



BUJ, as 26 June 2007

REPORT

GICHD Advisory Board Meeting 27 April 2007

1. Date and Venue

The GICHD Advisory Board Meeting was held between 09:00 and 13:00 hrs on 27 April 2007 at the GICHD.

2. List of Participants

Advisory Board

Steinar Essen - Deputy Director, Norwegian People's Aid

Gustavo Laurie - Liaison Officer, UNMAS

David Hewitson - Director, European Landmine Solutions

Oto Jungwirth - Director, Croatian Mine Action Centre

Melissa Sabattier - UNDP BCPR

Reuben McCarthy - Senior Project Officer, UNICEF

Mohamad Breikat - National Committee For Demining & Rehabilitation (NCDR)
-Jordan

Shohab Hakimi - Director, Mine Dog and Detection Centre-Afghanistan

Excused:

Etsay Gebre Selassie - Director, Ethiopian Mine Action Office

Heng Rattana - Deputy Director General, CMAC

Steve Wilson - Director for International Relations, MAG

GICHD

Ambassador Stephan Nellen - Director, GICHD/Chair of the Board

Ian Mansfield - Operations Director

Davide Orifici - Policy and External Relations

Juliana Buzi - Programme Officer

3. Welcoming comments and adoption of the agenda

The Director GICHD opened the meeting by welcoming the members of the Advisory Board and thanked them for their presence at the meeting. He explained the absence of some of the members and informed on their replacement by staff of the same organization. The Director then presented the agenda of the meeting, which was agreed by all members.

4. Adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting.

The Director informed that some comments submitted by the members on the draft minutes have been incorporated, and he requested if there were additional comments. As no further comments were made, the minutes were adopted by the members.

5. Interim report on the MDD and MRE Evaluation

The Director GICHD informed the members about the ongoing evaluation of two GICHD programmes: MRE and MDDs. The main objectives of the evaluation are to assess the results achieved by these specific programmes and to further strengthen the Centre's focus on the achievement of results. He then passed the floor to Dr. Russell Gasser, who made a presentation on the background of the evaluation and some preliminary results. Dr. Gasser, in his presentation informed about the composition of the evaluation team, the overall goal and objectives of the evaluation, methodology and analysis of data. For more details please refer to presentation handouts distributed during the meeting.

At the end of the presentation the members of the Board asked several questions and made recommendations as follows:

Questions:

1. Who are the end users in the terms of the evaluation?
2. What is the success of the MRE programme and how is that measured?
3. Who determines if the programme has been effective or not?
4. Is the basis for establishing several projects still relevant?

Recommendations for the evaluation. The members suggested that the evaluation should focus on::

1. How the GICHD is selecting its programmes and how its work is affecting the broad MA programme;
2. How the services provided address the needs, and how these needs are identified;
3. Review the sustainability of the projects;
4. What is the range of the services provided by these programmes; what is the level of demand for these services; the time between the demand and service offered; a comparison of the impact of the GICHD work with other organizations; review of the actual use of the GICHD publications;
5. Evaluation of the MDDs from other technology perspectives;
6. Recommendations to be based not only on interviews, but also in field visits;

Dr. Gasser responded to some of the questions made by the members and took note of the several recommendations. He explained that:

- a) The "end users" for the purpose of this evaluation are the donors, UN agencies, NGOs & national programmes, and not the affected communities.
- b) There has been a selection of documents for the MRE project due to the large amount of publications on this topic. It is recognized that is difficult to measure the outcome of the MRE programme.

- c) Preliminary results show that the GICHD has made a difference in creating an MDD community. In addition, it is widely recognized for its role in IMAS.
- d) A Technology comparison as suggested is not part of the Evaluation's ToRs.
- e) There will be conclusions, recommendations and suggestions listed in the final evaluation report.

6. Review of the GICHD 2006 Activity Report

Amb. Nellen informed the participants that the detailed Activity Report 2006 is now out in a new format. In addition, another shorter narrative Report is being produced for a more general audience. He gave the floor to Mr. Mansfield, who provided a general explanation on the legal base of the Centre including its structure, the main strategic documents and the identification and planning process of the projects undertaken by the GICHD. He further explained the structure of the Activity Report presented to the members, which follows the structure of the Action Plan. At the end he requested the opinion of the members whether the report should be posted on the GICHD website.

General comments and suggestions were provided by all members. The members of the Advisory Board expressed their general appreciation about the Activity Report, and made the following comments and recommendations:

- ✓ GICHD services should be distributed to different regions and some member encouraged a physical regional presence of the GICHD.
- ✓ The basis for each project should be explained and the results to be matched against the aim and not the activity. Achievements to be included in the report.
- ✓ The report is recommended to be posted on the website, considering it as an example of transparency.
- ✓ Another column with the outcomes of the specific activities should be added to the report.
- ✓ The name of the project responsible and the requesting agency should be added.
- ✓ The Report should remain as readable as possible.
- ✓ GICHD should be flexible when responding to a demand for services and the Action Plan should be a living document.
- ✓ GICHD and UN should closely cooperate by using the UN presence in the field.

Amb. Nellen, responding to some of the comments, explained that:

- ▶ The work of the centre is based on request, which then determines the geographic distribution. The GICHD has IMSMA regional representatives for Europe, Africa, Middle East and Latin America
- ▶ A programme based approach is undertaken by signing a *Memorandum of Cooperation* with some countries, which defines the areas of cooperation and support.
- ▶ The Centre is flexible in trying to address the needs of mine affected countries, but always taking in consideration the strategy framework.

7. Discussions and recommendations about the Action Plan 2008

Mr. Mansfield explained the process of formulating and preparing the GICHD Action Plan. He requested the advice of the Board on the approach to be taken whether thematic or geographic. Plans prepared by several GICHD sections were presented to the BoA members. The following suggestions and comments were made by the members in this regard:

- A matrix showing the activities relevant to specific countries could be prepared by the GICHD.
- The GICHD should focus on a few countries but at the same time remain flexible. It should be certain about the needs of specific countries before planning an activity, and the national plans for mine action should serve as a guide in this regard.
- The GICHD approach should be thematic, identified by the countries themselves. It should consider the effects in terms of shape and size of the organization, if follows a country based approach. However the thematic approach is strongly recommended.
- The GICHD should consider prioritizing its services in a mine affected country, so it can have a genuine impact on the achievement of the Ottawa Treaty obligations deadline.
- There should not be confusion or overlap about the roles of the different UN agencies.
- The socio-economic trainings should be analyzed in cooperation with UNDP. In addition, planning of different activities (IMSMA is taken as an example) should be made in coordination with the other agencies.
- Comments and inputs outside the meetings of the Advisory Board were encouraged.
- IMSMA is suggested to invest more funding and resources for surveillance systems and analysing the data, for purposes of strategic planning.
- Formalizing partnerships with other agencies is recommended.
- A repository of evaluation programmes for Mine Action is considered very useful.

- The Centre to consider including underwater operations activities in its Action Plan.
- The Linking Mine Action to Development project is considered very important and the Centre is recommended to put more emphasis on it as the demand for LMAD is foreseen to be growing.
- It is recommended to establish Study Advisory Groups before any major study is undertaken.
- The Centre should consider the Land Release Study as a top priority. Interaction among sections on this topic should be considered, as it is viewed as a cross-cutting issue.

8. GICHD role in Cluster Munitions

Mr. Orifici gave a presentation regarding Cluster Munitions and the role of the Centre in both CCW and the Oslo process. He explained that the GICHD has observer status in these processes and provides expertise at the technical level. He emphasized that the Centre has no political position in favour to one or the other process. Amb. Nellen further informed that the GICHD Council of Foundation decided that GICHD should not have a direct advocacy role. Several discussions took place regarding the Centre's position toward these processes. Some members suggested that the Centre should take a position, which could be taken on the grounds of supporting the humanitarian law. Mr. Laurie said that supporting one process did not necessarily exclude the other. He also recommended that Centre should consider preparing an IMAS covering Cluster Munitions and a linkage could be made with SALW regarding their disposal.

Amb. Nellen thanked the members for their valuable inputs and emphasized that the GICHD is always open for suggestions, which aim to improve its work, in particular from the AB, considering the vast experience among its members.

9. Discussion on the time, venue and agenda of the next meeting

The next meeting was commonly agreed to be held around the September-October 2007 period. The exact date would be fixed later, depending on the availability of the members.

10. Any other business

No other issues were discussed under this item.

_____.._____