

Sharmala Naidoo
Independent Consultant
1965 Gage Crescent
Ottawa ON K2C 0Z7
Canada

Geneva, 28 September 2018

Ref: Evaluation of GICHD Tools and Publications

Dear Ms. Naidoo,

I thank you for the submission of your final report on the Evaluation of Tools and Publications that have been developed at the GICHD. Annexed to this letter you will find the management response to the recommendations that you have made based on the evaluation conducted.

The GICHD appreciate the significant work that you have done – particularly the inclusive nature of the evaluation with the large number of staff and partners involved. I would also like to thank you for the excellent collaboration that you extended to Ms Gosia Loj who conducted an internal evaluations of 6 additional GICHD tools which were also included in a separate section under the auspices of your evaluation document.

We are pleased that the evaluation highlights the 'GICHD's commitment to developing innovative tools' and finds that a number of the tools evaluated are both fit-for-purpose and responsive to the needs of our partners in the mine action sector. We also welcome the observation that some of the recommendations from the evaluation, especially for tools that are several years old, have already been addressed by measures that the GICHD has since put in place, particularly the progressive introduction of Results-Based Management from 2014 across the organisation. This evaluation clearly states that 'some findings therefore point to issues that have already been addressed through recent Results Based Management (RBM)-related changes'.

We welcome the findings that identify specific benefits that the GICHD tools have afforded the mine action community. For instance, the reference to the ASM application being used to support stockpile destruction activities, where 'MINT supports operations in Tajikistan, Ukraine and the Falkland Islands' and where PriSMA' has helped promote greater transparency during the prioritisation processes in the pilot countries' – Sri Lanka, Tajikistan and Colombia.

At the same time, we understand that there is still progress to be made and welcome the recommendations of the evaluation in this regard. We acknowledge, for instance, that there have been appreciable differences in the tool development process between products and while there

may be good reason for such variance there is space to improve the standardisation of process, especially in the early stage of design as well as in outreach approaches and user feedback loops. To address these particular findings the GICHD is establishing a 'product development checklist' to ensure that relevant and appropriate measures are taken at respective stages, including conceptualisation, development, use and follow up for all new tools.

The GICHD value very much this evaluation and its recommendations. Considerable resources are placed on initiatives to develop tools for mine action and associated sectors by the GICHD and we will endeavour to utilise the finding from this report to better shape and strengthen our response to the needs of our partners.

Sincerely,



Stefano Toscano
Director

Response from the GICHD to the recommendations from the Evaluation of Tools and Publications

Recommendation	Response
<p>(1) Make needs assessments and market research mandatory.</p> <p>Put in place a system that requires Advisors/Project Managers to systematically conduct needs assessments and market research prior to the development of any new tools/products using either a tool development checklist, or through the SharePoint project workflow.</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The GICHD agrees that assessments and market research are critical to obtain appropriate perspectives and context for ensuring that tools and publications are relevant and address needs. Such GICHD products however do come in different sizes and forms, and the extent of effort placed on assessments and research will vary for different tools and publications.</p> <p>Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since 2015, the GICHD's internal control system for approving projects has been based on a process of electronic workflows requiring at least three levels of approval. The process starts with deliberation at the Divisional Coordination Meeting (DCM) that includes heads of each division, the Support Director and Head of Policy and External Relations, and is chaired by the Director of Operations. After this, Project Managers must submit a formal project brief on SharePoint. Heads of Divisions ensure technical quality of the project and any associated tools, the Director of Operations ensures that the value of the tool is considered in the wider perspective of the GICHD as a whole, and finally the RBM Advisor ensures that specific project-level outcomes are established, appropriate, and in line with GICHD strategic outcomes. Projects of strategic, political and institutional relevance will be subject to the approval at a Management Board Meeting (MBM) as well. Only once this process is completed can the implementation of the new project commence. • In response to the evaluation, the GICHD has further developed a 'product development checklist' to assist decision-making

	<p>processes for the development of in-house tools. This will be fully established ahead of the new strategy period starting 2019 but has already been trialed during the planning stages of a significant tool development initiative planned to support the OSCE in Ukraine starting in 2018. Projects of strategic, political and institutional relevance will be subject to the approval at a Management Board Meeting (MBM) as well.</p>
<p>(2) Tighten up the internal vetting process for new tools.</p> <p>As part of efforts already underway to tighten up the vetting process for new projects through the 3C process (Compliance, Coherence and Compatibility) whereby Advisors/Project Managers are required to demonstrate the extent to which new projects meet the criterion of Compliance, Coherence and Compatibility, Heads of Division should ensure the 3C process also applies to the vetting of proposed new tools.</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The 3C process was established as a requirement by the GICHD in 2017 as a way of ensuring the quality of GICHD activities. It composes three dimensions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Compliance: the project supports the GICHD's strategy 2. Coherence: the project is in alignment with other GICHD interventions 3. Change: the intervention is based on a clear theory of change that aims to ensure results <p>Where tools and publications are part of new, stand-alone projects, the vetting process through the above internal control system is now well established. Where a tool development initiative exists as just one component of a project (including already existing ones), the GICHD agrees that the 3C process must also be applied to vet proposed new tools.</p> <p>Measures:</p> <p>Project Managers will be required to demonstrate the extent to which new tools meet the criterion of Compliance, Coherence and Compatibility as part of the 'product development checklist' – irrespective of whether the tool is a stand-alone project or part of a larger ongoing one. For new projects that include one or more tools as components, Advisors/Project Managers will be required to attach a completed checklist including this information to their project brief form for vetting. In cases where tools are proposed at a later stage of</p>

	implementing a project (when the project brief has already been completed), checklists should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the DCM.
<p>(3) Ensure systematic consultation with colleagues.</p> <p>In recent years, GICHD has taken major strides forward in improving cross-division collaboration and coordination for example in the form of the inter-divisional thematic working groups. Continue in this regard, and require Advisors/Project Managers to regularly consult colleagues at different stages of the tool development process. Ensure there is clarity on objectives and on responsibilities of various team members. Communicate cross-divisionally, including consultations on tool specifications, rollout plans and outreach. Exchange lessons learnt.</p>	<p>Comment: The GICHD has indeed taken strides forward in recent years in improving collaboration and coordination within the organisation – as has been observed during the evaluation. Consultations regularly occur within divisions, between divisions at DCMs every two weeks and at a management board level through MBMs in alternating weeks. Formal consultation lunches held every other month between DCM and MBM members provide further opportunities for in-depth discussions on pre-defined topics, and several working groups have been established to ensure collaboration on particular themes such as conventional/explosive weapon destruction, unmanned aerial systems, geographic information systems & data analysis, improvised explosive devices, training, urban contexts, and gender and diversity.</p> <p>Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GICHD will continue promoting exchange and consultations • An internal workshop to review progress on further tool developments is envisaged mid-way through the new strategy in December 2020.
<p>(4) Prioritise and budget for external stakeholder consultation.</p> <p>Consultation with external stakeholders before, during and after tools are developed is critical and should be mandatory in order to ensure the development of relevant and practical tools.</p>	<p>Comment: The GICHD agrees about the importance of consulting with external stakeholders and that appropriate budgets should be allocated to support this.</p> <p>Measures: As part of the new ‘product development checklist’, project managers will be required to explain their plans (and demonstrate sufficient</p>

	budget) for external stakeholder consultations before, during and after the development of the tool. If this has not been planned for, project managers must justify the reason(s).
<p>(5) Develop clear tool/product work plans.</p> <p>As part of the vetting process, require Advisors/Project Managers to develop tool work plans to improve project management and oversight of the tool development process. Make sure tools are clearly defined as outputs within a wider theory of change of a project. Clarify how these outputs support achievement of longer-term outcomes and plan/budget for monitoring and evaluation.</p>	<p>Comment: As part of its RBM process, all GICHD projects must undergo an annual vetting process. This is implemented through the elaboration of project briefs that detail the workplan for the project and articulate how it links to a wider theory of change. These briefs must then be assessed and approved or denied by the respective Heads of Division and RBM Advisor. The GICHD agrees that more could be done to ensure that tools and publications receive <i>particular</i> oversight as part of this process.</p> <p>Measures: This measure is consistent with good project management and strengthened by the implementation of RBM at the GICHD. As part of the implementation of the new 'product development checklist,' tools and publications will now be mandated to complete a similar vetting process, with approval required from both Head of Division and Director of Operations. In this way, Advisors/Project Managers will be required to demonstrate their project management workplan and theories of change for new tools from an early stage.</p>
<p>(6) Prioritise the provision of sustained support to users.</p> <p>Match the investment in developing tools/products with a commensurate investment in staffing to ensure users receive sustained support and derive intended benefits. To build institutional memory, establish a standardised handover and documentation management process.</p>	<p>Comment: The GICHD is committed to ensuring the sustainability of its work and is therefore in agreement with this recommendation.</p> <p>Measures: The 'product development checklist' includes a section on sustainability. It requires Advisors/Project Managers to describe the describe follow-up/handover plans from the start and indicate how sustainable use of the tool will be promoted.</p>

<p>(7) Establish a system to track tool usage and obtain user feedback.</p> <p>Put in place systems to ensure that data is collected on tool usage and feedback from users, and that this data informs tool improvement and new tool development.</p>	<p>Comment: In principle the GICHD agrees with this recommendation, but the extent to which this should be implemented should depend on the nature of the particular tool. There is a trade-off that must be taken into account between the effort required to track usage and to encourage feedback from users against the resources required to do a thorough job in this regard.</p> <p>Measures: Significant tools may have user-groups established. Such bodies may be used for contributing to a review process. The 'product development checklist' requires Advisors/Project Managers to describe the plans envisioned to track tool usage and obtain user feedback, or else to justify why such measures are not planned (for instance, in the case of smaller interventions).</p>
<p>(8) Develop tool outreach plans at an early stage for each tool/product.</p> <p>Develop clear outreach plans at the tool initiation stage to identify intended users, how best to ensure their buy-in and how to promote their sustained use of the tool.</p>	<p>Comment: RBM approaches require Advisors/Project Managers to look ahead towards <i>outcomes</i> that include the adoption and implementation of the tools that are to be developed. The shift in focus from <i>outputs</i> to <i>outcomes</i> should ensure that responsible staff members are assessing the outreach plans for the tool. This should be outlined in the relevant Project Brief.</p> <p>Measures: Heads of divisions ensure that project briefs include outreach plans where necessary. To further assure this planning takes place for all tools and publications at an early stage, Advisors/Project Managers will be required to explain how they intend to identify users and ensure buy-in as part of the 'product development checklist'.</p>

<p>(9) Ensure Advisors/Project Managers track tool/product expenses.</p> <p>As part of the Centre's efforts to implement Results-Based Management, GICHD has made recent adjustments to its financial system which allows for output and outcome-based budgeting, and therefore enables the tracking of expenses for specific tools, products and publications. Heads of Division should therefore ensure that budgets for new tools/products are developed in a manner that facilitates monitoring and oversight.</p>	<p>Comment: This is a requirement for good project management, and the financial mechanisms put in place to track expenses for specific tools, products and publications have become a core aspect of project management at the GICHD.</p> <p>Measures: Project Managers will continue to use these already established financial tools.</p>
<p>(10) Commission external study on the use of Mine Detection Dogs (MDD).</p> <p>Commission an independent and rigorous evaluation on the use of MDD to settle conclusively the controversy surrounding the use of dogs in mine action.</p>	<p>Comment: The GICHD welcomes this recommendation and at the same time sees such an evaluation of MDD as addressing a broader issue in mine action beyond the scope of the frame of this evaluation.</p> <p>Measures: An evaluation of the use of MDD is to be considered in the context of wider priorities of the GICHD. There exists no immediate plans to undertake such a study given the significant investment that would be required to address all the global variables that affect the confident use of dogs in mine action, but this is something that could be considered in the future if resources and demand are sufficient.</p>
<p>(11) Commission an independent evaluation of GICHD's Information Management capacity development approach.</p> <p>To assess impact and inform the GICHD's future four-year strategy and the development of future IM/IMSMA-based tools, commission an external evaluation of GICHD's IM capacity development approach.</p>	<p>Comment: The GICHD does not believe that the timing is right for an independent evaluation of Information Management (IM) at the GICHD. In 2015, an IM Stakeholder Consultancy Group was established to advise on the development of IMSMA Core. This group has since been renamed the IM Expert Group. Given that IMSMA Core is currently in a roll-out phase of its deployment, more implementation time is needed before the next evaluation takes place.</p>

	<p>Measures:</p> <p>The GICHD are of the opinion that IMSMA Core should be deployed for two years before an evaluation occurs and plans to conduct the recommended evaluation in the latter half of 2020.</p>
--	--