinning” – what is it?

- Long-term, binding cooperation between two similar institutions
- An instrument of development: To enhance an institutions capacity to enable it to meet its responsibilities in a sustainable, targeted and efficient manner
- Used in different sectors



Agenda

- Background and approach of my work
- Findings
- Recommendations

Background material

- 7 reports
- The period of 1980 - 2008
- Statskonsult, Nordic Consulting Group, Scanteam, Danish Energy Authority, Senter for Helse og Sosial Utvikling
- Petroleum and energy sectors + the environmental, fishery, educational and health sectors

"Norad-tools"

- Guide for institutional cooperation
- Development Cooperation Manual
- Assessment of Sustainability Elements/Key Risk Factors
- Results Management in Norwegian Development Cooperation

Does anything work?

- Partners are to a large degree positive
- Norway can offer a broad range of institutions/experts ("actors")
- Norwegian actors are dedicated and flexible
- Good at not presenting the one and only answer
- Stability over time

Findings I

- Insufficient analysis of competence and capacity of the "twin" partners
 - Match?
 - Level of ambition?
 - Motivation?

- Insufficient analysis of needs and ownership
 - Use of LFA/Results Management, Needs Assessment, Stakeholder Analyses, Institutional Analysis?

Findings II

- Insufficient assessment of sustainability elements and key risk factors
 - Too much wishful thinking

- Insufficient establishment of baselines and indicators makes results management difficult

Findings III

- Insufficient reporting
 - Quality of reports and accounts
 - Outcomes and impacts, not only outputs
 - Within agreed deadlines
 - To summarize, communicate and use results and lessons learned

Conclusions

- The room for improvement is especially related to the phases of preparation and completion:
 - Analysis of competence and capacity
 - Analysis of needs and ownership
 - Establishment of baselines and indicators
 - Consideration of sustainability elements
 - Reporting

- The Norad "tools" seem adequate and sufficient

Recommendations

- Concentrate on fewer projects and countries
- Refine the "Norad-tools"
- Offer proper training for Norad employees and cooperating Norwegian institutions
- Develop best practices
- Establish forums to exchange experiences/lessons learnt

Take home message

Quality at entry –
give more effort to the preparatory phase

Thank you!

lava@norad.no