

# "Has it been worth it?"

## 1: Background

KS has since 1997 with support from Norad facilitated cooperation between municipalities in Norway and several African countries. The idea has been capacity building through mutual exchange of experience and best practice. The programme has been adjusted and refocused several times over the years based on experiences and findings from evaluations. An assumption which, however, previously has not been challenged is the idea of usefulness of this programme to the Norwegian partner. As Gran's generally perceived very successful partnership with Mukono (Uganda) is drawing to a close there was a felt need to document this success story and to better understand why both partners were satisfied. A study of Gran's experience would make it possible to evidence positive outcomes for the northern partner.

Based on a concept note prepared jointly by Gran and KS, the University of Oslo's Prosjektforum (<a href="http://www.sv.uio.no/iss/om/samarbeid/prosjektforum/">http://www.sv.uio.no/iss/om/samarbeid/prosjektforum/</a>) was commissioned to undertake the study.

#### 2: Approach

The study was conceived as primarily a desk review of documents available at Gran and KS, combined with semi structured interviews of key informant and a limited survey in Gran on information and knowledge about the municipality's collaboration with Mukono.

The study explores the importance of mutuality and attempts to identify outcomes at the individual, institutional and community level in the northern municipality.

### 3: Main findings

The study points out that most preconditions for a successful partnership as set out in MIC Guidelines are met inasmuch as the partnership is embedded in a mutual political commitment; it is based on equality and respect; it is concerned with municipal tasks in both municipalities; it is relatively focused and it involves peers sharing experiences.

Through the use of a mutuality requirement it is, nevertheless, evidenced that institutional and community level outcomes are hard to identify in Gran. Most involved individuals are very satisfied and find the partnership motivating and inspiring. The result matrixes for the programme as such and for this

individual partnership lack clear goals for the northern partner and no indicators for usefulness have been identified. It therefore becomes virtually impossible to document outcomes, in particular at the institutional and community level.

A surprising finding is that close to 50 % of Gran's population has information or knowledge about the partnership, a much higher share of the population then documented in similar surveys elsewhere.

#### 4: Conclusions and recommendations

The study's main finding and conclusion is that for results to be documented in the Norwegian municipality, goals must also be formulated for the northern partner.

#### 5: Observations

KS finds the study very useful and of great help in improving the MIC concept in preparing for a new MIC cycle. The only issue for improving the study we can think of is to possibly add in the report's chapter 6 an explicit discussion if mutuality requires identical outcomes in both cooperating municipalities.

Work has been conducted by a competent and thorough group of master students with tight supervision and quality control from professionals at the University of Oslo. We are very satisfied with the quality of work, respect of milestones in the agreed timeline and the report itself.