

22-11-07

International Campaign to Ban Landmines

Statement on Cooperation and Assistance

8th Meeting of States Parties: 22 November 2007

Thank you Mr. President,

I would like to highlight some of the findings of Landmine Monitor Report 2007 in relation to funding for mine action in 2006 and also to highlight some of the concerns raised by this year's Landmine Monitor Report.

For many reasons, 2006 was a positive year for global mine action funding. International funding for mine action reached record levels. Landmine Monitor identified a total of 475 million US dollars in funding, the highest level reported since 1992 and an increase of roughly \$100 million compared to 2005. Much of the overall increase in funding in 2006 was accounted for by contributions to emergency clearance in Lebanon, which received approximately \$69 million in assistance in 2006, compared to slightly more than \$6 million in 2005. Excluding the increase of funds to Lebanon, overall contributions increased by more than \$37 million. Eleven major international donors made larger contributions in 2006 than in any previous year.

In addition, Landmine Monitor identified more than \$84 million in national funding by mine-affected states to their own mine action programs, an increase from roughly \$50 million in 2005. These are all very positive developments.

Landmine Monitor found that the five largest international donors in 2006 were the United States, the European Commission, Norway, Canada, and the Netherlands. The EC and EU member states combined accounted for slightly more than half, or \$240 million (€191 million), of the global total.

The five largest recipients of international mine action funding in 2006 were Afghanistan, Lebanon, Angola, Iraq, and Cambodia.

And the five largest national contributions reported by mine-affected states to their own programs, including in-kind contributions such as equipment and facilities, were by Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sudan, Jordan, and Lebanon. Of course, national funding levels must be judged against the varying financial capacities of mine-affected states.

Detailed figures for all donor and recipient states can be found in Landmine Monitor Report 2007.

While the overall picture for funding in 2006 was positive, and reversed the downward trend observed in Landmine Monitor Report 2006, this year's reporting did raise or highlight several issues of concern to ICBL, namely:

- In spite of the overall increase in funds for mine action, many mine-affected states saw funding decrease in 2006: notable among these were Sudan, which received \$18 million or 38 percent less in 2006 than in 2005; Sri Lanka, where funds declined roughly \$9 million or 48 percent; and Mozambique, which saw a reduction of about \$4 million or 38 percent. The positive overall figures for 2006 should not obscure the reality that many mine action programs continue to face challenges in obtaining international funds, and that access to needed funds is becoming more difficult, not less so, for some mine-affected states.

ANTHONY FORREST
ICBL

- Regarding funding by mine-affected states themselves, although Landmine Monitor reported a sizable increase in national funding in 2006, some of this increase may be due to intensified research efforts by Landmine Monitor to identify national funding, and also to improved reporting by some states. In spite of improvements in some cases, many states have not yet made any information available on their own mine action expenditures, and in some other cases, reporting is still incomplete. In light of the Article 5 extension process now underway, much more thorough measurement and reporting of national funding by mine-affected states are essential, to assess national capacity and commitment, and to identify real requirements for international funds.
- Also, in some cases, significant changes in funding allocations by a single international donor from one year to the next resulted in a serious decline in overall funding levels to a recipient state. For example, as was already mentioned, mine action programs in Sudan received \$18 million dollars less in 2006 than in 2005. This was in large part accounted for by a drop in funding from a single donor, which in 2006 contributed about \$5 million compared to \$19 million in 2005. For the greatest efficiency and best results, mine action programs need predictable multi-year funding. Where there are such large changes from year to year in funding to a country, we question whether there has been sufficient advance coordination within the donor community, and between donors and recipients. It is important that rationales for such major changes are made clear before they happen, and that the donor community cooperates in such a way to prevent sudden shortfalls in international funds to recipient states and their potentially damaging impact on mine action programs.
- As we stated yesterday, we also encourage donors that are mainstreaming funds into development budgets to keep a central point of contact responsible for encouraging and facilitating continued funding for mine action within development budgets, as well as for tracking such spending and its impact on meeting mine-related policy objectives. In addition, since not all remaining demining work is limited to links with development, donors should place adequate emphasis on the need to develop national capacity and where necessary ensure that other budgets are available for mine-affected states until all treaty obligations are fulfilled.

In view of the large increase in international funding that took place in 2006, the question now arises whether funding will be maintained at these levels, or surpassed, or if funds will decline in the absence of specific emergency appeals on the scale of the one for southern Lebanon in 2006. Donor states have shown that annual funding of at least \$475 million is within their means. In doing so, they made 2006 a noteworthy year. They also set a new standard against which future funding levels will be judged.

Thank you Mr. President.