

The use of six indicators to judge progress in victim assistance: preliminary results

By Becky Jordan for the Working Group on Victim Assistance

The purpose of this ongoing study is to be able to judge progress in victim assistance from 1998-1999 to now. Using a study undertaken by the Canadian Government for internal purposes for the baseline information, I have simply plugged in information from LM 2000 and from the country reports given here in February.

Each comparative country report follows this format (see slide 2) and includes a short section of analysis. In each report you can see the color coded grades assigned in the original report, and the new grades based on my judgement of the new information. I repeated this process for 21 countries so far. With this, we can start to analyze progress in victim assistance.

The countries examined so far are:

- | | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Afghanistan*–High | 8. El Salvador - Low | 15. Pakistan - ? |
| 2. Albania* – Mod. | 9. Eritrea - High | 16. Rwanda* – Mod. |
| 3. Angola* – High | 10. India - ? | 17. Tajikistan* – Mod. |
| 4. Burma/Myanmar-H | 11. Laos - High | 18. Thailand* – Mod. |
| 5. Cambodia* – High | 12. Mozambique – H | 19. Uganda – Mod. |
| 6. Chechnya – Mod. | 13. Namibia* - ? | 20. Vietnam – High |
| 7. Colombia – Mod. | 14. Nepal - ? | 21. Zambia* – Mod. |

The countries examined using today's information were chosen somewhat randomly, although I made sure to include four countries which are generally known as highly impacted by landmines and having great needs in victim assistance: Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia, and Mozambique. I also chose 9 of the 12 countries that reported on Victim Assistance in the February meeting of the Standing Committee.

According to the original study, 8 are highly impacted, 8 are moderately impacted, and one is in the low impact category. 4 were not placed in high, moderate, or low categories in the original study.

The indicators, which were developed by a group of knowledgeable people in a conference at Meech Lake near Ottawa, are:

Indicator 1: The extent to which **information on mine victims' demographics** and needs is available.

Indicator 2: The extent to which a **national disability coordination mechanism** exists and recognizes mine victims.

Indicator 3: The extent to which programs and services for **the medical care and rehabilitation** of mine victims are available.

Indicator 4: The extent to which programs and services for **the social and economic reintegration** of mine victims are available.

Indicator 5: The extent to which mine victims are protected and supported by effective **laws and policies**.

Indicator 6: The extent to which there is a **disability** community **advocacy** network.

Each indicator is graded like this:

Indicator1: The extent to which information on mine victims' demographics and needs is available.

	A comprehensive system is in place to collect information on mine victims' demographics and needs / is probably not required.
	There is some capacity to collect information on mine victims' demographics and needs but it is not comprehensive and/or systematic.
	Capacity is being developed to collect information on mine victims' demographics and needs.
	There is no capacity to collect information on mine victims' demographics and needs.
●	Insufficient information or research is ongoing.

Limitations of the study are:

The grades I assigned should be checked by others. We will do this (using highly sophisticated, poorly paid interns) this summer.

No matter how many checks are done, however, there is still a fair amount of subjectivity in the grades assigned because the indicators may be interpreted in different ways.

The information provided both in LM and in the country reports may apply generally to the topic of the indicator but still not answer the question.

Kinds of analyses possible:

- Country by country results: See for yourself. This document will be on the GICHD website as part of the documentation of this intersessional week. You will be able to see in which areas covered by the indicators the country you want to know about has improved, declined, and not changed.
- Indicator by indicator results: Again, I recommend that you look for yourself. You will be able to see under which indicator more countries are doing well, doing poorly, or we still don't know enough about.
- Global trends: Are some parts of the world making more progress than others? Are some aspects of victim assistance gaining more quickly than others?

Slides 8 and 9 show all 21 countries in one chart.

Results so far:

- The most green in 2002 rows is in data collection, which concurs with what we have been saying in the past two intersessional meetings: that data collection is getting better and better. This is a positive trend, of course.
- That medical care and rehabilitation services have the strongest showing in both the original study and in the 2002 rows.
- That performance in social and economic reintegration is much poorer, even though survivors repeatedly say this is their top priority.
- The indicator with the least information concerns organizations of people with disabilities.

Finally, at this point in time, we can't be sure if the results shown represent real changes on the ground in mine-affected countries, or if the changes in grades are a reflection of having much better information. Nevertheless, with continuous use of this system, and having trustworthy information for several years in a row, by the time of the Review Conference of 2004 we will be able to produce a comprehensive and detailed report of the progress made in Victim Assistance.