

Renforcer les liens entre
**L'action contre les
mines et le développement
international**

Linking

**Mine Action to
Development Programming**

International Symposium December 4 & 5, 2007
Gatineau | Quebec | Canada

SUMMARY REPORT

Acknowledgements

Handicap International Canada expresses its deepest gratitude to all its partners for their support in the organization of **Linking Mine Action to Development Programming**, an international symposium held in Gatineau/Ottawa on December 4 and 5, 2007.

This symposium was made possible thanks to the financial support of the Canadian Government through the Mine Action Unit (MAU) of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

Numerous individuals and organizations provided invaluable assistance in the organization of the symposium. Amongst them we would like to mention:


- **Jean Devlin**
- **Anne Woodbridge**
- **Anne Capelle**
(for the production of the **the Background Paper on Anti-personnel Landmine, Mine Action and Development**)
- **Sharon De Gaspé Power**
(Master of Ceremony of the Symposium)
- **Colleagues of Handicap International in Europe, the United-States and in the field**
(particularly Hervé Bernard, Bill Howell, Wanda Munoz and Vianney Briand)
- **The entire Handicap International Canada team**
- **Toni Bessner, Bessner & Bessner Communications**

In addition, we would like to thank the Canadian NGOs who contributed to the production of the document entitled **Canadian Achievements in Mine Action** (CAMEO, CIDC, CPAR, Manitoba Campaign to Ban Landmines, UNICEF Canada and World Vision Canada). Finally, we extend our sincere appreciation to all the speakers, facilitators and participants of the symposium for sharing their expertise. Their contribution was greatly appreciated.

■

Editing: **Annie Lafrenière and Nancy De Graff**
Revision: **Traci Williams**
Design: **Bessner & Bessner Communications**

All photos contained in this report are the copyright of Handicap International
©Handicap International unless indicated otherwise



“One Love” project , Rwanda © MBCBL

Foreword

“This symposium is part of a broader commitment to continue supporting the aims of the Ottawa Convention; it is directly linked to the commitment we made to the landmine-affected populations.”

Jean Devlin

Manager, Peace, Security and Mine Action Group, **CIDA**

Around the tenth anniversary of its signing, the Mine Ban Treaty was referred to as a “success in progress”, which allowed to reduce the impact of landmines on civilians worldwide. Canadian actors participated in that success, as a lot of support has been given particularly through the Canadian Landmine Fund (CLF), a dedicated fund established by the Canadian government. This fund will however cease to exist after 2008. The Canadian government remains committed to providing assistance for mine action through regular programmes administered by the Department of Foreign Affairs and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). It is therefore entering a transition phase. For CIDA the approach taken will consist of linking Mine Action to development programming. This impacts not only decision makers and managers within the Canadian government, but also Canadian non-governmental organizations (NGOs) who need to dialogue in order to keep Mine Action (MA) as a key international priority.



The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and Handicap International (HI) Canada organized an international symposium that brought together a broad representation of participants from the Canadian government; Canadian development NGOs and MA NGOs; international MA experts; and local partner organizations in affected countries. The objective of the event was to raise awareness on the issue of Mine Action and to provide concepts and tools to promote the links between Mine Action activities and development, humanitarian, peace building and human rights programming.

■



Mine Risk Education ©Badonel / Handicap International

CIDC deminer using detector © CIDC



Table of Content

- 7 **OPENING**
- 10 **SESSION 1 - THE IMPACT OF LANDMINES / CLUSTER MUNITIONS AND THE MINE BAN TREATY**
- 10 Overview of the Issue of Landmines and Cluster Munitions and their Effect on Development
- 11 Discussion of the Mine Ban Treaty, the Nairobi Review Conference and the Oslo Process
- 12 Discussion of the Canadian Government's Response to Date
- 14 **SESSION 2 - APPROACHES TO MINE ACTION**
- 14 Introduction to Three Sectors of Mine Action
- 15 Examples of CIDA - Funded Mine Action Projects
- 16 **SESSION 3 - LINKING MINE ACTION TO DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMING**
- 16 Transition to Linking Mine Action to Development Programming
- 18 Examples from a Programming Perspective
- 19 **SESSION 4 - HUMANITARIAN MINE CLEARANCE AND MINE RISK EDUCATION**
- 19 Breakout Sessions
- 19 Group A: Linking Humanitarian Mine Clearance to Development
- 20 Group B: Linking Mine Risk Education to Development
- 22 **SESSION 5 - FOCUS ON VICTIM ASSISTANCE AS A DISABILITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS ISSUE**
- 22 Part 1: Plenary Presentations
- 22 Overview of Victim Assistance and its Various Components
- 23 Link Between Victim Assistance and Disability
- 24 Link Between Victim Assistance and Human Rights

Table of Content

26 Part 2: Breakout Sessions

26 Programming Approaches to Victim Assistance in Medical Care, Physical Rehabilitation and Psychological Support

27 Programming Approaches to Victim Assistance in Social and Economic Inclusion

28 Programming Approaches to Victim Assistance in Disability Laws and Public Policies

30 **SESSION 6 - ENGAGING CIDA AND CANADIAN NGOS ON MINE ACTION**

30 Introducing the Dialogue: the Actors and the Subject

31 Suggestions to Facilitate the Work Toward Linking Mine Action to Development

33 **SYMPOSIUM CONCLUSION**

34 **APPENDIX A** - Statement on the Occasion of the Mine Ban Treaty's Tenth Anniversary

35 **APPENDIX B** - Participants Contact List

37 **APPENDIX C** - List of Acronyms

Opening

Speakers:

**HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS
Prince Mired Raad al Hussein,
Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan**

Colin R. Newhouse
Chairman of the Board
Handicap International Canada

Jean Devlin
Manager, Peace, Security and
Mine Action Group, **CIDA**

Colin R. Newhouse welcomed participants to the symposium and introduced this one-and-a-half days of exchanges and discussions by first setting up the actual scenario. "Ten years ago, something very good was initiated and made a big difference all over the world. The Mine Ban treaty (MBT) was signed and a lot has been accomplished since then," said Newhouse. He noted however important facts about the reality we are still facing today. For example, last year nearly 6,000 new victims were estimated, 75% of which were civilians, and out of those, about a third were children. "Despite the excellent progress that we can be proud of, we still have almost half a million people around the world living as victims of landmines," stated Newhouse.



Much has been done; much remains to be done

After acknowledging that landmines represent a continuing problem, Newhouse also pointed out that part of this problem is that landmines are no longer a priority for many governments. Some have diminished or even ceased funding. Addressing mostly the Canadian participants, he reminded them that the current Canadian government decided to discontinue the Canadian Landmine Fund (CLF), so the dedicated funding from that source will soon no longer exist.

"What we have to do is keep the critical elements of the landmine problem on the radar screen," said Newhouse. He reminded all that mine risk education, demining and victim assistance are still very important. To finish, Newhouse invited participants to come up with measurable strong actions to keep Mine Action (MA) at the forefront of international priorities.

Linking Mine Action to Development Programming:

Recognizing the link

Jean Devlin also welcomed participants, mentioning his satisfaction in seeing that everyone could come together to pool energies, knowledge, practices and experiences in linking MA and development. Devlin explained that he wished this symposium to be as concrete as possible, and pointed out the different backgrounds of the participants: field practitioners of MA, mine victims who overcame the challenge of being disabled, actors working in areas dealing with MA and development workers. "Together, we can define real avenues for making MA a part of development work, and we can also determine its limits," said Devlin.

Introducing the reasons that led to the transition to linking MA to development programming, Jean Devlin pointed out that mine action can be addressed through different methods of cooperation, but that responsibility and commitment should remain the same.



There are different ways to approach MA, since it is not just about a weapon, a treaty, or a humanitarian issue. Devlin explained that the impact of landmines affects many sectors, for example, from poverty and access to housing, to productive means, such as land-for-food production, etc. "We have two days to address the right issues and exchange the ways and means to solve outstanding development problems and the presence of landmines and cluster munitions (UXOs), or, in other terms, solve mine problems through development means," Devlin said.

For all people living in mine-affected countries, the real or perceived threat of landmines poses obstacles to livelihood, as well as to the accessibility of schools, health services and water points. Economic opportunities and hopes for better lives are often lost. Mentioning the victims now living as

people with disabilities, Devlin reminded everyone that "the human factor of landmine issues lives on for much longer than the emergency or recovery phase." According to him, there is a clear case for looking at the needs of the mine-affected populations through development plans.

Looking at the current situation, Devlin mentioned that dedicated funding has played a major role in Mine Action, particularly in supporting mine-clearance activities. "Clearance operators have played a great role and are still contributing," said Devlin. He pointed out however that affected countries need to form their capacity, take on ownership and responsibility and finally show long-term commitment for demining, mine risk education and victim assistance. According to him, national resources over and above dedicated resources are therefore needed. Donors used to providing a first level of response can also tend to development cooperation.

"We can see how development cooperation can be instrumental in addressing landmine and other post conflict issues in a different and complimentary way"

said Devlin.

He then expressed his hopes to see this symposium, which highlights promising avenues for development activities, to integrate sustainable support for landmine victims at the micro-, meso- and macro-level.

Making the link

His Royal Highness Prince Mired Raad Al Hussein of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, as the President of the Eighth Meeting of State Parties to the Mine Ban Convention, and as the Chairman of Jordan's National Committee for Demining & Rehabilitation (NCDR), shared Devlin's point of view on the future of MA and how it can be linked to development.



Prince Mired highlighted three main factors that are, for him, very important for successful MA associated with the Mine Ban Convention, direct impact on a country's development and funding possibilities. They are leadership and political will, local ownership toward MA, and the essential link to the country's overall plan for development.

Since successful MA demands involvement and synergy of a multitude of actors from all sectors of society, proper leadership from the very top is required. Otherwise the approach to MA would not be comprehensive, and any attempts to link it to development could be hampered. "The most fundamental ingredient for successful MA, which produces benefits beyond the mere physical removal of mines, is having leadership that avails itself to the issue and provides the necessary political will to make things happen," said Prince Mired. As another important factor that directly impacts development and also influences donors will of granting financial support, Prince Mired mentioned the commitment of local communities and governments to identify their own problems and take the lead in solving them. Prince Mired therefore sent a message to mine-affected countries:

"Own the problem and you will find a helping hand."

He added that demining a high impact area earmarked for development makes more sense for the country and for the donors; therefore he recommended that the MA plan be part of the country's overall plan for development.

Prince Mired stressed the importance of linking MA to development, mentioning that, in his view, this link became fundamental for his country and for other mine-affected states, that with time might have more and more difficulties in justifying the need for financial support.

"It is therefore essential that mine-affected states think seriously about their MA programs and devise plans that are well thought out and that can produce numerous outputs. Hitting several birds with one stone is not only the intelligent way to go, but the only way to go."

He however reminded participants that, according to the MBC, all suspected mined areas have to be cleared and some areas are not always necessarily earmarked for development. Therefore this link between MA and development is preferable, but cannot always be achieved.

Prince Mired invited the MA community to renew their promise to the millions of people around the world, whose lives are threatened daily by the presence of landmines, and to respect their commitment and fulfill their obligations under the Mine Ban Convention.

"Eradicating landmines and the pain and suffering that they cause is a fight that can be won. We are well on our way to a time when landmines are no longer news, but history,"

concluded Prince Mired.

■

Session 1

The impact of landmines / cluster munitions and the Mine Ban Treaty

Landmines, the Mine Ban Treaty and the Oslo Process

The first session provided the context for the following discussions of the event. It offered an overview of landmines and cluster munitions and their impact in affected countries, presented the international response to those issues, and finally emphasized the Canadian approach to Mine Action within CIDA.

The Issue of Landmines and Cluster Munitions and their Effect on Development

Margaret Arach Orech

Ambassador of ICBL and Mine Victim, Uganda



Margaret Arach Orech, a landmine survivor, provided an overview of the issue of landmines and cluster munitions and their effect on development. She started her presentation by defining antipersonnel mines and cluster munitions (UXOs, unexploded ordnances). Pictures of landmines were then shown to participants; “very colorful, but very deadly,” pointed out Orech.

In terms of geographical impact and according to the 2007 Landmine Monitor (LM), Orech reported that at least 84 countries are mine-affected/contaminated, the most heavily contaminated areas being found in the regions of Africa, Asia, Central and South America, Middle East and Southeastern Europe. In turn, UXOs affects and threaten lives in, 30 states and territories.

Orech outlined a number of impacts of landmines/UXOs on development:

- Displacement of communities

- Breakdown in cultural structure
- Land issues; lost/stolen
- Less accessibility to school, education

- Livelihood

- Less accessibility to agricultural land
- Employment difficulties for victims with disabilities

- Health

- Landmine accidents cause injuries and death

- Strain on healthcare system having difficulties responding to the immediate and long-term care of victims
- Psychological support is needed for victim reintegration into the community

- Retarded Development

- Development of infrastructure delayed because of the unsafe area
- Donors funding is directed to safer areas
- Millennium Development Goals far from being achieved in states having to deal with landmines

To illustrate these impacts, Orech presented examples from her own country, Uganda, and noted that the situation could be similar or sometimes even worse in other countries. “In most of the African communities and a bit of Asia I believe, the extended family support system that held communities together is completely eroded and needs to be rebuilt,” said Orech, when discussing about population displacement. It was also mentioned that it is not unusual to find a classroom of 200 children in Uganda, since many schools have closed because of mine contamination. Going through important livelihood and health consequences brought by landmines, Orech emphasized the hard reality this situation brings upon a country's development. Highlighting the fact that development of infrastructure and funding possibilities are often delayed until areas are considered safe, Orech asked participants: “How long can the survivors wait?”

Orech also brought up the human factor surrounding Mine Action and the immediate need for victim assistance. In her view, the impact of landmines is often measured looking at the effects on survivors, community and the affected country at large.

“Human life should be the starting point and ultimate goal of any intervention,”

said Orech, reminding all that this man-made environmental factor has multiple consequences, and that mine-affected states often face many other difficulties and lack resources. Landmine survivors have long-term needs and, even though victim assistance might sometimes be included in states' longer term development plans, it is needed immediately.

“The future of our young generation needs to be safe guarded from the threats caused by landmines and cluster munitions. Limbs and lives need to be saved and not shuttered,”

concluded Orech.

Discussion of the Mine Ban Treaty, the Nairobi Review Conference and the Oslo Process

Jacqueline Hansen

Landmine Monitor Project Manager, MAC
ICBL Representative



Jacqueline Hansen first introduced the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) as a civil society coalition working to raise awareness and open discussion spaces on the landmines issue, to change public opinion and policies, to engage States that have not yet signed the Mine Ban Treaty and also to support State Parties to implement the convention. Hansen

also promoted the Landmine Monitor (LM), which is the ICBL research project yearly reporting on implementation and compliance with the MBT.

Mine Ban Treaty

“We call the MBT a success in progress,” says Hansen, introducing this treaty that “prohibits the use, production, stockpiling and transfer of antipersonnel mines, has deadlines for the destruction of stockpiles and the clearance of mined areas, and calls for assistance to mine survivors as well as international cooperation and assistance.” This Treaty, which Hansen characterized as a “humanitarian treaty, focused around mine-affected communities,” was signed by 122 countries in Ottawa on December 3, 1997 and entered into force on March 1, 1999. “What the ICBL was very pleased with is that it was a Treaty with no loopholes, exceptions and reservations,” said Hansen.

Hansen recognized that a lot has been accomplished in the last ten years, due in part to the sustained action and support, the different level of work, the consistent monitoring and link between policy and field, and also the unique partnership between NGOs, international organizations and governments. Hansen noted the following successes:

- Strong mechanism were set up to make sure the Treaty is implemented
- Gaining widespread acceptance of the Treaty, global norm against mine use

- Stopping transfers of antipersonnel mines
- Less use of landmines
- Less production of landmines
- Substantial amounts of stockpiled antipersonnel mines have been destroyed
- Large tracks of land have been cleared and returned to communities for productive use
- Victim assistance was included as a Treaty obligation

Nairobi Review Conference

After acknowledging the success of the Mine Ban Treaty, Hansen mentioned the first review conference that took place in 2004 in Nairobi, Kenya, five years after the treaty had come into force. As the halfway mark between the treaty's establishment and the deadline for many member-states to clear minefields, this review studied what had been done and what the challenges to come were, plus it provided a framework for the next five years, until the second review conference in 2009.

To share some of the conference outputs, Hansen mentioned the Nairobi Action Plan, a 12-page document outlining actions to take until 2009, from which chosen articles¹ were read to all participants. For affected countries, these concerned the prioritizing of mine clearance and victim assistance, the consistency of the Mine Action framework with the national priorities, as well as cooperation with relevant actors and sharing of information and technical expertise. For donor countries, the articles highlighted the support to be given to States in need as well as the sustainability of donor commitments. Finally, Hansen underlined in the action plan the recognition by all State Parties that Treaty obligations have to be fulfilled, and that Mine Action is often fundamental to the advancement of the UN Millennium Development Goals. Regarding that last point, "the ICBL is supportive of linking MA and development, but we just want to note that not all MA can be mainstreamed into development, for example, stockpile destruction, research and advocacy, [those] might fall outside of development programming," cautioned Hansen, asking participants to keep that in mind while further discussions take place on the subject during the symposium.

To conclude on the fight against landmines, Hansen encouraged sustained government support and Mine Action funding, pointing out that much work still needs to be done.

Oslo Process

"As we are working to implement the [Mine Ban Convention], we are also working on negotiating a new legal instrument," says Hansen, to introduce the work being done currently to stop the use of cluster munitions. Noting that cluster munitions are now considered a problem, Hansen stressed that the work being done actively is to prevent this problem from becoming a crisis. The process has come a long way already according to Hansen. It started at the beginning of 2006, when Belgium banned these weapons, after which other countries opened to the idea. The November Convention on Certain Conventional Weapon (CCW) failed to ban cluster munitions, and Norway took the lead to announce a process outside of the CCW, resulting in the gathering of 49 States in Oslo in February 2007. Out of those States, 46 agreed to a political declaration committing them, by 2008, to sign a legally binding instrument to prohibit cluster munitions; more discussions took place a few months later in Lima, Peru. At that point, 70 countries were supporting the Oslo process, while, as of today, this number has gone up to 84, plus up to 120 countries are registered to attend the next meeting on cluster munitions. This process is indeed ongoing and will be discussed during several planned occasions², in order to see a new treaty signed in Oslo by the end of 2008.

Hansen concluded by reminding everyone that, despite all the work that has been carried out implementing the Mine Ban Treaty and within the Oslo process, much still remains to be done:

“This is a time for us to recommit, to make sure that we're remembering why we do this work, so that we can achieve our goal of a mine and cluster munitions free world”.

Discussion of the Canadian Government's Response to Date

Jean Devlin

Manager, Peace. Security and Mine Action Group, CIDA

Jean Devlin closed the first session of the symposium by presenting information on Canadian government support for Mine Action (MA) and on what is currently being done to ensure a smooth transition in linking MA to development

programs. Participants were first provided with a historical background leading to this change in functioning, starting with the Canadian Landmine Fund (CLF) established in 1998-1999, which Devlin referred to as "the privileged instrument Canada has used to reduce the humanitarian and developmental impact of landmines on vulnerable populations in mine-affected developing countries." It was in 2003, after the CLF was renewed, that the government encouraged CIDA and the other concerned departments³ to integrate Mine Action into their regular development programs, since the CLF would not be renewed after March 2008.

Since 2003, progress has continually been made in MA, since the support provided to mine-affected countries has increased and is more focused than before and more in line with countries' priorities. Facing this new reality, work is being done to facilitate this transition from dedicated funding, and departments have already made progress in integrating MA into relevant programs.

Before going further into discussing the results between CIDA, DFAIT and DND, Devlin noted that almost all MA components are included in the Canadian government's Official Development Assistance envelope to provide assistance to developing countries in the form of humanitarian assistance and longer-term cooperation. Devlin indicated that the Government remains committed to supporting mine action beyond the end of the Canadian Landmine Fund. He mentioned that together the CIDA and DFAIT had agreed to maintain a level of commitment totaling \$30M per year until 2010.

Up to this date, the results of efforts to link Mine Action can already be seen. Devlin mentioned, for example, the different programming that occurred without dedicated funding, as well as the work being done with the GICHD, developing tools that should be available in 2008, and this symposium, highlighting the continuous thematic work being done on victim assistance and on linking MA to development on a broader scale. Devlin also added that program frameworks were developed in all three departments concerned:

- DFAIT: commitment until 2010, through the Global Peace and Security Fund, MA programming concentrated on five countries, but MA is also pursued in MBT universalization and stockpile destruction
- DND: committed to continuing residual support; playing a role in research and development of technologies and the protection of deminers;
- CIDA: commitment until 2010, focus concentrated on a smaller number of countries, integration of MA into humanitarian, peace-

building and other development programming, maintenance of partnerships with NGOs and multilateral organizations.

Looking at what has been done so far in the Canadian government's efforts to link MA and development, Devlin shared the lessons learned so far in this process. He mentioned that, to guide their work and measure performances, a framework is important, and senior level support and commitment is needed at all times. "An Agency MA focal point is necessary to make sure there is a constant reminder, and, to a certain extent, slight diplomatic pressure on our other colleagues within the agency and in the department of foreign affairs," said Devlin, adding also that bilateral programming takes longer than does dedicated funding, and that flexibility is required in an emergency response. He also shared challenges, for example, the fact that CIDA often shifts priorities, and the constant dialogue needed with other colleagues to include MA in the different programming. He insisted on the importance of good governance and the MA capacity-building needed in the mine-affected countries.

According to Devlin, three generations of Mine Action have been evolving over time. First, since Mine Action continues to be in the area of emergency humanitarian response, work is done with resources dealing with post-conflict recovery issues and peace-building responses, to keep MA on their radar screen. Then, Devlin acknowledged the slow transition to programmed development cooperation, and finally underlined the potential for evolution from an emergency response to development cooperation. He pointed out, "The ultimate level is basically programming that doesn't need the MA programming support, that goes ahead on its own in response to the needing country and includes MA activities when required."

To conclude, Devlin said that the Canadian government plans next to expand NGO programming through partnership programs, expand the number of targeted countries by the work with selected bilateral programs, consolidate existing programs, report on achievements to date, encourage donor coordination, and finally open new multilateral windows.

1. Nairobi Action Plan: Cooperation and Assistance, Sections 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45 and 47

2. Vienna (Dec 5-7), Wellington (Feb 18-22), Dublin (May 19-30)

3. Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), Department of National Defence (DND) and Industry Canada (IC)

Approaches to Mine Action

Following the overview provided in the first session, the second session presented some key components of Mine Action programming in further detail.

Introduction to Three Sectors of Mine Action

Pascal Simon

Chief Technical Advisor, Mine Action Programme
UNDP, Senegal



Since participants in the symposium came from different backgrounds, before going deeper into linking Mine Action (MA) and development, Pascal Simon reviewed MA and its components. Simon defined Mine Action as “a set of activities, which aim to reduce the social, economic and environmental impact of mines and Explosive Remnants of War (ERW).” From the five components of MA, he presented humanitarian demining, mine risk education and victim assistance, in more detail,

leaving aside advocacy and stockpile destruction, which, however, he felt were no less important.

Starting with humanitarian demining, referring to the removal of mine and ERW hazards, Simon mentioned some of the activities included in this component, such as technical surveys, mapping, clearance, documentation and land handover. Presenting mine risk education, he discussed information dissemination, training and education, referring to them as “activities reducing the risk of injury from mines/ERW by raising awareness and promoting behavioral change.” The last component discussed was victim assistance, defined by Simon as “all aid, relief, comfort and support provided to victims (including survivors) with the purpose of reducing the immediate and long-term medical and psychological implications of their trauma”. “It obviously is an important pillar of MA,” continued Simon, providing an example of activities, such as physical rehabilitation, medical care, psychological support and laws/policies implementation.

Following this overview of MA and its components, Simon emphasized certain aspects that are important to consider while looking at MA from a broader perspective: “Community mine action liaison aims to ensure that community needs and priorities are central to the planning, implementation and monitoring of mine action operations, and should

therefore be an essential part of every MA component.” He also highlighted the importance of an integrated approach to MA, where activities are not implemented in parallel or individually. “Only the combination of those elements will ensure the restoration of human security, the socio-economic development and the satisfaction of victims’ needs.”

Simon concluded his presentation by referring participants wanting more information to the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS). Maintained by the UN, these standards help to improve safety, efficiency and effectiveness in Mine Action, and serve as an important glossary enabling the exchange of information.

Examples of CIDA-funded Mine Action Projects

Anne Woodbridge

Senior Program Officer
Peace, Security and Mine Action Group, CIDA



Anne Woodbridge provided participants with examples of projects funded by CIDA in the three sectors of Mine Action presented previously by Pascal Simon, since they are the components in which CIDA is more involved. Woodbridge then presented four projects, all implemented in partnership with Canadian NGOs, as well as a few results that had been documented.

First, a demining project carried out in cooperation with Handicap International in Mozambique was presented. Recognizing that demining is the most expensive component, Woodbridge insisted that it represents a critical first step for reconstruction of post-conflict countries. In Mozambique, several results were noted from this project over the last ten years, such as the development of a comprehensive survey and the clearance of a considerable amount of land. “Areas near schools, water sources, missions, railway lines were [cleared] and removal allowed normal life to resume an expansion of agriculture and communications routes,” said Woodbridge, adding that clearance is socially useful.

Two projects, both in Uganda, were then presented to illustrate the work done for victim assistance. The first project, called Integrated Mine Action Program, was

conducted by World Vision and improved livelihood opportunities for victims and their family, as well as access to healthcare and psychological support. Woodbridge then shared lessons learned from the Survivor Assistance and Landmine Injury Control Project, conducted by CPAR. First, regarding livelihood, the importance of including psychosocial support was noted, as well as offering a wide variety of training to prevent market saturation. This project also showed the effectiveness of integrating medical rehabilitation with psycho-social support. Woodbridge mentioned in the end that both projects included also a mine risk education component.

Finally, Woodbridge presented a mine risk education project done in Angola with UNICEF. This project included several axes of intervention, such as capacity-building for the government as well as training for journalists, advocacy and awareness-raising through the organization of special events, work being done to include MRE in the school curriculums, and finally mine risk education conducted at community level through local organizations.

“I have tried to show that MA is an intrinsic part of, and no different from, what we have all always done in development projects,” concluded Woodbridge.

“Once one is aware of mine action issues, there is hardly a development project that cannot be slightly stretched to include, for example, health or other assistance to landmine survivors, education in mine awareness or clearance to increase access to agriculture or other rural enterprise.”

Linking Mine Action to Development Programming

With the second session detailing Mine Action (MA) programming, the third session aimed for a better understanding of the linkages between MA and key development priorities.

Transition to Linking Mine Action to Development Programming

Bill Howell

Mine Action Department Director
Handicap International France



The transition to linking Mine Action to Development was presented by Bill Howell, from Handicap International France, who introduced himself as an operational level actor, for whom Mine Action activities are linked with clearance, mine risk education and various kinds of surveys. Recognizing that Mine Action includes other components and activities, Howell however decided to focus his presentation on linking clearance and its associated activities to development, as it is,

according to him, the link that seems to raise more questions.

Howell started with a historical background on the idea of linking clearance and development and informed participants that, “at the beginning of mine clearance in the eighties [...], there were already development impacts and ideas to be integrated.” The link was however delayed according to Howell because of liability issues to ensure quality and safety of this activity, with the support of military people, and also because mine clearance was viewed as a humanitarian response in crisis and emergency situations. To this last point he added that “it soon came apparent that MA was going to be a longer-term activity, which would never be limited to the temporality of a crisis period. And that even if the crisis period was sustained, it was bound to shift to something else later.” Howell then underlined that, during the fight against landmines that led to the Mine Ban Treaty, development links were part of the rationale for the ban arguments, particularly through the notion of impact. Several documents were stated⁴ and Howell invited participants to search on the Internet, since many studies have been conducted on the subject to date. “What I want to emphasize is that for me, there is little that is new on the notion that MA has to be linked with Development,” stated Howell.

“Why do we need this meeting? [Because] we don't really know how to do this. [...] There are as many methodologies for making at least a notional operational link between MA and development as there are actors doing it, and there is no way yet to manage or guide this process,” said Howell, mentioning he would be answering three questions in his presentation:

- 1. Why hasn't a solid link between MA and Development already been forged; is experience trying to tell us something?**
- 2. What does it mean, linking MA to Development?**
- 3. Will achieving or working toward this linkage make it more or less likely that the final MBT obligations are achieved?**

Why aren't we there yet?

Howell pointed out that the numerous methodologies that have already been developed for linking MA to development are often more linked with efforts for better cost effectiveness than development effectiveness. Some efforts are therefore made in constructing a needed methodology link. In that sense, Howell mentioned a Participatory Mine Action and Development program currently being carried out in Bosnia-Herzegovina by Handicap International and the Swiss Development Cooperation. This program involves communities affected in the decision-making process regarding their needs. It intends to work in vulnerable areas not yet targeted by development programs, helps improve socio-economic conditions and works at the governmental level for policymaking. Howell also pointed out the HI project in Mozambique presented earlier by Anne Woodbridge, adding that, to meet their needs for development projects, several international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) funded the operational costs of a demining Mine Action organization.

“Eventually the shared operational space for clearance-related activities and demining will become so small, that alone it can't sustain a reasonable operational capacity. I think it's at this point, if both the clearance and the development activities are to remain in place, that they will tend to diverge,” said Howell.

What does it mean, linking MA to development?

Regarding that question, Howell asked the participants another question: “Why do you think it's not linked already?” As Howell mentioned before about perhaps not knowing how to make that link, he also shared now the idea that it might already have been made. To support this idea, Howell reported that many indicators show the already existing link: IMAS, UNMAS, poverty-reduction programs, etc.

Can development linked with Mine Action be Ottawa compliant?

“This question is dear to our hearts, it's dear to my mind and dear to the mind of my organization,” announced Howell.

Howell first mentioned the time factor related to the Mine Ban Treaty obligations. “Meeting these obligations will require continuing support from donor nations and [...]INGOs. The pressure of time has led to serious questions on whether the notion of impact-free should replace the notion of mine-free as an objective,” added Howell, reminding participants however that impact-free is not Ottawa-compliant.

Then, Howell pointed out that “Mine Action needs and development needs are often, but not always, mutual. Looking at the last ten years, we can see that most development activities, even in mine-affected countries, have taken place away from the mine fields, and that much of mine clearance has been done without a strict link to development priorities.”

Howell concluded his presentation by restating the importance of considering all elements when studying the linkage between Mine Action and Development. “MA understands development and can act to support it when necessary. But there must be ways to support MA where there is no immediate development needs, if only to assure its humanitarian preventative goals and move toward a mine-free instate. If actions are taken to prioritize these steps in the overlap of space between MA and development, it can be done that way, but care has to be taken not to limit actions to this rationale. The model or models for managing and encouraging...

the linkage that CIDA and other donor agencies will adopt over the next years must leave room for survival of capacities for MA that are capable of dealing with the problem in a timeframe that [does not] prolong the time of MBT compliance [...].”

4. Document from the Bad Honnef Conference, June 1997, surveys conducted by HI in Laos and NPA in Angola, as well as a second Honnef document published mid-1999.

Examples from a Programming Perspective

Robert Eaton

Director
Survey Action Center



To illustrate the transition of Linking Mine Action (MA) and Development from a programming perspective, Robert Eaton shared with participants some of his observations and methodologies at the field level. Since Anne Woodbridge had mentioned earlier examples of linkage from a donor's perspective, Eaton decided to concentrate his presentation on a transition

point currently taking place in MA.

Eaton started by stating that the MA community is facing a problem. He referred to MA as a “developed engineering task” and highlighted that the focus seems to always be put on mine clearance, leaving aside the question of “what is the problem we are trying to solve, and how are we going to do it?” “If you have to solve a problem, you have to know how big it is,” said Eaton, introducing the three units of measurement often used in the Mine Community: number of mines in the ground, square meters polluted, and lastly number of victims. To show that these units of measurement are inadequate, Eaton presented different graphics of comparison between Afghanistan and Bosnia-Herzegovina/Croatia. Looking at the results, it was impossible to say which area had the worst problems. “Square meters are important, but measure only one thing: work done. They tell you nothing about what it does to communities and why we’re worried about them,” said Eaton, sharing his hopes that the Mine Action community will begin to take a development perspective, setting its goals on outcomes and effectiveness, not efficiency.

The Landmine Impact Survey (LIS) tried to develop a new measurement for the mine problem, which is impact on communities. “We’re going to solve the problem through community action and community involvement. [...] Emphasis changes from clearing mine fields to reducing the impact and helping the community begin to solve the problem by releasing them from their fear of landmines,” stated Eaton, referring to this as a whole new paradigm for Mine Action. To illustrate this concept, Eaton reported on two examples from the field. The first was in Bosnia-Herzegovina

when, after comparing their mapping with results from the LIS, the Bosnia-Herzegovina Mine Action Center reviewed their plans by consulting, for the first time, people from the community. “Once you change that perception, you get the proper relation of things,” said Eaton. An example from Angola was also mentioned, where people living in communities affected by mines were asked what they needed. Mine Clearance was not mentioned. Seeds, fertilizer, credit were what the communities needed to overcome the impact of mines. “This is seen as a development project, but I would claim that it’s a mine action project, because you’re allowing people to make a decision to solve their mine problem,” said Eaton.

“How does all this relate to the treaty?” Eaton asked participants. He answered that “development choices in Mine Action will not take care of every mine in the field [...], but that it supports the Treaty.” Eaton explained that the impact on communities will lead to better prioritization on the way to getting rid of all mines.

“Focusing on the impact on communities is a first essential part that gets us back into the real world of communities that suffer,”

Eaton concluded.

■

Session 4

Humanitarian Mine Clearance and Mine Risk Education

Breakout sessions

Group A: Linking Humanitarian Mine Clearance to Development

FACILITATOR: **Frank Jewsbury**,
Secretary Treasurer, CAMEO

BREAKOUT SPEAKERS: **David Horton**,
Executive Director, CIDC

Robert Eaton,
Director, SAC

Adérito Ismael,
Manager, Mine Clearance Program,
Handicap International in Mozambique

Summary of breakout presentations

David Horton focused his presentation on the linkages between humanitarian demining and development, from a field based on an NGO's point of view. The combination of dedicated funding for Mine Action (MA) and development funding was questioned by Horton, who wondered whether “global funding will increase or not under a mainstreamed regime.” Important challenges were mentioned, such as identifying the right funding sources, understanding their management and finally fastening MA and development priorities. The Mine Ban Treaty (MBT) obligations as well as the Millennium Development Goals were referred to as challenges that donors are facing in deciding how government funding will be combined. Horton also pointed out the challenges this linkage brings to the national MA centers, and finally to NGOs, such as “folding MA into traditional programming, acquiring the necessary MA or development expertise, forging new links and avoid being in a reactive posture.”

The second presentation was made by Robert Eaton, who focused on using economic analyses as a planning tool to facilitate the interface between the MA and the development community. The economic analysis encourages a dialogue with many resources that the MA community is not familiar with, as economic decision making and development opens up many possibilities. Examples from Afghanistan were given by Eaton to illustrate that mines are a key factor in development projects, such as road building and credit. In one, mine clearance planning was linked with the road-building process, and, in the other, wheat field production in conjunction with a loan system ended up covering clearance costs.

“A lot of the clearance problems can be solved if we can get the discussions going between development and MA people,”

said Eaton. His presentation was completed by Ted Paterson, Head of Evaluation and Policy Research at the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), who explained a graphic developed by his organization, called the Program Life Cycle for MA Programs. This graphic presented the transition phases that a country in or emerging from conflict goes through, linked with the amount of activities in MA. It showed that “MA isn't just one thing; that a lot of its activities are there to promote other purposes: humanitarian, peacekeeping, reconstruction and also development,” said Paterson.

Adérito Ismael followed by making a presentation on his field experience, working in Mozambique on an MA program with Handicap International. He mentioned the importance, in the assignment of priorities, of having quality impact surveys done before the work can begin in MA. This was not the situation in Mozambique, given the Landmine Impact Survey (LIS) was done eight years after the work had begun, and did not reflect the real needs at the community level. Investigating at the community level takes a lot of time and expertise, since needs are often linked with development. It was then noted that the resulting prioritization often increases costs for mine clearance. Ismael emphasized that there are treaty implications to this, since Mozambique had ratified the MBT and made a commitment to be clear of mines by 2009, but is unlikely to meet the deadline while facing diminished funding for landmine clearance.

Frank Jewsbury reported that participants discussed the different perceptions of development and MA projects on individuals and communities, and reinforced that prioritization raised questions and brought challenges. The fact that the higher-level plans often changed at the community level was acknowledged, but did not hinder a program's implementation. Jewsbury then reminded everyone that a recognized transition period was essential in linking MA and development. He concluded by directing his last comment to development actors, asking them to “stop avoiding doing development work in mine-affected areas.”

Group B: Linking Mine Risk Education to Development

FACILITATOR: **Bruno Leclercq**,
Program Country Director,
Handicap International in Cambodia

BREAKOUT
SPEAKERS: **Andrew Wheatley**,
Regional Mine ction Advisor,
ICRC, Bogota

Aneeza Pasha,
Mine Risk Education Technical Coordinator,
HI

Sharif Baaser,
Programme Specialist, Landmines and
Small Arms Teams, UNICEF

Summary of Breakout Presentations

Breakout presentations started with Andrew Wheatley, who provided an overview of key development issues and stated that mine risk education (MRE) represented the key to linking MA and development. Wheatley mentioned that “MRE supports and assists the work of deminers”, and links it to community development needs. It responds to other key challenges of demining by facilitating the prioritization, encouraging community's ownership, improving clearance impact and finally building strong links with the community



and other development stakeholders. This is done through community liaison (CL), which represents, along with public information, education and training, the three main aspects of MRE. Wheatley provided a field example from Sri Lanka, in a post-conflict context, where he witnessed incredible trust and respect between communities and demining organizations, which had been gradually built through community liaison officers. To conclude, Wheatley emphasized the importance of trust and communication with communities, as well as on the interesting results of MRE acting as an interface between key stakeholders, including MA and development actors.

Aneeza Pasha focused her presentation on the CL aspect mentioned by Wheatley, and further underlined the links to be made with development, as opportunities to collaborate and work toward similar goals. Pasha first specified that CL is also an approach used by various sectors of development to engage with the community. In the context of MA, it was created to ensure that development would follow MA activities, and consists of communicating with communities to solve their landmine-related problems through MA methods. Pasha specified that, by community, she was referring not only to the affected populations, but also to local organizations, governments, as well as national and international NGOs.

“It is a very broad range of community that are involved in the process of linking MA and development, and each of these actors is vital to the broad perspective of development of which MA is a part,”

said Pasha. Given Wheatley had mentioned the support CL gives prior, during and after clearance activities, Pasha reinforced that statement by underlining the importance of informing and working with communities during the whole process. She also insisted on the support CL gives to non-clearance activities, such as surveys and prioritization, public education, victim assistance and risk-reduction alternatives. To illustrate the possibilities of linkages between MRE and development, Pasha mentioned field examples from Iraq and Bosnia-Herzegovina. The first showed cooperation with Save the Children, involving the inclusion of MRE in their project activities to engage children and their parents. In her second example, MRE helped facilitate economic development in rural communities by inviting communities to define livelihood projects and assisting with related clearance activities.

Sharif Baaser, as the last breakout speaker, started by saying that in many cases, the knowledge of danger is put aside by people engaging in risky behaviors to respond to their socio-economic needs. Baaser pointed out that this is where the link between MRE and development becomes essential, and that MRE evolved in that sense to better answer the needs of the population. Baaser shared his experience of working in Sudan, in post-conflict emergency and more-stable phases. In the emergency phase, he highlighted the role MA played for the safe return of Internally Displaced People (IDP) and refugees to mine-affected areas. Through the inter-agency coordination mechanism, MA was done through mine clearance and MRE before, during and upon arrival to the final destination. CL followed and further links with development could be drawn. Once the situation was stabilized in Sudan, Baaser presented the efforts that were done to integrate MRE into the broader education system. This had been possible

through an MA development strategy developed in cooperation with various stakeholders, such as local authorities, governments, and local and international NGOs. Regarding the work done closely with the Ministry of Education, Baaser highlighted key elements important to the success of integrating MRE into the education system. He mentioned that, for the Ministry's political commitment, the establishment of a coordination mechanism and resource allocation were important elements. For the organization, technical support and training of local resources as well as support during the implementation were highlighted as key issues.



Discussions

Bruno Leclercq reported that, within the discussions following the various presentations, the issue of children's difficult access to education was raised, questioning this medium used for MRE. In addition, it was reiterated that MRE is a process of negotiation with communities and can be done through different approaches within the same country. Leclercq reported that MRE was not exclusive, and that, as with other education and awareness creation campaigns such as HIV/AIDS prevention programs, it can be included in sustainable components. The interest of sharing lessons learned in MRE was expressed within the group to facilitate the linkage with development and the design of related project proposals.

Leclercq concluded by saying that

“challenges ahead are broad [and] if we want to encourage the people to [consider the dangers of mines], we also have to think about the alternative activities and other related issues.”

Focus on Victim Assistance as a Disability and Human Rights Issue

The fifth session of the symposium focused on Victim Assistance and its links to various development priorities and sectors of activity.

Part 1: Plenary Presentations

Presentations in plenary were conducted and provided an overview of Victim Assistance (VA), highlighted possible links with the issue of disability, and illustrated how VA could be integrated into broader rights-based programming.

Overview of Victim Assistance and its Various Components

Anne Capelle
Mine Action Consultant



As an introduction to the presentations and breakout sessions to be made on this third axis of Mine Action (MA), Anne Capelle provided participants with an overview of Victim Assistance (VA) and its various components.

Capelle started her presentation by looking at the two articles from the Mine Ban Treaty (MBT) in which VA is mentioned. Since the first article concerned States' rights to ask and receive assistance from any other

State, the other article stated that each State in a position to do so should provide VA.

“It was the first time that victims were recognized in a disarmament treaty; because it was also a humanitarian treaty,”

Capelle pointed out. Repeating the right of States to receive help, Capelle also emphasized the collective responsibility all State Parties have toward landmines survivors.

Capelle also underlined weaknesses from the MBT such as the difficulty of monitoring VA because of the lack of completion indicators, as well as the absence of compulsory reporting. In link with the second article stating “States in a position to do so,” Capelle recognized that VA was therefore not compulsory. Finally, Capelle also pointed out to participants that VA is defined nowhere in the MBT.

For this last point, participants were informed that “efforts of the NGOs involved in VA [were made] to build a common understanding of what [are] victims and victim assistance.” Two definitions were mentioned by Capelle and showed the transition to a wider understanding of victims, as mentioned in the Nairobi Review Conference final report⁵, where notions of rights were also included.

The following components of VA were then presented:

- Understanding the extent of the challenge faced
- Emergency and continuing medical care
- Physical rehabilitation, including physiotherapy, prosthetics and assistive devices
- Psychological support and social reintegration
- Economic reintegration
- Establishment, reinforcement and implementation of relevant laws and public policies

The components mentioned came from the Nairobi Report (Paragraph 69), and represent “what is used in the MBT framework as the base for mine-affected states to express their needs,” informed Capelle. Commenting on each component, Capelle outlined that, even though some of those aspects appear to have had a good response, such as medical care and physical rehabilitation, a lot still remains to be done. Capelle also stressed the huge impact psychological support can have on victim reintegration, saying that this aspect is too often absent from programs. “People involved in development activities will be very useful,” Capelle continued, when discussing about socio-economic reintegration, considered by her to be the key element for many survivors.

To conclude her presentation, Capelle mentioned guiding principles that people are asked to respect while working in VA. Those principles, according to Capelle, can help when discussing about development and VA, “because VA is not to be considered in isolation.

“We don't speak here about landmine survivors, we speak about the victim in his community, but we also speak about the landmine survivors within the broader context of people with disabilities in a country.”

The principles, which were documented by the ICBL, are the following:

- Victim assistance has to be thought of from a human rights perspective

- Victims should be included in all decision making process that affect them
- Non-discrimination at all levels, including between victims of landmines and victims from other type of war-related accidents or other cause of disability
- Gender and age considerations need to be kept in mind while developing programs
- Two-track approach
- Accessibility principles have to be respected (to education, housing, employment, health, etc.)
- Variety, comprehensiveness and integrated nature of services
- Capacity-building, sustainability and ownership need to be taken in consideration
- Coordination is required as there are numerous actors and stakeholders involved in VA
- Remaining need for individual approach, since all survivors needs are different.

Link Between Victim Assistance and Disability

Hervé Bernard
Inclusion Department Director
Handicap International France



To present the link between victim assistance (VA) and disability, Hervé Bernard mentioned that this question of linkage had to be addressed with regard to the relationship between four elements: Mine Action (MA), VA, development and disability. “It is by looking at the links between VA and MA and between disability and development that we will be able to think about VA

and disability,” said Bernard.

Bernard started by referring to the MBT articles on VA mentioned earlier by Anne Capelle, to stress that those articles do not have the same strength as the other articles focusing on mine destruction and other mine issues. “Over the last ten years [...] VA has been put into the agenda,” added Bernard, thanking the ICBL, the Standing Committee

5. “Victims include those who either individually or collectively have suffered physical or psychological injury, economic loss or substantial impairment of their fundamental rights through acts or omissions related to mine usage.”

on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, as well as the GICHD, for their efforts on this issue.

To present the link between disability and development, Bernard emphasized the importance for development initiatives to be inclusive of people with disabilities. To illustrate the essential link between disability and development, Bernard mentioned some of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), outlining disability factors to be taken into consideration for all of them. "Twenty percent of people affected by poverty are people with disabilities," said Bernard, when he presented, for example, the first development goal: poverty reduction.

“Inclusive development [with] people with disabilities in the process is important; otherwise we will not be able to reach the MDGs.”

The definition of victims from the Nairobi Review Conference, mentioned by Anne Capelle, was used by Bernard to introduce the link between VA and disability, since it states that “those individuals directly impacted by mines are a subgroup of larger communities of people with injuries and disabilities.” Bernard then presented the twin-track approach, used generally with people excluded from a community. He explained the specialized approach for the empowerment of landmine victims, and the inclusive approach for those victims within the wider framework of people with disabilities. “This approach shows how we must coordinate measures allowing inclusion in general activities for people with disabilities, and measures specially defined for landmine victims,” explained Bernard, to ensure the “full participation of mines and UXOs victims, survivors, and PwDs in general.” Presenting some of the specifics about landmine victims to justify the need for a specialized approach, Bernard reminded everyone however that “all PwDs are different, but all of them have to benefit from the same rights.”

In terms of rights, Bernard warned people working at the community level, when targeting vulnerable groups, to avoid stigmatization and discrimination:

"Women & children, PwDs, mine victims and survivors represent a complex addition of vulnerability factors, and it is difficult to work with one and avoid the other."

As a last aspect to be considered while discussing the link between VA and disability, Bernard mentioned the UN convention for the rights of people with disabilities, and

referred to it as “an important tool to lobby and advocate for the rights of PwDs, including landmine survivors.”

To illustrate the link between disability and VA from a programming perspective, Bernard gave examples of two projects conducted by HI, one in Cambodia, and the other in Senegal. The Cambodian project targeted a whole community, without distinction of victims and survivors, and showed, as a result, that most of the beneficiaries ended up being PwDs, survivors and their families. The second project, conducted in Casamance, started as a very specific project targeting only victims of landmines, and evolved within years to become a community project focusing on disability and inclusive development.

“VA and inclusion of PwDs have very strong links and it's quite impossible at local level to make a distinction between both. [Links have to be drawn] at the beginning of a project or within its evolution,” concluded Bernard.

Link Between Victim Assistance and Human Rights

Nerina Cevra

Rights and Advocacy Program Manager
Landmine Survivors Network

To link Victim Assistance (VA) and Human Rights, Nerina Cevra's presentation focused on the recent UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, highlighting the role it plays in the future of VA efforts.

Cevra started by providing information on the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, referred to as “the Convention”. Adopted in December 2006 and opened for signature in March 2007, the Convention recognizes the rights of People with Disabilities (PwDs) and comes as a response to years of advocacy by disability rights movements. “The most important achievement of the Convention is the paradigm shift away from the medical and charity approach to PwDs, to one that is based on human rights principles,” added Cevra. Mentioning that the motto of the civil society participating in the Convention negotiations was “nothing about us without us,” Cevra pointed out the important representation of people with disabilities during the entire process. “The Convention process was the most inclusive ever [...] and, in the end, 80% of the [Convention] text is said to have come from the civil society,” stated Cevra.

Cevra also recognized the Convention text as an evolution in the international human rights laws. “The Convention text,” said Cevra, “covers all human rights [...] and do not create new rights, but outlines how human rights are applied in the context of PwDs.” Furthermore, Cevra recognized that this

text is an evolution in the international human rights laws, and shared some of its unique characteristics, unprecedented in any other human rights treaties:

- **Guideline principles are developed for the Convention implementation.**
- **International cooperation is encouraged, as opposed to rights viewed as only a matter of sovereign states.**
- **National implementation and monitoring guidelines are ensuring that domestic mechanisms are put in place.**
- **An international expert body, the committee on rights of people with disabilities is set up and includes people with disabilities.**

To introduce the link between this Convention and VA, Cevra started by referring to Anne Capelle's presentation on VA. She focused on the wider definition of VA recognized by the Mine Action (MA) community, and the link between the needs of survivors and people with disabilities.

“The comprehensive approach to victim assistance is more than just a matter of giving fake legs and physical rehabilitation; it is a human rights issue,”

said Cevra. Participants were then invited to look at a matrix developed by LSN, outlining the connections between the MBT, the VA provision, the Nairobi Action Plan and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Cevra went through the six components of VA and linked them with articles from the Convention, to show that they are all being reinforced by this legal text, from a human rights-based approach. In addition to elaborating on the VA components, Cevra pointed out that the Convention also addresses relevant issues in VA, for example, obligations on the inclusion of survivors, equality and non-discrimination and inclusive development.

Acknowledging that much has been improved in terms of VA since 1997, Cevra noted however that “much remains to be done and that the Convention can help to achieve the goals of future comprehensive VA programs and ensure their sustainability.” Cevra mentioned some of VA future goals, and explained how they could benefit from the Convention:

- **By providing a legal framework for VA, national implementation and monitoring at national and international levels, the Convention can help increase the government's ownership.**
- **The range, quality and availability of services to survivors can also be increased because of the steps elaborated within the Convention,**

ensuring equal access to services for PwDs, without discrimination.

- **Underserved population such as women and children with disabilities are taken into account in the Convention.**
- **Survivors' participation is increased also by the Convention, which required the participation of PwDs at all levels.**
- **The coordination mechanism required to implement the Convention can serve as a coordination body for VA at national and international levels.**

Cevra called up to the State Parties of the MBT to sign and ratify the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disability.

“By implementing the Convention, States will be able to fulfill their obligations under [the MBT] as well [...] and they will also ensure sustainability and greater effectiveness of VA programs,”

concluded Cevra.

Part 2: Breakout Sessions

Three breakout sessions were simultaneously conducted, and aimed to highlight specific programming approaches to Victim Assistance (VA) in various sectors: 1) medical care, physical rehabilitation & psychological support; 2) social and economic inclusion; 3) disability laws and public policies. Each group included presentations from two to three speakers presenting their field experiences, and led to larger group discussions among all participants. Following discussions in subgroups, each group's facilitator presented in plenary the main points of what had been discussed.

Group A: Programming Approaches to Victim Assistance in Medical Care, Physical Rehabilitation and Psychological Support

FACILITATOR: **Anna Miller**
Director of Programs, CPAR

BREAKOUT SPEAKERS: **Anne Capelle**,
Mine Action Consultant

Fiona Gall,
Senior Technical Advisor Rehabilitation,
Swiss Committee for Afghanistan

Brenda Tapia,
Technical Coordinator, Health and
Rehabilitation, Handicap International
programme in Nicaragua

Summary of Breakout Presentations



Anna Miller introduced this breakout session by pointing out common aspects brought up during the breakout presentations and discussions, which according to her outlined similarities with development programming concerns. She mentioned issues of sustainability, related costs of recovery, adaptive material, gender concerns, ownership, and challenges to integrating medical care and physical rehabilitation for landmines survivors and people with disabilities (PwDs) in the broader health system. Miller also reported the quote “nobody is prepared for a loss of limb or sense,” which was said at the beginning of the session, and served as a basic principle for the following discussions.

Brenda Tapia, as a first breakout speaker, shared her experience building the sustainability of an orthopedic

laboratory in Nicaragua. Related sectors of intervention were mentioned, such as infrastructure set-up, equipment purchase, repair and storage, linkages with other laboratories, and finally training for personnel of rehabilitation services and public health network. Tapia mentioned that an economic guide was created, including coordination mechanisms with local and governmental actors, as well as a set of procedures to develop seed capital in order to purchase key equipments. Focusing on sustainability, Tapia outlined that it was not yet achieved, having 55% of total budget costs related to prosthetics and laboratory equipment, and no financial support from the Ministry of Health. The reality of trained health workers migrating to other countries, for recognition and better salaries, was also outlined.

“In developing countries, primary health is often considered, but PwDs are not considered,”

said Tapia, pointing out that advocacy is needed for services of rehabilitation, prosthetics and orthotics to be included.

As second speaker, Fiona Gall focused her presentation on lessons learned from physical rehabilitation services within the context of community-based rehabilitation (CBR) program in Afghanistan. As a result of collaborative efforts from local and international NGOs, Gall explained the work that had been done in terms of physical rehabilitation, pointing out that much still remains to be done. As Brenda Tapia had mentioned, Gall noted the needs for training and the important work to be done with the ministries responsible for disability-linked services. This work will enable them to provide the framework for policy and planning needed for effective programming. An emphasis was put on the CBR approach as being a practical way of integrating various services, as it is based on individual needs and community mobilization and advocacy for issues such as employment, access to school, etc. The community approach builds and reinforces referral networks, and is beneficial for all PwDs, not only landmine survivors. To conclude, Gall mentioned aspects that needed to be improved at the policy, technical and community levels, and added that advocacy needs to be done toward donors, as these issues require longer-term funding.

Following the first presentations concentrating on physical rehabilitation, Anne Capelle started by presenting the medical care aspects and the link that can be made with development programming. Capelle pointed out that often, because of lack of training or equipment, amputations or other types of surgeries are in many countries not conducted properly. This can affect the recovery process, and, in a longer term, for landmines survivors, it can affect their economic and social reintegration. The gender aspect of the

medical world was mentioned also by Capelle, who reminded the importance in certain cultural context of having trained women surgeons and therapists to work with women survivors. In the broader context of poverty and insecurity, the importance of community structures mentioned by both previous speakers was stressed by Capelle. Indeed, community structures provide an accessible platform for better medical care and response, as well as for better social recognition of PwDs as a part of the community. Capelle provided field examples of peer support initiatives done through the landmine survivors networks, as well as sports and arts inclusive activities. “It is important for the person to reconfirm her identity and focus on abilities, as opposed to disabilities,” said Capelle, to encourage the inclusion of psychological support in health- and social-related initiative.

Discussions

Miller reported that group discussions and exchange of experiences took place around specific topics, mainly the prioritizing of children and the broader challenges of psychological support for landmine survivors. Discussing integrating development and survivors programs, Miller emphasized the critical transition for the person from victim to survivor. This transition, through an often individualized approach, is essential for the sustainability of other activities such as micro-finance and provision of agricultural support. Within discussions, two resources⁶ were shared to support better programming, documents to which Miller invited participants to refer. To conclude, Miller mentioned a recommendation that arose from the discussions: for any effective programming, it is important to recognize that support for landmines survivors is a lifetime commitment, and cannot be limited to one project.

Group B: Programming Approaches to Victim Assistance in Social and Economic Inclusion

FACILITATOR: **Chantal Vallée**
Project Manager, Oxfam-Québec

BREAKOUT SPEAKERS: **Denis Compingt**,
consultant

Wendy Batson,
Director, Handicap International USA



Summary of Breakout Presentations

Wendy Batson presented lessons learned in the field of economic inclusion, working with war victims and landmine victims. Batson started by referring to the Mine Ban Treaty and the way Victim Assistance (VA) was conducted at the beginning of its implementation in mine-affected countries. As the focus had been put at the outset on medical care and physical rehabilitation, it became clear after some time that victims were often more concerned about livelihood issues. Batson recognized the lack of economic integration expertise among rehabilitation NGOs, as well as the difficulties linked with survivors, often marginalized and living in societies with low economic opportunities. She gave an example from her experience working as Director of VVAF in Cambodia, where a shelter workshop including PwDs was turned into a business after a few years. The transition from a charity to a business approach resulted in sustainable livelihood, a recovery of social roles and better living conditions. Starting from an emergency perspective working with landmine victims, Batson noted the transition to larger issues of inclusion and mainstreamed development activities, helping people find a way to work within their community. Looking at disability inclusive policies developed by USAID, Batson was optimistic regarding the dialogue with donors,

6. 1) Project guide and program guide developed by LSN, available on their Web site, entitled Supporting prosthetics and orthotic services in low income settings: a common approach for organizations implementing aid programs ; 2) Minas antipersonal en Colombia, el camino hacia la rehabilitacion en inclusion social, Handicap International, 2007

and also pointed out the important role of the UN Convention for the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

“PwDs should be included in all development projects within their community [and] survivor assistance needs to be linked with poverty reduction and national development plans,”

concluded Batson.

Denis Compingt shared his experience working in Afghanistan on a socio-economic reintegration project targeting PwDs, including war victims. This project included two components: income improvement and awareness-raising. For starters, Compingt explained the different actions needed to improve socio-economic inclusion, such as improvement of self-confidence, vocational training, access to income, etc. The twin-track approach was used for direct services to PwDs and to develop referral networks with local and international partners. Compingt emphasized the importance of having an outreach approach for the most vulnerable people, as well as the value of individualized accompaniment throughout the process. Compingt mentioned some means to achieve employment, such as vocational training, and pointed out that, for women, this was also combined with basic education improvement. Given partnerships with local actors and international NGOs are very important, Compingt mentioned the difficulties encountered often due to lack of knowledge regarding disability, and discussed the need for awareness-raising. He mentioned several targets for disability awareness-raising, such as local authorities, government, service providers, and people with disabilities and their families. To conclude, Compingt said that community-based projects that do not discriminate against vulnerable groups have greater impact.

Discussions

In her summary of the discussions, Chantal Vallée mentioned that difficulties were clearly identified in terms of establishing a referrals system for PwDs to other local and international NGOs working in the livelihood sector, which outlines the need for awareness-raising and advocacy. The need for common employment standards was noted, enhancing the importance of labor market coherency within a country. Vallée emphasized also the necessary transition from charity to business, and noted the need to scale up in terms of production and marketing perspectives. Finally, since disability is on the way to being mainstreamed like gender and the environment, Vallée reminded everyone of the importance of not losing sight of the goal of providing assistance to those who suffered from landmines.

Group C: Programming Approaches to Victim Assistance in Disability Laws and Public Policies

FACILITATOR: **Rachel Logel**
Program Manager, Humanitarian and Emergency Affairs,
World Vision Canada

BREAKOUT SPEAKERS: **Anna Kudarewska**, consultant
Olaf Juergensen, Chief Technical Advisor, UNDP Jordan
Steven Estey, Human Rights Officer, Disable Peoples' International



Summary of Breakout Presentations

Anna Kudarewska, as the first speaker, shared her experience working in Angola, where she dealt with providing capacity-building to local rehabilitation managers, Disabled People Organizations (DPOs), as well as advising national governments. Through this experience, Kudarewska provided an overview of how a rights-based approach can be used in programming, working with people and transforming them from passive aid recipients into rights holders.

“A rights-based approach is the central focus of sustainable human development,”

said Kudarewska, however pointing out the challenges of a closed political context, especially working with issues such as disability. The importance of coordination and the different axes of intervention in policy development were explained

further. Kudarewska also sent a warning about the limited effectiveness of disability laws imposing no sanction for violations of any of their provisions. Moreover, there are barriers linked to policymakers and to PwDs' self-perception, which inhibit the transition from the provision of a direct service to legally ensuring its accessibility.

Another example taking place in a different political context of implementation was presented by Olaf Juergensen, who shared his experience working in Jordan. Juergensen started by explaining the main points of the UN policy thinking and the MA strategy developed in regards to the MBT, such as national capacity-building, support to civil society and the mainstreaming of VA into policies and debates. The example of Jordan led to discussions on the support needed for data collection, the importance of multidisciplinary needs assessments, strong strategies and national plans as well as good coordination. Juergensen concluded by mentioning the positive experience of Jordan in implementing the MBT and respecting disability rights. He outlined from that experience the important level of leadership and ownership in Jordan, with the implication of the Royal Family, for example, as well as the people committed and demanding their rights.

The last presentation was done by Steven Estey, who offered some reflections on connecting the work being done in MA to the activities linked with the development of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Estey gave an overview of the process through which the Convention was developed, and emphasized the fact that it does not create new rights for PwDs. As part of a cross-disability organization, Estey reminded that landmine victims are part of the broader community of PwDs. Acknowledging the significant progress made in the area of landmines survivor assistance, Estey pointed out that the MBT is not compulsory in terms of VA activities. It does not explain what VA is or require States to report on their VA activities. In response to the shortcomings of the MBT, Estey stated that “the advantage of the UN Convention is that it begins to develop the thinking in the international system around how you actually achieve goals [such as the provision of VA through the MBT].” Finally, under the Convention, Estey highlighted the opportunity for civil society to hold States accountable for reporting and following up on their obligations.

Discussions

Rachel Logel mentioned that within the discussions, several questions were directed at the speakers to obtain further information on their project experience. Other points were further raised, such as the compartmentalization of the different components of VA and the reality that some countries tend to deal with those components using a charity

model. Logel concluded by underlining the opportunity for civil society to encourage the shift to a more rights-based approach. ■

Engaging CIDA and Canadian Organizations on Mine Action

The final session of the event aimed to identify concrete suggestions and proposals as to how the Canadian government and non-governmental actors can move forward and be supported in their efforts to link Mine Action to their development programming.

The sixth session first took the form of breakout sessions, where participants were divided into three groups, with equal representation from the Canadian government, Canadian NGOs, international Mine Action experts and representatives from affected countries. Participants were encouraged to discuss how civil society and government can work together in linking Mine Action to Development, looking at possible cooperation around Mine Action, the integration of this concept within CIDA's programming, and the interest and cooperation of Canadian NGOs on this issue.

After open exchanges were done in subgroups, the main points of discussions were presented in plenary by each group facilitator.

- FACILITATORS: **Jean Devlin**
 Manager, Humanitarian Assistance,
 Peace and Security Directorate, CIDA
Christa McMillin
 Program Manager, Mines Action Canada
James Freedman
 Consultant



Introducing the dialogue: the actors and the subject

As a preface to the discussions, Jean Devlin and Christa McMillin reported that the distinction between civil society and government had been clarified within their group. McMillin added that a participant had

made an interesting comment, reminding everyone that the government was a manifestation of civil society, and that this false distinction between both discouraged collaborative efforts. James Freedman mentioned that a clarification of terminology had also been carried out regarding the words linking, integrating and mainstreaming. "As MA should not be disappearing, linking came up as a better phrase, [however] for people working in Victim Assistance (VA), mainstreaming was seen for them as a better terminology," reported Freedman.

Each group acknowledged that, after several years of programming in Mine Action, the Mine Community was entering a phase of transition, in Canada as well as in other parts of the world. The following discussions reflected the common understanding that something must be done now in order to facilitate that transition.

Suggestions to facilitate the work toward linking Mine Action to development programming

Suggestions to both the Canadian government and non-governmental organizations

Change the perception of Mine Action:

The perception of Mine Action as being too technical has to change. "People working in CIDA have to understand that Mine Action in programming is not impossible to deal with, and MA NGOs have to facilitate this understanding by making it comprehensive and approaching it in a practical way," said Freedman.

Maintain efforts in making advocacy:

"Advocacy is important [in order] to maintain visibility on landmines issues," said Devlin. He then addressed Canadian NGOs, reminding them that advocacy is a way of ensuring that fundraising is done, and that funding issues are therefore not exclusively dependant on government funding.

Take risks:

McMillin reported that someone in her group said that "providing seed money for different programs and different organizations for doing things that they have not done before" represents a risk for the donor agency, but could be a way of generating a confidence and legitimacy for MA NGOs.

Encourage continuous dialogue:

All groups reported the need for a continued dialogue between CIDA and Canadian NGOs. "This dialogue can be both at the informal and higher levels," added McMillin,

giving examples, such as informal brown bag lunch presentations at CIDA, project presentations, as well as meetings with higher management.

Suggestions specific to the Canadian International Development Agency

Ensure consultative process:

"When CIDA is designing a new programming approach in a mine-affected country, it is important to offer the possibility for MA NGOs and other people preoccupied about MA to be involved," said Devlin.

Information dissemination:

In some groups, participants recommended that, to learn from the achievements of years gone by, the results of the evaluation of the Canadian Landmine Fund (CLF) should be disseminated inside CIDA as well as among development and MA Canadian NGOs. It was also suggested that CIDA could provide a list of their upcoming programs and objectives, so that Canadian implementing or field based organizations could adjust themselves.

Remind multilateral organizations not to avoid mine-affected areas:

It was pointed out that some multilateral organizations tend to leave aside mine-affected areas, partially because they are driven by the donor community on quick results and efficiency. "Because we are contributors to these multilateral organizations, we should ask them to focus on mine-affected areas and not leave out vulnerable groups," Devlin pointed out.

Mine Action focal point:

Each group mentioned at one point the importance of having an MA focal point within CIDA once the CLF comes to an end. "There is a need for a focal point, perhaps even a network of people, who could be able to review proposals coming in, [as well as] respond to Canadian NGOs and civil society on inquiries they have," reported Devlin. Freedman added that this focal point could "ensure the inclusion of MA in country program frameworks, link NGOs between themselves as well as with donors."

Suggestions specific to Canadian non-governmental organizations

Encourage partnerships and collaboration:

All groups highlighted the importance of facilitating a dialogue between MA NGOs and development NGOs. McMillin reported that her group concretely suggested more collaboration between MAC and CCIC. "This collaboration [...] could put forward both development and MA programs' submissions as well as educate high level and program based level CIDA colleagues on the successes, challenges

and future of Mine Action and development programming,” said McMillin. Acknowledging the importance of this collaboration, Devlin mentioned the example of MAG and World Vision working together in Cambodia, while pointing out the time needed for developing such partnerships.

Highlighting development aspects:

“As dedicated funding is expected to end, MA actors will have to evolve [and better highlight] development aspects in their programming,” said Devlin, adding that mine-affected countries are also encouraged to include MA in their development planning.

Devlin added that CIDA was “not a monolith”, and that various programs can be explored, for example, the governance program. “The disability thematic from a rights-based approach becomes more and more a reality, and this window will be another opportunity for us to respond to mine-affected communities' needs,” said Devlin. Freedman also referred to this issue, recognizing that indeed it had not been talked about enough. He went further by saying that “decentralization of obligations and responsibilities in governments opens the way for local governments to undertake responsibilities [...]. That evokes the word ownership in a practical way, that

investing in government is a very critical responsibility. Whether it's by an NGO, or by CIDA, or another agency, one knows that it has to be done.”

McMillin reported that a field-based colleague said, “If you give, give a little bit more.” This message, addressed not only to governmental agencies but also to NGOs, reminded that help is still needed. To conclude, McMillin referred back to the earlier discussions on civil society and the government, reminding everyone that both are just real people. McMillin insisted that face-to-face connection and dialogue provide the opportunity to see points in common and differences, as well as how to reconcile the two different, sometimes competing agendas of both sides.

■

Symposium Conclusion



Jean Devlin

Manager, Peace, Security and Mine Action Group, CIDA

Nancy DeGraff

Director,
Handicap International Canada

The symposium was concluded by Nancy DeGraff and Jean Devlin, as representatives of the organizations hosting the symposium: Handicap International Canada and CIDA.

Nancy DeGraff first thanked all organizers, participants and speakers, for their help in making this event possible. Jean Devlin noted that there had been extremely valuable exchanges of knowledge and experiences, which allowed discussions on the different aspects of MA and development of possible linkages. Recognizing that the information shared represents probably only “the tip of the iceberg,” Devlin kept optimistic and stated that according to him, “there is definitely a lot of potential that can be exploited” and that the linkages with development showed possibilities on all aspects of MA.

“[To link MA to development], we need to adapt our approaches, modulate our techniques in doing so and we have to learn as we go along,”

said Devlin, pointing out that “there is no magic formula to pass from a very quick reaction dedicated fund to complex integrated MA activities.”

DeGraff admitted that in events such as this symposium, when people are coming from all over the world, one of her biggest fear is that, after everyone meets, everyone disappears and nothing is done to put into practice or apply what has been learned. The link was made with the last session of the symposium on engaging CIDA and Canadian NGOs, and DeGraff shared her wish that “this dialogue be continued and that a space can be found where [both parties] can work on these issues and look at how to better collaborate.” This was corroborated by Devlin, who acknowledged certain elements both parties had to continue working on, for example issues of policy dialogue as well as programming strategies and design. “I think the best way forward is not to replace national governments' rules and responses, but to help along, if the governments can demonstrate commitment,” added Devlin, specifying this referred also to mine-affected countries' governments.

Devlin concluded by saying that the transition to linking MA and development has started and that more work needs to be done.

“The workshop is over, but the job for all of us has just started,”

said Devlin.

■

Appendix A

Statement on the Occasion of the MBT's Tenth Anniversary



His Excellency Jean Lint, Ambassador of Belgium in Canada

His Excellency Jean Lint, having wide experience working in disarmament issues, was invited as a keynote speaker, and shared his thoughts on the process that led to the signature of the Mine Ban Treaty, as well as on the current situation, ten years later.

After introducing the MBT, Lint stated that it was “an incredible success,” since it entered into force only fifteen months after its signing. “Today, ten years after the signature, we have completed 80% of our task as 156 States have accepted the responsibility to never use, produce or transfer anti-personnel mines and to cooperate in addressing the devastating impact of those mines.” According to Lint, the success of the MBT is due to several factors. He mentioned in that sense the “widespread recognition of this international norm and the spirit of cooperation between all State Parties, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC),” outlining that the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize also recognized the success of the mine ban movement. Lint also underlined the unique coordination and implementation mechanisms, formal and informal, which allowed the conversion of the Convention words into meaningful concrete actions, and the monitoring of progress and challenges to come.

Given he mentioned that, to date, 156 States had ratified the Treaty, Lint focused on the 39 States that have not yet ratified it and questioned this situation. Looking at the results of the annual UN meeting, aiming for the universality of the Convention, Lint pointed out States who signed but never ratified, others who abstained or were absent for the vote, and finally States who voted in favor, but are still outside of the Convention. “We are particularly concerned by those States remaining outside of the Convention, which still use and/or produce antipersonnel mines, as well as by those that have huge stocks of anti-personnel Mines,” Lint said. “We need to increase our efforts to stress that no conceivable utility of anti-personnel mines could possibly justify the devastating human costs of these weapons.”

“There are no such things as smart mines [...], there are only indiscriminate, cruel and inhuman anti-personnel mines, which destroy the lives of thousands of innocent civilian victims each year,” said Lint, reminding that victims are why we are still fighting today. **“We have done a great job until now. It is time to finish it,”** concluded Lint.

Appendix B

NAME	ORGANIZATION	CONTACT	COUNTRY
Adib, Alain	Bilateral Desks, CIDA	alain_adib@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada
Addison, Catherine	Bilateral Desks, CIDA	CATHERINE_ADDISON@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada
Armstrong-Lehman, Jennifer	Canadian Landmine Foundation	jennifer@canadianlandmine.org	Canada
Arnold, Jonathan	Bilateral Desks, CIDA	JONATHAN_ARNOLD@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada
Baaser, Sharif	UNICEF	sbaaser@unicef.org	USA
Batson, Wendy	Handicap International USA	wbatson@handicap-international.us	USA
Benjamin, Stanley	Consultant	sbenjamin@plannet.ca	Canada
Benoît, Sylvain	Montmorency International	SBenoit@cmontmorency.qc.ca	Canada
Bernard, Hervé	Handicap International France	hbernard@handicap-international.org	France
Bernard, Yves	Bilateral Desks, CIDA	YVES_BERNARD@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada
Capelle, Anne	Consultant	anne@capelle.cc	Belgium
Cevra, Nerina	Landmine Survivors Network	ncevra@landminesurvivors.org	USA
Champigny, Christian	Handicap International Canada	christian.champigny@handicap-international.ca	Canada
Chang, Trish	Mine Action Unit, CIDA	trish_chang@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada
Collins, Robin	World Federalist Movement Canada	robincol@gmail.com	Canada
Compingt, Denis	Consultant	denis.compingt@yahoo.fr	France
Conway, Denise	Policy Branch, CIDA	DENISE_CONWAY@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada
Côté, Marie-Hélène	Bilateral Desks, CIDA	MARIEHELENE_COTE@ACDI-CIDA.GC.CA	Canada
Daun, Meredith	Manitoba Campaign to Ban Landmines	mdaun@mts.net	Canada
DeGraff, Nancy	Handicap International Canada	nancy.degraff@handicap-international.ca	Canada
Devlin, Jean	Mine Action Unit, CIDA	JEAN_DEVLIN@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada
Dooley Tremblay, Brigid	Policy Branch, CIDA	brigid_dooleytremlay@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada
Douglas Megill, James	CAMEO landmine clearance	jdmeigill@hotmail.com	Canada
Eaton, Robert	Survey Action Center	bob@sac-na.org	USA
Ennis, Mary	Disabled People International	mary@dpi.org	Canada
Estey, Steven	Disabled People International	sbestey@eastlink.ca	Canada
Fortin, Marie-Eve	Evaluation, CIDA	MARIEEVE_FORTIN@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada
Freedman, James	Consultant	freedman@uwo.ca	Canada
Formanek, Sacha	Specialized associations, CIDA	sacha_formanek@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada
Gall, Fiona	Swiss Committee for Afghanistan	sgaakabul@yahoo.com	Afghanistan
Hansen, Jacqueline	Mines Action Canada	jackie@icbl.org	Canada
Hébert, Maryse	Evaluation, CIDA	maryse_hebert@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada
Horton, David	Canadian International Demining Corps	davidhorton@cidc.ws	Canada
Howell, Bill	Handicap International France	bhowell@handicap-international.org	France
Hudson, Zachary	Adopt-A-Minefield	zhudson@unausa.org	USA
Ismael, Adérito	Handicap International Mozambique	himosiba@teledata.mz	Mozambique
Jewsbury, Frank	CAMEO landmine clearance	frank.jewsbury@rogers.com	Canada
Juergensen, Olaf	UNDP	olaf.juergensen@undp.org	Jordan
Kudarewska, Anna	Consultant	aqdarek@yahoo.co.uk	Poland
Labaj, Annie	Canadian Auto Workers	Annie.Labaj@caw.ca	Canada
Leclercq, Bruno	Handicap International Cambodia	bruno.leclercq@hib-cambodia.org	Cambodia
Logel, Rachel	World Vision Canada	Rachel_Logel@worldvision.ca	Canada
McBride, Heather	Mine Action Unit, CIDA	HEATHER_MCBRIDE@ACDI-CIDA.GC.CA	Canada
McMillin, Christa	Mines Action Canada	Christa@minesactioncanada.org	Canada
Mequanent, Getachew	Policy Branch, CIDA	getachew_mequanent@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada
Miller, Anna	Canadian Physicians for Aid and Relief	amiller@cpar.ca	Canada

NAME	ORGANIZATION	CONTACT	COUNTRY
Mitrevski, Oliver	Canadian International Demining Corps	mdd@lol.ba	Balkans
Munoz, Diana	Canadian Embassy in Bogota	Diana.Munoz@international.gc.ca	Colombia
Naidoo, Sharmala	Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining	s.naidoo@gichd.org	Switzerland
Nepveu, Jerome	Policy Branch, CIDA	jerome_nepveu@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada
Newhouse, Colin R.	Handicap International Canada	leader@colinnewhouse.com	Canada
Orange, Nevin	Bilateral Desks, CIDA	nevin_orange@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada
Orech, Margaret Arach	International Campaign to Ban Landmines	margaret@icbl.org	Uganda
Orozco, Carlos	Organization of American States	oea_dmdo@ibw.com.ni	Nicaragua
Pasha, Aneeza	Handicap International France	apasha@handicap-international.org	France
Paterson, Ted	Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining	t.paterson@gichd.org	Switzerland
Pentlow, Sarah	Volunteer Services Overseas Canada	sarah@vsocan.org	Canada
Phillips, Carol	Canadian Auto Workers	Carol.Phillips@caw.ca	Canada
Reid, Mary	Council of Canadians with Disabilities	Mary.Reid@ottawa.ca	Canada
Simon, Pascal	UNDP	pascal.simon@undp.org	Senegal
Summerbell, John	Bilateral Desks, CIDA	JOHN_SUMMERBELL@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada
Szyszló, Peter	World University Service of Canada	pszyszlo@WUSC.ca	Canada
Tapia, Brenda	Handicap International Nicaragua	hinic_ctsalud@cable.net.com.ni	Nicaragua
Vallée, Chantal	Oxfam Québec	ValleeC@oxfam.qc.ca	Canada
Volkes, Carly	Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade	carly.volkes@international.gc.ca	Canada
Wheatley, Andrew	International Committee of Red Cross	awheatley.bog@icrc.org	Colombia
Woodbridge, Anne	Mine Action Unit, CIDA	ANNE_WOODBRIDGE@acdi-cida.gc.ca	Canada

Appendix C

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CAMEO	Canadian Association for Mine and Explosive Ordnance Security	UXO	Unexploded Ordnance
CCD	Council of Canadians with Disabilities	VA	Victim Assistance
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency	VVAF	Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation
CIDC	Canadian International Demining Corps	VSO Canada	Voluntary Service Overseas
CCIC	Canadian Council for International Cooperation	WUSC	World University Service of Canada
CPAR	Canadian Physicians for Aid and Relief		
DFAIT-Canada	Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada		
GICHD	Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining		
HI	Handicap International		
ICBL	International Campaign to Ban Landmines		
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross		
IMAS	International Mine Action Standards		
LMAD	Linking Mine Action and Development		
LSN	Landmine survivor Network/MAC Mines Action Canada		
MBT	Mine Ban Treaty		
MRE	Mine Risk Education		
NGO	Non Governmental Organization		
OAS	Organization of American States		
SAC	Survey Action Center		
UN	United Nations		
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme		
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund		
UNMAS	United Nations Mine Action Service		