

**ICBL Statement on International Cooperation and Assistance
Mine Ban Treaty Intersessional Standing Committee Meetings
Geneva, Switzerland
30 May 2013**

Thank you Madame/Mr. Chair.

My name is Umedjon Naimov, I am a mine survivor member of the Tajik Campaign to Ban Landmines and Cluster Munitions and the Ban Advocates Project.

While we sometimes hear about donor fatigue, so far we are fortunate to see mine action continuing to receive substantial funding, with international contributions for mine action in 2011 totaling more than \$467 million and with indications that funding levels in 2012 stayed at similar levels.

To ensure support remains at current levels, it is important to have clear communication between all parties so that needs are best matched with resources, and the resources are used efficiently. In that regard, the ICBL welcomes the co-chairs' initiative of a platform for partnerships, which can help facilitate provision of support from *all* States Parties, including by the sharing of expertise and good practices. We would also like to promote South-South cooperation on victim assistance, like the examples of cooperation between Afghanistan and Tajikistan or Thailand and Burundi. We also suggest opening the platform in the future to resources available from civil society, UN and other actors.

To further promote communication, we encourage donors to clearly spell out their criteria for funding mine clearance, as has been done in recent years by Australia, Germany, Norway and Switzerland for example. These states have highlighted the importance of national ownership, including good management and coordination, solid planning, and clear reporting. They have also said they need concrete, up-to-date plans that are in line with the reality on the ground.

We encourage affected states to respond to such requests for clear information. For example, states with mine contamination should be working harder to know the *real* amount of contamination, not an inflated picture based on old data. A state that has a good picture of known mined areas, and a clear plan to address them, shows it can efficiently manage the problem and might be more attractive to fund. Clear and comprehensive reporting can also help a state attract international support.

I would now like to talk about funding for victim assistance.

Victim Assistance is a vital promise of the treaty. Direct and indirect victims should have access to necessary services for their lifetimes. In many countries this will mean a need for national and international support even after the country has been declared mine free.

As with mine action, national ownership on victim assistance is very important as we want to see leadership and good coordination by affected states. Most affected states have made progress in

developing VA plans and budgets, and they need to show how requested funding will support those plans. More states should also provide information about national resources dedicated to VA.

But earmarked funding for victim assistance decreased by 30% in 2011, accounting for only 6% of total mine action funding in 2011.

It may be that some donor states are hoping to contribute more to victim assistance through other funding streams, such as development cooperation. But do donors know that these contributions are enabling a state to better assist survivors and family members? Are they able to determine whether the funds reach the most vulnerable people with disabilities in rural and remote areas? Do they know whether the funds given through such broad programs are making their way to landmine victims? These are difficult questions, but ones we need to answer if more funding for victim assistance will be going through broader channels.

On the other hand, the benefits of dedicated victim assistance funding are already visible and traceable. They reach not only survivors, but to a greater extent they reach other people in their communities with similar needs. Funding that donors defined as victim assistance through their mine action contributions actually mostly went to programs that assist persons with disabilities in general, including survivors. In reality, such funding is already “mainstreamed,” and we can track it as long as donors keep reporting clearly.

If we all commit to improving the monitoring of cooperation and measuring the changes it brings, it will also help to gather good practices and disseminate lessons learned. This applies to all areas of mine action.

Thank you.