
Evaluation of the 2012-2015 Mine Action Strategy of the Swiss Confederation

Submitted By:

Mine Action Resources

May 16, 2015

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	2
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	3
1 INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Evaluation Background	4
1.2 Objectives of the Evaluation	4
2 METHODOLOGY	5
2.1 Methodology.....	5
2.2 Assessment Model	6
2.3 Evaluation Workflow	6
2.4 Report Structure.....	6
3 THE MINE ACTION STRATEGY OF THE SWISS CONFEDERATION, 2012-2015	7
3.1 Institutional Framework	7
3.2 The Strategy Development Process	7
3.3 Mine Action Objectives of the Strategy	7
3.4 Operational Priorities	7
3.5 Implementation Modalities	8
3.6 Coordination	10
3.7 Monitoring and Reporting Mechanisms	10
4 KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	11
4.1 Strategy Wording and Structure	11
4.2 Management of the Strategy	12
4.3 Efficiency.....	13
4.4 Effectiveness	14
4.5 Relevance.....	16
4.6 Impact.....	16
4.7 Sustainability.....	17
4.8 Gender Considerations.....	17
5 SUMMARY TABLE OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18
Annex 1 - List of Interlocutors	19
Annex 2 – Terms of Reference, Swiss MA Strategy Evaluation - 2012-2015	20
Annex 3 – Evaluation Matrix	24
Annex 4 – Operational Mine Action Priorities of the Swiss Confederation	27

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Swiss Confederation, long a pioneer in the struggle to eradicate landmines has established itself as a committed and generous donor in the sector. As part of that commitment, and in order to add greater clarity to its efforts, it has taken care to develop clear, relevant and timely strategies for intervention. The 2016-2019 mine action strategy of the Swiss Confederation is the third such document (earlier strategies were developed for the periods 2004 to 2007 and 2008 to 2011) and puts forth a framework for political and operational activities with regard to anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions and other explosive remnants of war (ERW).

In order to build upon the current strategy and develop new ideas and recommendations for the next strategic period, 2016-2019, the Human Security Division (HSD) of the Swiss Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA) commissioned an evaluation of the strategy.

The strategy has been a relevant and effective tool for the Swiss Government to realise its mine action goals. The unique structure of Swiss intervention, with four divisions within two government departments responding to the demands of the strategy, has created both opportunity and flexibility, but also has created certain inefficiencies.

As the next strategic period unfolds minor changes in the strategy itself, accompanied by more the introduction of a more robust management structure that includes both a clearly articulated plan of action and a results based management framework, will enhance monitoring ability, reduce response times, harmonise coordination and help ensure the next strategy's success.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Mine Action Resources (MARS) would like to express its thanks to the many people who have so graciously shared their time and energy throughout the course of the evaluation and as such, have contributed immeasurably to making it possible. *Annex 1* contains a list of the many people with whom I worked over the course of the evaluation, however in preparing this report I would note the pivotal roles played by François Garraux - Deputy Head of Section, Multilateral Peace Policy, FDFA, Robert Diethelm – Deputy Director International Relations, DDPS, Robert Amsler - Head Mine Action Unit, DDPS and Agnes Marcaillou – Director UN Mine Action Service. All of whom added important information and helped bring greater clarity to the process.

Finally, I would like to stress that the findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned contained in this report represent are entirely my own. The Swiss Confederation, as well as any other key informants consulted during the course of the evaluation is not responsible in any way for the content of this report nor are they bound by its recommendations.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AoR	Area of Responsibility
APMBC	Anti-personnel Mine Ban Convention
AXO	Abandoned Explosive Ordnance
CCM	Convention on Cluster Munitions
CCW	Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons
DDPS	Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sport
DIL	Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Directorate of International Law
EOD	Explosive Ordnance Disposal
ERW	Explosive Remnants of War
FDFA	Federal Department of Foreign Affairs
FSD	Swiss Foundation for Mine Action
GMAP	Gender and Mine Action Programme
GICHD	Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining
HMA	Humanitarian Mine Action
HSD	Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Human Security Division
ICBL	International Campaign to Ban Landmines
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IMSMA	Information Management System for Mine Action
ISU	Implementation Support Unit
MAG	Mine's Advisory Group
MARS	Mine Action Resources
MRE	Mine Risk Education
MSP	Meeting of States Parties
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PfP	Partnership for Peace
PSSM	Physical Security and Stockpile Management
RBM	Results Based Management
SAF	Swiss Armed Forces
SDC	Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SALW	Small Arms Light Weapons
SWISSINT	Swiss Armed Forces International Command
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNMAS	United Nations Mine Action Service
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Evaluation Background

The 2012-2015 mine action strategy of the Swiss Confederation is the third such document, after earlier strategies for the periods 2004 to 2007 and 2008 to 2011. As such, it defines the framework for political and operational activities with regard to anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions and other explosive remnants of war (ERW).

The current strategy also defines the guiding principles, the vision, the strategic objectives, the activities, and main partnerships with other countries, international and non-governmental organisations. It further highlights the distribution of tasks, coordination mechanisms, resources, and the monitoring, evaluation and reporting requirements with regard to Switzerland's activities in mine action. The strategy also recognises the need to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation of mine action policies and projects, and as such it emphasizes policies and operational activities within the framework of the strategy.

In December 2014 Mine Action Resources was commissioned by the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA) to implement the evaluation exercise.

1.2 Objectives of the Evaluation

Through the examination of the current mine action strategy's strengths, weaknesses, achievements, added value and remaining challenges/unfulfilled tasks, the evaluation has specifically endeavoured to assess:¹

1. How efficient has the strategy been in translating its inputs into relevant outputs?
 - a. Have the measures been taken in an appropriate way?
 - b. Have the goals been obtained with a reasonable effort?
2. How effective has the realisation of the strategy been (outcomes with regard to goals)?
 - a. Do the outcomes contribute to the overall goals as intended?
3. How relevant have the measures undertaken been within the context of the strategy's overall goals? Specifically, vis-à-vis?
 - a. Swiss MA policies
 - b. National MA policies
4. What is the presumed impact of the strategy and its implementation?
 - a. What impact does the current strategy have with regard to multilateral mine action efforts?
 - b. What changes can be observed (due to the strategy)?
 - c. Do the changes correspond to the intended impact?
 - d. Have there been any unintended results /changes?
5. What is the sustainability of the various interventions initiated as a result of the strategy?
6. Have relevant gender aspects been respected during the implementation of the strategy?

Thus, the overall purpose of this review is to generate concrete recommendations that can form part of the Swiss Government's Mine Action Strategy planning and development cycle for 2016 to 2019. In particular, develop recommendations with a view to including a Results Based Management (RBM) approach and highlight potential threats and opportunities.²

¹ Though clearly relevant to an assessment of overall impact, the evaluation did not examine activities at the project level for either the federal departments, or their operational partners.

² See *Annex 2* for the evaluation Terms of Reference.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Methodology

The evaluation is underpinned throughout by both the key OECD DAC Evaluation Criteria³ as well as the SEVAL Standards⁴ and has employed a simple mixed-methods approach. The process has emphasised qualitative rather than quantitative methods and has included four key elements.

I. Desk Review

An initial desk review was undertaken that focussed on the most relevant background material and normative references to ensure that the Evaluator was fully up-to-date with the strategic mine action objectives of the Swiss Government. Further, the review included elements of context/stakeholder analysis in order to build a clear picture of the mine action partners and their activities – past, current and planned.

The aim was to identify the key organisations, their policies, strategies, activities and interventions (international, national and sub-national) that have impacted mine action at key stages over the review period. Also, to gain a more in-depth understanding of the policy context, sector activity and any changes that may have occurred. Data sources reviewed included, but were not limited to:

- The Swiss Mine Action Strategy - 2008-2011,
- Annual reports submitted to the FDFA and/or DDPS from its main implementing partners,
- Any previous FDFA and/or DDPS evaluations (2012-2014) of its main implementing partners,
- Annual reports issued by key Swiss stakeholders (FDFA and/or DDPS, SDC, HSD, DII),
- Specific activity/project reports,
- PfP Training Reports.

II. Key Informant Interviews

Key informant interviews make up the bulk of the data collected for the evaluation in order to both investigate the coordination and implementation modalities of the Swiss Government and also the extent to which the activities and programming of Switzerland's various mine action partners have:

- Strengthened implementation and universalisation of the relevant legal instruments,
- Contributed to the alleviation of suffering and improved the livelihoods of affected populations,
- Promoted the integration of mine action into other relevant policy fields and sectors,
- Contributed to the development of new instruments, policies and activities in mine action and related areas.

At the federal level, key interlocutors in this process have included the Human Security Division (HSD), the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and the Directorate of International Law (DIL) at the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA) as well as the Swiss Armed Forces/EOD-Center. At the partner or implementation level, the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), Anti-personnel Mine Ban Convention Implementation Support Unit (APMBC ISU), the Swiss Foundation for Mine Action (FSD), the HALO Trust, Geneva Call, the Gender and Mine Action Programme (GMAP), the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) and the United Nations Development Project (UNDP).

³ Adapted as follows:

- **Relevance** - The extent to which the objectives of an intervention fit the requirements of the beneficiaries.
- **Efficiency** - A measure of how resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.
- **Effectiveness** - The extent to which the intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved.
- **Impact** - Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.
- **Sustainability** - The continuation of benefits from an intervention after major assistance has been completed.

⁴ Evaluation Standards of the Swiss Evaluation Society (SEVAL Standards).

III. Analysis and Reporting

As previously indicated, data collected for the evaluation has been reviewed and analysed in order to determine the strategy's overall progress vis-a-vis the OECD DAC evaluation criteria, but also to demonstrate:

- Possible differences in understanding and implementation among the four divisions of the two federal departments,
- The significance of those differences, if any,
- Progress towards gender issues, and
- Possible unintentional impacts linked to the implementation of the partner programmes.

IV. Feedback, Review and Finalisation

This final step in the evaluation process involved stakeholder feedback and comment. The draft evaluation report has been shared with all relevant stakeholders for quality assurance and following the designated time period, the Evaluator has collated the feedback received and made amendments to the draft report as required.

2.2 Assessment Model

Evaluation Matrix

The primary evaluation tool has been the evaluation matrix, based on the key issues identified in the terms of reference. The preliminary, working version is included in *Annex 3*. As such, it has aided in developing the individual evaluation questions and the overall consistency and structure of the report.

The evaluation matrix summarises:

- The key evaluation questions and criteria to be employed when assessing each question,
- The type of data or indicators required to assess each question,
- The likely sources of this data, and
- The appropriate data collection methods.

2.3 Evaluation Workflow

The evaluation was initiated on January 5th, 2015 and ran through March 13, 2015. The evidential core consisted of a preliminary document review which, enhanced by key informant interview in Bern and Geneva, January 20-25, 2015 and again in Geneva, February 16-19, 2015. This phase of the evaluation was followed by analysis, consolidation and report drafting which culminated in the submission of the first draft report on March 13th, 2015.

2.4 Report Structure

The report is structured as follows:

The Executive Summary outlines the main findings and highlights key recommendations. Section 1 introduces the evaluation while Section 2 describes the methodology and evaluation workflow. Section 3 provides a contextual analysis of the strategy and its activities, while Section 4 discusses key findings vis-à-vis the OECD-DAC criteria. Section 5 puts forth key recommendations while Section 6 presents a summary table of relevant findings and recommendations. The report is followed by four annexes.

3 THE MINE ACTION STRATEGY OF THE SWISS CONFEDERATION, 2012-2015

3.1 Institutional Framework

Applying what is termed a “whole of government” and 3C⁵ approach, the strategy serves as a guideline for the entire Swiss Government regarding landmines and ERW and creates the back-drop for a multi-faceted programme that falls across four separate Swiss Federal bodies: The Swiss Armed Forces (SAF) of the Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sport and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), the Human Security Division (HSD) and the Department of International Law (DiL), all of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs.⁶

The role these different departments play in fulfilling the strategy’s objectives is not mandated by the strategy itself, but has been agreed through inter-departmental dialogue and discussion. No one department or individual directs the other in regards to the strategy. Therefore, practically speaking, each department places both thematic and geographical emphasis where it best aligns with its own activities.

3.2 The Strategy Development Process

Following the same participatory principles expressed in “whole of government” and 3C approaches, the development of the strategy as a written document included representation from various federal departments and key partners. This open and participatory process has grounded the strategy in current best practice and has contributed considerably to both its coherence with other strategies in the sector, but also with the various policies and operational perspectives of the participating federal departments.

3.3 Mine Action Objectives of the Strategy

The 2012-2015 Strategy puts forward four broad objectives. Switzerland will:

1. Contribute actively to the strengthening, the implementation and the universal application of all international legal instruments in this domain ratified by Switzerland.
2. Aim to alleviate the suffering and to improve the living conditions of populations affected by anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions and other explosive remnants of war.
3. Enhance the integration of mine action into other relevant policy fields and operational activities, and develop instruments for the measurability of change.
4. Contribute proactively to new instruments, policies and activities in mine action and related areas.

3.4 Operational Priorities

Held within these four overriding objectives are a series of operational mine action activities that are given particular importance. Through specific support to the GICHD, the Swiss Armed Forces and through various bi-lateral relationships the strategy endeavours to⁷:

- Strengthen the Anti-personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) and other relevant instruments of IHL through promotion of their universalisation and direct support to the APMBC and Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM) Implementation Support Units (ISU’s),
- Provide expertise to support land release, EOD, PSSM and other operational risk-reduction activities,
- Support the GICHD’s ongoing work programme, with particular emphasis on information management (IMSMA),
- Support the development of the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS), and
- Support national mine action capacity development, with a focus on residual risk management,

⁵ Coherent, coordinated and complementary.

⁶ For a complete list see *Annex 4 - Operational Mine Action Priorities of the Swiss Confederation*

- Promote gender inclusion through adherence to the UN Gender Guidelines for Mine Action, UN Security Council Resolution 1325 and support to the Gender and Mine Action Programme (GMAP),
- Promote Geneva as a center for disarmament issues,
- Promote synergies between mine/ERW action and SALW, PSSM, and other like sectors,
- Optimise existing legal instruments and promote the development of new ones.

3.5 Implementation Modalities

The annual Swiss contribution to mine action falls between 16 and 18 million CHF. The number fluctuates slightly from year to year based on other budgetary concerns and the outcome of the annual appeals/approvals conducted within the Swiss Legislature. However, this fluctuation has been minor over the strategic period and the number has remained consistent. This total sum is initially apportioned among four distinct entities and earmarked approximately as follows:⁸

- 50% to the GICHD,
- 30% to the SDC,
- 10% to the FDFA Human Security Division,
- 10% to the Swiss Armed Forces.

Mine action activity and its spending manifest themselves quite differently among the GICHD and the different government divisions.

The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD)

Founded in 1998 by the Swiss Government, the GICHD is the preeminent institution of its type in the mine action sector and is the Swiss Government's key strategic and operational partner. The Centre is guided by a clearly articulated strategy⁹ which shares many objectives of the Swiss Strategy. This is no accident as the two entities have a commonality of purpose, work closely together and play a role in one another's coordination and steering mechanisms.

As a preferred mine action partner, the GICHD is the only institution to receive annual, core funding in this fashion from the Swiss Government.¹⁰ This core funding covers both the GICHD's operational costs as well as specific projects and is fundamental to the Centre's operational ethos and abilities.¹¹ Included as part of this annual allotment, are funds designed specifically to allow the GICHD to develop programmes that:

- Provide technical, operational consultancy and strategic support to mine affected states, the United Nations, NGOs and other relevant organisations,
- Continue to develop, improve and universalise the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA),
- Continue to steward the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS),
- Support relevant instruments of IHL.

Within these broad work streams the Centre implements numerous projects that are varied in scope theme and geography, though clearly fall in line with the overall objectives of both of the Centre and the Swiss Federation.

Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Federal Department of Foreign Affairs

The SDC is a large part of the Swiss Department of Foreign Affairs and focusses its efforts on the strategic goals of preventing and overcoming conflict and disaster, creating universal access to resources, promoting sustainable economic growth, supporting transition to democratic economic

⁸ This division of resources has been derived through experience and consensus decision, but is not policy as such.

⁹ See <http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/GICHD/about-us/GICHD-strategy-2015-2018.pdf> for the latest iteration of the GICHD Strategy, 2015-2018.

¹⁰ Geneva Call also receives 500'000 CHF core funding per year - but Geneva Call is not necessarily a prime partner in mine action, but more in humanitarian policy in general.

¹¹ The Swiss Parliament has pledged 36.2 million CHF to support the GICHD for the 2012-2015 strategic period.

systems and helping develop responsible environmental stewardship and social responsibility.¹² As such, the SDC does not carry a specific mine action mandate or priority. With an approximate annual budget of CHF 1 Billion, the relatively small amount of mine action specific funds available to it do not greatly influence programming decisions. That does not imply the SDC has failed to embrace the mine action strategy, quite the opposite is true. When the presence of landmines or ERW is seen to impede or interfere with the ability for a country/community to address key development issues, the SDC has taken on the issue and funded a variety of mine action projects in different countries. However, it should be noted that mine action is but a small part of a large portfolio.

Organisationally, the mine action portfolio rests with an individual focal point that is housed in the SE Asia desk but counts mine action among other responsibilities and thus only serves as facilitator to the process. The logic and evolution of this structure is not entirely clear, however it reflects the quite decentralised fashion by which the SDC operates. Project decision making is very much in the hands of individual country offices and it is those offices that serve as the primary focal point for country level mine action organisations wishing to engage the Swiss on landmine/ERW issues.

In one sense this local level cooperation is positive in that it allows country specific assessment, analysis and coordination that helps ensure the relevance and appropriateness of funded projects. On the other, it can create a certain disjointed approach to the projects funded and countries emphasised as the SDC country offices may analyse the mine/ERW impact on development differently and wish to support mitigation efforts in different ways. This may also be true of the decision to house mine action in the SE Asia geographical desk as the vast majority of SDC supported mine action activities have been in SE Asia. The extent to which this differing emphasis adheres to SDC policy/country requirements and the countries most in need of mine action support is not clearly defined.

Human Security Division (HSD), Federal Department of Foreign Affairs

Of the government divisions primarily concerned with mine action, the HSD functions in a way most reminiscent of a “typical” bi-lateral donor in that project requests are forwarded to a focal point in Bern, weighed, vetted and if approved, funded. Globally, it manages over 25 individual projects, both operational and institutional at any one time.

As part of the political directorate of the FDFA, the HSD leads the Swiss mine action process on the policy front. Operationally, the HSD focusses more on humanitarian/emergency mine action contexts and works with a variety of operational partners such as the UN, MAG and Geneva Call. Over the strategic period the geographical focus has predominantly been split between the Former Yugoslavia, the Horn of Africa and the Middle East, though the HSD is flexible and able to respond wherever the need may arise. On the policy or institutional level, where the bulk of HSD’s projects lie they manage the annual core contribution to the GICHD (including the APMBC and CCM ISUs), as well as support to the ICBL, GMAP and the APMBC ISU.

The Directorate of International Law (DiL), Federal Department of Foreign Affairs

The DiL, as part of the FDFA, is the federal government's centre of competence for questions relating to international law and deals with the legal aspects of Switzerland's international relations. As such, mine action is only one of numerous elements in its portfolio. The DiL works less with operational partners *per se* than it serves in an advisory capacity to other Swiss bodies in order to advance the goals of the Geneva Conventions.

¹² Within these broad goals SDC has identified nine core operational focus areas: Health, Agriculture and Food Security, Water, Climate Change, Migration, Conflict Transformation and Resilience to Crisis, Basic Education and Vocational Training, Private Sector and Financial services State Reform, Local Government and Civic Participation.

Within mine action specifically, its role focusses on promoting universalisation of the relevant legal instruments (*i.e.* CCW, APMBC, and CCM), assuring compliance – something done in both bi-lateral and multi-lateral fora and have also supported the work of Geneva Call and ICRC.

The Swiss Armed Forces (SAF)

The niche that the Swiss Armed Forces have carved out to support the strategy is quite unique due to overarching forces that govern the use of Swiss Military personnel in international operations and the mandate of the military itself. Its activities are therefore more clearly delineated than those of the other federal divisions.

Mine action funding is used, via the Swiss EOD Centre, to second two different types of expert to UN Mine Action Programmes: EOD-Experts from the Swiss EOD Center of Excellence and experts in the fields of finance, logistics, administration and information management. The former are Swiss Army personnel, while the latter are militia-personnel. Operating under the greater umbrella of the Swiss Armed Forces International Command (SWISSINT) and as part of their overall peace support operations, the SAF second these individuals only at the request of the United Nations (or potentially the OSCE) and are permitted to only work under the UN operational umbrella. Practically speaking this means that a given seconded individual will form part of an UN Mine Action Service (UNMAS) supported mine action centre.¹³ For example, the UN supported operations in DRC, Lao PDR and Kosovo.¹⁴ These deployments are often highly specialised and technical in nature and the SAF pride themselves on their ability to provide highly qualified staff.

A potential dilemma, though minor, can arise through this arrangement in that the mandate of the Swiss strategy is squarely centred on long-term development and capacity building while the UNMAS operational mandate is more often focussed on emergency or humanitarian mine action. Though not in contradiction, as the two approaches or phases of mine action are inexorably linked, it should be noted that SAF seconded personnel may be pursuing mine action goals that are not specifically covered by the current Swiss Strategy. They may also find themselves deployed to countries/contexts that are also not wholly within Switzerland's mine action strategic priorities.

3.6 Coordination

The strategy is coordinated formally through an inter-departmental steering group that meets a few times per year, and informally through open dialogue and personal contacts among departments. The number of concerned parties is relatively small, the level of cooperation is positive and by all accounts this somewhat loose arrangement works well. It is worth noting that this process is not exceptional and similar processes are applied, for example in regards to Small Arms Light Weapons (SALW).

Another important coordination mechanism involves the governing body of the GICHD, the Council of Foundation (COF). The COF sets the general direction and orientation of the Centre, supervises its activities and decides how to allocate its resources. The Swiss Government has two representatives on the council. Though the COF is not formally involved in the development or direction of the Swiss MA Strategy, the GICHD Director is invited to the interdepartmental steering-group. This allows for a timely and high level exchange of information.

3.7 Monitoring and Reporting Mechanisms

As mentioned, implementation of the strategy falls across four distinct and independent government divisions, each with its own internal monitoring and reporting mechanisms. As a result, the strategy in effect, has no one true owner or "home" in a traditional sense. There is no one central body or

¹³ Though the SAF can also support UNDP the majority of their projects have been in cooperation with UNMAS, which in-turn often implements through the UN Office of Project Services (UNOPS).

¹⁴ The SAF also supports a seconded expert at UNMAS HQ in New York.

individual to which reports are sent or who has an overarching responsibility to monitor the strategy as a whole.

The four federal divisions independently manage the partners, interlocutors and projects that fall within their focus area, and internally apply their own reporting standards to the projects and partners they support. There does not appear to be a collective reporting process nor a standardised format for either the frequency or type of reporting required.¹⁵

It is worth noting that careful selection of well accredited and trusted operational partners has gone a long way towards alleviating the need to micro-manage activities and under the current structure little need for more stringent oversight mechanisms, of either partners or individual projects has arisen.

4 KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Strategy Wording and Structure

The 2012-2015 Mine Action Strategy of the Swiss Confederation has been a positive, well written document that has provided great clarity and guidance to the various invested stakeholders, both within the government and those outside who wish to engage with it. It is inclusive and addresses the key mine action issues and challenges of its day without being overly prescriptive, or too broad. It allows the participating departments as well as the government as a whole to implement mine action initiatives that are procedurally consistent with their mandate, policy and procedures, but is not a binding document and serves solely as a guideline for the operations of the different federal departments.

As the Swiss Government enters its new strategic period for landmine and ERW action, there is little need to make radical changes to the strategy as a whole. Though, like any document, it can only capture a snapshot in time and after a certain period, as conditions and attitudes change, becomes less relevant.

The focus on mine action support, though varied by country, is increasingly shifting towards residual risk management, often as part of larger PSSM or even SALW programmes. Not that traditional mine action activities have ceased by any means, simply that more and more countries have achieved a level of progress that brings them into a new type of challenge. The next iteration of the strategy should be updated to reflect this evolution in the sector.

Recommendations

Certain wording and areas of emphasis should be adapted to meet new and emerging trends:

- 1) Update the **Key Objectives** section to (slightly) shift emphasis from humanitarian response/development towards the development of capacities to manage residual risk.
- 2) Adapt wording in both the **Vision and Guiding Principles** sections to reflect the following:
 - The Swiss have been and will remain committed to the fight to eradicate landmines,
 - That considerable progress has made in mine action and it is fair at this point to assess the collective sum of this progress. This leading to the position that,
 - Though work remains, the Swiss anticipate more and more states to become self-sufficient before too long.
- 3) In the **Main Partnerships** section it may be beneficial to remove reference to specific partners and operators. The choice of operational partners (with the exception of the GICHD) will always be somewhat fluid and project dependent. Therefore, it may be best to avoid the potential to create undue expectation or allegiances.
- 4) In the same **Main Partnerships** section include a precise description of the GICHD, emphasising its role as a centre of excellence and stressing its independence/neutrality.

¹⁵ The exception being the annual report on the strategy's implementation issued jointly by the FDFA and DDPS.

4.2 Management of the Strategy

Plan of Action

Though the strategy creates a clear vision for how the Swiss Confederation would like to address the mine/ERW problem, quite significantly it is not accompanied by a plan of action or other similar document that helps to harmonise projects across divisions and ensure the full spectrum of strategic objectives are being addressed. A natural extension of this omission has been the decision not to include a results based framework in the current strategy. Though noted in the evaluation ToRs as being by design, it is clear that applying one under the current structure may not have been practical.

As previously described, this is partly due to the disparate way mine action is coordinated and implemented across divisions. However, the lack of such a supporting operational document is a major factor in attempts to fully realise the strategic objectives.

Recommendations

- 1) *A key recommendation that bears relevance to all aspects of the evaluation is the need to develop, concurrently with the next strategy, an intra-departmental plan of action.*

The plan should respect the independence, mandate, available resources and geographic presence of each department, but at the same time ensure the strategic objectives of the new strategy are being fully and evenly addressed. It should be an overarching document that determines which department/division or partner is best suited to address a particular objective, activity and/or location and how that activity balances with the process as a whole. Further, it should clearly delineate roles and responsibilities to ensure the right entity is responsible for the right projects and locations that together, will address all of the strategy's objectives evenly and with the right degree of emphasis. Importantly the plan of action should also serve as the baseline for a more results based management perspective and process.

Results Based Management

By design, the current strategy has not adopted a results based management (RBM) approach. A RBM process, at the very least, places great emphasis on accurate planning and timely monitoring. It is a proactive and participatory process that requires commitment, resources, and must be actively driven. Currently, the unique structure of the Swiss Government and the independent roles played by the HSD, SDC, SAF and DiL create certain challenges to applying a RBM approach.

The strategy as a process is cross-implemented and cross-managed via the four government divisions, and as mentioned, has no single owner *per se*. This management characteristic will likely need to change if the next version is to adopt a more results based focus.

Of the entities operationally involved in mine action the SDC, has the largest budget, widest operational scope and most relevant mandate. Further, it is the most familiar with results oriented policy planning and management systems and as a participating institution seems to be under-utilised. Internally, the SDC has delegated mine action to the Southeast Asia geographical desk and though actively supported, does not drive it with any priority. This is by no means extraordinary as mine action is not a core goal, however it has potentially allowed mine action's profile to be down played within the SDC as a whole.¹⁶

¹⁶ It may well have also led to an exaggerated emphasis being placed on SE Asia projects as well.

Recommendations

Recognising that major structural changes within any of the four divisions to accommodate mine action is not currently viable, assure that the next iteration of the strategy clearly delineates roles and responsibilities, as follows:

- 1) The SDC, as the primary operational body, continues to take on the majority of operational tasks.*
- 2) The HSD remains the focal point for mine action policy and continues its operational role via its geographical desks.*
- 3) The SAF maintain its UN cooperation/secondment role, but is mindful of the juxtaposition between the Swiss and UN operational mandates and geographical focus.*
- 4) The DiL maintain its support and oversight of applicable conventions.*
- 5) Using the mine action strategy plan of action and the already established RBM framework used by SDC in other sectors as a starting point, develop an RBM framework for the next strategy.*

The newest GICHD Strategy is a prime example of how results based management can and should be incorporated into an institutional strategy.¹⁷

4.3 Efficiency

- Have the measures been taken in an appropriate way?
- Have the goals been obtained with a reasonable effort

Assessing efficiency is a slightly complicated question in some respects given the unique way the four separate federal divisions have been apportioned both funds and responsibilities.

Taken on a division level, each respective entity has its own policies and procedures, is independently focussed, mandated and operationally managed and no one department or section has authority over the other. Thus, each division is essentially free to follow its own operational path.

As a result, and regardless of ongoing coordination efforts, there is a risk that activities across divisions lack harmony, are weighted towards one theme over another and thus do not optimise opportunities for more efficient implementation. For example, the SDC has clearly focussed on SE Asia geographically and themes that coincide with its more development oriented mandate. The HSD provides considerable policy support globally (including the core funding given to the GICHD) as well as for certain country based humanitarian projects and the SAF are, in essence, bound to operate within the framework of UN operations, and thus sometimes may be asked to respond in countries that do not fall strictly within the overall Swiss perspective or priority.

This somewhat fractured approach has led the SDC, HSD and the SAF to engage in upwards of 50 individual projects spread across 21 or more countries at any one time (not to mention those pursued by the GICHD or other partners), and though valuable projects in their own right, they are not in any visible way “linked” to one another by either theme, operational period and duration or by country.¹⁸

¹⁷ See <http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/GICHD/about-us/GICHD-strategy-2015-2018.pdf>

¹⁸ Based on the Humanitarian Demining Project List, 31.07.2014

Recommendations

- 1) *Any real inefficiency observed by the evaluation stemmed from the inter-divisional structure of the process and not structural issues within the divisions themselves. Therefore, the single most important step to increase efficiency is the introduction of a mutually agreed, intra-departmental/divisional plan of action.*

As previously noted, such a plan of action would alleviate a good deal of the disparity regarding project and country selection among the FDFA and the SAF and serve as a reference point for increased monitoring via the intra-departmental steering group.

4.4 Effectiveness

- How effective has the realisation of the strategy been (outcomes with regard to goals)
- Do the outcomes contribute to the overall goals as intended?

As was the case when examining overall efficiency, the lack of harmony among the countries and themes supported by the different actors has led to a somewhat lopsided emphasis when attempting to address the four key strategic objectives.

Strategic Objective 1

Efforts to strengthen and universalise legal instruments have been a key area of activity and could well be considered an area in which the Swiss excel. Support to the APMBC¹⁹ and CCM ISUs²⁰, the MSP/standing committees/sponsorship programme as well as other multi-lateral efforts are vital and have been fundamental to those initiatives overall effectiveness.

The strategy does aim to support UN Resolution 1325 and the UNMAS Gender Guidelines and does so primarily through support of the Gender and Mine Action Programme. Their work is divided between Geneva based advocacy and operational field training. Assessing the effectiveness of this approach is more of a challenge as many of the outcomes are based on attitudes and beliefs and take considerably more time before they can be translated into action. With that in mind it would be fair say that the GMAP has been effective in changing the dialogue regarding gender and has made it a more prominent and important issue in the sector.

Recommendations

- 1) *Continue a similar pattern of support for existing legal instruments and processes, including the APMBC and CCM ISUs.*
- 2) *Maintain or potentially increase support for the emerging CCM ISU in order for it to establish itself soundly.*
- 3) *Continue a similar pattern of support for the promotion of gender issues in mine action.*

Strategic Objective 2

Like-wise, efforts to improve the livelihood of populations affected by landmines and ERW are an area where the strategy has been effective. The core support given to the GICHD, represents 50% of the annual Swiss mine action budget and supports a wide range of initiatives. The annual arrangement is relatively broad and places great trust in the GICHD to fulfil its objectives according to plan. To its advantage, the GICHD strategy shares many of the same objectives and goals as the Swiss strategy and can thus proceed without concern. Further, the GICHD leads the development and management of the International Mine Action Standards, the Information System for Mine Action (IMSMA) and is a recognised leader on the themes of land release, survey and the development of national capacities.

¹⁹ Though no fault of the Swiss, the APMBC ISU has suffered an unforeseen budget shortfall in 2014.

²⁰ Swiss efforts were in fact fundamental to seating the CCM ISU in Geneva.

The work of the SAF is also an important contributing factor as it has provided essential expertise to UN managed programmes in crucial environments. Bi-laterally funded projects with the ICRC/NGOs/field partners and through the work of the SAF, has provided assistance to mine and ERW victims, surveyed, cleared and released land, improved the management of mine action projects and ultimately, given tangible benefit to the livelihoods of populations affected by landmines and ERW.

Recommendations

- 1) *Continue support for the GICHD at current levels (support to the GICHD is not guided through the strategy as such, but through the Swiss Parliamentary directive on support for the Geneva Centres - GICHD, DCAF, and GCSP. This directive also specifies, through individual annual agreements, the services to be provided and funds to be allocated).*
- 2) *Encourage and support the GICHD's new strategy and results based focus.*
- 3) *Maintain the operational support given to the UN (UNMAS) via the SAF secondments with an emphasis on programmes that share, to the greatest extent possibility, the same specific objectives as the new strategy.*
- 4) *Endeavour to ensure SAF deployments are to countries that fall within the priorities of any new plan of action that may be developed.*
- 5) *Continue to support NGOs partners with an operational emphasis on land release, IMAS, IMSMA, gender and victim assistance issues.*

Strategic Objective 3

With regards to the third objective, enhancing integration of mine action into other policy fields/ activities and developing instruments that measure change, the strategy has shown somewhat mixed results. On the positive side, Switzerland is an active and committed donor that regularly engages with international partners, the UN and others and a number of its work streams do fall across different sectors. For example,

- The SDC supports projects as part of its wider development mandate,
- The SAF functions as part of Switzerland's general peace support operations, and
- The Partnership for Peace (PfP) trainings form part of a wider security policy effort.

Overall however, there does not appear to be a fundamental integration of Swiss supported mine action into similar sectors.

Recommendations

- 1) *The plan of action should specify project areas that represent the highest potential for integration into broader development and disarmament sectors.*
- 2) *Endeavour to ensure SAF deploy, where other Swiss humanitarian aid and development cooperation presence can be utilised or synergised.*

Strategic Objective 4

The 4th strategy objective stresses the need to contribute to new instruments and activities promoting mine action and related fields. Through support to the GICHD and its ongoing research into methodologies and procedures as well as its stewardship of IMAS, the strategy does realise some success. That being said the objective as a whole is somewhat unclear in its intention and may not be as relevant in the next strategic period.

Recommendations

- 1) *Consider the elimination of Objective 4 as a stand-alone objective and incorporate its activities into Objective 1.*

4.5 Relevance

- Have the appropriate measures been taken within the context of the strategy's overall goals?

The 2012-2015 strategy has been highly relevant to the mine action needs of affected states. As we enter 2015 however, emphasis is shifting from mine action for development (though still relevant in many contexts), towards assisting states create systems designed to tackle residual rather than omnipresent threats. This evolution has often come about as a result of mine action's desire to integrate into wider-contexts such as PSSM and SSR. The strategy recognises this and has promoted the importance of creating synergies and linkages between these different sectors.

Where a slight contradiction does exist however, is between the role played by the SAF secondees as they form part of an UNMAS operation and the more development centred approach of the Swiss strategy, with emphasises universalisation of the treaty, capacity building and promotion of relevant legal instruments. Though complimentary and certainly part of the mine action process as a whole, they do represent two very different approaches to addressing the needs of the mine affected states: That of the UNMAS emergency or humanitarian mandate and that of the Swiss focus on universalisation of legal instruments and development cooperation.

Recommendations

- 1) *Re-examine the four key strategic objectives of the current strategy to more prominently reflect the growing need to place mine/ERW action in the wider SSR and PSSM context.*
- 2) *Clarify the specific role of the SAF secondees' vis-à-vis the UNMAS operational mandate of humanitarian intervention and the Swiss strategy's focus on development.*

4.6 Impact

- What impact does the current strategy have with regard to multilateral mine action efforts?
- What changes can be observed (due to the strategy)?
- Do the changes correspond to the intended impact?
- Have any unintended or unexpected impacts been produced and if so, how have these affected the overall impact.

The overall impact of the strategy is somewhat difficult to measure due to the kind of reporting data and information available (*i.e.* non-RBM Framework and a baseline from which to measure) however, the evidence available does indicate that the strategy and the programmes that make up its implementation have resulted in a number of positive tangible impacts. For example,

- It has been fundamental in the effort to bring the CCM ISU to Geneva and begin the process of establishing itself.
- Through support to the GICHD, both new IMAS have been created (including the important standard on land release) and their reach has been widened as a result of the ongoing training and language development programmes.
- The same can be said of the IMSMA system which while constantly undergoing review and improvement, has grown to become arguably the most advanced and widespread information management tool in the humanitarian sector.
- Through the PFP Training partnership numerous individuals, both civilian and military have received the most up to date mine action training available.

On the more operational front, Swiss support has been spread quite widely over a relatively large number of projects and countries, each with relatively modest levels of funding.²¹ A higher degree of impact could possibly have been realised if higher levels of funding were channelled through fewer partners and countries.

²¹ Exceptions exist including UNDP Cambodia and ICRC Myanmar.

Though overwhelming positive, one potentially negative unintentional impact does bear mentioning. As is discussed below, it is the potential for a dependent relationship to evolve between the Swiss Government and its chief partners.

Recommendation

- 1) *Consider establishing, as part of the plan of action, a shorter list of focus countries.*
- 2) *Promote diversification of funding sources among partners.*
- 3) *Be aware of creating funding dependencies.*

4.7 Sustainability

- What is the sustainability of the different interventions and processes initiated as a result of the strategy?

In one sense the overall sustainability is quite high in that the Swiss Government has long shown a commitment to mine action and has expressed its intention to continue doing so. However, at the same time both the generosity and unique structure of the Swiss mine action programme, with the GICHD as its core partner and other Geneva-based operational partners, has perhaps unwittingly created a precarious level of dependence on Swiss funding:

- The GICHD is a competent and respected operator and its presence in the mine action sector is well-established. That being said, the core funding the GICHD receives each year from the Swiss Government represents approximately 50% of the its annual budget. Though the Centre does have a more diverse donor portfolio than some, this is still a potentially precarious situation for key programmes such as IMSMA and possibly the GICHD as an institution. This is equally true of the APMBC ISU, which similarly receives a high percentage of its support through this process
- The same could be said for GMAP and to a lesser extent Geneva Call, which may owe their ability to operate (financially speaking) in part to Swiss funding and if that funding were for any reason to reduce significantly or cease, these agencies may have difficulty continuing operations.
- The other partners in the Swiss framework, such as the ICRC, MAG, HALO, etc., are generally simple recipients of bilateral funding and are not dependent beyond the project level.

Recommendations

- 1) *This Swiss commitment to mine action has been strong and consistent and should not change in the foreseeable future.*
- 2) *Be aware of potential risks for creating funding dependencies in the formulation of the next strategy/action plan.*

4.8 Gender Considerations

As touched on in the section on effectiveness, the promotion of gender aspects has been clearly flagged as a priority in the strategy and has been operationalised through support to the Gender and Mine Action Programme as well as UN Resolution 1325. The amount of traction those initiatives have gained and their likelihood of sustainability is dependent to a large extent on mine action in general adopting the same position.

Recommendation

- 1) *Continue support for initiatives and programmes that respect the UNMAS Gender Guidelines, UN Resolution 1325 and other mechanisms designed to respond to the unique needs and capacities of women and children in mine affected environments.*

5 SUMMARY TABLE OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

	Current Assessment	Recommended Action
Strategy Wording and Structure	Well written document, participatory development process.	Repeat process with minor wording changes to reflect new developments in the sector.
	Lacking formal management oversight tools.	Develop a detailed plan of action and application of a results based framework.
Efficiency	Intra-departmental efficiency generally high.	No change.
	Inter-departmental efficiency could be improved.	Development of a detailed plan of action More formally assign oversight of the mine action portfolio/strategy to one of the four divisions.
	Inter-departmental efficiency could be improved.	Development of a detailed plan of action More formally assign oversight of the mine action portfolio/strategy to one of the four divisions.
	Rational for SDC's decision to place MA portfolio in the SE Asia geographical desk unclear.	Reorient MA within SDC.
Effectiveness	Objective 1 – Support to universalisation of legal instruments has been effective.	Continue the same level of support.
	Objective 2 – Efforts to alleviate suffering caused by mines and ERW have also been effective.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to support the GICHD including its efforts to develop a more RBM framework. ▪ Continue support to the UN via the SAF. ▪ Continue to support victim assistance programmes and projects through the SDC.
	Objective 3 – Efforts to enhance integration have been moderately successful.	As part of the plan of action, emphasise countries and projects where the most synergy and cross-sectoral cooperation can be realised.
	Objective 4 - Efforts to develop new instruments have fully materialised.	Consider removal of the Strategic objective as a stand-alone goal.
Relevance	Relevant, over the time period to the needs of mine affected states	Update language and focus to reflect emerging trends.
	SAF secondments to programmes with different mandates.	Clarify the specific role of the SAF secondees' vis-à-vis the UN/UNMAS mandate in country.
Impact	Impact difficult to measure due to non-RBM Framework.	Development of RBM Framework
	Evidence suggests positive impact in a number of areas: IMAS, APMBC and CCM ISU's, PfP training etc.	No change.
	Work of the Swiss spread widely.	Plan of action should determine a shorter list of focus countries.
Sustainability	Sustainability of commitment.	No change.
	Some partners heavily dependent on Swiss funding – could create vulnerability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Be aware of potential risks in the formulation of the next strategy/action plan. ▪ Possibility to promote diversification.
Gender	Support to gender issues has been low-key, but consistent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue support through relevant programmes and channels.

Annex 1 - List of Interlocutors

Bern, 26/01

1. François Garraux, M.Sc., Deputy Head of Section, Multilateral Peace Policy, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs Directorate of Political Affairs DP, Human Security Division
2. Peter Marti, Deputy Head, Defence and Arms Procurement Policy - Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sport

Bern, 27/01

3. Robert Amsler, M.A. UZH, Head Mine Action Unit, Swiss Armed Forces, Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sport DDPS
4. Franz Bar, Head HMA & PSSM, Swiss Armed Forces, Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sport DDPS
5. Ole Feurer, Humanitarian Mine Action, Swiss Armed Forces, Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sport DDPS
6. Michael Siegrist, Legal Officer, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs – Directorate of International Law

Bern, 28/01

7. Barbara Affolter Gomez, Programme Officer, Conflict and Human Rights, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation

Geneva, 29/01

8. Guy Rhodes, Director of Operations, GICHD
9. Pascal Rapillard, Head, External Relations and Policy, GICHD
10. Faiz Paktian, Assistant Director, Standards and Linguistic Outreach, GICHD
11. Kerry Brinkert, Director, APMBC ISU
12. Ambassador Stefano Toscano, Director, GICHD

Geneva, 30/01

13. Hansjorg Eberle, Director, Swiss Demining Federation (FSD)
14. Benedikt Truniger, Deputy Director, Swiss Demining Federation (FSD)
15. Bruno Donat, Chief, Geneva Office, UNMAS
16. Gustavo Laurie, Political Affairs Officer, UNMAS
17. Julia Knittel, Associate Political Affairs Officer, UNMAS

Geneva, 16/02

18. Robert Diethelm, PhD, Col, Deputy Director International Relations, DDPS, Swiss Armed Forces
19. Andrew Moore Caucasus and Balkans Desk Officer, HALO Trust
20. Calvin Ruysen Southern Africa Desk Officer, HALO Trust

Geneva, 17/02

21. Agnes Marcaillou, Director, UN Mine Action Service, Department of Peace Keeping Operations
22. Kurt Eric Chesko, Donor Relations Officer, UN Mine Action Service, Department of Peace Keeping Operations
23. Tim Lardner, Chief Technical Advisor UXO-Lao, UNDP Lao PDR

Geneva, 18/02

24. Arianna Calza Bini, Director, Gender and Mine Action Programme
25. Katherine Kramer, Programme Director for Asia and Coordinator for Landmines and other Explosive Devices, Geneva Call
26. Maud Bonnet, Head of Communications and External Relations, Geneva Call

Annex 2 – Terms of Reference, Swiss MA Strategy Evaluation - 2012-2015

I. Background and context of the Evaluation

1. The mine action strategy of the Swiss Confederation for the period 2012 – 2015 ('the current strategy') defines the framework for political and operational activities with regard to anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions and other explosive remnants of war (ERW). The current strategy represents the third strategy of the Swiss Confederation in this domain, after earlier strategies for the periods 2004 to 2007, and 2008 to 2011, based on the parliamentary legislatures.

2. The current strategy defines the guiding principles, the vision, the strategic objectives, the activities, main partnerships with other countries, international and non-governmental organisations, the distribution of tasks and coordination mechanisms, the resources, and the monitoring, evaluation and reporting with regard to Switzerland's activities in mine action.

3. The current strategy recognises the need to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation of mine action policies and projects. It emphasizes that the policies and operational activities within the framework of this strategy will be concretised, monitored and evaluated on a regular basis and the relevant working instruments will be developed. However, the current strategy does intentionally *not* follow a Result-based Management approach (RBM approach).

4. The current strategy further defines that an **external evaluation of it, led by the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA), should be concluded in order to include the relevant recommendations in the development of the next revised strategy.**

5. As 2015 marks the last year of the current strategy, the process of the evaluation should hereby be initiated. The planned evaluation represents the first evaluation of the Swiss Confederation's mine action strategies.

II. Basis, aim and purpose

6. The evaluation of the current strategy represents the initial phase of the review of the current strategy and the drafting of a succeeding Mine Action Strategy of the Swiss Confederation for the period 2016 to 2019. This process should come to a conclusion by autumn 2015.

7. The key purpose of the planned evaluation is to generate recommendations that serve as the fundament for the review of the current strategy and in particular the drafting of the succeeding strategy.

8. Taking the intentional omission of a RBM approach for the current strategy into account, it is desired that in a **first part**, the results of the evaluation give a precise overview

- On strengths and weaknesses of the current strategy;
- On achievements and added values of implementing the current strategy; and
- On remaining challenges and unfulfilled tasks in implementing the current strategy.

9. It is desired that in a **second part**, the results of the evaluation present potential threats as well as opportunities for the succeeding strategy.

10. It is desired that in a **third part**, the evaluation results show concrete recommendations with a view to the review process of the current strategy and the drafting of the succeeding one. It is particularly desired that the recommendations are drafted with a view to *include* a RBM approach in the *next* strategy.

III. Questions for the Evaluation/Criteria and Indicators

11. The evaluation should particularly answer the following **questions**:

- a. Efficiency (output with regard to measures):
 - i. Are the measures taken in an appropriate way?
 - ii. Are the goals attained based on a reasonable effort?
- b. Effectivity (outcome with regard to the goals of the current strategy): Do the outcomes contribute to the overall goals as intended?
- c. Relevance: Are the appropriate measures undertaken within the context of the overall goals?
- d. Impact:
 - i. Which impact has the current strategy with regard to multilateral mine action efforts?
 - ii. What changes can be observed (due to the strategy)?
 - iii. Do the changes correspond to the *intended* impact?
 - iv. Are there any unintended results / changes?
- e. Sustainability: How sustainable are the processes initiated through the strategy?
- f. Gender: Are relevant gender aspects respected during the implementation of the strategy?

12. The evaluation should make use; inter alia, of the following **criteria and indicators**:

- a. Strengthening, implementation and universal application of all international legal instruments in this domain:
 - i. political leadership in the implementation of the conventions, including a proactive involvement in universalisation and implementation efforts as well as assuming effective official functions and responsibilities
 - ii. Universal application of the conventions between governments at bilateral and multilateral level as well as by supporting international and non-governmental organisations
 - iii. Contributions and political support for activities aimed at facilitating the adherence of non-state armed groups to humanitarian principles and the norms of international humanitarian law
 - iv. Contributions to the GICHD and to the Implementation Support Units (ISU), including, if possible, respective Sponsorship Programmes and other activities
 - v. inclusion of gender aspects in mine action, including by applying the UNMAS Gender Guidelines for Mine Action and UN Security Council Resolution 1325, inter alia by contributing to the activities of the Gender and Mine Action Programme (GMAP)
 - vi. Promotion of Geneva as an important centre of competence for disarmament issues and specifically for mine action
- b. Alleviation of the suffering and improvement of the living conditions of populations affected:
 - i. contributions to the release of land through survey and clearance; the latter includes activities to identify contaminated land, to implement appropriate land release methodologies, to strengthen national capacities as well as to evaluate and to contribute to efficient and cost-effective programme implementation
 - ii. contributions in the form of expertise, equipment, material, finances and political support to programmes and projects aimed at stockpile destruction and other relevant aspects of Physical Security and Stockpile Management (PSSM),
 - iii. support for appropriate initiatives and efforts aimed at integrating victim assistance as a component in national policies and plans; implementation of specific victim assistance projects (medical aid, rehabilitation and socio-economic inclusion) as well as enhancing victims and disabled persons' accessibility to humanitarian and development co-operation programmes
 - iv. contributions to the GICHD and field programmes with the aim of – inter alia – enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of land release through survey and clearance processes, including the strengthening of national ownership and national capacities
 - v. support to the GICHD for the development of International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) and their translation into national standards and into the field of Information Management in mine action, including the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA)

- c. Integration of mine action into other relevant policy fields and operational activities:
 - i. support to the development of national and local capacities to manage the remaining challenges and risks associated with mines, cluster munitions and ERW and the related risks, and their integration into other development activities in affected countries.
 - ii. Promotion of community development projects and strategies that integrate the management of risks and problems associated with mines, cluster munitions and other ERW
 - iii. Efforts to ensure that development projects are accessible to survivors and disabled persons impacted by mines, cluster munitions and other ERW
 - iv. possible synergies for mine action activities with development co-operation, humanitarian aid and peacebuilding (e.g. protection of civilians, resolution 1325, armed violence and development, Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW), Physical Security and Stockpile Management (PSSM), etc.)
 - v. enhancement of capacities to measure results and the impact of mine action activities e.g. by including mine action activities in the monitoring and evaluation of programmes
- d. Contribution to new instruments, policies and activities in mine action and in related areas:
 - i. participation in efforts to optimise the existing instruments.
 - ii. Contributions to the formulation of new standards and policies, where necessary.

13. The above order of questions, criteria and indicators does not represent any priorities or emphasis on specific aspects; all of the above is to be treated in an equal way.

IV. Requirements to the expert

14. All of the following competences and skills are required for the evaluation:
- a. the Expert should hold an independent position, and in particular not be an employee of the Swiss Federal Administration, the United Nations or the GICHD, and was not at any time employed by these institutions within the past 12 months
 - b. the expert should have experience and competence in evaluating governmental strategies in the domain of peace and security (i.e. peace promotion, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, human rights, humanitarian policy, sustainable development, etc.)
 - c. the expert should have experience and competence with regard to organisational development, management, etc.
 - d. the expert should have an advanced knowledge of mine action (in its broad sense, as covered by the current strategy),
 - e. the expert should be sensitive to gender issues.

V. Procedure, organisation, and timeframe

15. With regard to the procedure, the evaluation should include the in-depth study of documentation, including the strategy, annual reports, project documents of the FDFA (financial requests), operational notes by the DDPS, documents of the inter-ministerial coordination group (KAM policy), etc.

16. With regard to the procedure, the evaluation should further include interviews with the relevant stakeholders of the FDFA (particularly HSD, DIL, DDC, Mission Geneva) and the DDPS, as well as with external partners such as the GICHD, or the ISU APMBC and (if possible) ISU CCM/interim ISU. Interviews with operational partners (UNMAS, MAG) are welcome, yet not required.

17. The evaluation will be overseen by a steering board consisting of the members of the inter-ministerial coordination group (KAM policy). Throughout the whole evaluation and strategy review process, the steering board will meet regularly on working level in order to analyse the current status and to decide on the further steps. The independence of the evaluating expert is guaranteed at all times of the evaluation process.

18. The following timetable is suggested:

Until 1 November 2014	Finalisation of the ToR for the Evaluation
November 2014	Selection of the evaluation expert Financial requests and contract
8 December 2014 to 20 February 2015	Evaluation according to TOR / mandate
27 February 2015	Submission of preliminary draft report (for consultation)
20 February 2015 to 13 March 2015	Writing of Evaluation Report, Submission of the report to the steering board
1 April 2015	Management response by the steering board

VI. Reporting

19. A report should be submitted at the end of the evaluation (due date: see timetable); intermediate reporting is welcome, but not necessary, given the relatively short periods of time available.

20. No particular length of the report is required; however, the expert's report should be comprehensive, yet concise, focusing particularly on tangible recommendations. The report can be written in English or a Swiss official language (to be agreed in advance).

21. The report will be unclassified and falls under the principle of freedom of information (as the costs of and the management response to the evaluation do).

VII. Other information

22. The relevant documentation will be accessible without restrictions for the evaluating expert, except for cases of classified information according to the Ordinance of 4 July 2007 on the Protection of Federal Information (SR 510.411).

23. The point of contact for the evaluation on the side of the Swiss Federal Administration will be the focal point for Humanitarian Mine Action of the Human Security Division: Mr. François Garraux (francois-philippe.garraux[at]jeda.admin.ch).

Annex 3 – Evaluation Matrix

Issue/Question	Criteria	Possible Indicators	Sources of Data (Preliminary)	Data Collection Methods
How has the Strategy development process been managed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Efficiency ▪ Coherence ▪ Effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of stakeholder participation ▪ Evidence of stakeholder acceptance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relevant reports and views of vested partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review ▪ Key informant interviews
Subsequently, how well has the implementation of the Strategy been managed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Efficiency ▪ Coherence ▪ Effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concrete examples of stakeholder participation ▪ Evidence of stakeholder acceptance ▪ Roll-out time frames 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Views of the FDFA, DDPS, SDC, etc., programming documents and relevant reports. ▪ Views of the key mine action partners: GICHD, ISU, UN, NGOs, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review ▪ Key informant interviews
Does the strategy provide a coherent evidence based framework for Switzerland's mine action work?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coherence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concrete examples of contributions to the mine/UXO action process ▪ Existence of cross-sectoral policy/legislation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Survey and planning documents, project plans and other relevant reports. ▪ Views of relevant stakeholders. ▪ Comparison of overall mine action strategy with those of other mine/UXO action programmes. ▪ Strategy and programming documents, project plans and relevant reports. ▪ National development plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review of project documents ▪ Key informant interviews
Has the Strategy contributed to improved livelihoods?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relevance ▪ Effectiveness ▪ Impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence of recent casualty data showing a reduction ▪ Existence of increased reporting of incidents/objects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Views of the FDFA, DDPS, SDC, etc., programming documents and relevant reports. ▪ Views of the key mine action partners: GICHD, ISU, UN, NGOs, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review ▪ Key informant interviews
Does the Strategy link well with other programmes and agencies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effectiveness ▪ Coherence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of engagement with other mine/UXO, relief & development planning processes and agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Views of the FDFA, DDPS, SDC, etc., programming documents and relevant reports. ▪ Views of the key mine action partners: GICHD, ISU, UN, NGOs, etc. ▪ Views of other government departments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review ▪ Key informant interviews

To what extent have the objectives of the Strategy been delivered in the various mine action programme results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relevance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Specific achievements vis-à-vis objectives for MA pillars ▪ Capacity development milestones vis-à-vis objectives ▪ Concrete examples of contributions to development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IMSMA & other mine action data bases ▪ Article 7 Reports (where relevant) ▪ Project management reports ▪ Evaluations ▪ Landmine Monitor Reports ▪ National Mine Action Plans ▪ Sector development plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review of secondary data ▪ Project documents, QA reports, etc. ▪ Key informant interviews
What are the effects (impact) on women and girls in mine affected countries and on issues of gender?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effectiveness ▪ Coherence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concrete examples of contributions to the mine/UXO action process ▪ Specific achievements vis-à-vis objectives for MA pillars ▪ Programme compliance with UN Guidelines on gender 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Views of the key mine action partners: GICHD, ISU, UN, NGOs, etc. ▪ Relevant operator reports ▪ Evaluations ▪ Other stakeholders, particularly groups representing the needs of women and children 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review of secondary data ▪ Project documents, QA reports, etc. ▪ Key informant interviews
How do the different approaches to linking mine action and development by the implementers compare?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of engagement with other mine/UXO, relief & development planning processes and agencies ▪ Existence of cross-sectoral policy/legislation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Mine Action Authority and other Government planning documents and relevant reports. ▪ Views of relevant stakeholders such as National Mine Action Authorities, the UN, NGOs and other government ministries. ▪ Comparison between programme strategies and activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review of secondary data ▪ Project documents, QA reports, etc. ▪ Key informant interviews
Do the programmes deliver what they say they will?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effectiveness ▪ Efficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Specific achievements vis-à-vis objectives for MA pillars ▪ Capacity development milestones vis-à-vis objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IMSMA & other mine action data bases ▪ Article 7 Reports (where relevant) ▪ Project management reports ▪ Evaluations ▪ Landmine Monitor Reports ▪ National Mine Action Plan ▪ Sector development plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review of secondary data ▪ Project documents, QA reports, etc. ▪ Key informant interviews
What is the value for money embedded in the delivery mechanisms for the various delivery partners?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Efficiency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Benchmarking against other MA programmes/projects ▪ Evidence of operator efficiency ▪ Evidence of cost-reduction/cost saving philosophy ▪ Evidence of operator QM approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual reports from operators, national authorities, etc. ▪ Monitoring & evaluation reports ▪ Case studies ▪ Programme audits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review of secondary data ▪ Project documents, QA reports, etc. ▪ Key informant interviews

<p>What, if any, are the areas where the Strategy can be strengthened?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New developments and trends, changing programme priorities, new funding modalities, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IMSMA & other mine action data bases ▪ Article 7 Reports (where relevant) ▪ Project management reports ▪ Evaluations ▪ Landmine Monitor Reports ▪ National Mine Action Plans ▪ Sector development plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review ▪ Key informant interviews
--	--	--	---	---

Annex 4 – Operational Mine Action Priorities of the Swiss Confederation

1. Switzerland will contribute actively to the strengthening, the implementation and universal application of all international legal instruments in this domain ratified by Switzerland, by

- Providing political leadership in the implementation of the conventions, including a proactive involvement in universalisation and implementation efforts as well as assuming effective official functions and responsibilities.
- Promoting the universal application of the conventions between governments at bilateral and multilateral level as well as by supporting international and non-governmental organisations.
- Providing contributions and political support for activities aimed at facilitating the adherence of non-state armed groups to humanitarian principles and the norms of IHL.
- Contributing to the GICHD and to the Implementation Support Units (ISU), including, if possible, respective Sponsorship Programmes and other activities.
- Supporting further inclusion of gender aspects in mine action, including by applying the UNMAS Gender Guidelines for Mine Action and UN Security Council Resolution 1325, inter alia by contributing to the activities of the Gender and Mine Action Programme (GMAP).
- Promoting Geneva as an important centre of competence for disarmament issues and specifically for mine action.

2. Switzerland will aim to alleviate the suffering and to improve the living conditions of populations affected by anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions and other explosive remnants of war, by.

- Providing contributions in the form of expertise, equipment, material, finances and political support to programmes and projects aimed at stockpile destruction and other relevant aspects of Physical Security and Stockpile Management (PSSM), as well as for the release of land through survey and clearance; the latter includes activities to identify contaminated land, to implement appropriate land release methodologies, to strengthen national capacities as well as to evaluate and to contribute to efficient and cost-effective programme implementation.
- Providing support for mine risk education programmes in coordination with other mine action activities for populations at risk.
- Providing support for appropriate initiatives and efforts aimed at integrating victim assistance as a component in national policies and plans; implementing specific victim assistance projects (medical aid, rehabilitation and socio-economic inclusion) as well as enhancing victims and disabled persons' accessibility to humanitarian and development co-operation programmes.
- Providing contributions to the GICHD and field programmes with the aim of – inter alia – enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of land release through survey and clearance processes, including the strengthening of national ownership and national capacities.
- Providing support to the GICHD for the development of International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) and their translation into national standards and into the field of Information Management in mine action, including the Information Management System for Mine Action.

3. Switzerland will enhance the integration of mine action into other relevant policy fields and operational activities; and develop instruments for the measurability of change, by.

- Promoting community development projects and strategies that integrate the management of risks and problems associated with mines, cluster munitions and other ERW.
- Ensuring that development projects are accessible to survivors and disabled persons impacted by mines, cluster munitions and other ERW.
- Actively seeking possible synergies for mine action activities with development co-operation, humanitarian aid and peacebuilding (e.g. protection of civilians, resolution 1325, armed violence and development, Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW), Physical Security and Stockpile Management (PSSM), etc.).
- Enhancing the capacities to measure results and the impact of mine action activities e.g. by including mine action activities in the monitoring and evaluation of programmes.

4. Switzerland will contribute proactively to new instruments, policies and activities in mine action and in related areas, by.

- Participating in efforts to optimise the existing instruments.
- Contributing to the formulation of new standards and policies, where necessary.