



GCSP Website

**“External Evaluation of the Geneva Centres, GCSP, GICHD and DCAF”  
(2010-2013)**

**Final Report**

By the INNOVABRIDGE Foundation, Caslano / Switzerland

Sophia Procofieff, Anna Matveeva, Dieter von Blarer (Team Leader)

Submitted: 16 June 2014

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

The Message to the Swiss parliament on funding of the Geneva Centres and the Framework Agreements between the Swiss Confederation and the Centres envisages commissioning of an independent evaluation on the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the Geneva Centres for 2014. The “Comité de Pilotage” which consists of FDFA and DDPS decided that one team shall evaluate all three Geneva Centres and on 23 November 2013 launched a call for proposals.

#### Scope and objectives

The evaluation assesses aspects of the corporate and strategic governance of the Centres. It covers the period of 2010 – 2013 and the year 2014 is outside of the evaluation scope. The report comments on the on-going and planned developments in 2014 where it deems appropriate. The pre-2010 period has been a subject of previous evaluations and is referenced when essential for understanding of the current issues.

The evaluation has two interrelated objectives:

1. Accountability for the work done in the 2010 – 2013 period and the results achieved in order to inform the Swiss Parliament on the implementation of the current framework credit line.
2. Institutional learning to increase the objective-oriented and results-based management, to strengthen the quality of governance and administration.

The evaluation focus is on strategic orientation, and the quality of implementation in terms of services and the Centres’ achievements, as well as on the analysis of the governance structures, institutional mechanisms and management procedures. It will also assess the relevance of the Centres for Swiss Foreign Policy and the International Geneva. It is expected that the assessments, conclusions and recommendations of the current evaluation will contribute to the next Message to Parliament for the up-coming credit frame period 2016 - 2019.

While the internal decision-making mechanism of the CDP is out of the scope of the evaluation, in the evaluators view the CDP’s influence/impact on the governance of and contractual arrangements with the three Centres are part of the dynamics to be assessed. The Swiss Federation is the main donor of all three Centres. Therefore, leaving the influence of the FDFA on different aspects of the Centres functioning out of the evaluation’s scope would negatively impact on the credibility of the evaluation. This includes that the evaluation takes the liberty to address recommendations also to the FDFA if it may help, in the view of the evaluators, to clarify the level of action required to follow up recommendation.

Assessing the contributions as being ODA eligible or not is in the view of the evaluators not within the scope of the evaluation. It would require a deeper assessment and knowledge on the Swiss Federation’s ODA reporting. The evaluation does not have this information and does not include an assessment on the justification of the Swiss contribution to the Centres being ODA or not. It should however be noted that through the decision of OECD ministers, DCAF has the status of an international development organisation, and financial contributions from member states are ODA-deductible. If the qualification of contribution as not being ODA has an impact on the evaluation approach or analysis as it is to a certain extend the case with the GCSP this is mentioned where it seems relevant<sup>20</sup>.

### 1.2 Methodology

The evaluation was conducted in three phases:

---

<sup>20</sup> The contributions to GICHD and DCAF are mentioned in the list of Swiss multilateral ODA on SDC website. The GCSP is not mentioned on this list.

1. An inception Phase consisting of an in-depth document review and initial interviews. The Inception report was validated on February 26<sup>th</sup> during a meeting with the CDP.
2. Data collection phase – interviews with internal and external key stakeholders. Reflective workshops. Data collection (from 1 February to 22 April 2014) overlapped with the inception and with the analysis phase due to busy schedules of some respondents.
3. Analysis, synthesis and elaboration of the report phase – 22 April to 14 June 2014

### 1.2.1 Data collection

A set of questionnaires was prepared to respond to the ToR and was adapted to each group of key respondents of semi-structured face-to-face interviews and reflective workshops. All major involved stakeholders, such as selected members of the Bureaus, the CoFs and Advisory Board members were covered. Interviewees were divided into four categories:

1. Partners, beneficiaries, research and expert collaborators;
2. Centres' staff and close associates, e.g. involved Bureau members or former staff;
3. Control group: independent observers, funders, other significant actors in the field and external stakeholders<sup>21</sup>
4. Swiss federal government officials

'During the evaluation phase 262 individuals were contacted for an interview. For example, in 29 cases the interview meeting did not take place.

Inquiries were made through public inquiry forms at websites of the following institutions to solicit interviews:

- Atlantic Council
- The US Army War College
- Wilton Park
- UK Defence Academy
- International Institute of Strategic Studies
- US Postgraduate Naval College
- BAKS
- UK Stabilisation Unit
- George C. Marshall Centre

Three public inquiries were responded to by BAKS, the US Army War College and SU.

214 interviews took place (with 78 women and 136 men) either through individual interviews, during reflective workshops, by phone or Skype. 12 respondents answered in writing (see Annex 2 for the list of respondents).

The interviewees spoke under Chatham House rule, unless they were employees of beneficiary governments and were speaking on behalf of their institutions. The evaluation team is happy to discuss further if specific questions on responses arise, but will be guided by the need to protect their sources as appropriate.

### 1.2.2 Staff reflective workshops

The rationale for the workshops was to foster a collective reflection about the strategy and a common vision, and the different roles of the actors involved in the programme.

---

<sup>21</sup> External stakeholders' are those individuals and institutions who are not staff, former staff, CoF and Bureau members, and Associate Fellows. It was difficult to identify such stakeholders on GCSP. Two of the GCSP-identified respondents failed to respond to inquiries. The EU contacts were not available for interviews. One UN respondent was interviewed in Geneva. Four NATO representatives indicated by the FDFA refused to give interviews citing little knowledge of the Centre. The same applies to a US army respondent. To move the inquiry forward, the evaluation contacted about 10 organisations through public inquiry forms on their websites (list in the chapter 1). Two of them responded, one with a respondent on GCSP and one – on DCAF.

The rationale for the workshops was to foster a collective reflection about the strategy and a common vision, and the different roles of the actors involved in the programme.

Three reflective workshops were held at the GCSP and the DCAF (Geneva and Tunis) in each case with a group of six staff members (mix of seniority, gender, nationality, and length of service) alongside a set of prepared questions to ensure comparability of findings. Due to unexpected circumstances the reflective workshop could not take place in GICHD. Eighteen persons participated in the workshops altogether.

During the field visits one reflective workshop with DCAF staff members was held in Tunis and one with beneficiaries at Serbia's Ministry of Interior in Belgrade.

### 1.2.3 Field trips – Primary case studies

Two fieldtrips took place during the data collection phase.

1. South Eastern Europe - from March 10 to March 14 – total of 23 interviews:
  - March 10-11 - DCAF Ljubljana Office (BSP program and PCC secretariat)
  - March 12-14 – Belgrade – visit of two projects funded by SIDA implemented at the Ministry of Interior – interviews mainly with beneficiaries, but also donors, Swiss representatives, partners.
2. DCAF Tunis – March 24-28 – 27 interviews with various stakeholders – mainly partners, donors, other actors and not that many beneficiaries. TFNA implementation.

### 1.2.4 Secondary case studies

The aim of the secondary case studies was to ensure that there was one field operation for each Centre to evaluate each Centre more in-depth. The idea was also to see how the Centres operate in difficult/ fragile contexts.

1. DCAF Central Asia (Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan), February. Seven interviews were held. The case allowed a brief assessment of DCAF's operations in an unpromising political climate and of the quality of the relationship with UNDP and OSCE as intermediary organisations for interaction with the national governments. The interview with the person responsible for the Border guards programme in Central Asia at DCAF, directly attached to the Director, took place very late due to schedule constraints.
2. GICHD – Afghanistan: GICHD supports the Mine Action Coordination Centre for Afghanistan (MACCA). Impressions from the field were acquired through Skype and personal interviews with organisations operating in mine action in Afghanistan.
3. GCSP - OSCE Academy (Kyrgyzstan),<sup>22</sup> March 10 - 19: GCSP supported the OSCE Academy in Bishkek since 2004 by providing advice and visiting lecturers for the Master of Arts Programme in Politics and Security. The contribution of GCSP to the development of the Academy was assessed by interviews with the management, the students, alumni and former Directors of the Academy.

The field phase largely relied on qualitative data collection methods, such as in-depth key informant interviews, reflective workshops with the Centres' staff, engaged field observation and on-going documentation study. The evaluation also relied on quantitative data collected by the Centres themselves, such as on gender ratio, and drew data from public sources, such as Google Scholar citation index, to assess how widely the Centres' publications are read.

### 1.2.5 Data analysis

#### Triangulation of data

The evaluation team has applied a **set of research methods and tools** to collect and analyse data. To ensure the accuracy and validity of study findings the team ensured:

---

<sup>22</sup> Proposed by InnovaBridge in the response to tender and accepted by the CDP at the meeting on 28 February 2014. The case study was entered in the inception report. Efforts were made to identify another case study together with the GCSP by inquiries sent to the Deputy Director by the evaluation in March 2014, but no appropriate case study was identified, as no other proposal came from the GCSP than to evaluate the ICT, which has been certified and is regularly assessed.

- Source triangulation: information from different sources was compared, i.e. at various management levels within different functional units,
- Method triangulation: Team members compared information collected by different methods, e.g. interviews, reflective workshops, document review.
- Researcher triangulation: Comparison and collation of information collected by different team members during the course of their research to align the conclusions.
- Context triangulation. The evaluation triangulated findings from different countries and operational contexts.
- Interlocutors can speak openly and that findings cannot be attributed to one interlocutor;
- Conclusions are clearly based on findings, and recommendations are clearly based on conclusions;
- All outputs are practical, easy to read, and useable for the target audience.
- The evaluation employed the Theory of Change approach to the analysis of programmatic interventions. The team tried to make the Centres' assumptions on the context and change explicit by activating critical reflection. It explored:
  - The context for the interventions, including social and political conditions, and the donor environment;
  - Process and sequence of change anticipated to lead to the desired long-term outcomes; and
  - Assumptions about how these changes should happen; whether the activities and outputs are appropriate for influencing change in the desired direction.

The findings for DCAF were put into the Theory of Change Evaluation Matrix 1. The evaluation found it appropriate to do this in the case of DCAF as its activities need very long term perspectives to bear fruit and show results and are depending on complex dynamics.

Data from each source was placed into the evaluation framework to assist in identifying key findings, conclusions and results. Data analysis has been carried out throughout the assignment alongside the criteria in the section on 'Key Questions' of the Inception Report. The evaluators formed preliminary conclusions by the end of the field missions, which are reflected in the current draft report.

The analysis has been carried out in accordance with the OECD-DAC evaluation standards and the Swiss Evaluation Standards (SEVAL-Standards),<sup>23</sup> paying attention to the key concepts, such as Transparency of Value Judgments: 'the underlining reasoning and points of view upon which an interpretation of evaluation results rests are described in such a manner that the bases for the value judgments are clear' and Anticipating Political Viability.

The International Mine Action Standard 14.10 on "Evaluation of Mine Action interventions" has been applied to the GICHD if specificity for GICHD so required.

### **1.2.6 Key methods, informants and sources of data**

#### **Control group**

The evaluation team identified 'control-group' respondents who were aware of the activities of the Centres, but are not direct clients or beneficiaries, and could offer an impartial view. Donors were among this category. The examples include respondents from the following institutions:<sup>24</sup>

- International organisations: OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre, ICRC, NATO
- Federal College for Security Studies (BAKS)
- Norwegian Peoples Aid<sup>25</sup>

<sup>23</sup> SEVAL Standard: Version 5 December 2000.

<sup>24</sup> See full list in Annex.

<sup>25</sup> In its comments to the evaluation team, the GICHD objects that three out of 15 control group respondents are Norwegian and may have a potentially strong strategic and political position regarding MA or may be a direct competitor, which would affect the impartiality of those respondents. Being asked about main competitors of GICHD, respondents did not mention NPA. NPA is listed however as one of the main partners of the GICHD on the website. The Norwegian Embassy was mainly interviewed on GCSP and

- Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House)
- US Army Peacekeeping Stability Operations Institute
- US Army War College
- Swedish MFA, SIDA, Folke Bernadotte Academy
- Norwegian MFA
- UK Aid
- International NGOs: Saferworld, Small Arms Survey
- Peace Research Institution in Oslo
- UN agencies, e.g. UNDP, UNESCO, UNITAR and UNMAS
- Razumkov centre Ukraine

### 1.2.7 Limitations of the evaluation

The different stage in which the Centres are at the moment, the different mandates and the different funding situation challenges the evaluators to produce a consistent assessment for each Centre of the achievements/challenges they have reached/faced since 2010 and at the same time synthesise the findings in an overall report on synergies and comparisons.

Measuring impact is a challenging undertaking in development and policy influencing as it is difficult to assess the level of attribution with respect to overall change. The issue of attribution arises because of multiple influences and the involvement of other actors. The team used the contribution analysis to underpin the questions in the ToR and to assess the different levels of contribution. The main limitation was that measuring GCSP by OECD DAC categories<sup>26</sup> was only partially possible, because the Centre was not requested to abide by them from the start, and because it is not funded through the ODA budget. The evaluation gathered data as it could, but the nature of the Centre's activities is such that not all questions could be answered to full satisfaction.

### 1.3 Report structure

The report is structured as follows: the executive summary outlines the main findings, key strategic and managerial recommendations follow. The summary reporting provides for a broader outline on all aspects of the evaluation making broad comparisons between the Centres where necessary. The evidence for the assessment is presented in the chapters of the main report. The *Assessment* paragraphs reflect the evaluation's own views. Chapter 1 introduces the evaluation, describes methodology and the process of data collection. Chapters 2, 3 and 4 contain dedicated analysis on the individual Centres – GCSP (2), GICHD (3) and DCAF (4). They are intended for the CDP and specifically for each Centre. Chapter 5 deals with cross cutting issues including governance, International Geneva and gender, and is meant to be shared with all Centres to allow a reflection on these broad themes. The report is followed by seven annexes.

Dieter von Blarer is the team leader and the author of chapter 3 (GICHD), the case study on OSCE Academy for GCSP and the section on governance in chapter 5 as well as the executive summary. Sophia Procofieff is the author of chapter 4 (DCAF) and the section on International Geneva in the Cross-cutting issues. The summary report, chapter 2 (GCSP), the gender chapter and case studies on Tunisia and Central Asia for DCAF are written by Anna Matveeva. Sophia Procofieff and Anna Matveeva co-authored chapter 1 (Introduction).

The evaluators wish to thank all the respondents for so generously sharing their ideas and insights, and the Centres and the FDFA/ DDPS for their assistance with our inquiries. Our special thanks go to the staff of DCAF's Ljubljana, Belgrade and Tunis regional offices for their outstanding support during the field missions.

---

DCAF and just mentioned an obviously dissenting (to GICHD) opinion on MA policies and the future of MA. SIPRI was only contacted on GCSP and is also mentioned as one of the main partners on GICHD website.

<sup>26</sup> The Categories of OECD evaluation standards are: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. The evaluation relates also to the OECD DAC Guidelines and Reference Series: Evaluating Peacebuilding in Settings of Conflict and Fragility (2012)

The assessments and conclusions are our own independent evaluation.

### **3. THE GENEVA INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR HUMANITARIAN DEMINING (GICHD)**

#### **3.1 Summary of findings and recommendations**

##### **3.1.1 Strength / weaknesses / critical challenges**

###### *Strengths*

- Convening and normative power in the Mine Action community
- Recognized and up to date knowledge hub (one stop shop)
- Clear program with clear offerings
- Flexibility in the use of human resources

###### *Weaknesses*

- Clarity of identity: International Organisation? Consultancy? International NGO?
- Depending partly on outside know how
- High dependency on Swiss funding
- Irregular reporting on outcomes and results

###### *Critical Challenges*

- Maintain relevance in a competitive and changing environment
- Look out for strategic partnerships to gain/hold critical mass rather than be perceived as an unfair competitor
- While broadening the scope of work remain in a distinct niche of expertise and consultancy
- Mature and saturated Mine Action “Industry” may be on its peak and funding for research and development of tools, policies and instruments might be dwindling

##### **3.1.2 Summary of recommendations**

###### **The evaluation recommends to the Centre**

###### *On a strategic level*

- Within an inclusive strategy development process use input/feedback of other actors/partners including the relevant INGOs to define pertinent objectives to eventually broaden its scope of work and elaborate options for the future development of the Centre (3.3.1.6).
- To develop more strategic cooperation with Swiss (e.g. SDC) and other actors, namely DCAF, GCSP and SAS.
- To develop a comprehensive understanding of armed violence control and protection of people within a holistic (whole of government) approach.
- To develop clear indicators to show achievements and successes while keeping a balance between the requirements to maintain internal M&E systems and the burden on staff to comply with requirements thereto.

###### **The evaluation recommends to the CoF**

- To develop or according to the needs amend a Terms of reference for the President, the Secretary and the Treasurer of the Foundation and for the Director of the Centre.

###### **The evaluation recommends to the FDFA**

- To provide clear reporting expectations to the Centre in the frame work agreement and in the annual agreements.

### 3.2 Background

The Swiss Federation founded the GICHD in 1998 as one of three Geneva Centres.

*The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) is an international expert organisation based in Switzerland that works to eliminate mines, explosive remnants of war and other explosive hazards. By undertaking research, developing standards and disseminating knowledge, the GICHD supports capacity development in mine-affected countries. It works with national and local authorities to help them plan, coordinate, implement, monitor and evaluate mine action programs. The GICHD also contributes to the implementation of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, the Convention on Cluster Munitions and other relevant instruments of international law. The GICHD follows the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence (mission statement on GICHD web site).*

#### An overview

##### Governance and Human Resources

| Management | Staff/<br>Head count <sup>87</sup> | Council of<br>Foundation | Bureau      | Advisory Board |
|------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| 8 males    | 16 males<br>36 females             | 23                       | 6 (3 Swiss) | 22             |

##### Finances

| Revenues<br>2013     | Swiss Funds<br>including rent | Non-Swiss<br>Contributions <sup>88</sup> | Deferred from<br>2012 and<br>Extraordinary |                             |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| 11'847'176           | 8'677'200                     | 2'036'724                                | 1'133'251                                  |                             |
| Expenditures<br>2013 | Programmes                    | Laws and<br>Standards                    | Outreach                                   | Management<br>Admin/Support |
| 11'825'125           | 8'095'101                     | 686'246                                  | 966'558                                    | 2'077'219                   |

The FDFA and DDPS have developed together a Swiss Mine Action-Strategy (MA Strategy) for 2012-2015, which states:

*“Despite the fact that the attention of some countries tends to shift away from mine action, Switzerland will continue to oppose this trend and to support the momentum to implement the relevant conventions...”* With this commitment Switzerland makes clear that supporting MA and the implementation of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) remains a priority for its security and foreign policy, as well as for its civilian peace building efforts.

The Swiss government’s financial support to the GICHD is based on four yearly framework credits, endorsed by the Swiss Parliament. In its last statement, given on 17 November 2010, expectations of the GICHD, in the context of 2012 to 2015 funding were as follows:

- context analysis and strategic alignment;
- strategy development and program consultancy with systematic integration of gender specific approaches and aspects related to minorities;
- technical and operational consultancy;
- information management;
- mine action standards (IMAS);
- support for the implementation of international instruments;
- international participation and diversification of financial support.

The Swiss Parliament has pledged 36.2 million Swiss Francs to support the GICHD for the 2012-2015 period.

<sup>87</sup> Information from GICHD as of 30 March 2014 including ISU.

<sup>88</sup> Non-Swiss contributions are mainly coming from Australia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Sweden, the US, DFID and UN Agencies.

In 2010 an MA expert and a gender expert evaluated the GICHD; their evaluation is partly reflected in the expectations of the 2010 parliament statement. It also recommends several areas which require attention, including:

- clearer definition of outputs and outcomes;
- clearer definition of measures of quality and success;
- use of better defined outputs against existing well-defined inputs to yield valid indicators of efficiency;
- a more rigorous assessment process for selecting new projects, continuing existing projects and shutting down those which are no longer necessary or justified;
- promotion of gender and diversity sensitive policies and practices in the wider MA world;
- development of a better system for bridging language barriers in the delivery of services;
- adopting a more active approach to managing relationships with key actors within the working context.

Following the 2010 evaluation, the GICHD commissioned a MA working context analysis (July 2011) and a communications review (November 2012). It developed a 2012-2014 strategy and a 2013-2014 communications strategy. A new strategic process will be launched by GICHD at the end of April 2014.

The GICHD still views itself as a leading Centre of excellence on mine action and as a service provider bridging gaps between research, lessons learnt and practice.

### **3.3 Evaluation and analysis**

#### **3.3.1 Relevance**

The mine action environment has changed in recent years. The community has become more mature and expertise related to technical demining and management approaches (including EOD/ERW/UXO) is more widespread. International NGOs have become significant actors, which develop approaches taking into account the socio-economic and development aspects of post armed conflict clearance. National MA Centres, such as those in Afghanistan and Lebanon, strive to play a more important and relevant role on a regional level. While mine clearance may have reached its peak on the quantitative side, more complex aspects of clearance, such as its socio-economic impact and relevance for development, may become more challenging in the future. Complex situations, such as those in Libya and Syria, where different armed groups hold weapons in unknown quantity and quality, challenge the traditional understanding of how international conventions and standards can be implemented.

The Swiss MA strategy acknowledges the growing complexity of post armed conflict clearance in a larger sense.<sup>89</sup> The Swiss strategy takes into account the growing relevance of synergies between MA, humanitarian aid, development cooperation, peace building and security.<sup>90</sup> The strategy mentions the GICHD as one of the main implementation partners.

##### **3.3.1.1 Relevance of vision/mission**

*The GICHD strives for a world free of mines and other explosive hazards, where individuals and communities live in a safe environment, conducive to development (GICHD strategy 2012-2014).*

The GICHD provides services for State Parties to the APMB and for the wider MA community. While it is not involved in mine clearance and clearance of other explosive remnants of war (ERW) the Centre “*bridges the gaps between research, lessons learnt and practice; it promotes evidence-based policies, develops standards*

---

<sup>89</sup> This includes ERW (abandoned explosive ordnance, forgotten ammunition, improvised explosive devices and cluster ammunition) as well as “Certain Conventional Weapons” regulated in the CCW.

<sup>90</sup> The support to develop instruments of measurability on ERW clearance and Physical Security and Stock Pile Management (PSSM) is mentioned as an activity.

and enhances professionalism, making mine action faster, cheaper, safer, more effective, sustainable and inclusive” (GICHD Strategy 2012 to 2014).

Since 2010 the Centre has made considerable efforts to reposition itself within the MA community and maintain what has in the past been seen as its unique and distinct expertise. The Centre’s vision is in line with the APMBC’s objectives and the Swiss Mine Action Strategy 2012-2015. The aim includes not only the clearance of APM but also of other explosive hazards. The Centre’s strategy looks towards emergence of new needs and trends such as stock pile and ammunition management, environmental issues and ARV.

### 3.3.1.2 Relevance of the institutional environment analysis

#### Institutional environment

The GICHD is not only a service provider for the MA community, but also supports the secretariat of the APMBC and has an observer status to the convention including the Intersessional and Preparation meetings. It has observer status to the State Party Meetings on the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM) and the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW). The Centre also provides the Secretariat for the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) and manages and updates the standards on behalf of the UN Mine Action Service (UNMAS).

**Assessment:** *The GICHD operates in a complex and dynamic institutional environment. While it has an institutional obligation related to the implementation of international “disarmament treaties”, it is a strategic partner of UNMAS and a service provider to National MA Institutions, UN Agencies and the wider MA community. National and international NGOs are arguably also institutional partners depending on the specific relationship between them and the Centre in various mine action theaters<sup>91</sup>. The cooperation with SDC has so far been less prominent. There might be a potential to be explored in the future to jointly develop with SDC and other Swiss actors (DCAF/HSD) comprehensive strategies and approaches to link conflict transformation post conflict rehabilitation, peace-building and development.<sup>92</sup>*

#### Competition

Through the interviews conducted with different actors in the MA sector it became clear that GICHD has no direct competitors, as long as it operates in its distinct field of services for the whole MA community. The nearest to a competitor might be the James Madison University’s Center for International Stabilization and Recovery<sup>93</sup>, which is more of an academic institution, but also provides specific services to National MA institutions.

Interviews have also raised the question whether the GICHD, in its effort to secure a wider funding base, risks competing with other actors in mine action. This brings up the dilemma we look at under 3.4 (expansion of funding base). As a mainly Swiss (government) funded institution, with comfortable core funding, the Centre could be seen as an unfair competitor if it participates in competition for funds. This may have a direct impact on the Centre’s relevance:

#### Competition and relevance

The Centre is recognized as an institution, which not only delivers services to the mine action community, but also largely as an “international organisation”. The Centre has normative power in the development and management of IMAS, and in hosting the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) of the APMBC (and in the future the CCM) under an agreement with the state parties to the Conventions. The GICHD is perceived or has been perceived as an impartial, or even neutral research and service provider for the MA community and for National MA Centres. For many actors this is an important feature of the Centre’s relevance within the MA community and contradicts the Centre’s potential efforts to compete with other actors in the “industry” for international tenders. Therefore, this dilemma must be taken into account when attempting

<sup>91</sup> The evaluation could establish the institutional relationship e.g. for Afghanistan, Tajikistan, Vietnam and Lebanon.

<sup>92</sup> e.g. the GICHD’s IMSMA and tools/instruments for land release comprise potential for such cooperation

<sup>93</sup> [www.jmu.edu](http://www.jmu.edu)

to broaden the Centre's funding base.

The UNMAS and other UN-Agencies are strategic partners for the GICHD. Potential overlap and areas of competition are a risk to the GICHD. For example, the UN mine actions strategy 2013-2018<sup>94</sup> is very similar to the GICHD's strategy 2012 – 2014. The different roles of the UN and the GICHD mitigate but do not exclude overlap.

These strategies share similar objectives in their support for national MA Centres. While there is wide scope for cooperation and mutual support, there may also be space for less productive turf fights and competition. Interlocutors from the commercial sector and larger NGOs, as well as from the UN, suggest that the GICHD runs the risk of not being distinct enough in its mandate compared to the UN. Some have even bluntly said that now that the systems are in place and the standards mature, there will be no reason for the GICHD to exist in the foreseeable future (five to ten years).

**Assessment:** *The GICHD still plays a distinctive role for the MA community. In widening its scope of work and using tools and methodologies developed for the traditional MA sector on other fields such as stock pile management and linking them e.g. to environmental and development issues the GICHD may maintain its relevance as a developer of tools, methods, QM as well as M&E for a wider community working with holistic approaches on post conflict reconstruction, peacebuilding and development. It must however be careful to avoid creating a sense of unfair competition with other actors by keeping in mind that it **serves** the MA or a wider community. If the Centre's capacity and expertise are specifically requested, it does not have to shy away from entering into "business" with clients or partners.*

### **Identity and Swiss Foreign Policy**

Like the other two Geneva Centres the GICHD is a Janus headed institution. This may be an asset as it allows referring to it as typically Swiss when addressing the Swiss donor. It also allows arguing that it has a distinctive international face being governed by a CoF composed of member states. Interviewees look at this rather relaxed and think it is justified to use the ambiguous identity of the Centre for the good of the cause and in a pragmatic way. Some national MA authorities maintain it is important that the Centre has a Swiss label and works out of Geneva rather than out of New York. The neutrality of Switzerland and its convening power are recognized and appreciated. As a service provider within the MA community the excellence of the Centre's performance is relevant and not its Swiss label. People do not see the Centre as an instrument of Swiss foreign policy but rather as a service mainly financed by Switzerland to mitigate the security threat to persons through APM and other REW.

The security of people is a corner stone of Swiss contribution to humanitarian aid, post conflict reconstruction, peace-building and development. As a strategic partner within the Mine Action Strategy of the Swiss Federation for 2012 - 2015, the GICHD looks more like a Swiss foreign policy asset.

#### **3.3.1.3 Relevance of strategic objectives**

The GICHD defined its strategic objectives for 2012 – 2014 as follows:

##### **Strategic Objective 1**

###### *Global Clarity on explosive hazards*

Interviews and a review of documents demonstrate the relevance of on-going endeavours to clarify the scope of explosive hazards contamination. While the implementation of the APMBC is widely regarded as a success, the challenge of dealing with ever new "explosive hazards" in changing environments of armed conflicts requires constant research and adaptation of strategies, approaches and operations. While the GICHD is well placed to play a leading role in working towards this objective, it has to coordinate with other actors in order to make the most of a joint effort towards clarity in the sector. Objective 1 is also in line with the Swiss Mine Action Strategy 2012 - 2015 (page 12 on top).

---

<sup>94</sup> [http://www.mineaction.org/sites/default/files/publications/mine\\_action\\_strategy\\_mar15.pdf](http://www.mineaction.org/sites/default/files/publications/mine_action_strategy_mar15.pdf)

## **Strategic Objective 2**

### *High performing national authorities and national ownership*

National MA authorities or national MA Centres are key to achieving the aims formulated for the GICHD in the Swiss MA Strategy and the UN's MA strategy. Interviews, document review and the case study on Afghanistan confirm the crucial role the GICHD has played and can play in the future to strengthen the performance and ownership of national authorities. Contextual sensitivity and recognition of existing national capacities is crucial to maintaining the relevance of the support the GICHD provides.

In 2011 the GICHD commissioned a paper called "Mine Action - a description of working context". Together with the 2010 evaluation of the Centre, this paper is an important input to the organisation's strategic development. In view of the upcoming strategizing process (2015 to 2018) the Centre commissioned an update of the context paper. Thus, the GICHD is trying to not only rely on its own analysis of a changing and dynamic environment, but is also looking for outside input to improve and check its own strategizing and planning processes.

### **3.3.1.4 Implementation of the strategy**

Objectives need to be aligned with operational strategies and mechanisms, which are reflected in Programs, and ultimately in projects. The GICHD defines specific programs, which work towards achieving its strategic objectives. It also defines specific longer term activities, such as support to standards, laws and outreach.

#### **Programs**

##### *Strategic management*

- Linking Mine Action, Security and Development Sectors
- Quality Management, Monitoring and Evaluation

##### *Operations*

- Land Release
- Stockpile Destruction, EOD and Technology

##### *Information management*

- Information management capacity development
- Information tool maintenance and development
- Research, Innovation and prototyping

A thematically organized program helps the Centre to stay in a process to achieve its objectives. Also, the programmatic openness towards a development and violence reduction agenda provides potential for GICHD to participate in and contribute to a wider debate on e.g. poverty reduction and AVR. The new GICHD Handbook, "10 steps to a national quality management system", as well as the new edition of the MA Handbook are good examples of how the Centre is integrating AVR and wider development agendas into its tools/publications<sup>95</sup>.

#### **Standard setting and support to International Law**

##### *Standard Setting*

The GICHD provides support to the development of Standards by running the secretariat of the IMAS Review Board, participating in the IMAS steering Group and developing, reviewing and disseminating the IMAS, the Technical Notes for Mine Action (TNMA) and the Test and Evaluation Protocols (T&EP).

While this service provided by the GICHD to the MA community is viewed positively by most, some interview partners consider the GICHD's position as monopolizing a sector, which is no longer relevant as standards

---

<sup>95</sup> MA Handbook (March 2013) p. 96 (on poverty reduction) p. 197 (more general)

are already set and the MA industry is saturated. However, national actors assess GICHD's role in standard setting positively. Some see the GICHD as an impartial leader with normative power and pertinent know how, which enable it to support the development of national MA standards. The contribution of the Centre to the IMAS is important for harmonization of the MA-sector. The GICHD plays a distinctive and important role in the development and dissemination of IMAS and its instruments. This role does not remain uncontested and the Centre has to justify its position in this realm by convincing its critics. Some critics, especially those from NGOs and the commercial sector, as well as some from the UN system, believe the Centre should amend IMAS only if important and relevant new feedback from the field suggests that another round of amendments is needed, because routine amendments are a costly routine exercise<sup>96</sup>. Also some interviewees suggest that while input from civil society and private actors is often taken on board for discussion on IMAS, these views are not always taken into account when standards are finally set. Therefore, the question arises of who sets the pace of standard development: the UN (UNMAS) or GICHD.

#### *Support to International Law*

The GICHD hosts the Implementation Support Unit of the APMBC (ISU-APMBC). Cooperation is governed by an agreement between the GICHD and the state Parties to the APMBC. A similar arrangement is envisaged for the ISU of the CCM.

The GICHD also supports legal and political processes aimed at reducing the humanitarian and development impact of weapons at the request of national authorities or the UN.

The arrangement whereby the ISU works under an agreement with the GICHD is widely accepted. However, there are some critics, who contest the *raison d'être* of the GICHD and believe that the ISU could work under the UNMAS or another UN body, or have its own structure.

#### **Outreach and publications**

##### *Knowledge hub for mine action*

The GICHD is a nearly undisputed hub of information for the MA community. Its effort to improve communication and make technical and policy information on MA and related fields available for the MA community and for researchers is positively recognized, with the GICHD seen as a *one stop shop* for information on MA and related fields. The up-to-date website and use of social media support the access to MA information developed and provided by GICHD (sometimes in cooperation with other actors) and foster communication on more tailor made and specific information, e.g. on IMAS. However, some actors question the *per se* added value of new publications and handbooks. According to them, the knowledge in the sector has increased in the past five to ten years. The Centre has to be careful to produce publications and methodologies, which provide evidence-based value for the MA community. Some interlocutors believe that the Centre's comfortable funding situation leads to the risk of producing information on the basis of "nice to have" rather than needs-based<sup>97</sup>.

##### *Linguistic outreach programs*

The Centre's Linguistic Outreach Programs have a positive resonance within the targeted language groups. Representatives of Persian, Farsi, Dari and Arabic language groups not only see a potential for wider information dissemination, but also a potential for more cooperation within the language group and for potentially setting up centres of expertise in the language relevant area.

#### **3.3.1.5 Excellence**

While the relevance of the Centre is widely undisputed, its excellence as a Centre does not remain uncontested. Statements suggest that the excellence of the Centre is highly dependent on its experts. Some interlocutors have noted that highly respected experts have recently left the Centre. This is not an unprecedented situation and shows that firstly, the Centre is under continuous scrutiny from the MA

---

<sup>96</sup> Support to law and standards cost CH 787'000 in 2013, which includes the costs for staff in the unit.

<sup>97</sup> According to the Centre the 2012 – 2013 statistics will show a considerable reduction of new publications.

community. Secondly, it reminds the management of the Centre to continuously develop the social and technical capacity of its staff and keep the working environment attractive for the best female and male experts on MA and related fields.

### Interview quotes

*In general, the Centre produces high quality work, has sound expertise, contributes to policy thinking and occupies a useful niche. The fact that it is less operational and has an independent funding base means that it provides less biased information and analysis than UNMAS and NGOs, which have their own agendas and which are too driven by operational considerations to be able to delve into policy. It is positive that GICHD is not operational and should not go down that route. There are many operators, while GICHD is unique.*

*GICHD should beware of mission creep. Needs should be based on the realities in affected nations, rather than being determined by GICHD. It is up to the Council of Foundation to keep GICHD within the bounds of needs, rather than becoming akin to a GICHD business development plan.*

**Assessment:** *The Centre has a reputation of excellence in its field. However, as explained later, the notion of excellence often depends on individuals who interact with clients and partners. Those individuals are often consultants contracted by the GICHD. Many actors see the Centre as a “one stop shop” for information and development of standards as well as a reference point for providing support for a wider field of post armed conflict clearance and ammunition management. While the comfortable core funding makes an objective assessment difficult as many services and the information hub are provided for free, the positive feedback by other (non-Swiss) donors on specific contracts suggests a good reputation for delivery of services. The developed tools and publications are to a certain extent demand driven. Would they also be in demand if not provided for free?*

#### 3.3.1.6 Opportunities and risks in expanding the scope of work

The GICHD has a set of tools, methodologies and approaches on offer, which enable it to bring added value to a widening sector dealing with explosive hazards outside the traditional MA environment.<sup>98</sup> If it sticks to its strengths as a provider and developer of know how, a knowledge hub and a convening point for a wider community aimed at improving people’s security and AVR, it capitalizes on what it has developed and remains in line with its mandate and vision. A holistic approach, which includes developing an interface between clearance, stock pile and ammunition management on one side and conflict transformation, post conflict rehabilitation, peace building and development on the other, would benefit and help to engage also more with other Swiss actors, as well as strengthen ties within the MDP.

Broadening the scope of work bears also risks. The GICHD needs to acknowledge that other actors have developed over time and have positioned themselves within the wider AVR debate. The risk for overlap and competition may rise and use up energy, which could be invested to better ends elsewhere. Cooperation with the DCAF and the SAS, which should be intensified within the MDP, will support the GICHD’s meaningful development beyond the scope of the mine action sector to bring about an approach to influence also civilian military interface where appropriate. Expanding the scope of work bears as well the risk that the expertise level of the staff in specific areas may become shallow and the GICHD becomes more vulnerable to turnover or more dependent on outside consultants. The GICHD may mitigate the risks it faces when expanding its scope of work through continuous and objective analysis of the context and its own relevance, through strategic cooperation with other actors, in order to group together the expertise of different players to gain *critical mass* rather than to compete<sup>99</sup>.

**Assessment:** *The evaluation encourages a forward strategy of the GICHD widening its scope of work while keeping in mind, that the main mandate will stay with the Centre for an unforeseeable future and the*

<sup>98</sup> e.g. ammunition safety, stock pile management and destruction

<sup>99</sup> Various interview partners perceived the alleged attempt of merging with the SAS as unfriendly takeover and commented it rather negatively.

*growing complexity of MA with managing residual risks and new challenges (e.g. non-state actors/environmental dynamics) need on-going attention. Other options include a development of merger or a transition to phasing out strategies.*

#### **Options for the future**

- The GICHD has the option to go a proactive path by widening its scope of work, its funding base through tenders and strategic cooperation to maintain critical mass, relevance and independence within a wider sector of MA and AVR.
- Tighter cooperation and strategic partnering within the MdP namely with the IHEID, DCAF, GCSP and SAS may bring about synergies, maintain critical mass and suggest in the longer term a more comprehensive structure (e.g. holding/managerial and administrative roof/etc.).
- GICHD may also decide to stick within a more narrow scope of mine action and work on a transition towards a phasing out strategy.

### **3.3.2 Effectiveness**

#### **3.3.2.1 Does the Centre achieve its strategic objectives?**

##### **Strategic Objective 1**

##### *Global Clarity on explosive hazards*

GICHD has set up a variety of instruments supported by studies, which attempt to clarify explosive hazards contamination and how to dispose of or manage them. Examples are<sup>100</sup>:

- The Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA), which has recently had an update including capabilities for victim focused information management.
- Land Release, which includes a series of activities to better define areas of contamination and promote efficient mine/EWR clearance.
- Management of Residual Explosive Remnants of War (ERW) Contamination Study  
*Lessons learned from World War II; ERW risk management should give a new perspective on risk management in countries affected by more recent wars (e.g. Vietnam/Cambodia/Laos).*
- Standard setting activities to reach a unified understanding of technical and legal approaches to MA and newer topics such as ammunition safety management.

While management of residual ERW is a relatively new activity of the Centre, IMSMA and Land Release are part of the core instruments to achieve strategic objective 1. Both instruments have been developed further throughout the period under evaluation. According to feedback from the MA community and National MA-Centres the newest version of IMSMA with the addition of victim focused information management has reached a sophistication and broadness enabling competent users to extract useful information for national institutions responsible e.g. for rural development or public health. Land release instruments do not only contribute to improvement of efficiency and cost effectiveness but also encompass legal aspects in order to gain clarity over owner or user rights, once the land is ready to be handed over.

To enable the GICHD to measure outcomes and impact related to the instruments developed and provided for the MA community, it will be important to consistently introduce RBM based ToC monitoring tools.

There may be an overlap between the UNODA/IATG and the IMAS in standard setting related to ammunition safety management. This was raised at the AB meeting in May 2012. The conclusion was: *“On the matter of*

---

<sup>100</sup> Examples taken from the 2013 Annual Report.

*standards, participants stressed that the IATG and the IMAS are different conceptual sets of standards which are complementary rather than overlapping, even though the approach may be better unified”.*

## **Strategic Objective 2**

### *High performing national authorities and national ownership*

It is one of the core competences and tasks of the GICHD to support national mine action authorities and enhance national ownership (see also message to parliament pp. 8200/8201). To this end, the GICHD provides strategic and management support to national MA authorities and also provides evaluation for national MA programs. Specifically, the GICHD has different levels of intervention to achieve this objective:

- support the development of NMAS in line with IMAS;
- support to strategic planning processes and management (e.g. South Sudan and DRC);
- support of learning processes and development of good practices through country case studies (e.g. DRC, Vietnam, Tajikistan);
- provision, implementation and maintenance of IMSMA;
- development of Quality Management Systems and publications, as well as capacity building (10 Steps to A National Quality Management System);
- organisation of regular meetings of Mine Action National Program Directors and UN Advisors (also open to NGOs and other actors in the MA sector).

According to interviews with actors on different levels (NGOs, national MA authorities, academic institutions, UNMAS in the field) the instruments, research and publications that the GICHD has developed over time, usually reach their target audience. Some have said that the publications are too dense/complicated to be used on a community level.<sup>101</sup> Representatives of national MA Centres confirm that they use the handbooks and encourage their staff to do so as well.

Since the introduction of French, Arabic and Persian (Farsi, Dari, Persian) outreach programs, the GICHD has improved the dissemination of IMAS in these languages (for the time being in French and Arabic) and provides regional training to improve cooperation of national MA authorities.

The GICHD’s achievements in strengthening national MA authorities are widely recognised (e.g. Vietnam/Afghanistan/Lao PDR/Iraq/Tajikistan). Often the GICHD’s achievements are described as bringing about a change in mind sets on the national level, which make political leaders or mine action authorities understand that in mine affected countries, MA is ultimately the responsibility of the state/government and the state should take a leading role.

### **Interview quotes**

*Vietnam may have been engaged in MA since 1975, but they had never thought about a national program or strategy. The response was patchwork, but with no system to record or connect activity. Each ministry had its own activity, but there was no coordination, no plan.*

*When GICHD came they found this gap. They then supported the Vietnam authorities to set up a national mine action programme (MAP). This was a great achievement. MA in Vietnam costs around \$100m per year; the problem wasn’t lack of money (it mostly comes from the Vietnam Government), but the fact that there was no master plan.*

*Now the country has a strategy and plan and that is almost entirely as a result of GICHD involvement (with the support of IC-VVAF102).<sup>103</sup>*

*I was involved in the start of the contracting mine action study. I remember the discussion. The intent was to capture best practice. In the end it focused on a couple of countries that people wanted to go to or which*

<sup>101</sup> Interview with a representative of an academic institution providing also support to National MA Centres

<sup>102</sup> The Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation und the International Centre

<sup>103</sup> <http://english.vov.vn/Society/Vietnam-strengthens-intl-cooperation-in-demining/256758.vov>

*GICHD wanted to support. This is typical. Studies are driven by results from a couple of countries that people want to go to or support.*

The Centre introduced a Mine Action Security and Development Program (MASD) during the period under evaluation<sup>104</sup>. The program aims to provide tools and information to mine action and development practitioners to link MA with a wider development agenda of countries and International Organisations.

**Assessment of achievements:** *From interviews with actors in the field and with national authorities the evaluation can conclude that the GICHD produces achievements through its interventions. Since the 2010 evaluation, the GICHD has improved its outreach capacity through the language outreach programs. The Centre does expose its new strategies and objectives to the AB, as a sounding board. The MASD is a significant step forward on the road to link MA with a wider development agenda and hopefully also towards improvement of civilian/military cooperation. The statements made by the interviewees on achievements and results of the GICHD's interventions in different countries and contexts suggest that it is possible to measure achievements as well as, to a certain extent, impacts. The CoF took this up in the 29 November 2013 meeting (item 19 and 20 of minutes). During the visit to the Centre the evaluator observed that the Centre is on the way to developing instruments and also a theory of change approach<sup>105</sup>.*

### **3.3.2.2 Monitoring arrangements**

Effective monitoring tools and methods are a prerequisite for transparent and realistic reporting and effective/efficient program/project management. Since the evaluation in 2010, the GICHD has started to think more about an RBM approach for its own programs and projects. While the GICHD provides state of the art evaluation and management consultancy to national mine action authorities and those in the wider community who ask for it, it has so far not put in place the instruments it promotes to the MA community into its own activities for the whole Centre<sup>106</sup>. To follow up projects internally, the operations consultancy unit however has set in place an M&E procedure, including a yearly update on the basis of a ToC approach.

#### **External Reporting and monitoring**

In its bi-annual report to the FDFA, the GICHD mainly reports its activities (outputs) rather than its results or impacts (outcomes). The framework agreement of 9 December 2011 between the HSD/CDP and the GICHD under item 6.1 asks for:

1. A mid-yearly activity report by 31 July of the respective calendar year
2. An activity report on each year by 30 June of the following calendar year
3. ....

Annual agreements ask for the same reporting, meaning that the main donor asks the GICHD to report on its activities. Simply asking the Centre to provide additional information to the FDFA upon mutual agreement (frame work agreement 6.2) is not enough. Other donors explicitly ask for results based reporting (Germany) or for a Results Assessment Framework (RAF), developed by the GICHD measuring the achievements of the specific action (Sweden's SIDA).

The Centre has set up results based reporting systems based on the requirement of specific donors. Consistent contractual obligations with the main donor for reporting on outcomes and results would also enhance the GICHD's improvement in this area.

#### **Internal monitoring / Quality management**

The GICHD runs an online participants survey for its training workshops (Management Consulting Section). The results are mainly used by the training teams to identify specific areas for improvement and are not

<sup>104</sup> Mentioned and explained in the Annual Report 2011 p. 6

<sup>105</sup> According to the Head of Management Consulting at GICHD some units already use RBM and ToC approaches. The evaluation got the impression that tools and capacity exist, but that they have not yet been introduced systematically.

<sup>106</sup> The Activity report

analyzed systematically. In the current year, the GICHD is introducing an M&E system for training workshops and country interventions. A systematic approach to information management capacity building, based on assessed baselines and targeted development plans, should also come under way this year. What GICHD calls results in its reporting to the FDFA and in its annual activity reporting (e.g. 2012) are in the view of the evaluators rather output than outcomes understood as measurable results<sup>107</sup>.

The Management Support Unit uses back office reporting to adjust and improve on-going projects. The unit also uses a ToC approach to measure the development of outcomes once a year. Some staff complain about time consuming follow up procedures, which eat into their time for action development and implementation.

**Assessment:** *While the GICHD does not yet have an overall and systematic complaints or internal quality management system, interviewees confirm that complaints, suggestions and inputs are taken seriously and are swiftly answered. Usually, complaint confirmations arrive quickly and a substantial reaction may follow a priority complaint. GICHD is not far from being able to produce RBM and ToC based reporting. Some donors require it already. While QM systems and RBM/ToC are important monitoring instruments, they must be designed and implemented in a way to be supportive to the staff. An inclusive process to introduce these instruments would help to make them part of a positive working culture.*

### 3.3.2.3 Instruments and context

The GICHD uses different instruments to achieve its objectives; some of the main ones are:

- training and workshops;
- quality management support;
- evaluation and assessment;
- development and dissemination of standards;
- development and introduction of handbooks;
- development and testing of new technical and programmatic approaches.

Most of the respondents give a positive assessment of how the GICHD uses its instruments. In some events (e.g. South Sudan and sometimes in Afghanistan) there have been comments that the GICHD has not done enough testing on the ground before an intervention or has not created a tailored enough approach. Digging deeper into such anecdotal evidence shows that there is sometimes a problem of attitude, meaning that issues in coordination and communication may lead to misunderstandings with other actors on the ground, rather than a lack of preparation. Some interviewees explained they would therefore rather engage the GICHD with a clear contract and pay for its services in order to remain the unrivalled owner of a specific process.

### 3.3.2.4 Sustainability of achievements

The GICHD develops know how, provides knowledge transfer, develops and maintains standards and offers capacity building in strategic planning and quality management. It also hosts the ISU to the APMBC and, will eventually host the ISU to the CCM and the GMAP. The Centre can also implement M&E tools for national MA authorities and MA implementers. It sometimes provides research and case studies in cooperation with others.<sup>108</sup>

The MA knowledge hub and publications provided by the GICHD are widely regarded as useful and are known to be used. On-going interaction with key actors in the field, national authorities but also NGO representatives<sup>109</sup>, will keep these instruments updated and sustainable. As other actors also develop new

---

<sup>107</sup> Interviews with GICHD management and staff confirm this impression.

<sup>108</sup> E.g. joint GICHD/SIPRI research on impact of Anti Vehicle Mines (AVM); GICHD Case study on Action on Armed Violence and post conflict Rehabilitation and Reintegration.

<sup>109</sup> E.g. MAG, NPA, DDG or ICBLCMC as a more activist and policy oriented actor.

tools, further cooperation will improve the quality and mainstreaming capacity of the instruments.<sup>110</sup> The web page count keeps the GICHD informed about the number of requests for information (Annex 4). The download statistics provide evidence based numbers on the demand for publications (Annex 5)<sup>111</sup>. The google analysis shows a high access rate to the GICHD's website, it becomes how ever obvious, most "hits" originate from western countries. But there are also considerable amounts of "hits" from mine affected countries. The download statistic shows a respectable interest for the Centres publication within a rather small "industry".

The 2010 evaluation of the Centre delivered an analysis of whether the Centre is achieving its mission (item 4.2.1). This analysis is partly still valid and the recommendations relevant. The management of the Centre acknowledges that while it is on its way to developing instruments to measure outcomes and achievements including sustainability, it has not yet arrived there. While the restructuring of the management team (valid since 2014) has concentrated operations consulting and management consulting teams under the Director of Operations, after such short time it is not yet clear if the different teams are acting together in a more concerted way. Reactions from the field (less from national authorities than other actors) suggest that information exchange and follow up on the potential sustainability of the GICHD's achievements might improve internal M&E instruments and their value in internal planning and strategy development. To improve and maintain effectiveness it is important to make sure that different teams within the Centre interact and use know how and knowledge synergies. Anecdotal evidence suggests that with the dynamic staff turnover during the last four years and the move to the MDP, some of the previous silo structures have been broken up and more horizontal interaction and cooperation now takes place.

### 3.3.2.5 Quality of staff

To be effective, staff needs to be qualified and motivated. For efficient consulting a credible development of management tools and research, as well as, certain closeness to the action is certainly positive. On the other hand, to be an impartial and neutral observer, developer, advisor and researcher, a certain distance from the field is also required. The 2010 evaluation states:

*"A widely expressed view (although not amongst National Centres) is that some of the Centre's staff have been away from field programmes too long and are out of touch with current practice. ...If the Centre's representatives are seen as being out of touch then, whether they are or aren't, audiences are likely to pay less attention to them and ascribe less credibility to the information they are providing."*

Interlocutors, especially from commercial actors and some larger NGOs have expressed similar views during interviews for this evaluation. A short assessment of the turnover at the GICHD shows that since 2010 the staff turnover at the GICHD has been slightly above 30%<sup>112</sup>. Some of the new operational staff have come directly from the field (NGOs) and have worked as consultants in mine action, have a military background in MA and ERW or worked previously at an IO, such as the UN (e.g. UNMAS) or the ICRC. There seems to be a good mix of seasoned MA experts, younger professionals with experience and JPOs.

Also, the GICHD spends between 30% and 40% of total human resources costs on external consultants. On the one hand, this is an asset because it provides flexibility, but on the other hand it makes the GICHD dependent on outside resources. On the whole, the mix of turnover, core staff and outside consultancy adds to a dynamic atmosphere. It is not clear if external consultants to GICHD represent the Centre when they are on assignments or if they act only in their own name. The evaluation suggests to look at this situation and to clarify the functions especially of regular consultants and the methods on how those can improve the

---

<sup>110</sup> The Mine Action Intelligence Tool MINT of GICHD might have some overlap or similarities with instruments developed by DRC/DDR and other NGOs.

<sup>111</sup> In 2013 GIHCD got orders for 58 books and 72 CDs through the website, it distributed 2'888 hard copies and 1'099 CD's through workshops and conferences.

<sup>112</sup> Turnover in four years has been more than 30% at the Centre. Administration and support staff have been more stable while in operations turnover has been more dynamic.

visibility of the Centre (e.g., business card, clear communication to the client, etc.). This might also not be desirable for consultants who desire to promote their own brand.<sup>113</sup>

While the language outreach program (obviously) provides for language diversity, other sections in the Centre are still dominated by Western, or rather, European experts.<sup>114</sup> In this respect the language question as part of overall effectiveness and efficiency (reaching the audience directly), has not noticeably improved. The challenge might be mitigated by flexible cooperation between different teams and strategic cooperation with local experts.

The GICHD staff have high dedication. This is reflected in the positive feedback on the work done in the field. As any other organisation with a consultancy approach, the Centre's own prestige depends on the quality and prestige of its experts. Feedback from clients related to the quality of interventions was generally positive. However, within an overall positive assessment of an intervention the following criticisms were brought up:

- GICHD only coordinated the intervention with the donor and not with the recipient
- Country assessments use up time of staff, who are already dedicated. GICHD did not collect feedback nor took recommendations from actors in the field for the country assessment seriously.
- In singular instances GICHD may have overstepped the mark in relation to national ownership, by becoming too involved in implementation and not remaining within an advisory only function.

#### **Case Study Afghanistan**

Afghanistan is one of the most mine affected countries in the World. Various internal conflicts and also the war against the former Soviet Union have left mines, unexploded ordnances (UXOs), as well as improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and other Explosive Remnants of War (ERW), which threaten the security of people. As the International Security Assistance Force ISAF is slowly phasing out it leaves, according to the director of the Mine Action Centre for Afghanistan (MACCA) new challenges related to battlefield clearance behind. NATO does reluctantly share know how on how to safely conduct clearance on NATO ERW with MACCA or even UNMAS for that matter. Afghanistan is still a fragile environment in many regions and situations can move quickly. However, under the guiding support of UNMAS, the MACCA has over time developed into a strong national mine action authority. Many actors are working in the field, which renders coordination and cooperation a challenge.

GICHD started to support the demining in Afghanistan in 2003 by leading an assessment of options for a transition to national ownership. It has then conducted Afghan Landmines & Livelihood surveys from 2009 to 2012 and case studies on national transition and Strategic Planning in mine action. In cooperation with UN-Habitat GICHD conducted a support mission on mine action and land rights in 2012 and 2013, which led to a publication with a Frequently Asked Questions document on MA and land rights in Afghanistan. This document was translated into Dari and Pashto, for dissemination to key actors in Afghan mine action. With a lens on Armed Violence Reduction (AVR) GICHD commissioned an Afghan case study on HALO Trust's Reintegration of former combatants into demining. GICHD provided the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) to MACCA and supported its implementation. From December 2013 to March 2014, under a UNOPS IM contract, GICHD prepared and tested the IMSMA upgrade, which includes also a Victim focused information management. At the same time it delivers capacity building in MACCA to bring MACCA to autonomy in running IMSMA. Mainly since 2009, GICHD provided training, support and capacity building for development of QM systems and a national M&E system. GICHD was instrumental to support the development of National Mine Action standards (NMAS). It has started the language outreach program in which Iranian, Afghan and Tajiks

<sup>114</sup> In 2013 an Arabic speaker and in 2014 an Urdu and Farsi speaker joined the management support section. Apart from Spanish and Portuguese the operations consulting section does not have experts with language skills who are able to communicate with local staff of national MA centres, who do not speak English or French.

cooperate to transfer inter alia technical terms of IMAS into Farsi/Dari/Persian. In 2013, GICHD/GMAP delivered a Gender assessment on the Mine Action Program Afghanistan (MAPA) as well as training on gender sensitive action plan development. It supported mainly the development of MACCA in cooperation with the UN-system. Field Research was provided for the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) and HALO trust.

Recipients of the GICHD services to Afghan Mine action are on a whole very positive in assessing GICHD's intervention. They highlight the professionalism of the experts and the relevance of the services. The GICHD was a key contributor to the development of NMAS, the installation and maintenance of IMSMA, the transition process to nationalisation of MAPA, the implementation of QM, as well as, M&E systems and the development of gender sensitive mine action policies. Achievements in these fields can be largely attributed to the GICHD. The services were timely, adequate and context sensitive. The recently started language outreach program is seen as a relevant contribution not only to the development of NMAS, but also to supporting regional cooperation.

When the Centre intervenes with its own activities such as country study or other types of research, it is sometimes perceived as not coordinating sufficiently with local actors and requiring support and inputs at short notice. Such support to GICHD self-initiated activities often took considerable time and energy from local staff. Also GICHD sometimes delivered services when it was not asked. Therefore, UNMAS had to intervene and make sure GICHD delivers what it is asked and when it is asked.

*Assessment: The "Afghan case" illustrates the potential of GICHD in the fields where it is strong and where it is perceived being unique and providing expertise over a wide range of MA. The activity over time and the results/achievements thereof are remarkable. It is probably hard to find another actor in MA who is capable to deliver such a wide range of targeted expertise out of a one stop shop. However, GICHD needs to be careful to serve the demands of clients who are in the field and not the assumed necessities thought out in Geneva. It has to be aware of its relative distance to the field. This is a strength (objective outside view) and also a weakness (assumptions made without reality check). Sensitivity to clients' needs and situations is especially crucial when GICHD does research and country studies out of its own means and driven partly by its own interests.*

**Assessment of outcomes:** *The GICHD has a good and measurable track record of empowering and supporting National Mine Action Authorities. The support to the implementation of National Mine Action Standards (NMAS), which are in line with International Standards (IMAS) but adopted to their context, directly impact the improvement of national mine action management and national legislation. IMSMA and the land release program provide clients with information and tools to improve quality, efficiency as well as cost effectiveness. They also serve the MASD Program. The Language Outreach Program in Arabic and Persian/Dari/Farsi opens access to a wider circle of mine clearance professionals, who are not comfortable in English. It also opens up the opportunity for neighbouring countries (with the same language) to better cooperate on mine action. References to long term programs, such as those in Afghanistan and Vietnam, prove the longer term impact of the implementation of quality management and information management systems.*

### **3.3.3 Efficiency**

The overall assessment on efficiency remains positive (see also evaluation 2010). The instruments set up before the last evaluation have settled in. The financial reporting to the CoF is transparent and congruent with activity reporting. In a very short time, the system allows to check the contributions that different donors make to specific activities. Apart from the on-going introduction of M&E instruments, some aspects of governance need attention in view of the upcoming strategic process.

### 3.3.3.1 Management

Aspects of governance related to all three Centres are discussed in a chapter on Governance related to all three Centres. In the report related to the GICHD, the evaluation assesses the management arrangements, their dynamics, as well as their opportunities and challenges.

#### Management structure

The Management structure has slightly changed as of January 2014. The Operations Consulting unit and the Management Consulting unit are now headed by a Director of Operations. They remain otherwise unchanged as separate units under a head of unit. The logic behind this change is not obvious to the evaluator, because the management has not become leaner. The main gain of the change may be more coherent cooperation of the important sections of operations and management consulting.

#### Management arrangements

There is positive feedback on how the previous Director managed the turnaround process for the Centre and was able to repair some of the frictions in international actors' relationships (see also p. 25 of 2010 evaluation). However, some staff feedback suggests that the management style was perceived as being rather top down and not very inclusive. Interlocutors explain that important management decisions, including the structure change of 2014, were not accompanied by appropriate consultations with the staff.

The development of the 2012 to 2014 strategy has been partly inclusive. While the input from the operations side were gathered more systematically and partly taken into account, there was allegedly less input from the administrative and support side. Also it is not easy to have a fully inclusive strategizing process when staff, including key staff, are travelling a lot. The interaction with the AB and the CoF seemed appropriate for the development of the strategy.

One might also argue, strategy development and management arrangements are within the scope of the strategic leadership of the director and the management in cooperation with the governing bodies of the Centres. There might not be a lot of space for long and potentially contradicting or heated discussions for the development of a new strategy.

#### HR-Management

The GICHD developed over time procedures and rules for HR-Management. It has a clear and transparent table for functions & salary. Recruitment procedures are driven by the HR-management, which is professional. An annual staff appraisal system is in place. Its implementation has improved over the years. Some staff members still see it more as a routine than an instrument to improve staff performance and staff development.

**Assessment:** *In an expert organisation like the GICHD, appropriate involvement of staff in change management processes and strategy development is advisable. Staff identification with the institution is high in this environment as it should be. On the other hand, strategy development and change management can be cumbersome processes, which may also have a negative impact on efficiency and effectiveness over time. If such processes are led in a climate of inclusion, and perceived to be the result of a consultative approach, the results might yield higher identification and improved effectiveness and efficiency over time. Despite the criticism of these processes, the evaluation can state that during the last four years the Centre's capacity to deliver timely and adequate services to a wide range of clients has improved. The Centre is rather well positioned in a complex environment.*

### 3.3.3.2 Value for money/cost effectiveness

The Centre's financial reporting system allows the assessment of financial inputs into its activities. The value of the instruments developed and made available to the MA community and the national MA-authorities cannot be easily measured. Investment in developing and maintaining tools on a state of the art level is costly. Some interlocutors suggest that IMSMA is now developed and should not become more complex

through ever new updates. Reactions from the Centre take these caveats into account. IMSMA's recent update should now be followed by consolidation and maintenance of the system on a high level. The Centre has so far failed to set outcome and result measuring instruments and processes in place. It is positive to note that as this evaluation took place, the Centre proved credibly that it is now making a serious effort to develop and implement an M&E system for its own activities and products. At the operational level and for reporting to other donors such instruments are now available. Until the Centre streamlines M&E systems and reports consistently on outcomes and results and on concrete examples of how it measures cost effectiveness, the observations of the 2010 evaluation remain valid.<sup>115</sup>

Geneva is an expensive location to set up a large consultancy and research institution. Competitive salaries are relatively high. Ultimately, it is a political/policy decision to have the majority of the Centre's activities run out of Geneva. This has an impact on the cost-effectiveness ratio. Some interviewees suggest that having part of the activities set up nearer to the field would raise the Centre's credibility and make more means available for the Centre's mission or for other Swiss MA related activities. On the other hand, Geneva is an important hub for cooperation between actors in the wider security and disarmament sector, as well as, in the sector of post conflict operations, peace building and development. On the whole, the gains delivered in cost cutting would be balanced or outweighed by the loss of direct communication and cooperation capacity within international Geneva.

The Centre's financial management system allows staff to follow the development of costs in each activity sector and program. It also allows staff to answer critical questions from the governing bodies, the auditing and the Swiss Government as the main donor, if they wish to check the effectiveness of expenditures. The system assures planning and implementation to take place according to available funding. Costs, including staff costs, are allocated according to the budget set for the Centre's specific goals, relative to the input delivered for the goal.<sup>116</sup>

The Centre has not calculated real overhead costs. It cannot bill them to third donors, because Switzerland is financing the costs related to the headquarters and infrastructure.<sup>117</sup> Management costs from the expenditures table for financial reporting 2012 amount to CHF 2'232'148.00. These costs include support activities (CHF 1'005'868.00)<sup>118</sup>. It also includes the rent of the office premises, which are paid directly by the FDFA (CHF 525'800) and the costs for the Governance structure (CHF 368'300.00). Purely administrative costs, which also include services to goals 1, 2, 3 and 4, amount to CHF 929'107.00. The administrative costs include human resources and financial management, audit costs, and administration of Trust Funds<sup>119</sup>. Taking into account in-kind expenditures which are estimated at CHF 1'100'000.00, the administration managed total expenditures of CHF 13'290'000.00 in 2012. The administration represents 6.99% and support 7.86% of the total expenditures managed<sup>120</sup>.

**Assessment:** *While the instruments and procedures to measure cost effectiveness are in place at the GICHD and there is no evidence that the Centre spends funds ineffectively, it is difficult to have a clear assessment of the cost effectiveness without a systematic outcome and results based reporting system.*

### 3.3.3.3 Expansion of the funding base

GICHD is mainly dependent on funding from the FDFA. This makes it vulnerable to dynamics and shifts in Swiss foreign policy priorities, the country's internal politics and most importantly, potential future financial constraints of the Swiss Federation. The contribution of Switzerland to the GICHD has been constantly between 75% and 80% in the last three years.

---

<sup>115</sup> 2010 evaluation report 4.3.1

<sup>116</sup> Draft Financial Report 2012 for the CF meeting on 28 June 2013 - see p. 4-6 with an explanation of expenditures.

<sup>117</sup> Annual Agreement between the Swiss Confederation and GICHD on 20 December 2012 Item 4.3

<sup>118</sup> (Including salaries) to programmes, events, ICT acquisition and maintenance, training courses, travel organisation for staff members and visitors of events and exchange rate losses.

<sup>119</sup> TF ISU-APMBC, TF APMBC SP, TF CCW SP, TF CCM SP and GMAP,

<sup>120</sup> Source: Auditing report Deloitte 2012, Statement of the Treasurer to the CoF meeting on 28 June 2013

#### Funding (in CHF)

|       | 2010       | 2011       | 2012       | 2013       |
|-------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Swiss | 8'627'479  | 8'001'739  | 8'201'990  | 8'151'400  |
| Other | 2'546'367  | 2'453'316  | 2'202'220  | 2'036'724  |
| Total | 11'173'846 | 10'455'055 | 10'404'210 | 10'188'124 |
| Swiss | 77 %       | 76 %       | 78 %       | 80 %       |

Source: Annual Financial reports 2010 to 2013.

By statement of the message to parliament, statute and contractual agreement with the Federal Council (25 February 2003) the Centre is free and independent to use its funds according to the statutory scope of its mission. However, as explained, Switzerland provides the core funding of up to 80% of the Centre's revenue. While the annual agreements related to this funding provide for considerable freedom of action, they also give clear instructions on what activity sectors the donor wants the funds to be spent. Some third donors contribute to specific activities of the Centre or to the execution of its core mandate. Therefore, the Centre's independence depends on the political will of the Swiss parliament to continue financing it, and to uphold its independence within the wide spectrum agreed in the framework agreement and in the annual agreements.

The GICHD can continue to choose to rely on the conviction that the Swiss parliament will continue funding it. However, this could be a risky choice.

**Assessment:** *GICHD staff and management are aware of the risks related to the dependency of Swiss funding. The financial crisis since 2008 made donors generally more critical. They want to see results in order to report ultimately to taxpayers. The Centre tries to take the changing donor environment into account and is seeking for instance multi-year funding agreements and/or to initiate contacts with new potential donors. In a longer perspective the Centre needs to also show its main donor, that its product and services are in demand. The Centre has failed to substantially broaden its funding base since 2010<sup>121</sup>. It has lost Norway as an important donor. It will need a concerted effort of the management, the CoF and Switzerland to broaden the funding base in the future through strategic cooperation and also through the marketability of some services, which GICHD provides today out of the core budget.*

#### 3.3.4 Conclusions

GICHD is an expert organisation, which is well introduced as an important worldwide actor to eliminate mines, explosive remnants of war and other explosive hazards. Switzerland founded the Centre in 1998 to support the international cooperation in humanitarian demining. At the time of the evaluation the Centre delivers services to around 50 countries. Over time the Centre has developed different instruments to support the growing mine action community and to empower and support national mine action centres in taking over the responsibility for professional, safe, effective and efficient demining. This support resulted in the development of national mine action capacity and the positioning of mine action on the national agenda (Vietnam) and as an important contribution to national development strategies (Afghanistan).

The mine action environment has changed in the past years. The "industry" has grown more mature and other competent actors also offer services and know how.

To meet new challenges GICHD has therefore launched a strategy for 2012 to 2014. The strategy is in line with the Swiss mine action strategy for 2012 to 2015. It takes into account the growing complexity of hazardous explosives contamination and new threats to security of people. GICHD hosts and administers the Implementation support unit to the APMBC. It has an observer status to the state parties meetings on the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) and provides technical input to minimize humanitarian impact of such weapons. Since 2006 GICHD is mandated by the state parties to administer the CCW sponsorship program. GICHD participates as an observer at the meetings of the state parties to the APMBC

<sup>121</sup> New donors are: UK through DFID (since 2010), Qatar and the UAE with small contributions in 2012.

and the Convention on Cluster Munition (CCM). Through organizing the regular meeting for National Mine Action Program's Directors and UN Advisors, GICHD keeps regular contacts with key actors in Mine Action worldwide.

The organisation and the agenda setting of events hosted and/or financed by GICHD are generally regarded as being professional and relevant. The evaluator participated in parts of the 17<sup>th</sup> meeting of National Mine Action Programs and UN Advisors in Geneva and experienced a lively and well organized platform for exchange, contacting and contracting, the presentation of new tools or approaches by different actors and the reporting on policy impacts (e.g. Gender in Mine Action Policy) in different mine affected countries around the world.

GICHD has developed over time an important knowledge hub with wide information on mine action and related fields. Its web page is in demand and the feedback by most interviewees is positive. Researchers as well as practitioners use the publications and value the *one shop stop* quality of the website and the Centre. The high level of knowledge throughout the MA-community is challenging to the relevance of new publications. The statistics of downloads and hits as well as orders for publications demonstrate the demand for them. In Vietnam and Afghanistan publications combined with training yielded lasting results and at times the explanation in a GICHD publication helped to end a conflict on how to approach a specific situation.

The support of GICHD to standard setting accounts for its normative power. While this activity is appreciated by most and especially by National Mine Action Authorities, critical voices suggest the costly procedures could be performed in a slower pace. The process of Standard setting while being inclusive does not always acknowledge sufficiently the input from the field namely from NGO's.

The GICHD relies on a functioning governance structure with an active bureau, a CoF with members taking actively part in the meetings and asking relevant questions related to the strategic development of the Centre. The current strategy has been discussed and approved by the CoF. Norway, who was also an important funding member withdrew from the Council as it did not agree with the Centre's new strategy and was also not in support of the Centre's attempt to host the ISU of the CCM.

By organizing conferences the GICHD offers an excellent convening potential for the whole industry. It is in a strategic cooperation with UNMAS on the development of international standards. There might at times be overlap with UNMAS and also tensions if interventions in the field are not always coordinated well. The Director of UNMAS has however expressly applauded the Centre's strategy to broaden the scope of its mission.<sup>122</sup> The cooperation with national mine action authorities yields positive reactions. Some larger INGOs are more critical about the current strategy of GICHD and also of its cooperation within the community. They suggest GICHD should stick to its MA mandate, shrink with the demand on mine clearance and vanish within five to ten years. They suggest the funding can be used more efficiently if invested in direct action. They also think that GICHD is too far from the field and has lost touch to base. On the other hand, GICHD has an on-going cooperation with a larger operator in mine action with DFID funding. It cooperates with SIPRI on a research activity on the humanitarian impact of anti vehicle mines. GICHD is still a competent actor and has wide recognition for its services delivered to the MA-community. It is no longer regarded as the outstanding and unique place to go for advice and development of new approaches by everyone. The further away interviewees are from the Centre, the more critical they become. People and institutions working closely with GICHD appreciate its expertise and its inputs. Most of them also appreciate a widening of the scope of the GICHD's work.

GICHD's attempt to widen its scope of work and link up its IMSMA and land release tools to a wider development agenda merits support and acknowledgment. However, it needs to maintain the quality and appearance of a niche player, which offers services and products in demand for the MA and eventually a

---

<sup>122</sup> Statement of UNMAS Director in the CoF meeting on 29 November 2013.

wider community. It has to be careful to remain within the expertise it has developed with instruments, approaches and services. Strategic cooperation may help to reach a *critical mass* in areas in which the Centre wants to widen the scope.

GICHD's management arrangements still look a bit heavy with 7 (all male) members of the management in a 50 staff institution (without ISU and including part time staff). Nevertheless, the management structure is functional for the time being. It will need attention as part of the upcoming strategy development. While the overall gender balance in the Centre seems good, there is a sense that the management remains a "boys only club". Change management and strategic processes need to involve stakeholders on all levels appropriately.

### **3.3.5 Recommendations**

#### **The evaluation recommends to the Centre**

##### *On a strategic level*

- That the GICHD uses its impending strategy development to ensure a working perspective, which takes into account the dynamic development of the MA environment and the development in other fields of interest to the Centre. While the Centre needs to remain relevant in the core of MA portfolio, it is justified to widen the scope of its activities. While widening the scope the Centre needs to remain in a niche as a service provider and knowledge sharing hub for a widening and growingly interlinked community of post armed conflict clearance, post conflict reconstruction, security, development and peace promotion. The Centre needs to elaborate realistic options for its future development including a potential phasing out strategy (see 3.3.1.6).
- The upcoming strategy development should be inclusive within the Centre and interactive with key actors/partners of the wider Mine Action Community. The GICHD should seize the opportunity to define more precisely where it is broadening its thematic offering. The strategy development should also include the development of future institutional options.
- That the Centre develops more strategic partnership with Swiss actors such as SDC as well as with DCAF, GCSP, IHEID and the SAS to develop a common Swiss understanding of armed violence control and protection of people.

##### *On an operational level*

- While broadening its funding base, to stay attentive to perceptions of unfair competition by other actors of the MA community and maintain its identity as an impartial provider of distinct services.
- To actively include donor requirements in on-going development of a Results Based Management and the use of a Theory of Change approach to measure and report on changes.
- To develop clear indicators to show achievements and success while keeping a balance between the requirements to maintain internal M&E systems and the burden on staff to comply with requirements thereto.
- To steer and coordinates the pace of IMAS revision and IMSMA maintenance according to the needs and requirements of the MA community and the national MA authorities.

#### **On governance the evaluation recommends to the Centre**

- To further improve the cooperation and synergies between its different units.
- To assess its management structure mid-term into the next funding cycle.
- To maintain a healthy ratio between management procedures and 'real work' for meaningful operations.
- To keep an appropriate balance of staff hired directly by the Centre and consultants from outside the Centre and to adapt the existing guidelines on how consultants act (in their own name, or in the name of the Centre).

**The evaluation recommends to the CoF:**

- To provide guidance and if necessary instructions to the Centre's management for reporting, which includes, achievements and assessment of outcomes using a ToC approach.
- To make sure changes on legal representation for the Centre are expediently registered in the relevant registry.