



EVALUATION 2009/4  
**SWITZERLANDS'  
BILATERAL AND  
MULTILATERAL  
COOPERATION:**  
TO WHAT EXTENT DO  
OPERATIONAL SYNERGIES EXIST?



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft  
Confédération suisse  
Confederazione Svizzera  
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Agency for Development  
and Cooperation SDC



# Summary Conclusion and Agreement at Completion Point

## Evaluation

### Switzerland Bilateral and Multilateral Cooperation: To what extent do operational synergies exist?

Commissioned by the  
Evaluation + Controlling Division of the  
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)

and

Evaluation and Controlling Division of the  
Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO)

Evaluationteam:

**AGEG Consultants eG**

Barbara Massler (MSc) (Team Leader) <a href="mailto:clevermass@aol.com">clevermass@aol.com</a>	Dr. Horst Breier <a href="mailto:HBreier@t-online.de">HBreier@t-online.de</a>
Dr. Pierre Harrisson <a href="mailto:ph@consultharrisson.com">ph@consultharrisson.com</a>	Björn Wannhoff (M.A) <a href="mailto:bjoern.wannhoff@gmx.de">bjoern.wannhoff@gmx.de</a>
Dr. Rosa Flores Medina	Dr. Roduel Rogriguez
Dr. Xuan Nguyen	Alain Onibon

**Bern, July 2009**



# I. Executive Summary of the Evaluation Report

## Background

The systematic exploitation of synergies between the bilateral and multilateral cooperation is a key objective of the Switzerland's Multilateral Development Cooperation Strategy (2005). **Synergies are seen as contributing to a better achievement of development objectives through mutual learning and exchange of experiences.** The Senior Management of the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC) and the State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO) have mandated its respective evaluation units to assess to what extent "*synergies between the bilateral and multilateral activities in the Swiss development cooperation "exist" at operational level*". SDC and SECO established a Core Learning Partnership group (CLP) with stakeholders from both organizations to guide this evaluation. Discussions in the CLP demonstrated the complexity of the issues involved in the planned evaluation. In 2007, the CLP agreed to go ahead with the evaluation and prepared an *Approach Paper* to guide the planned evaluation. This paper focused the thrust of the evaluation on the **operational relationship and the value added** of Switzerland's bilateral cooperation with its multilateral counterparts within a partner country. Particular attention was to be paid to the **driving factors** contributing to successful synergies that would reinforce both multilateral and bilateral cooperation. It was also emphasised that many of the issues and assessments addressed in discussions on synergies between bilateral and multilateral cooperation did not necessarily rely upon factual knowledge only.

The key objectives of the evaluation were:

- I. *To assess the extent to which synergies between Switzerland's bilateral and multilateral aid exist in selected partner countries and show the evidence of its value added.*
- II. *To assess the characteristics and impediments for successful bilateral and multilateral synergies.*

## Methodology

The basic structure of this evaluation consisted of three sequenced phases of work reflecting the **iterative approach chosen for this evaluation**:

- An **Inception Phase** (April to June), covering desk work, document analysis, establishing a data base, compilation of so-called Country Profiles, and conducting a series of interviews with informants at SDC and SECO headquarters in Berne;
- A **Research Phase** (July to September) covering the country case studies in Benin (end-August-September), Nicaragua (September), Serbia (July) and Vietnam (September) as well as the questionnaire-based survey of all Swiss Coordination Offices; and
- The **Synthesis Phase** (October to November) comprising the feedback consultations among the evaluation team, the writing of the country reports, the comparative analysis of results obtained from compilation, verification and analysis of Country Profiles, the questionnaire based survey and the country case studies, and the drafting of the final report.

In order to avoid that the evaluation process would suffer from definitional battles, the evaluation team suggests that a working definition of synergy for the purpose of this report would be: **(a) interaction between two (or more) actors, including direct financial interaction and contributions to pooled funding mechanisms, with a view to achieving (b) a sum that is more than the total of the parts.** This combination of several elements (interaction, financing, intent, and results that are more than the total of the parts) is a pragmatic and manageable approach to describing what team members were looking for in this evaluation.

## **Main Findings**

The *Swiss Multilateral Development Cooperation Strategy* of 2005 is perceived more as an orientation document than a compulsive guideline, **is only superficially known in SDC and SECO Headquarters and largely unknown in the COOFs:** It has not had any significant impact in practical terms in the planning process at the operational level or at headquarters.

Nevertheless, the evaluation team found in the four countries different examples of **synergies at operational level**, practices responding to the goodwill and the decisions of individual desk officers in Berne and of COOF staff in partner countries. The potential for synergies of bi-multi activities, though, is normally not analysed up front and systematic planning for them is relatively rare. Developmental synergies are mainly attained because they are “discovered” ad hoc during project implementation, as opportunities present themselves, which are then actively pursued. Overall **the estimated level of attainment of synergies in the four countries is satisfactory.** When disaggregated by Swiss agencies, the result for SDC is better than for SECO. As far as SECO is concerned, it is part of the agency’s strategy to use a selected group of multilateral organizations as executing agencies but also to discuss and influence their policies through a dialogue at headquarters level more than following the implementation at country level with COOF’s support.

There is a good range of **tools** applied in bi-multi cooperation which were developed by Switzerland’s Development Cooperation in the four case study countries. Core elements for many of these tools are the ability of Switzerland to provide quick and flexible funding, its recognized excellence and networks at national and local levels for specific themes, and the quality of its professional staff. **Obstacles** mentioned are the insufficient knowledge management, the communication policies, and the heavy procedures and sometimes the lack of transparency of multilateral agencies. The existing tools allow making contributions to bi-multi cooperation activities that fill gaps, enable experiments, promote new and innovative approaches, implement initiatives, provide expertise and assume lead functions in donor and other sector or thematic coordination groups.

The *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness* has made a significant difference that leaves increasingly **little room for individual donors’ initiatives towards synergy.** New donors appear on the scene, and there is a multiplication of multi-donors or sector wide approaches (SWAPs). This is bound to affect the strategy and the operational practices of Switzerland on bi-multi cooperation. The cooperation between multilaterals and bilateral passes always more through a triangulation process, where both are doing joint support to national strategies and policies. The actual synergies result then both from diversified collaborations, between different cooperation actors (bilateral and multilateral agencies), government and civil society, and from specific co-funding initiatives between Switzerland’s bilateral cooperation and multilaterals.

All in all, **the relevance of Switzerland's Bi-Multi Cooperation**, leaving aside the funding aspect, **is modest**. This form of development cooperation is not indispensable, and it could be replaced by other configurations of cooperation between bilateral and multilateral actors. The involvement at local and national levels, the combination of funding and technical assistance, and innovative and participatory approaches contribute to the **efficiency**. The strong centralization of SECO's works and only modest delegation of authority for staff in COOFs and the funding of only a limited number of multilateral organizations without enough integration in Switzerland's development cooperation country programmes pose some difficulties in terms of efficiency.

Among the 30 projects and programmes analysed in this evaluation several can be considered **good or even very good in terms of effectiveness**. This effectiveness is often due to individual actors, to activities not foreseen originally and to unexpected turns of a project or programme in the course of implementation. The question of Switzerland's visibility in bi-multi cooperation activities was raised on many occasions during the evaluation. Overall, **Switzerland's visibility is acceptable**. Especially some UN organizations have found satisfactory answers to the visibility requirements of bilateral stakeholders in their projects, including Switzerland. In other cases, the development partners of Switzerland in Bi-Multi Cooperation are not as forthcoming on visibility.

## Recommendations

Six strategic recommendations have been identified by the evaluation team:

1. The changes presently taking place in development cooperation or looking imminent to happen in the near future are likely to result in improved and stronger cooperation frameworks for all donors, with enhanced emphasis on complementarity and comparative advantage, on joint work and better focus, on improved targeting and well coordinated activities. Although room will continue to exist for individual initiatives of donors looking for improvements in the planning and delivery of aid, **the relevance of Switzerland's Bi-Multi Cooperation is bound to decline in the years to come**. It may even become obsolete in the medium term and be replaced by multiple donor frameworks for Bi-Multi Cooperation. Therefore, **it is recommended to review Switzerland's Bi-Multi Cooperation in its present form and drop it as a discrete approach. Instead, the idea of synergies from Bi-Multi Cooperation for better development results should be incorporated in a wider context, for instance in Switzerland's strategies and operational guidance to implement the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness**.
2. In Switzerland's partner countries which are making progress towards the One UN approach, **it is recommended that SDC and SECO actively review their existing and planned Bi-Multi Cooperation activities with UN organizations to see how far these activities could be integrated in the One UN Plan and Switzerland's funding be channelled directly to the One UN Fund, perhaps even at significantly lower overhead fees than at present**.
3. The so-called **two-pronged approach** of Swiss development cooperation puts a premium on the potential for synergies that can be attained from the experiences at the **local and sub-national level with relevance for national programmes**. It is recommended to **use this premium pro-actively in as many Bi-Multi Cooperation activities as possible**.

4. The **differences of working between SDC and SECO** do not seem to be sustainable in the long run. SECO is likely to find itself increasingly at a disadvantage in partner countries if the efforts presently undertaken to start decentralising operations and giving more authority to staff in the Swiss Coordination Offices do not bear fruit quickly. It is recommended to **develop the decentralisation strategy envisaged for SECO as early as possible in 2009 with a view to strengthen, step by step, Saco's profile and negotiating power in partner countries.** More authority delegated to the staff in Coordination Offices would also contribute to facilitating the achievement of greater coherence between SDC and SECO in their country programmes and modalities of aid delivery.
5. The performance of multilateral partners in providing adequate Swiss **visibility** in Switzerland's Bi-Multi Cooperation is uneven. This unevenness does not primarily reflect existing constraints which are beyond the control of the respective organization. It reflects differences among the various multilateral organizations in the understanding of the need for visibility of the bilateral partner, of the multilateral partner's willingness to respect this need, and, of course, of the specific contributions made by Switzerland under the agreed cooperation. **It is recommended to take up issues of visibility with all multilateral partners that have not yet made sufficient efforts to give due credit to the contributions of Switzerland's development cooperation.**
6. Finally, the evaluation has confirmed that there is little activity in place yet to establish a systematic knowledge retrieval, exchange and management system on Bi-Multi Cooperation. Such system would cover all forms of Bi-Multi Cooperation, the ones existing at present between Switzerland and individual multilateral organizations as well as the emerging multiple donor arrangements. The purpose of the knowledge retrieval, exchange and management system would be to distil the relevant experiences and best practice at the operational level in all partner countries, process them, and feed them into a distribution and learning network. This network would allow other Swiss and multilateral actors, at country level as well as at headquarters, to access the existing knowledge and use it. As a first step, **it is recommended introducing and establishing an efficient monitoring system for the implementation of the Multilateral Development Cooperation Strategy of Switzerland to the extent that this Strategy is going to continue to exist. This monitoring system should become the nucleus of a broader knowledge retrieval and management system on Bi-Multi Cooperation. That system would be designed so as to allow quick and flexible, vertical and horizontal, institutional and individual learning, through the exchange of experience, readily available information on best practice, and learning from new and innovative approaches and experiments conducted elsewhere.**

## II. Lessons Learned

Below is a list of lessons learned and challenges drawn out by the Core Learning Partnership (CLP) consisting of members of the SECO and members of SDC during the Agreement at Completion Point Meeting on January 7th 2008.

### Generally

The concept of synergies between the bilateral and multilateral activities of the Swiss cooperation system is used in manifold ways in policy documents and strategic notes, but it remains an unclear concept, widely open to individual interpretations.

- SDC and SECO should refrain from putting a lot of energy into policy documents which - at the end - do not have any operational relevance, or, it should be clearly stated that a specific document has been developed mainly for political reasons.
- As many other evaluations have already shown, the implementation of policies and strategies is generally not sufficiently binding and very much left to individuals. In some cases, interesting efforts are implemented or underway to strengthen systematically multi-bi synergies, in other cases, these issues are not dealt with. Generally speaking, SDC and SECO have to invest more in the implementation and operationalisation of strategies as well as in related quality control mechanisms.

### Methodologically

- Be more demanding at the moment of the inception report! Once an offer of an evaluation team is accepted, in-depth discussions about methodology is needed. The inception report is a "moment fort" for it!
- Have the courage to drop an evaluation if you anticipate that the necessary pre-conditions for a robust evaluation are not given!
- Be careful about the topic selected for an evaluation: not in the sense that some topics should not be evaluated, but rather in the sense that some topics are not clear enough and too broad to be subject to an evaluation. Discuss this issue with the Senior Management.
- Importance of clear and comprehensive ToRs, as a key determinant of the results of the evaluation process.



### **III. Agreement at completion point of the Evaluation**

The Core Learning Group (CLP) reacts as follows to the final report:

#### **General comments regarding the evaluation**

The CLP takes note of the initial remarks in the preface of the report. It is stated there that:

- the findings are not representative for the totality of the Bi-Multi Cooperation implemented by SDC and SECO
- the report provides hard evidence based on the feedback of questionnaires of the Coordination Offices
- the report is illustrative of what happens in the four case study countries

Nevertheless, in the view of the CLP, the overall report falls short of the initial expectations, reflecting to some extent the above limitations. Various factors lead the CLP to conclude that evaluation report is not sufficiently based on hard evidence. It mainly reflects triangulated impressions registered by the evaluation team and is only partially based on rigorous evidence (questionnaire). This seriously limits the validity of the findings and recommendations. Many statements are difficult to understand and subject to interpretation.

The shortcomings of the report are due to a number of factors.

#### **Shortcoming on the part of Swiss cooperation:**

- It became evident that the concept of synergies between bi-multi within the Swiss system is vague and that the only overall framework which refers to it – the multilateral strategy – has little normative relevance for programme planning and implementation.
- The evaluation process uncovered various differing understandings of the multi-bi concept. Even within the CLP, a common understanding was difficult to find. The implementation of the multi-bi concept is, therefore, very context as well as individual specific.
- The Swiss cooperation has to accept the critique that it does not systematically document its multi-bi synergies. Databases are hardly designed accordingly and measures for documentation in the field are not systematically in place. Much remains implicit in the heads of collaborators.
- Finally, the CLP recognizes that the mandate given to the evaluation team was quite ambitious: to our knowledge, no other actor has embarked on a similar evaluation. Therefore, it was not possible to build on the experience of others. In hindsight, the TORs were not specific enough.

### **Shortcomings on the part of the evaluation team:**

- In the view of the CLP, the evaluation team did not adequately grasp all the dimensions of the multi- bi activities in the Swiss system, despite many comments from the CLP explaining the various dimensions.
- The CLP questions whether the methodologies applied in the evaluation were sufficiently robust. The CLP is of the opinion that –even taking into account the shortcomings on the Swiss side – there was enough room to work with sound methodologies, which should have resulted in conclusions and recommendations based on stronger evidence and in clearer, more actionable recommendations. The CLP thinks that the results of the 4 case study countries have been insufficiently aggregated in the synthesis report.
- The CLP is unable to follow the evaluators' (implicit) chain of reasoning leading from the findings to the conclusions to the recommendations. Recommendations, therefore, appear to be anecdotic rather than based on a solid chain of evidence and reasoning.
- The CLP considers that some of the evaluation questions were only partially addressed.

In conclusion: With regard to the synthesis report, the CLP is of the opinion that the report does not meet the standards of a robust evaluation report due to the above mentioned shortcomings.

However, the CLP recognises that interesting findings have been produced in specific case study countries. Within SDC, some recommendations are underway to be implemented.

### **Comments of the Core Learning Group regarding the recommendations of the synthesis report**

#### **Recommendation 1: "Drop the multi- bi approach"**

*This report shows that synergies between the bilateral and multilateral activities of Switzerland's development cooperation exist at the operational level. The synergies observed vary in relevance, reach and impact. The specific features of the Swiss concept of synergies through Bi-Multi Cooperation are not always easily understood. Are they a direct element of Switzerland's efforts towards implementing the Paris Declaration? Or do they contribute indirectly to the achievement of the objectives of this Declaration? Also, the term synergy is open to individual interpretations. Interpretations tend to oscillate around terms such as complementarity, mutual reinforcement, comparative advantage, division of labour, and similar. The changes presently taking place in development cooperation or looking imminent to happen in the near future are likely to result in improved and stronger cooperation frameworks for all donors, with enhanced emphasis on complementarity and comparative advantage, on joint work and better focus, on improved targeting and well coordinated activities. Although room will continue to exist for individual initiatives of donors looking for improvements in the planning and delivery of aid, the relevance of Switzerland's Bi-Multi Cooperation is bound to decline in the years to come. It may even become obsolete in the medium term and be replaced by multiple donor frameworks for Bi-Multi Cooperation. Therefore, it is, recommended to review Switzerland's Bi-Multi Cooperation in its present form and drop it as a discrete approach. Instead, the idea of synergies from Bi-Multi Cooperation for better development results should be incorporated in a wider context, for instance in Switzerland's strategies and operational guidance to implement the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.*

#### Stand of the CLP

The CLP is of the opinion that this recommendation is overloaded and difficult to understand. For the reader it is difficult to trace back the different ideas to facts and figures gathered in the evaluation process and the underlying concept of multi- and bilateral synergies is not sufficiently clear. The CLP nevertheless recognizes that the multi- bi concept within the Swiss system is vague and needs to be clarified also in the light of the implementation of the Paris declaration. The CLP does not understand why the multi- bi concept will become obsolete, considering that like-minded actors are trying to strengthen their multi-bi cooperation. The statement/recommendation is also in contradiction to the new bill to parliament, which advocates the combined use of different modalities (bilateral, multilateral and multi-bilateral) channels to enhance effectiveness of Swiss Aid. .

#### **Stand of the Senior Management of SDC and SECO**

The multi-bi concept has to be clarified within the Swiss aid system. The Senior Management accepts that the notion of "synergies between bilateral and multilateral Swiss aid" has often been used in an unclear way and this has to be improved. Switzerland claims that these synergies are a specific comparative advantage of the public Swiss aid. In order to gain credibility, conceptual clarity is needed.

#### **Recommendation 2: "integrate the approach in the ONE-UN"**

*In Switzerland's partner countries which are making progress towards the One UN approach, it is recommended that SDC and SECO actively review their existing and planned Bi-Multi Cooperation activities with UN organizations to see how far these activities could be integrated in the One UN Plan and Switzerland's funding be channelled directly to the One UN Fund, perhaps even at significantly lower overhead fees than at present.*

#### Stand of the CLP

This recommendation is only for ONE-UN pilot countries valid and has no relevance for others. It is specifically relevant in the few situations in which the Swiss system operates in parallel with the ONE-UN pilots. In those situations – as for instance in Vietnam – the CLP accepts the recommendation with the qualification that earmarking of operational funds to the UN system in a ONE-UN pilot country should be in line with the UN system of delivering as ONE.

#### **Stand of the Senior Management of SDC and SECO**

The Senior Management shares the stand of the CLP, but finds that the experience of Vietnam (advantages and challenges for the Swiss Cooperation) should be assessed and disseminated. As a principle, in One UN pilot countries, Switzerland must operate in line with the UN system of delivering as one in line with its commitment to the Paris Declaration.

**Recommendation 3: "Enhance the two-pronged approach"**

*The so-called two-pronged approach (interventions at micro--macro level) of Swiss development cooperation puts a premium on the potential for synergies that can be attained from the experiences at the local and sub-national level with relevance for national programmes. It is recommended to use this premium pro-actively in as many Bi-Multi Cooperation activities as possible.*

**Stand of the CLP**

The CLP is confused by this recommendation as it seems to contradict recommendations one and two. But generally speaking, SECO and SDC agree with the recommendation suggesting to further identify and pursue lessons and synergies emerging from experiences at the micro-, meso- and macro level. These lessons must be systematically included in the policy discussions at the level of national programmes in partner countries. The CLP thinks that this is in itself a strength of the Swiss cooperation system that must be further enhanced. By means of such an approach, poverty and equity issues can be better addressed.

**Stand of the Senior Management of SDC and SECO**

The Senior Management shares the position of the CLP. The micro-meso-macro approach of the Swiss aid system must be maintained and even strengthened. For both institutions, it is a clear cut strategy to bring the realities at micro level into the policy dialogue at macro level.

**Recommendation 4: "Decentralize – give more negotiation power to the staff in the Coordination Offices"**

*The differences of working between SDC and SECO do not seem to be sustainable in the long run. SECO is likely to find itself increasingly at a disadvantage in partner countries if the efforts presently undertaken to start decentralising operations and giving more authority to staff in the Swiss Coordination Offices do not bear fruit quickly. It is recommended to develop the decentralisation strategy envisaged for SECO as early as possible in 2009 with a view to strengthen, step by step, SECO's profile and negotiating power in partner countries. More authority delegated to the staff in Coordination Offices would also contribute to facilitating the achievement of greater coherence between SDC and SECO in their country programmes and modalities of aid delivery.*

**Stand of the CLP**

The CLP does not fully understand the recommendation as it deals with issues which are linked to many other dimensions than only to multi- bi synergies. At least, the direct link to the synergies is not very obvious. The CLP questions also whether the ideas behind this recommendation are not in contradiction with recommendation 1, where it is stated that the multi- bi concept should be dropped as a whole. Nevertheless it is accepted that decentralisation of negotiation power is a strategic dimension for both SDC and SECO. Initiatives are underway to develop a meaningful task-sharing between the Headquarters and the field offices and decisions will be taken very soon. The CLP also agrees that the degree of delegation of responsibilities for SECO and for SDC staff in shared cooperation offices should be harmonised to the greatest extent possible. Staff planning mechanisms should be designed accordingly.

### **Stand of the Senior Management of SDC and SECO**

The Senior Management fully supports the response from the CLP. Significant initiatives are now underway or will be introduced to address the issue of decentralisation of decision power to the field offices. Within these processes, SDC and SECO are in discussion in order to harmonise to the maximum their modus operandi.

#### **Recommendation 5: "Discuss your visibility concerns with your multilateral partners"**

*The performance of multilateral partners in providing adequate Swiss visibility in Switzerland's Bi-Multi Cooperation is uneven. This unevenness does not primarily reflect existing constraints which are beyond the control of the respective organization. It reflects differences among the various multilateral organizations in the understanding of the need for visibility of the bilateral partner, of the multilateral partner's willingness to respect this need, and, of course, of the specific contributions made by Switzerland under the agreed cooperation. It is recommended to take up issues of visibility with all multilateral partners that have not yet made sufficient efforts to give due credit to the contributions of Switzerland's development cooperation.*

#### **Stand of the CLP**

The CLP does not fully understand why the "visibility issue" made its way up to the level of a recommendation of this evaluation. The recommendation is not explicit enough to clarify the visibility concept it deals with (visibility vs. Swissness). SECO and SDC recognize that the visibility of its cooperation is an important issue mainly in order to secure public funds from its constituency. But visibility is not an objective per se of the multi-bi cooperation, neither for SECO nor for SDC. The Swiss cooperation aims to be visible through its engagement and contributions to sectors or themes and aims for a level of professionalism that produces results which then create (through their content) visibility and credibility across the funding bodies. The CLP repeats its concern that this recommendation can be interpreted as being in contradiction to recommendations 1 and 2.

### **Stand of the Senior Management of SDC and SECO**

The Senior Management shares the stand of the CLP and underlines the importance that visibility issues are discussed in a regular manner with partners, specifically in times of the AAA. A certain level of Swiss visibility is needed in all cases to secure a sufficiently broad constituency in Switzerland for development cooperation.

Recommendation 6: **"Establish a systematic knowledge retrieval, exchange and management system on multi- bi cooperation."**

*Finally, the evaluation has confirmed that there is little activity in place yet to establish a systematic knowledge retrieval, exchange and management system on Bi-Multi Cooperation. Such system would cover all forms of Bi-Multi Cooperation, the ones existing at present between Switzerland and individual multilateral organisations as well as the emerging multiple donor arrangements. The purpose of the knowledge retrieval, exchange and management system would be to distil the relevant experiences and best practice at the operational level in all partner countries, process them, and feed them into a distribution and learning network. This network would allow other Swiss and multilateral actors, at country level as well as at headquarters, to access the existing knowledge and use it. As a first step, it is recommended introducing and establishing an efficient monitoring system for the implementation of the Multilateral Development Cooperation Strategy of Switzerland to the extent that this Strategy is going to continue to exist. This monitoring system should become the nucleus of a broader knowledge retrieval and management system on Bi-Multi Cooperation. That system would be designed so as to allow quick and flexible, vertical and horizontal, institutional and individual learning, through the exchange of experience, readily available information on best practice, and learning from new and innovative approaches and experiments conducted elsewhere.*

**Stand of the CLP**

The CLP accepts the recommendation. The first step will be to decide whether the "multilateral strategy" will be continued in its current form. If the decision is positive, the strategy needs to be made more relevant and better integrated into operational activities. A first step could be taken by establishing a monitoring system for the implementation of the strategy. In addition, SDC and SECO have to seriously address the issue of documenting the multi- bi activities and synergies. Cross-country learning processes are challenging particularly for donors which are organised by geographical sections. It can hardly be undertaken by country offices. The Swiss multi-bi cooperation has continuously contributed to such cross-country exchange since it is mainly based on global programmes and long-term institutional partnerships. Moreover, many of these programmes specifically address knowledge exchange and institutional capacity building. The CLP is disappointed that this aspect is hardly mentioned in the evaluation.

**Stand of the Senior Management of SDC and SECO**

The Senior Management will discuss the validity of the multilateral strategy with the SECO management in 2009. If maintained, a clear-cut monitoring mechanism shall be put in place. The documentation of the results of multi-by synergies must absolutely be boosted within the processes to mainstream the MfDR agenda.

## Recent SDC Evaluations

EVALUATION 2009/3	TWO RURAL FINANCE AND EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMMES IN INDIA
EVALUATION 2009/2	KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING IN SDC
EVALUATION 2009/1	EVALUATION OF SDC'S PERFORMANCE IN MAINSTREAMING GENDER EQUALITY
EVALUATION 2008/1	SDC HUMANITARIAN AID IN ANGOLA 1995–2006
EVALUATION 2007/2	DECENTRALISATION IN SDC'S BILATERAL COOPERATION Relevance, Effectiveness, Sustainability and Comparative Advantage
EVALUATION 2007/1	SDC'S PERFORMANCE TOWARDS EMPOWERMENT OF STAKEHOLDERS FROM THE RECIPIENTS' PERSPECTIVE
EVALUATION 2006/1	EVALUACIÓN INDEPENDIENTE DEL PROGRAMA REGIONAL DE AMÉRICA CENTRAL 1999–2005
EVALUATION 2005/3	INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF THE SDC/seco MEDIUM TERM CONCEPT 2002–2006 IN SERBIA & MONTENEGRO
EVALUATION 2005/2	INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF SDC NEPAL COUNTRY PROGRAMMES 1993–2004 Building Bridges in Nepal – Dealing with deep divides
EVALUATION 2005/1	AUFGABENTEILUNG ZENTRALE – KOBÜ
EVALUATION 2004/4	SDC'S INTERACTION WITH THE SWISS NGO'S (for internal use only)
EVALUATION 2004/3	QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF SDC'S EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORTS (not published)
EVALUATION JR 2004/2	SWISS-SOUTH AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION PROGRAMME 2000–2003 Joint Review
EVALUATION 2004/1	SDC'S HUMAN RIGHTS AND RULE OF LAW GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS INFLUENCE, EFFECTIVENESS AND RELEVANCE WITHIN SDC
EVALUATION EE 2003/6	SDC – COUNTER TRAFFICKING PROGRAMME MOLDOVA
EVALUATION EE 2003/5	SDC – HUMANITARIAN AID IN ANGOLA
EVALUATION EE 2003/4	12 JAHRE OSTZUSAMMENARBEIT BAND 1 DIE TRANSITION UND IHR SCHATTEN BAND 2 BILANZ DER ÖFFENTLICHEN SCHWEIZERISCHEN ZUSAMMENARBEIT MIT OSTEUROPA UND DER GUS 1990–2002
EVALUATION 2003/3	PROGRAMME DE LA COOPERATION SUISSE AU NIGER 1997–2002
EVALUATION 2003/2	SDC'S INTERACTION WITH THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)
EVALUATION 2003/1	SDC'S BILATERAL ENGAGEMENT IN THE POVERTY REDUCTION STRATEGY PAPER (PRSP) PROCESS
EVALUATION 2002/1	EIN JAHRZEHNT CINFO 1990–2001

DEZA  
Sektion Controlling  
Freiburgstrasse 130  
CH-3003 Bern  
Telefon +41 (0) 31 325 36 03  
Fax +41 (0) 31 324 16 92  
E-Mail [info@deza.admin.ch](mailto:info@deza.admin.ch)  
[www.deza.admin.ch](http://www.deza.admin.ch)

July 2009

Photo: DEZA/Dino Beti