



Management Response

to the External Evaluation Report on the Geneva Centres GCSP, GICHD and DCAF, June 2026

Introduction

1. The Comité de Pilotage for the Geneva Centres (CdP)¹ welcomes the submission of the external evaluation report on the Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP), the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), and the Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance (DCAF) (hereafter: the three Geneva Centres). The CdP expresses its appreciation for the work conducted by the evaluation team from IOD PARC and for the regular, frank and constructive exchanges held with the evaluation team.
2. The Swiss Confederation supports the three Geneva Centres through both core and project funding and is represented in their respective governing bodies. Core funding is provided on the basis of the decision by the Federal Parliament of 28 September 2023.
3. The Parliament decided, *inter alia*, that an evaluation shall be undertaken in accordance with the dispatch concerning a commitment appropriation for the continued support of the three Geneva Centres for the years 2024 to 2027. The CdP initiated this evaluation in April 2025, with a view to contribute to the development of a next report and dispatch of the Federal Council to the Federal Parliament for the 2028-2031 period. Subsequently, the evaluation was managed by a technical Steering Group (StG).

Overall appreciation of the evaluation report

4. The CdP is of the opinion that the evaluation report on the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the Geneva Centres addresses all the issues and questions as agreed in the Terms of Reference (ToR) published on 20 June 2025. The CdP confirms that the methodology applied is based on both the ToR and regular exchanges between the evaluation team and the StG.
5. The CdP further confirms that the recommendations emanating from the evaluation report are of strategic relevance, tangible and concrete, and directly informative for the forthcoming dispatch and the definition of tasks at hand for the 2028-2031 period.
6. The CdP welcomes the evaluation's overall positive assessment that the three Centres have maintained their reputation as centres of excellence and that they contribute to Switzerland's foreign and security policy objectives. The CdP is especially pleased to read that:
 - The relevance of the Centres has increased in the current geopolitical context. They have retained a distinctive ability to work on sensitive issues, in unstable environments, adopting a neutral, discreet and long-term approach.
 - The quality of their expertise remains widely recognised: they are perceived as centres of excellence, supported by qualified teams with strong technical credibility.
 - The Centres have demonstrated a significant capacity to adapt, notably through the diversification of their funding and the integration of new technologies and AI.

¹ With representatives from FDFA and DDPS, the CdP is the body designated for the management and steering of the Swiss contributions to the Geneva Centres and for the Swiss Confederation's representation in the Centres' governance bodies.

7. The CdP also noted that challenges remain:
 - Faced with a rapidly changing international context and increased competition, the Centres must continue to adapt in order to cope with rapid changes and thus remain relevant without losing their specific added value.
 - The Centres must further consolidate their strategic profile and continue their efforts to monitor, evaluate and measure results.
 - Diversifying funding sources strengthens financial resilience but also increases the risk that the Centres will become more driven by donors' demands, to the detriment of a strategic positioning aligned with Swiss priorities.
8. The CdP took note of the recommendations addressed to it. Details of its responses can be found in Annex 1. The CdP has taken note of the Centres' assessment of the recommendations. Annex 1 shows both the assessment by the Centres as well as the position of the CdP.

Way forward

9. The recommendations have been taken into consideration in the drafting of the new Dispatch to Parliament. Where appropriate, specific objectives will also be set for each Centre in the annual agreements and in the framework agreements to ensure that the recommendations are implemented.
10. The CdP will accompany the implementation of the recommendations. The three Centres are requested to update the CdP on a regular basis on the implementation of all recommendations attributed to them.

State Secretariat
Tim Enderlin
Ambassador
Chair of the Comité de Pilotage Geneva Centres

Annex 1: Compilation of recommendations with assessment by the CdP and the Geneva Centres

External Evaluation

of the

Geneva Centre for Security Policy - GCSP

Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining - GICHD

Geneva Centre for Security Sector Governance - DCAF

Annex 1 to the Management Response by the Swiss Confederation

Recommendations addressed to the Comité de Pilotage

Synthesis Report			
#	Conclusion	Recommendation	CdP's response
1.1	Office rent: the second largest expense for the three Centres after staffing costs is rent. The annual payments amount to a cumulative 4 million CHF for all three Centres.	The federal authorities in Bern should support the three Centres with rent negotiations for Maison de la Paix. The Directors of the Centres should engage on this and mutually shape the structure, including objectives, for these negotiations.	The CdP agrees with this recommendation and reiterates its willingness to support the Centres with the rent negotiations.
1.2	The three Centres are an instrument of Swiss foreign and security policy and part of the foundation of International Geneva. On the one hand the Geneva Centres are perceived as strategic Swiss partners and key instruments of Swiss Foreign and Security Policy. The three Centres are universally seen as Centres of Excellence and as integral supporters of international peace and security. They contribute significantly to Swiss foreign and security policy norms and objectives. On the other hand, this is not reflected in the scale of financial support they receive from the Confederation and raises a question about the alignment between the country's strategic ambition and its resource allocation. Their cumulated budget amounts to less than 1% of Swiss ODA (noting that GCSP budget is not ODA eligible), have decreased in	Increase Swiss funding levels to no less than the equivalent of 1%+ of ODA to the three Centres , in line with apparent Swiss prioritisation of the three Centres as key tools of Swiss foreign and security policy. The work of the Centres has remained effective, as reflected in the external feedback on the Centres' work, and is more relevant than ever in the current geopolitical context and Swiss financial backing should reflect this.	The CdP partially agrees with this recommendation. It acknowledges the efficiency and relevance of the Centres' work. Budgets within the Federal Administration are allocated following a sound balancing of interests in accordance with the established objectives and the available resources.
2.1	Strategic prioritisation The evaluation finds that further significant cost reductions across the Geneva Centres would require more direct strategic steering from the federal authorities. In the absence of such guidance, decisions on programme scope and resource allocation will	Strategically steer cost-saving through scope reduction based on strategic prioritisation of Swiss-funded components/activities. - Meaningful savings would require strategic prioritisation and likely reduction in scope. - Switzerland could therefore consider conducting a targeted strategic funding review of Swiss-supported	The CdP agrees with this recommendation and recognises the need for a strategic prioritisation, when appropriate, while taking into account possible constraints on third-party funding. Discussions will take place as part of the process of drawing up

	continue to be taken independently by each Centre, limiting the potential impact of mutualisation efforts.	activities, assessing programme lines and thematic areas against their most immediate relevance for Swiss foreign and security policy priorities, and complementarities and overlaps with other key Swiss partners. Such an approach would allow cost reductions through strict alignment with Swiss strategic choices, while preserving the Centres' ability to mobilise funding from other donors. There is a risk that this would potentially limit the Centres' ability to leverage Swiss funding to attract other third-party funders however.	annual contracts and framework agreements.
3.1	<i>This level of recommendations on structural reform is intended to prompt discussion and thinking around the direction, level and depth of synergies and support for the three Centres.</i> Discussions on mutualisation and synergies have been ongoing for a significant amount of time with little progress to date. This is in part because no one Director has oversight over all operational functions across the three Centres; there is not a unanimous view on the benefits of mutualisation across the three Centres; there is limited understanding of the detail of each Centre's work and limited time to address this; and work to date on synergies (including the joint IT service) has not delivered value for all Centres. Furthermore, the evaluation team found that there is limited potential for significant future savings. If the federal authorities in Bern are clear that it requires synergies and increased strategic cooperation – potentially leading to cost savings over time – then something materially different needs to be done. In the absence of this, it is likely that these conversations will continue on in the same vein for years to come.	Revise the leadership structure of the three Centres: • One option (amongst others) could be appointing one 'Geneva Centres' Director (at Ambassador level), supported by Centre Deputy Directors (at senior expert level). • This would ensure one person has oversight over all strategic and operational aspects of the three Centres with no preference/bias for any one of them, allowing them to 'connect the dots' in a way no one else currently can or does. • This would not involve dissolving the Centres but rather refining the overarching leadership structure whilst respecting the mandates and work of each individual Centre. • The trade-offs of this approach would need to be carefully considered. These trade-offs are set out in more detail below. Resources would be required to support this new structure i.e. a central 'Geneva Centres' budget and secretariat: • A central budget would cover shared admin and other mutualised functions, e.g. IT, travel, cleaning services, some procurement etc. • This would be overseen by the Geneva Centres Director and a small secretariat to support	The CdP takes note of the recommendation, intended to promote discussions and thinking. The proposal will be given due consideration taking into account potential trade-offs, risks and costs.

		coordination, meeting preparation, planning, tracking decisions, and liaison with the federal authorities in Bern). Without dedicated capacity, there is a high risk that the structure would exist “on paper” but not translate into faster decisions, clearer accountability, or measurable gains. This would need to be designed in a cost-neutral/cost-effective way to ensure that additional coordination cost is demonstrably offset by improved service quality, reduced duplication, and/or faster delivery.	
GCSP Report			
5	GCSP continues to play a role in Swiss foreign and security policy and has shown itself to be a key part of International Geneva. However, GCSP and the federal authorities in Bern’s relationship is under strain. This impacts trust and strategic alignment, a concern given the pressure on International Geneva and Switzerland’s role in mediation, and wider shifts to hard security.	Reinvest in the Relationship with the federal authorities in Bern: Senior leadership on both sides should engage in a structured process to reinvest the relationship, including a high-level dialogue to surface mutual expectations and areas of misalignment. The federal authorities in Bern should provide an explicit and formal articulation of what it values in GCSP’s wider work but particularly its mediation and dialogue work, which should in turn inform GCSP’s programming priorities and reporting. GCSP should adopt more proactive engagement; not waiting for signals from the federal authorities in Bern but regularly sharing results, surfacing challenges, and proposing collaboration. This could boost GCSP’s profile in Bern and support the Centre’s image in Switzerland more generally, helping make the case for continued funding.	The CdP agrees with this recommendation and will ensure that a dialogue will take place to discuss mutual expectations and points of disagreement.
6	GCSP has successfully expanded its mediation and dialogue portfolio. However, much of the work is dependent upon the director’s access and network in the diplomatic world. Therefore, the current arrangement creates a key-person dependency that should be addressed through a more robust mitigation plan.	Develop a succession plan for senior management and mediation and dialogue work: Develop a succession plan for GCSP’s mediation and dialogue work. A formal succession plan and knowledge management strategy for the mediation and dialogue function should be developed, including documenting	The CdP agrees with this recommendation and will follow the development of the succession plan and knowledge management strategy for the incoming leadership.

		key contacts, process notes for active dialogue tracks, and a transition plan for incoming leadership.	
--	--	--	--

Recommendations addressed to the three Centres

Synthesis Report				
#	Conclusion	Recommendation	Joint response by DCAF, GICHD and GCSP	Comment by the CdP on the Centres' response
1.3	IT: The current IT arrangements including the IT steering committee not working in its current composition. Although the IT helpdesk works well; innovative IT solutions for supporting three Centre synergies are not apparent. All three Centres are also currently considering their organisational positions on the use of AI which presents an opportunity to develop a common position paper and jointly consider opportunities and challenges posed by the use of AI.	Re-examine options for the IT synergies: - Introduce a formal review or sunset clause for current IT arrangements, after which alternative service delivery arrangements should be considered. This could be an opportunity to further develop and refine the mutualised IT model, both at the level of each Centre and across the three Centres, strengthening - FDFA could task one of the more operationally oriented Centres (such as DCAF or GICHD) or an external assessor with conducting an independent assessment of alternative models (including competitive external providers). Conduct joint analysis of each Centre's use of AI and develop a common position paper, policy and guidelines for staff on the use of AI for their work.	The Centres agree with the recommendation to introduce a formal review of the current IT arrangements. Their strong preference is for an outside independent review rather than tasking DCAF or GICHD. They also agree to develop a common approach and practical guidance on artificial intelligence across the three Centres, building on existing guidelines already developed by each one.	The CdP agrees with the response and supports a formal review.
1.4	Evidence, Learning and Impact: The evaluation has low confidence levels in	Commission an external Evidence, Impact and Learning expert to assess	The Centres agree with the recommendation to assess their MEL and	The CdP agrees with the response.

	impact and sustainability evidence across all three Centres. Various MEL/RBM approaches to measuring and tracking outcome and impact level change are at varying levels of maturity across all three Centres, with room for improvement in different areas. Research is conducted and published, but limited understanding of how this research is used in practice.	the MEL and RBM capacity of all three Centres. • This would include producing recommendations and tangible, realistic action plans for which areas to focus on for strengthening (and potentially additional resources). This could include, for example, harmonisation of tools and/or systems. • This could also include lesson sharing/technical capacity exchange between the three Centres, e.g. DCAF sharing their experience of using Outcome Harvesting and Stories of Change. • Identify ways in which research is applied and used by intended audiences.	RBM capacities through light and centre-specific external reviews, complemented by cross-learning exchanges among the Centres. This will provide an external perspective on existing practices, help identify areas for improvement and enable the Centres to explore opportunities for greater harmonization of MEL tools and systems where relevant and feasible, while taking into account their respective mandates and operational specificities.	
1.5	Communications and the ‘Three Centres’ brand: There are some good examples of communications done by each of the Centres individually and some joint communications. This presents an opportunity to consider a joint approach to communications which in turn would strengthen the ‘Three Centres’ brand.	Develop a joint communications strategy • This could include joint communications around events as well as lesson sharing on what communications tools/approaches work best to support technical capacity exchange • This would need to be light touch to avoid adding to already busy workloads and would require communications focal points from each of the Centres to work together. • Explore the possibility of a monthly shared newsletter. This could include, for example, a monthly geographic focus for Centres to share details of their specific regional/country work or a thematic/technical focus e.g. GEDSI.	The Centres partially agree with this recommendation. They support strengthening practical cooperation in communications, building on existing coordination mechanisms among communications teams and ongoing joint initiatives. Opportunities exist to further enhance collaboration through shared resources, training, joint messaging, and a light-touch communications approach for areas of common interest, while respecting the distinct mandates and audiences of each Centre. However, more resource-intensive initiatives, such as fully unified communications strategies, joint newsletters, or common onboarding packages, would strain resources without providing clear strategic benefits.	The CdP agrees with the response.

		Develop a joint onboarding package for the Three Centres with key cross-Centre policies, and potentially new policies including anti-harassment, guidance on how to write proposals etc.		
2.2	Strategy cycle of the three Centres These are not currently aligned.	Align the strategy cycles of the three Centres This would allow for some joint discussions and planning of strategic priorities and resourcing.	The Centres agree with this recommendation in principle. They support greater alignment of their strategic planning cycles with the Swiss framework credit period, recognizing the potential benefits for joint engagement on strategic priorities and resource allocation. Given the Centres' current planning timelines, full alignment is however not immediately feasible and should be considered a longer-term objective. The Centres therefore propose to revisit this issue during the 2028–2031 framework agreement period, with a view to exploring gradual convergence of future strategy cycles.	The CdP agrees with the response.
2.3	Geographic collaboration The three Centres - in particular DCAF and GICHD - focus on several similar geographic areas in different ways. There are also some good examples of collaboration, e.g. Syria and Sri Lanka. This presents an opportunity to further strengthen collaboration and information exchange.	Scope ways in which the Centres can collaborate more strategically in relation to their geographic focus to improve coherence and future cost-efficiency (as is the case with the new, joint DCAF/GICHD regional office in Amman) - Jointly map the top 5-8 geographic priority areas for each of the Centres and identify overlapping priority areas. - Learning from examples of what has worked well and why, set up light touch geographic working groups/networks to facilitate the exchange of experiences,	The Centres partially agree with the proposal to support enhanced geographic collaboration where relevant and feasible, building on existing coordination efforts and opportunities for joint analysis, outreach, and engagement with Swiss partners. This could be facilitated through periodic meetings of the Centres' operations teams to share updates and assess potential collaboration in areas of overlap. While deeper operational integration, such as shared offices or joint programming, should remain selective and guided by operational needs, costs and mandates, the Centres welcome consideration for future initiatives	The CdP agrees with the response and encourages the Centres to assess geographic collaboration.

		challenges, partnerships, stakeholder engagement etc. • This would allow for further identification of possible joint projects/events etc. Engage with the Swiss missions in these geographic priority areas – a responsibility of both the Centres and Swiss missions.	where opportunities arise and conditions are favorable. Enhanced coordination can strengthen complementarity, leverage Swiss diplomatic networks and showcase the collective contribution of the Geneva Centres to Switzerland's engagement in peace and security. With the aim of using synergies in the MENA region, GICHD and DCAF are about to establish a Regional Office/hub in Amman in summer 2026 with a joint administrative support pool.	
--	--	---	--	--

Recommendations addressed to GCSP

GCSP Report				
#	Conclusion	Recommendation	GCSP's response	Comment by the CdP
1	GCSP's wide-ranging activities can be mutually reinforcing and offer advantages such as adaptability. However, the Centre lacks a well-defined set of thematic priorities which creates a risk of diluting the Centre's offering, external image, reputation for quality and strategic relevance.	Define a clear set of thematic priorities: As part of the strategy review process, GCSP should identify the key themes in which it has a comparative advantage e.g. emerging technology and crisis management. The strategy should deprioritise areas where GCSP lacks distinctive expertise or resources i.e. migration management. Activities across the five pillars, including research and policy should be assessed against this framework, to ensure	The GCSP partially supports this recommendation. A strategy review process will be conducted in preparing for the new medium-term strategy 2028 -2031. The Executive Education Department is currently undergoing an internal restructuring aiming at breaking down silos and strengthening collaboration. Structurally, this will entail having two main clusters, including a Business Unit, allowing for a more collegial and participative working environment. The GCSP agrees on the need for improved prioritisation. As the Centre will increasingly rely on external program and	The CdP partially agrees with the response. The CdP considers that a clearer definition of thematic priorities would be beneficial for the Centre and therefore encourages it to continue its efforts in this direction in a timely manner.

		that activities across the five pillars are mutually reinforcing where possible. This would provide a stronger thematic niche for GCSP, helping provide a sharper comparative advantage and 'pitch' for the Centre as a whole which would support GCSP's fundraising.	project funding, the GCSP will have to carefully manage the dilemma between strategy and opportunity-driven activities. Building on our improved MEL techniques (see below) will help us further refine the GCSP's strategic priorities.	
2	GCSP has developed its mediation and dialogue pillars considerably since 2024, which has expanded the Centre's work and funding sources. However, the Centre's internal structure inhibits collaboration. The two mediation and dialogue departments have created inefficiencies and competition which limits sharing of information across the organisation and risks creating an incoherent external image of the Centre. Similarly, the executive education department is split into over ten clusters. GCSP has several examples of good practice including two departments which share a staff member which can be built on.	Conduct an Organisational Structure Review: A review of the Centre's structure (led either internally or externally) could assess: (a) whether the two mediation/dialogue departments should be merged, restructured, or given clearly differentiated mandates and priorities (including geographic areas); (b) how cross-departmental working can be incentivised through joint staffing arrangements i.e. staff working across two departments, shared workplans, or matrix management; (c) whether reporting lines and team configurations reflect current strategic/thematic priorities; and (d) whether secondment posts on the senior management team should be reconsidered for more permanent roles.	The GCSP partially supports this recommendation. An organisational structure review has been conducted in the framework of the structural reform process triggered by the cuts imposed by the saving package. Given the volume of the diplomatic dialogue portfolio and the need for senior staff to conduct dialogue tracks, having two dedicated departments makes sense. Their division of labour is organised in function of themes, geographies and entry points. The leadership will examine a further clarification of the tasks. Following a recent senior leadership team retreat, structure- and process-related measures have been introduced to promote Centre-wide collaboration. They are already positively impacting. There is good continuity in the Senior Leadership Team (SLT). Only two positions are subject to rotation (Executive Director and Chief of Staff). This is a structural constraint.	The CdP partially agrees and expects GCSP to carry out an organisational structure review.

3	Although there is good anecdotal evidence of the outcomes of GCSP's work, the Centre's MEL system does not systematically capture outcomes or impact. Therefore, evidence on impact and sustainability remains inconclusive and insufficient to support GCSP's Theory of Change. This means GCSP does not have strong data on which approaches are most effective which could support decision making. This also potentially limits GCSP's ability to sell its work to new donors or partners.	Strengthen the MEL System for Outcomes and Impact: Progress the MEL focus from outputs to outcomes and longer-term impact, incorporating qualitative methodologies such as outcome harvesting and stories of change alongside quantitative indicators. This should track issues including gender-related impact. This could provide useful data for fundraising with new donors and partners including foundations and the private sector. The system should be linked to inputs (e.g. resources including staff days required for running activities) to link resources to added value which would provide evidence on which approaches are most effective. The evidence should inform strategic decision-making and performance management based on what activities are most impactful/sustainable. The framework should be harmonised with DCAF/GICHD – more details of this are provided in the synthesis report.	The GCSP fully supports this recommendation. While the GCSP's MEL system is already well-integrated in some areas of our work, for instance in Executive Education, the Centre is currently working towards bettering and further developing the MEL system in the two dialogue departments. An internal audit is scheduled in Q3/2026 to assess the impacts of the two departments in terms of qualitative KPIs. It will also aim at developing better outcome measurements for partners and donors. Moreover, inspired by the "Monitoring Dialogue in Conflict-Affected Contexts: A Guide for Practitioners", the two dialogue departments will receive training from the authors of the report to understand how this methodology could inform their MEL processes in their future work. Furthermore, the Executive Education Department restructure will further strengthen its MEL system. Indeed, the new organisational model provides an opportunity to embed MEL more systematically across the entire department. With fewer organisational boundaries, teams can align indicators, harmonise methodologies and develop a shared learning culture. This will facilitate stronger cross-program analysis, support continuous improvement, and enhance the department's ability to demonstrate impact and strategic relevance to stakeholders. The GCSP would benefit from the proposed synthesis report recommendation to commission an independent MEL expert to assess the MEL and RBM capacity of all three Centres. While unsure that a harmonised framework throughout the three Centres would be pertinent due to the divergence in products, the GCSP is open to the recommendations that will be offered by the expert in its assessment.	The CdP agrees with the response.
---	---	--	--	---

4	GCSP has successfully diversified its funding over the last years across the pillars of its work. This has happened in the context of an increasingly constricted funding environment which should be commended. While funding diversification is well underway, GCSP lacks the systems and oversight to ensure that partnerships, funding opportunities and proposals are strategically aligned and of sufficient quality, which in some cases has led to GCSP taking on non-aligned work which can represent a reputational risk.	Build Structured Capacity in Partnership and Fundraising: Develop a formal partnership and fundraising function with dedicated capacity (including knowledge of the private sector and philanthropic foundations). This should include: • a mapping of priority funding markets and partners - suggested areas for exploration include partnerships with Swiss or European private small or medium companies working globally, Global South partnerships, and greater defence ties • a tiered partnership framework distinguishing strategic, programmatic, and transactional relationships • mandatory use of Salesforce for tracking donor relations, pipeline opportunities, and follow-up actions A formal quality assurance mechanism should be established for new programme proposals and partnerships, assessing strategic alignment, reputational risk, delivery capacity, and expected impact before commitments are made. Where opportunities are identified, the Foundation Council	The GCSP partially supports this recommendation. GCSP's revised fundraising strategy tasks the Marketing Communications (MARCOM) department to coordinate fundraising activities of all departments. There is a mandatory Salesforce monitoring platform. The GCSP has created an effective Customer Relationship Management (CRM) tool with cyclic reporting functionality. Staff have been trained on its use, Know Your Customer (KYC) and sequencing requirements. MARCOM has created external pitch and fundraising-specific collateral to be used in conjunction with face-to-face meetings and opportunities. The Centre defines a clear distinction between business development and pure fundraising activities and works with departments to best decide in which direction to develop any relationship opportunity. In this sense, the recently created Business Unit within the Executive Education Department is contributing to business growth –consistently- while also strengthening the development of partnerships with GCSP's internal subject-matter experts. The GCSP will continue to reach out to the Foundation Council and intensify efforts to mobilise its alumni community for fundraising purposes.	The CdP agrees with the response and welcomes the measures taken and encourages the Centre to continue its efforts to build its capacity and increase coordination.
---	--	---	---	---

		should support on fundraising efforts where possible.		
5	GCSP continues to play a role in Swiss foreign and security policy and has shown itself to be a key part of International Geneva. However, GCSP and the federal authorities in Bern's relationship is under strain. This impacts trust and strategic alignment, a concern given the pressure on International Geneva and Switzerland's role in mediation, and wider shifts to hard security.	Reinvest in the Relationship with the federal authorities in Bern: Senior leadership on both sides should engage in a structured process to reinvest the relationship, including a high-level dialogue to surface mutual expectations and areas of misalignment. The federal authorities in Bern should provide an explicit and formal articulation of what it values in GCSP's wider work but particularly its mediation and dialogue work, which should in turn inform GCSP's programming priorities and reporting. GCSP should adopt more proactive engagement; not waiting for signals from the federal authorities in Bern but regularly sharing results, surfacing challenges, and proposing collaboration. This could boost GCSP's profile in Bern and support the Centre's image in Switzerland more generally, helping make the case for continued funding.	The GCSP partially supports this recommendation. The GCSP will examine ways to more systematically share insights gained in its work with stakeholders in the Federal Administration, continue to strengthen its outreach through media presence, public events and stakeholders reporting in International Geneva and wider Switzerland.	The CdP partially agrees . It agrees with the response related to sharing of insights and outreach. Additionally, it puts emphasis on the need for dialogue as mentioned in the recommendation 5 addressed to the CdP.
6	GCSP has successfully expanded its mediation and dialogue portfolio. However, much of the work is	Develop a succession plan for senior management and mediation and dialogue work:	The GCSP fully supports this recommendation. A knowledge management strategy for track 2 diplomacy work will be developed.	The CdP agrees with the response.

	dependent upon the director's access and network in the diplomatic world. Therefore, the current arrangement creates a key-person dependency that should be addressed through a more robust mitigation plan.	Develop a succession plan for GCSP's mediation and dialogue work. A formal succession plan and knowledge management strategy for the mediation and dialogue function should be developed, including documenting key contacts, process notes for active dialogue tracks, and a transition plan for incoming leadership.	Succession planning will be undertaken where appropriate with support of FDFA and DDPS.	
7	GCSP's executive education offer is consistently praised for its quality. However, the high cost of its courses compared to other providers and the lack of academic accreditation are constraints on the brand awareness, reputation and commercial viability of GCSP's executive education offer.	Accelerate Academic Accreditation for Executive Education: Accelerate efforts to secure academic accreditation for courses with recognised higher education institutions. This should involve identifying priority programmes most suited to accreditation, mapping credible institutional partners with shared interests, and establishing a clear workplan with milestones. In doing so, GCSP can provide a stronger selling point for potential participants, particularly for its open enrolment courses, and can leverage the stronger brand awareness of higher education partners to promote the organisation.	The GCSP partially supports this recommendation. The GCSP is actively expanding collaborations with universities and professional schools through co-branded programmes (as it has already been done successfully with UNIGE). See section above: Business Unit. Instead of pursuing a lengthy and costly accreditation process itself, this approach allows the GCSP to provide participants with accredited learning opportunities where appropriate, while remaining focused on its comparative advantage: policy relevance, executive education, skills development and professional networking.	The CdP agrees with the response. While the CdP welcomes internationally recognised certifications for GCSP courses, it has doubts whether academic accreditation would add value to GCSP's offer.

Recommendations addressed to GICHD

GICHD Report

#	Conclusion	Recommendation	GICHD's response	Comment by the CdP
1	Sustainability of capacity strengthening work GICHD is widely recognised for the high quality of its technical delivery. However, the findings suggest that this has not always translated into sustained institutional strengthening at the national level. GICHD is sometimes perceived more as a high-quality service provider than as a transformational actor, with limited visibility on whether -capacity building support leads to lasting systemic change. This points to a need for a more explicit focus on institutional systems strengthening and clearer articulation and evidence of how this support contributes to -long-term- national ownership and sustainability.	1.1 Adopt a more explicit systems-based approach to strengthening the institutional capacity of affected States, with a clear focus on enabling sustainable national ownership of mine action and ammunition management programmes. This would include for example, deeper systems-based institutional/organisational analysis and associated action plans tailored to the organisational/systems needs identified as part of that analysis.	The GICHD fully agrees with this recommendation. In order to move towards a more explicit system-based approach to strengthening the institutional capacity of affected States, it recently established a Regional Coordination Unit, which has developed dedicated regional roadmaps. These roadmaps provide a strategic vision for GICHD's support to affected States, tailoring and sequencing the support to specific countries and regions for a more lasting impact, including in Ukraine, Syria and the Pacific. This approach will be further strengthened under the upcoming GICHD Strategy 2027-2030 with a dedicated strategic objective that will aim to enable effective national ownership of responses to explosive ordnance. To this end, the GICHD will support affected countries and territories in establishing and sustaining clear frameworks, strong national institutions and capacities, in line with international obligations, recognized standards and other commitments, and aligned with national priorities and local context. The Centre has also increased the resources of its Planning Unit to track the implementation of support towards national ownership and to assess needs and capacities of national authorities in more details.	The CdP agrees with the response.
		1.2 Develop and apply clear methods and indicators to measure and track progress on institutional systems strengthening over time.	The GICHD fully agrees with this recommendation. The Centre will take this into account when developing the monitoring framework for the next GICHD Strategy 2027-2030.	The CdP agrees with the response.
		1.3 Strengthen communications and reporting to donors by clearly articulating how GICHD's capacity-strengthening support	The GICHD agrees with this recommendation. The GICHD will strengthen its indicators to track impact on the ground (see previous recommendation) and provide accessible communication products, including through storytelling, to	The CdP agrees with the response.

		contributes to long-term institutional change and sustainability at national level.	donors and partners to illustrate such impact. The GICHD's Fundraising and Donor Partnership Team and the Communication Team will work closely with donors to implement this recommendation.	
2	Evidence, impact and learning While GICHD produces a substantial volume of high-quality- research and reporting, tracking the uptake and application of research is perceived as limited. While MEL processes have improved, outcome and -impact level- measurement and monitoring remain underdeveloped and not as well understood by the full staff group. Reflection and learning processes are not yet consistently embedded in programming. The lack of interoperability between financial and programme monitoring also creates inefficiencies, with fewer resources invested in MEL systems to date.	2.1 Assess GICHD's capacity to systematically follow up on research products and to understand the extent to which they are taken up and applied by stakeholders.	The GICHD agrees with this recommendation. The Centre will take it into account when developing the monitoring framework for the next GICHD Strategy 2027-2030. The GICHD will ensure that its capacity is sufficient to track uptake of research products and confirm that they meet identified needs to then have a more defined impact on their targeted audience. This is an approach that has already been adopted for recent research products, such as its studies on operational efficiency in mine action or on underwater explosive ordnance.	The CdP agrees with the response.
		2.2 Strengthen organisational understanding and practice related to outcome- and impact-level measurement, including guidance on developing, tracking, and using relevant indicators.	The GICHD fully agrees with this recommendation. The Centre will take it into account when developing its next strategy 2027-2030. While the drafting of the strategy is well advanced, the Centre now needs to develop an updated monitoring framework, in line with results-based management (RBM).	The CdP agrees with the response.
		2.3 Ensure that ambitions for outcome and impact measurement are matched with realistic capacity and resources to support consistent monitoring over time.	The GICHD fully agrees with this recommendation. The Centre will take it into account when developing the monitoring framework for the next GICHD Strategy 2027-2030.	The CdP agrees with the response.
		2.4 Invest in fit-for-purpose MEL systems by conducting a targeted assessment of options and ensuring interoperability between financial management and project/programme monitoring tools.	The GICHD agrees with this recommendation. It is timely given that, as mentioned above, the Centre is about to develop its monitoring framework for the next GICHD Strategy 2027-2030. The question of the tools to be used in this context will be an integral part of the discussions, taking into account the RBM tools that the Centre already has at its disposal.	The CdP agrees with the response.

3	Organisational structure and workforce sustainability Recent restructuring and organisational change have contributed positively to management, culture, and performance, but the pace and cumulative effect of change over the past four years have also resulted in staff fatigue. Heavy workloads, particularly at more junior levels, and concerns about limited or unclear career progression pathways present risks to workforce sustainability. These issues could undermine staff motivation and retention if not addressed as GICHD moves into the next strategic period.	3.1 Consolidate and maintain the current organisational structure during the next strategic period to reduce staff fatigue and allow recent changes to stabilise.	The GICHD fully agrees with the recommendation to consolidate the organisational structure during the next strategic period. However, targeted changes to the Centre's organizational structure will be necessary to best serve the implementation of the next GICHD Strategy 2027-2030. For example, by reviewing MEL capacity in line with the previous four recommendations and by better adapting our policy research program to the needs on the ground.	The CdP agrees with the response.
		3.2 Assess staff workloads across the organisation to ensure job descriptions are realistic and aligned with available capacity, with particular attention to junior roles.	The GICHD agrees with this recommendation. The Centre is aware of this issue, has already consulted with GICHD staff on the matter, and has taken initial steps to address it. Workload is distributed uneven throughout the organization. The Centre's People & Culture division is responsible for this.	The CdP agrees with the response.
		3.3 Finalise, communicate, and implement a clear career progression framework to support staff motivation, retention, and longer-term workforce sustainability.	The GICHD fully agrees with this recommendation. The Centre is aware of this issue, has already consulted with GICHD staff on the matter, and has taken initial steps to address it. The Centre's People & Culture division is responsible for this and the objective is to present the framework at the GICHD staff retreat in September 2026.	The CdP agrees with the response.
4	GEDSI The integration of GEDSI is widely recognised as an important driver of structural change and long-term- impact in the mine action sector. However, the findings highlight a real risk of backsliding due to external political and donor pressures. While GEDSI is present across GICHD's work, there is scope to deepen its integration at outcome and impact levels and to ensure that progress is sustained, even in challenging contexts and	4.1 Continue to integrate GEDSI across all areas of work using flexible and context-appropriate approaches that balance responsiveness to donor and partner priorities with the need to prevent backsliding and sustain progress over time.	The GICHD agrees with this recommendation. The Centre's work in GEDSI is cross-cutting and supervised by the GICHD's Inclusive Risk Reduction (IRR) division. One of the expected outcomes of its upcoming strategy is that national responses are inclusive and localized. The Centre will also ensure the integration of key cross-cutting priorities, including conflict sensitivity, climate resilience, human rights, gender equality, and inclusive approaches.	The CdP agrees with the response.

	where explicit demand for GEDSI related- work is weakening.			
5	Links to Swiss foreign and security policy GICHD's contribution to Swiss foreign and security policy is strong and well-articulated at headquarters level. However, engagement with Swiss Embassies and Missions at the country level is more limited. This represents a missed opportunity to strengthen visibility, coherence, and mutual reinforcement between GICHD's operational work and Switzerland's diplomatic and development engagement in priority contexts.	5.1 Systematically engage with Swiss Embassies and Missions during field visits and in priority contexts to improve information sharing-, visibility, and coherence between GICHD's operational work and Switzerland's diplomatic and development engagement.	The GICHD agrees with this recommendation. The Centre wishes to emphasize, that numerous efforts have been made over the past two years to strengthen cooperation with Swiss representations abroad, particularly in Ukraine, the Middle East, South Caucasus and the Sahel/West Africa. It understands that these efforts need to be more systematic and will work towards this goal.	The CdP agrees with the response.
6	Working in conflict-affected/fragile contexts GICHD increasingly operates in complex, fragile, and conflict affected environments, but the findings show mixed performance in terms of speed, agility, and consistency of response. Capacity for rapid mobilisation in crisis situations varies, as does understanding of conflict sensitivity across staff groups. While progress has been made in advancing localisation and humanitarian-/development-/peace nexus approaches, these areas	6.1 Assess barriers to rapid mobilisation of staff and resources in response to crises and sudden contextual changes and identify practical measures to improve speed and agility.	The GICHD agrees with this recommendation. In the current global context, the Centre recognizes the need to be quick and agile in order to respond to crisis situations and sudden contextual changes. The establishment of the new regional office for MENA is testament to this. The GICHD believes it has demonstrated this agility in contexts such as Ukraine, Cambodia and Thailand, and Syria, despite the inherent challenges of such engagements. The Centre will continue to proactively coordinate with partners in these contexts to ensure their involvement supports, rather than delays, the implementation of a timely and effective rapid response.	The CdP agrees with the response and encourages GICHD to continue its efforts to adapt to the rapidly evolving international environment.
		6.2 Conduct a focused review of GICHD's work on localisation and humanitarian-development-peace nexus approaches to identify	The GICHD agrees with this recommendation. The Centre has already taken steps to address this recommendation. On 1 June 2026, the GICHD established the new Social Impact & Policy Research (SIPR) Unit. This new unit will focus on the social impact of mine action and ammunition	The CdP agrees with the response.

	could be strengthened further through more systematic learning, clearer guidance, and targeted staff support.	emerging good practice, success stories, and remaining gaps.	management through policy expertise, policy and inclusion research, localisation, and national capacity development. In 2026, this new unit will primarily focus on its current projects but will be tasked with developing an innovative work plan within the framework of the next GICHD strategy.	
		6.3 Provide targeted training, guidance, and ongoing support to staff on conflict sensitivity, localisation, and nexus approaches, tailored to their roles and operational contexts.	The GICHD fully agrees with this recommendation. The Centre has already taken steps to address this recommendation and will continue to strengthen its approach to these issues. As mentioned above, the GICHD has established a new SIPR unit. The Centre also developed internal guidelines on localisation (updated in 2025) and a practice note on conflict sensitivity in GICHD's programmes.	The CdP agrees with the response.

Recommendations addressed to DCAF

DCAF Report				
#	Conclusion	Recommendation	DCAF's response	Comment by the CdP
1	Lack of clear policy priorities internally and externally	Articulate a concise set of strategic policy priorities - DCAF should identify and consistently communicate a <i>small</i> number of flagship policy priorities that i) reflect its comparative advantage and operational experience, and ii) to be championed internationally.	DCAF agrees with this recommendation. DCAF recognizes the importance of clearly defining and consistently communicating a concise set of strategic policy / thematic priorities. These priorities should reflect the organization's strengths, operational experience, and areas of recognized expertise, as well as horizon scanning to identify the future key challenges where DCAF has a role to play in contributing towards solutions. DCAF has already taken significant steps in this direction through its 2025-2030 Strategy and 2025-2030 Policy Engagement Plan (both of which have been communicated publicly, including to DCAF's major partners / donors), and through the establishment of a dedicated Policy Engagement	The CdP agrees with the response.

			entity. Together, the Strategy and the Policy Engagement Plan provide an <i>initial</i> framework of priorities. Building on this foundation, an internal process is underway to identify up to five cross-organizational thematic priorities that can be championed internally and externally by all DCAF entities. Once endorsed, these thematic priorities will be integrated into DCAF's programming, research, policy engagement, and external communications activities. They will also guide strategic positioning, resource allocation, and partnership development efforts across the organization.	
2	In a context of hard security, DCAF's interlocutors need data and evidence on how governance and oversight make the security sector more effective.	Strengthen and systematize policy messaging on governance as a driver of security effectiveness - DCAF should more consistently frame its work around the idea that governance reforms strengthen the operational effectiveness of security and defence institutions.	DCAF agrees with this recommendation. Effectiveness has always been central to security sector governance and to DCAF's approach to designing, implementing, and evaluating its programmatic, policy, and advisory work. It is embedded in DCAF's operational approach and underpins engagement with partners across contexts (Ukraine, Lebanon, the Gambia etc.). Over the past year, also taking into account the shift towards hard security paradigms, steps have been taken to demonstrate the link between governance and strategic effectiveness and to develop a clear and consistent narrative that positions governance as a key driver of effective security outcomes. This includes contributions to policy debates, the development of a policy brief on security assistance and business cases that highlight how governance reform underpins effectiveness in security and defence institutions. DCAF will continue to advance this work and further strengthen the organisation's position in this area.	The CdP agrees with the response.
3	The EU SSG/R funding architecture increasingly prioritises EU based state-aligned operators + train and equip models (EPF).	Strengthen strategic engagement with large security assistance programmes - DCAF should develop a clear	DCAF partially agrees with this recommendation. DCAF recognizes the broader shift towards, and potential benefits of partnership-based approaches, including consortia and large-scale security assistance mechanisms. DCAF has	The CdP agrees with the response and encourages DCAF to continue assessing

		organisational approach to consortium-based programming and large-scale security assistance mechanisms, particularly within EU funding frameworks.	engaged in such arrangements in the past, with varied results, and sees the need for a clearer institutional position on this. DCAF will continue to assess consortium opportunities on a case-by-case basis, considering the specificities of each context, political sensitivities, operational value, and alignment with DCAF's mandate. Partnerships will be further developed through a strengthened network of trusted organizations which could be mobilized into consortia, should suitable opportunities arise. Within this broader reflection, DCAF will continue to leverage its Brussels office to engage with EU instruments and structures, recognising the EU's central (but not exclusive) role as a major donor and a key actor in European and global security governance. Looking ahead, DCAF is also reviewing and considering options to increase our ability to access EU funding. Overall, DCAF will continue to adapt to the evolving landscape in a measured strategic way, balancing engagement in partnerships while maintaining its distinct profile.	consortium opportunities.
4	DCAF workforce lacks people with background in government, law enforcement and security agencies.	Broaden expertise in reform processes for defence and security institutions – DCAF should progressively broaden in-house expertise in core defence and security governance and reform domains.	DCAF partially agrees with this recommendation. DCAF recognizes that core expertise in defence and security governance and reform remains central to its mandate and has become increasingly important in a context of heightened focus on hard security. DCAF also recognizes the added value of personnel with prior experience in defence, law enforcement, or security institutions, particularly when combined with the right set of soft skills and experience supporting governance and reform processes. While DCAF already employs well-trusted expert consultants and some staff with such experience, this remains a relatively	The CdP agrees with the response.

			small proportion of its workforce. DCAF sees merit in increasing the proportion of such profiles, while recognizing that this alone is not sufficient. DCAF will maintain a diverse and adaptable skills mix, including strengthening capacities to respond to rapidly evolving security challenges and the fast-moving technological landscape.	
5	DCAF has shifted towards a results culture, but learning remains uneven across the organisation.	Consolidate the shift towards outcome-oriented learning - DCAF should pursue the consistent and systematic implementation of the new organisation-wide monitoring and learning framework, including when it comes to i) documenting both successes and setbacks, and ii) integrating lessons and evaluations into programme design and strategic planning across all teams.	DCAF agrees with this recommendation. As was confirmed by the evaluation, DCAF has already made a clear shift towards a more results- and outcome-oriented culture, with increased emphasis on monitoring, evaluation, organizational learning and evidence-based decision-making. This direction is clearly set out in DCAF's 2025–2030 strategy. As implementation is still at an early stage, more is needed to ensure consistency across the organization. This effort is already underway as part of DCAF's organizational development agenda. Key steps taken over the past year include the establishment of a dedicated Strategy Execution unit (Stratex), the development of tools and processes such as organizational Results Framework, Outcome Harvesting and Stories of Change, the rollout of a strengthened network of MEAL focal points, and the development of a "One DCAF Data Hub" to improve data monitoring, access and use. The focus is now on consolidating these structures and tools and ensuring that data and learning are used more systematically to inform programme design, implementation and strategic decision-making.	The CdP agrees with the response.