

Minutes of the Dissemination Seminar on the Evaluation of the European Commission's support to Justice and Security System Reform (JSSR) in third countries over the period 2001-2009

Brussels, 03-02-2012

Morning session (9.30-12.30)

Introduction

Mr. Martyn PENNINGTON, Head of DG DEVCO's Evaluation Unit (B2), gave a welcome note presenting the day's agenda. This was followed by opening statements by Mrs. Denisa-Elena IONETE, Head of Unit A5 "Fragility and Crisis Management" at DG DEVCO and Mr. Jean-Louis VILLE, Head of Unit D1 "Governance, Democracy, Gender, Human Rights" at DG DEVCO.

Mrs. Denisa-Elena IONETE reminded the audience that, based on the October 2011 Communication on the "Agenda for Change" of EU Development policy, the future focus of development aid is intended to be on fragile countries and those the most in need. In this context, supporting states out of fragility and contributing to the rule of law, security and development nexus was key. Mrs. IONETE stated that the EU has a number of instruments - diplomatic, development, security-focused - which the post-Lisbon Treaty context requires EU institutions to draw on in a synergic and integrated way. Mrs IONETE recognised that EU institutions needed to do this better (in the Sahel, the Horn of Africa, in Afghanistan). Developing human skills within the EU and its partners was key in this matter. She announced her and her unit's intention to work hand-in-hand with colleagues and partners to address the challenges identified in the evaluation.

Mr. Jean-Louis VILLE highlighted the importance of the reform of justice and security systems in contributing to citizens' security, to the protection of human rights and to socio-economic development. He commended the comprehensiveness of the review conducted by the evaluation team which showed a vast, complex and multiform picture of the Commission's assistance in the area over the last 10 years. He considered the results identified by the evaluation to be mixed, and he stressed the politicized, complex and sector-specific nature of this field of donor intervention, expressing that experience from one country to another could greatly vary. A key lesson of the evaluation was that JSSR processes required time and that changes needed long-term efforts. Finally, he added that post-conflict situations and shortcomings in available data made donor assistance to JSSR all the more difficult. Mr Ville identified a number of contextual developments which have brought governance issues higher on the EU donor agenda, notably, (1) the EU's post-Lisbon Treaty obligation to act in the area of JSSR, on the basis of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, (2) the May 2011 Communication "A new response to a changing Neighbourhood" presenting a new European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) following the "Arab Spring" events, and (3) the October 2011 Communication "Agenda for Change" calling for a more strategic EU approach to reducing poverty and a more targeted allocation of funding. This growing importance of governance and human rights has also been reflected in the December 2011 proposals for new financial instruments, he reported. The evaluation was described as a fundamental reference point for future work in the field.

Presentations

Mr. Martyn PENNINGTON, the head of DEVCO's Evaluation Unit, gave a presentation of the evaluation's mandate, scope and aims. He also gave an overview of the evaluation unit's pluriannual programme and of the thematic, geographic and aid modalities evaluations published in 2011 by DEVCO. He finally explained the unit's role in ensuring that lessons drawn from evaluations were fed back into the programming and implementation system, and identified avenues for improvements.

Mr. Dylan HENDRICKSON, Team Leader of the external evaluation team, then gave a presentation of the approach followed by the evaluation's main conclusions and main recommendations.

Questions and answers

The presentations were followed by a round of questions from the audience (Q) and answers by the evaluation team (A).

The following issues were discussed:

1. On JSSR programmes in Chad :
 - § A representative of Chad took the floor to congratulate the evaluation team for their work which had captured difficulties in Chad well. He also thanked the European Commission for the long-term support provided to Chad, which, he considered, had managed well the complexities of the Chadian justice and security systems (police, gendarmerie, traditional justice providers, NGOs). He gave a short historical review of the Commission's support to JSSR in Chad. He concluded by stating that donors needed to avoid adopting different approaches to JSSR and that programmes supported needed to be evaluated to identify results.
2. On the implementation of a holistic approach to JSSR:
 - § Q: A representative of a Norwegian consulting company with extensive work experience on Fragile States explained that implementing a holistic approach to JSSR was particularly difficult in fragile countries as institutions are very weak (difficulty to develop horizontal networks, increase of transaction costs when another national body is involved, problem of accountability of certain national institutions).. He questioned the soundness of the evaluation's recommendation for supporting JSSR processes in a more holistic manner (Vol.1, p. 110). He asked the team whether they had more concrete recommendations on measures to better implement a holistic approach to JSSR.
 - § A: The evaluation team explained that an holistic approach to JSSR is usually advocated within the SSR community but that this does not mean that everything needs to be reformed at once. Comprehensive reforms are generally not possible, not least of all because of capacity restraints in beneficiary countries. The priority is to ensure that when selecting entry points to support JSSR, the Commission looks at "the bigger picture" and understands the linkages between different sub-sectors or issues before designing an intervention. It was acknowledged that most donors realistically only have the resources to work on one sub-sector, or have

interests in one particular issue. But the holistic and cross-cutting nature of reform processes needs to be acknowledged and factored into the design of JSSR assistance programmes.

3. On the evaluation's recommendation to improve M&E in JSSR programmes:
 - § Q: The same representative of a Norwegian consulting company explained that M&E in fragile counties is expensive and that baseline data could rapidly change in moving contexts such as in fragile or (post) conflict states. He suggested the use of opinion surveys via mobile phones to monitor people's perceptions of changes in their lives and their evolution. He argued that opinion surveys trump the need for baselines and are more appropriate to M&E in fragile countries as asking weak institutions to conduct M&E when they aren't even able to deliver basic services is unrealistic. He gave the example of the use of an online survey via mobile phones in Afghanistan. He asked whether this data collection method had been used or considered within the evaluation.
 - § A: The evaluation team answered by giving an example of a UK-supported survey on popular perceptions of security conducted in the DRC at the start of the DFID Security Sector Accountability and Police Reform (SSAPR) programme. This survey acts as the baseline data-source and is intended to be followed-up five years later, at the end of the programme, as a means to measure progress. The evaluation team considered that such instruments needed to be context-specific so as to be realistic about what they could achieve and that the Commission needed to discuss this. (A).

4. On the State-centred institutional capacity-building approach followed by the Commission:
 - § Q: The same representative of a Norwegian consulting company questioned the choice of recipients of the Commission's JSSR support, which, the evaluation has found, was based on a state-centred institutional capacity-building approach. He questioned whether, as a result of this approach, corrupt institutions had been strengthened and whose interests the Commission had ultimately supported.

5. On NSAs' provision of security and justice:
 - § Q: An independent consultant, returning from 5 years working with the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) on peace and security issues, questioned the Commission's shortcomings in taking beneficiaries' views into account in its JSSR support, which the evaluation highlights. She considered that this point was too linked in the evaluation with another aspect of: the lack of Commission's support to NSAs in the provision of security and justice. For her these two points needed to be better differentiated and citizens are entitled to expect due process of law regardless of whether the State or NSA provided those services. On the provision of justice and security services by NSAs, she presented her wariness of the assumption, made by the evaluation, that NSA were fit to provide justice and security services. She questioned whether this assumption would not lead to providing support to local self-defense groups and private security companies.
 - § A: The evaluation, it was clarified, did not take a view on whether NSA were fit to provide security and justice services. Rather, the evaluation noted that non-state security and provision is a reality in certain countries which must be acknowledged

and understood before designing SSR assistance programmes, particularly with a state institutional capacity-building focus. In many cases, NSAs have legitimacy in the eyes of citizens and do, for better or worse, provide security and justice services which the population has come to rely on in the absence of state security and justice provision. The point was made to incite the Commission to ask, before designing its assistance programmes, where the local population received their security and justice services, how effective these services were, what improvements were needed, and whether the State could actually provide these services more effectively in such fragile and sensitive contexts.

6. On the €1bn figure (total contracted amount by the Commission over 2001-2009 in support to JSSR in third countries, as identified in the evaluation):
 - § Q: A representative of an NGO active in justice reform questioned whether the €1bn figure had been compared to (1) other donors' JSSR funding and to (2) overall donor community JSSR funding. She also questioned what could realistically be achieved with such an amount considering, as she reported, that the UK's legal aid budget alone amounted to £2 billion pounds per year.
 - § A: The evaluation team agreed that there was a need for realism regarding what could be achieved with €1bn, in comparison to EU MS' own spending on security and justice. In view of this, the point remained that donor funds need to be used effectively and strategically. The Commission has made choices to engage, even when the overall amount of funds is small, in the hope of launching a longer-term change process.

7. On the evaluation's focus on the security sector (and not on justice sector reform):
 - § The same representative of the NGO active in justice reform asked whether the evaluation had looked at links between the Commission's JSSR programming and projects giving direct support to beneficiaries (such as legal aid projects) and whether tangible effects on beneficiaries had been identified.

Afternoon session (14.00-17.00)

The afternoon session was dedicated to the presentation by the Commission services and the EEAS of the follow up measures to be given to the Evaluation's recommendations and on on-going work in the field of JSSR. It was followed by a question and answers session with the audience.

Questions and answers and reactions from Commission and EEAS representatives working on JSSR

Mr Federico BIROCCHI, from DEVCO unit A5, reacted first. He first noted that the fact that 40% of the €1bn contracted in support to JSSR over 2001-2009 had supported fragile countries was of particular relevance to the work of the Fragility unit. He then recognized the relevance of the evaluation's recommendations as a whole and made the following points on how to address them:

- § On the necessity to improve the EU's policy framework for JSSR, he indicated that colleagues from the EEAS and from DEVCO unit D1 were intent on working

jointly towards this. He considered that the gaps in the policy framework were more of an organizational nature than a strategic one and that some improvements had already been made, giving the example of the definition of working arrangements between EEAS and the Commission on the programming of assistance.

- § Security and justice competencies overlapped and could not be too clear-cut.
- § On making further use of local inputs in JSSR programming: this requirement is recognised. It has been introduced for programming in post-conflict situations. The better use of political economy and conflict analysis where appropriate has been accepted.
- § On the need to support JSSR within a longer time frame than previously done: this is also accepted. Unit A5 considers that all EU instruments need to be drawn on to this effect. The example of Georgia (included in the report) was considered as positive, this country having benefited from support from the IfS, CSDP, EUSR, and from long-term Commission assistance. Considered as a whole, support provided by the Commission and the Council was sufficiently long-term to make an impact.
- § On the need to improve the flexibility of aid modalities and procedures: in addition to the current work on the new aid instruments, the Commission is working on the introduction of more flexible procedures, especially for support to post-conflict (crisis) countries.
- § On the Commission's focus on an institutional capacity-building approach (vs service-delivery): indicators on perceptions are considered by the unit to be needed. Indicators to better track progress were agreed on in the frame of Busan, he reported.
- § On the recommendation to pool EU expertise: the unit answered that an SSR pool of experts exists and is managed by the EEAS. DEVCO also proposes a pool of deployable staff of experts within DEVCO and EUDs for hotspots.
- § On the Commission's over-reliance on IOs for aid delivery: the unit recognized that this needed to be addressed.
- § On the need to develop operational guidance and tools for JSSR: the unit stressed that EU guidance was needed (rather than Commission-specific guidance).
- § On the recommendation to improve the integrated, EU-approach to JSSR: the unit stated that joint- EU and EU Member States programming was an existing tool. Mr. Birocchi quoted the example of South Sudan where this had been conducted as a pilot. He also highlighted limitations in this approach and necessary improvements which had been identified in the course of the pilot exercise. The unit presented examples of the existence of synergetic strategies at the regional level: such as the security and development strategy in Sahel and in the Horn of Africa.
- § On the risk of "spreading too thin" (and the significance of the €1bn figure): the unit reiterated an "Agenda for Change" Commission Communication recommendation that assistance should be concentrated, amongst others, on support to governance and the Rule of Law.

Mr Urban SJOSTROM from DEVCO unit D1 thanked the evaluation team for the comprehensive study provided. He added the following comments:

- § Whilst the evaluation's mandate did not cover Enlargement countries nor the Council's work, which limited it, he considered it nevertheless to be very good and

- valid and explained that the reference group had concurred with most of its recommendations,
- § He also specified that Justice reform was broader than what the evaluation highlights (due to the choice made in the evaluation to cover only those aspects of justice reform which mostly directly fall under Security System Reform, such as strengthening of criminal justice systems and the legal institutions involved in the oversight of security institutions),
 - § He specified that the Commission does not have JSSR programmes per se but that it had supported entry points into sectors which could develop into more integrated reform approaches, considering the recognition that developing an integrated approach to JSSR was particularly ambitious,
 - § On the use of local knowledge, Mr. SJOSTROM highlighted the Commission's wish to include opposition movements, NSAs, parliaments and so on to have broader sense of people's needs,
 - § He also mentioned the need to build on what already exists and to be consistent with the objectives of JSSR as a field of intervention and of the EU's external action (HR and gender issues),
 - § In terms of capacity-building, he made reference to an AIDCO seminar on "Justice and Security Sector Reform in EU external aid" conducted on 16-20 May 2011. Mr. SJOSTROM indicated that the workshop had been an opportunity for EUDs to provide a wealth of issues to pay attention to when providing JSSR assistance. He made a reference in particular to the level of State institutions' legitimacy, which the Commission needs to be careful about when designing its assistance. He noted that this had also been identified in the evaluation report.
 - § He stressed the need to link this approach to attention to service-delivery, and to a people-based approach, working towards improvements in services provided to end beneficiaries,
 - § He considered that shortcomings in support to legal empowerment, oversight and accountability mechanisms had not been sufficiently highlighted in the evaluation,
 - § He recognized shortcomings in impact measurement and declared the unit's intention to work on this,
 - § On weaknesses in the policy framework highlighted by the evaluation, he considered that whilst they were many in the field of the Rule of Law, he considered they were few in the field of SSR. In view of this, he stressed that what was mostly needed is a practical EU (not EC/EEAS) handbook on "how to do JSSR".

On the policy framework, Mrs IONETE underlined that the strategic context was ripe for improvements in support to JSSR considering that the Commission Communication "Agenda for Change" on the future EU development put some of the focus of its future assistance on governance, Human Rights and gender issues and also on fragile countries in particular or countries most in need. Mrs. IONETE said that stronger in-house expertise in the field of JSSR would contribute to reaching the Communication's objectives and that this was on DEVCO's agenda. On the Commission's focus on an institutional-building approach, Mrs. IONETE stressed that the Commission was cautious of providing Budget Support in fragile states and that whilst it was difficult to refrain from supporting institutions in those countries, risk assessment and management and strong project monitoring would help.

Two representatives of the EEAS (Division Conflict Prevention, Peace-building and Mediation and Division Crisis Management and Planning) took the floor.

Mr Marc Van BELLINGHEN expressed his agreement with the DEVCO response to the evaluation and commented on a few points.

- § On the need to reinforce the policy framework for JSSR, Mr Van BELLINGHEN considered that whilst gaps may exist, developing EU operational guidance was the most pressing priority. He expressed the EEAS's intention to work with DEVCO on this.
- § On the Council's involvement in the Commission's JSSR support, Mr Van BELLINGHEN underscored that EU SSR support started as European Security and Defense Policy support in 2005. The Commission followed with its 2006 Communication which led to the 2006 Council Conclusions on a Policy Framework for Security Sector Reform. The Fragility Communication¹ which followed was reportedly inspired by the JSSR agenda. He reported that following those documents, assistance provided at the EU-level sought to involve all sides of the EU. The South Sudan example of successful EU-wide programming of assistance, including EU Member States' was presented as a "revolutionary case".
- § Mr Van BELLINGHEN regretted that support provided by DG ELARG could not be covered by the evaluation in view of the breadth of experience gathered in the Balkans. Indeed, the blending of CSDP tools and of Commission-managed instruments in providing SSR was core to the EU assistance approach in Bosnia, as it became obvious that organized crime needed to be addressed urgently and that capacity-building of the police force was required.
- § On EU capacity, Mr Van BELLINGHEN highlighted the existence of the EU pool of SSR experts which was set up in the context of CSDP.
- § He also expressed a view that lessons from CSDP missions which supported SSR processes should also be further looked at, notably their framework for M&E. He invited Council representatives to add further information on this.

Mrs Catharina WALE GRUNDITZ thanked the evaluation team and made the following comments:

- § On the policy framework, she also highlighted that SSR support at EU level started within the ESDP. She highlighted that the CSDP missions with SSR mandates (civilian) focused on individual sectors, rather than covering the full SSR spectrum.
- § On EU in-house capacity, she added that the EU SSR pool of experts set up in 2010 focused to a large extent on the CSDP side rather than on Commission assistance and that in view of this, the flexibility of the pool needed to be looked at.

A roundtable discussion on "Perspectives and the way ahead" with representatives of the European Union services (Commission, EEAS, and interventions from the floor) followed. It was facilitated by Mrs. Victoria WALKER, from ISSAT and chaired by Mrs. Denisa-Elena IONETE, Head of Unit A5 at DG DEVCO.

First, two reactions were given following the above comments:

- § A representative of the EEAS explained that he was not able to comment on the approach followed to assess CSDP missions due to confidentiality reasons. He

¹ Communication from the Commission: Towards an EU response to situations of fragility (October 2007).

highlighted, however, that expectations from civil society and State institutions in countries which received CSDP missions were high as they consider the EU as a “blueprint for peace”. He highlighted the great responsibility which came with such expectations and stressed that, in view of this, EU SSR advice needed to be consistent and accountable to partner countries, rather than being a sum of the advice provided by individual experts. A truly European strategic approach to SSR was a key issue to be addressed.

- § On Mr. Urban SJOSTROM's point that shortcomings in support to civil oversight should have been further highlighted in the report, the evaluation team agreed, explaining that few of the projects examined had a civil oversight element and that a much larger focus had been put on support to civil management bodies and their ability to deliver services. The example of Chad was given where a budget line to support NGOs existed but it had been found that Chadian NGOs lacked capacity to develop proposals to obtain project funds.

The following issues were discussed between the panel and audience:

1. On strategic thinking and operation guidance:
 - § Mrs. Aurelia WILLIE from DEVCO unit D1 stressed that strategic thinking had positively evolved over the past 10 years She stressed that sometimes “starting small was the result of a strategic choice” and that “a holistic approach can start with a small action “pulling bits together to achieve a holistic approach”, based on existing opportunities, considering the maturity of institutions in beneficiary institutions and the willingness to reform in partner countries.
 - § A representative of the criminal justice directorate at DG JLS commented that whilst in Western Balkans countries, Council of Europe standards had been used by the Commission, an EU model of justice reform per se did not exist. Rather he had noticed that different EU MS legal traditions and standards, had been exported in regions where the EU provides assistance. In view of this, he commented on the necessity to exploit the major legal instrument which is the Charter of Fundamental rights and which provides a model for European justice and could be used for drafting operational guidelines on procedural rights, the independence judiciary and so on. Victoria WALKER asked whether operational guidance did not run the risk of being over-prescriptive and asked the audience and panel for suggestions to overcome this or for experiences to share.
 - § An NGO representative suggested the following guidance: using checklists to make sure that a programme is relevant to people's needs, paying attention to the history and traditions of the country of intervention. Need to change expectations to have people sit at tables, and to have security defined.
 - § Another NGO representative shared experience in criminal justice work, namely on linking or coordinating the demand side of justice (support to CSOs) with the supply side (support to State institutions' supply of justice services).
 - § Mr. Federico BIROCCHI also urged caution in creating a handbook or a new policy but rather stressed the necessity for EU operational guidance for internal use.
 - § A representative of the Crisis Management and Planning Directorate (now at the EEAS) shared the CMPD's experience in planning which, he reported, starts with the development of a Strategic concept and short Fact-finding missions which result in the definition of a planned operation with concrete measures and outputs.

He commented that whilst the planning of civilian mission was different from that of development assistance, a clearer idea of what is achieved resulted. He added that CSDP missions had focused on individual SSR sectors (police, border authorities) –and as such some of the lessons would be irrelevant to Commission development assistance. He further highlighted the ISSAT-developed checklists and literature on support to JSSR. It was also recognized that even within CSDP, a political instrument, it is difficult to tell a government that they are not delivering services to their people. In view of this internal discussions within the EU are needed.

On political engagement within JSSR support:

- § Q: An independent consultant returning from 5 years working with ECCAS on peace and security issues, expressed her concerns that simple operational guidance could potentially miss the importance of political engagement and sensitivities in beneficiary countries: “You can have the best technical tools, but you need political framework”. She reported that her experience in the field had showed that political engagement by EUD and EU MS with the beneficiary had been missing. She linked this to another issue, namely the insufficiency of project preparation, considering the political character of SSR: “it doesn’t get by far the required level of time, attention and involvement it deserves: consultants come in for few months and you commit €10m”.
 - § Another NGO representative suggested that future tools and guidance for EU assistance in the field of JSSR should draw attention to the following points: existing incentives and blockages to JSSR in beneficiary countries and the level of political engagement in beneficiary countries. The NGO representative also suggested integrating successful cases as illustration.
2. On the necessity to follow a holistic approach to JSSR support:
- § Q: Mrs. Aurelia WILLIE explained that it was rare for partner governments to be willing to address all issues relevant to SSR, including oversight, and HR. A representative of the Latin America Directorate at the EEAS commented that assistance is provided based on existing opportunities and that this may prevent following the “holistic approach” blueprint. She stressed that JSSR is very sensitive in some countries even when it is profiled as governance, as certain problems are difficult to acknowledge. She also expressed that there was a tension between the necessity to provide holistic support and the need for national ownership (government and civil society). The Commission’s approach has therefore been programmatic “we try to get a foot in the door and exert influence to hopefully go further at a later stage”.
 - § Q: Mr. Urban SJOSTROM stressed the need to develop a bridge between the security and justice and development sectors. He explained that discussions on linking CSDP and Commission assistance had been taking place when discussing reactions over the Arab Spring. Mrs. Aurelia WILLIE agreed that engagement in the Neighbourhood region was different from traditional development assistance, and that, as a result, sequencing interventions and creating complementarity between DEVCO and EEAS instruments were key in working towards an effective holistic approach.
 - § A: The evaluation team stressed that working holistically does not mean working on “everything at once” but should rather involve understanding the “bigger picture” and understanding potential linkages before designing programmes.

3. On Justice reform:

§ Q: Mrs. Aurelia WILLIE expressed her view that there is a need to deepen the debate on Justice support, which in the evaluation was limited to criminal justice and did not cover the full breadth of Commission assistance to Justice reform. A representative of an international human rights NGO expressed that the justice sector had not sufficiently been looked at in the evaluation, including family and succession law and that the focus on criminal justice had been too narrow.

§ A: The evaluation team explained that a choice had been made, from the outset, that within this evaluation, only those aspects of justice reform most directly related to security sector reform – such as criminal justice - would be examined. It was acknowledged that there is an ongoing debate about how justice and security reforms are related, but it was not within the mandate of the evaluation to answer this question.

4. On the fact uncovered by the evaluation that assistance had been channeled mainly through International Organizations, a representative of the criminal justice directorate at DG JLS expressed a view that the Commission needed to “be braver” and rely less on International Organisations for the channeling of its assistance. He also thanked the evaluation team for an interesting and comprehensive evaluation.

5. On cross-cutting issues such as HR, gender, environment:

§ Q: A member of the panel commented on the lack of information in the evaluation on the Commission’s attention to cross-cutting issues such as HR, gender, environment.

§ A: The evaluation team explained that this reflected shortcomings in the Commission’s attention to such issues: it was found that attention to those issues increased over the evaluation period but were often “sprinkled on” rather than mainstreamed. The team also emphasized that such issues needed to be mainstreamed in the political dialogue also.

6. On maximizing the Commission’s added-value in support to JSSR:

§ Q: Mr. Urban SJOSTROM said that one conclusion of the evaluation was that EU MS did not recognise the Commission as an important JSSR donor. He asked the evaluation team to further substantiate.

§ A: The evaluation team first said that the EU as a whole (Commission, EU MS and Council), by virtue of the large amounts of funding for JSSR that it provides and its supranational character – could have a potentially large impact, though there was disappointment in some MS with the Commission’s achievements in this area. To provide greater added-value to international SSR efforts, the Commission would need to better match its technical assistance with EU political power as a whole. The evaluation team further explained that EU MS views on this issue were based on interviews with a small number of EU MS involved in SSR.

Victoria WALKER from ISSAT closed the roundtable discussion by summarizing the conclusions reached:

§ The emphasis on the need to produce operational documents. The evaluation has been a useful starting point and some work has already been conducted since 2010,

notably on building internal capacity and in terms of the focus put in the “Agenda for Change” Communication on future EU development policy.

- § The agreement on the need to have some form of guidance in the shape of checklists for instance, to allow staff in delegations to make sure they do not miss anything and especially in view of time constraints in the preparation phases. A caveat being that the guidance need also include attention to the political dimension of SSR and to balance an EU approach, with cross-institutional engagement, to providing support in the area.
- § The discussion on what is to be included in JSSR and the need to balance justice and security requirements, as well as the need to have a holistic approach.
- § With advice comes responsibility. Risk management needs to be underlined and design of assistance should be context-based rather than following a single blueprint.

Closing remarks

Mrs. Joelle JENNY, Head of the Peacebuilding, Conflict prevention, Mediation Division at the EEAS thanked DEVCO for having organized the seminar and for having commissioned the evaluation. She highlighted the importance of conducting such thorough evaluations to move forward and described the report as hard-hitting, and thorough, to its credit, and thanked the evaluation team for it. She considered the following points of the evaluation to be key to the EEAS’ work and to which it would contribute:

- The need for more strategic reflection on national ownership issues, on evolving contexts and on linking military, diplomatic and development assistance,
- Demonstrating EU Added Value in JSSR support through a comprehensive and coherent approach using military, diplomatic and development assistance, to which, she argued, that the EEAS would contribute to,
- The challenge of operationalisation, which would start with a better understanding of the local context, the political economy, incentives and blockages. She argued that shortcomings have been linked to unrealistic expectations from the start in the programming,
- The need to revise the inter-service group on SSR in order to bring experts together, considering the immense expertise available,
- The need to complement the SSR training course organized by the EEAS with DEVCO knowledge and experience,
- The need for better political engagement, which the EEAS has the mandate to provide, in complementarity to development assistance.

Mr. Klaus RUDISCHHAUSER, Director for Quality and Impact at DG DEVCO, closed the seminar. He stressed the importance of evaluations in shaping future instruments and policies. He picked up on a few recommendations which he considered as very good, namely the need to develop or find the expertise in our EUDs and at HQ, the need to embed JSSR activities into the wider context, and to improve follow-up on activities. Mr. RUDISCHHAUSER then stressed the need to make sure that evaluations’ results feed into the programming cycle. He expressed his view that the evaluation’s operational conclusions would be useful in this respect. In light of this he explained that, within the new legal instruments proposed for the period 2014-2020 and which were to be discussed at the Council and European Parliament, a midterm reporting clause had been

introduced in order to produce a results-oriented evaluation to guide the next multiannual funding framework. Mr. RUDISCHHAUSER thanked the evaluation team again and all those who took part in discussions.

Further seminar details

The full report "Thematic Evaluation of European Commission Support to Justice and Security System Reform (JSSR)" can be downloaded from the website:

http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation/evaluation_reports/2011/1295_docs_en.htm

Meeting settings	
Non-exhaustive list of participants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr Federico BIROCCHI, Policy Desk Officer, unit A5 (Fragility and Crisis Management), DEVCO 2. Mr. Patrick DOELLE, International Aid / Cooperation Officer, unit G1 (Geographical Coordination Latin America and Caribbean), DEVCO 3. Mrs. Denisa-Elena IONETE, Head of unit A5 (Fragility and Crisis Management), DEVCO 4. Mrs. Joëlle JENNY, Head of Division - Peace-building, Conflict Prevention and Mediation, EEAS 5. Mrs. Roxana OSIAC, Evaluation Manager, unit B2 (Evaluation), DEVCO 6. Mr. Martyn PENNINGTON, Head of unit B2 (Evaluation), DEVCO 7. Mrs. Catherine PRAVIN, Evaluation Manager, unit B2 (Evaluation), DEVCO 8. Mr. Klaus RUDISCHHAUSER, Director of Directorate B (Quality and Impact), DEVCO 9. Mrs. Genoveva RUIZ CALAVERA, Head of unit FPI.2, (Stability Instruments Operations Unit of the Foreign Policy Instrument Service of the European Commission) 10. Mr. Corrado SCOGNAMILLO, Policy Desk Officer, unit A5 (Fragility and Crisis Management), DEVCO 11. Mr. Urban SJOSTROM, Quality Management Officer - Justice, droits de l'homme, unit D1 (Governance, Democracy, Gender, Human Rights), DG DEVCO 12. Mr. Marc Van BELLINGHEN, Division - Conflict Prevention, Peace-building and Mediation, EEAS 13. Mr. Jean-Louis VILLE, Head of Unit D1 (Governance, Democracy, Gender, Human Rights), DG DEVCO 14. Mrs. Catharina WALE GRUNDITZ, Division - Conflict Prevention, Peace-building and Mediation, EEAS 15. Mrs. Victoria WALKER, Senior SSR Advisor (Governance), ISSAT 16. Mrs. Aurélie WILLIE, Quality Management Officer - Justice, droits de l'homme, unit D1 (Governance, Democracy, Gender, Human Rights), DG DEVCO 17. Other participants including representatives from (non-exhaustive list): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NGO representatives - Third countries representatives

	- Think tanks representatives
Eval. Team	Anne-Laure CADJI (ADE s.a, Medium Expert), Edwin CLERCKX (ADE s.a, Director Evaluation Department), Laura EID (ADE s.a, Junior Expert), Antoine HANIN (ADE s.a, Medium Expert), Dylan HENDRICKSON (King's College London, Team Leader)
Subject	Evaluation of the Commission's support to Justice and Security System Reform (JSSR) – dissemination seminar
Location	Berlaymont Building, Walter Hallstein Room, Brussels
Date	Friday 3 February, 9:30 – 17:00