



Management Response

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

Introduction / The process

1. In December 2014, the steering board consisting of the members of the inter-ministerial coordination group (KAM policy) on mine action mandated the evaluation of the Mine Action Strategy of the Swiss Confederation 2012-2015 (hereafter “the current strategy”), in particular with a view to generate recommendations relevant for the development of the next revised strategy for the period 2016-2019. After careful analysis of the applications received, the mandate was given to Mr. Eric Filippino, Director of Mine Action Resources.
2. The steering board welcomes the submission of the evaluation report and would like to express its appreciation and thank for the work done by Mr. Eric Filippino, who conducted the evaluation as mandated. The steering board appreciates the evaluation process as very positive and appreciates the frank and open dialogue and interaction with the evaluator.

Overall appreciation of the evaluation report

3. The steering board confirms its view that the evaluation report on the current strategy addresses all of the issues and questions as agreed in the Terms of References dated 17 November 2014.
4. It is noted with appreciation that the evaluation report assesses the current strategy as a “*relevant and effective tool for the Swiss Government to realise its mine action goals*” and that no fundamental changes are recommended. This confirms the perception among the Swiss governmental stakeholders involved that the strategy is a useful and necessary fundament for both the political and the operational work in mine action. It thus also confirms the view that the development of a subsequent strategy is imperative.
5. It is particularly appreciated that the evaluation report contains clear recommendations that will be relevant for the drafting of the revised mine action strategy. As such, the evaluation report contains a number of findings and recommendations that can be seen as being of fundamental nature. The following analysis represents initial thoughts by the steering board, however without anticipating the decisions to be made within the drafting process of the new strategy.
6. The report, however, does not provide an assessment of the nature of the engagement of the different federal stakeholders. SDC for example, except for multilateral cooperation and contributions to organizations, is a decentralized donor agency, where the Mine Action (MA) activities have to be developed out of the context, within the country strategies and existing sector approaches (such as land issues, conflict causes, livelihood etc.). MA as such is no priority theme and there is no separate budget line for MA accordingly..According to the matrix structure of SDC, the thematic responsibility for the

topic Conflict & Human Rights, including MA for the whole SDC, is located physically within the South Asia division.

7. The recommendations contain important food for thought and pertinent indicators on possible amendments and improvements for the next strategy, even though some of the recommendations will have to be duly checked against the realities of governmental management, structural hierarchies, wider policy contexts and international developments in mine action.
8. The drafting of the next strategy will also include consultations among the relevant partners that supported the key informant interviews in order to ensure certain continuity with regard to external perceptions and reality-checks.

Main focus of the recommendations

9. With regard to the **strategy wording and structure** and its **relevance**, the steering board shares the views of the evaluator on the changing nature of mine action. The new strategy will indeed take into account that traditional mine action – the commitment against anti-personnel mines, cluster munitions and explosive remnants of war – has not become irrelevant at all, but that new realities in neighbouring domains such as physical security and stockpile management of conventional ammunition, or small arms and light weapons, as well as contemporary approaches to the wider context of peace and security have to be taken into account. This particularly with the view to enhance the outcome of potential activities of the Swiss Government in these domains in the near future.
10. With regard to the **management of the strategy** and its **efficiency**, the steering board carefully analysed the recommendations and notes that the evaluation identifies certain inefficiencies based on the unique structure with two federal departments including three different offices, namely the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (incl. the Human Security Division HSD and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC) and the Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sport (incl. the administration of the Swiss Armed Forces SAF). While recommendations referring to a clearly articulated action plan will further be analysed with interest, the steering board sees little possibility at this stage to fundamentally change the management framework and to assign the strategy to the SDC. This conclusion bases on the different roles particularly with regard to the HSD as policy focal point and part of the FDFA's Directorate of Political Affairs, and the predominantly operational focus and the strategic approach to MA at SDC. However, the steering board shares the view that a clearer separation of the tasks between HSD, SDC and SAF should be discussed. It also shares the views that experiences (particularly made by SDC) with a result based management approach should be taken into account during the drafting of the new strategy. The new strategy will be an opportunity to highlight need for action in contexts of interest for SDC, according to the existing strategic orientations.
11. With regard to the **effectiveness** of the four strategic objectives of the current strategy, the steering board notes with appreciation the recommendations on the continued support for the relevant international instruments, the respective Implementation Support Units, the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining GICHD, or gender issues. The steering board however seizes the opportunity to recall that the sustainability of the funding model for the ISU APMBC and ISU CCM is far beyond the reach of a new Swiss mine action strategy, as the ISUs will also in the future be funded by the States Parties of the relevant Conventions (regardless of the nature [voluntary or assessed] of the funding model). The steering board also seizes the opportunity to indicate that the financing of the GICHD is not steered through the Swiss mine action strategy, but based

on the parliamentary decision to support the three Geneva Centres¹ and the respective annual agreements between the centres and the Swiss Confederation.

12. With regard to the **impact**, the **sustainability** and **gender considerations**, the steering board notes with appreciation the recommendations and particularly shares the view that financial dependencies of organisations potentially create negative impacts and have to be avoided.

(PLEASE scroll down and see list in Pages 4-6)

¹ GICHD, DCAF and GCSP



Management Response

	Current Assessment	Recommended Action	Management Response Agree / Disagree + Reference; Measures taken
Strategy Wording and Structure	<i>Well written document, participatory development process.</i>	Repeat process with minor wording changes to reflect new developments in the sector.	Agree <u>Measures</u> : next strategy will be drafted
	<i>Lacking formal management oversight tools.</i>	Develop a detailed plan of action and application of a results based framework.	Agree in principle, see also para 10 <u>Measures</u> : utility of a potential plan of action as well as scope etc. have yet to be analysed during the drafting process, particularly in comparison to the existing coordination procedures
Efficiency	<i>Intra-departmental efficiency generally high.</i>	No change.	Agree <u>Measures</u> : (continuation without change)
	<i>Inter-departmental efficiency could be improved.</i>	Development of a detailed plan of action More formally assign oversight of the mine action portfolio/strategy to one of the three departments.	Agree only in principle, see also para 10 <u>Measures</u> : utility of a potential plan of action as well as scope etc. have yet to be analysed during the drafting process, particularly in comparison to the existing coordination procedures Disagree at this stage, see also para 10
	<i>Rational for SDC's decision to place MA portfolio in the SE Asia geographical desk unclear.</i>	Reorient MA within SDC.	Disagree . This would mean to reconsider the whole thematic matrix structure and the decentralization (SDC Reo II).

Effectiveness	<i>Objective 1 – Support to universalisation of legal instruments has been effective.</i>	Continue the same level of support.	Agree (see para 11) <u>Measures:</u> (continuation without change)
	<i>Objective 2 – Efforts to alleviate suffering caused by mines and ERW have also been effective.</i>	Continue to support the GICHD including its efforts to develop a more RBM framework. Continue to provide support to the UN via the SAF. (Victim Assistance?)	Agree on RBM framework, agree on GICHD support in general (taking into account considerations expressed in para 11) <u>Measures:</u> (continuation without change) Agree (see para 11) <u>Measures:</u> (continuation without change) (-> And continue to support victim assistance projects and programmes by SDC)
	<i>Objective 3 – Efforts to enhance integration have been moderately successful.</i>	As part of the plan of action, emphasise countries and projects where the most synergy and cross-sectoral cooperation can be realised.	Agree in principle, see also para 10 <u>Measures:</u> utility of a potential plan of action as well as scope etc. have yet to be analysed during the drafting process, particularly in comparison to the existing coordination procedures
	<i>Objective 4 - Efforts to develop new instruments have fully materialised.</i>	Consider removal of the Strategic objective as a stand-alone goal.	Agree <u>Measures:</u> integration of this goal into other strategic goals (most probably rather connected to political and institutional processes)
Relevance	<i>Relevant, over the time period to the needs of mine affected states</i>	Update language and focus to reflect emerging trends.	Agree (see para 9) <u>Measures:</u> updating of language
	<i>SAF secondments to programmes with different mandates.</i>	Clarify the specific role of the SAF secondees' vis-à-vis the UN/UNMAS mandate in country.	Agree <u>Measures:</u> discuss a better contextualisation of mine action as “enabler” for peace support / humanitarian aid / development, and focus on this aspect in case of requests by UN
Impact	<i>Impact difficult to measure due to non-RBM Framework.</i>	Development of RBM Framework	Agree <u>Measures:</u> RBM framework will be developed according to needs
	<i>Existing evidence does suggest positive impact in a number of areas:</i>	No change.	Agree (see para 12) <u>Measures:</u> (continuation without change)

	<i>IMAS, APMBC and CCM ISU's, Pfp training etc.</i>		
	<i>Work of the Swiss spread widely.</i>	Plan of action should determine a shorter list of focus countries.	Agree in principle, see also para 10 <u>Measures</u> : utility of a potential plan of action as well as scope etc. have yet to be analysed during the drafting process, particularly in comparison to the existing coordination procedures
Sustainability	<i>Sustainability of commitment.</i>	No change.	Agree (see para 12) <u>Measures</u> : (continuation without change)
	<i>Some partners heavily dependent on Swiss funding – creates vulnerability.</i>	Be aware of potential risks in the formulation of the next strategy/action plan. Possibility to promote diversification.	Agree (see para 12) <u>Measures</u> : point will be taken into account when drafting new strategy Agree (see para 12) <u>Measures</u> : point will be taken into account when drafting new strategy
Gender	<i>Support to gender issues has been low-key, but consistent.</i>	Continue support through relevant programmes and channels.	Agree (see para 12) <u>Measures</u> : continuation, but aspect of financial dependencies has to be taken into account (programmes vs. core)