

# Management Response

The Comité de Pilotage (CdP) has mandated the evaluation and has formally approved the evaluator's final report in its meeting of 27 June 2014. It presents here the Management Response by formulating an overall appreciation of the evaluation process and of the quality of the report (Part A) and by commenting the evaluators' summary recommendations (Part B).

The Directors of the Centres were invited to formulate their Management Response at the level of the detailed catalogue of recommendations respectively for each Centre. The CdP has taken note of the Management Responses of the Directors. They constitute a very valuable base for discussion and for the definition of the action plan for the implementation at the level of each Centre.

## Part A      Overall appreciation of the evaluation

### The Process

The Comité de Pilotage (CdP) decided that the evaluation shall be conducted by one evaluation team that carries out the assessment of all three Centres and that the evaluation team shall be selected through an open tender on simap.ch. This was another approach compared to the previous evaluations of the Centres that were carried out for each Centre separately in 2006 and in 2010. The integrated approach was expected to allow for a coherent assessment and for analyzing the potential for synergies between the Centres. The CdP was responsible for the strategic guidance of the evaluation. The CdP formulates the management response regarding the overall recommendations addressed directly to the CdP or in general manner "at strategic level". It also makes hereafter the overall appreciation of the evaluation.

The Steuergruppe (SG) ensured the steering and the quality of the evaluation process. The leader of the SG functioned as the point of contact for the Geneva Centres during the evaluation process. An external evaluation expert accompanied the process providing support to the SG and ensuring that the evaluation was carried out according to the OECD-DAC standards for evaluation.

The GCSP, the GICHD and the DCAF are the evaluated system. The directors of the Centres were involved in the formulation of the evaluation questions for the Tender Document. They also commented on several draft versions of the Evaluation Report and they hereafter

formulate the management response regarding the specific recommendations addressed to each Centre.

InnovaBridge Foundation won the open tender and was mandated to conduct the external independent evaluation. The team was composed by Dieter von Blarer (Team Leader), Sophia Procofieff and Anna Matveeva. The suggestions of the evaluation team regarding the methodology, the calendar and the interviews were intensively discussed with the SG and allowed to fine tune the evaluation methodology and procedure. The initial suggestion of the evaluation team on the attribution of tasks and mainly the question which team member carries out the assessment of each Centre was also discussed intensively in order to allow for the most appropriate mix of competence. This led to a re-allocation of the responsibilities of each team member for a Centre in order to ensure good quality based on thematic competence and also to ensure good acceptance and dynamic in the evaluation process.

The evaluation process was a challenging endeavor. The different stage in which the Centres are, the different mandates and the differences in the funding situation challenged the evaluators to produce a consistent assessment for each Centre and at the same time synthesize findings that are valid for all three Centres. This approach to evaluate in one mandate all three Centres resulted to be very intensive work in terms of coordination efforts within the evaluation team as well as between the evaluation team and the SG and with the directors of the Centres. Also in terms of the methodology the evaluation was a challenge, the team realized e.g. more than two hundred interviews. The feedback loops between SG and evaluation team on several drafts of the report that embraces more than hundred pages required also high engagement from both sides, from the evaluators as well as from the members of the SG.

The SG appreciates the evaluation process as overall very intensive and as fairly positive. The SG appreciates the frank and open dialogue and interaction with the team leader. The CdP values the presentations and the exchange with the evaluation at the briefing and at the debriefing sessions. The composition of the evaluation team with three experts was basically sufficient and the competence of two evaluators responded to the expectation. However some interviewed persons complained about the third team member that had some difficulties in terms of communication and therefore also of acceptance. The team leader counterbalanced this weakness and he strived for coherence and equal treatment of the three Centres as much as possible and in the elaboration of the evaluation report. There were also several conversations between the team leader and the leader of SG to re-adjust the evaluation concerning the GCSP to a proper direction.

## **The Report**

The evaluation report reflects the external independent view of the evaluators on the Centres work and on the Centers' governance. The report contains a mass of valuable information at the strategic as well as at the operational level.

The CdP appreciates the overall quality of the evaluation report. The CdP is aware that the task was delicate and that the expectations were high. The evaluators managed to satisfy in great part these high expectations in assessing each Centre specifically as well as

assessing the common issues of governance, gender and the opportunities of the move into the MdP (Maison de la Paix). The evaluation was carried out according to the evaluation standards required in the ToR. Despite the efforts of the team leader to strive for coherence and equal treatment, the CdP still identifies a certain imbalance in terms of tonality and findings, evoking a sense of bias against one center, namely the GCSP. This issue was brought up by the SG on several occasions, leading to some improvement. The CdP will take this into account in its assessment of the evaluation.

Based on the assessment of the relevance, the effectiveness, efficiency and governance as well as gender, the evaluators' recommendations address issues that need specific attention at the strategic and operational level as it was requested in the ToR. The CdP welcomes that the recommendations are categorized and clearly oriented to the addressees responsible for the implementation. The CdP agrees with most of the recommendations. However the CdP is of the opinion that the recommendations are too many, that some go too much in detail of micro-management issues, that some are overlapping between the different parts of the report, and that some are contradicting each other. The CdP would have liked to see a stronger crystallization and prioritization of the recommendations at strategic level. The issue of effectiveness was not clearly dealt within report respectively the question how to assess the effectiveness of the three centres. There was also some lack of understanding the specific role of the Centres for Switzerland.

The findings and recommendations allow for concrete improvements at operational and strategic level, sometimes they are quite superficial and not very much reflected. The Management Response to the recommendations is given hereafter by the CdP and by the Directors of the Geneva Centers and where explicitly addressed by the SDC. The CDP will comment the recommendations addressed to the Council of Foundation (CoF).

## Main focus of the recommendations

The CdP concludes from the evaluation that the following three main issues are to be addressed at strategic level by the centers themselves and supported by the Swiss steering mechanism:

- Strengthening and improving the governance structures of the Centers: move from management led to board led organizations
- Initiate a process towards a comprehensive result orientation which includes the strategy processes of the centers, the management of programs, human resources and finances.
- Further strengthening of the profile of each Centre *and* explore options for cooperation among the Centers and with others. Put into common value the MdP.

## Part B Management Response to the Summary Recommendations

*On strategic level the evaluation recommends to the CoFs and Directors*

Recommendations	Management Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To develop in cooperation with the CdP 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 and other partners within the MdP.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree / Not agree + Comment:</b> The CdP agrees with this recommendation.</p> <p><b>Measures :</b> The CdP suggests integrating a long term vision with options for cooperation explicitly into the strategy development process that the three Centres are actually undergoing.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To use the opportunity of the MdP to develop in cooperation with Switzerland in view of the upcoming new framework budget a comprehensive strategy for the development of services, trainings, activities related to post conflict rehabilitation, peace building, development and SSR/SSG including the IHEID and other Swiss and Geneva based international actors as potential partners (e.g. HSD, SDC, CSS, Swiss Peace).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree / Not agree + Comment:</b> The CdP basically welcomes the recommendation.</p> <p><b>Measures :</b> The CdP suggests exploring interest and opportunities and further developing the cooperation with Geneva based partners active in the same or in similar thematic, including issues of hard security( e.g. disarmament, cyber security) and to explore these opportunities by a mapping exercise of the potentials in 2015.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To develop in cooperation with the CDP a comprehensive modus of cooperation and interaction between the CoF (Bureau's), the CdP and the Directors (top management) of the three Centres.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree / Not agree + Comment:</b> The CdP agrees with this recommendation.</p> <p><b>Measures:</b> The CdP suggests the CoFs Bureau's and the Directors to address this issue.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree in cooperation with the CDP on a common fund of seed money for the development of joint activities and a common visibility within the MdP and from the outside.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree / Not agree + Comment:</b> The CdP does not agree: a common visibility and joint activities should be based on a common strategy and sharpened profiles of each of the Centers.</p>

**The evaluation recommends to the CoFs**

Recommendations	Management Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To develop or adapt according to the needs of the Foundations a ToR and professional requirements for the President, the Secretary, and the Treasurer of the Foundation and for the Directors of the Centres.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree / Not agree + Comment:</b> The CdP agrees with recommendation.</p>
	<p><b>Measures:</b> The CdP invites the Bureau of the CoF to prepare the ToR. In addition the CdP suggests to clarify the role and functioning of the Bureaux.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To clarify the different roles of the CoFs and their area of interaction.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree / Not agree + Comment:</b> CdP disagrees with the recommendation. The CoF are defined by law.</p>
	<p><b>Measures:</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To agree on a course of action on how to select the respective Centres' Directors and on rules related to the term in office of the Directors.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree / Not agree + Comment:</b> The CdP disagrees. The CdP defines the selection process.</p>
	<p><b>Measures:</b></p>

**The evaluation recommends to the FDFA and the DDPS**

Recommendations	Management Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To ensure the continuing representation of DDPS in the CDP.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree / Not agree + Comment:</b> CdP agrees.</p>
	<p><b>Measures:</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To clarify the CDP's role and area of interaction with the three Foundations and the Geneva Centres.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree / Not agree + Comment:</b> CdP agrees</p>
	<p><b>Measures:</b></p>
	<p>ToR will be elaborated for the phase 2016-19.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To ensure that the Swiss Government (FDFA) strategic level working group on the MdP becomes fully operational with a ToR and a defined list of members with clear roles and responsibilities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree / Not agree + Comment:</b> Disagrees. The working Group is a temporary set-up under the auspices of the Head FDFA to elaborate concrete proposal how to position the MdP with its partners. The ToR were proposed to the Head FDFA before establishing the working group.</p> <p><b>Measures:</b></p>
---	---

**The evaluation recommends to the FDFA (HSD/SDC)**

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Management Response</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To develop clear and as much as possible harmonized reporting expectations for the core contributions to the Centres.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree / Not agree + Comment:</b> The CdP agrees. (Result based reporting).</p> <p><b>Measures:</b> Measures with DCAF are ongoing. Process for GICHD and GCSP to be initiated.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To explore the possibility of having the Directors of the Centres contracted directly by the respective Foundations.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agree / Not agree + Comment:</b> CDP agrees.</p> <p><b>Measures:</b> Concrete proposition is in the pipeline and will be discussed with the CdP.</p>