

A BUSINESS CASE FOR MINE ACTION COMPLETION

A study commissioned by the
Mine Action Support Group

Ian Mansfield

with the support of the

Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining

Draft

(as at 22 August 2012)

CONTENTS	PAGE
1. Introduction	3
2. Context	3
3. Definitions of Completion	5
4. The United Nations Completion Initiative	8
5. Business Case aspects	10
6. Case Studies	12
7. Conclusions	14
8. Recommendations	15

Annexes:

- A. Terms of Reference
- B. APMBC – Deadlines for the clearance of mined areas
- C. CCM – Deadlines for clearance
- D. United Nations Completion Initiative
- E. Business Case for Completion: Economic Analysis
- F. Brief on Mozambique landmine situation

1. INTRODUCTION

The Mine Action Support Group (MASG) is composed of some 30 donor states and it serves as a forum for the exchange of information and it also endeavours to coordinate the humanitarian mine action programs of these donor states. In the MASG workplan for 2012 it was agreed that a study should be undertaken to recall what 'completion' means as understood by the States Parties to the different Conventions and what it might mean to States that have not acceded to these Conventions, and to;

- To prepare a business case analysis of how the MASG may contribute to the Completion Initiative established by the United Nations, and to assist affected countries meet their APMBC and CCM clearance obligations.

The Terms of Reference for the study were agreed at the March 2012 meeting of the MASG and are attached at Annex A. The study was undertaken by the MASG Secretariat (Mr Ian Mansfield) along with input from the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) through research, review of documentation and consultation (mainly by email) with key mine action stakeholders.

2. CONTEXT

It is estimated that over 70 countries and seven territories in the world are affected by the presence of landmines or other Explosive Remnants of War (ERW)¹. Of these, about 50 states have established some form of national mine action program designed to plan, manage and implement operational activities covering demining, risk education, victim assistance and stockpile destruction programs. Most of these programs are reliant on some level of donor support to function properly. The actual conduct of activities is often undertaken by international or national non-governmental organizations, commercial companies or United Nations agencies.

At the international level the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) and the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM) have successfully provided a focus for stigmatizing the weapons and have dramatically limited their use. Both Conventions contain obligations for affected countries to take steps to remove the hazards posed by these weapons and to assist victims, and for other countries to destroy stockpiles and to provide assistance where possible. In addition, the Amended Protocol II on Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices, and Protocol V on Explosive Remnants of War within the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) establish general restrictions and responsibilities regarding mines, cluster munitions and ERW. More recently, the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) has helped the various states parties of the above Conventions with a more

¹ Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor 2011

systematic, sustainable and human rights based approach by bringing victim assistance into the broader context of persons with disabilities.

In the early years of mine action the main focus was on anti-personnel landmines as they were the single weapon type that was causing the most civilian casualties. Exaggerated claims were made about the number of anti-personnel landmines planted around the world (the UN initially estimated over 100 million landmines) and the number of years it would take to clear them. These claims came about because of a lack of detailed knowledge about the extent of the contamination, the desire for affected countries and the United Nations to attract donors, and the help they gave advocacy groups in their call for a ban on landmines. However, as the sector evolved and more data was collected through various survey efforts and concepts like land release were developed, the task of clearance was no longer regarded as a “mission impossible”. A large number of affected countries joined the APMBC which, with its clear obligations and deadlines for clearance, started to focus the minds of affected countries and donors on ‘finishing the job’. However, for a variety of reasons, when the first 10 year deadlines were reached under the APMBC many affected countries had to apply for an extension. While this was disappointing to some, the process of granting extensions did force affected countries to more precisely define the scale of their problem and to estimate the time and cost to meet their clearance obligations. Currently 20 states parties out of the original total of 54 affected states have reported that they have completed their obligations under Article 5.

As a major source of funds and technical support to affected countries, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) launched a ‘completion initiative’ in 2003 with the aim of identifying a number of smaller countries that could be helped to complete their clearance obligation. This initial idea was probably ahead of its time as meeting APMBC clearance deadlines was not so pressing in the early years of the Convention, and it caused a degree of confusion as some affected countries felt that they would be missing out. However, the ‘Completion Initiative’² was relaunched in 2011 and its scope was expanded to include cluster munitions. The United Nations believes that “with concerted and focussed action by states, the UN and Non-Governmental Organizations, and funding by the international community, many states around the world are in a position to ‘finish the job’ in the next five years and others will have their efforts greatly enhanced”. The UN Completion Initiative is attached at Annex B and is discussed in more detail in this paper.

The success of the APMBC and its strong emphasis on clearance of anti-personnel landmines has led to some interesting issues. Most clearance operators state that they clear all explosive remnants of war on a task, and do not just clear the anti-personnel landmines and leave the rest. However, reporting and segregating clearance statistics by weapon type has not always occurred or been done well, and the true picture of results is often not clear.

² Eradicating Cluster Munitions and Landmines Completion Initiative 2011 -2015, Concept paper, UNDP, BCPR, 28 January 2011

The entry into force of the Convention on Cluster Munitions has led to another obligation to report on a specific weapon type. In addition, a number of affected countries may now feel pressured to change their priorities in order to meet Convention obligations, rather than say clear the highest risk ERW affected areas first. Some countries and organisations have developed their own definitions of completion, and terms like ‘mine free’, ‘mine impact free’ and ‘free of all known landmines’(which are not contained in any of the Conventions) have been used.

It would appear obvious that the sooner clearance is completed a country will be better off economically, socially, etc. However, some argue that in countries where mine action programs are not particularly well run and they employ a lot of people, there may be little incentive to finish the job. Others may argue that if an affected country is granted a 10 year extension to its Convention obligation, it will drag it out to obtain maximum support from international donors, or why should a country that has made little effort to meet its deadlines be ‘rewarded’ through a completion initiative. There may also be an argument that the ‘completion initiative’ will reward countries with smaller and low risk mine/ERW problem while diverting much needed funds from countries with larger problems and higher casualties.

3. DEFINITIONS OF COMPLETION

This section looks at the existing definitions of completion in the APBMC, the CCM, the CCW and other terms that may be in use by various countries or organisations.

3.1 Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention.

Article 5 of the APBMC is clear and unequivocal in its definition of the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas – “Each State 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 not later than 10 years after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party”. The question of “What is completion of the Convention’s mine clearance obligations?” has recently been described in a chapter in a publication from the ISU of the APBMC titled “Understanding Mine Clearance in the Context of AP Mine Ban Convention”³.

The chapter starts by reminding that the Convention states that the ‘primary responsibility for ensuring compliance rests with each State Party’ and that affected states have an obligation to report ‘the location of all areas that contain, or are suspected to contain anti-personnel mines’. Article 2 defines a ‘mined area’ as an ‘area which is dangerous due to the presence or suspected presence of mines’ and that completion would mean that ‘the implementation of Article 5 requires that States Parties render all such areas no longer dangerous due to the presence or suspected presence of mines’. Achieving this end state has been aided by the

³ Understanding Mine Clearance in the Context of the AP Mine Ban Convention, ISBN 2-940369-41-0, GICHD, January 2011

guidance and direction provided in the International Mine Action Standards.⁴ A voluntary declaration of completion of Article 5 obligations was adopted at the 7 MSP to ensure consistency in reporting and to avoid uncertainty over the fulfilment of Article 5⁵. The chapter finally notes that “Ambiguous language and terminology, such as ‘mine free’ or ‘impact free’ is absent from the completion declaration”. A table showing the clearance deadlines for affected States Parties is at Annex B.

The destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel landmines also has relevant, time-bound obligations under Article 4 of the Convention that could be brought to bear as another area for completion plans. However, this aspect is considered to be outside the Terms of Reference for this study and will not be discussed. Also, a successful approach to completion should not be at the expense of ensuring continued residual attention and support for survivor and victim assistance, even though this may not be expressed as a strict ‘completion’ obligation under the Convention.

3.2 Convention on Cluster Munitions

The provisions of Article 4 of the CCM on the clearance and destruction of cluster munition remnants are similar to that of the APMBC. Cluster munitions are defined in Article 2 of the CCM, and although it is a much more detailed definition than that of APL’s, it is clear what munitions are covered by the Convention (which includes most cluster munitions used to date). Article 4 states that ‘Each State Party undertakes to clear and destroy, or ensure the clearance and destruction of, cluster munition remnants located in cluster munition contaminated areas under its jurisdiction or control...’ The Article then goes on to set the time limit of 10 years for clearance but also adds text on the requirement to make a ‘declaration of compliance’ when the work is completed. Article 4 also has provision on surveying areas, warning civilians, taking into account the International Mine Action Standards and the steps necessary for a State Party to apply for a time extension.

The Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor for 2011 reports that in terms of contamination, at least 28 states and three other areas, of which 16 are States Parties or signatories to the CCM, are believed to be contaminated by cluster munition remnants or unexploded sub-munitions. Eight contaminated states have ratified the Convention, including heavily affected Lao PDR and Lebanon. Although early in the life of the Convention, two States Parties, Albania and Zambia have already announced completion of their clearance obligation. There is likely to be a strong emphasis on completion early in the life of the CCM, learning from the experience of the APMBC.

Like the APMBC, the CCM has a deadline for the completion of the destruction of stockpiles of cluster munitions, but this aspect will not be addressed in this paper.

⁴ International Mine Action Standards, United Nations and GICHD, 2011

⁵ For the text of the ‘Voluntary Statement of Completion’ see Annex IV to the Final Report of the 7th Meeting of States Parties (UN document APLC/MSP.7/2006/5)

3.3 Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons

The 1980 Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) is an instrument of international humanitarian law that regulates the use, and in certain circumstances the transfer, of specific conventional weapons. CCW Protocol II limits the use of landmines to military targets and Amended Protocol II strengthened the rules governing anti-personnel mines but did not include a total prohibition. Protocol V allocates responsibility for the clearance, removal or destruction of explosive remnants of war (ERW).

The general rules of Amended Protocol II declare that “States and other parties to conflict who use mines must...remove them following the end of active hostilities...and maintain records concerning the locations of such weapons”. However, the Protocol does not define any state of ‘completion’ or set a time frame for when the mines should be cleared. Protocol V ‘allocates primary responsibility for the clearance, removal or destruction of ERW to the party that is in control of the affected territory’. It also requires the ‘users’ of explosive ordnance ‘*where feasible*’ to provide technical, financial, material or human resources assistance, and also for other States Parties ‘*in a position to do so*’ to provide assistance for the marking and clearance, removal or destruction of explosive remnants of war’. The Protocol also has a non-legally binding technical annex which mainly deals with the retention and provision of information about ordnance that has been used. Again, Protocol V does not define any state of completion, set any time limits or obligations for clearance operations and does not apply to ERW existing on the territory of a State before it became a party to Protocol V.

3.4 Other terms

Over the years and at a variety of fora, different terminology or definitions have been used to describe “completing” or ‘finishing the job’ of mine or ERW clearance. Probably the most enduring has been ‘mine-impact free’. The International Mine Action Standards define ‘impact free’⁶ as ‘a term applied to countries that may still have mines but where the mined areas are not having a negative socio-economic impact on communities, e.g. the mines may be in remote, marked and unpopulated areas’. IMAS notes ‘In most cases ‘impact free’ should not be considered in a static sense (i.e. impact free at this point in time) because changes in socio-economic patterns may bring people into contact with mines / ERW that previously had no impact’. This suggests however that ‘impact free’ is only an intermediate step in achieving ‘completion’.

Other discussions have focussed on ‘exit strategies’ or ‘transition to national ownership’ or a ‘risk management approach’ to mine and ERW clearance. The main point about all these discussions is that they are often based on the donors’ perspective and not the affected countries. When and if a donor decides to stop supporting an affected country, or when that

⁶ IMAS 04.10 Second Edition - Glossary 3.136 Impact Free (2004)

country has sufficient capacity of its own, does not necessarily mean that completion has been achieved.

3.5 More than one 'Completion' situation

The conclusion from this discussion is that there is more than one 'completion' situation in most affected countries. War torn countries are affected differently by anti-personnel landmines, anti-vehicle landmines, cluster munition remnants, unexploded ordnance and abandoned ordnance. Survey data usually will identify what type of contamination is expected in a suspect area, but this is not always accurate and/or the contamination may be mixed. Most clearance programs say that they clear everything in an affected area, but their clearance data is often not disaggregated, so it is not always possible to measure the progress in clearing specific munition types.

On top of this, some countries have joined the APMBC and the CCM, while others have joined only one or the other, or neither. There could well be a case where a country has cleared all its anti-personnel mines and reported completion of its obligations under Article 5 of the APMBC, but still has an ongoing problem with ERW (like a number of countries in Europe). Conversely, a country like Chile may be able to clear all its cluster munition affected areas but still have an anti-personnel landmine problem for a number of years. This makes one single definition of completion difficult.

Affected countries and donors will need to be clear on the definition of clearance or which 'component' of completion they are seeking. In most cases, it would be best for the affected country itself to define what it means by completion. The different types of completion are;

- Completion under Article 5 of the APMBC
- Completion under Article 4 of the CCM
- Completion of clearance of all ERW (as loosely defined by the CCW)
- Completion as defined by a non-State party to any of the above

4. UNITED NATIONS COMPLETION INITIATIVE

The United Nations Completion Initiative of January 2011 is an attempt to list those countries that could be considered relevant for additional support to enable them to achieve completion of the clearance of anti-personnel mines and cluster munitions remnants. A copy of the paper is attached at Annex B. However, it should be noted that it is only a 'concept paper' and is not developed sufficiently to form the basis of a business case or for a MASG commitment to support to a particular country.

The purpose of the initiative is summarized as follows: "UNDP believes that with concerted and focussed action by states, the United Nations and Non-Governmental Organisations, and funding commitments by the international community many states around the world are in a

position to 'finish the job' within the next five years and others will have their efforts greatly advanced, improving the situation of post conflict communities. Overall, this program seeks to accelerate mine action activities in countries that have a significant mine/cluster munition problem, government commitments and treaty obligations to fulfil, the presence of effective operational partners, but where additional resources are required to ensure a more systematic and predictable response to the problem.

The initiative is intended to enable:

1. States to more clearly articulate the timeframes and resource requirements to complete their commitments.
2. Mine Action operators to more consistently deploy mine action assets to undertake demining, survey and hazardous area marking as required.
3. Greater access to resources previously denied by weapons' contamination.
4. Mine Action operations undertaken to the highest standards, more consistently.

The initiative is intended to result in:

1. A greater number of states fulfilling their international commitments in a timely fashion.
2. Enhanced cooperation frameworks to promote peace and security through disarmament and community protection.
3. Public protection and welfare greatly improved that in turn can function as a multiplier for efforts to attain many of the Millennium Development Goals".

The table on page 8 of the Completion Initiative reviews 32 countries against a number of criteria, such as the nature of the problem, the affected countries response and convention aspects. The paper also breaks these countries into Priority 1 and 2 categories.

The objectives of the Completion Initiative are sensible but many of the countries currently listed are a long way from completion e.g. Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam, and in some other cases the extent of contamination is not accurately known. A number of the Priority 1 countries e.g. Angola, Chad, Sudan and Yemen do not appear to be close to 'completion-initiative ready'. The Initiative could give more guidance on when donors should undertake a completion initiative in a specific country at a specific time. To this end, the MASG should encourage the United Nations (through the IACG-MA), in partnership with affected states and the other partners mentioned in the concept paper, to re-work the paper into a proposal where the United Nations would focus on the achievement of two outcomes;

- assisting more countries to the 'starting line' for a credible completion project (basically, when they meet certain preconditions).
- assisting countries that have reached the starting line with the formulation of business cases for consideration by MASG members, individually or collectively.

5. BUSINESS CASE ASPECTS

5.1 Introduction

As mentioned earlier, at first glance it 'may appear obvious' that the sooner an affected country achieves 'completion' the better off it will be socially, economically, etc. However, it can be argued that spending money on clearing contamination with little or no impact means not spending that money on other activities that would have a more positive impact. This section will consider some 'business case' aspects of the question.

A business case captures the reasoning for initiating a project or task. The logic of the business case is that, whenever resources such as money or effort are consumed, they should be in support of a specific business need.⁷ A compelling business case adequately captures both the quantifiable and unquantifiable characteristics of a proposed project.

The objective of this study was to prepare a business case of how the MASG may contribute to the United Nations Completion Initiative. However, the reality is that there is unlikely to be a generic business case that suits the variety of countries on the United Nations list. Given the country list, there might be four alternative cases, two of which would be for 'completion' – that is 'comprehensive completion' and 'one component completion', with the other two being 'transition' and 'no solution at present'. There are very few candidates for comprehensive completion (i.e. clearing of all types of contamination) but a fair number for 'one component' completion (e.g. where, say, all known anti-personnel mines have been cleared but there will continue to be a residual problem with ERW). 'One component completion' and 'transition' are, in many ways, rather similar – in both cases the intent is to transition to a program that is sustained by the national government, including having an ongoing capacity to address residual threat.

Generally, the economic analysis of mine action shows that demining is often a sound investment, even just in narrow financial terms (i.e. even before factoring-in the savings of lives and limbs, the increased sense of security, the elimination of explosives that could be used by insurgents, the peace-building benefits of having a 'peace dividend' and showing the government is actually delivering something of value to people, and the progress towards treaty obligations)⁸. But the good results of cost-benefit studies undertaken to-date apply to the minefields that had been given a high priority because they impacted something. Such results would not be obtained for low- or no-impact contamination, and other factors such as political considerations (e.g. clearing border minefields) and meeting Convention obligations would then need to be factored into a business case. A more thorough look at the socio-economic aspects of completion has been prepared by the GICHD and is contained in Annex E.

⁷An example could be that a software upgrade might improve system performance, but the "business case" is that better performance would improve customer satisfaction, require less task processing time, or reduce system maintenance costs.

⁸Economic cost-benefit analysis would attempt to incorporate these non-financial factors.

5.2 Higher level business case

A 'higher level' or global business case could be made for an eventual United Nations coordinated program to assist affected states reaching a point where a 'completion initiative' could be launched with a reasonable expectation of success. This would entail the United Nations developing a structured and systematic process to encourage countries to commit to the transition to national ownership, including;

- a clear decision on the scope of the national mine action programme (just landmines; landmines and UXO; landmines and cluster munitions, landmines and ERW, and stockpile management...)
- a clear and credible decision on the level and organisation of long-term capacity to address the residual ERW contamination
- a financing plan that incorporates an appropriate level of government contribution (which may be quite low for some least developed countries) but that rises over time to cover the costs of the long-term capacity⁹
- having the country, the United Nations and donors sign a 'compact' for completion that links priority setting, transparency of aid instruments and funding commitments, and mutual accountability between countries and their international aid partners.
- the United Nations developing a structured and systematic process to encourage countries that have agreed transition plans to get to a position where an end game to 'comprehensive completion' or 'one component completion' can be agreed
- the United Nations developing concepts for financing such completion initiatives, including innovative, Results-Based Aid mechanisms and the use of trust funds
- the United Nations assisting countries to develop and present their business cases for 'comprehensive completion' or 'one component completion'

5.3 Country level business cases¹⁰

Country level business cases (or completion plans?) would then need to be developed for each specific country, taking into account the extent and types of contamination, their Convention obligations, government commitment, etc. This country specific business case would have the following general features:

- Defined state of completion or the desired end state.
- Clear performance targets
- Implementation plans based on value-for-money considerations (e.g. a few big operations to garner economies of scale; results-based contracting; external Quality

⁹The conditions to this point in the list are to ensure any completion point agreed by the government and donors represents a 'principle-based' solution: that is, based on the underlying principles of the conventions.

¹⁰These could also be termed, simply, Completion Plans.

Management services) rather than inertia (i.e. donors keep funding whatever they have funded to date)

- Clear agreement on the level, organisation and governance of the long-term capacity
- Financing mechanisms that provide incentives for success and penalise failure (with perhaps a commitment of a certain % of funding to be provided by the affected country).

In brief, country-level completion initiatives require credibility. Where this is lacking, the ‘business model’ of the programme – in particular, the financing arrangements – would have to be significantly altered if there is to be a credible business case.

With particular reference to the APMBC, the following guidance has been given to States parties, with the recommendation that they set their own completion targets;¹¹

- a) high level interest and leadership in fulfilling mine clearance obligations;
- b) a national authority empowered, and provided with the human, financial and material capacity, to carry out its responsibilities;
- c) a clear understanding of the size, location and quality of the Article 5 implementation challenge or a commitment to promptly acquire such an understanding;
- d) a realistic but not unambitious plan to complete implementation of Article 5 as soon as possible; and
- e) a regular, significant national financial commitment to the State's own humanitarian demining programme.

6. CASE STUDIES

In the Terms of Reference for the study it suggests that identification of a list of countries close to completion could be useful to the MASG.

6.1 APMBC

To date, 20 States Parties to the APMBC have indicated that they have completed implementation of their obligations under Article 5. One recent example of this is Jordan, which declared in April 2012 that it had cleared all known mined areas. However, Jordan is continuing with verification activities in certain areas and has maintained the capacity to deal with a residual ERW threat or the subsequent discovery of previously unknown minefields. Jordan’s achievement is testimony to the importance of strong national leadership, an effective and well-coordinated mine action program, and the high value placed on ‘completion’. In contrast, a number of countries have had to apply for extensions under Article 5 and appear

¹¹Understanding Mine Clearance in the Context of the AP Mine Ban Convention

to have made little progress. Nicaragua, for example, first announced that it would achieve completion in 2004, but had to extend five times (until mid-2010). The selection of countries to be the focus of a 'completion initiative' needs to be done with a realistic assessment of what is credible.

Looking at the current list of APMBC Article 5 deadlines (see Annex B) the following countries have deadlines prior to the end of 2014; Angola, Burundi, Chad, Gambia, Mozambique, Nigeria and Sudan. Aside from Mozambique, it is difficult to judge how 'completion ready' these other States are (a background note on Mozambique is attached at Annex F as an example of the type of information that would be useful when considering countries). Advice from the ISU of the APMBC¹² was that the following countries, in addition to Mozambique, were suitable countries to currently consider – Burundi, Niger and Serbia. A next group of States that could be considered would include Ecuador, Ethiopia, Peru and Senegal (Ecuador, Peru and Serbia are classed as middle income countries and may not be eligible for assistance from some donors). UNDP¹³ suggested that Mozambique, Tajikistan and Uganda were possible countries for completion support. Certainly, imminent deadlines are one important determinant for completion, so as to contribute to the overall progress of the Conventions and avoid the time consuming and perhaps costly extension request process.

From these lists it would seem that Mozambique, Burundi and Niger are possible contenders for consideration for completion support in the near future.

6.2 CCM

As mentioned earlier, Albania and Zambia have already met their CCM clearance obligation, and it is felt that there will be a strong emphasis on completion early in the life of this Convention. The list of CCM States Parties with clearance deadlines is at Annex C. As States Parties have up to ten years for clearance there are still a number of years before completion deadlines will be reached. However, a number of countries have indicated earlier targets.

A slightly different approach to clearance of cluster munitions remnants under the CCM could be taken compared with the APMBC – that is to tackle the 'easy' countries first which will leave only three or four countries (both CCM members and not) with a longer term problem (such as Laos, the eastern part of Cambodia, Vietnam and possibly Iraq). Provision of moral and constructive support early in the process will prevent the CCM ending up with a list of unfinished jobs when the first deadlines are being approached in 2019. As long as clearance is undertaken and equally supported in those countries with larger contamination, finishing the job early in, say Grenada and Montenegro (that do not require other humanitarian support) will be good examples that clearance can be done within given time and financial frames.

¹² Email from Director ISU APMBC dated 17 July 2012

¹³ Email from Mine Action Team Leader, BCPR

Based on this argument, countries to be considered for early completion support are; Bosnia Herzegovina, Chile, Grenada, Lebanon, Mauritania and Montenegro.

6.3 Non-Convention countries

An interesting case is Nepal, which has achieved ‘completion’ of clearing all known anti-personnel mines (even though it is not a State Party to the APMBC). Nepal was able to do this because the contamination was modest, the mines had been laid by the Army in known areas and the Army was highly committed to clear all mined areas.¹⁴

There are a number of other countries that have not joined one or both of the major conventions, but which may still be of interest to MASG members for completion support. These could include Azerbaijan, Libya and Sri Lanka.

7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Although we talk about ‘completion’ of clearing all known mined areas, cluster munitions remnants and other ERW in a singular sense, the reality is that with the Convention obligations applying to single weapon types, there are a number of different components or ‘completions’. These are;

- Completion under Article 5 of the APMBC
- Completion under Article 4 of the CCM
- Completion of clearance of all ERW (as loosely defined by the CCW)
- Completion as defined by a non-State party to any of the above

7.2 Affected countries and donors should agree on a common definition of what ‘completion’ is being aimed for in any partnership agreement. Where possible, it is best left to the affected country to define what completion means to them.

7.3 The evidence of history, the nature of the ERW problem in most countries and the lack of a binding convention, means that it will be difficult to ever achieve true completion for ERW clearance. Most ERW affected countries will need to maintain some operational capacity to deal with residual threats.

7.4 The United Nations Completion Initiative recalls what ‘completion’ means as understood by the States Parties to the APMBC and CCM, and lists 32 possible completion countries against a set of criteria. However, this list contains some countries that are a long way off completion and the Initiative could give more guidance on how to get countries to the ‘starting line’ and when donors should undertake a completion initiative in a specific country at a

¹⁴The Nepalese Army has a tradition of contributing troops to peacekeeping operations and wishes to contribute demining units in the future. Clearance of its own minefields according to International Mine Action Standards was seen as an important demonstration of the Army’s capability vis-à-vis demining.

specific time. An alternative approach could be that countries are encouraged to 'make a case' for completion support to the MASG (or through the United Nations) – noting that the MASG would be just providing a forum for affected countries to make the case to donors.

7.5A higher level business case can be developed to support the United Nations Completion Initiative. This would include clearly defining the scale of the problem and what completion component is being aimed for, an assessment of the capabilities needed to achieve the completion and a sound financing plan.

7.6 Likewise, a country level business case / completion plan can be developed. Again, such plans would be based around defining clear targets, milestones and deadlines, and the financial requirements. At the country level, to encourage completion, there are options to approaching and supporting completion through new business models that are different to the normal donor funding model. For example, funding could be better linked to achieving an agreed result, with incentives for success or penalties for failures

7.7 One major element of the business plan is economic analysis. In this context, a strong cost-benefit case can be made for demining when high priority, high impact areas are being cleared. However, the same does not apply to low impact areas, and in these cases other aspects of the business case like Convention obligations or political considerations need to be factored in.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS OR OPTIONS FOR THE MASG

It is recommended that the MASG:

8.1 Acknowledge that the concept of completion, as applied to mine action, may apply to one or more weapons, including anti-personnel landmines, cluster munition remnants and other explosive remnants of war.

8.2 Agree that the desired state of completion in any affected country should best be defined by the country itself (and guided as relevant by the Conventions of which it is a State Party).

8.3 Acknowledge that in many countries it will not be possible to achieve completion for ERW clearance. In such cases, the emphasis for donor support should be on assisting the affected country to assume responsibility for sustaining the operational capacity to deal with residual threats.

8.4 Encourage and support the United Nations (through the IACG-MA) to update and further develop the Completion Initiative, and give an indication to the United Nations as to whether the MASG would review or endorse any update.

8.5 Focus on discussing completion, including as it applies to two or three countries per year, at the MASG annual meeting.

8.6 Acknowledge that business/completion plans, as relevant, should be developed on a country-by-country basis, as the context and situation in each is different.

8.7 Encourage business/completion plans to contain the following elements:

- Definition of the completion as it applies to the country
- Agreement on a clear performance target
- Agreement on a price and payment terms (make most payments only when targets have been achieved)
- Results based financing plan
- Agreement on Quality Management provisions

End

22 August 2012

Annexes:

A. Terms of Reference

B. APMBC – Deadlines for the clearance

C. CCM – Deadlines for clearance

D. United Nations Completion Initiative

E. Business Case for Completion: Economic Analysis

F. Brief on Mozambique landmine situation

ANNEX A. TERMS OF REFERENCE

STUDY INTO BUSINESS CASE FOR COMPLETION INITIATIVE

Introduction

Most mine affected countries require international assistance to fulfil their mine clearance obligations. Whilst there are a number of countries facing long-term clearance, the majority will be able to meet their clearance deadlines over the short to medium term with the provision of international assistance. Some countries require relatively small amounts of assistance to complete clearance but have no donor support. Other countries may need assistance that is beyond the levels of the donors currently active in the country. To maintain the momentum of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) and provide some early wins for the newer Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM), it is desirable that countries nearing completion or countries with only small clearance challenges are assisted at the earliest opportunity so as to reduce the number of countries requiring extension requests and maximise the number of countries that become mine free.

Objective

To prepare a business case analysis of how the MASG may contribute to the Completion Initiative established by the United Nations, and to assist affected countries meet their APMBC and CCM clearance obligations.

Scope of work

The study will discuss what ‘completion’ means as defined in the different Conventions, and also to various stakeholders. It will look at a number of case studies and then the business case aspect will describe the benefits of focussing on completion which may include, *inter alia*:

- Release of land for productive use to local community with flow on economic benefits, including positive mental and physical health effects
- Freeing up of resources in affected countries to focus on other development priorities.
- Tangible outcome for donor countries with regard to their investment in the initiative
- Assist countries to meet international obligations under the relevant Conventions
- Encourage greater coordination amongst the donor community

- Promote success stories for clearance organisations and affected countries
- Promote universalisation of the three mine related Conventions (APMBC, CCM and the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW)).

The study will outline the possible options for how MASG could implement the initiative (e.g. identification of list of countries close to completion, regional focus by certain donors with strong existing links) and an analysis of each approach (including costs, other resources, time required). Any risks associated with each approach should also be factored into this analysis.

This study would then use the logic and methodology of the Business Case analysis to develop a case that would assist both the United Nations Completion Initiative and help mine affected countries to meet their Convention obligations.

Completion would allow affected states to move on from mine clearance and mine risk education and focus their efforts, with increased organisational capacity, to tackle other pressing issues such as conventional weapons disposal, as Albania has recently done. A concerted effort to reach completion in a particular country would also reduce cost over time since the critical mass of coordination would not linger over additional years, thus adding to the bottom line of each meter cleared. Traditional clearance budgets are often under threat when clearance no longer contributes significantly to development or humanitarian objectives. The required resources could be the hook to show how a concerted effort at completion will in the end lower costs with a sliding scale for each programme.

Methodology and workplan

The study would be undertaken as a desk review. The Secretary of the MASG (Mr Ian Mansfield) would undertake the study using 15 days of his MASG consultancy, plus it may require additional expertise to be contracted for a number of days. The timetable for the study would be;

- Approval of TOR; 29 March 2012 (at the MASG meeting)
- Inception phase; May/June2012
- Desk study; July/August 2012
- Draft report September 2012
- Final report; October 2012

Reporting

The study will result in a paper no more than 12 pages long, outlining how the MASG could assist mine affected countries meet their Convention obligations, and support the United Nations Completion Initiative.

End. 14 June 2012

ANNEX B – APMBC DEADLINES FOR THE CLEARANCE OF MINED AREAS

State Party	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Afghanistan				1 March 2013							
Algeria				1 April 2012				1 April 2017			
Angola				1 January 2013							
Argentina	1 March 2010										
Bhutan							1 February 2016				
Bosnia and H.		1 March 2009								1 March	
Burundi					1 April 2014						
Cambodia	1 January 2010										
Chad		1 November 2009			1 January 2014						
Chile				1 March 2012							
Colombia		1 March 2011									
Congo, Rep. of		1 November 2011		1 January 2013							
Croatia		1 March 2009								1 March	
Cyprus					1 July 2013						
DRC			1 November 2012			1 January 2015					
Denmark		1 March 2009	1 July 2012								
Ecuador		1 October 2009						1 October 2017			
Eritrea			1 February 2012			1 February 2015					
Ethiopia						1 June 2015					
Germany											
Hungary											
Iraq										1 February 2018	
Mauritania		1 January 2011						1 January 2016			
Mozambique		1 May 2009			1 May 2014						
Peru		1 March 2009						1 March 2017			
Senegal		1 March 2009						1 March 2016			
Serbia					1 March 2014						
Somalia											
South Sudan											
Sudan						1 April 2014					
Tajikistan	1 April 2010										
Thailand		1 March 2009								1 November 2018	
Turkey					1 March 2014						
Uganda		1 August 2009			1 August 2012						
United Kingdom		1 March 2009								1 March	
Venezuela		1 May 2009			1 May 2014						
Yemen		1 May 2009				1 May 2015					
Zimbabwe		1 March 2009		1 January 2013							

ANNEX C – CCM LIST OF CLEARANCE DEADLINES¹⁵

State Party	Treaty clearance deadline	Target date for clearance completion
Lao PDR	1-Aug-20	No date set
Lebanon	1-May-21	31-Dec-16
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1-Mar-21	Apr-17
Mauritania	1-Aug-22	31-Dec-13
Afghanistan	1-Mar-22	Apr-14
Croatia	1-Aug-20	No date set
Germany	1-Aug-20	No date set
Norway	1-Aug-20	31-Dec-13
Montenegro	1-Aug-20	No date set
Chile	1-Jun-21	No date set
Grenada	1-Dec-21	No date set

¹⁵ Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor 2011

ANNEX D – UNITED NATIONS COMPLETION INITIATIVE

ERADICATING CLUSTER MUNITIONS & LANDMINES
COMPLETION INITIATIVE 2011-2015

Concept Paper, Bureau of Crisis Prevention and Recovery
28 January 2011



PROBLEM TO BE ADDRESSED

Landmines, cluster munitions and other explosive remnants of war (ERW) are present in more than a hundred countries around the world. Of these over 80 are affected by antipersonnel landmines and more than half of those affected are among the least developed countries - those least able to bear the burden.

These weapons have killed and maimed hundreds of thousands of people over the last decades. The vast majority of victims are civilians and not soldiers. In the longer term, landmines, unexploded cluster munitions and other ERW have a profound effect on reconstruction and development efforts. Their presence on roads and infrastructure makes the tasks of travelling and reconstruction hazardous and ultimately requires the development of expensive demining programmes. In countries emerging from conflict these weapons slow the repatriation of refugees, hamper the provision of aid and relief, and deprive communities of the productive and safe use of land for cultivation, collection of firewood, building material, and water. It can impede the use of hunting grounds, the development of livelihood activities and the access to places of cultural and religious significance. It impedes freedom of movement and other human rights.

The impact of these weapons on human security and development was widely recognised in the late 1980s and early 1990s leading to the development of humanitarian Mine Action¹⁶ Programmes and campaigns to ban antipersonnel landmines and cluster munitions around the world. These efforts culminated in the development of the Mine Ban Treaty in 1997 and the Convention on Cluster Munitions in 2008 and have led to a number of countries previously affected by landmines and cluster munitions being able to declare themselves free of these weapons.

PRESENT SITUATION

20 years ago Mine Action was an unknown sector, while today the majority of the world's affected countries have put in place Mine Action Programmes and structures and are committed to the eradication of these weapons and an end to their use. The primary responsibility for the clearance of these weapons rests with the governments of affected states, though everyone acknowledges the scale of the problem requires national and international partnership. Each year, states report the destruction of stockpiled munitions and the clearance of vast areas that have been contaminated. Thanks to support from the international community, most mine affected states among least developed countries have structures and systems in place to clear unexploded weapons and are on the way to eradicating the threat.¹⁷

UNDP has been working in support of governments mine action efforts since the early 1990s and today supports national mine action programmes in nearly 40 countries. Over the years, UNDP has been successful in strengthening the capacity of national authorities to effectively manage, coordinate, and plan Mine Action activities as well as supporting advocacy to universalise the Mine Ban Treaty and Convention on Cluster Munitions. Among UN agencies, UNDP is presently the largest provider of technical support to affected states in the world.

Following two decades of Mine Action activities and capacity development, many states are well along the road to completing the clearance of unexploded weapons on their territories, while some of the more affected countries have a considerable amount of work remaining. Numerous civilian service providers exist to provide destruction and land release operations and risk education, where almost none had existed prior to the 1990s. These bodies and

¹⁶Mine Action includes activities to clear landmines and ERW, destroy stockpiles of munitions, support victims of accidents and undertake advocacy to universalise legal instruments and promote their implementation.

¹⁷Today, only Myanmar has been recorded as utilising antipersonnel landmines recently and has taken no visible steps to initiate Mine Action projects (ICBL).

organisations continue to require technical and financial support to undertake their activities, to work towards a world free of landmines and cluster munitions.

Through its public and private partnerships, long standing expertise and presence in many of the most severely affected countries, UNDP is in a position to formulate a more systematic and predictable strategy to support states meet their commitments to rid themselves of these weapons. This concept note provides a framework for the development of a global 'completion' programme, one that incorporates technical assistance, resource mobilisation and partnership to address the remaining threats posed by landmines and cluster munitions.

PROGRAMME PURPOSE

UNDP believes that with concerted and focussed action by states, the UN and Non-Governmental Organisations, and funding commitments by the international community many states around the world are in a position to 'finish the job' within the next five years and others will have their efforts greatly advanced, improving the situation of post conflict communities. Overall, this programme seeks to accelerate mine action activities in countries that have a significant mine/cluster munition problem, government commitments and treaty obligations to fulfil, the presence of effective operational partners, but where additional resources are required to ensure a more systematic and predictable response to the problem.

The programme will enable:

5. States to more clearly articulate the timeframes and resource requirements to complete their commitments
6. Mine Action operators to more consistently deploy mine action assets to undertake demining, survey and hazardous area marking as required
7. Greater access to resources previously denied by weapons' contamination
8. Mine Action operations undertaken to the highest standards, more consistently.

The programme will result in:

4. A greater number of states fulfilling their international commitments in a timely fashion
5. Enhanced cooperation frameworks to promote peace and security through disarmament and community protection.
6. Public protection and welfare greatly improved that in turn can function as a multiplier for efforts to attain many of the Millennium Development Goals

TARGET COUNTRIES

Given the vast number of countries affected to some extent by these weapons, the Bureau of Crisis Prevention and Recovery undertook an exercise to determine which countries are most in need of UNDP's support, have the most pressing obligations, and where UNDP has the greatest capacity to support them in the short to medium term.

From a list of over a hundred countries, 32 countries were identified for support over the coming five years. Prioritisation of the countries/territories was based on: (a) severity of impact; (b) treaty deadlines; and (c) UNDP's history and capacity to provide Mine Action Support.

Sixteen countries were identified as Priority 1: These countries are experiencing a severe to moderate problem and treaty deadline within next 5 years, or are without a treaty deadline but committed to the destruction of the weapons and clearance of explosive remnants of war to reach development outcomes. They are countries where

UNDP has ongoing Mine Action programmes or has a history of providing Mine Action support and where there are effective operational partnerships:

- | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Algeria | 9. Mauritania |
| 2. Angola | 10. Mozambique |
| 3. Burundi | 11. Occupied Palestinian Territories |
| 4. Chad | 12. Senegal |
| 5. Eritrea | 13. Sudan |
| 6. Ethiopia | 14. Uganda |
| 7. Guinea Bissau | 15. Yemen |
| 8. Jordan | 16. Zimbabwe |

Sixteen Priority 2 countries were identified: These include countries with a moderate to low problem and treaty deadline in more than ten years or without a treaty deadline but committed to the destruction of weapons and clearance of explosive remnants of war to reach development outcomes. They include countries where UNDP has ongoing programmes and/or a history of providing support.

- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| 1. Azerbaijan | 9. Lebanon |
| 2. Bosnia/Herzegovina | 10. Libya |
| 3. Cambodia | 11. Niger |
| 4. Colombia | 12. Somalia |
| 5. Egypt | 13. Sri Lanka |
| 6. Iran | 14. Tajikistan |
| 7. Iraq | 15. Thailand |
| 8. Lao PDR | 16. Vietnam |

All of these countries/territories suffer significant problems related to explosive remnants of war that have an impact on human security, peace building, development and/or humanitarian outcomes. The majority have government structures in place to address the problem as well as there being a UNDP mine action programme of varying sizes to ensure that UNDP's engagement is practicable. The majority of the countries also have obligations under the Mine Ban Treaty and Convention on Cluster Munitions. All 32 countries/territories have requested support from UNDP to address these problems and realise their development goals. All of these countries have serious financial constraints that impede the delivery of results.

OUTPUTS & ACTIVITIES

As the strategic focus of this programme is on the completion of commitments to destroy landmines and cluster munitions, promote peace, development and human security, so the operational focus is on the deployment of tools to do this in a timely and efficient manner. UNDP recognises that it does not have sufficient resources or capacity to realise the outcomes of this programme alone and that success depends on mobilising resources, maintaining and nurturing effective relationships with Mine Action government bodies, UN agencies and operational organisations.

Over the last few months, UNDP has had discussions with numerous NGO, IO and national government counterparts to assess the nature and degree of support that it has to develop such a programme. So far the response has been overwhelmingly positive and all parties agree that an operational focus on 'completion' for all affected states is timely and required.

UNDP's support will be dictated by a rapid assessment of the scope of the problems being faced, the range of partners' involved, technical competencies and the availability of resources in each country/territory. Nonetheless, following discussions, five overall outputs have been identified to support the programme:

1. Effective partnerships in affected countries between UNDP, government and operational organisations promoted and developed.
2. Resources mobilised and leveraged on behalf of all programme partners in support of the development and deployment of Mine Action operations.
3. Effective communication on results undertaken to sustain resource commitments and demonstrate the practical achievements of all partners.
4. Global advocacy undertaken to ensure consistent commitments to results and the adoption and implementation of relevant legal instruments.
5. Activities globally coordinated and technically supported to ensure the consistent application of high standards, maintenance of partnerships and implementation of projected activities and outcomes.

Over the coming five years UNDP will seek to focus attention on the completion of commitments and the attainment of measurable results. It will foster closer partnerships to achieve these results and will work with like-minded organisations to achieve common aspirations. An important part of this includes a commitment by partners to enable states to address the problem in an efficient and time bound manner.

Globally, UNDP will leverage existing *Standby Arrangements* with suitably qualified implementing partners (such as MSB, DCA, and UNOPS) to make available skilled teams of technically qualified mine action personnel. This project will:

- Help Country Offices deal with increased workload, especially in acute mine action recovery situations, when the activity level is above normal.
- Assist Country and Regional Offices meet interim human resource requirements until permanent staffing solutions are in place.
- Allow field offices to rapidly deploy staff to the crisis areas without having to go through extensive and time-consuming human resource processes (identification, selection, placement, etc.).
- Help Country Offices by bringing-in experts for programme implementation and by so saving field office funds used for staff mobilization.

UNDP will capitalise on the skills and expertise present in the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) and other expert organisations, drawing on its expertise in the areas of information management, evaluation, standards development, treaty support and the development of new technologies and methodologies for demining and explosive ordnance disposal.

At the country level, UNDP will engage with high-standing operational partners (such as NPA, DDG, DCA, The HALO Trust, MAG, HI, and others) to undertake or facilitate land release operations. UNDP will continue to support the technical and management capacity of government counterparts. This may be done through technical cooperation, the allocation of resources, coordination of activities or a combination of these.

Through technical support and knowledge management, UNDP will promote technical cooperation between affected states and operational partners. Through its Mine Action Exchange project UNDP will facilitate cooperation and peer-exchange and review among and between affected countries, and capture and disseminate good practices

in an effective and sustainable manner. Through its involvement in the development of international mine action standards and collaboration with GICHD, UNDP will promote best practice, operational safety and efficiency.

With civil society organisations and states, UNDP will increase its efforts to universalise the Mine Ban Treaty and Convention on Cluster Munitions providing support to states in the administration and implementation of these instruments.

UNDP will endeavour to effectively communicate the achievements of the programme and mobilise resources of behalf of all project partners. UNDP will also undertake advocacy for the role of public-private partnerships in advancing the objectives of this programme.

PROJECTED COST OVER FIVE YEARS

An indicative budget for this programme has been developed that spans five years, with an average annual cost of 20.3 million USD. It is recognised that the budget will not entirely fulfil the funding requirements of affected countries, but provide a catalyst and security to ensure that operations can be undertaken without interruption, enable results, and form the basis to mobilise additional resources.

95% of programme expenditure will be earmarked for in-country Mine Action operations and national programme development. 5% of the budget will be reserved for global coordination, technical support, evaluation, advocacy and communication.

More detailed country specific budgets have been elaborated in relation to the scale of each affected country's problem and the capacities and resources already in place. An indication of these is attached.

ACCOUNTABILITIES

Globally, the programme will be coordinated and overseen by the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR). Donor states are encouraged to allocate resources through the Thematic Trust Fund administered by BCPR to consolidate contributions, ensure coordinated actions and ease the processes of monitoring, reporting and evaluation. An ad hoc body, including civil society, donors and other partners, will be convened by BCPR for the duration of the programme. This body will promote transparency in the allocation of resources; enable joint planning, communication and monitoring; while providing a forum to show the strengths and weaknesses in different aspects of the programme's execution.

UNDP Country Offices will coordinate the programme in affected countries, promoting partnerships and government ownership, raising additional bi-lateral resources, devising multi-year strategies and programmes with governments and civil society partners. Their work will be technically supported by BCPR.

#	Country/area	Problem			Mine Action		Status of Conventions		Clearance Deadlines		Forecast Budget
		MINES	CMS	ERW	NMAC	UNDP	Mine Ban Treaty	CCM	MBT	CCM	
1	Algeria	Low	No Known	Moderate	NO	YES	State Party	NO	01-Apr-12	n/a	\$2,000,000
2	Angola	Severe	Low	Moderate	YES	YES	State Party	Signatory	01-Jan-13	n/a	\$2,000,000
3	Azerbaijan (Nagorno-Karabakh)	Moderate	Low	Low	YES	YES	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	\$2,000,000
4	Bosnia & Herzegovina	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	YES	YES	State Party	Ratified	01-Mar-19	07-Sep-20	\$5,000,000
5	Burundi	Low	No Known	Low	YES	PREVIOUS	State Party	Ratified	01-Apr-14	n/a	\$700,000
6	Cambodia	Severe	Severe	Severe	YES	YES	State Party	NO	01-Jan-20	n/a	\$8,000,000
7	Chad	Moderate	Low	Moderate	YES	YES	State Party	Signatory	01-Jan-14	n/a	\$3,000,000
8	Colombia	Moderate	No Known	Moderate	YES	YES	State Party	Signatory	01-Mar-21	n/a	\$2,500,000
9	Egypt	Moderate	No Known	Moderate	YES	YES	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	\$3,000,000
10	Eritrea	Moderate	Low	Moderate	YES	YES	State Party	NO	01-Feb-12	n/a	\$3,000,000
11	Ethiopia	Moderate	Low	Moderate	YES	YES	State Party	NO	01-Jun-15	n/a	\$4,000,000
12	Guinea-Bissau	Moderate	No Known	Moderate	YES	YES	State Party	Ratified	01-Jan-12	n/a	\$2,000,000
13	Iran	Moderate	No Known	Low	NO	PREVIOUS	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	\$500,000
14	Iraq	Yes	Yes	Yes	YES	YES	State Party	Signatory	01-Feb-18	n/a	\$3,000,000
15	Jordan	Low	Low	Low	YES	YES	State Party	NO	01-Mar-12	n/a	\$1,000,000
16	Lao PDR	Low	Severe	Severe	YES	YES	NO	Ratified	n/a	18-Mar-19	\$10,000,000
17	Lebanon	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	YES	YES	NO	Ratified	n/a	05-Nov-20	\$4,000,000
18	Libya	Moderate	Low	Moderate	YES	YES	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	\$500,000
19	Mauritania	Low	Low	Low	YES	YES	State Party	Signatory	01-Jan-16	n/a	\$1,000,000
20	Mozambique	Moderate	No Known	Moderate	YES	YES	State Party	Signatory	01-Mar-14	n/a	\$2,500,000
21	Niger	AVM	No Known	Low	NO	NO	State Party	Ratified	n/a	n/a	\$1,000,000
22	Occupied Palestine Territories	Moderate	No Known	Moderate	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$1,000,000
23	Senegal	Moderate	No Known	Moderate	YES	YES	State Party	Signatory	01-Mar-16	n/a	\$3,000,000
24	Somalia	Moderate	No Known	Moderate	YES	PREVIOUS	NO	Signatory	n/a	n/a	\$1,000,000
25	Sri Lanka	Moderate	Suspected	Moderate	YES	YES	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	\$5,000,000
26	Sudan	Moderate	Low	Moderate	YES	PREVIOUS	State Party	NO	01-Apr-14	n/a	\$1,000,000
27	Tajikistan	Moderate	Moderate	Low	YES	YES	State Party	NO	01-Apr-20	n/a	\$5,000,000
28	Thailand	Moderate	No Known	Low	YES	YES	State Party	NO	01-Nov-18	n/a	\$1,000,000
29	Uganda	Low	Low	Low	YES	YES	State Party	Signatory	01-Aug-12	n/a	\$2,000,000
30	Vietnam	Moderate	Severe	Severe	YES	NO	NO	NO	n/a	n/a	\$10,000,000
31	Yemen	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	YES	YES	State Party	NO	01-Mar-15	n/a	\$5,000,000
32	Zimbabwe	Moderate	No Known	Low	YES	PREVIOUS	State Party	NO	01-Jan-13	n/a	\$2,000,000
TOTAL											\$96,700,000
<i>Coordination costs</i>											\$5,000,000
GRAND TOTAL											\$101,700,000

ANNEX E: BUSINESS CASE FOR COMPLETION: ECONOMIC ANALYSIS



Economic analysis of
Completion.pdf

ANNEX F. BRIEF ON MOZAMBIQUE LANDMINE SITUATION

- Background information
 - Landmines were widely used by all sides in the independence struggle and wars of destabilization that ended in 1993.
 - Landmines primarily used to defend large infrastructure sites (e.g. Railroads, powerlines, dams, etc.) and to target troop movements during the war.
 - Almost no maps were maintained of where landmines were placed resulting in large, undefined suspected areas with small numbers of scattered mines.
- The 5 Year Extension
 - During the first 10 years of implementing the Ottawa Convention, mine action focused on high-priority humanitarian areas that resulted in reduced casualty figures.
 - In 2007 and 2008, the Government conducted an assessment of the remaining area which was used to formulate Mozambique's National Mine Action Plan for 2009-2014.
 - In 2008, a 5 year extension period was approved for March 2009 to March 2014.
- Current Situation
 - As of today Mozambique has 21 months remaining until the March 2014 deadline.
 - Remaining hazard areas:
 - **377 sites** equaling **16,042,136 square meters** of hazard areas remain
 - This **includes 2,222,100 square meters along the Moz-Zim Border.**
 - Landmine and UXO Victims
 - 2010 – Total of 9 accidents resulting in 7 deaths and 24 injured.

- 2011 – Total of 3 accidents resulting in 9 casualties in Mozambique including:
 - Deaths: 2 men, 1 woman;
 - Injured: 2 men, 2 women, 2 boys.
 - 2012 – Total of 2 accidents resulting in 3 casualties (1 death and 2 injuries)
 - Demining Capacity:
 - 4 Humanitarian Demining Operators (Apopo, Halo Trust, Handicap Int and NPA)
 - National Commercial demining Companies
 - IND QA team.
- Plan for 2012-2013
 - In 2011, in total **7,204,777 square meters** were cleared and released by all demining operators.
 - Target for 2012, to clear and release ca. 8,000,000 square meters
 - Target for 2013, to clear and release ca 8,000,000 square meters.
 - Strategies to accelerate demining are implementation of land release procedures and more mechanical demining machines.
 - Mine Free District Approach ensures all known areas are cleared district by district.
- Funding 2012-2014

Estimated budget 2012-2014	Confirmed and Pledged Funding	Estimated Budget shortfall
USD \$33,000,000	USD \$19,541,000	USD \$13,459,000

Demining Results 2008 -2011

- The 2007-2008 Baseline Survey served as the basis for the 2008-2014 National Mine Action Plan and the 5 year extension under Article 5 of the Mine Ban Convention.

- The Baseline Survey identified 541 suspected hazard areas corresponding to 12.2 million square meters in the provinces of Tete, Manica, Sofala, Inhambane, Gaza e Maputo.
- An additional 146 areas were identified in the 4 northern provinces of Niassa, Cabo Delgado, Nampula e Zambézia.
- Between 2008-2011, 418 areas were demined corresponding to 9.6 million square meters of the tasks identified in the 2008 Baseline Survey. Meaning 80% of all baseline tasks are completed.
- From 2008 to 2011 new suspected areas not identified in the Baseline Survey totaling 512 areas and ca. 22.2 million m2.

Demining Results 2008-2011

Year	Area planned in NMAP (Baseline Survey)	DEMINING			
		Nº areas	Area (m2)	Mines destroyed	UXO destroyed
2008	1,571,252	237	2,346,130	1142	846
2009	1,997,266	126	4,314,197	914	871
2010	2,239,402	136	6,134,630	883	531
2011	2,574,329	229	7.204.777	8487	406
TOTAL	8,382,209	728	19,999,734	11,426	2,654

