

### **Session 3: International Assistance and Cooperation in Mine Action: The Role and Responses of Northern and Eastern Europe**

#### **“Mobilising and Utilising Resources to Meet the Objectives of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention”**

**Ambassador Steffen Kongstad  
Deputy Director General, Department for Global Affairs  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway**

- The landmine process, or the Ottawa Process, has changed its character over the years. In many good ways, and in some more challenging ways. The public attention is not what it was a few years ago, but I think this seminar has been very encouraging as it demonstrates that the interest remains strong, which is perhaps particularly important in this year of the first Review Conference.
- The Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention is one of the more successful instruments of International Humanitarian Law and it is different from other instruments, as it sets out not only what States Parties should *not* do, but also what needs to be done to address a humanitarian problem. The Convention provides a political and legal framework for practical action on the ground.
- As Kerry Brinkert said in his presentation yesterday, there are two elements to the Convention: Actions that are *prohibited* and actions that are *required*. The focus of resource mobilization is the actions required. These are primarily related to mine clearance, stockpile destruction and victim assistance.
- Since this issue was firmly placed on the international agenda in the mid-1990's, largely thanks to people like Dr. Sommaruga, we have managed to raise resources to quite an impressive extent. Just to give you a few figures: Over the last 7 years, close to 2 billion USD have been allocated to mine related activities. 19 mine-affected States Parties have invested more than 200 million dollars in mine action; 38 donor States Parties have provided 960 million dollars. And then we have various institutions, regional, international and non-governmental organizations, development banks and private donors, which have provided at least 300 million dollars.
- There are at least two particular observations to be made: First, mine-affected countries have, themselves, provided a considerable share of resources which is most impressive as these are countries facing monumental post-conflict reconstruction problems often following several years and even decades of war.

The second thing is that this overall impressive resource mobilization will not continue endlessly by itself. The challenge is to ensure continued and enhanced access to financial, technical and human resources.

- At the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in 2002, it was recalled that States Parties “in a position to do so” committed themselves on a long-term basis to sustain the process of achieving the Convention’s humanitarian aims, and that States Parties should continue to give high priority to mine action within their development and humanitarian policies.
- At that meeting, Norway initiated the establishment of an informal, open-ended Contact Group to explore all avenues for mobilizing resources. These avenues include:
  - 1) Current traditional donors, which should be encouraged to renew financial commitments;
  - 2) Mine-affected States Parties, which should be encouraged to provide domestic resources in support of national programmes;
  - 3) Multilateral agencies and development banks, which should be encouraged to consider how they could enhance their involvement in support of the Convention’s implementation;
  - 4) Mine-affected States and non-traditional State donors, which should examine how they could share experiences and technical support with others;
  - 5) The private sector, which should be further mobilized to contribute to mine action; and finally
  - 6) More effectively linking the needs of mine-affected countries with the donor community to ensure that available resources are used in the best possible manner.
- In this context, it is important to say that we do need the continued advocacy provided by non-governmental organizations, like the ICBL and its members, as well as international organisations such as the ICRC.
- The more contributors we have, the more we underpin the partnership between various actors, which has been a hallmark of the Ottawa Process and is one of its essential and core features and also embodied in Article 6. I think this seminar has also demonstrated the possibilities and the importance of regional cooperation, as evidenced by Lithuania’s offer to share their funds, experience and technical expertise. This region certainly has something to contribute to mine action in other parts of the world.
- We also need to emphasise that more systematic coordination is needed at the country level and in the field. During the early years much attention was given to establish a machinery that could support the implementation of the objectives of the Convention. Today, we have the intersessional meetings, the annual

Meetings of States Parties and, not the least, the Implementation Support Unit in place. Now I think we have reached a stage that calls for improved coordination and cooperation in the field between donors, operators, local authorities and mine-affected communities.

- The intersessional sessions taking place in Geneva have developed into an important meeting place where all interested parties can share their needs and views. In the past couple years the intersessional meetings have quite rightly focused more on practices at the national and local level. This includes mine-affected States Parties reporting on their “4 Ps”: Plans, Priorities, Progress and Problems. It is clearly the responsibility of the mine-affected countries to define and address their own needs *and* to define mine action as a priority, especially if they expect external assistance to address their problems. National and local ownership is key to lasting solutions.
- Another thing is, given that mine action is a relatively new discipline, there is a need to promote professionalism. We must strive to become more effective, both in terms of cost and in terms of impact. Mobilising resources is not enough. We must work to ensure that we get the maximum impact of mine action with the resources available.
- As long as there are new mine victims, the resources required to care for them will continue to increase. We must ensure that adequate and quality care is provided to mine victims, within the broader context of national health systems and programmes for persons with disabilities. It is evident that many mine victims will require care, rehabilitation and opportunities for social and economic reintegration for their lifetimes. These are long-term needs, as well as an obligation for all States Parties to address them. The needs also extend beyond the individual victim of a landmine to his or her family and the mine-affected community at large. It is a societal problem, not just that of an individual.
- How we mobilise and utilise resources must be addressed at the upcoming Review Conference. The informal Resource Mobilisation Contact Group, which meets during the intersessional weeks and Meetings of States Parties, has discussed these issues in the past. Norway coordinates the efforts of this group and endeavours to provide input on resource mobilisation to the process leading up to the Review Conference. We have circulated a draft paper containing possible elements on resource mobilization, not only for the Review, but also for the Action Plan that will hopefully be adopted by the Review Conference. We plan to discuss these elements during the meeting in Geneva during the intersessional week. Your input would be highly appreciated, The first Review Conference will have a five-year perspective leading up to the second Review Conference. The Nairobi Summit should provide us with direction and impetus for the future.

- In conclusion, the competition for resources is getting keener. Much keener. There is a large variety of worthy needs. To solve the problems caused by anti-personnel mines, we are in for a long haul. It is our humanitarian duty, and should be well within what is possible, to meet the objectives of the Mine Ban Convention.