

Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration (SC-VA)

PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE CONVENTION

Presented by

Sheree Bailey
Landmine Monitor Victim Assistance Research Coordinator
[Handicap International Belgium]
e-mail: bailey@icbl.org

27 May 2002, Geneva

Today, I will briefly talk about two aspects of mine victim assistance, funding and data collection, to assess progress in implementing the convention in these areas. But firstly, I will provide an update on progress on the four suggestions that were made at this Standing Committee in January on how we could work together to better package and communicate victim assistance needs.

- More affected States could make use of the Form J attachment to their Article 7 reports – due on 30 April;

To date, 6 mine-affected States Parties have submitted their Form J in 2002: Albania, Cambodia, Colombia, Honduras, Peru, and the Philippines. In addition, Croatia and Yemen provided information on victim assistance as part of the Form I report. Information varies in each report but includes casualty data on new mine victims, victim assistance programs and action plans. Albania, Cambodia and Colombia submitted their Form J for the first time in 2002. Furthermore, ten donor countries have already submitted the Form J: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, and the Netherlands.¹ France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, and Mexico are submitting the Form J for the first time. Already, with only around half of the annual Article 7 reports for 2002 submitted, the number of Form Js has passed the number

¹ Four States submitted the Form J to report on other activities in 2002: Bahamas, Brazil, Bulgaria, and Malta.

submitted in 2001.² As more States submit the Form J it will be possible, not only to get a clearer picture of mine victim assistance in affected States, but also to better assess the global resources available to support affected States in assisting mine victims.

**STATE PARTY USE OF FORM J TO REPORT ON
VICTIM ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES**

	2002	2001	INFORMATION PROVIDED IN 2002
MINE-AFFECTED			
ALBANIA	√		Various issues – one paragraph on victim assistance
CAMBODIA	√		Casualty statistics and prosthetics
COLOMBIA	√		Victim assistance activities
CROATIA (Form I)	√	√	Casualty statistics and victim assistance
HONDURAS	√	√	No rehabilitation programs (detailed information in 2001)
MOZAMBIQUE		√	
NICARAGUA*		√	
PERU	√	√	Casualty information and legislation
PHILIPPINES	√	√	No activities
THAILAND*		√	
YEMEN (Form I)	√	√	Victim assistance activities
ZIMBABWE		√	No activities
	8	9	
DONOR			
AUSTRALIA	√	√	All mine action funding, including victim assistance
AUSTRIA	√	√	All mine action funding, including victim assistance
BELGIUM	√	√	All mine action funding, including victim assistance
CANADA	√	√	Victim assistance funding, and some other funding
FRANCE	√		Details on mine action, and victim assistance funding
GERMANY	√		Victim assistance funding
IRELAND	√		All mine action funding, including victim assistance
ITALY	√		All mine action funding, including victim assistance
JAPAN*		√	
MEXICO	√		Information on support for victim assistance programs in El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua
NETHERLANDS	√	√	All mine action funding, including victim assistance
SWEDEN*		√	
	10	7	
TOTAL TO DATE	18	16	

* Input pending

² It should be noted that as of 24 May, sixteen Article 7 reports had been submitted by States Parties but were pending input onto the UN disarmament website: Bosnia, El Salvador, Hungary, Jamaica, Japan, Liechtenstein, Mauritius, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, and Uruguay. Some of these reports might also include the Form J.

- Landmine Monitor, at the request of the Co-Chairs, would prepare questionnaires that could help guide the provision of information on the part of affected States;

The Landmine Victim Assistance questionnaires have been translated in English, French and Spanish and are available at this meeting. To date, we have not had a response to the few questionnaires that have been sent out. We are waiting on feedback to the questionnaires to judge the effectiveness of the data requested and received. The aim is to have tailored questionnaires sent to all affected States Parties by the end of September for completion and return so that a detailed global overview on victim assistance can be presented at the Standing Committee meeting in January 2003. However, we would urge you not to wait for the Co-Chairs to send the questionnaire but rather take a copy with you today and request your Victim Assistance Focal Point to respond to the questions and return the completed questionnaire to us.

- Affected states should continue to respond to Landmine Monitor researcher's questions to assist us in presenting a composite view of needs;

Final editing has commenced on the *Landmine Monitor Report 2002*, and a global overview of landmine victim assistance in 2001 will be available for the Fourth Meeting of States Parties in September.

And finally,

- Affected states could bring their needs directly to the Standing Committee in May.

Over the course of the next day you will be able to judge for yourselves how affected States have responded to this suggestion.

The second part of my presentation relates to funding for mine victim assistance, and data collection. As has been discussed at previous Standing Committee meetings, comprehensive and comparable figures for victim assistance funding are difficult to

obtain. However, based on information provided in Form J reports submitted so far in 2002, it is possible to make a limited comparison between funding available in 2001 and funding for 2000, as reported in the *Landmine Monitor Report 2001*.

It is not possible to compare total victim assistance funding from States Parties between 2000 and 2001 as input is still pending on reports from Japan, New Zealand, and Norway. Nevertheless, it is possible to show that in five of the nine countries with available data, funding for victim assistance has declined: in some cases quite substantially. It is disappointing that, even though Canada has reported a 19.5% increase in victim assistance funding in the year to March 2002, based on available data to date, funding from States Parties in 2001 appears to have declined by over \$1 million. We remind States that victim assistance is one of the pillars of the Treaty, and that the many mine-affected States require support from the international community to provide adequate and appropriate assistance mine victims. We strongly urge you to review your funding priorities to reverse this decline.

**STATES PARTIES REPORTING VICTIM ASSISTANCE FUNDING
FOR 2001/2002**

	2001/2002**	2001/2002 (U.S.\$) ³	2000/2001*** (U.S. \$)	INCREASE/ (DECREASE)
AUSTRALIA	A\$ 892,711	\$ 499,918	\$ 1,880,000	\$(1,380,082)
AUSTRIA	€ 279,240	\$ 257,066	\$ 233,105	\$ 23,961
BELGIUM	€ 247,894	\$ 228,062	\$ 716,172	\$ (488,110)
CANADA	C\$4,525,638	\$2,941,665	\$ 1,340,000	\$ 1,601,665
FRANCE	€ 487,835	\$ 448,808	\$ 213,980	\$ 234,828
GERMANY	€ 1,074,565	\$ 988,600	\$ 1,000,000	\$ (11,400)
IRELAND	IR£ 400,000	\$ 344,000	\$ 341,743	\$ 2,257
ITALY	€ 1,272,734	\$1,132,733	\$ 1,320,000	\$ (140,001)
JAPAN*			\$ 1,140,000	
NETHERLANDS	€ 1,672,295	\$1,538,511	\$ 2,410,000	\$ (871,489)
NEW ZEALAND*			\$ 93,842	
NORWAY*			\$ 4,480,000	
TOTAL U.S.\$			\$15,168,842	\$(1,028,371)

* Input Pending

** Source: Form J

*** Source: *Landmine Monitor Report 2001*

³ Exchange rates at 24 May 2002: A\$1 = U.S.\$0.56, €1 = U.S.\$0.92, C\$1 = U.S.\$0.65, IR£1 = U.S.\$0.86

In previous discussions in this Standing Committee it has been acknowledged that effective data collection is required to best know how to use scarce resources. Effective data collection can tell us where casualties are occurring, and whether the infrastructure exists to support not only new victims but all landmine survivors. In 2000, the Canadian Government prepared a report entitled *Performance Measurement System for Global Mine Action*. Part Four of the report, Indicators Pertaining to Meeting the Needs of Landmine Victims, included an assessment of data collection of mine victims' demographics and needs available in 1999. I have taken the liberty of using this study as a benchmark to determine if progress has been made since 1999 on the implementation of mine victim data collection systems.

The Canadian study analysed 65 States and areas. In 1999, a comprehensive system of data collection was found in 6 States or areas, some capacity for data collection in 13, a capacity was being developed in 12, no formal capacity for data collection was found in 21 States or areas, and there was insufficient information to make an assessment in 13 States. For 2001, it is possible to analyse data collection in 73 States or areas. A comprehensive system of data collection is now found in 12 States or areas, some capacity for data collection in 17, a capacity is being developed in 2, no formal capacity for data collection was found in 21 States, and either there was insufficient information on the data collection capacity or no casualties were reported in 10 States. Full details of the States and areas that are included in this analysis are available in the notes to this presentation.

Clearly, some progress has been made since 1999 in implementing data collection systems to record information on landmine casualties. Data is now collected through Landmine Impact Surveys, databases maintained by Mine Action Centers and National Demining Organizations, government authorities, the ICRC, UN agencies, NGOs, and in some countries, databases established by the country campaigns of the ICBL. Even in the 21 countries with no formal capacity to collect data Landmine Monitor

researchers collate information obtained from sources such as media reports, hospitals, NGOs, the UN and other international agencies. However, it must be acknowledged that in many mine-affected countries data collection is not comprehensive, and it is believed that mine casualties continue to be under-reported. It is also of concern that in at least two mine-affected countries, Chad and Thailand, where Landmine Impact Surveys were completed in 2001, there appears to be no mechanism in place to continue the recording and dissemination of data on new mine casualties.

	CANADIAN GOVT ANALYSIS 2000	LANDMINE MONITOR 2001
Comprehensive system in place	6	12
Some capacity	13	28
Capacity being developed	12	2
No formal capacity	21	21
Insufficient information/ or no casualties reported	13	10
	65	73
STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION		
Comprehensive system in place	4	6
Some capacity	7	11
Capacity being developed	8	1
No formal capacity	9	13
Insufficient information/ or no casualties reported	9	7
	37	38
STATES NOT PARTY TO THE CONVENTION		
Comprehensive system in place	1	2
Some capacity	6	14
Capacity being developed	3	0
No formal capacity	10	8
Insufficient information/ or no casualties reported	4	3
	24	27
OTHER MINE-AFFECTED AREAS		
Comprehensive system in place	1	4
Some capacity	0	3
Capacity being developed	1	1
No formal capacity	2	0
Insufficient information/ or no casualties reported		0
	4	8
	65	73

STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION	CANADIAN GOVT ANALYSIS 2000	LANDMINE MONITOR 2001	MINE VICTIM DATA COLLECTED BY
ALBANIA			AMAE/ICRC
ALGERIA			
BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA			ICRC
CAMBODIA			Cambodian Red Cross/Handicap International
CHAD			Landmine Impact Survey – no data since survey
CHILE			
COLOMBIA			UNICEF and Colombia Campaign to Ban Landmines
CONGO (BRAZZAVILLE)			
COSTA RICA		●	
CROATIA			CROMAC
DJIBOUTI			
ECUADOR			
EL SALVADOR			CORDES
ERITREA			Ministry of Health/UNAMEE
GUATEMALA			ASCATED UNICEF
GUINEA-BISSAU			
HONDURAS		●	
JORDAN			
LIBERIA	●		
MALAWI	●		
MAURITANIA			
MOLDOVA	●	●	
MOZAMBIQUE			Landmine Impact Survey/Ministry of Health/National Demining Authority
NAMIBIA			Namibian Police Explosives Department
NICARAGUA			CND – National Demining Commission
NIGER	●	●	
PANAMA	●	●	
PERU	●		Article 7 report/media
PHILIPPINES			Armed Forces of the Philippines
RWANDA			National Demining Authority
SENEGAL			Handicap International
SIERRA LEONE		●	
TAJKISTAN	●		
THAILAND			Landmine Impact Survey – no data since survey
UGANDA			
YEMEN			Landmine Impact Survey - RTEU
ZAMBIA	●	●	
ZIMBABWE	●		
TOTAL STATES PARTIES = 38			

STATES NOT PARTY TO THE CONVENTION	CANADIAN GOVT ANALYSIS 2000	LANDMINE MONITOR 2001	MINE VICTIM DATA COLLECTED BY
AFGHANISTAN			MAPA/ICRC/Handicap International
ANGOLA			INAROE
ARMENIA			Armenian Campaign to Ban Landmines
AZERBAIJAN			ANAMA
BELARUS	•		
BURMA/(MYANMAR)			
BURUNDI			
CONGO, DEMOCRATIC REP			
CYPRUS		•	
EGYPT			NGO - Landmine Struggles Center
ETHIOPIA			NGO – RaDo
GEORGIA			Georgia Campaign to Ban Landmines
IRAN			
IRAQ			UNIKOM/ICRC
KUWAIT			
LAOS			UXO Lao
LEBANON			Landmine Resource Center
LIBYA	•	•	
MOROCCO	•		Military casualties only
NEPAL			Nepal Campaign to Ban Landmines
PAKISTAN			NGO – Human Survival and Development
RUSSIA			
SOMALIA			UNDP/SMAC
SRI LANKA			
SUDAN			NGOs – OSIL-S/NRRDO
SYRIA	•	•	
VIETNAM			
TOTAL STATES NOT PARTIES= 27			
ABKHAZIA			NGO - AIS
CHECHNYA			UNICEF
KOSOVO			Mine Action Center – since December 2001 appears to be no data collection
NAGORNY-KARABAKH			ICRC
NORTHERN IRAQ			UNOPS
PALESTINIAN AREAS			NGO – DCI/PS
SOMALILAND			Somaliland Mine Action Center
WESTERN SAHARA			MINURSO
OTHER MINE-AFFECTED AREAS = 8			
	Comprehensive system in place to collect data on mine victims' demographics and needs		
	Some capacity to collect data on mine victims' demographics and needs but it is not comprehensive and/or systematic		
	Capacity being developed to collect data on mine victims' demographics and needs		
	No formal capacity to collect information on mine victims' demographics and needs		
•	Insufficient information / or no casualties reported		

In conclusion, there is good news and bad news on progress in implementing the Convention: information on mine victims is improving, nevertheless resources to assist those victims appears to be decreasing. The challenge of this Standing Committee is to identify the needs of mine-affected countries to adequately assist mine victims, and other persons with disabilities, and to encourage donor States to provide the resources to meet those needs. The ICBL and Landmine Monitor welcome the opportunity to continue working with the Standing Committee in this important process.