



2013:38

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Julian Brett
Lars Lyhne Stensgaard
Niels Eilschow Olesen

2011 Evaluation of ACCORD, SALLA and CCR – Regional Peace and Security in Africa

Final Report

2011 Evaluation of ACCORD, SAIIA and CCR – Regional Peace and Security in Africa

**Final Report
December 2013**

**Julian Brett
Lars Lyhne Stensgaard
Niels Eilschow**

Authors: Julian Brett, Lars Lyhne Stensgaard and Niels Eilschow Olesen

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2013:38

Commissioned by Sida

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: December 2013

Published by Citat 2013

Art. no. Sida61666en

urn:nbn:se:sida-61666en

This publication can be downloaded from: <http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of Contents

Executive summary	i-vi
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Focus of the evaluation	2
1.3 Swedish Regional Development Cooperation Strategy	3
1.4 Structure of this report	3
2 Evaluation methodology	5
2.1 Terminology used	5
2.2 Approach and tools	6
2.3 Limitations	7
3 Evaluation findings	8
3.1 African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD)	8
3.2 The Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR)	19
3.3 The South African Institute for International Affairs (SAIIA)	34
3.4 Comparative analysis – also including IJR and ISS	51
4 Conclusions and recommendations	58
4.1 Conclusions	58
4.2 Summary of recommendations	58

Table of Appendices

- Appendix A: Terms of Reference**
- Appendix B: Resource persons consulted**
- Appendix C: Website assessment**
- Appendix D: Documents consulted**

Executive summary

This evaluation of the African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD), the Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR) and the South Africa Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) has been initiated in order to inform Sida's decision making process concerning the continued support to the three organisations. A further two organisations (the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation - IJR) and the Institute for Security Studies - ISS) which are also the object of Sida support are included in a comparative analysis as they were evaluated earlier in 2011.

Each of these organisations has different but often overlapping niches of operation within the broad field that is peace and security. Each of them engages in advocacy in one form or another, engaging both government and civil society in the countries where they are active. Each undertakes research and disseminates it to a range of stakeholders. Each is supported by a number of international donors, in addition to Sida.

Sweden has provided core support to the five institutions over a number of years to enhance their institutional capacity and to support their work in promoting peace and security on the African continent.

This evaluation builds upon the 2008 Sida evaluation (Sida Evaluation 2008:26) that assessed five regional institutions based in South Africa in the field of peace and security and follows up on specific recommendations and issues emphasised in that report. The current evaluation period covers the period from mid-2008 to mid-2011.

The evaluation assesses the role, performance and impact of the three organisations, taking into account the particularities of each organisation and focusing on the following issues and questions:

- The aims, objectives and progress achieved for the organisations during the evaluation period (2009-2011)
- Following up on the 2008 evaluation recommendations concerning strategic plans and strategies, management/accountability structures, human resource capacity, appropriate portfolio of products, and external partnerships
- The quality of each organisation's activities in terms of relevance, coverage, accessibility and reliability
- The status of the monitoring and evaluation systems
- Ability to fulfil the needs of beneficiaries and respond to the demanding for services, and

- The long-term sustainability of the organisations concerning funding and support and how this is affected by possible expansion and the general institutional development of each organisation.

The evaluation has used a number of methodologies for data collection: document review, semi-structured and group interviews with staff and stakeholders of the organisations, SWOT workshops, organisational self-evaluation, e-surveys and web-analysis.

As an introductory remark, the team would like to highlight that each of the five organisations is a significant contributor to the development and application of knowledge on peace and security; each has developed niche areas of work and competencies that distinguish it from the others; and each represents a reliable partner for Sida (and other funders). Both singularly and collectively, the organisations succeed in delivering quality products to stakeholders in South Africa, the Southern African region, and the Continent as a whole.

A further observation relates to the differing size of the organisations – in ascending order – IJR (20), CCR (29), SAIIA (35), ACCORD (89 – half of whom are at its Burundi office) and ISS (129 – spread over five offices). This obviously has an impact on the organisations' coverage and range of products.

The following summarise specific findings, conclusions and recommendations for each of the three organisations assessed in this evaluation.

ACCORD:

- ACCORD is a widely recognised Institution, especially for its activities on mediation, conflict management and training on the African continent. ACCORD is contributing to the peace processes in several African conflicts, including Burundi, Sudan, Somalia and the DRC.
- The evaluation team assesses that ACCORD has followed up on the recommendations of the 2008 evaluation, particularly with regard to the process to implement a Monitoring and Evaluation framework.
- ACCORD staff has a high capacity to deliver its services and its administrative and financial functions are well established.
- ACCORD needs to document its focused strategy on the Centre's coverage on the African continent.
- ACCORD needs to develop a clear communication strategy that defines target groups, sets audience for the different publications, and guides when or when not media is to be informed for events etc.

The evaluation team **recommends** that:

- ACCORD initiates the discussion of harmonisation of donor reporting either during its Joint Donor Meetings held every 2nd year or bilaterally with each of the main donors.
- When determining a new vision, ACCORD should formulate an overall strategy for the Institution which explains the link between the different programmes and priorities to ensure coherence and a focus on coverage, partnerships, themes, interventions, communication and target groups, taking account the needs of stakeholders, the organisational capacity and future funding opportunities.
- ACCORD - as part of the overall strategy – considers how to deal with media and confidentiality issues in sensitive or volatile situations.
- ACCORD considers its target audience vis-à-vis its different publication products and includes social media in its strategy.
- The proposed development of a consultancy arm is undertaken in such a way that it is ensured that it is strategically different from ACCORD and adequately separated from ACCORD.

CCR:

- CCR remains an energetic and engaged contributor to African peace and security. It demonstrates a significant convening power that allows it to address key issues in a timely and focused manner; it produces and disseminates a variety of publications that are topical, timely and relevant to its key stakeholder groups; and it provides training and mediation services that serve to resolve conflict and increase the capacity of others to do so.
- Its administrative and financial functions are firmly in place and indeed it has strengthened them further since the 2008 evaluation. It has taken some steps to strengthen its financial sustainability.
- CCR's objectives remain relevant. It has made significant progress on results based management systems (including monitoring and evaluation). The development of a new strategy in 2012 provides an opportunity to link this progress to new programmes. CCR should continue and if possible extend its use of internal and external results monitoring.
- CCR is generally successful in identifying and responding to beneficiary needs and that this aspect is now being enhanced through the application of the new M&E system.
- CCR's lean programme staff relies upon a well-oiled administrative machinery to produce an impressive range of outputs. CCR is encouraged to strengthen its programme staff to the extent that funds allow and to further enhance the linkages between its policy research and training/mediation areas so that optimum use is made of the resources available.

- Staff turnover appears to be stabilising since the turbulence noted in the 2008 evaluation. However, with a relatively smaller number of programme staff, CCR needs to maintain a careful watch on staff retention issues. It has the mechanisms in place to do this.

The evaluation team **recommends** that:

- As CCR moves towards a new programme phase (2013+) it develops a more thorough strategy document that can serve as the basis for its programming and operations. The new strategy should start with and include a clear statement of CCR's goals and objectives and then explore how these will be met.
- The synergies between programme areas could be further enhanced so that it is systematic and enables the best possible use to be made of the capacities within the organisation.
- CCR consider establishing an internal peer review committee with a membership drawn from all of its work clusters that would be used for all internal quality assurance of all formal publications (i.e. including seminar reports and policy briefs).
- CCR assess the value and relevance of its current indicators (from the perspective of being meaningful, monitor-able and reflecting the level of impact desired from their work). The information gathered should be used to inform the results-based management approach that will underpin the new strategy and programmes in 2013.
- The CIPS and National Programme staff are amalgamated so that they can function as one group.
- In view of the continued staff fluctuation, CCR management continues to monitor the situation closely and the impact of the various staff retention policies that have been introduced.

SAIIA:

- SAIIA is well-established and highly regarded contributor to international affairs in Southern Africa. There are few similar organisations focusing on the underlying socio-economic reasons for conflict. It demonstrates its relevance through its ability to focus on the wider peace and conflict agenda within South Africa as well as across Africa in a timely and independent manner. The relevance and timeliness is evidenced through feedback from key stakeholders that express a high degree of satisfaction with the research outputs.
- The Institute has taken several steps towards becoming more focused on the region and on issues across Africa. Several new partnerships have been established over the past three years with research institutes outside South

Africa. These new partners are increasingly becoming integral with the research programmes.

- Organisational processes and procedures have been further developed since 2008 to ensure that the Institute works effectively and efficiently. A recent retrenchment process has increased the ratio of research vis-à-vis support staff. Steps have been taken to develop the M&E practices but further steps are required to develop an Institute-wide M&E system.
- SAIIA's objectives are relevant and developed through a process of interaction with key stakeholders and through the research process in the programmes. The development of a new post 2012 strategy provides an opportunity for presenting a more complete strategy which includes i.a. considerations concerning key issues over the coming five year period, lessons learned, the capacity of the Institute, partnership with institutes abroad, etc.

The evaluation team **recommends** that:

- SAIIA articulates more clearly the context and rationale for its research programmes, taking account of stakeholder needs, the capacity of the institute, lessons learned, demand for services, a theory of change, partnerships with South African, regional and African institutes and the expected funding available.
- Regular internal communication practices should be institutionalised to ensure transparency and legitimacy about decisions taken at management level.
- The Institute considers the use of interns and Ph.D. students and considers advertising research assignment on its website in order to ensure competition between interested candidates.
- The Institute liaises with ACCORD, which has been able to adopt a way of obtaining corporate work permits.
- A senior M&E post is created. Seniority and experience is required in order to provide firm direction and oversight on the implementation of an Institute-wide M&E system. Alternatively, an existing senior staff can be assigned with this responsibility.
- SAIIA's research approach including its M&E system is consolidated in a *programme research manual*, which should serve as a guideline for e.g. research procedures, choice of methodology, guide on the research processes and data collection, incorporation of M&E procedures, peer review process, style guide, etc. Such a manual would provide a common point of reference across the institute research staff as well as for external researchers on what is an acceptable research standard. Moreover and important for developing research capacity, it could also be used in the collaboration with external partners as a benchmark for working with SAIIA.

- Given that the process of following up on website design and structure has been going on for quite some time, this activities should be completed before year-end.
- The Institute continues its efforts in diversifying its domestic and international funding and as a result becomes less dependent on few large donors.
- The Institute establish full transparency concerning the selection criteria (e.g. synergy, timing, sectors, etc.) when accepting to carry out different types of consultancies.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

This evaluation of the African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD), based in Durban; the Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR), based in Cape Town; and the South Africa Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA), based in Johannesburg, has been initiated in order to inform Sida's decision making process concerning the continued support to the three organisations.

A further two organisations which are also the object of Sida support are included in a comparative analysis. These organisations were evaluated earlier in 2011 through an assessment sponsored by the Netherlands Embassy in Pretoria. The two organisations are the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (IJR), based in Cape Town, and the Institute for Security Studies (ISS), based in Pretoria.

Each of these organisations has different but often overlapping niches of operation within the broad field that is peace and security. Each of them engages in advocacy in one form or another, engaging both government and civil society in the countries where they are active. Each undertakes research and disseminates it to a range of stakeholders. Each is supported by a number of international donors, in addition to Sida.

Sweden has provided core support to the five institutions over a number of years to enhance their institutional capacity and to support their work in promoting peace and security on the African continent.

This evaluation builds upon the 2008 Sida evaluation (Sida Evaluation 2008:26) that assessed five regional institutions based in South Africa in the field of peace and security and follows up on specific recommendations and issues emphasised in that report. The current evaluation period covers the period from mid-2008 to mid-2011.

The evaluation team would like to express its thanks to the large number of people who generously gave their time and assistance during the course of the evaluation, in particular: staff at the Swedish Embassy in Pretoria and the management and staff of ACCORD, CCR, SAIIA and also IJR and ISS. In addition, we would like to thank the large number of other stakeholders and people with

knowledge of the organisations who agreed to be interviewed or who contributed in other ways to the evaluation. While each of the organisations has had an opportunity to comment on their sections of the report, the report's findings and judgements are those of the evaluation team alone.

1.2 Focus of the evaluation

As stated in its Terms of Reference (ToR)¹, the purpose of this evaluation is “to support the decision-making process related to a possible continuation of Sida’s support to the five institutions based in South Africa. The objective of the evaluation is to follow-up on comments and recommendations presented in the 2008 Sida evaluation”.

While the 2008 evaluation focused on all five organisations to an equal depth of analysis, this evaluation focuses mainly on ACCORD, CCR, and SAIIA as ISS and IJR were evaluated in the first half of 2011.² However, a comparative assessment of all five organisations covering the main issues of this evaluation is included.

The evaluation assesses the role, performance and impact of the three organisations, taking into account the particularities of each organisation and focusing on the following issues and questions:

- The aims, objectives and progress achieved for the organisations during the evaluation period (2009-2011), including how these aims were established by each organisations and how they have responded through activities and outputs to the needs for peace and security in Africa
- Following up on the 2008 recommendations that the previous evaluation made for each organisation concerning strategic plans and strategies, management/accountability structures, human resource capacity, appropriate portfolio of products, and external partnerships
- The quality of each organisation’s activities in terms of relevance, coverage, accessibility and reliability
- The status of the monitoring and evaluation systems, including the ability to capture and measure own goals and attribute them to impact in a structured way
- Fulfilling the needs of beneficiaries and responding to the demanding for services

¹ See Appendix A to this report

² “External Evaluation of the Institute for Security Studies” (March 2011) and “External Evaluation of IJR” (March/April 2011). Both reports are made by COWI A/S for the Royal Netherlands Embassy in Pretoria, South Africa.

- The long-term sustainability of the organisations concerning funding and support and how this is affected by possible expansion and the general institutional development of each organisation.

The above evaluation issues and questions are presented and discussed separately for each of the three organisations.

1.3 Swedish Regional Development Cooperation Strategy

A new strategy for regional development cooperation with Sub-Saharan Africa was launched in 2010.³ Overall, the strategy provides a well-defined platform for the collaboration and support to civil society organisations that contribute to solving regional challenges.

The overarching focus of the strategy is “regional trans-boundary challenges or issues common to several countries”. The aim of the strategy is to develop the capacity of regional actors, primarily AU and RECs to strengthen their capacity to fulfil their mandates and roles. But support can also be given to “civil society organisations, economic organisations, and other relevant national and regional actors or initiatives, which are engaged in efforts to meet regional challenges...”.

The priority areas mentioned in the strategy are “peace and security, environment and climate, and economic integration including trade, business, and financial systems.” However, the strategy also supports strategic research contributions through closer regional integrations within research.

All of the above elements of the regional strategy are important elements when assessing the relevance of the strategy vis-à-vis the support to ACCORD, CCR and SAIIA. All of the organisations focus on peace and security issues in different contexts. In sum, the focus of the three organisations is in line with and highly relevant to the strategic direction of the regional strategy. All the organisations collaborate with the AU and RECs and contribute directly through mediation and conflict prevention/management/resolution activities and indirectly through knowledge production to strengthen their capacities.

1.4 Structure of this report

This report is structured in three parts: firstly, an Executive Summary providing the key findings of the evaluation; secondly, the main body of the report, which provides essential background and which answers the main questions sought by Sida in the Terms of Reference. There are three organisational assessments -

³ Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2010), “Cooperation Strategy for Regional Development Cooperation with Sub-Saharan Africa, 2010-2015”, Stockholm (<http://regeringen.se/sb/d/108/a/39806>). There is also a peace and security strategy above the regional level: Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2010), “Swedish Policy on Peace and Security”, Stockholm (<http://regeringen.se/sb/d/108/a/162575>).

one for each of the organisations; and thirdly, a comparative analysis which also includes findings relating to IJR and ISS. The report responds, and is structured according to, the evaluation questions posed in the Terms of Reference.

2 Evaluation methodology

The methodology that we have used reflects international best practice for evaluations by drawing from the OECD/DAC and Sida evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact).

2.1 Terminology used

The evaluation team has used the following terms and definitions based on the standard evaluation criteria elaborated by the OECD/DAC:

- **Relevance:** The relation of objectives to the needs of the beneficiaries of target groups / systems. We have asked whether the outcomes achieved by the organisations targeted the priority issues in the given context.
- **Effectiveness:** The ability to match objectives with results achieved (outputs or out-comes). The team has examined how organisational and financial management procedures and human resources were used to achieve the outputs and outcomes.
- **Efficiency:** The ability to achieve maximum results with given resources.
- **Impact:** The long-term changes that result in the condition of society from a series of outcomes. These changes can be intended or unintended, positive or negative.
- **Sustainability:** The continuation of the outcomes after implementation has been completed.

In addition, the following three criteria were indicated in the Terms of Reference in order to assess the quality of each organisation's activities:

- **Accessibility:** Whether the organisation is accessible to stakeholders' views and needs, and whether the websites of the organisations provide an effective overview of products and activities.
- **Coverage:** The ability to cover relevant research areas as well as to fulfil its geographical scope.
- **Reliability:** The ability to deliver credible and trustworthy findings and conclusions.

2.2 Approach and tools

The evaluation was carried out in three phases:

- 1 Preparation phase: desk review of key documentation material from Sida (internal notes, financial appropriation documents and reporting from the organisations to Sida) and finalisation of evaluation tools.
- 2 Data collection phase: visits to and interviews with key staff of the organisations, e-surveys and continued desk study.
- 3 Reporting phase: consolidation of data from the three organisations, comparison with the findings of the evaluations of IJR and ISS, and drafting the final report.

The evaluation was implemented through a combination of evaluation tools that has included desk studies, interviews, self-evaluation and e-surveys.

2.2.1 Interviews and questionnaires

For each of the organisations, the evaluation team met with a representative sample of management and non-management staff over approximately two days. Introductory meetings were held with the directors and/or heads of departments to get an overview of the overall strategy and any follow-up on the 2008 Sida evaluation. Individual sessions were then held with heads of departments, programme and administrative staff, including finance, HR, and administration to gain a better understanding of the different programmes of the organization, including output/deliverables, stakeholder feedback, planning & strategy, relevance and impact. Separate sessions were held on monitoring and evaluation since it was a key issue raised in the 2008 evaluation. The visits were concluded by a debriefing meeting with the director and key staff where initial findings were presented and discussed.

Brief follow-up meetings were also held with ISS and IJR in order to ensure that the evaluations conducted in the first half of 2011 were up-to-date.

Before leaving South Africa, the evaluation team met with representatives of the Swedish and the Danish embassies in Pretoria and presented preliminary findings and conclusions.

2.2.2 Self-evaluation

A self-evaluation template was designed in order to capture all of the recommendations from the 2008 evaluation for each of the organisations. It was sent to the organisations and they were asked to evaluate themselves what they had done to implement each of the recommendations, what had been achieved, indicate if no action had been taken, and indicate sources of the evidence. The information provided was used by the team in discussion with the organisations and clarifications were sought where necessary. The progress shown in the self evaluation has been validated by using information provided by stakeholders

and the team's own assessment of the organisations based on interviews and documentation.

The self-evaluation template was tailored to each organisation in order to reflect the particular observations made in the 2008 evaluation.

2.2.3 E-survey

As for the 2008 evaluation, a short questionnaire was prepared aimed at soliciting views of external stakeholders on the organisations' performance. We asked the organisations for their help in two ways: firstly, through placing the questionnaire on their websites for a limited period and, secondly, through sending it directly to people on their mailing lists. The questionnaire was structured in a similar way for each organisation with minor modifications to reflect particularities of each organisation.

2.2.4 Web analysis

Drawing from COWI's communication specialists, we have also undertaken a brief technical examination of the organisations' websites in order to assess their accessibility, information content and user-friendliness.

2.2.5 SWOT analysis

During the visits to the organisations, the team undertook a participatory SWOT workshop with all staff available to identify internal Strengths (S) and Weaknesses (W) and external Opportunities (O) and Threats (T). The SWOT sessions were divided in groups of management staff and groups of non-management staff (except in CCR).

2.3 Limitations

We should reflect that the evaluation has been undertaken under a number of limitations.

The time spent with the organisations has been limited to approximately two-three days per organisation. Given the scope of the evaluation, the evaluation team was not able to travel to country projects and interventions to ask beneficiaries for evidence of impact. Hence, the evaluation has focused at the overall organisational level, which means that all projects/programmes of the organisations have not been assessed systematically and in-depth. This limitation is mitigated to a certain extent by the results of the stakeholder questionnaires.

The surveys conducted, however, will most likely have a positive bias since they have been completed by stakeholders that the organisations maintain regular contact with and which are likely to be positive to the organisations (otherwise they would probably not be on the mailing lists of the organisations).

3 Evaluation findings

This chapter presents the detailed findings, conclusions and recommendations on the main evaluation issues for each of the three organisations. Progress against the 2008 evaluation (ToR Question 2) is assessed in the various sub-sections as and when these deal with the issues raised. The last section (3.4) presents the comparative analysis of all five organisations also covering the main evaluation issues.

3.1 African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD)

3.1.1 Background

The African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD) was established in 1992 by the initiative of senior political leaders in South Africa. The mandate was then to provide conflict management mechanisms during the transition from Apartheid in South Africa, but it has since developed and changed its focus and coverage to include the African continent. Today, ACCORD has 19 years experience in Mediation, Training and Research on conflict.

ACCORD's head office is based in Durban and ACCORD presents itself as a South African-based civil society institution working throughout Africa to bring creative African solutions to the challenges posed by conflict on the continent.

The 2007 - 2012 vision for ACCORD is:

Encouraging and consolidating dialogue towards the prevention, management and transformation of conflict.

The aim of the present vision is to affect a paradigm shift towards dialogue. ACCORD's vision is formulated for periods of five years and is approved by a Board of Trustees. Since the first vision of ACCORD in 1996, there has been a sequential shift in focus from conflict management to prevention, management and transformation of conflict.

ACCORD wishes to become the leader in its area of work by focusing on civil responses to conflict as opposed to military responses. This is reflected in its Mission:

ACCORD seeks to encourage and promote the constructive resolution of disputes by the peoples of Africa and so assist in achieving political stability, economic recovery and peaceful co-existence within just and democratic societies.

ACCORD's core activities fall into two categories: Knowledge production and interventions. The knowledge production produces research, articles and publications tailored for different target groups. Interventions cover training, seminars, workshops, policy development, analysis and different programme activities within peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding.

ACCORD employs 44 permanent staff in South Africa at its Head Office in Durban. In 2003, ACCORD opened an office in Burundi which presently employs 45 staff (May 2011). The total operating expenditure in 2009 was ZAR 50.681.335.⁴

The total amount of the support to ACCORD covered by the Sida agreement during the period 2009-2011 is SEK 30.200.000.⁵ The SIDA support consists of two components, namely:

1) Institutional support for capacity development (core support). The core support amounts to SEK 26.200.000 (2009: SEK 9.300.000, 2010: SEK 8.200.000, 2011: SEK 8.700.000).

2) Programme support in favour of a partnership between ACCORD, DPCR (University of Uppsala's Department of Peace and Conflict Research) and NAI (Nordic Africa Institute). ACCORD and NAI collaborate using Sida funds according to ACCORD's work plan for its documentations centre, and funds for these activities sit with ACCORD. The Partnership ACCORD/DPCR amounts to SEK 4.000.000 (2009: SEK 800.000, 2010: SEK 1.500.000, 2011: SEK 70.000).

ACCORD is headed by the Board of Trustees which consists of eight highly prominent members, including the Founder and Executive Director of ACCORD Mr Vasu Gounden. The Board has since December 2008 been chaired by Mme Graça Machel (President FDC, Mozambique).

Besides the Board of Trustees, ACCORD also has an Executive Committee (EXCOM) of the Board, which meets twice a year and which reports at the two full Trustees meetings held each year. The EXCOM consists of four trustees and two ACCORD general managers and focuses on financial sustainability, policy development, insurances, etc. of the Institution.

⁴ Annual Financial Statement, December 2009

⁵ Agreement between SIDA and ACCORD on (a) core support and (b) financing a partnership during 2009 - 2011

3.1.2 Quality of objectives and strategy

This sub-section is concerned with the objectives set by ACCORD for its development and its role in relation to peace and security. It examines how these have been determined and how the Centre has progressed against them (ToR Question 1).

The Institution has developed a clear framework that defines vision, objectives and activities of the Centre's programmes. The overall vision, mission and institutional objectives have informed the development of specific objectives, outcomes and activities.

The five institutional objectives of ACCORD are:

- Provide training in the skills of negotiation, conflict anticipation, resolution and management.
- Conduct and promote research in the field of conflict resolution in order to develop, document, analyse and apply innovative local (African) concepts, trends and techniques to improve conflict anticipation, resolution and management on the African continent.
- Establish forums to foster the development and application of the above skills.
- Provide conflict resolution services in the form of facilitation, mediation and other consensus building techniques.
- Host seminars to raise public awareness of conflict resolution as a process.

ACCORD views itself as a strong intervention based institution, supported by the research within conflict resolution as reflected in the objectives. It wishes to establish a strong coherence between its knowledge production (e.g. the research) and its intervention work. The emphasis is less on producing academic research for academic purposes only, but to produce African oriented knowledge and materials that directly benefit and feed into the interventions of the Centre. An example of cross pollination between the Knowledge Production Department and the Interventions Department is the collaboration between researchers and the Peace building Unit to address and formulate regional programming on peace building.

ACCORD has a strong international profile reflected in the countries it works in, priorities, activities, production and staff composition. Since the previous evaluation in 2008, ACCORD has expanded its coverage on the African continent from 15 to 31 African countries.

As an outcome of ACCORD's effort of introducing an M & E framework, the Centre now uses a Log Frame Approach (LFA) to develop programmes. The Institutional log frame provides the basis for development of unit log frames.

The unit log frames are considered as "internal products" where partners are consulted, but there is no direct involvement of stakeholders in the process.

The Log Frame Approach will also improve the annual reporting to Sida as it will provide an overview of results and impact for the reporting when all the verifiable indicators have been identified by ACCORD. Not all donors use the Log Frame Approach to reporting and the problem with handling different formats of reporting has been discussed at the bi-annual review meeting with Sida. ACCORD holds Joint Donor Meetings every 2nd year, but the issue of streamlining reporting has not yet been raised in this forum. It is therefore **recommended** that ACCORD initiate the discussion of harmonisation of reporting during these meetings or through other channels.

ACCORD holds at least one Management Committee (MANCO) meeting a quarter during an institutional "in-week", when the whole staff reviews, reflects and reprioritises its activities against the Year Plan. MANCO involves all General Managers and Department Managers and reviews activities and provisioning for the remainder of the year, to ensure that all objectives set for the year are met. This helps to ensure the quality and value of the work undertaken by ACCORD.

The senior managers in ACCORD have been in the Institution for many years and constitute the core experience and knowledge of the Institution. The senior management are therefore able to overview the vision, mission, objectives and log frames and strategise according to these. It is nevertheless **recommended** that when determining a new vision, ACCORD should formulate an overall strategy for the Institution which explains the link between the different programmes and determines priorities to ensure coherence and a focus on coverage, partnerships, themes, interventions, communication and target groups, taking account of stakeholder needs, the organisational capacity and future funding opportunities.

In certain interventions ACCORD has to keep a low profile in order to maintain a neutral position, e.g. when calling in different partners in a conflict situation. It is therefore **recommended** that ACCORD - as part of the overall strategy - considers how to deal with media and confidentiality issues in sensitive or volatile situations.

3.1.3 Quality of activities

This sub-section provides an assessment of ACCORD's activities in terms of their relevance, coverage, accessibility & reliability (ToR Question 3).

ACCORD's core activities are carried out in the two departments: the Intervention Department and the Knowledge Production Department.

The Intervention Department aims at facilitating the introduction, support for, and sustainability of conflict management initiatives in conflict affected societies. This is done through:

- identifying, analyzing and tracking trends in (conflict) issues, parties and peace processes
- identifying peace/dialogue constituencies to be engaged for positive impact on peace processes
- building the conflict management capacity of parties and stakeholders that enables such beneficiaries to demonstrate their efforts toward mitigating conflict
- supporting facilitators of peace processes
- supporting the enhancement of African regional entities/mechanisms through capacity building and policy development initiatives and
- interpreting a variety of existing conceptual frameworks and reflect the convergence and/or confirmation of theory and practice.

Monitoring, tracking and analysis guides ACCORD in its choice of intervention strategy in different conflict situations. Interventions include trainings, Training of Trainers, seminars, facilitation of dialogues, mediation and other events.

Since 1992, ACCORD has trained more than 20,000 people in conflict management and conflict resolution skills. The main target groups are community organisations and public sector organisations in society. Companies and private organisations are offered conflict resolution, negotiation and mediation skills training through a Fee for Service component. Since 2007 the training events has primarily taken place in South Africa or Burundi, but training has also been conducted in Angola, Zambia, DRC, Zimbabwe, Liberia, Botswana, Kenya, Sudan, Swaziland and Cote d'Ivoire.

In order to position itself as a training provider within the South Africa qualification framework, ACCORD has succeeded in attaining South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) accreditation for the conflict management training offered to the Foreign Service Training Institute. The training is for diplomats of the Department of International Relations and Co-operation (DIRCO). The team assesses that ACCORD has established well organised systems and structures to plan and carry out these interventions.

The Knowledge Production Department has its strategic objective to establish ACCORD as a positive and constructive learning organisation that enhances policy, research and practice in the field of conflict management.

The Departmental Objectives are to:

- Strengthen and inform interventions
- Provide a platform for learning and reflection
- Contribute to building capacity of staff
- Take the lead in conversations of transforming conflict.

The main activities of the department concerns research, publications, knowledge sharing and capacity development. The knowledge production is published through the *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, the magazine *Conflict Trends*, Policy and Practice Briefs, reports and Occasional Papers.

The themes of the publications are within ACCORD's focus areas and include policy and conflict analysis, peacemaking, mediation efforts, transnational issues and governance issues. In 2011, the themes in the publications covered 20 countries on the African continent.

In terms of coverage, the team finds that ACCORD's international reach is significant. ACCORD has built up a database with partners and individuals in specific fields who receive the different publications.

The *African Journal on Conflict Resolution* is an in-depth publication, which is published twice per year and distributed to 723 subscribers worldwide of whom 41 % are distributed within Africa and 52% distributed in Europe and Northern Africa. Almost two thirds of the 2300 prints of the quarterly magazine *Conflict Trends* are distributed within Africa, the remaining one third outside Africa.

All the publications are also available for website download and during the first half of 2011 ACCORD has registered more than 2657 downloads of different publications from the website.⁶ Policy and Practice Briefs are also distributed through e-mail as are some of the other publications, e.g. special reports to target audiences.

The survey conducted among the stakeholders as part of this evaluation gave only a few respondents, but those who responded expressed that ACCORD's programmes, activities, publications and policy research are highly relevant. Especially the publications and the website are rated as high-quality by the respondents.

Table 3-1 Main ACCORD activities and stakeholder focus

ACCORD products/services	Main beneficiaries/stakeholders
African Journal on Conflict Resolution	Scholars and graduate students; university libraries; civil society organisations, scholars, and policymakers; and academics, students and policymakers in North America, Europe and Latin America
Conflict Trends	Policymakers and practitioners; institutions such as the African Union (AU) and regional economic communities (RECs); UN agencies; government agencies and departments; donor partners; academics and graduate students in Africa and elsewhere.
Practice Briefs	Policy makers and practitioners mainly in civil society organisations, AU and RECs, UN agencies and departments, donor partner institutions, peace support operations and military institutions engaged in peace making.
Special issues	Policy makers and practitioners mainly in civil society organisations, AU and RECs, UN agencies and departments, donor partner institutions, peace support operations and military institutions engaged in peace making.
Occasional papers	Scholars and graduate students; university libraries; civil society organisations, scholars, and policymakers; and academics, stu-

⁶ 6.1.2 Distribution Dissemination List 2011.docx Sida

	dents and policymakers in North America, Europe and Latin America.
Reports	Policy makers and practitioners mainly in civil society organisations, AU and RECs, UN agencies and departments, donor partner institutions, peace support operations and military institutions engaged in peace making.
Seminar papers	Academics, policymakers and practitioners – depending on the final output of the article (i.e. if it is prepared for publication in the journal, in the magazine, as a policy and practice brief, or as a report).
Articles	Scholars and graduate students; university libraries; civil society organisations, scholars, and policymakers; and academics, students and policymakers in North America, Europe and Latin America.
Website	Stakeholders in Africa and elsewhere, students, the media and the general public
Training	Community organisations and public sector organisations (non-profit) Companies, corporate and private organisations and individuals (Fee for Service) AU and RECs, UN agencies and peace operations, civil society actors
Seminars	Parties to conflict, civil society actors, military actors engaged in conflict resolution, government actors, donor partners.
Dialogues	Parties to conflict, civil society actors, military actors engaged in conflict resolution, government actors, and donor partners.
Staff exchange/PhD programmes	Uppsala University, ACCORD staff, external stakeholders and constituencies such as donor partners, civil society actors in Europe, North America and Africa, the AU and RECs (as outputs from staff exchange and PhD research are meant to evolve into publications, interventions and dialogues).

ACCORD's website has been assessed by COWI's web specialists and a brief summary is provided in Appendix C. The website fulfils its objective of providing well structured information about conflict resolution in Africa.

Overall, the evaluation team assesses that ACCORD's products and services are **accessible** to its present target groups.

ACCORD is considering a more aggressive marketing and distribution strategy which seek to enhance distribution and identify a more diverse target group. Other types of outputs are also considered, e.g. newspaper articles or summaries which will enable ACCORD to reach a broader audience. Recently there has been an internal discussion on how to use twitter and facebook in communicating with the public. It is **recommended** that ACCORD consider its target audience vis-à-vis its different publication products and includes social media in its strategy.

Overall, the team assess ACCORD's activities to be **relevant** to its own vision, mission and objectives, and also Sida's development policy. ACCORD contin-

ues to contribute with interventions and knowledge production in relation to prevention, management and transformation of conflict. The team also assess that ACCORD has benefitted from the interaction with Uppsala University through its exchange programme on research methodology. This has resulted in improved use of research methodology among the researches and intervention staff.

3.1.4 Quality of Monitoring & Evaluation System

This sub-section provides an assessment of ACCORD's progress in terms of developing its monitoring and evaluation (M & E) system and the effectiveness of this as a tool to capture and measure the results of its activities (ToR Question 4).

Since 2009 ACCORD has begun developing an M & E framework for the Institution and from 2011 ACCORD is in the process of implementing the system according to a set timeline.

Table 3-2 Implementation plan of M&E framework

2009	System Design
Latter half-2009 into 2010	System Set-Up and
2011 and onwards	Review of institutional system and implementation of the M & E System

Two external consultants have been assisting ACCORD with the conceptualisation and training of an organisational-wide M & E system. The aim is to promote institutional and staff learning with a view to improving the effectiveness and quality of operations and interventions. As one of the outcomes, ACCORD has developed an institutional Logical Framework Matrix that is utilised across the Operations Division and guides its general operations.

The team assess the process to be well on track, especially aided by the foundation laid by the external input and the recruitment of an M & E coordinator in October 2010 who drives the process in the Institution. The Logical Framework Matrix has improved ACCORD's ability to monitor its activities and its progress. However, in connection with interventions, the team believe that ACCORD would benefit from a systematic post event follow up with participants and their host organisations to capture views on the impact of its training, seminars and other events. In connection with its knowledge production, ACCORD would benefit from systematically capturing views and opinions on the quality and impact of its publications.

3.1.5 Meeting beneficiaries' needs

This sub-section is concerned with the degree to which ACCORD's activities meet the needs of its stakeholders and beneficiaries (ToR Question 5).

The Board of Trustees consists of eight high profile key players with an extensive political and governmental influence, who are capable of setting an overall agenda and advising ACCORD management on new initiatives.

In January 2011, ACCORD was recognized as the 5th most influential Think Tank in Sub-Saharan Africa, and amongst the top 100 worldwide, in a report by The Think Tanks and Civil Society Programme at the University of Pennsylvania, USA. This is a noticeable achievement considering that ACCORD does not have any ambition to be a Think Tank.

The impact survey received too few responses to conclude on the responsiveness and influence of ACCORD, but all respondents rated ACCORD well above the norm for similar organisations.

The team assesses that ACCORD is successful in responding to emerging needs concerning mediation, conflict management and training on the African continent. Especially ACCORD's interaction with UN, AU, RECs and direct involvement with national governments through present and former Board members is a strong evidence of meeting stakeholders' needs. ACCORD's partners and extensive international network enables them to respond to the needs and opportunities that materialises.

3.1.6 Long term sustainability

This sub-section examines the sustainability of ACCORD as an organisation. It takes into account the Centre's financial sustainability (in terms of funding resources) as well as its technical sustainability (in terms of its ability to conduct operations through its staff and associates) (ToR Question 6).

The team finds that ACCORD has developed efficient financial procedures and systems. Procurement and finance rules and regulations are in place. Standard operational procedures - the rules and regulations manual - are being reviewed in view of future expansions and interlinked with the M&E process/review.

Since 2011, ACCORD has introduced an electronic signing system for payments/checks which has increased efficiency through direct cooperation with its bank.

ACCORD receives its grants from a diversified group of donors which include Sida, the Norwegian Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs, USAID, Finish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and UNHCR. The funds vary between multi-year grants, short term projects, programme grants, and activity specific grants. ACCORD has been able to explore additional funding through charging fees and contracting its service in training, mediation and facilitation, but the contribution has been minimal in terms of what ACCORD requires for its Annual Budget.

Table 3-3 Overview of major donors to ACCORD (ZAR million)⁷

	2008	2009	2010	2011
Sida	8.0	12.7	6.8	12.7
DFA Ireland			0.8	
DFID	3.99			
UNHCR	2.47	2.31	2.22	2.37
MFA Norway	14.4	14.0	9.7	26.4
MFA Finland	1.24	9.19	12.2	12.2
Other grants	8.17	6.29	6.98	8.13

To improve its **management structures**, a decentralisation process was initiated from 2009-2010 which empowered managers and delegated roles and responsibilities. ACCORD is considering to do further decentralisation in the Operations and Business development departments as they are relatively large in numbers of staff. Furthermore ACCORD has recruited a Human Resource Coordinator to strengthen the administrative capacity of staff management.

Since 2008, the staff turnover in the main office has fluctuated between 4.75 % and 6 % - in 2011 it is 5.9 %, which the evaluation team considers to be reasonably low for an organisation of this type.

There is a general concern in ACCORD concerning being able to attract qualified people for job positions, including researchers, senior conflict resolution specialists at strategic and implementation levels. Since 2008, ACCORD has implemented remuneration policies, a wellness programme, performance appraisals and a salary grading system to attract and hold on to key staff. Salaries are benchmarked according to an international scale, but a salary survey for similar organisations (from 2007/8) revealed that ACCORD was behind the domestic market in salary levels. At the latest Board meeting, it was agreed to align salaries with the market level and the Board approved that salaries should be adjusted upward. For new recruitments ACCORD uses a recruitment bureau. The bureau keeps a database on potential candidates which is an advantage when ACCORD needs to employ a specific profile for a certain position.

⁷ Note that in some cases funding is provided on a multi-year basis according to the programme cycle.

Table 3-4 *ACCORD total staff and turnover*

DURBAN OFFICE	2011 8 months	2010	2009	2008
Total staff strength (% turnover)	48 (5.9%)	37 (6%)	36 (4.75%)	28 (5%)
Programme staff	24	23	15	18
Admin staff	29	18	13	12
BURUNDI OFFICE	2011 8 months	2010	2009	2008
Total staff strength (% turnover)	48 (4.4%)	45 (6.6%)	44 (15.9%)	38 (18.4%)
Programme staff	31	33	28	28
Admin staff	14	12	10	10

Work permits for international researchers and administrative staff have been negotiated directly with the Ministry of Home Affairs and ACCORD has managed to obtain corporate work permits - blanket authorization on a number of expat staff. This is a significant advantage compared to a standard work permit that is an 8 month process where you need to document that the position has been advertised and it was here is unable to be filled domestically. The HR policy is presently being revised to provide additional assistance to expatriate staff arriving in South Africa, e.g. in connection with practical issues, accommodation, extra costs of establishing a home etc.

ACCORD presently accommodates 9 interns. They are engaged for periods of 3- 6 months and it is a deliberate strategy to recruit new junior staff from the pool of interns.

In terms of securing future funding, ACCORD is seeking to establish a consultative arm. The consultancy will undertake traditional consulting, outsourcing and administering of donor funding. The objective is that the consultancy arm will generate income for ACCORD. At the same time the consultancy and its management will be totally separated from ACCORD.

Given ACCORD's impartiality, the activities of the consultancy arm have been designed to not interfere with the activities of the Centre but rather to enhance its ability to deliver on its core focus by providing services that can contribute towards sustainable peace. In addition, the consultancy arm will be operated as a separate business with strong governance from ACCORD to ensure that it adheres to its principles and does not interfere in any way with ACCORD's activities, programmes or reputation.

Another major development that will support the sustainability of the activities of ACCORD is the **Africa Peace Centre**. The African Peace Centre is a residential mediation, training and research facility providing specialized training and research in conflict management. When established it will be a permanent facility for mediation of political conflicts. The Centre is planned to increase ACCORD's ability to quickly respond to emerging situations.

The African Peace Centre will be self-sustainable. The revenues will be derived from the use of the conference centre venue and from the associated use of accommodation and dining facilities. All surplus income will be invested in a rapid response fund, which will enable ACCORD to provide pro-active intervention in African conflict situations.

The Centre is currently raising the necessary funds and it is expected that contributions from the South African corporate sector will cover most of the costs.

The team appreciate ACCORD's innovative approach to ensure financial sustainability. However, there is a risk of a negative impact on the perception of ACCORD as a neutral actor and its high level of reputation and integrity if the activities of the consultancy arm interfere or overlap with ACCORD activities and programmes. It is therefore **recommended** that the consultancy arm develops a model which is strategically different from ACCORD and adequately separated from ACCORD.

3.2 The Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR)

3.2.1 Background

The Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR) was established by the University of Cape Town in 1968 as an independent non-profit organisation. The current Executive Director (Dr Adekeye Adebajo) arrived in 2003, by which point CCR had already established a strong reputation thanks to its ability to combine training, conflict mediation, and policy research and its reach stretched from the local community in the Western Cape to the wider Southern African region. With the new leadership, CCR extended its programmes to cover the broader pan-Africa peace and security agenda and this trend has continued during the period under review. About a quarter of CCR's staff and half of its Board now come from African countries other than South Africa.

CCR's overall vision, mission and goals are set out in its annual reports. In its vision, CCR describes itself as *a pan-African organisation playing a leading role in contributing towards the resolution of conflict and the reduction of violence in Africa*. And it describes its mission as *to contribute towards a just and sustainable peace in Africa by promoting constructive, creative and coopera-*

*tive approaches to the resolution of conflict through training, policy development, research, and capacity building.*⁸

The Centre has two main programmes: the Africa Programme and the National Programme. The former focuses on delivering policy research through its Policy Development and Research (PDR) project and training and development interventions through its Conflict Intervention and Peace building Support (CIPS) project. Meanwhile the National Programme provides mediation and training services in South Africa. During the period under review, the relative focus of these programmes has shifted further towards the regional and continental activities and there are now relatively few national activities.⁹

CCR currently has 29 staff and in 2010 had an operating expenditure of ZAR 15.7 million.¹⁰ Sida has supported CCR since 2004 and the current contribution (2009-2011) is for SEK 9.0 million divided into three annual tranches provided as core budget support.¹¹ In practice, the major focus of the Sida grant has been on CCR's Africa Programme. Other major donors are: Denmark, the Netherlands, and Switzerland.

CCR's governance structure consists of the Centre's senior management and an external board. The Executive Director and three heads of department jointly constitute the Centre's senior management.¹² The Board of Governors comprising 14 eminent African scholars and diplomats, roughly equally divided between South Africa and other parts of Africa. The Executive Director sits on the Board, as does a staff representative. The Board has a sub-committee responsible for overseeing audit and financial management. External audit is provided by SAB&T Chartered Accountants.

3.2.2 Quality of objectives and strategy

This sub-section is concerned with the objectives set by CCR for its development and its role in relation peace and security. It examines how these have been determined and how the Centre has progressed against them (ToR Question 1).

CCR has two sets of objectives: the first are a series of eight institutional goals while the second encompass the various programme objectives set out in the programme documents and their LFAs. The first set can be said to provide an overall framework for CCR's work to which the achievement of the second set contribute.

⁸ CCR Annual Report 2009/2010.

⁹ This partly reflects the closure of parts of the Mediation and Training Services (MTS) project relating to CCR's support to conflict mitigation and mediation skills in South African prisons and schools.

¹⁰ CCR Annual Report, 2009/2010

¹¹ Decision on Contribution, Sida, 17.2.2009

¹² These are the Executive Director (who also doubles as the head of PDR programme), the Head of the CIPS project, and the heads of finance and human resources/administration.

The eight **institutional goals** are: (a) to document and disseminate the Centre's policy research and peace building activities; (b) to develop skills of individuals, groups and institutions to manage political and social conflict; (c) to initiate and contribute to peace and conflict transformation initiatives; (d) to influence policy development; (e) to promote democratic values and constructive conflict resolution; (f) to contribute to the development of African researchers and practitioners in the field of conflict resolution; (g) to support the research, training, and policy-making capacity of state institutions; and (h) to analyse South Africa's political, socio-economic and foreign policy challenges and to support the integration of the country into the rest of Africa.¹³

These goals reflect CCR's perception of itself as a pan-African organisation but one with its roots in South Africa. Thus, CCR's relationship with South Africa is important; besides being based there, the Centre acknowledges the need to also contribute to South Africa's transition and to its active role in the Continent. Thus, the last goal is important and one to which CCR still devotes considerable attention through its conflict prevention and mediation training activities as well as through its public dialogue events. The relevance of continuing to work in South Africa was a point also emphasised by several of the Board members.

With regard to the other institutional goals, the evaluation team assess these to be fully reflected in CCR's programmes and activities. The Africa Programme, which is CCR's main programme, has an overall goal to contribute to a just and sustainable peace in Africa. Its immediate objective is to strengthen the capacity of African institutions and actors to resolve conflicts in their own regions. CCR also seeks to influence positively and critically policy and academic debates on African security and governance issues.

The overall theme for the current phase of the Africa Programme is *peacebuilding in Africa*.¹⁴ As noted above, this is pursued through two project "streams": the Policy Development and Research (PDR) project and the Conflict Intervention and Peacebuilding Support (CIPS) project. Both project streams include a number of activity areas whose intervention logic is set out in a combined log-frame for the Africa Programme as a whole.

- PDR's main research outputs have related to Southern Africa's peacebuilding challenges; post conflict peacebuilding (including the AU, UN and civil society); Africa and the EU; and HIV/AIDS and post conflict societies. During the period, the Centre has arranged a number of policy seminars within this framework, including on post conflict reconstruction in the DRC, peacebuilding in Southern Africa, state reconstruction in Zimbabwe, and it published nine policy briefs, eight seminar reports (reporting the findings of policy seminars held) and four book volumes on African human rights and security themes (including on Africa and the United Nations, Transitional Justice in Africa, and Peacebuilding in Africa). In a few cases, the Centre also appears to have gone further than suggested by

¹³ CCR Annual Report 2009/10

¹⁴ Africa Programme proposal submitted to Sida, November 2008

PDR's focus areas; for example, through its work streams on *stabilising Sudan* and *China and Africa (FOCAC)*.

- Meanwhile, the CIPS project has provided skills training and technical support to build the conflict resolution capacities of institutions in South Africa, the Southern Africa region, and other African countries (with activities in all regions). During the period, CCR reports that it has trained 330 people, in particular members of National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs).¹⁵

The Centre's annual reporting to Sida has improved since the 2008 evaluation and now includes an overview of the results achieved (not just outputs). CCR's own monitoring indicates a degree of successful uptake and this is partly confirmed by the contacts with stakeholders made through this evaluation. In the PDR project, the Centre has attempted to identify the results from the policy recommendations arising from CCR seminars, the use made of publications in universities and other institutions, and direct requests from key stakeholders for input. In the CIPS project, results include the delivery and uptake of training and CCR-inspired conflict resolution and human rights approaches amongst African governments, civil society and human rights institutions. The capacity building of the NHRIs in Sierra Leone, Tanzania and Uganda, where an emphasis has been placed on the utility and sustainability of the interventions, is worth highlighting.¹⁶

In terms of its overall **strategy**, CCR's programmes during the period have been guided by a short strategy document - *Peace building in Africa* - from April 2007 (i.e. before the previous evaluation and also before the new M&E system was introduced). The strategy is prefaced by CCR's vision and mission and provides an overview of the main intervention areas proposed as well as research themes, major publications, seminars and other activities. It provides details of past interventions where these are relevant. However, in the view of the team, there is comparatively little analysis of lessons learned and very little contextual analysis. As a result, it is difficult to see the overall rationale for the programmes (the strategic choices) and how they relate to beneficiaries needs and the capacity of the Centre to deliver.¹⁷

Although CCR consider this strategy document as an internal think piece that could more accurately be described as "proposals for future activities", the team believe that such a document (and the process surrounding its production) should serve as an important internal planning mechanism. By making its strategic choices and synergies explicit in a distinct strategy document, it will be

¹⁵ Training has also been provided on gender and on early warning.

¹⁶ Various sources, including stakeholder feedback to the evaluation questionnaire and the external review undertaken by John Roux, August 2011. The results are reported in the Progress report to Sida January to December 2010. CCR, May 2011

¹⁷ In response, CCR have pointed out that a contextually based justification for its programmes and activities is provided in the Africa Programme Proposal (2009-2011). While this is indeed the case, the Team still believe that there would be benefits from strengthening. Correspondence between the evaluation team and CCR. September 2011.

easier for CCR to link its expected results to the objectives that it has set itself. The team see that this would fit very well with the new approach to M&E that is being mainstreamed in the organisation. The strategy document is the right place to do this – and from which the various programme/project documents can be folded out.

As it moves towards a new programme phase (2013+), it is therefore **recommended** that CCR develop a more thorough strategy document that can serve as the basis for its programming and operations. Ideally, this should articulate clearly the context and rationale for its work programmes, taking account of stakeholder needs, the Centre's capacity, lessons learned, demand for services, its theory of change, synergies between programme areas, external partnerships, research agenda, and expected funding available. The new strategy should start with and include a clear statement of CCR's goals and objectives and then explore how these will be met.

CCR aims to draw upon synergies between programme areas (and highlighted twelve examples of inter-departmental collaboration since 2006, including in relation to book chapters, policy seminars, and training manuals).¹⁸ However, we **recommend** that this aspect could be further enhanced so that it is systematic and enables the best possible use to be made of the capacities within the organisation. In the new strategy, the team believe that an explanation of how the two "streams" complement each other and interact would be very useful and would help show how CCR, within the resources available, is able to produce the results that it does.

3.2.3 Quality of activities

This sub-section provides an assessment of CCR's activities in terms of their relevance, coverage, accessibility & reliability (ToR Question 3).

Overall, the team assess CCR's activities as **relevant** to its own strategy; the local, regional and continental peace and security environment (which is its main *raison d'être*); and also Sida's development policy. CCR continues to contribute knowledge and skills to African peace and security practitioners and has an important role in disseminating African perspectives beyond the continent. The Centre's success in this respect is illustrated by its current ranking as number 40 in the World's top 50 Think Tanks and as number 4 in Sub-Saharan Africa.¹⁹

CCR's approach to the implementation of its strategy through the Africa Programme reflects an understanding of the *wider processes* surrounding research and knowledge products (by which we can group CCR's main outputs being books, reports, seminars, public dialogues, media articles, training etc.). This forms part of CCR's theory of change, although it could be made more explicit.

¹⁸ Correspondence between CCR and evaluation team, September 2011.

¹⁹ The University of Pennsylvania's 2010 assessment of global think tanks, a comprehensive ranking of 6,480 think tanks worldwide. <http://www.gotothinktank.com>

Seminars, for example, provide an opportunity for reflection and creative sparring, as well as knowledge dissemination, when they are prepared and managed with this purpose in mind. They also feed into research outputs.

Apart from basic relevance to the context, success requires that products and services are well targeted (in terms of their timing and content/theme). In the case of seminars and dialogues, their impact will be enhanced when attended by people with influence at the policy and/or operational levels. CCR appears to perform well in this respect. Its convening power and quality is critical and needs to be preserved. An example is the Sudan seminar – *Stabilising Sudan* - in August 2010 that included Francis Deng, Jan Pronk, Richard Williamsen and Henry Anyidoho (former deputy JSR UNAMID). The timing here was good, being just prior to the referendum and the participation from policy makers relevant.

CCR's products and services are focused and appear to be highly regarded. A number of them (for example, the training provided on human rights and conflict management) have been developed over a long period of time and are well polished and practical. Such products appear highly relevant to practitioners who are either new to the field or seek to expand their skills and knowledge. Comments from stakeholders responding to the evaluation questionnaire have pointed to the value placed on the "utility" of the knowledge and skills gained. In other words, they must be *useful*. There were a number of cases cited by stakeholders where this was seen to be the case. Examples include the training of NHRIs in Uganda and Sierra Leone where stakeholders have reported to the team that they have been applying the knowledge gained.

In relation to its sustained interventions in Lesotho and Swaziland, CCR is aware of the importance of remaining relevant and of monitoring this – also from a "do no harm" perspective. The Centre informed the team that it undertakes regular conflict analysis and mapping of lessons learned and risks – and that the results of these are fed into its programme activities. During interviews in Cape Town, CCR management pointed to the potential risks involved in interacting with some stakeholder groups in Swaziland as an example of where a good understanding of the local context is required. The team see that the tools available through the new M&E system (see below) will assist this in the future.

In terms of its research agenda, CCR's flagship publications (for example, its book series that includes *From Global Apartheid to Global Village: Africa and the United Nations*, 2009, *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon*, 2008 and *South Africa in Africa*, 2008) provide serious contributions to enhancing knowledge on major issues affecting Africa's development. These are current and relevant – and useful for a variety of audiences, certainly academics and students of international relations but also policy makers and practitioners. The overall quality of these publications is testified to by the positive reviews that they receive from internationally respected journals, such as *Foreign Affairs*, *International Affairs*, and *Survival*. And while their overall impact may be difficult to determine precisely (the attribution/contribution problem), a number of stakeholders responding to our questionnaire noted that they had had an influence.

Other products (for example, the policy seminars and their associated policy briefs and reports) are especially relevant for the policy community and audiences come from this sector (often at high level). In addition to information exchange and knowledge development on key issues, they provide scope for soft-dialogue and networking. As noted above, a critical factor here is securing participation from relevant people – in which respect, the connectedness and convening power of CCR’s Executive Director and its Board are important assets.

In terms of **coverage**, the team find that CCR’s international reach is significant. Its publications are distributed widely in Africa and internationally (notably European and American universities). CCR commented that there is a need to increase the distribution of its publications within Africa (particularly amongst African universities). This was also a point made in some of the questionnaire responses. The team suggest that specific (donor) funding could be sought for this purpose if CCR is unable to meet the costs through its existing programme financing.

The team assess CCR’s products and services to be **accessible** to these stakeholder groups. The availability of material on CCR’s website obviously increases its accessibility. Thus, books are relatively less accessible than articles and seminar reports etc.

CCR’s communications strategy was developed in 2005 that takes an active approach to leverage the communication’s impact of its work. It is noteworthy that the Centre allocates a relatively high proportion of its resources to this area (2 staff members). The team regard this prioritisation as an important factor in maintaining CCR’s outreach and reputation.

Taking account of the wide spread of its stakeholders, CCR uses a variety of mechanisms for distributing its products, including its mailing lists, book fairs, and conferences. Briefing papers and seminar reports are downloadable from CCR’s website – and are also sent directly to seminar participants. As part of this evaluation, CCR’s website has been examined by COWI’s in-house communications experts who assess that it could be further improved through simplifying and prioritising the information architecture. A copy of the assessment is attached at Appendix C.

CCR also makes use of newspaper articles and audio techniques (podcasts). Between 2009 and 2011, a total of 88 news articles were produced by 16 staff members. In some cases, this can lead to global coverage as was the case in January 2011 when Associated Press published an interview with Ade Adebajo on the AU leadership that was subsequently syndicated globally. The team would like to highlight that CCR has increased the exposure of junior staff and has broadened the number of staff contributing to publications.

The team see that CCR’s location in Cape Town offers both advantages and disadvantages. It means that there are some limitations regarding access to key South Africa based stakeholders (including the Government and the diplomatic community) – although it should be said that CCR nonetheless manages to at-

tract these also to Cape Town and a number of activities are also held in the capital or in other countries. Moreover, CCR points to the presence in Cape Town of a strong academic community as well as parliamentarians – both of which it targets.

CCR makes an effort to invite relevant stakeholders to its events, including funders, based on its mailing lists. The Centre stated that funders are routinely invited to events that they support and have also served as chairs and speakers (for example at the SADC, UN, and EU/Africa policy seminars).²⁰ They also sometimes attend training workshops.

As noted, the value and impact of the Centre is linked closely to the quality of its products and services. The Centre emphasises the need to maintain high academic and editorial standards. Major publications (books) are externally peer reviewed after they have undergone an internal editing process. Other publications are subjected to internal review (within work clusters and with the communications staff) and are sometimes also sent to external experts. As this can be a relatively narrow field, the team **recommend** that CCR consider establishing an internal peer review committee with a membership drawn from all of its work clusters and that would be used for all internal quality assurance of all formal publications (i.e. including seminar reports and policy briefs).

3.2.4 Quality of Monitoring & Evaluation System

This sub-section provides an assessment of CCR's progress in terms of developing its monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system and the effectiveness of this as a tool to capture and measure the results of its activities (ToR Question 4).

CCR deserves credit for the significant progress made regarding M&E since the last evaluation. With financial support from CIDA, an integrated programme monitoring and evaluation system was developed and embedded in the Centre's work practices.²¹ Between 2009-2010, four training seminars were held in which 16 staff members were trained in data gathering methods and interview skills. One staff member attended an M&E certificate course at Cape Town University and has since been used as the M&E focal point at the Centre. As the M&E system was introduced halfway through the current programme cycle, it entailed retro-fitting programme logframes with more quantifiable results and indicators. As the revised logframe shows, this is an often difficult and not totally satisfactory exercise.²² Nonetheless it represents a step forward.

By and large, the need for sufficient "hooks" within projects to enable them to be monitored and assessed has meant that they have become more participatory and responsive to beneficiary needs. As an example, CIPS staff explained that

²⁰ One funder questioned this.

²¹ *Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for the Centre for Conflict Resolution's Africa Programme (2008-2012)*. May 2008

²² For instance, the value of including "key African Organisations and Leaders" as a target is obviously related to what is understood by the word "key".

the “project” process in relation to conflict prevention training typically involves fact-finding and feasibility assessment (to establish precise needs); training design; pre- and post-course questionnaires; and follow up at three and/or six months after the event. In this way, beneficiaries become part of the M&E process and CCR is better able to capture medium term outcomes. The results are leading to better focusing in activities.

In the research area, CCR draws from citations from stakeholders and from post-seminar assessments, visits to stakeholders, and questionnaires. An effort is made to assess the degree to which CCR materials and recommendations are incorporated into the work of key stakeholders. In the view of the team, the results of this can be somewhat anecdotal – in practice, policy tends to be the product of a number of factors. However, to the extent that CCR can gather accurate assessments, it can be said to be having an influence. Examples include the CCR seminar recommendations on HIV/AIDS and the military (which have been adopted by various Southern African militaries) and the recommendations arising from the seminar and report on the Forum for China-Africa Cooperation (which feed into the FOCAC Summit).

CCR makes use of available technology in order to track users of its material and generate data that can be used for strategic planning. The Centre’s active and capable communications department is essential to its success in this respect.

The progress made on M&E over the past three years – and the results and lessons now available – is being captured and internalised by the Centre. In the reporting to Sida and other donors, there are now specific sections dealing with the outcomes (as opposed to the previous focus on outputs only). This is a step forward. Nonetheless, it is **recommended** that CCR assess the value and relevance of its current indicators (from the perspective of being meaningful, monitorable and reflecting the level of impact desired from their work). The information gathered should be used to inform the results-based management approach that will underpin the new strategy and programmes in 2013.

3.2.5 Meeting beneficiaries’ needs

This sub-section is concerned with the degree to which CCR’s activities meet the needs of its stakeholders and beneficiaries (ToR Question 5).

The team assess that CCR is generally successful in identifying and responding to beneficiary needs and that this aspect is now being enhanced through the application of the new M&E system. By and large, the team received positive feedback from stakeholders in response to questions relating to the utility of CCR’s products. As one stakeholder summed it up “the strength of CCR lies in its ability to combine academic research with policy workshops and to bring together academics with diplomats and other government representatives”.²³ A

²³ Questionnaire response from academic stakeholder.

further important point adding to the organisation's credibility is that it is regarded by stakeholders as being non-partisan.²⁴

The team believe that it is important to acknowledge the wide range of stakeholders asking for and using CCR's products. As illustrated in the table below, this includes the policy community (e.g. UN, AU, RECs, national governments, bilateral donors), practitioners (militaries, NHRIs, NGOs), academics (in and outside of Africa), & grass roots organisations and individuals.

Table 3-5 Main CCR activities and stakeholder focus

CCR products/services	Main beneficiaries/stakeholders
Policy seminars	Policy makers, practitioners, academics – mainly Africa & donors, UN, AU & RECS
Policy reports/briefs	Policy makers, practitioners, academics - distributed in Africa, Europe, United States, UN, AU & RECS, other organisations
Books	African and western academic and think tanks/research institutes, policy makers
Articles and newspaper opinion	Policy, academic institutions, and general public in Africa, United States and Europe
Lectures, briefings	Large range of policy and academic institutions in Africa, United States and Europe
Public dialogue	Policy makers, parliamentarians, civil society, general public – largely local, Cape Town based.
Website	General use
Training (Human Rights & conflict management; gender & peace building; early warning and response, HIV/AIDS etc)	NHRIs, civil society (incl. grass roots), AU, RECS, UN agencies, African militaries
Technical support/assistance	NHRIs, esp. in Sierra Leone & Tanzania AU, RECS, UN agencies, national governments (e.g. South Africa, South Sudan, Tanzania, Namibia)
Sustained interventions (dialogue sessions, training)	Lesotho & Swaziland – various official and civil society stakeholders, including churches

In assessing CCR, it is therefore important to reflect that these groups have different needs, interests and capacities. Not all products will carry equal weight with all beneficiaries. Products therefore also need to be “pitched” correctly to ensure that they are attractive and useful. As part of its M&E processes, the team suggest that it would be worth CCR collecting information on this aspect in order to ensure a clear view of what different stakeholder groups look for amongst the Centre's products.

²⁴ While our evaluation questionnaire responses indicate a high degree of customer satisfaction, this may be symptomatic of the people bothering to respond, our direct interviews provided a greater variation of view points.

In the policy area, a key role is played by CCR seminars and public dialogues. The value of these events for beneficiaries is enhanced through the choice of theme, their timing, and the quality of panellists and other participants. Examples include seminars on FOCAC (China/Africa), South Sudan, SADC and Zimbabwe that have all been highly topical and, judging from the citations provided to the team, useful to beneficiaries. The topics fall within CCR's general focus but are also responsive to events outside of CCR's control. Thus it is important that the Centre has a mechanism for deciding what events to hold (and when to hold them) that draws from both its own structures and from regular contact with key stakeholders. CCR's contacts with SADC, the South African Government, and the UN have been important in this respect. The policy agendas of such organisations appear to provide an obvious opportunity for alignment that would help strengthen the scope for achieving impact.²⁵

The public dialogues, which normally take place in Cape Town, provide a cost effective way of reaching a predominantly local audience (which nonetheless can include members of parliament, academics, students, and diplomats). Topics include a mix of South African and continental/global issues (for example, on law and order, the Arab spring, South Sudan independence). Attendance at these events typically exceeds 100, which provides an indicator of their value to beneficiaries.

CCR continues to publish regularly in a variety of media. The policy briefs are a relatively new innovation (which the 2008 evaluation welcomed) and respond to the needs of the policy community for short, punchy analysis. CCR regards them as relevant to the policy environment (which is often pushed for time) but wishes to ensure that it continues to publish more thorough research (through books) that also reaches other stakeholders. The policy briefs are always followed by a more thorough seminar report that provides greater depth. Our stakeholder survey provides evidence that stakeholders find these publications useful and that they have contributed to the policy formulation process.²⁶

CCR's output of books (four during the period with several further editions on the way) is directed at enhancing knowledge within Africa and elsewhere and contributes to achieving CCR's objective in this area. The beneficiaries here are mainly universities and other places of learning. CCR has made an effort to track the usage of its books and it is clear that they are widely held in university libraries (in Europe, the U.S, Africa and elsewhere) and are included within course reading lists. A further indicator is provided by book sales. At the fourth European Conference on African Studies in Uppsala in July 2011, a total of 108 CCR books were sold to university libraries to support course material. Many of CCR's books have been reviewed favourably in internationally renowned journals (e.g. *Foreign Affairs*), which is also an indicator of their value.

In the training area, CCR's post training questionnaires and follow up visits appear to confirm the value placed on the learning by participants. An external review of CCR's Human Rights and Conflict Management Programme in 2011

²⁵ This is clearly indicated from some of the responses to the stakeholder questionnaire.

²⁶ Stakeholder response (South African Government).

points to a high degree of beneficiary satisfaction. Participants “felt they had developed both understanding and mediation skills which were directly useful in their work”. This appears to have been particularly clear in the support provided to the NHRIs in Sierra Leone, Uganda and Tanzania where CCR has provided training and CCR manuals and materials are used in the further training and human rights work subsequently provided by the institutes.²⁷ These observations are supported by the results of our stakeholder survey.

The team observe that an important contributing factor to CCR’s results in the areas mentioned above is the participatory approach being taken to the design and follow up of interventions/projects. CCR appears to have strengthened this aspect since 2008. The team received a positive impression from Government stakeholders in Namibia of the impact of its work on HIV/AIDS research and training.²⁸ As this is an example of a long running work stream involving close cooperation with beneficiaries, it is likely to provide useful lessons for CCR with regard to how to gain impact/traction.

3.2.6 Long term sustainability

This sub-section examines the sustainability of CCR as an organisation. It takes into account the Centre’s financial sustainability (in terms of funding resources) as well as its technical sustainability (in terms of its ability to conduct operations through its staff and associates) (ToR Question 6).

CCR maintains a tight control over its **finances**. The team has been given access to recent audit reports and can confirm that there are no issues of significance arising.²⁹ A variety of measures, including savings measures and improved procurement rules, have been taken to improve operating efficiency. Under the Audit Committee, the initiative has been taken to establish a comprehensive risk management process where key management, financial and other risks are highlighted and colour-coded to facilitate monitoring. CCR is accessed as a reliable partner in this respect.

In terms of external funding, CCR has attracted new donors but remains vulnerable to sudden changes amongst its core and long-term donors. CCR follows the trends in donor policies closely and is aware of the shift away from South Africa focused activities to more regional and continental approaches. Its current portfolio of projects is in line with this – but the lack of interest from bilateral donors in financing local (South Africa) interventions is clearly a challenge.

²⁷ Review of CCR’s Human Rights and Conflict Management Programme 2005-2011. John Roux.

²⁸ Response to questionnaire.

²⁹ Compliance reviews were undertaken in 2004 and 2008 (there has not been one since). The results of these were assessed in the 2008 evaluation and are not therefore covered again here.

The team note that while CCR has a ceiling of up to 15% of its income that may be generated from commercial activity (due to South African NGO legislation), it does not current achieve this. Some paid work is already commissioned directly by South African authorities and this could perhaps be increased. Between 2008 and 2011, nearly ZAR 2 million was generated directly by CCR. The team learnt that CCR's management is in the process of developing a business plan to enhance the Centre's income-generating capacity. Two areas that appear promising are delivery of accredited training courses (expected to be in place by December 2011) and alternative dispute resolution.

Table 3-6 Overview of major donors to CCR (ZAR Million)³⁰

	2008	2009	2010	2011
Sida	2.48	5.45	1.49	3.19
Danida	6.59	9.48	1.68	3.36
Netherlands	0.65	5.00	5.00	5.00
Norway	3.05	0	0	0
Switzerland	0.30	2.00	2.00	3.60
Others	16.64	24.69	11.36	17.65

With regard to transaction costs of donor support, steps have been taken to harmonise support and reporting arrangements for the major bilateral donors. This evaluation is an example of such a collaboration between the main bilateral donors.

CCR has reassessed its auditors and has re-tendered. Eleven proposals (including from KPMG, Price Waterhouse, and Deloitte) were received. Following consideration of the proposals received, the Audit Committee recommended retention of the existing auditors (SAB&T). The team was also informed that CCR is expecting to comply with South African legislation concerning corporate governance (King III). Given the Centre's good performance in this area, this should not pose any difficulties.

With regard to **staff capacity**, there appear to be two issues to highlight: firstly CCR's lean programme staff and secondly staff turnover.

CCR's total staff establishment is now 29, of which three positions are currently vacant.³¹ While this appears to be significantly less than the total staff establishment in 2008 (which was 38), it is important to note that the actual staff compliment at that time was in fact 32. So, the actual difference in terms of positions occupied is six. CCR explained that one reason for the reduction in staff

³⁰ Note that in some cases funding is provided on a multi-year basis according to the programme cycle.

³¹ The vacant positions are: one senior researcher, one senior project officer, and a Personal Assistant to the Executive Director. CCR informed the team that it has plans to fill these positions in the near future.

is due to the closure of the prisons project (following which two staff members were released).

The team has some concerns about the low number of programme staff in the PDR and CIPS projects compared to CCR's ambitions and profile.

- The PDR project draws from three researchers (one of whom is part time) and also the Executive Director (who functions as programme head). There is one senior research position vacant. CCR has continued its practice of augmenting these staff by using partnerships with other organisations and by outsourcing book chapters. The latter appears as a pragmatic way of also ensuring the relevance of quality of the publications. Also, reflecting an observation in the 2008 evaluation, CCR has increased the degree to which programme staff produce work that is published, although in terms of major publications (books, journal articles, book chapters and occasional papers) this continues to be dominated by the Executive Director.³² The team believe that it would be worth continuing to seek a greater balance in terms of the staff having published output and sees that the recruitment of further senior staff should assist here.
- The CIPS project has two programme staff, including the programme manager, and there are steps underway to fill a vacant senior project officer position. It is noted that closely aligned to the CIPS project is the National Programme which also has two programme staff.³³ Taken together, these two groups provide conflict mediation and human rights training and capacity building in South Africa and elsewhere in Africa. There appears to be potential for pooling resources between the two groups as many of the competences and skills required will be similar (indeed some pooling is already taking place in practice). We **recommend** amalgamating the CIPS and National Programme staff so that they can function as one group.

The team note that the staffing levels reflect the funding available and that, with more and predictable funding, CCR would be able to recruit additional staff. CCR wishes to be a responsible employer and the experiences of other organisations that have had to lay off staff due to funding difficulties was highlighted. That said, it is important that CCR monitors the workload on individual staff members so as to avoid stress. It is noted that the need for a better balance between staff capacity and outputs was mentioned as a concern in the SWOT analysis. Besides directly hiring new staff, the proximity and CCR's connections with the University of Cape Town might make it possible to draw upon interns as a way of bolstering staff capacity, for example.

One positive consequence of the lean programme staff is that it encourages the development of effective and efficient administration and procedures. In short, CCR needs to make maximum use of its programme staff within their main areas of competence – and correspondingly, the Centre places emphasis on capa-

³² Annual Report 2009-2010, p 54 & p 68-70.

³³ In order to augment its capacity, CIPS makes use of external trainers on an ad-hoc basis. When these are used, they are combined with a member of CCR's core staff.

ble administrative staff that are able to provide a well-oiled machine focused on production. In addition to capacity benefits, this also provides the staff concerned with an important and meaningful role in the organisation. CCR appears to function well from this perspective.

The 2008 evaluation made a number of observations regarding **staff turnover** which was seen as a challenge for all of the organisations covered by the evaluation. While a certain amount of flux is typical in this sector, it was felt that some of the organisations (including CCR) had difficulty in retaining staff. It is noted that a high staff turnover not only depletes the organisation of skilled resources (potentially seriously) but can be destabilising for those that remain. Moreover, it presents a reputational risk depending upon the reasons for departure.

As shown in the table below, staff turnover in CCR has fluctuated during the period since 2008 and now stands at 10%. It should be noted that this is considerably lower than during the period of the previous evaluation (where turnover rates were as high as 27%). However, in view of the continued fluctuation, CCR management is **recommended** to continue to monitor the situation closely and the impact of the various staff retention policies that have been introduced (see below).

Table 3-7 CCR total staff and turnover

	2011 8 months	2010	2009	2008
Total staff establishment (% turnover)	29 (10%)	30 (17%)	31 (13%)	38(16%)
Programme staff leaving	2	3	2	4
Admin staff leaving	1	2	2	3

In the time since the 2008 evaluation, CCR has instituted a range of initiatives to attract and hold key staff. These include revising its pay scales (increasing pay for middle grades), increasing the availability of further education (to which a large proportion of CCR staff has actively responded), and paying attention to staff team building and discussion. Staff participate in monthly staff and cluster meetings as well as biannual strategy meetings. Orientation processes have been put in place to assist the integration of new staff members and hand-over procedures developed to minimise the effect of knowledge loss when staff depart. These are all positive steps and should contribute to stabilising staff retention and the quality of CCR's outputs.

Finally, the team would like to highlight **two further issues** relating to CCR's longer term sustainability. The first is the need to maintain the current high quality and high profile Board, which is regarded as a major asset and is actively used by the Centre as a sparring partner and contributor to its publications and events. As some members are approaching retirement, CCR is bringing in

new members in a conscious effort to maintain the Board's relevance. This approach seems very sensible. At the same time, the team would like to emphasise the importance of continuing to use the Board and individual members actively as resources for the Centre.

Secondly, it is obvious that the current Executive Director performs a pivotal scholarly and administrative role in the organisation. It is important that an organisation like CCR has such a person at its head. However, it also suggests that adequate time should be given to succession planning as the Executive Director approaches the end of his current term (unless a decision is made for a further contract renewal) and that there are sufficient senior staff within the organisation capable of maintaining the quality of its outputs during a transition.

3.3 The South African Institute for International Affairs (SAIIA)

3.3.1 Background

The South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) is an independent, non-governmental institute, which aims to produce and disseminate information on international affairs. The Institute was founded in Cape Town in 1934 and has since 1960 been located in Johannesburg at Jan Smuts House off the campus of the University of the Witwatersrand. Apart from the main office, offices were established in Cape Town in 2008 and in Pretoria in 2009.

As a membership-based organisation, SAIIA has branches in East London, Pietermaritzburg and the Western Cape. The branches, which are based on voluntary work, provide support for SAIIA objectives and work with their local universities and attempt to include academic staff and students in branch activities.

SAIIA's overall vision, mission and goals are set out in its annual reports. SAIIA describes itself as *an independent, non-governmental think tank whose purpose is to engage wider and more informed awareness of the importance of international affairs. It is both a centre for research excellence and a home for stimulating public debate [...]* The institute's activities include: *Making input into policy by engaging with government officials locally and internationally on various aspects of research; Undertaking research on current issues of importance to Africa and South Africa in the realm of international relations; Developing linkages and joint programmes with international organisations and agencies throughout the world; Maintaining a resource centre and reference library (that is a United Nations depository library and a World Bank Development Information Centre; Organising events on a wide range of topics addressed by prominent South Africans and distinguished international guests; Encouraging an interest in international relations among the youth through its*

*leadership programme for postgraduate interns and its various development programmes for university students and high school learners.*³⁴

SAIIA has maintained four of its previous research clusters and further expanded with a fifth cross-cutting research area:

- Economic Diplomacy
- Governance and Democracy
- South African Foreign Policy and African Drivers
- Great Powers and Africa
- Global Challenges and Sustainable Development.

By August 2011, SAIIA employed 36 full-time staff (excluding 4 interns) and one visiting fellow. It had an operating budget of ZAR 28 million in 2010. Sida has supported SAIIA since 2005 and the current contribution (2009-2011) provided as "core funding" amounted to SEK 13.8 million divided into four annual instalments for both core institutional and project support. Since 2009, other major donors have been Danida, Norway, DFID and the Netherlands.

According to the Sida funding agreement, SAIIA agrees to use the contribution *to strengthen the institutional capacity of SAIIA for promoting peace and security in Africa [...] to deepen its partnership and cooperation with other African institutions [...] to strengthen SAIIA's organisational capacity to ensure a careful balance between staff capacity and deliverables....*³⁵ Clearly, the contribution from Sida is aimed at developing the capacity of the Institute as well as funding specific research priorities. In 2010, Sida provided an additional contribution in the amount of SEK 1.15 million. This contribution was provided as core contribution under the same headings as the original 2009-2011 contribution. Thus, Sida's total contribution over the period has been SEK 14.95 million.

SAIIA is governed by a National Council who meets once a year (March) and whose members represent the Institute's branches in South Africa as well as senior profiles in business, diplomacy and civil society. The Executive Committee (Exco) works under the National Council and meets quarterly. Exco has established a Finance Committee (FINCOM) that governs SAIIA's finance division and meets four times per year. Further, the Remunerations Committee (also under Exco) meets once a year to recommend salary increases and bonuses for approval by Exco. The annual external audit is currently provided by KPMG.

³⁴ SAIIA Annual Report 2010.

³⁵ Sida funding agreement, Contribution no: 2008-001972

3.3.2 Quality of objectives and strategy

This sub-section is concerned with the objectives set by SAIIA for its development and its role in relation to peace and security. It examines how these have been determined and how the Institute has progressed against them (ToR Question 1).

SAIIA has established a set of overall institutional goals followed by programme specific goals outlined in each of the five research programmes.

The Institute's overall institutional goals include:

- Making input into policy by engaging with government officials locally and internationally on various aspects of research
- Undertaking research on current issues of importance to Africa and South Africa in the realm of international relations
- Developing linkages and joint programmes with international organisations and agencies throughout the world
- Maintaining a resource centre and reference library (that is a United Nations depository library and a World Bank Development Information Centre; Organising events on a wide range of topics addressed by prominent South Africans and distinguished international guests
- Encouraging an interest in international relations among the youth through its leadership programme for postgraduate interns and its various development programmes for university students and high school learners.³⁶

These goals reflect SAIIA's wish to be an international institute that produces high-quality and policy relevant research for Africa as well as for South Africa.

The integration between the overall institutional goals and the five research programmes is easily achieved as the research programmes clearly cover policy relevant themes which are relevant for policy makers in South Africa, the region and beyond. The focus of the five research programmes is as follows:

- 4 **Economic Diplomacy:** exploring the economic diplomacy options open to South Africa and Africa at a country, continental and multilateral level with special attention to trade policy and the implications of the financial crisis for Africa
- 5 **Governance and Democracy:** exploring key governance and accountability challenges at the national, regional and continental level through the prism of the African Peer Review Process and international governance standards, also as it pertains to the role of communities, the media, political

³⁶ SAIIA Annual Report 2010.

parties, parliaments and governments in the sustainable governance of Africa's resources

- 6 **South African Foreign Policy and African Drivers:** exploring South African norm-setting in the region, its regional diplomatic and peacekeeping initiatives and the potential for bilateral and trilateral co-operation with key African states and external partners
- 7 **Great Powers and Africa:** exploring emerging relations between Africa and rising powers such as China, India and Brazil, and the more established relationships of the United States and the European Union with Africa, with the purpose to inform African policymaking towards these powers
- 8 **Global Challenges and Sustainable Development:** exploring key global governance reform questions and challenges and their implications for Africa, such as climate change, the global financial crisis, UN reform, IFIs reform, and the role of informal groupings in these debates such as the G20 Finance, BRICs, BRICSAM and IBSA

In the annual report to Sida, SAIIA has both in 2009 and 2010 provided not only a recording of the outputs of the research but a heading focusing on “evidence of policy impact”. The indicator used for “policy impact” is the level of attendance at organised conferences, the level of the participants, the level of feedback received from government, business and academia and, finally, invitation to contribute to policy processes. In all the research programmes which receive support from Sida, there are examples of evidence of policy impact illustrated by the aforementioned indicators. This is a reflection that SAIIA is very much aware of the importance to continuously capture signs of policy impact. However, if the Institute wish to document policy impact in a more systematic and less anecdotal manner, its recent steps to use a dedicated media monitoring service (since 2009) and to regularly carry out impact surveys (see section on M&E) will produce more valid and reliable data about policy impact.

Since the evaluation in 2008, SAIIA has embarked on a new media and communications strategy to ensure that the Institute takes full advantage of its market position and that its products are relevant in order to ensure maximum policy impact. The concrete goal mentioned in the Rationalisation Strategy is to *create uniformity, streamline publishing production processes and alleviate revenue employed*.³⁷ This strategy indicated that SAIIA needed a major overhaul and a revised publishing strategy. As a result of this process, SAIIA's new communications strategy represents a streamlined and goal-oriented way to ensure that the institute communicates in the most appropriate manner when publishing commentaries and research results. As a result, the following means of communication represent the main tools: web-based publishing products, policy briefings, occasional papers, research reports.

³⁷ SAIIA (2009), Division of Marketing and Communications, *SAIIA Publications – Rationalisation Strategy 2008/9*.

SAIIA has for the period 2008-2012 been guided by the strategy "Condensed SAIIA Strategy Document", which presents a number of institutional goals concerning: 1) The research agenda, 2) Sustainability of the funding base, 3) Improving the effectiveness of the organisation, 4) Effective talent management, and 5) Monitoring and evaluation. The strategy, which serves as a framework for keeping up-to-date on outputs, actions, outcomes and status of the agreed priority actions, is a rolling plan and is updated regularly.

In the annual reports to the National Council, the Institute prioritises the objectives in the strategy which are to be in particular focus for the year. For example in 2011, key priorities are "appropriate staffing" and "diversified funding".

However, in the review of the strategy, the evaluation team has identified some shortcomings. The strategy does not provide much contextual analysis that justifies the research programme areas. Nor does it give examples of lessons learned that explains how these areas have evolved or connects the areas with the needs of the target beneficiaries. In the new strategy (2013+), it is **recommended** that SAIIA articulates more clearly the context and rationale for its research programmes, taking account of stakeholder needs, the capacity of the institute, lessons learned, demand for services, a theory of change, partnerships with South African, regional and African institutes and the expected funding available.

The following provides examples of the 2008-2012 priorities and actions by the Institute.

Development of the research agenda and programmes

The development of the research programmes follows a tailoring process where key stakeholders are identified and a specific methodology is developed for each programme (including type of analysis/methodology, internal or external commissioned research, type of consultation with key stakeholders groups, process of peer reviewing, research outputs, media activities, etc.). Each programme also involves different types of networking and collaboration with domestic, regional and international partners. Apart of commentaries and research outputs, each research programme hosts a number of high-profile public events, which are integral to the research process and used as input in the research process including conferences, workshops and roundtables.

SAIIA's research agenda and its network of regional and African partners has continuously developed since 2008. Particular attention has been devoted to ensuring that other regional and African institutions are added to its network and that research collaboration in the region and in Africa is increased, including hosting visiting researchers/fellows from the region.

SAIIA's management explained to the evaluation team that research programme formulation cycles take up to two years and involve several consultations with potential funding partners, stakeholders, establish working groups, networks and research partnerships with key institutions. These activities con-

tribute to ensuring the relevance of the research agenda vis-à-vis those interested in the research which again ensures that the results of the research influence the policy agenda.

Some of the approximately 600 days that SAIIA staff spent in the field in 2010 were used for assessing future platforms for engagement. In addition, regular travels to selected European capitals are undertaken in order to assess priorities and interests among partners (donors and research partners) and also to present SAIIA's proposals, focus and priorities.

Organisational development

Organisational and human resource development has been undertaken in view of the growth of SAIIA and to overcome shortcomings pointed out in the 2008 evaluation. Through a capacity development grant from CIDA, SAIIA has been able to hire external assistance to support a number of organisational development activities. A Human Resource Consultant was hired in January 2010 as a part-time HR support and project manager of this grant. The project focused on: 1) organisational review and subsequent reallocation of research support staff from the Research department to the Marketing department. The aim was to increase organisational efficiency by ensuring that all research support staff referred to the same director and that the director of the Research department could focus more on research and strategy, 2) Finalising job descriptions for all staff, 3) Training of managers in giving and receiving feedback, 4) Revision of the staff performance management system.

In the staff interviews and in the SWOT workshop, the issue of internal communication was mentioned. Some staff members indicated that directors and managers should focus more on timely and regular communication of decisions to all staff members. Staff meetings for all staff only happen every six months and regular communication in between does not happen regularly. It is **recommended** that regular internal communication practices should be institutionalised to ensure transparency and legitimacy about decisions taken at management level.

Another dimension of organisational development is the financial management system, which was renewed in 2008/09. The Finance department was upgraded from 1.5 person in 2007 to 3 in 2009 in order to provide sufficient oversight and financial reporting capacity. A new finance director was appointed in late 2008. The new system can accommodate the financial requirements of having more donors that require their own separate reporting formats. Overall, the financial control systems are designed with a high degree of transparency and the evaluation team found no evidence of fraud reported since the previous evaluation.

Transaction costs have also been brought down with the introduction of an annual institute-wide audit carried out by an independent audit company (currently KPMG). This replaced several individual audits for each donor contribution.

Likewise, some of the financial and narrative reporting dates have been negotiated with the donors to bring these in sync with SAIIA's financial year.

The Finance department is also responsible for overseeing the investment reserve, which successfully has increased since 2008 despite the financial crisis. The income generated from investments has occasionally been used to close an annual funding gap.

Talent management

Being able to attract high-calibre researchers has increasingly become an issue for the Institute. The quality of researchers is important in order to ensure that the research process is focused and efficient.

The head of the research department indicated that it is a challenge to attract high-calibre researchers. As a result, significant resources are used for on-the-job training and quality assurance by the programmes heads and head of department.

A better use and planning of interns is another key area that could improve SAIIA's ability to identify the needed talent. This also pertains to using Ph. D. students as an important research resource. It is **recommended** that the Institute considers the use of interns and Ph.D. students and considers advertising research assignment on its website in order to ensure competition between interested candidates.

One of the challenges that the Institute is facing is obtaining work permits for foreign research staff. Such permits are difficult to obtain in South Africa due to the labour regulation, which requires proof that a South African candidate for a position cannot be recruited before foreign candidates are allowed. This is a lengthy process which requires advance planning and administrative resources. It is **recommended** that the Institute liaises with ACCORD, which we understand has been able to adopt a way of obtaining corporate work permits.

In terms of remuneration SAIIA realises that it cannot be at the top-end of the salary scale. Therefore salary inquiries and surveys have been undertaken in order to be aware of the going salary level and ensure that salaries remain competitive in the NGO segment. Salaries in the South African public sector are difficult to match for NGOs.

3.3.3 Quality of activities

This sub-section provides an assessment of SAIIA's activities in terms of their relevance, coverage, accessibility & reliability (ToR Question 3).

Overall, the evaluation team assesses SAIIA's activities as **relevant** to its strategy i.e. the increase in awareness and contributions to qualify the debate about international affairs in South Africa, in the Southern Africa region and on the African continent. Moreover, the Institute's effort to increase African voices on

African problems is also very relevant and important in the process of building African leadership and research capacity.

The Institute's focus is on the broader peace and conflict agenda as opposed to knowledge and research producing organizations with a more narrow focus on, for example, the security sector, transitional justice, etc. The cross-cutting and cross-disciplinary research programmes cover important issues, which add to the understanding and to the level of debate concerning the underlying reasons and factors affecting peace and conflict in Southern Africa as well as in Africa.

The Institute's five research programmes and their focus on gradually developing a research platform within specific fields through public and media interaction and different types of research outputs shows an understanding for making the research relevant for policy makers. This is further demonstrated in the survey among stakeholders as well as in the impact survey (see below).

Examples of relevance are also highlighted in the 2011 report to the National Council where the following events serve to illustrate recent (2010-2011) policy interactions at national and international level in the different research programmes:

- Engagement with South Africa's Department for International Relations and Cooperation (DIRCO) in panel discussions (e.g. on defining South Africa's national interests and values), formal and information discussions (e.g. on a South African Foreign Policy White Paper, on establishment of a South African Advisory Council on Foreign Affairs)
- Engagement with National Treasury in dialogue meetings in the framework of the Economic Diplomacy programme on G20
- Regular meetings with the Pan-African Parliament and the SADC Parliamentary Forum
- Closed roundtable with the Southern Africa Customs Union (SACU) secretariat, government and business representatives
- Co-hosting an African Union China-Africa event in Addis Ababa.

Based on the survey conducted among the stakeholders as part of this evaluation, the research products of the institute appear to be very useful for those government officials (national, regional and international), researchers, NGO sector and press/media that have responded to the survey. In fact, the survey shows a high degree of respondents that perceive SAIIA's research output as high-quality.

Table 3-8 Assessment of SAIIA's research outputs as well-researched, objective and non-partisan (n=32)

Assessment	Response (%)
Outstanding/excellent	34
To a very large extent	41
Above the norm for similar organisations	12
Average	6
Some degree/unsatisfactory	6
Not at all	0

In terms of **coverage**, the evaluation team finds that the Institute has progressed well since the 2008 evaluation in its effort to move beyond South Africa. The Institute's research products cover national, regional and continental wide issues. The focus on Africa and expanding the African voice in research programmes has gained in significance over the past three years.

Since 2009, SAIIA has hosted more than 10 visiting researchers from Africa and abroad. In 2010, SAIIA launched a Distinguished African Visiting fellowship as a new way of promoting opportunities for African researchers. The first Distinguished Fellow under this umbrella was Ambassador Kaire Mbuende, the former SADC executive secretary (in 2011). Likewise, networks involving African institutions have increased in all the research programmes.

Examples of partnerships with institutions focused on improving policy making in Africa include the launching in 2010 of the Governance of Africa's Resources Network (GARN) in Ghana; the Southern Africa Trade Knowledge Network; the South-North Trade and Development Network.

Collaborating and networking with institutions abroad have increased since 2008. The following are examples, which illustrate foreign partners: the Botswana Institute of Development Policy Analysis, the European Centre for Development Policy Management in Brussels, the Economic and Social Research Foundation in Tanzania, CDD-Ghana in Accra, the Catholic University of Angola, The Institute for West Asian and Africa Studies of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in Beijing, etc. Both of the above indications show that the Institute has a wide **coverage** in the region and beyond.

In addition, together with Makerere University in Uganda and the Canadian Center for International Governance Innovation (CIGI), SAIIA is a partner of the **Africa Portal** project. The aim of the portal is to make new research from

Africa more accessible to the African and international policy making community via an on-line open access platform. SAIIA is the leading Southern content partner and the party responsible for identifying new content partners for the portal. SAIIA has so far signed content partnership agreements with sister organizations in Botswana, Ghana, Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda to make their research publications accessible on the Portal.

Table 3-9 Main SAIIA stakeholders and product focus

Products/services	Main beneficiaries/stakeholders
Policy briefing	Policy makers, practitioners, researchers
Occasional papers	Policy makers, practitioners, researchers
Research reports	Policy makers, practitioners, researchers
The South Africa Journal of International Affairs	Libraries, universities, researchers, policy makers in Africa, Europe and USA. Online readership growth since commercialisation from 2008-2010: 89 to 8153 readers.
Books	Libraries, institutions, researchers, policy makers in Africa, Europe and USA.
Diplomatic pouch (web)	Policy makers
Featured theme (web)	Policy makers
The members newsletter (web)	Members (1682 subscribers: corporate, diplomatic, government, NGO, branch members, individual and student members)
The governance perspective (web) newsletter	5000 subscribers among civil society groups, researchers, governments and development partners)
The trade perspectives newsletter	4000 subscribers among civil society groups, business constituents, researchers, governments and development partners

Overall, the evaluation team assesses that SAIIA's products and services are **accessible** to the target groups.

As indicated previously, SAIIA's publication strategy was revised in 2008/9 as a result of the strategic positioning process that led to the 2008-2012 strategy. The focus was to ensure that the publications matched the objectives of the Institute and that publications were seen as an integral part of the research, which in the end promoted *the research reputation of the institute and attract new stakeholders and partners*.³⁸ As a result of this process, publication products became fewer and more focused. In addition, open source publishing has meant that all SAIIA publications – excluding commercially published books and the Journal – are available online on the website.

The team assesses that the publications communicates in different and varied ways and thus increases the accessibility of the research results to the target groups.

³⁸ Division of Marketing and Communications, SAIIA Publications – Rationalisation Strategy 2008/9.

The Institute uses a variety of mechanisms for distribution of its products. The most important is the website where all non-commercial products are available. As part of this evaluation, SAIIA's website has been examined. A brief summary of the assessment is provided in Appendix C.³⁹ An important message from the assessment is the need to rethink the information architecture to fit the main purpose of the website, weighing the information according to relevance, and structure it accordingly. Likewise, the structure of the events page is rather confusing. We suggest creating a clearer view and archiving events which have already taken place.

The location of SAIIA's main office at the campus of the University of Witwatersrand offers advantages. This brings the Institute close to the academic environment of the Wits University as well as several other universities in Johannesburg. Thus, SAIIA is easily **accessible** for an important target group namely researchers. The location of the international reference library in the same building as the Institute ensures that library guests are also made aware of the existence of the Institute when they visit the library, which add to the visibility of the institute. The location also offers opportunities to identify good candidates among the students for internship positions. For SAIIA's Youth Development programme, its positioning on the campus has provided additional opportunities for university liaison with students in the Wits School of Social Sciences through the Model UN and Environmental Sustainability Programmes. These have also empowered girl children at high schools, who make up the majority of participants.

In view of the location of the government and the foreign embassies in Pretoria as well as the traffic congestion in Johannesburg, SAIIA has located one of the research programmes in Pretoria where it hosts a number of public events. This has resulted in attracting more government and embassy representatives for meetings, consultations, etc. However, in the current financial situation pros and cons are being weighed as it is costly to maintain separate offices.

3.3.4 Quality of Monitoring & Evaluation System

This sub-section provides an assessment of SAIIA's progress in terms of developing its monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system and the effectiveness of this as a tool to capture and measure the results of its activities (ToR Question 4).

One of the important recommendations in the 2008 evaluation was to develop an effective M&E system at an organisational wide level.

SAIIA's management has indicated that it is an organisational priority to develop such system. This is demonstrated in the strategy (referred to above) where it is indicated that the Institute should "undertake and introduce an effective M&E system to assist the Institute to access, evaluate, and guide its policy engagement activities".

³⁹ The website is currently in a process of redesign.

An important step in the direction of an organisation-wide system was taken in February 2011 with a two day workshop tailored at discussing the different components of an M&E system.⁴⁰ This included exercises on log frames (including indicators, outputs, outcome, results, etc.), action learning, integration across the research programmes, methods, etc. In accordance with the institute's strategy plan, a second workshop is scheduled in the second half of 2011. After that follows development and integration of the system in all the activities of the Institute.

Obviously, there will be a need to find ways of adapting the current research programmes to the new M&E system. However, as new research programmes are being developed, integration of M&E methods will become integrated and as such less cumbersome to manage.

Notwithstanding the plans to introduce an M&E system, several monitoring activities take place throughout the year in the research programmes. In order to ensure proper communication and information sharing (monitoring), a structure of regular meetings has been instituted among directors, managers and support staff. The collaborating between research programmes is continuously a challenge, but it has been addressed through an appropriate meeting structure ensures regular information exchange between the various programmes staff and levels in the organisation (essentially three locations in Johannesburg, Pretoria and Cape Town).

SAIIA meeting structure

Annual strategy meeting (Lekgotla): an event for all staff which lasts 1-2 days and includes teambuilding elements as well as discussions on the research agenda

Quarterly research integration meeting for research heads, research support heads where the integrated research planning calendar is updated (this meeting follows a fixed agenda). The aim is to ensure collaboration and coordination between the different units and programmes.

Quarterly research support coordination meeting where all research support programme heads and programme administrators meet, plans and shares experience and focus on learning.

Monthly information sharing meetings for keeping both research and programme staff informed of events, publications and travel commitments.

Every two month senior staff meeting for all directors, managers and senior researchers. The aim is to discuss policy direction, give an opportunity for feedback and discuss financial issues.

Weekly directors operational meeting

The structure of regular internal meetings is indeed an important feature for the Institute in monitoring and evaluation as well as in coordination and integration between research programmes. For example, the quarterly research coordina-

⁴⁰ Report from Emthunzini, *SAIIA Planning, Monitoring, Evaluating and Reporting Workshop 1*

tion meeting allows programme heads to meet for two days at the main office in Johannesburg and discuss coordination across the five research programmes and go through activities for the coming period.

Presently M&E templates for events and research networks have been deployed in the programmes. This is much needed given SAIIA hosts 50-70 events per year with up to 150 participants. Of these, 15-20 are monitored through post-events evaluation forms. The results of these evaluations are being used to assess, for example, if the target audience has been achieved, degree of satisfaction, etc. Other elements in the current M&E system are:

- A media service employed to monitor SAIIA's media profile and impact (started in 2009)
- Google analytics used regularly to track website hits, article hits, traffic trends over time, traffic generated by the occasional papers (started in 2009)
- Reference sites that are monitored and analysed every six month (google, facebook, LinkedIn, Africaportal)
- Monitoring of readership of the SA Journal of International Affairs via Taylor & Francis (publishers) tracking system
- New structure of internal meetings to improve M&E (coordination, learning, etc.
- Pilot testing of the M&E structure in the Governance of Africa's resources programme with a dedicated M&E officer

Given the complexities of the different research programmes and the need to ensure homogeneity and compliance across the institute, it is **recommended** that a senior M&E post is created. Seniority and experience is required in order to provide firm direction and oversight on the implementation of an Institute-wide M&E system. Alternatively, an existing senior staff can be assigned with this responsibility.

Furthermore, SAIIA would benefit from consolidating its research approach and including the specifics of an M&E system in a *programme research manual*, which should serve as a guideline for e.g. research procedures, choice of methodology, guide on the research processes and data collection, incorporation of M&E procedures, peer review process, style guide, etc. Such a manual would provide a common point of reference across the institute research staff as well as for external researchers on what is an acceptable research standard. Moreover and important for developing research capacity, it could also be used in the collaboration with external partners as a benchmark for working with SAIIA.

3.3.5 Meeting beneficiaries' needs

This sub-section is concerned with the degree to which SAIIA's activities meet the needs of its stakeholders and beneficiaries (ToR Question 5).

Overall, the team assesses that the Institute has been successful in building up an image of a very well reputed international institute that to a large degree meets beneficiary needs.

This is, for example, evidenced in the institutional capacity building project funded by CIDA that focused on ways to improve the institutional capacity of SAIIA to enhance its contribution to policy making. The project focused on i.a. the impact of the Institute's policy work among its key beneficiaries. This was explored through an externally led impact survey among key beneficiaries of the Institute. The objective of the survey was "to provide objective criteria for assessing the effectiveness and impact of SAIIA's work" and "to improve service delivery to core stakeholders". The survey was conducted through telephone and personal interviews combined with an electronic survey. Some sixty in depth interviews were conducted with representatives from donors, diplomatic missions, government, media, multilateral agencies, and sister institutions in South Africa and abroad.

The impact survey demonstrated that SAIIA has a strong reputation (58% responded "strongly agree" and 34% "agree") as an organisation that makes a positive contribution to relations between South Africa and the international community. Likewise, high scores (>75%) were given on dimensions such as the quality of the products and services, content of the public events, quality of speakers in public events and ability to link-up with other international organisations.

In the e-survey that the evaluation team conducted as a part of this evaluation, more than two thirds of the respondents confirmed that SAIIA's research and output had an influence on the opinion and position of the respondent. The analysis concerning the Southern African Customs Union (SACU) is an example of where the Institute has impacted the respondents.

The aforementioned impact survey also indicated areas in need of improvement. These were mainly the SAIIA website (ref. above). It is **recommended** that the process of following up on the website design and structure be completed before year-end - given that it has been going on for quite some time.

In the e-survey, the respondents were asked to indicate "what would make SAIIA products even more useful". The views of the respondents pointed at, for example, more in-depth analysis, more focus on trans-boundary issues, and more direct linkage with global policy processes. Irrespective of these valid suggestions, 87% of the respondents indicated that the Institute comprehensively address key issues on peace and conflict in Africa.

Table 3-10 Assessment of the degree that SAIIA's research and seminars comprehensively address the key issues on peace & conflict in Africa (n: 32)

Assessment	Response (%)
Outstanding/excellent	28
To a very large extent	34
Above the norm for similar organisations	25
Average	3
Some degree/unsatisfactory	10
Not at all	0

When asking the beneficiaries in the impact survey about areas in need of improvement, networking/cooperation and communications/publicity was indicated as the areas that needed most improvement. In particular, a greater diversity of views/commentators is required as well as more focus on economics. Both areas have received more attention by the Institute since last year but more may be required to fulfil these needs.

In terms of meeting beneficiary needs by making direct input into policy by engaging with government officials locally and internationally, there are many good examples that show that the Institute has played a constructive and catalytic role.⁴¹ In 2009, the key interlocutors in South Africa with whom the institute collaborated were the Department of International Relations and Cooperation (examples of issues are human rights and humanitarian affairs, EU-Africa affairs, civil society and foreign policy), the Department of Trade and Industry, Ministry of Mines, Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Portfolio Committees of Parliament (international affairs, environment and trade and industry). The Africa Union has been engaged on the issue of the China-Africa relations and several policy workshops have been co-hosted with South Africa and foreign organisations.

Since the previous evaluation, SAIIA has engaged actively with the media. In 2009 the Institute received over 350 media enquiries and institute staff appeared in approximately 170 national and international television interviews and 90 radio interviews. Likewise, it published over 40 op-eds in local, international media and on the Institute website. The monitoring of SAIIA print media coverage shows that references to the research output of the institute is picked up mainly across Africa, Europe, and in North America and to a lesser degree in Asia Pacific and Asia.

⁴¹ SAIIA, Annual Report to the Swedish International Development Agency, 1 January to 30 September 2009.

3.3.6 Long term sustainability

This sub-section examines the sustainability of SAIIA as an organisation. It takes into account the Institute's financial sustainability (in terms of funding resources) as well as its technical sustainability (in terms of its ability to conduct operations through its staff and associates) (ToR Question 6).

SAIIA keeps tight financial control over its resources. The team has been given access to programme accounts and recent audit reports (annual audits are undertaken) and can confirm that there are no issues of significance arising. Since the 2008 evaluation, operational efficiency has improved through an improved accounting system, which i.a. allows easy management of donor contributions. Minutes from the quarterly meetings of the Finance Committee confirm that the Committee is involved in discussing and overseeing the financial status of SAIIA.

SAIIA is a membership-based organisation. As of 2011 there are approximately 1000 individual and corporate members. Income from members is quite modest at approximately 5% of total income. SAIIA's approach to corporate memberships has been further developed since 2008 but the income from corporate members still account for only a relatively small part of the annual budget.

In connection with SAIIA's 75th years anniversary in 2009 a fundraising campaign was undertaken to raise funds for the renovation of the SAIIA premises, to establish an African fellowship targeting prominent African policy makers, to digitalise the library holdings and to fund the youth development programme. The campaign succeeded in raising a total of ZAR 5.4 million not least from corporate donations. The amount of funds raised indicate that the institute has an excellent reputation and brand based on which it is possible to mobilise significant funds for special occasions.

In 2009/10 SAIIA's income reached ZAR 30 million, up from ZAR 22.6 million in 2007/08. However, the Institute does not expect that it can maintain this level of income in the coming years in view of the international financial crisis. The unaudited financial statement for 2010/11 shows a 7% decline in funding to ZAR 28.1 million. The cuts in public spending starts to affect SAIIA's income in 2011 and 2012 as the immediate effect shortly after the crisis in 2008 was cushioned by several multi-year funding agreements.

Table 3-11 Overview of top five major donors to SAIIA (ZAR Million)⁴²

	2008	2009	2010	2011
Sida	3.1	4.4	4.2	5.8
Danida	1.4	1.8	5.2	2.2
Norway	2.9	5.3	4	4.6
DFID	2	1.3	1.8	3
The Netherlands	5.9	6.7	3.5	1

⁴² Note that in some cases funding is provided on a multi-year basis according to the programme cycle.

As indicated above, SAIIA has been adjusting its organisation in 2011 i.a. with a view to the budgeted income in 2012 and 2013. This has been a difficult process but has resulted in slimming of the organisational structure with fewer support staff. As a result, SAIIA has gone from a ratio of two thirds support and one third research staff towards a goal of 50/50. The goal has not quite been reached yet, but is expected to be reached before end of 2012.

As a result of the financial situation, all new staff are hired on fixed-term contracts. This procedure ensures that programme funding and staff costs are synchronised. However, it is important to take into account that fixed-term contracts may increase staff-turnover in a competitive labour market.

The concern about the sustainability of funding was also reflected in the inputs at the SWOT workshop, which was held during the evaluation team's interview process and was attended by all staff. Funding issues were among the external threats mentioned in particular the increasing competition for funding between think tanks as well as the changing requirements for donor funding. This was further elaborated as a weakness where the overreliance on too few donors was seen as problematic.

In the report to the Executive Committee of June 2011, it is indicated that the Institute needs to look for "new products streams that may create more opportunities to source domestic income, an area which to date has been underrepresented in SAIIA's income composition". The evaluation team **recommends** that the institute continues its efforts in diversifying its domestic and international funding and as result becomes less dependent on few large donors.

In general, SAIIA has maintained a relatively modest level of staff-turnover since the 2008 evaluation. However, compared to administrative staff there has been some staff turnover among research staff. In fact, some of the five research programmes have also suffered from lack of research staff over periods of 3-6 months in between leaving of old staff and arriving of new staff.

Table 3-12 Staff turnover

	2011 8 months	2010	2009	2008
Total staff (% turnover)^a	15%	21%	14%	25%
Research staff^b	15	18	20	16
Admin staff^b	20	25	22	15

a) Total staff turnover in the year is calculated by expressing the number of staff who had left in the relevant period as a proportion of the average number of staff on the payroll for the same period.

b) As at 31 December of each year, except for 2011 which is 31 August. (Please note the section 189 retrenchment procedures occurred in July 2011.)

SAIIA has experienced an increasing demand for consultancy assignments, which has become a source of revenue. While consultancies constituted ZAR 1.2 million in 2008, they increased to ZAR 2 million in 2010. Consultancies cover specific research assignments for one donor, government or corporate entity. Thus, consultancy reports are not available on the SAIIA website. Although they are not publicised widely, they allow SAIIA to use its capacity to make direct input to policy making, which is among its key objectives. Consultancy assignments also provide access to recent policy work and to policy makers. In this way, there is synergy between research work and consultancy.

As consultancies appear to be growing in volume, the Institute needs to monitor if time spent on consultancies at some point starts to compete with research work in the respective research programmes. The heads of the research programmes indicated that this is a careful balance, which should be respected in terms of not taking on too many consultancies. In any case, the South African legislation only allows SAIIA (as an NGO) to receive 15% as income from consultancy work. However, before this level is reached, it is **recommended** that the Institute establish full transparency concerning the selection criteria (e.g. synergy, timing, sectors, etc.) and requirements, which must be present in order to accept consultancies.

3.4 Comparative analysis – also including IJR and ISS

In addition to the evaluation of ACCORD, CCR and SAIIA, the Terms of Reference ask for a comparative analysis that also includes the other two South Africa-based think tanks supported by Sida that work on peace and security issues – these are the Institute for Security Studies (ISS) and the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (IJR). The two organisations were assessed in the 2008 evaluation for Sida and again in early 2011 for the Netherlands Embassy in Pretoria.⁴³ The findings from these evaluations are included here – and have been supplemented by updates when they were again visited during the current evaluation.

The methodology used for this comparative analysis is to take the six main evaluation areas identified by the ToR and highlight the key issues emerging for each area drawing from the findings across the five organisations. The six areas are:

- Attainment of objectives
- Response to the 2008 Evaluation
- Quality of activities
- Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)
- Meeting beneficiary needs, and

⁴³ External Evaluation of ISS by Tom Dahl-Østergaard and Julian Brett, March 2011 and External Evaluation of IJR by Birgit Lindsnæs, Julian Brett and Sarah Henkeman, April 2011.

- Sustainability.

In order to avoid overly repeating the discussion that has been included in the preceding chapters of this report, the chapter will draw out the key issues only in a way that is as balanced as possible (i.e. so that ISS and IJR are given the same coverage as ACCORD, CCR and SAIIA).

As an introductory remark, the team would like to highlight that each of the five organisations is a significant contributor to the development and application of knowledge on peace and security; each has developed niche areas of work and competencies that distinguish it from the others; and each represents a reliable partner for Sida (and other funders). Both singularly and collectively, the organisations succeed in delivering quality products to stakeholders in South Africa, the Southern African region, and the Continent as a whole.

A further introductory remark is to note the differing size of the organisations – in ascending order – IJR (20), CCR (29), SAIIA (35), ACCORD (89 – half of whom are at its Burundi office) and ISS (129 – spread over five offices). This obviously has an impact on the organisations' coverage and range of products.

3.4.1 Attainment of objectives

Each of the organisations has clearly defined goals and objectives to which programmes and projects respond. Four of the organisations (ACCORD, CCR, IJR and ISS) present this in terms of social change relating to *peace, security, democracy, rule of law, justice, human rights* etc. Three of the organisations (ACCORD, CCR, and IJR) appear more specifically aimed at active *conflict prevention, management and resolution, non-violent dispute settlement* etc. And all of them work in the area of *knowledge development and its application to policy and practice* which they pursue through a mix of research, training, and policy dialogue. Of the five organisations, SAIIA has the broadest objectives, aiming at *wider and more informed awareness of the importance of international affairs* and is less focused on training.

The goals generally reflect a pan-African vision that means the organisations see themselves as South African-based but focusing their activities nationally, regionally and continentally. This partly reflects South Africa's own development since the end of Apartheid but is more largely a response to the number of peace and security issues existing in the rest of the continent and the interests of the major bilateral funders in drawing upon the organisations' capacities in response to these.

Nonetheless, all the organisations still operate on issues in South Africa and they are all conscious that the South African transition is not yet complete. IJR's annual *Transformation Audit and Reconciliation Barometer*, the training and conflict mediation/reconciliation work of CCR and IJR in the Western Cape, and ISS's work on South African crime issues are examples. All of the organisations interact and support South African state and non-state capacity to respond to conflict at the policy level (for example through contacts with the Department for International Relations and Cooperation, DIRCO, and the De-

partment of Defence, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, other line ministries, the South African Police Service etc.). In some cases, they have been able to develop a “trusted advisor” role based upon individual staff members’ competences.

Outside of South Africa, the organisations generally list similar stakeholders, including the AU and regional organisations (RECs), other African governments, human rights institutions, regional police organisations, NGOs and, to a lesser extent, CSOs. Two of the organisations (ACCORD and ISS) have offices in other parts of Africa that they see as facilitating greater interaction with key stakeholders. It is clear that attainment of goals and objectives is only possible through an active engagement with stakeholders in the rest of the continent and they appear to be successful in this.

All of the organisations develop knowledge products through original research that they disseminate through books and monographs (normally peer reviewed and of an international standard), journals, websites, policy seminars and workshops, and direct policy dialogue. The issues addressed reflect the goals and objectives of the organisations.

Four of the organisations (ACCORD, CCR, IJR and to a lesser extent ISS) also deliver their knowledge through training programmes, which are often targeted on distinct stakeholder groups. For example, CCR’s training for National Human Rights Institutes, NHRIs. Two of the organisations (ACCORD and ISS) are in the process of developing training institutions themselves. ACCORD provides accredited training, while CCR is planning to seek accreditation of its courses.

Three of the organisations (ACCORD, CCR, and IJR) operate directly on conflict using training and mediation/dispute resolution. Their work in the Western Cape, in Burundi, DRC, Lesotho, South Sudan, Swaziland, Zimbabwe and elsewhere are examples.

3.4.2 Response to the 2008 Evaluation

The evaluation team heard that each of the organisations found that the 2008 evaluation was useful and is of the opinion that its findings have been taken seriously and have to a large extent been implemented.

The organisations all have **strong management structures** that provide decision-making and link senior staff with programme and administrative staff within departments. This is as important for the smaller organisations (CCR, IJR and SAIIA) as it is for the larger organisations (ACCORD and ISS). All of the organisations have strong leaders but there are systems and processes in place to ensure staff participation in decision-making. In the case of ISS, which is now also present in West Africa following the opening of its Dakar office, there are additional challenges of a dispersed organisation to manage. This places pressure on both office heads and on headquarters staff. However, the recent decision to adopt a cross-cutting thematic approach within the organisa-

tion should support inter-office communication and joint working processes. Several of the organisations now have staff representation at Board level.

The organisations have adjusted their strategies to reflect more closely **beneficiary needs and interests**, for example through producing short policy briefs aimed at the policy community. This appeared to be welcomed by stakeholders. However, the evaluations have also taken note of the need to reflect a nuanced view of beneficiaries – that not all beneficiary groups have the same needs and interests and that the organisations serve a variety of them. This underlines the point made in both the 2008 evaluation and the present evaluation that it is important to ensure feedback on what stakeholders needs and think. The steps being taken by the organisations to strengthen their M&E systems will assist here.

The 2008 evaluation noted the need to ensure a careful **balance between staff capacity and deliverables**. The concern raised here was that, while all of the organisations appeared very productive, there was a risk of either over-burdening staff (leading to stress and burn-out) or lower standards. In response, several of the organisations (notably CCR and IJR) have strengthened their staff/human resource policies. CCR has, for example, added opportunities for further education in relevant fields. Nonetheless, there remain some concerns about the lean programme staffing in relation to outputs in certain of the organisations and this is an aspect that they should continue to monitor. The organisations have improved the balance between support and programme staff.

All of the organisations have a **broad portfolio of products** where practical field experience flows into research and is then either feed back into training or channelled into policy input. While still covering a lot of ground, ISS and SAIIA have narrowed their focus slightly over the period in order to promote better targeting.

The organisations have also continued to develop **participatory partnerships** with other like-minded organisations in other parts of Africa and elsewhere. ACCORD's partnership with Uppsala University in Sweden is an example of a productive partnership that benefits both parties. A general observation is that this aspect should be further strengthened in line with greater focus on key activity areas. For example, given the broad approach necessary to some topics (regional integration, for example), the five organisations could be encouraged to develop further collaborative approaches with other organisations based on their core areas of added value.

All the organisations have made progress with regard to **M&E** and demonstrate a move away from pure output based monitoring towards monitoring of results/outcomes. This has been a challenging process which has required external assistance (supported in some cases by CIDA). But the results are obvious from the recent reporting which is now more outcome based. As the organisations approach their new strategies (2013+), they should reap the benefit of this effort. In view of the experience that has been gained and the differences in approach, it is **recommended** that some knowledge exchange between the organisations is arranged in order to capitalise on the progress made.

3.4.3 Quality of activities

The team finds that the five organisations supported all undertake activities that are relevant to their strategies/objectives, to the context in which they operate, and to the Swedish Regional Development Cooperation Strategy. As in the 2008 evaluation, our assessment is that they generate and disseminate knowledge on peace and security in Africa and contribute to its application through policy dialogue and training. ACCORD, CCR and IJR also undertake direct interventions (mainly mediation/conflict management). The input to the evaluations from various stakeholders confirmed the generally high regard in which the organisations are held.

The perceived overall quality of the organisations' activities is also illustrated by the fact that four of them are located in the top five sub-Saharan think tanks in the University of Pennsylvania's 2010 survey of global think tanks (SAIIA – No 1, ISS – No 2, CCR – No 4, and ACCORD – No 5).⁴⁴

The team finds that the five organisations occupy different parts of the overall playing field. At times there is some overlap – CCR, ISS and SAIIA have all contributed to the discourse on China's role in Africa, for example. And a number of the organisations also work with the same stakeholders (the South African Government, AU, RECs, UN agencies etc.). But they also have a recognisable footprint so that the impact is complementary rather than duplicatory.

Of the five organisations, SAIIA has the broadest research agenda (which is not restricted to peace and security) and ISS, due to its size, is able to cover the widest range of specialist security topics (from organised crime to peacekeeping) in depth. The remaining organisations have their own niche areas where they have recognised expertise. As in the 2008 evaluation, the team consider this aspect important and would encourage the organisations to focus on areas where they have a comparative advantage and prioritise collaborative ventures where necessary in order to cover a broader research issue.

The organisations' coverage and the accessibility of their products is also good. The opening of an ISS office in Dakar can be expected to enhance its coverage of West Africa (and to some extent also the Magreb) – and, although it is perhaps too early to judge, the organisation's impending shift to a cross-cutting theme approach can also be expected to have a positive impact by linking the regional offices more closely together. As described above, the other organisations also operate across the continent. Examples include CCR's support to NHRIs in Sierra Leone, Uganda and Tanzania; IJR's transitional justice activities in DRC and South Sudan; and SAIIA work with networks across Africa, for example, the Governance of Africa's Resources Network launched in Ghana at the Centre for Democratic Development (includes 12 network partners) or the Africa Portal which is an online knowledge resource for policy-related issues on Africa in collaboration with the Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI), Makerere University (MAK).

⁴⁴ The University of Pennsylvania's 2010 assessment of global think tanks.
<http://www.gotothinktank.com>

3.4.4 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

Since the 2008 evaluation, the five organisations have developed and commenced implementation of improved M&E methodologies – this was a key recommendation. As noted above, this has not been an entirely painless exercise and, in some cases, researchers have needed to adopt a different way of thinking about their work. The need for adopting a more rigorous approach is perhaps easier to argue with organisations such as these that function in an applied research capacity – i.e. where research is intended to produce some sort of result. Nonetheless, it has entailed a shift away from thinking in terms of outputs to one where the outcomes (i.e. the change produced) is important. The difficulty with this is well known – that it is tricky to “attribute” change to any single actor in the socio-political environment in which the five organisations are operating, although somewhat easier to talk in terms of “contribution”. Even so, identifying change is complicated where there are no reliable baselines and where indicators are lacking and, as the organisations have discovered, re-engineering project documents and logframes so that they are more measurable is not a simple task.

Taking these factors into account, the team consider that the five organisations have made good progress and that there have been positive lessons learned. The team **recommends** that these lessons are exchanged – with the development of new programmes in mind.

3.4.5 Meeting beneficiary needs

The team assess that the five organisations are successful in identifying and responding to their stakeholder groups – and the feedback processes that are part of the M&E reforms will further strengthen this aspect. The evaluations have shown that the five organisations have a large number of different stakeholders and it is natural that not all products will be of equal interest. It is, however, important that the organisations are able to capture this information and target their products accordingly. The introduction of short, focused policy briefs by ISS, CCR and SAIIA appears to be appreciated by the policy community that is often short of time. On the other hand, we had positive comments from the same stakeholders about the value of seminars and other dialogue events that are appreciated because they provide direct contact with counterparts.

All the organisations appear to use similar forms of information dissemination concerning their research agendas and are regular contributors in the media (mainly in South Africa but to some extent also further afield). We found that dissemination of publications to African libraries to be an area that could be improved.

3.4.6 Sustainability

The evaluations found that all the organisations are financially sustainable in the short term but have a dependency on a few core donors which raises questions about long term sustainability. Senior management is aware that donor priorities are changing – and this is to some extent reflected in the organisations

movement outside of South Africa (which is seen as healthy). However, there remains a need for reliable, predictable and flexible funding. Both ISS and CCR have had to close projects when donor funding has dried up. The organisations are responding to these developments by developing alternative forms of income generation – including attracting new donors but also through commercial activities. ACCORD, for example, offers accredited training and has plans to develop a management consultancy. CCR is also seeking accreditation for its training. In SAIIA the number of direct consultancies are growing and the organisations is considering new streams of products, for example, to attract more corporate members.

The other aspect of sustainability that the evaluation has highlighted is the organisations' ability to attract and retain quality staff. In the 2008 evaluation, it was found that all the organisations had relatively high staff turnover. In part, it was seen that this reflected the NGO environment. But there have also been signs that it has been difficult to recruit the right quality of staff with the result that either vacancies persist or that staff hired require longer than desirable introduction and mentoring.

4 Conclusions and recommendations

This chapter presents our conclusions and a summary of the main recommendations. The conclusion is deliberately brief in order to avoid being repetitive of the comparative analysis of the five organisations in section 3.4.

4.1 Conclusions

Overall, it is the evaluation team's assessment that each of the organisations has performed well and has well-developed programmes, organisational structures and management/accountability systems, which enable them to work in an effective and efficient manner. The focus of the three organisations is also fully in line with and highly relevant to the strategic direction of the 2010 Swedish Regional Development Cooperation Strategy with Sub-Saharan Africa. As such these organisations remain reliable partners for Sida.

The overall impression is confirmed when soliciting the views of external stakeholders and in the ability of the organisations to become known as highly influential think tanks with a quality reputation and ability to impact at the policy level. However, while the three organisations have followed up on the previous evaluation recommendations in 2008, there are still issues and dimensions of the organisations – as reflected in the recommendations - that they need to focus on in a process of continued development.

4.2 Summary of recommendations

The following bullets summarise our main recommendations for each of the organisations.

4.2.1 ACCORD

The evaluation team recommends that:

- ACCORD initiates the discussion of harmonisation of donor reporting either during its Joint Donor Meetings held every 2nd year or bilaterally with each of the main donors.
- When determining a new vision, ACCORD should formulate an overall strategy for the Institution which explains the link between the different programmes and priorities to ensure coherence and a focus on coverage,

partnerships, themes, interventions, communication and target groups, taking account the needs of stakeholders, the organisational capacity and future funding opportunities.

- ACCORD - as part of the overall strategy – considers how to deal with media and confidentiality issues in sensitive or volatile situations.
- ACCORD considers its target audience vis-à-vis its different publication products and includes social media in its strategy.
- The proposed development of a consultancy arm is undertaken in such a way that it is ensured that it is strategically different from ACCORD and adequately separated from ACCORD.

4.2.2 CCR

The evaluation team recommends that:

- As CCR moves towards a new programme phase (2013+) it develops a more thorough strategy document that can serve as the basis for its programming and operations. The new strategy should start with and include a clear statement of CCR's goals and objectives and then explore how these will be met.
- The synergies between programme areas could be further enhanced so that it is systematic and enables the best possible use to be made of the capacities within the organisation.
- CCR consider establishing an internal peer review committee with a membership drawn from all of its work clusters that would be used for all internal quality assurance of all formal publications (i.e. including seminar reports and policy briefs).
- CCR assess the value and relevance of its current indicators (from the perspective of being meaningful, monitor-able and reflecting the level of impact desired from their work). The information gathered should be used to inform the results-based management approach that will underpin the new strategy and programmes in 2013.
- The CIPS and National Programme staff be amalgamated so that they can function as one group.
- In view of the continued staff fluctuation, CCR management continues to monitor the situation closely and the impact of the various staff retention policies that have been introduced.

4.2.3 SAIIA

The evaluation team recommends that:

- SAIIA articulates more clearly the context and the rationale for its research programmes, taking account of stakeholder needs, the capacity of the institute, lessons learned, demand for services, a theory of change, partnerships with South African, regional and African institutes and the expected funding available.
- Regular internal communication practices should be institutionalised to ensure transparency and legitimacy about decisions taken at management level.
- The Institute considers the use of interns and Ph.D. students and considers advertising research assignment on its website in order to ensure competition between interested candidates.
- The Institute liaises with ACCORD, which has been able to adopt a way of obtaining corporate work permits.
- A senior M&E post is created. Seniority and experience is required in order to provide firm direction and oversight on the implementation of an Institute-wide M&E system. Alternatively, an existing senior staff can be assigned with this responsibility.
- SAIIA's research approach including its M&E system is consolidated in a *programme research manual*, which should serve as a guideline for e.g. research procedures, choice of methodology, guide on the research processes and data collection, incorporation of M&E procedures, peer review process, style guide, etc. Such a manual would provide a common point of reference across the institute research staff as well as for external researchers on what is an acceptable research standard. Moreover and important for developing research capacity, it could also be used in the collaboration with external partners as a benchmark for working with SAIIA.
- Given that the process of following up on website design and structure has been going on for quite some time, this activities should be completed before year-end
- The Institute continues its efforts in diversifying its domestic and international funding and as a result becomes less dependent on few large donors.
- The Institute establish full transparency concerning the selection criteria (e.g. synergy, timing, sectors, etc.) when accepting to carry out different types of consultancies.

Appendix A: Terms of Reference

Appendix B: Resource persons consulted

Name	Position	Type of interview	Place
SAIIA			
Elizabeth Sidiropoulos	National Director	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Jonathan Stead	Director of Marketing & Communications	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Neuma Grobbelaar	Director of Research	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Ian Nankin	Director of Finance & Administration	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Catherine Grant	Programme Head – EDIP	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Kathryn Sturman	Programme Head - GARP	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Nomfundo Ngwenya	Programme Head - SAFPAD	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Mari-Lise du Preez	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Khetiwe Mude		Personal interview	Johannesburg
Sarasa Ananmalay	Events Manager	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Renette Collins	Librarian	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Chevon Erasmus Porter	Communications Manager	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Angela Thomas	Publication Consultant	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Desiree Kosciulek	Youth Development Officer	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Nicole Ramjee	HR Consultant	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Lucelle Naidoo	Management Accountant	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Rosemary Vingerling	Manager of the Office of the National Director	Personal interview	Johannesburg
Peter Fabricius	Foreign Editor, major South African newspaper	Telephone interview	Johannesburg
Jeggan Grey-Johnson	Advocacy&Communications, Afrimap	Telephone interview	Johannesburg
ACCORD			
Vasu Gounden	Executive Director	ACCORD	Durban
Pravina Makan-Lakha	General Manager: Operations & Business Development	ACCORD	Durban
Hayden Allen	General Manager: Corporate Affairs	ACCORD	Durban
Sunitha Singh	General Manager: Finance, Administration and Human Resources	ACCORD	Durban
Karishma Rajoo	Interventions Department Manager	ACCORD	Durban
Grace Maina	Knowledge Production Department Manager	ACCORD	Durban
Tamara J. Kirkwood	Coordinator: Monitoring, Evaluation and Systems	ACCORD	Durban
CCR			
Yasmin Sooka	Chair of CCR Board	Group interview	Cape Town
Prof. Gilbert Khadiagola	Board Member	Group interview	Cape Town
Jody Kollagen	Board Member	Group interview	Cape Town
Prof. Chris Landsberg	Board Member	Group interview	Cape Town
Amb. James Jonah	Board Member	Group interview	Cape Town
Prof. Adebejo Adedeji	Board Member	Group interview	Cape Town

Dr. Khabele Mathola	Board Member	Group interview	Cape Town
Com. Leon Levy	Board Member	Group interview	Cape Town
Mary Chimery-Hasse	Board Member	Group interview	Cape Town
Dr Adekeye Adebajo	CCR Executive Director	Personal interview	Cape Town
Karin Pretorius	HR & Admin manager	Personal interview	Cape Town
Mark McGinty	Finance manager	Personal interview	Cape Town
Ollen Mwalubunju	CIPS programme manager	Personal interview	Cape Town
Dr Chris Saunders	Research Fellow, PDR	Group interview	Cape Town
Dawn Nagar	Researcher, PDR	Personal interview	Cape Town
Elizabeth Otitudun	Researcher, PDR	Personal interview	Cape Town
Margaret Struthers	Librarian	Group interview	Cape Town
Mark Patersen	Communications consultant	Group interview	Cape Town
Oscar Siwali	Senior project officer, MTS	Personal interview	Cape Town
Rosaline Daniel	Senior project officer	Group interview	Cape Town
Vimla Pillay	Project manager, MTS	Group interview	Cape Town
Antonia Porter	Project officer, CIPS	Personal interview	Cape Town
Prof. Ben Toruk	Member of South African Parliament	Personal interview	Cape Town
Dr John Akokpari	University of Cape Town	Group interview	Cape Town
Prof. Jimi Adesina	University of the Western Cape	Group interview	Cape Town
Norbert Furnon-Roberts		Group interview	Cape Town
Keith Gottschalk	University of the Western Cape	Group interview	Cape Town
Brian Williams	University of the Western Cape	Group interview	Cape Town
Dr. Kwesi Aning	Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre	Personal interview	Skype
Babatunde Afolabi	ECOWAS Commission	Personal	E-mail
Takwa Zebulun Suifon	AU Commission	Personal	E-mail
IJR			
Dr Fanie du Toit	Director, IJR	Group Interview	Cape Town
Dr Tim Muruthi	Programme Head, TJ & R in Africa	Group Interview	Cape Town
Renee Choto	Finance manager	Group Interview	Cape Town
Kenneth Lukuko	Project leader, Community Healing	Group Interview	Cape Town
Jan Hofmeyr	Programme Head, Policy & Analysis	Group Interview	Cape Town
Carolin Gomulia	Strategic Management & Communication	Group Interview	Cape Town
Simona Brandi	HR Consultant	Group Interview	Cape Town
ISS			
Dr. Jakkie Cilliers	Executive Director, ISS	Personal interview	Pretoria
Dr Paul-Simon Handy	Director of Research	Personal interview	Pretoria
Other persons consulted			
Marianne Milligan	National Programme Officer		Embassy of Sweden, Pretoria
Mads-Emil N. Stærk	Councillor – Political		Embassy of Denmark, Pretoria

Appendix C: Website assessment

Brief expert assessment of the [ACCORD](#) website

Design and impression

The website appears modern and well designed. The impression is that the site is tidy and easy to read, with a modern layout, good, simple colours and logical typography. However there are slight problems with cross-browser compatibility. More specifically Internet Explorer.

Taxonomy/structure

We find that the website fulfils its objective of providing information about conflict resolution in Africa. This is achieved through clear and correct language and a wealth well structured of information.

There is a tendency to an excessive amount of information on the front page. The top menu contains 10 tabs. The convention for web structure is to have a maximum of 8 tabs, so we recommend restructuring the information into 8 tabs. The drop-down menus on the horizontal menu are too long, so there is a need to consider how to condense this information.

The ACCORD logo should be a link to the front page on each page (i.e. clicking on the logo returns the reader to the front page).

The triptych layout works well, but it is not completely clear which type of information is included in the left and the right hand columns respectively. A clearer distinction would be useful. For instance, the left column should include a recurring theme on all pages, such as a menu to make navigation easier.

Search functions and interaction flows

It is possible and easy to find specific contact persons. The search function does not appear to yield results on publications. However, these are quite structured under the publications tab.

Brief expert assessment of the [CCR](#) website

Design and impression

The website appears serious with a wide variety of relevant information.

Taxonomy/structure

The layout of the front-page is limited to two columns. To accommodate the large amount of information the front page could benefit from adding more columns. The front-page would gain from reconsidering what the central goals and the central information of the website is and thus presenting it in a way where the user quickly gets an idea of what he/she can expect of the website. This would entail a reconsideration of information value and how to promote

the most valuable information through the use of typography and layout resulting in a more legible website.

The large amount of relevant content is reflected in the left menu which helps to give the user a quick overview of the site. However the user would gain an overview more quickly if the amount of items in the left menu was limited to eight as long as the website keeps the positive feature that the user should not need click more than three times to find the relevant content.

Interaction flows and search functions

The quick links in the right column is a helpful feature and reports are indexed in a meaningful way. Having a search function with build in AJAX suggestions is also a very helpful feature albeit that it could benefit from tweaking the code to gain faster suggestions and more relevant search results. Alternatively it is worth to consider that as a non-profit NGO the CCR should be eligible for an ad free implementation of Google Custom Search.

It is very positive to see that both helpful features are placed on the right hand side which is in compliance with modern web usability standards.

Brief expert assessment of the [SAIIA](#) website

Design and impression

The website appears trustworthy, but the small typeface and overwhelming amount of information on the front page make it difficult to read. Also the font on the top menu bar could be made larger and thus easier to read.

Meaningful contrasts in typography and graphics would catch the readers' eyes and help indicate which information is the most important. There should be more spacing around each item, and headings should be emphasised with bold type.

For instance, it works well to have news in the right hand column. In contrast, the left hand column is "visually loud" and could be down-toned to encourage readers to focus on the most important information.

Taxonomy/structure

We find that the website fulfils its objective of providing information about South Africa's and Africa's international relations.

We suggest rethinking the information architecture to fit the main purpose of the website, weighing the information according to relevance and structure it accordingly. Thus clearing space on the front page and creating new sub-categories for more specific information.

The structure of the events page is rather confusing. We suggest creating a clearer view and archiving events which have already taken place. Also, as

there is a specific events page, it is not necessary to have the same information on the front page. Redundancy in terms of content is not advisable in contrast to redundancy in terms of functions.

Search functions and interaction flows

It is possible and easy to find specific contact persons.

The search function on the front page, however, does not appear to work well. It yields no results. For instance, we were unable to find the publication "Supporting South African Exporters". It is, however possible to find publications using the tab in the top menu.

Appendix D: Documents consulted

Sida

Agreement with SAIIA (The South African Institute of International Affairs) on core support during 2009-2011

Assessment MEMO, Core Support to South African Institute of International Affairs

Proposal For Core Funding for period 2009-2011 to South African Institute of International Affairs

Agreement between Sida and the South African Institute of International Affairs SAIIA on Core support during 2009-2011

Protokoll, Team Committee Meeting for REPS, 2009-02-05

Beslut och kommentarer från Sveriges ambassad i Pretoria om core support till SAIIA

COWI A/S (2011), External Evaluation of the Institute for Security Studies (ISS), Final Report, for Royal Netherlands Embassy, Pretoria

COWI A/S (2011), External Evaluation: Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (IJR), South Africa, Final report, for The Embassy of the Netherlands, Pretoria

Sida (2008), Five Regional Institutions Based in South Africa Working in the Field of Peace and Security in Africa, Final Report, Sida Evaluation 2008:26

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2010), "Cooperation Strategy for Regional Development Cooperation with Sub-Saharan Africa, 2010-2015", Stockholm (<http://regeringen.se/sb/d/108/a/39806>).

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2010), "Swedish Policy on Peace and Security", Stockholm (<http://regeringen.se/sb/d/108/a/162575>).

ACCORD

Final Annual SIDA Narrative & Financial Report: 2009

2009 January -Sept SIDA Capacity Development

2009 July-Oct SIDA Partnership ACCORD-DPCR

2009 March-October SIDA Secondment Report

SIDA Financial Statement 2009

Final Annual SIDA Narrative & Financial Report: 2010

2010 SIDA Final Narrative

ACCORD Financial Report 2010

Sida Financial Statement 2010-31052011

Trustees Reports 2009-2011

Audited Financial Statement 2008, 2009

Notes to AFS 2008

Human Resources Information 2008-2011:

Organograms 2009, 2010, 2011

Staff lists 2008-2011
 Institutional Monitoring & Evaluation framework
 Institutional Logistical Framework Matrix
 Distribution and Dissemination Statistics 2011
 Training Activities Information and Statistics 2008-2011
 Website Readership Statistics
 1325 durban statement
 Evaluation form (2011)
 Pre training assessment questionnaire draft
 Internship Policy Document
 Finance Rules and Procedures 011104
 Generic SERVICE CONTRACT for ACCORD
 Introduction to the Standard Operating Procedures
 SOP on Contracting Partners or Individuals
 SOP on Preparing and Running an Activity
 SOP on Requesting Approval + Memo
 SOP on Submitting News Items
 SOP on Updating the Year Plan
 The Internship Programme at ACCORD
 Buying Rules and Procedures 011104
 Generic Delegates Manual Joining Instructions
 Guidelines on Memos for Approval
 ORDER OF CONTENTS OF sops
 SOP on Booking and Use of Resources
 SOP on General Report-Writing
 SOP on Remuneration Policy
 SOP on Requesting Procurement and Budgets
 SOP on the Internship Programme at ACCORD
 SOP on Writing Proposals
 Burundi Operation Transition Organogram July 2011

CCR

Strategy Document 2008-2013: Peacebuilding in Africa. April 2007
 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for CCR's Africa Programme (2008-2012)
 Annual Financial Statements (2010)
 Africa Programme Proposal, January 2009 – December 2011, November 2008
 Executive Director's Presentation to Sida Evaluation 15-17 August 2011
 Africa Programme, Progress Report (2010)
 CCR "Guidelines to Authors" – internal document
 Concept Paper for a Policy Advisory Group Seminar on Sudan, August 2010 – internal document
 CCR Strategic Risk Assessment – internal document
 Self Assessment Form – response from CCR to evaluation team
 Power Point presentation of programme and institutional results – various (prepared by CCR for evaluation team)
 Review of CCR's Human Rights & Conflict Management Project, John Roux, 8 August 2011
 CCR Annual Reports for 2008, 2009, & 2010
 Selected Policy Seminar Reports
 Taming the Dragon – CCR Policy Brief, July 2009

Stabilising Sudan – Policy Advisory Group Seminar Report, August 2010
CCR Human Rights and Conflict Management Training Manual
The Curse of Berlin: Africa after the Cold War, Adekeye Adebajo, 2010
South Africa in Africa: The Post Apartheid Era, Adekeye Adebajo, Adebayo Adedeji, Chris Landsberg (eds), 2007

SAIIA

Annual report to Sida, October 2009 - September 2010
Annual Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2009
Annual report to Sida, January 2009 - September 2009
Examples of Policy Engagement, Internal document
Special SAIIA Partnerships focused on improving policy making in Africa, Internal document
Department of Marketing and Communications, Communications strategy
Division of Marketing and Communications, SAIIA Publications, Rationalisation Strategy 2008/09
Annual reports to the National Council, 2009, 2010, 2011
Minutes of the National Council meetings, 2009-2011
Reports to the Executive Committee, 2009-2011
Minutes of meetings in the executive committee, 2009-2011
SAIIA Reputation and Impact Survey, by Ipsos Markinor, 2010
Report from Planning, Monitoring, Evaluating and Reporting Workshop 1
SAIIA Style Guide
SAIIA HR Policies
South Africa Journal of International Affairs, Trends in Journal subscriptions
Highlights 2009, 2010, 2011
Strategic Plan 2008-2012: Responsibilities of Division of Marketing and Communications
CBTAF, Final Sub-project Report, 2010
Financial Internal Control, Policies and Procedures, 2011
Finance documentation: Financial systems design, accounting system, Minutes of Finance Committee meetings, Schedule of Commissioned Research and Briefings, Salary trends, Rollover percentage, Budgets



2011 Evaluation of ACCORD, SAIIA and CCR – Regional Peace and Security in Africa

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

