

**Linking Mine Action and Development (LMAD) Contact Group Meeting**  
**8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of States Parties - Jordan**  
**19 November 2007**

**Summary of discussions**

**Co-chairs:** Mr. Mohamed Breikat, The National Committee for Demining and Rehabilitation (NCDR) and Mr. Jean Devlin, Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)

**Incorporating mine action in national development planning processes and organisations**

*Sharmala Naidoo*, Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), provided a brief update on the regional LMAD workshop held in Cambodia (12-13 June 2007), which was co-organised by GICHD, Austcare Cambodia and UNDP. The workshop focused on sharing experiences and lessons learnt from linking mine action with development at the national, and particularly local levels in South East Asia. Some of the key issues raised during workshop discussions related to priority setting processes for undertaking clearance (ensuring they are transparent, bottom up and reflect community needs) and challenges in relation to the provision of post clearance support (putting in place a clear legal framework to guarantee secure land tenure and prevent land grabbing in countries like Cambodia).

*Mansour Al-Azi*, Yemen Executive Mine Action Center (YEMAC), discussed the recent regional LMAD workshop held in Sana'a (4-5 November 2007) with mine action and development practitioners from the Middle East, North and Horn of Africa

([http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma\\_development/contact\\_group/Statement-lmadCg-YEMAC-nov2007.pdf](http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/contact_group/Statement-lmadCg-YEMAC-nov2007.pdf)). The focus of the workshop was on incorporating mine action in development planning process and organisations. South Sudan was provided as an example where mine action has been incorporated in rehabilitation and reconstruction programmes, e.g. clearance of the Babanusa-Wau railway linking North and South Sudan. Ethiopia was also mentioned with regards to the incorporation of mine action in Ethiopia's Emergency Rehabilitation Programme (ERP). Yemen's own efforts to link mine action with development were also shared, in particular the findings of post-clearance livelihoods analysis undertaken in mine-affected communities in 2006. The survey identified significant benefits resulting from clearance, but also identified several areas where the provision of development support is required to strengthen livelihoods and local capacities, as well as address other socio-economic issues, e.g. secure land tenure.

*Deemah Nasser*, NCDR ([http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma\\_development/contact\\_group/Slides-lmadCg-NCDR-nov2007.pdf](http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/contact_group/Slides-lmadCg-NCDR-nov2007.pdf)) stressed the need to put words into action and focus discussions on "how to" actually link mine action with development. Jordan's national mine action programme has been proactive in making links with broader development actors in the country. NCDR meets with key sector ministries to see how mine action can support their work programmes. For example, after speaking to the Ministries of Planning, Tourism and Agriculture, NCDR found out about a planned \$800 million investment project in Aqaba, which led to discussions regarding clearance needs to support the development project. NCDR also works closely with communities to obtain their priorities for clearance and facilitate the provision of post-clearance support to affected communities. For example, in one area, NCDR consulted community members about their clearance priorities, and the community identified a specific area for clearance, and indicated their desire to turn it into a date farm. However, the community lacked resources to productively farm the land. NCDR contacted relevant government ministries, e.g. Ministry of Water, who provided the necessary post-clearance support to the communities to enable them to use the land productively.

During the plenary discussion, *Ambassador Henry Zipper de Fabiani*, Government of France, noted that the discussions provided the impression that the link is only between clearance and development, and therefore emphasised the need to ensure that all pillars of mine action are effectively linked with each other, and with development.

*Aneeza Pasha*, Handicap International-France, asked how Jordan balances priorities in relation to community development needs vs. larger-scale government development priorities, e.g. dams, and how NCDR determines which type/level of development is a higher priority in Jordan. *Dema Nasser* responded to the question, explaining that Jordan's priority setting is done on two levels – at the

community level for smaller scale projects and at the government level, for major development projects, which provide larger employment opportunities, etc. As Jordan has only a matter of months before they complete all of their clearance and meet their APMBC clearance obligations, all land will be cleared in a short time frame whether it is for large or small development projects.

*Sharif Baaser*, UNICEF, cautioned against viewing development simply in economic terms but encouraged taking a broader view which includes human security, and felt that mine risk education and survivor assistance contribute to development more broadly. He suggested clarifying a definition of development for the mine action community. In response, *Jean Devlin*, CIDA, emphasised that an inclusive approach to development is taken which includes human security.

### **Sharing experiences of linking mine action with development**

*Dr. Maligna Saignavongs*, Lao PDR National Regulatory Authority (NRA), shared experiences from Laos, explaining that at the national level, a National Strategic Plan guides mine action, and mine action is also reflected in the national development plan and Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper ([http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma\\_development/contact\\_group/Slides-ImadCg-LaosLMAD-nov2007.pdf](http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/contact_group/Slides-ImadCg-LaosLMAD-nov2007.pdf)). Priority-setting was identified as a key challenge as Laos does not have a standard system in place for determining clearance priorities, with clearance operators using different criteria to set priorities. For example, UXO Lao sets priorities based on bottom up processes and requests which come through district and provincial officials, whereas clearance operators like Mines Advisory Group (MAG) and Fondation Suisse de Déminage (FSD) set priorities based on the level of contamination, the priorities of donors and development NGOs, and specific requests. Weak coordination at the national level, and between provincial and national levels was also cited as another challenge. While donors generally do not provide bilateral or multilateral development funding for mine action, AusAID does, and is funding an integrated UXO action and development programme in Laos. With regards to post clearance assessments (PCA), there is no system or guidelines in place which obliges all operators to conduct them. However the NRA has developed standards on this and is intending to put in place a unit which will focus specifically on PCAs. Key lessons learned include the need to ensure that there are linkages at the highest level and that key ministries understand the nature and extent of mine/UXO contamination and how it affects their programme of work. In this regard, the NRA is currently working with the Ministry of Land Management. Other initiatives include the World Food Programme's Food for Work project, and an initiative supported by the Humpty Dumpty Institute.

*Catherine Gill*, AusAID provided a comprehensive overview of AusAID's integrated approach to mine action ([http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma\\_development/contact\\_group/Slides-ImadCg-AusAIDLMA-nov2007.pdf](http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/contact_group/Slides-ImadCg-AusAIDLMA-nov2007.pdf)). The provision of multi-year funding for mine action is a key feature of their approach, allowing recipients to develop medium term strategies and multi-year programmes, promoting capacity development and sustainable outcomes, and allowing for greater budget certainty. Mine action has been mainstreamed into AusAID's development programmes, and largely been devolved to regional and country offices, although a mine action focal point coordinator remains in place at the headquarters level. A key consideration is the socio-economic impact of contamination, as opposed to supporting clearance for clearance sake. AusAID is currently supporting integrated mine action programmes in Cambodia and Lao PDR, where they are also working to enhance donor harmonisation through for example sector working groups, particularly in countries like Cambodia where the donor environment is rather crowded and there is need for to prevent duplication and inconsistencies. As land and ensuring secure land title is a key issue in countries like Cambodia, and an issue which directly touches on mine action, AusAID is supporting efforts to address this issue.

*David Spence*, European Commission (EC) Geneva, discussed the EC's approach to mine action which is similar to that of AusAID, e.g. it is also underpinned by support for good governance and emphasises partnerships. From the point of view of a donor, when considering whether and how to integrate mine action in development programming, he emphasised that integrated mine action with development requires greater and improved central management on the part of donors. It also means greater complexity for donors, and for recipients. This said, there is need to fully integrate mine action comprehensively into development programmes, ensuring that it is based on local needs. The EC has been doing this for several years, through its Country Strategy Papers, national indicative programmes, yearly action programmes and the implementation of specific projects.

Recent changes have taken place in the EC approach. Previously, the EC had a specific budget line for mine action and had a central mine action focal point, serving as in-house mine action expertise for

the EC's bilateral development staff and encouraging development staff to support mine action. Now however, the EC focal point is no longer there, and all responsibility for mine action has been devolved to country delegations. The danger with this approach is that the staff responsible in delegations for mine action are lost and geographic desks in Brussels are responsible for determining whether mine action is a priority. In cases where the latter lack mine action expertise and information, the risk is that mine action is not prioritised or supported both in Brussels and in delegations, given other competing development priorities – and as a result, support for mine action is lost. This does not have to be the case, as demonstrated by AusAID, who maintained their focal point for mine action.

It is not yet clear what the implications will be in terms of future EC funding for mine action, after the dedicated mine action fund came to an end in 2006. Thus far, approximately 33 million euro has been committed for 2007 and by the end of this year, it is likely that funding levels will remain at roughly the same levels at previous years. But it is not clear what will happen in future years to funding as a result of this change. David Spence emphasised that EC country delegations are being strengthened to manage this new transition as fund seeking organisations and institutions will no longer be able to go to Brussels to get information and support for mine action. The case of Belarus of such coordination difficulties in that due to problems encountered with signing/counter-signing support agreements, deadlines were missed and funding was not allocated to Belarus, who then was not able to destroy stockpiles in accordance with the APMBC obligations.

*Tamar Gabelnick*, International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), and *Ambassador Henry Zipper de Fabiani* underlined the importance for donors to keep a mine action focal point, and emphasised that as not all contaminated areas constrain development, e.g. border or remote areas, mine-affected states should not forget their treaty obligations with regards to clearing all known mined areas.

#### **Draft Principles and Guidelines for Policy and Programme Development on LMAD**

*Sharmala Naidoo* ([http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma\\_development/contact\\_group/Slides-lmadCg-guidelines-GICHD-nov2007.pdf](http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/contact_group/Slides-lmadCg-guidelines-GICHD-nov2007.pdf)) provided an update on GICHD's efforts to develop practical LMAD policy and programming guidelines for: mine affected states (national governments and national mine action authorities); mine action organisations (mine action centres and mine/ERW operators); development partners (humanitarian and development NGOs); official development cooperation agencies (bilateral donors, multilateral development banks and UN agencies); and other state actors (sector ministries, core budget and planning units, and subnational governments). The guidelines are currently in draft form consisting of broad principles and key messages, and once finalised (April-June 2008), will include more detailed "how to" information, case studies and examples, as well as supplementary information. GICHD is currently consulting widely to ensure the core messages are relevant and grounded in practice. The draft guidelines can be downloaded from the GICHD website ([www.gichd.org/operational-assistance-research/linking-mine-action-and-development/lmad-contact-group](http://www.gichd.org/operational-assistance-research/linking-mine-action-and-development/lmad-contact-group)) and feedback is requested by mid January 2008 (please send comments to [s.naidoo@gichd.org](mailto:s.naidoo@gichd.org)). GICHD will be contacting key development NGOs, bilateral donors and UN agencies for input during January-February 2008.

#### **Update: OECD Development Assistance Committee**

*Jean Devlin* provided an update on the work of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The DAC is currently involved in developing a guidance manual for donors on integrating armed violence prevention (which includes mine action) into development programming. The manual will be ready in mid to late 2008. CIDA will seek to circulate the draft manual to the virtual LMAD practitioners' network for feedback.

#### **Conclusion and Next Steps**

*Jean Devlin* provided a brief summary of discussions, which included: the need for mine action actors to reach out and establish links with other ministries to ensure a cross-sector approach; the importance of land tenure in relation to the purpose of clearance, who uses cleared land and how, and who benefits from clearance; ensuring support for institutional capacity and governance, and working with strong institutional partners; ensuring that LMAD is seen as one approach among others for dealing with APMBC obligations; and cautioning donors to retain a mine action focal point to ensure mine action responsibilities are met and to provide in-house expertise to geographical desks.

*Mohamed Breikat* of NCDR concluded that political will, commitment and transparency with donors are essential for mine-affected states.