

**Terms of Reference**  
**Senior Mine Action Evaluation Consultant**  
**Evaluation of UNDP Support to Countries on Mine Action**  
**December 2014**

**BACKGROUND ON MINE ACTION**

Landmines and unexploded ordnance (UXO) constitute a devastating problem to humans globally, causing death and injury, and undermining socio-economic development in affected areas. The UN identifies 78 countries as being affected by landmines/UXO from past conflicts. Despite international treaties, landmines continue to be produced, stored and used, including by non-state groups.

Mine Action is a domain within humanitarian aid and development support focused on activities which aim to reduce the social, economic and environmental impact of landmines and explosive remnants of war (ERW). Mine Action is a collective term used internationally to refer to mine and UXO clearance, mine risk education, mine victim assistance, destruction of mine stockpiles, and advocacy against the use of mines. Given the range of activities that fall under Mine Action, there are many actors in this field, including civil society, international organizations and government agencies.

Mine Action has long been a high profile effort of the United Nations, dating back since its formation. During this half century there has been a significant reduction in mine and UXO related accidents, reducing the fear and constraints on post-conflict populations. The combined efforts of national governments, the UN, civil society and other partners has all but halted landmine use in most of the world. During this period, significant improvements have also been demonstrated in tools and techniques for identifying, removing and destroying landmines and UXO.

The work of the UN in Mine Action rests within responsibilities set out in the UN Charter as well as through international conventions, commencing with the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction (1997). Since then, the international legal framework for mine action has expanded, most notably through the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices (1996), annexed to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, (1998) and Protocol V of the Convention on Conventional Weapons (2006). Also pertinent are the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2008), and the Convention on Cluster Munitions (2010).

Recently, Secretary General Ban Ki Moon launched the Strategy of the United Nations on Mine Action 2013-2018. This strategy provides analytical and programmatic guidance for the formulation, implementation and revision of United Nations assistance at the country level, 'in a manner that is consistent with the specific needs, requests and legal regimes of each context'. The strategy reaffirms that States have primary responsibility in Mine Action. In each affected state, UN assistance should shift over time, as well as in nature and intensity, based on country needs and requests for assistance, and the comparative advantage of other actors. The strategy covers the work of 14 UN offices, funds and agencies coordinating through the UN Interagency Coordinating Group on Mine Action.

**UNDP SUPPORT TO MINE ACTION**

UNDP's Mine Action support is global in reach and has been ongoing for decades. Institutionally, this work has been carried out by UNDP country offices, supported by the Livelihoods and Economic

Recovery Group (LRG), of the UNDP Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR)<sup>1</sup>. UNDP views the indicators of success in its Mine Action support to be improved livelihoods, accelerated socio economic development and contribution towards the MDGs. UNDP's recent work in Mine Action can be categorized within four overlapping areas of work:

- 1) Government capacity building (for example, establishing institutional and legal frameworks, mine action centres, data and information management systems);
- 2) Landmine clearance and stockpile destruction (for example, coordinating and training demining specialists, conducting baseline surveys, and improving storage sites);
- 3) Reintegration, resettlement and land reuse (for example, providing sustainable livelihood programmes and promoting the release of demined land for the poor); and
- 4) Victim assistance and advocacy (for example, physical rehabilitation, access to basic social services and care and protection for the disabled).

The work of UNDP has not been evenly spread across these four overlapping areas, but centres especially on building the capacity of national institutions to provide mine action services. UNDP is rarely a direct service provider. In the limited cases where UNDP support has included service provision and/or facilitation and/or contracting, it has been typically in support of new government policies and practices, and to demonstrate new procedures and technologies to be replicated and scaled up by government and other mine action service providers.

UNDP management at the end of 2014 has announced that in line with the UNDP 2014-2017 Strategic Plan, UNDP will no longer provide global policy and programmatic support for Mine Action. UNDP Management has noted, however, that there are important residual commitments to programme countries and donors in the form of active projects that UNDP will fulfil over the next several years. While the absence of a Mine Action global offer of expertise and resources does not mean that all UNDP-supported Mine Action work will immediately come to a halt, it does mean that UNDP, starting in 2015, will transition out of mine action specific activities, narrowing its focus to the seven outcome areas that the Executive Board approved for UNDP in the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan. Parallel to this evaluation, the UNDP Bureau for Policy and Programme Support will be carrying out a close out strategy for its global mine action programme.

## **BACKGROUND ON THE EVALUATION**

The Evaluation of UNDP support to countries on Mine Action is part of the UNDP Executive Board approved work programme for the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office in 2014 / 2015. It is scheduled for submission to the UNDP Executive Board in September, 2015

The objective of this evaluation is to determine, to the fullest degree possible, the results and impacts of UNDP support to countries in the area of Mine Action since the beginning of this century. The evaluation is global in scope, analysing all UNDP global, regional and country-based mine action programmes and projects. The evaluation will assess UNDP mine action achievements in terms of relevance, effectiveness (outputs and outcomes) and efficiency, and to the fullest extent possible: sustainability and impact.

### ***Key questions that the evaluation will address include:***

1. To what extent has UNDP been relevant as a mine action partner with national governments, other UN and international organizations, and international and non-governmental actors?
2. How efficiently did UNDP use its resources to support mine action?
3. How effective have UNDP mine action programmes and activities been? What have been the direct results (positive and negative, intended and unintended) of UNDP work in relation to mine

---

<sup>1</sup> UNDP has revised its structure in November 2014, consolidating its two global policy bureaux: BCPR and the Bureau for Development Policy, into the combined Bureau for Policy and Programme Support, (BPPS).

action? Have these results contributed to or are they likely to contribute to long term outcomes and impacts?

4. To what extent have programmes and activities that commenced through the UNDP mine action support frame continued, and what is the likelihood that governments will continue their mine action activities in the future?

Objectives and planned achievements will be directly compared to results through a close review of project and programme documents and previous evaluations. Issues of efficiency will be analysed, with operational activities and resource utilisation benchmarked against other service providers. The sustainability of programmes and projects developed by UNDP will be analysed, with respect to whether activities launched with UNDP support have been continued, up-scaled and replicated. The impact of UNDP support will be scrutinised, especially in terms of strengthened national institutions, legal frameworks and practices that result in responsive mine action services for affected communities.

The evaluation will focus attention across the global portfolio of mine action support programmes carried out by UNDP. It will include a synthesis of evidence across the entire portfolio, a subset of specific country programmes analysed as desk studies, and three country case studies with field work to consider community-level results and impacts.

For the desk and field studies a refined list of thirteen countries was developed in consultation with stakeholders and using the main selection criteria of UNDP regional balance, the socio-economic and political context, security, program type balance (e.g. NIM or DIM implemented), program engagement origin, pre/post-Ottawa Treaty, type of contamination; level of access (security and seasonal access to communities), availability of primary and secondary data related to mine action and broader macro-level data. The countries are included in ANNEX 1.

### ***Desk Studies***

Desk-reviews will be carried out for all thirteen of the selected countries, focusing on programme processes and implementation of activities, outputs, reported outcomes and impacts, and the contextual conditions in which they occurred. The desk reviews will be limited to a review of existing data and information with no in-country field visit although some interviews with key informants may be undertaken by phone and/or electronically administered survey. The desk-reviews will include a comprehensive sampling of the available literature, including evaluations and program documents. The findings will be analysed on a case by case basis, guided by the evaluation questions and will examine the pre-intervention situation, programme activities, targeted participants, intermediate outcomes, impacts and contextual variables and where possible identify key actors or change agents and their characteristics. This initial analysis will be followed by a meta-evaluation to synthesise what the cases collectively reveal about UNDP's contribution to mine action across the three components of institutional capacity building, demining and post-clearance land use and victim assistance.

### ***In-depth field studies***

Three of the thirteen countries will be selected for in-depth field studies. The specific countries will be selected in consideration of the cases that have the potential to reveal particular insights into the evaluation questions, and in particular to provide community-level evidence of impact. The selection will be based on criteria that includes a) extent and duration of UNDP mine action support; b) ongoing and/or recent cessation of UNDP mine action engagement; c) availability of background documentation; e) ability to conduct observations in the field recognising safety considerations, f) regional variation, g) national counterpart acceptance.

## **TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of international and national experts will be selected to assist the UNDP Independent Evaluation office in carrying out the evaluation. The evaluation team will include the following members:

- Evaluation Manager (senior member of the UNDP IEO professional staff)
- Research Consultant (full time consultant to UNDP IEO)
- Senior Mine Action Consultant
- Mine Action consultant
- National Consultants

In addition, two members of the UNDP IEO Independent Evaluation Advisory Panel, plus an international mine action expert, will be appointed to serve as an advisory group, providing quality assurance on the methods used, and deliverables produced.

## **ASSIGNMENT TERMS AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

The Senior Mine Action t will be responsible for providing both substantive and operational inputs to the evaluation. The Consultant will work closely with and report directly to the Evaluation Manager in implementing the project from inception to completion of the final report. Responsibilities of the senior mine action consultant include:

### ***1. Document Review***

Extensive background documentation on UNDP's work in mine action across 38 countries has been compiled and will be supplied to the consultant upon contract signing. This information will include project documents, project evaluations, and a database compiled of every UNDP mine action project and programme carried out since the year 2000. The consultant is expected to first review these pertinent materials in order to get fully up to speed on the work of UNDP on mine action.

### ***2. Evaluation Planning***

An initial set of key questions and criteria have been established for the evaluation, as well as approaches to be used to establish findings, conclusions and recommendations. An evaluation matrix aligning the selected tools and techniques with the evaluation questions has been developed, and a draft 'Theory of Change' for UNDP's work in mine action has been produced. The consultant will be expected to review and refine these materials, in particular with regard to the content of desk reviews and field studies.

### ***3. Field Study management***

The consultant will work with the Evaluation Manager to finalise the conceptual framework and methodology for the desk studies and field studies and to select the three countries where the field studies will occur.

The consultant will support the identification and selection of the rest of the consulting team, (including a second international mine action consultant hired to carry out desk reviews, and national consultants for each of the three field study countries), and will manage the field study teams, including overseeing the production and synthesis of the three field study reports.

### ***4. Support to data analysis and the elaboration of findings***

The consultant will synthesise the data collected from the field studies, and work with the Evaluation Manager to draft the evaluation report.

## **DURATION OF ASSIGNMENT AND TRAVEL**

The assignment entails approx. 65 days of work, between 5, January and 5, June 2014. The assignment will at a minimum involve travel to three case study countries and two trips to the UNDP headquarters in New York. Specific dates and locations will be developed jointly with the Evaluation Manager, and set out in an Inception Report. The consultant should anticipate 40% of the contract duration to be spent on travel, with the rest home-based.

## **DELIVERABLES**

- An Inception Report within 2 weeks of contract signing.
- Three field study reports, by the end of March, 2015.
- Report on the synthesis of evaluation findings from field studies and desk reviews, by mid-April 2015.
- Support to the drafting of the evaluation report, May, 2015

## **PAYMENT SCHEDULE**

The senior mine action consultant will be paid a percentage of the total consulting fees according to the following schedule, based on approval by the UNDP Evaluation Office of the following submissions:

- 20%            Approved Inception report
- 50%            Approved field study and synthesis reports
- 30%            Final Evaluation Report submitted for design and editing

Travel costs and other pre-approved expenses will be covered separately by the Evaluation Office, per the relevant UNDP rules and regulations.

## **COMPETENCIES**

The senior mine action consultant is expected to meet the following competency expectations:

### **General:**

- Understanding of and ability to work in cross-cultural environments, with local counterparts and interpreters;
- Recognition of normative and ethical issues when evaluating for the UN in post-conflict settings;
- Excellent written and verbal communication skills;
- Ability to work under pressure and meet deadlines; and
- Understanding of and ability to take a systematic approach to analysing qualitative data.

### **Demonstrated Specialist skills:**

- Understanding of the relevant mine action international legal frameworks and treaties;
- Understanding of the work of the UN in mine action;
- Competencies in analysing mine action programmes and evaluating the outcomes and impacts of demining;
- Competencies in participatory, community-based impact evaluation approaches; and
- Competencies in reviewing and assessing organisational and institutional capacity building in post-conflict and donor assisted countries.

## **REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE**

### **Education:**

- A Master's degree in social science or related field.

### **Experience:**

- At least 15 years of international development experience; and
- Previous experience managing evaluations of UN mine action programmes.

**Language:**

- Fluency in English. Working knowledge of other UN languages will be an advantage.

**EVALUATION ETHICS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

The consultant selected must be independent of the UNDP and its management, and not have been in a strategic / supervisory position at UNDP, with direct oversight of the mine action programme, during the past decade. The selected consultant will be required to sign an agreement that he/she will abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System. The consultant is expected to operate within UNEG norms and standards, and under the following ethical guidelines:

**Evaluators:**

- Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded
- Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
- Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
- Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
- Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Parallel to this evaluation, the UNDP Bureau for Policy and Programme Support will be carrying out a close out strategy for its global Mine Action programme. Participation in that exercise does not prohibit a consultant from being considered for this evaluation.

# ANNEX 1: SHORT-LISTED COUNTRIES FOR DESK AND FIELD REVIEWS

Region	Country	GDP (billion)	UNDP Mine Action engagement (10+ years)	Origin of Mine Action Engagement	Implementation	ID	VA	C/LU	Mine Ban Treaty/ Status
Asia and the Pacific	Cambodia	Low income (15.25)	1993 Present –	Peace-keeping	UNOPS, UNDP (DIM), NIM	✓		✓	Ratified
	Lao PDR	Low middle (11.14)	1996 Present –	UNDP	UNOPS, UNDP (DIM), NIM	✓	✓	✓	Not joined
	Sri Lanka	Low middle (67.18)	1997 – 2013	UNDP	UNDP (DIM)	✓		✓	Not joined
Arab States	Jordan	Upper middle (33.68)	2004 – 2011	UNDP	NIM	✓	✓	✓	Ratified
	Lebanon	Upper middle (44.35)	2001 Present –	UNDP	NIM	✓	✓	✓	Not joined
	Yemen	Low middle (35.95)	1999 Present –	UNDP	UNOPS, NIM	✓		✓	Ratified
Europe and Central Asia	Albania	Upper middle (12.90)	2002 Present –	UNDP	UNDP (DIM), NIM	✓	✓	✓	Ratified
	Azerbaijan	Upper middle (73.65)	1999 Present –	UNDP	UNOPS, UNDP (DIM), NIM	✓	✓	✓	Not joined
	Bosnia-Herzgovina	Upper middle (17.83)	1996 Present –	Peace-keeping	UNOPS, UNDP (DIM)	✓		✓	Ratified
	Tajikistan	Low income (8.508)	2003 Present –	UNDP	UNDP (DIM), NIM	✓	✓	✓	Ratified
Latin American and the Caribbean	Colombia	Upper middle (378.1)	2002 Present –	UNDP	UNDP (DIM),	✓	✓		Ratified
Africa	Ethiopia	Low income (48.87)	2001 – 2012	UNDP	UNOPS, UNDP (DIM), NIM	✓		✓	Ratified
	Mozambique	Low income (15.32)	1994 Present –	Peace-keeping	UNOPS, NIM	✓		✓	Ratified

ID - Institutional Development; VA - Victim Assistance; C/LU - Clearance, Land Use

## Africa

1. **Ethiopia:** A number of internal and international armed conflicts dating back to 1935 have contributed to the landmine and ERW problem in Ethiopia. UNDP directly implemented a mine action programme in Ethiopia for over a decade, which was handed over to the Government in 2012. This includes support to the Government through the Ethiopian Mine Action Office (EMAO) and a UNDP Mine Action Advisory Team. Ethiopia is one of the countries in which UNDP support the Landmine Impact Survey (other field case studies in this evaluation with an LIS process include Cambodia, Azerbaijan and Lebanon). This will be considered as a possible standard for discussion of landmine impact, and a baseline to measure improvement. In some cases, such as Ethiopia, resurvey have taken place over time, opening up the potential for time series data.
2. **Mozambique:** Landmines and ERW in Mozambique are from 30 years of conflict that ended in 1992. Initial UNDP involvement in mine action in Mozambique included financial and operational support for the National Demining Institute (IND), through Phase One (1994-2000) and Phase Two (2000-2005) of an Accelerating Demining Programme. Examples of other UNDP-funded work include a project on the Socio-Economic Reintegration of Landmine Survivors (1999-2002), and a Flood Related Mine Action emergency project (2000-2001). UNDP has recently assisted in the development and implementation of a National Mine Action Plan (2008-2014). Currently, UNDP's 'Support to the National Demining Programme' (2012-2015) provides assistance toward mainstreaming Mine Action and advocating for victim assistance, among other activities. Mozambique is a well-researched and well-documented mine action country.

## Arab States

3. **Jordan:** ERW, UXO and AXO contamination in Jordan is primarily from the 1948 partition of Palestine, the 1967-1969 Arab-Israeli conflict, the 1970 civil war, and the 1975 conflict with Syria. UNDP has provided a technical advisory support role to the National Committee for Demining and Rehabilitation (NCDR). UNDP project support includes a Northern Border Clearance Project, implemented by the NCDR and Norwegian People's Aid. The project has been cited as having a strong emphasis on local community participation in clearance operations, alongside gender sensitive processes. UNDP has also facilitated the participation of mine action centre staff from other UNDP countries for courses at an Arabic regional training centre in Amman, supported by UNDP. While there is limited secondary documentation on UNDP's mine action work in Jordan, the case study may provide an opportunity to explore broader mine action activity impacts at a community level.
4. **Lebanon:** The landmine and ERW contamination in Lebanon is a product of 15 years of civil conflict that ended in 1990. Invasion by Israel in 2006 led to new contamination in Southern Lebanon. UNDP has supported mine action in Lebanon since 2001, including support to the Lebanon Mine Action Center (LMAC) and the development of a national End-State Strategy for Mine Action (2011-2020). UNDP has also supported projects focused on socio-economic rehabilitation and land use following clearance, including initiatives in the development of national NGOs in mine victim assistance, vocational training and reintegration programmes.
5. **Yemen:** A series of past conflicts (i.e. 1962-1969; 1970-1983; 1994) have contributed to the landmine and ERW problem in Yemen. Through its long-term support, UNDP is the lead agency that coordinates all mine action support clearance related programmes in the country. This includes an ongoing and successive Strengthening National Capacity in Mine Action Programme in Yemen (from 2000 and currently in Phase Four). The programme has focused on efforts to support the Government in establishing and carrying out activities of the Yemen Mine Action Centre (YEMAC), including initiatives to revive livelihoods, enhance provision and access to public and specialized services, and secure the return of IDPs. YEMAC was completely nationalized in



2004. Conflict over 2010-2012 led to an increased demand for mine action activities, and increased role for UNDP support in this area.

## Asia and the Pacific

6. **Cambodia:** The landmine problem in Cambodia is a legacy of three decades of war and remains a burden, particularly in rural areas of the country. As one of the oldest and largest mine action cases, UNDP first engaged in Mine Action in Cambodia in the early 1990's when it established a Trust Fund for Demining in Cambodia and provided advisors. Early involvement included technical and financial support to the Cambodian Mine Action Centre (CMAC) and the Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority (CMAA). Recent UNDP-supported programmes include Phase One (2006-2010) and Phase Two (2011-2015) of a Clearing for Results Programme (CfR), which continues to support the CMAC and CMAA. Through the CfR Programme, UNDP is supporting the implementation of the National Mine Action Strategy (2010-2019), which includes assistance in policy frameworks for land release and the improvement of economic opportunities and growth. Findings of this evaluation will contribute to and align with the completion of Phase Two of CfR (December 2015).
7. **Lao PDR:** Lao PDR continues to address UXO contamination from the Indochina War of the 1960s and 1970s. The UNDP UXO programme in Lao PDR is the first one started by UNDP, and dates back to the 1990s. It remains one of the largest and best funded mine action/UXO programmes. Through its UXO programming, UNDP has been actively building institutional capacity of two key state institutions: the National Regulatory Authority (NRA) and UXO Lao. UNDP has also supported the management of the Lao PDR Trust Fund for Clearance of UXO. The case study provides an opportunity to look at UNDP's work in UXO-related activities exclusively. The extensive duration of UNDP engagement may allow for a rich historical account in the country.
8. **Sri Lanka:** Landmine, ERW, and UXO contamination in Sri Lanka is due to three decades of armed conflict between the Government and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), which ended in 2009. The phases of mine laying, and consequently, UNDP long-term and comprehensive support was shaped by this conflict. In parallel with UNDP's support to peace and recovery in Sri Lanka, mine action largely focused on supporting the Government in managing, implementing, coordinating and sustaining mine action activities (i.e. clearance and mine risk education) in the North and East. For example, UNDP's Support to Mine Action Projects (phases, over 2002 to 2013) have supported the National Mine Action Programme, including a National Steering Committee on Mine Action, and a National Mine Action Office. In line with broader UNDP interventions and outcomes, mine action has focused on increased equity in socioeconomic opportunities and services for conflict-affect communities and IDPs. In 2013, UNDP was transitioning all mine action activities to the Government.

## Europe and Central Asia

9. **Albania:** Landmines and UXO in Albania were a legacy of the 1999 Kosovo conflict, with large numbers of landmines and UXOs contaminating border areas. UNDP has implemented a Support to Mine Action Programme (initial engagement in 2002), and Mine Action Completion and Coordination projects over the last decade. UNDP support was important in the development of the Albanian Mine Action Executive (AMAE) and the Albanian Mine Action Committee (AMAC). For example, in 2002, UNDP assumed responsibility for the development, management and running costs of AMAE. Through partnerships with local NGOs, UNDP has provided victim assistance and support to landmine, ERW and UXO survivors, including rehabilitation and socio-economic reintegration support. UNDP continues to directly implement a Mine Action and Ammunition Disposal in Albania. The case study provides an opportunity to explore the UNDP role in ensuring national ownership and sustainability of mine action capacity.

10. **Azerbaijan:** The landmine and ERW problem in Azerbaijan is primarily a consequence of armed conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan from 1988-1994. UNDP has supported the development of the Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action (ANAMA) since 1999, and maintains a strong partnership to date. UNDP has successfully transitioned mine action activities to national ownership, through a clear exit strategy. Furthermore, UNDP has supported ANAMA in South-South cooperation, including knowledge sharing with other mine-affected countries (e.g. Afghanistan, Tajikistan and Georgia). UNDP's mine action support to ANAMA has consistently incorporated socio-economic development (including physical rehabilitation, micro-credit initiatives and skills training), and mainstreaming into Government development plans. For example, UNDP recently supported ANAMA in a Coordination and Implementation of Mine Victim Assistance Projects initiative (2013).
11. **Bosnia-Herzegovina:** Landmines in Bosnia-Herzegovina are exclusively from the 1992-1995 war in the country. Initial UNDP involvement included the management of a Mine Action Centre (BHMAL). UNDP helped change the funding for the BHMAL from donors to the government, and BHMAL is now fully funded by the government. UNDP-supported programmes include Phase One (1999-2000), Phase Two (2000-2004), and Phase Three (2004-2009) of an Integrated Mine Action Programme (IMAP; previously called MAP). Through IMAP, UNDP has supported the development of both legislative and strategic measures, including the current National Mine Action Strategy (2009 to 2019), and various government capacity building initiatives, such as the expansion of Mine Action coordination systems. Since 2005, UNDP has also been engaged in Small Arms Control and Reduction (2005-2012) including cluster bombs, and the destruction of ERW (2012-2015), including unsafe munitions. Recently, UNDP played a role in resurveying landmines following the 2014 floods.
12. **Tajikistan:** The mine and ERW problem in Tajikistan is the result of civil war (1992-1997) and mine-laying along its borders by Russian and Uzbek forces. Possible new contamination from the conflict with a non-state armed group, the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan, remains unknown. UNDP has provided support to mine action activities in Tajikistan since 2002, including the development of the Tajikistan Mine Action Centre (TMAL). Recent UNDP support includes Phase One (2010-2012) and Phase Two (2012-2015) of a Support to the Tajikistan Mine Action Programme (STMAL), which have contributed to the current National Mine Action Strategic Plan (2012-2015). Both STMAL Phases include a strong emphasis on victim assistance, land release activities and mine risk education, allowing for an in-depth exploration into these areas of work. For example, UNDP projects include support to prosthetic-orthopedic centres and psychosocial support services, in partnership with Handicap International. UNDP mine action recently transitioned to national implementation (2014).

#### **Latin America and the Caribbean**

13. **Colombia:** The mine and ERW problem in Colombia is the result of over 20 years of conflict between Non States Armed Groups (NSAGs) and the Government. UNDP's mine action work in Colombia has been relatively small-scale, though long term. The focus of UNDP's involvement has been on knowledge generation, information management, and knowledge sharing. This includes, for example, the development of an interface to integrate landmine accidents within the national health surveillance system, the production of a Colombia mine action directory of mine action actors in the country, and the strengthening of inter-institutional alliances and networks. UNDP mine action activities in Colombia have been integrated into the REDES programme. The Organization of American States (OAS) has been a key provider of mine action support in the Latin America and the Caribbean region, including in Colombia. However, Colombia is the only country in this region where UNDP has engaged in mine action work. This may present an opportunity to develop comparisons between the institutional experiences of OAS and UNDP in-country.