

# Linking Mine Action and Development Contact Group Meeting

9<sup>th</sup> Meeting of States Parties to the APMBC  
Geneva, Monday, 24 November 2008

## Summary of Discussions

**Co-chairs:** Lt. Col. Alioune O. Mohamed El Hacem (National Humanitarian Demining Office, Mauritania) and Anne Woodbridge (Canadian International Development Agency)

### LMAD and Mine Action funding

Paul Hannon, *Mines Action Canada* discussed mine action funding trends between 1997 and 2007 ([http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma\\_development/contact\\_group/Slides-LMADCG-MineActionCanada-Hannon-Nov2008.pdf](http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/contact_group/Slides-LMADCG-MineActionCanada-Hannon-Nov2008.pdf)). There has been an overall rise in mine action funding, which reached 431 million USD in 2007. Funding peaked in 2006 (475 million USD), which was largely related to the Lebanon war. Following 2006, mine action funds have declined by 10%, although total amount remained above 400 million USD. The share of overall funding by donor states has changed notably during the past two years, with some major donors reducing their contributions and others maintaining or increasing theirs – largely related to changes in funding strategy and practice. These trends in funding show that while it is not necessary to remain anchored to the top 10 donor countries, many donors are still needed to fund mine action. The estimated amount of expenditure needed to fulfill current Article 5 extension requests is 2.3 billion USD over 3 years. However, this is only to fill article 5 extension requests and does not include those states which need ongoing funds to finish their clearance before the deadline.

### LMAD Guidelines for Official Development Cooperation Agencies

Sharmala Naidoo, *Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD)* provided an overview of the recently released LMAD guidelines for Official Development Cooperation Agencies

([http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma\\_development/contact\\_group/Slides-LMADCG-GICHD-Naidoo-Nov2008.pdf](http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/contact_group/Slides-LMADCG-GICHD-Naidoo-Nov2008.pdf)). The guidelines are aimed at bilateral donors/EC at headquarters, country programme and field levels, UN agencies and Multilateral Development Banks. The intent is to provide clear and practical guidance to mine action and development practitioners on how to link mine action with development. Key messages aimed at bilateral donors and the EC include:

Country assistance strategies should reflect support for mine action

- Reconstruction and development programmes should consider and address the needs of contaminated communities
- Country programme and field staff should be encouraged to integrate mine action activities in development programming, and
- In-house mine action expertise and the commitment to include mine action in ongoing programming are essential.

### Different Approaches to Funding Mine Action in Support of Development

Chris Clark *United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS)* discussed how UNMAS was able to access support from the United Arab Emirates, a non-traditional mine action donor, for mine action in South Lebanon

([http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma\\_development/contact\\_group/Slides-LMADCG-](http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/contact_group/Slides-LMADCG-)

[UNMAS-Clark-Nov2008.pdf](#)). He explained that when trying to access funding, it is crucial that the right messages are given to the in-country embassy, that the country mission in NY is active and that the capital city is also engaged. Through Operation Emirates Solidarity (2003-2004; July-August; 2006 after the Lebanese war), funding was accessed from the UAE. The UAE's bilateral contribution was part of an agreement with Lebanon. As a result, there was a commitment to complete the job within a certain time-frame. Key to UAE relief investment following 2006 was the concept that before reconstruction efforts are undertaken it is necessary to remove all the cluster bombs in the area. OCHA also manage a Human Security Trust Fund which is a Japanese initiative. Japan provides almost 100% contributions. Funding is not only allocated for demining but also for post-clearance reconstruction and development. Follow-up projects (such as vocational training for former deminers) are also envisaged as part of the Human Security Trust Fund.

*Iztok Hocevar, International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victim Assistance (ITF)* outlined how for the ITF, clearance programmes are considered as development projects ([http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma\\_development/contact\\_group/Slides-LMADCG-ITF-Hocevar-Nov2008.pdf](http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/contact_group/Slides-LMADCG-ITF-Hocevar-Nov2008.pdf)). Social, economic and productive infrastructures are acknowledged when defining a mine action project. The ITF is implementing a new pilot project in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia involving private-public partnerships to promote post-clearance development in affected communities. Preliminary results should be ready by the Intersessional Work Programme meetings in May 2009. Through these partnerships, local communities are involved in defining their post-clearance development needs.

### **What impact will the Convention on Cluster Munitions have on mine action funding?**

*Richard Moyes, Landmine Action/ Cluster Munitions Coalition* explained that the funding implications of the new Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM) remain unclear ([http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma\\_development/contact\\_group/Slides-LMADCG-CMC-Moyes-Nov2008.pdf](http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/contact_group/Slides-LMADCG-CMC-Moyes-Nov2008.pdf)). Although it fits within an already well-established stream of humanitarian and development work, the CCM needs to be recognised as creating new legal obligations for affected countries and donors alike. Specific articles of the Convention call on States Parties in a position to do so to provide assistance, including through integration into development assistance programmes. A key achievement is Article 5 which obliges States Parties to provide assistance to victims under their jurisdiction and control, going far beyond the APMB/ CCW Protocol V. Meeting these obligations will require financial support, not just through funding channels dedicated to mine action but also as components of wider development programming.

### **Plenary discussion and conclusions**

*French Ambassador Henry Zipper de Fabiani* inquired how communication with private companies for the purpose of financing mine action and development projects is undertaken and whether this dimension is part of the LMAD Contact Group. He emphasised the need to develop a comprehensive set of adaptable tools to engage the private sector. *Lt. Col. Alioune O. Mohamed El Hacen* relayed the example of Mauritania, where an oil company contacted the National Mine Action Centre (NMAC) and included mine action in its budget. He emphasised the need to involve national ministries of development. *Ulrich Tietze (UNDP Chief Technical Advisor, Egypt)* explained that in Egypt, it is very difficult to convince private firms to fund mine action.

The question of ownership of cleared land should be addressed more carefully. *Sharmala Naidoo* explained the NMAC guidelines encourage NMACs to engage development actors – private sector, government, non-governmental - and provide information about the contamination problem and the mine action services available to assist them. *Anne Woodbrige* lamented the general absence of representatives from development agencies at states parties meetings and suggested as well that representatives of private companies be invited to the June 2009 LMAD Contact Group meeting and asked for suggestions on whom to invite.

*Ould Mohammed Salem Sid* asked about the rationale for a new Convention on Cluster Munitions, rather than amending existing conventions. *Richard Moyes* replied that politically states would have never supported a convention that deals with all forms of attacks.

*Ms. Chhiv Lim, IFRC* pointed out that resource mobilisation is easier when seeking funds for rebuilding infrastructure (eg schools, etc). However, donors seem to be less interested in supporting victim assistance. *Chris Clark* agreed that raising funds for victim assistance is among the most difficult in mine action. The CMC emphasises the need to support victims. The language in the CMC is stronger than any other convention.

*Patrick Fruchet, Independent Mine Action Consultant*, asked the donor representatives to confirm whether funding for mine action is available through development, humanitarian and peace-building channels, or whether there are other funding channels that should be considered. *Anne Woodbrige* emphasised that there is the need to be more imaginative when seeking funding. Post-conflict assistance is being compartmentalised and the category “early recovery” may be useful for mine action. In CIDA, the peace and security team has merged into an early recovery/disaster risk reduction team which is not yet fully defined. In order to ensure that mine action continues to be funded at the same level, mine action needs to see how to access funding through different channels of post-conflict assistance. *David Spence* explained that through the EC Stability Instrument, mine action has been moved into early recovery. *Richard Moyes* stated that from the perspective of the Cluster Munitions Coalition, it is not desirable or viable to divide funding per weapons and that practical operations should deal with these problems as a whole. *Amy White, DfID* explained that increased funding just for cluster munitions and as a separate funding channel from mine action is not viable. *Ted Paterson, GICHD* explained that as we move away from early recovery into development, it is important that national governments exercise leadership and coordinate donors. The first points of call would be the Ministries of Planning and Finance, as well as ministries that work with explosives contamination. It is important that these ministries take ownership. *Anne Woodbrige* explained that while there are several funding sources (including private foundations), accessing funding for mine action and cluster munitions will become increasingly difficult. Hence the need to partner with development agencies to jointly access funding.

*Ted Paterson* concluded by briefly flagging future activities for GICHD’s LMAD programme: LMAD guidelines for mine/ERW operators and mine affected states (by 2009 Review Conference); Laos workshop on priority-setting and post-clearance assessment, involving the NRA and UNDP in Laos in March; production of practitioners guides on priority-setting and post clearance assessment; training workshop on evaluating mine action and assessing development outcomes; research, potentially with

Landmine Monitor, on donor funding for mine action, donor priorities, different funding channels.