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# ACeNOMYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHD C</td>
<td>Armenian Humanitarian Demining Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDDCO</td>
<td>EuropeAid Cooperation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Auto Immune-Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANAMA</td>
<td>Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Action Plan (for ENPI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM</td>
<td>Anti-Personnel Landmines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APMBPC</td>
<td>Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArcBL</td>
<td>Armenian Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Battle Area Clearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASEVAC</td>
<td>Casualty Evacuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCW</td>
<td>Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons of War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CED</td>
<td>Executive Commission for Demining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFSP</td>
<td>Common Foreign and Security Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID A</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Country Strategy Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Dangerous Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDG</td>
<td>Danish Demining Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDR</td>
<td>Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG DEV</td>
<td>EC Directorate General for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG RELEX</td>
<td>EC Directorate General for External Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBRD</td>
<td>European Bank for Reconstruction and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission or European Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>European Community Humanitarian Aid Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENPI</td>
<td>European Neighbourhood Policy Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD</td>
<td>Explosive Ordnance Disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERW</td>
<td>Explosive Remnants of War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>European Security Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUSR</td>
<td>EU Special Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GICHD</td>
<td>Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoA</td>
<td>Government of Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoAz</td>
<td>Government of Azerbaijan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAC</td>
<td>Humanitarian Aid Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Handicap International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>International Committee of the Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPF</td>
<td>International Eurasia Press Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAS</td>
<td>International Mine Action Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMSMA</td>
<td>Information Management System for Mine Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>International Financial Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITF</td>
<td>International Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTC</td>
<td>Khanlar Training Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIS</td>
<td>Landmine Impact Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRRD</td>
<td>Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Mine Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>Mines Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDD</td>
<td>Mine Dog Detecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRE</td>
<td>Mine Risk Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRR &amp; R</td>
<td>Ministry of Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSF</td>
<td>Doctors without Borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMSA</td>
<td>NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHDs</td>
<td>National Human Development Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAA</td>
<td>National Mine Action Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCE</td>
<td>Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP</td>
<td>The Partnership for Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSP</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Relief Azerbaijan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Rapid Assistance Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDP</td>
<td>Reconstruction and Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRM</td>
<td>Rapid Response Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRP</td>
<td>Relief and Rehabilitation Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSP</td>
<td>Regional Strategy Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>Survey Action Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALW</td>
<td>Small Arms, Light Weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHA</td>
<td>Suspected Hazardous Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>Standing Operating Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Technical Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACIS</td>
<td>Technical Aid to the Commonwealth of Independent States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTA</td>
<td>Technical and Administrative Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMAS</td>
<td>United Nations Mine Action Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
<td>United States Dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEUCOM</td>
<td>United States European Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UXO</td>
<td>Unexploded Ordnance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Victim Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTF</td>
<td>Voluntary Trust Fund (of the UN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWL</td>
<td>Williamson Wealth Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**EVALUATION OF EC-FUNDED MINE ACTION PROGRAMMES IN THE CAUCASUS AND CENTRAL ASIA**

**FINAL 16.07.09**
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND
In 2001 the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament adopted two Regulations on the reinforcement of the EU response against Antipersonnel Landmines (APL). These (referred to collectively as “the Regulation”) laid the foundation of an integrated and focused European policy. The Regulation states the need to regularly assess operations financed by the Community and that the European Commission shall submit to the European Parliament an overall assessment of all Community mine actions. To implement these provisions, the Commission commissioned a global assessment of EC mine policy and actions over the period 2002-2004 and entered into an agreement with The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) to, inter alia, manage the programme of regional evaluations to identify lessons learned within EC-funded mine action projects in the six regions, one of which is the Caucasus and Central Asia.

The regional evaluations complement the Global Assessment by focusing on relevant conclusions and recommendations from the Global Assessment, and EC mine action strategy and programming issues at the country level. The evaluation will not assess the efficiency, effectiveness, and impact of individual projects, except to illustrate changes since the Global Assessment or critical programming issues.

METHODOLOGY
The evaluation covered the period 2002 until today. Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia were selected. For practical reasons, the GICHD decided to issue two volumes for this region, the first covering Afghanistan and the second one covering the Southern Caucasus. The country focus of the Southern Caucasus evaluation is Armenia and Azerbaijan as the country mission to Georgia had to be dropped due to non-availability of relevant actors due to national holidays and bridging days.

The Evaluation Team comprised Vera Bohle, GICHD Evaluation Officer, and Nara Weigel, GICHD Programme Officer for Development and Evaluation.

OVERVIEW OF EC FUNDED MINE ACTION IN SOUTHERN CAUCASUS
The total EC funding to mine action in Southern Caucasus is only 2.3% of the total EC finding to mine action worldwide. For Southern Caucasus, there was a decrease in total funding between 2002-04 (period covered by the first EC Mine Action Strategy) and 2005-07 (period covered by the second Strategy) of more than 50%. The worldwide decrease of total EC funding to mine action due to the change in strategy was about 25%.


2 However, one must consider that although the Armenian Landmine Impact Survey (LIS) was a multi-year project covering the period 2004-2007, EC funding was only counted for the 2004 period.
All funds for mine action in the Southern Caucasus came from the dedicated APL budget line and the bulk of mine action funding between 2002 and 2007 went to Azerbaijan, which is understandable given the pattern of contamination.

**Figure 1 – EC-Funded Projects in the Southern Caucasus: Allocation per country**

![Allocation per country chart](image)

Most EC funding for the Southern Caucasus was channelled through UNDP (€5.05 million). UNDP in turn implemented the projects through international partners such as the Survey Action Center for the Landmine Impact Survey in Azerbaijan, and through national bodies like the National Mine Action Centres in Armenia and Azerbaijan.

Projects of the two international NGOs – HALO Trust (€ 500 000) and Geneva Call (€ 250 000) – were directly funded.

**Table 1 – Number of EC-funded projects per partner and country**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Number of countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geneva Call</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (Georgia)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALO Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (Georgia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: The € 250,000 Geneva Call project is listed under Georgia, but it also includes action in Nagorno Karabakh, the disputed territory between Armenia and Azerbaijan.

Apart from capacity building, the bulk of funds went into clearance and area reduction. Mine risk education and victim assistance were considered, but these components naturally require less funds than clearance. Generally, the Commission has supported all mine action components and there were no proposals from the affected countries to change the ratio between the components.

**EC MINE ACTION STRATEGIES FOR THE SOUTHERN CAUCASUS**

The programming decisions for the Southern Caucasus followed the EC global mine action strategies for 2002-04 and 2005-07 (the Regulation). As neither Armenia nor Azerbaijan have signed the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) or are party to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons of War (CCW) and its Protocols, EC programming decisions for
mine action in the Southern Caucasus were based on humanitarian and development criteria, as defined in the EC mine action strategies.

The Country Strategy Papers (CSP) elaborated together with the respective national authorities of the Southern Caucasus reflected the national and EC priorities. In Azerbaijan, the EC considered the national mine action strategy for its programming. In Armenia, this does not seem to be the case – there is a strategy, but it did not serve as a basis for decision making. After 2007, strategic considerations were no longer made for the implementation of mine action in the region.

The EC programming decisions were also influenced by the risk of war. The table shows that when mine action was mentioned, it was always in the context of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict.

Table 2 – Mine Action in EC Country Strategy Papers for 2002-6 and 2007-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002-6</th>
<th>2007-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – mine action to contribute to the settlement of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>Yes – mine action to contribute to the settlement of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict</td>
<td>Yes – mine action to contribute to the settlement of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – under the heading Stability Instrument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding EC regional strategies, between 1991 and 2007 the main EC instrument used for support in the Southern Caucasus was the Technical Assistance to the Commonwealth of Independent States (TACIS). In 2007 this instrument was replaced by the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI). As the thematic APL strategy and budget line covered the mine action projects in Southern Caucasus, TACIS did not deal with mine action in the region.

With the elimination of the thematic budget line for mine action and the introduction of the ENPI in 2007, Regional Strategy Papers (RSPs) provided strategic guidance for countries within the ENPI region. The RSPs are intended to complement the CSP. The ENPI Eastern Region RSP for 2007-13 is intended to complement the country-specific programmes outlined in the CSPs for Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia. The Eastern Regional Programme Strategy Paper 2007-2013 recognises the problem of mines and ERW in the regional context of the Southern Caucasus and the need for the use of the ENPI to address this problem in a regionally coordinated manner. However, objectives of the RSP are implemented through bilateral Action Plans (AP) and the evaluation team is not aware of any regional efforts to put into practice the statements of the Eastern Regional Programme Strategy Paper.

COUNTRY FINDINGS

ARMENIA

Landmines and explosive remnants of war in Armenia mainly result from the Nagorno Karabakh conflict between 1988 and 1994. Both Armenia and Azerbaijan laid landmines until 1994. As the mines were laid by untrained military staff, mine maps are inadequate. For this reason, the precise extent of the contamination is difficult to determine. However, compared to other countries,
Armenia has a modest landmine and mine victim problem (411 victims between 1994 and 2007). Still, mines, ERW and other munitions have significant socio-economic effects in the border areas.

For the most part, Armenia has a well established mine action sector. However, the Ministry of Defence (MoD) dominates the mine clearance sector, which has some disadvantages, including:

- Limited opportunities for the Armenian Humanitarian Demining Centre (AHDC) to engage more actively with communities, civil society organisations and international bodies;
- A focus on demining rather than on the overall coordination of all pillars of mine action;
- Lack of involvement of affected communities in defining priorities;
- Constraints on international funding;
- No external oversight.

The slow pace of mine clearance may have various causes but, overall, the evaluation team did not get the impression that there is significant progress towards the end state as described in the national Mine Action End Strategy. Important steps to meet the goals of the 2007-2010 Strategic Plan are lacking, particularly regarding resource mobilisation and increasing demining capacity. There is no explicit link between the Armenian Mine Action Strategy and various government development programmes. Even though the government representatives met stated that mine action was a priority, the government makes no significant financial contributions at present.

The EC-funded project has been one of the key mine action projects in Armenia, and it has contributed to meeting the needs of the country. However, as the focus was on capacity building, it would have been important to do a proper handover and put sustainability measures in place, instead of just ending the project. At present, there is no clear responsibility for mine action within the EC delegation or UNDP in Armenia, which means there is a loss of institutional memory and no continuity.

The decisions not to prolong the project and not to commission an evaluation or a follow-up project were not strategic: they were just the consequences of the termination of the mine action thematic budget line. Continued capacity building is not foreseen in the new CSP. The National Mine Action Strategy, produced during the course of the EC-funded project, was not used as a basis for assessing further funding requirements.

The EC-funded LIS served as a basis for the national mine action strategy and for priority setting for the limited clearance undertaken. However, it is not systematically updated and will soon be outdated. The LIS proposals on victim assistance have not been implemented, mainly due to the refusal to grant a no-cost extension to the EC-funded project.

Overall, the EC-funded project had some merit, but it had to deal with three main problems: the unresolved Nagorno Karabakh conflict, the lack of continuity and the absence of an exit strategy. The concept of national capacity building has been good, but it needs long-term attention and follow-up monitoring, to ensure Government commitment. Moreover given the modest scale of the mine problem, clearance and victim assistance could have been addressed in a more effective way.
AZERBAIJAN

The scope of the mine contamination assessed in the evaluation covers only the accessible territory of Azerbaijan. Fizuli district in the south and Aghastafa district further north are most affected. The number of victims is relatively low, at 1,968 for the entire period covered by the evaluation. The mine and ERW problem in Azerbaijan stems from the Nagorno Karabakh conflict between 1988 and 1994 as well as the Soviet era. Clearance is complicated by the fact that not all minefields were laid by trained soldiers and recorded properly. The most contaminated area is along the borders and confrontation lines between Armenia and Azerbaijan, including the area in and around Nagorno Karabakh.

Azerbaijan has a well established mine action sector. The Azerbaijan National Mine Action Authority (ANAMA) is responsible for planning, coordinating, managing and monitoring of mine action countrywide. While it was not possible to assess ANAMA in detail, the evaluation team had the impression that it has a sound structure and is very active, not just in its duties in Azerbaijan, but also in regional or international mine action events. ANAMA is has good funding support from international partners such as UNDP, NATO/NAMSA, USA, EC, ITF, etc., as well as the Government. Capacity building has been successful.

As it is not under the MoD, ANAMA has significant freedom of action (for example, direct access to donors) and has developed into a respected partner for a number of district administrations and state agencies. However, ANAMA is not as influential as the MoD, and would have modest input on broader state policies. Naturally, donors would have some concerns in providing certain kinds of assets (i.e. dual use equipment) to ANAMA while there remains any risk of renewed fighting over Nagorno Karabakh.

Mine action is overshadowed by the continuing tensions with Armenia. The contaminated areas in the conflict zone, including Nagorno Karabakh itself, are inaccessible to Azerbaijan. Nevertheless, the latest strategy highlights the possibility of working in the ‘liberated’ areas in the future. At the same time, Azerbaijan works quickly on the clearance of the accessible areas.

The EC funded three projects in Azerbaijan covering a Landmine Impact Survey, capacity building and demining. All funds were allocated through UNDP. The EC-funded projects had clear results, and national ownership was demonstrated by Government contributions to the projects. Considering the extent of contamination, the projects were relevant for Azerbaijan.

ANAMA has not received EC funding since 2007, despite its request for further support. The effects of this are not yet tangible, as ANAMA has other donors. However, the decision not to continue funding was not based on strategic considerations. The EC did not prepare the partner country and organisations for the end of the APL thematic budget line.

---

3 Nagorno Karabakh, adjoining Jabrayil, Zangilan, Gubadly, Lachin, and Kelbajar, as well as part of Fizuli, Terter and Aghdam districts are under the control of Armenian forces.
4 ANAMA has received positive assessments from assessments by the Survey Action Center (SAC – 2009), the World Bank (2005) and NATO (2003), which has reinforced its credibility within the Government. See Downs, Charles (2009), Mine Action Services for Development – Azerbaijan Case, Survey Action Center.
5 ANAMA is mentioned in the State Programme for Socio-Economic Development 2004-2008, but ‘...as a specialized agency dealing with a localized problem...’ (Downs, 2009, p. 5). However, the SAC report gives a number of examples in which, since 2004, ANAMA has developed effective partnerships with district administrations, state agencies, and development/IDP return projects.
In sum, ANAMA currently considers itself in a learning phase. It is preparing itself to deal eventually with the mine/UXO contamination in Nagorno Karabakh – the biggest problem for ANAMA in the future. At this stage, the sustainability of the project is not endangered due to the termination of EC funding. However, the EC should have a clearer exit strategy, accompanied by a vision of what should be achieved in a country, before funding is terminated. Otherwise, project decisions appear to be ad hoc and reactive.

CONCLUSIONS

1. ERW in Southern Caucasus present a regional, cross-border problem that continues to impact the population. The ENPI identifies Southern Caucasus as an important partner for the EU, relevant for its safety and security. From a global perspective, the Southern Caucasus has a smaller mine and ERW problem than some other regions, but it still is significant and affects the population. For this reason, the decision to fund mine action programmes in the region is relevant.

2. In both Armenia and Azerbaijan, the EC projects significantly contributed to setting-up a national capacity to deal with the contamination problem. Hence, EC support for mine action projects in Southern Caucasus has been effective to a degree. However, most of the projects (apart from the Geneva Call project) did not include a regional conflict resolution aspect, or any regional aspect at all. The political dimension of mine action has not been considered. Even though there is an RSP highlighting the importance of mine action, the only regional initiatives came from international NGOs. Efforts to address the mine and ERW problem would benefit from a regional approach.

3. The EC response has been to implement projects mainly on the country level (the small Geneva Call advocacy project has a regional reach).

4. The contamination problems have been addressed effectively to a degree, even though the focus of some projects, particularly in Armenia, could have been more on clearance and victim assistance. National ownership has been fostered (to a high degree in Azerbaijan). Support to civil society organisations could have been more pronounced. The link to development priorities has been made most of the time (for example, based on the findings of the LIS or through the national development plans), but not always translated into action plans with budgets.

5. The EC programme in the Southern Caucasus had no clear end-state defined and there was no exit strategy.

6. As mine action is only mentioned in the short-term component of the Stability Instrument, it is not a suitable mechanism to support longer term projects aimed at capacity building and development.

7. The individual EC-funded projects have been good, but the EC never attempted to play a coordination role for mine action in the Southern Caucasus. Such a role could be valuable, particularly given the involvement of EU member states in mine action.

8. There is no designated EC focal point for mine action in Southern Caucasus, and the country delegations often do not have specialised knowledge.

9. There was a lack of effective monitoring and evaluation, the results of which could have fed into programming decisions. Furthermore, there are shortcomings in institutional memory due to staff turnover, and an inadequate filing system.
10. EC funding goes through many layers: EC to UNDP, UNDP to others (for example, the Survey Action Center, which in turn worked with other organisations to implement surveys). Each additional layer has administrative costs.

11. Even if there are other regional security threats such as weapons of mass destruction and small arms and light weapons, mines and ERW have an impact on the local populations. A successful intervention in mine action could provide a point of entry for projects to address other regional security issues. This, however, would require that the EC considered mine action within the broader strategic framework of regional security.

12. Due to the ongoing tensions, no EC support for mine action has been directed to Nagorno Karabakh, even though mine action is possible (HALO Trust is operating there). The question for the EC is whether it would be politically feasible or beneficial to fund such mine action.

13. There is an implementation problem within the EC programming instruments. The ENPI Regional Strategic Plan (RSP) is implemented through bilateral Action Plans, which did not lead to continued support to mine action in the Caucasus even though mine action was mentioned. At the same time, the RSP and the Action Plan can, but do not automatically, affect the CSP. In the Caucasus, the wording on mine action in the RSP did not feed into the CSPs.

14. EC-funded mine action has not (yet) achieved tangible results for the universalisation of arms control and disarmament treaties in the region. Due to the difficult political situation, this is a long-term task. Continued advocacy work is a requirement to achieve the goal of universalisation of the Ottawa Convention, the CCW, and of future treaties, such as the Convention on Cluster Munitions.

15. Victim assistance has been addressed in both Armenia and Azerbaijan. However, even though the health facilities and networks are functioning, psycho-social rehabilitation is rarely available in the Southern Caucasus.

16. The effect of deconcentration could be observed in Armenia, where mine action is not a priority for the EC Delegation. The case of Azerbaijan is different because the projects were managed from Brussels until they ended in 2006. However, in neither case has there been expertise available for mine action programming, and no knowledge where to get advice or funds.

17. As mine action in the region was funded exclusively through the APL budget line, the ending of this budget line had a significant effect: there is simply no more EC-funding for any mine action projects. This decision was not made strategically or in a well-planned manner, as none of the projects had a clear exit strategy.

18. EC representatives in the Southern Caucasus do not promote EC mine action policy. There is no effort on behalf of the EC to encourage the countries to sign the APMBC or to use mine action as an entry point for efforts to address regional security issues.

19. While the APL budget line still existed, the EC-funded Geneva Call project included an advocacy component for non-state actors in the region to commit to the norms of the APMBC. From a universalisation perspective, it would have made sense to support other advocacy work targeting the states not yet party to the APMBC. Discussions should continue on whether and how the EC can fund initiatives such as the Geneva Call project engaging non state actors, which require long term funding.
20. There is no overall responsibility for EU mine action in the region and no expertise in the mine action field. It is unclear how the initiatives of the different EU institutions are coordinated in the region. While there is an EU Special Representative for the Southern Caucasus, he does not consider mine action to be part of his work. Nevertheless, the adherence of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia to the APMBC could contribute to reducing tensions and, ultimately, improve regional stability. Although this would imply an increased role for the Council of the EU relative to that of the Commission in the “policy mix” for the region, the benefits of including some aspects of mine action in the CFSP warrant further study.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1 – Integrate the need for continued mine action support for Southern Caucasus into the current EC mine action strategy.

Recommendation 2 – Consider mine action in Southern Caucasus as a regional, cross-border issue.

Recommendation 3 – Identify an EC regional focal point for mine action to deal with the following:
   - EC programming
   - Programme and project implementation
   - Advocacy
   - Reporting

Recommendation 4 – Identify and, perhaps, pre-qualify mine action experts who can advise a regional focal point for Southern Caucasus and specific Delegations on programming issues.

Recommendation 5 – As part of the EC mine action strategy, develop concepts how to handle a region that includes a number of countries with a modest mine/ERW problem.

Recommendation 6 – As part of the EC mine action strategy, develop concepts how to handle mine action in a region or country at the time of conflict.

Recommendation 7 – Consider mine action within the broader strategic framework of regional security.
1. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

In 2001 the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament adopted two Regulations on the reinforcement of the EU response against Anti-Personnel Landmines (APL). These (referred to collectively as “the Regulation”) laid the foundation of the European integrated and focused policy.

Article 13, paragraph 1 of the Regulation states that: The Commission shall regularly assess operations financed by the Community in order to establish whether the objectives of the operations have been achieved and to provide guidelines for improving the effectiveness of future operations. The APL Regulation goes on to state: Every three years after entry into force of this Regulation, the Commission shall submit to the European Parliament an overall assessment of all Community mine actions... (Article 14)

The Commission’s Mine Action Strategy and Multi-annual Indicative Programme, 2005-2007 further specifies that more specific, geographic, evaluations of EU-funded mine actions, analysing the results and their impact will be undertaken to complement the overall assessment.

To implement these provisions, the Commission:

- Commissioned a global assessment of EU mine policy and actions over the period 2002-2004;
- Entered into an agreement with The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) to, inter alia, manage the programme of regional evaluations to identify lessons learned within EU-funded mine action projects in the following regions:
  - Africa
  - Caucasus-Central Asia
  - Latin America
  - Asia-Pacific
  - Europe
  - Middle East

The Report from the Global Assessment was issued in March 2005, and the agreement with the GICHD was concluded in December of the same year.

The objective of the Global Assessment was to determine to what extent the objectives and means set in the APL Regulation had been complied with and used in terms of strategy, programming, commitments and implementation. The regional evaluations will complement the Global Assessment by focusing on (i) relevant conclusions and recommendations from the Global Assessment and (ii) European Commission mine action strategy and programming issues at the
country and regional levels. Thus, the evaluation will not assess the efficiency, effectiveness, and impact of individual projects, except to illustrate changes since the Global Assessment or critical programming issues.

OVERALL OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION:
To provide systematic and objective assessments of EC-funded mine actions in Southern Caucasus to generate credible and useful lessons for decision-makers, allowing them to improve the planning and management of existing and future mine action projects, programmes, and policies.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES:
1. To assess the relevance of EC-funded mine activities vis-à-vis:
   - the geographic and thematic priorities defined in the Strategies for 2002-2004 and 2005-2007;
   - national and regional needs, strategies, and priorities;
   - European Commission Country Strategy Papers and National Indicative Programmes in Southern Caucasus;
   - European Commission strategy documents for Southern Caucasus;

2. To analyse the allocation of funds among mine-affected states in Southern Caucasus, and across the various components of mine action (survey, clearance, MRE, etc.);

3. To assess the effectiveness of EU-funded mine action support in:
   - addressing the landmine & UXO problems in mine-affected partner countries
   - fostering national ownership and the development of local capacities;
   - supporting the overall development and rehabilitation priorities/programmes of the beneficiary countries;

4. To assess the coordination among the EU and other agencies supporting mine action in a country (national; UN; donors; international NGOs; etc.);

5. To assess the impact of deconcentration on the planning and delivery of EU support to mine action in Southern Caucasus;

6. To assess the potential impact of the end of the specific budget line for anti-personnel landmines on future mine action support from the EU to Southern Caucasus;

7. To make recommendations to improve the identification, the definition, the implementation and the impact of EU-funded mine projects;

8. To generate recommendations to enhance the opportunities for cross-fertilisation among mine action programmes in Southern Caucasus and globally.

TERMS OF REFERENCE
The full Terms of Reference are attached as Annex 1.

STUDY METHODOLOGY
The evaluation entailed:
(i) preliminary planning and data collection;
(ii) selection of ‘focus countries’ to which missions would be undertaken;
(iii) desk research, including the review of strategic documents for Southern Caucasus;
(iv) visit to Brussels to conduct interviews with desk officers;
(v) missions to the focus countries (Armenia and Azerbaijan);
(vi) e-mail and telephone interviews with persons who could not be met during the missions\(^{10}\) and
(vii) analysis and reporting.

During the initial phase, two rounds of questionnaires were submitted to the EC-Brussels mine action team and to EU delegations in Southern Caucasus countries which had received EC funding for mine action. The responses allowed the identification of the key evaluation issues and the selection of focus countries.

The Evaluation Team comprised Vera Bohle, GICHD Evaluation Officer, and Nara Weigel, GICHD Programme Officer Development. The country missions were organised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Team Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>28 April – 02 May 2008</td>
<td>Vera Bohle &amp; Nara Weigel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>03 – 10 May 2008</td>
<td>Vera Bohle &amp; Nara Weigel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A country mission to Georgia was planned, but had to be dropped due to non-availability of relevant actors due to national holidays. For this reason, the country focus of this evaluation report will be on Armenia and Azerbaijan.

\(^{10}\) This includes meetings in Geneva with Geneva Call and the current and former UNDP Armenia mine action officers.
2. MINE ACTION IN THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION STRATEGIES

The basic programming framework for EU support to mine action in any country is made-up most directly by:

(i) the European Commission Country Strategy Paper (CSP),
(ii) the National Mine Action Strategy and Programme, and
(iii) until recently, the EC Mine Action Strategy.

CSPs and National Mine Action Strategies are influenced by a number of other policies and strategies issued by European and national authorities. For the Southern Caucasus, there is, for example, an EC Regional Strategy Paper.

On the European side, the aid delivery system for the Southern Caucasus includes the Directorate General External Relations (DG RELEX), responsible for aid policy, and a separate Directorate for the implementation of the Commission’s assessed budget for aid (EuropeAid Cooperation Office or AIDCO).

THE GLOBAL MINE ACTION STRATEGY AND RECENT REFORMS TO AID POLICY

Until 2006, there were hundreds of specific regulations that foresaw EC assistance for specific aid purposes, including the two Regulations for Mine Action. These regulations established both policy guidance and the special budget line for AP landmines. External Relations then formulated the two EC Mine Action Strategies, covering 2002-04 and 2005-07 respectively. These documents outlined how the Commission would implement Community mine action and provided an overall strategic focus for Commission programming for mine action.

Textbox 1 – The Objectives of the Mine Action Regulation and Strategy

The twin Regulations were adopted in 2001 as “a direct response to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (Ottawa Convention).” Thus, the Regulations were explicitly aimed at Treaty implementation, as well as humanitarian and development objectives.

Similarly, the EC Mine Action strategies specify commitment to the Mine Ban Treaty as a criterion for assistance, along with humanitarian and development needs, strategic importance to the EU, effectiveness of the national mine action programme, and coherence with the wider assistance programme.

It is clear therefore, that both the Regulations and the Strategies specified disarmament (i.e. Treaty implementation), humanitarian, and developmental objectives.

The 2005 Global Assessment of the EC Mine Policy and Actions found that EC staff have consistently sought to achieve high standards and the EC manages its mine action programme at least as well as other similar international donors (p. v), and provided a number of recommendations for further enhancing the policy and its implementation. However, broader reforms of the EU aid policies and institutions meant the recommendations for mine action could not, for the most part, be implemented. Most fundamentally, the broader reforms led to the replacement of the hundreds of aid policy regulations – including those specific to mine action –
with a handful of broader regulations.\textsuperscript{11} As a result, the specific budget line for anti-personnel landmines disappeared, and the small units in Brussels charged with implementing the budget line and the EC Mine Action Strategy were reduced in size.

The elimination of the specific budget line for anti-personnel landmines together with the absence of a new mine action strategy may also have an effect on the place of mine action within the structure of the European Union. Mine action was traditionally considered an area of action of the European Commission. The disappearance of the APL budget line and specific thematic funding opportunities at the Commission’s disposal have re-opened institutional discussions on the potential role of the Council of the European Union (thus the member states) in mine action. Therefore, the effect of differences (structure, decision-making procedures etc.) between EU institutions on the type of mine action funded and the external perception of such action should be considered.

**Textbox 2 – Mine Action within the structure of the European Union**

The 1993 Treaty of Maastricht which established the European Union, divided EU policies into three main areas, called pillars. The first or ‘Community’ (EC) pillar concerns economic, social and environmental policies. The second or ‘Common Foreign and Security Policy’ (CFSP) pillar concerns foreign policy and military matters. The third or ‘Police and Judicial Co-operation in Criminal Matters’ (PJCC) pillar concerns co-operation in the fight against crime. This pillar was originally named ‘Justice and Home Affairs’.

Mine action does not easily fit completely within one pillar: aid and development are first pillar responsibilities, and security is the second pillar. Generally, mine action has been considered as within the first pillar, and the APL horizontal budget lines provided a mechanism to fund some of the aspects of mine action not associated with geographic budget lines. First pillar decisions are made by Qualified Majority Voting which favours supra-national policies. For issues in the second pillar the relevant bodies are (usually) the Council of the European Union Secretariat proposing projects which are implemented by joint action at an inter-governmental level by Member State ministries (possibly by a sub-group of member states).

This may appear an arcane distinction, but currently, since the reforms of 2006 which removed the thematic budget lines it has the potential for an impact on mine action. First, it further increases already serious fragmentation by potentially moving part of mine action from the first into the second pillar with its different procedures, including implementation by different Member State ministries and not the European Commission. Since non-geographic funding is no longer foreseen in the four new Instruments there could be pressure to fund some (admittedly minor) parts of mine action from the second pillar. Secondly it could move the focus of mine action towards being regarded as a security issue instead of a development issue. Pressure for his move also comes from the increased mainstreaming of some parts of mine action within development work, leaving other parts such as stockpile destruction perceived as security related and not development issues.

There is debate about the placement of that part of “mine action” which occupies an area between the first and second pillars, which may in the end be resolved by the European Court of Justice. At present International Peace and Security are part of the second pillar so this may be the correct place for some of the non-geographic actions, such as advocacy for universal adherence to the APMBC, previously considered under the thematic APL budget line. However, second pillar actions are generally shorter term than development actions, and placement here could lead to a blurred distinction between the security aspects of mine action and anti-terrorist actions.

\textsuperscript{11} General information on the reforms at http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/reform/intro/index.htm
EC STRATEGIES FOR THE SOUTHERN CAUCASUS

Between 1991 and 2007 the main EC instrument used for support in the Southern Caucasus region was the so-called Technical Assistance to the Commonwealth of Independent States (TACIS). In 2007 this instrument was replaced by the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI). In addition, a number of strategies and budgets for specific aid purposes including mine action existed until 2007. As the APL strategy and thematic budget line covered the mine action projects in Southern Caucasus, TACIS did not deal with mine action in the region.

This situation changed dramatically with the elimination of the thematic budget line for mine action and the introduction of the ENPI in 2007. The concept of Regional Strategy Papers (RSPs) was introduced for countries in the ENPI region. The RSPs are intended to complement the ENPI Country Strategy Papers (ENPI CSP) which are the principal strategy documents for EC engagement. Regarding the countries of the Southern Caucasus evaluated in this report, the ENPI Eastern Region RSP for 2007-13 is intended to complement the country-specific programmes outlined in the CSPs for Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia. It is important to note that there are no regional action plans as the objectives of the RSP are implemented through bilateral Action Plans (AP).

The Eastern Regional Programme Strategy Paper 2007-2013 recognises the need for the use of the ENPI to fund future mine action: Since 2001, actions against anti-personnel landmines have been covered by the APL regulation, and since then there have been two EU Mine Action Strategies and Indicative Programmes, 2002-2004, and 2005-2007. These strategies carried their own indicative funding under the APL regulation. With the simplification of external assistance regulations, it is necessary for ENPI to finance future assistance in this area. This assistance will follow on from the European Union Mine Action Strategies, but may, if necessary, also include activities for the elimination of explosive remnants of war and of the illegal spread and availability of small weapons and ammunition as well as of non-proliferation of WMDs and their means of delivery. (p. 18/19)

The problem of mines and ERW in the regional context of the Southern Caucasus was clearly recognised: As a result of past and present conflicts, almost all of the countries of the region have, to varying degrees, difficulties with the existence of anti-personnel landmines and explosive remnants of war. In some parts of the region, this represents a serious threat to civilians as well as to the environment. Action in this area requires increased cooperation and coordination between the countries of the region, and would benefit greatly from progress in frozen conflicts. (p. 8)

Due to the “frozen conflicts” in the ENPI region, additional future support for efforts to resolve such conflicts may also be provided under the Stability Instrument (RSP, p. 20/21). This could include support for mine action.

---

12 The RSP covers Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia and Russia and can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/world/enpi/pdf/country/enpi_eastern_rsp_en.pdf
14 For the EU Mine Action Strategies and Indicative Programmes for 2002-4 and 2005-7 see http://ec.europa.eu/comm/external_relations/mine/intro/strategy.htm
15 Georgia and Russia have a difficult relationship as a result of the separatist regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, while Armenia and Azerbaijan are locked in conflict over Nagorno Karabakh. The outbreak of armed conflict in South Ossetia between the Russian Federation and Georgia in August 2008 showed how quickly these conflicts can “defrost”.

Textbox 3 – The Stability Instrument and Support for Mine Action

The Stability Instrument* empowers Community short-term (up to 18 months) technical and financial assistance in response to a situation of crisis or emerging crisis, including assistance for mine action, specified as follows: support for measures to address, within the framework of Community cooperation policies and their objectives, the socio-economic impact on the civilian population of antipersonnel landmines, unexploded ordnance or explosive remnants of war; activities financed under this Regulation shall cover risk education, victim assistance, mine detection and clearance and, in conjunction therewith, stockpile destruction; (Article 3, par. h)

In addition, the Instrument makes provision for assistance to support for the rehabilitation and reintegration of the victims of armed conflict, including measures to address the specific needs of women and children; (Article 3, par. k). This would include landmine survivors.

In comparison, the former Mine Action Regulations and Strategies had a broader range of objectives – disarmament (Treaty implementation), humanitarian, and development. However, the Stability Instrument can provide only relatively short-term support for mine action for (principally) humanitarian purposes in a crisis. Thus, there is no specialised instrument to support mine action for either long-term development or disarmament in mind.

* REGULATION (EC) No 1717/2006 establishing the Instrument for Stability, 15 Nov. 2006. This also makes provision for assistance to various aspects of Security System Reform, including demobilisation and reintegration of armed forces, and elements of small arms, light weapons (SALW) programming.

Other EU programmes for Southern Caucasus countries include the Black Sea Cooperation Programme, other thematic and nuclear programmes. A variety of other European Community cooperation policies, such as the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), trade and justice must also be considered when dealing with partner countries of the region. This is essential as the internal policies and relationships among the institutions of the EU have an influence on the external dimension of the policies. The right “policy mix” is called for in programming, meaning that in the light of the external relations objectives of EU, policy coherence needs to be ensured between all available instruments in dealing with a country.

EC COUNTRY STRATEGY PAPERS AND INDICATIVE PROGRAMMES

In line with the principles of aid effectiveness, the CSPs are not only influenced by the overall EU strategies, but also by the recipient country’s own development priorities, normally outlined in national development plans (e.g. Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers - PRSP), which in turn should be based on sector strategies and the availability of financial resources. For EU support to mine action, programming decisions should also be in-line with the national mine action strategies (where these exist).

To repeat, while between 2002 and 2006, mine action funding for the Southern Caucasus was secured through the APL thematic budget line following its strategic priorities, from 2007, landmine and ERW contamination and mine action must be specifically mentioned in the CSPs to be considered a funding priority. Mine action competes with all other priorities such as health, infrastructure, or education for funding.
Table 3 – Mine Action in EC Country Strategy Papers for 2002-6 and 2007-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002-6</th>
<th>2007-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – support humanitarian and demining initiatives under the headline Cooperation for the settlement of the conflict over Nagorno Karabakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>Yes – mine action to contribute to the settlement of the conflict and for post-conflict reconstruction</td>
<td>Yes – same as Armenia demining in Nagorno Karabakh, but also as disarmament as political goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – under the heading Stability Instrument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While landmine and ERW contamination are not always explicitly mentioned in the CSP, provisions have been made to support mine action. However, in the case of Armenia and Azerbaijan, these provisions are closely linked to the solution of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict. It is interesting that, unlike the Armenian and Georgian CSP, the Azerbaijani CSP mentions disarmament as a political goal, even though the issue is relevant for all three countries.

---

16 “EU accords very high priority to measures which can both (a) underpin a peaceful settlement and (b) prepare Azerbaijan to derive maximum benefit from the ending of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict and the reopening of communications. In this context priority should be given to demining actions in war damaged areas adjacent to the cease fire line and in the event of peace settlement in what are currently occupied territories” CSP Azerbaijan 2002-6

17 CSP Azerbaijan 2007-2013 “Under the headings EC Response Strategy and Political Dialogue and Reform: In terms of enhanced cooperation on foreign and security policy, particular attention will be paid to issues relating to WMD non-proliferation and disarmament, including conventional disarmament and landmines, and to conflict prevention and crisis management with a particular focus on Azerbaijan’s role in settling the protracted conflict with Armenia over Nagorno-Karabakh”( p. 20)

18 “Equally important for Georgia may be measures to address the effects on the civilian population of anti-personnel mines, unexploded ordnance ammunition, surplus firearms or other explosive devices. Such measures may, where appropriate, be addressed under the Stability Instrument and under the national and regional envelopes of the ENPI”. CSP Georgia 2007-2013, p. 27.
3. REGIONAL FINDINGS SOUTHERN CAUCASUS

Figure 2 – Map Southern Caucasus

OVERVIEW OF EC-FUNDED MINE ACTION IN SOUTHERN CAUCASUS

AMOUNT OF SUPPORT

The total EC funding to mine action in Southern Caucasus is only 2.3% of the total EC finding to mine action worldwide. For Southern Caucasus, there was a decrease in total funding between 2002-4 (period covered by the first EC Mine Action Strategy) and 2005-7 (period covered by the second Strategy) of more than 50%. The worldwide decrease of total EU funding to mine action due to the change in strategy was about 25%. However, one must consider that although the Armenian Landmine Impact Survey (LIS) was a multi-year project covering the period 2004-2007, EU funding was only counted for the 2004 period.
Table 4 – EC Mine Action Funding in Southern Caucasus relative to total EC Mine Action Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total EC funding to mine action</th>
<th>EC funding to mine action Southern Caucasus</th>
<th>% to Southern Caucasus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-04</td>
<td>€145.2 million</td>
<td>€4.05 million</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-07</td>
<td>€107.8 million</td>
<td>€1.75 million</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>€253.0 million</td>
<td>€5.8 million</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Total EC funding – Landmine Monitor; Funding for Southern Caucasus – our figures

All funds for mine action in the Southern Caucasus came from the dedicated APL budget line. The following individual projects have been funded:

Table 5 – EC-funded Projects in the Southern Caucasus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Implementing Partner</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Funds allocated</th>
<th>Project description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>12/08/2004-12/08/2007</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>Landmine Impact Survey (LIS), MRE, victim assistance and demining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>16/12/2005-15/12/2006</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>Marking and fencing, de-mining, victim assistance coordination and mine victim data collection (Integrated mine action programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>HALO Trust</td>
<td>14/10/2006-4/12/2007</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>Complete the ongoing mine action programme for Georgia/Abkhazia, comprehensive mine clearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Geneva Call</td>
<td>Oct 2006-Oct 2008</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>Engaging non-state actors in Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Nagorno-Karabagh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COUNTRIES SUPPORTED

All three Southern Caucasus countries have received support, as follows:

Table 6 – EU Mine Action support in Southern Caucasus by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2002-04 € million</th>
<th>2005-07 € million</th>
<th>Total € million</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: The 250,000 Euro Geneva Call project is listed under Georgia, but it also includes action in Nagorno Karabakh, the disputed territory between Armenia and Azerbaijan.
Funds committed in 2005-2007 are in line with the financial targets set in the second EC mine action strategy for Armenia and Azerbaijan. Georgia received 250,000 Euro less than planned.

The financial targets for mine action in the Southern Caucasus for the entire period from 2002 have not been met: a total of € 9.9 million had been planned for all countries in the region.\(^\text{19}\)

**Table 7 – EC Targeted and Allocated Funds for Mine Action in Southern Caucasus by Country as per EC Strategies for 2002-04 and 2005-07 (in € million)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Target 02-04</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
<th>Target 05-07</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia / Azerbaijan*</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>Not listed as such</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia / Abkhazia</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not listed as such</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The 2002-2004 strategy lists the title like this. It refers to Nagorno Karabakh. The funds were provided to Azerbaijan.

While it is not known why Georgia did not receive the planned funds in 2002-2004, it has been clear in the beginning of 2008 that the mine problem in Abkhazia was mostly solved.\(^\text{20}\) Due to the ongoing conflict in South Ossetia, clearance there has not been possible yet.

**TYPE OF ORGANISATION SUPPORTED**

The bulk of EC funding for the Southern Caucasus has been channelled through UNDP (€ 5.05 million). UNDP in turn implemented the projects through international partners (for example the Survey Action Center for the Landmine Impact Survey in Azerbaijan), and through national bodies like the National Mine Action Centres in Armenia and Azerbaijan.

Projects of the two international NGOs – HALO Trust (€ 500 000) and Geneva Call (€ 250 000) – were directly funded.

**Table 8 – Number of EC-funded projects per partner and country**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Number of countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geneva Call</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (Georgia)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halo Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (Georgia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: The 250,000 Euro Geneva Call project is listed under Georgia, but it also includes action in Nagorno Karabakh, the disputed territory between Armenia and Azerbaijan.

**MINE ACTION COMPONENTS SUPPORTED**

Apart from capacity building, the bulk of funds went into clearance and area reduction. Mine risk education and victim assistance were considered, but these components naturally require less funds than clearance. Generally, the Commission has supported all mine action components and there were no proposals from the affected countries to change the ratio between the components.

---

\(^{19}\) Plus another € 2 million or more in case of joining the APMBC. As of May 2008 none of the three countries have joined the APMBC.

\(^{20}\) Even though the events of August 2008 indicate the need for a stand-by EOD capacity.
Note that, depending on the mine action project, it may be difficult to distinguish between the mine action components. The UNDP projects always contain capacity building components, but it may be hard to distinguish for example if a landmine impact survey serves as capacity building tool or as a basis for clearance planning, or for both. For others, the distinction between components is clearer, for example clearance in the case of HALO Trust and advocacy in the case of Geneva Call.

EC MINE ACTION FUNDING RELATIVE TO TOTAL MINE ACTION FUNDING IN THE SOUTHERN CAUCASUS

The figures for total mine action funding in Southern Caucasus have been taken from the Landmine Monitor Reports 1999-2007 for Armenia and Georgia (including Abkhazia), and from the ANAMA\textsuperscript{21} 2008 report for Azerbaijan. Due to the use of different currencies and the fact that some sums were difficult to allocate or seemed duplicative, the figures may not be totally accurate.

Armenia has received about $10.6 million in total from external donors for mine action since 2001. The main donor has been the U.S., with about $8.8 million. The EU is the second biggest donor, and smaller contributions were received from ITF and UNDP. The Armenian Government contributed about $60,000 in total, of which € 30,000 went to the UNDP/EC project.

Azerbaijan has received a total of about $16.1 million between 1999 and 2006. The main donor was the US with about $9.3 million. The Government of Azerbaijan has contributed about $3.7 million to mine action in the same period. For 2007, both the US and the Azerbaijani Governments have contributed about $2.2 million. In the last two years (2006 and 2007), the total mine action budget for Azerbaijan has nearly doubled, mostly due to a considerable increase of Government contributions in 2006 and 2007.

Georgia, apart from Abkhazia, has received very little funding, mainly because landmines are reported not to be a major problem. The total is about $1 million since 1998, provided by the U.S., Netherlands, Germany, U.K. and via ITF. For Abkhazia, about $10.9 million has been contributed by the U.S. and, apart from the EU, other donors such as UK, Germany, Netherlands, Japan, Canada, Finland. The main donor is the U.S. with about $9.3 million.

CURRENT EC MINE ACTION FUNDING IN THE SOUTHERN CAUCASUS

At this stage there are no follow-up projects planned in any of the countries, as illustrated in the table below, which also lists the mentioning of EC support in the respective CSPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>EC support for mine action mentioned in CSP for 2007-2013</th>
<th>EC MA Projects planned after 2007</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Yes – support humanitarian and demining initiatives under the headline Cooperation for the settlement of the conflict over Nagorno Karabakh</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Conflict over Nagorno Karabakh not settled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{21} ANAMA is the Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action.
In the cases of Armenia and Azerbaijan, it can be argued that further funding was not provided because the Nagorno Karabakh conflict is not yet settled. However, the earlier projects did not depend on resolution of the Nagorno Karabakh issue because mine action is mentioned as a measure to encourage cooperation for the settlement of the conflict. Overall it does not seem that a strategic decision was taken to end mine action. It could also be argued that the CSPs are too limited in these two countries, as a clear exit strategy for mine action funding would have been better than just terminating the funds. In addition, there may be other projects worth funding while the Nagorno Karabakh conflict remains frozen.  

In Georgia, the Abkhazia project came to a natural and positive end as the remaining mine impact was marginal. This remains to be the case for landmines after the latest conflict, but Abkhazia is facing an EOD problem, which is currently addressed by HALO Trust. However, projects related to committing non-state actors to respect the obligations of the APMBC will certainly need longer-term engagement.

There is no concept to promote peace through regional initiatives, such as the workshops organised by ITF (see below, Regional Mine Action).

THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN THE SOUTHERN CAUCASUS AND THE EU RESPONSE

The political situation in the South Caucasus is far from stable and may be deteriorating. The European Security Strategy (ESS) states that it is in the European interest that countries on the EU’s borders are well-governed because, neighbours who are engaged in violent conflict, weak states where organised crime flourishes, [and] dysfunctional societies…all pose problems for Europe. The South Caucasus was also explicitly mentioned in the European Security Strategy as an area where the EU should take a “stronger and more active interest.”

ABKHAZIA AND SOUTH OSSETIA

Despite some engagement, the EU chose not to play a very important role in conflict resolution issues in Georgia. The EU decided to focus on Georgia’s reform and transformation instead, which is seen as a precondition for conflict settlement. In 2004-2005 the EU deployed a one year long “rule of law” mission to Georgia (EJUST THEMIS), and in 2005 a team of experts was deployed to support the border reform process. The recently finalised EU-Georgia Action Plan of the Neighbourhood Policy is consistent with such a “Georgia first” approach. Rather than conflict resolution, the priorities of the Action Plan’s are rule of law and improving the investment climate.

For example, continued mine action capacity building, clearance in non-disputed areas, victim assistance, or monitoring of the sustainability of achievements from the previous projects.
The latest developments in South Ossetia, where the frozen conflict rapidly escalated into war in August 2008, is an illustration of how fragile stability in the region is.

**NAGARNO KARABAKH**

The EU policy towards the Nagorno Karabakh conflict, which pits Azerbaijan and Armenia against each other, has been even more modest. The unresolved Nagorno Karabakh conflict remains an obstacle to regional stability and cooperation. Unlike in other post-Soviet conflicts such as Transnistria (Moldova), Abkhazia and South Ossetia, the EU is not even a *demandeur* for a greater role in the conflict settlement process in Nagorno Karabakh. The official position of the EU is that it would consider a contribution to peacekeeping forces in the region if and only if there is agreement between the parties on the deployment of such forces.

This is not to say that Europe’s voice in not heard in the Nagorno Karabakh case. France, along with Russia and the US, co-chairs the OSCE Minsk Group that mediates in the Nagorno Karabakh conflict settlement process. It must be noted though that France does this in its own capacity and not in the name of the EU.

One EU voice is that of the EU Special Representative (EUSR) for the Southern Caucasus, appointed through a Joint Action of the Council of the European Union in 2003 (see textbox). EUSR are mandated to promote EU policies in specific troubled regions and consequently directly support the work of the EU High Representative for the CFSP. The role of the EUSR for the Southern Caucasus has become increasingly important, as the accession of Romania and Bulgaria to the EU have pushed its border further east. The situation in the Southern Caucasus is now of direct concern for the EU. The mandate of the EUSR for the Southern Caucasus is to prevent conflict in the region and contribute to the peaceful settlement of conflicts by encouraging the governments of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia to cooperate around regional themes, and recommending actions targeting civil society and the rehabilitation of the territories. However, it has been pointed out by several actors, including the EC Delegation and the International Crisis Group that the EUSR could be more active regarding Nagorno Karabakh.

**Textbox 4 – Common Foreign & Security Policy and EU Joint Actions**

The Council of the European Union is the principal decision making institution in the EU. It is composed of 27 national ministers (one per state). The exact membership depends upon the topic being discussed; for example, when discussing the CFSP the 27 national foreign ministers form the Council. The Foreign Ministers of the EU Member States meet regularly in this External Relations Council to establish EU policy on key foreign-policy issues. The External Relations Council is represented by the EU High Representative for the CFSP.

Three different instruments are used to implement these policy decisions: Joint Actions, Common Positions and Common Strategies. In sum, these refer to coordinated action of all EU Member States for which resources of all kinds are deployed to achieve objectives defined by the Council of the European Union. Joint Actions commit the EU Member States to the positions they adopt and, subsequently, in the conduct of their activity. A Joint Action is usually a time-limited project but may be extended if appropriate.

Initially Joint Actions mainly mandated EU military or police missions in: Bosnia-Herzegovina, Moldova, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the African Great Lakes, the Southern Caucasus, the Middle East peace process and Central Asia. Over time Joint Actions developed

---

into instruments that support activities connected to International Organizations and treaties such as the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and now the APMBC.

Despite these initiatives the EU applies neither pressure nor incentives to push the conflict resolution process forward. The EU is careful to stay neutral in the broader debates between Armenia and Azerbaijan. The EU is opposed to the Turkish and Azerbaijani blockade of Armenia, while also being careful to remain in cooperative relations with Azerbaijan. While the EU Action Plan with Azerbaijan supports the principle of territorial integrity, the EU-Armenia Action Plan supports the principle of self-determination. In other words the EU has little if any policy towards the Nagorno Karabakh conflict.

Textbox 5 – Background on the Nagorno Karabakh conflict

While Armenian-Azerbaijani frictions over Nagorno Karabakh were contained during Soviet rule, the struggle escalated with the crumbling of the Soviet Union in the late 1980s. In February 1988 an appeal from Nagorno Karabakh deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR asking to transfer control of Nagorno Karabakh from Azerbaijan to Armenia was turned down. In July of the same year the legislative body of Nagorno Karabakh, together with the Armenian Supreme Soviet, decided to unify Nagorno Karabakh and Armenia. Attacks against the minority populations of the respective countries multiplied as the inter-ethnic conflict intensified. In response, Moscow proposed enhanced autonomy for Nagorno Karabakh within Azerbaijan. Neither Armenians nor Azerbaijanis were satisfied with this decision. Azerbaijan began an economic blockade of fuel and supply lines to Armenia that passed Azerbaijani territory (at the time 90% of Armenia’s imports from other Soviet republics went through Azerbaijan). In December 1989 the legislative bodies of Armenia and Nagorno Karabakh voted for the unification of Armenia and Nagorno Karabakh. Hence, the Armenian communist leadership and the Karabakh anti-communist coalition for national sovereignty became allies.

Three declarations of independence followed the break-up of the USSR in 1991: Armenia in August 1991, Azerbaijan in October 1991, and Nagorno-Karabakh in December 1991. The declaration of independence of Nagorno Karabakh was, of course, controversial. The referendum held in December 1991 was boycotted by local Azerbaijanis. Nagorno Karabakh appealed for recognition by the international community based on the right to self-determination. The Government of Azerbaijan insisted the principles of national sovereignty and the inviolability of existing borders must be respected. Although de facto self-governing, de jure no country has recognized the independence of Nagorno Karabakh.

With the departure of the Soviet army from the region in early 1992, the conflict developed into a full scale war. Supported by Armenia, the Karabakh army pushed the Azerbaijani army from Nagorno Karabakh and occupied territory around the enclave to create a buffer zone. A corridor was also established to connect Nagorno Karabakh with Armenia, going through the Azerbaijani region of Lachin. Those ethnic Azerbaijanis who had not left already were expelled from the Nagorno Karabakh region. By the end of 1994 around 724,000 people had left their homes in Armenia, Nagorno Karabakh and surrounding districts, and had sought refuge in Azerbaijan. Around 413,000 ethnic Armenian refugees and IDPs were registered in Armenia.

In May 1994 there was a cease-fire agreement, but since then no final settlement has been reached. There is no international monitoring of the cease-fire and, according to the U.S. Department of State, each year 30-40 people die due to cease-fire violations. The Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) mediation efforts have been going on for more than 15 years, but three peace plans were rejected in the first ten years. Since April 2004 new negotiations (Prague process) have been facilitated by the OSCE Minsk Group.

In general terms, the Azerbaijanis want the occupied areas to be returned to Azerbaijan, but

---

propose to give greater autonomy to Nagorno Karabakh. Armenia sees itself as a guarantor of Nagorno Karabakh's security and in particular of the security of ethnic Armenians living there. Armenia shows little willingness to return the other occupied territories – it rejected an offer from the President of Azerbaijan to route an oil pipeline through Armenia, entitling Armenia to some transit revenues in exchange for Armenia’s withdrawal. Nagorno Karabakh wants independence, but is willing to discuss the return of other occupied territories (with the exception of the Lachin corridor) if its own security is guaranteed.

In Nagorno Karabakh, a new de facto president was elected in July 2007. Unrecognized by the international community, the elections caused considerable controversy.\(^{25}\)

The United Nations General Assembly recently reaffirmed its continued support for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Azerbaijan within internationally recognized borders, and demanded the withdrawal of the Armenian forces.\(^{26}\)

The 2008 presidential elections in both Armenia and Azerbaijan led to further tensions. After a twenty-day state of emergency was declared in Armenia to deal with post-election protests, the most serious cease-fire violations in years were recorded.

The solution of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict is of geo-political importance for Russia, Iran, Turkey and even the EU. Regarding energy supply for example, the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan oil pipeline runs close to the cease-fire line and many actors have an interest in preventing clashes. Despite this, observers such as the International Crisis Group criticize failure of the EU, U.S. and Russia to effectively use economic and political pressure to bring about a settlement.\(^{27}\)

**EFFECTS OF THE CONFLICTS ON THE ECONOMIES OF THE REGION**

The conflicts in the region hinder the hopes to transform the South Caucasus into a transportation hub between East, West, North and South. It also could be an energy hub: the three possible alternative gas transit routes from the Caspian Sea to the EU (the Nabucco, Baku-Tbilisi-Erzurum and trans-Black Sea pipeline projects) depend on stability in the South Caucasus.

Since 1994, when the Nagorno Karabakh conflict gave way to a situation of ‘no war, no peace’, the different parties have faced mixed economic prospects. While oil has fed the vaults of government, economic security for the majority of the population remainscrippingly low. In Armenia, the psychological boost of military success over Azerbaijan is tarnished by lost economic opportunities, as economic migration to Russia and the West has reduced the population significantly. Nagorno Karabakh itself suffers from severe under-employment and is increasingly dependent on external support, particularly from Armenian diaspora groups in the West and from ‘inter-state’ loans from Armenia.

**MINE AND ERW CONTAMINATION IN THE REGION**

The most contaminated area in Southern Caucasus is along the borders and confrontation lines between Armenia and Azerbaijan, including the area in and around Nagorno Karabakh – possibly apart from South Ossetia, where renewed outbreaks of conflict do not allow a final assessment. For details on the contamination, see the chapters below on the two countries.

Within the territory of Georgia, apart from South Ossetia, the area of Abkhasia has been affected by mines and ERW.

REGIONAL MINE ACTION INITIATIVES

As mentioned, the whole region is far from stable, which makes regional cooperation a challenge. Regional initiatives mainly come through international actors such as the International Trust Fund (ITF), Geneva Call or the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL).

- The Slovenia-based ITF conducted a regional workshop on “Mine Action as Confidence Building Measure” in 2005 in Tbilisi, Georgia and another one on “Confidence Building and Regional Cooperation through Mine Action” in Almaty, Kazakhstan. ITF wants to further promote regional confidence building and cooperation through joint trainings, bilateral and/or multilateral assistance among national mine action programmes, or even through the establishment of a regional coordinative technical body in the field of mine action in South Caucasus. ITF also puts an emphasis on interregional cooperation between the South Caucasus and South East Europe. Knowledge transfer could be provided through lessons learned with the South Eastern Europe Mine Action Coordination Council (SEEMACC). Finally, ITF also has country specific activities in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia. ITF has not received any EC funding. The reason given was that ITF is too closely related with the Slovenian Government, and thus funding would be support to a EU member state. Therefore, support to the ITF initiatives came bilaterally (e.g. Slovenia and Canada) or through OSCE.

- The second regional mine action actor is the Geneva-based NGO Geneva Call. It received € 250,000 from the EC for its project “Engaging armed Non-State Actors in the South Caucasus in the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban”. The objective is to secure a firm commitment from the self-proclaimed authorities of Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Nagorno Karabakh to ban anti-personnel landmines. Activities range from promoting awareness of the region’s mine problem among civil society and national authorities, to capacity-building for local campaigns against APLs, providing confidence-building measures through increased dialogue, and encouraging the de facto authorities to sign Geneva Call’s Deed of Commitment.\(^{28}\)

- Geneva Call has conducted a number of workshops in the Southern Caucasus and contributed to the creation of a regional consortium of NGOs to facilitate civil society cooperation on a regional level. While holding frequent meetings with the de facto authorities, Geneva Call also met with the authorities of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia to inform them about the missions to the regions governed by the de facto authorities. Due to political sensitivities and the frozen conflict situation, a progressive approach is necessary to achieve the goals of Geneva Call.

- The difficult political situation affects the operations of the ICBL, which acts at the national level in all three countries: even for it, regional cooperation is difficult. The Armenia Campaign to Ban Landmines reported that due to the difficult political situation they no longer have good contacts to their counterparts in Georgia and Azerbaijan.

- Although it cannot be considered a regional initiative, the humanitarian demining NGO HALO Trust is active in various areas in the Southern Caucasus. The EC funded a humanitarian mine clearance and explosive ordnance disposal project in Abkhazia (Georgia) between October 2006 and November 2007. HALO had been working in

\(^{28}\) The Deed of Commitment is available at [www.genevacall.org/about/testi-mission/ec-04oct01-deed.htm](http://www.genevacall.org/about/testi-mission/ec-04oct01-deed.htm). The purpose of this deed of commitment is twofold. It is a mechanism whereby the self-proclaimed governments can adhere to the norms of the APMBC and thereby advance the cause of a mine-free world even though they are not recognised by the international community. This in turn may encourage the South Caucasus states to adhere to the APMBC. It also facilitates the implementation of new mine action programmes in the region.
Abkhazia since 1997 with most of the funding received from the U.S. Department of State until 2005. The EC decided to support HALO to enable it to complete its ongoing demining programme with the ultimate goal of declaring Abkhazia mine impact free at the end of 2007. As this goal was not achieved by 2007 HALO submitted another request for funding to the EC and other donors so that Abkhazia can be declared mine and UXO free in 2008. HALO also conducted various mine clearance programmes in Nagorno Karabakh which were not EC funded. An 18-month project started in 2005 helped the de facto authorities establish local mine clearance capacities, including a mine action centre. Unfortunately no further information on this project was provided to us: HALO Trust did not respond to questions from the evaluation team. This is rather unfortunate as HALO’s experience in these territories characterised by conflict and high political tensions would have certainly been relevant for this evaluation.

29 On several occasions the evaluation team requested more information from the HALO Trust on its project in Nagorno Karabakh, its assessment of the contamination in the region etc. Unfortunately this information was not provided. Although the project in Nagorno Karabakh is not EC funded, it would have been interesting for the overall conclusions of the regional evaluation to get more information from the only NGO which is undertaking mine action in both Nagorno Karabakh and Abkhazia.
4. COUNTRY FINDINGS: ARMENIA

SOCIO-ECONOMIC SITUATION IN ARMENIA

Armenia has enjoyed a double-digit growth rate in the last seven years. In 2007 GDP growth was 13.8%. GDP per capita in 2006 was $1,989. Steady economic progress has earned Armenia increasing support from international institutions. The International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), as well as other international financial institutions and foreign countries are extending considerable grants and loans to the country. In December 2005, the US Millennium Challenge Corporation approved a 5-year $235 million Compact with the Government of Armenia, which focuses on rehabilitation of irrigation networks and upgrading of rural transport infrastructure.

Despite these positive developments, like other New Independent States of the former Soviet Union, Armenia’s economy still suffers from the legacy of a centrally planned economy and the breakdown of former Soviet trading networks. In addition, the unresolved Nagorno Karabakh conflict and the related closure of the Azerbaijani border, as well as the closure of the Turkish border, has prevented Armenia from realising its economic potential. Armenia is dependant on outside supplies of energy and most raw materials. Land routes through Azerbaijan and Turkey are closed, though air connections to Turkey exist; land routes through Georgia and Iran are inadequate or unreliable.

Poverty is still high, at 25%. There are substantial differences in poverty levels between regions (marzes), as well as between rural and urban areas. These differences are mostly conditioned by the existing disparities of economic development, as well as territorial, physical-geographical and infrastructure development peculiarities. Poverty incidence is higher in marzes affected by the devastating earthquake in 1988, and remote, and border marzes (which have very unfavourable conditions for agriculture, especially with small share of irrigated agriculture land), as well as in marzes with mostly urban population.

ORIGIN AND EXTENT OF THE MINE AND ERW CONTAMINATION

Landmines and explosive remnants of war in Armenia mainly result from the Nagorno Karabakh
conflict between 1988 and 1994. Both Armenia and Azerbaijan laid landmines until 1994. As the mines were laid by untrained military staff, mine maps are inexistent or inadequate. For this reason, the precise extent of the contamination is difficult to determine.

After the 1994 cease-fire following the conflict, the Armenian army surveyed approximately 1,000 kilometres of borderline in Armenia. As a result, the Ministry of Defence of Armenia has estimated 50,000 to 80,000 emplaced landmines.

The (EC-funded) Landmine Impact Survey completed in 2005 identified 60 communities impacted by a total of 102 dangerous areas, summing to 321.68 square kilometres or 1.08% of the territory of Armenia. The contaminated areas are located in five marzes, all bordering Azerbaijan. The contamination is mainly in rural areas, blocking pasture and agriculture land. These figures are low in comparison with highly affected countries like Afghanistan (2,368 mine-impacted communities – after 14 year of mine action) or Angola (1,988 mine-impacted communities). But it is important to note that these figures do not include the territory of Nagorno Karabakh, the most affected part of the region, which remains under the control of the Armenian forces.

The majority (68%) of the 321.68 contaminated km² lay within closed military zones, formally inaccessible for civilians. Thirty-six communities with 50 SHAs are in the restricted areas. However, according to ICBL the mines in the restricted areas still have a humanitarian impact: there have been accidents since the residents face economic pressure to use these areas.

Figure 4 – Map: LIS results of impacted communities

32 Landmine Monitor 2008. In contrast, ANAMA claims (email from Nazim Ismaylov, 11 December 2008) that the Armenian minefields serve the border protection and are thus not a result of the conflict, but part of military policy. For this reason, ANAMA thinks all mine related data should be available at the Armenian MoD, and the contaminated area is much smaller than the LIS indicates.
33 From the Survey Action Centre website: http://www.sac-na.org/
Mines and other ERW are recognized as a significant barrier on the way of economic recovery in the country.\textsuperscript{34} The comparison between the results of the Landmine Impact Survey and the National Human Development Survey (NHDS, conducted by the Government of Armenia and UNDP in 2002 and 2003\textsuperscript{35}) showed that mine-affected communities are more isolated due to perceived social exclusion, poor roads and less access to markets than non-impacted communities in similar socio-economic and geographic environments. In affected communities, the percentage of very poor communities and landless households is considerably higher than in neighbouring non-affected ones.\textsuperscript{36}

It needs to be noted that the LIS does not cover the whole picture – in addition to the recorded dangerous areas, there are ammunition stockpiles and depots from Soviet times in Armenia.

\textbf{Figure 5 – Map recent victims}\textsuperscript{37}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & Ararat & Gegharkunik & Syunik & Tavoush & Vayots Dzor & Total communities & Total affected population \\
\hline
High & 0 & 0 & 2 & 2 & 0 & 4 & 4,052 \\
\hline
Medium & 3 & 4 & 6 & 16 & 2 & 31 & 48,349 \\
\hline
Low & 1 & 7 & 10 & 2 & 5 & 25 & 16,336 \\
\hline
Total & 4 & 11 & 18 & 20 & 7 & 60 & 68,737 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{34} From the Armenian Mine Action Strategy.
\textsuperscript{35} The NHDS was conducted in spring 2003. It covered 6,000 households in 170 rural and 41 urban communities selected from all regions of the country. The information collected was used to track human development, human poverty and progress in achieving the Millennium Development Goals. The main findings are summarized in the fifth issue of Armenia Social Trends \url{http://www.gov.am/old/enversion/programms_9/ahrc/ahrc_mshitakan_gorc_9_2.htm}
\textsuperscript{36} See Armenia LIS final report, pages 31-34.
\textsuperscript{37} From the Survey Action Center website.
In recent years, there have not been many mine or ERW victims: 2005 - 0 mines, 5 ERW; 2006 - 1 mine, 1 ERW; and 2007 – 1 mine. The Armenian Landmine Monitor 2005 reports a total of 403 victims between 1990 and 2004, with a peak between 1992 and 1999. These figures are likely to include military personnel. For comparison, in Afghanistan, there were 2,245 recorded victims between 2002 and 2004, 966 in 2005, 796 in 2006 and at least 811 in 2007.

MINE ACTION IN ARMENIA

National Mine Action Strategy

In 2006 with support from UNDP and participation of all mine action actors, Armenia produced a national mine action strategy, which includes a Mine Action End Strategy and a Strategic Plan for 2007-2010. It is available in Armenian and English languages.

The vision in the Strategy is a country free from the impact of mines and ERW. The responsibility lays with the Armenian authorities and the goals for demining, MRE, victim assistance, advocacy, information management and regulatory matters are formulated accordingly. Guidelines are provided for mine action priorities and various other issues, including the use of the LIS and support to national development plans. The strategy foresees the development of medium- and long-term plans, and of annual workplans.

The strategic goals of the Armenia Mine Action Strategic Plan for 2007-2011 are to:

1. Build capacities
2. Implement national humanitarian demining standards and standard operating procedures as a basis for a quality assurance system
3. Enable continuous and efficient humanitarian demining operations according to the needs of the country, available material and human resources, and recognized standards
4. Significantly reduce the level of mine risk to the population by mine risk education integrated with humanitarian demining operations (clearance, technical survey, marking)
5. Establish sustainable capacities for MRE within the education system
6. Support the assimilation of mine victims into society
7. Cooperate with local and international research and development centres
8. Cooperate on the international and regional levels to develop mine action capacities
9. Maintain communication with relevant public organizations, improve advocacy and domestic legal regulations.

Chapter 1 of the 2007-2011 plan also includes detailed operational objectives to meet the strategic goals. Chapter 2 provides detailed activity plans, divided by mine action pillars. The activity plans include timelines, expected results, and further guidance how to achieve these results. Finally, the financial requirements are listed by pillar and year.

---

39 Landmine Monitor 2008. Nine military personnel were also reported injured by mines, but it was not clear from reporting if these casualties occurred in Armenia or in Nagorno-Karabakh. Casualties may well be under-reported as there is no systematic casualty data collection.
42 The total funding requirement 2007-2011 is 14.3 billion AMD (about USD 36 million), of which over 96% is for humanitarian demining operations.
The Armenian Mine Action Strategy is a sound document. It could serve well as a basis for further planning for all mine action actors, including donors.

**Coordination**

The basic responsibility and authority for implementation of the mine action strategy lies with the Inter-Agency Governmental Commission on Mine Action, which is responsible for developing the National Mine Action Strategy plus long term and annual mine action plans; demining contaminated areas in support of economic development (through the Armenian Humanitarian Demining Centre – AHDC, see below); and mobilizing necessary resources. The Commission comprises representatives of relevant ministries and marzpets (heads of regional administrations). The priorities for mine clearance are based on recommendations of the Ministry of Defence and marzpets.

The Commission does not have any cooperation mechanisms with the NGOs working in this field. The need for such cooperation is accentuated in the Landmine Monitor Report 2006 and by the ACBL.

**Demining**

The AHDC was established in March 2002, mainly with U.S. funds. Based in Echmiadzin near Yerevan, it continues to be the implementing body for demining. The AHDC is essentially part of the Ministry of Defence, and thus purely military.

**Figure 6 – National Demining Structure in Armenia**

---

The AHDC took the lead in training of 200 deminers, dog handlers and other staff. Within the framework of a US-funded initiative, the AHDC conducted a pilot survey in the region of Tavoush in 2002. As well, mine clearance activities were conducted between 2003 and 2006 in the Syunik region.\(^\text{44}\)

The Ministry of Defence provides the only demining capacity in Armenia -- manual, mechanical and mine detection dogs (MDD). Its capacity to demine effectively is disputed. UNDP reported that there was no comprehensive dog breeding programme, which means that the dog capacity (currently 16) would fade out within 2-3 years. Furthermore, there is only one machine in Armenia, and there are more deminers than equipment. Conversely, AHDC claims to have a breeding programme for the dogs and assesses its demining equipment as sufficient,\(^\text{45}\) with the only need being in more machines.

Demining in Armenia has been slow, with low productivity. Only 1.04 km\(^2\) of land was cleared in the five years to 2006. In 2007, only 102,283 square metres were cleared according to AHDC: reasons given included weather conditions, which restricts clearance from May to October, and difficult terrain, which sometimes allows only the use of manual assets. Other countries with similar problems have better clearance rates. At the current rate, the clearance of just the areas outside the military restricted zone will require more than 1,000 years. If the current capacity is not increased, demining of the target area defined in the Strategy for 2007-2011 will take almost 80 years.

Quality assurance of the demining activities is done by the AHDC, which means there is no real external control.

**Mine Action Policy**

Armenian authorities say that they support the APMBC and Protocol II of the CCW in principle, but that adoption would put the country at a disadvantage so long as Azerbaijan refuses to sign them. However, Armenian authorities decided to submit (on a voluntary basis) to the UN Secretary General, the annual report required under Articles 11 and 13 contributing to global mine action.

The only visible civil society actor in the field of policy/advocacy in mine action is the Armenian Campaign to Ban Landmines (ACBL). After its establishment in 1999 through financial support of the ICBL, volunteers conducted projects such as the translation of the APMBC, as well as development and publication of a annual Landmine Monitor Reports for Armenia.

**Mine Risk Education (MRE)**

The first MRE activities in Armenia took place in the framework of the EC-funded mine action project in 2005 and were implemented through the Armenian Red Cross (ARC). In 2006, a bigger MRE project followed (not funded by the EC). Data from the LIS on affected communities was the basis for this project, but it started in 2006, 11 years after the conflict. The affected communities were puzzled about the purpose of the project as most accidents occurred during or immediately after the war.

\(^{44}\) Since 2005, the preliminary results of the LIS were used for priority setting by the Governmental Comission on Mine Action. The village Shurnukh in the Syunik region of Armenia was identified by the LIS as one of the four high impact communities.

\(^{45}\) AHDC spoke of 70 detectors and 26 demining kits.
In 2007 the EC-funded MRE project was terminated, and the Ministry of Education and Science included MRE in the curriculum. The fact that MRE has since been included in the course of “Primary Military Preparedness” indicates the military dimension the issue still has in Armenia. As all 1,400 schools in Armenia are covered, the awareness level among the younger generation should be high. Nevertheless, according to UNICEF, repeats of the courses will be required.

Victim Assistance
Victim assistance is the third mine action sector under civilian oversight (along with advocacy and MRE), under the Department on Disabled and Elderly People within the Ministry of Labour and Social Security. The Landmine Monitor 2007 reports it lacks resources, and that access to medical service and rehabilitation are a problem. Furthermore, military victims are better taken care of than civilian victims. UNDP in Armenia reported a lack of psycho-social reintegration services for victims.

The LIS reported that victim assistance needed expansion and capacity building, as well as a legislative framework. This contradicts the assessment of the ICRC in 2006, which concluded that the needs of victims were adequately met and ICRC assistance thus not needed.46 On 30 March 2007, Armenia signed the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its Optional Protocol.

Findings on Mine Action in Armenia
On the surface, it looks like all preconditions to reach an impact-free Armenia are present: a mine action capacity has been established; there is an excellent strategy; the Government claims that it views mine action as a priority; there are hardly any victims; and the contamination problem is limited. The reality, however, is much more complicated.

• The tensions concerning Nagorno Karabakh overshadow mine action efforts. Mine action is of interest to the Government to keep the border areas populated and to develop these for economic and political reasons. To this end the Government runs programmes in these areas, and mine action is seen as part of these.

• We were unable to obtain figures for financial allocations to mine action from the Defence budget. What is obvious, however, is that demining output is small, with no real prospect to achieve the goals of the 2007-2010 Strategic Plan, let alone those of the End State Strategy. In addition, the achievement of the goals of the National Mine Action Strategy is hampered by the fact that the document is not well known among the main mine action and development actors. The ACBL was unsure whether such a strategy existed and many others did not have the final version.

• The reasons for this, apart from the continuing security concerns, are: (i) limited resources, state funding seems modest, and there are almost no international funds provided;47 (ii) apart from the U.S., most international humanitarian mine action donors do not like to fund ministries of defence; (iii) there is no external oversight over demining, and no competition;48 (iv) demining is largely regarded as a military secret;49 and (vi) donors do not use the strategy as a basis for funding.

46 Herbi Almazi, Head of the Regional Preventive Mine Action Project, ICRC Azerbaijan.
47 The only funding provided and reported recently was € 20,800 by Slovenia, according to Landmine Monitor 2007.
48 This means pressure could only come through the GoA or through external donors and structures they set up.
49 There is not even a publicly available operational plan.
• The 2007-2010 Strategy foresees an annual increase in demining capacity of 37%, but this has not happened.

• The Strategy also mentions that the economic situation and the level of potential economic development are such that the support of the international community and specific donors will be necessary. There is no active effort to search for international funds;\(^{50}\)

• An open question remains how the restricted zones will be dealt with. No such plan seemed to exist at the time of the evaluation mission.

**Government of Armenia Programmes, Mine Contamination and Humanitarian Demining**

The Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) is one of the key government documents. The first PRSP (PRSP-1),\(^ {51}\) adopted in 2002, acknowledged the economic significance of mined areas. In paragraphs 270 and 271 it states that: “...A substantial part of agricultural lands is mined ... Mine clearing is extremely important; should this be fulfilled it is expected that cultivated lands will increase by 25% and the panic will subdue. In case mines are not cleared from the area, out-migration will persist”. It did not, however, formulate a specific project under PRSP for mine clearance: rather it referred to three government programmes, namely:

(i) *The program of “Post-conflict Rehabilitation in Near-border Regions of Armenia”*, which exclusively targets internally displaced people;

(ii) “*Initial program of improving residential conditions for residents of near-border regions damaged by bombing*”;

(iii) “*Comprehensive development program in near-border regions*” provided by the Law of Armenia on Adoption of the Comprehensive development program in near-border regions.

The second PRSP (PRSP-2),\(^ {52}\) in its current draft form (May 2008), does not even mention mined areas as a specific problem: rather, it views border areas as one of geographic priorities. The Program of the Government of Armenia, which was adopted in May 2008, follows the same approach.\(^ {53}\) Assistance to bordering regions is one of the six priorities of the Government.

Thus while there is a Mine Action Strategy in Armenia,\(^ {54}\) it is not explicitly linked to or reflected in the main Government Programs.

The Mine Action Strategy specifies three criteria for setting priorities – restricted or non-restricted status; level of impact defined during the LIS; and the poverty level of the community impacted by SHAs. The reasons for these criteria are as follows, according to the document:

---

\(^{50}\) For example, there are no appeals in UN portfolios since 2006. Furthermore, OSCE had mine action funds available in 2005, but did not receive a request from UNDP.

\(^{51}\) www.gov.am

\(^{52}\) The draft of the document was provided to the team by UNDP Armenia Country Office.

\(^{53}\) www.gov.am, currently available only in Armenian.

\(^{54}\) The Strategy was provided to the team by UNDP Armenia Country Office. It is not available on the government portal. Furthermore, many NGOs and other actors involved in the strategy elaboration process were not in possession of the latest version.
SHAs in military restricted (border) areas cannot be subject to humanitarian demining, unless there is a peace agreement and corresponding decision of the Government of Armenia.

The categorization of impacted communities according to the landmine impact survey scoring system provides a good and internationally acceptable assessment of the level of landmine/UXO impact in terms of human life and social-economic resources.

It is assumed that by eliminating social-economic blockages caused by landmine/UXO contamination, demining operations may contribute to the general poverty reduction strategy of the Government of Armenia. The assessment of the level of poverty in impacted communities is based on the results of National Human Development Survey.

Based on these criteria the following priorities were defined:

1st importance category – Communities with high level of impact and with suspected areas outside military restricted zone.

2nd importance category - Communities with medium level impact and with suspected areas outside military restricted zone that are qualified as very poor communities by the NHDS.

Table 10 – SHA size and blockages by categories of high and medium impact communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Total size (m²) **</th>
<th>Blockages eliminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Syunik</td>
<td>Yeghvard*</td>
<td>1,515,000</td>
<td>Pasture, Rain fed Cropland, Drinking Water, Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total area of SHA 1,515,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Gegharkunik</td>
<td>Kut*</td>
<td>4,756,000</td>
<td>Pasture, Rain fed Cropland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syunik</td>
<td>Nerqin Hand*</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>Pasture, Rain fed Cropland, Forest, Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total area of SHA 5,556,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL AREA - 7,071,000

* After demining, communities will become impact free.

** The total size indicates the total size of SHAs to be cleared in order to decrease the level of landmine/UXO impact on communities, for example, from high to medium.

The Mine Action Strategy stipulates that the demining plan for 2007-2011 aims at reducing mined areas by 7.07 km². The planned level of activity will result in only a 2.19% reduction of the current SHA and 6.81% of the SHA outside the military restricted zone by the end of 2011.

While the Mine Action Strategy clearly categorises the mines areas into (1) military restricted areas and (2) the rest of the mined areas, the various government programs are not explicitly tied to any clearance timetable of the areas subject to clearance (lands in the second category). The Strategy states that “The local community and individual have a central position in the planning and conduct of mine action. Therefore, integrated plans of Mine Action for impacted communities are of a key importance and will enable multiplication of the effects of mine action.

Almost half the 60 affected communities were the object also of surveys that the GoA and the UNDP conducted in 2002-03, under the designation of the “National Human Development Survey (NHDS)”. The NHDS comprised community, family, and family member surveys for estimating national and regional poverty levels.
In reality, the communities are not proactive in achieving the goals of mine clearance. By law, all communities in Armenia develop Local Economic Development (LED) plans. While mine clearance is often mentioned as an acute need in the LEDs originating from mine-affected regions, these plans do not necessarily become a basis for the clearance schedule, which is set by the MoD. The lack of budget resources for LED is cited by the experts as the key reason for this. Consequently, the population in affected areas rely on the central government as the only potential body for effective clearance and do not place their hopes with the community administrations.

**Opinions of and impact on communities**

Surveys conducted by the ACBL since 2001 indicate that the proportion of population supporting the decision of the Government of Armenia not to join the Ottawa convention is growing, from 42% in 2002, to 38.8% (2005), and 59.0% (2006), which is, most likely, a result of the increased military rhetoric by the Azerbaijan government in the last few years. At the same time, 47.7% of the respondents consider the decision as wrong due to the danger the mined areas pose for the local residents and the adverse impact on livelihoods. About half the population officially classified as poor lives in the bordering regions, and almost 80% of these do not have other sources of income than land. Especially worrying is the fact that 70.4% of the respondents in Syunik marz mentioned that the territories under the immediate use by the population are dangerous (the comparable rate is 47.8% in Tavush marz). The fact that many bordering regions were repopulated by the refugees from Azerbaijan, who did not have cultivation skills, exacerbates the situation.

While there is no evidence that aid agencies avoid implementing development projects in contaminated areas, their presence is limited: assistance is still largely concentrated in Yerevan and only recently has started drifting more noticeably towards regions. These communities are however in a need of a more targeted and increased assistance. More could be done in terms of coordinating Government efforts in mine clearance and the post-clearance development projects undertaken by aid agencies. For example, UNDP implements a Community Development Program in Armenia, which is not explicitly linked to demined communities. The need for that is increasingly being recognized.

**EC SUPPORT TO MINE ACTION IN ARMENIA**

**Description of the Project**

As mentioned above, the EC is the second biggest mine action donor in Armenia after the U.S. Between 2004 and the end of 2006, the EC provided € 1.4 million to the Armenia Humanitarian Demining Project. The project was implemented through UNDP, in cooperation with the Armenian MoD, AHDC and the Ministry of Territorial Administration and Infrastructure Coordination.

The objectives of the project were:

---

56. Source: interview with Nataly Lapauri, Communities Association of Armenia, May 10, 2008
58. Source: interview with the Deputy Minister of Labour and Social Welfare, Mr. Ara Petrossyan.
59. Landmine Monitor Report 2006, Armenian National Committee of ICBL.
60. Source: Interviews held by the team with UNDP Armenia, May 1, 2008.
61. The total cost for the project was € 1.45 million, minor co-funding of the project was provided by UNDP for the salaries of their own staff and the Government of Armenia for equipment.
• Conduct a full countrywide Landmine Impact Survey;
• Public awareness and MRE in mine affected areas;
• Targeted victim assistance in mine affected areas;
• Conduct a full technical survey, marking and clearance in the southern region: Syunik was selected as a pilot project; and
• Support to the AHDC.

The three-year project was subdivided in three parts: the LIS and MRE in the 1st year, technical survey in the 2nd year, and victim assistance and mine action legislation in the 3rd year.

The project achieved its objective of strengthening the national capacity for coordination and implementation of demining programs in Armenia. In its course, the Armenia LIS, a pilot technical survey and clearance, a public awareness campaign and mine risk education in high and medium impact communities were conducted.

The project ended on 31 December 2006 and has not been renewed. There has been no external evaluation of the project by the EC, but UNDP was responsible for continued monitoring and reporting. According to Landmine Monitor 2007, the EC conducted internal monitoring, but reference files were not made available for the evaluation team on request.

Findings on EC Support to Mine Action in Armenia
While it was not the task of the evaluation team to evaluate the project in detail, some observations relevant to our ToR can be made. Overall, the project certainly contributed to mine action in Armenia, but the following points seemed interesting:

EC inflexibility/shortfall with regards to victim assistance.
The EC-project started in 2005 with an 8 month delay due to difficulties in signing the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the MoD and in allocating state funds to the project. Once the MoU was signed, UNDP asked the EC for a no-cost extension, to be able to deal with all project components. This extension was not granted, which shortened the project to 28 months. For this reason, it was not possible to implement the victim assistance component, which was scheduled for the last phase of the project. UNDP returned 359,752 € to the EC.

Right balance?
The project was successful in some ways, particularly in the initial national capacity building, but not in getting the mines out of the ground. ACBL stressed that the LIS did not provide direct benefit to the affected populations, neither did the MRE campaign (as it was too late), the film about mine action in Armenia (mainly public relations), nor the victim assistance component, which was never implemented. However, as demining is a military issue and many of the affected areas are restricted, it would have been impossible to “just clear the mines” without military support. Furthermore, without signing the APMBC or a solution to the Nagorno Karabakh conflict, the sustainability of the clearance is questionable. These aspects make the sustainability of national capacity building a very important issue; even though Armenia has a small landmine problem and few recent victims, the problem requires a long-term solution.

Questionable sustainability due to lack of exit strategy
The achievements of the project (national capacity building & survey) require a strong national
commitment to be sustainable and useful, as well as the ability to access international funds, as additional actions are needed to really make a difference for the population. For the MoD and the AHDC, it is difficult to access international funds. Without UNDP, there is no longer external oversight or a civilian point of contact. As well, given increased security concerns, mine action is not naturally a Government priority, in spite of its declarations. This means there is a risk that the achievements will not be sustainable without continued EC commitment or follow-up projects, including particularly the continued effort to achieve greater Government commitment. Trying to achieve sufficient Government commitment in the given project period (and in the given conflict situation) proved to be unsuccessful. This situation has not been assessed or acknowledged by the EC prior to finishing the project and it did not feed into project modifications (for example extension of duration) or new project planning.

Effect of the termination of the project
There are a number of adverse effects due to the termination of the project. AHDC has been well staffed because a salary supplement was paid through the project. This supplement is no longer paid, which means that trained staff looked for other employment. At the end of the project, some important structures (such as a system to access international funds or an external quality assurance system) were not yet in place. Both are required for sustainability. As UNDP no longer deals with mine action, there is nobody who could communicate with the EC directly.

Bearing in mind there are no other big donors at present, clearance output dropped significantly, particularly as demining machinery is no longer maintained.

No mine action focal point in EC delegation
Nobody feels responsible for follow-up of the project within the EC Delegation in Armenia, or to integrate mine action within other EC-funded projects (for example, rural development). By now all EC funds for Armenia have been allocated until 2010, and changes will only be made if there are significant events. In addition, lapse in time since the end of the project, there is no institutional memory within the delegation.

No mine action focal point in UNDP
During the implementation period, there was a project team responsible for mine action at UNDP. This is no longer the case. When the project came to its end, the “institutional memory” was transferred to UNDP DG Portfolio; however, it has no focal point for mine action. As a result, nobody deals with mine action or applies for funds, and nobody has a vision or the “big picture” of mine action. As most positions are created within projects, it would now be the task of the office of the UNDP Resident Representative to advocate for mine action projects. This did not seem to be the case.

No support for national policy issues
This was not one of the core goals of the project, but it can be seen as a by-product. Considering that the bulk of mined areas are in closed military zones, but still have a socio-economic impact, who advocates for the clearance of these areas? (It needs to be noted that we heard reports that the local population sometimes does not want the mines to be cleared, because it feels protected by them.)

National ownership/handover
UNDP stated that at the end of the project there was a handover of all results, knowledge products, equipment and property to the GoA in compliance with UNDP rules. However, there was no sustainability plan developed as part of the project.
Landmine Impact Survey (LIS)
The results of the LIS are being used by the AHDC, but there is no systematic follow-up or update. It provided good and important bases for the national strategies and plans, but as these are not effectively implemented, the LIS becomes outdated and thus less relevant each year.

Relevance of the EC Mine Action Project
The EU/UNDP project was relevant for Armenia given the impact that mined areas have on livelihoods, poverty, and the development of the economies of the bordering regions.

The LIS has revealed the main needs that the EC project was meant to address. Hence, we assume that the project design should have responded to all the needs identified. While this is generally the case, one important aspect was overlooked. The Survey identified the need to educate people living in the contaminated areas about their social, economic and human rights, and in particular their entitlements in terms of economic and health benefits. Many people are not in a position to use the land allocated to them. Thanks to the efforts of the ACBL, farmers are now exempted from paying land tax if their lands are mined, but this is not well-known among residents. Mine victims are entitled to free health care, and again, not all know this. Unfortunately the project did not address these issues. Studies confirm a continued lack of knowledge of these rights by the residents in contaminated areas.\(^6^3\)

In addition, one of our findings is that different project partners did not in fact coordinate closely their activities, even if they were working in the same communities.

CONCLUSIONS
Compared to other countries, Armenia has a modest landmine and mine victim problem. Still, mines, ERW and other munitions have significant socio-economic effect in the border areas.

For the most part, Armenia has a well established mine action sector. However, the MoD dominates the sector, which has some disadvantages:

- Limited opportunities for the AHDC to engage more actively with communities, civil society organisations and international bodies;
- A focus on demining rather than on the overall coordination of all pillars of mine action;
- Lack of involvement of affected communities into demining priority-setting;
- Constrained opportunities for international fundraising;
- No external oversight.

The slow pace of mine clearance may have various reasons, but overall the evaluation team did not get the impression that there is strong motivation to reaching the end state as described in the Mine Action End Strategy. Important steps for meeting the goals of the 2007-2010 Strategic Plan are not visible, particularly regarding fundraising and increasing demining capacity.

There is no explicit link between the Armenian Mine Action Strategy and various Government Programmes. Even though the Government representatives stated mine action is a priority, there are no significant financial contributions reported at present.

The unresolved Nagorno Karabakh conflict overshadows mine action.

The EC-funded project has been one of the key mine action projects in Armenia, and it has contributed to meeting the needs of the country in mine action.

Capacity building efforts in Armenia have been structured and successful, with a steering committee separate from the implementing body, management tools like the LIS, and a good mine action strategy in place. However, a different approach with a greater focus on clearance and victims would have been possible.

With the focus on capacity building, it should have been important to do a proper handover and put sustainability measures in place, instead of just ending the project.

At present, there is no clear responsibility for mine action within the EC delegation or UNDP in Armenia, which means there is a loss of institutional memory and no continuity.

The decisions not to prolong the project and not to plan an evaluation or a follow-up project were not made for strategic reasons: they were just the consequences of the termination of the mine action thematic budget line. Continued capacity building is not foreseen in the new CSP.

The National Mine Action Strategy, produced during the course of the EC-funded project, was not used as a basis for further analysis of funding requirements.

The LIS served as a basis for the national strategy and for priority-setting for the limited clearance undertaken. However, it is not updated systematically and will soon be outdated.

The LIS proposals on victim assistance have not been implemented, in part due to the refusal to grant a no-cost extension to the EC-funded project.

Overall, the EC-funded project had some merit, but it had to deal with three main problems: the unresolved Nagorno Karabakh conflict, the lack of continuity and the absence of an exit strategy. The concept of national capacity building has been good, but it needs long-term attention and follow-up monitoring, to ensure Government commitment. Moreover given the modest scale of the mine problem, clearance and victim assistance could have been addressed in a more effective way.
5. COUNTRY FINDINGS: AZERBAIJAN

Figure 7 – Map of Azerbaijan

SOCIO-ECONOMIC SITUATION
GDP growth rate in real terms in 2007 was 23.4%. This is impressive, and continuing for a number of recent years, high economic growth is attributable to large and growing oil exports. Oil production declined through 1997, but registered an increase every year since. Production-sharing arrangements with foreign firms, which have committed $60 billion to long-term oilfield development, should generate the funds needed to spur future development. A consortium of Western oil companies began pumping one million barrels a day from a large offshore field in early 2006, through a $4 billion pipeline it built from Baku to Turkey’s Mediterranean port of Ceyhan. By 2010 revenues from this project could double the country’s current GDP.

Baku has begun making progress on economic reform, and old economic ties and structures are being replaced. While oil resources brighten economic prospects, obstacles like the continuing Nagorno Karabakh conflict impede Azerbaijan’s progress. Long-term prospects will depend not only on world oil prices but also the location of new oil and gas pipelines in the region, and the conflict hampers Azerbaijan’s prospects for such infrastructure investments.

ORIGIN AND EXTENT OF THE CONTAMINATION
The scope of the problem described here refers to the accessible territory of Azerbaijan. The mine and ERW problem in Azerbaijan stems from the Nagorno Karabakh conflict between 1988 and 1994, and from the Soviet era. The British firm BACTEC conducted a survey in 1998, but it only provided a general picture of a small part of the potential problem, because most areas, including Nagorno Karabakh, were not accessible. The information provided by the BACTEC survey indicated limited mined areas and a predominantly ERW problem.

Minefields were laid by the Azerbaijani and the Armenian armies. Many of them were not recorded. The ERW problem was not only caused by the conflict, but also through the 1991 explosion of a munitions warehouse at the biggest Soviet military base in Southern Caucasus.

65 Nagorno Karabakh, adjoining Jabrayil, Zangilan, Gubadly, Lachin, Kelbajar, and partly – Fizuli, Terter and Aghdam districts are under the control of Armenian forces.
The contamination in Aghstafa district stems from this event. Other suspected hazardous areas were contaminated as a result of military training in the 1970s.

A LIS was conducted in Azerbaijan from September 2002 to June 2003. The survey covered all of Azerbaijan, apart from the areas occupied by Armenian forces and the Autonomous Republic of Nakhchivan, the Azerbaijani exclave between Turkey and Armenia. A total of 480 communities in 11 districts were found to be impacted by mines or ERW, and 970 SHA totalling 736 km$^2$ were identified, mainly along the border with Armenia and the occupied territories, but also further inland in places where the munitions storage facilities exploded or military training took place. The impact of the contamination on the 480 communities, was high in 11 (2%), medium in 101 (21%) and low in 368 (77%) cases. Two-hundred, thirty three communities are affected by UXO only, 164 by mines and UXO, and 83 by mines only. The main impact is blockage of pasture and agriculture land.\(^{66}\)

**Figure 8 – Map surveyed districts and impacted communities (based on LIS)**\(^{67}\)

![Map of surveyed districts and impacted communities](image)

The Fizuli district in the south and the Aghastafa district further north are most affected, but the major problem in Aghastafa comes from the exploded munitions depot and has a low socio-economic impact.

In late 2006, on request of the Azerbaijan National Mine Action Authority (ANAMA), a 'Re-survey' was undertaken by the local government authorities of the 11 mine/UXO affected districts. Their reports have partly confirmed the results of the LIS. However, the re-survey reduced the contamination estimations from 736 to 306 km$^2$. Some new areas were identified.

---

\(^{66}\) Figures do not include 163 communities that were affected by the destroyed military depot in Aghstafa.

\(^{67}\) From the Survey Action Center website.
through ongoing mine action activities.

Approximately 287 km$^2$ of land are reportedly suspected as mine/UXO contaminated as of end-2007. In 2008, ANAMA expects to clear approximately 12 km$^2$ of mine/UXO contaminated land and cancel about eight km$^2$ through re-surveying SHA. This is a significant amount, particularly in comparison with the achievements in Armenia in the same time period.

**Figure 9 – Mine/UXO Contamination Map as of End 2007**

ANAMA expects that the areas under Armenian control have an extensive mine/ERW contamination with an estimated area of 350 to 830 km$^2$ affected with 50 to 100 thousand mines.

The total number of landmine/ERW victims in Azerbaijan remains unclear. The LIS recorded 52 victims in 33 communities in the two years preceding the survey (2000-2002), mainly in Fizuli, Tovuz, Aghstafa and Gasakh. The EC-funded 2004 ANAMA countrywide Mine/UXO Victims Needs Assessment survey identified 1,883 mine survivors, including military personnel. The Landmine Monitor 2007 reports 59 victims in 2005 and 17 in 2006. In 2007, ANAMA registered 20 victims, of which 15 were military. AzCBL reported 32 new mine/ERW casualties in 2007. Altogether, ANAMA keeps records on about 1,968 victims.

---

68 From the ANAMA website: www.anama.baku.az
69 Landmine Monitor 2008.
70 The total number of persons with disabilities in Azerbaijan as of end 2007 is reported to be 16,664. This figure was used by the Azerbaijani NGO Ojag when applying for EC funds, with a general reference to statistical information. The number includes WW II and other war veterans, Chernobyl victims, general invalids, invalids from birth etc.
Table 11 – Table: Mine/UXO victims in Azerbaijan by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                    | Killed | Injured | Killed | Injured | Killed | Injured | *
| As of December 2004 | 289 | 1,652 | 8 | 34 | 44 | 204 | 341 | 1,890 |
| During 2005        | 7 | 23 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 22 | 10 | 40 |
| During 2006        | 2 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 |
| During 2007        | 6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 14 |
| During 2000        | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 |
| During January - May 2009 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| During June 2009   | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Total              | 395 | 1,722 | 9 | 39 | 46 | 220 | 361 | 1,999 |

* Data on injured people has been updated starting from July 2006 report based on the results of most recent Country Wide Mine Victims Needs Assessment.

MINE ACTION IN AZERBAIJAN

Coordination & Operations

ANAMA, established in July 1998 by a Presidential Decree under the State Commission for Reconstruction and Rehabilitation of War-Affected Territories, is responsible for planning, coordinating, managing and monitoring of mine action countrywide. ANAMA is also the executing agency for demining and other mine action activities in cooperation with affected communities and other partners.

ANAMA lists the main achievements of Azerbaijani mine action as follows:

- Headquarters of ANAMA in Baku, two Regional Offices in Horadiz, Fizuli district and Khanlar district established and fully operational
- Landmine Impact Survey completed and data mapped and stored
- MRE integrated into school curriculum and covers 38,000 children in 920 schools of war-affected districts
- 60 community MRE groups active in 3 affected districts
- 4 technical survey teams, 160-person manual clearance capacity, and 60-person UXO clearance team, as well as 32 mine dog detection (MDD) teams trained and operational, plus 5 mechanical demining machines supported by a 13-person team
- National training and quality assurance team established and fully operational
- 175 minefields and more than 447 battle areas cleared (that directly benefit a total of about 174,000 people) and handed over to local authorities
- 63,728,879 m² of suspected land cleared, 138 anti-personnel, 164 anti-tank landmines and 298,468 UXO destroyed
- Countrywide mine victim needs assessment conducted.

---

71 From ANAMA monthly report, June 2009.
As of end-2007, the total number of people involved in mine action in Azerbaijan is 517, along with the MDD and machines.

The guiding documents are the Azerbaijan National Strategic Plan and the ANAMA Principles. The first National Strategic Plan was produced in 2000, with a new version prepared in 2003 after the LIS. The core aim is to clear all high impact areas by end 2008. A new National Mine Action Strategic Plan for 2008-2013 has been prepared (see below, sub-chapter on strategy).

The ANAMA Principles, apart from effectiveness, safety, efficiency and socio-economic impact, cover more detailed operations criteria, including the pre-conditions that the territory needs to be secure and free from fighting. Demining has to match national priorities, as well as specific prioritization criteria (e.g. casualty reduction, socio-economic need and IDP resettlement).

The Government of Azerbaijan (GoAz) sees mine action as a priority and has contributed significant funds. After the USA, the GoAz is the second biggest contributor.

ANAMA is well linked in the mine action sector and cooperates with international partners such as Cranfield University, James Madison University, the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET), the International Trust Fund (ITF), and the GICHD. The closest cooperation is with the Croatian Mine Action Centre. In Azerbaijan, ANAMA also works with international partners such as UNICEF, Red Cross, IOM and, in the past, with MAG. ANAMA objects, however, to the mine action by HALO Trust in Nagorno Karabakh, stressing that HALO has no permission to work in the area, and does not present reports on its work.

73 From the ANAMA website.
There are two local NGOs operating in mine action in Azerbaijan – Relief Azerbaijan (RA) and International Eurasia Press Fund (IEPF). Both conduct demining and MRE activities, IEPF is also active in victim assistance. They have between 80 (RA) and 120 (IEPF) staff. Both NGOs receive training, equipment and the vast majority of their funds from ANAMA, and are thus almost 100% dependant on ANAMA.

A more independent civil society organisation is the Azerbaijani branch of the Campaign to Ban Landmines (AzCBL). After some difficulties to get registered, it started work in 1998. AzCBL states it has good cooperation with countries in the region. However, Armenia did not participate in seminars organised in Baku in the previous years. In 2007, Norway implemented a cluster munitions survey in Azerbaijan through AzCBL, which – according to AzCBL – ANAMA had not appreciated. ANAMA had expressed concern that the survey would have been more efficient if it had been involved, because it has better access to all regions of Azerbaijan and a database of previously surveyed areas. The issue has now been resolved.

At present, no commercial companies are active in mine action in Azerbaijan. ANAMA feels they are not needed considered the current scale of contamination. However, plans exist to conduct tenders in future with the local NGOs and companies.

**Funding**

The mine action programme in Azerbaijan has a broad funding base including GoAz contributions. Funding is summarized in the table below:

*Figure 11 – ANAMA funding overview (from ANAMA)*

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) was the first organisation to carry out MRE in Azerbaijan when it disseminated material and information among IDPs in 1996. ICRC support continued until 2000 when responsibility in this area was handed over to ANAMA. In 2001 UNICEF, in close cooperation with ANAMA and the Ministries of Health and Education, launched a major MRE initiative with funding from the U.S. The project involved the training of

---
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75 E-mails from Emil Hasanov, ICBL researcher for Azerbaijan, 12 and 19 March 2009.
508 health workers and 1,043 teachers. It also oversaw the mainstreaming of MRE into the health education system and national school curriculum.

Victim Assistance
A victim support needs assessment conducted in 2004 noted that, while ICRC and government prosthetic centres provide orthopaedic assistance to mine and UXO victims, psycho-social and vocational rehabilitation was neglected. As a result, UNICEF developed an integrated approach to victim assistance, incorporating components such as psychological rehabilitation, social adaptation, and vocational training. ANAMA assisted in the process through data collection and management of victim related data, and intends to continue coordination and information sharing.

Mine Action Strategy
The first national strategy was developed in 2000, based on 1998 survey information. It outlines ANAMA’s responsibilities, structure and capacity building goals. The strategy does not explicitly mention the need for an LIS, but did highlight the need for survey data and the IMSMA system. It also includes a short paragraph on resource mobilisation, outlining responsibilities for UNDP in the initial phase and the subsequent take-over by the GoAz and ANAMA.

The LIS served as a basis for the 2004-2008 strategy, which was developed with the support of Cranfield University. The strategy foresees the elimination of all high and medium impacted areas in Azerbaijan (about 36 km$^2$) by end 2008, as well as continued MRE and victim assistance. Furthermore, the strategic objective 3 was to Develop processes to reduce risk posed by mines and UXO in newly liberated areas of Azerbaijan by 2006.

In 2005, the World Bank conducted a Review of Demining Activities$^{76}$ in Azerbaijan. The assessment was done at a stage when peace seemed achievable for Nagorno Karabakh. It was very positive about ANAMA and meeting the objectives of the 2004-08 strategy, but strongly recommended the development of a strategy to expand the programme in the event of a peace agreement with Armenia. Priorities for the strategy were also provided.

The 2009-2013 strategy is based mainly on the overall state plan on socio-economic development and is only available in the Azerbaijani language. The strategy foresees mine action as part of the Government programme for socio-economic development and as an important component of the long-term strategy for Nagorno Karabakh.

Mine Action Policy
The Republic of Azerbaijan has not acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty or to Additional Protocol II of the CCW. While it still states that it cannot accede until the Nagorno Karabakh conflict has ended, Azerbaijan has shown signs of support for a ban of landmines as well as greater willingness to discuss the landmine issue. For example, ANAMA states that Azerbaijan complies with the requirements of the Convention and will accede once the war is over. In addition, Azerbaijan has submitted a transparency report in 2008, following Article 7 of the APMBC.$^{77}$

$^{77}$ Excerpt from the Geneva Progress Report (APLC/MSP.9/2008/WP.1, unofficial version of 8 December 2008) of the 9th Meeting of State Parties: Since the 8MSP, three States not parties – Azerbaijan, Morocco and Poland submitted a voluntary transparency report. Poland shared information on all pertinent matters mentioned in Article 7. Azerbaijan and Morocco did not provide transparency information on stockpiled antipersonnel mines.
Way Ahead

Following the strategies, the GoAz is planning to further increase its contributions to mine action. However, ANAMA stressed that it is important for ANAMA not to lose its international partners and support.

ANAMA plans to transform the Khanlar Training Centre (KTC), which is part of its regional base, into an international training centre; principally for the Caucasus, but also Central Asia, the Middle East, East and South-East Asia, Afghanistan, Iran, and Turkey. The KTC was established in 2004 with financial support of the EC and other donors, and from the GoAz.

Findings on Mine Action in Azerbaijan

While it was not possible to assess ANAMA in detail, the evaluation team had a clear impression that ANAMA has a working structure and is very active, not just in Azerbaijan but also in regional or international mine action events. ANAMA has well qualified and bi- or multilingual staff. This contributes to international recognition of ANAMA and good cooperation with international partners.

In addition, ANAMA is well financed. As it is not under the MoD, ANAMA has freedom to access donors directly. The Government also contributes, with the ultimate goal of clearing Nagorno Karabakh. ANAMA is a capacity building success story, and EC support significantly contributed to this. However, the sound funding base for ANAMA does not mean that donors should end support without a proper exit strategy.

At present, it appears that communities accessible to ANAMA are not facing major development constraints because of mine contamination. The major problem remains Nagorno Karabakh.

Mine action is overshadowed by the unresolved Nagorno Karabakh conflict. The main affected areas, including Nagorno Karabakh, are inaccessible to ANAMA. The situation is worse than three years ago when an agreement between the belligerent countries seemed close and plans for mine action in the inaccessible areas were being made. Nevertheless, the latest strategy considers the possibility of working in the ‘liberated’ areas in the future. Re-gaining control over Nagorno Karabakh and the re-settlement of IDPs and refugees in this territory is a political priority for which mine action will be necessary. It is hard to assess if the planned capacities will be sufficient to deal with the problem, but it is good that the mine problem is acknowledged by the GoAz, and it can be assumed that international support will be provided.

Supposedly, the two local NGOs, RA and IEPF, were established to promote civil society, but they remain dependant on the state. This is normal in Azerbaijan, which has a weak civil society. Dealing with civil society organisations is still new and needs further time and development.

The centralised system is also reflected in the responsibilities of the regional mine action centres. Although these are well staffed and equipped, all operational decisions are made by ANAMA headquarters. The system was reported to be efficient, but the need for further delegation of responsibilities was also acknowledged by the director of ANAMA.

By and large, ANAMA works in a planned fashion and achieves its goals. Its structure matches the tasks. However, at present there is no real external quality assurance. This would change if more tasks were contracted out, and ANAMA did the quality assurance on other operators.

---

78 The ANAMA director pointed out (e-mail from Nazim Ismaylov, 10.03.2009) that a team of five deminers has been
ANAMA is a state agency and could be drawn into a future conflict: what could protect ANAMA from Government pressure? UNDP played a buffer role, but is no longer a strong partner. Donors do not play a strong role in this regard.

In sum, ANAMA currently considers itself in a learning phase. It is preparing itself to deal with mine/UXO contamination in Nagorno Karabakh. However, should there be rapid progress in resolving the frozen conflict, it still needs to be seen that the mine action capacity can be increased that quickly. A clear concept for this has not been presented; only rough figures of what might be required. UNDP reported that the GoAz has a ‘Great Return’ project in case of a peace agreement, and mine action is part of the plan. However, UNDP doubts that ANAMA will be able to handle the rapid extension at this stage.

**EC SUPPORT TO MINE ACTION IN AZERBAIJAN**

In 2001, the Deputy Prime-minister of Azerbaijan requested financial support from the EC for the Azerbaijan Mine Action Programme. In conjunction with ANAMA and UNDP, the EC examined the ANAMA work plan and decided to fund the LIS. Two other projects followed (see below).

**Description of the Projects**

The EC funded three projects in Azerbaijan via UNDP:

- 2002-2003 Azerbaijan LIS & Clearance (€ 1,337,153)
- 2003 Capacity building ANAMA (€ 1,314,101)
- 2005 Demining, Victim Data Collection & Assistance (€ 1,000,000)

The LIS was coordinated by UNDP, managed by the Survey Action Center (SAC) and implemented by the local NGO, IEPF. ANAMA only acted as a supporting agency, as the LIS aimed to be an independent assessment. Despite this, ANAMA co-funded parts of the LIS. LIS data was entered into the IMSMA database, consequently serving as the basis for priority setting.

Remaining funds from the LIS project were used for equipment procurement for ANAMA which was used mainly for the clearance of the former Soviet munitions storage facility in the Aghstafa region. Since January 2005, NATO/NAMSA have taken on the work on this site in cooperation with ANAMA.

For the second EC-funded project, ANAMA agreed the following priorities with the EC:

1. Establishment of the mechanical demining capacity
2. Establishment of the second regional base
3. Mine Risk Education
4. Mine Victims Support
5. National Capacity Support

After international tendering, a Bozena 4 was procured for mechanical demining.
The ANAMA regional office in Khanlar was built with financial support from the EC and other donors as well as the GoAz. The regional office includes a Training Centre.

With support from UNICEF, the MRE achievements in 2004 were the production of MRE material, training of volunteers and the establishment of committees in affected communities. The project also started the process of integrating MRE in the school curricula.

Regarding victim assistance, an assessment was conducted during 5 months. The results served for planning of assistance programmes.

The national capacity support component of the EC funded project supported ANAMA to improve coordination, management and operations.

The third EC-funded project included the following priorities proposed by ANAMA:

1. Further development of the capacity for area reduction, marking and fencing
2. Mine Risk Education
3. Mine Victim Assistance

A new machine, a Bozena 5, was purchased in 2005 to enhance the capacity for area reduction.

Based on results from the 2004 survey, pilot victim assistance projects were implemented in 2006. The focus was on medical care and physical rehabilitation, reintegration, legal support, and continued needs assessment to adjust the victim assistance strategy. Affected communities were also strengthened to deal with victims.

MRE took place in schools and communities. Further progress was made to continuously integrate MRE in school curricula.

The mine action projects in Azerbaijan were centrally managed from Brussels. Since 2002 the EC was represented in Azerbaijan by the so-called Europa House, replaced in May 2008 by a fully-fledged EC Delegation. However, deconcentration will only be finalised end 2008, when all projects have been handed over to the EC Delegation in Baku.

The EC conducted a monitoring visit in 2006 led to a report on the project achievements. The monitoring team was generally positive, but saw problems in the quality of the project design and the efficiency of implementation. It proposed a revision to the intervention logic, separating overall objectives, specific objectives and results planned for the EC project from those of other donors or the state budget. Regarding efficiency, the monitoring team mentioned that activities had been slow to start, and MRE activities were carried out on an ad hoc basis which, according to them, explains why fewer results were achieved than planned. Effectiveness, impact and potential sustainability of the project were rated as good. The assessment does not include points on funding requirements beyond the term of the project nor other projections of requirements. There is no documentation on changes to the project as a result of the monitoring visit.
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79 Fuad Bagirov and Hennie Maters, 25.10.2006.
80 The evaluation team does not go along with this recommendation, because it would normally lead to greater fragmentation, which increases transaction costs and reduces effectiveness.
Findings on EC Support to Mine Action in Azerbaijan

The EC-funded projects had clear results, and national ownership was promoted through the fact that the GoAz contributed to the projects. Project decisions were based on needs assessments and relevant documentation. The sequencing of the projects, with area reduction, MRE and victim assistance building on capacity building, data collection and strategic and operational planning, makes sense. Looking at the degree of contamination, the projects were relevant for Azerbaijan.

An LIS is a good starting point for mine action planning, but is not a panacea. An LIS does not reflect national development plans and the data may get outdated rapidly, so follow-up work is required such as re-survey and updates from development plans. These actions were taken in Azerbaijan. At the same time, the LIS was not detailed enough for operational planning and created large suspected hazardous areas that needed to be reduced afterwards. One reason for this is that the LIS was conducted in winter and many areas were inaccessible.

ANAMA has not received EC funding since 2007, despite its request for further financial support. While the effects of do not appear overly negative as ANAMA has a number of other donors, the decision not to continue funding was not based on a strategic analysis. The EC desk officer confirmed that he was content with the projects and the cooperation with ANAMA, and that he wished to continue funding, but he was not aware of options for doing so in the absence of the APL thematic budget line. At the same time, his priority was border management, which meant mine action could not consume too much of his work time.

There was insufficient effort by the EC to prepare ANAMA for the ending of the thematic budget line. Initially, ANAMA did not understand that mine action had to be mentioned in the CSP in order to continue receiving EC funds. Once ANAMA realised this, the GoAz had already made the decisions on the priorities included in the CSP (mentioning mine action only in the context of Nagorno Karabakh). ANAMA is now taking measures to build up the necessary connections and support systems to include mine action for development and resettlement (irrespective of a solution of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict) in the Azerbaijani CSP in the future.

UNDP reported having advised the EC that the current funding system does not work for ANAMA. According to UNDP, ANAMA’s chances of accessing funds through the government system are slim as the process is very competitive. In addition, ANAMA can no longer use EC funds to attract government contributions, a process that worked well in the past. UNDP emphasised the importance of sustainability. The EC did not announce the ending of the budget line and the implications this would have. Also, if there is no exit strategy, sustainability is even harder to achieve, particularly if all donors depart at the same time. In the case of mine action in Azerbaijan, the U.S. (the biggest donor) is also planning to reduce funds significantly.

At this stage, the sustainability of the project is not yet in danger due to the termination of EC funding. In addition, it is not clear in the current situation of continued conflict that additional EC support was warranted. However, the EC should have reviewed the situation from a strategic perspective prior to simply terminating funding, to assess all options and arrive at an informed decision. A vision and long-term strategy of what EC mine action could achieve would have been valuable: otherwise, project decisions seem ad hoc and reactive.
6. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

The unresolved Nagorno Karabakh conflict is the overarching issue for Armenia and Azerbaijan and influences all decisions. Without successful peace negotiations there is a threat of renewed fighting, which would result in new contamination. Consequently, mines and ERW are a cross-border problem, but it is not clear how to get the belligerent countries and Nagorno Karabakh together agree on a political solution. Engagement will be needed on a regional level. There should be strong efforts to link mine action with regional peace building measures, including SALW, border management, police training, and/or security policies. Should there be a solution for the Nagorno Karabakh conflict, significant support to enhance current mine action capacities will be required.

The individual EC-funded projects have been good, but the EC did not assume a coordination role in mine action in the Southern Caucasus. Such a role could have been valuable given the involvement in mine action of EU member states.

EC PROGRAMMING STRATEGY

The programming decisions for the Southern Caucasus followed the EC mine action strategies for 2002-04 and 2005-07. As neither Armenia nor Azerbaijan are party to the Ottawa Convention or the CCW and its Protocols, EC programming decisions for mine action in the Southern Caucasus must have been based on humanitarian and development aims, as defined in the EC mine action strategies, as well as political considerations.

On request of ANAMA, the EC also considered the national mine action strategy in Azerbaijan for its programming. In Armenia, this does not seem to be the case – there was a strategy, but it did not serve as a basis for decision making. After 2007, none of the national mine action strategies fed into the EC country strategies.

The CSPs mention mine action in the event that the Nagorno Karabakh conflict is resolved, but not as a continued need. This raises two questions: (i) how can it be assured that mine action is considered in the relevant EC strategy papers? And (ii) even if it is considered, how can it be assured that the EC strategy is implemented?

ERW in Southern Caucasus present a regional, cross-border problem, but the EC response has been to implement projects mainly at the country level. The EC mine action programme in Southern Caucasus has no clearly defined end-state goal. There is no exit strategy or provision for funding continuity. This endangers the sustainability of the projects, particularly the capacity building components.

As mine action is only mentioned in the short-term component of the Stability Instrument, it is not a suitable mechanism to support longer term and developmentally oriented projects. This is even more important for projects which include longer-term capacity building, such as the EC-funded projects in the Southern Caucasus.

There was a lack of effective monitoring and evaluation, the results of which could have fed into programming decisions. There certainly are reasons pro and contra further funding in Southern Caucasus, but the various options have not assessed. As a matter of fact, there is no capacity within the EC to assess these aspects in a strategic manner. Furthermore, there are shortcomings in institutional memory due to staff turnover and an inadequate filing system.
The evaluation team could not find a clear mechanism for mine action strategy development for Southern Caucasus within the EC. This lack became particularly clear when observing that the political aspects of mine action have not been covered, even though they were relevant in the given situation.

EFFICIENCY OF EC SUPPORT
The evaluation team is not in a position to assess the efficiency of the individual mine action operations, but it can observe that EC funding goes through many layers: EC to UNDP, UNDP to others (like for example SAC, who in turn worked with VVAF and Ronco). Each additional layer adds to administrative costs.

It has also been beyond the terms of reference of the evaluation team to assess the performance of key implementing partners, such as UNDP. By experience, the quality of UNDP mine action varies from country to country. The evaluation team could not find a clear mechanism within the EC to assess the quality of UNDP, or of other intermediate organisations. For this reason, EC programming for Southern Caucasus could not benefit from information highlighting whether or not UNDP has been the right partner.

RELEVANCE OF EC SUPPORT
The ENPI identifies Southern Caucasus as an important partner for the EU, relevant for its safety and security. From a global perspective, the Southern Caucasus has a smaller mine and ERW problem than some other regions, but it still is significant and affects the population. For this reason, the decision to fund mine action programmes in the region is relevant.

Even if there are other regional security threats such as weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, or small arms and light weapons, mines and ERW have an impact on the local populations. As well, a successful intervention in mine action could provide a point of entry for more projects aimed at these other regional security issues. This, however, would require that the EC considered mine action within the broader strategic framework of regional security.

In both Armenia and Azerbaijan, the EC projects significantly contributed to setting up a national capacity and directly helped to reduce the contamination. Hence, EC support for mine action projects in Southern Caucasus has been relevant. However, most of the projects (apart from the Geneva Call project) did not include a regional conflict resolution aspect or any regional aspect at all. The political dimension of mine action has been widely excluded. Even though there is a RSP pointing out the importance of mine action, the only regional initiatives came from international NGOs. Efforts to address the mine and ERW problem would benefit from a regional approach, as well as from drawing attention to the management of the political aspects of mine action in the region So far, the EC has no clearly designated capacity to deal with this.

The EC projects have been a good entry point for mine action in the region, but national capacity building projects require longer term commitment and follow-up capacities.

EFFECTIVENESS OF EC SUPPORT
The contamination problems have been addressed effectively to a degree, even though the focus of some projects, particularly in Armenia, could have been more on clearance and victim assistance. National ownership has been fostered (to a high degree in Azerbaijan). Support to civil society organisations could have been more pronounced. The link to development priorities
has been made most of the time (for example, based on the findings of the LIS or through the national development plans), but not always translated into action plans with budgets.

Of course EC-funded mine action can only be effective in areas where projects have been implemented. Due to the ongoing conflict, Nagorno Karabakh has not received any EC support for mine action, even though mine action is possible (HALO is operating there). The question for the EC is whether it would be politically feasible or beneficial to fund such mine action.

There is an implementation problem within the EC: the ENPI Regional Strategic Plan (RSP) is implemented through bilateral Action Plans, which did not lead to continued support to mine action in the Caucasus even though mine action was mentioned. At the same time, the RSP and the Action Plan can, but do not automatically, affect the CSP. In the Caucasus, the wording on mine action in the RSP did not feed into the CSPs.

The effectiveness of EC support is limited if there is a lack of action behind the verbal commitment to mine action by governments. In Armenia for example, more funding cannot replace the political will of the government.

EC-funded mine action has not (yet) achieved tangible results for the universalisation of arms control and disarmament treaties in the region. Due to the difficult political situation, this is a long-term task. Continued advocacy work is a requirement to achieve universalisation of the APMBC, the CCW, and of future treaties, such as the Convention on Cluster Munitions.

Victim Assistance has been addressed in both Armenia and Azerbaijan. However, even though the health facilities and network are functioning, psycho-social rehabilitation is rarely available in the Southern Caucasus.

As it is incorporated into the national school curricula, MRE has been continued successfully, but adults may not be reached.

THE IMPACT OF DECONCENTRATION

The impact of deconcentration could be observed in Armenia, where mine action is not a priority for the delegation, which also lacks specific mine action expertise. The case of Azerbaijan is different because the projects were managed from Brussels until these ended in 2006. However, in neither case has there been expert knowledge available for mine action programming, and no knowledge where to get advice or funds.

There is no designated EC focal point for mine action in Southern Caucasus, and the country delegations often do not have specialised knowledge.

THE IMPACT OF THE END OF THE DEDICATED FUNDING AND UNITS

As mine action in the region was exclusively funded through the APL budget line, the impact of the ending of this budget line is significant: there is simply no more EC-funding for any of the mine action projects. This decision was not made strategically or in a well-planned manner, as none of the projects had a clear exit strategy.

Not enough effort was made to ensure continued mine action in the Southern Caucasus by including mine action for humanitarian and development purposes in the CSPs. No short-term funding alternatives were conceived either.
There was insufficient effort by the EC to prepare partner countries and organisations for the ending of the thematic budget line.

EC representatives in the Southern Caucasus do not promote EC mine action policy. There is no effort on behalf of the EC to encourage the countries to sign the APMBC or to use mine action as an entry point for efforts to address regional conflicts and, more broadly, security issues.

While the APL budget line still existed, the EC-funded Geneva Call project included an advocacy component for non-state actors in the region to commit to the norms of the APMBC by signing a Deed of Commitment. From a universalisation perspective it would have made sense to support other advocacy work targeting the states not party to the APMBC.

In June 2008, such an initiative was launched by the Council of the European Union in the form of a Joint Action. The overall objectives of this Joint Action are the promotion of the universality of the Convention, as support for full implementation of the Convention by States Parties and for the preparations of its Second Review Conference in 2009. In light of the end of the APL budget line, efforts by EU institutions other than the Commission are valuable. However, the Southern Caucasus will not benefit from this initiative as it is not one of the target regions.

Therefore, the question remains whether long term, continuous, targeted efforts rather than ad hoc, short term and limited initiatives are more appropriate to achieve certain goals of mine action. Discussions should continue on whether and how the EC can fund projects that require long term funding, such as the Geneva Call project.

There is no overall responsibility for EC mine action in the region and no expertise in the mine action field. It is also unclear how the initiatives of the different EU institutions are coordinated in the region. While there is an EU Special Representative for the Southern Caucasus, he does not consider mine action as part of his mandate. Nevertheless, the adherence of Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia to the APMBC could contribute to reducing tensions and, ultimately, improve regional stability. Although this would imply an increased role for the Council of the EU relative to that of the Commission in the “policy mix” of the region, the benefits of including some aspects of mine action in the CFSP warrant further study.

Overall, after the revocation of the APL budget line, a number of important questions remain regarding the “policy mix” and EU engagement in mine action in the Southern Caucasus.
7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1 – Integrate the need for continued mine action support for Southern Caucasus into the current EC mine action strategy.

- ERW may seem as a minor problem when looking only at the country level, and when ignoring Nagorno Karabakh, but on a regional scale there clearly is a problem that requires action. The recent outbreak of armed conflict in South Ossetia shows the acuteness of the problems.
- Southern Caucasus is of strategic importance for the EU, and mine action can support security and stability in the region.

Recommendation 2 – Consider mine action in Southern Caucasus as a regional, cross-border issue.

- The EC mine action engagement in Southern Caucasus should be guided from the regional level, but with implications on both regional and national levels.

Recommendation 3 – Identify an EC regional focal point for mine action to deal with:

- **EC programming:**
  - Integration of mine action into EC Regional and Country Strategies and their respective Regional and National Indicative Programmes. Advise national partners how to bring mine action in the CSP, so that it is at least mentioned even if not as a separate priority.
  - Ensure not only conflict resolution is considered with regard to regional mine action, but also the sustainability of the EC-funded mine action achievements and goals such as zero victims, resolution of socio-economic impacts of ERW, plus diplomatic efforts to promote the universalisation of the APMBC, the CCW and the future Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM).
  - Ensure development projects in mine/ERW-contaminated areas have (community-based) mine action components, to ensure that mine affected communities are not left out of development plans.
  - Ensure more support to regional initiatives.
  - Consider opportunities for using mine action as a confidence building measure, as done in Sudan for example.
  - Ensure that mine action forms part of any potential peacekeeping mission.

- **Programme and project implementation:**
  - Ensure that the points from the ENPI RSP (and the Action Plan based on the RSP) are included in the CSP of all countries, and that the regional aspects mentioned are truly considered and implemented.
  - Provide guidance to the country delegations on mine action issues.
  - Review options for mine action programmes at the regional level. As mine and ERW problems are strongly linked to the political situation in the region, consider projects fostering regional cooperation and strengthening civil society, including regional civil society linkages.
  - Consider working with fewer implementing partner intermediaries. Every additional layer costs money, sometimes for marginal benefit.
  - Commission timely regional and country-specific reviews of EC-funded mine action in Southern Caucasus. It is not enough to include evaluation obligations into the project documents, but EC personnel have to be available to ensure (i) the proper design and conduct of the evaluations, and (ii) that the conclusions and recommendations find their way in the new planning cycle.
o Ensure that there are sustainability mechanisms and commitments in project
funding documents.
o Enhance institutional memory through better filing.
o Insure exit strategies exist for EC-funded mine action projects, incorporating end-
state goals, to avoid situations where the cessation of funding means the collapse
of capacities and other achievements. This would best be done in consultation
with other donors. Strategic goals could include, for example, the universalisation
of arms control and disarmament treaties. End-state goals could include that (i)
national organs and civil society organisations are dealing effectively and in a
sustainable manner with mine action, (ii) the zero-victim target has been
achieved, (iii) an AP mine impact-free Southern Caucasus has been achieved, (iv)
a clear and pre-defined development goal has been reached.
o Ensure contingency plans are in place for various scenarios requiring mine action
assistance, such as a resumption of conflict in Georgia or a peaceful resolution of
the Nagorno Karabakh conflict.
o Consider support to victim assistance projects with focus on psycho-social
rehabilitation. Upon completion, responsibility for sustaining these services
should be transferred to the Governments.
o Coordination on programming aspects with other donors, particularly from EU
member countries.

• Advocacy:
o Explicit integration of mine action into wider conflict resolution efforts and
regional peace and security processes. Mine action could be considered in the
work of the EUSR as a stabilisation or peace building measure.
o Explicit integration of mine action into regional and national poverty alleviation
and development plans.

• Reporting to the mine action focal point in Brussels on aspects relevant for regional mine
action.

Recommendation 4 – Identify and, perhaps, pre-qualify mine action experts who can advise
a regional focal point for Southern Caucasus and specific Delegations on programming
issues.

Recommendation 5 – As part of the EC mine action strategy, develop concepts how to
handle a region that includes a number of countries with a modest mine/ERW problem.

• This pattern is likely to occur in other regions once the main post-conflict ERW priorities
have been addressed.
• The focus in such regions could be, for example, on sustainability of the achievements
and capacities, development in communities affected by contamination, and treaty
implementation or universalisation.

Recommendation 6 – As part of the EC mine action strategy, develop concepts how to handle
mine action in a region or country at the time of conflict.

• At the time of conflict, mine action has a political dimension that cannot be ignored. This
is why different approaches are needed, for example:
o the inclusion of mine action in community development projects;
o consideration whether the problem can be addressed through regional and cross-
border cooperation initiatives;
o funding of policy-oriented projects;
o support of civil society organisations as well as government institutions.
Recommendation 7 – Consider mine action within the broader strategic framework of regional security. A successful intervention in mine action could provide a point of entry for projects to address other regional security issues such as weapons of mass destruction, terrorism or small arms and light weapons.
ANNEX 1 – TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. BACKGROUND
In 2001 the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament adopted two Regulations on the reinforcement of the EU response against Anti-personnel Landmines (APL). These (referred to collectively as “the Regulation”) laid the foundation of the European integrated and focused policy.

Article 13, paragraph 1 of the EC Regulation states that: The Commission shall regularly assess operations financed by the Community in order to establish whether the objectives of the operations have been achieved and to provide guidelines for improving the effectiveness of future operations.

The APL Regulation goes on to state: Every three years after entry into force of this Regulation, the Commission shall submit to the European Parliament an overall assessment of all Community mine actions... (Article 14)

The EC Mine Action Strategy and Multi-annual Indicative Programme, 2005-2007 further specifies that “more specific, geographic, evaluations of EC-funded mine actions, analysing the results and their impact” will be undertaken to complement the overall assessment.

To implement these provisions, the EC:

1. Commissioned a global assessment of EC mine policy and actions over the period 2002-2004;
2. Entered into an agreement with The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) to, inter alia, manage the programme of regional evaluations to identify lessons learned within EC-funded mine action projects in the following regions:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Caucasus-Central Asia</td>
<td>Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia-Pacific</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Report from the Global Assessment was issued in March 2005, while the agreement with the GICHD was concluded in December that year.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION
The general objective of the Global Assessment was to determine to what extent the objectives and means set in the APL Regulation had been complied with and used in terms of strategy.

---

82 This is the second strategy and multi-year indicative programme since the adoption of the EC Regulation: the first covered the period 2002-04.
83 Additional objectives of the EC-GICHD Agreement are to: provide a repository and dissemination service for reports from mine action evaluations and similar studies; train people from mine affected countries in evaluation; support the participation of key players from mine-affected countries in official meetings relating to the Mine Ban Treaty (MBT).
programming, commitments and implementation. The regional evaluations will complement the Global Assessment by focusing on (i) relevant conclusions and recommendations from the Global Assessment, and (ii) EC mine action strategy and programming issues at the country level. Thus, the evaluation will not assess the efficiency, effectiveness, and impact of individual projects, except to illustrate changes since the Global Assessment or critical programming issues.

**Overall objective:**

To provide systematic and objective assessments of EC-funded mine actions in the Caucasus and Central Asia to generate credible and useful lessons for decision-makers within the EC, allowing them to improve the planning and management of existing and future mine action projects, programmes, and policies.

**Specific objectives:**

- To assess the relevance of EC-funded mine activities vis-à-vis:
  - the geographic and thematic priorities defined in the Strategies for 2002-2004 and 2005-2007;
  - national and regional needs, strategies, and priorities;
  - EC Country Strategy Papers and National Indicative Programmes for mine-affected countries in the Caucasus and Central Asia for 2002-2006;
  - EC strategy documents for the Caucasus and Central Asia
- To analyse the allocation of EC funds among mine-affected states in the Caucasus and Central Asia, and across the various components of mine action (survey, clearance, MRE, etc.);
- To assess the effectiveness of EC-funded mine action support in:
  - addressing the landmine & UXO problems in mine-affected partner countries
  - fostering national ownership and the development of local capacities;
  - supporting the overall development and rehabilitation priorities/programmes of the beneficiary countries;
  - supporting local mine action organisations;
- To assess the coordination among the EC and other agencies supporting mine action in a country (regional; national; UN; donors; international NGOs; etc.);
- To assess the impact of deconcentration on the planning and delivery of EC support to mine action in the Caucasus and Central Asia, including the capacity of EC delegations to assess proposals for mine action projects and to monitor/evaluate the implementation of these projects;
- To assess the adequacy of the EC national strategies and plans, and the effectiveness of implementation;
- To assess the existence of an ‘exit strategy’ for the country to graduate from donor assistance (including plans for sustainability);
- To assess the linkages between mine action and other issues, such as humanitarian assistance, development, and armed violence reduction
- To assess the impact of the end of the specific budget line for anti-personnel landmines and the introduction of the new ‘stability instrument’ on future mine action support from the EC to the Caucasus and Central Asia;

---

85 This question addresses, among other issues, the fact that “Commitment to the Mine Ban Treaty” is one of the criteria listed in the EC Mine Action Strategy 2005-2007 for determining geographic allocations.
To make recommendations to improve the identification, design, and implementation of EC-funded mine projects;

- To generate recommendations to enhance the opportunities for cross-fertilisation among mine action programmes in the Caucasus and Central Asia and globally.

**Expected results**

The evaluation report shall give an overview of EC mine action support to the Caucasus and Central Asia, and to particular mine-affected countries in the Caucasus and Central Asia, since 2002. It shall incorporate more detailed assessments of EC mine action support in a limited number of ‘focus country’ cases to illustrate and support its findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Recommendations will aim in particular to guide EC personnel in designing and implementing programmes of support to mine action that complement the actions of other actors, including national authorities, other donors, and UN agencies for the next years.

**3. METHODOLOGY**

The evaluation shall entail the following main components of work:

- Preliminary Planning & Data Collection (now underway)

- Desk Research

- Country Missions (two of the following – to be confirmed)
  - Afghanistan
  - Azerbaijan
  - Georgia
  - Tajikistan

- Analysis and Reporting

**Country Missions**

As the evaluation will not focus on the performance of individual projects, Evaluation Team members will spend most or all of their time in capitals and major centres to meet with and collect documents and data from:

- EC delegations
- National authorities and officials from national mine action centres
- UN agencies supporting mine action
- Representatives from other major donors to mine action in that country
- Representatives from mine action operators (local and international)
- Other key government officials
- Representatives from key regional organisation (where present).

**Additional data collection**

Additional information will be obtained from:

- Review of project documents (project proposals and contracts; mid-term and final reports, as well as final evaluations, monitoring reports, audit reports, etc., where available);
- Interviews with relevant Commission officials (in Brussels);
− Questionnaire surveys and some follow-up telephone interviews with project managers/implementers/ recipients of EC funds and projects (Officials in other EC Delegations, managers of operator organisations, both in organisations’ headquarters and on the field, and beneficiary countries’ officials, etc.).
− EC Country Strategy Papers and National Indicative Programmes.
− National Development Plans, Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, and National Mine Action Strategies from the focus countries
− Relevant reports from the UN (including inter-agency assessment mission reports for mine action) and the World Bank
− Recent mine action evaluations commissioned by other agencies
− Other sources, as appropriate.

4. OUTPUTS
An evaluation work plan will be prepared and distributed following the preliminary planning and data collection stage (February 2008).

A debriefing of preliminary findings and conclusions will be provided to EC officials and other stakeholders at the end of each country mission.

Within one month of the end of the country missions, a draft report will be prepared and distributed to the GICHD and EC delegations for comments, and subsequently distributed to other stakeholders. For both comments the deadline is two weeks.

A final report will be submitted to the GICHD and EC Brussels.

All reports will be in English.

All reports will clearly indicate on the cover page that the evaluation was financed by the European Union and managed by the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD). The reports should display the logos of both the EU and the GICHD.86

86 http://europa.eu.int/comm/europeaid/visibility/index_en.htm. The GICHD logo shall be provided by the GICHD.
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Among the key conclusions of the Global Assessment were:

- The need for a transparent process for determining which countries and projects will receive EC funding for mine action;
- In light of ‘deconcentration’, the need to clarify “who does what” in mine action within the EC;
- Request for proposal and selection processes, including:
  - The need for more high quality proposals,
  - The need to reduce the number of proposals rejected on technicalities, and
  - The need for more rigorous assessments – including technical criteria – of proposals and projects.
- Contracting issues, including:
  - The need for greater contractual rigour in specifying performance requirements;
  - The need for greater clarity in defining the chains of responsibility and authority;
  - The limitations inherent in the use of non-renewable contracts issued for short durations.
- All interventions should incorporate exit strategies.
## ANNEX 2 – ITINERARY AND PERSONS MET

### Armenia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Persons met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 27 April</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Alla Bakunts, Democratic Governance Portfolio Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Armen Grigoryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Monday April 28</td>
<td>Vera Bohle and Nara Weigel arrive in Yerevan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 29 April</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Alvard Poghosyan, UNICEF Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICBL Armenia</td>
<td>Jemma Hasratyan, Armenian National Committee of the ICBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSCE</td>
<td>Margarita Lazyan, Senior Assistant in Political/Military Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>David Shakhverdyan, ICRC Responsible for Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armenian Red Cross</td>
<td>Hayk Hovhannisyan, Responsible for Disaster Management Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armenian Red Cross</td>
<td>Hayk Hayrapetyan, Responsible for Population Movement Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 30 April</td>
<td>Armenian Humanitarian Demining Centre (AHDC)</td>
<td>Vostanik Adoyan, Major General, Head of Engineering Corps, RA Ministry of Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Territorial Administration of the RA</td>
<td>Vache Terteryan, Deputy Minister of Territorial Administration of the RA and former National Director of the Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Labor and Social Issues (MLSI)</td>
<td>Arayik Petrosyan, First Deputy Minister of Labour and Social Issues (MLSI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EC Del</td>
<td>David Avakian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 1 May</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Consuelo Vidal, UNDP Resident Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday May 2 and Saturday May 3</td>
<td>Vera Bohle and Nara Weigel travel to Baku, Azerbaijan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Azerbaijan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Persons met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday May 3</strong></td>
<td>Vera Bohle and Nara Weigel arrive in Baku, Azerbaijan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday May 5 2008</strong></td>
<td>Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action (ANAMA)</td>
<td>Dr. Nazim Ismaylov, Director&lt;br&gt;Aziz M. Aliyev, Information Manager&lt;br&gt;Murad Rahimov, MIS Officer&lt;br&gt;Musa Jalalov, MRE Manager&lt;br&gt;Nigar Azimova, Head of Planning and Development Department&lt;br&gt;Fikret Aliyev, TQA Senior Officer&lt;br&gt;Samir Poladow, Operations Manager&lt;br&gt;Landmine Monitor&lt;br&gt;Emil Hasanov, Mine Action Researcher and Editor for CIS/Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday 6 May</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation Team travels to Khanlar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday May 6 2008</strong></td>
<td>ANAMA Khanlar Regional Base</td>
<td>Elnur Qasimov, TSQA Division Leader&lt;br&gt;Humanitarian Union “Ocaq”&lt;br&gt;Shahin Ramazanov, Chief of Union (Ganja carpet weaving workshop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday May 7 2008</strong></td>
<td>ANAMA Emergency Response Team in Terter</td>
<td>Habile Catarov, ERT Supervisor ANAMA&lt;br&gt;Faiz Mammhdov, Information Officer ANAMA&lt;br&gt;International Eurasia Press Fund (IEPF), in Terter&lt;br&gt;Ramil Azizov, Peacemaking actions and conflictology department&lt;br&gt;Executive of Terter District&lt;br&gt;Isayev V.I., Chief Executive of Tar-Tar District&lt;br&gt;Tarter District Administration&lt;br&gt;Ilqar Musayev, Representative of Tarter District Administration&lt;br&gt;Relief Azerbaijan, in Agdam&lt;br&gt;Ehtieram Jafarov, Relief Azerbaijan Operations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday 7 May - Evaluation Team travels to Baku</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday May 8 2008</strong></td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Nijat Valiyev, Infrastructure Specialist&lt;br&gt;ICRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friday May 9 2008</strong></td>
<td>International Organisation for Migration (IOM)</td>
<td>Sarat Das, Chief of Mission&lt;br&gt;Ashraf Mirzazade, Project Manager&lt;br&gt;Sevda Mirzakhanova, Project Liaison/Donor Relations Assistant&lt;br&gt;OSCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday May 10 departure</strong></td>
<td>Vera Bohle and Nara Weigel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 3 – LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

**Literature, Reports and Evaluations**


International Trust Fund (ITF, 2007), Confidence Building and Regional Measures through Mine Action, Workshop in Almaty, Kazakhstan

ITF (2005), Mine Action as Confidence Building Measure, Workshop in Tbilisi, Georgia

ITF (undated), Memo on the South Caucasus, internal


Republic of Armenia, Landmine Impact Survey, 2005

UNDP (2007), Armenian Demining Project Final Report, UNDP, Yerevan

UNDP, Final Project Reports, UNDP, Yerevan

**Policy Documents**


**Policy Documents European Community**

**Azerbaijan**


European Union and Azerbaijan, European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument, Action Plan,


**Republic of Armenia**


**Regional**


**Websites consulted for Textbox 5 on Nagorno Karabakh**

http://www.economist.com/displayStory.cfm?story_id=10225045
http://www.eurasianet.org/departments/insight/articles/pps020907.shtml
http://www.rferl.org/featuresarticle/2008/03/06f6071c-c439-4c76-b389-928e9409de9b.html
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/country_profiles/3658938.stm
http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/war/Nagorno Karabakh.htm
http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=2456&l=1
http://www.nkrusa.org/
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/world/analysis/72268.stm
http://www.alertnet.org/thenum/newsdesk/N05610373.htm
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/textis/vtx/refworld/rwmain?page=country&amp;docid=482457c7c&amp;skip=&amp;coi=AZE&amp;
rid=4562d8cf2
http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-
bin/textis/vtx/refworld/rwmain?page=country&amp;docid=481715781a&amp;skip=&amp;coi=AZE&amp;
rid=4562d8cf2
http://assembly.coe.int/documents/workingdocs/doc94/edoc7182.htm
## ANNEX 4 – TIMELINES

### Armenia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Armenian NGOs established the Armenian Committee of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>U.S. military personnel conducts humanitarian demining training of Georgian, Armenian and Azerbijani soldiers (Beecroft Initiative) in an aim to uild confidence in the southern Caucasus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>RONCO starts training National Mine Action Centre staff on how to implement national mine action programs. RONCO also trains two companies in humanitarian mine action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Armenian National Mine Action Centre is opened in Echmiadzin. Monitoring mission of the Armenian-Azerbaijani border is conducted by the Office of Humanitarian Mine Action Programs of the US Department of State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Armenia signs an agreement for a four year mine action programme with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The project includes a Landmine Impact Survey (LIS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>The LIS is completed. Authorities decide to submit the annual transparency reports required by the Ottawa Convention and Protocol II to the CCW. An Intergovernmental Commission on Mine Action (IAGCMA) is created by prime ministerial decree. First Armenian demining team is sent to Iraq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>UNICEF starts conducting trainings in mine risk education (MRE) and developing a mine risk education strategy. MRE is implemented by the Armenian Red Cross Society and UNICEF. The IAGCMA discusses the national mine action strategy for 2007-11 and the inclusion of mine action into Armenia’s PRSP. The US Marshall Legacy Institute establishes a mine detection dog partnership programme in Armenia. The NGO Geneva Call launches a program in the South Caucasus. Project components include strengthening civil society and advocacy to get non-state actors to sign a deed of commitment not to use mines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Azerbaijan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>The Ministry of Labor and Social Defence of Azerbaijan and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) sign an agreement on victim assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>HALO Trust begins a 15 month mine clearance project. In this context it trains former members of the Nagorno Karabakh army in humanitarian mine clearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>The national agency for rehabilitation and reconstruction of areas (ARRA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>The ICRC, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Halo Trust start carrying out mine awareness programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>BACTEC International undertook a Level 1 Mine Survey in the Fizuli and Agdam region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action (ANAMA) is established by presidential decree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>UNDP starts providing technical support to ANAMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Mines Advisory Group (MAG) starts training deminers, which are subsequently employed by Relief Azerbaijan (RA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. military personnel conducts humanitarian demining training of Georgian, Armenian and Azerbaijani soldiers (Beecroft Initiative) in an aim to build confidence in the southern Caucasus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relief Azerbaijan (RA) and the International Eurasia Press Fund (IEPF), two national “NGOs” were trained in mine survey and clearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF starts a country wide mine risk education programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>ANAMA produced a national mine action strategy, which was updated in 2003 to cover the period 2004-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-3</td>
<td>A landmine impact survey (LIS) is carried out under the leadership of the Survey Action Centre (SAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>A second phase of the “Partnership for Peace” NATO maintenance and supply agency (NAMSA) UXO clearance project starts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX 5 – DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO MINE ACTION IN AZERBAIJAN (1999-2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONOR</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>167,849</td>
<td>232,177</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td>265,410</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>1,810,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoAz</td>
<td>124,111</td>
<td>603,537</td>
<td>242,000</td>
<td>258,760</td>
<td>203,417</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>749,561</td>
<td>1,241,379</td>
<td>2,235,296</td>
<td>5,913,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1,698,039</td>
<td>1,040,633</td>
<td>1,125,000</td>
<td>1,275,461</td>
<td>1,803,979</td>
<td>2,326,840</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
<td>11,469,952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEUCOM</td>
<td>234,000</td>
<td>234,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>468,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,180,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,730,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>486,724</td>
<td>78,807</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>635,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITF (Slovenia)</td>
<td>104,490</td>
<td>384,102</td>
<td>146,919</td>
<td>635,511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>640,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>88,250</td>
<td>20,060</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>112,140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO PfP Trust Fund</td>
<td>227,880</td>
<td>538,805</td>
<td>139,841</td>
<td>906,526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Club of Baku – Intern’l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>47,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47,522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

87 From ANAMA Yearly Report 2009.
88 According to the figures known to ANAMA on USA contributions to Azerbaijan Mine Action Programme (with those made through RONCO, now through ARMORGROUP, and USAID as well).
89 This is the cost of the training conducted in 2003. No costs presented here of other trainings, equipment and continuing technical assistance provided by US Department of Defense through USEUCOM.
90 The EC contribution in 2002 includes the cost of Landmine Impact Survey Project conducted by SAC.
91 In 2004 Japanese Government has funded the establishment of IEPF 5-men Technical Survey Team and its activity during a year.
92 In 2007 Austrian Development Agency, South Korea, Slovenia and Azerbaijan contributed through the ITF to support the IOM-ITF-ANAMA joint project for Community Based Small Business Trainings and Micro-credit Revolving Fund for Azerbaijan Mine Survivors.
93 Donors contributed to the Saloglu Project through NATO PfP Trust Fund: Azerbaijan, Turkey, UNDP, Norway, Luxembourg, Finland, Switzerland, USA, Australia, Slovenia, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Latvia.
### Evaluation of EC-Funded Mine Action Programmes in the Caucasus and Central Asia

#### Final 16.07.09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONOR</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WWM Foundation</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>204,620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In-kind contribution:
- **Rotary Club International** – Support to expansion of operational capacity (four new mine detection dogs donated)
- **Switzerland** – Technical support (Information technical advisors), Leica Lazer Binocular, SM EOF Shape Charges for Demolition
- **USA (The Marshall Legacy Institute)** – Support to expansion of operational capacity (Provision of new mine detection dogs)