

**Contact Group on Resource Mobilisation  
Report from the Coordinator (Norway)  
13 June 2005**

The Resource Mobilisation Contact Group has functioned for almost three years. It has focussed on two objectives that are critical to the successful implementation of the Convention:

- continued and adequate funding for mine action; and
- the best possible utilisation of resources available for mine action.

Both aspects of the resource issue are reflected in the Final Report of the First Review Conference, where we concluded that “while a great deal of funding will be required to fulfil obligations over the next five years, the States Parties have learned that cooperation and assistance in the context of fulfilling the Convention’s aims is about more than simply money. Of equal importance is the matter of how well finite resources are spent and on what. It will be an increasing challenge for the States Parties to ensure greater cost-effectiveness in implementation, applying lessons such as those related to effective coordination and advancing national ownership.”

In advance of the First Review Conference, Norway in its capacity as Contact Group Coordinator put a lot of effort into establishing an overview over the financial resources that were generated in pursuit of the Convention’s aims. The amount is impressive – at least US\$2.7 billion between 1997 and 2004. However, as discussed in Nairobi, we need to look behind these total figures, find out what they were generated for, and which results they have led to. Deeper knowledge about the flow of resources is needed as a basis for reflection on how resources can be most usefully spent. This means asking more detailed questions about the record of resource mobilisation to date. To this end, we have asked the Implementation Support Unit of the GICHD to undertake such research.

The heart of the matter for the Resource Mobilisation Contact Group rests with applying, in the context of Article 5 obligations, the Good Humanitarian Donorship exercise’s “good practice” of ensuring a high degree of accuracy, timeliness, and transparency in donor reporting on official humanitarian assistance spending. This is done by seeking information from all significant actors who have a role in disbursing, generating, applying or receiving mine action assistance.

To donors and key implementing actors we have been posing questions regarding what resources were intended for, through whom were they channeled, for whom were they intended, and what was the impact of them. In addition, we will seek information from the main funding channels – such as the International Trust Fund, the United Nations and the Organization of American States, and from mine-affected States Parties, to identify in a more comprehensive manner from where resources are derived and how they are applied.

I ask you all for your ongoing cooperation with the ISU's researcher – Ms. Pernilla Springfield – in providing the information that is being requested. On the basis of this research, we hope to draw a detailed map of funding flows over the past few years ahead of the Sixth Meeting of States Parties. This information will contribute significantly to ongoing discussions on efficiency and effectiveness and provide meaningful input into our discussions on cooperation and assistance.

Let me turn to the concrete activities of the Contact Group. It last met on the margins of the Review Conference in Nairobi. No meeting is foreseen for the June intersessionals. I would, however, like to update you on discussions held, and progress made on follow-up. The Contact Group participants should have received this information via the ISU, but the message has unfortunately not gone out yet.

At its last meeting, the Contact Group discussed which further steps should be taken to ensure the most effective use of resources for mine action. References were made to the need to make use of standards and guidelines, and to share best practices. A proposal was made to establish a forum for exchange of the results of evaluations. This is being followed up on by the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining, whose website already contains a chapter on cooperation. Here, you can find both the overview over resources mobilised thus far for mine action, and reports from meetings with the World Bank.

The NGO perspective informed the meeting about plans to organise a workshop with a focus on issues related to cost effectiveness. The ICBL noted that perhaps Landmine Monitor could address the subject in future editions and offered to follow up on the idea with Landmine Monitor.

The meeting also discussed follow-up to the high-level visit to the World Bank, which took place in July 2004, including concrete steps to facilitate cooperation between states parties and the World Bank, and to enhance contacts with other development actors. The African Development Bank was introduced to the Contact Group, who among other things learnt that the bank is considering co-financing mine related activities in former war zones. The AfDB representative encouraged participants in the Contact Group to follow up this contact by paying a visit to the bank. I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate that message. I encourage delegations of interested African countries to take advantage of intersessional week, and get together to agree on follow-up of this contact.

Lastly, I would like to refer to the Contact Group's discussions on a range of questions and issues related to how to integrate mine action into development activities. This is, as it was pointed out in Nairobi, a great challenge. I thank Canada for organising today a dialogue meeting on integrating mine action with development and peace-building. This is an important step, and I look forward to learning about the result of the meeting later in the week.