



UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET

INTERNATIONAL
SCIENCE
PROGRAMME
ISP



Minutes

Tanzania Bilateral Collaboration Meeting

11-12 April 2019

Rosersbergs Slottshotell, Sigtuna, Sweden

Presentations and documents from the meeting are available for download at:
<http://www.isp.uu.se/what-we-do/bilateral-coordination/bilateral-reporting>

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| About the meeting | 2 |
| 11 April | 2 |
| Welcome and Introduction (Ernst van Groningen) | 2 |
| Coordinator & Supervisor Survey (Rebecca Andersson, ISP) | 2 |
| Next bilateral phase with Tanzania (Ernst van Groningen, ISP) | 5 |
| Scientific presentations by Swedish Coordinators/Supervisors | 5 |
| 12 April | 6 |
| Sustainable Instrumentation (Cecilia Öman, ISP) | 6 |
| Financial Reporting (Archana Ganganaboina, ISP) | 6 |
| Views of Tanzanian students present (Archana Ganganaboina, ISP) | 6 |
| Scientific presentations by Tanzanian Students | 7 |
| Pictures | 8 |

About the meeting

International Science Programme (ISP), Uppsala University organized this meeting to discuss and collect the experiences and opinions of the Swedish participants in the program. Also, the results of a survey to the Swedish coordinators and supervisors were presented and discussed. Information about the (preliminary) Sida plans on the next phase (2020-2025) were presented. Other program items were a presentation on sustainable instrumentation, the financial & final reporting for current phase and scientific presentations by coordinators and students so that they can share the thoughts.

Approximately 40 participants attended the meeting including Swedish coordinators, supervisors, administrators and Tanzanian students currently in Sweden and ISP staff.

11 April

Welcome and Introduction (Ernst van Groningen)

The overall coordinator of the Swedish side of the collaboration with Tanzania, Ernst van Groningen from ISP, greeted the approximately 40 participants attending the meeting.

Coordinator & Supervisor Survey (Rebecca Andersson, ISP)

Rebecca Andersson from ISP presented the preliminary results of the online survey sent out via email to 60 coordinators and supervisors at Swedish institutions in the bilateral program with Tanzania. The power point presentation is available on the website. In summary:

The respondents

- 44 out the 60 coordinators and supervisors answered the survey (77%), 24 out of the 28 subprograms are represented in survey answers.
- 77% of respondents has not been involved in any previous program phases – which most likely is due to a generation shift according to discussions at the meeting.
- On average, respondents have an overall positive experience of coordinating/supervising in the program. Coordinators seem slightly less positive than the supervisors. 77% express being positive or very positive, while 23% have an overall negative coordinator/supervising experience.

Postgraduate program and supervision

- 73% of respondents have postgraduate students in their programs. About half of these are involved in PhD program development, while about 31% are involved in MSc program development. Most, 66% are involved in the supervision of local students, some state having all the responsibility while others would like to be more involved.
- Students starting and graduating on time seems to be an issue that is mainly due to bureaucracy in Tanzania but also in Sweden – i.e. long and time consuming processes for recruitment, registration, procurement, release of students' field funding and resident permits in Sweden etc.
- The main challenges related to the postgraduate area seem to be Tanzanian ownership of the budget and supervision – a challenge for both Swedish institutions and

Tanzanian students. Due to lack of budget control on the Swedish side, supervisors and students (not in all programs) express frustration since they cannot move projects along. Supervisors express feelings their 'hands are tied' and they are not able to help out in time of need – buying regents, air tickets, funds for field studies etc.

- Some also consider the supervisor budget too low and not considerate of the actual time and cost of supervision, research and curricula development etc.

Important point raised by meeting participants:

- Swedish coordinators/supervisors may not be able to cater for all student activities such as conferences, courses for students or to procurement of equipment with the available Sida funds. In some cases, the supervisors have tried to find additional funds from other sources. Moreover, extra funding may also be useful when there is a delay in releasing of funds by Tanzanian institutions. A student mentioned that if students have good abstract they have a chance to get extra travel grants from Sida to attend a conference.
- Sida should consider more in Research collaboration than capacity building at universities in Tanzania. A program can be sustained when there is good research collaboration.
- Administrative Capacity building is not considered by Sida – due to administrative/financial process at partner universities there is serious delays in the program.
- What supervisors are supposed to do and what they are able to do are two different things – the hands of Swedish supervisors are tied.
- The Sida program was delayed by half a year already from the start of this program phase – and this raised the question what this will mean for the students who have been delayed due to this. Ernst pointed out that students in this program phase normally will be funded by Sida for the full period they are entitled to but that the Swedish partners should make sure that it is budget for on the Tanzanian side in the next program phase.

Communication & collaboration

- 64% of the survey respondents are satisfied with communication with their partners in the subprograms. Communication does however seem to decrease with hierarchy at the Tanzanian institution – i.e. most communication issues are with Tanzanian PI's.
- Main issues with communication seem to be silence for long periods, lack of or late response to emails and insufficient info regarding meeting and involvement in general, Swedish side are not aware of planning, too tight time schedule and seldom consulted in time. Using Whatsapp and other means of communication than emails seems to have improved communication for some.
- 73% of the respondents are satisfied with the research collaboration. Their general impression of the research collaboration is good, even though the issues mentioned under supervision pose some major challenges.
- On average respondents meet their partners physically 1-2 per year. 61% of all respondents have participated in ARM or APM.
- Suggested improvements of the meetings from respondents - include participation in these meetings in the Swedish budget, involve Swedish partners in the preparations and thereby also improve the information and communication about the dates and

the agenda of the meetings in time, and invite Swedish partners to participate via link – if internet allows. Focus meetings on each subprogram instead, to make it more efficient.

- When it comes to reporting 55% are involved in annual reporting 34% are involved in budget
- Many are involved in the annual reporting to a limited degree, contributing with input and comments while the main responsibility lies with the Tanzanian partner. Generally a positive tone - however some would like to be more involved and see the draft sooner than just before or after submission
- Less satisfaction is shown with involvement in the budget planning – a larger involvement and/or transparency in the process is necessary. Some are fine with their limited involvement, as it emphasizes the local ownership and limits the administrative burden on the Swedish side.
- Main challenges - Swedish partners are not feeling involved enough in the processes (in some programs) goes for the planning, the reporting, the budget, meetings – more transparency wanted. Communication main issue – cultural clash in meeting and planning culture. Again ownership is brought up – decision making and initiatives affecting collaboration. Budget is hindering meeting participation.

Important points raised by meeting participants:

- The centralized decision making power at some Tanzanian institutions are posing a problems for both Tanzanian PI's and students. All the decision needs to go through the top management which is time consuming.
- Some participants experience that there is no transparency when it comes to Tanzanian budget. If there are lots of funds left from the budget then it is important for the Swedish coordinator to have this information. When students are in Sweden, they have clear picture of the available funds which makes it possible for the students to plan and budget for their own activities, whilst in Tanzania in many cases they do not know what funding is available.

Preliminary Conclusions

- There are a general positive view of the program and the effects of it and most supervisors and coordinators would like to continue if given the opportunity.
- A difference between programs and institutions some functions better than other – chemistry between collaborators also affecting.
- Ownership, level of Swedish involvement, communication (culture), bureaucracy (in SWE and TAN) seem to be the biggest challenges.
- There is a need to conduct a survey on the Tanzanian side as well.

Swedish partners suggestions

- To increase the decision power given to Swedish PhD supervisors in terms of budget control.
- Improve the selection process of the PhD candidates and involve the Swedish partners in the selection of candidates.
- Make courses for supervisors mandatory.
- More involvement of Swedish partners in the writing process and budget planning.

- Higher level of accountability and transparency on the Tanzanian side and clearer.
- Outlined responsibilities for the Swedish coordinator.
- Improved communication –how?
- More time in Sweden for each PhD students, open up for postdocs, skip the sandwich model focus on pure research collaboration.
- Increase the funding to Swedish partners.
- Closer collaboration with the Swedish Migration Agency to improve the administration of student visas (ISP and Sida are involved in a working group addressing this).
- Student research funds in Tanzania needs to be handled better and clearer procedures (how?)
- Coordinators would like to request a separate meeting with Embassy, just before the APM in May, 2019.

Next bilateral phase with Tanzania (Ernst van Groningen, ISP)

Ernst van Groningen informed about the future in the bilateral program phase.

Warning: everything described in this section is preliminary at this stage. The final decision on the process will be made by Sida and the Embassy in the coming months.

The power point of the presentation is available on the website. In summary:

- There will be a new program phase. There will, however, be **no open call procedure**.
- Sida's plans are to invite a number of the present projects to apply for the next phase (2020-2025). This would be the final full phase, possibly followed by a short exit phase of two or three years. So, there will be no open call process for the next phase. The Tanzanian partners will have the option to include new Swedish partners.
- Only "Successful" subprograms will be invited to apply for the next phase: which subprograms are considered as "successful" still has to be determined by Sida and the Embassy, and will depend on the results of the external evaluation that will take place soon. Positive factors will be if the subprogram has started local PhD programs and the have been approved by TCU, if subprogram is (judged to be) sustainable and if there is good collaboration between Tanzania and Swedish partners.
- Swedish coordinators/supervisors raised question, what if the Swedish partners would like to have a new Tanzanian partner? Will Swedish be able to choose a (new) Tanzanian partner?
- Questions were raised by the participants if a programme is very successful in terms of results, good impact on the environment and is very useful for the environmental awareness etc., but has no good collaboration, no publications yet? When the program is very new and need more time for actual results, how would a newly established program be considered? For ex. Marine Science subprogram vs Sustain subprogram at UDSM.

Scientific presentations by Swedish Coordinators/Supervisors

Susann Bacteman Erlanson - *Traffic Injury Prevention and Care in Tanzania*;

Sara Gabrielsson - *Sustainable Sanitation in Theory and Action*;

Zeinab Tag-Eldeen - *Quest for Alternative Urban Planning Model for Small Towns in Tanzania and other two programs*;

Tomas Kjellqvist - *Fostering innovation for sustainable socio-economic development*;
Dirk-Jan de Koning - *Marine Science*;
Mats Björk - *Consolidating Research and Analytical Capacity in Fisheries and Aquaculture Technology for Food Security*.

12 April

Sustainable Instrumentation (Cecilia Öman, ISP)

Cecilia Öman from ISP have presented on how an instrument or equipment can be sustainable by using a model called FAST- Functioning Advanced Scientific Equipment. The power point is available on the ISP website.

Financial Reporting (Archana Ganganaboina, ISP)

Archana Ganganaboina presented about financial reporting, review of the reports by ISP and final reporting. The power point is available at the ISP website. In summary:

- ISP is responsible to check subcontracts/amendments etc. with Swedish institutions.
- Transfer of funds to Swedish partners according to the contract.
- Receive audit reports and financial statements from Swedish institutions, review and report to Embassy.
- Funds shall be used for activities in the program before 30 June 2020. Funds used for final audit/any other outstanding expenses within the programme shall be reported no later than 30 September 2020. Final reporting must be no later than 30 September 2020. Unused funds shall paid back to ISP latest 31 December 2020.

Discussion during the meeting:

- 250 000 SEK is divided as approx. 175 000 SEK for supervision, 50 000 SEK for student costs and 25000 SEK for Travel costs. If there is no special post for audit expenses then expenses shall be taken from the students' costs or funds left over from other budget line.
- Standard budget ration i.e. 175:50:25 are approximate numbers, which means that Swedish partners have flexibility to budget according their planned activities, however it is important that they keep to their budget and not to reallocate more than -/+ 30% without formal approval from ISP/Sida. Any funds in huge percentage not used must be given an explanation for not using the funds.

Views of Tanzanian students present (Archana Ganganaboina, ISP)

During Annual review meeting in November 2018, Archana Ganganaboina had chance to meet students separately and talk to them. Though, not all students but within the program but students who attended the meeting and had chance to talk. During the talk, students got the opportunity to share their thoughts, their challenges, reasons for delay in their studies etc.

There is an Insufficient an unequal stipend to students from the different Tanzanian institutions:

- The stipend for UDSM students is 600 000 TSH/month which includes food & accommodation. Additional, 500 000 TSH/ per annum for books and stationary and approximately and 300 000 TSH to cover tuition fees.

- Students from MUHAS are paid TSH/month which includes accommodation, food and transportation. MUHAS students do not know about extra fee for tuition, books or stationery.
- Students from Ardhi get 150 000 TSH/month, which includes accommodation, food and transportation. Students do not have any idea about extra amount for tuition, books or stationary. Students mentioned that there is a standard level of stipend at their university but the stipend in this program is much lower than that.

Questions raised during the meeting are, why is so much difference stipends level when all the students are living in the same city and having the same level of expenditure? Does Sida have an opportunity to check and argue for this level of payments?

When students get paid so less amount of stipend and delayed in the payments, students struggle to go to Sweden and get allowances so that they can save some money and use for family expenditure etc.

No laptops yet: Students have requested a laptop, and hence when they have checked for the prices at store and the price when they have got from Tanzanian supervisors. Some Tanzanian supervisors mentioned that the procurement through the university system may result in prices that are three times as high as the price in a local store.

Students have requested to have separate meeting only with students & the Embassy just around the time of the Annual Review Meeting every year.

Coordinators have requested separate meeting with Embassy, around the time of the APM in May, 2019.

Scientific presentations by Tanzanian Students

Amleset Kelati - iGrid;

Mohamed Semkunde & Merezia Wilson - *Agribusiness and Sustainable Development*;

Frank Msafiri - *Access to Land Resources Vulnerability and HIV/AIDS in Tanzania*;

Juma Hussein - *Capacity Building in Interdisciplinary Molecular Biosciences Program*;

Fadhun Alwy Al-beity - *Getting the Health system to deliver for mothers and babies in Tanzania*;

Rashid Ismail - *Marine Science*;

Egino Millanzi - *Real Estate Market Dynamics and Housing Finance*.

Pictures

→ [Facebook.com/isp.uu](https://www.facebook.com/isp.uu)

