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As part of the preparation for the Nairobi Summit for a Mine-Free World and beyond, Mines Action Canada (MAC) invited key players from governments (mine-affected and donor countries), campaigns, landmine survivors, youth, experts in development, humanitarian mine clearance, mine risk education, and victim assistance to Building the Road Beyond Nairobi which took place in Ottawa, Canada from September 15–17, 2004.

The main objective of this uniquely structured 2.5-day symposium was to provide an opportunity for the development, policy and mine action communities to come together and discuss strategies for concretely, proactively paving the future towards the full implementation of the Ottawa Convention in Nairobi and beyond. The symposium also aimed to provide an opportunity for focused, thorough discussion by important stakeholders to try and turn these important ideas into plans for the future. We felt our event was an important opportunity for stakeholders to:

- Have an opportunity to focus on and discuss the landmine issues that are important to them in a structure that does not limit or inhibit all participants from having input;
- Identify actionable ideas for maintaining the momentum of this global campaign and be an active part of building the future past Nairobi especially concerning the mainstreaming mine action;
- Share ideas, possibilities, and strategies for a landmine-free world with a cross-section of important actors in the movement in a way that is not feasible at official meetings;
- Identify next steps for identified ideas and strategies including naming the champions that will help keep them alive toward the Nairobi Summit and beyond; and
- Strengthen old relationships and build new ones in anticipation of the turnover of NGO and government actors in the movement post-Nairobi and the mainstreaming of mine action into development agencies.

To ensure that we achieved this, the event was structured using a facilitation technique called Open Space. Open Space is a highly participatory, dynamic facilitation technique, appropriate for encouraging the full, inclusive, and equal participation of marginal groups. One of the reasons we selected this technique was because it has been proven to be effective for engaging highly diverse groups working on complex issues. A second rationale was that we believed this structure could be a more effective way of encouraging the full, meaningful participation of survivors and stakeholders from mine-affected countries. In this structure, participants have full control over what is discussed, how long they remain in a discussion group and the quality of discussions.

Open Space works by:

- Using professional facilitators to brief participants on the Open Space process and the specific parameters under which discussions can take place;
- Inviting participants to create a list of discussion topics on issues of concern to them and post them on a wall. Once all of the discussion topics are posted, facilitators cluster similar discussion topics together and assign meeting times and rooms to each topic;
- Participants self-select the discussion groups they want to attend and participate in a variety of groups over a day and a half. At the end of each session, each group creates a report of outcomes and discussion points that are posted publicly and circulated to all participants;
- Once all of the discussion groups are complete, participants collaboratively cluster and prioritize the group of issues on which they would like to develop action plans. Participants again self-select into groups based on their interest and expertise to action planning on a particular issue;
- Action plans are reported back to the larger group. The group identifies and names champions who will be responsible for moving the plans forward;
- Participants leave the conference with draft copies of all discussion report and action plans.

In keeping with the unique structure of the event, you will find this report is also not traditional. In the first section, you will find a summary of all discussion reports grouped thematically. The second section contains action step summaries of the discussion group reports that participants voted to prioritize for planning. Many action step summaries are related to more than one discussion topic and this is indicated in the report where applicable. Because these reports were originally produced by the participants, we have tried—where possible—to edit them as little as possible to protect the integrity, intention and flavour of the group's discussion.

These reports and action steps are meant to be part of an ongoing conversation between symposium participants and interested members of the global landmine community who were not able to come the symposium. A full contact list has been included in Appendix A and we encourage you to contact champions or other group members if you are interested in joining these discussions.

We hope you find the report as useful and thought provoking as we found the symposium to be!
The group started with the premise that providing socio-economic reintegration for landmine survivors in war affected countries—where few traditional employment options exist—is extremely complex. Conventional skills training alone cannot meet the diverse needs of survivors nor tap into the diverse income generation opportunities that exist. Tapping into the creativity of survivors and implementing organizations can help address this challenge.

Creative victim assistance requires
1. Assessing the needs of survivors and their families to find out what their real needs are. Let survivors teach the donors what they need.
2. Use participatory methods to identify needs.
3. Meeting basic needs first: food and shelter, then income generation that will lead to poverty reduction.
4. An ability to assist survivors in indirect ways:
   a. Facilitating access to education for their children;
   b. Income generation initiatives that work with the partners and children of survivors may help the survivor more than providing that individual with skills training;
   c. Working with the sustainable village concept of the “Aid for Victims of Cambodian Landmines” organization—economic reintegration for survivor and community.
5. Assistance for local survivor organizations to provide landmine survivors with a support network to:
   a. Allow survivors to communicate with donors to explain what they need;
   b. Provide survivors with moral support;
   c. Provide long-term small business development support and access to funds for micro-enterprise start up or expansion;
   d. Link local survivors who are agricultural producers/artisans to local and regional markets.
6. Flexibility to assist income generation initiatives that are locally appropriate such as:
   a. Interning survivors in a technical training centre for duration of training;
   b. Providing experienced training brigades who will travel to communities on a continual basis;
   c. Facilitating “micro” micro-enterprise;
   d. Providing survivors with access to revolving loan funds (both cash and animals). Cash/animals are to be repaid to local organizations so the funds can be reused in the community of survivors;
   e. Developing appropriate apprenticeship programs can be a win-win solution for survivors, local implementing organizations, employers and donors;
   f. Offering non-conventional skills training that taps into local niche markets may be best way to facilitate income generation in areas where traditional employment options do not exist. Non-conventional skills training linked to local environmental and/or community development needs can meet multiple goals; tap into creativity of survivors;
   g. Facilitating partnerships between survivor organizations and municipalities to create employment through the provision of community services, i.e., ALGES, El Salvador;
   h. Combining training of landmine survivors with other war victims, and people with disabilities.

Other Challenges
How do you address victim assistance needs for survivors in areas currently in conflict i.e., Colombia?

Potential Proposals:
1. Find new ways to support local survivor organizations and national ICBL campaigns to raise funds to implement skills training projects and build organizational capacity. The ICBL and/or member organizations could provide local organizations and campaigns with fundraising support, a wide range of capacity building and assistance to help open doors to funding opportunities.
2. Document and use socio-economic reintegration success stories to spark new initiatives and donor interest.
3. Lobby for funding for small enterprise development programs for landmine survivors that can meet the diverse needs and creative income generation opportunities that exist.
Motivation for this topic came from a desire to explore empowerment versus a power-sharing approach to rights. It was accepted that each of these approaches works in different contexts. As well, the group explored how other human rights instruments like the Disability Rights Convention are structured. They also looked at ways of maximizing the links between the Disability Rights Convention and the Ottawa Convention.

Participants shared their regional experiences in working with survivors on their rights:

**Experience in Burma**
When you talk to survivors about what rights they think they have, the people view this as empowerment without any negative connotation (i.e., getting people in touch with their rights). However, the government—as in most of Asia—considers the rights-based approach to be hostile.

**Experience in India**
Hostility to human rights and a rights-based approach exists in India as well, but it has been proven that a vocal civil society can usually overcome this hostility. It was also noted that in India, the legal system has proven to be effective in the face of government corruption.

**Impediments to using a Rights-Based Approach**
It is hard to talk to people in these countries about their rights as survivors, when they do not have the experience of having “rights”—especially survivor rights guaranteed under the Ottawa Convention such as rights to full medical, social and economic reintegration. One participant noted that this was the challenge in Thailand. The Thai government argued that illegal immigrants in border areas do not have rights to begin with, so how could they support a rights-based approach for survivors in this group? This meant that the people could not take groups of these people to training programs.

This leads to a core issue: how do you guarantee rights for victims who are stateless? Many mine victims are stateless. Victimization caused by statelessness is similar to that caused by mine injury—an issue that arbitrarily affects civilians usually belonging to already vulnerable groups. Many mine victims are stateless and stateless people do not have rights. Therefore, there is no reason for stateless people to respect rights themselves which can then lead to despair, terrorism and violence.

On the flipside, we see an example of how stateless people’s rights to victim assistance has been positive (i.e., mine victims who come to Greece across the Turkish border). ICBL Landmine Monitor in Greece has managed to negotiate with authorities to get help for these people. This is an example where stateless people’s right to victim assistance has worked, as opposed to other areas like Thailand and mined border areas in Africa.

Many landmine victims are included in other vulnerable groups: economically marginalized people, ethnic minorities and indigenous groups. So, a rights-based approach should recognize that rights are indivisible—not only linked to the right to statehood, but also the right to economic development.

For people who have never had the experience of rights, how do you get them to the stage of hopes, dreams and aspiration for rights? In these cases, empowerment is necessary as opposed to power-sharing.

The ICRC approach to rights is that all victims are equal and action is taken based on responding to needs in emergency situations. International Humanitarian Law (IHL) training is part of that approach. In IHL, the approach to the authorities is dual and includes prevention i.e., reminding states of their obligations under...
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IHL to prevent further violations and promoting changes in military behavior; as well as protection i.e., ICRC acting in place of authorities when the latter is unwilling or unable to do so.

**Future beyond the Nairobi Summit for RBA**

RBA has promise, but it is confrontational and governments do not generally like it. One of the most positive aspects of this approach is the empowerment it generates. However, in many cases, it has not demonstrated solid results yet, at least in the experience of Southeast Asia.

On the other hand, when cooperation has been the approach of some ICBL campaigns, RBA has been successful. In India, for example, government authorities are no longer hostile to RBA and police in border areas are cooperative. It should be noted that international pressure brought to bear on this situation has been essential. Different approaches are needed at different times in different regions.

We do know that focusing on the injuries and suffering (through educational activities and quantitative data) of victims has changed minds and influenced authorities as was the case in Burma. It was also noted that the use of footnotes capturing this data in the Burmese-language LM report was received very positively and was seen as very empowering by readers. However, the use of images and pictures as a means to influence states was not persuasive with the authorities, because this was seen as the “cost of war” in Burma.

The issue, then, becomes how to effectively use pictures, data and evidence. Which medium is more persuasive? Cold hard numbers of victims? Injuries? Today, we seem to need large numbers of victims to get people to react. However, accuracy of these numbers is questionable as well.

How do we communicate that lower numbers of new victims do not mean injuries and deaths are not a problem? Are facts and figures more persuasive for some audiences like military authorities? Stories or anecdotes seem to be more empowering for victims and more compelling for the general public.

Both the numbers and stories are needed. For example, the Indian campaign, using international pressure, media attention and legal pressure, forced the government to grant compensation to landmine injury victims and to farmers who had lost three crops due to landmines recently.

*Participants Anne Woodbridge (CIDA) and Frank Jewsbury (CAMEO) write the topics of the discussion groups they would like to have.*

*Participants post their discussion topics.*
Ensure Progress on Victim Assistance

INITIATOR: SYLVIE BRIGOT

PARTICIPANTS: SYLVIE BRIGOT, BECKY JORDAN, DENISE LABELLE, VALERIE CEYLON, MARGARET ARECH ORECH, PHILIPPE CHABASSE, KJELL KNUDSEN, PATRICIA CAMPBELL

SUMMARY:

Assessment:
The group began the discussion with defining the meaning of “ensure.” Is this meant to be an assessment or a means to describe the way forward? The group decided to discuss the issue from an assessment perspective, referring to these established indicators:

- Medical care and physical rehabilitation;
- Social and economic reintegration;
- Data collection system;
- National coordination mechanisms, including mine victim assistance;
- Disability laws and policies;
- Organizations of people with disabilities.

Even though these indicators are currently being used, the group found that they were not satisfactory. For instance, the collection of data may prove to be difficult in developing countries. The Landmine Monitor reporting and networking may be useful in this regard, but not sufficient.

There are different levels on which the assessment can be made from the local to the national and international perspectives. Nevertheless, the group concluded that assessment at the international level was extremely difficult.

Mainstreaming or specialization regarding the needs of landmine victims:
The group also discussed the issue of mainstreaming or specialization of the treatment of landmines victims, as opposed to treating victims as all people with disabilities. Landmine Survivors Network uses a “twin-track approach” incorporating both mainstreaming and specialized assistance for survivors.

The group concluded that the disabled community is fragmented in terms of their particular needs, but there are universal needs in regards to legal issues. The community of disabled people should gather under the same movement and lobby to have a stronger representation as in Uganda.

In some cases, the principle of the least restrictive option (matching what people need with what is most mainstream) is of practical use.

The need for social and economic integration constitutes, in many cases, a priority for landmine victims.

Coordination:
The final point of the discussion was coordination of landmine victim assistance within different governmental agencies. The group considered that there is a strong call for an integrated approach among different agencies at the international level, but this does not necessarily exist at the national level. At the national level, the Ottawa Process has been basically led by a specific national agency i.e., only ministries of foreign affairs and/or defense.

The group suggested that there should more dissemination of victim assistance news and guidelines across different governmental agencies and stakeholders, as well as from official meetings to the field. The group specifically suggested considering inviting relevant ministries to post-Nairobi follow-up meetings to help get these bodies on board.
Working with Survivors in Advocacy

INITIATOR: SUE WIXLEY

PARTICIPANTS: MARILYN LEMON, NARINE BERIKASHVILI, MARGARET ARACH ORECH, DENISE LABELLE, CHRISTINE MANULA, ANGELO SIMONAZZI, PETER SUNDBERG, SHUSHIRA CHONHENCHOB, SONG KOSAL, BECKY JORDAN, KJELL KNUDSEN, HABBOUBA AOUN, MELANIE REGIMBAL, SYLVIE BRIGOT, SUSAN ECKEY, VALERIE CELYON

SUMMARY:

Why work with survivors in advocacy?
- They can talk about their needs;
- They are best placed to convince others;
- Principle of “nothing about us without us”;
- Legitimacy;
- Part of reintegration process;
- To be inclusive;
- Survivors are demanding to play a role;
- Building on success of survivor participation in campaigning;
- It is their right;
- It is both their and our responsibility;
- It makes things happen.

How?
- Capacity building programs such as “Raising the Voices” of LSN;
- Advocacy as first step;
- Securing long-term funding;
- Training in fundraising;
- Policy of ICBL to include survivors in local campaigns;
- Raising awareness of importance of listening and involving survivors;
- Protecting survivors from harassment in their work;
- Developing messages and advocacy activities (take into consideration a range of advocacy messages and activities);
- Balancing risk with aims;
- Taking the context into consideration;
- Helping get access to governments, donors, etc.;
- Letters of support;
- Introduction;
- Helping to develop proposals;
- Allowances for travel to sub-committee and mine action meetings;
- Support for computers and other infrastructure;
- Assisting in formalizing and registering organizations or campaigns;
- Encouraging government and other structures to involve survivors;
- Understanding barriers to access;
- Finding ways to hear different voices amongst survivors—gender equality, youth;
- Making information available (i.e., through radio, word of mouth, children, community work);
- Victim assistance awareness program and disability awareness;
- Making links with disability rights groups;
- Getting funding to bridge gaps;
- Mainstreaming the issue in development at all levels;
- Mainstreaming issue of survivors in disability programs;
- Helping groups develop staff and strategies through organizational capacity building;
- Do we need separate groups for survivors? Depends on its objectives;
- Umbrella organization: Disabled Peoples International (DPI);
- Support and encouragement;
- Finding creative ways to financially support survivor advocates;
- Giving small financial support thoughtfully;
- Helping governments implement their disability laws;
- Adopting a different approach to involve female landmine survivors in advocacy.

ICBL Youth Ambassador and Cambodian landmine survivor, Song Kosal and Shushira Chonhenchob from the Thailand Campaign to Ban Landmines engage in a discussion group on “Working with Survivors in Advocacy”.
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Putting the Survivors Back on Their Feet

INITIATOR:  MARGARET ARACH ORECH

PARTICIPANTS:  PURNA SHOVA CHITRAKAR, PETER HERBY, SONG KOSAL, SHUSHIRA CHONHENCHOB, JEAN DEVLIN, DAVID HORTON, NANCY DEGRAFF, ILARIO MAILO, PETER SUNDBERG, PATRICIA CAMPBELL, BECKY JORDAN

SUMMARY:

Discussions focused on the variety of needs for mine survivor assistance and how to better ensure that governments fulfill the commitments they have made under the Convention in this field.

Holding governments to their commitments:
The lack of adequate care and opportunities for mine survivors were recognized as a pervasive problem that forms part of the broader issue of support for the disabled. Recommendations for addressing this problem included:

- Clarifying what is expected of States Parties by developing minimum standards/expectations through the Intersessional Standing Committee on Victim Assistance;
- Landmine Monitor could develop a “scorecard” on States’ implementation of their victim assistance commitments;
- Parliamentarians and prominent personalities could be enlisted as public advocates for mine victims in the national context;
- Advocate for transparency of governments in regards to the amount spent on persons with disabilities;
- The Review Conference should recommend the establishment of national focal points in States Parties for victim assistance. As well, the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance should host meetings of officials from health and social service ministries to consider how their governments are fulfilling their Convention responsibilities in this field;
- The Review Conference should also reaffirm the comprehensive approach to mine survivor assistance and create a position where a respected personality would serve as a special representative (or spokesperson/ombudsman) for mine victim assistance. They could help and encourage States Parties to fulfill their commitments in this field;
- The World Health Organization could be used as a forum to promote actions benefiting mine survivors and other persons with disabilities.

Emergency response after the incident:

Emergency care after a mine incident is often unavailable or requires excruciatingly long delays. Local health posts often lack staff, doctors and medicine, resulting in increased deaths and disabilities. There is a need in affected areas for:

- Training for local persons in first aid to stabilize the victim;
- Training of local health staff in essential skills;
- Transportation to health facilities;
- Recognizing the even greater challenges faced in situations of ongoing conflict.

Medical care:

As mine injuries are the result of actions by governments or insurgent forces, it should not be the victims, but the State concerned to bear primary responsibility for this care. This principle was recognized under the Convention, but has not been implemented effectively to date. To remedy this:

- The range of steps identified in the above section needs to be pursued;
- Survivors in affected countries need to work together and “politely harass” relevant government officials.

Physical rehabilitation:

Accessibility of services is essential. In some cases, even if rehabilitation centres exist and offer free services, people cannot get to them. Creative approaches to this issue are needed. These might include:

- Mobile services or clinics for first-time fittings, re-fitting or servicing of existing prosthetics;
- Ensuring that support is adapted to the environment and preferences of the survivor. Sometimes the terrain means crutches are preferable to an artificial limb.

Empowerment and reintegration:

The survivor needs not only to walk again, but also to walk with dignity—“with their head held high.” This implies a wide range of measures offering opportunities and support including:

- Developing skills for economic independence;
- Networking with others, peer support and confidence building opportunities;
- Changed thinking about the disabled within society;
- Opportunities to advocate for their own needs including participating in developing government policies and programs for the disabled.
Meeting the Challenge of Victim Assistance in an African Context

INITIATOR: PAUL SAOKE

PARTICIPANTS: MARILYN LEMON, CAROL PHILLIPS, ROB BECHAMP

SUMMARY:

This discussion dealt with changing the focus of current landmine issues more to the landmine victims. Although emerging landmine policies are important, the victims of landmines need to be brought into focus to increase the public awareness on the issue. Major issues discussed on how to support landmine victims included:

- Wait times associated with primary care are typically very long—how can these be shortened;
- Lack of infrastructure where medical operations could be performed;
- Government priority needs to shift to these aforementioned items rather than on policy;
- Lack of medical personnel, materials, as well as medical training relating to the treatment of landmine victims. Can resources for these issues, including manuals, be made available? They would need appropriate distribution;
- Access to landmine victims in conflict situations needs to be addressed. How can they be reached in rural areas where medical supplies and proper facilities are sparse;
- Public health NGOs are a great resource that could focus on victim assistance rather than policy;
- A network of medical personnel throughout an area could help alleviate wait times through appropriate communication and cooperation;
- Do medical staff need to focus on landmine victims, or should there be an integrated approach to helping all sick or injured people;
- How to deal with the poverty situation? The current structure of primary care doesn’t work;
- Better organization and communication between NGOs and landmine communities is required (i.e., food drops in fields with landmines results in more injuries and deaths whereas communication and organization would resolve this issue);
- Universal approaches to solving the problem of providing better care and assistance to landmine victims might not be the best approach. Focusing on regional solutions with considerations of stability of government, etc., might help provide real solutions to each area;
- Low morale in medical staff often results in them leaving for higher paying work in other countries. Proper training and support may help to attract and maintain a larger network of medical and support staff;
- Training on landmine injuries and the appropriate treatments should be mainstream curriculum in medical schools (or specific medical schools);
- Landmine community education and involvement in the care of victims of landmines may reduce some workload for medical staff;
- NGO participation in supporting local communities should recognize the importance of the community structure. How can the community continue to function when the NGO moves to another location?

Above all, there is a need to shift landmine victims to the centre of attention instead of policy-making. Focusing resources on the treatment and care of the victims is necessary. More awareness may help instill more empathy and involvement in landmine problems that plague the global community.
The group discussed the need for two levels of intervention required to promote non-signatories to join the Ottawa Convention including the political and security levels.

The group developed several recommendations for interventions at the political level including:
- Encourage non-signatories to participate in intersessional meetings, state parties meetings, etc.;
- Encourage non-signatories to abide by the norms of the Ottawa Convention even if they have not yet signed. For example, encourage both the government and rebel parties to sign a deed of commitment. This should be an internal document and not the Geneva Call Deed of Commitment. One way to achieve this is by holding closed-door meetings with both the government and rebel groups in an attempt to reach agreement on a code of conduct where both parties would not use landmines;
- Encourage governments to produce voluntary reports on stockpile destruction, use and production of landmines;
- Approach other local state party embassies to apply pressure on non-signatory countries to join the Ottawa Convention;
- Advocate for the inclusion of the landmine issue in all peace talks;
- ICBL campaigns continue existing advocacy and lobbying actions at the local government level to promote joining the Ottawa Convention;
- Donors should encourage non-signatories to join the Convention by providing a sunset clause in aid funds. For example, if a donor country provides aid funds to a particular country, indicate that if the non-signatory has not signed the Ottawa Treaty in a predetermined number of years, funding would stop.

Recommended actions at the security level include:
- Encourage high level military officers of non-signatory countries to participate in the Nairobi Summit and attend the special military sessions where use of landmines is shown to be an ineffective means of ensuring security in their country;
- Continue to host regional meetings on the Ottawa Convention;
- Become knowledgeable about alternative measures to using landmines. Negotiate ways to reduce the use of arms, such as landmines, in the peace dialogue.
The group started the discussion by exploring the military utility argument used to keep landmines as well as looking at the number of states still using this rationale as a reason not to join the MBT. Although all agreed that these arguments could be refuted, there is a need to disseminate tools to help campaigners. One example is the follow up to Friend or Foe ICRC study or by contacting the Ottawa Convention Generals Support Team who could help campaigners refute the military argument with more credibility.

Many stated that the underlying problem is that in most non-signatory states, it is the military and defence departments who are still in charge of the landmines issue. Some military groups believe that it is unnecessary to take this weapon out of their “toolbox” as they believe landmines will have to be replaced by more expensive and technologically advanced weapons. Whether the final say falls to the military or to a top political leader, this person has to be targeted in order to achieve tangible results. Others suggested that the military should be engaged, but the focus should be on higher political levels by using the pressure and shame tactic.

Although many foreign affairs departments are getting involved in this issue, in some countries they often have less authority than the military. Foreign affairs departments must bring the humanitarian aspect of the issue forward. Another strategy that was mentioned was to help create friction between the foreign affairs and defence departments as a possible way to make things move.

In approaching a non-signatory state, a member state could either use the humanitarian argument or the military utility argument. However, NGOs can use many more arguments to try to convince the governments to accede the MBT.

Another argument brought forward was that it was important not only for member governments and high officials to exert pressure, but also for civil society to advocate in such a manner. It is important to educate the whole population on this issue including the media and lower level politicians. In countries where there is no civil society, carrying out these advocacy initiatives can be difficult, however another resource could be the United Nations community. In many of the non-signatory countries, landmines are used to “protect” borders from an invasion. Notwithstanding this issue, it was stated that some countries have started to remove border mines as they have realized they are ineffective. However, not all countries are convinced of this rationale.

The Belarus success story was explored. The reason for success in Belarus was two-fold. First, the international community pressured Belarus to ban landmines. Second, the national campaign targeted the various people and agencies who use mines or who are in charge of landmine policy. One of the key factors in success was to find people who were sympathetic to the cause. Afterwards, these sympathizers spoke with their organizations and step by step, the campaign was brought forward.

The issue of trust also came out in this discussion. Some states were weary of the international community or of civil society. The credibility of the MBT should also be used to build trust. For example, if neighboring countries were invited to witness a country’s stockpile destruction or other commitments to the MBT, that would be a good, trust building opportunity. There is also a need to better utilize media to show neighboring countries and the whole world what is happening in countries that have joined the MBT.

**Long-term actions for dealing with difficult states:**

- Identify the opposition and deal with them directly;
- Find people within the organizations in charge of mine policy who are sympathetic to the cause and encourage them to bring the issue forward;
- Pressure alone does not work. Campaigns are a step-by-step process and each small victory should be celebrated. Positive reinforcement could be used with public recognition and funding.
Immediate actions to deal with difficult states before and during Nairobi Summit:
Every UN member state has been invited to the Summit. Each government attending must contribute to the costs; however, this might discourage some states from attending. Some participants thought that non-signatory states must be constantly encouraged to attend in order to facilitate dialogue between various states that have mines on their borders.

A broad discussion revolved around the idea of a letter campaign to non-signatory states. There were variations on this idea:
- President of the Review Conference should write letters and send political declarations signed by the 143 states.
- At the Summit, encourage each head of government to send a letter to every non-signatory. The logic behind this proposal is that a letter would be taken more seriously if it came from a head of government. Also, each government could use its bilateral relationships to target states and use specific arguments to make the case.
- Some thought that this extensive letter writing campaign was unrealistic. Others thought that the idea should at least be proposed at the Summit or at the next preparatory meeting in late September.
- President of the Review Conference should write to all non-signatory states and invite them to write back to explain why they are not joining the Treaty. These answers would be distributed to all campaigns and specific action could be taken to target each state.
- Some warned against letter writing as a strategy that brings limited impact in terms of pressure. Participants noted that the letter campaign strategy has already been used. However, if these letters were signed by 143 states as well as the President, this would give more credibility and impact. Others were worried that this letter campaign would take up a long period of time during the conference for discussion and approval. Yet another suggestion was to bring this issue up during the last preparatory meeting in Geneva in late September and prepare in the following two months.
- Another suggestion was to encourage non-party states that are not attending the Nairobi Summit to send a letter explaining any positive steps their country has taken towards joining the Treaty. Some of this work has already been done by the universalization working group.
- ICBL should remind all states parties of their obligation under the Treaty to encourage universalization.
Joint Demining Projects and Mine Action as Confidence—Building Measures

INITIATOR: LI GENXING

PARTICIPANTS: SUMITA DIXIT, MELANIE RÉGIMBAL, MARGARET BACK, THOMAS NASH, STEPHAN NELLEN, CHANDARAMONY EANG

SUMMARY OF VIEWS:

The discussion was led by a representative from a Chinese NGO and focused on his desire to develop partnerships for joint demining projects as a means to influence Chinese authorities to join the Ottawa Convention.

- China is ready to undertake joint demining projects;
- China wants to participate in the world-class demining community;
- Some non-signatory countries are landmine affected or producing countries. They have expertise in making landmines and they can remove them as well. To do this, they need financial and technical cooperation;
- China has skills in manual demining, prosthetics and stockpile destruction;
- Some states may find it difficult to work on stockpile destruction with China when China has not destroyed its own stockpile;
- Some developing countries consider Western demining techniques too expensive and would like to cooperate with China in cheaper demining activities;
- All countries have the right to choose their own methodology for mine clearance;
- We need more political will to strengthen cooperation between state parties and countries outside the Convention to help the region;
- Improvements in the regional security environment will help everyone;
- ASEAN is an example of the spirit of cooperation being fostered in Southeast Asia where mine action is a part of these efforts;
- Experience in Peru and Ecuador—mine clearance has slowed down, but former enemies are now working together and building confidence for peace;
- Joint projects in mine action can strengthen relationships and build confidence between countries as well as within the region;

- Corruption is a problem in mine-affected countries. This corruption can hamper joint projects and mine action in general;
- It is a good idea to start a dialogue first and then move towards possible joint projects.

Proposals:

- Victim assistance may be a good option to start working on joint projects with countries outside the Convention;
- Big powers and donors (Canada, E.U., Australia, Japan, U.K.) can work together with China to build a world-class task force and a strategic program for demining;
- Thailand, Vietnam, Lao, Myanmar, South Asia, Central Asia, South America and Africa are possible candidates for projects that may be less costly than existing demining operations;
- More competition between demining operators may improve development of demining methods and tools.
Engaging Non-State Actors (NSAs)

INITIATOR: FRED LUBANG

PARTICIPANTS: PURNA SHOVA CHITRAKAR, BALKRISHNA KURVEY, DAN BERMAN, FREDDY DE ALWIS

SUMMARY:

Context:
- NSAs are not a uniform group and they operate in a variety of different contexts and structures. Thus, when dealing with NSAs, the specific regional context and structure must be considered.

Concerns:
- Definition of NSAs and corresponding targets and priorities (gray areas like unformed republics);
- Sensitivities:
  - NSAs—may not want to be called such (problem of terrorist labeling);
  - States—legal and political concerns on engagement with NSAs by providing support for, or as obstacles for access, visas and security guarantees;
  - There are security risks involved in engaging NSAs—especially for campaigners.

Existing tools for engagement:
- Geneva Call Deed of Commitment;
- Unilateral statements/commitments;
- Bilateral (peace and ceasefire) commitments;
- Partial/comprehensive agreements;
- Code of Conduct;
- Human rights mechanisms and agreements.

Approaches:
- Formal and/or informal consultations facilitated largely by campaigners and contacts on the ground;
- Various links which we establish directly or indirectly with NSAs—within or outside the territories where they operate;
- Reaching out to NSA leadership, either directly through contacts or indirectly through publicly broadcasted messages, helps get the message across to the decision makers;
- Confidence building measures such as joint mine action projects (even without full commitment to a mine ban as in Sri Lanka) or temporary cessation of use of APMs as part of the ceasefire agreement (as in the Philippines);
- Commitment to the landmine issue as an accompaniment or confidence builder to peace processes;
- Different publications or press releases;
- Organize advocacy/mine action programs openly;
- Engage forum with human rights groups, negotiators and media;
- Engage NSAs who have their leadership based in a third country;
- Involve human rights commissions in monitoring and abiding by the landmine ban.

Tools for States to engage NSAs:
- Mine Ban Treaty;
- International Humanitarian Law;
- Declaratory statements (i.e., in the meeting of state parties or at other official meetings, etc.);
- Link with the International Criminal Court process;
- Mine Ban Treaty framework for violations/accountability;
- Naming and shaming;
- Engaging the global mine ban community to condemn acts by rebel groups i.e., leverage pressure from the ICBL having an international status and Nobel Laureate and other bodies like the United Nations;
- Donor governments who are actively involved in supporting peace processes should, in all possible ways, aim to discuss the landmine issue with warring parties.

YMAAP’s Christa McMillin poses with Freddy de Alwis (Sri Lanka) and Fred Lubang (Philippines).
Dealing With Non-State Actors

INITIATOR: FRANK JEWSBURY

PARTICIPANTS: BRIGITTE ODERLIN, MEREDITH WOTTEN, CAMILO SERNA, PETER SUNDBERG, DAN BERMAN, FRED LUBANG

SUMMARY:
The discussion covered how the international community should deal with non-state actors. Is there a justifiable difference between providing humanitarian food aid and emergency medical assistance to NSA areas and providing mine action assistance? What circumstances justify mine action assistance?

Humanitarian aid: We concluded that humanitarian food aid was different in nature from mine action assistance. Donors are more willing to supply food, as food is generally in surplus on a global basis. Also, food aid is targeted at the individual level rather than at the organizational level.

How to use mine action assistance:
- Must be considered on a case-by-case basis;
- Primarily a peace building/confidence building measure. Therefore, only initially used in the context of some sort of peace talks/negotiations;
- Generally shown to increase cross-border communication and understanding between rival groups;
- May be more acceptable to donors as a service provided by an outside agency (analogous to humanitarian food aid) rather than as a capacity building exercise;
- Mine risk education may be a more acceptable and appropriate tool in these circumstances than mine clearance.
The group agreed that MRE is essential for sustained humanitarian mine action. It should be integrated in the different mine action activities and should not be limited to mine clearance activities, because it needs to continue beyond the closure of any demining project. MRE is less expensive and should continue to be on the agendas of all mine affected countries. MRE is contextual where underlying principles do not change, but messages and methods are linked to the characteristics and needs of the targeted communities.

Beyond the Nairobi Summit, we feel MRE should continue in all countries through integrating it in the school curricula. Through schools, we reach students, their parents and ultimately, their communities. We are considering formal classes, but also of more interactive approaches to engage student clubs and parent-teachers associations.

We propose to develop appropriate material for school curricula and pilot it in certain countries like Lebanon, Georgia or elsewhere. We need to develop the material, work with the ministry of education and train teachers. While MRE needs pilot testing and perseverance, it can happen. Today, MRE is a well developed discipline. We just need to tailor it appropriately with the help of scholastic pedagogues (decision makers on curriculum development) and those concerned at the ministries of education.

Mainstreaming MRE, as well as victim assistance, in the national development plans of the countries is essential.

MRE is important and should be kept high on the agenda because it is an initiator of data gathering, victim assistance, risk avoidance and mine clearance.

We also propose to continue engaging youth in their existing structures (clubs, scouts, student unions, etc.) and disseminate MRE messages with and through them. Through youth, we can reach families in a very interactive way.

Lastly, the children should be involved. They can make a change, easily!
The Ottawa Convention banning landmines states in Article 3 that State Parties must destroy all anti-personnel mines with exception of retaining mines for training and research purposes. In this case, the state can retain the "minimum number absolutely necessary." The initiator feels that this “minimum” number of mines allowed to be retained needs to be clarified so that this clause does not become a loophole for states to keep stocks of anti-personnel mines for potential future use.

**Examples of problematic cases:**
- **Brazil** "Brazil retains mines to keep its conditions on international cooperation."
- Although they did not use any mines in 2002 and 2003, they did use five of these mines in 2001.
- **Japan** Japan’s statement in the June Intersessional meeting indicated that a limited number of states holding on to excessive quantities of anti-personnel mines would block the full universalization of the Convention.
- **Americas region** Argentina and Chile proposal’s in Quito (Organization of American States meeting on "road to Nairobi" in 2003) stated that "...if some states want to retain 50,000 mines for training, there is no problem, but they should explain why.”(Argentina representative).

**Questionable necessity and relevancy of the issue:**
- There are over 350 types of mines, so is it still useful to retain one or two types considering there are 350 types useful in different soil, weather conditions, etc.?
- Is there a real necessity to keep mines for training? Is the training of deminers without live mines less effective than using inactive mines? Is there a legitimate fear that those states wanting to retain a huge amount of mines for training would use them? Which is the rationale we can use to limit the number of mines retained for training?

**Conclusion:**
- The initiator invites readers to contact him to further discuss and explore this issue.
Information provided by the field surgeons of the ICRC regarding civilian victims of landmines started the movement of the ICBL. The medical community in developing countries is respected and listened to by the public. However, in many developing countries, the medical community is not involved in advocacy for the MBT.

With involvement of medical associations including doctors, nurses and health workers, we can focus on the victims and attract much needed attention.

The relationship between the medical community and the landmine movement should help provide better data on victims and will bring victim assistance issues to the forefront of both national and regional forums. Doctors associations could promote tours of medical and victim rehabilitation facilities to policy makers to help in building a mechanism for greater medical access for victims. Interaction between policy makers and health professions could be very useful for advocacy in developing countries.

Currently, doctors only treat and discharge the victims. Strategically, we have to motivate them to look beyond their service and engage them in this humanitarian cause. Landmines are not only a health related issue, but they also have humanitarian and social aspects. Doctors could be invited to speak on critical injuries/trauma and lobby local policy makers to provide more social services to victims. We have to urge doctors to understand that landmines are a health issue from a man-made epidemic. Every epidemic has a cause that must be removed. In the landmine issue, it is landmines that are killing and maiming innocent civilians. Only by completely destroying all landmines will we remedy this epidemic.

Doctors have the knowledge, expertise and responsibility to engage in this humanitarian issue. A well-informed medical community could persuasively inform policy makers and the public, which will help in the Movement’s ultimate advocacy strategy.
More Media and Public Engagement

INITIATORS:  ISABELLE DAOUST, SUZANNE LEMIEUX

PARTICIPANTS: ANDREW SHORE, ISABELLE DAOUST, SUZANNE LEMIEUX, VALÉRIE CELYON, MEREDITH WOTTEN, CHRISTA MCMILLIN, MARGARET ARACH ORECH, SHANNON SMITH, KJELL KNUDSEN, SUE WIXLEY, BRIGITTE OEDERLIN, ILARIO MAIOLI, NANCY INGRAM, ENRIQUE ROMAN-MOREY

SUMMARY:
The discussion focused on keeping and renewing momentum through the media and public engagement.

Purpose of the media
The first step in success with the media is to identify why the media should be engaged. It is important to see if media engagement is sought for fundraising, public awareness or political pressure. It was noted that attention on landmines does not always translate to the Ottawa Convention. In this circumstance, the media will address the problem of landmines without mentioning the solution (i.e., the Ottawa Convention).

Generating media interest
The campaign in its initial phase benefited from a great deal of media coverage. However, over the past four years it has been noted by participants that it has become more difficult to engage the media on the topic of landmines without mentioning the solution (i.e., the Ottawa Convention).

Youth can be utilized both as audience and initiators of media interest as in the Youth Mine Action Ambassador Program in Canada. Using a prominent spokesperson — similar to the UN Goodwill Ambassadors— is another possibility. Another option is to promote survivor stories or link landmines with unexploded remnants of war. Engaging journalists in a personal manner by organizing field trips to mine-affected areas was also discussed along with organizing seminars on the landmine issue specifically for journalists.

Other possibilities for garnering coverage aside from traditional media outlets also exist. These may include commercials—which are often used as a fundraising tool, the internet and in-depth editoral coverage.

Getting independent and community-based papers as well as the local media involved can be another very effective way to engage the public. Generally, the most successful method of getting the attention of all media outlets is by trying to find a local aspect to an international story.

Leveraging the Publicity at the Nairobi Summit
The Summit will obviously generate a great deal of media interest since it is the first major diplomatic event since the signature of the Convention. If there is a high level delegation from the U.S., this will definitely increase media attention.

Informal media networks can allow interested parties to exchange ideas on how to mobilize the media. Websites with specific sections devoted to the Summit include:

http://www.icbl.org/treaty/meetings/nairobisummit
www.icrc.org
www.nairobisummit.org
The Role of Youth

INITIATOR:  EVA MORRISON

PARTICIPANTS:  SONG KOSAL, SHUSHIRA CHONHENCHOB, JACKIE HANSEN, FRED LUBANG, PUNNA SHOVA CHITRAKAR, GUSTAVO VIEIRA, CAMILO VILLEGAS, HABBOUBA AOUN, MONIQUE ST-JEAN, KAREN MOLLICA, CORY ANDERSON, NARINE BERIKASHVILI, ELODIE BUTTON, GABRIELLE WHITE, EVA MORRISON, IOURI ZAGOUHENNOV

SUMMARY:

Brainstorm benefits of youth involvement:

- Can play a role in gaining momentum and putting unexpected ideas forward;
- Creative and persistent;
- Play a different role that is complementary to existing structures;
- Network—youth involvement provides access to other networks of potential participants i.e., school, community/youth groups, etc.;
- Youth innocence or lack of experience is an advantage as it avoids linear thinking;
- Open to dialogue;
- Helps to create responsible global citizens;
- Good way to create ownership over the issue for future generations;
- Can shape public opinion;
- Youth energy;
- Willingness to participate.

How are youth presently used in the campaign:

- Targets for mine risk education;
- Advocacy—creating public awareness and lobbying governments;
- Researchers (LM, ERW) as part of studies;
- Informants—convey valuable information about the issue;
- Community outreach;
- Fundraising;
- To convey a strong message that people will listen to;
- Provide assistance to community via volunteer work and youth service.

Objectives of youth movement (present and future):

- Need the next generation to fulfill our goal of a mine-free world;
- Networks/twinning—to make it easier for groups to communicate;
- Sharing of resources and ideas;
- Giving youth a role with a clear objective thereby creating a feeling of ownership;
- Need to ensure that the environment is there to create a global conscience;
- Need to strengthen existing structures to render them favourable for youth involvement.

Existing tools:

- Online resources (valuable to those with access to computer/Internet);
- Camps;
- Student unions;
- Festivals and ceremonies;
- Letter writing campaigns—regionally and internationally;
- Schools—issue part of curriculum/workshop;
- Youth parliament;
- Use of youth to assist with support of mine victims;
- Train victims to promote legislation;
- Take advantage of existing military services/education;
- Publications and many resources available in various languages.

Challenges identified:

- Identity needs to be developed further;
- Local levels are good but there are barriers to the international movement and solidarity;
- Important to have communication between youth all over the world;
- Need international identity for all of them to know that there are others working for the same objectives in regions worldwide.

Maintaining Momentum
Twinning and Networking:
- Sustainable past 2004;
- Stresses opportunities to meet;
- Sharing and exchanging information;
- Identifying with other groups/cultures;
- Useful for broader coordination purposes;
- Primary goal is to increase strength at a local level;
- Challenge: Would networking respond to other issues as well? (i.e. child soldiers).

Technology as a Tool:
- Many youth are comfortable with and have access to electronic technology (mobile phones, text messaging, email, Internet, etc.). However, in many parts of the world there is limited or no access to information technology.

Additional points generated post-discussion:
- Government should be seen as a tool in supporting and making internships and other similar opportunities available for youth;
- Youth engagement is meant to correspond with campaign goals to enrich and continue the work of the campaign;
- Youth can build on what is already done and help to visualize and realize the future;
- Youth are in a position to support initiatives and break down communication barriers i.e., access to office supplies, computers, training, etc.;
- Youth can create solid plans for campaign cooperation;
- Youth have concrete ideas on how best to keep furthering dialogue:
  - For those with Internet access: e-group, email, website, etc;
  - Meet at conferences to engage other youth;
  - Correspondence between youth campaigns.

MAC’s Eva Morrison facilitates a discussion group on the role of youth in the mine ban movement.
Mainstreaming Mine Action into Development

INITIATOR: EARL TURCOTTE

PARTICIPANTS: CORY ANDERSON, HABBOUBA AOUN, DERMOT CARTY, NANCY DEGRAFF, JEAN DEVLIN, DAVID HORTON, FRANK JEWSBURY, MARILYN LEMON, CHRISTINE MANULA, CHRISTA MCMILLIN, KAREN MOLLICA, THOMAS NASH, STEPHAN NELLEN, PAUL SAOKE, GABRIELLE WHITE, ANNE WOODBRIDGE & MEREDITH WOTTEN

SUMMARY:

- Mine action has traditionally been viewed as a humanitarian assistance issue and it will continue to be a humanitarian issue. However, it is now recognized that mine action is also a development issue and a means to fulfilling the Millennium Development Goals.
- Example: Jordan imports 80% of its food because of a lack of land due to landmines.
- Example: A landmine explosion in rural Kenya killed five people and injured 12 others. As a result, grain prices shot up 1000% within a very short time; all economic activities in the region came to a virtual standstill; and people were afraid to travel. This example shows how landmines directly impact life-sustaining activities on a daily basis.
- “Selling” mine action as a development issue helps meet the objective of increasing resources to mine action.
- A Resource Mobilization Task Force (currently chaired by Norway) has been formed and has engaged in constructive dialogue with the World Bank.
- Some cost-benefit analysis of mine action has been done by the WB. This research and research from the UNDP in Afghanistan indicates that mine action generated a higher rate of return than any investment (with the exception of infrastructure).
- WB has prepared a Task Manager’s Guide to Landmine Clearance. Although this is not official WB policy, it makes the case to country directors that mine action is a development issue versus a purely humanitarian issue. The task force met with the WB Vice President in July 2004 and has encouraged the WB to promulgate the message that mine action is a development issue.
- The WB states that it is open to doing business in mine action, however, it gets few requests from developing countries for funding of this sort. WB said it will be at the Nairobi Summit and offered to do a workshop on its work and how it relates to mine action.
- There is the concern that if the WB provides more funding, funding from other sources would decrease. However, the task force emphasized that 2009 is a critical deadline for many countries to meet their Treaty obligations and that there is a definite need for increased resources.
- Questions are sometimes raised about the opportunity costs i.e., what will suffer if funding for mine action is increased? However, the multiplier effect of landmines makes a clear argument against this. There are so many indirect victims of landmines in addition to the direct victims/survivors (i.e., lack of arable land, lack of access to water and markets). It is clear that mine action will increase abilities and opportunities vis-à-vis other development issues, rather than take away from them.
- The mainstreaming approach, it must be noted, is not trying to change the way mine action has been or is currently done, but rather to add another option.
It is important for the mine action community to maintain a macro perspective (i.e., an institutional approach is needed for mainstreaming). Ministries of foreign affairs must engage colleagues in development agencies.

A great deal of development assistance is misused due to lack of governance and minimal transparency in developing countries' governments. This restricts the accessibility of funding for mine action and development and may determine which countries get access to funding.

It was noted that implementing agencies are comfortable with how mine action is currently funded (as a stand-alone project). Changing the funding model to a mainstream approach will need to be “sold” to implementing agencies in the field. There is a concern over how field organizations will react to being “bit players” in a mainstream approach. It was countered, however, that mine action is by no means a “bit player” in development programming. World Vision noted that mine action takes millions of dollars to implement and this is motivation for finding other resources.

Building long-term national capacity for dealing with landmines and explosive remnants of war is needed. Funding could be available from development agencies for capacity building (i.e., UNICEF mine risk education strategies include building the capacity of the educational sector).

UNDP is working on the Completion Initiative, which keeps funding in place until the job is done, versus moving resources out of a country when it comes close to being mine-free.

**Conclusions:**

- Increasing funding for mine action must be approached by mobilizing resources from the development community;
- Mine action is multi-dimensional and requires a multi-sectoral approach;
- Mine action is a means to the end of fulfilling Millennium Development Goals. Research is needed to show the direct links between mine action and MDGs;
- Political will is a pre-condition for mainstreaming and sustainability. It must be part of developing countries' identified priorities and budgets, written into national legislation and supported at the highest political levels;
- Inclusion of mainstreaming in the Nairobi Declaration will be an important step;
- Mainstreaming builds on the existing model of supporting mine action—it does not eclipse it;
- Mine action should not be isolated, but integrated into existing capacities and plans i.e., health centres include victim assistance versus separate victim assistance clinics;
- Capacity building must be seen as a long-term issue (10–15 years versus 3–5 years); national governments must make it a priority and donors must plan for it;
- Sustainability must be the principal goal.

**Recommendations for action:**

- Requests for mine action funding from development organizations must come from developing countries i.e., IFIs, bilateral development agencies. Mine-affected countries must integrate mine action into their development planning and identify it as a priority (PRSPs);
- Advocate to make mine action a national priority with dedicated resources;
- An inter-ministerial approach is necessary: government departments in donor and developing countries that are responsible for planning, budgeting, development and mine action must be engaged;
- Build coalitions in both donor and development countries between the humanitarian and development communities in both civil society and government spheres;
- Establish benchmarks to measure progress i.e., number of landmine survivors as employees, amount of land cleared;
- Perform research and analysis to make clear links between mine action and fulfilling development objectives and to identify the funding gap;
- Develop a roadmap for the Nairobi Declaration on implementing mainstreaming. Meetings within existing mechanisms (Meetings of States Parties, Intersessionals) should be dedicated to topic of mainstreaming. Representatives of development organizations must participate.
Maintaining Focus After Mainstreaming

INITIATOR   FRANK JEWSBURY

PARTICIPANTS: NANCY DEGRAFF, DAVID HORTON, MARGARET BACK, JEAN DEVLIN, FRED LUBANG, CORY ANDERSON, ANDREW SHORE

SUMMARY:

There was a wide-ranging discussion on this topic. It was emphasized that the end result of mainstreaming should be to provide more resources for mine action rather than a mere re-allocation or overall reduction of existing resources.

Communications strategy to address buried resources in development projects:

- Mine action implementers need to develop a communications strategy to take advantage of the opportunities provided by mainstreaming and to counter the possible detrimental effects;
- Need to enhance advocacy and underscore the benefits of projects now possible and more sustainable due to the mine action component;
- Mainstreaming makes leveraging dedicated funds through other development funds for projects possible—use this to sell the idea of mainstreaming to other donors;
- Need more success stories documented to support the communications strategies. Success stories exists.

Measurement and reporting of mine action activity:

- Need to maintain separate records and reports of levels of activity on a global basis (i.e., a mine action monitor);
- Records need to be more widely publicized;
- Records need to be easily available and easy to use. Donor community needs to develop a reporting system that captures mine action component of development projects;
- Need more return on investment/cost-benefit studies of both pure mine action projects and development projects with a mine action component.

Measurement of Effectiveness:

- Need well-articulated measures of effectiveness for mine action. These may be different from project results;
- Reports on projects need to include a section on impacts. How the project has improved transportation, safety, agriculture, communications, livelihood of local populations etc.;
- Need some post-project evaluations to assess impacts on the local area i.e., five years after completion.
Mainstreaming Mine Action

Resource Mobilization Within Mainstreaming

INITIATOR: DAVID HORTON

PARTICIPANTS: ANNE WOODBRIDGE, DENISE LABELLE, EARL TURCOTTE, PAUL HANNON, AREZOU AZAD, PETER SUNDBERG, PATRICIA CAMPBELL, DERMOT CARTY, JEAN DEVLIN, CAROL PHILLIPS, ALEXANDER KMENTT, NANCY DEGAFF, FRANK JEWESBURY, BILL MCDONOUGH, ANGELO SIMONAZZI, BOB EATON, SUSAN WALKER, STEPHAN NELLEN

SUMMARY:
Areas of focus needed for successful resource mobilization:
1. Development of NGO Partnerships
2. Better NGO-Donor Partnerships
3. Intra-NGO relationships: “Niche” mine action NGOs need to form alliances with their development counterparts to encourage them to consider mine action in their programs.
4. Mine action is perceived by many NGOs as a technical issue and not a development issue. In Canada, a role for Mines Action Canada would be to bridge this gap and bring coalition members together.
5. Must ensure (to maximum possible extent) that future project designs link mine action with sustainable development goals

Opportunities for action:
1. Participation in development of national mine action plans. Role of UN and bilaterals in support of national authorities to build mine action plans which are development-oriented, including priority setting;

Considerations:
1. Budgets for demining often far exceed those for development;
2. Humanitarian/peace building/development approaches;
3. Attempts to mainstream mine action to attract additional resources;
4. Donor continuity essential.

Recommendations:
1. National plans consider mine action as a development issue;
2. Joint World Bank/UNDP invitations to development community to become engaged with the mine action issue and to attend the Nairobi Summit.
Mainstreaming Mine Action in Africa: Can it Work?

INITIATOR: PAUL SAoke

PARTICIPANTS: MEREDITH WOTTEN, ANGELO SIMONAZZI, NANCY DEGRAFF

SUMMARY:

The challenges facing mine victim assistance in Africa require specific approaches due to the diversity of situations in the continent. These situations are characterized primarily by armed conflicts, poverty and poor infrastructure. On the other hand, most African countries have poor governance, weak central governments and their administrations are often non-responsive to the needs of their citizens. The situation is further compounded by poverty and lack of food security.

Most African countries are not in positions to fully implement international conventions, which make compliance difficult to achieve. For example, there is the least observance of the Geneva Convention on the conduct of warfare in many parts of Africa and this has led to “genocide” in Central Africa, ethnic cleansing in West Africa and numerous other obscene atrocities against civilian populations. Mainstreaming mine action in Africa can only be possible if most of the threats to peace are mitigated. How do we mitigate these threats?

It is important to examine the root causes of conflict in Africa and to develop conflict resolution mechanisms. This should be complemented with conflict prevention and management. Mechanisms need to be developed to ensure that governments provide basic services to their citizens. The international community needs to find ways and means to enforce international treaties in Africa. We need to further develop meaningful synergies in mine action between NGOs and governments.

Proposal:
The topic raises more questions that cannot be answered in the interim. This issue needs an international forum dedicated to exploring the complexity of the issues involved with a view to coming up with recommendations.
Making the Nairobi Declaration Work

INITIATOR: DERMOIT CARTY

PARTICIPANTS: ALEXANDER KMENTT, ANDREW SHORE, ANNE WOODBRIDGE, AREZOU AZAD, BOB EATON, CHRISTA MCMILLIN, EARL TURCOTTE, ENRIQUE ROMAN-MOREY, MARGARET ARACH ORECH, STEPHAN NELLEN, SUE WIXLEY, SUSAN WALKER, SYLVIE BRIGOT

SUMMARY:
Keeping the momentum of the Mine Ban Convention after the Nairobi Summit will be a challenge. The Nairobi Declaration and the Action Plan are intended to maintain momentum and set a framework for action. The discussion focused on strategizing how to ensure that the Declaration becomes an effective, living document.

The document
The Nairobi Declaration is a political statement of vision and commitment. The power of the Declaration will lie in its brevity and simplicity, but also in its linkage to future action. While the current draft of the Declaration is the product of intense inter-governmental consultations, States Parties should consider adding explicit reference to and endorsement of the Action Plan.

Post-Nairobi:
Stakeholders need to continue to work in partnership towards implementation after the Review Conference. Local ownership of the Treaty implementation process is key. States Parties should hold post-Nairobi implementation meetings chaired by States Parties with comprehensive stakeholder participation. The United Nations and civil society organizations need to remain engaged in support of governments that work to fulfill their Convention obligations.

Stakeholders should develop strategies to ensure that the results of the Nairobi Summit are communicated to all levels of their respective organizations including their headquarters, regional and country offices and grassroots actors.

Summary of required actions agreed upon:
- Nairobi Declaration refers to the Action Plan;
- National plans set specific benchmarks;
- Stakeholders continue to work in partnership;
- States Parties hold post-Nairobi implementation meetings;
- Stakeholders develop communication strategies to ensure Nairobi results are understood within their organizations.
This topic was inspired by the persistent problems with implementation of the Ottawa Convention such as:

- Corrupt physicians who are supposed to be giving free medical care to mine victims in Cambodia;
- Discrimination against those injured due to causes other than landmines.

The question was asked, given problems in implementing the Ottawa Convention, what other international law instruments could be used to reach the Ottawa obligations and mine goals post-Ottawa treaty?

- One solution, apart from international law, is simply mainstreaming mine action and victim assistance obligations into development;
- Another solution is to influence compliance with other related international obligations under other treaties and conventions:
  - Convention on the Rights and Dignity of Peoples with Disabilities which is being negotiated, not yet adopted (Reporter’s note: there is a government of Canada delegation at these negotiations—are mine victims on their agenda?);
  - Convention on the Rights of the Child;
  - Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (Reporter’s note: Review Conference to be held in N.Y. in 2005; Preparation conference held earlier this year included Canadian delegation with representatives from FAC, CIDA and Status of Women Canada; major theme was impact of armed conflict on women and girls—was mine action discussed and will the delegation be taking this forward to the Review Conference?);
  - Millennium Development Goals;
  - International Criminal Court, special tribunals i.e., Cambodia, Sierra Leone;
  - Conventional Arms Register;

What is the role of domestic legislation in implementing mine obligations under these instruments?

- The ICRC develops ratification kits to help countries draft domestic legislation to implement treaties of international humanitarian law like the Geneva Conventions, Ottawa Treaty and Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court;
- Training programs for judges (IICL in Canada), Speaker of the House of Commons, parliamentary groups (IPU, PGA);
- National plans of action that countries agreed to at the UN General Assembly Special Session on Children in 2002 (which are intended to incorporate the principles of the Convention on the Rights of the Child) are a tool; civil society in mine-affected countries can monitor these plans to make sure they include commitments to victim assistance and mine action for children (perhaps through Landmine Monitor);
- Human rights treaties in particular suffer from lack of enforcement mechanisms. Assistance exists to implement humanitarian law obligations; and international criminal courts or tribunals can secure reparation for grave violations. However, no systematic, comprehensive means of helping countries fulfill their human rights obligations exist—including the right to mine-free development or the right to medical care for mine victims. One support in this direction could be the consolidated reporting mechanisms for human rights treaties being developed at UN.

Even if (and when) the mine problem is solved, the problem of ERW will remain. We need to develop and maintain our capacity to deal with the impact of mines to be able to confront similar problems caused by ERW. The CCW will be key in this regard and thus should be one of the focal points for efforts beyond Nairobi. CCW Protocol V deals with the effects of ERW post-conflict.

- What needs to be done to ensure that CCW Protocol V takes effect?
- Need 18 more ratifications;
- Compliance mechanism for whole CCW is being negotiated.
The Goal is Mine-Free

INITIATOR:      PAUL HANNON

PARTICIPANTS:   ALEXANDER KMENTT, ANDREW SHORE, IOURI ZAGOUHENNOV, MELANIE REGIMBAL, ENRIQUE ROMAN-MOREY,
                GUSTAVO OLIVEIRA VIEIRA, SHUSHIRA CHONHenchob, SUSAN B. WALKER, SHANNON SMITH, JACKIE HANSEN,
                LIZ BERNSTEIN, SONG KOSAL, DAN Berman, PETER HERBY, FRED LUBANG

SUMMARY:
The group discussions placed emphasis on the fact that ultimate
goal of the Convention is to achieve the complete destruction of all
landmines in order to be landmine-free. This includes the destruc-
tion and removal of all mines—not just the ones that pose an
immediate danger. The priority must be no **new victims** rather than
**victim-free**.

Group discussion also focused on the confusion created by the dis-
tinction between mine-free and mine-safe. It was concluded that
the issue must not be seen solely as a development and humanitarian
issue, but rather as an issue within a disarmament treaty context.

The discussion further highlighted the importance of messaging.
There must be a clear message that the deadlines stipulated in
Article five of the Ottawa Convention need to be respected by all
state-member signatories. This obligation entails the destruction of
all anti-personnel mines in areas known and suspected to contain
anti-personnel mines (in as much as the state must make every effort
to identify all areas).

Some participants expressed that reluctance exists on the part of
signatory states to declare Article five obligations fulfilled, in fear
that the state will be held accountable under section eight of the
Convention. The scope of these obligations must be clarified in
order to encourage further actions.

Participants stated that all deadlines must remain firm, but
acknowledgement must be given that this is all part of a process.
In other words, Nairobi must not be a space for signatory states to
violate their obligations, but rather a forum to present the difficul-
ties that have arisen during the process of working towards a land-
mine-free environment. These difficulties can only be remedied by
reviewing the obstacles faced by member states.

We also must achieve balance between sending a message that we
take the present delays in the Convention seriously, while simulta-
neously opening a space for states to ask for specific assistance in
challenging areas.

**Requests from states can be evaluated for credibility by**
**examining the state’s implementation strategy:**
1. Does the country have a plan?
2. Has the country identified high and medium priority areas?
3. Is the country making substantive efforts to implement and see
   these plans through?

Donor states can use these indicators as a method of evaluating the
state’s willingness to implement the Convention while taking into
account the accessibility to financial and technological resources in
each particular case. This process can only be achieved through the
continued momentum and action of the international community,
by adopting a good faith approach and by giving ownership of the
programs and strategies to the state itself.

Rather than focusing on what cannot be achieved during
2005–2009, the discussion leading up to Nairobi and beyond must
highlight and reinforce the strategies already adopted by state
members through policy planning.
Sustainability

Capacity Building and Local Advocacy

INITIATOR: JEAN DEVLIN

PARTICIPANTS: MARILYN LEMON, PETER SUNDBERG, CAMILO SERNA VILLEGAS, PATRICIA CAMPBELL, MAJA ZIVIC, GABRIELLE WHITE, BILL MCDONOUGH, NARINE BERIKASHVILI, CAROL PHILLIPS, HABBOUBA AOUN, SONG KOSAL, BECKY JORDAN, SHUSHIRA CHONHENCHOB, FRANK JEWSBURY, PHILIPPE CHABASSE, CHRISTINE MANULA

SUMMARY:

How does one build capacity enough to be able to transition out of a region?

We become victims of our own design sometimes: offering stipends, insurance, and other support which, when withdrawn, can cause the project to fall apart.

Are there other impediments to building capacity that do not depend on eternal presence of outside assistance?

**Capacity building in victim assistance has some of the same issues:**
- Technical skills are relatively easy to achieve;
- Good governance and local ownership/commitment of financial responsibility is much more difficult to achieve.

**Capacity building versus sustainability: what is the relationship?**
- Is capacity building a pre-condition to sustainability?
- Is total withdrawal necessary for sustainability?

**What is the message of sustainability to send to Nairobi?**
- Long-term commitments from donors and local governments are necessary for mine action to be sustained.

**What is the message of sustainability to send to the general public?**
- Pressure from within to promote long-term commitments i.e., Rotary Clubs, churches, local Red Cross, etc.

**Proposals:**
- Exit strategies need to be built in and understood from project’s beginning;
- In some successful cases, governments have picked up funding of staff with outside assistance filling gaps for materials. However, government commitment to fund may not exist—self-standing entities may be necessary;
- Cost recovery mechanisms (fee for service) can work in some places;
- Capacity building is more than imparting technical skills—“internalizing” it into the system;
- Mine action (specifically demining) that needs to travel/reach a whole country may be different in terms of building local capacity versus building local capacity in a fixed geographical location;
- Strong locally based survivor organizations need to be developed to maintain long-term focus and tap into government, donor and private funds to sustain mine action and victim assistance programs;
- Local investment in generating advocacy—this is a shared responsibility between the donor and the recipient;
- One strategy is to “Raise the Voices” of the few individuals who can represent the many who fight just to survive each day.

Jean Devlin, Chief of CIDA’s Mine Action Unit, asks people to discuss capacity building and local advocacy.
Ensuring Local Capacity Remains Once AP Mines are Cleared

INITIATOR: THOMAS NASH

PARTICIPANTS: THOMAS NASH, KJELL KNUDSEN

SUMMARY:

The discussion focused on two main themes:

**MRE—community reporting—national EOD response capacity:**
- In countries affected by AP and AV mines as well as ERW, there may be a need to maintain a local capacity to deal with other existing or future explosive threats once AP mines have been cleared;
- The local capacity to deal with AP mines is similar in some respects to the capacity needed to deal with other ERW;
- By retaining local capacity developed through clearance operations in removing the AP mines threat, countries will be able to deal with ERW once AP mines clearance has ceased. This can happen through MRE that leads to community reporting which alerts a national capacity to respond to EOD threats.

**Helping mine action professionals find new work once clearance operations end:**
- Societies that have emerged from mine contamination often have a large number of trained mine action professionals. Once clearance operations have ceased and money for mine action projects dries up, these professionals may find themselves unemployed;
- It is important to think about how we can help these professionals use their skills to help other communities affected by mines/ERW or to use their skills to help their own community deal with future threats from mines/ERW.
The Goal is Mine-Free

Priorities:
State Parties must take ownership of the process of creating plans that identify challenges and solutions for their Convention responsibilities.

There is a need to refine the messaging around “mine-free” and Article 5 obligations. In addition, we need to focus on State Parties’ plans to carry out mine action work and steps taken in implementing these plans. These steps could include reporting on accomplishments and other measures taken towards meeting their obligations. Positive reinforcement by all stakeholders is essential.

We need to keep the vision of a mine-free world (clearance, end production/use and assisting survivors). The Convention obligations (Article 5) are the framework and process to achieving a mine-free world.

Nairobi is not a forum for State Parties to announce that they cannot meet their Treaty requirements—this is unacceptable. Rather, the focus is best described in the draft Nairobi Action Plan 2005–2009, “The State Parties are thus committed to an intensive, accelerated effort to ensure the most effective and most expeditious possible fulfilment of Article 5 obligations—and—to fulfill their obligations to reduce risk to populations—in the period 2005–2009.”

Next Steps:
- Prior to Nairobi, mine-affected State Parties that have not developed a plan will do so in order to present their implementation plan at the Summit. The plan will include identifying priorities and resources the State Party will contribute towards meeting the plan as well as identifying areas where assistance is needed. Mine-affected State Parties that have previously presented implementation plans will report on the steps that have been carried out;
- State Parties with no plan should report on when they will have a plan to present to the international community;
- All participants at Nairobi Summit should recognize and reinforce successes;
- The Nairobi Summit is the best opportunity for mine-affected countries to take ownership of the Treaty and present plans they have identified and dedicated resources towards implementation; thereby outlining needs for assistance;
- Post-Nairobi, use the calendar of regional and Convention-related meetings to continue sharing plans, successes and challenges leading to the goal of a mine-free world;
- At every intersessional and meeting of States Parties, affected states should complement their transparency obligations (Article 7) by reporting on the steps they have taken to meet their Treaty obligations. Those efforts and successes should be acknowledged and supported by all actors;
- Declare and celebrate victories as they happen;
- Prior to Nairobi, utilize all multinational forums, such as the Geneva meeting, the OAS meeting and the UN General Assembly meeting to re-emphasize the importance of the Summit and expectations. The UNGA resolution this year and other resolutions and recommendations from other multilateral forums should use Nairobi language—especially in terms of meeting obligations;
- States and other interested partners should also pass on these same messages bilaterally.

Results desired:
- At Nairobi, affected states will either present comprehensive updates on their existing plans or present their new plans. All states should support these efforts taken by the affected states and encourage those without plans to do so quickly.
- State Parties should not approve any requests for extensions on Article 5 obligations at this time.

Resources required:
- National ownership and international cooperation: “The State Parties are thus committed to an intensive, accelerated effort to ensure the most effective and most expeditious possible fulfilment of Article 5 obligations—and—to fulfill their obligations to reduce risk to populations—in the period 2005–2009.”
Making the Nairobi Declaration Work

CHAMPION OF THE NEXT STEPS: DERMO CARRY AND GROUP

PARTICIPANTS: ANNE WOODBRIDGE, AREZOU AZAD, ENRIQUE ROMAN-MOREY, KAREN MOLLICA, PHILIPPE CHABASSE, SUMITA DIXIT

Related Discussion Topics: All

Priorities:
- Influence the drafting of the Nairobi Declaration and Action Plan;
- Support development of national implementation plans;
- Suggest and support annual implementation meetings at the national level;
- Support creation of an international day on landmines.

Next Steps:
- States Parties, civil society and the UN seek to influence the Nairobi Declaration and Action Plan drafts at the informal meetings of the Intersessional Committees and in the lead-up to Nairobi;
- National governments, with the support of civil society and the UN, develop national implementation plans;
- National governments, with the support of civil society and the UN, carry out national implementation meetings;
- UN Secretariat and agencies, with the support of civil society and Member States, influence the creation of an international day on landmines through a General Assembly resolution.

Results desired by:
- Revised declaration and action plan draft by the end of the informal meeting of the intersessionals on September 24, 2004;
- National development plans finalized before the end of 2005;
- National implementation meetings, on an annual basis, starting in 2005;
- First international day on landmines on March 1, 2005.

Resources required:
- Continued financial, human resource and political commitment.
Mainstreaming Mine Action into Development

CHAMPION OF THE NEXT STEPS: EARL TURCOTTE

PARTICIPANTS: BOB EATON, SUE WIXLEY, SUSAN ECKEY, CORY ANDERSON, MARILYN LEMON, CAROL PHILLIPS, DAVID HORTON, EARL TURCOTTE, PAUL SAÖKE, MAYA ZIVIC, FRANK JEWSBURY, LI GENXIN

Priorities:

- Must fully research the nexus between mine action and development to establish how mine action can contribute to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals;
- Acknowledge the primacy of the mine-affected state in addressing the problem. This includes government and civil society actors;
- Urge mine-affected states to make mine action a development priority and factor it into national and sector plans, programs and budgets;
- Take an integrated, inter-ministerial approach at national level;
- Form strategic partnerships at the field level;
- Have affected states put mainstreaming forward to the international development community when external resources are required and be prepared to borrow against it if grant resources are not available;
- We should all encourage the international development community to integrate MA as means to advance the Millennium Development Goals and provide resources on the most conceding terms possible;
- Conduct two-day workshops hosted by a government of mine affected state involving development and mine action actors in government, multilateral organizations and civil society;
- Establish ongoing working groups at the country level involving both communities;
- Identify opportunities for joint programming;
- Encourage participation of MA community at major development meetings for mainstreaming and vice versa;
- Follow up on meeting between the Resource Mobilization Task Force and World Bank;
- Encourage greater cooperation between donors and civil society on mine action and development;
- Governments should encourage participation of development agencies in Nairobi and beyond.

Next Steps:

- UNDP to write development agencies around the world encouraging participation in Nairobi and mainstreaming into ongoing programs;
- Nairobi participants to attend World Bank workshop at Summit;
- ICBL to send letters to ministers of finance ahead of World Bank meetings after Nairobi;
- ICBL to write to development agencies regarding link between MA and development;
- UNDP Paper on Mine Action and Development and Report on meeting with World Bank to be made widely available;
- Mine action NGOs need to engage development NGOs;
- MAC to make a presentation to CCIC;
- Development actors to write articles on experience in MA for in-house publications first;
- Refine our arguments; learn the development language; link MA to traditional development issues;
- CIDA to provide history of mainstreaming MA to date (success stories);
- UNDP to gather examples and promulgate success stories;
- Establish benchmarks against which progress can be measured in all areas.

Paul Saöke stresses a point during the discussion group.
Action Step Summaries

Creative Victim Assistance: Skills Training

CHAMPIONS OF THE NEXT STEPS: CAMILO SERNA VILLEGAS AND PETER SUNDBERG

PARTICIPANTS: DENISE LABELLE, CAMILO SERNA VILLEGAS, PETER SUNDBERG

Related Discussion Topics:
- Rights-Based Approach to Victim Assistance: Pros and Cons;
- Ensure Progress on Victim Assistance;
- Working with Survivors in Advocacy;
- Resource Mobilization Within Mainstreaming;
- Meeting the Challenge of Landmine Victim Assistance in an African Context;
- Putting the Survivors Back on their Feet.

Priorities:
- Promote a strong focus on landmine victims and their special needs caused by war and conflict;
- Promote a hands-on approach based on the implementation of on-the-ground projects that provide concrete impacts and provides a base from which we can address other mine action issues;
- Work with national ICBL campaigns and survivors groups to develop creative victim assistance projects;
- Start working on projects with civilian survivors in areas of conflict as a means to start the skills training process and engage non-state actors.

Next Steps:
- Prior to Nairobi, the champions will develop a Colombia skills training project proposal to:
  - Identify civilian survivors and their key skills training priorities;
  - Start with on-the-ground small-scale survivors skills training and micro-enterprise development;
  - Confidence building and engagement: Use this project as a tool in existing non-state actor negotiations—invite survivors of the ELN and other non-state actors to participate in skills training initiatives.

Results Desired:
- In one month, completion of project concept paper (building on work previously completed);
- Send to Denise Labelle, CIDA, for comment and recommendations;
- Submit to UN Project Portfolio;
- Engage other interested parties.

Resources required:
Our time and commitment as well as input and assistance from other interested people. Please contact us at: p_sundberg@yahoo.com
Putting Survivors Back on Their Feet

CHAMPION OF THE NEXT STEPS: MARGARET ARACH ORECH

PARTICIPANTS: CHANDARAMONY EANG, PAT MCCOLL, CHERYL SHEPHERD, MARGARET ARACH ORECH

Related Discussion Topics:
- Creative Victim Assistance: Skills Training;
- Mainstreaming Mine Action into Development;
- Ensure Progress On Victim Assistance;
- Working with Survivors in Advocacy;
- Meeting the Challenge of Landmine Victim Assistance in An African Context.

SUMMARY:
The overriding goal behind this plan is to hold governments to their commitment towards the MBT on victim assistance related issues such as:
- Emergency response after the incidence;
- Medical care;
- Physical rehabilitation;
- Empowerment and reintegration.

Priorities:
- Identify potential allies at national and international levels (i.e., CCIC who have a list of organisations working around the world in related topics);
- Link with national campaigns, and other organisations whose mandate includes victim assistance (i.e., DPIs);
- Develop advocacy messages;
- Identify special representative/spokesperson/ good will ambassador for mine victim assistance;
- Mobilize public health, NGOs and advocacy groups to meet the medical needs of mine victims;

Next steps:
- Country campaigns should work with representatives from relevant line ministries and get them to publicly acknowledge that people with disabilities are an issue; therefore, investing in empowerment and reintegration programs should be a priority;
- Country campaigns should conduct a letter writing campaign asking governments to provide for the survivors i.e., costs of hospital stay and accommodations during the fitting of prosthesis. This supports the priority of linking with other organizations whose mandate includes VA;
- Better collaboration with other WGVA members by e-mail;
- Scheduling of an online meeting of group members as soon as possible.

Results desired:
Ongoing

Resources required:
- Communication (e-mail, telephone, etc.);
- Stationery;
- Support staff.

Margaret Orech Arach, Co-Chair of the ICBL Working Group on Victim Assistance and landmine survivor, presents her group’s vision on the next steps for “Putting Landmine Survivors Back on their Feet.”
Action Step Summaries

Working with Survivors to do Mine Action Advocacy

CHAMPION OF THE NEXT STEPS: ORGANIZATIONS IN THE WORKING GROUP ON VICTIM ASSISTANCE

PARTICIPANTS: BECKY JORDAN AND CHRISTINE MANULA

Related Discussion Topics:
- Creative Victim Assistance: Skills Training
- Rights-Based Approach to Victim Assistance: Pros and Cons
- Capacity Building and Local Advocacy
- Putting the Survivors Back on Their Feet

SUMMARY:
The overall objective of this plan is to continue to support and encourage survivors to participate substantively in advocacy efforts at local, national and international levels to promote universalization and implementation of the MBT and other efforts to realize survivors’ rights.

Next steps/results desired by:
- LSN will introduce motion in ICBL CC to develop written policy of inclusion of survivors in all national campaigns to ban landmines (next ICBL CC Meeting);
- Working Group on Victim Assistance chairs and interested members will develop tools that provide guidance on how to advance MBT goals and survivor rights through survivors, people with disabilities and relevant NGOs (February 2005);
- Develop a strategy to engage relevant UN bodies in developing the capacity of survivors and working with them on MBT advocacy efforts (early 2005);
- Encourage States Parties to include landmine survivors in developing their input into intersessional work group meetings and Meetings of States Parties. (Begin in Nairobi—see results in first intersessional meeting post-Nairobi).

Resources required:
- Commitment from States Parties, UN groups, ICBL, WGVA, and other relevant actors to work toward the objective and activities listed above;
- Commitment of funds for advocacy related activities.
Mine Risk Education

CHAMPION OF THE NEXT STEPS: STAN BRABANT AND HABBOUBA AOUN

PARTICIPANTS: FRANK JEWSBURY, NARINE BERIKASHVILI, SUZANNE LEMIEUX, HABBOUBA AOUN

Related topics:
- Mainstreaming Mine Action into Development
- Role of Youth
- Putting the Survivors Back on their Feet
- Making the Nairobi Declaration Work

Next steps:
- Taking commitment 19 of the Nairobi draft action plan as the key to go further, so that all mine-affected countries have MRE component in their national development plans. Concrete steps could be:
  - Incorporate MRE in national school curricula;
  - Incorporate MRE in relief and development activities.
- Look at the LM reports, the Article 7 reports and LIS reports in order to know which countries have:
  - Mine action plans;
  - MRE integrated in the mine action plans;
  - Mine action plans integrated in the national development plans;
  - Develop a list of mine-affected countries needing immediate action.
- Advocate for these countries to implement needed MRE programs through:
  - Facilitating their access to appropriate knowledge and skills;
  - Mobilizing resources to help them implement adequate interventions;
  - Lobbying governments to make sure they appreciate the importance of MRE as a precautionary measure and as a sustainability factor helping afterwards in victim assistance and other aspects of humanitarian mine action;
- Lobbying donors to continue funding MRE activities so that MRE interventions are not so expensive;
- Provide follow up and monitoring.

Results desired by:
- The MRE sub-working group takes the lead from now to Nairobi and beyond Nairobi;
- Beyond Nairobi, the MRE sub-working group needs to further develop in order to acquire capacities for appropriate monitoring and follow up;
- The LM should remain the tool that would observe and report progress. There should be a way to use its findings to recommend immediate actions when deemed necessary;
- By the Nairobi Summit, the freshly published LM 5-year review will provide important findings on the developments of countries in integrating MRE in mine action plans, development plans, etc., that can be incorporated into all above actions;
- After Nairobi, it is our hope the MRE sub-working group would have gained capacities allowing it to advocate for mainstreaming and implementing some concrete activities (like MRE integrated in the school curricula of a certain number of countries).

Resources required:
- LM reports, Article 7 reports, LIS reports, etc.;
- Coordinating body to ensure follow up;
- Appropriate funding.
Action Step Summaries

Capacity Building and Local Advocacy

CHAMPION OF THE NEXT STEPS: JEAN DEVLIN

PARTICIPANTS: PURNA SHOVA CHITRAKAR, FREDDY DE ALWIS, NANCY DEGRAFF, STEPHAN NELLEN, THOMAS NASH

Related topics:
- Creative Victim Assistance: Skills Training
- Ensure Progress On Victim Assistance
- Working With Survivors in Advocacy
- The Role of Youth
- Engaging Non State Actors
- Ensuring Local Capacity Remains Once AP Mines Are Cleared
- Putting the Survivors Back on Their Feet
- Mine Risk Education

Priorities:
- Mine action organisations should build strategic alliances with development organisations;
- Create opportunities for these alliances to happen through training, workshops and mine action liaison officers. Training is important for mine action as well development organisations;
- Organisations like the ICBL should work on facilitation and outreach internationally and nationally with the development community;
- International NGOs should work with local pressure groups. Need to develop advocacy capacity as well as technical capacity;
- Need to win people’s understanding and support; motivate people and promote ownership;
- Need to create a local network, strengthen national entities—in particular on MRE and advocacy;
- Build capacity of survivor networks to be organized and become more involved in different activities (build skills, etc.);
- At the field level, we need to ask why a project has failed. Often, it is because there is no capacity building;
- Need to understand the real needs of a local community, their resources and capacity;
- Must respond to local needs to ensure ownership by the local community;
- Build capacity with local authorities and government—police, fire, civil defence;
- How do we do this? It depends on the country—is it centralized or decentralized? Many governments leave mine action to NGOs and external actors and take it for granted without taking responsibility;
- MRE is an important tool for spreading the message of mine action throughout communities—teachers and village chiefs are often influential;
- Need for coordination; in an ideal world, we could fund local communities who would then choose how to deal with the problem themselves, but this would be a revolution.

Next steps:
- Governments should consider what their needs are for capacity building in mine action;
- ICBL should consider capacity building and local advocacy with its membership;
- Local mine action NGOs should engage with development NGOs;
- International mine action NGOs should work systematically with local authorities;
- NGOs should work with local community, local NGOs and local authorities to push the government to get involved. Country context is important in determining what action to take—internal or external pressure may be more appropriate;
- MAC can work with ICBL to encourage capacity building among ICBL membership;
- Analyse what we have done in terms of capacity building from 1997 to present;
- Define some steps to integrate capacity building in all mine action activities from the time of the Review Conference on;
- Suggestion that within ICBL, create a small committee working on how to handle capacity building.

Resources required:
This was difficult for the group to assess. We can try to ensure that capacity building (learning skills, awareness, etc.) becomes an aspect of all future mine action activities (projects) systematically.
Action Step Summaries

Role of Youth

CHAMPIONS OF NEXT STEPS: FRED LUBANG, MEREDITH WOTTEN, JACKIE HANSEN, EVA MORRISON

PARTICIPANTS: FRED LUBANG, MEREDITH WOTTEN, JACKIE HANSEN, CHRISTA MCMILLIN, EVA MORRISON, CORY ANDERSON, REHANA TEJPAR, JESSE BAILTHUS (OTTAWA YOUTH MINE ACTION COMMITTEE VOLUNTEER), MONIQUE ST-JEAN, ELODIE BUTTON

Related Discussion Topics:
- Mine Risk Education
- Media and Public Engagement
- Victim Assistance
- Capacity Building
- Mainstreaming Mine Action

The group identified the following priorities and strategies/mechanisms for moving forward:

Priorities:
- Mainstreaming of youth in development and dissemination of landmine information;
- Utilization of YMAAP Resource Manual on Engaging Youth in Mine Action;
- Youth voices heard in development of ICBL 2005–09 campaign action plan;
- Ownership of sharing information i.e., youth reports on youth events;
- Communication and networking: local, national and international;
- Ensure support from national and international campaigns;
- Connecting campaigns to share information, resources and initiatives.

Strategies/Mechanisms:
- MRE with advocacy component;
- Youth development and dissemination of news, reports, etc.;
- Include workshop at International Youth Symposium in Nairobi on posting to web, sharing information, etc.;
- Improving access to electronic technology i.e., Youth LEAP branch program to provide technology and small grants in targeted regions;
- Youth declaration at Nairobi Summit;
- Adult allies meeting in Nairobi with youth;
- Use LM process and research as a venue for youth participation;
- Make info available, usable, appropriate and relevant;
- Facilitate cooperative campaign efforts to raise funds, awareness and youth participation;
- Strategies developed in full partnership and solidarity with partners;
- Networking opportunities in Nairobi;
- Develop and disseminate information about involving volunteers in campaigns;
- Further cooperation with organizations involved in awareness raising campaigns such as LSN and Adopt-a-Minefield.

Next steps:
The group has chosen four champions to oversee the role of youth until Nairobi. At Nairobi, the group will re-assess the priorities at the International Youth Symposium and name new champions.

Results desired:
This is an ongoing process. In Nairobi we will create the forums for dialogue between partners. The discussion will continue via e-mail, web forum and through use of partner campaigns.

Resources required:
Creativity, energy and a fresh outlook!
Priorities:
- Identify champions by organizations and country as appropriate
  i.e., make use of UN Goodwill Ambassadors;
- Identify one international champion;
- Urgent need to develop a strategy to build momentum on a
  continual basis (not event-focused).

Next Steps:
All involved in the group have a collective responsibility to carry
out action in their own countries such as:
- Harvest existing networks for points of leverage;
- Use existing tools and events; share that information and dis-
  seminate resources i.e., compile list and location of resources;
- Identify follow-up actions;
- National coordination of work plans;
- Identify compelling stories for the media and share them, i.e.,
  what’s new or different?

Results desired by:
These actions require a two-step approach:
- Lead-up to and in Nairobi;
- Post-Nairobi.

Resources required:
- Human resource commitment;
- Use of existing tools and networks.
Hard Talk: Universalization in “Tough” States

CHAMPION OF THE NEXT STEPS: NO SPECIFIC CHAMPION IDENTIFIED AS ALL GROUP MEMBERS ARE WORKING ON THE ISSUE ON AN ONGOING BASIS

PARTICIPANTS: YESHUA MOSER-PUANGSUWAN, GUSTAVO OLIVEIRA VIEIRA, DAVID OLSON, SHANNON SMITH, KAREN MOLLICA, JOHN MACBRIDE, BRIGITTE OEDERLIN, SUMITA DIXIT, JESSE BAILTHUS, REHANA TEJPAR, ELODIE BUTTON

Related Discussion Topics:
Concentrate On Non-Signatories by Signatory Countries

Priorities:

- Encourage more States Parties to support their own national senior officers’ participation in the Ottawa Convention Generals Support Team and make use of it more broadly;
- Identify/implement the link between confidence-building and universalization:
  - Stockpile destruction and other mine action measures: ensure States Parties take into account the political aspects/benefits of inviting their neighbours and other key actors to witness such actions i.e., Asia, Singapore;
  - Include the issue in peace and confidence building talks;
  - All should work to identify, and share with relevant actors i.e., through the Universalization Contact Group who are the decision makers on the issue in specific States not Parties;
  - Those conducting universalization efforts should approach all of the relevant actors on the issue (i.e., not only ministries of foreign affairs, but also the ministries of defense, parliamentarian groups, and so on);
  - Demarches and joint demarches should continue, aimed at the right people at the right level in States not Parties; undertaken by the States Parties that are most likely to influence a particular non-party state;
  - Encourage regional groups to carry out more in universalization. They should make it a priority and develop plans to that effect;
  - Communicate interim measures or steps States not Parties, can take towards the Convention such as voluntary Article 7 reporting, reporting on stockpiles and destruction, moratoria, etc.;
- In their discussions, States Parties should encourage States not Parties to have dialogue and cooperation with civil society.

Results desired by:

- Mines Action Canada should report these discussions to the next meeting of the Universalization Contact Group at or following the Nairobi Summit;
- All others in the group will continue with their ongoing and new universalization efforts and will encourage other relevant actors to take on the actions listed here.

Next steps:

- Next meeting of the Universalization Contact Group. Contact Groups are open forums, in which any active actor can participate.

Enrique Roman Morey, Secretariat of the Nairobi Summit, presents his group’s findings.
# Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALGES</td>
<td>Association of War Wounded of El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM</td>
<td>Anti-personnel landmines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of Southeast Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVM</td>
<td>Anti-vehicle mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCIC</td>
<td>Canadian Council of International Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCW</td>
<td>Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Canadian Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI</td>
<td>Disabled People International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELN</td>
<td>Ejército de Liberación Nacional (National Liberation Army)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD</td>
<td>Explosive Ordnance Disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERW</td>
<td>Explosive Remnants of War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Foreign Affairs Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICBL</td>
<td>International Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICBL CC</td>
<td>International Campaign to Ban Landmines Coordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Criminal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>International Committee of the Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>International Financial Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHL</td>
<td>International Humanitarian Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIICL</td>
<td>Institute for International and Comparative Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPU</td>
<td>Inter-Parliamentary Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIS</td>
<td>Landmine Impact Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Landmine Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSN</td>
<td>Landmine Survivors Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>Mines Action Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBT</td>
<td>Mine Ban Treaty (a.k.a. Ottawa Convention)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millenium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRE</td>
<td>Mine Risk Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>Non-State Actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA</td>
<td>Parliamentarians for Global Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSP</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBA</td>
<td>Rights-Based Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGA</td>
<td>United Nations General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGVA</td>
<td>Working Group on Victim Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMAAP</td>
<td>Youth Mine Action Ambassador Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth LEAP</td>
<td>Youth Leadership, Education and Action Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix A  Participant Contact List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Kmentt</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Austria</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alexander.kmentt@bmaa.gv.at">alexander.kmentt@bmaa.gv.at</a></td>
<td>AUSTRIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfredo Lubang</td>
<td>Phillipines Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alubang@codewan.com.ph">alubang@codewan.com.ph</a></td>
<td>PHILLIPINES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Shore</td>
<td>“Mine Action Team, Foreign Affairs Canada (FAC)”</td>
<td><a href="mailto:andrew.shore@international.gc.ca">andrew.shore@international.gc.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Simonazzi</td>
<td>Handicap International Belgium</td>
<td><a href="mailto:angelo.simonazzi@handicap.be">angelo.simonazzi@handicap.be</a></td>
<td>BELGIUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Woodbridge</td>
<td>CIDA Mine Action Unit</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anne_woodbridge@acdi-cida.gc.ca">anne_woodbridge@acdi-cida.gc.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arezou Azad</td>
<td>UNMAS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:azada@un.org">azada@un.org</a></td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Jordan</td>
<td>Landmine Survivors Network</td>
<td><a href="mailto:becky@landminesurvivors.org">becky@landminesurvivors.org</a></td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill McDonough</td>
<td>Mine Action Program - OAS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wmcdonough@oas.org">wmcdonough@oas.org</a></td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigitte Oderlin</td>
<td>ICRC Regional Delegation for United States and Canada</td>
<td><a href="mailto:boederlin.was@icrc.org">boederlin.was@icrc.org</a></td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilo Serna Villegas</td>
<td>Campana Colombiana Contra Minas/LM Colombia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:camilo@colombiasinminas.org">camilo@colombiasinminas.org</a></td>
<td>COLOMBIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Phillips</td>
<td>Canadian Auto Workers Social Justice Fund</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carol.phillips@caw.ca">carol.phillips@caw.ca</a>; <a href="mailto:cawint@caw.ca">cawint@caw.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandaramony Eang</td>
<td>Aid for Victims of Cambodian Landmines</td>
<td><a href="mailto:AVCLM@hotmail.com">AVCLM@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Avendano</td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:charlie@minesactioncanada.org">charlie@minesactioncanada.org</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christa McMillin</td>
<td>Youth Mine Action Ambassador Program</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cncmillin@dangermines.ca">cncmillin@dangermines.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Manula</td>
<td>Landmine Survivors Network</td>
<td><a href="mailto:christine@landminesurvivors.org">christine@landminesurvivors.org</a></td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory Anderson</td>
<td>Foreign Affairs Canada</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cory.anderson@international.gc.ca">cory.anderson@international.gc.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Berman</td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dan@minesactioncanada.org">dan@minesactioncanada.org</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Horton</td>
<td>Canadian International Demining Corps (CIDC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cidd@cidd.ws">cidd@cidd.ws</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Olson</td>
<td>Foreign Affairs Canada</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.olson@international.gc.ca">david.olson@international.gc.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Labelle</td>
<td>Mine Action Unit - CIDA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:denise_labelle@acdi-cida.gc.ca">denise_labelle@acdi-cida.gc.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermot Carty</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dcarty@unicef.org">dcarty@unicef.org</a></td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Turcotte</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:earl.turcotte@undp.org">earl.turcotte@undp.org</a></td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Bernstein</td>
<td>ICBL</td>
<td><a href="mailto:banemnow@icbl.org">banemnow@icbl.org</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elodie Button</td>
<td>Ottawa Youth Mine Action Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Roman-Morey</td>
<td>Review Conference Secretariat</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eroman-morey@unog.ch">eroman-morey@unog.ch</a></td>
<td>SWITZERLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Morrison</td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eva@minesactioncanada.org">eva@minesactioncanada.org</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Jewsbury</td>
<td>CAMEO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:frank.jewsbury@rogers.com">frank.jewsbury@rogers.com</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Jewsbury</td>
<td>Canadian Association of Mine and Explosive Ordnance Security (CAMEO)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:frank.jewsbury@rogers.com">frank.jewsbury@rogers.com</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freddy De Alwis</td>
<td>Inter-Religious Peace Foundation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fdea@dialogsl.net">fdea@dialogsl.net</a>; <a href="mailto:slbs@sltnet.lk">slbs@sltnet.lk</a></td>
<td>SRI LANKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrielle White</td>
<td>Youth Mine Action Ambassador Program</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gwhite@dangermines.ca">gwhite@dangermines.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavo Oliveira Vieira</td>
<td>Campanha Brasileira Contra Mines Terrestres</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brasil@icbl.org">brasil@icbl.org</a></td>
<td>BRASIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Ross Hynes</td>
<td>Mine Action Team, Foreign Affairs Canada</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ross.hynes@international.gc.ca">ross.hynes@international.gc.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Stephan Nellen</td>
<td>GICHD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:c.tillet@gichd.ch">c.tillet@gichd.ch</a>; <a href="mailto:s.nellen@gichd.ch">s.nellen@gichd.ch</a></td>
<td>SWITZERLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habbouba Aoun</td>
<td>Landmines Resource Center</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aounacs@cyberia.net.lb">aounacs@cyberia.net.lb</a>; <a href="mailto:habbouba.aoun@balamand.edu">habbouba.aoun@balamand.edu</a></td>
<td>LEBANON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilario Maiolo</td>
<td>Canadian Red Cross</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ilario.Maiolo@redcross.ca">Ilario.Maiolo@redcross.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iouri Zagoumennov</td>
<td>Belarus Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
<td>iza@<a href="mailto:gmail@yahoo.com">gmail@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>BELARUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabelle Daoust</td>
<td>Canadian Red Cross</td>
<td><a href="mailto:isabelle.daoust@redcross.ca">isabelle.daoust@redcross.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Hansen</td>
<td>International Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jackie@icbl.org">jackie@icbl.org</a></td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Devlin</td>
<td>Mine Action Unit CIDA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jean.devlin@acdi-cida.gc.ca">jean.devlin@acdi-cida.gc.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John MacBride</td>
<td>Mine Action Team, Foreign Affairs Canada</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john-eric.macbride@international.gc.ca">john-eric.macbride@international.gc.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Mollica</td>
<td>Africa, Maghreb and Middle East, Mine Action Team, Foreign Affairs Canada</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen.mollica@international.gc.ca">karen.mollica@international.gc.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kjell Knudsen</td>
<td>ICBL</td>
<td><a href="mailto:webmaster@icbl.org">webmaster@icbl.org</a></td>
<td>NORWAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Genxin</td>
<td>China Arms Control and Disarmament Association</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ligenxin@hotmail.com">ligenxin@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>CHINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maja Zivic</td>
<td>Ottawa Youth Mine Action Committee</td>
<td><a href="mailto:majazivic@hotmail.com">majazivic@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Arach Orec</td>
<td>ICBL Victim Assistance Working Group, Uganda</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maoprech1@yahoo.co.uk">maoprech1@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>UGANDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Back</td>
<td>Science for Peace</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ea590@freenet.carelton.ca">ea590@freenet.carelton.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Lemon</td>
<td>World Vision Canada</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marilyn_lemon@worldvision.ca">marilyn_lemon@worldvision.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Regimbal</td>
<td>OAS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:melanie.regimbal@international.gc.ca">melanie.regimbal@international.gc.ca</a></td>
<td>PERU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Wotton</td>
<td>Adopt-a-Minefield Canada</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mwotte@po-box.mcgill.ca">mwotte@po-box.mcgill.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique St. Jean</td>
<td>Ottawa Youth Mine Action Committee</td>
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<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Degraff</td>
<td>Handicap International Canada</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nancy.degraff@handicap-international.ca">nancy.degraff@handicap-international.ca</a></td>
<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
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<td>CANADA</td>
</tr>
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<td>ICBL Georgian Committee</td>
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<td>GEORGIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Permanent Mission of Nicaragua in Geneva</td>
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<td>Mines Action Canada</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Paul Ochanda Saoke</td>
<td>Kenya Coalition Against Landmines</td>
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<td>KENYA</td>
</tr>
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<td>Mines-Arms Unit, ICRC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Sundberg</td>
<td>Landmine Monitor Nicaragua/El Salvador</td>
<td><a href="mailto:p_sundberg@yahoo.com">p_sundberg@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>NICARAGUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippe Chabasse</td>
<td>Handicap International France</td>
<td><a href="mailto:philippe.chabasse@wanadoo.fr">philippe.chabasse@wanadoo.fr</a></td>
<td>FRANCE</td>
</tr>
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<td>Purna Shova Chitrakar</td>
<td>Ban Landmines Campaign Nepal</td>
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<td>Mine Action Team, Foreign Affairs Canada</td>
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<td>THAILAND</td>
</tr>
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<td>ICBL Youth Ambassador</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Wixley</td>
<td>ICBL</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wixley@icbl.org">wixley@icbl.org</a></td>
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<td>World Food Program</td>
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</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Symposium Program and Process

I. Theme and Structure
The theme that provided context and parameters for all discussions during this unique 3-day symposium is "Building the Road Beyond Nairobi". In order to build the road beyond Nairobi (the first Review Conference on the Ottawa Convention), there needed to be focused, specific discussions on the issues that are critical to the success of the Ottawa Convention with a representative cross-section of stakeholders—including equitable representation of those from mine-affected countries.

The following are some of the key issues that have come up repeatedly at formal and informal Convention meetings that Beyond Nairobi, with its multi-stakeholder and participatory approach, generated discussion and action planning around for the purpose of preparing for the next phase of successful implementation of the Ottawa Convention. Open Space discussion sessions revolved around the topics of:

- Funding and sustainability: How can we successfully and globally mainstream mine action into development programs?
- International cooperation: How can we get more consistent involvement and ownership of stakeholders from mine-affected countries in planning for and addressing Convention obligations?
- Victim assistance: How can we increase adequate input and involvement of survivors in victim assistance program planning or policy-making? How do we keep the promise of full reintegration back into communities for victims from becoming a broken promise?
- Mine clearance: Are we aiming for a mine-free world or impact-free world as a final goal?
- Universalization: Given current political situations, how do we ensure the use of mines by non-state actors becomes taboo?
- Public engagement: How do we ensure the sustainability of the campaign given the anticipated turnover of players post-Nairobi? Will substantively incorporating more youth into the movement address this issue?

To ensure we achieved this, the format used for this event was Open Space—a highly participatory, dynamic facilitation technique, which allows the participants to contribute additional or revised discussion topics under the strict parameter of the theme. The daily dynamic assessment of the Open Space structure allowed the symposium content to be refined and adapted based on the relevance and value to the participants throughout the event.

The structure of Open Space facilitation also ensured that all participants had equal opportunity to contribute and lead sessions that are important to them. The promotion of equitable and meaningful participation was one of the many reasons MAC feels that Open Space is an appropriate tool for encouraging the full participation of cross-cultural and marginal groups not possible in formal Convention meetings. MAC hopes that this type of conference technique will serve as a model for the full inclusion of mine-affected stakeholders in future landmine meetings.

II. Outcomes and Objectives
The purpose of Beyond Nairobi was to provide an opportunity for focused, thorough discussions by a representative cross-section of important stakeholders and a space to turn discussions on important ideas into action steps for the future.

The program of events was structured to:

- Identify actionable ideas for maintaining the momentum of the global campaign and being an active part of building the future past Nairobi especially concerning the Canada-led initiative of mainstreaming mine action;
- Identify next steps for these ideas and strategies including naming the champions who will help keep them alive toward the Nairobi Summit and beyond;
- Have an opportunity to focus on and discuss the landmine and mainstreaming issues that are important to them in a structure that does not limit or inhibit any participant from having input;
- Share ideas, possibilities, and strategies for a landmine-free world with a cross-section of important actors in the movement in a way that is not feasible at official meetings;
- Strengthen old relationships and building new ones in anticipation of the turnover of NGO and government actors in the movement post-Nairobi and the mainstreaming of mine action into development agencies.

In addition to identifying champions to carry action ideas and discussions forward, a further benefit of this structure is that it allowed for instantaneous reports to be produced throughout, capturing all of the discussion points and action plans developed. All participants left the symposium with these reports and were able to take them back to their organizations to use immediately in planning and discussions.
Appendix B: Symposium Program and Process

Program Components

Part 1: Official Opening

The first part of the symposium consisted of two official events marking the opening of the ceremony:

- ICBL symbolic archive handover where the international community, Canadian government and civil society gathered together commemorating what has been achieved to date and Canada’s role; and
- Formal luncheon serving as the official opening of Beyond Nairobi symposium hosted by Library and Archives Canada.

Part 2: Introduction to Open Space

MAC’s professional facilitators briefed participants on how Open Space works, the specific parameters for discussion, and provide an opportunity to refine agenda topics.

Part 3: Identifying issues of concern

Under the parameter of the theme, and using the examples issues indicated above, participants created a list of issues of concern for discussion. Once all of the discussion topics were posted, facilitators clustered similar discussion topics. Participants self-selected discussion groups and began discussions. At the end of sessions, each discussion group created a one-page report of outcomes that was be circulated to all participants.

Part 4: Prioritizing issues of concern

After the issue discussion groups were finished, participants collaboratively clustered and prioritized the group of issues on which they would like to develop action plans. They, again, self-selected into groups based on their interest and expertise for action planning on a particular issue.

Part 5: Action planning

Each group had an opportunity to develop action plans or steps on one of the identified priority issues.

Part 6: Group feedback and closure

All action plans were reported back to the larger group for debate and decisions on which aspects should be moved forward. The group identified and named champions who will be responsible for moving the plans forward. Copies of the action plans were handed into symposium organizers who compiled and distributed all outcomes of the talks to all participants.
### Appendix B: Symposium Program and Process

#### III. Program

**WEDNESDAY SEPTEMBER 15, 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:30–11:30am</td>
<td>Handover ceremony marking the acceptance of ICBL archives into the National Library and Archives of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00–1:30pm</td>
<td>Formal luncheon for symposium participants serving as the official opening ceremony of the symposium (invited guest speakers Ambassador for Mine Action, Ross Hynes, and CIDA President, Paul Thibault).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30–2:00pm</td>
<td>Transition from LAC to symposium venue (Residence Marriott Hotel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00–3:00pm</td>
<td>Introduction to Open Space and the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00–4:30pm</td>
<td>Issues of Concern: Small group discussion session #1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30–5:30pm</td>
<td>Group report-back on discussions and first day evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30–7:00pm</td>
<td>Newsroom remains open to participant for typing up day's reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 16TH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00–9:30am</td>
<td>Morning updates and any business from previous day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30–10:45am</td>
<td>Issues of Concern: Small group discussion session #2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45–12:00pm</td>
<td>Issues of Concern: Small group discussion session #3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00–2:15pm</td>
<td>Issues of Concern: Small group discussion session #4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15–3:30pm</td>
<td>Issues of Concern: Small group discussion session #5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30–4:30pm</td>
<td>Group report-back on discussions and second day evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: reports of all discussions to be compiled and printed for all participants overnight*

**FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 17TH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:45–9:30am</td>
<td>Participant review of consolidated reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30–10:30am</td>
<td>Group prioritizing of issues for action planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30–1:30pm</td>
<td>Action planning: small group action planning sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30–3:30pm</td>
<td>Group report-back on action plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30–4:30pm</td>
<td>Naming of champions to carry action plans forward and closing session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A. DISCUSSION REPORT FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic:</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiator:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion Summary, Proposals, Actions:**

*Participants type up their notes for circulation after sessions.*
### B. ACTION STEPS TEMPLATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan - Priority #___</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion of the Next Steps:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Discussion Report No.(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Related topics: Identify Discussion Reports #s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. What do you want to do now to move forward?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Who will do what by when?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Results: Target date for results?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Resources needed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. First Steps: Date of the next meeting. Who's invited?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix D: Further Information

Several documents and organizations are noted throughout the report. Please refer to the links below for further information on the following references:

Full text of the Ottawa Convention banning landmines:
http://www.icbl.org/treaty/text

Nairobi Action Plan:

The Nairobi Declaration:

Information on the Nairobi Summit for a Mine-Free World:
http://www.nairobisummit.org

Landmine Monitor:
http://www.icbl.org/lm

ICBL Bangkok-Nairobi Action Plan
http://www.icbl.org/campaign/actionplan

ICBL Working Group on Victim Assistance:
http://www.icbl.org/campaign/wg/va

ICBL Mine Risk Education Sub-Working Group:
http://www.icbl.org/campaign/wg/mre

ICBL Non-State Actors Working Group:
http://www.icbl.org/campaign/wg/nsa

ICBL Mine Action Working Group:
http://www.icbl.org/campaign/wg/ma