

Linking Mine Action and Development Contact Group Meeting

Meetings of the Standing Committees of the APMBC
Geneva, Wednesday, 23 June 2010

Measuring the developmental outcomes of mine action Summary of Discussions

Co-Chairs: Jurkuch Barach Jurkuc, South Sudan Demining Authority; Jonas Zachrisson, MSB

Afghan Knowledge, Attitude, Perception and Belief (KAPB) Survey

Susan Helseth (Mine Action Coordination Centre for Afghanistan) discussed the 2009 KAPB survey undertaken in Afghanistan. A KAP (Knowledge, Attitude, Perception) survey was first carried out in 2004 in order to assess the impact of MRE, justify continued funding for MRE and establish a baseline of information in order to compare the findings with future KAP surveys. A KAPB survey was undertaken in 2005. Beliefs were added to find out what people thought about how injuries occur and who they believe is responsible. Like the previous KAP survey, it also concluded that people understood MRE messages and valued them, and that MRE was resulting in behavior change and targeting the most vulnerable. In late 2009, MACCA piloted a new survey, KAPB+, which was similar to the 2005 survey with additional questions added on clearance and prioritisation. The 2009 survey also ensured that women and girls were 50% of the respondents, and involved the use of more female surveyors than in the past. Preliminary results are available and the full report will be available in July 2010. The initial findings reveal that the priorities of some groups are being addressed however greater community consultation and outreach is needed. KAPB surveys are cluster surveys, which try to get an understanding of what is happening in the field. They do not collect quantitative data. While this methodology has its limitations, it is useful for assessing general knowledge, and is relatively inexpensive to facilitate. However entering the results in a database and analysing them is resource-intensive. For MACCA, in-house analysis and reporting were difficult due a lack of capacity and time. As a result, they hired a consultant. Specific recommendations include: develop survey questions carefully; ensure survey personnel have sufficient training in order to ensure valid results; field test survey tools to make sure they work and provide surveyors with field training; and monitor the survey process to ensure quality.

Measuring Psycho-Social Impact

Graeme Goldsworthy discussed the methodology he has developed in association with Harvard University Medical School and Harvard's International Center for Disaster Resilience. It is a standard statistical methodological system which uses quantitative and qualitative methods to measure mental health, post traumatic stress disorder, somatic functioning and social capital. The measurement methods are valid for responding to other types of issues, e.g. humanitarian emergencies, terrorist attacks. The methodology is cost effective in that it does not require a complex structure and relies on the use of local staff. The methodology is careful to avoid the bias of mine action. Landmines are put in a broader context, so for example, in terms of the survey questionnaire used, questions about mine contamination only appear around the 15th question. Only local staff are used as surveyors. The survey is careful to ensure an appropriate gender mix of respondents, and to only interview those aged 14-64 (as per the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki - Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Subjects). The qualitative methods involve key informant interviews and focus group discussions (e.g. mothers of school-aged children, agricultural workers). As mine action seeks to rebuild contaminated communities, the social capital aspect involves looking at issues such as community relations, levels of trust in community leaders and neighbours. The methodology has been piloted in Sri Lanka where they have found that in mined areas, social capital levels tend to be much lower than non-mined areas. Community involvement prior to, during and after the process is essential to build their confidence and ownership.

www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/contact_group/Slides-LMADCG-Goldsworthy-June2010.pdf

Jamie Eyre (Mines Advisory Group) discussed MAG's Post Conflict Impact Assessment methodology used in Cambodia, and their Impact Assessment Tool used in South Sudan. MAG's impact assessment methodologies are based on two models, the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework (SLF) developed by DfID and the Livelihoods Asset Tracking System (LAST) developed by Manchester University. The LAST approach focuses on the use of word pictures to look at households in affected communities, from the poorest to those which are self-sufficient. In February 2009, MAG piloted PCIA in Cambodia which is used through out the project cycle and can provide excellent baseline data. Constraints of the methodology include: difficulty developing word pictures, subjective process, and time intensive. MAG concluded that the methodology is best suited to a large programme, ideally one which is integrated with development projects. In South Sudan, MAG has been piloting a slightly different Impact Assessment tool. The tool involves the use of a spot task survey. Eight questions are asked to look at the economic impact of contamination and the risk of accidents, in order to get a sense of the likelihood of behavior change, assess MRE sessions, etc. It is still a work in progress and the tool is being revised. www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/contact_group/Slides-LMADCG-MAG-June2010.pdf

Analysis of MAG's impact assessment methodology in South Sudan: Main findings

Asa Masselberg (SCBL Gender and Mine Action Programme) undertook an assessment of MAG's impact assessment tool in South Sudan in April 2010 to analyse its implementation, gain insight into gender roles in affected communities, and to share good practice and lessons learned. Community involvement is a necessary precondition for measuring the positive and negative impact of mine action on communities. It is not enough to have a community focus. A gender perspective throughout the project cycle is also essential in order to maximise the impacts on communities in an equal way. For example, pre clearance interviews in one community found that land was not being used and this was still the case post-clearance which surprised the CL teams. When they investigated, they found that as there was no handover process following clearance, community members were unclear about whether the land was safe. A proper handover process with community involvement would have addressed this. MAG includes land use issues in its pre-clearance forms. Many households said that if land is cleared it will lead to land conflicts and prevent them from using the land for agriculture. MAG's gender balanced CL teams enable MAG to better reach out to all members of the communities and help to ensure inclusive consultation. Challenges identified included: the need for greater community involvement (e.g. handover); the need to triangulate data; the use of inaccurate data can flaw priority-setting; difficulty attributing positive changes to clearance activities; and in South Sudan, MAG releases land through non-technical and technical survey, however the impact assessment tool only looks at clearance. www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/contact_group/Slides-LMADCG-GMAP-June2010.pdf

DDG's approach to monitoring impact

Bodil Jacobsen (Danish Demining Group) discussed DDG's efforts to improve impact measurement. Their methodology uses an impact chain (similar to Results Based Management) and is based on DfID's Sustainable Livelihoods Approach. The methodology seeks to assess the impact of DDG's mine action operations on safety, security and livelihoods. It uses qualitative and quantitative methods – similar to MAG – and data is stored in an Excel spreadsheet which is straight-forward to use and which a lot of DDG's national staff know how to use. Data is collected both pre and post-clearance in order to ensure a baseline for comparison. In most of the countries where DDG works, they have implemented baseline studies. DDG has found that while it is good to have a generic tool, there is need to tailor it to the operating context. DDG also uses a locally embedded approach to M&E by training and developing the capacity of national programme staff. One challenge they have faced is convincing senior DDG management who are unaccustomed to working with development data, of the need to assess impact. www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/contact_group/Slides-LMADCG-DDG-June2010.pdf