

GICHD | CIDHG



Mine Action Funding: Trends, Modalities and Future Prospects

Results of a survey of donor countries carried out in May-June 2010

**Jean Devlin
November 2010**

**Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining
Centre International de Déminage Humanitaire | Genève**

7 bis, av. de la Paix | P.O. Box 1300 | 1211 Geneva 1 | Switzerland | t. + 41 (0)22 906 16 60
f. + 41 (0)22 906 16 90 | info@gichd.org | www.gichd.org

The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) strives for a world free of anti-personnel mines and from the threat of other landmines and explosive remnants of war, and where the suffering and concerns of populations living in affected areas are addressed. The Centre is active in research, provides operational assistance and supports the implementation of the Anti - Personnel Mine Ban Convention.

This project was written by Jean Devlin, independent consultant.

This project has been managed by Sharmala Naidoo, Project Manager, Linking Mine Action and Development, GICHD, s.naidoo@gichd.org

© Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining. The designation employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the GICHD concerning the legal status of any country, territory or armed groups, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Table of content

Executive summary	5
1. Introduction.....	7
2. Background.....	7
3. Survey findings and analysis.....	8
A. Policy and strategic planning.....	8
A.1 Policy making with regard to mine action.....	8
A.2 Strategic planning for mine action.....	9
A.3 Donor coordination	11
A.4 Conclusions	12
B. Budget and Programme Management.....	13
B.1 How donors determine their budgetary allocations to mine action.....	13
B.2 Issues relating to the management of mine action programmes.....	14
B.3 Conclusions.....	18
C. Addressing relationships with mine affected recipient countries and mine action organisations	19
C.1 Representation and dialogue with recipient countries (in the field and in international meetings).....	19
C.2 Involvement in consulting host country governments	19
C.3 Role of multilateral organisations, NGOs and mine action operators	20
C.4 Conclusions.....	20
D. Future trends and funding prospects.....	20
D.1 Commitment to support mine action	20
D.2 Conditions influencing funding levels	21
D.3 Changes in funding channels in the near future	21
D.4 Changes in programme type.....	21
D.5 Stability in funding	22
D.6 Trends likely to influence future funding.....	22

D.7 Areas to benefit from sustained dialogue on effective international cooperation and assistance for mine action..... 22

D.8 Conclusions on future trends..... 23

Annex A: Terms of reference..... 25

Annex B..... 26

A. Mine action strategies and funding modalities..... 26

B. Addressing relations with mine-affected recipient countries and mine action organisations..... 28

C. Future trends 28

Annex C List of contact people 30

Annex D Reference documents consulted 33

Executive summary

In May 2010, the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) commissioned a survey to examine donor decision-making processes and future support for mine action. This report is the summary of findings drawn from answers to a questionnaire circulated to 25 donors between May 3 and June 25, 2010.

Responses to the survey from most of the key mine action donors indicates that donor policy is now marked by pragmatism in the way donors relate to mine action. Without actually promoting the notion of a mine-safe world as opposed to the ultimate aim of a mine free world, donor policy language does not place emphasis on the original call of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC). The policy construct is more nuanced and realistic in terms of what can be achieved. Thinking has shifted towards placing more emphasis on socio-economic impact, protection, reintegration and return to normal livelihoods among other things, rather than just on how many mines have been found and destroyed. Over the years, the factors that donors use to select and assess project proposals have changed, from focusing narrowly on getting the mines out of the ground and providing assistance to victims, to a more results-based approach aimed at minimising the number of new victims and ensuring that priority is given to reducing the impact of mines on lives and livelihoods.

Mine action is no longer seen, as in the early days of the Convention, strictly as a humanitarian issues. It is now well accepted by most donors as being part of the broader development cooperation family. Efforts focused on better understanding the dynamic of fragility, conflict prevention and post-crisis involvement have opened the way to emerging programming in the broad peace and security field of cooperation. With increasing attention given to aid effectiveness and to the domain of peace and security, mine action programmes have been affected by the growth of competing fields, such as peacebuilding, security sector reform, conflict prevention and recovery.

Donors are generally in favor of improved coordination both among themselves and with mine affected countries. However, they tend to respond to invitations to coordinate, as opposed to being proactive and initiate activities in support of coordination. Donor administrations, and in particular, the number of responsible officers for mine action, have been reduced over the years. As a result, donor capacities have been weakened, resulting in a loss of focus, greater devolution for implementation to other organisations, increased dependency on mine action operators, NGOs and the UN, and loss of corporate memory and in-house expertise.

Interaction with host country authorities prior, but also after making funding decisions, is neither systematic nor extensive. Although most of the donors surveyed confirmed that they consult with relevant ministries and central agencies in host countries, these consultations vary in approach and in depth.

Specific recommendations made by donors for helping secure continued mine action funding include:

- Focus on priorities
- Support the capacity development of national mine action authorities

- Develop better performance measurement tools to improve reporting on results
- Apply gender-sensitive programming
- Take advantage of opportunities to further integrate mine action in other types of development programming, i.e. traditional development, recovery, peace and security
- Better identify needs
- Ensure links with development, and national development strategies

In conclusion, unless there is an unexpected turn of events, donors are unlikely to launch new initiatives and increase their level of funding for mine action. Donor positions are rather attentive at this point, and they have expressed no interest in making radical changes to the way they support mine action. This form of conservatism may well be a preview of a leveling off in programming. While funding for mine action has remained relatively high until now, and donor commitment was positive, it is likely that in the coming years, funding will become increasingly limited and difficult to secure. Donor funding may well have peaked in the past two years and has reached a new plateau for the immediate future. It is likely to gradually reduce to another plateau in the medium term, i.e. 2012-2015. This situation could change during the 2014-2015 period as some major donors will review their multi-year mine action assistance.

Is this trend irreversible or can a combination of initiatives bring new life to the level of assistance? Many donors and experts say it is not the level of funding that counts as much as the effectiveness of assistance programmes, ownership demonstrated by national authorities, and pace of progress in land release. These issues will be at the heart of an engaged dialogue on resources which will be proposed at the 10th Meeting of States Parties to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention.

1. Introduction

According to the Landmine and Cluster Munitions Monitor (LCMM), total funding for mine action amounted to \$626.5 million US in 2008. Of this amount, \$517.8 million US¹ came from international sources and \$108.7 million US from mine affected countries themselves. This amounted to some of the highest levels of investment to reduce the threat of landmines since support was first recorded back in 1992.

The LCMM also recorded that since 1996, and despite minor fluctuation from year to year in donor data, there has been a constant growth in annual contributions to mine action. Despite this encouraging trend, concerns remain about three key issues:

- the effectiveness of existing mine action programmes
- the unevenness of distribution of support
- the sustainability of such high levels of funding.

In 2008, the top ten mine action donors accounted for close to 80% of all international support. The EC and European Union (EU) member states contributed 52% of all international contributions. Both of these groups can influence the course of mine action. Of the 32 mine-affected states that receive support from EU members, six (Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia, Cambodia, Sudan and Iraq) continue to have substantial needs and receive a large portion of international assistance.

At the annual Meeting of States Parties to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) in Sarajevo, in 2006, it became clear that several States Parties would not be able to fulfill their obligation to clear all known mined areas within the ten year period prescribed by Article 5 of the Convention. An extension process was developed in collaboration with several stakeholders and at the 2nd APMBC Review Conference in Cartagena in 2009, 19 countries submitted requests for an extension. The total cost of extensions to article 5 alone is estimated at \$2.78 billion US from 2009 to 2019, which represents more than half of the total funding provided by donors between 1992-2008.

There is ground for concern, particularly as the 2009 LCMM reports that cost projections for extension in 2009 represent 49% of all international funds required. This trend will not only be maintained, but will increase as more countries get ready to submit extensions. It remains to be seen how the donor community will react to this call for additional funding.

2. Background

GICHD commissioned this study on **Mine Action: Trends, Modalities and Future Prospects** to examine the key factors driving the funding decisions of mine action donors and the modalities they choose to respond to the needs of countries affected by mines and Explosive Remnants of War (ERW). The study also obtained donors' views on how to make international coordination and consultation a more effective tool to meet the needs of mine-affected developing countries. In this regard, it is anticipated that the study will supplement the information currently available

¹ At the request of the EC the Monitor revised downward its total external funding for 2008 to US \$448.3 million. This figure has been used in calculating the relative share of donor based on 2008 Landmine Monitor report.

and complement the work of the Resource Utilisation Contact Group, chaired by the Government of Norway.

The study was carried out between May 3 and June 25 2010, and consisted of a written questionnaire sent to 25 donors, including the European Commission (EC), as well as telephone interviews conducted with 10 selected donors². The report is based on the compilation of answers provided by 18 donors, as well as a review of donor documents and web sites dealing with foreign policy and aid programmes related to mine action.

3. Survey findings and analysis

A. Policy and strategic planning

A.1 Policy making with regard to mine action

18 countries³ (85.3% of total external funding) have a mine action policy, which varies from a formal statement indicating the country's position, to a more detailed and articulated document highlighting positions and actions taken. The motivations behind these policies also vary significantly, from supporting victims of conflict and meeting the needs of affected communities to helping countries meet their obligations under the Ottawa Convention.

All donors except one (the US – which is not a State Party to the APMBC), justified their position as directly related to the Convention. This said, mine action is no longer seen as a single action item. Wording in donor policy documents have shifted over the past decade touching on a variety of programme types such as peacebuilding, recovery, development cooperation, disarmament as well as keeping the original humanitarian mine action driver, with a more nuanced emphasis. Most donors now tend to set their policies at the intersection of more than one programme type. For example, humanitarian and development programmes are mentioned in responses and reference material. Donors have identified broader policy areas in which mine action has been integrated: humanitarian, post conflict recovery, fragile states, development cooperation and disarmament. Under the broad heading of official development assistance (ODA), donors have found their own way of identifying the most logical niche for mine action within their administration. So for a growing number of donors, the old debate about whether mine action is a humanitarian or development issue is no longer relevant in 2010.

Another interesting aspect of donor policies is the inclusion of ERW, Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs) and cluster munitions together with anti-personnel mines, which reflects a broadening focus. Attention on the part of donors is no longer directed to single item pursuits like landmines, but to a grouping of explosive devices that pose a threat to human security.

Policy dialogue with civil society organisations: 13 donors said they consulted civil society when developing policy. The form in which these consultations take place, varies from

² Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, the European Commission (EC), Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Canada stated it was unable to respond at this time as it is undergoing a review and France, Spain, Czech Republic, China and UAE and South Africa did not respond to the initial message.

³ Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, the European Commission (EC), Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Canada stated it was unable to respond at this time as it is undergoing a review and France, Spain, Czech Republic, China and UAE and South Africa did not respond to the initial message.

occasional and casual consultation, to formal and sustained. Consultations are held primarily with NGOs and mine action operators. Two donors also mentioned consulting commercial organisations. Donors view this form of consultation as essential to policy formulation.

Whole of government approach: Most donors consult widely with different government ministries and departments when developing their mine action policy. Of 15 donors who answered this question only two do not carry out interdepartmental consultations. The EC is not considered as a government, but it has a sophisticated consultation and coordination process involving different directorates and divisions within these directorates.

Links to development issues: Mine action is largely viewed as a subset of development cooperation by the majority of donors surveyed. Thirteen out of 17 donors stated that they adhered to the principles of aid effectiveness. Some mentioned Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD), as well, as guiding principles. Only four respondents (Belgium, Germany, Austria and USA) stated that the bulk of their aid is not linked to the broader development cooperation agenda. This is also reflected in their management of mine action. Nevertheless, an increasing number of donor policy statements recognise the link between mine action and development outcomes, even though they may not integrate mine action in their aid programmes.

Length of commitment: Four out of the 14 donors that responded indicated that they do not have multi-year commitment capacity. Ten others do have multi-year commitment capabilities that vary in time, but do not exceed five years.

Periodic reviews are carried out by most donors who have policies on mine action or policies that include mine action as a component. These reviews usually vary in time between three and four years. The majority of respondents will undergo a review in 2012 or 2013. One donor recently completed a review, and two are currently carrying them out.

Donors have different approaches to reviewing policy and strategies. Ten countries have a policy extending over a period of time. Among them, six have scheduled reviews that vary in form and in time from yearly to every five years. Four other donors stated they do not review their strategies or multi-year programmes (US, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg and Austria).

The lead ministry for policy on mine action in 15 countries is the ministry of foreign affairs or its equivalent (the EC is not counted here as a country but as a multilateral organisation). In most countries, the ministry of foreign affairs is the home of a department responsible for development cooperation. Exceptions to this rule are the United Kingdom (UK), Australia, the US, Japan and Canada, each of which have independent or semi-independent aid administrations. Their contribution to policy development varies from country to country.

A.2 Strategic planning for mine action

Out of 18 donors that provided responses and information, seven have official strategic documents associated directly, but perhaps not exclusively, to mine action (Denmark, EC, US, Switzerland, Australia, UK and soon, Sweden). Another two donors (Norway and Finland) refer to their humanitarian assistance strategies for guidance on mine action. Five donors do not have a formal strategy but are guided by similar basic principles. The documents made available vary

in terms of their presentation, length and detail. Three strategy documents (UK, EC and Finland) are similar to guidelines, whereas three others are specific mine action strategies which clearly spell out the areas of focus, the means to achieve them, etc (Australia, Switzerland, Denmark).

The following sub-section is divided in two parts. The first looks at the specific issues donor focus most upon, the links they make between mine action and other horizontal programming fields and their reliance on performance measurement and knowledge based decision making. The second part looks more closely at specific elements of strategic thinking aimed at priority setting.

A.2.a Issues, linkages and performance

On issues, donors (with or without strategies) prioritise a range of subjects that are grouped under 17 headings.⁴ In order, the eight most frequently mentioned areas of focus are as follows:

- a) priority countries
- b) attention to one or more specific mine action pillars
- c) increasing national ownership
- d) protection by mitigating the impact
- e) reinforcing cooperation, coordination and partnership,
- f) commitment to treaty obligations
- g) promoting gender equality
- h) lifting obstacles to development

This grouping of focus areas provides a good indication of where donor attention is concentrated and how their programming is likely to be shaped.

In terms of **horizontal linkages** made in strategic thinking, the spectrum is wide⁵. Mine action is seen as part of a continuum of post conflict involvement. More and more donors recognise this and the debate on whether mine action is a humanitarian or development issue has faded. More donors are also emphasising the link between security and development.

Donors are also giving greater attention to **performance measurement** and evidence based programming. Fifteen donors responded that their actions and strategies had been influenced by the results of evaluations and audits from which it was possible to draw lessons for future cooperation. To be able to capture all this information and process it in a way that could be shared by all donors would prove to be very useful. On the other hand, donors are divided on their readiness to carry out joint strategic reviews in countries they assist. This might be more of a resource constraint than a fundamental opposition to this kind of activity which has proven effective, for example in humanitarian assistance (Tsunami and Pakistan earthquake responses).

⁴ In no specific order, commitment to treaty, reinforcing cooperation, coordination and partnerships with international organisations and civil society, national ownership, incorporate lessons learned from past programming, cost efficiency and effectiveness, conformity with IMAS, capacity development, mitigation of human impact (protection), reduction of obstacles to development (socio-economic), support for mine action pillars, focus on priority countries, significance of needs/demand driven, regional security, gender dimension, competitive tendering, outcome and results, and advocacy.

⁵ Links to: rehabilitation and recovery, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, disarmament, other programmes of the UN, EU and NGOs, traditional development cooperation, aid effectiveness agenda, the security-development nexus, poverty reduction and humanitarian assistance.

When asked what criteria they take into account when choosing **priority** countries, 16 donors responded, and referred to 14 different criteria⁶ that basically mirror their policies and strategies in a consistent way. Interestingly, 15 donors also said that, to varying degrees, the countries receiving assistance for mine action are also partner countries for other forms of aid. The reasons given above, together with this choice of partnership, explain the trend toward concentration of assistance in a smaller number of countries. It is also in line with the broader concept initiated around the Aid Effectiveness agenda, which encourages donor countries to concentrate on a smaller number of partner countries.

It appears that all donors do have a special relationship with a limited number of mine affected partner countries, even the countries that claim not to select priority countries. This also corroborates statistics showing that most of the aid to mine action is earmarked to specific countries as opposed to being given without any earmarking or conditions. Even looking at the new funding mechanisms being experimented with, countries are being pre-selected. This will continue to pose a problem for countries that have fallen outside the grid of criteria used by donors to select recipient countries. Some alternative methods of dealing with these orphan countries will have to be developed, such as reinvigorating the UNDP Completion Initiative, to find effective ways of attracting funding to these countries.

A.3 Donor coordination

This section will examine coordination in terms of a) policy and strategic planning, b) among donors internationally and c) in the field and with mine affected countries. At the policy and strategic level, 15 donors out of 16 said they coordinate internally the development of their position. This typically involves inter ministerial or interdepartmental consultations that vary substantially in scope, depending on the complexity of their involvement. One donor (Germany) involves civil society at the same time as other departments in a standing coordination committee structure.

At the international level, when asked if coordination among donors could be strengthened, and if mechanisms like the Mine Action Support Group (MASG) or a new standing committee on resources could improve coordination, generally the response was favorable but qualified. 11 donors out of 14 said they were in favour of strengthening coordination mechanisms, with a preference for improving existing mechanisms rather than creating new ones. They recommended the need for donors to regularly debate thematic and operational issues in order to reinforce synergy, complementarities and coherence. They remained reserved on the idea of supporting a new standing committee on resources.

In terms of relations with mine affected countries, 13 donors said they attend meetings in mine affected countries. However, five indicated that they only attended meeting in countries of interest. When asked about consulting local authorities in pre-funding decision making, one (US) out of 16 donors confirmed that they conduct a systematic field assessment. Two other donors answered yes but did not provide more detail (Australia and Italy). Five other donors would be involved in specific partner countries of interest to them.

⁶ Link to overall development and humanitarian policy (4), constraints to development (2), commitment vis `vis the Treaty (5), needs (4), geographic strategies (4), thematic choice (2), ownership (3), concentration of other donor funds (2), humanitarian imperative (4), impact (1), sustainability (1), capacity development (1), peacebuilding (1).

A.4 Conclusions

Donor policy statements converge mainly around APMBC obligations and their drive to mitigate suffering caused by landmines. The most significant change in donorship patterns in the past ten years has been to shift focus from a fixation on the object, the antipersonnel mine as an indiscriminate weapon and its control, to minimising the impact on affected communities and survivors. The language used by donors has evolved to touch upon more than landmines. In addition, much of the official documentation explaining policy and/or strategy includes cluster munitions, ERW and landmines.

Donor policy is now marked by pragmatism in the way donors relate to mine action. Without actually promoting the notion of a mine safe world as opposed to the ultimate aim of a mine free world, donor policy language does not place emphasis on the original call of the APMBC. The policy construct is more nuanced and realistic in terms of what can be achieved and thinking has shifted toward placing more emphasis on socio-economic impact, on protection, on reintegration, return to normal livelihoods and gender and on care for survivors issues, than on how many mines have been found and destroyed.

There does not seem to be much appetite for a big policy shift on mine action that would rally donors around new principles of action. Donors are not so sure this is the right response and prefer to be guided by aid effectiveness principles and good humanitarian donorship.

A number of policies and strategies are scheduled for review from now until 2015. While general positions relative to the APMBC itself have not changed much, further change is likely to take place in donor thinking about assistance to mine affected countries. The factors likely to influence change in policy and strategy are listed further on in the report.

Unless there is an unexpected turn of events, donors are not likely to launch new initiatives and increase their level of funding. Donor positions are rather attentive at this point, and they have expressed no interest to make deep changes in the way they relate to mine action. This form of conservatism could well be the preview of a leveling off in funding.

Donors have not expressed unanimous support for joint strategic reviews or joint programme evaluation. One of the problems is that donors do not have the in house resources to do such joint venture in evaluation. Nevertheless, more effort could be expended in sharing lessons learned.

It seems as though having a formal strategy, whether it is specific to mine action or incorporated in a broader strategic cover, is a clear advantage over being guided by broad principles. It also makes donors more accountable for their own programme results.

With regards to coordination, it is clear that:

- Donors are generally in favor of coordination among themselves and with mine affected countries but are not proactive. They will tend to respond to invitations as opposed to initiate activities in support of coordination (with the notable exception of Japan who has place a greater emphasis on this aspect of cooperation recently in its aid policy)
- They recognise the need to improve coordination but again, no one seems to take the lead.
- They are divided about establishing new structures like a standing committee on resources.

- Their participation in coordination activities in the field depends very much on the type of programming and the approach they take to relationships with the host country.

B. Budget and Programme Management

B.1 How donors determine their budgetary allocations to mine action

The budget process varies considerably from country to country. Excluding the EC, 15 donor countries provided information on their budgetary allocation process. In most cases, mine action allocations are not highlighted as specific line items in budgets. They are subsumed in either humanitarian, development, security and other related chapters.

A number of donors dedicate a portion of their budget allocations for external assistance to mine action or a mix of mine action and ERW/cluster munitions (without specifying the breakdown).⁷ Two dedicate part of their budget allocation for mine action for a specific purpose, eg victim assistance.

Dedicated funding is renewed on a ministerial or parliamentary basis, in most cases following a review process. It is generally administered by a single department (11 out of 13 donors), although other departments may have a predetermined share.

The budgetary process involves the pre-selection of priority countries for which funding is earmarked in 4 cases out of 15 responses (representing roughly 15% of funding). Most donors are not locked into country funding through budgetary approval. While they each utilise selection processes that vary in complexity, they still have the flexibility to earmark and decide on how much weight to give potential recipients of aid.

Respondents did not highlight any major constraints in yearly expenditures other than the normal regulatory environment in which they must function. The most important issue, in most cases, is that funds committed but not spent in a given year cannot be carried over to the next year (with minor exceptions). 10 out of 12 respondents indicated they could not carry over unspent allocations. This implies that donors need to be vigilant in delivering their programmes and that flexible and time sensitive mechanisms should be in place to avoid lapsing of funds.

Key factors that motivate donors who integrate mine action in their development cooperation remain the pursuits of the traditional mine action pillars, of which, mine clearance (7 out of 15 donors) followed by victim assistance and integrated mine action. 13 out of 14 donors make use of various programme types to respond to needs, and 10 make use of more than one programme types. Donors who integrate mine action generally tend to go through the existing mechanisms in their aid administrations.

All donors, with the exception of one, said they were not bound by specific budget targets and that needs of mine affected countries were the main driving factor.

Donors relate to multi-year programming in different ways. Out of 14 respondents, 7 can enter into multi-year programming arrangements.

⁷ Denmark, Finland, Luxembourg, Australia, Ireland, Netherlands, Switzerland, US, Austria, Italy, Japan.

B.2 Issues relating to the management of mine action programmes

1. Internal coordination: All 14 respondents reported some form of internal coordination of programme management. This varies considerably from non formal consultations to more elaborate and frequent meetings. The more countries have integrated mine action in various programme types, the more sophisticated the coordination. The EC and the US generally have the most extensive coordination processes. Based on the answers provided, 9 countries have established coordinating mechanisms, and in some cases, other security related issues are included.

Generally the lead department for mine action is the ministry of foreign affairs or its equivalent, and more specifically the unit responsible for security or disarmament. Some countries have shared responsibility especially when it involves implementation. Two other donors (Australia, UK) have placed the lead role in the hands of their development cooperation agencies. Cohesion in the donor community does exist, in terms of sharing a common strategic set of activities, even if each department or administrative entity has its own programme responsibility.

2. Focus on mine action priorities (geographic, thematic, capacity building, technology transfer...)

Donors responded in some detail on priorities they set in planning their assistance. The overriding factors for all donors are expressed need, zero new victims, minimising the negative impact of mines on affected communities and security in affected areas. Some donors also identify specific pillars and provide in-depth explanation for their choices. In order of frequency and funding potential, the programming areas most donors prioritise are, clearance, protection measures to eliminate new victims, victim assistance and capacity development. On victim assistance, however, many donors indicated that their assistance has moved from dedicated funding to other parts of their aid programmes, particularly as far as long term assistance to survivors is concerned.

One relevant point with many donors, and in particular the largest one, is a strong preference for impact driven activities particularly as clearance is concerned. These same countries place emphasis on country ownership, capacity building, national mine action plans and integration into broader national development plans.

Out of 18 responses, it is interesting to mention that only two donors mentioned clearly that their decision-making involved consultations with mine affected governments. This is discussed further in Section C of this report.

3. Translating mine action priorities into projects or programme support: criteria and requirements

18 donors (representing roughly 85% of funding potential) provided information on their minimal internal requirements and the criteria they apply to mine action. The information provided lists 29 criteria and 14 minimal requirements.⁸ This illustrates the diversity and

⁸ Factors that help make a choice: effectiveness, national priorities and policies, relevance, impact-outcome-results, indicators, benchmarks on surveying impact on socio-economic analysis, integration in national plan, included in UN Portfolio, functional mine

complexity of processes stakeholders have to face. Participating donors did not question these processes as being too bureaucratic or heavy. They recognised their usefulness in ensuring sustainable progress in achieving the goals of the APMBC, as well as accountability for public money being spent on mine action. Each donor applies the criteria required by its own administration to make decisions on choosing mine action projects or programmes to fund. Four donors (EC, Norway, US and UK) have developed very useful and comprehensive guidelines for selection and funding.

The criteria that are central to selection can be grouped in the following categories:

- measurement and prioritisation of needs i.e. focusing on the areas of clearance that count most
- national ownership and capacity
- commitment to meeting APMBC obligations
- results in terms of measuring developmental outcomes and the experience and capability of local and international partners
- the aid effectiveness family of criteria(effectiveness, coherence, coordination, sustainability, capacity development etc.)

The promotion of gender equality was raised as an important factor in examining project proposals. In-country experience and expertise of an implementing partner are key, as is proven efficiency and effectiveness of local/national mine action institutions.

Countries that integrate mine action in traditional development programmes go to another level as they check if the proposal is part of the list of priorities presented by the mine affected country. This is the case for the EC, Sweden, Australia and Canada (to a lesser extent).

Some of the challenges mentioned by donors relate to financial resource constraints, which limit their ability to do more. Others touched on the challenge posed in defining the right kind of projects that meet both mine action obligations and development benefits to affected populations. Moreover, others raise the difficulty of getting high quality data and information to prepare good projects for approval.

Donors are not unanimous about the degree of confidence they have in data supplied by recipient authorities and/or by survey techniques to identify priority areas. They recognise the difficulties encountered by mine affected states in getting accurate data on the work to be done, as well as the amount they contribute themselves. Lack of socio-economic indicators and baseline data were raised as impediments or factors that slow down the approval process. One donor mentioned trying to make sure affected communities benefit from cleared land. This requires a combination of mine action and development inputs by implementing partners and their associates, and sometimes requires a multi-disciplinary partnership. Interestingly, few donors made reference to consulting local communities.

action centre, performance of operational partners, commitment to meet Treaty obligations, ownership, comprehensiveness of approach, country experience of the operational partner, supporting transition situations, capacity development, coherence, complementarity, efficiency, sustainability, synergy, overall quality of proposal, humanitarian effect, suitability, coordination, commitment of non-state actor, capacity of local organisations, gender sensitive. Minimal requirements were as follows: Logic model, clear project proposal, co-funding, meeting basic internal requirements, review by field office, strategic importance of country, evaluation and monitoring information, donor visibility, respect for humanitarian principles, compliance with standards, human resources needs, prevention of further crisis, transparency.

Time-sensitive programming is often neglected in dealing with donors that have integrated mine action into development. The case of the EC programming cycle is a good example. Some mine action projects are not picked-up due to lack of clarity, and as a result, they may have to wait for the next programme review, two years later, to be considered anew. Combined with the normal slow pace of project approval, this might account for delays that stakeholders mentioned as slowing the process. The impact of mine action on development depends on how well mine action is coordinated with other development projects and programming cycles.

4. Choosing funding channels (bilateral, multilateral, NGOs)

The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD refers to three important channels for ODA funding, of which mine action is a sub-category: bilateral country to country, multilateral funding which is global and unearmarked, and funding through civil society organisations such as NGOs and mine action operators.

The majority of mine action assistance is channeled bilaterally. 15 donors indicated that they select both the country and the projects they intend to support. In doing so, they may choose to partner with a multilateral organisation, an NGO or an operator.⁹ Most donors provide some amounts to unearmarked, core funding through multilateral channels (e.g. the UN Mine Action Service (UNMAS) and GICHD) as well as through NGOs (e.g. ICBL, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), Geneva Call) but these amounts are substantially smaller. The marked preference for the bilateral channel is based on foreign policy/strategic reasons, as well as a desire to concentrate aid in the neediest countries. This explains, in part, why funding is skewed towards five to six mine affected countries.

With a dominant trend in bilateral funding, there are two broad directions followed by donors: the first group directs their aid to specific countries and minimises their level of involvement for various reasons, not the least of which is to reduce their internal transaction costs. This group typically supports NGOs, mine action operators, private sector and multilateral organisations to implement projects they have chosen after a selection process. The funded projects will vary from off the shelf proposals to designer specification. The other group of donors, less numerous (6) but not less important in terms of funding capability (59%), will look first at what governments of mine affected countries propose as their priorities and will be more involved in discussions with these governments. However in the end, they are likely to make use of the same major NGOs, UN organisations and operators, but having gone through a different process.

This study did not explore other forms of multilateral and civil society funding. For instance, part of the assessed contributions made by member states to UN peacekeeping operations will be used for humanitarian demining. As well programming undertaken by civil society that is not specifically mine action but that assists affected communities and people with disabilities, including survivors were not explored.

The general trends described in this section are not likely to be modified significantly over the next 3-5 years according to respondents.

⁹ According to the DAC definition, this aid is bilateral because it is specifically directed to a country.

5. Choosing funding programmes (dedicated mine action funds, humanitarian responses, development assistance, post-crisis recovery, reconstruction, peacebuilding, peacekeeping, armed violence reduction, security sector reform)

Five out of 17 donors reported using only dedicated funding (Italy, Austria, Ireland, Finland and Luxembourg). Two donors make primary use of dedicated budget lines and smaller amounts from development (USA and Switzerland), defense and conflict prevention programmes. Two donors reported using humanitarian assistance programmes as the only source of funding, while four others use a mix of humanitarian and development programmes to assist. Concern over loss of dedicated funding may be overstated.

When asked if they anticipate any change in programme channels, all 16 responded that they did not foresee a change. At this point in time, the message is quite clear. This could be attributable to the administrative structures that have been set up. Changes in programme types would not normally surge over night. They are more likely to happen as a result of a policy decision emanating from a major review, or an organisational restructuring.

When asked if additional programme types could be used to access funds for mine action, four responded that there were marginal possibilities.

6. Selecting programming mechanisms and modalities (directive, responsive, direct transfers, un-earmarked voluntary funding, core funding, tied aid, in kind).

The majority of funding is provided responsively i.e. projects are conceived and designed by either the host country or by potential implementing partners and are presented to donors for funding. There were very few indications of directive programming i.e. projects in which donors have played a major role from inception to approval of funding. For example, on occasion, Japan will provide its own technical assistance and demining equipment to a host country.

Three donors are experimenting with new approaches (Norway, UK and Finland), using framework arrangements to cover a range of activities in specific countries. These arrangements provide the contracting organisation with a substantial degree of flexibility while leaving the management and accountability for results in the hands of the implementing agencies.

Finally, we have not seen any direct budgetary support or sector wide approach being used in mine action. This is not to say that funding under these modalities does not go to mine action. Reporting on this mode is not available. With the exception of the health services, it is unlikely that much indirect funding would have benefited populations affected by mines.

7. Impact of mine action: (effectiveness and efficiency, planning for results, measuring performance, documenting good practices and lessons learned in mine action)

Donors use evaluation and monitoring reports to draw lessons, however it does not seem to be a sustained and systematic practice across all donors. This study did not examine how many individual donors have learned from their own evaluative work as well as from others.

The notion of sharing lessons learned did not raise much enthusiasm, but was not rejected outright either. Part of the problem might be attributable to the time constraints and pressures

touched upon earlier. Relying perhaps on an independent third party to do this could perhaps be the solution.

B.3 Conclusions

Over the years, the factors that donors use to select and assess project proposals have changed, from focusing narrowly on getting the mines out of the ground and providing assistance to victims, to a more results-based approach aimed at minimising the toll of new victims and ensuring that priority is given to reducing the impact of mines on lives and livelihoods.

Donors use a set of criteria and conditions that they apply to proposals in mine action, much as they would in other post-conflict programming, and generally to development assistance.

Donor criteria have been largely influenced by the principles of aid effectiveness and of good humanitarian donorship. They apply a large range of instruments currently recognised as acceptable. The business of selecting and vetting mine action projects in the context of providing support to mine affected countries basically parallels the evolution of development cooperation.

All respondents, except one, turn to the APMBC as a base for programme management. However, as the Convention cannot prescribe how donors do their business, individual approaches have been developed. The action plans from Nairobi and Cartagena provide a general framework for further guidance.

This being said, little is done to harmonise donors requirements. Coordination does not seem to touch much on management simplification. As a result, host countries and implementing partners may encounter difficulties in understanding and responding adequately to multiple donor requirements.

As mentioned earlier, each donor has its own set of criteria and requirements, and it would be unrealistic to suggest that donors used the same set to select their projects. However, consideration could be given to identifying a limited number of key criteria upon which a consensus is desirable to ensure effectiveness in achieving results. This form of cohesiveness would be a concrete step forward.

Donor administrations, and in particular, the number of responsible officers for mine action, have been reduced over the years. Donor capacities have been weakened with the following consequences:

- Scattering of focus.
- Limited capacity for essential tasks such as evaluation and monitoring, project assessment, field visits and contacts with national mine action authorities.
- Greater devolution of implementation to outside entities, intermediaries between donor and host country representatives.
- High dependency on mine action operators and NGOs and, to a lesser degree, on UN organisations to form an opinion.
- Limited oversight capacity.
- Loss of corporate memory and in-house expertise.

One could conclude from this section that mine action has reached a new peak for the time being in terms of accessing various aid programmes and management approaches. This situation could change during the 2014-2015 period, as some major donors review their multi-year mine action assistance. This situation prompts a number of questions: does the current mix of programmes offer the appropriate response? Can a consensus be reached on priorities to address? Can progress be better measured? Should there be a division of labour between donors using different programmes to better complement each other?

C. Addressing relationships with mine affected recipient countries and mine action organisations

C.1 Representation and dialogue with recipient countries (in the field and in international meetings)

All 16 donors who answered, reported that they participated in meetings with host countries either in country or at international meetings. Only two specified that they attend only international meetings). Eight donors stated that their embassies or aid offices had little or no role to play. The remaining donors stated that their representatives on the ground performed a range of functions, from receiving proposals, providing comments and assessing proposals, to approving and extending small grants related to mine action. For the most part, donors function in a responsive mode, i.e. they react to proposals that are submitted to them by mine affected governments, NGOs, multilateral organisations or mine operators. Most donors do not rely heavily on field staff to take decisions or even to influence the course of decisions taken in capitals.

14 donors reported maintaining contacts but the level and frequency varied from occasional to ongoing. Most donors will concentrate their contacts with priority countries, or where they fund projects. Based on the answers given, visits from capitals are few and far apart. They are principally monitoring and evaluation visits not prospective. Most of the liaison work is left to embassies.

C.2 Involvement in consulting host country governments

Interaction with host country authorities prior, but also after making funding decisions, is neither systematic nor extensive. Although 10 donors out of 16 report having consultations with relevant ministries and central agencies in host countries, these vary in approach and in depth. However, this needs to be qualified as four donors (US, Italy, Australia and Switzerland) do consult host governments, while another six hold consultations under certain circumstances when the host country is more directly involved. The only clear statement of systematic consultation with host governments came from the US.

Direct contacts with central agencies occur more frequently when countries integrate mine action in development such as in the case of Sweden and Australia. On the other hand, major donors like Japan and Norway (for Mozambique only) will have only occasional discussions with key ministries. The EC will participate in consultations with central agencies because its funding is integrated in country cooperation strategies.

Another illustration of the light footprint that donors have in-country is the way they inform host governments of their decisions to fund a mine action project. Only six out of 13 donors inform officially the relevant host country authority when they provide assistance and three others inform host countries in cases where they are directly involved in a project, or when they meet and exchange information on mine action. Five donors provide the information through other channels, mostly their implementing partners, the UN or through an officially designated government contact in the case of the EC.

Eleven donors out of 17 show a degree of openness towards including mine action in development project. For donors who integrate mine action in development, it goes without saying. For others, this is a door opened to new programming which may be worth exploring, even if it proves to be occasional funding as opposed to being part of a policy shift. Mine action authorities should explore this avenue as it may represent another tool to assist contaminated communities in the context of broader development programmes.

C.3 Role of multilateral organisations, NGOs and mine action operators

All 12 donors who responded said they were satisfied with and looked forward to entertaining productive relations with these organisations. While some indicated that they were pressing for more impact-oriented programming, there seems to be no major issue here.

C.4 Conclusions

The degree of satisfaction expressed by most donors when questioned about the role played by UN organisations, NGOs and mine action operators further demonstrates their importance in the dynamics of mine action cooperation and assistance. However, should donors exercise greater stewardship either on an individual basis or collectively? The current explanations given by donors give an impression of devolution of responsibility rather than delegation of implementation role.

As a consequence, with the notable exception of the US and the EC, the direct engagement with host government authorities on mine action issues and programming is neither systematic nor frequent. They would have even less contact if they were not given the opportunity to meet during international meetings.

This trend is not likely to change. Given the overall assessment of responses, it is unlikely that donors will achieve more than a marginal improvement in engagement at the country level. With the possible creation of a mechanism on cooperation and assistance in the context of APMBC standing committees, there is an opportunity to seek greater harmonisation and alignment on key issues, such as ownership, capacity development, and new approaches for long term cooperation with both host countries and operators.

D. Future trends and funding prospects

D.1 Commitment to support mine action

Seventeen (representing roughly 81% of external funding¹⁰) of the 18 donors that were surveyed clearly stated that their mine action funding commitments would hold until the end of their

¹⁰ According to the 2008 Landmine Monitor report. Landmine and Cluster Munitions Monitor 2009 figures were not all available. Calculations of percentage share are based on corrected 2008 external funding assistance.

current funding period (usually part of an official strategy, a mine action plan, or a public commitment of some sort). One donor is in the process of reviewing its strategy and could not commit itself. Dates vary from 2011 to 2015 in most cases, although a few donors do not have such time-bound commitments. Nine donors are confident about renewing their mine action commitments, four indicated they didn't think dedicated funding would be renewed, and one did not know at the time of being interviewed. It is worth noting that one major donor, Canada (9.4% of total funding in 2008), whose share of funding has dropped considerably in 2009, did not respond to the questionnaire.

Three donors expressed some concern about overall budget cuts that could affect mine action funding as well (Denmark, Netherlands and Finland). However, important donors like Japan, the UK, the US, the EC and Sweden indicated they remain committed. Switzerland is hoping for a modest increase.

Donors announce commitments when looking to the future. These commitments however must be concretised through programming decisions. As donor agency contacts mention, prudence should always be applied, as budget decisions may be influenced by negative factors and programme implementation could be delayed. All stakeholders in this process may encounter difficulties, which explains the discrepancy between announced commitments and the actual expenditures, as illustrated by the Landmine and Cluster Munitions Monitor in its annual reviews.

Other external considerations enter into account which cannot be accurately captured in making a prospective analysis. For example, the effects of the 2008 financial crisis and the more recent budgetary crisis in Europe have the potential to affect the actual level of budgetary allocations made available to aid administrations. If faced with the necessity to proceed with cuts, what selection process will donors take?

D.2 Conditions influencing funding levels

Twelve donors, representing 66% of total funding, do not anticipate policy shifts or budget constraints that could involve a reduction or a phase out of dedicated mine action funding. Two donors are concerned about budget restrictions being applied to their mine action funding.

D.3 Changes in funding channels in the near future

Twelve donors do not foresee changes in funding channels and modalities. Three mentioned transformation processes underway that could have an impact on funding channels. However these changes will likely only affect funding channels for one donor.

D.4 Changes in programme type

Sixteen donors do not see their approach to mine action changing in terms of the type of programme they use to provide assistance. Eleven donors out of 17 show a degree of openness toward **including mine action in development projects**. For donors who have opted for integrating mine action in development it goes without saying. For others, this is a door opened to new programming. It should be pointed out that the initiative would not come from donors but from mine affected countries.

D.5 Stability in funding

Two donors anticipate possible budget reductions (representing 6.8% of funding). Ten others (59.2%) are fairly confident that their funding mechanisms will remain stable for the next few years.

Of the 13 donors that have dedicated funding, 8 countries said they would renew this mechanism, while four said they would reduce it or cut it entirely (Denmark, Switzerland, Japan and Australia). However, Japan, Denmark and Australia have substantial funding for mine action and dedicated funding is only a very small portion of the support they provide. Hence, not a significant impact overall.

D.6 Trends likely to influence future funding

D6.1 Factors likely to influence future funding decisions

In terms of the main factors likely to influence funding decisions, eight donors outlined the following:

- identification and magnitude of needs (8)
- mine action integrated in consolidated appeals (6)
- links to development (7)
- national development plans (4)
- integration in to donors development programmes (3)
- links to peacebuilding (3)
- other international drivers that could influence funding patterns (3)

Among the points mentioned, some relate to external factors such as political or economic issues and national capacity to deal with the problem, while others are more action or programme oriented e.g. more precise measurement of need, linking to development or peacebuilding. Perhaps part of the problem is that donors do not have full access to and appreciation of the situation on the ground in each affected country.

D 6.2 Improvements that could influence continued funding

Donors think the following improvements are needed in order to influence their decision to continue funding:

- better survey results (4)
- improved results reporting (5)
- national ownership (8)
- impact on sustainable livelihoods (9)
- capacity building (9)

Donors are equally split on whether host countries provide some of their own financial contribution. The fact that it influences certain donors positively and that it does not influence others should nevertheless not be interpreted as a neutral factor. Increased host investment in this sector should be encouraged.

D.7 Areas to benefit from sustained dialogue on effective international cooperation and assistance for mine action

Suggestions on subjects that could benefit from sustained dialogue on effective international cooperation and assistance for mine action can be summarised as follows:

- more accuracy on national mine action plans (10)
- determining more cost effective mine action (5)

D.8 Conclusions on future trends

The majority of donors representing 80.3% of external funding¹¹ indicate that they expect to maintain their level of funding in the near future, eg 2010-2011. While two donors anticipate budget cuts but not an end to mine action funding, the impact is likely to be marginal as their share of funding is currently 6.8% of total funding. As the 2009 figures have shown, a drop in funding relative to 2008, is attributable in large part to three donors according to a preliminary Landmine Monitor report. It can be concluded that the downward trend will continue in 2010 but at a slower pace. There is no confirmation that donors having reduced their funding will recover their past level.

Trying to draw a more precise picture at this point would not yield credible information. The absence from the survey of a few important donors who represent at least 15% of external funding, and lack of systematic answers from a few other key donors does not allow sufficient data to make reliable predictions.

Based on a combination of answers to questions in section D, donor funding may well have peaked in the past two years and has reached a new plateau for the immediate future 2010-2011. It is likely to gradually reduce to another plateau in the medium term, i.e. 2012-2015. This situation could change during the 2014-2015 period as some major donors will review their multi-year mine action assistance. There are many reasons for this slow but predictable trend towards gradually reduced funding levels: lack of clarity and progress on clearance, the lack of value for funds invested, extension requests with unreasonable financing estimations, budget restrictions and competition for limited funding. Is this trend irreversible or can a combination of initiatives bring new life to the level of assistance? Many donors and experts say it is not the level of funding that counts as much as the effectiveness of assistance programmes, ownership demonstrated by national authorities and pace of progress in land release. These issues will be at the heart of an engaged dialogue on resources which will be proposed at the next annual meeting of the membership.

Competing demands by new programming in aid administrations have had an impact on the amount of time responsible officers have for mine action. For the most part, assistance to mine action has relied on NGO and mine action operators for implementation of aid programmes. This trend will be accentuated in the future with modified terms and conditions responding to a need for better focus and accountability for results. It nevertheless confirms that donors are adjusting their relationship with their partners from past devolution to future conditional delegation. The difference is in increased need to demonstrate results in areas that are real priorities. The need to support mine action over the next decade at the same relative levels as in the past ten years is likely to cool donor support. Ways and means have to be found to be more cost effective, to accelerate land release and to be able to turn over full responsibility for

¹¹ Landmine Monitor 2008

addressing residual contamination to national authorities, as opposed to further extending dependence on international mine action operators.

The degree to which results can be demonstrated in the capacity development of national and local administrations, as well as in commitment and ownership, will have a bearing on donor attitude. The amount of funding that mine affected countries will devote to mine action is also a determining factor, but not essential for the least developed category of mine affected countries. Capacity to contribute is taken into consideration by donors, hence it is expected that countries like Angola can afford increasing its share of the burden, while Afghanistan will continue to be considered in greater need of external inputs.

We may need to better define national ownership to be able to measure the level of capacity and autonomy and to better identify the type of cooperation needed in this regard. If donors expect national authorities to take on more ownership and capacity to deal with their contamination problems and care for survivors at a faster pace than now, they need to engage more on these issues.

Annex A: Terms of reference

Objectives of this study

To provide more in depth information on donor decision making and operational modalities regarding mine action.

Deliverables expected from the consultant

1. Review the GICHD discussion paper on Mine Action Funding: Current Trends and Future Prospects and provide feedback
2. Once the GICHD has made an initial contact to key donors through an introductory email or letter informing them of the center's intention to carry out this study¹², the consultant will make contact with them and further refine the list of interlocutors involved in decision making relative to mine action.

Pursuant to this, the consultant will undertake the following:

3. Prepare an introductory text and a comprehensive list of issues and questions to raise with each donor. A standard questionnaire and adaptable interview points will be prepared based on the list of issues proposed in annex A below.
4. Follow up with donor contacts and seek further detailed information from them, based on the a pre-established interview protocol (e-mail questionnaire and exchange of additional information, telephone interviews, reviewing donor web sites, obtaining documents providing additional information, and meetings with key persons involved in the decision making process and meetings with selected donors (e.g. U.S.A. and European Commission).
5. Based on initial feedback from donors and in consultation with the GICHD, extend visits to other European donors e.g. UK, Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland.
6. Collect, collate and analyze findings.
7. Produce a draft report which summarizes findings and outlines recommendations on the way forward and debrief the GICHD on early findings.
8. Participate in the June intersessional meeting of the Standing Committees (June 21-25, 2010), in order to carry out additional interviews with donor representatives, mine affected countries, multilateral organisations and NGOs, round out findings already collected and make a presentation at a side event on resource mobilization and utilization.
9. Produce a final report and deliver it to the GICHD.

¹² The GICHD has suggested the following donors: Netherlands, Swiss, UK, Sweden, US, Australia, Canada, Germany and EC

Annex B

Questionnaire for donor governments commissioned by GICHD

A. Mine action strategies and funding modalities

1. Policy development

Mine action as an issue in foreign policy

- a) Does your government have a policy or an official position with regards to mine action assistance to affected states?
- b) Does this policy or position explain your government's motivations for supporting mine action? How have these reasons evolved over the years?
- c) Is this policy or position included within a broader foreign or official development assistance policy or position? If so, what is the link?
- d) Does the policy or position clearly specify medium to longer term commitment to funding mine action?
- e) Is your policy or position scheduled for review? If so, when?
- f) Which part of your government is responsible for taking the lead on developing mine action policy or official position?
- g) Do you consult civil society organisations in policy making relating to mine action?
- h) Is a whole of government approach used, i.e. consulting all departments and agencies involved?
- i) Do you try to ensure that mine action assistance is consistent with the principles of effective aid delivery (Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and Accra Action Plan)? If so, how?
- j) Does your government encourage improved harmonization of mine action support via donor coordination mechanisms? If so, which mechanisms are used and at what level (e.g. international; regional; in-country)?
- k) Is there need to strengthen donor coordination on mine action funding at the international level? If so, what form should this take (e.g. a strengthened Mine Action Support Group? A new APMBC Standing Committee on Resource Mobilization)?

2. Strategic planning for mine action

- a) **For countries with a mine action strategy:** What are the key areas of focus specified in your strategy?
- b) **For countries without a formal strategy:** What kind of guidance does your government make use of? What are the main priority issues?
- c) What role does **performance measurement** play in defining your mine action strategy? Does evidence-based analysis play a leading role in strategic planning? Does the track record of a mine-affected country or mine action organisation play a role?
- d) **Mine action priorities** (geographic, thematic, capacity building, technology transfer...)
 - i. What factors/criteria do you take into account when choosing priority countries?
 - ii. Are your mine action priority countries also partner countries for development assistance?
 - iii. What criteria have you used to select thematic priorities? Do these have a link to other development cooperation thematic priorities within your Official Development Assistance (ODA) strategy?
 - iv. If your government does not have priority countries, what guides your decision to assist a particular country (degree of need, effectiveness, and results)?

3. Budgeting allocations for mine action

- a) How does your government determine annual **budgetary allocations** for mine action e.g. set by a lead department, by each department involved, by individual country programmes within departments or some other approaches?
- b) Dedicated funding :**
- i. Do you provide dedicated mine action funding?
 - ii. Does the budget process imply an annual confirmation of dedicated funding for mine action or do you have multi-year budget approval? If multi-year, until what year is it in effect?
 - iii. What conditions are needed for the dedicated budget allocation to be renewed again, (e.g. new strategy adopted, programme review carried out, cabinet decision)?
 - iv. Do you have any constraints regarding expenditure within your fiscal year? If so, please describe.
 - v. If your budget allocation is not spent in your fiscal year, is it automatically carried into the next year? Please explain.
 - vi. Is dedicated mine action funding shared between more than one department or government agency? Please explain.
 - vii. Do you earmark specific amounts for mine action, in advance, for your priority countries?
- c) Integration of mine action in other programming areas:**
- i. What mine action key issues/areas does your government prioritize?
 - ii. Do you currently channel support for mine action to countries in support of these key issues/areas through your various aid programmes?
 - iii. Are budget allocations specifically earmarked to mine action in any of your programmes (humanitarian, bilateral development programmes, multilateral programmes, recovery, reconstruction, peace-building...) or has mine action been totally integrated in programmes and their related budgets?
 - iv. Within these programmes, do you have specific budgetary targets you need to reach for mine action or is demand by the mine affected country the prevailing factor?
 - v. Are budgetary allocations usually used for multi-year programming?
 - vi. Do you have any concerns related to your future budget allocation process in terms of integrating mine action in your various aid programmes?
- 4. Managing programmes**
- **Degree of internal coordination:**
 - i. What mechanisms does your government have in place to coordinate your response to mine action needs?
 - ii. Which department has the lead? Which other departments have a programming and funding role and what are they?
 - iii. Do you share the same strategic approach or does each department have a specific and independent programming approach?
 - **Identifying and planning project and programme support:**
 - Within the five pillars of mine action, what motivates your choice e.g. mine clearance vs. victim assistance?
 - What key factors do you consider when selecting mine action projects for funding?
 - What minimum requirements do you look for when analyzing a project prior to funding?
 - What constraints or limitations do you typically incur when responding to requests for assistance?
 - Do government representatives based in mine-affected countries play a role in selecting projects for funding? If so, what is their role?

- **Choosing funding channels and programme types:**
 - Which funding channels do you use and in what proportion? For example, bilateral (technical cooperation, direct budgetary assistance, programme assistance, private sector), multilateral (earmarked by country or sector, core funding unearmarked to a trust fund) or NGOs (programme funding, project support...).
 - Through which programming area(s) is mine action funded? For example, dedicated mine action funds, humanitarian responses, development assistance, post-crisis recovery, reconstruction, peacebuilding, peacekeeping, armed violence reduction, security sector reform, others.
 - Are there additional funding sources within your government that could potentially be accessed by mine-affected countries or by mine action organisations, e.g. development programmes, funding for armed violence reduction (AVR), recovery and reconstruction...?

B. Addressing relations with mine-affected recipient countries and mine action organisations

1. Mine affected countries

- a) Involvement in selecting priority countries and regions
 - i. Are partner countries involved in pre-funding consultations?
 - ii. Are their central ministries/departments/agencies involved in consultations, e.g. planning, treasury, finance, international cooperation...?
 - iii. How do you inform countries of your mine action funding decisions?
 - iv. Are they informed of the programme options open to them?
 - v. Can a partner country include mine action projects within a bilateral assistance framework or agreement with your government?
- b) Representation and dialogue with recipient countries
 - i. Does your government attend meetings in-country or international meetings to discuss mine action assistance?
- c) What are the nature, level and frequency of contacts with national authorities for mine action?

2. Multilateral organisations, NGOs and Mine action operators

What role does your government envisage for continued involvement with multilateral organisations, NGOs and mine action operators (funding, contracting, responsive mode, planning projects/programmes, joint evaluations...)?

C. Future trends

1. Is your government committed to providing dedicated mine action funding and/or integrated programming in future?
2. At this point is your government considering renewing its dedicated mine action funding?
3. What trends or factors are likely to influence future funding decisions, e.g. consolidated appeals, seriousness of the contamination, internationally coordinated efforts to assist, links to development projects, links to peacebuilding, emergence of other funding channels which mine action organisations could access, decline in overall mine action needs, other international drivers that could influence funding patterns?
4. As a consequence, do you foresee any changes in use of programme type you might choose to fund mine action, e.g. humanitarian, development, peacebuilding...?
5. Do you anticipate changes in funding channels/modalities in the near future e.g. bilateral, multilateral, NGO, private sector...?
6. Over the next years, what improvements in mine action are likely to influence your funding decision, e.g. better survey results, national ownership and capacity, improved reporting of results in terms of positive impact on affected populations?

7. Does the fact that mine affected countries assume some funding responsibility influence your funding decisions?
8. Do you anticipate that one or more of your funding mechanisms is likely to decline in the foreseeable future? If so, which ones?
9. Do you anticipate aid policy shifts, budget constraints or other conditions that could lead your government to consider a reduction or phase-out of your dedicated mine action funding? If so, please explain.
10. What areas do you suggest could benefit from a sustained dialogue on effective international cooperation and assistance for mine action, e.g. more accuracy on national mine action plans, determining more cost effective mine action, exploring new ways of mobilizing funds?

Annex C List of contact people

Australia	Mr. Derek Taylor Acting Director Iraq and Middle East Section AusAID Ph +612 6206 4539 PO Box 887 Canberra ACT 2601 www.ausaid.gov.au	derek.taylor@ausaid.gov.au
Austria	Wolfgang Banyai Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs Department on Arms Control, Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Tel.: +43 501150 3926	Wolfgang.BANYAI@bmeia.gv.at
Belgium	Henri Vantieghem Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation - BELGIUM Direction M5 - Service M5.1 Human Security and conventional disarmament tel +32 2 501 88 87, fax +32 2 501 38 22	Henri.Vantieghem@diplobel.fed.be
Canada	Earl Turcotte, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Alexis Zoe Porter, Program Analyst Analyste de programme Stabilization and Reconstruction Task Force Programming Unit (IRG) Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada Tel./tél.: 613-943-6381, ax/télécopieur : 613-944-2128 www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca	Earl.Turcotte@international.gc.ca , Alexis.Porter@international.gc.ca
China	Zhang Zhizhong, Deputy Division Director, Department of Arms Control and Disarmament, LI Yang, Counsellor, Disarmament Permanent Mission of China to the United Nations Office at Geneva General email: chinamission_gva@mfa.gov.cn; mission.china@ties.itu.int Tel: +41 22 879 5678	zhang_zhizhong1@mfa.gov.cn
Czech Republic	Klotka Rostislav, Desk Officer, Ministry of Defence Ivan Pinter, Counsellor, Disarmament Permanent Mission of Czech Republic to the United Nations Office at Geneva Tel.: +41 22 910 3780; 022 910 3810 General email: mission.geneva@embassy.mzv.cz	rostislav.klotka@atlas.cz

Denmark	Hanne B. Elmelund Gam Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Humanitarian Office	hangam@um.dk
EC	Maria Cruz Cristobal Policy Assistant, DG RELEX, Phone: +32 2 299 90 40	maria-cruz.cristobal@ec.europa.eu
Finland	Anna Gebremedhin Counsellor, Unit for Humanitarian Assistance , MFA, Helsinki FINLAND tel. +358 9 160 56286	anna.gebremedhin@formin.fi
France	Béatrice Ravanel Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Beatrice.RAVANEL@diplomatie.gouv.fr
Germany	Klaus Koppetsch Desk Officer, Mine Action, Task Force for Humanitarian Aid, Foreign Office Tel.: +49-30-5000 3098	vn05-1@diplo.de
Ireland	David Keating Third Secretary. Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Section. Tel: 01 408 2076. Ruaidhri Dowling Deputy Director Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Department of Foreign Affairs	david.keating@dfa.ie
Italy	Manfredo Capozza Humanitarian Demining Advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Tommaso Andria (tommaso.andria@esteri.it) General Directorate for Cooperation Policies	manfredo.capozza@esteri.it , tommaso.andria@esteri.it
Japan	Miki Nagashima Conventional Arms Division, Foreign Policy Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tel.: 03-5501-8000, EXT. 5693	miki.nagashima@mofa.go.jp
Luxembourg	Daniel Gengler Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, Direction Politique T: (+352) 247-82469	daniel.gengler@mae.etat.lu
Netherlands	Jos Uijterlinde Policy Officer, Humanitarian Aid Division, Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs +31 70 348 4222	jm.ujterlinde@minbuza.nl
New Zealand	Frederik van der Vloodt Multilateral Development, NZAID	Frederik.VanDerVloodt@nzaid.govt.nz
Norway	Ingunn Vatne Senior Adviser. Ministry of Foreign Affairs	ingunn.vatne@mfa.no

South Africa	Johann Kellerman Counsellor, Disarmament, Permanent Mission of South Africa to the United Nations Office at Geneva	sarutey@yahoo.ca
Spain	Luis Gómez Nogueira Sub-department for International Disarmament, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Co-operation	luis.gomez@maec.es
Sweden	Louise Calais Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Department for Disarmament and Non-proliferation, SE - 103 39 Stockholm + + 46 8 405 39 56	louise.calais@foreign.ministry.se
Switzerland	Claudia Moser Section for Multilateral Peace Policy Federal Department of Foreign Affairs Political Directorate / Political Affairs Division IV, Human Security Bundesgasse 32; CH-3003 Bern Tel. (+41 31) 322 08 16 Mobile (+41 79) 504 00 58 Fax (+41 31) 323 89 22	claudia.moser@eda.admin.ch
UAE	Adel Issa AL MAHRI Chargé d'affaires, Permanent Mission of the United Arab Emirates to the United Nations	mission.uae@ties.itu.int
United Kingdom	Raja Dasgupta Conflict, Humanitarian and Security Department, DFID	R-Dasgupta@dfid.gov.uk
United States	Jim Lawrence Team Leader, Resource Management Team Office of Weapons Removal and Abatement (WRA) Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, U.S. Department of State 202-663-0107	LawrenceJF@state.gov

Annex D Reference documents consulted

References documents for the study on donors funding in mine action

EC

Policy

http://ec.europa.eu/development/aboutgen_en.cfm?CFID=4247916&CFTOKEN=35124474&jsessionid=0806bf9f6613677a7ac3

Mine action issue

http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/anti_landmines/index_en.htm

Guidelines on European Community Mine Action 2008-2013

http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/anti_landmines/docs/guidelines_08_13_en.pdf

Booklet: Advice for donors on setting up and running mine action programmes

Aid effectiveness

http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/SEC_2010_0422_COM_2010_0159_EN.PDF

http://ec.europa.eu/development/how/aid_effectiveness_en.cfm

Aid delivery modalities:

http://ec.europa.eu/development/how/aid_en.cfm

OECD/DAC

http://www.oecd.org/department/0,2688,en_2649_33721_1_1_1_1_1,00.html

Switzerland

http://www.eda.admin.ch/etc/medialib/downloads/edazen/recent/media.Par.0035.File.tmp/Minenstrategie_2008-2011_EN.pdf

<http://www.eda.admin.ch/eda/en/home/doc/publi/pdev.html>

<http://www.eda.admin.ch/eda/en/home.html>

Australia

<http://www.dfat.gov.au/>

<http://www.ausaid.gov.au/>

<http://www.ausaid.gov.au/keyaid/mineaction.cfm>

http://www.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pubout.cfm?ID=9122_1232_8366_4003_7783&Type=

<http://www.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pdf/minestrategy-1014.pdf>

Denmark

Denmark's assistance to mine action 2009 (power point presentation)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs: Denmark's support to mine action

Ministry of Foreign Affairs – Denmark's support to mine action: Strategy

(e-copies of these documents were sent separately to GICHD)

US

<http://www.state.gov/documents/organisation/125873.pdf>

http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/humanitarian_assistance/the_funds/lwvf/

Norway

<http://www.regjeringen.no/en/dep/ud/Documents/Propositions-and-reports/Reports-to-the-Storting/2008-2009/report-no-40-2008-2009-to-the-storting/1.html?id=577647>

<http://www.norad.no/>

Germany

<http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/diplo/en/Aussenpolitik/Themen/Abruestung/Uebersicht.html>

UK

<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/About-DFID/Finance-and-performance/Annual-report/Annual-Report-2009/#contents>

<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/About-DFID/Quick-guide-to-DFID/Who-we-are-and-what-we-do/>

<http://www.stabilisationunit.gov.uk/index.php/about-us>

<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications-old/guidelines-confl-human-sec-fund.pdf>

DFID Programme Strategy 2010 – 2013: Creating a safer environment - clearing landmines and other explosive remnants of war.

Japan

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/oda/mid-term/policy.pdf>

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/oda/index.html>

<http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/landmine/pamph0411.pdf>

http://www.jica.go.jp/english/operations/thematic_issues/

Canada

<http://www.international.gc.ca/cip-pic/index.aspx?lang=fra>

<http://www.international.gc.ca/mines/index.aspx?lang=fra>

<http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/acdi-cida/acdi-cida.nsf/eng/home>

<http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/acdi-cida/ACDI-CIDA.nsf/eng/JUD-32373530-HXR>

The Netherlands

http://www.minbuza.nl/en/The_Ministry

Belgium

http://diplomatie.belgium.be/en/binaries/Peacebuilding%20CriteriaEN_tcm312-99163.pdf

Sweden

<http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/11083>

Finland

Finland Humanitarian guidelines: Finland's plan for implementing good humanitarian donorship principles, Ministry of foreign affairs

Cartagena Review conference

<http://www.cartagenasummit.org/decisions-and-documents/>

Review of the operations and status of the Convention on the prohibition of the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of antipersonnel mines and their destruction: 2005-2009

Part I and Part II

<http://www.cartagenasummit.org/fileadmin/pdf/review-conference-2nd/2RC-Review-PartI-18Dec2009.pdf>

<http://www.cartagenasummit.org/fileadmin/pdf/review-conference-2nd/2RC-Review-PartII-18Dec2009.pdf>

Cartagena action plan 2010 – 2014: ending the suffering caused by anti-personnel Mines

<http://www.cartagenasummit.org/fileadmin/pdf/review-conference-2nd/2RC-ActionPlanFINAL-UNOFFICIAL-11Dec2009.pdf>

GICHD

Kerry Brinkert, power point presentation : Enhancing the discussion on cooperation and assistance, may 2010.

UN

<http://www.mineaction.org/>

<http://www.mineaction.org/section.asp?s=projects>

<http://www.mineaction.org/downloads/1/A64287E.pdf>

OECD- DAC

Paris declaration

http://www.oecd.org/document/18/0,3343,en_2649_3236398_35401554_1_1_1_1,00.html

<https://community.oecd.org/community/factblog/blog/2010/04/16/aid-for-fragile-states>

Landmine and Cluster Munitions Monitor 2008