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1. Introduction and summary

Without doubt the concept of development-oriented mine action is a success story. While in the past mine action has been considered rather a military and technical challenge the concept of humanitarian mine action developed in the early nineties has taken into consideration that landmines pose a deadly threat to civilians with devastating humanitarian and development consequences, and therefore need a humanitarian and development response.

Beyond the death or disability of individuals or the deny of agriculture or the damage to the infrastructure, landmines put also psychological and social upheavals, affecting individuals and the society as a whole.

In order to develop a blueprint for mine action, that allow to react on this complex situation of societal destruction after war, international mine action and development experts gathered in Bad Honnef in 1997. The outcome has become known as the “Bad Honnef Framework - Guidelines for Development-Oriented Mine Action Programmes”.

Today, all actors involved in mine action - donors, recipient countries as well as implementers - consider the linkage of mine action and development as crucial.

To discuss best practices and future challenges of the comprehensive approach of mine action a group of NGO representatives together with representatives of mine-related UN agencies and of some donors gathered in Nairobi in the margin of the first review conference on the Ottawa Convention banning anti-personnel mines.

Key questions have been:
- What has been the practice to translate the holistic approach of mine action to a reality?
- What should be done to further support the holistic approach?

The examples of best practices to build up humanitarian mine action programmes in the context development are impressing, indeed.

- The Mines Advisory Group reported on cooperation and partnerships with development actors in Cambodia and Sri Lanka.
- DanChurchAid reported on the linkage of mine action with other sectors like HIV/Aids, repatriation and rehabilitation efforts of refugees and IDPs in Angola, DR Congo, and Sudan.
- The Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation reported on the combination of landmine/UXO surveys and data-analysis with health, food and agriculture issues in Afghanistan, Kosovo, DR Congo, Lebanon, Iraq, and Vietnam.
- Finally, the Survey Action Center made the case, how the landmine impact survey have been used by mine victim assistance actors, mine risk education actors, the national and provincial governments, and the UN for priority setting, for health issues, and the verification of the administrative division in Angola.

The UNDP explained the concept of “mainstreaming” and suggested to rename the term of humanitarian mine action to mine action in order to add development funding to mine action. Present NGOs as well as UNICEF expressed concerns that this will exclude the humanitarian aspect of mine action.

It was agreed to distribute the documentation of the workshop widely to development NGOs and to donors and recipient countries for mine action seeking more support of the integrated approach in the development sector. Secondly, the workshop participants favoured a follow-up meeting on the Bad Honnef framework with extended participation of development experts and representatives of donor and recipient countries, and welcomed the idea of the EC representative to held this meeting in the European Parliament in Brussels.
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2. **AGENDA**

**Nairobi-Workshop “Integrating mine action and development – chances and constraints”**

Date: 29.11.04  
Venue: UNON, Room 7

Co-chairs: Markus Haake (Action Group Landmine.de), Tim Carstairs (Mines Advisory Group)

**14:00** **Key note** (Markus Haake, Action Group Landmine.de): What can donors learn from the integrated approach - the example of Germany’s funding policy.

**14:10** **PARTICIPATION AND COORDINATION - Building intersectoral partnership**

Inputs from the field

- DanChurchAid (Steven Oljeas): The integrated approach of DCA in Sudan, Congo, Angola.

Key questions are: How and how far main components of the Bad Honnef guidelines as i.e. participation and coordination, or coherence have been translated to reality? What have been the main constrains? What have been the main achievements? Lessons learnt? What should be done from donor side to support the integrated approach?

- Survey Action Center (Uli Tietze): The Landmine Impact Survey from a development-oriented point of view. The example Angola.

Key questions are: What practical use have been made of the LIS, so far? Who is using the LIS? How LIS can in be used beyond mine/UXO removal for development purposes? Also, what should be done from donor side to support the integrated approach?

**15:10** **Input from the UN**

- UNDP (Earl Turcotte)

Key questions are: How can the UN support these integrated projects of NGOs? How the UN can promote the integrated approach through their coordination bodies? What should be done from donor side to support the integrated approach?

**15:20** **Coffee Break**

**15:50** **Open discussion - Comments by the donors and NGOs (60 min)**

**16:50** **ACTION PLAN (35 min)**

Discussion points:

- Common NGO-Policy Statement to the Nairobi- Review Conference – (draft statement to be circulated before the workshop).
- Making the success of development-oriented HMA visible – compiling pilot projects of the integrated approach.
- Popular version of the Bad Honnef Guidelines – new name for the development-oriented approach.

**17:25** **Wrap-up by the co-chairs**

**17:30** **End**
3. PRESENTATION

- **Keynote: What can donors learn from the integrated approach - the example of Germany’s funding policy.**  
  (Markus Haake, Action Group Landmine.de)

One criticism that could be made of the Ottawa Treaty is a lack of explanation or definition of what kind of Humanitarian Mine Action states should support. This is a question of quality. The guidelines for HMA from a development-oriented point of view is an attempt to propose such a conceptual framework of best practice to explain what is meant by ‘quality’ HMA.

This integrated approach to HMA described within the Guidelines for Mine Action Programmes from a Development-oriented point of view is indeed ambitious. A set of complementary components defines the term Humanitarian Mine Action in extending the activity of mine action to mine clearance, mine victim assistance, socio-economical rehabilitation, reconciliation, and advocacy: a holistic approach. In doing so the guidelines stresses:

- the need for the full participation of the mine victims (not only the individual but the communities) in the planning and implementing of HMA,
- the need for extended and lasting partnership between the implementers of the different components of HMA,
- the need for providing funds without vested interests of the donor but with the aim of producing/generating autonomy of the beneficiaries.

Let me give you one example that of my country, how difficult it is to see what kinds of HMA are being supported, because the guidelines are not being followed or are misinterpreted. My conclusions are indeed not exclusive to Germany’s funding policy. I suggest that this applies to many donors, however, I take one concrete example to highlight the questions, we would like to follow at this workshop.

**The example of Germany’s funding policy 1997-2002**

The data of Germany’s allocations are available at the UNMAS’ e-mine system. The categorisation is taken from the German Government and shows that in 1997 the German Government allocated from its annual budget for humanitarian mine action less than 10% to what it calls integrated projects while ca. 50% has been allocated to mine clearance.

In 2002 the picture and the words are completely changed: 85% of the Germans funds have been allocated to integrated projects while just 12% went into mine clearance projects. Is this a reality or public relations?

It is important to note that between 1998 and 2001 Germany’s allocation to mine clearance increased from ca. 50% to more than 80%, while allocations to what it calls integrated projects decreased from 18% to 5% or less.

**My first proposition is: Donors may learn from the Bad Honnef Guidelines improved public relations.**

The idea of integrated projects has been a success, since its introduction in 1997. NGO’s successfully lobbied not only the donor community but also the public both the wider and the more specialised to the landmine issue that the simple removing of landmines from the ground away means little in terms of the benefit to the affected communities.

However, we don’t know what the term “integrated mine action” exactly means when it is inputted into the UNMAS e-mine system. The question is: What kind of activities is covered by the term? Does the UNMAS system help with appropriate criteria?

Are we able to clear up this confusion by providing better information? Or is just PR? Or are some donors unable to merge HMA and development for structural or other political reasons? If so, are we able to identify and to get over those constraints?
My second proposition concludes therefore: Donors may learn from the Bad Honnef Guidelines that the wider definition of Humanitarian Mine Action covers more than mine removal. They may learn, that the full range of components as victim assistance, socio-economical rehabilitation, reconciliation, and advocacy are essential part of HMA.

What does that mean in concrete terms? The Bad Honnef guidelines for HMA from a development-oriented point of view addresses field workers, donors, and campaigners. Field workers may make use of the Bad Honnef guidelines when planning and implementing projects in the area of HMA taking the guidelines as a blueprint for the design of the project or using them as a checklist for existing programme design processes. Campaigners, researchers, and the media may make use of the Guidelines to find out both the meaningful and the questionable use of funds.

My third proposition is: Donors may learn from the Bad Honnef Guidelines an improved decision making process when deciding on the allocation of funds. They can take the Guidelines as a blueprint when judging the anticipated impact of proposed projects.

My fourth proposition is consequently: Donors may take the Bad Honnef Guidelines as a blueprint for the evaluation of projects.

In conclusion, I have asked a number of ‘policy’ questions related to the guidelines. Now we will hear some examples of best practice and we hope the following discussion will enable us to clarify whether there are problems with the interpretation of the guidelines, what ideas of best practices we can bring together, and how together and independently we can improve the partnership between NGOs, the understanding of the integrated approach by donors and NGOs, and the interaction between the two.

Mines Advisory Group (Adam Komorowski and Rob White):
MAG in Cambodia and Sri Lanka – the challenge of partnership and coordination with the development sector.

At the heart of MAG’s mine action approach is an understanding that the sector cannot exist in a vacuum and needs to consider development and poverty alleviation objectives – for MAG the clearance figures do not provide the full picture – we want to see how we can have a positive impact on people and economies, in short to make a difference to lives and livelihoods.

Equally, MAG has always looked at the value of partnerships and collaboration at the operations level and across the breadth of our programmes has been involved with a wide range of organisations and agencies. These incorporate the funding partners themselves, UN agencies, existing national and regional development and mine action bodies such as the Cambodian Mine Action Authority and the National Steering Committee for Mine Action for Sri Lanka and we also work to develop integrated projects on the ground which ensure long term sustainable development takes place, getting involved with both local and international NGOs such as Wathnakpheap in Cambodia and White Pigeon in Sri Lanka and World Vision, CARE and Health Unlimited.

The work of clearance makes a direct impact in many different ways, including:

- Providing safe access to water, shelter and food
- Clearance of access routes for aid agencies to reach remote communities
- Opening of access routes for trade
- Providing safe access to spiritual sites
- Safe land for agricultural development and animal husbandry
- Mine-free land for construction, reconstruction of schools, houses and health centres
- Employment of national staff, often from the affected communities themselves

The reality of what we are involved in on the ground is obviously determined by the nature of the working environments and the potential partnerships that exist. For the purposes of this brief presentation I will go through how this approach has been manifested in Cambodia and Sri Lanka.
Cambodia

Almost all of our demining activities are undertaken in cooperation and collaboration with community development NGOs. Some are direct partner/donors- such as World Vision, LWF and CWS, and others are partners that MAG have chosen to create mutually beneficial relationships with such as Wathnakpheap and Action Against Hunger. MAG conducts joint prioritisation visits with the community development organisation, ensuring the demined land is utilised to its fullest benefit. The majority of MAG’s clearance is for resettlement, schools, health centres, agriculture, wells etc- all of these are activities supported by our partners. For example in Preah Vihear MAG cleared land for our partner Health Unlimited who have since constructed a Community health clinic on the site.

It is also important to note that MAG works within the National Mine Action plan and always seeks to ensure that what do compliments the development plans for the area based on local authorities and the targets as set by the relevant NGOs.

Sri Lanka

MAG attends and contributes to monthly meetings of MARC – Mine Action Resource Centre based in Colombo. This meeting is attended by all mine action agencies operating in Sri Lanka and is a good opportunity to share concerns/experiences. Last year MAG became a member of the Consortium of Humanitarian Agencies, and this group meets regularly to discuss issues surrounding humanitarian work in Sri Lanka.

MAG provides advice and assistance to international agencies seeking to work (or already working) in areas of landmine contamination. MAG has provided tailored reports to many agencies including ACF, MSF and UNDP to assist in their planning of project activities in specific landmine contaminated areas. NGO projects supported by MAG have included road clearance, well sinking, building toilets, reconstruction of hospitals, schools, and community buildings. Additionally MAG’s CLAs have provided MRE to NGOs working in mine/UXO-contaminated areas.

This is by no means an exhaustive list of the ways in which we are contributing to and coordinating with the wider development sector, but it should illustrate MAG’s commitment to this approach.

However, I do think it is important to add that whilst MAG embraces this way of doing things, we are under no illusions as to the difficulties we face in terms of practical implementation, and at this stage I would like to summarise some of what can be diplomatically described as the ‘challenges of development’ – and by no means do we suggest that we have all the answers to these.

- Sustainability – a development mantra and not something that in HMA terms can be considered a guarantee simply because land has been cleared or declared as such – the challenge is to ensure that land is then put to a purpose that benefits the local community – for example ensuring legally viable handover of land, (MAG’s programming in Cambodia has for example closely coordinated with CMAC, carrying out joint planning activities and meeting regularly with the Land Use Planning Units (LUPUs) to build in some joined up thinking in our work plans).

- Linked with this is capacity building – we need to focus not only on training in technical skills and competencies but also on management, leadership, finance, administration, planning, proposal writing, reporting and so on. With this approach we can better empower national organisations to function effectively long after the clearance has been completed.

- Genuine national Stakeholder involvement – development theory and practice are not always one and the same, and getting realistic and effective local involvement is never going to be an easy process – it inevitably makes operations slower and more complicated, but the alternative is a top-down process that fails to draw on local knowledge and does not necessarily deliver the assistance as identified by the beneficiaries. Proper and useful assessment takes time, needs to work with the relevant stakeholders (it is not about numbers it is about quality of input) and needs to be participative not consultative.

- Development planning – an integrated approach that positions HMA under the development umbrella will enable agencies to be far more effectively involved in national planning, and being able to see how and where mine action can fit in with these wider priorities, complementing the work conducted in other sectors such as...
health, water sanitation, transport infrastructure and agriculture. HMA agencies need to have their issues represented in and be working with Poverty Reduction Strategy Plans rather than working as organisations who are bolted on to the side of such programmes.

To sum up, whilst undeniable progress has been made in mine action we have to be aware that there is a danger of reinventing the wheel at this juncture - there is much now to be learned from the experience of other well established development sectors - both the successes and the failures. We need to accept that at management level within our programmes there is a role to be played by development professionals, to keep our eye on the outcomes rather than focussing too much on the processes; we know we have the skills and the tools for mine action, now we need to build on the post-clearance possibilities.

- **DanChurchAid (Steven Oljeas):**
  The integrated approach of DCA in Sudan, Congo, Angola.

**Example 2 – Dual objectives**

- Combining Survey and MRE with delivering HIV/AIDS awareness messages to remote villages in DR Congo:
  - To capitalise on obvious synergies of common methodology
  - To address the major causes of the choking low socio-economic development

**Example 3 – Operational co-ordination**

- The entire DCA operation in Angola was conceived to support the repatriation and rehabilitation of refugees and IDPs:
  - More than co-ordination and support: Joint assessments and planning
  - Easier to get an holistic approach to priority setting
- Vietnam Veterans of America
  Foundation (Chuck Conley and
  William Barron):
  A Multi-sector Approach to
  Mainstreaming Humanitarian Mine
  Action.

**Mine Action & Development**

**VVAF Experiences in**
**Integration of Mine Action**
**Activities with the Broader**
**Humanitarian/Development**
**Continuum**

**iMMAP Background**
- Specialty: Information management in post-
  conflict relief and development environments;
- Expertise gained through landmine/UXO
  surveys, other sectoral surveys and IM support
  to MACC’s and HIC’s;
- Recognized other sectors were lagging behind
  information management developments in the
  Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) community
  → iMMAP began exporting expertise to other
  sectors in Afghanistan, Iraq, Liberia

**Problem**
- HMA in Kosovo, as far as IM is
  concerned, was *hugely* advanced over
  other sectors
- As a result, attempts to incorporate key
  data from other sectors mostly failed
- An exception occurred when MACC /
  VVAF created agricultural shape files
  from third-party raster files and used
  them in the priority scoring scheme for
  clearance

**Analysis**
- Essentially relied on
  proxy indicators,
  both for:
  - NATO data in lieu of
    non-existing
    landmine knowledge
    among returnees;
  and
  - GIS constructs in
    lieu of development-
    relevant primary
    data

**Agenda: Brief point each on ..**
- Afghanistan
- Lebanon
- Iraq
- D.R. Congo
Lesson From Kosovo

- If VVAF wanted to make a contribution to HMA IM in the direction of greater integration with development agendas, then

- It had to directly cooperate with organizations working in or near the development field, notably the UN Humanitarian Information Centers.

Analysis

- The primary thrust was to support AIMS with personnel: Technical Manager

- Other projects with VVAF involvement
  - Post-conflict Contamination Assessment (PCCA);
  - Mortality/Injury/Disability Survey (MIDS);
  - could be leveraged to produce combined HMA-development IM outputs (see map)

Problem

- From its Kosovo experience, iMMAP recognized that HMA IM competencies were needed by other sectors;
- OCHA’s AIMS required technical support and resources;
- Interaction/integration between HMA and AIMS was initially limited.
Combined Landmines/UXO, Health and Food

Lessons From Afghanistan

- There were good synergies between HMA and other sectors, but they remained patchy and high-maintenance.
- AIMS itself was subject to the vagaries of institutional succession from OCHA to UNDP.

Problem

- Mandate to both establish framework for HIC and develop landmine/UXO information sources
- Challenge to apply lessons from past experience elsewhere, benefit from lead time
- More and more experienced manpower available

Analysis

- Involvement in two major IM endeavors:
  ✓ (with MAG) Emergency Mine Action Survey (EMAS) in northern Iraq;
  ✓ UN HIC Rapid Assessment Process (RAP)
- Creates regions of good data overlap
- Opportunity for “dual analysis”, as suggested in two maps:

Iraq
How many schools within 100 meters of a Dangerous Area? (MRE perspective)

**Lessons From Iraq**
- As we all know by now, data collection and processing at mercy of security developments
- High-quality community gazetteer very important as common grid for all sorts of surveys
- HMA surveys benefit from clearer end-user expectations than HIC-coordinated multi-sectoral assessments

**Problem**
- UNMACC Southern Lebanon reported, and anecdotal evidence concurred that:
  - although contaminated communities were cleared almost universally (“Operation Emirates Solidarity”), a large fraction of the cleared land was not returned to previous agricultural usage.
  - This resulted from structural problems of Lebanese agriculture, such as import competition, under-capitalized farmers, etc.;
  - Farming on cleared land would be profitable in selective local environments only.

**Analysis**
- Incorporation of External Data:
  - Access to GoL Agricultural Census data;
  - Calculation of “active land use” and “irrigation intensity” ratios;
  - Concept of “agricultural vibrancy” as combination of the two.
- GIS and Statistical Analysis:
  - Mapping all agricultural census tracts by their local vibrancy;
  - Overlaying map with mine-affected communities;
  - Link to suspected hazard areas; estimating fraction of area situated in agriculturally vibrant communities.

Note: Red dots stand for landmine/UXO-affected communities.
Note: For 10 of the 289 affected communities, the agricultural data was not available.

Clearance and Return to Active Agricultural Use

- Only a small part of contaminated land, if cleared, can be expected to be returned to active agriculture without supplementary development investments;
- If budgets are limited, a combination of selective clearance, fencing and livelihood investments may be more productive;
- Three months after the survey results were presented to stakeholders (May 2003), the director of the NDO informally shared a map of areas critical to the rehabilitation of major irrigation infrastructure upon which future clearance projects would be focused.

Problem

- UXO problem is more serious than landmines. Most contaminated areas are being actively used;
- UXO is essentially of two kinds:
  - “Bombies” [CBU] on or close to the surface, or in local dumps;
  - Large bombs, often deep in the ground;
- Importantly, strikes occur in two types of situations:
  - Scrap metal collection;
  - Land use change, particularly construction;
- The basic concept of “ERW blocking access to a resource” does not apply.

Lessons From Lebanon

- Incorporation of external data:
  - An excellent, detailed and geo-referenced public-access database exists regarding “Poverty and Inequality”;
  - Vietnam War strikes zones have been extensively documented through the “Indochina Bombing Data Project”;
  - VVAF has maps of built-up areas, on the fringes of which construction can be expected to activate a good part of future strikes.

Analysis

- GIS and statistical analysis:
  - Data from three sources [administrative EOC, historic bombing record, Poverty Atlas] were combined for the sampling of suspected communes in Phase I;
  - Once sufficient Phase I commune data is available, the exploration of an index of socio-economic impact will be pursued;
  - It is expected to combine interview information with GIS derivatives and to be cross-analyzed with the Poverty Atlas data.
Problem

- Limited landmine/UXO information available;
- Due to country size and logistics constraints, HMA NGO's operating in limited areas;
- National authorities require information, support in order to safely conduct elections in 2005 – getting people safely from their homes to Election Liaison Offices.

Lessons From Vietnam

- The environment is different:
  - The Vietnam survey operates in a highly-reputed poverty research environment, with a government that formulated a clear poverty-reduction strategy;
  - The survey data is collected by an experienced and independent-minded branch of the armed forces;
  - The link between the two seems to have worked well at the EOC and sampling stage, but no prediction is possible about future synergies.
- When concepts change, we struggle for data:
  - The nature of the contamination requires conceptual adaptations; good data to match them is not automatically available, and requires a great deal of networking, translation and training and simply “good luck” (as with the Poverty Atlas).

Democratic Republic of Congo

Problem

- Limited landmine/UXO information available;
- Due to country size and logistics constraints, HMA NGO's operating in limited areas;
- National authorities require information, support in order to safely conduct elections in 2005 – getting people safely from their homes to Election Liaison Offices.

Analysis

- iMMAP conducted Assessment Advance Mission in April and May;
- iMMAP, in concert with UNMAS, HI/B, FSD, DCA, MAT, and MAG, has proposed conduct of an Explosive Remnants of War Contamination Assessment (ERW CA);
- SRSG, MONUC, national stakeholders support the need for this project to be conducted rapidly.
Conclusion

HMA and Development

HMA and Development (1)

- Other applied disciplines, such as Nature Conservation and Public Health have proven that they can integrate with poverty reduction agendas
- HMA can achieve greater integration as well. …

HMA and Development (2)

- It requires:
  - Thinking and acting outside traditional core concepts;
  - Aggressive acquisition of conceptual tools, institutional and personal relationship capital, and relevant external data within a useful window of time;
  - More emphasis on testing and dissemination of results in strategic planning frameworks;
- These ideas are close to the concept of “mainstreaming the LIS”, promoted in a recent LIS evaluation.

Survey Action Center (Uli Tietze): The Landmine Impact Survey from a development-oriented point of view. The example Angola.

Landmine Impact Survey
The example Angola

The LIS from a development-oriented point of view.

Actors in the Angola LIS

National Authority: CNIDAH

Executing Agency: SAC

Donors: EC Canada Germany US-DoS Angola

National Authority:

CNIDAH

Executing Agency:

SAC

Implementing Partners:

NPA MAG InterSOS DWA

International and national Demining Agencies as implementers
Strategic planning advisor (Cranefield University)
Needs assessment planner (Development Workshop)
39 Interview teams 17 Field staff 16 Management and administrative staff

LIS Operators
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LIS Operators
**The LIS methods**

- Preliminary opinion collection on district level.
- Semi-structured group interviews with community mapping in each impacted locality.
- Visual inspection of the Suspected Hazard Areas identified by the community.

**Use of the LIS by Demining agencies**

- UXO spot clearance during the survey
- Marking
- Key blockages removal
- Prioritizing with the provincial Governments
- Planning of clearance operation

**The Mine Impact in Angola According to POC**

- Presumably Mine Impacted Localities (Total 9,865 Localities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Not Impacted</th>
<th>Presumably impacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Immediate UXO Removal**

- UXO Spot Findings (Total 131)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Not Removed</th>
<th>Removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use of the LIS by Mine Risk Education agencies**

- Immediate MRE during interview
- Response follow up through Community liaison teams
- Facilitating contact to national MRE agencies via UNICEF
- Special MRE maps

**The Mine Impact in Angola According to POC**

- Presumably Mine Impacted Localities (Total 9,865 Localities)
Needs in Mine Risk Education

- Received MRE
- Not Received MRE

Use of the LIS by Mine Victim Assistance Agencies

- Response follow up (through CAPDC in Moxico Province).
- Facilitating contact to national and international Mine Victims Assistance agencies.
- Victims needs maps
  - Have Prostesis
  - Don't Have Prostesis

Use of the LIS by the National and Provincial Government

- National Mine Action agency, CNIDAH
  - Use of the data of the LIS for the elaboration of the National Strategic Plan on Mine Action 2006-2010.
- Provincial Governments
  - Prioritizing road rehabilitation and road clearance operation based on LIS data.
  - Task assessment planning.

Task Assessment Planning Decision Tree

What practical use have been made of the LIS, so far?

- Creation of a national LIS data base
  - Use of IMSMA as the preferred data base tool after 1. January 2005
  - Verification of the existing data base (INAROEE) to prepare its transfer into IMSMA
  - Revision of operational Mine Action planning in the surveyed provinces.

Goals of the LIS

- The LIS gives national authorities the information needed to focus planning on areas of greatest impact.
- Donors are in a better position to apportion funds to places of greatest human need.
- Implementers have baseline data from which to measure progress.
**LIS and Data on Development**

- Administrative division of the country
- Affected Population
  - Urban / Rural
- Population Growth
- Returnees
- Infrastructure
- Education Facilities
- Health facilities

**Demographic Data on Health Facilities in Angola**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Facilities in Mine Affected Localities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No facilities</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inoperational</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Build up of a National Gazetteer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative division - upcoming elections 2006!</th>
<th>Preliminary Opinion Collection (POC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World Food Program</td>
<td>Verification of the administrative division of the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92% of all survey communities depend on agriculture.</td>
<td>Build up of a national gazetteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WFP Vulnerability Analysis Group has requested LIS Data in its search for more viable indicators to reduce subjective perceptions on vulnerability.</td>
<td>Planning of MRE in remote areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot study on needs assessment of High and Medium impacted communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use of the LIS by UN - Agencies**

- **World Health Organization**
  - Creation of a Technical Working Group on the use of GIS for Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation
  - Use of the IMSMA database with mapping interface for data of Landmine Impact survey to the WHO "Health Mapper"
  - Use of LIS data on medical facilities for a national data base on health structure

- **Use of the LIS Beyond Mine/UXO Removal?**
  - Verification of the administrative division of the country
  - Build up of a national gazetteer
  - Planning of MRE in remote areas
  - Identifying Mine Victims in need of physical rehabilitation
  - Vulnerability assessment for WFP
  - Pilot study on needs assessment of High and Medium impacted communities
Rapid Rural Appraisal in 14 High and Medium Impacted Communities

- Similar interview techniques like the LIS
- Focus on existing survival strategies
- Discussing poverty as a general issue
- Asking for a priority of needs
- Not addressing mines as a special problem

Pilot Study on Needs Assessment by Development Workshop

Priority of Needs in 14 Mine Impacted Localities

Conclusion

- Landmine Impact Surveys are intended to:
  - Define the problem in terms of scale, type, location, hazard and social and economic impact experienced by local communities.
  - Improve national planning by allowing for clear prioritization of resources.
  - Strategic planning based on LIS data has to be linked up with:
    - Poverty Reduction Strategies,
    - Integrated Recovery Programs and
    - Food Security Strategy.

What should be done from donor side to support the integrated approach?

- Take LIS data as a whole serious

Categorizing SHA’s

The Bosnia SHA Indicators

- Estimated clearance cost
- Estimated fencing cost
- Number of beneficiaries
- Public/private benefit
- Number of sustainable livelihoods
- Probability of sustained jobs/livelihoods
- Size of planned investment (if any)
- Likelihood of investment going forward
- Cost of alternative solution
- Number of returnees
- Important social assets blocked
- Important gender issues
- Perceived relative risk
- Special cultural significance
Mine impacted communities

- Percentage of localities with a distinct no. of SHA
  (Total 421 localities)
  - 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%
  - **Total**

High impact SHAs

- Suspected Hazard Areas with Recent Victims
  (Total 633 SHA)
  - 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%
  - **Total**

Recent Victims

- No. of Recent Victims (<24 months)
  (Total 401 Localities)
  - 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%
  - **Total**

Training Module for Bosnia TAP

- What is a SHA and what does it imply?
- What makes an SHA a priority?
- What does 'Impact' mean to you?
- What is it that landmines are hindering?
- Conditionality and Likelihood
- In what way can you obtain information?
- What do we ask and how do we ask?

Demographic Data on Education Facilities

- Education Level in Mine Affected Localities
  (Total 401)
  - 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%
  - **Total**

- No school
- Primary
- Secondary
- Higher education

Demographic Data on Education Facilities

- Facilities
  - 27% 66% 4% 2%
  - 0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%
  - **Total**

- Conditionality and Likelihood
- In what way can you obtain information?
- What do we ask and how do we ask?
Mainstreaming. The role of the UNDP (Earl Turcotte)

I. What is mainstreaming?
Mainstreaming is understood as the integration of mine action into a larger context.

II. Why mainstreaming?
i) The effort to mainstream mine action into development is driven by need for more resources, and

ii) the desire for greater efficiency + effect-oriented impact

RISKS
Mine action will get lost. It will find a home, but not our home + the mine action community will be marginalized.

If done properly, mine action will not only remain in its home, but have homes in different communities.

OPPORTUNITIES
1. Main resources exist and are available. If we can demonstrate, how in concrete terms mine action can help development actors to fulfil their mandates. I have heard today from MAG and others, how the case can be made.

2. Strategic partnerships are possible. Once the development community understands, how critical it is, they will seek out the mine action community.

3. The mechanism for cooperation, coordination and partnership are already in place.

4. Concerns that dedicated resources will dry up. Mutual inclination of committed people to plan ahead in openness and enthusiasm,

5. Fears that things are spinning out of control

6. Precedents have been set + nothing succeeds like success.
   i) Mine affected countries are putting it forward as a development priority.
   ii) Donors are more open as this understanding increase. CIDA is doing it. DFID has created an enabling policy environment.

CONSTRAINTS
1. Lack of knowledge of the divers approaches + actions within the development community.

2. Fears that opening the door will result in loss of control + resources. Need to build mutually beneficial partnerships can help to push this rock up the hill.

SUPPORT TO NGO WHILE MAINSTREAMING
UNDP can offer
1. to play the broker role at the country level

2. to play the broker role at the international level. Most international NGOs have links with ODA agencies.

3. to make the development case: assist the development NGOs with understanding some of the basic principles, approaches, structures, modalities that currently govern the development community.

4. Agency specific intelligence

5. Stop calling mine action “humanitarian demining”, because the development community comprehends this as an emergency “humanitarian” issue.

BENEFITS – PAY OFF
I. Mainstreaming will bring more financial, technical, and human resources.

II. Mainstreaming will increase efficiency and effectiveness and will multiply the impact.
7. **Draft Policy Paper**

Mine Action and Development – A Holistic Approach

Draft Policy Paper

**SINCE THERE HAS BEEN NO PROGRESS ON ENGAGING DONORS IN THE INTEGRATED, HOLISTIC APPROACH, NGO’S ARE CARRYING OUT FOR YEARS NOW, WE REITERATE WHAT WE HAVE PRESENTED TO THE LANDMINE COMMUNITY ON SEVERAL OCCASION:**

Humanitarian Mine Action NGOs concerned with providing best practice solutions for mine and UXO-affected countries underline the need for and the requirements of a holistic and integrated approach to mine action and development.

Landmines and UXO impact on communities in a variety of ways. These impacts can be considered in the short-term (emergency) and in the long-term (economic and social development) and affect the broad spectrum of humanitarian and development assistance,

- causing death and injury
- closing or hindering access in the immediate post-conflict period
- endangering medical, relief, and emergency programmes
- increasing pressure on health care programmes and disease-related activities (vaccination, HIV prevention)
- endangering rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts with additional pressure on financial and logistical resources
- hampering local subsistence activities, access to water and preventing the fulfilment of basic human needs
- prohibiting transportation, trade and communications
- prohibiting or endangering the return of IDPs and refugees
- killing livestock and damaging farm tools
- hindering or prohibiting forestry, the maintenance of irrigation, prohibiting agriculture, and subsistence economic activity

- hindering the maintenance of social infrastructure
- prohibiting access to energy resources and maintenance of energy infrastructure
- impacting Human Rights, DDR, the democratisation process

The Ottawa Treaty bans anti-personnel mines and encourages those nations in a position to fund Humanitarian Mine Action (including Victim Assistance) to do so. On the occasion of the first review of this Treaty, NGOs implementing Humanitarian Mine Action projects and programmes recommend that

1. **Best practice is to provide a holistic HMA response to landmine and UXO problems.**

The problem of landmines impacts on a broad range of human activity. Addressing these different areas requires at best a holistic appreciation of the problems and their solutions. There are clear linkages that can be implemented across the themes presented above. The Group calls therefore on concerned non-governmental and governmental agencies to recognise these linkages and co-operate and collaborate in policy and implementation to ensure that a holistic approach to reconstruction and post-conflict development can be provided to communities in need.

The Group invites concerned NGOs to comment on the present document in its broad lines and requests expressions of interest to the Chair of the meeting.

2. **The NGOs furthermore request that donors, recipient governments and other beneficiary groups integrate a holistic response to the broad impact of landmines and UXO into planning and funding decisions.**

The Group requests that donors make available funds for such holistic provision of humanitarian mine action, and to engage in education within their departments and ministries in the linkages between HMA, emergency and development assistance. Beneficiary governments should ensure emergency and development planning for a holistic response to mines and UXO is undertaken through relevant departments.

Nairobi, 30th November 2004
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Annex:

MINE ACTION PROGRAMMES from a development-oriented point of view
(“THE BAD HONNEF FRAMEWORK”)

Adopted by the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), Co-laureate of the Nobel Peace Prize 1997.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Landmines are murderous instruments of war and armed conflicts, which have devastating humanitarian and development consequences long after the end of armed hostilities. Like no other weapon, mines illustrate the fact that wars do not simply end, and certainly not automatically at the moment when peace is made. The continuing threat posed by millions of mines in large parts of the world today is both a real and symbolic manifestation of the permanent damage caused by wars and armed conflict.

The psychological and social upheavals endure beyond the damage to the infrastructure of a country, affecting individuals as much as the society as a whole. Violence, trauma, mistrust and family breakdown are not easily repaired; indeed they become dominant factors in the life of the community.

Efforts at rehabilitation in post-war societies require a comprehensive concept of reconstruction and development. It must be ensured that the conditions which led to war in the first place are not recreated. It is not sufficient to simply provide a few technical “inputs” such as mine-clearance and the provision of prosthetics. Rather, rebuilding and development must be approached “societally”, in other words through a lengthy struggle to change those things which on the one hand made war possible and which on the other hand have been seriously damaged by war; namely the social fabric, traditional social transactions and the economic foundations of the country.

A rehabilitation which can stabilise the peace requires a readjustment of the relationship between the individual and the social environment, a relationship which varies from culture to culture. Current practice in rehabilitation rarely achieves this goal. The allocation of funds and the guidelines applied are determined by political interests and the aim of being able to show results as soon as possible. Rather than the sustained rehabilitation of war-damaged societies it is more often a matter of pragmatic “quick impact” programmes which as a rule are measured in terms of their “output”, such as how many kilometres of road have been de-mined, how many refugees have been resettled or how many prosthetics have been distributed to the injured. Whether the de-mining of roads really does contribute to the rejuvenation of agriculture, whether the resettled people are able to build democratic social structures which respect human rights and whether the prosthetics really help the reintegration of the injured, remain matters of only secondary interest.

However, the aims introduced by the International Convention on the Prohibition of Anti-personnel Landmines which came into force on March 1st 1999 are far-reaching and show the way forward. The so-called “Ottawa Treaty”, which came about due to international public pressure, unites a weapons ban with concrete provisions for disarmament as well as humanitarian and development obligations. Article 6 of the Agreement requires alongside mine clearance the physical rehabilitation of victims as well as their social and economic reintegration. Reintegration can only succeed of course when the social fabric into which they are to be reintegrated and which has been damaged by war, is itself rehabilitated.

The Bad Honnef Framework on Mine Action Programmes makes such an approach mandatory. It is based on the experience of Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and community based organisations acquired at the project level and in their efforts towards achieving a ban on landmines.

In June 1997 experts from all over the world met in Bad Honnef in Germany in order to draft a framework for such comprehensive
Mine Action Programmes. The objective was not to design a catalogue of universally valid criteria, directly prescribing action. Such a catalogue, however tempting it may be, would inevitably be bound to fail because it would, by its very nature, ignore the specific social and cultural context in which any concrete actions must be embedded. Instead, the Bad Honnef Guidelines posited “critical guidelines” which propose a framework for possible, locally adapted, activities according to three central principles. These three principles are:

I. Participation – Since the needs and aspirations of those people affected by mines and not the particular interests of the funders must be the starting point for all endeavours, Mine Action Programmes require the appropriate involvement of those affected, at all levels and from the beginning.

II. Coherence – As part of the rehabilitation efforts in post-war situations Mine Action Programmes are embedded between straight emergency relief measures and long-term development programmes. Only with an integrated consideration of all the areas of activity aiming at rebuilding and a resumption of peace, can Mine Action Programmes contribute to a permanent change.

III. Solidarity – The aim is the immediacy of support which is conveyed by the idea of solidarity and the encouragement of autonomy and which does not promote new dependencies.

The BAD HONNEF GUIDELINES were again ratified in 1999 by representatives from NGOs, community based organisations, the UN, international organisations and some governments. The guidelines, now called “The Bad Honnef Framework”, simultaneously address several audiences:

- Field workers, who are offered a framework for action,
- Donors, who want to find out about both the meaningful and the questionable use of funds,
- Campaigners, who are presented with arguments to show that only the combination of public political action and practical solidarity can guarantee success.

The success of Mine Action Programmes lies in the lasting improvement in the living conditions of those affected by mines. It is indeed also the creation of social justice and peace which guarantees the permanent success of Mine Action Programmes. In view of such a comprehensive objective, the monitoring of individual projects requires the setting, in advance, of concrete goals with the participation of all sides and especially of those affected.

From the above comes the need for three definitions:

I. Mine

NGOs and community based organisations define anti-personnel mines by their impact rather than by their design. This view holds that a weapon which has the impact of an anti-personnel mine is an anti-personnel mine. Accordingly, for these Guidelines, a mine is any device that possesses one or more of the following characteristics:

a. a device which may be exploded through contact by, or presence or proximity of, a person or persons, and which is capable of killing, injuring or incapacitating one or more persons;

b. any device or munitions which, although its primary purpose or design may be other than specified in (a) above, can be deployed in a manner to achieve such effect without modification or through a specific design feature;

c. any device, including an anti-tank mine, which is fitted with an anti-handling, anti-disturbance or similar mechanism which will cause that device to be exploded...
through contact by, or presence or proximity of, a person or persons and which is capable of killing, injuring or incapacitating one or more persons.

NGOs and community based organisations will also consider damage to the wider environment as a criteria for the definition of such weapons.

II. Mine Victims

In accordance with the World Health Organisation (WHO) definition of health, all human beings impaired in their physical, psychological, or social integrity are to be regarded as victims. Among these are:

a. human beings immediately maimed by a mine (suffering from physical and psychological trauma);

b. family members and/or dependants of people disabled or killed by mines;

c. all human beings affected by the existence of mines including all those who, due to the threat of mines, could not or cannot pursue their normal activities.

This understanding of what constitutes a victim views disability not as an impairment specific to an individual human being, but as an interaction between human beings and society that has been impaired and damaged by a specific event. Mines and wars damage this interaction between individual human beings and the social reality surrounding them. Rehabilitation must therefore take into account both the suffering of the individual, with all the attendant psychosocial and economic ramifications, and the collective damage impairing the way of life, reproduction, and existence of the broader social group.

Accordingly, mine action programmes cannot limit themselves to addressing individuals. By means of organisational development and support for collective self-help, they must contribute towards overcoming the injustice suffered by the community, group or society as a whole.

III. Mine Action

Estimates of 60 – 110 million landmines do not provide any information in terms of impact on populations, societies, health, reconstruction and economic development of a mine affected country. Mine action is more than clearing mines. To ensure the success of mine action requires the achievement of sustainable improvements in the living conditions of mine victims and their communities.

Beyond the integration of mine survey, marking, clearing and awareness, as well as the accompanied physical, psychological, socio-economic and cultural rehabilitation of mine victims, mine action must be part of peace-building and reconstruction and development programmes, if it is to be sustainable. It is, therefore, necessary that participation by the afflicted community, and their capacity enhancement, is guaranteed in all measures which concern their interests.

Since no single organisation or international institution has the overall knowledge and competence to fulfil all elements of the integrated and comprehensive approach, close co-operation between national and local authorities with the organisations, which take responsibility for a specific component of the mine action programme, is crucial.
GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPMENT-ORIENTED MINE ACTION PROGRAMMES

Basic principles

1. The needs and aspirations of people affected by mines are the starting point for mine action programmes. Mine action programmes must be environmentally specific; they must be compatible, in form and content, with the conditions in individual countries.

2. As much as any human being, mine affected people and communities have the right to shape their own lives and to participate in political and economic decision making which concerns their interests. The implementation of the humanitarian action in a spirit of solidarity designed to promote autonomy rather than creating new dependencies is crucial.

3. Mine action programmes must be part of an integrated response. They have to support peace-building including reconstruction and development of the community and aim at enhancing the socio-economic and cultural infrastructure. Empowerment of the community to carry out all aspects of mine action programmes by providing the proper training, equipment, standard and supervision is the ultimate goal.

4. Social indicators that will determine the progress and success of a mine action programme should be defined in advance in consultation with the affected community and donors. Each programme should have well-defined goals, to be reviewed continuously.

5. Mine action programmes should be designed on the basis of objective data obtained through accurate socio-economic taking into account indicators and factors particular to the cultural environment. There is a need to review and revise programme objectives in consultation with the community and donors as the programme evolves.

6. The complex situation of societal destruction after war requires a coherent and simultaneous approach for all of the following elements of mine action programs:
   a) insertion in a national and local peace-building and development framework;
   b) community and victim/survivor participation;
   c) mine awareness and accident/incident prevention; mine surveying, marking and mine clearance
   d) effective emergency response capacities to accidents (emergency first aid);
   e) physical and psychological rehabilitation of mine victims;
   f) political, social, and economic reintegration of mine victims, families and their communities,
   g) empowerment of local communities, and
   h) political advocacy and support for the programmes.

7. Mine action programmes should reflect the impact of landmines on the environment and wildlife providing appropriate support.
PARTICIPATION AND CO-OPERATION
- Integrated mine action programmes based on community participation

Awareness building, Surveying, Marking and Demining:

8. It is essential that clearing mines and other explosive debris (UXO) is accompanied by information, education, and training, taking into account the specific cultural environment of each mine affected community. The population should be made aware of the dangers and consequences of mines in ways that are appropriate to the age, gender and social group of those being trained.

9. Surveying and marking of mine infested areas, as well as the actual demining process, including the destruction of mines and UXO, must take place in close cooperation with the affected population and all relevant authorities and organisations.

10. The guidelines (8) and (9) should be carried out by fully skilled and equipped local specialists trained by qualified trainers and planned and implemented in an integrated and co-ordinated manner.

Emergency first aid and physical rehabilitation

11. Access to prompt medical attention and the availability of surgical care is imperative. Local paramedics and physicians should be trained to competently provide emergency first aid, ambulance care and longer-term treatment to victims of mine explosions.

12. Prostheses and wheelchairs or other aids for the victims must be provided through the development of local production capacities. The highest possible quality standards, adapted to local circumstances, should be reached.

13. Physiotherapeutic and other rehabilitative measures should be carried out with an emphasis on the training of local specialists.

14. In order to guarantee continued success of the medical measures, the affected communities should be supported in their efforts to provide medical support and follow-up care for people with disabilities.

Socio-economic, cultural and psychological rehabilitation

15. Personal suffering and rupture of the social fabric must be countered by

a) offering appropriate accompaniment, educational and vocational training and/or other income generating possibilities for economic reintegration;

b) providing psycho-social care for the disabled and their kin (with the care tailored to the cultural traditions), helping to generate community capacities in this regard;

c) supporting healing cultural activities (such as sports, cinema, theatre, dance, newspaper, etc), as the realm of social integration, with a balanced participation of disabled and non-disabled;

d) supporting local organisations and particularly the efforts of the affected people to organise themselves.

16. Mine action programmes must address peace-building, reconciliation and needs of mine affected communities. This means for example to guarantee access to education and justice systems as well as creation of citizen security. Access to water, rural credit schemes, village roads, provision of primary health care should also be ensured, in order to sustain livelihoods.

17. Efforts at psychosocial rehabilitation should be accompanied by basic and further training of local monitors (social workers, health workers, teachers, and other community monitors).

18. Mine victims and landless people must be given priority in the allocation of demined land.

Institution building, co-operation and synergy

19. To correspond as best as possible with the needs and aspirations of affected communities, local institutions implementing individual parts of mine
action programmes should be supported both in establishing themselves as well as in their work (capacity enhancement).

20. Close co-operation between organisations is required in planning and implementing mine action programmes, mobilising different organisational competencies. A practical division of labour and responsibility in different aspects of projects contributes to an integrated and participatory approach.

21. Since no single organisation or international institution has the overall knowledge and competence to fulfil all elements of the integrated and comprehensive approach close co-operation between national and local authorities and organisations which take responsibility for a specific component of the mine action programme is crucial.

22. Co-operation between institutions of the North and the South (North-South-co-operation) as well as between institution from the South (South-South-co-operation) should be supported to build mutual confidence. An improved and mutual transfer of organising ability and other competencies is therefore required. Exchanges of community based experiences should be encouraged.

23. Non-local workers need to be sensitised in local culture and language in recognition of the demandingly holistic approach. They are a guest in a foreign country, and working for the benefit of that country. They should contribute to insuring sustainability.

24. The creation of local campaigns for the banning of landmines should be supported, for instance in helping to bring about an awareness of a collectively suffered injustice, or in averting the possible renewed use of mines.

COHERENCE AND SUSTAINABILITY - Mine action programmes as part of peace-building, reconstruction and development programmes

General requirements

25. Mine action programmes are part of national reconstruction and development programmes guided by the goal to create a community empowerment, social confidence and a development-oriented civil society.

26. Mine action programmes are part of peace building programmes. Beyond victim assistance, they should take into consideration the need for fully reintegrating refugees, displaced persons, and demobilised soldiers. There should be no discrimination of ex-soldiers, particularly of victims of mine accidents and other war disabled.

27. The participation of diverse social groups in mine action promotes both the sustainability of programmes and national reconciliation. The success of reconciliation, particularly among war victims, is an indicator of progress.

28. Efforts on the part of the victims (and their dependants) to establish a reparation fund, and financial aid such as pensions, should be supported. States are required to draw up and implement appropriate legislation regarding war victim and disabled rights, including the rights of veterans.

29. Mine action programmes require the creation of national data management systems including archives, mine related records, Geographical Information Systems, and national-wide databanks. Data should not only cover planted and stockpiled mines but also victims, internally displaced, demobilised soldiers. Comprehensive data collection and transparency with free access for all participants needs to be assured.

The role of NGOs and community based organisations in implementation and monitoring

31. NGOs and community based organisations welcome the steps taken so far on the path towards prohibiting mines, especially the
Ottawa Convention for the prohibition of anti-personnel mines. However, they regard the results achieved to date as a first step that has to be followed by further steps:

- extending the prohibition to include all mines and weapons covered by the effect-oriented definition;
- ensuring transparency of information on research into mines and weapons similar to mines and on the sale, transfer or export of mines;
- verifying the destruction of all mines;
- ensuring transparency in funding the research, development and procurement of new mines and mines delivery systems;
- rededicating funds allocated to the research and development of new mine technologies to mine action programmes.

32. NGOs and community based organisations support the universalisation of the Ottawa convention and beyond this the comprehensive banning of landmines and weapons with similar effect. Relevant work by local, regional and national campaigns towards an overall ban should be supported.

33. NGOs and community based organisations should demand international and national standards for the main elements of mine action programmes, such as demining and the rehabilitation of victims. NGOs and community based organisations should be part of the relevant negotiations on these and should bring their influence to bear.

34. National control mechanisms such as legislation should include NGOs and community based organisations in verifying compliance with these standards.

35. NGOs and community based organisations should monitor the overall impact of mine action programmes put into practice, in order to ensure compliance with the holistic approach.

SOLIDARITY AND FINANCING - Promotion of autonomy instead of creation of new dependencies

General principles

36. The NGOs and community based organisations demand that governments or warring parties, who developed, produced, exported and/or used landmines, accept their responsibility for the eradication of mines and addressing the impact of mines.

37. Comprehensive, integrated, participatory mine action programmes should become the norm for development policy in mine-affected societies. Plain demining cannot be the only goal of developmental or humanitarian considerations in the face of the pervasive destruction wrought on these societies. It is important that civil institutions are involved in all aspects of demining and mine action. The NGOs and community based organisations will strive continuously for this.

38. For the provision of additional funds, the principle that the polluter pays should be considered: companies that have profited from the development, production and sale of mines, could pay into a reparation fund.

Standards for the allocation of funds

39. Resources for mine action programmes should be allocated according to humanitarian considerations and according to these guidelines. If commissions are given to commercial enterprises, profits must not go into weapons production or into activities that are counter to these guidelines.

40. The comprehensive, integrated approach of mine action programmes demands a long term planning perspective, which needs to be considered when providing funds. Funding decisions should be made as close to the field as possible. Funds should be released rapidly to ensure programme coherence and timely implementation. Donors should practice direct funding to implementing organisations and take greater and closer responsibility for programme monitoring.
41. Funding allocation decisions must be based on the needs and aspirations of mine victims and their communities. These decisions should involve mine action protagonists at all stages of the allocation process. Vested interests of the donor or recipient countries should not play a decisive role.

42. While NGOs and community based organisations accept appropriate research into new mine clearance technologies based on end-user requirements and existing technologies, the ratio of funding should be balanced in favour of community-based mine action programmes. New mine clearance technology should reflect local capacities and be locally manageable.

43. Donors should be fully transparent about the funds allocated to mine action. The purpose of the grants should be specifically designated in different categories: these should include mine clearance, research and development of new mine clearance and detection technology, and mine victim assistance. This will clarify whether humanitarian funds are being used to fund non-humanitarian work, and/or commercial and military research and development.

44. NGOs and community based organisations encourage mine-affected countries themselves to create, in full transparency, their own mine action budgets commensurate with the extent of the landmine problem. Such budgets should include corresponding decreases in military spending for mine technology.

45. Development, commercial and other investments in mine-affected countries should include appropriate mine-action elements in project planning, budgeting and implementation. In particular, all mine clearance organisations and commercial investments in affected areas should privilege local capacity-building.

**CHANGES AND IMPROVEMENT OF THESE GUIDELINES**

46. Changes to these guidelines will make use of experts representing the diverse elements of integrated mine action programmes.
These Guidelines were drafted by the German Initiative to Ban Landmines. They were discussed and adopted at the First International Conference of Experts in Bad Honnef, 23rd/24th June 1997. At the Second International Conference of Experts (Bad Honnef II) in Berlin-Kladow from 21st till 23rd June 1999 they were renewed and revised.

Significant contributions to elaborate these guidelines were made among others by following experts:

- Sayed Aqa (Afghan Campaign to Ban Landmines)
- Andrea Lari (Angola/Jesuit Refugee Service)
- Denise Coghlan (Cambodia/Jesuit Refugee Service)
- Mary Foster (Mines Action Canada)
- Nicolas Drouin (Mine Action Unit – Canadian International Development Agency)
- Raul Mijango (El Salvador/Member of the Asemblea Legislativa)
- Bill Howel (France/Handicap International)
- François De Keersmaeker (Germany/Handicap International)
- Horst van de Meer (Germany/Solidaritätsdienst International)
- Thomas Gebauer (Germany/medico international)
- Ulrich Tietze (Germany/medico international)
- Sebastian Kasack (Germany/medico international)
- Hein Winnubst (Germany/Misereor)
- Jörn Kalinski (Germany/Oxfam)
- Fritz Mamier (Germany/Gesellschaft für technische Zusammenarbeit)
- Wolfgang Mai (Germany/Brot für die Welt)
- Günter Mulack (German Ministry for Foreign Affairs)
- Christiane Hieronymus (German Ministry for Economical Co-operation and Development)
- Justin Brady (Consultant medico international)
- Jim Monan (Hongkong/Oxfam)
- Nicoletta Dentico (Italian Campaign to Ban Landmines)
- Katsuhiko Takeda (Japan/Association to Aid Refugees)
- Mereso Agina (Kenyan Coalition of NGOs Against Landmines)
- Tony West (Laos/Handicap International)
- Undule Mwakasungur (Malawi/CHHR)
- Alejandro Bendaña (Nicaragua/Centro de Estudios Internacionales)
- Jacobus T. Theyse (Republic of Namibia Ministry of Home Affairs)
- Kristian Berg Harpviken (Norwegian People’s Aid)
- Mario Weima (Netherlands/Novib)
- Abdulkadir H. Ismail Jirde (Somaliland Coalition Against Landmines)
- Aleu Ayieny Aleu (Sudan/OSIL)
- Elisabeth Reusse-Decrey (Swiss Campaign to Ban Landmines)
- Wolfgang Hirsch (Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining)
- Noel Stott (Mines Action South Africa)
- Olaf Juergensen (South Africa/International Development Research Centre)
- Mark Albon (Permanent Mission of South African in Geneva)
- Ian Mansfield (UNDP)
- Hemi Morete (UNMAS)
- John MacInnis (UNDHA)
- Pete Abel (United Kingdom/Omega Foundation)
- Rae McGrath (United Kingdom/Killing Secrets)
- Tim Carstairs (United Kingdom/Mines Advisory Group)
- James Cobey USA/Physicians for Human Rights)
- Jerry White (USA/Landmine Survivors Network)
- Bob Eaton (USA/Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation)
Comments and proposals for improvement of these guidelines are most welcome!

Please contact:

- **medico international**, 
  Obermainanlage 7, 
  D-60314 Frankfurt 
  Germany  
  Phone +49 69 944380  
  Fax +49 69 436002  
  Email: medico_international@t-online.de

- **Misereor**  
  Mozartstraße 9  
  D-52064 Aachen  
  Germany  
  Phone +49 241 4420  
  Fax +49 241 442188

- **Action Group Landmine.de**  
  Markus Haake  
  Rykestr. 13  
  10405 Berlin  
  Germany  
  Phone +49 30 421 36 86  
  Fax +49 30 428 01 688  
  Email: haake@landmine.de

The Action Group Landmine.de has established a Website with actual figures, trends and analysis of the landmine issue:  
**www.landmine.de**
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