

Winter 1-2004

Integrating Demining with Development: The Way Forward

Domrei Research and Consulting

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cisr-globalcwd>



Part of the [Defense and Security Studies Commons](#), [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#), [Public Policy Commons](#), and the [Social Policy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

and Consulting, Domrei Research, "Integrating Demining with Development: The Way Forward" (2004). *Global CWD Repository*. 1133.

<https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cisr-globalcwd/1133>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for International Stabilization and Recovery at JMU Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Global CWD Repository by an authorized administrator of JMU Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact dc_admin@jmu.edu.

World Vision Cambodia

**Integrating Demining with Development:
The Way Forward**

September 2004

Domrei Research and Consulting

Phnom Penh, Cambodia

Gabriel Pictet

Ian Ramage

Kate Richmond

Contents

Abbreviations	2
Introduction and Background	3
Methodology	4
Case Studies	4
Svay Prey	4
Svay Sor	5
Rationale for Integrated Mine Action	6
Understanding Integration	9
Elements of Best Practice	10
Conclusions and Recommendations	14
Appendices	
Appendix One: References	15
Appendix Two: Question Guides	19
Appendix Three: List of Key Informants	23

DOMREI Research and Consulting expresses its gratitude to the people who kindly took the time to participate in this research and answer our questions: Brian Agland (CARE), Sarah Bearup (WVC), Marc Bonnet (NPA), Jullien Chevillard (UNDP), Oum Sang Onn (Austcare), Bruce Powell (MAG), Ray Worner (CMVIS) and the people of Svay Sor and Svay Prey.

Abbreviations

ADP	Area Development Program (World Vision)
CBMRR	Community Based Mine Risk Reduction
CMAA	Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority
CMAC	Cambodian Mine Action Centre
CMAD	Community Mines Awareness Development (GTZ)
CMVIS	Cambodian Mine/UXO Victim Information Service
GTZ	German Agency for Technical Cooperation
IHDD	Integrated Humanitarian Demining Development (GTZ)
IMAP	Integrated Mine Action Program
LUPU	Land Use Planning Unit (of Provincial Department of Rural Development)
MAG	Mines Advisory Group
MAPU	Mine Action Planning Units
NGO	Non Government Organisation
NPA	Norwegian People's Aid
NPRS	National Poverty Reduction Strategy
SEILA	Cambodian development project (UNDP/UNOPS)
TDI	Transformational Development Indicators (World Vision)
UXO	Unexploded ordinance
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNTAC	United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia
VDC	Village Development Committee
WVC	World Vision Cambodia

Background and Introduction

Cambodia is one of the most landmine and unexploded ordnance (UXO) affected countries in the world due to almost three decades of conflict. Several years of aerial bombing, together with widespread use of landmines, had a devastating impact on the country. In 2002, 98 percent of landmine and UXO casualties were civilian.¹

The recent history of mine action in Cambodia has some unique features. As many informants interviewed for this review noted, mine action programs in Cambodia often grew out of refugee programs. At the time of the UNTAC sponsored elections in 1993

We beg the world to give money for demining and development so that we can rebuild our lives, our communities, our villages and our countries again!

Amputee Ambassador Tun Channareth, Nobel Peace Prize Days, 1997

there were more than 300,000 refugees in camps within Cambodia and in Thailand. Development agencies like World Vision, Lutheran World Service and CARE worked in these camps since 1979 to support refugees, initially providing emergency relief.

As the situation in the country settled, refugees were repatriated, usually to new land granted by the government. The

development agencies conducting emergency relief operations moved to facilitate repatriation and resettlement. The land granted to refugees was usually far from established communities, had no infrastructure and was often heavily contaminated by landmines and UXO.

More recently, rapid population growth in Cambodia (estimated at 2.5%)² has placed increased pressure on available land and many families move to new areas only to discover landmines and UXO. The extent of the problem is such that rural civilians' access to essential facilities such as water, roads, bridges, and cultivable land is restricted and hazardous

The situation in Cambodia today provides a clear example of the need for mine action programs to address more than merely humanitarian needs and to recognise the role of mine action in the longer term establishment and support of self-sufficient communities and their development.

In Cambodia, mine action is no longer only about saving lives; it is also about supporting development efforts.

heng Mouly, Chairman, CMAC 2003

Recognising the link between mine action and development, World Vision Cambodia embarked upon a review of integrated mine action programs. The aim of this research was to collect evidence on the success of integrated mine action; highlight best practices in integrated mine action and gain an increased awareness of the types of integrated

¹ Cambodian Landmine Monitor 2003 page 4

² Ministry of Planning, National Institute of Statistics, Statistical Yearbook - 2003

mine action programs being implemented in Cambodia - their successes and challenges.

After a brief overview of the research methodology, we present two cases studies, and examine the rationale for integration as it appears in the literature and the discourses of our key informants. We then attempt to clarify the concept of integration and provide a structured inventory of elements of best practice.

Methodology

We used three methods to collect information on integrated demining.

Literature Review. We reviewed organisational studies and reports; internet documents and research papers relating to integrated mine action and development (see appendix 1 for the most relevant documents).

Village Case Studies. We conducted semi-structured interviews with informants from two villages in mine affected areas. One village was purposely selected as an example of a community in which a stand alone mine action program was implemented and the other as an example of a village in which an integrated mine action program was implemented. A researcher from Domrei visited the villages and conducted interviews with households and village leaders from both communities. We analysed the interviews and used the information collected from each village to compose illustrative case studies. These two villages are not representative of anything but themselves and we use them only to illustrate current thinking on the topic (see appendix 2 for interview guides).

Key Informant Interviews. We conducted interviews with program managers from key organisations participating in mine action activities in Cambodia. We designed the qualitative questionnaire to ascertain individual opinions about integrated mine action, the components of integrated mine action, to establish best practice in integrated mine action programs and highlight the strengths and challenges of integrated mine action programs (see appendix 3 for list of key informants).

Case Studies

In this section we describe and compare two communities in northwestern Cambodia: Svay Prey and Svay Sor. Svay Prey is the site of a stand alone mine action program, and Svay Sor the site of an integrated mine action program. We describe below each village and how they were affected by demining operations.

Case Study 1: Stand Alone Mine Action in Svay Prey village

Svay Prey village (population 268) is located on the Thai-Cambodian border in Kamrieng District, Battambang province. Khmer Rouge soldiers and their families settled here in 1993 when a road to the border was cleared. The village was an active battleground between the Khmer Rouge and troops of the Royal Government of Cambodia. More

mines were laid each time the village was lost and taken by different troops. In 1996, the local Khmer Rouge commanders surrendered and the village was integrated into the rest of the province.

Three different demining agencies, CMAC, MAG and the HALO Trust have worked to clear mines and UXO in Svay Prey.

The main access road, housing plots and water points were cleared of mines. However, land mines still surround the village. Many villagers are former soldiers, so awareness of the danger of mines is high and mine casualties are low. Population growth in Svay Prey has reduced the amount of safe land for housing and 22 families have no land to build their houses. These families are currently living with relatives or are renting small plots of land where they built makeshift homes.

The village submitted a request for demining to clear housing land for these families and earlier this year, a parcel of land at the back of the village was cleared and handed over to the families.

However, at the time of this research, not one of the 22 families in Svay Prey has settled or has plans to settle on their allotted land. When asked why, our informants explained that there were no proper roads to go there, that there was no clean water, that families did not have any means to farm the land. In the absence of irrigation, farmers are dependant on the rains and struggle to grow just enough to survive.

To make matters worse, health problems like diarrhoea and kidney stones are still widespread, malaria is endemic, and people do not know how to avoid preventable disease. Many families are overburdened by debt. Moneylenders charge an exorbitant 70% interest rate on small loans. All these difficulties combined are preventing the settlement of the demined land. The villagers have asked the government and NGOs to help them build a road, drill wells, build toilets and set up a micro-credit program.

The slow pace of development in Svay Prey raises doubts on the economic and social benefits of demining. Successful resettlement and tapping benefits from mined land obviously requires more than merely the removal of landmines and UXO. Can development programs be implemented as part of mine action efforts to ensure that villages like Svay Prey can become the home of healthy, educated and happy children, resilient families and empowered communities?

Case Study 2: Integrated Mine Action in Svay Sor village

Svay Sor village (population 565) is 65 km west of Battambang town in Rattanak Mondol District. Like most of northern Cambodia, the area was the scene of heavy fighting between the Khmer Rouge and government forces. Svay Sor was settled by refugees in 1997, so it is a relatively new community.

At the beginning of settlement, malaria, diarrhoea and other preventable disease were prevalent. Many villagers were injured, disabled or killed by landmines. The people of Svay Sor earned their living by farming, gardening, and selling wood and bamboo gathered in the outlying forests.

World Vision, in co-operation with MAG, started working in Svay Sor in 1998, barely a year after the village was settled. The two organisations implemented a full-fledged community development programme

Demining - After World Vision assessed the needs of the most vulnerable families and the overall community, the land around the houses were cleared first. **Awareness Raising Programmes** aimed to limit the risks associated with landmines by raising awareness on the risks of mines, and by proposing alternatives to foraging in heavily mined forest areas. **Food Security Programs** provided training in soil use and maintenance; training in the farming of various crop varieties, and supplied alternative seed varieties. **Health Programs** provided the village with community wells; community ponds, training in sanitation and hygiene and encouraged the community to build toilets and participate in vaccination programs. **Capacity Building Programs** included proposal writing for Village Development Committees to promote village development activities.

According to our informants, the benefits arising from World Vision's integrated approach to development and mine action in Svay Sor are obvious: there are fewer landmine victims, fewer cases of malaria and diarrhoea, almost all children are immunised and attend school. The people of Svay Sor are happy to live on their land and feel safer in their village. The increasing number of residents in Svay Sor supports this assertion.

The contrast between Svay Sor and Svay Prey is striking. World Vision and MAG's integrated demining approach is a compelling illustration of the positive and sustainable effects of integration on the well being of children, their families and their communities.

The review of the literature and our discussions with key informants reveal that there is an emerging consensus on the advantages of integration over stand alone demining. We will now analyse the discourses on integration, and present the rationale for integrated mine action as it appears in the discourses.

Rationale for Integrated Mine Action

As illustrated in the above case studies, the link between demining and development goes both ways. While demining can enhance development opportunities, a lack of development support can also limit the impact of demining. The two are intrinsically linked.

While most communities in Cambodia now have safe land to live on and survive, they are often islands in a sea of danger. Additional land for schools, health facilities and agriculture is still contaminated and further development is impossible until this land is made safe.

Internationally, the focus of demining has shifted. In 1997, an NGO symposium at Bad Honnef issued guidelines for integrating development into mine action programs.³ Since

³ Guidelines for Mine Action Programs from a development-oriented point of view (Bad Honnef)

then, the international community has come to recognise that demining with development is the way forward.

We can group the motives for integration in three broad categories: equity, efficiency and sustainability.

1. Equity

Improve equity nationwide:

individuals living in a mine area are disadvantaged compared to individuals living in area cleared of mines as the former do not have safe access to agricultural land, to water, health centre, etc. Making demining a national development objective reduces socio-economic inequalities by improving the standard of living of vulnerable individuals and

communities and thus improves overall equity. Making demining a development objective at community level also increases equity as NGOs will address the needs of the most vulnerable families first (cf. Svay Sor village).

The General Assembly, appeals to Governments, regional organizations and other donors to continue and, whenever possible, increase their support to mine action through reliable, predictable and timely contributions, including contributions through the Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Action as well as to national mine action efforts and humanitarian mine-action programmes of non-governmental organizations, to allow for the timely delivery of mine-action assistance, and stresses that such assistance should be integrated into broader humanitarian, development and other strategies.

Resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly 17 February 2004

2. Efficiency

Efficient resource allocation and priority setting at national level. Lands that have potential for sustained economic output (e.g. farmland, roads, ponds) are prioritised for mine clearance over land that has little economic potential. *In reality, there are not the resources to remove all of the mines in Cambodia, so an approach that targets development needs is preferable* (AUSTCARE). The purpose of demining is one of socio-economic development, rather than one of humanitarian aid: *CMAC still do "humanitarian" mining, but now mines are being cleared with a development purpose.* In the same way, evaluation of demining impact requires a socio-economic approach (AUSTCARE). *Measuring the success of mine action in terms of numbers of victims is simplistic. It does not measure the impact of mines on the community and the fact that lower casualties may be for a range of reasons unrelated to NGO demining efforts.* (CMVIS) At national, provincial and district levels: *Activities should not stand alone, but be part of the national and local development planning process. The SEILA framework is a good one to work through* (UNDP).

Optimise resource allocation in community. *Demining is a relatively expensive process and should be considered in terms of the opportunity costs for other projects...[full integration and] education allows communities to prioritise according to their needs, the costs and the benefits of each [activity] should be included in some programs* (MAG). Integrated planning avoids useless duplication of efforts: *Lack of information between partners working in the same village can lead to duplication* (AUSTCARE).

Build on synergies and economies of scale. NGO and government assistance are expensive (expert costs, monitoring and evaluation, field visits) and community mobilisation takes time and energy on all parts. One NGO can co-ordinate and supervise integrated activities, rather than duplicate these efforts. Community needs appraisal, participatory rural appraisals, surveys, community capacity building, good governance and women empowerment... *AUSTCARE emphasise building a strong civil society by creating processes of good governance within the communities.* Good governance and women empowerment are crosscutting issues that permeate all demining and development activities. *A baseline in advance is useful. CARE does these with CMAC to identify the at-risk communities and their needs (CARE).*

3. Sustainability

Ensure sustainability of impact: Mine clearing alone is insufficient to sustain improved standards of living. Families need secured land rights, access to water, schooling and health, and credit. *Demining does not provide the basic necessities of health, food security etc. Integration maximises the impact demining has on a community and the impact community development can have on a community ... The aim should be long-term sustainability: Governance, Income Generation and Infrastructure (AUSTCARE).*

For many countries, integrating mine action into broader development strategies and budgets may well prove to be the most promising path toward a sustainable response to the obstacles caused by mines and UXO.

Judy Grayson, former Deputy Director of the United Nations Development Programme's Mine Action Unit in New York. August 2003

Sustain community dynamics: a community that was successfully organised around demining activities can sustain its mobilisation to build community infrastructure (well, pond, pathways, health post or school). Demining prompts requests from community members (UNDP). *The demining activities are used as an enabling tool for a community's development (CARE).*

Sustain local support. *To sustain development activities, NGOs should build the capacity of local institutions. CMAC is the only thoroughly national demining organisation. Despite its reputation, CMAC now has quality standards similar to that of international NGOs. Does need capacity building for long-term sustainability (UNDP).*

Sustain donor support. New approaches and new activities that ensure sustainability or increased benefits of mine clearance can compensate donor fatigue. *Funding shifts from humanitarian budgets to development budgets (UNDP). Donors will not keep funding stand-alone projects, as there are other more visible humanitarian problems in the world. Resource mobilisation funding in the future will be integrated into community development (UNDP).*

... to be eligible for Bank financing, land-mine clearance must be an integral part of a development project or a prelude to a future development project or program to be adopted by the borrower.

World Bank Guidelines for Financing Land Mine Clearance

Avoid new problems created by the demining: *Clearing can create new problems if it is not done within a community development framework (CMVIS).*

Understanding Integration

Our interviews and readings left us with the impression that the concept of “integration” was at best loosely defined. Previous attempts by the demining community to define integration in practical terms have led to heated debate.⁴ A more pragmatic approach is to adapt the concept of integration to the local context, i.e. to determine the level of integration that is the most appropriate for local circumstance.

We identified nine levels of integration.

LEVELS OF INTEGRATION

1. **Low-level integration.** Communities living in or around areas being demined are also beneficiaries of development projects (the two, while complementary, are carried out independently by different organisations).
2. **Partnership.** Two or more organisations carry out demining and development projects in co-ordination, mobilising the same individuals or community groups. As there are generally at least two different bodies working together in integrated demining – community development and demining organisations, *the roles and responsibilities must be clear with the overlap as the critical point of co-operation and synergy* (CARE)
3. **Horizontal integration.** One organisation or one very closely co-ordinated group of organisations carries out demining and development projects jointly, mobilising the same individuals or community groups.
4. **Vertical integration (or Post clearance development assistance)** Mine victims and their families receive “socio-economic” assistance, or villages that are cleared of UXOs are assisted to make best use of their land. *It is important to plan together with the deminers as a whole development approach rather than community developers coming in after demining has taken place and having to work around what has been done* (CARE).
5. **National level integration.** At national or “macro” level, mine action planning is integrated into the National Poverty Reduction Strategy (cf. NPRS in Cambodia). *It has been a benefit to work co-operatively with national authorities rather than outside of the system. It is important to work within established government priorities* (CARE).
6. **Local level integration.** *Involve officials at all relevant levels of the project. This should involve both collaboration with authorities as well as providing them with*

⁴ Journal of Mine Action Issue 7.1, 2003

capacity building activities to assist them to improve the process of demining for community development (UNDP).

7. **Integrated community participation.** *The villages must have ownership over the process. For example, villages should allocate land and labour for community use. It is important to avoid the view that because the initiative cost them nothing, it is worth nothing. They must be involved in planning as well as implementation to ensure utility at a later date (CARE).*
8. **Integrated planning and impact assessment.** *Long-term economic and environmental impact is addressed to avoid destruction of non-renewable resources. Natural resources can be destroyed as demining activities open and provide access to previously inaccessible resources (e.g. logging). An environmental impact assessment, as part of an integrated demining approach was able to identify this as a problem and the community was provided cooking stoves to reduce the amount of firewood used for cooking... Make sure demining activities are consistent with community plans and priorities... It is important to be able to organise the program calendar ahead of time and according to the demining plan, taking into consideration seasonal restraints and ensuring infrastructure is not due to start until demining is completed (CARE). Joint planning sessions at the beginning of projects to develop priorities. This would entail community development workers from the same areas sitting down to decide on information to be collected, who is best placed to collect it, and then incorporating the information and using the shared information to inform activities. Joint assessments where possible would also be beneficial, or standardising village assessments for overall use. This way response is well informed and can target objectives (MAG).*
9. **Integrating development and mine-related prevention and awareness.** *World Vision recognises the important need to link mines awareness programs with community development activities that alleviate the livelihood pressures that force vulnerable groups and individuals to take increased risks... Poverty and risk reduction strategies are linked and critical needs in communities that are dependent on subsistence agriculture and forest foraging. Development of alternative livelihood strategies, increased access to agricultural land, food security and access to safe drinking water and toilet facilities are all important. Training and technology transfer is needed to help farmers diversify away from rice production to vegetable and animal raising (WVC).*

Elements of Best Practice

We asked key informants what they believe are the essential components of a successful integrated mine action program. From these interviews, we identified six principles that guide the design and implementation of integrated demining programmes. These principles and the activities they guide constitute elements of best practice.

1. Support of local systems and authorities.

- *Involve officials at all relevant levels of the project.*

- Build the capacity of local authorities to assist them to improve the process of demining for community development.
- Use PLG/SEILA to assist in the identification of needs and areas which will be used in the community.
- Conduct activities to inform policy issues concerning mine action and community development.
- Include the Land Use Planning Unit (LUPU), soon to become the Mine Action Planning Units (MAPU)
- Build the capacity of local institutions. CMAC is the only thoroughly national mine action organisation and requires capacity building and involvement to ensure long term sustainability.
- Become part of the national and local development planning process.
- Focus on government priorities and then see where activities can fit in terms of these and fill in any gaps.
- Diversify and respond to community and government requests while maintaining a smaller humanitarian response component.

2. Community Participation

- Establish participatory planning. It is important for demining and development organisations to plan a holistic development approach as opposed to community developers having to work around what has been done by demining organisation.
- Organise joint planning sessions before the commencement of projects, incorporating community development workers, villagers and local authorities to develop priorities; decide on information to be collected; and share information to inform all activities. This way the response is well informed and targets community objectives.
- Encourage commitment and ownership from the community as part of the process.
- Involve the communities to ensure utility later – to be worth something it must be seen to cost something, villagers must help in implementation.
- Build trust between the national level authorities and NGOs.
- Build the capacity of villagers to enable them to participate in community plans and in setting community priorities.
- Be consistent with community plans and priorities.

- Use village-based deminers. Villagers have a personal stake in the development of their community. Mobilising village-based volunteers is the most cost-effective method of demining.
- Provide opportunities for close liaison between the demining organisation, communities, the development organisation and local authorities.

3. Community Empowerment

- Ensure that the voices of the people are brought forward to the government and government partners.
- Enable communities to initiate development requests themselves.
- Provide communities with information about the processes available to them through LUPU and MAPU.
- Enable communities to access and utilise national systems and structures such as LUPU and MAPU.
- Increase village ownership over the process. For example, villages should allocate land and labour for community use.

4. Capacity Building

- Educate and raise the awareness of development workers and communities about the realities of mine action. This may even include sharing budget information with communities, as demining is a relatively expensive process and should be considered in terms of the opportunity costs for other projects.
- Alert development workers and communities to the fact that there are many different ways to demine, and provide them with options. This allows communities to prioritise demining activities according to their needs, the costs and the benefits of mine action.

5. Flexibility

- Adjust to the need of the specific community
- Encourage and enable the community to mobilise its resources – human and other.
- Implement activities during the rainy season. For example, demining around a pagoda to compensate for the seasonality of demining and development.
- Provide for short-term risk reduction in support of local development in addition to longer-term sustainability. For example, in the northwest organisations have

developed Community Based Mine Risk Reduction (CBMRR) where the community identifies immediate mining priorities.

6. Monitoring and evaluation according to development principles

- Establish evaluation guidelines and long term indicators at the onset of the programme in consultation with the communities and the demining organisation.
- Go beyond merely measuring the number of casualties or contamination levels when evaluating demining programmes, as the main problems caused by land mines are socio-economic. Assess the “silent” impact – the loss of development opportunities due to landmines.
- Monitor and evaluate impact using short and long term indicators as it can take up to two years for some of the impacts from demining to be realised.

7. Alternative Livelihood Strategies

- Focussing on the generation of income is vital to establish and improve the well being of people in the area.
- Propose alternative income sources for communities while demining is occurring, for example fast growing crops.

The principles that guide integrated demining are those of classic community-based development. This explains why development NGOs are pioneering the integrated approach. As specialists in Transformational Development, World Vision has the duty to rigorously document its own best practice and lessons learned so that the promotion of integrated demining worldwide may rest on more than the type of anecdotal evidence that we have presented in this report.

Mine action's admission into the development world should not require a revolution.

Mine Action and Development: merging strategies, 2003

Conclusions and Recommendations

While searching for documentation on integrated demining and development for this review, it became clear that this is a very specialised area. Only a handful of agencies in Cambodia have attempted to integrate demining with community development and documentation is rare.

Even for international organisations like World Vision and CARE, the integrated approach to demining programs in Cambodia appears to be the exception rather than the rule. A review of other CARE and WVI country mine action programs generally show only traditional mine action activities like mine clearance, mine awareness and victim assistance projects.

Internationally, integrated demining seems even rarer with most discussion and debate on integration being confined to the policy level. At this level the United Nations, donors, international mine action agencies and forums are clearly in favour of mainstreaming demining into development.

However, there is a critical lack of published documentation on integrating demining with development both in Cambodia and around the world. At the same time, there is significant program experience on integrated mine action available in Cambodia.

This combination of factors presents World Vision Cambodia with a significant opportunity to establish best practices in this area. The following recommendations are offered for this purpose:

1. Document the current model and approach to Integrated Mine Action used by WVC, including lessons learned and possible future directions.
2. Facilitate a workshop under the auspices of CMAA to bring together past and current implementers of integrated demining and development in Cambodia to share best practices, experiences and lessons learned.
3. Investigate the impact, cost-efficiency and sustainability of integrated demining compared to demining alone to provide scientifically sound evidence to develop this approach.
4. Ensure that the report, proceedings and findings from the three activities above are published and disseminated to promote, develop and improve integrated mine action worldwide.

Appendix One: References

Documents specifically on demining and development are very scarce. Although we reviewed over 100 documents, best practices in integrated mine action or research on impact remained elusive. The following list highlights some of the more relevant documents.

CARE (2001) Saving and Making Lives: Integrated Demining and Development, Scott Harding, August 2001.

The author notes that communities appreciate the combination of demining and development activities:

“In the opinion of the majority of beneficiaries, the most crucial assistance has come through demining of access roads and house plots, food assistance through Food for Work, home gardens, agricultural extension and land title documentation...”

Among the main conclusions is that *demining and development cannot yet be fully integrated*, referring to the slow pace of demining and the need for safe agricultural land. The report advocates strongly for recognition of informal or ‘village demining’ to speed the demining and development process.

CARE (2001) CARE USA Humanitarian Demining Initiatives 1999-2000. From www.care.org

Summary of all demining projects funded by CARE USA at the time. Out of six country programs, only CARE Cambodia conducts integrated demining with development.

CMAA (2004) Mine Action Achievements in the Kingdom of Cambodia 1992-2003, 2nd Edition, May 2004.

Notes that mine action is a top priority for rehabilitation and development of Cambodia and that demining and UXO have been integrated into Cambodia’s Millennium Development Goals.

Disarmament, Development and Mine Action (2003) Mine action and development: merging strategies, Judy Grayson

Excellent article providing a coherent argument for integrated mine action approaches. Good summary of current global sentiment re integration at a policy level and practical steps for advocacy. No discussion of the practice or the evaluation of integrated mine action.

Discussing the growing awareness of the link between socio-economic development and mines, she says:

“Gradually this has progressed to the point where the socio-economic impact of mines (primarily interdiction to land and other resources) has gained general acceptance as the second most important factor—after the number of casualties—in determining how scarce resources should be prioritized and allocated to mine action.”

GICHD/UNDP (2002) Socio-Economic Approaches to Mine Action — An Operational Handbook, GICHD/UNDP, Geneva, May 2002

A clear and detailed guide that highlights the need for good information, clear objectives and methods of measuring success in mine action programs.

“The ultimate impact of mine action on a nation’s development depends on how well mine action co-ordinates with other development projects in order to magnify the benefits brought about by mine action alone.”

GTZ (date not specified) An Integrated Global Demining and Development Strategy. Bernd Hoffmann, The German Agency for Technical Cooperation

Clearly advocates for demining to be integrated into broader development goals.

“Integrated Demining can be an important part of rehabilitation and reconstruction measures in development cooperation projects. These are selected in accordance with development policy priorities such as the alleviation of poverty, education and environmental protection.”

Handicap International (2003) LUPU Project Evaluation, Bolton, Limpanboon, Vanak, October 2003.

Interesting evaluation that concentrates on the capacity and functioning of Land Use Planning Units (LUPU). The report also notes a potential danger associated with integrated mine action in the Cambodian context:

“...there is some tendency for the LUPU process to be dominated by NGOs’ agendas. Whilst this is not necessarily a cause for concern... ...there is a risk that the linkage of demining to development comes to be seen as absolutely necessary in all cases. The evaluation team was concerned that this could lead to perfectly valid requests for clearance being rejected... ...simply because there is no development NGO working there.”

Journal of Mine Action Issue 7.1, April 2003 Plays Nicely With Others: Some Thoughts on Issues Raised at the 6th International Meeting of Mine Action Directors, Geneva, 2003, Dennis Barlow, Director.

<http://maic.jmu.edu/journal/7.1/director.htm>

Formatted

The author advocates for improved planning, co-ordination and information sharing between mine action programs. He also notes that:

“Discussions about how to integrate the various functions of mine action as well as the advisability of “mainstreaming” mine action activities into socio-economic development plans are healthy—and critical—trends.”

Journal of Mine Action, Issue 7.2, August 2003, Deminers Facing More Responsibilities in Developmental Phase, Ieng Mouly, Chairman, CMAC Governing Council. <http://maic.jmu.edu/journal/7.2/notes/mouly/mouly.htm>

Structured around a demining accident and dispute over responsibility in Pailin, the article calls for strict demining standards and strong government, NGO and civil society support for demining.

"In Cambodia, demining organizations continue to hand over cleared land to local authorities, as utilizable lands are in high demand in a country on the verge of a dynamic developing phase."

Mine Action Information Center Journal, Africa spring 1999, Opportunities for an Integrated Demining Strategy in Rural Areas, Dr U. Weyl.

This article argues firmly for the replicability of IHDD and CMAD in other developing countries. However, it offers no details on implementation of programs, best practice or evaluation of impact.

"The development of rural areas, the opening of access for inputs and outputs, and the freeing of land for increased agricultural activity are critical. It is in these areas that Integrated Humanitarian Demining Development (IHDD) and Community Mine Awareness Development (CMAD) have made, and will continue to make, their contribution. These are the steps toward national economic stabilization, growth, food, security and poverty alleviation. There are many practical examples where IHDD and CMAD can be applied."

United Nations (2003) United Nations Mine Action: A strategy for 2001-2005. Report of the Secretary-General.

Responding to comments from member states, the secretary general conducted a review of the 2000 UN mine action strategy taking into consideration the impact of the landmine problem on rehabilitation, reconstruction and development. The report notes that:

"The presence of landmines and unexploded ordnance is frequently an obstacle to progress towards the Millennium Development Goals, preventing the participation of affected communities in economic development. In countries where this is the case, the United Nations will encourage Governments to include a mine-action impact assessment in all development planning and to incorporate a strategic plan for mine action in the national development plan and poverty reduction strategies."

United Nations (2004) Resolution adopted by the General Assembly: 58/127 Assistance in Mine Action. 58th Session, February 2004

This recent resolution highlights the need to integrate demining with broader socio-economic development. In article nine the General Assembly:

"Encourages all relevant multilateral and national programmes and bodies to include, in coordination with the United Nations, activities related to mine action"

in their humanitarian, rehabilitation, reconstruction and development assistance activities, where appropriate, bearing in mind the need to ensure national and local ownership, sustainability and capacity-building;

World Vision (2001) Evaluation of World Vision Cambodia Mine Action and Awareness Project (MAAP), Bruce Powell, October, 2001

Evaluation found that overall each project component had a positive impact on communities, although community participation was not ideal. The evaluators recommended that the project refocus away from direct community mine awareness education to address other objectives. They also noted that:

"...participants identified the project's integration of mine awareness, mine clearance and development assistance as it's greatest strength."

World Vision (2002) Evaluation of World Vision Cambodia Banan Humanitarian Mine Action Project, Bruce Powell, September, 2002

A detailed project evaluation focusing mainly on partnership arrangements between WV and MAG and effectiveness, efficiency and quality of specific activities from the project log frame. Very little on beneficiary impact or lessons learned apart from the following:

"At each site, village authorities and community beneficiaries were able to clearly articulate the benefits of the project and how these had contributed to addressing some of the most pressing development needs in their villages."

World Vision (2003) Evaluation of World Vision Cambodia Destroy a Minefield (DAM) Project, Chab Vibol, September 2003

This evaluation found very similar findings to the Banan evaluation above. No discussion of lessons learned or impact on beneficiaries.

World Vision (2003) Integrated Mine Action Project, proposal to AusAID

Notes World Vision's long experience with integrated mine action in Cambodia and 12 year partnership with MAG.

Appendix Two: Question guides

Questions for WVC Village – Village leader, households

1. Background

Name of Village:

Where is the village?

Population:

How old is the village?

If it is a new village, why did they move here?

2. Before World Vision - I want to ask you about life in the village before World Vision came to work here. What problems did you have?

Health

Education

Farming

Water supply

Landmines

Road access

3. In the Village Today - Now I want to ask you about life in the village today.

Health

Education

Farming

Water supply

Landmines

Road access

4. In your opinion, what is the best thing about World Vision demining in your village?

Questions for WVC Case Studies – World Vision staff

1. How long has World Vision been working in this community?
 2. Why did World Vision choose this village to work in?
 3. What are the main achievements you have seen in this village?
 4. In your opinion, what are the advantages of doing demining with community development?
 5. What might be the disadvantages of only doing demining, without community development?
-

Questions for Demining village – Village leader, households

1. Background

Name of Village:

Where is the village?

Population:

How old is the village?

If it is a new village, why did they move here?

2. Before Demining - I want to ask you about life in the village before demining. What problems did you have?

Health

Education

Farming

Water supply

Landmines

Road access

3. In the Village Today - Now I want to ask you about life in the village today.
What problems do you have?

Health

Education

Farming

Water supply

Landmines

Road access

5. In your opinion, what help does the village need now?

Questions for Key Informant interviews – Integrated Mine Action

Opinion

1. Why does your organisation implement/fund demining integrated with community development – why not just one or the other?
2. Do you have any anecdotal evidence that demining with community development has advantages over demining alone?
3. What do you think is the best integrated demining and community development program in Cambodia or elsewhere? Why is it the best?

Program

4. In your opinion, what are the essential program components for a successful integrated demining approach?
5. What are the most difficult aspects of implementing an integrated demining approach?
6. Are there any new approaches or program components in integrated demining that you think are particularly promising?
7. Are there any major lessons your organisation has learned from experience in integrated demining – pitfalls to be avoided, etc.
8. How have you managed to show donors the advantages of integrated demining over community development or demining alone?

Lit review

9. Do you have any relevant research studies from your organisation or from others, which show the impact of integrated demining?
10. Do you have any other documents that would be relevant to this area of research?
11. Do you know of any other studies that might be relevant to this research?

Appendix Three: List of Key Informants

Marc Bonnet

Regional Resident Representative

Norwegian People's Aid

#4 St. 278, S/K Olympic, Phnom Penh, Cambodia +855 23 210 383

Oum Sang Onn

Country Representative

Austcare

#23A, St 57, Boeng Keng kang, Phnom Penh, Cambodia +855 23 994 117

Brian Agland

Program Manager

CARE Cambodia

#52 St 352, Boeng Keng Kang, Phnom Penh, Cambodia +855 23 215267

Bruce Powell

Program Coordinator

Mines Advisory Group

#30, St. 294, Boeng Keng Kang, Phnom Penh, Cambodia +855 23 215 115

Ray Worner

Project Advisor

Cambodia Mine/UXO Victim Information System

Ray Worner, Project Advisor, 012 802 051

cmvis@online.com.kh

Julien Chevillard

Mine Action and Aid Coordination Specialist, UNDP

United Nations Development Programme

#53 Street 51, Boeng Keng Kang, Phnom Penh, Cambodia +855 23 216 167

Sarah Bearup

Technical Advisor

World Vision Cambodia

#20 Street 71, Phnom Penh, Cambodia, +855 23 216 052