

“External Evaluation of the Geneva Centres, GCSP, GICHD and DCAF”

(2010-2013)

Evaluation Abstract

DONOR	HSD – Human Security Division, Political Directorate , FDFA SDC – Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, FDFA
REPORT TITLE	External Evaluation of the Geneva Centres, GCSP, GICHD and DCAF (2010-2013)
SECTOR	Security Policy, Security Sector, Demining, Peace Building, Training
LANGUAGE	English
DATE	September 2014
AUTHORS	Sophia Procofieff, Anna Matveeva, Dieter von Blarer (Team Leader), INNOVABRIDGE Foundation, Caslano / Switzerland (www.innovabridge.org/) "http://www.innovabridge.org/" HYPERLINK " http://www.innovabridge.org/ " HYPERLINK "http://www.innovabridge.org/" n HYPERLINK "http://www.innovabridge.org/" HYPERLINK " http://www.innovabridge.org/ " HYPERLINK "http://www.innovabridge.org/" ovabridge.org)

Subject Description

This is an independent external evaluation of the Swiss Contribution to the three Geneva Centres GCSP, GICHD and DCAF commissioned by the "Comité de Pilotage FDFA/DDPS" (CdP). The message to the Swiss parliament regarding the funding of the Geneva Centres and the Framework Agreements between the Swiss Confederation and the three Centres has foreseen an external independent evaluation on the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the work done by the three Centres. The mandate was assigned through an open tendering process on simap.ch. The evaluation targeted on reporting for accountability and on learning for strategic and operational improvement.

Evaluation Objectives and Methodology

The Swiss Confederation provides the GCSP, the GICHD, and the DCAF with important funding. The objectives of the evaluation were twofold: (i) To account for the use of the funding and the results achieved. The evaluation was asked to pay special attention on the results based management, results measurement and results monitoring at each Centre. The evaluation shall produce information for the report to Swiss parliament on the implementation of the current framework credit line 2012-2015 and

contribute to the next message to the parliament (2016-2019). (ii) The evaluation shall further contribute to institutional learning of the Centres in terms of strategic and operational improvements.

The evaluation was conducted by one evaluation team that carried out the assessment of all three Centres. This was an innovative approach compared to the previous evaluations that were carried out by different teams for each Centre (2006, 2010). The evaluation had to assess in the general part the aspects of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency that are common for all three Centres. Furthermore the evaluation had to assess issues specific to each Centre and answer the specific questions. The overall focus of the evaluation was on the strategic orientation, the quality of its implementation in terms of achievements and of the governance structures of the Centres. The evaluation assessed the quality of the services offered by the Centres and analysed the institutional mechanisms and management procedures in place. Specific interventions and individual projects were not in the focus of the evaluation. The methodology included study of relevant documents, interviews with different resource persons (internal and external) to the Centres. Field visits, which supplied material for the case studies, were paid to South Eastern Europe, Tunisia and Central Asia.

Major Findings

The evaluators found that although the three Geneva Centres came from the same root, having been established as foundations by the Swiss government and core-funded by it, they have by now developed into different institutional personalities. The DCAF became operational in the field and acquired a global remit, working in international development to affect change in regions of conflict and instability. The GCSP is more distinctly a service provider for training and dialogue facility, firstly in the Transatlantic, and presently – in the global framework. The GICHD's institutional identity lies in consultancy, in being a locus of documentation and expertise for international mine action. What the Centres have in common is that they have influence in their respective spheres, have developed *know how*, which they are renowned for, and possess the asset of Swiss neutrality. The DCAF is considered a think- and do-tank in its distinct field of security sector reform and security governance.

The **GCSP** is mostly a training centre for diplomats and the military. It provides a positioning for Switzerland in the international security landscape and presents it as a responsible global partner. It is a strategic investment, because it can provide access to power and influence in foreign and security policy establishments, though this potential is so far insufficiently utilised.

The **GICHD** is seen as a credible provider of technical expertise and research to the mine action community. Its niche is unique as it is neither an operational, nor an academic body. The GICHD serves as a supply of *know-how* and independent analysis, as well as information management, capacity building and monitoring tools. It sometimes appears to outsiders as a collection of independent experts with projects, rather than a research institution.

The **DCAF** has an excellent reputation as an organisation with solid expertise. DCAF has entered a stage when Swiss core funding remains with about 60% of its financial needs still critical, but is no longer the unique source of future financial growth, because the Centre is sufficiently embedded in the

international donor environment and positioned for further growth. Unlike the GCSP and the GICHD, which have institutional strategies and objectives, there is no equivalent at the DCAF and no internal structured process for rolling it out.

On the Governance aspects the evaluators found that the Governance of the Centres with the Councils of the Foundations (CoF) on one side and the Comité de Pilotage (CdP) on the other reflects a certain ambiguity. The division of responsibility and influence between the CoF and the CdP as the steering body is in the view of the evaluators not always clear. If the Centres expand their funding base as expected, the governance arrangements might become questionable in the future and will need attention.

The move of all three Centres to the **Maison de la Paix** is seen as a chance to put into value synergies benefits and stronger interaction between the Centres. The main finding at the strategic level for all three Centres is the need to develop in cooperation with the FDFA and the IHEID a five to ten year vision with institutional and strategic options for a comprehensive cooperation of the three Centres and the IHEID within the MdP.

Main Recommendations

The evaluation presents a long list of recommendations at the strategic level as well as at the operational level. They can be summarized as follow:

- Strengthen and improve the governance structures of the Centres (internal to the Centres and with the Councils of the Foundations).
- Further develop (DCAF) and initiate (GCSP and GICHD) a process toward a comprehensive result orientation which includes the strategy processes of the Centres, the management of programs, of human resources and of the finances.
- Further strengthen the profile of each Centre and explore options for cooperation among the Centres and with others.
- Put into common value the Maison de la Paix.

The “Comité de Pilotage” has commented the summary recommendations in the Management Response.