



Geneva International Centre
for Humanitarian Demining
Centre International de
Démunage Humanitaire Genève



Ensuring Mine/UXO Action Promotes Development: Priority-Setting and Pre/Post Clearance Assessment

11-13 March 2009, Vientiane, Lao PDR

Summary Report

The objectives of this workshop were to:

- > Discuss key issues and challenges in relation to setting priorities and undertaking pre/post-clearance assessments
- > Share experiences and lessons learned and agree good practice
- > Inform the development of short guidebooks on this topic

The following is a synthesis of the workshop discussions, lessons learnt and recommendations.

Session 1. Quick survey of core concepts – Ted Paterson, GICHD

The purpose of mine action priority-setting is to make sure we are doing the right job (not just doing the job right) and to get the most bang for the buck. Challenges typically include many different decision-makers, poor data quality and a rapidly changing context which means that priorities also need to change in response. Given that there are many different decision-makers, structure, hierarchy and coordination mechanisms are required at different levels.

http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/practitioners-network/wk-march2009/LMAD-wk-GICHD-1-Vien-Mar2009.pdf

Session 2. Context analysis: Mine action programme life cycle – Sharmala Naidoo, GICHD

The programme life cycle for mine action illustrates how as the context evolves in a mine/ERW affected country (from humanitarian/emergency situation -> post-conflict stabilisation -> priority reconstruction/recovery -> development), the priorities and values underlying the mine action programme change because the facts on the ground change:

- > Humanitarian emergencies, programmes are guided by humanitarian principles, saving lives and limbs
- > Stabilisation phase, the focus is on restoring peace and providing a secure environment
- > Reconstruction phase, the focus is on replacing what was lost, rebuilding and replacing damaged infrastructure and assets
- > Development – promoting economic growth and reducing poverty

As context and priorities shift, the challenge for programme managers is to:

- > work out how to achieve a balance between these considerations, based on actual needs and the level of contamination
- > anticipate changes in key international and national actors, and try to engage them and position the mine action programme accordingly
- > ensure the mine action programme is not operating in isolation of the country's broader development planning and management processes

http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/practitioners-network/wk-march2009/LMAD-wk-GICHD-2-Vien-Mar2009.pdf

Session 3. Priority-setting fundamentals – Ted Paterson, GICHD

A priority-setting system has the following basic elements:

- > Multiple actors

- > Funding (eg donors may allocate funding to a central pool for mine action or may fund operators, government agencies, etc directly)
- > Information on contamination problem in terms of technical data and the preferences of different agencies, communities and government which needs to be factored into priority-setting decisions
- > Policies (eg SOPs, standards, policies of development partners, government, etc, national development strategy and plans) which allow for decentralised decision-making, and standards to ensure that these types of decisions are relatively similar.

All resource allocation and priority-setting systems consist of a combination of top-down and bottom-up elements. For example, how to allocate resources from the national -> provincial -> district levels is a top-down element. Whereas gathering information and preferences from affected communities to ensure there preferences match the resources available is a bottom-up element. (Preferences are simply a list of wishes unless matched against resources available, in which case they become priorities.)

http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/practitioners-network/wk-march2009/LMAD-wk-GICHD-3-Vien-Mar2009.pdf

Tourism Development in Lao PDR: A priority? – Julie Van Den Burgh, UNESCO

UNESCO want to nominate the Plain of Jars as a UNESCO world heritage site. However, many of the Jar sites are based in Xiengkhoung province (XKH), and are UXO contaminated. UNESCO thinks 7 sites in particular should be prioritised for clearance. To date there have been no tourist casualties resulting from UXO. However with increasing tourists arriving, and the potential World Heritage nomination, the risk will increase. As tourism development will contribute to broader socio-economic development and poverty reduction in XKH, why aren't these sites being prioritised for clearance?

The government of Lao PDR recognises tourism development as a national development priority, as reflected in the national development strategy and national UXO strategy, The Safe Path Forward (soon be revised). UNESCO believes the government should prioritise clearance of the main sites and make tourists better aware of the risks without putting them off from visiting XKH. However, the government has done nothing as yet to clear the UXO from the sites and surrounding regions. Tourists are not provided with any risk education. Guides often take people to see UXO upon request, which could potentially lead to an accident. UXO Lao and MAG are working in XKH, however UXO Lao focuses its resources on clearing agricultural areas to promote food security. UNESCO has therefore worked with MAG to obtain funding and MAG has cleared 7 sites. It is likely that this issue will be revisited when the Safe Path Forward is revised in 2009/2010.

http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/practitioners-network/wk-march2009/LMAD-wk-UNESCO-Vien-Mar2009.pdf

Session 4. Priority-setting: Agreeing key principles and good practice

Priority-setting in Afghanistan

Afghanistan's priority-setting system has changed over the years, reflecting the shift in context from emergency to reconstruction. The Mine Action Coordination Centre of Afghanistan (MACCA) coordinates priority-setting through 7 regional offices. Priority-setting is based on Landmine Impact Survey (LIS) data (from 2004) and priority-setting criteria (eg killing zone, high or medium impacted community, do-able quickly, cultural site)

The LIS provides a list of high, medium and low priority areas for clearance. Data collection is a continuous process involving 16 Landmine Impact Assessment Teams (LIAT) who regularly collect data from impacted communities. Decisions are made on which areas to clear and are matched against IMSMA data. Implementing partners (NGO operators only; commercial operators do not follow this process) are given data (but have little involvement in decision-making). They develop their workplans and submit them to MACCA for approval and funds are released. Priority-setting decisions are also made in response to government priorities. For example, the Government of Japan is funding clearance of Bamiyan. Fortunately, MACCA has enough trained deminers to ensure demining resources are not diverted from the main system. One of the gaps is that demining operators not funded through MACCA can avoid the system altogether.

http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/practitioners-network/wk-march2009/LMAD-wk-MACCA-1-Vien-Mar2009.pdf

Priority-setting in Cambodia

- > Structure – Priority-setting in Cambodia is based on a mix of top-down and bottom up elements. The government may prioritise road reconstruction, border demining, etc which are top-down priorities. While community priorities filter up through the MAPU process (village -> commune -> district working group -> Provincial Mine Action Committee/MAPU -> Cambodia Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority (CMAA) -> Council of Ministers/Prime Minister). Mine Action Planning Units (MAPUs), technical teams which help provincial authorities and communities prioritise minefields for clearance, exist in each of the heavily contaminated provinces. MAPUs meet with Commune Councils who consult village representatives about preferences. All communes submit their minefield clearance requests and the Commune Councils decide which communes should be cleared. Top-down elements, eg private investment goes through the Cambodia Development Council and is discussed with the Technical Working Group (for Mine Action), who inform the PMACs on where they want to work.
- > Actors – include representatives of relevant government ministries, PMAC/MAPUs (chaired by provincial governors), District Working Groups, Commune Councils (elected every 5 years) and villages (chief, development officers, elders).
- > Information – based on 2002 LIS, CMVIS (Cambodian Mine Victim Information System) data on victims, commune databases and national gazetteers.
- > Resources – Each operator gets resources directly from donors and can bypass the prioritisation process.
- > Criteria/policies – Mine action is governed by a legal framework in Cambodia, comprised of sub-decrees and socio-economic guidelines for priority-setting. Simple system set up in communities to help them score and prioritise their minefields based on the criteria below:

Risk reduction potential

Reduce accidents
Peace of mind
Number of MRE sessions

Potential land use benefits

Resettlement
Agriculture (eg plantation, etc.)
Local infrastructure (eg schools, clinics, pagodas, roads, etc.)
Forest products
Other

- > Equity / fairness (will clearance benefit real poor? Men only?)
- > Living standards (how does it apply to whole communities?)
- > Land dispute (make sure cleared land does not lead to dispute)

Likelihoods of

- > Development partner assistance
- > Demining operator assistance
- > Beneficiaries (clarity on who will benefit)

http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/practitioners-network/wk-march2009/LMAD-wk-CMAA-1-Vien-Mar2009-R.pdf

Priority-setting in Vietnam and MAG Vietnam's approach

State projects are cleared by the army through state funding, commercial projects are cleared by the army or commercial operators, and humanitarian/development projects are cleared by NGO operators, including MAG. There is a proposal in place to develop a national coordination mechanism to establish a national committee to coordinate mine action. This will include representatives from various ministries (eg Defence, Foreign Affairs, Planning and Investment, etc). Priority-setting would be decided by that committee. A national coordination committee would also develop a national strategy, which would outline criteria for prioritisation, link to the national development plan and facilitate input from the operators. At present, priority-setting is largely done at the local level and is driven by donor preferences which MAG then uses to set targets. MAG undertakes a mix of static tasks (Battle Area Clearance) and mobile tasks (responding to village requests):

- > Static tasks - Requests for clearance are made by local governments, communities and development partners who submit a form to MAG. MAG then checks the requests to make sure they meet donor-funded clearance requirements, are viable and whether clearance will have a potentially detrimental impact on the community.
- > In terms of mobile / spot tasks, the provincial government provides MAG with a list of villages requiring clearance. MAG interviews villagers, checks areas and destroys UXO.

Priority-setting in Lao PDR and UXO Lao's approach

Lao PDR's national UXO strategy, The Safe Path Forward, outlines three priority categories (high, medium and low impact) for clearance. NGO operators focus on priorities 1 (high) and 2 (medium). UXO Lao prioritises

agricultural tasks. Affected villages submit requests to district authorities who then submit them to provincial authorities who have representatives from key ministries (which is roughly similar in each province). The national priority-setting system consists of:

- > Policies - National Growth and Poverty Eradication Strategy, National Socio-Economic Development Plan and the Safe Path Forward (national UXO strategy). However, the Safe Path Forward is out of date and a new strategy is required. There is a gap between the macro and local levels, despite these policies being in place. Insufficient detail is provided on how to set priorities at provincial and district levels, and how this links to district development plans. Greater clarity is needed on how priorities lead to broader development and poverty reduction so that operators have greater guidance.
- > Criteria – At the operator level, criteria are based on the Safe Path Forward but are interpreted differently by each operator. It is not clear what impact of UXO action is on poverty reduction. Number of casualties is not considered as part of the priority-setting system. Not clear how communities prioritise their preferences, and which tasks will result in greatest outcomes/impact.
- > Structure – Operators also take priorities outside of the NRA system, eg from development NGOs who go around the NRA direct to the Ministry of Agriculture, etc. Priority-setting in some areas is completely cut off from the NRA.

The priority-setting system could be strengthened through:

- formalised training for authorities at district and provincial levels
- greater flexibility and clarity regarding priority-setting and decision-making processes
- clarifying the link to development plans and other sector actors
- clarifying the balance between roving and clearance teams
- improved response to the correlation between impact status, development needs and size of the problem (ensuring the province with the largest problem has the most resources allocated to it)

Session 5. Pre-clearance assessments: Practical tools and approaches

Pre-Clearance Assessments: Practical tools and approaches – Luc Delneuve, Handicap International Lao PDR

Purpose of pre-clearance assessments is to:

- > Compare pre-clearance data with post clearance data to see the **impact** of intervention
- > Understand local needs & how UXO clearance will benefit communities and who will benefit
- > Gather socio-economic information on target beneficiaries
- > Set operational priorities (roving, clearance and risk education) and where and how to allocate resources
- > Understand the history of UXO, victim data, risky behaviour
- > Know current and future land use plans

HI undertakes pre-clearance assessments by:

- > Collecting and analysing secondary data (eg. UXO contamination data, UN agency data, poverty data, Government & NGO development plans etc), meeting with district, provincial & national authorities
- > Collecting and analysing primary data (village/general surveys)
- > Pre-clearance assessment survey/form similar to Post Clearance Assessment undertaken to understand socio-economic situation of target beneficiaries to help measure change to their well being
- > Interviews/meetings with community (gender balance, most vulnerable etc)

Common challenges:

- > Time consuming and expensive
- > Coordination and roles of stakeholders eg UXO operator and development NGO
- > Not all villagers participate equally
- > Active participation by villagers is difficult
- > Data analysis requires time and training
- > Villager fatigue – communities get tired of constantly being assessed by different agencies

http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/practitioners-network/wk-march2009/LMAD-wk-HI-Vien-Mar2009.pdf

Pre-clearance assessment in Cambodia – Mao Vanna, CMAA

Cambodia's pre-clearance assessment process is aligned with the commune development planning process. The process involves commune meetings -> minefield investigations -> district workshops -> provincial workshops -> clearance. Pre-clearance assessments begin with MAPUs conducting meetings with Commune Councils.

Investigations are then conducted to ensure that selected minefields comply with criteria. MAPUs then prepare pre-clearance work plans which are submitted to PMACs. In Cambodia, operators do not need to get government approval and have funding in place before undertaking assessments. When submitting a proposal to donors, they submit estimates, not actual work plans.

http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/practitioners-network/wk-march2009/LMAD-wk-CMAA-2-Vien-Mar2009.pdf

Pre-clearance assessment, survey and land release – Steve Pritchard, Norwegian People’s Aid/UXO Lao

In Lao PDR, there is no master polygon database. Tasks are request-based (by communities, companies, various levels of government). Previously one third of clearance tasks found no UXO, so there was a big question in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. This has since dropped to 5% of tasks based on the new national land release policy which has increased effectiveness and value for money for donors. UXO Lao’s pre-clearance assessment process involves:

- > Requests received from a range of sources
- > UXO Lao compiling and analysing requests against US bombing data and UXO Lao operational records
- > UXO Lao checking with communities and doing site visits

The objective is to use relevant information to make better decisions. The consequences of releasing land then having an accident is a problem and they are still analysing how to address this. However it is clear that clearing everything is not effective, and being risk averse is not good. Pre-clearance assessments can support consistent land release decisions.

http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/practitioners-network/wk-march2009/LMAD-wk-NPA-Vien-Mar2009.pdf

Pre-clearance assessment in Afghanistan - Mohammad Shafiq Yosufi, MACCA

In Afghanistan, pre-clearance assessment involves the following steps:

- > data is collected from impacted communities and is checked and entered into an IMSMA database
- > information is analysed and decision-makers add own knowledge
- > decision is made

Key challenges:

- > Difficult to collect 100% reliable data from affected communities
- > Community members tend to over-exaggerate the scale of the problem and/or are reluctant to provide necessary information
- > Level of mine/UXO impact changes
- > To have up to date information, impacted communities need to be visited frequently
- > In some cases, pre-clearance assessment information does not only determine priorities. Other factors, eg donor and government preferences also influence priority-setting.

http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/practitioners-network/wk-march2009/LMAD-wk-MACCA-3-Vien-Mar2009.pdf

Information management and linking data to planning and priority-setting processes

Decision-makers (typically Mine Action Centres and/or National Mine Action Authorities) typically want information on:

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| > Number of civilian victims | > Availability of resources |
| > Nature/scope of the contamination problem | > Logistical resources |
| > History of the minefields | > Accessibility and time of year |
| > Sustainability (can we continue working there?) | > Environmental information |
| > Type of devices (eg AP mines, UXO, etc) | > Number of beneficiaries |
| > Whether other operators / development NGOs working in same area | > Mine maps |
| | > Type of land and intended land use |

They don’t however always get all of this information. In some countries, info on the number of civilian victims, the scope/nature of the contamination problem, the history of the contamination problem, intended land use and mine maps is unavailable. The single most important changes that programmes in Yemen, Vietnam , Cambodia, Laos and Afghanistan have done to improve the information available to decision-makers include:

- > consulting women and children as part of data collection
- > conducting an LIS
- > compiling data on victims
- > using IMSMA

Data gathering and analysis: techniques for setting baseline indicators, gathering baseline data and analysing data

Techniques used to set baseline indicators and gather baseline data include:

- | | |
|--|--|
| > Determine what the objectives are , eg refugee return or poverty reduction etc. | > Focus groups |
| > Mapping technical data (using community mapping, gazetteer, database etc.) | > Questionnaires |
| > Socio economic data (primary and secondary data collected through variety of techniques) | > Survey report forms |
| | > Secondary data (mine action AND non-mine action) |
| | > Community liaison |
| | > Identify area to be cleared |

In situations where no baseline data exists, consider:

- > Asking affected communities retrospective questions, eg how has clearance made your life better?
- > Comparing with communities that have not yet been cleared (control group)

Specific tips/techniques for effective data analysis include:

- > Consistency – use the same methods, timeframe and data
- > Keep it simple (ask straightforward questions which will make data analysis easier)
- > Keep making progress (review methods and data periodically and improve where possible)

Using pre-clearance assessments to set operational priorities

How do pre-clearance assessments/surveys get to decision-makers and feed into priority-setting? Both internal and external data collection is required. Information needs to be tailored to the needs of the decision-makers. Unfortunately data analysis and presentation often isn't in an ideal format for decision-makers. Data is collected from communities using participatory rural appraisals (PRA), and field and desk study. When gathering data:

- > Determine the amount of time required for data collection
- > Identify the kind of information communities have (validation data)
- > Assess national staff capacity
- > Understand culture (including gender roles)
- > Avoid raising expectations

Diversity/gender-sensitive techniques for getting a full picture of the threat/priorities and ensuring all voices are heard

It's important to ensure that all voices are heard in order to obtain different perceptions, because different groups have different needs, eg people with disabilities, and because women are essential to poverty reduction.

Ensure pre-clearance assessments consider:

- > accident data (women, men, girls, boys)
- > perception of risk (at household level)
- > perceived needs (household level)
- > livelihood activities
- > impact of accidents on different groups

Ensure:

- > staff receive gender training
- > gender mixed teams for survey
- > people with disabilities and ethnic groups are included
- > language is considered

Techniques for promoting community participation in surveys:

- | | |
|---|--|
| > Ensure mixed gender teams, appropriate attitudes and flexibility | > Obtain permission from relevant authorities |
| > Build relationship with communities | > Enable accessibility/address barriers to surveyors |
| > PRA (participatory rural appraisal) and PRRA (participatory rapid rural appraisal) to include gender and diversity considerations | > Give community members the pen |
| > Interview training for survey teams | > Use visual aids and allow for limited literacy |
| > Effective and appropriate representation of women, men, girls, boys, etc | > Hire staff with local language skills |
| > Village mapping and surveys | > Work through existing mechanisms/structures |
| | > Respect cultural beliefs |
| | > Provide incentives |
| | > Follow up – do not make false promises Consult with sub-groups |

- > Allowing sufficient time
- > Respect local leaders and informal leaders

Session 6. Post-clearance assessment: connecting pre and post-clearance assessments

Overview of post-clearance assessment: How do we know we're doing the right job? – Ted Paterson, GICHD

The purposes of post clearance assessment are to:

- > Demonstrate accountability – we spent Other People's Money (OPM) – what have achieved with those resources? Did we achieve what we were expecting to achieve?
- > Improve performance / learn lessons

Basic principles

- > Cost effectiveness
- > Information is a public good (so share, don't duplicate and take advantage of partnerships)
- > Data is **not** information – it has to be presented in the right format and level of detail to the right people at the right time in order to be information. Often too much time is spent collecting data in mine action, and not enough time analysing it.
- > Analysis requires an 'analytic framework' that guides how data is combined & looked at to 'paint the picture' or 'tell the story' in a way people can make sense of it. Different approaches to PCA are largely based on different analytic frameworks, eg LIS framework (based on high, medium and low impact), cost-benefit framework, sustainable livelihoods framework.

Post clearance assessment, Project cycle management and Quality management (QM)

- > PCA is part of a QM system which focuses on the outcome/impact level rather than the output level.
- > PCA can be used for internal QA of all tasks (clearance, victim assistance, MRE, etc) by operators.
- > There are low cost methods to collect basic data. Operators could even get development partners to do socio-economic surveys as they have stronger socio-economic skills in-house than operators.
- > National authorities should design the national QM/PCA system and conduct their own PCA surveys to QA the PCA systems of operators. They can also pilot new initiatives or encourage operators pilot them. And occasionally conduct or commission evaluations.

http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/practitioners-network/wk-march2009/LMAD-wk-GICHD-4-Vien-Mar2009.pdf

DDG's Impact monitoring manual: Methodology, lessons learnt and next steps – Bodil Jacobsen, DDG

DDG has produced a manual on impact monitoring. This stems from the organisation's desire to find out what impact their interventions have had, both intended and unintended (eg safe access created, safer environment created, resettlement started, help to / or re-establish livelihoods, help to / or re-start activities in the communities, help to reduce the risk for accidents and increase (adopt) safer behaviour). DDG's impact monitoring tool is based on the sustainable livelihoods framework, focusing on aspects of safety and security (reducing physical threat and risk, improving level and perceptions of safety). The manual has 3 parts:

- > Chapter 1: Why conduct Impact Monitoring
- > Chapter 2: How to implement Impact Monitoring
- > Chapter 3: Data handling and analysis

The manual will be publicly accessible on DDG's website (www.drc.dk) the second quarter of 2009. MRE and community liaison teams in DDG are currently being trained to undertake impact assessment. DDG emphasises training national staff to ensure sustainability. This will be rolled-out in all DDG programmes during 2009.

http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/practitioners-network/wk-march2009/LMAD-wk-DDG-Vien-Mar2009.pdf

Post clearance assessment in UXO Lao: Progress, problems and future plans - Marco Heuscher, UXO Lao

UXO Lao currently undertake post clearance assessment, as opposed to post clearance impact assessment (ie they assess outputs, not longer term outcomes and impact). Survey teams visit cleared areas 6-12 months post-clearance. They typically conduct PCAs on 25% of their agricultural task and 100% on non-agricultural tasks. The data is then analysed at UXO Lao Headquarters. They intend to start working with IMSMA. PCAs involve a three part questionnaire comprised of interviews, observations from the site inspection and quality control. The site inspection involves interviews with land owners/users and checking the land. PCAs help UXO provincial management, who give feedback to district and local authorities on clearance results. UXO Lao HQ benefits as it

helps refine their internal task selection. It also improves accountability to donors and helps the national authority monitor effectiveness. UXO Lao is currently conducting PCA training for survey teams and intends to establish provincial work plans for PCA, start implementing by April 2009 and have a first report ready by August 2009. Key challenges include:

- > Cost – establishing a system that doesn't require additional staff or equipment
- > Capacity – survey staff typically have limited analytic capacity making an elaborate PCA system difficult
- > Attitude issues among survey staff
- > Trust issues – some community members say what the interviewers want to hear
- > Difficult to see visible results in 6-12 months. The challenge is to define what to measure.

http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/practitioners-network/wk-march2009/LMAD-wk-UXO-Lao-Vien-Mar2009.pdf

Assessing the impact of UXO clearance in Lao PDR from the perspective of rural households - Jo Durham, Curtin University and Boulaphanh Inthaxay, MAG Lao PDR

Jo Durham's PhD research is based on the sustainable livelihoods framework and assesses the impact of MAG clearance tasks undertaken between 2004-2007 for development partners or affected communities. Key research questions are:

- > What is the impact of UXO clearance on household livelihoods?
- > What helps or stops impact?
- > What are appropriate indicators of impact?

Example of impact

- > **Impact:** people feel proud/increased self-esteem, increased income and development opportunities, feel more secure.
- > **Outcome:** increased access to village health, hospital and market, increased business, children feel safer going to school/parents worry less
- > **Output:** cleared land used for road

Considerations

- > The poorest/most vulnerable communities do not have access to assets which they need to maximise the benefits of clearance. So how can operators help them? One way is by establishing collaborative partnerships between mine action and development organisations.
- > How to address the lack of baseline data? A question guide was used which looked at how land was cleared, what was cleared, etc. Community maps were used to focus discussion with communities, focus groups, interviews, etc and which provided pre and post-clearance perceptions of impact. A quantitative analysis will also be done to see how it compares against the qualitative data.

http://www.gichd.org/fileadmin/pdf/ma_development/practitioners-network/wk-march2009/LMAD-wk-Curtin-University-of-Technology-Vien-Mar2009.pdf

Session 7: Post-clearance assessment: Presenting the developmental outcomes of mine action

How to report results from demining/UXO clearance, victim assistance and MRE, key challenges and gaps & lessons learnt

Broadly speaking, national development priorities in Afghanistan Lao PDR, Cambodia, Vietnam and Yemen focus on education, food security, agricultural development, infrastructure development and poverty reduction. Demining/clearance, VA and MRE promote wider development through:

	Individual	Community	National
Demining/UXO clearance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Improved safety > Peace of mind > Access to resources > Sustainable livelihoods > Transferable skills/community capacity building (former deminers and admin staff) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Resettlement / refugee return > Enables follow on development projects, eg irrigation, clinics, schools > Facilitates free movement/mobility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Public investment promotion (eg commercial development, job creation) > Political stability > Achievement of national priorities > Reduced dependency on external aid > Urbanisation > Reforestation

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Oil and Mineral exploration > Tourism development
Victim assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Provides mobility and vocational training to victims > Psycho-social counselling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Micro-finance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Informs disability rights
MRE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Reduces accidents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Improved medical system > Improved community safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Improved medical system > Improved social support system

Indicators for representing these results in terms of development-related outcomes

Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Crop production (amount, type/diversification, saleable crops, income) > Food security / food secure households / length of food insecure period > Dependence on food aid -> amount of food aid delivered to communities > Rural communities assisted > Irrigated land > Value of agricultural exports > Social concession land granted to landless households 						
Investment	Domestic and foreign investment in previously contaminated areas						
Tourism	Potential for tourism						
Infrastructure	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 150px;">Roads</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Travel time to town shortened > Availability of goods </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Construction</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Access to markets and public services > Health facilities – reduced maternal/infant mortality > Schools – increased attendance, increased literacy </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Electricity</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Hydro-electronic distribution </td> </tr> </table>	Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Travel time to town shortened > Availability of goods 	Construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Access to markets and public services > Health facilities – reduced maternal/infant mortality > Schools – increased attendance, increased literacy 	Electricity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Hydro-electronic distribution
Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Travel time to town shortened > Availability of goods 						
Construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Access to markets and public services > Health facilities – reduced maternal/infant mortality > Schools – increased attendance, increased literacy 						
Electricity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Hydro-electronic distribution 						
Victim assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Higher income levels > Quantity of products > Statistical measure of poverty reduction > Employment level > Number of children of disabled people enrolled in school > Victim levels 						

Key challenges/gaps when reporting on development outcomes

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Lack of clarity regarding whose mandate/responsibility it is, eg should it be the demining/clearance operator, the national authority or the development partner? > Lack of publicly accessible baseline or LIS data > Attribution – figuring out whether other factors may have contributed to the outcomes > Making a clear connection between mine action and development outcomes > Objectivity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Victims are widely dispersed > Funding > Lack of relevant MRE > Lack of alignment between existing resources to agreed priorities > Lack of harmonisation with development planning system > Limited managing towards results > Lack of mutual accountability > Reliable livelihoods data is insufficient |
|--|--|

Session 8: How it all ties together – Ted Paterson, GICHD

- > It's about making a difference to peoples' lives rather than keeping busy
- > We can link to development priorities at various levels, eg national, sectoral, etc which tells us what government and others think is important. We can get data and indicators from them and learn what they need to know, what is relevant
- > We need to be able to answer “what difference are we making” in order to keep improving our own performance and to keep receiving funding
- > Some donors give funding for foreign policy and defence reasons. But 50% of mine action funding come from traditional development agencies who want to see some developmental results
- > We can use Project Cycle Management, Task Cycle Management and Learning Cycle to get basic data, analyse it, learn from it and build on it
- > We can and should partner with others more. Just clearing mines/UXO does not lead to development outcomes. Partner with development agencies to combine technical expertise with socio-economic skills.

- > National authorities and operators should work in partnership on this and help each other out.
- > If funding is a constraint, national authorities should set reasonable standards to collect data in an inexpensive way which will help operators make a compelling case to donors.
- > We need to explicitly advocate that mine action supports development to decision-makers at strategic levels

Session 9: Next steps – Guidance for practitioners on priority-setting and pre/post clearance assessment – Sharmala Naidoo, GICHD

GICHD will publish two guides in 2010 on priority-setting and socio-economic survey. The guides are aimed at mine action organisations (National authorities, MACs, operators), development agencies and donors. The purpose is to:

- > Provide practical, user-friendly guidance
- > Strengthen capacity and coordination
- > Enhance developmental outcomes resulting from mine action

Participants responded positively to the idea of practical guides in simple language. Specific feedback included:

- > should not be too broad or theoretical – some level of detail is required
- > include priority setting values, criteria and principles
- > include country case studies to broadly outline what is being done in different contexts (eg humanitarian, reconstruction, development)
- > draw on existing tools, eg NPA TIA manual, DDG impact monitoring manual, MAG PCIA, UXO Lao PCA
- > also look at non mine action procedures for project cycle management
- > ensure parts of the guides could be easily translated (eg key messages in powerpoint format) to ensure local ownership and sustainability

It was also agreed that it would be best to start with the guides, and then assess whether there is need for new IMAS on priority-setting and/or socio-economic survey at a later date.