



Mine Action Funding: Analysis of Trends, Modalities and Future Prospects

Meetings of the Standing Committees of the APMBC
Geneva, Thursday, 25 June 2010

Chair: Ambassador Stephan Husy, GICHD Director

Mine action funding: Analysis of trends, modalities and future prospects - Preliminary findings of a study commissioned by the GICHD¹

Jean Devlin (*international development consultant*) conducted research on the behalf of GICHD during May-June 2010. Questionnaires were completed by 18 mine action donors, representing 90% of external funding for mine action. The purpose of the research was to obtain donor views on how mine action is funded, key trends and future funding prospects. Key findings include:

- 16 donors channel the bulk of their assistance bilaterally. Many mine action donors provide money through the UN and because they earmark it for specific countries, this is considered bilateral funding.
- Different donors have different definitions of what constitutes dedicated funding for mine action however for the purposes of this study, it is defined as a specific budget line which is dedicated for mine action. Based on this definition, only 5 donors provide dedicated mine action funding.
- In terms of funding modalities (responsive, directive, core funding, assessed funding), most mine action donors are responsive, that is they do not develop mine action programmes, but instead, respond to requests for assistance.
- Donors are increasingly channeling their assistance through implementing partners, particularly NGO partners (e.g. mine/ERW operators) with minimal direct funding provided to national mine action authorities.
- Few donors have sustained relations with mine action countries/authorities. Out of 15 donors, only 4 report having consultations with relevant ministries and central agencies in host countries.
- The donors surveyed all unanimously committed to continue supporting mine action, however there is need to distinguish between levels of commitment and actual expenditure. 17 out of 18 donors clearly stated their commitments would hold until the end of their current funding period, with dates varying from 2011 to 2015. Of these donors, 8 are confident about renewing their commitment, 5 indicated they would not renew their dedicated funding and one did not know at this point.
- In terms of potential opportunities for accessing funding for mine action from other types of programming (e.g. armed violence reduction, peacebuilding, etc), most donors responded negatively with only 4 mentioning marginal possibilities.
- There is weakening capacity within donor agencies to deal with mine action. Few donors have full time people covering mine action. Mine action tends to be part of a much wider portfolio of issues.

www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/Mine-Action-Funding-Jean-Devlin-24June2010.pdf

¹ Mine action funding: Trends, Modalities and future prospects – Results of a survey of donor countries carried out in May-June 2010: http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/LMAD-Funding-Report-Nov2010.pdf

An inside look at donor contributions in 2009: What it means for mine action

Mike Kendellen (Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor Researcher and Coordinator for Support to Mine Action) discussed the new online Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor country profiles, which include 19 reports on donors. Preliminary figures indicate a reduction in mine action funding of USD\$60 million in 2009, and of this decrease, Canada alone accounted for a reduction of USD\$30million.

Sweden, the Netherlands, Italy, and Denmark had a combined decrease of \$28 million. Contributions from Switzerland, Australia, Belgium, Spain, and Norway were more or less the same in 2008 and 2009. But what will occur in 2010 is unclear. Afghanistan received more mine action funding than any other affected country, approximately 25% of the total in 2008 and 2009. All mine action donors, apart from Switzerland, provide funding to Afghanistan. The major recipients in 2008 remained the same in 2009 with the exception of Lebanon whose funding decreased. In terms of national funding, USD\$100 million was provided in 2008, and this increased in 2009, with Croatia alone providing USD\$60 million for mine action. More governments are putting their budgets online, making it easier to track national contributions to mine action. Approximately USD\$25-30 million / year is provided to victim assistance. ICRC is a key channel through which donors channel their victim assistance funding. It is difficult to track national funding for victim assistance.

www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/Mine-Action-Funding-Mike-Kendellen-24June2010.pdf

The Norwegian perspective

Christian Ruge (Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs) provided an overview of the workshop organised by the Government of Norway in May. The purpose of the workshop was to: discuss Article 6 on International Cooperation and Assistance and how to implement it for victim assistance and clearance; and to prepare for the Friday, June 25 special session on International Cooperation and Assistance. The workshop discussions focused on the need to be more specific about needs in mine affected countries in relation to victim assistance and clearance. The outputs of the meeting included two discussion papers which were circulated to help inform discussions during the June 25 special session. The decision to organise a special session on International Cooperation and Assistance on June 25 stems from the clear call made in Cartagena by States Parties, the ICRC and the ICBL on this issue in the context of treaty implementation. Some called for a new Standing Committee on Article 6. Norway intends to consult widely with all stakeholders before the 10th Meeting of States Parties, and will develop the President's paper with recommendations on this issue.

Ingunne Vatne (Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs) shared Norway's views from a national perspective. While continued funding for mine action is important, there is also need to look at improving cooperation, productivity and results. There is need to look at how clearance programmes are organised and managed, and make clearance a national priority. Norway will continue to support mine action but Norway's approach has changed over the years. Norway does not provide dedicated mine action funding. Support is channeled through humanitarian disarmament funding, and this is based on Norway's national policy and priorities. While donors tend to provide support in response mode, this does not mean that Norway reacts arbitrarily or unconsciously. Norway makes funding decisions based on strategies and priorities, and tries to ensure coherence between funding and political priorities. There is need to focus on needs and results and not just resources. Norway has agreed a multi-year strategic funding agreement with the Government of Mozambique which involves the provision of financial and technical assistance. This type of targeted partnership is a new way for Norway to structure its assistance.