# Victim Assistance then and now: 

 preliminary results
## ICBL Working Group on Victim Assistance

## Indicators

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A national disability coordination mechanism is in operation.
Some form of disability coordination mechanism exists, but its mandate is not comprehensive or is unclear.
A national disability coordination mechanism is being developed.
There is no disability coordination mechanism.
Insufficient information or research is ongoing.

## 21 countries examined so far

| 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) - <br> High | 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 |

## Each country report looks like this:

Key Developments (LM 2002):
Indicator 1: The extent to which information on mine victims' demographics and needs is available.

According to original study:
According to LM 2002:
Indicator 2: The extent to which a national disability coordination mechanism exists and recognizes mine victims.

According to original study:
According to LM 2002:
... and so on and so forth..
Indicator 5: The extent to which mine victims are protected and supported by effective laws and policies.

According to original study:
According to LM 2002:
According to Feb 2003 SC-Victim Assistance country report

## Limits

-Highly subjective grading system
-All grades need to be re-checked
-Original study had some gaps

## Kinds of analyses possible

-Country by country results $\square$ Indicator by indicator results

- Global trends
-Comparisons between countries
- Comparisons between indicators
-Etc.....



## ao PDR according to original study

 o PDR according to LM 2002 ozambique according to original study ozambique according to LM 2002 amibia according to original study amibia according to LM 2002 epal according to original study epal according to LM 2002kistan according to LM 99, graded by BJ
kistan according to LM 2002
wanda according to original study
wanda according to LM 2002
ajikistan according to original study
ajikistan according to LM 2002
hailand according to original study
hailand according to LM 2002
ganda according to original study
ganda according to LM 2002
ietnam according to original study
ietnam according to LM 2002
mbia according to original study

## Preliminary results

- Most number of high scores (green) in 2002 rows is in data collection
- Medical care and rehabilitation services have the strongest showing then and now
- Performance in social and economic reintegration is much poorer
- Least information concerns organizations of people with disabilities


## Article 6, Section 3

Each State Party in a position to do so shall provide for the care and rehabilitation and social and economic reintegration of mine victims...

