the exception of the United States and the European Commission. Direct contacts with central agencies occur more frequently when countries integrate mine action with development, such as in the case of Australia and Sweden.

5. Funding trends and prospects.

While the total flow of official assistance to developing countries may still be growing despite the current economic climate, there is little evidence that mine-action funding will follow this trend. On the contrary, mine action’s relative importance, combined with mounting donor interest in other global challenges, and the fact that the Ottawa Convention has delivered tangible results, will probably mark a turning point in the next three to five years. Beyond the next five years, the picture becomes difficult to predict. However, it is quite plausible that funding will take a further downward trend.

Donor reaction to the recent extension process is prudent. As other countries join the extension process with their list of additional resources needed, the gap between needs and available resources will likely widen considerably.

In terms of change between channels, programming types and modalities, donors do not anticipate any major changes in the way they do business. Donors are open to integrating mine-action programs in broader development programs if mine-affected countries take the lead in raising the issue. Opportunities within donor administrations for initiating new funding avenues for mine action are marginal.4

4 Naidoo at s.naidoo@gichd.org.

In terms of commitment to support mine action, 17 donors stated their commitments (which differ from actual expenditure) would hold until the end of the current funding period (usually part of an official strategy, a mine-action plan or a public commitment of some sort). Donor funding for mine action may well have peaked in 2008–09 and has reached a new plateau for the immediate future (2010–11). In the medium-term (2012–15), funding will likely fall to a lower plateau. This situation could change during the 2014–15 period, as some major donors review their multi-year, mine-action assistance.

Many reasons explain this slow but predictable trend toward gradually reduced funding levels including lack of transparency and progress on clearance, lack of value for funds invested, extension requests with unreasonable financing estimates, budget restrictions, and competition for limited funding. Many donors and experts, however, contend that it is not the level of funding that counts as much as the effectiveness of assistance programs, socioeconomic impact, national authorities demonstrating ownership and pace of progress in land release.5

The full report will be available for download through the GICHD website (http://gichd.org) by late 2010. For further information, contact Sharmala Naidoo at s.naidoo@gichd.org. See endnotes page 80.
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The United Nations Portfolio of Mine Action Projects

The United Nations Portfolio of Mine Action Projects allows government agencies and nongovernmental and international organizations in the field to publicize their plans to deal with local mine-action issues and to seek financial assistance for these plans. The annual appeal also serves as a compendium of global mine-action accomplishments and as a catalog for potential donors to browse. In addition, it is a reference and capacity-building tool, providing a snapshot of global funding requirements, the status of countries’ territories’ strategies and whose submission process helps appealing agencies hone their skills in proposal writing and strategic planning.

Simply submitting a project to the Portfolio, however, rarely gets it funded. In reality, the politics of aligning voluntary donors’ interests with those of the manifold field agents often involves complex negotiations. Routine communications between stakeholders are necessary to strategize the yearly process of approving, funding, facilitating and publicizing country projects.

The process begins when an appealing agency identifies an outstanding need for which it requires external funding. For example, DanChurchAid, operating in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, may lack the resources and personnel necessary to clear minefields in the Katanga province. The appealing agency must carefully articulate and submit a request to its respective Country Portfolio Coordinator who then liaises with the Portfolio Team at the U.N. headquarters. Getting indexed in the Portfolio requires that an appealing agency work with its implementing partners to formalize a detailed project proposal. In this example, DanChurchAid arranges for one implementing partner to provide mine-detection dogs and mechanical assets while another implementing partner conducts advocacy activities.

The U.N. Headquarters Portfolio Team—an interagency group of staff from United Nations Mine Action Service, United Nations Development Programme and UNICEF—reviews the project proposals to ensure consistency and coherence with the stated requirements by the Country Portfolio Team. Finally, donor representatives select projects to fund, specifying budget timelines and accountability measures. Throughout the predetermined duration of project implementation, the applicant (in the above example, DanChurchAid) and its partners report progress to all relevant stakeholders. Once a year, the Portfolio Team publishes a new Portfolio online, refreshing the register of new requests and ongoing projects.
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Note Information presented in this article was provided by the UNDP, UNICEF and UNMAS, members of the UN HQ Portfolio Team, inter-
viewed in July and August 2010. see endnotes page 81

Build upon Assets
Donors praise the Portfolio both for its utility as a reference tool and
both the North and South in confi-
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the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement.4
These success stories underscore the prospect that the Portfolio will
continue to serve the mine-action sector as a permanent fixture. Cur-
rently, the Portfolio Team is reviewing
inefficiencies and assets, listening to stakeholder feedback and improv-
ming objectives for the upcoming years. The 2011 Portfolio is expected to be delayed for some months as a result of this review. To learn more about the
Portfolio of Mine Action Projects, visit http://tinyurl.com/36g7juy.
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