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Development cooperation is not an easy terrain in which to work. The international development agenda is in constant change, from an approach with donors and recipients of aid, to an approach based on inclusive development partnerships. On the Norwegian scene aid has been replaced by development cooperation and subsequently included as an instrument for Norwegian foreign policy interests. This chapter argues that Norway has been at the forefront regarding the international development agenda, and that SANTED was a remarkable example of realising Norwegian policy interests, South Africa’s own political interests and those of the participating institutions, as well as students’ need for appropriate academic learning.

Features of the SANTED Programme that made it an example of best practice in international development cooperation include policy alignment, catalytic funds that provided room to manoeuvre in the higher education institutions, and people who wanted to use this space for redress and equity. The programme was guided by clear objectives and policy direction from management and champions at all levels, and flexibility for the individual institutions to follow their own development path (alignment to local priorities).

During the latter half of the 20th century Norway transformed from a relatively poor nation into a wealthy country. The wealth creation went along with a strong belief in an egalitarian society, equity and a fair distribution of the income derived from effective management of Norway’s abundant natural resources. These values were embodied both
in its internal social relations and in its broader relations with the world beyond its borders. One manifestation of this was in the active support that Norway provided for organised resistance against the apartheid regime in South Africa, particularly in the area of education. Norway provided scholarships and support for the training of South Africans inside and outside the country. This was a humanitarian gesture, an act of solidarity and a political commitment to the liberation of South Africa. In the course of these difficult years, close ties were created between individuals, churches and civil society organisations, as well as between the South African liberation movement and successive Norwegian governments.

It was natural to build on these bonds after apartheid. Cooperation in training, education, exchange, research and institutional capacity building have taken, and still take place, with some regional and international spin-offs.

**Recipient responsibility and the international agenda of development cooperation effectiveness**

Norwegian development cooperation was imbued with the values outlined above. Moreover, the idea of ‘recipient responsibility’ was a central element in its development policy. In the past decade, Norway, along with many other countries, has subscribed to the principles embodied in the international *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness* (OECD 2005), but in many respects, the principles of Norwegian development cooperation can be seen to have anticipated the *Paris Declaration* by several decades. The *Paris Declaration* focuses on five key principles of effective development cooperation: (1) ownership by developing countries; (2) alignment with countries’ strategies, systems and procedures; (3) harmonisation of donors’ support; (4) managing for results; and (5) mutual accountability.

The understanding and implementation of these principles have varied and changed over time. The fourth in a series of high-level forums on aid effectiveness held in Busan in the Republic of Korea in December 2011 defined four shared principles to achieve common development goals:
(1) the ownership of development priorities by development countries; (2) focus on results; (3) inclusive development partnerships; and (4) transparency and accountability to each other (Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation 2011).

The Paris Declaration developed out of a donors’ forum, but is now widely accepted as expressing the key principles and objectives, and differential commitments, for effective international development cooperation.

Did Norway live up to the intentions of recipient responsibility and the five principles in the Paris Declaration in the SANTED Programme of cooperation? This chapter intends to answer this question.

Negotiations, issues at stake and critical success factors

SANTED aligned to South African and Norwegian policy priorities

According to the Declarations of Intent of 1999 and 2004 agreed upon between the Kingdom of Norway and the Republic of South Africa, the overall objectives of the development cooperation were:

- consolidation of the democratic transition;
- cooperation in areas where the collaboration could result in long-term, self-sustaining, bilateral relationships; and
- strengthening regional integration and collaboration (through the utilisation of South African expertise in the region, added in 2004).

These objectives were to a large degree included in the individual development programme agreements between South Africa and Norway. How they were pursued in the context of SANTED will be discussed.

University and research cooperation was identified as a priority area in the development cooperation between South Africa and Norway after 2000. Norway expressed a commitment to support institutional capacity building in higher education and research, and to promote long-term bilateral relations between institutions, as well as regional institutional cooperation in the sector. These priorities must be understood in
the context of the long history of cooperation, the wish to maintain bilateral relations, Norway’s long-time support to the Southern African Development Community (SADC), and the political commitment of the Minister for Development Cooperation at the time, Hilde Frafjord-Johnson, who persuaded the Norwegian parliament to agree that ‘Education is job number one’.

South African higher education policies and priorities were identified in the 1996 *New Policy Framework for Higher Education Transformation*, in the *White Paper 3: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education* (1997), and in the subsequent Higher Education Act No. 101 (1997). These policy documents were the foundation for what was to become the South Africa Norway Tertiary Education Development (SANTED) Programme. In other words, the SANTED Programme was well embedded in the policies and priorities of both countries.

*Clear policy direction and ownership by the Department of Education*

The SANTED Programme was owned by the Higher Education Branch in the South African Department of Education (DoE) and managed by the deputy director-general of the Branch and her staff. An intense interest was taken in the programme by the senior staff who gave it the necessary attention and continuity, and provided consistent policy guidance and supervision. In-depth knowledge of the sector and its stakeholders was demonstrated by the leadership who were highly respected at all levels.

It was a huge advantage that the programme was embedded in the Branch and the higher education policy sphere of the DoE. This secured the alignment of the programme with key policy objectives. Other donor-funded programmes were often managed via the DoE’s International Relations Directorate, and in some instances the shaping of these programmes was less firmly anchored in strategic policy than was the case with SANTED.

This is not a trivial point: Norway had direct contact with the institutional policy and implementation centre of the DoE as compared to other donors and this secured access for Norway to policy-makers in the
DoE as well as to the beneficiary institutions. On the other hand, Norway was seldom invited to meetings between the DoE and other donors, which in turn led to less harmonisation on Norway’s part with other donors in the education sector. This cannot be seen as a disadvantage, as Norway gave higher priority to ‘recipient responsibility and ownership’ than to ‘donor harmonisation’ when or if these principles were not shared. In fact, Norway chose to take an active role in arenas that were led by the South African authorities, rather than to spend limited resources on donor-led forums. This was a matter of principle, but probably also influenced by Norway not being a member of the European Union.

*From institutions to themes*

Towards the end of the 1990s when negotiating cooperation in higher education, Norway funded research projects at the universities of Fort Hare, the North, the Western Cape and Durban-Westville through the Norwegian Council of Universities’ Committee for Development Research and Education (NUFU). NUFU focused on building research capacity through project-orientated collaboration between researchers in developing countries and Norway. NUFU did not support institutional capacity building in a broad sense. Hence, to find suitable ways and means to strengthen South African higher education institutions, a feasibility study was commissioned by the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Pretoria (RNEP) in 1999 for a complementary programme of institutional support aimed at the transformation of higher education in South Africa. The study suggested a programme with five major components (Kruse 1998):

1. capacity building of historically disadvantaged institutions through new partnerships between universities in South Africa;
2. institutional support programmes with the aim of assessing and strengthening the managerial and strategic capacities of particular universities, and supporting bridging programmes for disadvantaged individuals;
3. regional (SADC) networking and regional courses;
4. new innovative masters and/or bachelor courses; and
5. research capacity building.

In its response, the DoE suggested targeting a group of institutions for support and invited Norway to participate in the strengthening of the financial management capacity of six historically disadvantaged universities: the University of the North (UNIN), the University of the North-West, (UNW) the University of Transkei (UNITRA), the University of Zululand (UNIZUL), the Medical University of South Africa (MEDUNSA) and the University of Fort Hare (UFH). It was suggested that the Norwegian funds should contribute to rectifying some of the problems and irregularities in their systems and contribute to restoring the credibility of those institutions.

In the concomitant consultations between the DoE and the RNEP, it was agreed to include the universities of Durban-Westville and the Western Cape because of their involvement in the Norwegian-South African collaborative research programme (NUFU), and to limit the original number of universities. Four institutions (UNIN, UNW, UNITRA and UFH) were invited to submit proposals and the DoE, in consultation with the universities, prepared a consolidated project plan.

An appraisal of the proposed projects to be located in the four universities was submitted to the RNEP in March 2000. It expressed serious concerns about the inclusion of the universities of UNIN and UFH as their institutional capacity was considered too weak to manage donor-funded projects. It suggested the postponement of decisions about the funding of projects at these two universities until political guidance had been given about the future size and shape of higher education institutions in South Africa, expected later that same year. The appraisal did, however, recommend Norwegian funding of the Upward Bound Programme at Durban-Westville (UDW) and another access programme at the University of the Western Cape (UWC). It was further suggested that Norwegian funding should not be limited to UDW and UWC, but rather to establish a flexible funding mechanism whereby various institutions could apply and compete for project funds. Since the higher education sector was in ‘a state of flux’ (Kruse et al. 2000:43), a
thematic rather than an institutional approach was proposed. This strategy was adopted, and the agreement that was signed in November 2000 reiterated that the programme would focus on equity and redress, with three themes and five components.

The three themes were (1) access and retention of previously disadvantaged groups; (2) institutional capacity building of universities; and (3) regional cooperation (implementation of the SADC protocol on higher education). The five components consisted of:

1. the Upward Bound University-Wide Project at UDW;
2. the Equitable Access through Enrolment Management Project at UWC;
3. formative research on the access and retention projects;
4. institutional capacity building; and
5. promotion of cooperation between South African higher education institutions and higher education institutions in the SADC region.

The three themes were kept during the whole programme period with a shift in focus from access to retention and success in the second phase. Additional institutions were gradually included in the programme; in the first phase mainly weaker institutions, whilst the second phase included a mix of institutions with regard to institutional and academic capacity (see Table 1a on page 4).

Managing for results

In the last years of the decade after 2000, the RNEP worked closely with the National Treasury on implementing the principles of The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness where managing for results is a central element. The Treasury was introducing results-based management in government, but it had not ‘taken off’ in many departments at that time.

Both SANTED agreements specified a series of objectives at different levels: from the overall level of contributing to the restructuring, rationalisation and transformation of higher education in South Africa (Agreement of November 2000:5-7), to contributing to improved
retention and success rates in the higher education system; from building sustainable partnerships between South African universities and universities in other countries (Agreement of June 2006:9-10; Kruse 1998), to teaching and learning support and exchange programmes.

In the second agreement, Norway wanted to introduce indicators to track progress. This was not well received by the DoE, especially not in terms of overall programme indicators (Smith & Cross 2009) and the agreement was signed without indicators.¹

The view of the DoE reflected a combination of three factors. First, the DoE expressed concern that SANTED could not be held responsible for broad outcomes and impact on the sector as the programme was a small intervention in the system as a whole. This was well understood on the Norwegian side which emphasised that SANTED would not be held accountable for overall sector outcomes and impact, only for its planned outputs. Norway’s concern in this respect was to use an understanding of development trends in the sector as a basis for assessing results in a wider context. If development trends are not moving in the right direction, information about these trends can prompt reflection on the appropriateness and effectiveness of programme interventions and the chosen strategy.

Second, the DoE felt that the demand for programme indicators and targets was a bureaucratic demand from Norway.

Third, management for results requires a systematic application of statistics to development. From the Norwegian side it was not clear whether the resistance of the DoE stemmed from the absence of reliable sector data, or whether the DoE did not want to publish the data. Norway had only limited access to broad sector data from the Higher Education Management Information System (HEMIS) operated by the DoE.

The RNEP did not see it as SANTED’s responsibility to provide data on sector trends. Ideally an analysis of the programme in terms of wider sector trends would be provided by the DoE and included in the dialogue at the annual meeting. But only to a limited extent did the discussions in the annual meeting focus on development trends and sector outcomes.
As there was a demand by the Norwegian Parliament to focus on longer-term outcomes, the RNEP reported on sector trends to the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affair’s Annual Budget to Parliament using other data than that received through SANTED.

**Management structure – alignment with country systems and procedures**

The management structure was conducive to the programme’s success. Some of the features that characterised the programme’s management structure are outlined below.

**Governance of the programme**

In both phases of the programme, the governance structure for Norway’s involvement was established by an international agreement (the Business Plan) between the Kingdom of Norway, represented by the Ambassador in Pretoria, and the Republic of South Africa, represented by the Treasury with the DoE as implementing agency.

The agreement stated that there would be an annual meeting to: review results and progress; approve the annual report and the certified statements of accounts; approve annual work plans and budgets for the programme and the thematic components; and discuss, recommend and/or take decisions on the programme and projects.

Four weeks prior to the annual meeting, a report, accounts, plan and budget were to be submitted by the DoE.

This annual meeting was the only regular meeting scheduled in the agreement. Decisions, however, were also made in writing by the parties between the annual meetings. Norway approved the themes and the institutions to be included in the programme in both phases. During the first phase Norway approved projects; in the second phase Norway approved each project concept, commented on the project business plan, but did not approve the latter document. The DoE initially wanted Norway to approve all projects including those in phase two and expressed a wish for co-management, but the RNEP decided to take a step back from project management, in line with recommendations of an administrative review of the RNEP, carried out in 2005 by the
Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad), at the request of the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (NMFA).

In spite of few formal decision-making structures that involved Norway, there were many meeting points, especially in the beneficiary institutions. Both SANTED directors took great care in inviting the DoE and the RNEP to events and meetings at the universities. This gave all parties adequate opportunities to meet the stakeholders and to understand the issues. This implied that continuous monitoring took place, which in turn contributed to trust and flexibility.

The documents for the annual meeting were as a rule written by the SANTED Secretariat, based on input from the institutions (reports, plans, accounts and budgets), as well as first-hand information from numerous field visits. Due to the complexity of the programme, they were rather lengthy documents. However, especially during the second phase, the reports had an analytical approach with a focus on reflection and learning, as well as outputs/results as opposed to activities.

**Organisational structure on the Norwegian side**

In 2000 Norad was an agency under the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (NMFA) with wide responsibilities for bilateral development cooperation. In countries with a Norwegian embassy, the responsibilities for development projects and programmes were normally delegated from Norad to the Embassy through annual letters of allocations and approval of a workplan.

The first SANTED agreement was signed by the Norwegian Ambassador to South Africa, with delegated authority from Norad. By 2006 the responsibility for bilateral cooperation was taken back to the NMFA, which again delegated the responsibility for bilateral development projects and programmes to the Embassy through annual letters of allocation and approval of a workplan. Norad’s main role was now to provide technical advice to the NMFA and the embassies regarding bilateral and multilateral development cooperation. In both phases the Embassy had wide authority for monitoring a programme once the agreement was signed, with the responsibility to provide annual narrative and financial reports to headquarters.
Norad followed the SANTED Programme very closely, more than is commonly the case. This is mainly due to the continuity of Norad's advisers who knew the higher education sector both in Norway and South Africa. The advisers understood their role well, developed wide networks and provided the Embassy with good technical advice that was relevant to the South African context. Solid working relations were established between the Norad advisers and the SANTED Secretariat.

The Secretariat
Although the RNEP initially was of the opinion that the DoE should manage the programme, it was agreed at an early stage that a third party would house the programme on behalf of the DoE. The Centre for Education Policy Development (CEPD) was selected by the DoE to host the SANTED Secretariat as they had proven their ability to manage donor funds in other projects. In the contract between the DoE and the CEPD the latter was appointed to administer the funds and physically house the SANTED Programme management. The SANTED Secretariat was therefore located within the CEPD which played the role of fund administrator, while the Secretariat prepared budgets, plans and reports and performed all management, administration and coordination functions of the programme on behalf of the DoE. In practice the Secretariat was given the mandate for all tactical operations whilst the DoE made the strategic dispositions. The director of the Secretariat reported directly to the DoE and not to the CEPD.

CEPD was again chosen to host the programme during the second phase with the same functions as before.

The first SANTED Secretariat Director proved to be very capable with a solid understanding of the issues at stake. He established good processes and provided guidance to the institutions, and acted as a mediator between the institutions and the DoE. The same is to be said about the secretariat director in charge of phase two. The reporting requirements increased in the later stages of the programme as there were more results to show. The Secretariat delivered a thorough end-report after phase one, as well as analytical, results-based reports during phase
two. The other staff in the Secretariat were also capable, enthusiastic and very loyal to the cause of the institutions. These champions were critical to the programme’s success.

At this point, a word must be said about this kind of structure vis-à-vis the Paris Declaration, which explicitly advises donors to avoid creating dedicated structures for the day-to-day management and implementation of development cooperation-financed projects and programmes, so-called parallel project implementation units (PIUs), where ‘parallel’ refers to having been created outside existing country institutional structures, and gives three typical features of parallel PIUs (OECD 2007):

1. They are accountable to the external funding agencies rather than to the country implementing agencies.
2. Most of the professional staff are appointed by the donor.
3. The salaries of PIU personnel often exceed that of civil-service personnel.

CEPD hosting the SANTED Secretariat was not the creation of a ‘PIU’. The contract was approved by the RNEP the first time, but not the second time. There were no reporting lines between the SANTED Secretariat, and the RNEP, and no member of staff was contracted by Norway. Norway’s approach to running the Secretariat was completely hands-off. The SANTED Secretariat was created by the South African government and not by the donor to act as a secretariat for the DoE and as a coordinating body for the implementing institutions.

Disbursements
There was one apparent ‘anomaly’ in the funding procedures related to disbursements. According to Norwegian policy, as well as the Paris Declaration, donor funds should follow the partner country’s procedures. In South Africa funds should initially go from the RNEP to the Treasury’s Reconstruction and Development Fund. Most of the Norwegian funds to South Africa were in fact channelled to the Treasury, but in the case of SANTED disbursements went from the RNEP to the CEPD, after the
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request for funds had been sent from the DoE. The funds were reported in the DoE’s annual report to Parliament, and considered as donations ‘in kind’.

**Issues at stake for Norway: the overall objectives of the declarations of intent**

**Democratic transition**

SANTED was evaluated twice and scored high on the evaluation criteria. SANTED achieved a lot, and as such, gave Norway a chance to contribute to democratic transition. In the higher education sector Norwegian support helped open up opportunities for advancement for many university students through facilitating their access, retention and success, thus paving the way for their contributions to a new South Africa.

**Regional cooperation**

Norway and the other Nordic countries were staunch supporters of SADC. After the democratisation of South Africa, there were high expectations that South Africa would become an engine of development within the region, and that South African institutions would act as centres of excellence and nodes in regional networks. The expectation was that development cooperation would foster regional cooperation with South Africa in a leading role, and this was expressed as an objective in the SANTED agreements and the declarations of intent for the cooperation between the two countries in 1999, 2004 and 2009.

Based on experience, knowledge and trust in various South African institutions the RNEP was a prime mover for establishing a Declaration of Intent on Partnerships in Africa (trilateral cooperation) between South Africa and the five Nordic countries in 2008.

Norway added funds to SANTED from the regional budget vote (in addition to the funds allocated to South Africa) to underline its intention to foster regional cooperation, but Norway’s expectations proved to be unrealistic. Nonetheless, some small gains were made.

The SANTED Programme included several regional projects between institutions in South Africa, Angola, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia
and Zambia. These projects worked well when they were anchored in the institutions’ or institutes’ leadership, were motivated by professional interest and had competent drivers. SANTED had a particular approach to institutional cooperation: a project must be wanted by someone, it needs to be driven by those who want it, and there must be something ‘in it’ for the participants.

A lesson learnt is that cross-border academic cooperation works best when the project is embedded in the institutions’ strategy, (academic) priorities and plans, and provides for academic rewards to the participants.

Regional cooperation in Southern Africa has proven to be difficult and time-consuming. The SANTED-initiated forms of regional cooperation would probably have needed another ten years to become sustainable.

A third lesson is that the DoE, and most other South African government departments, do not have the capacity to extend their scarce resources outside the country. If funded, and if the cooperation is aligned to the participants’ priorities and gives rewards to the stakeholders, academia seems to have some capacity for cross-border cooperation provided it has an extended time-horizon.

Bilateral relations
Norway had two concerns in 2000 that could not in the end be reconciled when it came to the choice of SANTED beneficiary institutions. On the one hand, Norway wanted to build on existing partnerships with four universities in South Africa; on the other hand Norway wanted to promote self-sustaining academic relations between individuals and institutions in both countries and feared that the inclusion of weaker academic institutions might not be conducive to longer-term relations. In addition Norway did not want to ‘risk’ subsidising academically weak institutions. This last point may be understood from the perspective of development optimism where it was expected that the transformation in South Africa would be swift, and that the need for development cooperation would be short term.
As discussed earlier, SANTED was not set up to cater for bilateral cooperation, either as an objective or as a measure in the programme. An alternative vehicle was therefore set up to facilitate bilateral academic relations, which took the form of a research cooperation programme jointly funded by the Norwegian and South African governments. This programme is co-managed by the Norwegian and South African Research Councils, and all projects include researchers from both countries.

In retrospect, the combined portfolio of SANTED, the bilateral research programme, the NUFU research cooperation and various smaller projects have established a broad common ground and many arenas for cooperation in higher education and research between South Africa and Norway. An impact evaluation in five to ten years could establish the effects and the sustainability of this many-faceted cooperation.

Other spin-offs

This broad spectrum of cooperation in higher education and research has given opportunities for dialogue at all levels. The South African Embassy in Oslo and the Norwegian Embassy in Tshwane have both been deeply engaged in facilitating cooperation in higher education, and on both sides the relations have been a point of departure for bilateral relationships, knowledge and political capital.

There have been many encounters between ministers of education and research on both sides and every time the Norwegian Royals have travelled to South Africa they have visited institutions of higher education. According to a study (Wirak 2009), commissioned by Norad, there were 187 cooperative projects and activities in the higher education sector in 2009; 112 in research and 75 in higher education.

Another spin-off was the formation of the Southern Africa-Nordic Centre (SANORD). This is a network of 20 member institutions and a meeting place for academics and academic institutions in southern Africa and the Nordic countries, seeking to promote research for the development of technology in Africa. The association has organised conferences that address such topics as economic development, environmentally friendly technologies and education.
Going beyond development cooperation

Framing Norway’s views on development and political dialogue with South Africa

For the Embassy, SANTED turned out to be the ‘jewel in the crown’, a highly appreciated gem in the Norwegian development portfolio in South Africa. In all phases of the programme, the Embassy was invited to visit universities, faculties and institutes, and was integrated into the closely woven SANTED network which brought together the DoE, the university leaders, staff and students, in South Africa and also in other countries in the region. This gave the Embassy staff invaluable insight into a range of South African academic, political, social and cultural issues in an extremely dynamic situation. The connections, experience and knowledge gained gave the Embassy a unique understanding of the South African development context. This, in turn, was an excellent foundation for the Embassy’s reporting to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on political and development issues, and for framing Norway’s views on development and political dialogue with South Africa.

Merging development policy and foreign policy

In addition to the principles of ‘recipient responsibility’, of alignment with partners’ systems, of managing for results and of accountability, the Norwegian 2004 White Paper on Fighting Poverty Together also emphasises the importance of ‘the partnership for development’. This is a concept that situates the aid policy in a development context and, further, the development policy within the framework of wider foreign policy issues. These ideas have been taken further: in the last ten years or so, development cooperation has acquired yet another dimension. It has become an integrated element of a foreign policy that seeks to maximise Norwegian interests. Development cooperation, in addition to improving people’s lives and the situation in the beneficiary countries, is intended to foster diplomatic, economic, social and cultural bonds between Norway and its partner countries.

This shift in Norwegian policy is reflected in the last Declaration of
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Intent between Norway and South Africa of 2010 where it is envisaged that the cooperation shall be characterised by a ‘transformed relationship and mode of cooperation based on partnership relations on equal terms, where both countries have something to offer, and both countries have something to gain [...] Shared political and developmental priorities shall form the platform and legitimate basis for future cooperation. The modalities of future cooperation within the priority areas are envisaged to consist of institutional cooperation, tripartite partnerships (including skills training programmes) and research cooperation.’

Much of the basis for these modalities is found in experiences in the higher education and research sectors.

There may be an inherent tension between the concern for poverty reduction on the one hand, and use of development cooperation funds as a tool for Norwegian foreign policy interests on the other hand. In retrospect, the development cooperation between Norway and South Africa was one of the first examples in Norwegian foreign policy where these concerns were successfully merged. This is due to several factors:

- South Africans and Norwegians had co-operated on an equal footing against the apartheid regime.
- This mutual respect continued after the establishment of majority rule in South Africa.
- In line with South Africa’s policy for incoming aid, Norway and other donor countries were invited to play a catalytic role in the transformation of South African society.
- Cooperation was aligned to both the South African and the Norwegian policy agendas.
- There were champions on both sides who wanted the cooperation: on the South African side the DoE gave priority and attention to the success of the programme. SANTED had excellent leaders who managed to weave together a complex and closely knit web of committed and dynamic people in the higher education institutions and who contributed to the implementation of a programme where the different components were tailor-made to
meet the needs of the various institutions, while all along being aligned to the political priorities of the sector.

- On the Norwegian side there were visionary and far-sighted ambassadors who implemented what were to be the future elements of Norwegian foreign policy. At the headquarters in Norway and at the embassy there were staff members who had the principles of national ownership and recipient responsibility under their skin, and who had contributed actively to the development and implementation of the Paris Declaration in South Africa under the leadership of the National Treasury. This cooperation was extended: the close cooperation in implementing the Paris Declaration in South Africa was carried further, and extended to joint work in the Working Party on Aid Effectiveness hosted by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee following the Paris Agenda.

The SANTED cooperation was a small but strategic contribution to the transformation of the South African higher education sector, and the programme emerged as an example of best practice in bilateral partnerships for higher education. It lived up to the principles of the Paris Declaration and the cooperation successfully balanced Norwegian foreign policy interests with the concerns for redress and equity in higher education in South Africa and the region.

**Endnotes**

1. The second agreement stated that each institution participating in the programme was expected to provide baseline data pertinent to the nature of the project. Some projects did define indicators, provide baseline data and report in terms of these indicators.
2. The same expectation was expressed when the cooperation between Brazil, Russia, India and China (BRIC) was enlarged to include South Africa in 2010.
3. There was one bilateral project, a formative research project involving the universities of Bergen, Durban-Westville and the Western Cape, but for various reasons this did not deliver to expectations.