



Government of Sri Lanka

**Sri Lanka National Mine Action Strategy
2016 – 2020**

Ministry of Prison Reforms, Rehabilitation,
Resettlement, and Hindu Religious Affairs
Galle Road
Colombo
Sri Lanka

May 2016

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Glossary of Abbreviations	3
Introduction	5
Background.....	5
Origin, Nature and Scope of the Mine/ERW Contamination Problem	5
Landmines.....	6
Explosive Remnants of War	6
Response to the Contamination Problem	7
Extent and Impact of Contamination	8
Transition to National Ownership	9
National Mine Action Programme: Institutional Architecture	9
National, Regional/District Steering Committees for Mine Action	9
National Mine Action Centre	10
Regional Mine Action Office	10
Vision.....	11
Mission.....	11
Strategic Objectives	11
Survey and Clearance.....	12
Mine Risk Education	14
Victim Assistance.....	17
Advocacy	20
Management of Residual Contamination.....	23
Information Management	24
Prioritisation and Operational Planning	25
Resource Mobilisation.....	26
Monitoring and Reviewing the National Strategy	26
Endorsement.....	28
Annexes.....	29
Annex I: List of Participants – Strategic Planning and Priority-setting Workshop	29
Annex II: Agenda – Strategic Planning and Priority-setting Workshop	31
Annex III: National Mine Action Strategy Review Meetings: 26 to 29 October 2015.....	39
Annex IV: SWOT analysis results	41
Annex V: Results-based Management Implementation in Information Management Capacity Development	42
Annex VI: Priority-setting Timeline.....	45
Annex VII: Initial List of Priority-setting Criteria	46

Glossary of Abbreviations

APMBC	Anti-personnel Mine Ban Convention
AP	Anti-personnel
AT	Anti-tank
CCM	Convention on Cluster Munitions
CHA	Confirmed Hazardous Areas
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
DASH	Devon Assistance for Social Harmony
EOD	Explosive Ordnance Disposal
ERW	Explosive Remnants of War
GA	Government agent
GICHD	Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining
GoSL	Government of Sri Lanka
ICBL	International Campaign to Ban Landmines
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IMAS	International Mine Action Standards
IM	Information Management
IMSMA	Information Management System for Mine Action
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
LTTE	Liberation Tigers of Tamil Elam
MAG	Mines Advisory Group
MoD	Ministry of Defence
MoE	Ministry of Education
MoRRHRA	Ministry of Prison Reforms, Rehabilitation, Resettlement and Hindu Religious Affairs
MoSS	Ministry of Social Services
MRE	Mine Risk Education
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NMAC	National Mine Action Centre
NMAS	National Mine Action Standards
NTS	Non-technical surveys
PWD	Persons with disabilities
SADD	Sex and Age-disaggregated Data
SHA	Suspected Hazardous Area
SLA	Sri Lanka Army

SLA HDU	Sri Lanka Army Humanitarian Demining Units
SLNMAS	Sri Lanka National Mine Action Standards
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Emergency Fund
VA	Victim Assistance

Introduction

This national mine action strategy was developed with the active participation of all relevant stakeholders in Sri Lanka's mine action programme, including:

- representatives from the Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL);
- Sri Lankan Army Humanitarian Demining Units (SLA HDUs);
- national and international non-governmental organisations (NGOs); and
- civil society organisations.

The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) assisted with facilitating a four-day strategy and prioritisation workshop in Colombo in June 2015, bringing all key stakeholders together. The strategy is based on information gathered during that workshop as well as on follow-on meetings and discussions on specific topics.

The GICHD further conducted a follow-on mission to Sri Lanka in October 2015, to meet with stakeholders, gather additional information and finalise certain sections of the strategy. The participant list, workshop programme and a list of meetings during the October mission are available in Annexes I, II and III. As part of the June 2015 strategic planning exercise, workshop participants carried out a; 'strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats' (SWOT) analysis. The results from this exercise are available in Annex IV.

Background

Sri Lanka's national mine action programme started in 2002 with the assistance of UNDP, UNICEF, international NGOs (INGOs), national NGOs and several donors. Its stated goal was to create an environment free of mine and explosive remnants of war (ERW), in support of the GoSL's resettlement and development initiatives.

Sri Lanka is a High Contracting Party to the UN Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) and its Amended Protocol II on landmines, booby traps etc., but not to Protocol V on ERW. Sri Lanka is not a State Party to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) or the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM). On 2 March 2016, however, the cabinet of Ministers decided to grant approval to accede to the APMBC, though parliamentary approval is required to complete the process. Sri Lanka ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) on 8 February 2016, thereby becoming the 162nd State to ratify this Convention.

There is currently no legislation that addresses mines/ERW. The Government of Sri Lanka is using Emergency Regulation No. 34 amended in the Gazette Extraordinary No. 1651/24 dated 02 May 2010 as an interim measure to address this issue.

Origin, Nature and Scope of the Mine/ERW Contamination Problem

The two decade-long civil conflict between Sri Lanka's security forces and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Elam (LTTE) left many areas in the northern and eastern parts of the country contaminated by mines and ERW.

Landmines

Both Sri Lanka's security forces and the LTTE laid mines. The Indian Peacekeeping Forces also used landmines during their presence in the affected area from July 1987 to January 1990.




Figure 1 District map: Sri Lanka

Sri Lanka's security forces used anti-personnel (AP) and anti-tank (AT) mines; all were recorded. After ratification of CCW's Amended Protocol II in September 2004, all mines laid by the security forces were reportedly in accordance with the provisions of this protocol. The security forces handed over all minefield records to the mine action programme at the end of the conflict. All information is stored in the national Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) database.

LTTE used protective minefields in front of their defensive positions. They laid mostly AP mines and also utilised some AT mines, laid according to patterns. However, no minefield records are available. The LTTE also made use of nuisance mines, to prevent access to facilities including wells, buildings, roads and footpaths. Some mines were also scattered on the ground during the LTTE rapid retreat to the east during the final stages of the conflict in 2009. The LTTE used improvised explosive devices (IEDs) in the form of mortar shells connected to tripwires to act as fragmentation mines, bar mines, electrical

and magnetically initiated explosive devices/ mines placed at strategic locations and mines connected with detonating cord to mortar/artillery shells a distance away. LTTE manufactured most of the mines they used themselves; some were designed with an anti-lift/anti-tilt mechanism to prevent the removal of the mine from the ground after it was laid.

Starting in 2002, some mine/ERW-contaminated areas in the northern and eastern provinces were cleared. The escalation of the conflict in 2006, however, resulted in areas being re-contaminated, in particular in northern and eastern provinces, as Sri Lanka's security forces prepared for the final offensive in 2009.

Explosive Remnants of War

Sri Lanka's ERW contamination mainly consists of unexploded airdropped bombs, artillery-delivered shells and missiles, mortar bombs, handheld anti-tank projectiles, rifle grenades and hand grenades. There are also sizeable caches of abandoned explosive ordnance, particularly in the north. There are no reports that cluster ammunition/bombs were used in Sri Lanka during the conflict.

ERW were not viewed as a key threat during clearance operations after 2009. During the period of IDP return after 2009, the GoSL believed that mine risk education (MRE) coupled with an effective explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) response would be sufficient to address the ERW threat. During late 2010/early 2011, hundreds of ERW were reported every month by villagers and cleared by the SLA. In 2015, civilians and communities continued to report ERW regularly (an average of 177 reports were recorded every month in 2014; reducing to an average of 168 over the first 10 months in 2015¹).

Response to the Contamination Problem

Following more than two years of extensive military campaigns, the GoSL liberated and regained control over the entire territory of the island on 18th May 2009, including the North where the LTTE were driven out of their former strongholds in Killinochchi and adjoining districts.

Since early 2009, resettlement of IDPs has been the driving force behind survey and clearance activities, including in Jaffna, Kilinochchi, Mullaitivu, Vavuniya and Mannar districts in the north and Trincomalee, Batticaloa and Ampara districts in the east. Mine action has been instrumental in facilitating the Government's resettlement plans.

Several international demining operators, two national demining operators and the Sri Lanka Army Humanitarian De-mining Unit (SLA HDU) have implemented survey and clearance operations since 2002. Mine risk education (MRE), victim assistance (VA) and advocacy have also been part of Sri Lanka's mine action programme from the onset.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) was involved in mine action in Sri Lanka from 2002 to 2013. They developed the GoSL's capacity to plan, coordinate and manage the mine action programme. United Nations Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) has been involved in mine action since 1997, particularly in training national partners, including the Ministry of Education in providing MRE. UNICEF has also promoted VA and advocacy activities.

While mine clearance has resulted in the release of large areas of previously contaminated land and the safe resettlement of thousands of IDPs, areas contaminated with mines/ERW remain in Sri Lanka. A non-technical survey process is still ongoing, with the objective of gaining further clarity on the extent of the remaining problem by 2017.

The current practice in northern Sri Lanka is to release land for resettlement following the completion of non-technical (NTS) survey operations. The NTS allows confirmed hazardous areas (CHAs) to be demarcated, and areas outside of this are released for resettlement. Priority for mine clearance is given to the residential areas in villages identified for resettlement, in order to keep pace with and support the government's resettlement plans.

As people return to their homes, however, it is essential that areas used for livelihoods are cleared in parallel. Mines/ERW are often blocking access to livelihood options, including gardens and paddy fields. People are therefore prevented from developing effective and sustainable livelihood activities. Despite the clear demarcations of un-cleared and potentially contaminated land, and sustained MRE efforts, there is a real risk that returnees will increasingly start going into un-cleared areas (especially into agricultural land) in order to meet their livelihood needs. This increases the risks of mine/ERW accidents.

¹ Information obtained from UNICEF in October 2015. Each report can lead to the destruction of many items of UXO or of a cache of AXO. Each report is a clear indicator that the MRE messages were understood, taken seriously and the suspected dangerous items, or hazardous areas, were reported to the adequate channels.

It is therefore imperative that livelihood needs are taken into consideration in prioritisation processes related to resettlement plans.

Extent and Impact of Contamination

Sri Lanka's mine action programme has achieved significant progress in effectively clearing mines/ERW and releasing safe land to communities. A total of 131 km² has been reduced and cleared between 2002 and September 2015.²

As of mid-2016, 10 districts remain contaminated with mines/ERW: Ampara, Anuradhapura, Batticaloa, Jaffna, Kilinochchi, Mannar, Mullaitivu, Polonnaruwa, Trincomalee and Vavuniya. As of April 2016, NMAC estimated that a total of 54 km² remains to be processed through survey and/or clearance in these 10 districts.³

District	Before NTS		After NTS (after all data verification)					
	# of hazardous areas	Area (m ²)	# of confirmed hazardous areas	Confirmed area (m ²)	# of cancelled hazardous areas	Canceled area (m ²)	# of new hazardous areas	New area (m ²)
Mannar	103	23,000,000	47	2,300,789	56	18,666,152	2	50,927
Trincomalee	55	6,806,310	1	7,045	51	6,435,739	6	53,834
Ampara	7	74,474	1	9,200	6	65,274		
Batticaloa	128	14,779,983	4	34,640	123	14,733,836	9	277,121
Total	293	44,660,767	53	2,351,674	236	39,901,001	17	381,882
Jaffna	52	4,567,418	NTS is ongoing					
Kilinochchi	233	22,408,090						
Mullaitivu	163	18,198,705						
Vavuniya	99	6,444,291						
Anuradhapura	21	1,154,672						
Polonnaruwa	6	35,949						

Figure 2: NTS information, IMSMA, April 2016

² Information from NMAC, 31st March 2016.

³ It is important to note that the 54 km² figure is an approximation until the ongoing NTS activities have been completed in the remaining districts.




Figure 3: Projected Land use of areas remaining to be cleared before final re-survey; data analysed by NMAC, June 2015
Note: Water Area refers to mine/ERW-contaminated drinking water ponds inland, not to coastal areas.

Transition to National Ownership

UNDP and UNICEF were key stakeholders in Sri Lanka’s Mine Action Programme from 2003 to 2013. Transitioning to increased national ownership of the mine action programme started with the creation of a National Mine Action Centre (NMAC) in 2010 and was concluded by the end of 2013.

In addition to traditional capacity development of NMAC government staff, UNDP and UNICEF focused on seconded SLA personnel, through training, mentoring and exposure. The agreed minimum structure comprised the NMAC in Colombo and one Regional Mine Action Office (RMAO) based in Kilinochchi. Transitioning also included the transfer of physical assets including vehicles.

National Mine Action Programme: Institutional Architecture

National, Regional/District Steering Committees for Mine Action

Steering committees used to play an important role in providing guidance to the mine action programme and in promoting transparency and accountability. At the national level the Steering Committee fulfilled the role of a National Mine Action Authority. It used to convene key national stakeholders including the SLA and relevant Ministries, mine action NGOs and main development partners. At regional and district levels, steering committees were tasked to ensure priority-setting of survey, clearance and MRE activities.

The Government of Sri Lanka is currently seeking to convene steering committee meetings for mine action up to twice per year at the national level and at three regional levels; i.e. one for the East (Trincomalee, Batticaloa and Ampara) and two for the North (Jaffna, Kilinochchi and Mullaitivu, and Vavuniya, Mannar, Polonnaruwa and Anuradhapura respectively).

National Mine Action Centre

A Cabinet decision officially established the NMAC under the Ministry of Economic Development in July 2010. UNDP coordinated the mine action programme on behalf of the GoSL.

Following Sri Lanka's January 2015 Presidential elections and the subsequent change of government, the Ministry of Economic Development, NMAC's institutional home, was dismantled. As a result, a March 2015 Cabinet memorandum then assigned development activity, implemented by the former Ministry of Economic Development, to other relevant Ministries. This resulted in the National Mine Action Programme being assigned to the Ministry of Prison Reforms, Rehabilitation, Resettlement, and Hindu Religious Affairs (MoRRHRA).⁴

Regional Mine Action Office

In 2015 the mine action programme had one RMAO in Kilinochchi; a reduction from several Regional and District Mine Action Offices in most mine-affected districts (i.e. in 2010: Jaffna RMAO, Vavuniya RMAO and Batticaloa RMAO; sub-offices in Kilinochchi, Mannar, Mullaitivu, and Trincomalee).

⁴ Cabinet Memorandum, 10 March 2015

Vision

Sri Lanka is free from the threat of landmines and explosive remnants of war (ERW) by 2020, enabling women, girls, boys and men to live in a safe environment where the needs of mine/ERW victims are met.

Mission

To further develop a sustainable national mine action programme capable of planning, coordinating, implementing and monitoring all aspects of mine action, and mobilising required resources to make Sri Lanka free from the threat of mines/ERW through elimination, threat prevention and education, in accordance with Sri Lanka National Mine Action Standards (SLNMAS).

Strategic Objectives

This strategy is based around six strategic objectives; instrumental for the realisation of the strategy vision. Each strategic objective is accompanied by outcomes, baselines, indicators and targets.

1. Scope of the mine/ERW problem including location, size, type and related challenges, is identified, confirmed and addressed using appropriate methodologies and resources.
2. Mine/ERW safe behaviour among women, girls, boys and men is promoted.
3. The needs of mine/ ERW victims are determined and met and victims are integrated into the society.
4. Sri Lanka accedes to the APMBC and complies with relevant obligations.
5. Long-term residual contamination is effectively managed with appropriate and sustainable national capacities.
6. Sri Lanka mine action sector can access good quality information for its strategic and operational decision-making

Survey and Clearance

As of mid-2016, SLA HDU, national operator Delvon Assistance for Social Harmony (DASH) and two international operators (The HALO Trust and Mines Advisory Group (MAG))⁵, are implementing survey and clearance activities. In addition, national organisation SHARP secured funding to become operational from January 2016. SHARP inherited equipment and staff from INGO Danish Demining Group (DDG) when it pulled out of Sri Lanka in 2014.

Operators are currently conducting NTS, technical survey (TS) and clearance activities. NTS teams record suspected and confirmed hazardous areas depending on the type of evidence encountered. TS and clearance teams move in after being tasked by NMAC/RMAO, according to prioritisation. TS activities result in an average of 30 per cent reduction of the initial polygon. This means that clearance assets can be targeted to smaller areas, resulting in more efficient activities

NMAC made resurveying of all tasks a key priority in 2015; recognising the importance of gaining clarity on the extent of Sri Lanka's remaining contamination problem for planning purposes. Following on from this, a number of operators started implementing resurvey activities. This has resulted in cancellation of several areas that were previously identified as SHA.




figure 4: remaining contamination as of late 2015 (NMAC)

⁵ Both NGOs have been active in Sri Lanka since 2002.

Strategic objective	Outcomes	Baseline	Indicators	Targets to the baseline
<p>Scope of the mine/ERW problem including location, size, type and related challenges, is identified, confirmed and addressed using appropriate methodologies and resources</p>	<p>Improved and enhanced planning for land release activities in Sri Lanka</p>	<p>647 hazardous areas remaining, as of April 2016 (IMSMA database)</p> <p>54 km² of hazardous areas remaining as recorded in IMSMA database (April 2016)</p>	<p># SHAs/CHAs verified during resurvey (per year)</p> <p># of new SHAs/CHAs identified</p> <p>Annual work plan in place</p> <p>Detailed completion plan developed along stated timeline</p>	<p>Finalize resurvey by 2017</p> <p>Updated km² recorded in IMSMA following NTS resurvey by 2017</p> <p>Agreed annual work plans ready by December prior to the coming year</p> <p>Completion plan (including end state and end date) ready by end of 2016</p>
	<p>More efficient and effective use of mine action resources (human, technical and financial)</p>	<p>6,5 km² are expected to be reduced/cleared per year (with the same level of resources as in 2015)</p> <p>5.8 km² released in 2014 (none cancelled, 5.8 km² reduced and cleared)</p> <p>25.5 km² released in 2015, as of Sept. (18.7 km² cancelled, 6.5 km² reduced and cleared)</p> <p>117.5 m² processed on average for each mine cleared (2014)</p> <p>214 completion reports in 2014 (no</p>	<p># km² released/year (xx cancelled, yy reduced, zz cleared)</p> <p># of km² remaining to be addressed (as of 1 January each year)</p> <p># of SHAs/CHAs in IMSMA (following NTS)</p> <p># of CHAs cleared/year</p> <p># m² processed per mine cleared</p> <p># of completion/suspension reports/year</p> <p># of conformity/non-conformity reports/year</p> <p># of NTS /TS/ clearance/mechanical teams/year</p>	<p>30% reduction of areas of all SHAs/CHAs through technical survey (average/year)</p> <p>At least 6,5 km² cleared and reduced/ year</p> <p>Increased number</p>

		suspension reports) 2 non-conformity reports by September 2015 2015: 14 NTS teams; 19 TS teams; 35 clearance teams; 39 mechanical teams		of land release teams
	Safe land put back into productive use, including for resettlement, development, and livelihoods activities	Post clearance impact assessments (PCIA) reports completed: Year 2014 (Total 129): SLA: 25; MAG: 5; HALO: 61; DASH: 27; DDG: 11. Year 2015 (Total 76, as of Sept): SLA: 18; MAG: 2; HALO: 31; DASH: 25	% of land in use, by land use category # of PCIA reports by operator/ year # of reports highlighting lack of socio-economic benefit after handover	Implement PCIA on as many tasks as possible Implement impact study by the end of 2016; check land use against prioritisation mechanism

Mine Risk Education

In 2002, the GoSL requested UNICEF to act as the coordinating body for MRE in Sri Lanka. The Government and NGO stakeholders jointly developed national standards and a policy on MRE. MRE activities are coordinated at the national and district levels with the existing national mine action structures (NMAC and RMAO) and UNICEF national and zone offices (Colombo, Kilinochchi and Batticaloa). UNICEF provides technical and financial support.

Sri Lanka implements MRE through:

- the national education system;
- specialised national NGO staff;
- trained volunteers;
- demining NGOs; and
- SLA HDUs.

Key MRE stakeholders currently include:

- the Ministry of Education (MoE);
- the SLA HDUs; and
- six national NGOs (EHED-Caritas, Rural Development Foundation (RDF), People Vision, Sarvodaya, SHADE and Social Organisation for Development (SOND)).

Landmine/ERW safety briefings are given by UNICEF, MRE NGOs, UN Department of Safety and Security (UNDSS) and demining NGOs. MRE organisations are in charge of investigating and reporting mine/ERW accidents and casualties.

MRE seeks to reduce risk-taking behaviour among women, girls, boys and men living in mine/ERW affected areas. It also aims to educate those working temporarily in, or travelling to or through affected areas. Community liaison activities aim to support survey and clearance operations and to build a community capacity, enabling affected communities to reduce risks from mines/ERW.

MRE planning in northern Sri Lanka is based on a prioritisation mechanism that considers returning IDP patterns, number of recorded accidents, number of ERW/mine reports, etc. Prioritisation is currently defined during annual planning in Jaffna, Killinochchi and Mullaitivu. In Vavuniya and Mannar the implementing partners use an adapted prioritisation matrix that considers various indicators of injury prevention, including mine/ERW threats.




Figure 5 Mine/ERW accidents and casualties from Jan 2010 to Oct 2015; shared by UNICEF/NMAC, November 2015

Strategic objective	Outcomes	Baseline	Indicators	Targets
Mine/ ERW safe behaviour among women, girls, boys and men is promoted	Increased mine/ ERW safe behaviour among women, girls, boys and men	<p>Mine accidents (without demining accidents): 2014 = 11; 2015, as of Oct = 5</p> <p>Mine/ERW victims: 2014 = 16; 2015, as of Oct = 8</p> <p>2014, MRE beneficiaries: Total 322,654, women 72,314, girls 73,815, boys 86,918, men 89,607</p> <p># mine/ERW reports from communities: 2014 = 2119; 2015 as of Oct = 1682</p>	<p># of new mine/ERW victims/year (sex and age disaggregated data (SADD))</p> <p># of MRE beneficiaries SADD/year</p> <p># of mine/ERW community reports/year</p> <p># and type of materials developed and distributed to implementing partners</p>	<p>No new mine/ERW accidents by 2020 (from baseline 2014)</p> <p>At least 200,000 MRE beneficiaries/year (possibly decreasing with increased clearance)</p> <p>Revised set of MRE materials by the end of 2016</p>
	Increased mine/ ERW-safe behaviour among female and male pupils	<p>Year 2011: Curriculum for grade six-nine endorsed</p> <p>2014: North and East included MRE question into provincial level exam</p> <p>2014: 286 schools reached</p> <p>2014: 54,330 pupils reached (27,618 boys, 26,712 girls)</p>	<p>New curriculum developed and endorsed</p> <p># of education sector staff trained on MRE</p> <p>MRE question part of exam paper</p> <p># of schools reached</p> <p># of boys and girls reached/year</p>	<p>Integrate MRE into disaster risk reduction education at primary level</p> <p>Integrate MRE into curriculum on child injury prevention</p> <p>Provide school-based MRE in all high and medium affected areas (MRE matrix)</p>
	Government entities and NGOs have enhanced capacity to coordinate and facilitate MRE	<p>NMAC MRE Officer in RMAO (seconded)</p> <p>MoE: MRE focal point in place; 2 Provincial Education Office</p>	<p># of fixed MRE staff</p> <p>MoE focal point continued</p> <p>2 Provincial Education Office focal points</p>	<p>1 NMAC MRE Officer in Colombo, fully trained</p> <p>1 RMAO MRE Officer, fully trained</p> <p>MoE focal points</p>

		focal points	continued	receive refresher training once a year
	MRE is integrated into community-based planning and coordination mechanisms in high and medium level affected communities.	2014: 64 Mine Action Committees 2014: 132 village committees addressing mine action 2014: 186 mine/ERW community reports	# of committees addressing mine action needs/per year # of Mine/ERW Community reports /year	All villages in high and medium-affected areas have established coordination mechanisms

Victim Assistance

Victim Assistance (VA) in mine action refers to all care and rehabilitation activities aimed at meeting immediate and long-term needs of mine/ERW victims, their families, and affected communities. The term ‘victim’ refers generally to those who have been injured or killed by a mine/ERW, to their families who suffer emotional, social and financial loss and to the communities that lose access to land and other resources due to the presence of mines/ERW. VA requires that existing health care and social service systems, rehabilitation programmes and legislative and policy frameworks are sufficient to meet the needs of all citizens – including landmine survivors and family members of deceased/injured victims.

The first mine/ERW related incidents were recorded in Sri Lanka in 1982. The figures escalated to 162 accidents and 211 casualties in 2001. The numbers dramatically reduced over the years but started increasing again as IDPs returned to their communities.

UNICEF supports VA service providers, though at a much lower scale than MRE. UNDP provides socio-economic support in the north and east through its Transition Recovery Program, including to targeted vulnerable populations. Ministries dealing with VA as part of their disability focus, or in support of victims from conflict, include:

- the Ministry of Social Services (MoSS);
- the Ministry of Health (MoH);
- the MoE; and
- the Ministry of Defence (MoD) (Directorate of Rehabilitation).

The MoH focuses on immediate medical recovery and rehabilitation. Its main physical rehabilitation hospital is based in Ragama; provincial/district level rehabilitation services are provided with the support of other service providers. Military-managed rehabilitation centres provide care and rehabilitation and other assistance to permanently disabled war veterans.

Data on persons with disabilities (PWD) is scarce; data on mine/ERW victims exists but is incomplete and inconsistent. An injury surveillance system has been established and is functioning (Ministry of Healthcare and Nutrition, Non-Communicable Diseases with the support of the Trauma Secretariat). Medical services are available but do not yet reach all newly-resettled areas. Physical rehabilitative

services have improved over recent years but serious gaps remain to be addressed. Coordination in the sector is weak to non-existent.

The MoSS promotes the empowerment of PWD through community-based rehabilitation which includes establishing self-help groups, providing assistive and mobility devices, supporting income-generation projects, assisting with housing and encouraging self-employment for PWD living below the poverty line.

International agencies including the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), UNICEF, Handicap International (HI) and Caritas engage in various types of VA-related support programmes in collaboration with local organisations (Sarvodaya, Social Organizations Networking for Development, and Jaffna Jaipur Centre for Disability Rehabilitation, Caritas Valvuthayam, Meththa Foundation). Access/referrals to VA-related services in parts of Sri Lanka includes: production of prosthetics and orthotics; outreach programmes/mobile teams for those unable to travel to service providers; medical assistance; psychological assistance and psycho-social support; inclusive education; vocational training/skill development; economic inclusion, etc.

Sri Lanka does not have a centrally-coordinated mechanism for injury surveillance or for monitoring VA-related programmes. NMAC is yet to start coordinating with state and non-state VA partners to improve access for mine/ERW survivors to existing services and in seeking solutions to address the gaps.

Sri Lanka ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) in February 2016, thereby becoming the 162nd State to ratify this Convention. MoH and MoSS jointly developed a comprehensive National Action Plan on Disability which was adopted by the Cabinet of Ministers in 2014. The same year, the MoSS re-drafted the Disability Rights Bill in consultation with key stakeholders.

Strategic objective	Outcomes	Baseline	Indicators	Targets
The needs of mine/ERW victims are determined and met and victims are integrated into the society	Needs assessment survey (SADD) verifies existing data on mine/ERW victims and assesses their current needs	Nov. 2015: 8 victims; 0 fatalities; 8 survivors (8 men) 2014: 16 victims; 0 fatalities; 16 survivors (8 men, 5 women, 2 boys, 1 girl)	Annual updates: # of victims verified (SADD) Revised data set on casualties Database on victims and VA support provided exists	Conduct needs assessment of mine/ERW victims (SADD) and verify existing database Include VA service provision into IMSMA
	NMAC can coordinate VA and support the MoSS and other key ministries in providing support to mine/ERW victims	1 VA officer in place but not trained No VA focal points identified	NMAC VA officer trained # of VA focal points in MoSS, MoH, MoD at national and local levels	NMAC VA-officer in place and trained VA focal points in MoSS, MoH, MoD etc., are identified and trained
	Mine/ERW victims have improved access to quality and sustainable services	Baseline data are scarce and scattered across ministries and numerous service providers A baseline needs to be established (see needs assessment, above)	# of victims benefitting from medical and rehab services /year (SADD) # of victims benefitting from psychosocial support (per year) (SADD) # of victims benefitting from access to socio-economic inclusion/per year (SADD)	NMAC supports relevant ministries to provide access to existing services NMAC implementing partners are trained in referring mine/ERW victims to relevant services NMAC regularly monitors the provision of services to all known mine/ERW victims

	Enhance the institutional capacity to provide better services	No overview on # of service providers by VA sector 3.2% of GoSL budget allocation to MoSS (2013) ⁶	# of service providers by VA sector % of GoSL budget allocation to MoSS	NMAC with the support of line ministries maps out relevant service providers and prepares annual updates NMAC lobbies GoSL to increase its budget provisions for conflict victims and PWD including mine/ERW victims
	VA is part of government policies and programmes for conflict victims and PWD	Sri Lanka signed CRPD in 2007 National Action Plan for PWD (2014) Draft Bill on the rights of PWD is under revision (2015)	Sri Lanka accession and depository notifications at the UN SG office. Government policies and programmes referring to landmine/ERW victims as part of conflict victims and PWD	GoSL ratifies CRPD Government policies and programmes referring to landmine/ERW victims as part of conflict victims and PWD

Advocacy

Sri Lanka ratified the CCW (including Amended Prot. II on landmines, booby-traps etc.) in 1984, but has not signed the 2003 Protocol V on ERW). Sri Lanka is not a State Party to the APMBC or the CCM.

Since early 2000, the Sri Lanka Campaign to Ban Landmines (SLCBL) has campaigned for a total ban of the use of anti-personnel landmines and has lobbied for the importance of Sri Lanka acceding to the APMBC. The SLCBL regularly urged the GoSL to update the Voluntary Article 7 Report, to attend annual meetings, to interact with APMBC State Parties and to review its policy position.

Since humanitarian mine action resumed in post-war Sri Lanka, the GoSL has in many ways complied with the norms of the APMBC (destroying existing stockpiles of AP landmines is still to be achieved). In 2005, the GoSL submitted APMBC's Article 7 Voluntary Report, indicating its commitment, but has not submitted any additional reports since then. The GoSL attended several annual Meetings of State Parties (MSP) to the APMBC and the third APMBC Review Conference in Mozambique in 2014. Following the January 2015 Sri Lanka elections and the subsequent change of government, the SLCBL intensified its campaign work, advocating the new government to accede to the APMBC as a matter of priority. The GoSL issued a formal statement at the 14th APMBC MSP in Geneva in December 2015, for the first time publically announcing its commitment to acceding to the APMBC.

⁶ See: <http://www.who.int/countries/lka/en/>

Strategic objective	Outcomes	Baseline	Indicators	Targets
Sri Lanka becomes a State Party to the APMBC and complies with relevant obligations.	As a State Party to the APMBC Sri Lanka gains more international credibility and recognition.	<p>Sri Lanka has voted in favour of universalization of APMBC every year at the UN General Assembly since 1997.</p> <p>GoSL participates in APMBC MSP and intersessional work programmes as an observer.</p> <p>GoSL gave an official statement at APMBC 14 MSP in December 2015, announcing its commitment to becoming a State Party</p>	Sri Lanka accession and depository notifications at the UN SG office.	Decision and approval by the MoFA, MoD, MoSS and MoRRHRA to ratify CRPD
	GoSL represented at international mine action forums to share its experiences and fulfils its reporting obligations as a State Party.	<p>GoSL participation at MSP and intersessional work programmes as an observer.</p> <p>GoSL participation in UN Mine Action National Directors & Programme Managers' annual conferences.</p> <p>GoSL participation in regional universalization/VA events (2009 Thailand, 2013 Lao PDR, 2015 Thailand).</p> <p>Submission of Voluntary Article 7 report in 2005.</p>	<p># of GoSL's participation at MSP and intersessional meetings.</p> <p>Participation in meetings of other conventions/protocols.</p> <p># of timely submission of relevant reports to the international community.</p>	<p>MoFA, MoD and/or MoRRHRA participate at international meetings</p> <p>Stakeholder ministries including MoH and MoSS</p>
	National policy, legal and technical framework meet convention obligations.	No national laws banning AP mines, ERW.	<p>Domestic legislation banning AP mines, and cluster munitions developed and endorsed.</p> <p>Reports on relevant</p>	Law enacted by parliament through ministries of Foreign Affairs, Defence, Resettlement & Justice by the end

			convention obligations.	of 2016. Submission of initial and progress reports.
	Revisit and review international cooperation for National Mine Action Programme.	Insufficient international support for MA sector Post-war Sri Lanka's MA became a less attractive place for international donor community.	Extent of financial and technical support for all five pillars of MA by donor community.	Mobilisation of financial and technical support for high priority areas by all stakeholder ministries through MA donor agencies.
	GoSL raised its Mine Action profile at national and international level	Human capacity of NMAC/RMAO is insufficient. Government created a national budget line for mine action in 2015 No MA focal points at any stakeholder ministries	National Budgetary Allocation for Mine Action.	Fully qualified staff in NMAC Roles identified and ownership claimed by stakeholder ministries.

Management of Residual Contamination

Sri Lanka is approaching the ‘completion’⁷ stage of identifying and clearing all known contaminated areas, thereby transitioning from a phase of predominantly pro-actively identifying and clearing mines/ERW to a phase of reactively responding to reported threats. The issue of national ownership and that of developing sustainable national capacities to manage residual contamination⁸ is becoming increasingly more central. This transition is also often characterised by a transition from a predominantly internationally funded programme, to a context where activities are increasingly supported by the national budget.

While a number of international mine action operators have played important roles in Sri Lanka’s mine action programme, several national actors have been instrumental in the programme’s success. The SLA HDUs in particular, have been at the forefront, with significant resources dedicated through the national budget. Sri Lanka is therefore in a good position to effectively and efficiently manage the long-term residual problem with national capacities.

Strategic objective	Outcomes	Baseline	Indicators	Targets
Long-term residual contamination is effectively managed with appropriate and sustainable national capacities	Sustainable and transparent IM structures/procedures are in place to ensure effective and efficient info sharing, analysis and reporting	SLA HDU has the capacity to manage the IMSMA database	# of Hazard Area Reports received and processed # of accident reports received and processed # of SADD accident reports shared with the respective ministry # of clearance completion reports received and processed	SLA HDU to manage national data base

⁷ ‘Completion’ in this context refers to mines/ERW discovered after affected states have completed the pro-active survey and/or clearance of all known and suspected hazardous areas, thereby declaring them fit for normal human use.

⁸ Residual contamination in this context refers to the mine/ERW contamination discovered after all reasonable effort has been made to identify and process all suspected areas.

	Sustainable national EOD structures are maintained to efficiently address residual contamination	50 x SLA HDU 10-member teams available	# of national EOD teams established.	2 x teams each per district (16 x Teams)
	Transparent and sustainable national reporting system is developed	2015: information is collected/shared by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GAs • Police • SLA • UNDP/UNICEF • Civilians 	Monitoring system established.	Establishing a hotline dedicated to report residual contamination

Information Management⁹

IMSMA was established in Sri Lanka’s mine action programme in 2002 to more effectively and efficiently collect, analyse and store mine action information. IMSMA is playing a vital role in Sri Lanka’s mine action programme as a decision support tool, providing appropriate and effective data capturing, retrieving, manipulating, analysing and reporting mine action information with GIS references.

Mine/ERW information is crucial to the effective management of the mine action programme in Sri Lanka; information management involves, but is not limited to, the collection, processing, and dissemination of information. Information stored in IMSMA provides the baseline data for planning and coordinating mine action operations in Sri Lanka. IMSMA is the master database for all mine action information in-country. It is essential that clear and concise information is maintained to assist in improving programme efficiency.

Several data collection forms are used to gather necessary information. In addition to formal reporting activities, all mine action organisations have a general responsibility to gather and share information on the mine/ERW threat and its impact on communities. This informal information also contributes to the maintenance of the IMSMA database and the planning and execution of activities.

It is the responsibility of all mine action organisations to provide timely and accurate input to the RMAO to ensure that the database is updated and remains relevant. The RMAO will make regular IMSMA updates available to all mine action organizations and other stakeholders. NMAC/RMAO can produce IMSMA outputs such as thematic/threat assessment maps, thematic/statistical reports and data for

⁹ Baselines and targets presented in the IM table are based on the GICHD’s IM assessment framework. Each baseline and target is scored on a scale between 1(low) and 5 (high). GICHD, in close collaboration with NMAC, assessed NMAC’s IM capacity predominantly through a desk assessment. More information on the IM assessment framework is available in Annex V.

planning purposes. Maps are provided in hard-copy format unless otherwise requested by an organisation.

Strategic Objective	Outcomes	Baseline	Indicators	Target
Sri Lanka mine action sector can access good quality information for its strategic and operational decision-making	Data and information produced by NMAC's IM unit is considered fit for purpose by the users of information (beneficiaries and other civilians, NMAC staff, partner organisations, line ministries, donors)	2.67	Data quality management	5
		4.5	Acceptability and satisfaction of IM-products	5
		4.33	Ability to use/produce IM products to provide information/reports	5
	NMAC develops, documents and adopts clear IM NMAS, SOPs and processes that support the Sri Lanka mine action sector	1	Assessment of IM NMAS/SOPs	5
		2.8	Data flow processes	5
	Information Management is mainstreamed into NMAC's organisational structure and the IM unit is well connected to partner organisations (for coordination and information and knowledge-sharing purposes)	1	Role awareness	5
		5	Internal organisation	5
		2.33	Inter-agency cooperation and training	5
	NMAC has access to adequate and sustainable IM resources (financial, human and technological)	3.67	Staffing	5
		3.75	Training, experience and qualifications	5
		4	Technical/IMSMA version	5

Prioritisation and Operational Planning

During the strategic planning workshop held in Colombo in June 2015 NMAC, GICHD and several stakeholders discussed revising the process of priority-setting. NMAC highlighted that a previous process that had been in place would prove a useful starting point for further enhancement. An exercise was held to map the priority-setting process that should be set up in the future, using the previous system as a base. This process was linked with the national government's fiscal planning year, and took into account steps that need to take place prior to the fiscal year start, as well as review stages during the year. The various steps are presented in a table, available in Annex VI.

Following the mapping of the priority-setting process steps, the criteria for priorities, indicators, data and sources of data were examined. Participants reviewed the criteria set in the previous National Mine Action Strategy (2010-2015), updated it, and added indicators to measure against. Data to feed into the indicators, and the data sources, were also listed. The initial list of criteria is available in Annex VII.

This process should be formalised. As a first step, the National Steering Committee meetings and District Steering Committee meetings that had taken place previously should be reinstalled as they greatly facilitated coordination, including priority-setting.

During the workshop it was also agreed that NMAC would work with GICHD to pilot its Multi-Criteria Priority Setting Tool (PriSMA). Training of NMAC IM staff on the use of PriSMA for Sri Lanka took place during their participation in the A2 training in Geneva, October 2015. NMAC had provided all the datasets outlined in May for use in PriSMA by the end of September. In preparation of the A2 training visit, all data that was decided on for the pilot was prepared for use in PriSMA by GICHD before the start of the A2 training. In mid-November the pilot officially began in Sri Lanka after a few adjustments were made to the data following NMAC's further review of requirements. Currently the tool has been able to confirm previous prioritization plans made by NMAC and GICHD is providing a further breakdown of the data for NMAC to enable even more detailed prioritisation models in PriSMA as per NMAC's request.

Resource Mobilisation

The GoSL, in collaboration with the GICHD, developed a resource mobilisation action plan in early 2016. The action plan is a tool for the NMAC to effectively mobilise resources, to reach the strategy objective to make Sri Lanka mine/ERW impact free by 2020.¹⁰ The resource mobilisation action plan is accompanied by a worksheet that specifies, among other things, activities, tasks, responsible persons and time-lines. As financial resources is determined to be a key challenge to effectively and efficiently implement the strategy, the resource mobilisation action plan should be seen as key document, accompanying this national strategy.

The total budget in 2015 (NGOs and SLA HDUs) enabled operators to clear and reduce approximately 6,5 km². To address the remaining estimate of 54 km², approximately twice the amount of financial resources (2015 budget) will be needed every year to complete the work in five years by 2020. This estimation can however change, depending on the results of the on-going re-survey activities.

Monitoring and Reviewing the National Strategy

Monitoring and reviewing the national mine action strategy provides opportunities to understand the situation, to make corrections to the direction and structure of the mine action programme and to improve future versions of the strategy. Monitoring is a continuous function that uses systematic data collection on specified indicators to provide main stakeholders with information about the extent of progress and the achievement of objectives, measured against the established baselines.

The NMAC and RMAO, in close collaboration with relevant national and international stakeholders, are responsible for monitoring the implementation of this strategy. Effective information management with clear reporting systems and sound coordination and collaboration with relevant stakeholders are preconditions for this. NMAC and RMAO will continuously monitor progress against the targets, using the indicators presented in the strategy's various chapters.

Monitoring will enable strengths and weaknesses of the national mine action programme to be identified. It will further enable NMAC, RMAO and partners to address problems, improve performance, build on success and adapt to changing circumstance.

NMAC will request an external mid-term review of the strategy in mid-2018, to take stock of what has been achieved so far and to adapt the strategy to any potential contextual changes. This will ensure its continued relevance. The review will look into evidence related to the mine action programme's performance and progress. This will enable informed decisions regarding what needs to be done to keep the programme on track, improve it and possibly adjust it in case of changing circumstances. If significant contextual changes occur, a review may be scheduled prior to mid-2018, to ensure the strategy remains relevant.

Endorsement

This document titled "Sri Lanka National Mine Action Strategy 2016 – 2020" updates and supersedes all previous Sri Lanka Mine Action Strategy documents.

This document is hereby endorsed by the Government of Sri Lanka through the authorized signatories below.




Mr. M. M. Nayeemudeen

**Additional Secretary/National
Director Mine Action**

Ministry of Prison Reforms,
Rehabilitation, Resettlement and Hindu
Religious Affairs

Date : 2016 / 5 / 25

M. M. NAYEEMUDEEN
Additional Secretary
Ministry of Prison Reforms, Rehabilitation,
Resettlement and Hindu Religious Affairs
No 146, Galle Road, Colombo 03.



Mr. V. Sivagnanasothy
Secretary

Ministry of Prison Reforms,
Rehabilitation, Resettlement and Hindu
Religious Affairs

Date : 2016 / 5 / 25

V. Sivagnanasothy
Secretary
Ministry of Prison Reforms, Rehabilitation,
Resettlement and Hindu Religious Affairs
No 146, Galle Road, Colombo 03.

Annexes

Annex I: List of Participants – Strategic Planning and Priority-setting Workshop

Colombo, Sri Lanka | Tuesday 9 – Friday 12 June, 2015

Title	First name	Last name	Position / Function	Organisation
Brigadier	Ananda	Chandrasiri	Programme Manager	DASH
Mr.	S.	Viveganandarja	Deputy Director of Planning	District Secretariat Ampara
Mr.	A.	Sutharsan	Assistant Director of Planning	District Secretariat Batticaloa
Mr.	K.K.	Sivachandran	Assistant Director of Planning	District Secretariat Jaffna
Mr.	A.	Ketheeshwaran	Assistant Director of Planning	District Secretariat Kilinochchi
Mr.	K.	Sribaskaran	Director of Planning	District Secretariat Mannar
Mr.	V.	Mugunthan	Assistant Director of Planning	District Secretariat Mullaitivu
Mr.	Vidya	Abhayagunawardena	Country Researcher - Sri Lanka	Landmine & Cluster Munition Monitor
Mr.	Prasanna	Kuruppu	Campaign Advisor	Landmine & Cluster Munition Monitor
Mr.	Llewelyn	Jones	Director of Programmes	MAG
Mr.	Ivica	Stilin	Technical Operations Manager	MAG
Mrs.	Ranjini	Nadarajapillai	Secretary of the Ministry	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	M.M.	Nayeemudeen	Additional Secretary of the Ministry	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
H.E.	D.M.	Swaminathan	Minister of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	Mahinda Bandara	Wickramasingha	Assistant Director Operation, QM and Planning & Chairman Accreditation Committee	NMAC - Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	Sri	Mallikarachchi	IMSMA Officer	NMAC - Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	RMN	Karunathilaka	QCO	NMAC RMAO
Mr.	R.	Uthayamoorthy	Project Coordinator	RDF
Mr.	M.L.M.	Faris	Coordinator	Sarvoday-Batti
Mr.	R.	Umenathy	Project Coordinator	SHADE
Mr.	Savath	Jayawardhana	Director	SHARP
Mr.	Prabhatu	Naranpanawa	Operations Manager	SHARP
Mr.	S. Rodric	Arudselvam	Project Coordinator	SOND
Major General	Lasantha	Wickramasooriya	Chief Field Engineer	Sri Lanka Army - Humanitarian Demining Unit (SLA-HDU)
Lt. Col.	Indika	Liyamage	Head of SLA HDU	Sri Lanka Army - Humanitarian Demining Unit (SLA-HDU)
Brigadier	H.Jagath S.	Gunawardane	Commander Engineer Brigade	Sri Lanka Army - Humanitarian Demining Unit (SLA-HDU)
Major	Upul	Nayanananda	Major	Sri Lanka Army - Humanitarian Demining Unit (SLA-HDU)

Major	GAD	Alwis	GSO II (HDU)	Sri Lanka Army - Humanitarian Demining Unit (SLA-HDU)
Mr.	A.M.	Mihlar Mohammed	Programme Officer, Head of MRE	UNICEF
Ms.	Åsa	Massleberg	Advisor, Strategy, Transition and Development	GICHD
Ms.	Megan	Latimer	Advisor, Operational Efficiency	GICHD
Mr.	Olivier	Cottray	Head, Information Management	GICHD
Mr.	Marc	Bonnet	Head, Risk Management	GICHD
Ms.	Antonia	Does	Programme Officer, Risk Management	GICHD

Annex II: Agenda – Strategic Planning and Priority-setting Workshop

Colombo, Sri Lanka | Tuesday 9 – Friday 12 June, 2015

Day 1				
Time	Session	Content	Responsible	Exercises
08.30 – 09.30	Opening session	Formal opening of the workshop Brief history, key achievements main challenges and way ahead	Government of Sri Lanka, Ministry of Resettlement, Hon Minister, Secretary National Mine Action Centre (NMAC)	
09.30 – 10.00	Tea break			
10.00 – 10.30	Introduction to the workshop	Workshop objectives,	Welcome; admin aspects; introduction of participants; workshop overview Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian demining (GICHD): Ms Åsa Massleberg: Advisor, Strategy, Transition and Development Ms Megan Latimer: Advisor, Operational Efficiency Ms Antonia Does: Programme Officer Mr Olivier Cottray: Head, Information Management Division Mr Marc Bonnet: Head, Risk Management Division	
10.30 – 12.30	Introduction to Sri Lanka's national mine action programme	Brief history, key achievements main challenges and way ahead	Sri Lanka Army (SLA) Humanitarian Demining Units (HDUs)	
			Delvon Assistance for Social Harmony (DASH)	
			Mines Advisory Group (MAG)	
		Questions and answers	All participants	
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch			
13.30 – 14.00	Introduction to Strategic Planning	Presentation of good practices and lessons learnt in strategic planning processes globally	Åsa Massleberg	Power Point

14.00 – 14.30	Mainstreaming information management in strategic planning	Key IM principles IM and strategic planning	Olivier Cottray	Power Point
14.30 – 15.00	Mainstreaming operational efficiency in strategic planning	Operational efficiency and key principles	Megan Latimer	Power Point
15.00 – 15.30	Break			
15.30 – 15.45	Introducing the strategic planning process	Introducing the strategic planning process phase	Åsa Massleberg	Power Point
15.45 – 16.00	Understanding the context: Introduction	Introduction of context analysis tools	Åsa Massleberg	
16.00 – 16.30	Review of the day	Participant feedback; requests and suggestions	GICHD (Antonia Does)	

Day 2				
Time	Session	Content	Notes	Exercises
09.00 – 09.15	Recap	Key points from Day 1	GICHD (Antonia Does)	
09.15 – 10.15	Context Analysis	Stakeholders analysis, SWOT and PESTLE	Participants work in groups using different analytical tools; groups present their findings	
10.15 – 10.30	Context Analysis	Stakeholder analysis, SWOT, PESTLE	Group presentations and discussions	SWOT chart; PESTLE table; Stakeholder circle; Influence chart
10.30 – 11.00	Break			
11.00 – 12.00	Context Analysis	Stakeholder analysis, SWOT, PESTLE	Group presentations and discussions, continued	
12.00 – 13.00	Vision, mission, and objectives	How do vision, mission, objectives and outcomes differ?	GICHD presentation	
		Define and agree upon vision, mission and time-line for the national mine action strategy	Divide participants into groups, each group suggests a vision, mission and time-line	
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch			
14.00 – 15.00	Vision, mission and time-line	Group presentations on vision, mission and time-line. Feedback and discussions. Agree on vision and mission	Each group presents a suggested vision, mission and time-line.	Group work

15.00 – 15.30	A Results-based Management approach to strategic planning	Key principles of results-based management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline • Targets • Indicators 	Olivier Cottray	Power Point
15.30 – 16.00	Break			
16.00 – 16.30	Strategy structure	Present and discuss the proposed strategy structure. Agree on proposed structure	Åsa Massleberg	
16.30 – 17.00	Review of the day	Participant feedback; requests and suggestions	GICHD (Antonia Does)	

Day 3				
Time	Session	Content	Notes	
09.00 – 09.30	Objective, outcome, baseline, target and indicators	Review and clarification on objective, outcomes, baseline, targets and indicators. What they are, the difference and the purpose	GICHD	
09.30 – 10.30	Group work for each strategy section	Participants are divided into working groups, covering each strategy section, based on their experience and expertise	For each strategy section, each working group is tasked to develop: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective • Outcomes • Indicators • Baseline • Targets 	
10.30 – 11.00	Break			
11.00 – 12.30	Group work, cont.	Participants are divided into working groups, covering each strategy section, based on their experience and expertise	For each strategy section, each working group is tasked to develop: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective • Outcomes • Indicators • Baseline • Targets 	
12.30 – 13.00	Group work presentations	Group work presentations	Each group presents on the above.	
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch			
14.00 – 14.30	Group work presentations, continued	Group work presentations	Each group presents on the above.	
14.30 – 15.00	Monitor and review of the	Key aspects of the monitoring and review phase. Future plans and action	NMAC, GICHD	

	national strategy	points		
15.00 – 15.30	Break			
15.30 – 16.00	Way ahead: finalising and approving the national strategy	Agree on next steps	GICHD NMAC	

Day 4				
Time	Session	Content	Notes	
09.00 – 10:00	Current priority-setting process	Overview of past and current priority-setting process for mine action in Sri Lanka, including number and nature of requests for mine action assistance; discussion	NMAC	Power Point
10:00 – 10:30	Priority-setting	Review of key principles and terminology related to Priority- setting	GICHD	Power Point
10.30 – 11.00	Break			
11.00 – 11.30	Introduction to risk management, key terminology	Overview of risk management principles; review of key terminology related to both priority setting and risk management	GICHD	Power Point
11.30 – 13.00	Stakeholder Analysis	Stakeholder mapping exercise- identification of which actors are involved in priority-setting; responsibility for decision-making; main priority activities currently in Sri Lanka and over the next 5 years	Group work: Stakeholder mapping Process mapping of priority-setting and decision-making	
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch			
14.00 – 14.30	Group work presentations, continued	Group work presentations	Each group presents on the above.	
14.30 – 15.00	Workplan development	Agree on next steps for follow-up	GICHD NMAC	
15.00 – 15.30	Break			

15.30 – 16.00	Work-plan development continued	Agree on next steps for follow-up	GICHD NMAC	
16.00 – 16.30	Close	Workshop discussion	feedback; closing	GICHD NMAC

Annex III: National Mine Action Strategy Review Meetings: 26 to 29 October 2015

Title	First name	Last name	Position / Function	Organisation
26 October - Morning session at the Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs				
Mr.	M.M	Nayeemudeen	Additional Secretary	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	K.G.M.B	Wikramasinghe	Assistant Secretary	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	B.S	Mallikarachchi	Senior IMSMA Officer	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
26 October – Afternoon session at the Ministry of Social Services (now of Social Empowerment)				
Mr		Karunaratha	Additional Secretary	Ministry of Social Services (now of Social Empowerment)
Mr.		Ramamoorthy	Planning Director	Ministry of Social Services (now of Social Empowerment)
Mr.	Prasanna	Kuruppu	Advisor, Disability and Advocacy	Ministry of Social Services (now of Social Empowerment)
27 October				
Mr.	Rajendrakumar	Ganesarajah	Advisor Local Governance	UNDP
Ms.	Paula	Bulancea	Dep. Representative	UNICEF
Ms.	Caroline	Bakker	Chief Child Protection	UNICEF
Mr.	Mihlar	Mohamed	CP Officer Child Injury Prevention	UNICEF
28 October – Morning session (MRE, UNICEF)				
	A.D.J	Rajani	Project Manager	Rural Development Foundation
	S. Rodric	Arulselvam	Project Coordinator	SOND Jaffna
	R.	Umapathy	Project Coordinator	SHADE
	K.U.	Zairak	Project Manager	People Vision
Mr.	K.G.M.B	Wikramasinghe	Assistant Secretary	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	B.S	Mallikarachchi	Senior IMSMA Officer	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
	Z.	Thajudeen	Director Education	Ministry of the Environment
	A.H.	Abrar	Field officer	Rural Development Foundation
	A.M.	Mihlar	Child Protection Officer	UNICEF
	K.	Vasanth	Project Assistant	UNICEF

28 October – Afternoon session (Victim Assistance)				
Mr.	M.M	Nayeemudeen	Additional Secretary	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	K.G.M.B	Wikramasinghe	Assistant Secretary	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	B.S	Mallikarachchi	Senior IMSMA Officer	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	Vidya	Abhayagunawardena	Researcher	Landmine Monitor, Coordinator SLCBL
Mr.	Prasanna	Kuruppu	Advisor	Disability and Advocacy Landmines
Mr.	Matteo	Caprotti	Country Director	Handicap International
29 October – Morning session (survey and clearance operators)				
Mr.	M.M	Nayeemudeen	Additional Secretary	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	K.G.M.B	Wikramasinghe	Assistant Secretary	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	B.S	Mallikarachchi	Senior IMSMA Officer	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Major	G.A.D.	Alwis	GSO II (HDU)	Sri Lankan Army
Brigadier	Ananda	Chandrasiri	Director/Programme Manager	DASH
Mr.	Damian	O’Brien	Programme Manager	HALO Trust
Mr.	Ivica	Stilin	Technical Operations Manager	MAG
Mr.	Shajeev	Mahalingam	Community Liaison & Information Manager	MAG
Mr.	Deepal	Alwis	Programme Manager	SHARP
29 October – Evening session (advocacy)				
Mr.	M.M	Nayeemudeen	Additional Secretary	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	K.G.M.B	Wikramasinghe	Assistant Secretary	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	B.S	Mallikarachchi	Senior IMSMA Officer	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	Vidya	Abhayagunawardena	Researcher	Landmine Monitor, Coordinator SLCBL
Brigadier	Ananda	Chandrasiri	Director/Programme Manager	DASH
Ms.	Udani	Gunawardana	Assistant Director	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Debriefing				
Mr.	V.	Sivagnanasothy	Secretary	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	M.M	Nayeemudeen	Additional Secretary	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	K.G.M.B	Wikramasinghe	Assistant Secretary	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu Religious Affairs
Mr.	B.S	Mallikarachchi	Senior IMSMA Officer	Ministry of Resettlement, Reconstruction and Hindu

Annex IV: SWOT analysis results

Current situation	Future
Strengths	Opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National programme with well-established institutional structures • Conducive political environment • Availability of national resources (manpower, equipment and technical expertise) • International funding • Political commitment • Improved international relations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signing of APMBC • Complying with CCW • Ratifying CRPD • Exploring donor opportunities • Greater awareness • Contributing to global mine action activities • National budget allocation to mine action • Evolution of the national strategy • Strengthening management at the national level
Weaknesses	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited national coordination, management and planning • Security restrictions affecting the programme • Limited national budget allocation • Lack of coordination among stakeholders • Lack of reliable information • Insufficient and unreliable funding • Incorrect publicity on the work to be done • No ratification of CRPD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political change (2015 elections) • Donor fatigue • Incorrect publicity of work at hand and deadline for clearance

Annex V: Results-based Management Implementation in Information Management Capacity Development

Background

The GICHD has established itself as a pivotal provider of information management (IM) capacity development to the mine action community. Its main objective in that regard is to ensure that mine action actors are enabled to effectively leverage information towards evidence-based operational and strategic decision-making. This is accomplished by ensuring that the mine action community has an adequate pool of skilled personnel with at its disposal an up-to-date and fit-for-purpose information management system for compiling, storing, analysing and disseminating accurate, timely and relevant information on mine action. This goal is becoming all the more relevant as principles of Results-Based Management (RBM), which rely on the availability of sound information to build indicators, are adopted throughout the sector.

While GICHD's Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) has, over the years, become the *de-facto* standard IM tool in mine action, the discipline of Information Management itself has evolved from a largely technology-centric one narrowly focused on the development and implementation of information technology (IT), to a process-driven one where it is understood that, to be successful, an IM unit must develop not only its capacity to use technology but also to define and communicate clear processes that support an organisation's decision-making. While this requires a broader approach to training and support by GICHD than in the past (to incorporate process and organizational considerations) it also requires a more comprehensive mechanism to measure the results of its capacity development efforts. In addition, GICHD's commitment to being RBM-compliant requires it to measure not only outputs (number of people trained for example), but also outcomes (whether people have used their newly-acquired skills to implement more efficient IM processes).

Concept


The goal of GICHD's IM Division is, then, to increase the performance of national IM units and to reduce their dependency on external resources when delivering decision-support to their organisations. To better measure the progress of these IM units the Division has defined and implemented an IM Capacity Development framework that allows GICHD advisors and their national counterparts to define short-, medium- and long-term IM development targets. These targets are derived from structured baseline assessments and help determine concrete work-plans within which GICHD can anchor its support interventions. This not only allows for more measurability but also helps ensure that GICHD resources are used more efficiently and in a more targeted manner.

The framework is built around 4 broad categories of capacity, each broken down into a number of specific indicators. These categories are:

1. **Fitness-for-purpose of data:** does the data collected and stored through IM allow for the production of relevant, timely and accurate information products?
2. **Processes:** do appropriate NMAS and SOPs exist that adequately support the organisation's business processes?
3. **Organisation:** is the connection (collaboration/communication) between the IM unit and other units of the organisation adequate?
4. **Resources:** does the IM unit have access to sustainable technological and human resources?

These assessments provide the capacity baseline as well as a set of recommendations for addressing any areas that were found to be lacking. These recommendations are discussed between the GICHD advisor and his/her national counterpart with the view of prioritizing and planning action. While overall assessment scores would only be obtained ever year or two for a given country, the work-plan and deliverables by national counterparts offer an opportunity for continuous monitoring of progress towards the capacity indicators.

Implementation of the framework can be summarized as follows:



Results

In 2014 and 2015 the GICHD IM Division assessed the IM capacities of six UNMAS programmes as well as the IM capacities of national programmes in Angola, Cambodia, Lao PDR, Tajikistan and Lebanon.

A sample of the baseline indicator results can be seen in Figure 1. Each category is broken down into 7 or 8 indicators scored on a scale of 1(low) to 5(high). This data is then captured in GICHD’s Mine Action Intelligence Tool (MINT) for better visualization and analysis (Figures 2 and 3).

Indicator scores		
Indicator shortname	Indicator name	Score
Fitness-for-purpose of data		
S1-1	Do Data Quality Management systems exist and are in line with SOPs?	3
S1-2	Are Data Quality checks and verifications applied consistently? Is data checked and verified for accuracy and timeliness for each step in the dataflow?	4
S1-3	Result of database quality check (consistency and integrity of data)	3
S1-4	Level of use of IM products and outputs (reports, maps, statistics etc.)	3
S1-5	Satisfaction with IM products	5
S1-6	Ability to produce standard reports (International treaty information reporting requirements)	5
S1-7	Ability to produce organization-specific IM products (reports, maps, statistics designed for use within the organization)	4
S1-8	Ability to produce advanced IM-products (consistent graphs and reports)	3
Organisation		
S3-1	Level of awareness among Strategic/Ops staff of an IM Unit's role.	3
S3-2	Level of awareness of Strategic/Ops staff of their own role in defining IM activities	2
S3-3	Does the IM organigram reflect the organization's structure?	3
S3-4	What is the level of procedural integration of the IM unit with operational sections (regular interdivision meetings; presence of IM officer on senior management board)?	2
S3-5	What is the level of physical integration of the IM unit with operational sections (collocation of offices)	3
S3-6	To what extent does the organisation play a pro-active role in coordinating IM activities?	5
S3-7	To what extend are regular information exchanges established and conducted (feedback, workshops, meetings, trainings)?	3

Figure 1: sample baseline indicators




Figure 2: an example of the results from an IM Capacity assessment conducted in 2014 and the scores for each indicator of the four categories Fitness-for purpose of data, process, organisation, resources.




Figure 3: an illustration of how a series of IM Capacity assessments conducted every two years will show progress against the four capacity categories (fitness-for purpose of data, process, organisation, resource)

Annex VI: Priority-setting Timeline

Time (Fiscal Year)	Actor(s)	Action/Decision	Mechanism
September	RMAO, GA, DSs, GNs, area SLA commander, district operators	Information shared and sent to NMAC	District progress review meeting current year plan
End Sept	NMAC, SLA, Operators, relevant ministries	National review document against current year plan finalised	National Progress review meeting current year plan
Early Oct	RMAO, GA, DSs, GNs, area SLA commander, district operators	Prioritisation categories identified for next year	District meeting to review development plans
Mid-Oct latest	RMAO, GA, DSs, GNs, area SLA commander, district operators	District operational plan developed and submitted to NMAC by RMAO	District operational planning meeting
Mid-Nov latest	NMAC, SLA, Operators, relevant ministries	National annual operational plan finalised and approved	National planning meeting held
End Nov latest	NMAC, relevant ministries incl. finance and defence, Operators	Annual budget requirement set	NMAC, RMAO, SLA HDU and Operators present funding requirements
End Dec latest	Relevant SL Govt ministries, international donors and embassies	GoSL and international donor funding agreed	Donor meeting to present plan

Annex VII: Initial List of Priority-setting Criteria

	Criteria	Indicators	Data	Sources
1	Areas required for the resettlement of people	1) HA overlapping with resettlement area or access, 2) Number of households to be resettled	Resettlement Plans, Hazardous Areas	DS (resettlement plan), IMSMA HA
2	Land where people conduct their livelihood activities	1) HA overlapping with areas planned for livelihoods, 2) Number of households affected	Land Use Plans, Hazardous Areas	DS (land use plans), IMSMA HA
3	Land giving access to schools, hospitals, temples/churches	HA overlapping with access to schools, hospitals, temples / churches, 2) Number of children, women and men affected	Divisional maps / statistics, Hazardous Areas	DS, IMSMA HA
4	Land with essential infrastructure that requires repair, such as existing roads, electricity supply, water supply and irrigation systems	1) HA overlapping with priority infrastructure repair, 2) Number of households affected by lack of infrastructure	Infrastructure repair plans / priorities, Hazardous Areas	DS, IMSMA HA
5	Hazardous areas within three kilometres from villages, main roads and access roads	HA located within 3km of settlements or roads, 2) Number of households in relevant settlements	DS maps, Hazardous Areas	DS, IMSMA HA
6	Land required for development and construction of new infrastructure	1) HA overlapping with priority infrastructure development, 2) Number of households benefitting from new infrastructure	Infrastructure repair plans / priorities, Hazardous Areas	DS, IMSMA HA
7	Protective minefield around existing military installations		Mine field records	Military maps, IMSMA HA
8	Hazardous areas between three and five kilometres from villages, main roads and access roads	HA located between 3km and 5km off settlements or roads, 2) Number of households in relevant settlements	DS maps, Hazardous Areas	DS, IMSMA HA
9	Hazardous areas within jungles with no direct impact on the daily activities and requirements of the population and authorities	HA in jungle areas	DS maps, Hazardous Areas	DS, IMSMA HA

10	Hazardous areas further than five kilometres from villages, main roads and access roads	HA located over 5km off settlements or roads, 2) Number of households in relevant settlements	DS maps, Hazardous Areas	DS, IMSMA HA
----	---	---	--------------------------	--------------