

WITHOUT RESERVATION.



An international symposium addressing the challenges of achieving a mine-free world.

November 30- December 1st, 2002

Ottawa, Canada

LESSONS LEARNED...

The Ottawa Process is about redefining everyone's role in international law – civil society, governments and the public consciousness.



It reformed international relations because all actors involved had a common goal and worked as *partners* rather than *adversaries*.



As a Convention, we have five years of rapid growth and innovations to reflect on and learn lessons from in all areas of mine action...

**A Global
Ban on
Landmines**



Ottawa Canada

**Interdiction
complète des
mines terrestres**



The Landmine Treaty has resulted in the establishment of the notion that governments have a responsibility to protect innocent individuals.

Flexibility from all involved parties to create new mechanisms – formal and informal – to address concerns in implementation as they develop is crucial to success.



THE CHALLENGES...

The role and responsibility of the mine-affected State needs to be reinforced and supported. At present, donors are not keeping up with what is developing on the part of national authorities and the UN system with its strategic plan.



To keeping this process alive, especially the partnership aspect, the role of the IWP needs to be preserved as it provides a vital link for all interested actors – to exchange ideas and tools and experiences.





“Mainstreaming” mine action and related work, both *within* government institutions but also *across* sectors with respect to development work, peace building and disarmament more generally is critical for sustainability.



Youth need to become more integrated into all aspects of the campaign. We need to challenge the disillusionment of youth as they see international treaties being broken. The sustainability of this treaty is at risk if we do not encourage and engage youth

We want a standard binding on all states and non-state actors and this means we need to speak out strongly against any deviation from the norm.

There are several states that have a looming deadline for stockpile destruction who may not be able to destroy all their mines.

We have to decide how to facilitate them meeting those deadlines and how to react if deadlines are not met.

We need to provide more space for national actors to express their needs and their way of doing things recognizing it may not be our way of doing it.



The mine clearance deadlines call for increased output of square meters, better planning and improved coordination and increased, or at least sustained, funds and political will.

It also calls for improved priority setting and improved methods of verifying assessment of suspected areas, many of which turn out to be mine free.

There is a need for much greater involvement of the mine-affected communities themselves both in planning and setting priorities, in clearance itself and in benefiting from the mine action activities *post* demining.

There is also a need to merge national clearance interests with those of provincial and local priorities, which are often not the same.

We need to balance the goal of 'mine free' with decreasing the number of victims so we can focus on areas of greatest impact on communities.



We need to reassess and increase our advocacy efforts individually and collectively to stress that no conceivable utility could outweigh or justify the devastating humanitarian costs of these weapons.

THE STRATEGIES...

**We have to “let go” or expand the partnership.
Ownership means *we* do not control it anymore.
“Sustainability” and “letting go” and starting to see
national authorities stepping into the limelight.**



Youth involvement can take a number of forms in both affected and non-affected countries.



Politicians listen to youth. Who better to capture the political and public attention than youth?

To continue to speak out constantly and at every opportunity - stigmatizing landmines in the public consciousness and supporting efforts at every level to address the mine problem.



QUESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE...

- How we can persuade mine-affected states to prioritize the landmine issue and bring the issue forward *themselves* when they have so many other basic needs to be met?
- How do we keep the enormous provisions in the Convention for victim assistance from becoming unkept promises?
- There is a need for much greater involvement of the mine affected communities themselves both in planning and setting priorities. There is also a need to merge national clearance interests with those of provincial and local priorities, which are often not the same. How do we find the balance?



www.minesactioncanada.org