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FRAMEWORK OF THE EU MINE ACTION (MA)

Universalisation and Implementation of the Ottawa Convention (1997)

EU MA GENERAL OBJECTIVE
- To assist countries affected by landmines and unexploded ordnance
- To restore the conditions necessary for the security of their populations and their economic and social development: enhancing HUMAN SECURITY
- The EU “zero-victim target”.

EU ACTORS
- 27 EU MEMBER STATES/
  COUNCIL OF THE EU
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION
- EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

EU MA TOOLS
- JOINT ACTIONS
- EU MEMBER STATES' BILATERAL ASSISTANCE
- MULTI-ANNUAL PROGRAMMING DOCUMENTS
- STRATEGIES and POLICY PAPERS
- RESOLUTIONS
- DEBATES
THE 5 PILLARS OF EC MA

CLEARANCE OF MINED AREAS

MINE RISK EDUCATION

APL STOCKPILE DESTRUCTION

MINE AWARENESS

MINE VICTIM ASSISTANCE, REHABILITATION AND REINTEGRATION

2002-2008 EC MA ENGAGEMENT

Afghanistan
Albania
Angola
Armenia
Azerbaijan
Belarus
Bosnia-Herzegovina
Burundi
Cambodia
Chile
Colombia
Croatia
Cyprus
DRC
Ecuador
Eritrea
Ethiopia
Georgia
Guinea-Bissau
Indonesia
Iraq

Jordan
Kosovo
Kyrgyzstan
Laos
Lebanon
Mozambique
Myanmar
Nicaragua
Nepal
Peru
Senegal
Somalia
Sri Lanka
Sudan
Tajikistan
Tunisia
Uganda
Ukraine
Vietnam
Yemen

42 countries assisted around the world

TOTAL EC FUNDING: 300 Million Euro ca.
2005-2007 period:

The Nairobi Action Plan


Means:
- Dedicated funds: APL Budget line
- Geographical instruments:
  - Development cooperation & assistance funds
- Thematic instrument:
  - Humanitarian Aid Instrument

2007: Turning point in EC Mine Action

EC INTERNAL REVIEW

WHY?

- End of EC MA Strategy 2005-07
- New EC external cooperation architecture and introduction of new financial instruments
  - Repeal of APL dedicated funds
- Tenth anniversary and the run up to 2nd Review Conference
- 2007 Dead Sea Progress Report call to promote guidelines on how to more effectively link MA with development
- The EU commitment to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005)
OUTCOMES OF THE EC INTERNAL REVIEW:

- Guidelines on EC Mine Action 2008-13
- Regional evaluations of EC-funded mine action under the EC MA Strategy 2005-07
- Studies on good donorship: how to set up and run MA programmes

2008: NEW EC approach set by the Guidelines

Framework:
- MA in the context of EC development cooperation & assistance (Paris Declaration)
- EC Programming documents: Country and Regional Strategy Papers (CSPs and RSPs)

Means:
(for Central and South America):
- European Development Fund (EDF)
- Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI)
- Humanitarian Aid Instrument
EC assistance to the Americas (I)

Main features:

- Total EC funding for MA in Latin America in the 2002-08 period: € 9 Million ca.
- 9 countries in Latin America still with APL/ERW problems. In 5 of them no casualties and little or no mine impact on populations.
- EC supported the 4 countries with the highest level of contamination: Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru. Nicaragua also supported.
- Nearly 60% of funding to Colombia

WHY?

EC mine action driven by the « zero-victim target »: the impact on local populations

- Widespread contamination in Colombia: 60% of municipalities affected and one of the highest mine/ERW accident rates in the world (source: ICBL and GICHD).
EC assistance to the Americas (II)

Type of activities supported by EC in LA:

- Demining projects (including training and equipment): Chile, Nicaragua and Peru/Ecuador
- Emergency and long-term MRE: Colombia
- Universalisation of MBT with NSAs (Geneva Call): Colombia
- MVA: Colombia

EC assistance to the Americas (III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Type of project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Demining (including train &amp; equip)</td>
<td>1.0 M€</td>
<td>Political relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Capacity building national structures and rapid survey</td>
<td>2.5 M€</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Emergency MRE</td>
<td>54 k€</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Emergency MRE</td>
<td>1 k€</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Geneva Call - universalisation of MBT with NSAs</td>
<td>250 k€ (estimat ed)</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>MRE</td>
<td>50 k€</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>MRE and VA</td>
<td>875 k€</td>
<td>Not yet known - started 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Victim Assistance</td>
<td>300 k€</td>
<td>Not yet known - started 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>MRE and VA</td>
<td>525 k€</td>
<td>Not yet known - started 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador/Peru</td>
<td>Demining (including train &amp; equip)</td>
<td>1.0 M€</td>
<td>Political relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Demining (including train &amp; equip)</td>
<td>1.3 M€</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World-wide</td>
<td>Support for universalisation of MBT</td>
<td>5 k€ (estimat ed)</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GICHD Regional Evaluation for Latin America
EC assistance to the Americas (IV)

3 main dimensions of EC response to the APL problem:

1. **Political response**: support to the MBT and its universalisation and implementation peace-building measure
2. **Aid and delivery response** to the impact of landmines on local populations
3. **Security response**: presence of mines as sources of instability and security concerns (stockpiles or abandoned munitions)

How EC support to MA is triggered?

- **Higher role of the mine-affected EC partners**: EC support based on partners’ national development strategies
- **Decide the degree of importance given to MA**
- **Request for EC assistance (through EC delegations)**
- **Increasing importance of the inclusion of MA in the CSP**
How EC support to mine action is triggered?

2009: Crucial year to request for EC assistance

- Only Colombia and Peru have requested MA assistance through their 2007-13 CSPs
- In the context of their co-operation with the EC, APL problem is not perceived « as a priority » for many LA countries
- Review of the CSPs in 2009: process just launched

Now is the time for interested countries to request the inclusion of MA in the review of their CSPs

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
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