

Check against delivery

**RESOURCE MOBILIZATION FOR MINE ACTION:
NOTES FOR AN INTERVENTION BY CANADA**

Meeting of the Intersessional Standing Committees

Geneva, February 3-7 2003

Resource Mobilization for Mine Action: Notes for an Intervention by CANADA

Context :

Thank you Mr. Chairman, and our special thanks to Norway for taking the lead in establishing the Resource Mobilization Contact Group, for without resources, there can be little action.

- - It strikes us that there are two central aspects of this issue to consider – the mobilization of *additional* resources for Mine Action, and the effective and efficient uses of *existing* resources.

Let us look first at the general context. -- Anti-personnel landmines have been laid around the world for many decades, and the needs, especially of severely mine-affected states, have always exceeded the financial, human, and materiel resources available to address them. This resource-gap will likely become more pronounced as new countries accede to the Ottawa Convention and assume its attendant obligations. Exacerbating this situation is the fact that a measure of ‘donor fatigue’ seems to have set in, in recent years, as the initial enthusiasm surrounding the establishment of the Ottawa Convention has settled somewhat - as these things naturally do.

Nowhere is this ‘resource gap’ more apparent - or more critical - than in developing countries where these landmines kill and maim people who are already amongst the most vulnerable on earth. - - Most victims are non-combatants and most are killed well after the conflict has ended. Canada’s remarks, therefore, will focus mainly on strategies to meet the resource needs of mine-affected ‘*developing*’ nations.

2. As we know, civil society took the lead in bringing the landmine issue to the attention of the world. Since then, many NGOs dedicated to Mine Action have been established, and some pre-existing development or advocacy NGOs have incorporated Mine Action programs into their broader mandate.

Government and International organizations echoed this trend. Countries such as Canada established discrete, thematic units in relevant government departments and gave them valuable, if relatively modest, budgets. A similar process has occurred in the UN system.

3. What has not happened, however, - at least not to anywhere near the degree we think it should – is the integration or ‘mainstreaming’ of Mine Action into the ongoing, normal operations of development agencies around the world. This includes bilaterals, UN Agencies, International Financial Institutions including the World Bank and Regional Development Banks. - - In our view, this also applies to civil society, to national and international non–governmental organizations and institutions.

Nor has the landmines issue always been accorded the importance in Mine Affected countries’ own national and sector strategies, that it warrants. There are exceptions to this of course, Afghanistan and Cambodia for example, but this has been the rule.

4. We have to ask ourselves why this is? Is landmines not a ‘development’ issue? And if it is, where does it fit into the development context?

- -Well, if there is one thing we have learned in the almost half century of international development cooperation, it is that *development* is a multi-faceted and increasingly ‘inclusive’ notion. It is not enough that people have food, water, and shelter from the elements. We also need clean air, health care, education and the means to provide for ourselves and our loved ones over the long term. We need to live in societies where ‘rule of law prevails’, where civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights are respected, and where we are free to move about in safety.

5. The real question, then, is **not** where does the landmines issue fit into the development context, but *where doesn’t it?*

It is obvious that it is a *health* issue. If landmines inhibit the building of schools, or make the daily trek to school dangerous, then it is also an *education* issue. So too if they limit access to *water or vital agricultural* land.

As most developing country economies are agriculture and resource based, landmines are very much an *economic* issue.

- - Removal of landmines enables internally displaced people and refugees to return to their homes and resume their lives in safety. It is a major confidence building measure in brokering peace where it does not exist, in stabilizing post-conflict situations, and is - in so very many ways – an **precondition** to sustainable development.

Ambassador Hynes, Karen Mollica and I came to these meetings via Angola and Sudan, where we saw ample evidence of this...

In the final analysis however- by virtue of their deadly and indiscriminate nature - landmines are a weapon of terror and an affront to basic human rights. Article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that: ‘Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person.’ Landmines are a direct threat to all three!

6. So, why isn’t everyone convinced...even many serious- minded people in the International development community?

It would seem that a small but significant number continue to regard landmines as a fairly narrow ‘conflict’ or post-conflict issue, to be addressed by defence establishments, specialized agencies or specialized units within agencies, like ours.

Most, however, appreciate the importance of the issue *unto itself*, - - but deem it ‘marginal’ relative to other killers out there:

For example, UNICEF reports that **11million children** under age of 5, die each year largely from preventable causes including malnutrition.

Respiratory infections alone kill 2 million, followed by diarrhoeal diseases at 1.6 million.

Malaria kills a million, measles 900,000, pertusis 400,000, tuberculosis 400,000.

It's estimated that over half a million young children die of AIDs each year, and, despite a global campaign against AIDs, this number is going nowhere but up – - at least for the time being.

7. Now, in as much as landmines inhibit development, and many of these diseases are exacerbated by poverty, we know that some - perhaps many - of these deaths can be traced back to the existence of landmines.

Clearly it is a misconception then, but, the landmines issue is still seen in many quarters as a specialized area of activity - in competition with - other development sectors or priorities, rather than an essential element of them.

8. So, **if** we are going to mobilize new resources – on a scale to meet current and future needs – we must develop strategies:

- i) *To further persuade* mine-affected states and the broad community of development donors, that Mine Action is both a development priority unto itself – and a *cross cutting issue* – which should be an integral part of national development strategies – as well as all relevant *sector* strategies including health, agriculture, education, human rights, and the like.
- ii) *To encourage* mine-affected states to apply all the resources they are able to addressing the landmines problem. And when external resources are required, to bring this forward during their formal discussions and negotiations with donors.
- iii) Finally, to encourage donors to take on Mine Action – to mainstream it - as the humanitarian **and** development priority that it is.

9. The next, and equally important question is, *how do we manage existing and any new resources as effectively as possible?*

As in many things, **partnership** is the key.

Yesterday, a wise Sudanese man said of 'partnership'. "One hand cannot applaud".

If we are successful in engaging governments, international organizations and civil society in ways and to an extent we never have before, then greater coordination,

collaboration and complementarity of effort is vital to making the most of these resources.

10. Where the conditions are right, we propose building on the partnership that already exists with new program approaches that are attractive to host countries and to donors; - approaches that reflect the ‘state of the art’ in international development cooperation.

Is there any reason, for example, that there could not be a formal Consultative Group or sub -Committee that brings together all key players in Mine Action on a regular basis to share information, co-ordinate, collaborate and do all that is necessary to have the greatest collective impact possible? Then to ensure that this sub-committee is well represented in the larger development Consultative Group including during formal consultations with the host government?

(We know Afghanistan has something similar to this, and hope that those here who are most directly involved will speak to this matter, during our discussions.)

11. Many donors participate in what are called Sector Wide Approaches (SWAPs) or Sector Wide Management (SWIMs). If you are not familiar with these terms, they sometimes involve the pooling of resources towards a common goal. At minimum, they involve better coordination of individual efforts, with host governments clearly in the lead.

Is there any reason there could not be a Mine Action SWAP or a SWIM for every Mine Affected developing country in the world, beyond the Trust Funds that already exist?

12. If you find merit in any of these suggestions, we would propose the following steps for consideration:

12.1. First, in addition to the direct human impact of landmines, solid and current analysis of the ‘indirect’ but significant ‘costs’ of landmines in other sectors must be conducted.

12.2. Armed with this information, we must urge decision makers at the most senior levels in mine affected countries and amongst major donors to convince them that because Mine Action is a precondition to sustainable development, it must factor into their plans and resource allocations in a much bigger way than in the past.

We suggest that particular attention be paid to the IFIs, as it appears the World Bank is involved only to a limited extent, and to our knowledge, the Regional Development Banks are not at all active in this area. Perhaps a good start would be to invite each to be represented at meetings such as this, and for governments who are members of the

Boards of these institutions, to engage them on this subject during board meetings and on an ongoing basis through our respective Executive Directors.

12.4. But we also have to look much closer to home. - - Let's take Canada as a case in point. You may have heard that, at the end of November during the celebrations marking the 5th anniversary of the establishment of the Ottawa Convention, (our sincere thanks to the many of you fearlessly faced the Canadian winter and joined us on this special occasion) - our Prime Minister announced the replenishment of the Canadian Landmines Fund to the level of \$72 million over the next five years.

Although this is less than the \$100M allocated in the first phase of the Canadian Landmines Fund, we are committing to significantly **increase** our total contribution to Mine Action in coming years by doing our absolute best to mainstream Mine Action into all relevant programs of all involved departments – CIDA, our Department of Foreign Affairs, and our Department of National Defence on the technology and research side of things.

We encourage all of our bilateral counterparts to do the same. Some of you may be well ahead of us in this regard and if so, we look forward to learning from you.

Also, it would seem the UN system is somewhat ahead of the curve on this front and we look forward to hearing from Martin, Sayed and Polly as to how this has worked in their respective organizations.

12.5. We also encourage civil society in all of our countries to continue its work in this regard. Although some of the traditional development NGOs and international NGOs have incorporated Mine Action into their work, many who are involved in mine-affected countries, have *not*.

12.6. In addition to mobilizing new resources, we must ensure the best use of existing resources through something approximating the CG type mechanism discussed earlier. We propose establishing one in a country such as Afghanistan where many of the elements are already in place, while at the same time encouraging further movement in this direction in all mine affected countries. Martin and Tammy, we would welcome your views on the feasibility of this.

12.7. Finally, we would like to propose that we explore new opportunities to engage people around the world in the campaign against landmines, not just to regain lost momentum, but to create a tidal wave of support - one that will generate political will as well as financial and human resources on a level we have not seen before. We believe the 2004 Review Conference would be an excellent occasion to do this, and look forward to further discussion of it, later in the week.

Conclusion

Twenty years or so ago, the Environment was the preserve of specialized agencies, and it took some years to convince decision makers that it should be incorporated into regular programs of development agencies. So too with gender, and more recently with human rights.

Today, these are not only regarded as full and legitimate sectors, but also as cross-cutting themes that must be considered in almost every aspect of development programming.

The landmines issue can potentially evolve the same way. It will require this community to keep pushing. That this will happen, there is no doubt.

If we do our job well, the next generation of development worker will not remember a time when landmines was **not** considered to be a key development issue.

If we do our jobs *really* well, the generation after that won't remember when landmines was an issue at all!

Thank You.

03.02.03