



**IMAS**

---

**Report on the Development of the  
Mine Risk Education Component of  
the International Mine Action Standards**

---

**Prepared by**

**The Landmines & Small Arms Team  
UNICEF, New York**

**October 2003**

## Purpose

---

This report has been prepared to outline the background and process by which the Mine Risk Education (MRE) component of the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) have been developed.

## Background

---

In 2001, at the request of the United Nations Mine Action Service, UNICEF began developing the MRE component of IMAS. The IMAS compliant MRE standards were intended to update and supersede the *International Guidelines for Landmine & Unexploded Awareness Education* released by UNICEF in 1999. The purpose of the new standards was to establish a common framework and language, guiding principles and norms for undertaking MRE, consistent with other standards in mine action, which could form the basis for the development of national standards within different mine affected countries.

## Structure & development process

---

In July 2001 a meeting was organised by UNICEF to identify the framework and principles around which the MRE standards would be based. The meeting included a number of UNICEF officers, MRE practitioners and advisors from non-governmental organisations.

During the meeting the existing *International Guidelines for Landmine & Unexploded Ordnance Awareness Education* were reviewed and it was decided that the new standards would be developed according to the different phases of the project planning and implementation cycle identified in these old guidelines. Somewhat later, a decision was made to add standards on accreditation and management, in line with existing IMAS. Henceforth, standards were developed under the following headings:

1. Data Collection & Assessment
2. Planning
3. Implementation
4. Monitoring
5. Evaluation
6. Accreditation
7. Management

Participants in the meeting also identified a number of key issues or principles common to each of these programme phases, which were to be analysed and included in each of the standards. These included:

1. Stakeholder involvement
2. Coordination of activities
3. Community participation and empowerment
4. Integration of activities (for example, integration with other components of mine action, community development)
5. Information management and exchange
6. Appropriate targeting
7. Education
8. Training

Following the meeting a *programming matrix* was devised reflecting the key principles of the standards along with the different phases in programme implementation (below).

### **Mine Risk Education – Programming Matrix**

	Assessment	Planning	Implementation	Monitoring	Evaluation
Stakeholder involvement					
Coordination					
Integration					
Community participation					
Information management					
Appropriate targeting					
Education					
Training					

#### **Outreach workshops**

The programming matrix was used as the basis for capturing the substantive content of the standards in a number of outreach workshops. Prior to the workshop participants were sent a series of explanatory documents outlining the purpose and scope of the standards. During the workshops participants were requested to comment on and insert defining characteristics and activities of MRE under each column and row of the matrix. Discussion was then entered on whether such characteristics and activities were something that was an *essential* or *recommended* component of MRE programmes. This discussion enabled the division of activities by what 'should', 'shall' or 'may' be done in MRE as per the IMAS format. The results of each workshop were cross referenced and updated until a basis for consensus was reached on the content of the matrix and the standards.

Over 2001 and 2002, outreach workshops were conducted in five mine-affected countries, including:

1. Cambodia
2. Laos
3. Eritrea
4. Ethiopia
5. Somalia

The workshops included representatives from UN organisations, Mine Action Coordination Centres, UNDP advisors, UNHCR; National Mine Action Authorities; MRE organisations both national and international, organisations dealing with victim assistance, various Government Ministries (Health, Education, Labour and Information) and interested individuals (consultant specialists in MRE, demining or victim assistance). Average attendance at the workshops was between 15 and 20 participants, divided into working groups of three to four people.

#### **MRE standards web site**

At the same time as the outreach workshops, a purpose built web site was developed (<http://www.mrre.net> – no longer in use) to broaden the consultation process and provide up to date information to the people engaged in the process of developing the standards. A mailing list was also set up on the site, including key contacts and participants in the different meetings.

## User focus groups

In addition to the outreach workshops and the web site, UNICEF sponsored a series of User Focus Groups to steer the development process, including representatives from the Mine Risk Education Working Group.<sup>1</sup> The purpose of these groups was to provide a forum for specialists in the field of MRE to provide expert opinion on the outcomes of the regional workshops and the substantive content of the matrix, assist in editing drafts and ultimately decide what would or would not be included in each of the standards. Over 2001 and 2002, three User Focus Groups were convened:

1. New York (September 2001)
2. Geneva (December 2001)
3. Lyon (March 2002)

The User Focus Group meeting in Lyon finalised the technical content of the standards.

## Final editing

---

In 2003, UNICEF formed a partnership with the Cranfield Mine Action Unit (Cranfield University) to finalise drafting of the standards and ensure that they were compliant and consistent with other extant IMAS and reflected current best practice in MRE. Over the course of the first half of the year three subsequent drafts of the standards were worked on by Cranfield and UNICEF. Additionally, a new User Focus Group was set up to guide the final editing of the standards.<sup>2</sup> This group had the following responsibilities:

- a. To review and revise draft standards and provide editing support to UNICEF and Cranfield Mine Action.
- b. To act as an *expert group* in Mine Risk Education in order to ensure public accountability and transparency during the draft finalisation process.
- c. Represent the views and interests of the wider end-user community.
- d. Agree to the editing process timetable and Focus Group composition.
- e. Generally consider draft standards and their application, making recommendations where necessary.

This group was chaired by UNMAS and included representatives from the Mines Advisor Group, Handicap International France, the ICRC, GICHD, UNICEF country offices (Burundi, Cambodia and Sri Lanka), the Bosnia and Herzegovina Mine Action Centre (BHMIC) and UNOPS.

This group largely worked via email, though the staff at BHMIC convened separate meetings to discuss the standards, their relevance and their application as national standards. In addition, two meetings of the Mine Risk Education Working Group were convened to discuss the content, implications and development progress of the new standards. These meetings took place in:

1. Geneva (March 2003)
2. Bangkok (September 2003)

## Final draft standards

---

Following the meeting in Bangkok, UNICEF and Cranfield worked to produce the final draft standards, for presentation to the IMAS Review Board and the Inter-Agency Coordination Group for final endorsement. Consistent with the decision made in July 2001 the standards follow the project planning cycle identified in the old mine awareness

---

<sup>1</sup> Known at the time as the Mine Awareness Working Group, this group is co-convened by UNICEF and the ICBL and includes more than 80 MRE professionals from the UN, NGOs and the ICRC. A weakness of using the working group to draft the standards, identified by UNICEF consultants working on the process at the time, was that the membership and size of the group was different in each meeting leading to difficulties in achieving focus and consistent interpretations of issues.

<sup>2</sup> Membership of this group was set at 10 members and sustained for the duration of the review process in an effort to achieve the required focus and consistency of interpretation of the standards. Once the group had reviewed the standards consultation was undertaken with the MRE Working Group.

guidelines, with the addition of standards on accreditation and management. A total of seven standards are in final draft form, including:

⇒ <b>Guide for the Management of MRE: 07.11</b>
⇒ <b>Accreditation of MRE Agencies: 07.31</b>
⇒ <b>Monitoring of MRE Programmes: 07.41</b>
⇒ <b>Assessment &amp; Data Collection: 08.50</b>
⇒ <b>Programme Planning for MRE: 12.10</b>
⇒ <b>Implementation of MRE Programmes: 12.20</b>
⇒ <b>Evaluation of MRE Programmes: 14.20</b>

### **Terms & definitions**

The development of these standards has involved the introduction of a number of terms commonly used in MRE programmes, such as 'survivor assistance', 'education', 'public information', and so on. Many of these terms are not contained in extant IMAS, and definitions have been provided in Annex B of each draft MRE standard where the term has been used. Most definitions were developed following broad consultation, and effort has been made to keep them as simple and universal as possible.

### **Other issues**

---

#### **IMAS framework**

The 'IMAS Framework' attributes numeric identifiers to each draft and extant standard. In the course of developing the MRE standards it was recommended that the MRE standard for assessment and data collection originally identified as 'IMAS 12.10', should be moved to the '08.00' series of standards which are concerned with risk assessment and survey. This decision was made in the interests of consistency and integration. Other parts of the numbering system for the MRE standards have accordingly been adjusted.

#### **Mine awareness & mine risk education**

During the development of the standards it was decided to change from using the term "mine awareness education" and employ the term 'mine risk education'. The decision was made because it was felt that the term 'mine awareness' did not capture the full extent of activities undertaken by organisations and focussed only on the public information and awareness raising activities.

Mine risk education more fully captures the educational objectives and qualities of programmes, emphasising the need to teach safe behaviour and enable people to live more safely in contaminated environments, rather than simply informing people of the danger through public information. Included in the definition of MRE are:

- a. public information and awareness raising (the main component of stand alone 'mine awareness' programmes, usually involving *small media* and *mass media* programmes)
- b. education and training (activities often aimed at integrating safety messages and training in community groups and school curricula)
- c. community mine action liaison (activities specifically designed to link MRE activities with demining, victim assistance, community development and other associated work. Such activities are most often linked to assessment, information sharing and community 'empowerment' activities)

#### **International Guidelines for Landmine & Unexploded Awareness Education**

Released by UNICEF in 1999, these first international guidelines for mine awareness are to be replaced by the new IMAS compliant MRE standards, once they are endorsed by the IACG. The old guidelines were the product of many months of coordinated work and consultation and have formed the basic framework for undertaking MRE over the last four years. In many ways the new IMAS compliant standards reflect the substance of these first guidelines and care has been taken to ensure that no essential principles have been lost in the MRE component of IMAS. Comparatively,

the new standards are more detailed, complete and complex, being divided into a series of separate standards rather than one document, and offer a more solid framework for standardisation among MRE organisations and the adoption of national MRE standards.

## **General conclusions & recommendations**

---

The MRE standards are a reflection of the thoughts and experiences of many different people from different country programmes, representing national and governmental authorities, the UN, international and national non-governmental organisations, the ICRC and community perspectives. The standards have been subject to rigorous review and amendment over the last year, to ensure that they are compliant with other IMAS. Keeping in mind that all standards are 'living documents' that should be adapted to guide, suit and reflect the changing nature of programmes and activities, UNICEF finds the standards to accurately reflect 'best practice' in MRE programmes world wide. In view of this, UNICEF strongly recommends the full and speedy adoption of these standards.

Following the adoption of the standards, UNICEF commits itself to follow up on the their further development, assist in monitoring their implementation, assist national authorities in developing national standards and support national and international organisations in their efforts to comply with the different provisions of the standards. This will involve, 'capacity building', the development of appropriate 'user manuals' and 'outreach training'. In the short term MRE programmes supported and undertaken by UNICEF will be required to adopt the new standards.

UNICEF would like to express its thanks to all those individuals and agencies who have committed their time and energy to ensure the development of standards which reflect both the real and desired state of MRE programmes. Special thanks are given to Leone Barnes and Silva Ferretti for their role in the coordination and development of the standards over the years 2001 and 2002; to the members of the User Focus Group and Chair Sebastian Kasack, and staff at Cranfield Mine Action for their input during 2003. Special recognition should also be given to the dedicated staff of BHMAC who undertook to translate the drafts in whole and convene workshops on the implications of their adaptation to the local context as well as providing invaluable technical input.

## **Attachments**

---

1. Extracts from a version of the *Programming Matrix*
2. Preparatory end-user questionnaire for outreach workshops
3. User Focus Group Terms of Reference

	ACCREDITATION	ASSESSMENT	PLANNING	IMPLEMENTATION	MONITORING	EVALUATION
Information Management	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agency <b>shall</b> have capacity to develop and manage information management.</li> <li>There <b>should</b> be an information management system in place.</li> <li>Information management must be standardised in order to be easily input into the national database system.</li> <li>Resources (human and material) and capacity for implementation <b>shall</b> be present or being developed</li> <li>Information <b>should</b> be made available to all interested partners</li> <li>General points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information collected must be useful to MRE project, eg for project development and monitoring</li> <li>Use of reliable secondary sources where possible to avoid duplication</li> <li>Information management does not necessarily imply a database capacity. The IM strategy must be designed to reflect the needs of the project and stakeholders. (Community and wider mine action/development community) needs for information.</li> <li>The most important thing is that reliable and relevant information available to the MRE project is fed into a system that is then accessible by and to others.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There <b>shall</b> be a general rapid assessment of the national mines threat and humanitarian environment (harness existing databases where available with socio-economic/geopolitical data). It <b>shall</b> be followed by community based assessments</li> <li>A KAP approach at the assessment level – <b>shall</b> be essential for future evaluation and planning (also part of implementation, planning and evaluation). <b>May</b> use a mix of RRA/PRA, etc. to form initial baseline based on existing reports</li> <li><b>Shall</b> have performed an analysis of all the available previous years mine victim data which <b>should</b> include a breakdown of the following categories: Month, Place of injury, Age, Gender, Activity at time of injury, Nature of injury, Type of mine/UXO. (In accordance with the national standard)</li> <li><b>Shall</b> link objectives of programme with NA to assist with M &amp;E</li> <li><b>Shall</b> build on existing data. Review all secondary data before repeating a primary data collection system (Consider also the survey fatigue that <b>may</b> affect community (not to go and ask the same question to the same people)</li> <li><b>Shall</b> include Initial baseline, using IM to achieve measurable objectives to measure results oriented impact</li> <li>Where there is a national database system then the agency <b>shall</b> assess where the agency can gather info to fill in the gaps.</li> </ol> <p><i>(continued in next page)</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General rapid assessment data analysis <b>shall</b> be shared across all relevant public and private sectors.</li> <li><b>Shall</b> include strategy for information dissemination (MA) – training requirements will flow from this</li> <li><b>should</b> plan the building of networks for co-ordination and collaboration</li> <li>A log frame or similar approach to planning <b>shall</b> be used and <b>shall</b> include, who will do what, when where and how with measurable goals, milestones, objectives, activities relating to knowledge, attitudes and behaviours. - These activities <b>should</b> be captured in general planning.</li> <li>A detailed monitoring and evaluation process plan <b>shall</b> be developed including impact and outcomes related to goals and objectives and activities. This <b>should</b> also be related to feedback and existing reports.</li> <li>The budget <b>shall</b> include sufficient funding for monitoring and evaluation and funding for M&amp;E <b>should</b> be specifically requested from the donor.</li> <li>Standardised victim data <b>may</b> be collected as part of the mine awareness program. A detailed plan <b>shall</b> be provided on who will collect the data, how it will be transmitted the national database) and what immediate action <b>shall</b> be taken following a new mine incident</li> <li>A quality assurance/control function and strategy <b>should</b> be put in place to assure high quality and reliable data is collected and entered into the information system. This will ensure high user confidence in the quality of the information produced</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Shall</b> make designated resources available including budget, timeframe and equipment for IM</li> <li><b>Should</b> Implement full MA program as decided through the assessment and planning stages</li> <li>There <b>should</b> be on-going training of staff and capitalisation of experience</li> <li><b>Shall</b> establish relevant linkages with other organisations/ government agencies</li> <li>Information <b>should</b> be shared amongst the implementing organisation, the (targeted) community and the wider mine action community.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collection process <b>shall</b> conform to program need for reliability, coverage and quality</li> <li>Reliability/coverage <b>shall</b> be monitored to ensure quality of data</li> <li>Human and financial resources <b>shall</b> be available for monitoring</li> <li><b>Shall</b> respect issues of confidentiality (see WHO questionnaire standards), particularly in regard to information concerning victim data</li> <li>Ongoing quality control of delivery of information <b>shall</b> be in place (e.g. monitoring of animators, mine awareness committees) including appropriateness, relevance, effectiveness, coverage, satisfaction</li> <li>There <b>should</b> be an ongoing monitoring of behavioural change and contributing factors to non-compliance (e.g. non behavioural factors) all based on baseline NA &amp; programme objectives</li> <li><b>Shall</b> develop MINE SMART Indicators</li> <li>All elements of the process <b>should</b> be monitored: inputs, outputs and impact at regular intervals.</li> <li>Impact/results oriented data <b>should</b> provide changes to baseline survey data / program planning and objectives</li> <li>Monitoring <b>should</b> be objective and not influenced by special interest groups in the analysis or gathering of data</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Shall</b> evaluate quality of information collected and delivered/disseminated</li> <li><b>Shall</b> measure the use and analysis and effectiveness information collected and information disseminated</li> <li><b>Shall</b> choose methods /too evaluation which are transparent</li> <li><b>Should</b> use as criteria results oriented / impact indicators</li> <li>There <b>should</b> be an evaluation on the quality of information gathered and its appropriateness for management planning &amp; impact measurement</li> <li>NOTE: Need more emphasis on evaluation of info for assessing program goals/objectives at forward planning</li> </ol>

	ACCREDITATION	ASSESSMENT	PLANNING	IMPLEMENTATION	MONITORING	EVALUATION
<b>Methodologies and tools</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Shall</b> recognise that methodologies depend on the context</li> <li>2. There <b>shall</b> be a period of renewal</li> <li>3. The agency <b>may</b> be accredited for the following approaches – Institutional approach, community based approach and mass media or public information, education approach</li> <li>4. <b>Should</b> demonstrate the capacity to use tools and methodologies that meet certain basic standards, eg. Learning materials, learning methods etc</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The agency <b>shall</b> assess the strengths and weakness' of the existing community structure in relation to interactive (participatory and other relevant tools and methodologies) methodology</li> <li>2. The agency <b>shall</b> assess national resources, capacity and capability and availability to support interactive methodology. The implementing agency <b>should</b> also assess its own capacity in this area.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The plan <b>shall</b> include approaches, methodologies, materials and messages based on the needs assessment.</li> <li>2. The plan <b>should</b> contain appropriate staff development and training to implement interactive methodologies</li> <li>3. <b>Should</b> pre-test tools</li> <li>4. Regular assessment of methods and tools <b>should</b> be included in the planning</li> <li>5. Lessons learned from other counties/programmes and experience and results of M&amp;E <b>should</b> be incorporated into the planning process</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implementation <b>shall</b> be flexible and responsive to changing needs</li> <li>2. The implementation <b>may</b> be innovative and dynamic in accordance with techniques chosen to support interactive methodologies</li> <li>3. <b>Should</b> employ a community based approach/community involvement in implementation</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The monitoring plan <b>should</b> include the use of: Key informants: village committee, village elders, formal soldier, women groups, village deminers, teachers, out of school children, religious groups to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the exchange of information, methodologies, materials etc</li> <li>2. There <b>should</b> be external monitoring of the methodology and that monitoring <b>shall</b> be undertaken by a person experienced in the use of interactive methodology and other relevant methods and tools</li> <li>3. There <b>should</b> be an internal monitoring process with participation at all appropriate levels</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The program <b>should</b> assess impact of the use of interal specific methodology used project in the areas of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Psychological well beir</li> <li>• Behavioural change</li> <li>• Quality of life</li> <li>• Knowledge, attitude, pr</li> <li>• Memorability</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Based on the assessment i impact, the programme shz constantly re-evaluate the of methodology</li> <li>3. <b>Should</b> post-test tools</li> </ol>
<b>Community participation</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Organisation s<b>hall</b> demonstrate capacity to work with community and community participation</li> <li>2. Organisation s<b>hall</b> demonstrate commitment to the role of Community Participation (e.g. through action plan, mission statement, implementation (community participation)</li> <li>3. Organisation s<b>hall</b> demonstrate access to the community</li> <li>4. Note: What about programmes not requiring community participation?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The community <b>should</b> be involved in the definition of priorities</li> <li>2. Assessment <b>should</b> be done with full participation of community (but in emergency this <b>may</b> be not feasible)</li> <li>3. Assessment <b>should</b> NOT be done on a stand alone basis</li> <li>4. Community <b>should</b> have input on the indicators and objectives of the assessment. Community participation <b>should</b> be included in planning of the assessment stage.</li> <li>5. Target community <b>should</b> be the focal point.</li> <li>6. <b>Should</b> make use of appropriate informants: village committee, village elders, formal soldier, women groups, village deminers, teachers, out of school children, religious groups</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Community mine action plan <b>should</b> be based on the expressed needs of the community.</li> <li>2. Community <b>should</b> be seen as the primary stakeholder. Our focus <b>should</b> be community ownership of the process in addition to acceptance of the plan/output.</li> <li>3. Community action plan <b>should</b> be incorporated in higher level of mine action planning</li> <li>4. The planning process <b>should</b> address the issue of sustainability and community ownership</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There <b>should</b> be community involvement in the whole implementation process of mine action</li> <li>2. There <b>shall</b> be a mechanism in place to interpret community monitoring and evaluation results</li> <li>3. Community <b>should</b> participate in the preparation of MRE materials and field-testing.</li> <li>4. Community <b>should</b> actively participate in the execution of the mine action plan (including reporting of casualties, mine &amp; UXO reporting, demining requests, liaison role).</li> <li>5. Peer techniques <b>may</b> be employed.</li> <li>6. Community ownership <b>should</b> be needed from the beginning of the programme.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The affected communities <b>should</b> be actively involved in monitoring wherever possible</li> <li>2. Monitoring <b>should</b> ensure the involvement of the community in revising the appropriateness of programmes and objectives..</li> <li>3. Community based reporting systems <b>should</b> be established and a supporting system <b>should</b> be established to ensure that reporting systems are sustainable</li> <li>4. Programme, objectives, appropriateness <b>should</b> be reviewed regularly at the community level</li> <li>5. There <b>should</b> be community focus for making adjustments at community level during the project implementation</li> <li>6. There <b>should</b> be ways to gather information on the initiatives of the community</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The community <b>should</b> OV evaluation</li> <li>2. There <b>should</b> be internal evaluation.</li> <li>3. The role of the community i doing the evaluation <b>should</b> evaluated (by whom?)</li> <li>4. There <b>may</b> be external eve of the involvement of the community in the project</li> <li>5. Evaluation results <b>should</b> l shared with the community</li> </ol>

	ACCREDITATION	ASSESSMENT	PLANNING	IMPLEMENTATION	MONITORING	EVALUATION
Safety	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Should</b> abide by International or national Occupational Health and safety standards (where to find them)</li> <li>2. Staff <b>should</b> be trained in the safety aspects outlined in LSP Handbook (Landmine safety Handbook – UNMAS)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Staff safety standards <b>shall</b> be applied when doing assessment</li> <li>2. No member of staff or community <b>should</b> be put at unnecessary risk</li> <li>3. Community input <b>should</b> be sought for local safety strategies where regional specific – this particularly relates to villages and beneficiaries involved in designing safer village strategies</li> <li>4. Assessment <b>should</b> identify issues of safety in relation to community and safe strategies</li> <li>5. Assessment <b>should</b> be linked to site selection and prioritisation of land for development</li> <li>6. Assessment <b>should</b> be linked to site selection and prioritisation of land to reduce risk and avoid accident – i.e., could include status of land within and around a village or community in terms of level of risk – high risk, low risk, no risk etc</li> <li>7. There <b>should</b> also be an assessment of country stability/instability</li> <li>8. Data <b>should</b> be collected on injuries which occur in rescues of victims</li> <li>9. There <b>should</b> be an assessment of established first aid locations, available medical facilities and casualty evacuation procedures at the community level to assist in development of MRE messages. The assessment <b>shall</b> be based on reality rather than theory.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Emergency rescue techniques – a first aid element <b>should</b> be included and rescuer <b>should</b> be discouraged. Rescuer needs should be considered during the program assessment and linked back to program design and accident response.</li> <li>2. Village deminers &amp; teaching prodding: different views emerged in workshops = some for and some against</li> <li>3. Village deminers as a high risk group <b>should</b> be better targeted in mine risk education. They <b>should</b> not be encouraged in their demining activities although the fact that it is occurring <b>should</b> be acknowledged and acted on. Efforts <b>should</b> be made to discover the reasons why they are demining in the first place, rather than providing training which most village deminers say they do not want anyway.</li> <li>4. MRE teams <b>should</b> plan to support demining teams by working with communities where demining is taking place to ensure communities do not put deminers at risk during survey or clearance activities. This is a part of the community liaison function where after clearance a proper MRE handover is conducted. During clearance MRE is conducted to educate people about demining activities. Deminers themselves <b>should</b> be trained to have some capacity to provide awareness.</li> <li>5. Within MRE training of staff there <b>shall</b> be a component of the course dedicated to safety of personnel. There <b>should</b> be an assessment of the plan in terms of country stability/instability and personnel safety of staff.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Where village demining occurs, local level people with skills and knowledge of mines/UXO <b>may</b> be used as resources persons for MRE. MRE <b>should</b> build an existing knowledge of local demining initiatives to feedback to other agencies, national authorities and to assist in the development of MRE messages.</li> <li>2. Organisations <b>Shall</b> provide appropriate safety training to MRE personnel and ancillary staff (i.e., drivers etc)</li> <li>3. Ongoing safety training and practice evacuations drills <b>should</b> be carried out.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Community based demining initiatives <b>shall</b> be monitored at village and community level, at organisational level and overall by the national mine action authority.</li> <li>2. MRE agency <b>should</b> include safety aspects in internal monitoring programme</li> <li>3. Community <b>should</b> be involved in the process of monitoring the safety aspects of a project</li> <li>4. The number of mine/UXO victims/survivors <b>should</b> be used as an indicator of success of a MRE project</li> <li>5. All monitoring staff to have safety training before conducting monitoring</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To evaluate impact, evaluation activities <b>(should)</b> ask the following questions for community based demining initiatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What were the incident community based demining responded to? Was the response appropriate? safe?</li> <li>• Are community liaison reporting incidents/damage areas in a timely and accurate manner?</li> <li>• If there were mine accidents was first aid training utilized either by victim or help?</li> <li>• Is the community based demining initiative (CBI) sustainable?</li> <li>• For general safety – have MRE teams operated safely in the field over the given time frame</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The evaluation activities <b>shall</b> in any way put at risk the MRE teams or the community. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the risks associated with mines and UXO</li> <li>• the risk associated with investigating/ sharing information on sensitive issues</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. <b>Should</b> assess whether MRE reduced risk to CBI and communities in general, i.e. marking, reporting, theft of etc</li> <li>4. There <b>shall</b> be evaluation to ensure correct understanding of (the intention) of safety messages</li> </ol>

	ACCREDITATION	ASSESSMENT	PLANNING	IMPLEMENTATION	MONITORING	EVALUATION
Integration	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Plan <b>should</b> address integration and co-ordination with other MA agencies, authorities, relief and development agencies</li> <li>2. Plan <b>shall</b> address integration and co-ordination with the national government and /or national authorities</li> <li>3. National authority <b>should</b> co-ordinate with all organisations/agencies etc</li> <li>4. Responsibility of all agencies to ensure they co-ordinate with national authorities and other agencies</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Should</b> identify all relevant players at all admin levels / divisions, including govt, parastatal, UN, donors, military, INGOs, national NGOs</li> <li>2. Out of those <b>should</b> identify potential partners, discuss and float potential solutions. In doing so: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Should</b> identify gaps and opportunities for partnerships</li> <li>• <b>should</b> define duration and purpose of partnerships. Consider Relevance of partner in the long term and short term (relief and development)</li> <li>• <b>Should</b> look at ways to support National Mine Action plan this <b>may</b> be a <b>shall</b> if it is part of the national commitment</li> <li>• <b>Should</b> avoid duplication</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. All sectors <b>should</b> be aware and informed of UXO and mine hazards and collaborate in forward planning to support and or implement MRE for socio economic development</li> <li>4. <b>Should</b> look at ways to establish partnerships internationally as well as nationally, learning experiences from other countries, experiences etc</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Shall</b> consider national planning with all relevant sectors and agencies working in UXO and mine impacted areas.</li> <li>2. Planning <b>should</b> be co-ordinated whether the programme is integrated or stand-alone.</li> <li>3. National authority <b>should</b> compile integration plan after co-ordination</li> <li>4. National authority <b>should</b> regularly update the national plan based on activities undertaken</li> <li>5. The plan <b>should</b> be shared among different agencies who are working on similar activities</li> <li>6. Plan <b>should</b> fit the national strategy and be part of 5 year national plan</li> <li>7. National authority <b>should</b> organise regular workshops for all agencies to share information and define the strategy</li> <li>8. <b>Should</b> be a co-ordination body of some description under the national authority</li> <li>9. <b>Should</b> co-ordinate workshops at field level (provincial and district) for co-ordination among agencies with government partners</li> <li>10. NA <b>should</b> be responsible for organising the inclusion of all relevant agencies to draw up the national strategy</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Shall</b> be co-ordinated through national mine action authority where applicable / possible – this is not a national mine action authority responsibility, it is a responsibility of the agencies</li> <li>2. <b>Should</b> co-ordinate with other relevant agencies on a regular basis</li> <li>3. There <b>Shall</b> be co-ordination and co-operation of agencies in the implementation</li> <li>4. National authorities <b>should</b> support other agencies to work with other government agencies</li> <li>5. There <b>should</b> be co-operation with MRE agencies and other agencies in general i.e., communes, councils etc</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information that is relevant for the national mine action plan <b>shall</b> be shared with the co-ordinating bodies and <b>should</b> use established systems (e.g. IMSMA).</li> <li>2. Results from different programmes monitoring efforts <b>should</b> be integrated to provide a national indication of total results</li> <li>3. <b>Should</b> openly share results – with national authority and each agency</li> <li>4. <b>Should</b> identify gaps and integration/co-ordination process to address the gaps – achieve what has been planned, achieve full integration as planned</li> <li>5. National authority <b>shall / should</b> – but can be a <b>shall</b> depending on funding and authority monitor the co-operation of agencies, i.e. number of working partners and quality of co-operation (working groups).</li> <li>6. Reporting – agencies <b>should</b> have access to a national database of all results</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Lessons learned concerning integration/co-ordination or national and agency level s be shared.</li> <li>10. <b>Should</b> be an annual ratio evaluation to include all sectors/agencies to particip forward planning</li> <li>11. Integration <b>should</b> be a sp topic of project evaluations allow lessons to be pulled c</li> <li>12. <b>Should</b> be an external eva of the mine action authority gauge integration at nation</li> </ol>

Mine Risk Education Working Group

New York – September 2001

PREPARATORY QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of the Mine Risk Education Working Group is to collect and discuss experiences in mine awareness and feed them into the standards. This questionnaire is a very important part of this process, therefore all participants to the MREWG are strongly invited to fill it and return it **by the 6<sup>th</sup> September**.

Please, send replies to **mrre@mrre.net**.

Your ideas are very important to us.

**If you feel that other people in your country / your organisation could have valuable input on the question dealt with in this questionnaire, please pass a copy also to them!**

We do value all inputs.

The information will then be collated together, presented in the MREWG and circulated amongst all those who participated in the questionnaire.

1. BUILDING ON THE EXISTING GUIDELINES

The standards will need to capitalise on the “International Guidelines for Landmine and Unexploded Ordinance Awareness Education” (available on the www at the address: <http://www.unicef.org/landguide/mineawar.pdf>)

- ***Please indicate at least three sections / aspect of the guidelines you are particularly happy with (e.g.: that illustrate well an important point, that have been effectively implemented, that are a key component of mine awareness...) and explain why.***

Title of the section (and numbering if applicable)	Comments

- ***Please indicate at least three section / aspects of the guidelines that you are not particularly happy with / could be improved (e.g.: not clear, controversial, not applicable, difficult to implement, missing, not enough information provided...)***

Title of the section (and numbering is applicable)	Comments

- ***Please add here any other comment about the guidelines you feel relevant.***

--

## 2. IMAS STANDARDS

The mine awareness standards are part of a larger family of standards, the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS). Several mine action standards, particularly relating to clearance are in the process of being finalised. (you can find the full text on line at <http://www.mineclearancestandards.org/>)

We would like to draw your attention on them, as they could have potential implication for mine awareness programmes (i.e. for better integration of mine clearance and mine awareness activities).

- ***Please read the mine clearance standards and let us know your comments. How could mine awareness be better integrated in those standards? And, viceversa, how could the mine awareness standards help improving integration of those mine clearance tasks?***

Standard	Your comments
IMAS 01.10 Guide to IMAS	
IMAS 04.10 Glossary	
IMAS 07.10 Demining Management	
IMAS 07.30 Accreditation	
IMAS 08.10: National Survey	
IMAS 08.30 Post Clearance Documentation	

- ***Please add here any other general comment on the IMAS standards.***

--

## 3. MRE STANDARDS

The following is the proposed organisation of the MRE standards. For each of them a draft outline of the content is also provided.

- ***Please go through this provisional outline and write down your comments. Is any session needed / superfluous? What issues should be dealt in detail with in each section? Which should not be negotiated? Which are likely to be controversial?***

Proposed Standard	Your comments
1. INTRODUCTION TO MRE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Stand-alone / integrated</li> <li>♦ Integration of MMRE and IMAS</li> </ul>	
2. GUIDING PRINCIPLES / CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ introduction of guiding principles and cross cutting issues</li> </ul>	

3. ASSESSMENT AND DATA COLLECTION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ surveys</li> <li>♦ feasibility study</li> <li>♦ capacities and needs assessment</li> </ul>	
4. ACCREDITATION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Needs Assessment</li> <li>♦ Field testing</li> <li>♦ Curriculum Vitae of coordinators, facilitators etc</li> <li>♦ Evaluation Plan</li> <li>♦ Curriculum/ Lesson Plans/ Methodology</li> </ul>	
5. PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ communication approaches (direct, peer to peer, child to child, community strategy, safer village plan)</li> <li>♦ curricula</li> </ul>	
6. MONITORING AND EVALUATION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Purpose (accountability / lessons learning)</li> <li>♦ Criteria and questions</li> <li>♦ M&amp;E and project cycle</li> <li>♦ Responsibilities</li> <li>♦ TORs</li> <li>♦ Stakeholders</li> <li>♦ Indicators</li> <li>♦ Data collection and analysis: methodological issues</li> <li>♦ Data sharing / data sharing tools (e.g. databases)</li> </ul>	

- *Please add any other comment on this draft proposed structure*

--

#### 4. MRE: KEY CONCEPTS

The MRE standards intend to clearly illustrate some key concepts, ideas and cross cutting issues that should guide MRE a whole. "Community involvement" and "survivors and not victims" are some example of those.

The key concepts/cross cutting issues will be illustrated in a specific section of the standards. However, their meaning and implication in practice will also be further illustrated in the subsequent standards. Since those key concepts / cross cutting issues will guide the whole process of preparation of the standards, it is very important to understand what ideas are broadly shared by the MRE community.

- *Please list what are the key ideas and concepts (but also key stakeholders and key activities) that, in your view or in the view of your organisation, could not be foregone in MRE programmes.*

Key concept / Cross cutting issue	Explanatory comments


## 5. REFERENCE MATERIALS

The MRE standards will be accompanied by technical notes and guidelines to facilitate and illustrate their implementation. It is very important to build on and capitalise on what is already existing.

- ***Please list (and possibly send us a copy!) any publication / report / article / paper / video... etc. that you feel is particularly useful in guiding MRE programmes. Indicate if you are sending internal papers of your organisation, please indicate if this could be shared with a wider audience. We particularly value e-publications, as it will be much easier to share them***

## 6. PROPOSED DEFINITION FOR MRE

The following is the proposed definition for MRE and its components. It was developed during the recent UNICEF Mine Awareness workshop conducted in Glen Cove, USA. We would welcome your comments and suggestions on it.

---

Mine risk education is an essential component of Mine Action. It is a process that promotes the adoption of safer behaviours by at-risk groups, and which provides the links between affected communities, other mine action components and other sectors. There are three related and mutually reinforcing components:

- ♦ **Community / mine action liaison (CMAL)**  
The objective of CMAL is to place the needs and priorities of mine affected communities at the centre of the planning, implementation and monitoring of mine action and other sectors. CMAL is based on an exchange of information and involves communities in the decision making process. CMAL is intended to ensure the mine action programmes are sensitive and respond to community needs and priorities and the affected communities understand and support mine action.
- ♦ **Community based mine risk reduction (CBMRR)**  
The objective of CBMRR is to reduce the impact of the mine/UXO on individuals and communities until such time as the threat is removed. CBMRR promotes individual and community behavioural change and enables communities to develop interim safety strategies.
- ♦ **Public information (PI)**  
The objective of PI is to raise general awareness. PI is a mass mobilisation approach that delivers information on the mine/UXO problem. In an emergency situation, due to time constraints and lack of accurate data it is the most practical means of communicating safety information. In other situations, PI can support the two other components

- 
- ***Your comments and suggestions***

## YOUR CONTACT INFORMATION

Please add here your contact information

<b>NAME</b>	
<b>SURNAME</b>	
<b>ORGANISATION</b>	
<b>E-MAIL</b>	
<b>ADDRESS</b>	
<b>PHONE</b>	
<b>FAX</b>	

---

Thank you for completing the questionnaire.

**Please send it back to:**  
**mrre@mrre.net**

Feedback on the results will be given at the Mine Awareness Working Group in New York (September 2001) and will be published on the Internet at the address <http://www.mrre.net>. All those who filled in the questionnaire will be kept on our mailing list and informed on the development of the standards.

If you need any other information do not hesitate to contact us!

- Leonie Barnes (leonie@mrre.net)
- Silva Ferretti (silva@mrre.net)

# International Mine Action Standards for Mine Risk Education User Focus Group - Terms of Reference

## BACKGROUND

Over the coming year, UNICEF with Cranfield Mine Action will finalise the production of the draft International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) for Mine Risk Education (MRE), under the oversight of a User Focus Group formed out of the Mine Risk Education Working Group.

Work has begun with the appointment of an editing team with responsibility to finalise the draft standards that have been produced over the last two years. The editing team comprises:

*For UNICEF:* Mr. Reuben McCarthy, Project Officer, under the direction of Polly Brennan, Global Landmines Coordinator, UNICEF.

*For Cranfield Mine Action:* Ms. Belinda Goslin, Programme Officer, under the direction of Alastair McAslan, Director, CMA.

In addition to finalising the existing IMAS MRE drafts, the editing team will review all standing IMAS and propose amendments which may be necessary to integrate MRE components.

Edited drafts will be circulated among the User Focus Group and the wider mine action community for comment, with the final presentation being made to the Inter-Agency Coordination Group for endorsement in November 2003. Publication is expected to take place at the end of 2003, with an outreach phase to assist in the implementation of the standards in early 2004.

## USER FOCUS GROUP (UFG)

To assist UNICEF and Cranfield Mine Action in the finalisation of the draft standards a User Focus Group has been formed out of the Mine Risk Education Working Group. The Group will be convened for the duration of the editing process and will comprise up to ten expert representatives from the field of mine action. In view of its responsibility in mine action coordination, UNMAS has been invited to act as the moderator of the Group.

## UFG RESPONSIBILITIES

- To review and revise draft standards and provide editing support to UNICEF and Cranfield Mine Action.
- To act as an *expert group* in Mine Risk Education in order to ensure public accountability and transparency during the draft finalisation process.
- Represent the views and interests of the wider field user community
- Agree to the editing process timetable and Focus Group composition (annexed).
- Generally consider draft standards and their application, making recommendations where necessary.

## METHOD OF WORK

Work on the drafts will primarily be done through email and should not normally represent more than one day of work per month. It is not foreseen that the group will need to meet more than once during the year, if at all.