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There are four main steps to completing the life cycle of mine action, and demining is just a small part.

Without development, citizens continue to live in poverty and under oppression. The authors outline the four-step life cycle of mine action.

By Ted Paterson and Eric M. Filippino (Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining)

Like any development activity, a mine action programme evolves over its life cycle. It is important for mine action managers to understand this evolution, as priorities and partnerships—who we’re working with—change as part of this process.

As we in the mine action community know, most mine action begins in the chaotic period immediately following armed conflict. It is during this complex humanitarian emergency phase that former warring parties will ask the international community to provide assistance in the form of peacekeeping or broader peace-building missions. Where such efforts appear to be successful—or where major countries discern their national interests are at stake—the peacekeeping phase will lead to a major reconstruction effort, financed by donor countries and multilateral financial institutions.

Although in many cases “traditional” development work (new investments in infrastructure, social services, private sector development, etc.) would not have stopped entirely, the government and major donors initially focus on peacekeeping/peace-building and subsequently concentrate on the reconstruction programme. However, as the restoration of key infrastructure (roads, railways, ports, electrical utilities, water systems, etc.) and basic public services (education, health, policing, etc.) progresses, increasing attention will shift to more traditional development programmes with—we hope—the government increasingly taking ownership of the development effort.

Thus, we can place mine action within four main stages of a country’s conflict and subsequent recovery:

1. Conflict
2. Immediate, post-conflict stabilization (including peacekeeping/peace-building)
3. Reconstruction
4. Development

This depiction of the transition from conflict to development is a stylised one. In many cases, development will continue in some areas while conflict engulfs others. Conflict and development do not necessarily lead to a linear transition to the reconstruction and development phases. Other countries will not go through all the phases with the help of donors; for example, a major effort in post-conflict stabilization may not be required where there has been a clear victory in the conflict (or where the conflict was with another state rather than internal). In others, the “wrong” side wins (at least from the perspective of the major powers) and the country does not receive significant international assistance for its reconstruction. Some unfortunate countries will suffer from simmering conflict for prolonged periods, perhaps becoming a “forgotten emergency” and receiving little attention from the international community. Thus, the transition from conflict to development is uncertain and prone to reversals and may proceed at different rates in different parts of the country.

Regardless, conflicts eventually do end, and more-or-less normal development programmes eventually do begin; therefore, some sort of transition must occur. The important issue for us at this point is not so much the details of an individual country’s transition, but rather the dynamics of such transitions in general and the implications of these dynamics for those planning and managing mine action programmes, particularly the following:

- The country’s social, political and economic environment will evolve over time, in some aspects, quite rapidly.
- The size and relative importance of the different types of international assistance—humanitarian, peace-building/stabilisation, reconstruction and development—will evolve over time.
- Because of this evolution, the international actors present in the country, their primary objectives and their relative powers to influence local affairs will change over time.
- It is vital to emphasise that starting and ending points of the different phases will not be clear-cut; rather, phases overlap. For example, we will not see an abrupt end to the reconstruction programme followed by an abrupt start-up of more traditional development activities. Instead, the reconstruction programme will build to a peak of activity, then decline over a few years. During these years of decline, donors will shift proportions of their funding to standard development approaches. Perhaps they will build on smaller, localised development efforts that international non-governmental agencies have supported, even during the conflict. Thus, there will be shifts in the relative importance of these two types of programming, and these shifts will continue over some years. For example, large “priority reconstruction programmes” are often planned to last five to seven years, although delays in disbursements and implementation might add years before the programme ends.

The principal outputs of mine action (safe land and facilities; public awareness of dangers posed by landmines and UXO; amputees fitted with prostheses; etc.) are not ends in themselves; each mine action output is a means to an end. Therefore, mine action is (or should be) at the service of the mine-affected country and its citizens. At any point in time, it should be focusing on the link’s share of its resources in support of the most strategically important efforts underway in the country. More precisely, mine action should be focusing on those most important efforts constrained by landmine and UXO hazards (e.g., building roads, etc.). In short, mine action should be an integral part of the reconstruction effort, always keeping in mind the many international agendas and the role of mine action in supporting these agendas.

When segmented in this manner, the pattern of mine action expenditures over time might appear as depicted in Figure 1. Two additional types of changes will be occurring that are also vital to the performance of a country’s mine action programme. First, the programme’s capacities will be growing with new assets, training, better organisational management systems and experience. As well, capacities can be enhanced if countries adopt special legislation covering mine action, if public support for mine action grows, etc. Some of the likely developments over time for a mine action programme are listed at the bottom of the programme stages in Figure 1.

Second, mine action planners and managers will acquire additional data over time, allowing them (in theory, at least?) to make more informed decisions and better predictions concerning likely developments in the future that will affect the programme. Some of the important categories of data to a mine action programme are those concerning:

- Hazards—locations, numbers and types of devices, what communities assets are being blocked, etc.
- Livelihoods—how individuals, households and communities survive and prosper (this requires socio-economic data)
- National governance—how governments are formed and replaced, and how the machinery of government functions
- International aid—the key actors and their principal objectives at national, regional and community levels

Getting Quickly to Development

The life-cycle perspective emphasises that the links between mine action and development do not simply happen; rather, they emerge over time. The problem for mine action is that, over much of a programme’s life cycle, the attention is on development but on other related...
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Endnote 2. This phrase is from The Word Bank, which has been the font of perception, planning and post-conflict recreation since the wars arising from the break-up of Yugoslavia. The central role played by the Word Bank is in defining the few concepts of post-war reconstruction efforts, and during each period the Bank may be an important source of funding for demining.

Endnote 3. Logistical needs will vary from the need to translate from French to English: ‘The Mining Link in Strategic Planning: ALABA and the Endstate Strategy Concept for National Mine Action Planning,’ which was developed independently in 1998 by Chip Brown to illustrate the “Endstate Strategy” approach to developing national mine action strategies. For more information, see the International Buddhist Peace Fellowship and partnerships for a mine action programme will evolve in a manner that can be understood and planned for.

Endnote 5. Raw data does not help decision-makers unless it is “analysed” into information. Information is the right data presented in the right format at the right time to the right people.

Endnote 6. Editor’s Note: Some countries and mine action organizations are urging the use of the term “mine free”, while others are espousing the term “mine safe” or “impact free.” “Mine free” connotes a condition where all landmines have been cleared, whereas the terms “mine safe” and “impact free” refer to the condition in which landmines no longer pose a credible threat to a community or country. “Mine safe” connotes a condition where landmines have been cleared, whereas the terms “safe” and “impact free” refer to the condition in which landmines no longer pose a credible threat to a community or country.

Endnote 7. From Interventions to Integration: Mine Risk Education and Community Liaison, Durham [from page 80]


Sustainable Demining Mission, Raan [from page 75]


Endnote 2. The PRB M449 is a plastic-bodied, low metal content, circular anti-personnel mine.


Endnote 4. Editor’s Note: Some countries and mine action organizations are urging the use of the term “mine free,” while others are opposing the term “mine safe” or “impact free.” “Mine free” connotes a condition where landmines have been cleared, whereas the terms “safe” and “impact free” refer to the condition in which landmines no longer pose a credible threat to a community or country.
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