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Preface

These notes have been put together as a guide to donors who may wish to fund mine action programmes in mine-affected countries, with the aim of providing practical guidance to solve or avoid some of the problems that the donor may encounter. The notes were written by three mine action specialists, Paddy Blagden, Vera Bohle and Alistair Craib. Between the three of us, we have amassed some 44 years of mine action, as deminers, programme managers, advisers to donors, UN officials, directors of NGOs, consultants, evaluators and technical specialists, and all of us are still active in the fascinating and challenging field of mine action. Since 1991 we have set up, worked in or studied over 30 mine action programmes in well over 25 countries, so all the advice given is based on first hand experience.

We can be contacted through ECORYS Nederland BV. The mine action community is a small one; if we, or other people to whom you go for advice initially do not know the answer, we will probably know somebody who does.

Your feedback on these advice notes will be appreciated. If there are other subjects that should have been covered, please let us know.
Introduction

Mine action means the clearance of landmines and other explosive hazards from countries which have been affected by internal or external conflicts. It is a comparatively new undertaking and started about 1989. As such it is a new ‘industry’ and has many aspects that can be confusing. Mine action is also both highly political and very expensive; it has many areas where resources can be wasted, with potential pitfalls for both donors and contractors. Mine clearance is only one aspect of mine action; others are survey, quality control, mine risk education, victim assistance and socio-economic reintegration, stockpile destruction and advocacy. In these notes, we are specifically excluding advocacy and victim assistance, donations to which are funded through dedicated organisations. This is because victim assistance and socio-economic reintegration, being primarily medical and public health matters, need a handbook of their own, the drafting of which would be outside the skills of the current authors. Another reason for their exclusion is that the majority of donor funding is spent on clearance, and this is where the authors believe that improvements in efficiency and cost-effectiveness can be made.

Since these guidance notes aim to help new donors as well as established donors, some of the points made in this guide may appear simplistic but most are based on actual situations the authors have met in the field. The notes also give a list of contact points, which are easy to access, if further advice on specific points is needed.

For simplicity, the donor’s government and operations are referred to as ‘donor’, while the mine-affected country and its organisations are referred to as ‘national’. The organisations carrying out the mine action are called ‘contractors’ (whether they are on a contract or not) and may include international or national commercial companies and NGOs, and country NGOs, commercial companies and armies. The term ‘mine’ is used to mean all types of landmines; the term ‘ERW’ (Explosive Remnants of War) refers to all explosive munitions remaining after a conflict, whether stored, dumped, fired or scattered, which are forming ‘contaminated areas’. The work carried out under donor funding is a ‘project’, and a group of ‘projects’ run by an agency is called a ‘programme’.

These notes seek to be impartial and sensitive so they do not use the names of countries, organisations or agencies except when it is necessary and not contentious.

These advice notes are divided into 17 parts, which are broadly based on the sequence of events that take place when a donor is considering setting up a mine action project, and then running it until it is terminated. They can be read as a whole but each part is structured so it can be consulted individually. The title of each is listed in the Contents page. Acronyms are used after the meaning in full has been spelt. It is assumed that the readers know the UN and its organisations, the EC and the EU. At the end of each part, we include some relevant documents or contact points for information or background.
reading, where these have not been added as footnotes to the text. There is a massive amount of literature available, but the web addresses and documents that we are including will be a good start, and will often lead you to others.

**Relevant documents**

For information on mine action see:
1 What is mine action?

Humanitarian mine action (also called humanitarian demining) is the process by which mines and explosive remnants of war (ERW) of all types are detected, removed and destroyed. Mines are ‘victim-activated’, and may be designed to kill or maim people (anti-personnel mines) or to disable or destroy vehicles and tanks (anti-vehicle or anti-tank mines). Some mines and unexploded ordnance (UXO) are collectively called ‘Explosive Remnants of War’ (ERW), and these may be any form of munition containing an explosive filling which is generally not designed to be victim-actuated but which, if mishandled, can explode, causing extensive and often lethal damage. ERW will be used as the term for such munitions in this paper.

The clearance process of mines and ERW in a contaminated country is a step-by-step process, which can be both time-consuming and expensive. The steps include warnings to the local people of the mine threat by mine risk education (MRE), surveys to find out where the mines are, and the effect they are having, and finally clearance and destruction. Several surveys are needed, of increasing accuracy, until each individual mine or piece of ERW has been located and identified. If possible the mines and ERW are destroyed in place, to prevent the risk associated with moving them but some may have to be moved to a demolition area for destruction. The integration of the MRE, surveys, clearance and destruction requires planning, and all these elements are integrated into individual projects to be carried out by contractors, which collectively become a national mine action programme.

Why is it called humanitarian mine action?
The name ‘humanitarian mine action’ took over from ‘humanitarian demining’ when it was expanded to cover areas beyond the clearance of mines and ERW, and because national programmes also include mine risk education (MRE), support for mine victims, mine survey, identification, marking and fencing of mined areas, in addition to the physical removal of mines and ERW, both in the ground and in stockpiles. It also covers the quality management of all these activities. It also applied to advocacy and support for mine victims, but as stated in the Introduction, these are not covered in these advice notes. Although the term humanitarian mine action is commonly used it may suggest a limitation in its scope. The word ‘humanitarian’ implies emergency, rapid response, post-conflict situations but, in fact, its reach is much broader as is explained below and in Part 16. This paper uses the shorter term ‘mine action’ to describe the activity in a non-conflict environment whether by civil or military personnel.

How does it fit in with other actions, such as development?
Mine action is a cross-cutting activity which can have a significant role in the immediate post-conflict, reconstruction and development situations. It is sometimes, and incorrectly, seen as a ‘stand-alone’ activity partly because it is often outside the experience of
development agencies, just as mine action agencies usually know little of other forms of
development. The false impression is not helped by some mine action contractors (NGOs especially) seeing it as a single issue activity. In fact, it is not ‘stand-alone’, nor should it be. It is merely the preparation of ground to allow other forms of development to take place. There have been comparatively few programmes that have deliberately joined mine action and development together, but such programmes exist and can function well, but they need proper preparation and planning.
It is beyond the scope of this paper to describe mine action in greater detail, but there is a useful guide to mine action available from the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), either online or in booklet form, obtainable free of charge.

Relevant documents
2 Why fund mine action

*The humanitarian imperative*
Mines and explosive remnants of war (ERW) pose a threat to the local population in a post-conflict situation, killing and maiming humans and their livestock long after the conflict has ended. They can prevent movement of all forms of aid, they do prevent return of refugees, and they can contribute to the de-stabilisation of the country. At village level, they create hazards that make the use of fields and pastures highly dangerous and prevent the gathering of wood for fuel or construction. The very fear of mines and ERW can de-populate wide areas and halt the use of roads and tracks. Although mines and ERW do not kill as many people as HIV/AIDS, water-borne diseases, malaria or malnutrition, they can exacerbate the effect of these and other scourges by preventing access for medical assistance, disease control or movement of food. In addition, mines and ERW can be eradicated relatively quickly and easily if funding for mine action is available, whereas other major problems are almost intractable.

*Support to reconstruction and development initiatives*
Mines and ERW can cause problems for all forms of reconstruction, by the closure of roads and tracks to deliberately isolated sabotaged bridges, power-lines and transformers, gas pipes and oilfields. This can delay all forms of reconstruction and development, with drastic effects on the regeneration of the economies of victim states. Too often, funding for reconstruction does not take the presence of mines and ERW into account, which causes major delays to all forms of development initiatives and can waste development funding. Donors need to fund mine action as an integral part of their development packages, a fact which is discussed further in Parts 3 and 5.

*Peace support and confidence building*
Peace, and creating the confidence necessary to get refugees to return and the reconstruction of towns and villages to start, depend on freedom of movement and freedom from hazard. Governments trying to recover from conflict situations urgently need stability in their countries and the re-introduction of law and order but stability will be difficult to achieve if the essential freedoms are missing. This means that donor funding for mine action can have much more far-reaching results than the mere removal of the mines and ERW. Such donor funding can become an investment in the return to normal life for many people in the mine-affected country, and a contributor to peace and stability. This is also discussed further in Parts 3 and 5.
**The Mine Ban Treaty (MBT)**

This is the most significant treaty for most donors’ mine action policies and it has been hugely important to the way mine action has progressed since 1998. Although it officially only covers anti-personnel landmines, in practice it is used more broadly to cover all other unexploded ordnance (UXO) and ERW, possibly because all mine clearance programmes aim to clear mines, UXO and ERW.

There are three main Articles that affect donors to mine action – Articles 4, 5 and 6.

### Article 4

> “... each States Party undertakes to destroy or ensure the destruction of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines it owns or possesses, or that are under its jurisdiction or control, as soon as possible but no later than four years after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party.”

### Article 5

> “Each States Party undertakes to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control, as soon as possible but no later than ten years after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party.”

### Article 6

> “In fulfilling its obligations under this Convention each State Party has the right to seek and receive assistance, where feasible, from other States Parties to the extent possible.” (Article 6.1)

> “Each State Party in a position to do so shall provide assistance for mine clearance and related activities.” (Article 6.4)

> “Each State Party in a position to do so shall provide assistance for the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines.” (Article 6.5)

Ratifying the MBT imposes obligations on donors and mine-affected countries and can present a significant challenge to both. All governments of mine-affected countries, once having ratified the Treaty, are required to find and clear the mines in their country by March 2009 (or within 10 years of acceding to the Convention if that is later). Donors who have acceded to the MBT themselves are obliged to help them to do so and that is now a major political imperative for donors to fund mine action. These notes assume that the donors’ primary aim will be to enable the governments of mine-affected states to create, manage and maintain their own mine action capability and capacity at an appropriate level. In all but very few cases, mines and other ERW will continue to be found, probably for decades to come (as is the case in Western Europe). However, whilst this country mine action capacity is being developed, a second donor objective could be to reduce to an acceptable level the impact on local people in mine-affected countries caused by mines to acceptable levels by funding direct mine action directly in addition to funding capacity-building. The donor’s choice of types of mine action and countries are discussed in Parts 3 and 4, and the issue of end-states and exit-strategies is discussed in Part 10.

---

1 This Treaty is also known by many titles including the Mine Ban Convention and the Ottawa Treaty. Its full title is “Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction.”
Relevant Documents

For information about mines and ERW:

For information on the MBT:
• see the Landmine Monitor website (www.icbl.org/lm),
• or the ICRC booklet “Banning Anti-personnel Landmines – The Ottawa Treaty explained” (see www.icrc.org),
• or Chapter 4 and Appendix 1 of the GICHD booklet mentioned above.
3 Choosing the mine action objective (Political and Strategic)

Introduction
If as a donor you have decided to fund mine action you should decide what your objective is in doing so. This guide assumes that you have a clear objective from the beginning. Of course, you may just want to give money to a mine action organisation and leave it to make all further decisions. That is a very poor way to proceed, benefiting neither your tax payers or contributors, nor the mine-affected country in which your money will be spent. The recipient of the money will be delighted but you may find you are disappointed with the outcome once the money has been spent. Even if you have only a little time to spend on managing the mine action portfolio, the first few parts of this guide are crucial. If you follow those, not only are you more likely to be pleased with the outcome but you will be able to demonstrate a duty of care to your contributors in the management of the funds.

The Mine Ban Treaty (MBT) has made mine action a highly politicised subject and some donors feels obliged to provide money as a demonstration of national support to it. Even if that is the case, the points made above about the value of the outcome and the duty of care should still apply.

Some reasons for funding mine action are suggested in Part 2 and, whichever one is chosen, it still needs clear objectives. The questions set out below provide some of the issues that can define them.

Political
The reasons for making the donations to a country may be totally political and, if so, your government may be less concerned about how it is spent. Even so, you will still need to answer the questions below because one-or-other may fit in with your own government’s political and policy agendas.

- Which countries does your government wish to support?
- Do you wish to support the development of the mine-affected government’s own capacity to manage mine action programmes?
- Do you only want to fund one of the mine action activities, such as mine risk education (MRE), survey or clearance?
- Are you willing to fund the costs of both management and mine action?
- Is it your intention to assist in the re-development of infrastructure or to assist economic regeneration?

The answers may affect your selection of contractors, the tasks they will undertake, and the areas in which they will work.
Strategic

Once you know which country you wish to support, you will have to consider your strategic aims for the mine-affected country you have selected and the outcome of your funding.

To achieve your aims, you might ask:
1. Is your interest solely in reducing casualties or in removing all mines?
2. Do you want to see the government of the mine-affected country assume full operational responsibility for mine action as soon as practicable?
3. Do you want to encourage and support stability in the country?
4. Is your interest in helping the victims of mines and explosive remnants of war?

To answer any of these, you will require some knowledge of the actual needs of the country concerned and there are independent organisations that can provide this, some of which are listed below. You will also need to know the operational capabilities of the contractors or other agencies to which your funding will be given.

Even at this stage, you may need to consider roughly how long you intend your funding to continue and what your ‘end-state’ outcome should be. Setting a limited series of outcomes to start with may enable you to answer this question as the national mine clearance programme develops, and you begin to see some output and outcome from your donations. End-states and exit-strategies are discussed in more detail in Part 10.

Relevant documents:
- The Landmine Monitor Report is online at [www.icbl.org/lm](http://www.icbl.org/lm). This has a section for each mine-affected country, and contains a lot of relevant information;
- Specific country needs information can be got from the Head of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU). Contact phone number +41-22-906-1660; and
- The United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) has a global overview and has the lead amongst the UN agencies on mine action and the clearance of explosive remnants of war. It has a comprehensive website at [www.mineaction.org](http://www.mineaction.org).
4 Capacity building

Some donors are only willing to fund operational mine action, perhaps because the outcomes are very visible and the value of the funding is easily seen. Fortunately others recognise that for that value to be sustainable there must be an appropriate and effective national capacity in the country in question. In most countries, and certainly those emerging from conflict, that capacity has to be built, sometimes from scratch. That process is called capacity building. Capacity-building has two major threads:

- The creation of a national operational mine action capacity such as (but not limited to) mine clearance teams; and
- The creation of an institutional capacity to manage the mine action taking place in the country.

Creation of local operational capacities is frequently done by NGOs as part of the task they are undertaking. Hiring local staff is cheaper than international staff and most mine-affected countries will expect it anyway. Ensuring that local staff is always employed whenever practicable is something you may wish to insert in the contract. The National Mine Action Centre (itself probably a focus for capacity building – see below) may be able to advise on the correct procedures. In this way the contractor will create good working teams with experienced local managers, with a good working relationship with the National Mine Action Centre and, perhaps, even the government. These operational capacities can function very well when the international NGOs are still in place. It is through them that the local teams will get their funding, their tasking and the supervision. However, when the international NGOs leave, as one day they will, and if the teams are to continue working, it is essential that there is a national mechanism which will replace the functions previously undertaken by the international NGOs. Without that mechanism they will probably collapse and there are examples where this has happened, such as recently in Mozambique.

That mechanism should be provided by the government of the mine-affected country, usually through two organisations authorised to perform this function. These are the National Mine Action Agency (NMAA) and its implementing partner, the Mine Action Coordination Centre (called the MACC in this document, though it may have other titles). The NMAA is an over-arching organisation, set up to ensure that all relevant Government ministries are able to state their requirements for mine action, and to set national priorities for mine action. It is also required to state the national strategy, and formulate long-terms plans for clearance, including the financial structure necessary to carry them out. The MACC, as the NMAA’s operating partner, carries out the day-to-day control of all mine action. It ensures that all mine action is within the national priorities, allocates clearance and MRE tasks to NGOs and commercial companies, and is responsible for Quality Assurance on the cleared sites, and subsequent acceptance of the cleared land on behalf of the NMAA. In practice, these organisations rarely start with the necessary skills to
undertake their work; they have to be developed, and that process is usually referred to as institutional capacity building. In most cases the United Nations undertakes this capacity building. It is generally recognised that creating an effective capability at this level can be difficult and there are some well known failures, like that of Mozambique mentioned above. In part, those failures can be blamed on a lack of international interest and support leaving them under-resourced and lacking encouragement and motivation. Nevertheless, if mine action is to continue long into the future, and after the international community support for it reduces, then creating this capability is essential. There are some excellent examples where this has succeeded; Bosnia and Croatia, for instance, and Cambodia. All operate well without the need for external skills. The same cannot be said for some of the NMAAs and MACCs in West Africa, which are usually less effective because there is not sufficient political will on the part of the government of the country to set up competent organisations.

Article 5 of the Mine Ban Treaty\(^2\) places full responsibility for the clearance of all anti-personnel mines in a country on the government of that country. For that to be realistic, all the capacities discussed above are essential. It should be remembered that much of Europe, with all its relative wealth and its advanced technology base, is still dealing with the explosive remnants of war from two world wars. Although it may not be fully recognised, mine-affected countries will also face a long-term problem with explosive remnants of war (including anti-personnel mines). The internationally sponsored work will clear much of the problem but not all. The residual problem will be left to the national capacities.

Capacity-building takes time and resources and, most of all it requires a clear vision and consistent support. The government is the main actor and without its active support capacity building will fail. Most likely it will fail also if the donors and the United Nations do not recognise the importance, especially for an effective institutional capacity. Some NGOs see this as a waste of money and cite those cases where, in the past, national institutions have failed. Much has been learned since those days and success is much more common, even in some partially dysfunctional countries.

Relevant documents:
There are few references discussing capacity building in mine action. However, the following may help.
- See the discussion on Measures of Success, End-States and Exit Strategies in Part 10;
- International Mine Action Standards 07.10 at www.mineactionstandards.org.

More general references are:
- “Building Capacity, Granting for Impact”. The Ontario Trillium Foundation at www.trilliumfoundation.org;
- “About Capacity Building”. Co-operative Venture for Capacity Building at www.rirdc.gov.au/capacitybuilding/about.html; and

\(^2\) “Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction”. 
5 Which mine action?

Having selected your objectives, you should now select which part of mine action will suit your objectives best. Mine action has many parts, including activities which aim to reduce the social, economic and environmental impact of landmines and explosive remnants of war (ERW). There are ‘five pillars’ to mine action, which are:

a. Education in mine and ERW awareness and risk reduction (usually called mine risk education or MRE);
b. Minefield survey, mapping, marking, and clearance;
c. Victim assistance, including rehabilitation and reintegration;
d. Advocacy to stigmatise the use of landmines and support a total ban on anti-personnel landmines; and
e. Destruction of stockpiles of antipersonnel mines in accordance with Article 4 of the Mine Ban Treaty (MBT).

As mentioned in the Introduction to this document, we are not considering c. (victim assistance) or d. (advocacy) in these notes.

If your strategic aim in Part 3 is “reducing casualties”, any or all of the mine actions in a. and b. above could form part of the programme you will be funding.

If you have opted for “getting the country Government to accept full responsibility” (capacity-building) this is not automatically included in any of a. to e. above. Capacity building is not one of the mine actions so it requires specific and separate consideration. It is an issue discussed in more detail in Part 4. Capacity building costs money and its progress can be hard to measure but many consider it to be the most important type of support a donor can give to a mine-affected country. Without capacity building the project you have been supporting will be vulnerable when you leave.

If you have opted for “Destruction of Stockpiles” to comply with the MBT, specialist advice will be required and special facilities may be needed. Stockpile destruction also requires expertise in ammunition management and logistics in addition to explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) experience. These skills are fairly easy to obtain and at reasonable cost.

In practice, most mine action organisations in-country automatically carry out all the pillars mentioned except for advocacy, which is usually left to national government organisations. There is a high degree of synergy between MRE and clearance – the more trust that is built up between the deminers and the local people, the more information and cooperation they are given, which increases their efficiency. All mine clearance organisations, which usually have an EOD component, will destroy any UXO and ammunition stockpiles that they find in the local area. Some NGOs take local cooperation
further by carrying out “community-based” mine action, which can have a high level of MRE, and which can work well where communities are living among minefields, such as some of the Mines Advisory Group (MAG) operations in Cambodia. This can also dilute effectiveness due to the need to deal with widely distributed “call-out” cases, which can be expensive in resources.

**Relevant documents**

For information on the five pillars of mine action:


If you need to address advocacy and victim assistance matters see:

- The International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) at www.icbl.org; and
- Or the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), website www.icrc.org.

For a useful introduction to stockpile destruction see:

- The GICHD document “A Guide to the International Mine Action Standards”, available online at www.gichd.org; and
- Also see the relevant International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) 11.10 to 11.30 at www.mineactionstandards.org
6 Where to fund mine action

There are more than 78 countries and 8 other areas are affected by landmines.

Africa
Angola, Burundi, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe, (Somaliland)

Americas
Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Peru, Venezuela

Asia/Pacific
Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Korea, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Republic of Laos, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Vietnam, (Taiwan, Nagorno-Karabakh)

Europe/Central Asia
Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, France (Djibouti), FYR Macedonia, Georgia, Greece, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Serbia & Montenegro, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, Yugoslavia, UK (Falklands), Uzbekistan, (Abkhazia, Chechnya, Kosovo)

Middle East/North Africa
Algeria, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Syria, Tunisia, Yemen (Palestine, Western Sahara)

The decision on which country to choose will come from whichever political objective you have chosen in Part 3. Most donors can respond to emergency situations in any country but some governments have focus countries in which their money must be spent, and which may be part of a wider aid strategy. Some donors only fund those mine-affected countries that have signed and ratified the Mine Ban Treaty (MBT). To find out which have and have not look at the relevant websites shown below. The MBT requires all signatory governments to clear all anti-personnel landmines in their countries within 10 years of accession to the treaty.

Some donors have existing national development agencies already operating in the mine affected country. This can be an advantage for getting local advice. Your own national development agencies may be helpful.

It is often better to fund mine action where there is already a country mine action programme with a recognised authority running it, such as a National Mine Action
Authority or a National Mine Action Centre. These authorities are often assisted, at least in the early stages of their operation, by international specialists, usually employed by the United Nations. This can reduce the risk of the mine action programme failing or getting out of control. These specialists can usually give good advice to donors, both on which country to fund and who are the good contractors already working there. For the relevant contacts see the information below.

Some caution is required when selecting the country in which you want your funds to be used. While the governments of all mine-affected countries will express their complete commitment to the clearance process at international fora, this commitment is sometimes less obvious on the ground. This is a subject discussed again in Part 13.

You will find that contractors approach you as a potential donor for funds to carry out clearance in a particular country. They may propose that they should start a programme in a country or seek to expand their own existing programmes. It will be prudent to check with the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) that the programme is known to them and that it is of value to the country in question. Co-funding existing programmes may also be attractive because donor risk is reduced. This subject is discussed in more detail in Parts 9 and 14.

Experienced contractors will point out that some countries are easier to work in than others. This is indeed true and you should seek independent advice from your national Foreign Ministry or from the United Nations agencies shown below.

Relevant documents
For information on countries with mine action programmes see:
- the UNMAS website (www.mineaction.org);
- the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (www.undp.org); and
- Landmine Monitor Report online at www.icbl.org/lm.

Information on contact points for National Mine Action Centres can be obtained from the:
- UNMAS website;
- UNDP website; and
- Geneva Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) website (www.gichd.org).
7 Selecting a contractor

Introduction
The next important step is the selection of a contractor, a process which remains one of the most important of any donor’s responsibilities. There are many different types of potential contractors, some of whom can be effective in certain situations, but others less so. The most common types of mine action contractors are shown below.

NGOs
These may be international or local. In general, most international NGOs have experience of mine action in many countries but it is the local NGOs that have the most contact with the local people. It is sometimes possible to combine the two with an international NGO providing specialist staff member to bring the necessary technical skills to a local organisation. NGOs have a long track record of good work but some can be difficult to deal with. Many NGOs claim to be more humanitarian and more efficient than commercial companies but this is not always true. That said, many NGOs find MRE easier than Commercial Companies, possibly because the benefits and outcome of MRE are long term, and notoriously difficult to quantify. NGOs can also carry out stockpile destruction, but it is perhaps more cost-effective to get Armies, with their larger personnel and transport resources, to carry out the movement and un-packaging of stockpiled ammunition, but attaching an experienced EOD specialist from an NGO to teach the military units how to carry out the safe destruction of the large amounts of explosive objects usually found in stockpiles.

Established NGOs are experienced in building up a mine action capacity within the country in which they are working but this is usually at individual and team level. Should the donor wish to carry out institutional capacity-building, this will need to be made clear at the beginning of the donor’s relationship with the NGO.

You may have your own national NGOs which may assume that they will be preferentially funded. If this is the case and, even if it were unpopular, you should check on the track record of these NGOs before employing them.

Commercial companies
In the majority of circumstances commercial companies are employed after a process of competitive tendering. So, since their competence and their costs are subject to scrutiny and comparison, they often can be more cost-effective than NGOs. The key to using commercial companies is the contract which has to be carefully drawn up (see Part 8 and Annex A).

In general, commercial companies can take on any mine action work for which they can be given a contract. Commercial companies are however better suited to work that can be
clearly defined and that has specific time-constraints. This would indicate that they would be better at clearance-type tasks than MRE (see above), although they are fully qualified to do both. They understand that if they do not meet their obligations, at best they may get no further work, or, at worst they may go bankrupt. Once the contract is in place, most commercial companies can be very flexible although that may incur additional costs to the donor.

Local commercial companies can also be successful because, like local NGOs, they can be better integrated with the local community but, in certain countries, ownership of such companies needs to be checked before they are funded to ensure there are no conflicts of interest with the government or mine action authorities nominated by the government. Donors should confirm that they are comfortable with the transparency and probity of such companies.

**Government clearance teams**

There are countries, such as Cambodia, where some clearance teams are provided and trained by, or on behalf of, the national government. Many, but not all, were former soldiers. Again it is wise to ensure there are no conflicts of interest with the government or mine action authorities nominated by the government. Donors should confirm that they are comfortable with the transparency and probity of such organisations. It is not uncommon for such teams to work in conjunction with established international contractors although there are some national programmes where government-sponsored mine action is highly effective. In some cases the division between government-sponsored teams and non-government teams is minimal.

**Military clearance teams**

Some donors may be prohibited by their own legislation from directly funding military clearance teams although the difference between government clearance teams and military clearance teams may be very slight. In Vietnam international contractors are obliged to use military clearance staff who are highly effective. The combination of military clearance staff and international specialist skills seems to work effectively and some such combined clearance teams are successful and have found external donors.

One problem with military clearance teams is that in some countries, the local people are frightened of them, especially in the immediate post-conflict period, due to their treatment at the hands of military and paramilitary units during the conflicts. This limits their effectiveness at community work. They are often poor at MRE, due to lack of training – during demonstrations they will often pick up a mine or UXO in their hands, thus indicating to an audience that it is safe to do so, when the opposite is the case. Military clearance units are well-equipped for stockpile destruction, but the EOD skills required are so small that ordinary military units are preferable, with specialists in EOD, storage and accountancy added to them.

One problem with military organisations is that the members sent to carry out mine action duties are often rotated to other duties after a year or so or, in some cases, after a few months. Obviously this affects the continuity of skills. If you are able to fund military teams, and you are inclined to do so, you should seek specialist advice. Assisting the military to undertake mine action is, perhaps, an ideal way of developing a country-level
technical capacity for the long term, provided that the clearance teams can work to International Mine Action Standards. Most countries in Europe use their military to clear the explosive remnants of war still being found after the two world wars.

**Contractors given preferential treatment**

In some mine-affected countries donors are encouraged by the government towards using specific local contractors and, in some countries, international contractors must partner with a local contractor as a condition of operating there. There is an obvious and positive potential for capacity building but there may be some less positive implications. It has sometimes been the case that a local agency is preferred because those giving the preferment have a financial interest. As stated earlier, it is wise to ensure there are no conflicts of interest with the government or mine action authorities nominated by the government agreeing to support such agencies. Donors should confirm that they are comfortable with their competence, transparency and probity.

It is also true that many established donors have preferred contractors and some will not use any others. That may give the donor confidence in the capability of these contractors but it can encourage complacency in their attitude to the work. To combat this, periodic monitoring and evaluation is advisable. Even if donors do have their preferred contractors, it can be beneficial to occasionally invite tenders from other contractors to give some idea of the prevailing level of prices. However, submitting a tender or quote costs the bidding contractor time and money so this process should not be used unless there is a genuine prospect that a non-preferred contractor will win. Otherwise the process is unfair.

**Selection process**

If you intend to select a contractor, the process should be as stringent as possible, and International Mine Action Standards give some guidance (see below). Your own contracts department will have procedures which you will be required to follow and, in general, the process can comprise 3 phases:

- Pre-selection by which you select the potential contractor considered likely to best meet your needs. Some donors require a minimum number of bidders to show that a proper competition has taken place. Those selected should be informed that they will be allowed to bid. This stage can be omitted if you already have a list of preferred contractors;
- The invitation to tender (also called the request for proposals) is sent to the pre-selected contractors and this will follow your normal procedures. The key document will be the Scope of Work (see Part 8 and Annex A); and
- Selection of the contractor takes place when all the bids have been received and evaluated. This can be a quite simple process or it can be quite complex and this again will depend on your own policy.

What is unlikely to be covered by your own internal policy is the information you should obtain about those you will invite to bid. This could include:

- Financial status of the contractor. This may be a standard requirement for you;
- Legal status of the contractor (NGO or commercial company);
- Experience demonstrated by previous contracts or programmes undertaken;
- Knowledge and experience of the country where the project is to be undertaken;
• The staff qualification and experience levels;
• How locally recruited staff will be selected and trained;
• Familiarity with, and experience of, the type of operation to be funded;
• Safety record; and
• If the contractor has standard operating procedures (SOPs) relevant to the task.

Relevant documents
For advice on contracting see:


For a list of organisations working in mine action see:
• www.mineaction.org
• www.gichd.org
• www.maic.jmu.edu.

None of these last 3 websites is selective and the first two are incomplete. Anyone can apply to be listed so you may wish to seek impartial advice when selecting from the lists.

(If possible, it would be useful to add a table regrouping the advantages and drawbacks of the four main types of contractors (IOs, NGOs, Armies and Commercial companies) according to the different situations (post-conflict, fragile states, etc.) and activities (demining, stockpile destruction, MRE, etc.))

Antoine, this is not a clear-cut issue, because it depends very much on the capabilities of the individual organisations, the countries and the circumstances. A table is perhaps too simplistic, and may be good in some cases but miss-represent the situation in others.
8 Arranging a contract

Introduction
The contract is perhaps the most important element of the donor’s responsibilities. Probably all donors have their own standard contract and, of course, that will be followed. What is unique to each contract, irrespective of the individual formats, is the part that specifies the task. For some donors that will be managed through Terms of Reference and for others it will be the Scope of Work. The document uses the latter term. A sample Scope of Work is shown at Annex A.

Donor-let contracts
Many donors let their own contracts through their own contracts departments and mine action contracts are very similar to many other forms of contract. The key exception is the Scope of Work. This can be very specialised and unless the donor is familiar with mine action, he may require some specialist advice. In all cases, the terms of the contract need to be discussed with the contractor to ensure he understands what is required and the donor is confident the contractor can deliver. It may become clear that some modifications are required if some of the requirements in the Scope of Work are unachievable.

Ideally, contracts should be for periods of at least 12 months, and longer if possible. Start-up costs for any mine action organisation may cost up to 30% in the first year, and multi-year funding is financially more efficient. Pressure can still be applied on the contractor, by making every successive time extension dependent on satisfactory performance. In most cases, NGOs and some commercial contractors are awarded lump sum contracts, but if performance criteria are being set, these may be dangerous for the contractor, due to variability of the terrain, weather and the mine and munitions threat. Cost-plus contracts can be more appropriate for very difficult areas, especially in areas with security problems such as Afghanistan,

Contracting takes time but it is a price worth paying to avoid disappointment and to ensure that the outcome of the project to be funded is that expected.

Contracting through a third party
Sometimes, because they do not have the time of the specialism to write mine action contracts, some donors use third parties to act as the interface between the donor and the contractor. The 4 main third party agencies for mine action are:
- United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS). UNMAS does not actually undertake its own contracting but uses UNOPS for that purpose. However, many donors give funds directly to UNMAS for it to use on projects;
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP);
- United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS); and
• International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance (ITF).

These agencies charge between 3 percent and 13 percent depending on what contractor supervision is required.

They all have their own competent staff to undertake the contracting but donors still need to make sure that their money will be used on projects that meet their funding objectives and, if necessary, that the contractor used is acceptable. Some donors have a longstanding relationship with these agencies and a common understanding has been achieved, reducing the need for detailed discussions in every case.

**Stating the objectives**

Contract writing can be difficult but providing funding without a contract and relying on the contractor to ‘do its best’ without agreeing what is to be achieved is a recipe for disappointment and a poor use of money. It is essential that the contract states – and this is the role of the Scope of Work – what is to be done, in what time-span, to what standard and at what cost. Some donors are now calling for clear performance targets to be inserted into contracts and, although they must be chosen with care and agreed with the contractor, they are an important component of a successful contract. No matter how good the contract, a successful outcome cannot always be guaranteed but without a good contract, the risk of failure will be very much higher. Of course unforeseen problems can occur and the contract should be flexible enough to accept a problem that could not reasonably be foreseen without significantly weakening the performance targets.

Setting some performance targets can be difficult and each of the separate mine actions present different challenges. Even setting a target that may look simple may be inappropriate. Some benchmark target figures exist for manual clearance, but every minefield is different, and an alteration in vegetation, slope or ground conditions may make a disproportionate difference to the clearance time. Target figures provided by equipment manufacturers should be treated with great suspicion. Setting simple targets can also need care. Targets such as numbers of mines to be cleared are no longer used, as a minefield with no mines in it may still have to be laboriously cleared by hand. Targets such as – in the case of a clearance project – a number of square metres to be cleared may miss the real value of the project. In most instances mines are not cleared simply because they are in the ground but because there is a loss of value to something else because of their presence. It is this loss of value that should be measured. That value may be achieved fully immediately the land is cleared but in many cases, it can be years before the full value is realised.

Targets for MRE may also be difficult to set. MRE depends on the availability of target audiences, and although schools may be an attractive starting point, where there are none, it may be difficult to get a suitable number of people together to make an MRE session cost-effective. The results of MRE can take years to appear, and even then may be skewed by other factors; most farmers in South East Asia who have received MRE know that cutting up UXO is highly dangerous, but will keep on doing so as long as the price for scrap steel is high. If targets must be set, they must be discussed with the mine action organisation doing the task, and checked with the national MACC, who may have other organisation’s performance figures to use as benchmarks.
Another important measure is cost-benefit which, like so much else, can be difficult for the non-specialist. This is less a mine action skill than a cost-management skill and is probably available within the donor’s department. Mine action is expensive so it is important to be sure that the value required actually needs mine action as part of the process of achieving it. If it does not, then do not fund mine action. If it does, then mine action is probably an unavoidable cost. However, even within mine action, there are many techniques, equipments and processes that can be used, each with a different cost-base, but selecting the most appropriate may require specialist advice.

Relevant documents
For information on contracts for mine action see:

Some information on costs is contained in “A Study of Manual Mine Clearance” Part 5, produced by and available from the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining.

For information on the various mine actions look at the publications on the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining website at www.gichd.org

Contact points
For information on the third-party agencies mentioned above see:
- For ITF: see www.itf-fund.si
- For the UN agencies see: www.mineaction.org

It would be useful to have an indication of the ideal length/time frame of a contract for the best value-for-money as well as on the type/nature of the contract (grant, service or work contract).

Have done so.
9 Managing funding

Introduction
Once a donor has agreed to fund a mine action programme, agreed the type of project, the country, selected the contractor and arranged the contract, the next important factor is arranging how the money will be managed. This will involve selecting the mechanism for payment and how the payments will be scheduled. In some ways this issue is similar to letting the contract and each donor will have its own set procedures which must be followed. However there will usually be some flexibility and this part is designed to offer suggestions on how best to use that flexibility.

Channels of funding
Part 8 discusses the various channels through which a contract can be let and the channel through which funding is to be released will depend on the choices made.

If the donor decides to let the contract himself then he will also be the funding channel to the contractor.
- The main advantage is that full control is maintained and no money is lost in management fees. Another is that the money is more likely to arrive with the contractor on time; and
- The disadvantage is that it requires more time from the donor. However, the time loss should be very little more than it would be if the funding were passed through multilateral channels.

If the contract has been let through a multilateral agency, then that agency will have the contact and the contract with the contractor but the donor is still involved since he must provide the money to the agency. As discussed in Part 8 the agencies shown below have their own staff to oversee projects that are funded through them. The 4 main agencies for mine action are:
- United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS). UNMAS does not handle the money; that is done by the Controller’s office. This has been an inefficient arrangement in the past but it has improved considerably in recent years;
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP);
- United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS); and
- International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance (ITF). The ITF can attract ‘matching funding’ from the United States government, where one donor’s funding for a project may be partially or totally matched by American funds. This matching funding will probably not be for the same project but it will be allocated to the same country or area.
Some donors have a longstanding relationship with these agencies and a common understanding has been achieved reducing the need for detailed discussions in every case. The agencies are not always as efficient as they would like but they can be very useful.

- The advantage of using a multilateral agency is that, with the exception of the provision of money, the donor need not be involved in the project any further;
- The main disadvantages are:
  - The agencies charge between 3 percent and 13 percent depending on what contractor supervision is required;
  - The donor is distant from the project and will not have the same visibility of its progress and, perhaps most important, any problems it is experiencing; and
  - Money can be late arriving with the contractor.

Another channel that is sometimes used, but rarely for mine action, is that of budgetary support where the donor gives the money directly to the government being supported. In most cases that will be to the Ministry of Finance but it could be another ministry or department. Perhaps as the capacity of countries develops and of their mine action authorities (see Part 4) this should be considered for mine action support more than at present.

**Scheduling payments**
The schedule of payments is important for the contractor. Again this is likely to be a matter in which the donor is limited by his own rules but the following points should be considered if possible.

- All new projects incur high start-up cost of between 25-30% of the total funding. The donor can assist the contractor by agreeing valid large first payments;
- Some donors believe in waiting 60-120 days before making payments. This puts serious financial strain on any contractor and especially the small ones. That is unreasonable and unfair and not in the spirit of the Good Donorship Initiative;
- Few donors can pay the full annual funding at one time and use staged payments. That makes good sense if the stage payments are made on time. Contractors also have a key role to play in this as subsequent stages are normally only released by the donor on the receipt of a report or a formal request from the contractor. If the contractor is late, so will be the staged payment;
- Many donors can only agree one year’s funding at a time and, if that is a matter of government policy, there is little that can be done. However, if the donor is confident that further funding will be available, it is helpful if the contractor can be told. There may be no guarantees but at least the contractor is aware that there is a wish to continue funding and that can help his planning; and
- Some donors are setting up partnerships with selected contractors usually for 3 or 4 years. That has the advantage of guaranteed continuity of funding for the contractor and less work for the donor but there are disadvantages:
  - There is no flexibility over the choice of contractor;
  - The money must be spent only in countries in which that contractor is operating which create very little incentive for him to conclude his projects; and
  - Experience has shown that, in fact, there is very little saving in time for the donor.
If time management is a key issue for the donor then it may be prudent to fund a small number of projects perhaps with slightly larger funding over a longer term. Obviously the more projects there are the more difficult they are, potentially, to control. However, the small, short-term project should not be ignored because some of them will create benefits far in excess of some longer-terms ones.

Relevant documents:
For information on the third-party agencies mentioned above see:
- For ITF: see www.itf-fund.si; and
- For the UN agencies see; www.mineaction.org
10 Measures of success, end-states and exit-strategies

Many donors are now specifying in contracts how to measure performance to ensure that the programme is successful. In addition, they are setting deadlines and benchmarks in the contract for financial spend and output. Donors should always have an end-state in mind because the end-state required should form the basis of the justification for funding. That end-state is often one of two:

- Helping the mine-affected country to develop the necessary skills and resources at all levels to deal with the contamination by itself. This is termed End-State 1 below; and
- Funding mine action operations in the mine-affected country, hopefully in co-operation with the government of that country. This is termed End-State 2 below.

The Mine Ban Treaty (MBT) sees a world free of anti-personnel landmines and that end-state, although politically worthy, is not realistic in the timescale set of 10 years. Here there is a separation between the political vision and a practical end-state. Supporting the vision costs nothing but the practical end-state must be affordable. The limit to the funding a donor is prepared to provide should be the basis for defining the end-state he is prepared to support. In practical terms that is probably no more than trying to achieve an impact-free status, not a mine-free status.

The European Commission and the United Nations have mine action strategies and both have stated specific end-states. In the United Nations’ case the end-states are similar to those outlined below and a time is envisaged when “UN mine action assistance will no longer be necessary”. The clear implication of end-states is that funding will reduce or cease at some point and this should be managed through an exit-strategy with that strategy depending upon the end-state.

The tables below on the 2 end-states, their measures of success and the end-states are suggestions only. Each donor will wish to make adjustment to them but they are intended to give some ideas and, if necessary, provide food for thought.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End-State 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The government of the mine-affected country has in place the institutional mechanisms and operational capability sufficient to continue by itself whatever mine action it considers necessary. It is accepted that limited external funds and occasional technical assistance may still be required&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measures of Success

- The host government agreeing to and implementing measures to facilitate mine action activities in the country. This will include matters such as appropriate customs exemptions, prompt release of necessary equipment and the creation of the supervisory body mentioned below.
- The host government developing effective and transparent strategies to implement mine action and its integration into development plans, such as the Poverty Reduction Strategy.
- The creation of technical capabilities able to plan and manage mine action activities in their areas of responsibility. Initially such organisations will need to be trained, equipped and managed by international partners but the supervisory management should transfer to a national body as soon as practicable.
- The creation of a supervisory body which, on behalf of the national authority, can undertake the required strategic planning, prioritisation, and supervisory management of all mine action actors in the country.

Exit Strategy

The exit-strategy should be considered at the start of the donor’s involvement in a project or as soon as possible thereafter. The process has already been applied informally to a few countries and it should be applied to all. A progressive exit-strategy should be based on the measures of success shown above.

Once progress is established, the donor may set a provisional timetable (possibly 2 years) after which it will consider ceasing funding. The exit timetable will be flexible only if there is continued commitment to achieving End-State 1 and a genuine prospect of success.

End-state 1 may not be achievable, or the impact of landmines may have reduced to a point which makes continued support on humanitarian grounds unnecessary. In such circumstances, End-state 2 can be defined as:

Table 10.2  End-State 2

End-State 2

“If End-state 1 is unlikely to be achieved within a reasonable timescale, an alternative end-state will be set. These will vary according to the situation in the mine-affected country but will most likely be based on an impact reduction target”.

Measures of Success

For end-state 2 the measures of success are more complex and could be determined by one or more of the following achievements. These are the key issues that form the basis of measuring progress in mine action. Although not all the issues are likely to be appropriate for every action supported, it is expected that many of them will be. The donor should expect maximum benefit to be gained as a result of his support and he will expect partners to include as many as possible.

- Reduction in mine-related casualties (some donors are unlikely to fund projects down to zero victims).
- Restoration of access to land and infrastructure.
- Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) able to return to their land.
- Provision of social infrastructure, such as schools, medical centres etc.
Provision of economic infrastructure, such as roads, areas of production, power supply and distribution systems etc.

Land cleared to facilitate the work of other humanitarian and development organisations.

Whatever the actual measure is, it should be defined after discussions with the co-ordinating agency and the mine action implementing organisations.

**Exit Strategy**

Whatever the measure of success, the exit-strategy will be along the lines, except in exceptional circumstances, that at least a full 12 months notice will be given of the intent to cease funding. This will be discussed with the co-ordination agency in the mine-affected country and with the mine action implementing organisation.

**Relevant documents:**

For mine action strategies and their end-states, measures of success and exit strategies see:


Unfortunately, very little has been written on end-states and exit strategies for mine action and what is written above was requested by the EC Group of Experts and written by one of the authors to this document. One additional source might be:


For comments on indicators and benchmarks, see section 8 above.
11 How to ensure full value for the mine-affected country

Deciding what is ‘value’ is a judgement that should be made by the government of the country in question which itself may be influenced by dialogue with donors on what they are prepared to support. For the purposes of this discussion value is seen as a practical outcome that affects directly the lives of people or improves their security and economic well-being. Most mine-affected countries have a mine action strategy setting out how the mines and explosive remnants of war are to be cleared. In the majority of cases, the strategies are focussed on meeting the obligations of the Mine Ban Treaty which, arguably therefore, are not necessarily considering best value in the sense described above.

Ideally, value should be discussed in the country’s own plans for meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and in their Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan (PRSP). For the donors, value should be described in their Country Strategy Paper or Country Assistance Plan (or whatever title is appropriate). It is the case that, with very few exceptions, mine action is not mentioned at all, or only in passing. In most countries, there is a National Mine Action Centre which, in the absence of any other guidance, decides the value for that country. Some countries have a regulatory authority which provides guidance to the mine action centre and it may decide the value. Even when a government has defined the value it requires in its MDGs, some donors are still reluctant to provide any funding, perhaps because it is not one of the donor’s targets for support.

Some values are suggested in Part 10, namely:

- Reduction in mine-related casualties;
- Restoration of access to land and infrastructure;
- Refugees and IDPs able to return to their land;
- Provision of social infrastructure, such as schools, medical centres etc.;
- Provision of economic infrastructure, such as roads, areas of production, power supply and distribution systems etc.; and
- Land cleared to facilitate the work of other humanitarian and development organisations.

In most countries there are more mine-related problems than there are resources to deal with them, therefore tasks must be prioritised. A very important, and relatively easily achieved value a donor can insist on is that tasks are prioritised to meet the most urgent needs at the time the decision is made. It is important that mine action centres remained focussed on real priorities and that the process is transparent. Equally contractors must not be allowed to ignore proper priorities and just do what they want. It is donors who have the greatest influence over proper prioritisation as they can insist that an effective
process be established before funding will be agreed. It is helpful, and provides greater authority, if donors have already included mine action in their Country Assistance Plans.

Another way of getting best value is by making sure that a competent well motivated contractor is selected, coupled with a clearly laid out Scope of Work in the contract. That should ensure that the job is done right, but it is important also to ensure that the right job is done. That should be a discussion between the donor, the National Mine Action Centre in the country, and the contractor.

If your selected contractor suggests a project for you to fund, you should check with the country National Mine Action Centre that the project is of value and that it fits within the list of high priority needs. Some countries have completed a Landmine Impact Survey (LIS) and that can be a very helpful guide to need and thus how to get best value.

Relevant documents
For strategies look for the:
• The country MDGs;
• The country PRSP;
• The country Mine Action Strategy; and
• Your own Country Assistance Plan.

For a list of the National Mine Action Centres and their contact addresses see:
• www.mineaction.org If necessary contract the United Nations Mine Action Service at mineaction@un.org.

Some information on mine action assessment and survey see:

For Landmine Impact Surveys see:
• The Survey Action Centre website at www.sac-na.org
12 What level of reporting you should expect

All donors require periodic reports on their funded programmes from the contractors. These take time to prepare and whilst the donor must expect to be kept informed, there are things he can do to make the reports more meaningful for him and less burdensome on the contractor. The contractor may have more than one donor with different reporting formats, requiring different information and the reporting times may be different from yours.

The time spent on report-writing can be minimised by synchronising the required times for your reports with those of other donors and seeking the same information in the same format. This can be achieved by discussing your reporting needs with the contractor before drafting the contract or agreement and through inter-donor co-operation (see Part 14).

Some donors are content with a standardised narrative section for all normal information, with a donor-specific annex for any special information requirements. Financial information will probably always be donor-specific and the type of financial matrix to be used is another factor that needs to be agreed between you and the contractor.

The frequency at which you require reports should be specified in the contract and can vary between monthly, quarterly, half-yearly and annually. Also at the end of the project a final report should be expected. It is very likely that some of these reports will be required before staged payments can be made. The frequency you require should be a balance between your real need for the information and the effort required to prepare them. Whatever frequency you decide, a reasonable rule of thumb is that the more frequent the reports, the smaller they should be.

At their simplest, reports should include information such as:
- The amount of clearance achieved since the last report;
- The amount of money spent;
- Details of any incidents or accidents;
- Any changes in management; and
- Any other factors that might affect the completion of the programme, such as the security situation.

Some reports ask for much more detail, like vehicle mileage and fuel expenditure but donors should ask themselves what value this level of detail provides and what use they will make of it.

Most reports need factual information, to indicate that the contractor’s project is going according to plan. In addition donors will want to know some of the background
conditions, especially in countries where there are security problems, or where the national government is causing delays or restrictions. When milestones are specified in the contract, the reports should include progress towards them.

A draft report format is attached at Annex B.

Relevant documents
Since the contents of the contractor’s reporting documents are (or should be) agreed between the donor and contractor, there are no international standards that apply, and no other documentation has been found. Any contractor will be willing to discuss your reporting requirements with you and it should, anyway, be stated in the contract.
13 Co-operating with in-country authorities

Introduction
Except in emergency situations, and in very general terms, the quality of the mine action programme in a country is only as good as the relationship between the international actors and the government of – or its representatives in – the country. There are some well-known situations where the accuracy of this statement has been very clear. It is therefore an issue of great importance.

The Mine Ban Treaty puts the responsibility for clearing the landmines in a country on the government of the country yet some countries have neither the skills, the resources and, in some case, the political will, to meet this obligation. There needs to be a partnership, therefore, between the government and the international actors and it should be one in which the government has the lead. There are a number of matters that should be considered and these can be discussed with the donor’s embassy.

Capacity building
The need for capacity building is discussed in Part 4 and the level to which that can be achieved can be seen as a measure of the partnership mentioned above. Just ignoring the government and its representatives because they may be institutionally weak may be pragmatic but it is neither helpful nor, in the long-run, is it in the interest of the donor community. A contractor can get away with that attitude because his relationship with the country might be short but donors cannot as, in most cases, they will continue their relationship indefinitely.

Enabling mine action
It is a sad fact of life that some governments demonstrate their authority by imposing what are often seen as needless obstacles in the way of those trying to manage mine action projects. Except when specifically agreed to the contrary, the international actors cannot expect to be exempt from the laws of the country or its legitimate processes. If, for example, there is an employment law, then that law must be obeyed and if that imposes difficult conditions on contractors then that should have been considered at the beginning.

There are cases where governments have imposed new regulations, such as the importation of equipment for humanitarian purposes, and in many cases this has been helpful but in some cases quite the opposite. Part 14 discusses inter-donor co-operation and this is one situation where combined donor action can be helpful. The intention should not be to repudiate a law or regulation but to seek appropriate concessions which not only help the efficiency of the projects but will also provide earlier and better benefits for the country.
It is also important to work with the National Mine Action Centre since, if it exists at all, it will be the delegated national authority on mine action. In many cases, they will have specialist United Nations advisors working with them and whilst the centres may vary in capability, co-operation will not be improved if they are just ignored. It is the donor, and not the United Nations, that has the greatest ability to persuade these centres to improve.

**Strategic interests**

It is very evident that donors have strategic interests in some of the countries in which mine action takes place. Most likely that strategic interest has a higher priority than mine action issues. That is understandable and is unlikely to change. However, in those countries where this applies, donors should consider the following points:

- Funding mine action should continue to be judged on its real merit and not forgotten because there may be other more strategic issues;
- Mine action should not become a political issue whose aim is simply to enhance strategic interests. Mine action should ‘deserve’ the money it gets; and
- Donors should continue to encourage a constructive approach from the government towards mine action and not avoid it for fear of offending the government.

Concerted donor power (see Part 14) may be more difficult to achieve in the midst of separate donor interests but it should not be ignored on the grounds of political expediency alone.

**Relevant documents**

No documents on co-operating with in-country authorities have been found. As this is not a matter unique to mine action, donors will have experience of it by their normal diplomatic processes through their embassies.

On mine action matters:

- Details the country authorities, such as the National Mine Action Authorities, are available on the United Nations Mine Action Service website [www.mineaction.org](http://www.mineaction.org);
- A list of United Nations Development Programme Resident Representatives can be found on the website [www.undp.org](http://www.undp.org).
14 Inter-donor Co-operation

Introduction
It is a sad reality that donors were once a significant cause of confusion, due to many of them pursuing separate agendas in certain countries with no reference to each other. This led to money being wasted and poor quality work being undertaken. This situation has improved but donor co-operation remains one of the weakest elements of international support to mine action. This is not for lack of guidance. The Good Donorship Initiative and the Paris Declaration both place obligations on donors that assume that donors will co-operate with each other when that is helpful to the outcome. Donors can both co-operate and co-ordinate, and it is important to differentiate between the two.

- For the purpose of this document, co-operation is a process by which donors can share a common purpose but usually undertake the associated work independently of each other. That might simply involve talking to each other and sharing information but might also mean taking a combined approach when negotiating with country governments; and
- Co-ordination, by contrast, would normally involve the combination or sharing of resources between donors to achieve a common purpose. With a few exceptions, such as co-funding, this has not been achieved, and is not discussed further.

Fora for co-operation
There are a number of fora where inter-donor consultation on mine action can take place.
- The biggest is the annual Meeting of States Parties (MSP) to the Mine Ban Treaty (MBT) and the annual intercessional work groups associated with the MBT. Donor groups meet and discuss issues but co-operation rarely seems to progress beyond the workings of the MBT itself which, though important, may not make an impact on mine action at country level;
- In the United Nations General Assembly mine action is very rarely mentioned except to endorse pre-prepared high-level statements of general intent such as the Annual Resolution on Assistance in Mine Action; and
- The European Union used to have an ‘Experts Group’ comprising only donors but that stopped meeting in 2006.

The group offering the best potential for co-operation is the Mine Action Support Group (MASG), which is an informal group that meets 3 to 4 times a year. The first part of each meeting is open to donors, the United Nations agencies and others invited according to the situation. This is primarily a time at which briefings given by the agencies involved in mine action and, often, a particular country will be invited to provide a briefing on the situation in that country and to allow time for some country-specific discussion. The second part is restricted to donors only, allows them to discuss difficult issues in a frank manner which would be more difficult in a more open forum. Unfortunately, little donor
co-operation has so far been generated by the MASG. This is a wasted opportunity since there are many issues that merit discussion and where added value that might come from a shared approach.

With a couple of exceptions there is no expectation that all donors will co-operate with all the others, but there is no doubt that a number of donors working together can achieve things not available to a donor working on its own. Some of the aspects of co-operation are discussed below. They are grouped under diplomatic, in-country negotiation, and co-ordination of mine action outcomes

**Diplomatic co-operation**

At the diplomatic level, a group of donor countries can try to persuade non-signatories to the MBT to sign and accede to the treaty. The 40 countries that have not signed may not do so any time soon but it should remain a diplomatic objective.

On occasions, when the government of a mine-affected country is acting against the best interests of achieving mine action objectives, donors can unite very successfully to bring pressure on the government, either through a Démarche or some other mechanism.

**Funding**

Co-funding of individual programmes is welcomed by some donors and most contractors. Co-funding provides some reassurance for all concerned. For the donor it means: sharing the cost of a project; greater stability for the project making more likely that it will conclude successfully. For the contractor it means a broader funding base increasing confidence that the project can survive even if a donor later withdraws.

Some donors are more willing than others to fund the less glamorous but very important aspects of mine action such as capacity-building in-country mine action institutions. Those that are willing to do so, could co-operate in providing the money for this vital task (see also Part 4).

**In-country co-operation**

In the country there are many benefits to donor co-operation and in some countries this happens. There are opportunities for making economies such as – but not limited to – funding shared evaluations or sharing the reports of separate evaluations.

There are mine action donor groups in some countries and some of these are very useful. Their usual role is in supporting the national, bilateral and multilateral efforts and although most of this support is passive, there have been a number of occasions when the donors have taken stronger action through collective approaches.

The subject of the Démarche is mentioned briefly above at it is usually at country level that it, or some lesser mechanism, will be implemented.

**Co-ordination of outcomes**

Co-ordination of mine action outcomes is necessary when donors are considering their exit strategies. It is important that donors are open about their intentions and especially about when they plan to reduce or end their funding and this is a subject on which donors
should co-operate. If any single donor ends his funding precipitously it will cause major
difficulties. If a number of donors do this at the same time there is a danger that this
might terminate the project and even bankrupt the contractor. This very situation arose
recently with the result that the national implementing partner collapsed creating a near
chaotic situation. The more donors that support a single end-state, the clearer it is to the
government of the mine-affected country and the contractors which is helpful for their
future planning. If a common end-state can be agreed, common standards can be called
for and common measures of success expected.

Except in cases of humanitarian emergency, many donors have a policy of concentrating
their funding on countries of specific interest to them, which are often called ‘focus’
countries. There is no intention to question this concept but, although there may be a limit
to the countries in which each donor is interested, there is still considerable scope for
working with others on matters of common interest in those countries.

Relevant documents:
For information on the MASG see:
•  www.mineaction.org/overview.asp?o=144
15 Monitoring and evaluating progress

Monitoring
All programmes should be monitored. The question is how it should be done. It is essential to check on the progress of your contractor and there are many ways in which it can be done. Monitoring will check any figures given in the contractor’s reports and the extent to which any benchmarks or progress goals have been achieved. It is however unlikely that a monitoring agency can do more than record such figures and if they are lower or higher than expected can ask the contractor why but will probably have to accept the reasons given.

If you are using a multilateral organisation to do the contracting (see Part 8) it will normally arrange the monitoring. The National Mine Action Centre should undertake regular monitoring as part of its quality assurance and quality control checks.

If you are doing your own contracting, you should commission your own monitoring and evaluations. If your embassy has a military attaché in-country, he/she may be able to carry out the same checking and, ideally, visit with one of the organisations mentioned above.

Financial monitoring should be conducted by professional auditors and they should be able to ensure that the funding is being used in the correct way. Monitoring should be done annually but if there are any anomalies in the financial or progress reports the frequency of monitoring should be increased to every 6 months.

Evaluation
Evaluation is a different process from monitoring although it carries out some of the same functions. The aim of an evaluation is to check all aspects of the programme which can be summed up by the two questions “Is the contractor doing the job right?” and “Is the contractor doing the right job?” This process involves not only the activities of the contractor but the whole background to the project. This could cover checking the:

- Degree of assistance to the contractor given by the National Mine Action Centre (and vice versa);
- Priority level of the programme in country and regional terms;
- Contact and support with your national embassy or mission;
- Technical capabilities of the contractor teams;
- Effectiveness of their equipment;
- Efficiency of their administration;
- Safety and efficiency of their mine action.

The evaluation should be carried out by experienced mine action practitioners, many of whom have extensive field experience including as programme managers. The terms of
reference of the evaluation are laid down by you, the donor but advice should be sought from the evaluation team.

Evaluations also offer the chance for the contractor’s managers to discuss problems with fellow-professionals, who many have met similar problems themselves, or during other evaluations. This means that the evaluation becomes a valuable two-way process of communication, rather than a series of examination questions.

Evaluations should be done preferably after the contractor has been working on the programme for about six months. This means that the mine action teams will be trained and worked up to operational efficiency and that the administration will have got over any early problems. By this time, any limitations in the support given by external organisations will have begun to have some effect and any faults in the operational use of manpower, dogs or equipment will have become clearer. The contractor will also have submitted its first periodic reports, which can be compared with reality on the ground. Evaluations done too soon are unfair to the contractor and those done too late in the programme mean that any suggestions to increase safety or cost-effectiveness are too late to implement. Evaluations usually take from 10-20 days to carry out and up to 10 days to write the resultant report. The need for time is because as many hours as possible need to be spent in the field watching mine action taking place. This is time-consuming but essential and field visits are almost the only way of checking the safety and efficiency of field work and the truthfulness of some of the reporting.

At the end of the visit, the contractor’s programme manager should be briefed on the findings of the evaluation and he may also see a rough summary of the report. After the report is written it becomes the sole property of the donor and is released only with your permission. It is normal for you to be briefed on the recommendations of the report by the evaluation team at the time that the report is submitted. This will fill in any details and background not brought up in the report. Evaluators must report what they find which sometimes implies criticism of individuals and organisations. This is often unwelcome even when the criticisms are justified.

The evaluator’s visit and report are only part of the evaluation process. The most important factor is the use to which the donor puts the report and carries out the recommendations. Donors do not always pay full attention to the report and ignore the recommendations if they might be troublesome. If the evaluation is undertaken simply because it is required by your internal regulations, an enhanced monitoring process might be more appropriate; that will save time and cost. Experience has shown that an evaluation can improve the quality of a project and the value of its outcomes. It is quite possible that an evaluation can save project funding.

Relevant documents:
For information on monitoring mine action see:
- The publications issued by the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) at www.gichd.org/gichd-publications/by-subject-english/
- International Mine Action Standards at www.mineactionstandards.org and especially IMAS 07.40, 07.41, 14.10 (draft) and 14.20.
16 Links between mine action and development

Mine action is a cross-cutting activity that can benefit a wide range of disciplines including but not limited to:

- Peace building and support;
- Distribution of humanitarian aid and assistance;
- Post-conflict reconstruction;
- Development.

Each of these is a subject in its own right but this Part only discusses peace-building and support, and development.

In the period immediately after the ending of conflict in any country, one of the major aims of the government, and organisations such as the UN if involved, will be the restoration of normality in the country. Especially after internal conflicts, in parts of the country peace may have been declared, but is not being observed, the fact that other parts of the country are being demined, that roads and markets are now open, can be an incentive for war-weary paramilitaries to stop any forms of military action. The more normal the country becomes, the less likely it is that fresh outbreaks of conflict will occur. In Angola in 1995, the priority tasks were to get the main east-west roads open, to be able to access the demobilisation areas in the centre of the country. Even when the conflict re-started due to the intransigence of one of the belligerents, demining and MRE continued in the remainder of the country, allowing the re-starting of the economy, and the rebuilding of villages as refugees returned. This means that demining can be a powerful element in peace-building, and rebuilding confidence in the government.

Mine action is not a stand-alone activity, but is in many cases an essential pre-requisite for other forms of development. Despite this fact, there are often problems with integrating mine action with development (or any of the disciplines mentioned), many due to the lack of understanding of mine action by the development community and the lack of understanding of development requirements by the mine action community. Many of the latter do not have a background of development and almost none of the former has an understanding of mine action. These are activities with different objectives and with different timetables. Although the mine action community is not especially good at marketing itself, the onus really lies with development agencies to check whether any of their projects requires mine action. There are very many examples of development programmes that have been seriously delayed because the planners did not take this into account. Mine action needs integration into the national or donor's development plan from the beginning.
This however should not stop donors from encouraging national governments to look for better ways to integrate mine action of all kinds into any national development programme that they are developing. Demining must be integrated with re-construction of all kinds, MRE with the information-dissemination capabilities of national communications media (as was successfully done in the Balkans and South East Asia) and the education system, and victim assistance with the health ministry. This often takes time to implement, but when in place, can be successful and cost-effective. It will however take time, because all the disciplines are so different.

In one successful joint development venture, the mine action staff and the development staff (in this case housing and infrastructure) were both under the control of a manager with knowledge of both disciplines. The result was that the integrated planning allowed the mine action to be set up and completed by the time that the construction was started and that the whole joint development worked smoothly. It also meant that if changes were made to the development plan, the necessary mine action could be generated quickly and few delays were caused.

In another joint development involving road construction, it took a long time and some waste of resources before the road contractor understood that the mine clearance staff needed sufficient advanced warning to move their assets into the development area and at sufficient strength to meet the output requirements of the road construction teams.

The donor, either directly or through the local United Nations Mine Action Service or United Nations Development Programme offices, can create links between mine action and development organisations. Some donors insist on seeing the post-clearance development potential of land, and how and by whom it will be developed, before they will agree to fund its clearance. This is most often the case for large infrastructure projects but it could be applied for smaller projects as well.

To set up such joint work, UNDP can normally state which development agencies are working in the country you wish to fund, or you may have national development agencies operating in the country already.

Relevant documents
For information on developmental approaches to mine action planning, see:

Contact points for UNDP offices abroad can be found on the UNDP website at:

The NGO, Norwegian People’s Aid, has been working on demining links to development, and its website is:
- (www.npaid.org) and a contact point is Per Nergaard at per.nergaard@npaid.org.
For information on land release, see:

- *Intervention on Norwegian People’s Aid Land Release Concept to the Resource Mobilisation Contact Group* during the seventh Meeting of States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty at:

  [www.npaid.org/?module=Articles;action=Article.publicShow;ID=4218](http://www.npaid.org/?module=Articles;action=Article.publicShow;ID=4218)

It would be useful to elaborate further on this point, explaining how mine action must and can be mainstreamed within National and Donor’s Development Plan as well as to give more examples of success and conversely of failure. The links between each pillar (victim assistance, MRE, etc.) of mine action with development should be developed further.

This again is a massive subject, which in practice in many countries has to wait until the disciplines (and the government ministries) to run them. When I first went to Angola, the hospitals had no beds, drugs or staff. Where possible they had been sold – apparently by the Minster of Health.
17 Post-clearance use of land

Introduction
In general there are 2 issues relevant to this subject:
- Is the highest priority land being cleared?
- Once cleared is it being put to the use that creating its priority for clearance?

There are some quite famous cases where humanitarian funds have been used to clear land to benefit an important land owner. More common cases are land that has been cleared for a specific development to take place but, once the land has been cleared, the development has not taken place. This is difficult to avoid, or even influence. Once the cleared land has been handed back to the national authorities, they are responsible for it, and the use that is made of it. Even when stipulations are made by the donor that the use must be returned to local farming and local ownership, it may later be found that the local recipients have been persuaded to sell their land for other forms of development.

Despite the difficulties and uncertainties, it is always worthwhile for the donor to try to stipulate the use of the land that its funds are clearing, but this must be done directly with the government and not become part of the mine action agency’s contract; the donor has considerably more power in this respect than the contractor, who can check the post-clearance land use after the event, but not influence the government before mine action starts.

Deciding the land that should be cleared
If land is cleared simply because there are mines there, it is unlikely that there will be a post-clearance use of that land. Before land is cleared the need to do so must be obvious and selected by a transparent process of prioritisation. If that is not done, donor money will be wasted. This is a subject discussed in much of this document and it is, probably, the most important issue of all. There must be a valid reason why land is being cleared and some suggestions are listed in Parts 10 and 11.

- Reduction in mine-related casualties;
- Restoration of access to land and infrastructure;
- Refugees and IDPs able to return to their land;
- Provision of social infrastructure, such as schools, medical centres etc.;
- Provision of economic infrastructure, such as roads, areas of production, power supply and distribution systems etc.; and
- Land cleared to facilitate the work of other humanitarian and development organisations.

If one or more of these reasons are present, there is valid basis for funding the mine action, although there is still the need to assess the use of land once it has been cleared.
Post-clearance use of the land cleared
Clearing land specifically to reduce casualties is the only justification listed above that may not, necessarily, lead to any post-clearance use. However, casualties normally occur when people move onto land that is important to them. Examples are land where they live, where they grow their crops or forage for firewood, water and so on. There may be no new land use but the pre-existing use is now a lot safer.

All the other justifications require the action of someone else after clearance is complete and this is often where problems arise and is another situation in which the donor has a role to play. Mine action contractors are sometimes just that and have no interest in ensuring that the land cleared by them is properly used. A problem with integrating mine action with development is the lack of understanding of mine action by developers, and the lack of understanding of development requirements by mine action staff, many of whom do not have a background of development. See Part 16 for further detail.

Checking the post-clearance use of land is something that could be done by monitoring but better through an evaluation (see Part 15). Some contractors do this for themselves.

Relevant documents
For an example of a post-clearance evaluation see:
Post-clearance Review of Operation Emirates Solidarity Area 3 and 5. This was undertaken in Lebanon and can be seen on:
www.maccsl.org/publications/Post%20Clearance/PCR%20OES%20Area%203_5.pdf.
Annex A  Skeleton scope of work

This is the key element aspect of any agreement between any contractor, whether an NGO or a commercial company and whether a formal contracting process is used or the less formal financing agreement. Time spent getting this document right will pay substantial benefits in the way the project is managed and in the outcomes achieved.

As the tile suggests, this Annex only provides a skeleton Scope of Work. There is much detail required under most of the headings listed below and you may wish to seek specialised advice to help you complete it.

17.1.1  Contract overview

Introduction
- A statement of the need forming the basis of the requirement;
- A brief outline of the information defining the need; and
- The contract period.

General Requirement:
- Broadly state the work to be carried out; and
- Broadly state the Contractor’s responsibilities.

17.1.2  Detailed scope of work

Terms and definitions:
- Define those that may be necessary for clarity.

NB. If necessary, refer to International Mine Action Standard (IMAS) 04.10³.

Scope strategy:
- State any fundamental principles; and
- Discuss the phases of the project (if any).

- This might include details such as pre-mobilisation activities; and
- If you require capacity building to be undertaken – and especially at institutional level – you should make that clear here.

³ www.mineactionstandards.org
17.1.3 Detailed process

The task
- State the task to be undertaken:
  - State what is to be done; and
  - State where is to be done.

NB. Apart from exceptional circumstances, do not tell the contractor how to do the work. He has been selected on the basis of his experience and competence so he is best able to define the methodology. However:
  - State any limitation you wish to apply. For example, for a mine clearance project, there may be environmental concerns that limit the use of heavy machines; and
  - State the outcome you wish to see. This will relate to the statement of need (see above) which formed the basis of the project.

Milestones
- State the milestones and measures of success:
  - Define, in conjunction with the contractor, what milestones should be set; and
  - Define how these are to be measured and verified.

End-state and exit strategy
- State the end-state and exit strategy:
  - State when the contract is due to end;
  - State how the end-state will be verified; and
  - State how the project is to close. This may include how redundancy payments for local staff are to be handled.

Tasking
- State how the contractor will be tasked;
- Provide details, if known, of any tasking process or document;
- State, if appropriate, whether a completion certificate is required; and
- State any technical details that you may wish to specify:
  - As an example, for a clearance contract, this may involve how explosive remnants of war are to handle once found and what is to happen to any scrap metal.

NB. The last 3 points may be outside your control and in the hands of a third party such as the National Mine Action Centre.

Management
- State the management team to be deployed by the contractor; and
- Specify and special qualifications required.

Manpower
- State the human resources to be provided by the contractor;
- State their level of competence and any specific qualifications required;
- If you wish, state the hours you expect staff to work; and
- The contractor will provide interpreters, if required.
17.1.4 Quality management

Standards
- State whether you require the contractor to have any ISO accreditation (such as 9001:2000 and 14001);
- State that, as a minimum, International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) are to be observed. If national mine action standards are available in the country where the work will take place, then these take precedence;
- State that the contractor and his teams must be accredited by the National Mine Action Centre before work commences;
- Specify that the contractor is to have his Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) accredited by the National Mine Action Centre; and
- Make clear that you may cancel the contract if the contractor does not fulfil his obligations as set out in this contract.

Monitoring and Evaluation
- State that the contractor must monitor his own work and ask him to explain how that will be done;
- Make clear that external monitoring by the National Mine Action Centre and by your representative is to be facilitated; and
- If you are obliged to have an external evaluation of the project, that should be stated. Otherwise you should make a general statement that any evaluations you may require are fully facilitated by the contractor.

End of task certification
- State how task completion is to be reported and certified; and
- You should make it clear that you accept no residual liability for the work undertaken with your money and that you expect the contractor to indemnify you against any such claims.

NB. These are matters that should be addressed by the National Mine Action Centre which should verify that the work is acceptable and, as such, removes any residual liability from you and the contractor.

- You may wish to specify penalties for late completion of the task set out or if the project ends without full completion.

Reporting
- State what reports you require; and
- State that the contractor is to comply with all reasonable requests for information from the National Mine Action Centre.
17.1.5 Administration and Logistics

Administration
- State that the Contractor is responsible for the management and administration of all the resources provided by him (both human and material) and of any resources provided to him for his exclusive use by a third party;
- State that the contractor is to supply all the facilities required by his personnel (and dogs, if appropriate) and for the effective deployment of all the equipment;
- State that the contractor is responsible for assembling the resources at the task location by the project start date and for the duration of the project; and
- You may wish to state a leave policy.

Insurance
- State that the contractor is to provide adequate accident and medical insurance cover in accordance with industry practice; and
- Specify any other insurances you require

Logistics
- The Contractor will provide sufficient vehicles to complete the task;
- The Contractors will provide all equipment required to complete the task; and
- All equipment and vehicles are to be properly maintained.

Discipline
- The contractor will observe all local laws and customs especially local employment law when hiring local staff. The contractor should seek advice from the National Mine Action Centre if he is in doubt; and
- All personnel deployed under this contract shall respect local customs and conform to acceptable standards of moral and ethical conduct.
Annex B  Specimen Short Reporting Proforma

Note: As stated in Part 12, many reports requested by donors contain information that may be donor-specific. The points below are non-specific and part of a common narrative. Donor-specific information can be placed attached in an Annex.

**General**
1. General points
   - Contractor;
   - Date of Report; and
   - Period covered by report.

**Measures of success**
2. Mine Risk Education
   - MRE training visits;
   - Numbers given MRE;
   - Number of schools contacted;
   - Liaison visits to local authorities; and
   - Other MRE information.
3. Capacity building
   - Local mine clearance staff trained;
   - Local management staff trained; and
   - Local Quality Management staff trained.
4. General Survey
   - Area surveyed m2; and
   - Area fenced and marked m2.
5. Technical Survey
   - Area surveyed m2; and
   - Area fenced and marked m2.
6. Clearance
   - Area Cleared m2.

**Mines and UXO recovered**
- Mines and UXO destroyed; and
- Area returned to local authorities m2.
7. Progress Data
   - Days worked;
   - Progress towards completion (%); and
   - Spend Matrix (special to donor).
Other data

8. Accidents, incidents and events
   • Number of mine/ERW related accidents;
   • Number of mine/ERW related incidents;
   • Number of traffic or other related accidents or incidents;
   • Visitors to headquarters;
   • Visitors to worksites;
   • Major problem areas encountered in this period;
   • Problem areas foreseen in next period;
   • Security situation; and
   • Other comments.
Annex C    Terminology

For simplicity, this glossary of most frequently used terms is in alphabetical order.


Contractor is used throughout this study to indicate the NGO or commercial company carrying out the task on behalf of the donor, whether the work is being done under contract, letter of agreement or some other legal instrument.

Demining is used to indicate all the actions needed to carry out a mine or ERW clearance operation, and may include the different kinds of surveys, quality assurance, handover to local or national government authorities, and post-clearance land use checks. Deminers clear both mines and ERW.

Explosive Remnants of War (ERW) means explosive ordnances that are left behind in the post-conflict environment. It does not mean landmines, but includes instead all the other forms of conventional explosive weaponry – mortar bombs, rockets, grenades, artillery shells, sub-munitions, cluster munitions and air-dropped bombs. The term ERW now formalised in the UN CCW Protocol V as unexploded ordnance (UXO) and abandoned explosive ordnance (AXO).

Humanitarian demining includes activities which lead to the removal of mine and ERW hazards, including technical survey, mapping, clearance, marking, post-clearance documentation and handover of cleared land.

Humanitarian mine action is another commonly used term yet may be misleading since ‘humanitarian’ implies emergency, rapid response, post-conflict situations. Therefore these guidance notes use the term ‘mine action’ to describe the activity in a non-conflict environment whether by civil or military personnel.

Impact is taken to be the effect of the contractor’s output on the country, region or local people in the longer term by the removal of the risks posed by mines and ERW.

Input is taken to mean the finance, equipment or other resources given by the donor to the contractor.

⁴ www.mineactionstandards.org.
Mines are explosive devices – normally placed on or just under the ground – that detonate when activated by their victim. Anti-personnel mines are designed to be activated by a person, and an anti-tank mine (also called an anti-vehicle mine) is designed to be activated by a tank or vehicle. Except when otherwise stated, in this study the term ‘mine’ is used, and the words mine clearance mean mine and ERW clearance.

**Mine action** includes activities which aim to reduce the social, economic and environmental impact of mines and ERW:

- mine and ERW awareness and risk reduction education;
- minefield survey, mapping, marking, and clearance;
- victim assistance, including rehabilitation and reintegration;
- advocacy to stigmatise the use of landmines and support a total ban on anti-personnel landmines; and
- stockpile destruction, to ensure that stockpiles of landmines are destroyed.

**Mine Action Co-ordination Centre (MACC).** Most mine action programmes have a UN-led or national MACC which sets priorities, allocates tasks, monitors progress and carries out independent quality checks on contractors.

**Mine free** means the removal of all anti-personnel mines from the country, as required under the Mine Ban Treaty (Ottawa Treaty). Bearing in mind that many countries in Western Europe are still dealing with UXO from two world wars, it is widely recognised that a more appropriate end state for donor-supported mine action is ‘mine-effect free’, sometimes also referred to as ‘mine-impact free’. These imply a state in which the impact of landmines and UXO has been reduced to a level where it no longer constitutes a significant threat to life, or an impediment to development, and where there is a competent and sustainable national capacity to tackle the issues that arise in the future.

**Outcome** is taken to be the effect of the contractor’s output on the country, region or local people in the medium term.

**Output** is taken to be the benefit given by the contractor to the mine-affected country and its people. This goes beyond the measurement of clearance in terms of square metres or of numbers of local people contacted during MRE.

**Unexploded ordnance** (UXO) means explosive munitions that have been primed, fused, armed, or otherwise prepared for use and used in armed conflict. They may have been fired, dropped, launched or projected, and should have exploded but failed to do so. In these notes, UXO have been included in ERW.