

Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention

25 June 2010

Intervention on behalf of GICHD

Delivered by Sharmala Naidoo

Thank you Co-Chairs.

On behalf of GICHD and the Co-Chairs, I would like to provide feedback on the discussions that took place during the **Linking Mine Action and Development Contact Group** meeting on Wednesday.

The meeting focused on the important issue of how to measure the developmental outcomes of mine action. Five speakers made presentations about the different impact assessment methodologies that their organisations have used, and discussed lessons learned and specific challenges that they have encountered.

Susan Helseth of the Mine Action Coordination Centre of Afghanistan discussed the Knowledge, Attitudes, Perception and Behaviour survey undertaken in 2009.

Graeme Goldsworthy discussed the assessment methodology that he has developed in association with Harvard Medical School for measuring the impact of mine contamination and mine action interventions on mental health and social capital in mine contaminated communities.

MAG's Jamie Eyre provided an overview of its approach to impact assessment and the specific challenges and lessons learned from piloting MAG's methodology in Cambodia and South Sudan.

Asa Massleberg of the SCBL Gender and Mine Action Programme reported on the findings of her assessment of MAG's impact assessment tool in South Sudan.

And lastly, Bodil Jacobsen discussed DDG's approach to monitoring and evaluating the developmental impact of mine action.

I will not go into the specific details of each of these methodologies but would like to highlight the following key message which came out of the discussions:

- Mine action is not just about removing mines and ERW. It's about making positive changes to the lives and livelihoods of people living in contaminated communities. Reporting on mine action outputs, that is the number of square metres cleared and the number of mines collected and destroyed, is no longer enough. It is the responsibility of the mine action community to demonstrate

how mine action resources are being used and to document the socio-economic impact. Measure and report on the developmental outcomes of mine action.

I would also like to share the preliminary findings of the research that GICHD has conducted on **Mine Action Funding: Trends, Modalities and Future Prospects**, for which we organised a side event on Thursday.

But first, let me begin by providing you with some background on what prompted us to conduct this study. Last year, we initiated joint research with the Landmine Monitor on mine action funding, in response to feedback we received from national mine action authorities and centres, as well as operators, on the issue of how to secure an adequate and predictable level of resources for mine action in the future.

Based on the findings, we felt we needed more detailed information on the key factors that drive donor funding decisions, the modalities they use for mine action funding, and their views regarding future support for mine action. This year, GICHD contracted Jean Devlin, the former head of Canadian CIDA's mine action unit, to conduct follow-up research.

The following is a brief summary of our preliminary findings:

1. Most donors concentrate their aid on six key mine affected countries: Afghanistan, Iraq, Sudan, Somalia, DRC, Bosnia-Herzegovina. These same countries are the top recipients of large and different types of programme assistance.
2. Donors remain committed to providing funding for mine action in the near future. However they are emphasising the need for greater ownership, demonstration of impact and capacity development.
3. Donor capacity is being challenged with regards to mine action. Few of the divisions and units responsible in donor agencies have full-time staff dedicated solely or even mostly to mine action. The mine action contacts or focal points typically handle a wider portfolio of issues. Staff turnover also causes difficulties in retaining expertise.
4. In terms of funding modalities, all donors function primarily in response mode. They typically do not develop programmes themselves, but respond to funding proposals.
5. The level of direct funding provided to national authorities is minimal. There is no habit to consult directly with mine action authorities. Donors typically channel support for mine action through implementing agencies, i.e. mine/ERW operators, mainly international NGOs.
6. Donors tend to have a light footprint at field level, with minimal field representation devoted to mine action and limited consultation with relevant ministries and central agencies in host countries. Although embassies are consulted, few funding decisions are made at field level. This is related to

the comparatively limited resources dedicated to mine action, as embassies have a full range of subjects to deal with.

7. We asked donors about the possibility of accessing new sources of funding for mine action. Most donors responded negatively, with a few suggesting marginal possibilities for accessing funding through other aid programmes.
8. When asked about which factors influence their decision-making processes for funding, donors listed the following as the top factors, which we've grouped into 3 categories:
 - i. relative need (actual or perceived)
 - ii. success – measured in terms of
 - a. links to development reflected in the national mine action strategy and/or mine action in the national development plan
 - b. efficiency of operations; and
 - c. growing capacity of national authorities
 - iii. simplicity (e.g. mine action integrated in common appeals)

We will publish these research findings later this year.

Thank you Co-Chairs.