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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND
This report presents the findings, conclusions, and recommendations from a study on the need for a new national mine action strategy for Cambodia. The study entailed a document review; the preparation and distribution of a stakeholder questionnaire and the analysis of responses; and interviews with representatives from a number of mine action and disability assistance organisations, government ministries, etc. It was designed to:

- identify the key gaps (in data, capacities, links with non-mine action organisations, etc.) that need to be addressed in the preparation of a new strategy;
- confirm the range of issues that should be covered in a new strategy; and
- formulate a roadmap to complete the new strategy.

During the course of the study, a number of parallel developments were in process that will affect how a new mine action strategy might be developed and what issues it should address. Key among these were:

- the establishment by CMAA’s Secretary-General of a working group to compile all available data on suspected contamination and demining achievements so this available as a basis for Cambodia’s Article 5 Extension Request;
- the agreement by over 100 countries – including Cambodia – on the text of a new Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM), to be signed in Oslo in December 2008;
- the finalisation of Cambodia’s the National Disability/Victim Assistance Action Plan
- the commissioning of an evaluation of Mine Risk Education in Cambodia

KEY FINDINGS
The need for a new national mine action strategy is widely recognised. The requirement that Cambodia submit an Article 5 extension request reinforces this recognition, as such requests need to be based on a clear and feasible national strategy incorporating an analysis of the socio-economic impacts of the remaining contamination and the socio-economic benefits of clearing all remaining mined areas.

There is strong support both among mine action stakeholders and government ministries/agencies. There is a consensus among government ministries that the mine action programme should begin ‘mainstreaming’ itself (i.e. using government systems established at the national, provincial, and commune levels for planning, priority-setting, etc., rather than ‘stand-alone’ mechanisms for mine action). Moves in this direction should be reflected in the strategy, although such an effort would have to be phased-in over time.

The Article 5 extension request process establishes a basic timetable for the exercise, as follows:

- November 2008 – presentation of the ‘work in progress’ on the extension request, for discussion at the 9th Meeting of States Parties to the APMBC
- end of March 2009 – formal submission of the extension request
- December 2009 – formal consideration of the extension request at the Second Five-Year Review Conference of the APMBC.

Cambodia can meet these deadlines, in part because work is already underway on key
components of a new strategy, namely:

- compilation of all contamination and clearance records into a single database, and the production of contamination and clearance maps
- survivor assistance (as part of broader efforts to formulate the national action plan for people with disabilities)
- MRE – an evaluation of all MRE services in Cambodia

As well, Cambodia benefits from having one of the best systems for recording landmine/ERW accidents. However, the recent election may mean the new government will not be in place until November. This could mean that decisions required of the RGC may not be fully reflected in the ‘work in progress’ that will be discussed at the 9th Meeting of States Parties in November 2008.

Cambodia has a good strategic framework for the formulation of a national mine action strategy, with the landmine/ERW problem featuring in Cambodia’s MDGs, the Rectangular Strategy, and the National Strategic Development Plan. In addition, there exist well-conceived guidelines from the RGC regarding the formulation of a national mine action strategy, namely:

- alignment with the goals and priorities of the National Strategic Development Plan
- adoption of a programme-based approach, featuring
  - a common assessment of needs, leading to…
  - a single strategy, endorsed by all stakeholders, to address those needs, with…
  - a common monitoring and evaluation framework
- linkages with other Technical Working Groups (TWG) on mutual/cross-cutting issues,
- promotion of Cambodia’s aid effectiveness agenda

CONCLUSIONS

The consensus is that a new strategy should embrace landmines, other ERW, and MRE. It should also touch on survivor assistance (e.g. meeting the reporting requirements; implications of the pending Convention on Cluster Munitions), while recognising this should be seen as part of a national strategy and action plan for people with disabilities.

The consensus is that the new strategy should address ‘end point’ issues and (perhaps) graduation points so donors and international partners can plan their exit strategies. Thus, the new strategy should reflect the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) vision for the future roles of CMAC, RCAF, and the Police.

A key strategic issue will be attaining the right balance between the scope of a new strategy, and the capacities of key organisations – particularly the CMAA – to discharge additional responsibilities. The responses to a questionnaire indicate a consensus that the new strategy should incorporate measures to rectify the following gaps (at least):

- Data gaps
  - True extent of contamination (note: now being addressed)
  - Achievements by military demining units and by demining firms
  - Socio-economic benefits from demining
  - Achievements in survivor assistance (note: responsibility of the disability assistance programme)
  - Data on future funding intentions of government & donors
• Capacity gaps
  o of the Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans, and Youth (MoSVY) & the Disability Action Council (DAC) to coordinate survivor assistance activities
  o The capacity of CMAA to discharge its responsibilities
  o The capacity of the MAPU &/or PMAC to discharge their functions

• Gaps in strategic management functions
  o The absence of a regular policy dialogue forum for mine action stakeholders
  o The weakness of mechanisms to advise donors & development organisations regarding the mine action plans and priorities of other donors

As well, links with the following organisations need to be strengthened:
• Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction
• Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
• National Authority on Border Affairs (NACBA)
• Ministry of Public Works and Transport

The new strategy should also seek to provide clarification on at least the following issues:

• RGC plans concerning the respective roles envisaged for CMAC, the Royal Cambodian Armed Forces, and the police
• The relative priorities of demining in support of (i) treaty obligations, (ii) risk/accident reduction, and (iii) other socio-economic benefits
• Clear statements on the ‘end points’ and ‘graduation points’
• Policy guidance on mine action issues to government departments and provincial governments
• Policy guidance on mine action issues to donors and development banks

This is an ambitious programme, and would have to be phased-in over some years. Therefore, the new strategy should incorporate capacity development requirements of CMAA and other bodies in an explicit fashion.

Greater engagement by donors is necessary to ensure they understand and support Cambodia’s effort to formulate a single strategy that will give strategic direction to all donor mine action programming. Accordingly, meetings of the TWG for Mine Action need to shift toward policy dialogue rather than activity reporting.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The separate initiatives of the Chair of the TWG for Mine Action (to commission this study) and the Secretary-General of the CMAA (to establish a working group for the Article 5 extension request) should be merged, with the CMAA taking this work forward to develop a new National Strategy for Mine Action (NSMA) and an Article 5 extension request.

2. The effort to formulate a new national mine action strategy should be launched at the meeting of the Article 5 Extension Working Group (18 August 2008) or shortly thereafter.

3. While the established mine action technical reference groups (TRG) groups (see recommendation 7 below) will be able to prepare many components to be contained in a new strategy, the essence of such a document is internal consistency and overall realism. The
different components must make a coherent package and difficult choices will need to be made in terms of resource allocations and priorities. A Mine Action Strategy Task Force should be appointed to:

- a. agree the scope of the new strategy (i.e. range of issues to be addressed, divided perhaps between ‘must have’ and ‘nice to have’)
- b. agree a draft outline for the final document
- c. advise TRG on the minimum set of issues each should consider, and the nature of the outputs required from them
- d. identify technical assistance requirements to support the exercise (e.g. to document government planning systems/cycles/timetables; to compile socio-economic evidence on the negative impact of explosives contamination and the benefits of mine action)
- e. identify issues that need inputs or decisions from senior government officials, other ministries and Technical Working Groups, etc. and, most importantly,
- f. obtain the required input/decisions or, should it be premature to obtain a decision, set a target date and action plan for obtaining the decision

4. The UNDP – as ‘lead facilitator’ for the TWG for Mine Action and an important partner of the CMAA – should be on the Task Force, with particular responsibility for negotiating and coordinating any technical assistance and other resources required. New contributions to the strategic planning effort from donors and specialist agencies (e.g. the GiCHD) should be channelled through/coordinated with the UNDP.

5. The endorsement by the principal donors of the strategic planning process and, eventually, the new national mine action strategy is critical. The CMAA & UNDP should present the initiative at the next meeting of the TWG for Mine Action, and provide regular updates on progress. One or more short workshops with donors should be considered to highlight and discuss key policy issues.

6. The established mine action TRG (on demining; MRE; victim assistance; database management; socio-economics; gender; etc.) should be utilised to review issues (including those raised in this report) relevant to their mandates, and prepare initial inputs to the strategy by 1 October 2008.

7. A full-time facilitator should be engaged to (i) serve as secretary to the Task Force and (ii) facilitate the efforts of the TRG.

8. The CMAA needs to ensure the process of formulating, approving and, subsequently, implementing the new mine action strategy adheres to the policies, procedures, and schedules set-out for national planning (by the Ministry of Planning) and aid effectiveness (by the CRDB/CDC).

9. The recommended schedule for achieving critical milestones in (i) the national process to develop the mine action strategy and (ii) the Article 5 extension request, is given on the following page.

---

1 It is necessary to recognise that the CMAA must play a central role in the development of a new national strategy for mine action, and its capacities will need to be supplemented during this process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>National process</th>
<th>Article 5 Extension Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2008</td>
<td>CMAA develops draft goals and priorities for period 2010-end 2019</td>
<td>Presentation of the ‘work in progress’ on the extension request, for discussion at the 9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President of CMAA confirms goals and priorities for 2010-end 2019</td>
<td>Meeting of States Parties to the APMBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposals for activities and projects from President and Secretary General of CMAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMAA finalises draft National Strategy for Mine Action (NSMA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2009</td>
<td>Approval of NSMA by President of CMAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Mar 2009</td>
<td>Approval of NSMA by RGC</td>
<td>Formal submission of the extension request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2009</td>
<td>Approval of NSMA by RGC</td>
<td>Formal consideration of the extension request at the Second Five-Year Review Conference of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APMBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual cycle</td>
<td>National Planning &amp; Budgeting Cycle</td>
<td>APMBC Annual Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates set by MoP &amp; by States Parties respectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PIP on Mine Action 1 &amp; 3 year programme &amp; budget (rolling plan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting Progress on performance indicators/results</td>
<td>Reporting Progress on performance indicators/results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

This report presents the findings, conclusions, and recommendations from a study on the need for a new national mine action strategy for Cambodia. The need for the study was first outlined in a concept paper presented to H.E. Prak Sokhonn, Chair of the Technical Working Group (TWG) for Mine Action, following extensive discussions with mine action stakeholders. Subsequently, H.E. Prak Sokhonn requested the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) to work with Chan Rotha, Director of the Socio-Economic Planning and Database Management Department of the Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority (CMAA) and Dr. Mao Vanna, consultant, to conduct this preliminary study, aimed at:

- identifying the key gaps (in data, capacities, links with non-mine action organisations, etc.) that need to be addressed in the preparation of a new strategy;
- confirming the range of issues that should be covered in a new strategy; and
- formulating a roadmap to complete the new strategy.

PARALLEL DEVELOPMENTS

Article 5 extension

The need for Cambodia to prepare an Article 5 extension request regarding its obligations as a State Party to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) has provided additional impetus for a new national mine action strategy. Cambodia will need to submit its extension request well in advance of the 2nd Five Year Review Conference of the APMBC, scheduled for November 2009, and work will need to be well advanced by the end of this year if it is to adhere to this schedule.

In a meeting at CMAA on 22 April 2008, H.E. Sam Sotha, Secretary-General of CMAA and Cambodia’s Mine Action Ambassador, confirmed that the preparation of an Article 5 extension request is a top priority. Accordingly, he established a working group to compile all available data on suspected contamination and demining achievements by 14 August 2008, so that an accurate, up-to-date picture of the remaining contamination would be available prior to the next meeting with the head of the APMBC Secretariat, scheduled for 18 August.

Convention on Cluster Munitions

At the end of May 2008, over 100 countries – including Cambodia – agreed the final text for a new Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM). The Convention will be signed in Oslo on 3

---

2 Moving to a Programme-Based Approach for Mine Action in Cambodia, attached as Annex 1.
3 Article 5 of the APMBC covers the obligations of States Parties to locate mined areas in their countries and to clear all landmines in known mined areas within 10 years. If clearance cannot be completed within 10 years, a State Party must request an extension.
4 In brief, the core elements of the extension request are (i) an accurate, up-to-date picture of the remaining landmine and other ERW contamination, (ii) a description of the negative impacts of contamination and benefits from mine action, and (iii) a clear & feasible strategy for addressing the remaining contamination.
5 Members are CMAA, NPA (which is providing technical assistance to the CMAA database unit) and the three main operators – CMAC, HALO Trust, and MAG.
6 The Implementation Support Unit of the GICHD serves as the APMBC Secretariat.
December 2008 (the International Day for Persons with Disabilities). Upon its entry into force, the CCM sets a 10-year deadline for States Parties to clear and destroy all cluster munition remnants located in areas under its jurisdiction or control. (Article 4)

Disability Programme Action Plan

In recent months, the disability community has made excellent progress in formulating a national action plan. Accordingly, the National Disability/Victim Assistance Action Plan will be presented to the Landmine Victim Assistance Steering Committee (LMVASC) on 6 August 2008.

STUDY METHODOLOGY

The study entailed:

- a review of documents relating both to mine action and to aid effectiveness in Cambodia
- the preparation and distribution of a stakeholder questionnaire focusing on the gaps and strategic issues that a new strategy should address
- the analysis of the questionnaire responses
- interviews with representatives from a number of mine action and disability assistance organisations, government ministries, etc.

REPORT LAYOUT

The next chapter discusses key parameters (strategic context; strategic framework; timing and key milestones) for a new national mine action strategy. This is followed by a chapter outlining the main findings from the study. The final chapter provides conclusions and recommendations, and is followed by appendices containing:

- Appendix 1 – the Concept Paper
- Appendix 2 – list of people interviewed
- Appendix 3 – stakeholder questionnaire
- Appendix 4 – analysis of questionnaire responses

---

7 For the Convention as a whole, “…on the first day of the sixth month after the month in which the thirtieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession has been deposited”: for individual countries (other than the first 30 to ratify) “…on the first day of the sixth month after the date on which that State has deposited its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.” (Article 17)
8 Previous to the study itself, extensive interviews were held with mine action stakeholders to identify gaps and issues they believed should be addressed in a new strategy.
9 The questionnaire is included as Appendix 3.
10 This is provided in Appendix 4.
11 The list of people interviewed is provided in Appendix 2.
1. CONTEXT, FRAMEWORK, AND TIMING

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

Extended civil conflicts and regional wars left Cambodia one of the countries most affected by explosives contamination.\(^\text{12}\) Fifteen years after the start-up of a mine action programme, the country still suffers from extensive landmine and other ERW contamination. Although a national Landmine Impact Survey (LIS\(^\text{13}\)) was completed for all accessible areas in April 2002, it has long been recognised that this does not provide a complete and accurate inventory of contaminated areas.\(^\text{14}\) Accordingly, Cambodia still lacks a complete, up-to-date, and accurate picture of its remaining contamination.

Since 2000, the Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance\(^\text{15}\) Authority (CMAA) has served as the country’s National Mine Action Authority\(^\text{16}\) with the CMAA Secretariat General functioning as the Mine Action Centre. CMAA responsibilities include the development of strategic medium and long-term visions, and strategic five year plans. Accordingly, it prepared a National Mine Action Strategy in 2003 (with an update issued in 2004) plus a number of Five Year Strategic Plans, with the most recent covering 2005-09.

It is widely recognised that both the Strategy and Five Year Strategic Plans remain inadequate to some degree. Most fundamentally, these documents: (i) are not based on a complete, accurate, and up-to-date inventory of explosives contamination and (ii) focus principally on landmines, rather than other ERW or assistance to survivors.\(^\text{17}\)

Most demining and mine risk education (MRE) services are provided by a number of ‘operators’, the main ones being:

- ‘humanitarian’\(^\text{18}\) operators, of which the three largest are:
  - CMAC (a statutory body)
  - HALO Trust
  - Mines Advisory Group – MAG
- the Royal Cambodian Armed Forces (RCAF), and
- a number of national and international firms.

In the most mine-contaminated provinces, Provincial Mine Action Committees (PMAC), supported by Mine Action Planning Units (MAPU), have the responsibility to identify demining

---

\(^{12}\) Explosives contamination comprises landmines and other explosive remnants of war (ERW). ERW includes both unexploded ordnance (UXO) and abandoned ordnance (AXO).

\(^{13}\) In Cambodia, this is often termed the Level One Survey (L1S).

\(^{14}\) The focus of an LIS is the socio-economic impact of explosives contamination on communities rather than the accurate determination of the presence and boundaries of contaminated areas.

\(^{15}\) CMAA has delegated its coordination responsibilities with respect to victim assistance to the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs, Veterans, and Youth (MoSVY) and the Disability Action Council (DAC).

\(^{16}\) Technically, the CMAA is an inter-ministerial committee with the Prime Minister as its president. The staff of the CMAA form the Secretariat General, headed by the Secretary-General who is also a member of the inter-ministerial committee.

\(^{17}\) A separate National Strategy on ERW was prepared in 2006, but has not yet been formally adopted.

\(^{18}\) In this context, ‘humanitarian’ implies non-military and non-commercial.
task priorities based on community preferences and to prepare provincial clearance plans each year to guide the work of the humanitarian demining operators. The operators also work on tasks that are not on the provincial clearance plans, but variances between planned and actual clearance have been declining over time.

Cambodia has a good system for tracking new landmine and UXO accidents, which is given significant weight in identifying mine action priorities. A number of national and international NGOs provide services (medical; physical rehabilitation; psycho-social rehabilitation; vocational training) to people with disabilities, including landmine/ERW survivors. However, the lead government agencies for disability issues (Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans, and Youth – MoSVY – and the Disability Action Council – DAC) have lacked the capacity to provide policy leadership and effective coordination.

**STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK**

**INTERNATIONAL TREATY OBLIGATIONS**

Cambodia acceded to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) on 1 January 2000 and, thus, assumed a number of international treaty obligations. Key among these are the Article 5 obligation to “destroy…all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction” within 10 years (for Cambodia, by the end of 2009). Along with all other States Parties, Cambodia also has an obligation to provide assistance to victims of anti-personnel landmines.

The Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) has also been active in the Oslo Process, which will culminate later this year in a new international treaty (Convention on Cluster Munitions – CCM). The text for the CCM includes an obligation to clear and destroy all cluster munition remnants within 10 years of the entry into force of the Convention (Article 4), with the possibility of an extension of up to five years. The CCM also incorporates obligations to collect reliable relevant data with respect to cluster munition victims and to “…adequately provide age- and gender-sensitive assistance, including medical care, rehabilitation and psychological support, as well as provide for their social and economic inclusion” to victims. (Article 6)

Cambodia has also adhered to the Paris Declaration. While this does not have international treaty status, it signifies the country’s commitment to enhance aid effectiveness. Cambodia has developed a Harmonisation-Alignment-Results (H-A-R) action plan that has implications for any new mine action strategy. These are discussed later in this chapter.

**KEY GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS**

There are three key documents issued by the RGC that, together with international treaties, provide the strategic framework for mine action in Cambodia.

- The Rectangular Strategy is the political platform of the current government, announced by the Prime Minister in the first Cabinet Meeting following the formation of the coalition government in July 2004. It covers Cambodia’s international and regional integration, political development, and security as well as economic and social development. It accords a

---

19 The Cambodia Mine/UXO Victim Information System (CMVIS), managed by the Cambodian Red Cross (CRC) with support from Handicap International-Belgium (HI-B).
high priority to enhancing the agricultural sector, and mine clearance features as an important element for this goal.\(^\text{21}\)

- The Cambodian Millennium Development Goals (CMDGs), issued in 2003. As with other countries, Cambodia set targets to be achieved for 2015 in the areas of poverty reduction, social development (education, health, gender equity), environment, and development partnerships. Cambodia, however, also set targets for ‘de-mining, UXO and Victim Assistance’.

- The National Strategic Development Plan: 2006-2010 (NSDP). This is “a single, overarching document containing RGC's priority goals and strategies to reduce poverty rapidly, and to achieve other CMDGs and socio-economic development goals for the benefit of all Cambodians.” (p. vii) This re-iterates the medium-term CMDG targets for mine action.

### Table 1 – Mine action targets in Cambodia’s MDGs and NSDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Benchmarks</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall target 24: Moving towards zero impact from landmines and UXOs by 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 9.1 Annual number of civilian casualties recorded</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 9.2 Clear completely all high/medium/low suspected contaminated areas</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1995(^\text{22})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall target 25 To eliminate the negative humanitarian and socio-economic impacts of landmines/UXOs by 2025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 9.3 A comprehensive victim assistance framework developed and implemented</td>
<td>To be developed</td>
<td>Implementing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 9.4 Numbers of landmine/UXO victims receiving an assistance package and integrated into the society</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Progress toward targets

Cambodia’s progress toward its strategic targets for mine action has been uneven. As of 2005, clearance was almost on target (50.3% of the baseline suspected areas compared to the target of 51%).

Progress on reducing victims was lagging in 2005 (797 new victims compared to the target of 500), but the numbers of new victims started falling rapidly the following year and the target of fewer than 200 victims in 2010 could be achieved.

After years of little concrete progress in formulating a comprehensive victim assistance framework, the recent finalisation of the National Disability/Victim Assistance Action Plan represents a real breakthrough. As is appropriate, the focus of the action plan is assistance to people with disabilities – including landmine victims – rather than one focused purely on landmine victims. The total numbers of landmine/UXO survivors requiring and receiving assistance remain unknown, although Cambodia does have a number of capable disability NGOs.

\(^{21}\) See also, Implementing the Rectangular Strategy and Development Assistance Needs, November 2004, prepared for the 7th Consultative Group Meeting.

\(^{22}\) The baseline figure of the contaminated area that would require clearance was 576 km\(^2\) – this seems to have been set as the baseline for Cambodia’s MDGs, but it is unclear what the basis for this figure was.

\(^{23}\) The NSDP shows 100% clearance of mined areas by 2015 rather than 2012.
More fundamentally, there remain inconsistencies in the clearance targets set by (i) the APMBC and (ii) key government documents, as shown below:

**Table 2 – Target date for clearance/release of all mined areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Target date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (Article 5)</td>
<td>end 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APMBC with maximum Article extension</td>
<td>end 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia MDGs (all severe, high, medium, low)</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular Strategy (all severe and high)</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular Strategy (all contamination)</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Strategic Development Plan</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The submission of the Article 5 extension request provides an opportunity to set clear milestones for the clearance of all known mined areas.

**CAMBODIA’S AID EFFECTIVENESS AGENDA**

The financing of mine action in Cambodia remains dependent on international donors. Therefore, a new national strategy for mine action should also comply with the efforts of the RGC and its principal development partners to enhance aid effectiveness. The Government and its development partners have established a set of mechanisms to enhance aid effectiveness (see Figure 1, next page). At the summit is the Cambodia Development Cooperation Forum (CDCF) – a high-level meeting that occurs periodically (in theory, annually, but the Forum for 2008 will be delayed until after the new government is formed). A Government-Donor Coordination Committee (GDCC) meets more regularly in Phnom Penh, in part to review the work of 19 Technical Working Groups (TWG), each of which brings government and donor officials together to discuss a sector, cross-cutting issue, or development theme.

Each TWG has a mandate that includes:

- to develop a programme in support of the NSDP,
- to link with other TWGs on mutual/cross-cutting issues,

This implies that the mine action community is expected to develop a work programme following a programme-based approach (PBA), that (i) is aligned with the goals and priorities of the NSDP, (ii) is based on discussions with some of the other TWGs concerning mutual or cross-cutting concerns, and (iii) promotes aid effectiveness.

---

24 The RGC focal point for these mechanisms is the Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board (CRDB) at the Council for the Development of Cambodia (CDC).
25 The TWG for Mine Action is chaired by H.E. Prak Sokhonn, and UNDP serves as the ‘lead facilitator’.
26 The Harmonisation–Alignment-Results (H-A-R) action plan is a key aid effectiveness document for Cambodia.
27 This is a generic term embracing Sector Wide Approach (SWAp), Sector Wide Management (SWiM) arrangements, etc.
Figure 1 – Mechanisms for Enhancing Aid Effectiveness in Cambodia

TOWARD A NEW MINE ACTION STRATEGY FOR CAMBODIA
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TIMELINE FOR COMPLETING A STRATEGY

One of the reasons for preparing a new national mine action strategy at this time is because the RGC must request an extension to its APMBC deadline for clearing all known mined areas. The date for submission of the extension request is March 2009. A complicating factor could be the 2008 elections, which mean that government decisions on key mine action policy issues may be difficult to obtain until a new government is sworn-in.

ARTICLE 5 EXTENSION REQUEST

Cambodia became a State Party to the APMBC on 1 January 2000. Accordingly, its deadline for clearing anti-personnel landmines from all known mined areas is 31 December 2009. Cambodia will not be able to meet the deadline and will need to request an extension for as long as 10 years. The APMBC Secretariat has requested that the RGC to adhere to the following schedule for the preparation of its extension request:28

- November 2008 – presentation of the ‘work in progress’ on the extension request, for discussion at the 9th Meeting of States Parties to the APMBC
- end of March 2009 – formal submission of the extension request
- December 2009 – formal consideration of the extension request at the Second Five-Year Review Conference of the APMBC

This schedule implies that work must get underway as quickly as possible on the preparation of an accurate and up-to-date inventory of the contamination remaining, which will provide the basis for the demining strategy and implementation plan for the extension period. In turn, the demining strategy will form the core of a broader national mine action strategy.

NATIONAL ELECTIONS

National elections took place on 27 July 2008. Election results should then be announced within a month, from which point the Election Law states the leader of the elected party has three months to form a new government.

---

28 The APMBC Secretariat has also provided an outline for an extension request, included as Appendix 5.
2. FINDINGS

QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN AND DISTRIBUTION

The questionnaire design was based on issues identified via (i) consultations with mine action stakeholders during June 2007 and February 2008, and (ii) a review of documents (Cambodia’s mine action programme; national development strategy; Cambodia’s aid effectiveness agenda). Accordingly, the questionnaire focussed on the following:

1. Gaps in:
   a. data concerning:
      i. contamination and clearance
      ii. accidents, victims & survivor assistance
      iii. financial resources available to mine action
   b. capacities
   c. strategic management functions
   d. linkages with other organisations

2. Other issues that a mine action strategy should or might address:
   a. landmines, other ERW, and victim assistance
   b. relative priorities for demining (treaty obligations; risk/accident reduction; other socio-economic benefits)
   c. policy guidance to other government bodies
   d. policy guidance to development partners
   e. ‘end point’ and ‘graduation points’
   f. future roles of
      i. CMAC
      ii. RCAF
      iii. police

The questionnaire was prepared in English and then translated into Khmer. It was widely distributed to stakeholders classified into the following categories:

- demining operators
- government agencies
- community development NGOs working in mine-affected communities
- mine action donors
- organisations working on disability programmes, including landmine survivor assistance
- other mine action stakeholders – organisations like NPA, AVI, and HI-B, which play other roles within the mine action programme in Cambodia

A total of 15 completed questionnaires were submitted. None were obtained from government departments (interviews were held with many of these, and the main findings are discussed below). Unfortunately, only one completed questionnaire was received from a donor agency. Because of this, the breakdowns by category are not presented here.\textsuperscript{29} One interesting observation

\textsuperscript{29} To protect confidentiality, we assured stakeholders that responses from individual organisations would
is that, on average, demining operators and ‘other mine action stakeholders’ (most of which are extremely knowledgeable about Cambodia’s mine action programme) gave somewhat lower scores (where 1=unimportant and 5=very important) than the overall average. This would indicate that, on average, these organisations believe a slightly less ambitious strategy is warranted in terms of the numbers of gaps or issues addressed.

**ANALYSIS**

The analysis is presented in the same sequence as the questionnaire. (Note that, in all graphs, the scale is from 2 through 5. This is because the lowest average score for a question was 2.57.)

**Gaps**

**In data**

The scores from respondents indicate great concern over data gaps on the extent of contamination, demining achievements, and the socio-economic benefits accruing from demining. Interestingly, there is somewhat less concern regarding the overall demining achievements than those of commercial firms and, especially, RCAF. This suggests that respondents believe the ‘humanitarian’ operators have the data on their own work (although this has not yet been compiled into a single database), but little or no information is obtained by CMAA on the achievements of commercial operators and RCAF.

![Figure 2 – Average scores for data gaps on contamination & demining](image)

Respondents have fewer concerns over data gaps on the numbers and locations of accidents and survivors. Follow-up interviews made it clear that stakeholders believe these data are important, but the CMVIS system is providing most of what is required. There is greater concern about the lack of data on the achievements in survivor assistance.

---

30 As there were more respondents from certain categories of organisations than others (e.g. more ‘other’ than ‘demining’), calculating simple averages would give extra weight to those categories with many respondents. Therefore, we gave equal weight to each category, rather than each organisation. For each question, we first calculated average scores for each stakeholder category (demining operator; survivor assistance; etc.), then averaged the category scores to obtain the overall average. This did not have a large impact on the overall scores, but probably reflects the balance of opinion more accurately.

31 The combination of these scores appear very reasonable to people knowledgeable about mine action in Cambodia, and suggest that respondents read the questions carefully and provided considered responses.
Respondents have only moderate concern about the lack of complete data on current funding for mine action, but significant concern that the future funding intentions of donors and the RGC are not available in many cases.

**Capacity gaps**
Respondents have significant concerns whether CMAA and MoSVY have the capacities to discharge their existing mandates – an important consideration for any future strategy that may increase the responsibilities of these agencies.

Scores were mixed concerning the capacities of PMACs and MAPUs. Follow-up interviews indicated that some respondents believe PMAC/MAPU capacity to be vital, but think these bodies already have reasonable capacity, so gave a low score to this question. Most others also see the PMACs & MAPUs as vital, but believe there are important capacity gaps now, or are concerned about the sustainability of these bodies without continued support. Thus, they gave a high score.\(^\text{32}\)

\(^{32}\) We had the opportunity for a group meeting with MAPU members from a number of provinces, who also provided many reasonable and concrete suggestions for future support.
Gaps in strategic management functions
Respondents are in strong agreement with the need to have a regular forum for policy dialogue on mine action, and for enhancing donor coordination. Presumably, the TWG for Mine Action could address this perceived gap, which would imply strengthening its secretariat.

There is moderately strong support that the new strategy should consider formal mechanisms for allocating demining support to national and provincial development projects.

Weak links with other organisations
There is a very strong consensus that better links between the mine action sector and the Ministry of Land Management (MLMUPC) are required to secure land rights on cleared land for deserving households. The need for stronger links with the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) is also widely recognised.

Scoring was more varied with respect to the other organisations listed (development banks; Ministry of Public Works & Transport; MoSVY; provincial governments). This would be expected given most respondents are involved in some but not all aspects of mine action and may not be familiar with the actual or potential connections with government departments, etc.
Strategic issues

The questionnaire included six questions on what we have termed strategic issues. These are presented in the table below, ranked by the average score.

Stakeholders see all the issues as important. Two of the top three relate to what is often termed an exit strategy:

- RGC’s future plans for CMAC, RCAF and the police vis-à-vis mine action
- statements on ‘end point’ and ‘graduation points’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Should the new strategy contain clear statements on the RGC’s plans concerning the respective roles of CMAC, the Royal Cambodian Armed Forces, and the police?</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Should the new strategy clarify the relative priorities of demining in support of (i) treaty obligations, (ii) risk/accident reduction, and (iii) other socio-economic benefits?</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Should the new strategy contain clear statements on the ‘end point’ and ‘graduation points’?</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Should the new strategy provide policy guidance to government departments and provincial government?</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Should the new strategy provide policy guidance to donors and development banks?</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Should the new strategy embrace landmines, other ERW and survivor assistance?</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most respondents indicate strong support for clarification of relative priorities (treaty obligations; risk/accident reduction; other socio-economic benefits) within a new strategy.

There is significant but not universal support for a strategy containing policy guidance to (i) government departments and provincial governments and (ii) donors and development banks. Follow-up interviews suggested that some respondents are unclear what types of issues might be covered by such guidance, and their scores may have been higher if concrete examples had been...
There is significant variation in scores on whether a new strategy should embrace landmines, other ERW, and survivor assistance. Follow-up interviews suggest that most of the concern is over the inclusion of survivor assistance because (i) it is hard to justify programmes targeted specifically to landmine survivors, excluding others with comparable disabilities and (ii) CMAA has delegated the responsibility for this to the MoSVY and the Disability Action Council.

CONSULTATIONS

WITH MINE ACTION AND DISABILITY ASSISTANCE ORGANISATIONS

Land
Land rights for poor households is seen as a critical issue for Cambodia generally. Mine action is specifically concerned that cleared land goes to the intended beneficiaries identified via the MAPU process, community development consultations, etc. This issue was highlighted in the November 2007 National Mine Action Conference.

In 2007, Austcare had done some groundwork toward a project addressing this issue. In early 2008, the Council of Ministers issued an Executive Order (No. 180, 7 February 2008) to designed to harmonise sub-decrees 70 (Socio-economic Management of Mine Clearance Operations) and 19 (Social Land Concessions). Since then, CMAA has drafted a project proposal to design and pilot a harmonised approach to ensure cleared land is allocated to deserving households via the Social Land Concessions process.

MAPU/PMAC

Clarification of provincial government responsibilities
Some mine action organisations emphasised that any further support to provincial government capacities should reflect the need to clarify PMAC responsibilities to ensure that demining operations were not impeded by lengthy procedures (e.g. to clear land following an accident when the task is not in the current provincial mine clearance plan). More generally, work is required to clarify what levels of governments and which ministries/departments/commissions etc. have authority vis-à-vis clearance for different purposes and in different provinces or designated areas (e.g. border ‘white zones’, forest protected areas, special military zones, etc.).

Multi-year planning/priority-setting
Some mine action practitioners we interviewed believe that MAPUs should prepare multi-year plans/priority lists with commune leaders and district officials, and only update priorities if significant changes occur in a commune. This would facilitate operations planning and, after the first year, reduce the workload of the MAPUs. (Note: this would be consistent with recommendations from government officials concerning provincial and commune development plans, which are mentioned below).

The Thai-Cambodia Border
Border disputes between the two countries mean some areas close to the border are treated as a ‘white zone’ and agreement from the Border Commission is required before clearance operations can go forward. Even so, some demining tasks in Cambodia have been disrupted by the Thai military.
The recent dispute over the classification of the Preah Vihear temple as a UNESCO Heritage Site has obvious implications for the mine action programmes in both countries, and recent press reports indicate that foreign ministers of the two countries have agreed on ‘…the demining of the disputed area, its vicinity and that adjacent to Preah Vihear temple.’

As parts of the K-5 mine belt are inside the special zone adjoining the border, some broader solution is required to ensure demining operations can go forward efficiently. Ideally, an agreement on demining operations close to the border should be sought with Thai authorities.

**Roads & other infrastructure**

The RGC has invested significant amounts in demining services in support of road reconstruction, but recent accidents on a road being reconstructed, together with other incidents on donor-financed projects, indicate a review of the demining, contracting, QA, and construction worker safety processes is warranted. This has added importance because the pace of reconstruction and infrastructure development (e.g. dams and hydroelectric plants, plus the associated power distribution plant) is accelerating. This would be a good example where the mine action programme could provide needed policy guidance to government departments and development partners.

**CMAA capacity**

It is widely recognised that the CMAA has never received adequate funding from the RGC and donors to allow it to fully discharge its current mandate. Existing UNDP and NPA projects support capacity development for the CMAA General Secretariat, and additional assistance is under discussion. At the same time, the implementation of a fully adequate mine action strategy almost certainly would imply an expanded role for the CMAA (e.g. in supporting PMAC/MAPU; in advisory/outreach services to government units whose work programmes are affected by explosives contamination; enhanced secretariat services to the TWG on Mine Action; etc.). Thus, a realistic balance must be struck between the ambition of the new strategy and the capacities of the CMAA.

**Unclear responsibilities among senior mine action officials**

A number of mine action organisations stated they are unclear about the relative responsibilities of the following positions: (i) Secretary-General of the CMAA, (ii) Cambodia’s Ambassador for Mine Action, and (iii) the Chair of the TWG for Mine Action.

**CBMRR Network**

A number of those interviewed expressed the view that the Community-Based Mine Risk Reduction (CBMRR) network is a great asset for CMAC (which administers CBMRR), but other mine action organisations do not fully capitalise on this network. However, managed, the CBMRR should be viewed as a national asset.

---


35 Reportedly, over $27 million since 2000, including $11+ million in 2007. Some of these funds are development bank or bilateral loans (and, therefore, have to be repaid by the Government).

36 In addition, some CMAA staff are called upon to work on projects, which limits the time available for their regular duties.

37 This point was raised at the February 2008 meeting of the TWG for mine action by the representative of the Mine Action Forum.

---
Victim Assistance
With assistance from AusAID and other donors, the MoSVY, DAC, UNICEF, and many NGOs/civil society organisations have been working for an extended period on a national Action Plan for assistance to people with disabilities (including landmine/ERW survivors). The National Disability/Victim Assistance Action Plan will be presented to the LVASC on 6 August 2008.

MRE
The MRE Working Group is commissioning an evaluation of all MRE services in Cambodia, and the results of this should feed into any new mine action strategy.

CONSULTATIONS WITH GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

In addition to a group meeting with staff from a number of MAPU, consultations were held with officials from the ministries of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries; Defence; Environment; Interior; Land Management; and Planning, as well as with the CRDB/CDC. Most expressed full support for the idea of a new national mine action strategy (none were opposed). Their suggestions can be broken down into (i) national level and (ii) provincial/commune levels.

National level

Most ministries suggested that CMAA should update the lists of contamination and clearance, together with maps, and distribute these to the planning units in the relevant ministries (i.e. any ministry whose work programmes may be affected by explosives contamination).

The same ministries strongly recommended that the TWG for Mine Action should be the key linking mechanism for strategic planning and other policy issues. In effect, the TWG for Mine Action should link with other TWGs as envisaged in the RGC aid effectiveness agenda.

Textbox 1 – TWGs with important common/cross-cutting issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High priority for links</th>
<th>Other TWGs for possible links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Water</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralisation &amp; Deconcentration</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure &amp; Regional Integration</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A third point emphasised by the representatives of other ministries is that CMAA should inform itself regarding key planning documents and cycles/timetables so it is in a position to provide technical support to ministries whose work programmes may be affected by explosives contamination.

These representatives also suggested working with the Ministry of Planning on the preparation of clear instructions to the planning units in other ministries regarding how to manage explosives

38 For the most part, the Ministry of Defence did not re-iterate the suggestions from the other ministries as it is represented at a senior level within the CMAA, and so has access to information and advice.
contamination problems.

Provincial/Local level

National ministries all have line departments at the provincial level. Most representatives we consulted were clear that they wanted the mine action programme, and specifically the PMAC/MAPU to coordinate with the established provincial planning mechanisms, and not operate in a stand-alone fashion.

In a closely related point, national ministry representatives recommended the PMAC/MAPU should be better integrated with other provincial committees (e.g. land use; social land concessions; protected areas). They saw the PMAC/MAPU as a temporary mechanism, and the MAPU should be more involved in the commune planning process, and the commune governments will eventually have to deal with explosives contamination issues within their commune development plans and investment programmes.39

This implies that commune clearance priorities should be put into the Three-Year Commune Investment Plans (CIP), and ‘rolled’ forward – rather than done anew – each year (i.e. adjust existing priorities where necessary, and add the new priorities for 3rd year of the new CIP). This would accord both with (i) recommendations by some mine action stakeholders that MAPU should prepare multi-year priority lists and (ii) the need for a new strategy to incorporate an end point, after which time residual contamination problems would be dealt with by established government mechanisms.

39 Communes are to produce a Five Year Development Plan plus a rolling Three Year Commune Investment Plan (CIP).
3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

MAIN CONCLUSIONS

The need for a new national mine action strategy is widely recognised. The requirement that Cambodia submit an Article 5 extension request reinforces this recognition, as the outline for such requests clearly suggests that applications should be based on a clear and feasible national strategy incorporation things such as “humanitarian, economic, social and environmental implications” and “nature and extent of the remaining Article 5 challenge: qualitative aspects” (see Appendix 5).

There is strong support both among mine action stakeholders and government ministries/agencies. There is a clear consensus among government ministries that the mine action programme should begin ‘mainstreaming’ itself (i.e. using government systems established at the national, provincial, and commune levels for planning, priority-setting, etc., rather than ‘stand-alone’ mechanisms for mine action). Moves in this direction should be reflected in the strategy, although such an effort will have to be phased-in over time.

The Article 5 extension request process establishes a basic timetable for the exercise, as follows:
- November 2008 – presentation of the ‘work in progress’ on the extension request, for discussion at the 9th Meeting of States Parties to the APMBC
- end of March 2009 – formal submission of the extension request
- December 2009 – formal consideration of the extension request at the Second Five-Year Review Conference of the APMBC.

Cambodia can meet this timeline. Work is already underway on key components of a new strategy, namely:
- compilation of all contamination and clearance records into a single database, and the production of contamination and clearance maps
- survivor assistance (as part of broader efforts to formulate the national action plan for people with disabilities)
- MRE – an evaluation of all MRE services in Cambodia

Cambodia has a good strategic framework for the formulation of a national mine action strategy, with the landmine/ERW problem featuring in Cambodia’s MDGs, the Government’s Rectangular Strategy, and the National Strategic Development Plan. In addition, there exist well-conceived guidelines from the RGC regarding the formulation of a national mine action strategy, namely:
- alignment with the goals and priorities of the National Strategic Development Plan
- adoption of a programme-based approach, namely
  - based on a common assessment of needs, leading to…
  - a single strategy, endorsed by all stakeholders, to address those needs, with…
  - a common monitoring and evaluation framework
- linkages with other TWGs on mutual/cross-cutting issues,
- promotion of aid effectiveness as outlined in the H-A-R Action Plan

The consensus is that a new strategy should embrace landmines, other ERW, and MRE. It should
also touch on survivor assistance (e.g. meeting the reporting requirements; implications of the pending Convention on Cluster Munitions), while recognising this should be seen as part of a national action plan for people with disabilities.

The consensus is that the new strategy should cover the entire period of the Article 5 extension request. Thus, it should address ‘end point’ issues and (perhaps) graduation points so donors and international partners can plan their exit strategies in line with the national mine action strategy. Thus, the new strategy should reflect the RGC vision for the future roles of CMAC, RCAF, and the Police.

The initiative by the Secretary-General to establish a working group to compile and map all contamination and clearance records addresses the single biggest gap that impeded the formulation of an adequate national mine action strategy in the past. As well, Cambodia benefits from having one of the best systems for recording landmine/ERW accidents and victims. As in most countries, documenting the need and potential benefits in socio-economic terms represents more of a challenge. However, a good deal of relevant information is available from mine action organisations and others, and a reasonable assessment could be prepared.

A key strategic issue will be attaining the right balance between the scope of a new strategy, and the capacities of key organisations – particularly the CMAA – to discharge additional responsibilities. The responses to the questionnaire indicate a consensus that the new strategy should incorporate measures to rectify the following gaps (at least):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data gaps</th>
<th>Score (max=5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True extent of contamination (note: now being addressed)</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements by military demining</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements by commercial demining firms</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic benefits from demining</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievements in survivor assistance (note: responsibility of the disability assistance programme)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data on future funding intentions of government &amp; donors</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity gaps</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The capacity of the MoSVY &amp; the DAC and the to coordinate survivor assistance activities</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The capacity of CMAA to discharge its responsibilities</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The capacity of the MAPU &amp;/or PMAC to discharge their functions</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaps in strategic management functions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The absence of a regular policy dialogue forum for mine action stakeholders</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The weakness of mechanisms to advise donors &amp; development organisations regarding the mine action plans and priorities of other donors</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaps in linkages with other organisations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak links with the MLMUPC</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak links with the MAFF</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, consultations have highlighted that (i) border disputes hamper clearance operations in some heavily mined areas, and (ii) a number of landmine/ERW incidents have disrupted road reconstruction projects. Therefore, links with the following bodies need to be addressed:

- National Authority on Border Affairs (NACBA)

---

This would include the community development NGOs that work in partnership with demining operators.
The new strategy should also seek to provide clarification on at least the following strategic issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (max=5)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGC plans concerning the respective roles envisaged for CMAC, the Royal Cambodian Armed Forces, and the police</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relative priorities of demining in support of (i) treaty obligations, (ii) risk/accident reduction, and (iii) other socio-economic benefits</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear statements on the ‘end points’ and ‘graduation points’</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy guidance on mine action issues to government departments and provincial governments</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy guidance on mine action issues to donors and development banks</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is an ambitious programme, and will have to be phased-in over some years. Therefore, the new strategy should incorporate capacity development requirements of CMAA and other bodies in an explicit fashion.

In the past year, with very few exceptions, the international donors to mine action in Cambodia have been relatively passive. Greater engagement by donors is necessary to ensure the understand and support Cambodia’s effort to formulate a single strategy that will provide strategic guidance to all donor mine action programming. The TWG for Mine Action should be the critical mechanism for engagement by donors, but the focus of TWG meetings needs to shift to policy dialogue rather than activity reporting.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The separate initiatives of the Chair of the TWG for Mine Action (to commission this study) and the Secretary-General of the CMAA (to establish a working group for the Article 5 extension request) should be merged, with the CMAA taking this work forward to develop a new National Strategy for Mine Action (NSMA) and an Article 5 extension request.

2. The effort to formulate a new national mine action strategy should be launched at the meeting of the Article 5 Extension Working Group (18 August 2008) or shortly thereafter.

3. While the established mine action technical reference groups (TRG) groups (see recommendation 7 below) will be able to prepare many components to be contained in a new strategy, the essence of such a document is internal consistency and overall realism. The different components must make a coherent package and difficult choices will need to be made in terms of resource allocations and priorities. A Mine Action Strategy Task Force should be appointed to:
   a. agree the scope of the new strategy (i.e. range of issues to be addressed, divided perhaps between ‘must have’ and ‘nice to have’)
   b. agree a draft outline for the final document
   c. advise TRG on the minimum set of issues each should consider, and the nature of the outputs required from them
   d. identify technical assistance requirements to support the exercise (e.g. to document government planning systems/cycles/timetables; to compile socio-economic evidence on the negative impact of explosives contamination and the benefits of mine action)
   e. identify issues that need inputs or decisions from senior government officials, other
ministries and Technical Working Groups, etc. and, most importantly,
f. obtain the required input/decisions or, should it be premature to obtain a decision, set a target date and action plan for obtaining the decision

4. The UNDP – as ‘lead facilitator’ for the TWG for Mine Action and an important partner of the CMAA – should be on the Task Force, with particular responsibility for negotiating and coordinating any technical assistance and other resources required. New contributions to the strategic planning effort from donors and specialist agencies (e.g. the GICHD) should be channelled through/coordinated with the UNDP.

5. The endorsement by the principal donors of the strategic planning process and, eventually, the new national mine action strategy is critical. The CMAA & UNDP should present the initiative at the next meeting of the TWG for Mine Action, and provide regular updates on progress. One or more short workshops with donors should be considered to highlight and discuss key policy issues.

6. The established mine action TRG (on demining; MRE; victim assistance; database management; socio-economics; gender; etc.) should be utilised to review issues (including those raised in this report) relevant to their mandates, and prepare initial inputs to the strategy by 1 October 2008.

7. A full-time facilitator should be engaged to (i) serve as secretary to the Task Force and (ii) facilitate the efforts of the TRG.

8. The CMAA needs to ensure the process of formulating, approving and, subsequently, implementing the new mine action strategy adheres to the policies, procedures, and schedules set-out for national planning (by the Ministry of Planning) and aid effectiveness (by the CRDB/CDC).

9. The recommended schedule for achieving critical milestones in (i) the national process to develop the mine action strategy and (ii) the Article 5 extension request, is given on the following page.

---

*It is necessary to recognise that the CMAA must play a central role in the development of a new national strategy for mine action, and its capacities will need to be supplemented during this process.*
Figure 7 – Developing & implementing the National Mine Action Strategic Plan
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Internal mine operators and active player discussion

Workshop to inform of goals, constraints etc and provide guidance to operators and active players

Consutlation with MAPU, operators and active players

Mine operators and active player proposal for activities and project

CMAA department director proposals for activities

Note: Key CMAA tasks shown in BLUE

Annual Planning & Implementation

Progress on performance indicators/results

PIP on Mine Action 1 & 3 year programme & budget (rolling plan)

Dept. of SEPD & MAPU guide implementation

Dept. of SEPD & MAPU monitor overall progress

Operators and active players implement and report achievements

Donors

Technical Guideline of NSDP (2006-2010) & MoP Instructions
10. The recommended schedule for achieving critical milestones in (i) the national process to develop the mine action strategy and (ii) the Article 5 extension request, is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>National process</th>
<th>Article 5 Extension Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2008</td>
<td>CMAA develops draft goals and priorities for period 2010-end 2019</td>
<td>Presentation of the ‘work in progress’ on the extension request, for discussion at the 9th Meeting of States Parties to the APMBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President of CMAA confirms goals and priorities for 2010-end 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2009</td>
<td>Proposals for activities and projects from President and Secretary General of CMAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMAA finalises draft National Strategy for Mine Action (NSMA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Mar 2009</td>
<td>Approval of NSMA by President of CMAA</td>
<td>Formal submission of the extension request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2009</td>
<td>Approval of NSMA by RGC</td>
<td>Formal consideration of the extension request at the Second Five-Year Review Conference of the APMBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual cycle</td>
<td>National Planning &amp; Budgeting Cycle</td>
<td>APMBC Annual Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dates set by MoP &amp; by States Parties respectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PIP on Mine Action 1 &amp; 3 year programme &amp; budget (rolling plan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting Progress on performance indicators/results</td>
<td>Reporting Progress on performance indicators/results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOCUMENTS CONSULTED


_____ *National Mine Action Strategy*, 2004


_____ *Action Plan on Harmonization, Alignment, and Results: 2006-2010*


_____ *Strategic Framework for Development Cooperation Management*, January 2006

_____ *The Rectangular Strategy for Growth, Employment, Equity and Efficiency in Cambodia*, (address by Samdech Hun Sen, Prime Minister), July 2004

_____ *Cambodia Millennium Development Goals* (excerpt from the Human Development Report), 2003

**Laws, decrees, and executive decisions**

Royal Decree No. 177, [establishing CMAA], 6 September 2000


Sub-decree No. 76, [organisation and functioning of CMAA], 8 August 2001

Sub-decree No. 19, [Social Land Concessions], 19 March 2003

Sub-decree No. 70, [socio-economic management of mine clearance operations], 20 October 2004

Executive Decision No. 72 SSR [On the composition of the Technical Working Group of Royal Government-Donors on Mine Action]42

---

42 Decision No. 21 SSR amended the composition, but the author of this report has not obtained this as yet.
## ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMAC</td>
<td>Agricultural Development in Mine-Affected Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APMBG</td>
<td>Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (the Ottawa Treaty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBMRR</td>
<td>Community Based Mine Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Council for the Development of Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDCF</td>
<td>Cambodia Development Cooperation Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAA</td>
<td>Cambodian Mine Action and Victims Assistance Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAC</td>
<td>Cambodian Mine Action Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMVIS</td>
<td>Cambodia Mine Victims Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRDB</td>
<td>Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D &amp; D</td>
<td>Deconcentration and Decentralisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Disability Action Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOSORN</td>
<td>Economic and Social Relaunch of the Northwest (an EC-funded project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GICHD</td>
<td>Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographical Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GICDH</td>
<td>Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALO</td>
<td>Hazardous Area Life-support Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAS</td>
<td>International Mine Action Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMVASC</td>
<td>Landmine Victim Assistance Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUPU</td>
<td>Land Use Planning Unit (now MAPU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>Mines Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPU</td>
<td>Mine Action Planning Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLMUPC</td>
<td>Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning and Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoSVY</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans, and Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRE</td>
<td>Mine Risk Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACBA</td>
<td>National Authority on Border Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPA</td>
<td>Norwegian People’s Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSDP</td>
<td>National Strategic Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSMA</td>
<td>National Strategy for Mine Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBA</td>
<td>Programme-Based Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUC</td>
<td>Provincial Land Use Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLG</td>
<td>Partnership for Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMAC</td>
<td>Provincial Mine Action Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCAF</td>
<td>Royal Cambodian Armed Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGC</td>
<td>Royal Government of Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAp</td>
<td>Sector-Wide Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWiM</td>
<td>Sector-Wide Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRG</td>
<td>Technical Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWG</td>
<td>Technical Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNTAC</td>
<td>United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UXO</td>
<td>Unexploded Ordnance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Victim Assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1 – CONCEPT PAPER

Concept Paper – Moving to a Programme-Based Approach for Mine Action in Cambodia

Summary

Cambodia’s mine action programme made many important contributions to human security and the country’s development. Further improvements in coordination could address remaining overlaps and gaps in (i) meeting the needs of people in mine affected communities and (ii) supporting other priorities outlined in the National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP). This paper recommends the development of a common strategy for Cambodia’s mine action programme, advanced by the Royal Cambodian Government (RCG) and endorsed by donors, multilateral agencies, and operators. Such a strategy would need to be based on a common assessment of needs, and should incorporate a common research, monitoring, and evaluation agenda to promote mutual responsibility and accountability for results. In building on the existing strategies for Mine Action and for ERW, such a strategy would institute a programme-based approach (PBA)\(^43\) for mine action, in line with the aid effectiveness agenda now being pursued by the RCG and its development partners.

Background

Cambodia faces daunting development challenges, many of which are legacies of conflict. In particular, regional and internal conflicts led to:

- a devastating loss of capacity through the collapse of state institutions and the decimation of a generation, leading to...
- a necessary but ultimately unhealthy dependence on foreign assistance to rebuild the country and re-start development, which has been constrained in many areas by...
- extensive contamination by landmines and unexploded ordnance (UXO) that prevents safe access to land and resources, and continues to take a toll on lives and limbs.

Cambodia has made significant progress on many fronts since the Paris Peace Agreement. The mine action programme in particular has developed substantial capacities. After a set-back in 1999, mine action actors have worked-out ways and means for effective delivery of services to the public, for enhancing coordination among themselves, and for aligning mine action

\(^{43}\) Essentially, this is a Sector-Wide Approach (SWAp) except it deals with a thematic or cross-cutting issue (such as mine action) rather than a traditional sector (agriculture, education, etc.).
with broader development priorities, particularly at local levels (village, commune, district). This progress reflects not only the long-standing support of donor countries and UN agencies, but also significant commitments by the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) in terms of policy leadership and the engagement of officials at the highest level at critical junctures. Still, all parties agree that much remains to be done given the extent of the contamination.

Mine action achievements have both mirrored and contributed to Cambodia’s progress more broadly, particularly in creating livelihoods/reducing vulnerability for growing rural populations, and in supporting the decentralisation and deconcentration agenda. In turn, the importance of mine action has been recognised by, for example: (i) adding mine action as a Millennium Development Goal (MDG); (ii) highlighting mine clearance in the Rectangular Strategy; (iii) incorporating mine action within both the National Poverty Reduction Strategy: 2003-05 and the National Strategic Development Plan: 2006-2010 (NSDP); and (iv) the establishment of a Mine Action Technical Working Group (TWG).

The Mine Action TWG is part of a broader mechanism for enhancing aid effectiveness to promote government ownership based on mutual accountability. Each TWG has a mandate that includes:  
- to develop a programme in support of the NSDP (a programme-based approach),  
- to link with other TWGs on mutual/cross-cutting issues,  

In line with the mandate given to the Mine Action TWG, there appears to be a broad consensus within the mine action community that mine action can make further contributions by promoting aid effectiveness, which would lead to the best use of resources available to mine action itself, and to other development programmes that work in mine- and UXO-affected areas; serve as a model for other TWGs (particularly those dealing with thematic and cross-cutting issues); and provide lessons for other national mine action programmes within South-East Asia and globally.

---

44 The main features of this mechanism are described briefly in Appendix 2. In recognition that aid effectiveness ultimately depends on government ownership, all TWG are chaired by a representative of the RCG.
45 For example, this was one of the main points of consensus that emerged at the Regional Practitioners Workshop for Linking Mine Action and Development (LMAD), held in Siem Reap, 12-14 June 2007.
Challenges, Achievements, and Remaining Gaps

While recognizing its considerable achievements, Cambodia’s mine action programme still reflects some of the systemic weaknesses in the world’s aid delivery mechanisms. These weaknesses are particularly pronounced in aid-dependant post-conflict countries due to this core dilemma:

- in the aftermath of a conflict, new governments must struggle to restore basic security and the other core state functions, and lack the capacity to deliver many essential services, particularly to rural areas and remote communities, which leads donors to...
- channel funds directly to NGOs and parallel programme implementation units to allow the delivery of essential services, but which then...
- inhibit national ownership of the development agenda and responsibility for development results by, for example:
  - the exodus of capable civil servants to NGOs, firms, project implementation units, etc.
  - the proliferation of strategies and policies for managing and accounting for aid resources, and
  - the fragmentation of programmes into multiple projects, none of which have the resources or mandate to address the needs of the entire country.

Another common symptom of these systemic weaknesses in aid delivery is the difficulty in formulating coherent ‘whole of government’ approaches to complex development issues. Development actors (government departments, donors, UN agencies, NGOs, etc.) form ‘clusters’ of agencies with common mandates to address concrete needs (disabled people; agricultural development; infrastructure; etc.). Each cluster strives to obtain the donor and government resources needed to meet the needs of their beneficiaries, setting-up a win-lose competition with other clusters (whatever money goes to one cluster is unavailable for others).

This creates particular difficulties for complex issues such as mine action which, to be fully effective, must provide services to support the work of other clusters (e.g. disabled people; agricultural development; road reconstruction; etc.). Competition over resources among ‘clusters’ can inhibit effective coordination to address problems that are common across

---

46 This simply means that, collectively, all government agencies affected by a problem have a coherent approach to addressing that problem, rather than pursuing independent strategies that may conflict. In mine action, for example, agricultural projects have often had a policy to avoid mine-affected communities.  
47 These are inherently political issues which in wealthy countries are addressed largely through the annual budgeting process. In aid-dependant countries, however, there is no one development budget as each donor tends to manage its own aid budget for that country.
clusters.\textsuperscript{48}

The mine action community within Cambodia has overcome many of these systemic problems through experience, research, and professionalism. In particular:

- mine action actors have supported important innovations to allow the identification of clearance priorities at the community level and to build the capacity of provincial administrations to support this process;\textsuperscript{49}
- Cambodia has one of the most effective systems in the world for the recording landmine and UXO accidents,\textsuperscript{50} which allows monitoring of progress in reducing the impact of explosives contamination and provides indicators to guide agencies concerning what parts of the country are in greatest need of additional resources;
- mine action operators and development NGOs are implementing a number of integrated mine action and community development projects, and are supporting provincial Mine Action Planning Units (MAPU) to support the participation of mine-affected communities in the identification of priorities;
- some donors have incorporated funds for mine action within their current agricultural/rural development projects in mine affected areas;\textsuperscript{51}
- Cambodia’s mine action community has supported path-breaking research on such complex issues as informal or ‘village’ demining and the influence on the scrap metal trade on tampering with UXO;
- working with other mine action actors, the Cambodia Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority (CMAA) has adopted national strategies for both landmines and UXO.\textsuperscript{52}

However, some gaps remain that, if addressed, could further enhance the overall performance of Cambodia’s mine action programme.

\textsuperscript{48} The classic case for mine action is victim/survivor assistance, where coordination is required with departments of health, social welfare, education, etc. More generally, as a mine action programme begins to move from humanitarian priorities (saving lives and limbs) to developmental ones (supporting the work of road contractors, community development NGOs, agricultural programmes, etc.), demining agencies must coordinate with many other clusters.

\textsuperscript{49} The Mine Action Planning Units (MAPU) and Provincial Mine Action Committees (PMAC) are central

\textsuperscript{50} The Cambodian Mine Victim Information System (CMVIS), supported mainly by Handicap International and the Cambodia Red Cross Society.

\textsuperscript{51} The EC-funded Economic and Social Relaunch of Northern Provinces (ECOSORN) and the CIDA-funded Agricultural Development in Mine Affected Communities (ADMAC) projects.

\textsuperscript{52} National Mine Action Strategy; National Strategy for ERW (not yet officially adopted).
First, there remain gaps in the information management system. Operators and provincial Mine Action Planning Units generate a tremendous amount of data concerning contamination, clearance (including informal or ‘village’ demining), victims/survivors, and livelihoods. There remain difficulties, however, in compiling this data in a common database so that the most up-to-date information is readily accessible to those who need it. The Landmine Impact Survey (LIS, termed the Level One Survey in Cambodia) would normally provide the basis for this, but the LIS has not consistently been updated with survey and clearance records from operators, victim data, etc. since it was completed in 2002. In addition, there are as yet no systematic means for incorporating relevant data from other sources (e.g. the Seila database; FAO databases; WFP poverty analysis) into mine action planning and priority-setting processes. Such information is required for a common needs assessment, which would be the basis for a common strategy.

Other gaps stem from the absence of clear decisions concerning fundamental strategic issues, such as the relative importance the mine action programme should accord to:

- risk reduction (i.e. reducing the number of new victims) versus development (including the reduction of poverty and vulnerability, sustainable livelihoods of rural households, economic growth, etc.);
- landmines versus UXO;
- the appropriate mix of contracting models (i.e. competitive tenders issued by UNDP’s Demining for Results programme and ECOSORN; grants issued by bilateral donors to the operators; partnership arrangements between development NGOs and operators; etc.);
- local community priorities versus national or provincial priorities.

Gaps also exist in the resource allocation and priority-setting mechanisms, which means there is no integrated system for ensuring that a national mine action strategy would be implemented in a coordinated fashion. For example,

- the MAPU/PMAC system supports the identification of community preferences for clearance. But as local communities do not have a clear idea concerning the total area that will be cleared in their area during the coming year, sometimes the final and most difficult choices for determining the actual priorities for clearance must be made at another level (e.g. PMAC) or by another actor (e.g. an operator). Ideally, commune councils would have the responsibility for setting

---

53 We will use the following definitions:

- **Resource allocation** is the process of dividing a programme’s total resources among components (by, say, provinces, sectors, operators, asset types) without stipulating the precise tasks those resources will be utilised for.
- **Priority-setting** is the process that determines the precise tasks to which a specific set of resources will be assigned.
priorities and their constituents would hold them accountable for their decisions, further bolstering the role of this new level of government;

- CMVIS data provide a clear indicator concerning the districts and communities in greatest need of mine action assistance to reduce casualties. But donors and operators respond to this indicator on an individual basis, which results in gaps and overlaps;\(^{54}\)
- CMVIS data provide an excellent indicator relating to risk reduction, but there is no common set of indicators to guide mine action resource allocations with a view to promoting development. As the number of victims declines, it will become more important that mine action actors have appropriate indicators to align their efforts with Cambodia’s development priorities.

In addition, there remain gaps in the mine action policy framework. Addressing the gaps discussed above would mean that mine action actors would have clearer guidance for their work, individually and collectively (i.e. coordination within the mine action programme). But policies are also needed to enhance linkages between mine action and other development programmes (sectors, themes, and issues). For example:

- ‘whole-of-government’ policies to guide other state agencies (government ministries; provincial governments; statutory bodies; etc.) in how to address explosives contamination that constrains their work programmes;
- aid effectiveness policies to guide development partners (official development cooperation agencies, NGOs, etc.) in how to address explosives contamination that constrains their work programmes.

Thus, the mine action programme should adopt a ‘programme-based approach’\(^{55}\) (PBA) which would build on the existing Mine Action and UXO strategies by addressing gaps in:

- the management of information\(^{56}\)
- strategic decisions

---

\(^{54}\) This also happens with development projects in mine-affected areas. For example, the geographic coverage of ECOSORN and ADMAC overlaps, while mine-affected communities served by some other rural development projects tend to be bypassed.

\(^{55}\) For the interim, we will assume the essential features of a programme-based approach (PBA) are:

- a common understanding of needs, to allow...
- a common strategy with...
- a common research, monitoring and evaluation agenda.

Here ‘common’ refers to the principal mine action actors (CMAA and operators) and stakeholders (RCG, donors, UNDP, development NGOs). As well, we understand that a PBA does not imply a single funding mechanism or the absence of projects.

\(^{56}\) There are existing initiatives involving CMAA, AVI, and NPA to strengthen information management. The move to a programme-based approach does not imply a duplication of these efforts, but needs to be coordinated with them.
the resource allocation and priority-setting system, and
the policy framework.

The move to a PBA would also assist the Government in assuming greater ownership by making it clear that there is one strategy and plan for the mine action programme that frames all mine action projects (whether pure mine action or mine action components within development projects).

The Way Forward

At this juncture, the three essential first steps are to:

1. Clarify what precisely is meant by ‘programme-based approach’ (PBA) within the Cambodian context;
2. Document more fully the gaps that need to be addressed in a PBA for mine action;
3. Develop a roadmap for introducing a PBA for mine action, for submission to the TWG and adoption by the RCG.

These steps can be completed in the short-term by a team of two: a development planning and management consultant with particular expertise on aid effectiveness in Cambodia, supported by, an expert in planning and management of mine action programmes, with sound knowledge about:
- linking mine action and development
- development planning and management/aid effectiveness
- the mine action programme in Cambodia.

The level of effort would be two to three person-weeks each.

Ideally, the first assignment would be undertaken by someone resident in Cambodia (whether national or foreign) who has had some direct engagement in the efforts to enhance aid effectiveness in Cambodia.

Both consultants would need to be conversationally fluent in English, and at least one would need to have the demonstrated ability to draft a complex report in English. At least one should be conversationally fluent in Khmer.

The work of the Consulting Team would be overseen by a Study Management Committee chaired by the CMAA and comprising representatives from (in alphabetic order) Austcare, GICHD, and UNDP, together with a representative designated by the main operators (CMAC, HALO Trust, MAG). The team would deliver a draft report first to the Study Management Committee, which would then ensure dissemination to other stakeholders.

57 Draft Terms of Reference are provided in Appendix 1.
before the report is finalised. The report would then be submitted to the Mine Action TWG, which would determine whether the likely benefits stemming from a programme-based approach outweigh the costs of developing the PBA strategy.
Annex 1 – Terms of Reference for the Consulting Team

Objective

To develop a roadmap for formulating a new national mine action strategy following a programme-based approach, which would:
- lead to more effective use of the resources available to mine action itself, and to other development programmes which work in mine-affected areas;
- serve as a model for other TWGs (particularly those dealing with cross-cutting issues); and
- provide lessons for other national mine action programmes within South-East Asia and globally.

Specific Tasks

General

1. Document the requirements of a ‘programme-based approach’ (PBA – i.e. the GDCC understanding of what constitutes a PBA)\(^\text{58}\)

Common understanding of needs

2. Define requirements for the formulation of the common understanding of needs:
- survey the current status and existing plans for establishing a common understanding of needs, incorporating
  - risk/casualty reduction
  - support to the development programming (micro, meso, macro, and regional\(^\text{59}\)) as outlined in the National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP)
  - support to poverty reduction efforts
  - meeting international obligations
  - surveillance (i.e. monitoring and evaluation to update and enhance the common needs assessment)
- map the key linkages and knowledge gaps vis-à-vis a common understanding of needs (at micro, meso, macro, and regional level)

---

\(^\text{58}\) For the interim, we will assume the requirements of a PBA are:
- a common understanding of needs, to allow...
- a common strategy with...
- a common research, monitoring and evaluation agenda.

\(^\text{59}\) In this context, regional means, at minimum, Cambodia and its immediate neighbours and, more broadly, the ASEAN countries.
Common strategy

3. Assess the mechanisms and processes now in place for:
   - mine action planning at the regional, macro, meso, and micro levels,
   - resource allocation, and
   - setting task priorities

4. Define requirements for the formulation of a common mine action
   strategy based on the common understanding of needs.

5. Assess the status of work by other TWGs in formulating programme-
   based approaches in sectors/issues which support, or may require
   support from, mine action (e.g. agriculture, land reform,
   health/disabilities, infrastructure, defence), and identify the key issues for
   mine action vis-à-vis each sector or issue.

Common research, monitoring, and evaluation framework

6. Identify and assess the principal research, monitoring, and evaluation
   mechanisms in place for mine action.

7. Define the research agenda for addressing the principal knowledge gaps
   identified in task 2, above.

8. Identify possible joint monitoring indicators to allow a common
   assessment of progress and to promote mutual responsibility and
   accountability for results.

Roadmap

9. Formulate a draft roadmap for instituting a programme-based approach
   for mine action in Cambodia, for submission to the Study Management
   Committee and other stakeholder umbrella bodies.

10. Based on comments, prepare and submit a final roadmap for instituting a
    programme-based approach for mine action in Cambodia, for submission
    to the Study Management Committee, the Mine Action Technical Working
    Group, and other stakeholder umbrella bodies.
Annex 2 – Mechanisms for Enhancing Aid Effectiveness in Cambodia

The Mine Action TWG is part of a broader mechanism for enhancing government-donor coordination and aid effectiveness, featuring the following organs:

- at the base, 18 joint government-donor TWGs organised around sector programmes (e.g. Education), thematic programmes (e.g. Decentralisation and Deconcentration) or issues (e.g. land, landmine/UXO contamination). Each TWG is to:
  - develop a programme in support of the Rectangular Strategy and the NSDP,
  - link with other TWGs on mutual/cross-cutting issues
  - promote aid effectiveness as outlined in the H-A-R Action Plan
- regular meetings of the Government-Donor Coordination Committee (GDCC) are held in Cambodia, involving the RGC and senior donor representatives based in Cambodia, to monitor the work of the TWGs and the overall progress on enhancing aid effectiveness;
- at the summit of the mechanism, the Cambodia Development Cooperation Forum (CDCF) is an annual high-level aid mobilisation, aid coordination, and policy dialogue meeting between the RGC and official development cooperation agencies. This is chaired by the RGC, with the World Bank serving as the focal point for international agencies.

The RGC has designated the Cambodia Rehabilitation and Development Board (CRDB) of the Council for Development of Cambodia (CDC) as the focal point for official development assistance.

---

60 Key documents (available at [http://www.cdc-crdb.gov.kh/default.htm](http://www.cdc-crdb.gov.kh/default.htm)) include:

- Strategic Framework for Development Cooperation Management, Jan. 2006
- The Government-Donor Coordination Committee (GDCC) and Technical Working Groups (TWGs) in Cambodia – A Review, Oct. 2006
- The Cambodia Aid Effectiveness Report, May 2007

61 H-A-R = Harmonisation, Alignment, Results, which are critical principles of the Paris Declaration (adopted by donor and aid recipient countries) to promote national ownership based on mutual accountability.

62 The CDCF has evolved from the Consultative Group mechanism, which was co-chaired by the Government and the World Bank.
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Appendix 3 – Resource Allocation & Priority-setting Mechanisms in Cambodia

Top down elements

- Are national development priorities reflected in criteria for setting priorities?
- Do allocations to provinces reflect relative needs?
- Do allocations to communes reflect relative needs?
- Are ‘true’ needs reflected in commune preference lists?
- Are national development priorities reflected in criteria for setting priorities?
- Do districts/communes know their clearance ‘budget’?

Bottom up elements

- Is Mine Action supporting other sectors?

National

Province 1

Province 2

Province 3

Province 4

National projects

Provincial Projects

District 1

District 2

District 3

Commune 1

Commune 2

Commune 3

Preferences

Do commune preferences get cleared?
### APPENDIX 2 – LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Leng Sochea</td>
<td>Deputy Secretary General</td>
<td>CMAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Sem Sovanny</td>
<td>Advisor to the Prime Minister; Deputy Secretary General; Vice Chairman, Joint Chief of Staff; President of Training and Mine/UXO Clearance Center</td>
<td>RCAF/CMAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Sem Sokha</td>
<td>Under Secretary of State</td>
<td>MoSVY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Heng Rattana</td>
<td>Deputy Director General</td>
<td>CMAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oum Phunro</td>
<td>Director of Planning &amp; Operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupert Leighton</td>
<td>Country Director</td>
<td>MAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Porter</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>HALO Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Grindle</td>
<td>Deputy Programme Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Courtnadge</td>
<td>Senior Advisor Multi-Donor Support Programme</td>
<td>UNDP (CRDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Monroe</td>
<td>Clearance for Result Manager</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sive Lim</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>CRC/CMVIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cladioo Fee</td>
<td>Regional Representative SEA</td>
<td>NPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave McCraken</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>bhpbilliton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Scott</td>
<td>Country Director</td>
<td>Cambodia Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouk Nida</td>
<td>Senior Project Implementation Officer</td>
<td>ADB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Phireak</td>
<td>Program Coordinator (MRER)</td>
<td>CRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plong Chhaya</td>
<td>Child Protection Officer</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leng Vireak</td>
<td>Senior Program Manager</td>
<td>World Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Barton</td>
<td>Field Project Manager</td>
<td>ADMAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine Mitchell</td>
<td>2nd Secretary Development Cooperation</td>
<td>AUSAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Mericourt</td>
<td>Senior Program Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguon Sokunthea</td>
<td>Program Offer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panhaviachet Pok</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>CCO (CIDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo Hotte</td>
<td>Mine Action Program Manager</td>
<td>HI-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kan Vibol</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Planning &amp; Legal Affairs</td>
<td>MoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kong Vinal</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham Hak</td>
<td>Partnership &amp; Communication Manager</td>
<td>DAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas Mao</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Rankin</td>
<td>Project Manager, MAPU Capacity Building</td>
<td>AVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann-Marie McCabe</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>MAPU-PLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrom Soeun</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>MAPU-PVH-OMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leng Ranin</td>
<td>Deputy Chief of MAPU</td>
<td>MAPU-BMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noum Chhay Ruom</td>
<td>Chief of MAPU</td>
<td>MAPU-BTB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huon Sotha</td>
<td>Chief of MAPU</td>
<td>MAPU-PLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhon Bun Noeun</td>
<td>Chief of MAPU</td>
<td>MAPU-PVH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khut Suert</td>
<td>Chief of MAPU</td>
<td>MAPU-OMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay Kim Tha</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>CHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oum Sang Onn</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>ECOSORN/CMAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manfred Staab</td>
<td>Advisor Team Leader</td>
<td>ECOSORN Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chharn Saruth</td>
<td>National Project Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm Sinath</td>
<td>Demining Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keo Chhunly</td>
<td>Senior Land Title Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, consultants met senior officers in MoP, MLMUPC, and MAFF who asked that their names be held in confidence pending a formal letter from the CMAA to their ministries advising of the purpose of the consultations.
APPENDIX 3 – QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire for Mine Action Stakeholders
Issues to Include in a New Mine Action Strategy for Cambodia

The CMAA and the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) are undertaking work in preparation for a new strategy for mine action in Cambodia. There is broad consensus that a new strategy is needed to:

- incorporate better estimates on the extent and nature of the remaining contamination as a basis for future planning and decision-making
- integrate the separate strategies for mine action, other Explosive Remnants of War (ERW), and survivor assistance
- provide a foundation for the request for an extension of Cambodia’s deadline for clearance of all known minefields
- contribute to broader efforts by the Royal Cambodian Government and international donors to promote aid effectiveness

However, it remains unclear what issues should be addressed by a new strategy. This questionnaire is designed to provide mine action stakeholders with the opportunity to score the importance of various strategic issues that have been raised by one or more organisations, and to identify additional issues for consideration.

The questionnaire will be complemented by interviews with as many mine action stakeholders as possible, to give people the opportunity to elaborate on the issues they believe should feature in a new strategy, as well as by secondary research (e.g. on the National Strategic Development Plan and various Sector Strategies). The findings from the research, questionnaires, and meetings will be reported back and will be incorporated into a recommended work plan to complete a new strategy.

The core team undertaking this preliminary work is Chan Rotha, Director of Socio-Economic Planning and Database Management Department at CMAA, Ted Paterson, Head of Evaluation and Policy Research at GICHD, and Dr. Mao Vanna, independent consultant. The Team will also draw on assistance from aid management experts at the Cambodian Rehabilitation and Development Board at the Council for the Development of Cambodia (CRDB/CDC).

The questionnaire should not take long to complete. It includes a series of questions about your views on issues that a new strategy may seek to address – to answer, just mark an ‘X’ in the appropriate box, as shown in the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should a new strategy provide policy guidance to donors and development banks on how they should deal with explosives contamination that affects their projects/programmes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please e-mail your completed questionnaire to maovanna_consultant@yahoo.com cc to
t.paterson@gichd.org – if possible by 20 April 2008. We apologize for the short deadline but the questionnaire should take only a few minutes to fill out. If you cannot meet the deadline, we still would appreciate your completed questionnaire when you have time. Thank you for your cooperation.

All responses will be kept confidential & responses from individual organisations will not be reported separately

The questionnaire is divided into two parts:

1. ‘Gaps’ in data, capacities, links with non-mine action organisations, etc. that may need to be addressed to enhance the achievements of the mine action programme;
2. Strategic issues that perhaps should be addressed by a new strategy.
**Part 1 – Critical gaps: How important are the following gaps in terms of limiting the achievements of Cambodia’s mine action programme?**

1. **Data gaps relating to the contamination and demining:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unimportant/ we have the data needed</th>
<th>Critically important/ we need better data</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. True extent of contamination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Achievements in terms of demining (areas cleared, reclassified, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Achievements by military demining units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Achievements by commercial demining firms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Achievements in terms of socio-economic benefits from demining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   1  2  3  4  5

   Elaborate on or add to the above list if you wish _____________________________________

   _____________________________________

   _____________________________________

   _____________________________________

2. **Data gaps relating to the accidents, victims, survivors:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unimportant/ we have the data needed</th>
<th>Critically important/ we need better data</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Numbers &amp; locations of accidents/victims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Numbers &amp; locations of survivors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Achievements in survivor assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   1  2  3  4  5

   Elaborate on or add to the above list if you wish _____________________________________

   _____________________________________

   _____________________________________

   _____________________________________

3. **Data gaps relating to financial resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unimportant/ we have the data needed</th>
<th>Critically important/ we need better data</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Complete data on funding to mine action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Data on future funding intentions of government &amp; donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   1  2  3  4  5

   Elaborate on or add to the above list if you wish _____________________________________

   _____________________________________

   _____________________________________

   _____________________________________
4. Capacity gaps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unimportant/ we have the capacity</th>
<th>Critically important/ we need more capacity</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The capacity of CMAA to discharge its responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The capacity of the MAPUs &amp; or PMACs to discharge their functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The capacity of the Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans + Youth &amp; the Disability Action Council and the to coordinate survivor assistance activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Gaps in strategic management functions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unimportant/ not a problem</th>
<th>Critically important/ a serious problem</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The failure of the CMAA Governing Council to meet as the National Mine Action Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The absence of a regular policy dialogue forum for mine action stakeholders*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The absence of a mechanism to allocate demining resources to support national development projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The absence of a mechanism to allocate demining resources to support provincial development projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The weakness of mechanisms to advise donors &amp; development organisations regarding the mine action plans and priorities of other donors (e.g. to avoid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A variety of meetings on mine action take place each year, but many stakeholders have said that most time is taken on reporting of achievements, funding commitments, etc., leaving little time for substantive discussion of strategic/policy issues.
overlaps or gaps in coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant/ not a problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically important/ a serious problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elaborate on or add to the above list if you wish

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

6. Gaps in linkages with other organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unimportant/ not a problem</th>
<th>Critically important/ a serious problem</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Weak links with the Ministry of Land Management, Urban Planning &amp; Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Weak links with the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry &amp; Fisheries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Weak links with the Ministry of Public Works &amp; Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Weak links with the Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans + Youth &amp; the Disability Action Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Weak links with provincial governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Weak links with the World Bank &amp; Asian Development Banks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elaborate on or add to the above list if you wish

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

Additional points – please note other gaps that a new strategy should address

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________
### Part 2 – Strategic issues: How important is it that a new strategy addresses the following issues?

#### 7. Should the new strategy embrace landmines, other ERW and survivor assistance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Strategy should not cover all</th>
<th>Essential to cover all in the new Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elaborate on the above if you wish

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

#### 8. Should the new strategy clarify the relative priorities of demining in support of (i) treaty obligations, (ii) risk/accident reduction, and (iii) other socio-economic benefits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Strategy should not address this</th>
<th>Essential to address in the new Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elaborate on the above if you wish

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

#### 9. Should the new strategy provide policy guidance to government departments and provincial government on how they should deal with explosives contamination that affects their projects/programmes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Strategy should not address this</th>
<th>Essential to address in the new Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elaborate on the above if you wish

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________
10. Should the new strategy provide policy guidance to donors and development banks on how they should deal with explosives contamination that affects their projects/programmes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Strategy should not address this</th>
<th>Essential to address in the new Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elaborate on the above if you wish

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

11. Should the new strategy contain clear statements on the ‘end point’ and ‘graduation points’?64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Strategy should not address this</th>
<th>Essential to address in the new Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elaborate on the above if you wish

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

12. Should the new strategy contain clear statements on the RCG’s plans concerning the respective roles of CMAC, the Royal Cambodian Armed Forces, and the police?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Strategy should not address this</th>
<th>Essential to address in the new Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elaborate on the above if you wish

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

Additional points – please note other strategic issues that a new strategy should address

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

64 Here, ‘end point’ means the end of international assistance, leaving Cambodian organisations responsible for residual risks, while ‘graduation point’ would be the end of certain types of assistance because of the growth of local capacity and ownership (full time technical advisors; separate projects supported by bilateral donors; earmarked equipment donations; etc.).
## APPENDIX 4 – ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>AVG</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Data Gaps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>True extent of contamination</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Achievements in terms of demining</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Achievements by military demining</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Achievements by commercial demining firms</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>Socio-economic benefits from demining</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Numbers &amp; locations of accidents/victims</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Numbers &amp; locations of survivors</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Achievements in survivor assistance</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Complete data on funding to mine action</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Data on future funding intentions of government &amp; donors</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Capacity Gaps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>The capacity of CMAA to discharge its responsibilities</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>The capacity of the MAPUs &amp; or PMACs to discharge their functions</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>The capacity of the MOSAVY &amp; the DAC and the to coordinate survivor assistance activities</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gaps in Strategic Management Functions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>The failure of the CMAA Governing Council to meet as the National Mine Action Authority</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>The absence of a regular policy dialogue forum for mine action stakeholders</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>The absence of a mechanism to allocate demining resources to support national development projects</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d</td>
<td>The absence of a mechanism to allocate demining resources to support provincial development projects</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e</td>
<td>The weakness of mechanisms to advise donors &amp; development organisations regarding the mine action plans and priorities of other donors</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gaps in Links with other organisations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Weak links with the MLMUPC</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>Weak links with MAFF</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>Weak links with the Ministry of Public Works &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d</td>
<td>Weak links with the MOSAVY &amp; DAC</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e</td>
<td>Weak links with provincial governments</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f</td>
<td>Weak links with the World Bank &amp; Asian Development Banks</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strategic Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Should the new strategy embrace landmines, other ERW and survivor assistance?</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Should the new strategy clarify the relative priorities of demining in support of (i) treaty obligations, (ii) risk/accident reduction, and (iii) other socio-economic benefits?</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Should the new strategy provide policy guidance to government departments and provincial government</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Should the new strategy provide policy guidance to donors and development banks</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Should the new strategy contain clear statements on the ‘end point’ and ‘graduation points’?</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Should the new strategy contain clear statements on the RCG’s plans concerning the respective roles of CMAC, the Royal Cambodian Armed Forces, and the police?</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: COUNT = Number of responses to this question
APPENDIX 5 – OUTLINE FOR ARTICLE 5 EXTENSION REQUEST

I. Executive Summary
- This could be 2-5 pages long, summarising the essential details required in accordance with Article 5, paragraph 4 and containing any other essential information which the requesting State Party would want to quickly and efficiently communicate.

II. Detailed Narrative
1. Origins of the Article 5 implementation challenge
2. Nature and extent of the original Article 5 challenge: quantitative aspects
3. Nature and extent of the original Article 5 challenge: qualitative aspects
4. Methods used to identify areas containing AP mines and reasons for suspecting the presence of AP mines in other areas
5. National demining structures
7. Nature and extent of progress made: qualitative aspects
8. Methods & standards used to release areas known or suspected to contain AP mines
9. Methods & standards of controlling and assuring quality
10. Efforts undertaken to ensure the effective exclusion of civilians from mined areas
11. Resources made available to support progress made to date
12. Circumstances that impede compliance in a 10 year period
13. Humanitarian, economic, social and environmental implications
15. Nature and extent of the remaining Article 5 challenge: qualitative aspects
16. Amount of time requested and a rationale for this amount of time
17. Detailed work plan for the period of the requested extension
   - If necessary, what survey activities will take place when to determine the actual location, size and other characteristics of mined areas?
   - How much will be released during each year of the extension period? (e.g., How much area? How many areas? Which areas? How will priorities be established?)
   - What demining, survey and other land release methods and what standards applied?
   - What is the annual cost and for what?
   - What are the expected sources of funding / other resources to implement the plan?
   - What assumptions are made regarding the realisation of the plan?
   - What are potential risk factors that may affect realisation of the plan?
18. Institutional, human resource and material capacity
   - What is available?
   - What institutions / structures will be established, and what changes to existing ones will be made, to realise the plan?

---

65 This outline has been prepared by the AP Mine Ban Convention Implementation Support Unit as a means to assist States Parties preparing requests for extensions of Article 5 in complying with the requirements of Article 5.4 of the Convention.
III: Annexes
- Map(s)
- List of abbreviations / acronyms
- Glossary
- Tables, possibly modified or replicated from the voluntary template adopted in November 2007, for example, listing all mined areas as well as their size, location, status and other characteristics.

Other considerations:
- Include a cover page containing the date of the document.
- Include contact information for an individual who can answer questions about the information contained in the extension request.