Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Awareness and Related Technologies of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction.

Geneva, 29 January 2002.

Opening Intervention on a Global overview, Review of progress made and an Outlook on future action, by Sara Sekkenes - NPA - on behalf of the Mine Action Working Group - MAWG of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines - ICBL.

Mr. President, Chairs, Ladies and Gentlemen,

We are gathered again, for the intersessionals of the Ottawa Convention on banning anti-personnel mines[1], to address issues of concern within the thematic area of Mine Clearance, Mine Awareness and Related Technologies. This Standing Committee, being the forum for issues specifically concerned with one of the three tiers of the Convention, mine action. The other two being either preventive dealing with advocacy and legislative and compliance issues and mine victim assistance as post-exposure activities.

Mine awareness is an imperative and integral part of mine action. It can be a preventive stand-alone activity, and thus, be grouped with advocacy. However, as experience has taught us, demining should not be a stand-alone activity and its success depends, among other things, on its ability to interact and communicate with mine-affected communities. Therefore, mine awareness natural place is in this session, and will be given special attention by colleagues from UNICEF and ICBL working group on mine awareness. Activities regarding socio-economic reintegration of mine victims should also be presented as integrated and form part of the progress report of mine action in line with the adopted concept of integrated mine action, but victim assistance is reported on separately, as is stockpile destruction which also forms part of mine action and will therefore be left aside.

Introduction & Overview

Under Article 5, the Convention stipulates as a general obligation of all State Parties, the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas, which includes the definition of mined areas as an area, which is dangerous due to the presence or suspected presence of mines, within ten years of joining the Treaty. There are 10-year extension arrangements, in the event deadlines are not met, but rigid explanations are required, among other things, regarding;

(i) preparation and status of work conducted under national demining programs;
(ii) financial and technical means available to the State Party for destruction of all anti-personnel mines and
(iii) circumstances which impede ability of the State Party

This we all know, but where does that leave us today? We are 30 percent into the stipulated 10-year time period, if counted from 1999, the year that the Convention entered into force as international law and as binding for 83 State Parties. Some 39 countries followed suit in 2000 and 2001 and others yet have stated their intentions to join the Treaty soon, leaving the Ottawa Convention the most successful international Treaty ever in terms of speediest joining of number of State Parties.

[1] For the complete wording of the Ottawa Convention, please refer to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, see Landmine Monitor Report 2001, pp. 1160. (ICBL, by Human Rights Watch, Washington D.C. US)

So, State Parties now need to ask themselves; how far are we in meeting the obligations, in compliance with the Convention, when a third of the journey now lies behind us? How much has been done in eradicating minefields and how much remains till the stipulated deadline 2009? And if requesting extension for compliance; How will that be possible if we do not know how much has been accomplished and hence, how much remains to be done? This is also what I attempt to do as a representative of ICBL and mine action operators with the purpose of this presentation to give a status report on where we stand today.

The Canadian delegations' circulated paper[2] on some initial thoughts regarding the successful implementation of the Treaty raises some interesting points in this regard. It suggests grounding Committee[3] discussions within the framework of the Convention and its obligations and gives examples of action points suggested in relation to, among others, paragraphs in Article 5, 6 and 7. I will attempt to reflect around some of these points, since these correspond with points needed for a presentation on the status of implementation of the Treaty on demining. Relevant points of action in this context are;

> from **§ 5.1;** A chart to show State Parties with mined areas, whether they have a national mine action program and /or demining plan, when they believe they will have cleared their mines, what their 10-year deadlines are, et cetera.
>
> from **§ 5.2;** *a*) An assessment of the challenges each mine-affected States Party faces in meeting the obligation to identify areas known or suspected to be contaminated and ensure that they are perimeter-marked, monitored and protected, *b*) a discussion of how particular aspects of the IMAS[4], SAC[5] and other initiatives can help, and *c*) a discussion of the political obstacles to implementation of this article.
>
> from **§ 6.4;** Reporting from the UN system, MACs[6] and others, including regional funds, about most urgent needs for donors in the coming 6 months.
>
> from **§ 7.f.g.;** The obligation to report on the status of mine clearance programs and measures taken for marking and surveying.
>
> (Suggested action points with ref. to particular paragraphs in Article 5, 6, and 7 respectively. Working paper circulated in the Standing Committee of Mine Clearance, Mine Awareness and Related technologies, by the Canadian Mine Action Team, dated 1 March 01.)

Unfortunately, we do not possess the full overview of the problem at hand. No one can, per today, state the amount of square kilometres of land suspected of mine contamination globally, let alone for a large number of the individual mine-affected countries respectively. Even more alarming perhaps, we also do not have an aggregated figure of how much of this land we have cleared. We have searched high and low for figures allowing exemplifications and consistent comparison to elaborate on progress done. Not much I am afraid, but if you allow me to elaborate on what we have found for a while, we can attempt to read trends, estimate and guesstimate, to produce a semi-qualified progress report and hence, also forecast, to see where we are today and, thus, also what lies ahead of us.

I would also like to refer to the sources and notes behind the figures used and request for an understanding of the aggregated and global view, seeking trends and overall progress, not denying faults but also not bogging down into details. We have plenty of expertise here in the

---

[2] Available from SC on Mine Clearance, Mine Awareness and Related Technologies.
[3] Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Awareness and Related technologies
[4] International Mine Action Standards
[5] Survey Action Centre
[6] Mine Action Centres

room that within their professional and geographical areas, most likely will find errors, but I kindly ask them to look less at that and more at where we are today, in the intersessionals, attempting to report on the global progress in compliance with the Ottawa Convention. We are attempting to quantify the problem worldwide, subtract the amount of work done, and come up with a figure stating the size of the problem left to be dealt with, for the majority of State Parties, in the remaining seven years.

After some initial fact finding about mine-affected countries, we can establish that approximately 2/3s, or 4 148 752 000[7] of the world population live in countries, which to various degrees, are mine infested. Everyone is obviously not physically at threat, but they all live in countries that in one way or the other are deprived of the potential land-use and benefit these areas could provide, in terms of productive land or subsistence livelihoods and psychological and physical freedom of movement. It is perhaps also surprising, that 46 percent of the world's total inhabited administrative areas fall within the borders of countries or semi-autonomous areas listed as mine-affected[8].

It was also my hope to look at the amount of dollars invested in mine action and come up with an overall universal cost per km². This, allowing us to use current price levels and simply multiply it with the number of km² left, giving us, indeed, a rough guesstimation of the resource requirements to meet the 2009 deadline. This was not easy. Everyone kept saying that it is impossible, that it all depends on this and that, and the lot. But I wonder, why can't we for the sake of the argument, just take the number of $ invested and divide it by units done? This would at least provide us with an inkling of what we need to know.

We know that costs per km² differ grandly due to a number of reasons depending on geographical features and climatically different demands, program mandates with everything from commercial to purely idealistic approaches with expensive capacity building components, country specific labour laws and labour costs, home country salary levels and insurance costs, etc., etc., etc. Not to mention, in comparison, the rather simple calculation, of various mine clearance and mine disposal techniques. Put some economics into the pot with sunken costs and overheads and the numbers are still possible to calculate. If only everyone reported consistently…

Now, looking back at some of the points for discussion brought up by Ms. Hadwen, we can broadly fit them as mine survey, mine clearance or mine action investments. And as requested in relation to Article 5.1, a chart to show State Parties with mined areas, whether they have a national mine action program and/or demining plan, when they believe they will have cleared their mines, what their 10-year deadlines are, etc. Let us start with a chart-overview of mine-affected State Parties and then look at Survey. The one thing not included, for reasons I will come to, is the time State Parties believe they will need to clear all their mines.

[7] Population figures from 1998, National Encyclopedin. Bra Böcker AB, Stockholm, 1999.
[8] Landmine Monitor Report 2001, GICHD website, Hidden Killers 98, among others.

Table 1: Mine-affected State Parties, mine clearance deadline & in country activities.

State Parties in 1999	Article 7	Survey and/or assessment	Deadline Mine Cl.	Existence of Mine Action Program	Demining Plan
1. Bosnia i Herzegovina	Yes	Assessment/Survey	1st March 2009	BHMAC, E MACs / UN + NGOs + MA op.	Sarajevo MA Plan, priority plan
2. Croatia	Yes	CROMAC survey	1st March 2009	CROMAC + NGOs + com. oper.	Mine Action Plan
3. Denmark	Yes	All marked	1st March 2009	All areas marked	-
4. Djibouti	**No**		1st March 2009	National Mine Action Centre	US made country plan
5. Honduras	Yes	Limited survey	1st March 2009	OAS / AICMA / PADCA/MARMINCA	Mine Action plan
6. Macedonia	Yes	Assessment	1st March 2009	ITF / Ministry of Defence FYROM / MACC	Mine Action plan
7. Malawi	**No**		1st March 2009	Member of SADC mine action committee	-
8. Mozambique	Yes	Impact Survey	1st March 2009	Institúto Nacional de Desminagem + NGO	Priority and coordination plan
9. Namibia	**No**	UNMAS 1999	1st March 2009	US sponsored MA program until 2001 + NGOs	Consciousness of problem
10. Perú	Yes		1st March 2009	Foreign Aff. working group / army	-
11. Senegal	Yes		1st March 2009	NGOs with internal plan	-
12. Yemen	Yes	Impact Survey	1st March 2009	NDC with national MA program, UN, NGOs	Strategic mine action plan
13. Zimbabwe	Yes		1st March 2009	Gov. run program in coop. with MA operator	Governmental priority plan
14. Chad	**No**	Impact Survey	1st November 2009	High Committee for National Demining	MA Plan 2001 formulated
15. Costa Rica	Yes		1st September 2009	AICMA / OAS / PADCA/MARMINCA + gov	Mine Action plan
16. Czech Republic	Yes		3rd December 2009	Police force / Ministry of Defence	-
17. Ecuador	Yes	UNMAS 1999	1st October 2009	OAS / CENDESMI	int. Mine Action plan
18. El Salvador	Yes		1st July 2009	OAS / CORDES IDG / PDDHH	Mine Action plan
19. Guatemala	Yes		1st September 2009	OAS / AICMA / PADCA/MARMINCA	Mine Action plan
20. Jordan	Yes	Army assessment	1st May 2009	Military survey, NDRC for coord and planning	-
21. Nicaragua	Yes	Ongoing locations	1st May 2009	OAS / AICMA / PADCA/MARMINCA / NGOs	MA coord. by CND and Nic army
22. Niger	**No**		1st September 2009	-	-
23. Swaziland	Yes		1st June 2009	US suggested Mine Action program	Survey plan by US
24. Thailand	Yes	Impact Survey	1st May 2009	TMAC/UN + army + NGOs	Master plan on hum. Mine Action
25. Uganda	**No**		1st August 2009	UPDF preparedness force for MA	-
State Parties in 2000					
26. Albania	**No**	Assessment	1st August 2010	Gov / AMAC-ITF-ICRC- UN - NGOs / NAMSA	-
27. Cambodia	Yes	Impact Survey	1st January 2010	CMAC / UN + NGOs + army	MineAction plan
28. Liberia	**No**		1st June 2010	Informal non-governmental program	Informal plan
29. Philippines	Yes		1st August 2010	AFP for clearance	-
30. Rwanda	Yes		1st December 2010	National Demining Office - NDO	Mine Action plan
31. Tajikistan	**No**	UNMAS 96, 97	1st April 2010	UN initiated assessment mission / ICRC	-
32. Tunisia	Yes		1st January 2010	Ministry of Defence, gov and military	Mine Action plan
State Parties in 2001					
33. Algeria	No		9th October 2011	Requested assistance from US, army clearance	-
34. Bangladesh	No		1st March 2011	Army clearance	-
35. Chile	No		10th September 2011	-	-
36. Colombia	No		1st March 2011	Gov. + NGO + Red cross coop. on program	National Mine Action plan
37. Congo Brazzaville	No		1st November 2011	Brazzaville Airport Program	-
38. Eritrea	No	Impact survey planned	27th August 2011	Gov – UN – MAC – EMAP - Int and Nat NGO's	Mine Action plan
39. Guinea Bissau	No	Assessment	1st November 2011	CAAMI + UN + NGOs	PAAMI 2001
40. Kenya	No		1st July 2011	British military clearance	-
41. Mauritania	No		1st January 2011	National Humanitarian Demining Office	Mine Action plan
42. Moldova	No		1st March 2011	Gov / NATO partnership for peace program	Mine Action plan
43. Sierra Leone	No		1st October 2011	NGOs with internal plans	-
44. Tanzania	No		1st May 2011	-	-
45. Zambia	No		1st August 2011	National Task Force for MA	National Strategic Plan on MA

Source: Landmine Monitor 1999, 2000 and 2001 and ICBL website. Report of the Secretary General 01–56935 (E) 021101. For additional information on each State Party, please refer to the country chapter in the Landmine Monitor Reports.

Twenty-five mine-affected countries became State Parties in 1999, giving them a deadline in 2009 for eradication of all mined areas. An additional 7 countries joined in 2000, with deadline in 2010 and 13 in 2001, with end date for mine clearance in 2011. We can also see that 16 mine-affected State Party countries have support from the UNDP[9]. An additional 16 have support from other international organisations, military forces or commercial operators in dealing with the mine problem while others, to various degrees, capacities and capabilities, have initiated national programs and plans for compliance with the Treaty. Of the 122 State Parties, 45 countries have a registered mine problem.

Three State Parties are found to have no mine action program. However in general, although existent, most countries have weak mine action plans, lacking priority systems and coordination structures[10]. This can, among other things, be related to the lack of information of the extent of the problem. Partly, it can be related to the inconsistent flow of mine action investments, making it difficult for long-term plans. With the exception of the surveyed countries, the full overview of mine contamination in the various mine-affected countries is unknown[11], hence the lack of information of the time and resources required to eradicate all mined areas, which brings us to the issue of the need for surveys.

1. Landmine Impact and Level One General Surveys [12]

Five Landmine Impact Surveys; Yemen, Chad, Mozambique, Thailand and Kosovo[13] have been finalised during the first three years of the Convention. The surveys have as objective to provide a national overview of mine infested areas in affected countries and to qualify the contaminated areas in terms of how, why and where they pose a negative impact on communities, i.e. categorising the communities as high, medium or low priorities for clearance. As a starter, this is exactly what we are looking for, a qualified survey to give us the overview and scope of the problem. According to the SAC, an Impact Survey:

- Allow donors to rationally apportion funds to places of greatest human need as defined by impact on communities;
- Permit national authorities to develop national plans focusing on regions and areas of greatest impact; and
- Give implementers baseline impact data that will provide success indicators for mine action programs

This would go a long way in planning and forecasting the job needed to be done in order for State Parties to successfully implement the Convention in terms of demining. It would also be an excellent initial priority setting tool to help improve the lives of millions of people around the world living under the threat of anti-personnel landmines. In addition, it would provide mine action operators with a true humanitarian *raison d'être* and commence at providing a cost-efficiency as well as cost-effectiveness measure.

---

[9] United Nations Development Program. Report of the Secretary General 01-56935 (E) dated 021101

[10] Landmine Monitor Report 2000 and 2001

[11] Semi-qualified estimations made for a few countries and areas, among them; Cambodia, Kosovo and Nicaragua but then based on loose extrapolations and guesstimations rather than qualified data.

[12] Level 1, 2 and 3 as defined in IMAS: **Level One General Survey**; the objective of a Level One, General Survey, is to collect information on the general locations of suspected or mined areas. Information must be collected about the areas affected by mines or UXO and about areas that are not affected. Areas must be categorised and the reliability and credibility of data recorded. A Level One, General Survey, is a prerequisite for the planning of a Level Two, Technical Survey. The content and level of detail will vary according to the level of survey undertaken. **Level Two Technical Survey**; the objective of a Level Two, Technical Survey, is to determine and delineate the perimeter of mined locations initially identified by a Level One, General Survey. The marked perimeter forms the area for future mine clearance operations. The Level Two surveys requires trained and properly equipped mine clearance personnel with the necessary skills to undertake and accurately record the survey work. Where possible, with time and resources permitting, these teams should also undertake area reduction work in order to accurately define the outer perimeters of the minefield. **Level Three Completion Survey**; the objective of a Level Three, Completion Survey, conducted in conjunction with the mine clearance teams, is to accurately record the area cleared. The benchmark is to be left in the ground to serve as a minimum marker of the initial minefield area. It is also recommended that permanent markers be used to indicate turning and intermediate points of he perimeter of the mined area. Once the clearance task has been partially or totally completed a clearance report with the Level Three Completion Survey, and in some cases a quality assurance check, will form the basis for the documentation necessary for the issuing of an authorized acceptance certificate.

[13] Modified Impact Survey conducted in 1999 by HALO Trust on behalf of UN.

Table 2: Status in 5 impact surveyed countries,
(assuming clearance has been targeted on high priority areas.)

Country	Funds provided 1993-2000, USD	Estimated size of mine/UXO infested area (High, medium and low priority)	Number of mine or UXO infested; a) areas b) comm. c) adm. areas	Estimated number of affected populations	Area reported cleared (Note m² or km²)	Cost per m² cleared	Area remaining to be cleared	Forecasted cost for remaining km² (current prices) USD
Chad	$ 5,4 mill. acc to UNMAS	H) 691 km² M) 195 km² L) 195 km² Tot) 1 081 km²	a) 417 b) 249 c) 23 dept.	H) 63 470 M) 66 925 L) 154 040 Tot) 284 835	0	n/a	H) 691 km² M) 195 km² L) 195 km² Tot) 1 081 km²	See note 3
Kosovo **1999-2001**	$ 35,4 mill. acc to UNMACC	H+M) 45,6 km² L) n/a Tot) ~ 361 km²	a) 252 b) n/a c) n/a	n/a	45,6 km², all H and M priorities	$ 0,78	H) 0 M) 0 L) n/a Tot)	All high and medium areas reported done
Mozambique **1992-**	$ 54,6 mill. acc to UNMAS	H) n/a M) n/a L) n/a Tot) 562 km²	a) 1374 b) 791 c) 123 districts	Tot) 1,2 mill.	200,2 km²	$ 0,27	H) n/a M) n/a L) n/a Tot) 361,8 km²	Tot) $ 97,5 mill. See note 4
Thailand	$ 6,4 mill. acc to TMAC	H) 661 km² M) 1 480 km² L) 412 km² Tot) 2 554 km²	a) 933 b) 530 c) 27 provinces	H) 188 824 M) 347 126 L) 206 027 Tot) 741 977	33 351 m²	$ 191.90 *	H) 660 km² M+ L) 1 900 km² Tot) 2 556,5 km²	See note 1
Yemen	$ 14,4 mill. acc to Y MAC	H) 43 km² M) 311 km² L) 568 km² Tot) 923 km²	a) 1078 b) 592 c) 18 govern.	H) 35 892 M) 117 503 Lo) 674 399 Tot) 827 794	792 277 m²	$ 18,29 *	H) 42 km² M) n/a L) n/a Tot) 922,2 km²	See note 1

Source and NB: SAC Impact Survey Reports, i.e.
Chad: Handicap International Impact Survey 2000,
Mozambique: CIDC Impact Survey 2001, Analysis yet not made available for H, M, L priority areas.
Thailand: NPA Impact Survey 2001,
Yemen: MCPA Impact Survey 2000,
Kosovo: HALO Trust modified Impact Survey (incomplete and overestimated due to difficulties and premature data collection acc. to HALO Trust and UN).

'**Cost per m² cleared**' is calculated from the total funding provided for mine action (not incl. identified funding for advocacy, mine awareness, and mine victim assistance) in the 5 countries respectively divided per m² reported cleared or otherwise discharged of suspicion. Deminers salary varies greatly, in between 100 – 300 USD per month in the various countries respectively. Other reasons for widely differing costs can be but are not limited to; maturity of program, i.e. initial high equipment investment costs as in for ex. Yemen and Thailand, security, access and logistics.

'Forecasted cost for remaining km²' is calculated by multiplying the size of mine infested area (minus the area cleared) with the calculated cost per m².

General comments:
1) *800 000 of total funding was earmarked for survey in Thailand, mine clearance barely initiated. Yemen also barely initiated and earmarked funds for survey; hence remarkably high clearance costs due to high investment costs and newly started programs.
2) no clearance done also makes it difficult to forecast costs unless using an average cost per square meter,
3) Chad has not had any mine clearance reported wherefore price per clearance unit not available, again and average figure could be used to reach forecasts.
4) The survey data from the Mozambique survey has still not been made widely available wherefore forecasted costs for clearance of high, medium and low priority areas cannot be calculated.
5) note average clearance speed in relation to funding level and maturity of program: Kosovo; 15 km²/year, Mozambique; 20 km²/year.

This would improve transparency and accountability on the spending of donor investments and would allow quality assurance of mine action activities in order to progressively be able to measure performance, evaluate priorities and enable reallocation of mine action resources for best targeting and practice. Unfortunately, we have to run another 38[14] or so surveys in the next coming year if the data shall become useful for affected State Parties for further clearance intended to deal with the actual demining of suspected areas before 2009. An impact survey costs approximately 1,5 million US dollars depending on, among other things, size of the country and anticipated mine contamination.

In 2002, surveys are planned to commence, or have just started in; Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Cambodia, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Somalia and Vietnam[15]. They will take along the line of 12 to 24 months to complete respectively. An additional 38 mine-affected State Parties and 39 other signatory and non-signatory mine-affected countries would also benefit from impact surveys to shed some light on the scope of their individual mine problem. Some have argued that by targeting the 25 most heavily mine-affected countries, we would have about 90 percent of the mine problem under control. Others argue all mine affected countries need survey for us to know. But if not all, a large number on the list do qualify.

The UN strategy calls for 15 surveys within the next two years. The UNMAS also reports that advanced assessment missions are planned to some mine-affected countries, to evaluate the possible initiation of a landmine impact survey or other UN supported mine action activities. Other types of surveys have been or are currently running in additional countries and would serve the similar, if not as comprehensive, purpose; obtaining a qualified estimation to the size of the mine problem. Some of these country surveys are also being examined for retrofit into the IMSMA[16] format used in the Impact Surveys as well as in an additional number of UN supported MACs, all in all, about 20 countries.

This brings us to the next point, demining, dealing with the marking, clearing and completion reporting of mined areas. Which becomes significantly more efficient if based on survey information. The IMSMA, however, no matter how sophisticated, can only report on information entered in the database in the first place. Therefore, the surveys with field data collection are essential first steps in mine action for allocation of resources, for planning and forecasting resource requirements and the benchmark so badly needed to measure progress.

[14] Up to 77 if counting all mine affected countries.
[15] According to the UNMAS and the Survey Action Centre information.
[16] Information Management System for Mine Action

Table 3: Progress report on five given mine infested countries.

Country	Funds provided 1993-2000 acc to UNMAS investment database	Estimated size of suspected mine / UXO infested area	Number of mine / UXO infested; a) areas b) communities c) adm. areas	Estimated number of affected population	Area reported cleared	Cost per m² cleared	Area remaining to be released from suspicion	Forecasted cost for remaining km² (current prices)**
Afghanistan *¹ 1989-	$ 153,8 mill.	723 km²	a) n/a b) n/a c) 162 districts	n/a	224,3 km²	$ 0,68	498,7 km²	$ 339 mill.
Angola*² 1995-	$ 54 mill.	~ 2 500 km²	a) 2 219 sites b) n/a c) 18 provinces	6 000 000	~ 25 km² (5,8 km² in 2000)	$ 2,15	Est. 2 475 km²	$ 5,3 bill.
Bosnia & Herzegovina *³ 1996-	$ 71 mill.	300-500 km² (averaged to 400)	a) 18 145 sites b) n/a c) n/a	2 500 000	32 km² (5,3 km² in 2001)	$ 2,22	368 km²	$ 817 mill.
Cambodia *⁴ 1992-	$ 74,3 mill.	3 812 km²	a) 2 119 b) n/a c) 4 997 villages	503 680	120.9 km²	$ 0,65	3 691.1 km²	$ 2,4 bill.
Nicaragua *π 1998- ?	$ 6,8 mill.	596,2 km²	a) 408 sites b) n/a c) 22 municipalities	834 500	2,2km²	$ 3,25	594 km²	$ 1,9 bill.

Source and NB: the information is gathered from Landmine Monitor report 1999, 2000 and 2001, the UNMAS website and donor investment database, Mine Action Centres and other mine action operator's progress reporting and information.
'**Funds provided**' are estimations in that information on donor funding is inadequate and in some cases absent. In some cases probably non-inclusive of bilateral funding.
'**Size of mine infested area**' is estimates and calculated using a variety of sources available in that any and all are insufficient for the purpose on their own.
'**Area cleared**' is also estimates and calculations based on any available information on reported mine clearance in the five countries respectively.
'**Cost per m² cleared**' is calculated from the total funding provided for mine action (not incl. identified funding for advocacy, mine awareness, and mine victim assistance) in the five countries respectively divided per m² cleared or otherwise discharged of suspicion through, for example level 2.
'**Forecasted cost for remaining km²'** is calculated from multiplying the size of mine infested area (minus area cleared) with the calculated cost per km².

General comments: 1) Minimum deminers salary is approximately $ 100 in Afghanistan, $ 180 in Angola, $ 200 in BiH, $ 150 in Cambodia and $ X in Nicaragua per month respectively. Other reasons for widely differing costs can be but are not limited to; maturity of program, i.e. initial high equipment investment costs, security, access and logistics as in Angola.
2) Extrapolation of known surveyed areas to indicate national contamination level gives significantly lower levels of contamination than guesstimations, taking military history and other available data into account. However, only a nationwide survey can confirm overview.
3) ** Training and equipment are incl. in price per m². These costs would diminish with time. Maintenance, some shift of equipment and retraining would occur.

4) Note approximated clearance speed in relation to funding level and length of program among other things, all with manual, mechanical and canine capacities, incl. clearance by all operators; i.e. humanitarian NGOs, military and commercial; Afghanistan, 17 km²/year, Angola, ~ 3,5 km²/year, Bosnia, ~ 6 km²/year, Cambodia 12 km²/year, Nicaragua, 0.75 km²/year.

***1 Afghanistan -** Data from MAIC, also stating reports of additional 12-14 km² mine contaminated land per year due to increased access to formerly inaccessible and un-surveyed areas. MAPA reports $ 153 800 000 in funding from 93-00, UNMAS investment database only $ 65 373 988. Cleared area – not stated whether physically cleared or otherwise discharged of suspicion.
***2 Angola -** The 2 500 km² potentially contaminated is a rather wild guesstimation more than a qualified estimation, probably much less. The size of the 2 610 suspected or verified mined sites vary between 1m² (1 single item of UXO) to as much as 1 km² or more. Area cleared is estimated (NPA physically cleared approx. 13 km² 95-01 and is generally believed to have undertaken 50% of the mine clearance in Angola, another large contributor is HALO Trust). Some areas have not yet been accessed, therefore additional suspected areas are expected from non-surveyed provinces and previously surveyed areas recently affected by war and therefore subject to suspicion of new mine laying.
***3 Bosnia i Herzegovina –** The initially state 4 200 km² estimated as potentially contaminated differs enormously from the 300-500 km² reported by BiHMAC as being a more realistic figure, calculated from extrapolation of surveyed areas.
***4 Cambodia -** 2 030 km² incl. both verified and suspected land, Article 7 report 30 June 2001. Area reported cleared acc to Article 7 report 30 June 2001.
***5 Nicaragua -** The size of the 408 reported contaminated sites is not stated.

2. Mine Clearance - Level 2 and 3 surveys

Picking one mine infested country from each continent or region Africa, Middle East, Latin America, Asia and Europe, I will attempt to present progress in mine clearance. However, we can note that some of these countries have received more $ and MA than others, therefore they are not representative for all mine infested countries. They just happen to be some of the countries we have more, although still not enough, data on. Nonetheless, lacking suffice data on a global level for aggregated presentation, they will be used to illustrate the relationship between 1) the mine problem, 2) the progress made, and 3) the job remaining to be done. Keeping in mind the lack of consistent and standardised data and information, they are case studies rather than comparative samples with global synergetic validity.

As you can see, this exercise becomes quite pointless due to the lack of reliable data. Enormous areas are stated as mined, and although a lot of mine clearance and marking has taken place, it sure looks as a totally overwhelming obstacle to overcome, both in labour and in financial resources required. Without a reasonable idea of the size and quality of the problem, it is impossible to provide any reliable and constructive overview and progress report. It is however, encouraging to see lower and lower figures on m^2 cleared and to see that in some countries, a significant amount of land has been handed over mine free. Better yet, if we could initiate targeted mine clearance on high priorities tied to deadlines and strategic plans set by the mine-affected countries.

3. Mine Action Investments

Since it is difficult to report on the most urgent needs for donors due to lack of overview of the problem in the first place, I chose to look at the reporting from the UN system, MACs and others about mine action investments and further urgent needs from donors, in the coming six months. Here, I would argue that it should be related to the 2009 deadline, not only the next six months, but then one needs to know the scope of the problem…

At the 3rd Meeting of State Parties, held in September in Managua, the Landmine Monitor reported among its major findings that funds for mine action had increased under the reporting period. At the same time, the report raised the concern of mine action operators having to lay off deminers due to lack of funds to cover salaries and insurance for the sappers. The jungle of sources and discrepancy between various data claiming to report the same information is rather large I am afraid.

I have tried to gather what has been available and organised it for presentation as a global overview and progress report on funding to mine action. The data comes from the UNMAS investment database, various MACs and the Landmine Monitor 2001. Where possible, I have tried to identify funding by excluding money donated for mine awareness, mine victim assistance and advocacy activities in order to get a more clear cost per m^2 cleared land or areas otherwise discharged of suspicion.

The graphs using figures from the UNMAS investment database show that the funding going to mine clearance and survey work has gone down, in all but two regions. (See Graph 1 and 3, M Cl and MA funding over years). Globally, as well as nationally, it has been fluctuating over time with great variations from year to year, making it extremely difficult for long term planning, multi year commitment and provision of job security for mine action staff. Furthermore, sustainable capacity building has been suffering from lack of investment once training has been done or vice versa, where equipment has been allocated but trained staff has been missing. The noticeable low level of dedicated coordination initiatives is no doubt partly the reason for this, (Graph 2, MA coordination over years).

What stands out quite remarkable in relation to the global and regional funding pattern over years is the progressive output in square metres cleared. Amazingly, mine action operators have managed to increase the amount of land cleared over time, stretching resources and maximising output quite substantially over the same period of time. No doubt this can be referred to the steep learning curve within the rather young discipline of Humanitarian Mine Action. Working methodologies and techniques have improved, information has increased, experience has trickled down and out and institutional knowledge has been built up, both internationally and nationally. (Graph 4-7, square metre output over years, available examples)

Although operators can show increased output and increased efficiency, unfortunately, we cannot rely on a continued annual duplication of output, as some operators can present for both two and three consecutive years. What many operators now are concentrating on, is improving the quality of the m^2 cleared, that is, making sure that the land they clear comes to good and appropriate use, giving developmental value to the money invested in mine action, integrating the mine clearance activities into that of other peace building, reconstructive and developmental projects and activities, not only adopting but also implementing the Bad Honnef Guidelines for Humanitarian Mine Action put forward by the ICBL Mine Action Working Group - MAWG in 1999.

4. Concluding remarks

In light of inadequate data, the MAWG would like to take the opportunity to call for reporting, standardisation and transparency of information regarding the three rather simple data; 1) total funding for mine action by donors and recipients, 2) size of suspected mine infested areas and 3) the clear definition and registration of area cleared or otherwise discharged of suspicion. This information must also be translated into strategic plans with priorities and timelines by appropriate mine affected authorities, supported by donor countries.

In relation to the IMAS[17], the MAWG suggest a much stronger emphasis on the already stated requirement for any accredited mine action operator, be that humanitarian, commercial or military, as well as donors to mine action activities and mine-affected country representatives, to cooperate fully and thoroughly on the reporting and registration of this data. This calls for a significantly improved and transparent coordination among donors, funding recipients and any mine action operator. It is also an obligation of State Parties to fully report accordingly in the Article 7, among other things, item 2 and 3. Reporting on funding remains voluntary but is imperative for evaluation purposes of MA programs. (See annex A for relevant article references).

And further, for donor countries to support resource weak mine-affected countries in obtaining an overview of their mine problem and to extend to all mine-affected countries the tools and training necessary, to compile, register and maintain this information. In this regard, a much simpler, user-friendly report format, including only the most necessary data is required. This does not at all exclude the standard format for Impact Surveys and clearance, which is carried out by professional mine action staff. Rather a summarising short version of data for inclusion in a national extract of a landmine database also intended for non-mine action staff involved in the more administrative, monitoring, reporting and economic aspects of mine action activities.

[17] International Mine Action Standards

This is the only manner in which State Parties will ever know what has been done and what remains to be dealt with. It is the only way to obtain a presentation on The Status of Implementation of the Ottawa Convention on Mine Clearance. Only then can we obtain an overview of progress made and an outlook on future action of survey, mine marking and mine clearance. Only then can donors allocate funds accurately and where most needed. And mine action operators will provide accountability and justification and know that they are doing the right job in the right place at the right time.

Curiously, the debate is going on in the corridors of whether we are working for a mine free or an impact free world. Even the word mine safe world has mysteriously entered from the sideline. Although, it is unclear to me whether a landmine can be said to be safe at all. However, there can, and should be, no doubt in the end goal of the Convention, a world free of anti-personnel mines.

This was also supported and restated by the UN General Assembly at the 56th session in 2001, through the reaffirmation made by State Parties in both the Maputo Declaration of a commitment to the total eradication of anti-personnel mines, and at the Second Meeting of State Parties to the Convention in Geneva in 2000, in the declaration reaffirming the commitment to completely and fully implement all provisions of the Convention. The debate can actually be put completely aside.

The current speed of mine clearance at current funding levels, averaging 10 square kilometres per year, in some of the most efficient country programs in the world clearly indicate that a redirection to rational, targeted and prioritised mine action has to be made, NOW. If we do not take action today, and realistically make necessary funds available, strategically plan and implement the mine action activities required, we will not reach neither an impact free nor a mine free world by 2009.

Thank you!

ABBREVIATIONS and ACRONYMS

AFP	Agence Française pour le Development
AICMA	Acción Integral Contra las Minas Antipersonal
AMAC	Albanian Mine Action Centre
BHMAC	Bosnia i Herzegovina Mine Action Centre
BiH	Bosnia i Herzegovina
CAAMI	National Centre for Coordination of Anti-mine Actions
CENDESMI	Centro de Desminado del Ecuador (Ecuadorian Mine Clearance Centre)
CIDC	Canadian International Demining Centre
CMAC	Cambodia Mine Action Centre
Com. Operators	Commercial operators
Coord.	Coordination
CORDES IDG	Partner organisation to International Demining Group
CROMAC	Croatian Mine Action Centre
E MAC	Entity Mine Action Centre
EMAP	Eritrea Mine Action Centre
est	established
Foreign Aff	Foreign Affaires
FYROM	Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
GICHD	Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining
Gov	Government
HALO Trust	Hazardous Area Life-support Organisation Trust
HI-B	Handicap International Belgium
HI-F	Handicap International France
hum	humanitarian
ICBL	International Campaign to Ban Landmines
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IMAS	International Mine Action Standards
Int	International
ITF	Slovenia's International trust Fund for Demining and Victim Assistance
MA or ma	Mine Action
MA op	Mine Action operation/operator
MAC	Mine Action Centre
MARMINCA	Mission of Assistance for the Removal of Mines
MAWG	Mine Action Working Group of the ICBL
MCPA	Mine Clearance Planning Agency
Mine Cl.	Mine clearance
MoD	Ministry of Defence
NAMSA	NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency
Nat	National
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NDC	Yemen National Demining Commission
NDO	National Demining Office
NDRC	National Demining and Rehabilitation Committee
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
Nic.	Nicaragua
NPA	Norwegian People's Aid
NSA	Non-State Actors
OAS	Organisation of American States
PADCA	Programa de Asistencia al Desminado en Centro América
PDDHH	Procurador para la Defensa de los Derechos Humanos
part	partner
SAC	Survey Action Centre
SADC	Southern African Development Community
TMAC	Thailand Mine Action Centre
TWG	Treaty Working Group
UN	United Nations
UNICEF	United Nation International Children's Emergency Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNMAS	United Nations Mine Action Service
US	United States
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance