



Statement on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance

11th Meeting of States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty
Phnom Penh, Cambodia
2 December 2011

Thank you Mr. President.

Lessons learned from the last decade on cooperation and assistance were very well reflected in the Cartagena Action Plan, with no less than 18 action points dealing with this topic. Now we need to ensure that they are implemented and we welcome the progress we have seen. We therefore welcome that the new Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance has already started to provide opportunities for frank discussions. We also welcome the Tirana Symposium on cooperation and assistance on victim assistance, convened this year by the President of the 10MSP.

Donors and affected states contributed approximately 637 million US dollars in international and national support for mine action in 2010, similar to the total recorded contribution in 2009. Landmine Monitor 2011 provides additional information on support to mine action and is available outside this room. Mine action globally receives substantial amount of funds, and we believe that concerted efforts from donors and affected states could help improve how this money is expended. We have shared multiple suggestions and observations over past few years, and we would like to focus once again on some of them.

We believe mine action funds should not be spent on nurturing layers of bureaucracy. Donors should discuss with their partners what they think is an appropriate ratio for funds spent on **coordination mechanisms** versus funds spent on actual clearance, mine risk education or victim assistance. They should also ensure that when funding coordination mechanisms, their size, structure and placement is established following an assessment of operational needs. It is not a given that large coordinating structures should be established in all affected countries. The norm should be that national authorities can handle the problem themselves, possibly with the assistance of other governments, UN agencies, or operators, including able NGOs.

We also believe mine action funds should not be spent on **research and development** unless such R&D is demand-driven and based on concrete needs from the field.

We would like to encourage the kind of **strategic partnership** that Norway and Mozambique have undertaken [and have spoken about today]. When donor states do not just allocate funds, but also engage in regular discussions about progress and challenges, this is an excellent way to foster commitment on behalf of both the donor and the affected state, as well as ensuring that funds are spent on recipient countries' priorities.

We would like to encourage **south-south cooperation** as a valuable and essential aspect of mine action. The good practices, skills, expertise and experience of affected states represent in themselves a contribution to cooperation and assistance. We commend China, Colombia, Nigeria, Thailand and Uganda for making such offers this week, and we thank Benin, Brazil, Ecuador and Peru for providing updates on this topic today.

Regarding **tendering** processes, we would like to appeal to donor states, either those doing tendering processes themselves or those using UNOPS or other mechanisms to tender on their behalf, to conduct tendering in a transparent, timely and accountable process that allows maximum flexibility of approaches and solutions.

We recall that affected states should not expect that making a request by itself is a guarantee to receive assistance. Affected states must demonstrate their qualifications, for example through realistic planning, SMART objectives, accountability and the adoption of national laws that facilitate assistance. Similarly, it is important for affected states to create an **environment** where funds are not being wasted, where operators do not have to wait idly for memorandums of understanding, importation of equipment, visas for the staff, and other delays due to bureaucratic processes.

At the same time, we need to recognize that some affected states with less political visibility receive less funding, even if they have made their needs clearly known. We encourage donors to seek ways to ensure no state in need slips through the cracks of Article 6.

At the June intersessional meetings, we shared several concrete recommendations for donor states, about the use of **multilateral channels** for donation, and the use of **bilateral donations**. It is a donor prerogative to choose which one of these systems to use, and we believe each can be an efficient and effective way to allocate funds, if pitfalls are avoided. Below are our succinct recommendations. We would also like to recall that longer term funding commitments can lead to better planning, efficiency and effectiveness.

When using multilateral channels we encourage donors to ensure that:

- Funding is administered and transferred to implementing partners in a timely manner. Donors need to set limits for maximum turnaround time, as waiting for months for funds means that work cannot get done, and that is neither efficient nor effective.
- They set a maximum percentage that can be used for administration, thus ensuring that the maximum amount of funds possible is spent for actual implementation.
- Transparent reporting on how funds are allocated and spent is provided by multilateral mechanisms.
- Regular external evaluations of the mechanisms are conducted and published.

Using multilateral channels is more efficient without earmarking of funds, so that the fund can allocate resources based on affected states' needs and priorities. Donors need to insist, however, that there are transparent procedures in place on how allocation of funds to different mine affected countries takes place. When donors want to allocate the funds for a specific country and /or operator, bilateral channels are usually a better and a more efficient option.

When funds are given bilaterally we recommend that donors:

- Ensure, before giving funds to an implementing partner, that a specific project is also a national priority.
- Discuss the performance of supported implementing partners annually with national authorities and ensure that they are satisfied with implementing partners as well.
- Ensure that there is evaluation of implementing partners regularly and that inefficient partners are held accountable.

The mine action sector is built on partnerships between states, the UN and NGOs that, in many ways, are unique. The UN 4th Committee deliberations on Assistance in Mine Action this fall, and the strong language they contain, are a good example of this partnership. We firmly believe that this is the strength of mine action sector and something that encourages us to continuously improve and increase efficiency and effectiveness. Communication, coordination and cooperation is needed and, while it had its low points in the last years, we welcome the much improved communication between

the UN and civil society over the last year. We look forward to a continued partnership, as we know it will further improve results on the ground.

Thank you.