

Gloor / Heiniger / Hebeisen
CH-1700 Freiburg, Schweiz

Evaluation of the Austrian Mine Action Programme 1998-2002

**Field Study about the projects supported by Austria
in Mozambique (since 1995)**

FINAL VERSION

Comissioned by the Austrian Ministry for Foreign Affairs,
Section development cooperation,
Division VII.6 (Evaluation, Inspection, control),
Vienna, Austria

October 2003

Contents

0. Executive summary	2
1. Introduction	3
2. Mine Action in Mozambique	4
2.1. The mine problem and its impact on development	4
2.2. Mine Action: actors and operators	4
2.3. The National Mine Action Plan (2002-2006)	5
3. The Austrian Mine Action Programme in Mozambique	6
3.1. Overview of the Austrian contribution to Mine Action	6
<i>Inventory of Mine Action Projects in Mozambique (table)</i>	7
3.3. The programme of the Austrian Cooperation in Mozambique	10
4. Multilateral Contribution: Support to UNDP Mine Action Programme	11
4.1. Objectives	11
4.2. Selection of Projects	11
4.3. Selection of Partners	12
4.4. Roles / Modes of cooperation	13
4.5. Results	13
4.6. Evaluation	14
4.7. Local Capacity Building, Sustainability, Gender	14
4.8. Relevance of Projects / Lessons learnt	14
5. Bilateral Contribution: Demining Sofala (DESSOF)	15
5.1. Objectives / Mine Action Approach	15
5.2. Selection of Projects	16
5.3. Selection of Partners	16
5.4. Roles / Modes of cooperation	17
5.5. Results	17
5.6. Evaluation	18
5.7. Local Capacity Building, Sustainability, Gender	18
5.8. Relevance of Projects / Lessons learnt	19
6. Organisation of Programme	19
7. Recommendations for the future	20

Annexes

I.	List of Acronyms
II.	Programme of field study with list of interlocutors
III.	Email to UNDP
IV.	Answer of UNDP
V.	Documentation of Evaluation
VI.	Ideas on "Proximity Demining"

Executive Summary

OBJECTIVES OF FIELD STUDY: To assess the Austrian contribution to Mine Action in Mozambique, to describe and explain its strengths and weaknesses, to contextualise Mine Action in a broader development perspective and to use the outcomes of the study to give recommendations on a possible continuation of the mine action programme in Mozambique.

MINE PROBLEM AND ACTION IN MOZAMBIQUE: The mine problem in Mozambique has significantly decreased after almost ten years of mine clearance and awareness raising. However, the country remains mine affected, and mines still represent an obstacle to development. Accordingly, the need for Mine Action in Mozambique persists.

The National Demining Institute (IND) has the overall responsibility for Mine Action in Mozambique. By mandate, IND sets priorities in collaboration with relevant ministries and provinces, coordinates and controls Mine Action operations (of NGOs and companies). It also collects and administers mine data. The practice shows that coordination and control are still weak in Mozambique and mainly focused on demining. Mine risk education and mine victim assistance always have been rather separated than integrated fields. There are no remaining stockpiles.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MINE ACTION PROGRAMME OF AUSTRIA IN MOZAMBIQUE

- ◆ **Multilateral and bilateral contributions:** All in all around 3.3 Mio. USD have been spent in Mozambique by Austria, of which roughly two thirds on multilateral and one third on bilateral projects. Between 1995 and 2002, 2.1 Mio. USD were invested through multilateral channels, via UNDP and UNICEF. In a second phase, since 2001, so far 0.7 Mio. USD have been invested in the bilateral project DESSOF. In 1999, Austria donated 220 Mine detectors to the Mozambican Foreign Ministry for almost 0.5 Mio. Euro.
- ◆ **Geographical concentration:** Nearly the full investment of Austria was directed towards the Province of Sofala in the centre of Mozambique, which is the concentration area for the development programmes of Austria.
- ◆ **Organisation:** The selection and management of the projects were carried out to a large extent locally by DESSOF and IND. The leading agencies at HQ and UNDP played a limited role in monitoring and controlling of the operations and the financial spending. The Cooperation Office of Austria in Beira partly managed to accompany projects, especially in the case of DESSOF. All in all roles were not clearly defined.
- ◆ **Relevance and effectiveness:** The projects were relevant and corresponded to national priorities. Both the multilateral and the bilateral contribution achieved most of the objectives. However, DESSOF didn't manage to carry out demining activities as initially planned. Effectiveness could have been improved by accurate financial planning.
- ◆ **Capacity building, Sustainability, Gender:** DESSOF responded largely to criteria related to capacity building, sustainability and gender, as all of these aspects were not only addressed in the project documents, but also in the project implementation. In the case of the multilateral contributions, little can be concluded in that respect based on the available information.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Continue to support Mine Action in Mozambique**
2. **Integrate Mine Action into the Austrian Development Programme**
3. **Maintain Regional Concentration in Sofala**
4. **Strengthen monitoring and control of Mine Action**

The team recommends to provide assistance to the Austrian Cooperation in Mozambique, either by a local Mine Action programme officer or a regular support coming from a specialised consultant to

- select projects (help to identify project and to establish project documents)
- select partners (e.g. accompany demining authorities in defining criteria for selection)
- set up projects (organisation and structuring of Mine Action projects)
- monitoring and control (setting up reporting mechanisms and organise field visits)

1. Introduction

Background and orientation of the field study

The main goal of the field study is to describe the Austrian contribution to Mine Action in Mozambique, its strengths and weaknesses, and to contextualise this contribution not only within the mine action situation in Mozambique, but also in a development perspective, mainly with respect to the ongoing Austrian programme in Mozambique.

The study gives a short overview of the mine action situation in Mozambique, followed by an overview of the Austrian contributions to mine action, before going into the two main contributions, i.e. the co-funding of the UNDP Trust Fund for Mine Action in Mozambique, earmarked to Sofala (province in the centre of Mozambique, where Austria concentrates its cooperation) and the bilateral programme DESSOF to check and increase awareness as well as knowledge of the mine problem in affected districts in Sofala. Both contributions are evaluated along the same set of criteria (in accordance with the overall TOR for the evaluation). The study concludes with recommendations for the future.

The field study in Mozambique (March 2003), in conjunction with the field study in South-Eastern Europe (July 2003), complete the desk study of the Austrian Mine Action Programme since 1998 (November 2002). The evaluation process will conclude in a presentation about all the findings in September 2003 in the Austrian Ministry for Foreign Affairs (BMAA). The evaluation is to provide a systematic knowledge about Austria's contributions to Mine Action and the way they are managed. In addition an input is provided as to how to look at possible future activities in that field.

Programme, methodology and limits of the field study in Mozambique

The field visit, carried out 25-29 March 2003, was prepared by studying the documentation of Austria's mine action programme in Mozambique, provided by the BMAA and the Austrian Cooperation in Mozambique. This documentation, however, turned out to be limited to an extent that the team spent an important part of time with information gathering and comparing, since information were not only missing, but also sometimes differing from one stakeholder to another. This goes especially for the contribution to UNDP, of which a full track record couldn't be made available to the team. UNDP's explanations on the use of the Austrian funds, which the team received months after the field visit and after various requests, does not fully correspond to the documentation received from the BMAA. As to the mine detectors, which Austria through adc donated in 1999, and the contribution to an UNICEF Mine Action Programme in 1997: The team learnt of these contributions only after the visit; no documentation could be made available so far. As a consequence, the team will not elaborate further on these projects.

The first part of the programme consisted of a two-day field trip in Beira, including a project visit in the district Dondo, in order to meet the partners of the DESSOF Project. The representative of IND in Beira, Juma Diniz dos Caniras, joined the team during this time as a local expert. Various meetings were held, but important stakeholders could not be met: The former DESSOF Project manager and his deputy are out of reach and Christian Zeininger, the head of the Austrian Cooperation in Mozambique, had to leave the country right before the team's arrival. The team interviewed him separately before and after the field visit. adc is not represented in the field and was later on contacted by phone.

The second part of the programme took place in Maputo, focussing on the UNDP contribution. It included meetings with the current UNDP desk officer for mine action, the team of IND and the most important operator of the multilateral funding, EMD (Empresa Moçambicana de Desminagem). However, none of the interlocutors, except the deputy director of IND, had been in charge at the time the works were carried out. Accordingly, to track back all the details of the activities financed by Austria proved to be beyond potential. Additionally the time frame was challenging: A programme of this size and complexity can hardly be evaluated in-depth within four days.

2. Mine Action in Mozambique

2.1. The mine problem and its impact on development

Landmines in Mozambique are a legacy of almost thirty years of armed conflict, starting with the fight for independence against the Portuguese (1964-1974), and continuing with a civil war between the two major parties Frelimo and Renamo (1977-1992).

Based on the **Mozambique Landmine Impact Survey**, certified in 2001, it is estimated that (still today) more than 10 percent of the population are facing direct threats to their lives and livelihoods. The Impact Survey confirmed that the distribution of landmines and unexploded ordnances (UXOs) in the country is *large, geographically diffuse, and random*. The Survey measured in very basic terms the socio-economic 'blockages' presented by this irregular pattern of contamination and calculated that more than **1.7 million** people are directly affected by the existence of landmines. The Survey helped to identify **791 villages** that are still living with one or more **Suspected Mined Areas** in their vicinity. The total estimated number of mined areas in the country – which range in size from one square meter to over several square kilometres – is **1,374**. The data collected through the Survey process has been deposited in the **Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA)** database at the IND and provides a central point of departure for future Mine Action planning and management in Mozambique. Other findings of the Impact Survey include: Landmines and UXOs are found in all 10 provinces (123/128 districts) - At least **558 km²** are suspected of having some degree of contamination - There have been **172 known accidents** in the past two years - The most frequently *reported* blockages were: **a) agricultural Land** (464 communities, 950,000 persons, 369 km²); **b) roads** (231 communities, 369,000 persons); **non-Agricultural Land** used for hunting, gathering firewood, and other economic /cultural purposes (180 communities, 291,000 persons, 137 km²); access to **Drinking Water** (55 communities, 87,000 persons). The MLIS provides the names and coordinates of the 791 villages and their corresponding SMAs. The IND has built on this information, and the mine impact score which ranks villages as either **High, Medium, or Low Impact**, to develop a set of specific targets for the 2002-2006 National Mine Action Plan (NAMP)."

2.2. Mine Action: actors and operations

The UN mission (**UNOMOZ**) was present from 1992 to 1994 to oversee the transition period. The UN was however not successful in helping rapidly build up coordination and local capacity in Mine Action. When UNOMOZ left in December 1994, no authority was in place to take over coordination. And only end of 1994 the UN's Accelerated Demining Programme (**ADP**) started (in the southern provinces). - After the democratic elections in 1994, the first government declared the clearance of landmines and UXO's as one of the necessary premises for implementation of the Government's programme related to the socio-economic rehabilitation of the country. In 1995, the *National Demining Commission (CND)* was established, without much success in defining and implementing effectively policies, strategies and organisation of the National Mine Action. 1999 CND was replaced by the *National Demining Institute (IND)* to put a more effective institution in place. The mandate of the IND is *to successfully establish and develop a coordination, supervision and management mechanism, in close cooperation with all other relevant organisations and agencies, to ensure the cost-effective execution of a National Mine Action Plan*. In 1999, the Government of Mozambique signed the "Mine Ban Treaty" (MBT, also known as Ottawa Convention). More and more **NGOs and commercial actors** had in the meantime entered the Mine Action sector. The main operators are the Accelerated Demining Programme (ADP) in the South (Maputo, Gaza, Inhambane), Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) in the Center (Sofala, Manica, Tete) and HALO Trust in the North (Zambezia, Nampula, Cabo Delgado, Niassa). Additionally there are 12 *commercial* mine clearance contractors and 2 quality assurance companies operating in Mozambique, of which 8 are Mozambican registered companies. The *Armed Forces of Mozambique (FADM)* play a limited role in the area of mine

clearance (not being one of the accredited regular operators) and a crucial role in stockpile destruction. The latter was accomplished in February this year.

2.3. The National Mine Action Plan (2002-2006)

In keeping with national priority concerns, mainly to reduce absolute poverty, the National Mine Action Plan (NMAP) adopts a '**development orientated**' approach that seeks to maximise the socio-economic impact and benefit of Mine Action in Mozambique by integrating its program framework into the Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty (PARPA) strategy. A second function of the Plan is to provide operators with a rationale **set of national priorities** that will more effectively target Mine Action (...). Thirdly, the NMAP will act as the blueprint for all future **detailed Annual Work Plans** prepared by the National Demining Institute (IND) who are responsible for the overall management and administration of Mine Action in the country. "There are five related components to Mine Action, namely: i) Mine Risk Education, ii) Surveys & Mine Clearance, iii) Victim Assistance, iv) Stockpile Destruction, and v) Advocacy. An objective in the designing of the NMAP was to integrate and operationalize all five of these elements".

The goals of the NMAP are ambitious: The following "Impact Free Milestones 2002-2006" should be achieved: "a) all High and Medium Impact Sites cleared; b) All UXOs destroyed; c) All Existing Stockpiles destroyed; d) Remaining Low Impact Areas surveyed and marked; e) Fully Operational National Mine Risk Education/Marking Programme; f) Long-term Survivor and Victim Assistance Programmes established." The Governments overall objective is to declare Mozambique "*mine impact free*" by 2009.

The NMAP underlines that, to prioritise Mine Action, "it must be remembered that the **exact size** of each suspected mine area needs still to be determined as this was not part of the Survey's terms of reference. Therefore, the NMAP priority list is driven by the rationale that there is an urgent need to quickly undertake area reduction of the 1,374 suspected areas through further **Analysis** and **Technical Surveys** followed by comprehensive **Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)**, **Mine Clearance**, and **Mine Risk Education (MRE)** programmes."

Observations:

- On paper, the **national coordination** is existing, led by IND, and including donors and operators: the Mine Action Plan is related to the Mine Ban Treaty; international standards have been translated and adapted into National Mine Action Standards (NMAS); operators must respect the NMAS to get accredited; the integration of mine action into development is conceptually visible; mine action is defined as an integrated area, combining all mine action; a national Level 1 Survey was carried out; annual plans are available, on national and on provincial level; UNDP invests in capacity-building of the IND to support efficient and effective implementation of its mandate (i.e. mainly by seconding several technical advisors).
- In practise, the national coordination and control of mine action witness a number of ongoing **challenges**, which seem, despite the increasing experience, not to be easily overcome. The Impact Survey that should serve as a reference for the mine problem as well as action, is contested in the mine action community and caused confusion as to the location and the number of mine fields; it doesn't match with all the existing mine data collected by the operators. The prioritisation nowadays involves provincial governments and operators, however, the affected communities have only a little say. Mine action operations still sometimes happen to be unknown to the national coordination body IND. As regards the quality control, IND has so far very limited capacity to check the works in the field. Little has been done so far from the official side to reduce the suspected area by a Level 2 Survey, which would help to save funds. Last but not least, corruption is a widely known phenomenon in Mozambique, including also the Mine Action sector.

3. The Austrian Programme in Mozambique

3.1. Overview of the Austrian contribution to Mine Action (see also table)

The Austrian Mine Action Programme in Mozambique goes back to **1995** when Austria signed an agreement over **900'000 USD** with **UNDP** for the support of Mine Action in Mozambique for the years 1996 and 1997 through the UN Trust Fund for Mine Action, administered by UNDP. The Agreement was renewed in July **1997** with additional 9'900'000 ATS / **765'602 USD** for Mine Action in 1997, 1998 and 1999.¹

In **2000** Austria decided on a bilateral contribution to Mine Action in Sofala through the Austrian NGO adc and the locally established project **DESSOF** (Desminage Sofala) for **724'504 Euro** to be spent in a period of approximately a year.

All the funds of both the multilateral and the bilateral contribution have been used so far for **Mine Action in the Province of Sofala**, where most of Austria's development activities in Mozambique take place. The activities aimed at analysing the mine problem (**impact survey**) as well as at **mine risk education** / awareness raising and **mine clearance** in priority areas for mine action in the Province of Sofala.

The programme included many **local partners** for demining, survey and awareness. All the activities have been carried out in close cooperation with the national demining authority IND (earlier: CND or MINEC), especially the IND Delegation in Beira, which was to be capacitated by the programme. Implementing partners have been selected through a public tendering / proposal call. Quality assurance mechanisms to accompany and control the activities were established and used.

Mine Action in Mozambique funded by Austria started in 1998 and ended by the end of last year. Currently **no activities are ongoing**.

Characteristics

- ◆ Geographical concentration in the Province of Sofala;
- ◆ Link to Austrian development programme existing, but loose;
- ◆ Involvement of IND in both contributions relatively high;
- ◆ Besides geographical focus and IND involvement no connection between the multilateral and bilateral contribution;
- ◆ Mine Victim Assistance not part of the programme;
- ◆ Broad partnerships.

¹ The money for the UNDP Trust Fund probably originated from the Development Budget for MOZ, not the general Mine Action Budget. The Austrian Mine Action Fund only was established in 1998.

Inventory of Mine Action Projects in Mozambique supported by Austria 1995–2003²

A) Multilateral contribution: Support to UNDP Trust Fund on mine clearance for Mozambique

Contribution of 1995, goal: Funding of ADP through UNDP for clearance of priority areas to be identified by Austria. Contract over 900'000 USD (corresponding at the time to 9 Mio. ATS; according to project list, Austria spent on this project 668'516 Euro)

Contribution of 1997, goal: "The overall objective of this project is to carry out demining conducive to yielding optimal socio-economic impact for the population of mine affected areas of the Province of Sofala." (Project Document, UNDP). Contract over 765'600 USD (corresponding at the time to 9,9 Mio. ATS; according to the project list, Austria spent on this project 719'467 Euro)

Total funds released by BMaA: 1'387'983 Euro

Total funds received by UNDP: 1'665'600 USD (*IND indicates 1'356'703 USD*)

Total funds spent until 31/12 2002: 1'314'715 USD (*not including contribution to clearance of Power line (officially a EU project) and 3% UNDP adm. costs*)

Year(s)	Project	Project Partners	Objectives	Results	Costs (spent) + 3% contr. To UNDP = app. 39'441
1998–1999	Level 1/ 2 survey Sofala	UNDP, CND; Implementer: MineTech	Clearance of priority areas in Sofala	Identification of targets (areas to be demined)	308'898 USD: Mine Tech
2000	Demining Sofala 1	UNDP – IND; Implementers: EMD, Qualitas	Clearance of priority areas in Sofala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearance of 11 targets (of which 2 partially) in the Districts of Buzi, Marromeu, Chibabava • 1'596'075 m² (of which 123 km of roads) cleared • 1'119 mines and 102 UXO's cleared 	615'000 USD: EMD 165'096 USD: Qualitas
2000-2001	Demining Sofala 2	UNDP, IND; Implementers:	Clearance of priority areas in Sofala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of clearance of 2 targets in the same districts 	101'831 USD: EMD 23'890 USD: Qualitas

² Only a part of the basic project documents could be made available to the team. Important stakeholders/partners have been unreachable for any form of interview. All the projects are closed and therefore couldn't be visited. The short time of four days didn't allow for more than one random impact survey in a village. Accordingly, the teams capacity to give an in-depth view and opinion of the program is limited. Wrong perceptions and errors in data might occur even after various checkings. For more information about the amounts released by Austria and spent by UNDP see p. 11ff.

Evaluation of the Mine Action Projects in Mozambique, supported by Austria 1995-2002

		EMD, Qualitas		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 122'249 m² cleared 	
2001-2002	Demining Power line Mavusi – Nhamatanda (Sofala)	UNDP, IND; Implementers: EMD, Qualitas	Clearance to enable maintenance of power line	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 425'598 m² cleared • 5'113 mines cleared • 28km power line (91 pylons) cleared • 40.9 km access routes cleared 	<i>Total amount of 396'000, but contribution of Austria, if there was one, unclear</i>
2002	Capacity Building IND Beira	UNDP, IND HQ (Maputo)	Capacity Building IND Beira	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure (office etc.) exists • Team in place • IND Beira is carrying out its functions 	100'000 USD: IND

B) Bilateral Contribution: Support to Mine awareness and surveys, Sofala (DESSOF).

Goal: Improved quality of life through increased freedom from mines for rural population in the Province of Sofala, focus on supporting IND as a national co-ordination body. Capacity building for IND, establishment of an efficient mine action and demining mechanism, through exchange of information (Project document). Contract over 724'504 Euro.

Total funds released by BMaA per 24/4/03: 652'054 Euro
Total funds received by adc up to 31/12/02: 381'665 Euro
Total funds spent until 31/12/02: 537'015 Euro

Year(s)	Project	Project Partners	Objectives	Results	Costs (spent)
2001-2002	DESSOF Studies about peoples perception of mine situation	Adc Vienna, DESSOF adc office Beira; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universidade Catolica de Mocambique • UP-Beira, Dept. de Geografica • ARPAC 	Peoples perception of mine situation Dissemination	2 studies written about impact of landmines on local population and recommendations to solve the problems from peoples view (e.g. to clear mines on sacred places is a top priority)	115'358 Euro: Studies (93'750 USD according to contracts)
2002	DESSOF Mine awareness, surveys Sofala (Selected areas in the districts of Buzi, Cherin-goma, Caia, Dondo and Mar-	Adc Vienna, DESSOF adc office Beira; Local implementers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Afrovita • Red Cross • Zaone • CCQ • CEPLAGA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mine awareness campaigns • Institution building of mine committees • Evaluation of previous awareness campaigns • Improvement of communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mine awareness campaigns (seminars, theatre, music, posters etc.) of population about danger/management of mines and UXO's • Local areas of Mines and UXO's are newly identified, marked and documented (local maps) 	42'274 Euro: adc project management 182'574 Euro: DESSOF office Beira 178'319 Euro: "Proposal Call (Projects of local implementers/NGOs) - 125'000 USD according to contracts 18'489 Euro: Demining (no indi-

Evaluation of the Mine Action Projects in Mozambique, supported by Austria 1995-2002

	romeu)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radio Mozambique 	<p>mechanism regarding mines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of all stakeholder (communities, NGOs, authorities) • Increasing of mine free zones 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mine committees set up in the targeted communities • Exchange between DESSOF partners, IND and provincial/district authorities (seminars) • Impact of mine awareness campaigns analysed 	<i>ation of demining in documentation)</i>
--	--------	--	---	---	--

C) Other Contributions: The following projects do not appear in the overview of the Austrian Mine Action Budget. The team was informed about their existence only after the field study. As a consequence, these projects haven't been evaluated.

- "Prevention and Response to Mine Accidents in Mozambique, Proximity Demining, Mine Awareness Campaign and Rehabilitation of Amputees in Manica and Sofala Province", UNICEF, 538'769 USD, 1.1.1997-30.7.1998. No further information available.
- 220 mine detectors for 476'733 Euro through adc, donation to ADP on behalf of the Foreign Ministries of Austria and Mozambique, 1999. The director of ADP (Accelerated Demining Programme) confirmed reception of the detectors in 1999 and stressed the usefulness of the donation for ADP's operations in the last years.

3.2. The programme of the Austrian Cooperation in Mozambique/Sofala

The Austrian development programme is geographically concentrated on the **Province of Sofala** (since 1993/95; before it was Maputo), since 1996 namely in the 2 concentration districts/sub regions of Cheringoma and Buzi ("Landesprogramm 1996-98", p. 13). Although the main focus of the country programme 1996-98 was on reconstruction and peacebuilding, Mine Action was not given any prominent place in the concept. The mine problem is only mentioned with a few sentences: Since 1996 one goal of the Austrian Cooperation was to contribute to "reconstruction, resettlement and reintegration", whereby the mine contamination was named as one of the main problems (p. 15). Contribution to **demining** (to UNDP / building up of a national demining structure / earmarked to Sofala) is mentioned as **one instrument** under "Programmhilfe" **since 1996** (p. 21).

The country programme 1999-2001 confirmed the concentration on Sofala (now mainly in the districts of Buzi and Marromeu) and the 4 working sectors, namely promotion of democracy/decentralisation, water, agriculture and small/middle sized enterprises. Interestingly "demining" was prominently presented as an element for the "continuum" between reconstruction and development (p. 4). Under "strategy" demining appears as an integrated component of reconstruction ("sektorintegrierte 'Wiederaufbau-Komponente' Entminung"). Again demining is mentioned also under "activities": demining and access to infrastructure and natural resources ("Entminung und Erreichbarkeit von Infrastruktur und Naturressourcen"). Under "financial resources" and "budget" however, there is no mention of Mine Action.

The country programme 2002-2004 reflects similar arguments regarding mine action. The main focus is on **rural development (poverty reduction) and decentralisation**. Mine Action is explicitly mentioned under the programme on decentralisation (p.16), but is not included in the overall budget table.

Observations:

- So far the **Mine Action activities are not an integrated part of the Austrian programme in Mozambique**. They seem to have more or less "slipped" in the form of a few sentences, but without integration in strategy and implementation. This reflects of course the situation in the overall context of the Austrian Mine Action programme, which so far has been planned and implemented apart from the ÖEZA structures.
- On the other hand, the **geographic concentration of Mine Action (to Sofala)** could be achieved successfully. In addition, the personnel of the **ÖEZA in the field plaid an active role** in the mine action programmes, particularly in the DESSOF. We therefore observe a transition period during which already in reality the ÖEZA structures (Mozambique) became more involved in the Austrian Mine Action Programme. This seems even more justified, as Austria contributes only 1 percent of all donor-funding going to Mozambique (LP 2002-04, p.14). **Pooling** of the scarce resources is a must for a small player.

4. Multilateral Contribution: Support to the UNDP Mine Action Programme

4.1. Objectives

Austria made two multilateral contributions to the **UNDP Trust Fund for Mine Action in Mozambique in 1995 and 1997** with a total amount of **1'665'600 USD**.

The means of the first contribution 900'000 USD in **1995** were intended to be "used to **clear areas indicated by the Austrian Development Cooperation**, represented by its coordinator in Beira", as stated in the agreement, signed 19 December 1995. "If no request will be made within these limits, UNDP is free to utilise the funds for other activities according to the project document". However, according to the available track records, no money was spent until the end of 1997.

The second contribution of 765'602 USD would be used, according to the agreements signed 15 July **1997**, "to **clear areas according to priorities decided by the National Demining Commission, with acceptance from the Austrian Development Cooperation**, represented by its coordinator in Beira, if requested. If no request will be made within 31 December 1998, UNDP is free to utilise the funds for other activities in accordance with the purposes laid down in the project document". The project document sets the objective "to carry out demining conducive to **yielding optimal socio-economic impact** for the population of mine-affected areas in the Province of Sofala" within twelve months in the mine-affected districts of Buzi, Chibabawa, Cheringoma and Marromeu.

Observations:

- The **rational** for the contribution to UNDP in 1995 and 1997, apart from the general intention to finance mine action in Mozambique, remains unclear. In July 1995, Austrian's former Secretary of State announced a contribution of ATS 10 Mio. for Demining in Mozambique, 9 Mio. for demining in the focus areas of the Austrian Cooperation, 1 Mio. for the capacity-building of the Mine Clearance Commission, an objective that later on was covered by DESSOF. Austria also wanted to contribute to the development and the coordination of a **national demining plan**, which, to our knowledge, only was established in 2001.
- The 1995 contribution originally was intended for **ADP**. However, as a consequence of the division of labour into geographical areas, ADP was not allowed to work in the Province of Sofala. And NPA, the designated demining organisation for Sofala, didn't, according to the documents, correspond to UNDP criteria. This created additional **deadlocks and delay**.
- Reasons for another contribution in 1997 were explained as an intention to provide **continuity**. However, by the end of 1997, the 1995 contribution hadn't been spent so far. Operations only started in 1998. In view of that it is not clear as to what should have been continued.

4.2. Selection of Projects

Concluding from the thin compilation of written and oral statements made by involved partners, Austrian money given to UNDP has been spent for

- 1) a **survey in the Province of Sofala**
- 2) **demining in the Sofala districts Buzi, Marromeu and Chibabava**
- 3) the demining of a **part of the Mavusi–Nhamatanda Power line**
- 4) the **financial support of the IND office in Beira**.

However, in most of the documents related to these projects (proposals, contracts, reports) **hardly any reference is made to Austria**. In the case of the demining of the Mavusi-Nhamatanda Power line, only the **European Union** is mentioned as a donor. As a consequence

the team presumes that Austria co-financed this project together with the EU. In the UNDP accounts, the Austrian money hasn't been clearly earmarked, but is probably related to budget post "**Sofala Demining**". In view of these circumstances, the following assessment is based on the assumption that the Austrian contribution to UNDP was used for the implementation of the projects listed above.

The support of the **IND office in Beira** was originally planned in the framework of the DESSOF project, but finally financed with the help of remaining funds in the UN Trust Fund. Given that this contribution for the capacity-building of IND Beira relates to the **concept of DESSOF**, it was assessed in the corresponding context and therefore will be discussed below.

Priorities for demining within the Province were defined by the Government respectively CND/IND. The team is not aware of any consultation process during the selection of the demining sites that would have included the donor or affected communities.

The **first project**, the **Impact Survey**, served as an indicator for the selection of sites to be cleared. Focus was given to streets and agricultural land, according to national priorities. No survey report could be made available to the team.

The **second project**, the **demining of districts of Buzi, Marromeu and Chibabava** (including extension of project), was based on the outcome of the survey and accordingly a logical follow-up project of the first one.

The **third project**, the **demining of the power line** is said to be a high priority of the Government. The power line provides Beira with electricity, and the remaining mines from the war hindered maintenance of this important infrastructure.

Observations:

- As to the selection of projects, **no information was provided that shows evidence that Austria had been involved in identifying projects.** However, demining in Sofala was pushed and promoted by the fact that Austria indicated its priorities in this province. In the case of the first two projects even a merger of districts relative for the Austrian development programme and the demining projects could be achieved.
- **The Survey** as a first step permitted to improve knowledge about needs in the field, helped to reduce the suspected area and therefore money. It can be considered as a **useful first step to demining.**
- The comments of the operators and the Technical Advisor of IND indicate that the **scope and the requested methodology** for project 3) were not well defined in the tendering documents for the clearance of the Mavusi–Nhamatanda Power line.

4.3. Selection of Partners

The partner for the survey was selected through a **tendering process** ("Request of Proposal" RfP), advertised in various Mozambican, South African and Zimbabwean newspapers. Out of four proposals, Mine-Tech was chosen by the "CND/UNDP Joint Evaluation Committee".

Hannes Hauser, the Austrian Coordinator in Mozambique at the time, mentions in his report of 8 September 1998 that the tendering criteria for the survey were not clearly defined. He also mentions that **Minec-Tech** was a slow, but experienced operator. He recommends for the future the use of a smaller, more flexible demining capacity in the Province, such as Handicap International.

The tender documents for the demining of selected districts in Sofala have been elaborated by **CND and UNDP together.** They are commonly mentioned in the documentation as responsible organisations. The documentation is comprehensive, i.e. describe procedures, conditions to be fulfilled by the competitors for the tender, detailed criteria for selection, the demining sites (targets), required demining methodology.

No documentation was available on the tendering for the Mavusi-Nhamatanda Power line.

Selected partners:

- Minetech for Survey
- EMD (Empresa Moçambicana de Desminage LDA) for demining
- Qualitas LDA for Quality assurance

Observations:

- **The involvement of Austria** in the selection of partners was limited.
- Information on the practical **assessment of the operators**, i.e. concrete reasons for having selected the partners listed above, could not be identified.
- The operators that were selected for the demining are all **commercial companies**.
- In principal a useful **division of roles** between different organisations carrying out survey, demining and quality control can be observed.
- The tender documentation is surprisingly substantial in comparison to many other similar documents in Mozambican.
- According to the selected operator for **clearance of the Mavusi–Nhamatanda Power line**, EMD, and the analysis of the implementation as it is reflected in various written exchanges, a lack of specifications as to the actual mine problem and appropriate demining methodology can be notified.

4.4. Roles/Modes of cooperation

CND/IND took the responsibility for the selection of projects and partner as well as for monitoring and control of the project implementation together with UNDP. Contracts were signed between the implementing agencies and CND/IND. The role of Austria was consultative, but not decisive.

Observations:

- UNDP has a responsibility for **financial control**, but a financial report was neither presented to the team by UNDP nor by the donor. This might explain the confusion with regard to the actual contribution, the spending made to and the actual expenses by the UNDP Trust Fund. According to the BMaA accounts, 1'387'983 Euro were released so far. According to UNDP accounts there were 1,665 Mio. USD for Demining Sofala available (most probably provided by Austria). The UNDP chief technical advisor speaks of 1,356 Mio. USD coming from Austria (see email attached).
- The **capacity of CND/IND** to tender projects, to select appropriate partners, to control the works and to administer money is known to be limited up to today. In addition, the area of mine action faces serious problems of corruption. Despite this background and the fact that a lot of money has been invested, UNDP and the donor disposed of limited, if any, monitoring and controlling mechanisms.

4.5. Results

See table above

Observation:

- Cleared m² and landmines/UXO are the only results available. They indicate little about **impact**. The time frame of evaluation didn't allow for an impact assessment in the field. Accordingly, the team is not in a position to make any statements about the socio-economic impact of the projects. However, as reported in the newspaper *diario de mocambique*, 21 March 2003, parts of the demined power line (project 3) have since been re-established.

4.6. Evaluation

The control of the quality of works of EMD was carried out by **Qualitas LDA**, a quality control company mandated by the IND. To the knowledge of the team, none of the leading partner agencies (UNDP, IND/CNE) or the donor evaluated the projects.

Observation:

- The quality of the operator and its operations is evaluated during the tendering process and through a QA company – that corresponds to the **normal procedures** in Mozambique and elsewhere.

4.7. Local Capacity Building, Sustainability, Gender

The team assumes that **capacity-building** was realised through the use of local deminers and by the fact that IND, which needs capacity-building, had the overall responsibility for the projects and as a consequence learnt on the job.

The **gender** aspect hasn't been addressed by the projects, whether intentionally nor by chance.

Observations:

- **No specific information** was given in relation to these aspects in any document.
- **Sustainability** is a difficult term in mine clearance. As soon as a minefield has been cleared successfully, the project closes and sustainability (if the term is appropriate in this case) consists of the use of the cleared area. However, sustainability can be questioned in project 3), given that it could not be finalised with the provided money.

4.8. Relevance of Projects/Lessons learnt

- ◆ The projects financed with a contribution to UN Trust Fund are **relevant** with respect to national priorities for demining, especially the demining of the Mavusi–Nhamatanda Power line.
- ◆ The survey and the demining allowed for a **safer environment** in the Province of Sofala.
- ◆ The Austrian contribution for Mine Action in the Province of Sofala is **significant**, compared to other donors, in terms of money as well as in terms of cleared m². Accordingly, it can be said that the concentration of funds for the Province of Sofala proved to be important to that effect. Yet donors such as the US (through the demining organisation Ronco) or Norway (through the demining NGO Norwegian People's Aid) still have, even in Sofala, in terms of financing, a more important role.
- ◆ The selection of projects and especially of partners was realised with **little involvement** of various stakeholders.
- ◆ **Gender, sustainability and peace-building** have been addressed to a very **limited** extent by the projects.
- ◆ Given the low degree of information that could be provided by UNDP and the donor on the projects analysed above, the team concludes that **monitoring and control has been carried on a very modest level**. However, no evidence is known to the evaluators that there was a misuse of funds.

5. Bilateral Programme: Demining Sofala (DESSOF)

Preliminary remarks: The team could not, despite various attempts, interview the programme head of DESSOF, Goncalo Antonio Ferrao Junior, or his deputy Jose Ferreira Antonio. Both were released by the end of 2002 from the programme, among other reasons for the abuse of funds. As a consequence, the view of crucial stakeholders in the programme is missing in the present evaluation. For this reason and because of an ongoing assessment on financial irregularities, and also because it is beyond the mandate of the evaluation, the team will not touch upon the financial problems of DESSOF.

Telephone interviews with Hans H. Bichler, the responsible for DESSOF within adc, as well as with Christian Zeininger, the head of the Austrian Cooperation in Mozambique, brought some additional light into the research after the field study.

5.1. Objectives / Mine Action Approach

The bilateral contribution to Mine Action in the Province of Sofala is based on a contract and an according proposal agreed between the BmaA and **adc Austria**, an NGO little experienced in mine action. The duration of the project was initially defined for the period 1.11.2000 to 30.4.2002, but during 2002 prolonged until the **end of 2003**. The budget of **724'504 Euros** originally covered the **support to IND Beira, a socio-economic impact study, MRE, demining, implementing structures in the field and monitoring capacity in Vienna**.

The overall aim of the project proposal is defined as a **contribution to free the rural areas of the province of Sofala from mines by an increased coordination capacity of IND**. Focus should be given to the establishment of mine action and demining mechanisms for the efficient flow of information on mines.

The objectives in the field as well as the approach and the methodology partly originated from the International Development Research Centre (**IDRC** – based in South Africa), i.e. from an idea of his former director Olaf Jurgensen. When Jurgensen left the IDRC to become the Chief Technical Advisor of the IND, the participation of IDRC in evolving the programme stopped.

Together with the Austrian Cooperation in Beira, adc established the programme structures called **DESSOF** (desminagem Sofala) and recruited a coordinator (Ferrao). The coordinator hired additional staff and started to develop and implement the programme. DESSOF worked closely with the **IND office in Beira**, with provincial authorities and selected NGOs. DESSOF, as it comes out of the documents and interviews, was guided by principles of local **ownership and participation**, and it intended to respond to needs on the grass-root level.

As a result of this process, the objectives in the field finally **focused on**

- **studies about the impact of mines and MRE as well as the perception of the mine problem in rural areas**
- **MRE in affected areas**
- **data collection including effective information exchange, managed by local structures (mainly IND office in Beira and police).**

Observations:

- The **priorities** set in the proposal that was submitted by adc to BmaA slightly differ from the priorities set in the field by DESSOF, but the main objectives remained. The team assumes that priorities in the field came out of a **participatory planning process** among the different stakeholders.
- To **free rural areas from mines** appears as an objective in most of the background documents and is indirectly also mentioned in the contracts. However, demining as such disappeared as an objective during the process of implementation. As a matter of fact, demining

was part of the original budget, but not carried out with DESSOF or other funds. Most of the mines/UXOs identified by the programme haven't been cleared so far. Only coincidentally a small number of mines were cleared with the help of FADM upon spontaneous requests of some of the partners.

- **Programme documents of DESSOF** are difficult to understand and not very clear regarding concrete aims and obligations, as implementing partners stressed. They reflect academic, certainly interesting brainwork, unfortunately presented in a rather unsystematic, hardly operational way. The objectives set out in the contracts between DESSOF and the partners for the proposal call can be given as an example: On the one hand, objectives are as general as poverty reduction and positive socio-economic impact, on the other hand as specific as to reach 80% of the adults in the targeted areas for MRE – needless to say that the **partners weren't in a position to respond to all obligations**.

5.2. Selection of Projects

The starting point for the selection of the projects was the Austrian programme itself: The bilateral contribution to mine action should be focussed, as in the case of the multilateral contribution, to the **Province of Sofala**, and if possible be combined with the existing programme. The impact study in the Province of Manica is an exception to this principle.

A second criteria for the project selection were the **national priorities as defined by the GoM**. Mine Action along the railway between Caia and Beira was indicated by IND to be a priority. In addition, the programme should respond to **local needs**, which were assessed in the first project, i.e. the impact studies.

The programme launched MRE projects in the districts of Buzi, Cheringoma, Caia, Dondo and Marromeu in Sofala Province, whereby the concrete activities should be chosen within a **participatory process** including the selected partners.

Observations:

- On the one hand, DESSOF responded to the general idea to integrate mine action into or at least to combine it with the Austrian cooperation programme in Mozambique. Accordingly, DESSOF mainly concentrated on Sofala. On the other hand, mine action never entered the overall **strategy** of the Austrian cooperation in Mozambique.
- Whilst the impact studies covered the district of Buzi, Gorongosa in Sofala Province as well as the districts of Gondola and Sussundenga in Manica Province, the MRE projects focus on Buzi, Cheringoma, Caia, Dondo and Marromeu in Sofala. Accordingly, only the results regarding Buzi of the impact study could be used for the MRE work. The **synergies** between phase I (impact studies) and phase II (proposal call) of DESSOF can therefore be considered to be rather weak.

5.3. Selection of Partners

In the case of the **impact studies**, the International Development Research Centre (**IDRC**) suggested the partners, ARPAC together with the Universidade Catolica and the Universidade Pedagogica, having developed approach and methodology of the studies beforehand with them.

As to the **MRE-Projects**, DESSOF organised a **consultation seminar** on 21 September 2001, in which the basic ideas and objectives were presented to potential partners. About a month later, DESSOF advertised the **proposal call** ("concurso publico") in the newspaper whereby interested partners could submit their proposals. A **selection committee**, composed by members of DESSOF and IND Beira, established selection criteria and assessed the proposals and

partners accordingly. However, the results of this assessment do not exactly correspond to the final selection of partners, which were:

- **Afrovita, Zaone and Cruz Vermelha (the Red Cross) for MRE**
- **Ceplaga and CCQ for the evaluation of MRE**
- **Radio Mocambique for the broadcasting of MRE-campaigns**

Observations:

- DESSOF selected partners together with the IND. However, the IND representatives in Beira claimed little responsibility in the selection of partners, giving the final **decision making** role to DESSOF. As the team could not talk to Ferrao or Ferreira, the major part of the rationale behind the partner selection remains unknown.
- As to the impact studies, partners were, according to the information given by Zeininger, chosen by **IDRC**.

5.4. Roles/Modes of cooperation

adc set up a local project management structure under the name of DESSOF. DESSOF, based in Beira, accompanied the impact studies, organised and defined the proposal call, chose the NGOs and projects in partnership with the IND, signed contracts with partners, monitored the activities together with IND Beira and was responsible for the financial administration of the project funding. Accordingly, **DESSOF had most of the responsibility**.

Observations:

- It can be observed that DESSOF responded to a far-reaching extent to the need of **local ownership**. The degree of involvement of adc was limited to field trips, approval of reports and the control of accounts, given that **adc has no representation** in the field.
- Role and responsibility of the **Austrian Cooperation Office** hasn't been defined so far. Despite the lack of any mandate, it seems that it initiated many ideas, was involved somehow in most of the project decisions and phases and all in all accompanied DESSOF as far as time allowed.

5.5. Results

See table above

The activities were basically carried out as planned, i.e. along the lines of reference documents defined by DESSOF. The programme was, according to all stakeholders, a **success**, but as expressed by the same stakeholders, **not meeting the strongest need**, i.e. demining. Irregularities in the financial management created an ambiguous perception of the programme among partners and in public.

Positive side effects of these activities, not being defined as immediate objectives in the local project documents, are

- the building of capacities within IND by integrating IND in the programme development and monitoring;
- the sporadic and almost spontaneous demining organised by some operators;
- the awareness raising within the public opinion and IND in Maputo for the specific problem of mines in rural areas;
- the development of creative approaches regarding the impact studies and the proposal calls.

The impact studies should have, according to oral agreements with UNDP, been published in the framework of a UN occasional paper. However, the idea could not be realised so far.

Observations:

- The reported results in the DESSOF Final-Annual Report 2002, which were taken up by adc in its last report, do not correspond to the **records of the implementing partners**. To give an example: These partners have generally not provided data as to e.g. the percentage of reached adults by MRE.
- All in all, the results of DESSOF (except the financial administration of DESSOF and the lack of demining activities) were commented by all interlocutors as **very positive**.

5.6. Evaluation

DESSOF organised a **workshop** with all the partners on 9 April 2002 to exchange experiences and lessons learnt. Partners presented their work along the first reports and concluded for the follow-up. IND has the overall responsibility to check the work in the field. It disposes of data as to the programme's results and provided the team with **short evaluation reports**.

Observations:

- The DESSOF Final-Annual Report 2002 mentions an **evaluation system**, but the concrete form and use of it remains unclear.
- There was **no evaluation carried out by adc or Austria**.

5.7. Local Capacity Building, Sustainability, Gender

Local capacity-building, sustainability and gender were each a focal point in the programme:

- adc's project proposal puts the capacity-building of IND in the centre of the objectives. Although Austria finally didn't financially support the **IND office in Beira** through DESSOF (but through UNDP) DESSOF provided space for IND to learn on the job. In addition, the programme reinforced IND's role for data management and coordination of mine action by developing activities and partnerships, which were directed towards the respect for IND's responsibilities. The approach of DESSOF also increased **ownership and capacity of village, district and provincial authorities** to deal with the mine/UXO problem, stressing the role of the police for human security also in relation to mine action. These outcomes can be considered as positive spillovers of the practical programme work.
- Given the high level of local ownership and capacity provided by DESSOF, the programme proved to **correspond strongly to the principle of sustainability**. However, **the programme has not lasted long enough to maintain the positive momentum**. Stakeholders agree on the need to continue activities, along the lines of the former project, in other affected districts. In particular stakeholders stress the fact that mines and UXOs have been identified by the project, but in most of the cases not destroyed. Accordingly, the project could neither fully address the mine/UXO problem nor guarantee sustainability by providing nor helping to provide capacity to "finish the job".
- **Women** are explicitly mentioned in the documents both as specific target groups for the impact survey and MRE as well as for providing MRE as local partners. The impact survey reflects on the specific problems of mines for women. The MRE partners worked partly with and for women groups. Accordingly it is to be concluded that gender issues were addressed both in the conceptualisation as well as in the implementation of the activities.

5.8. Relevance of programme/ Lessons learnt

- ◆ The programme can be considered to be **highly relevant** for the reason that
 - it responded to a problem that has been neglected so far, i.e. the mine contamination in rural areas, especially in villages close to important infrastructures;
 - it responded to the need of IND for capacity-building in the central region;
 - it created a locally based and owned approach, which allows for more adapted needs assessment and to accurate response to needs;
 - the approaches chosen for the impact study and the MRE are original and effective, and could serve as a model for future activities.
- ◆ The **concentration on Sofala** (with the exception of one impact study) helps to maximise impact and know how management.
- ◆ The focus on local ownership and capacity-building is to be maintained in the future, but requests a significant **strengthening of monitoring and control** by the Austrian partners.
- ◆ **Demining** as a last step in the progress of programme activities should be integrated in the future. This aspect ought to be immediately addressed.
- ◆ In order not to lose momentum and opportunities created by the programme, the team would like to emphasise the importance for **continuation** of the programme.

6. Organisation of Programme

In the multilateral as well as in the bilateral contribution it can be observed that roles, **responsibilities** and tasks were neither defined clearly nor allocated to specific actors. As a result, a systematic lack of monitoring and controlling had to be assessed in terms of financial spending as well as in terms of implementation in the field.

However, the **Austrian Cooperation Office** in Beira, despite not being mandated for the task, accompanied the projects quite closely, this is especially true in the case of DESSOF.

UNDP and **adc**, the official leading agencies for Austria, did not fully respond to their responsibilities for monitoring and controlling of the projects, both in terms of activities and spending of funds. In the case of adc it must be taken into consideration that adc does not dispose of the means to establish an office in the field and to do more than the regular number of 2-4 field trips per year. The case of DESSOF shows that there is more monitoring capacity needed than adc can provide. UNDP's track record of the Austrian contribution practically stops in 1999, i.e. with the funding of the Minetech operations. After that no data regarding spending or any matters could be made available by UNDP, despite a detailed request coming from the evaluation team (see Annex III). The information given so far by UNDP (see Annex IV) doesn't correspond in all respects to the data collected by the evaluation team.

The Austrian Headquarter **BMaA**, having the overall responsibility for the correct implementation and spending of funds, left practically all tasks regarding the selection, management and control of mine action projects to the implementing partners and the Austrian Cooperation in Mozambique. Based on the documentation that was provided by the BMaA Headquarter for the field study, the evaluation team has to conclude that none of the involved sections in Vienna disposes of the necessary data to respond to basic monitoring requirements. The project list isn't complete, more than 1Mio. Euro spent since 1998 for Mine Action in Mozambique didn't show in any documentation presented by the BMaA to the team. They appeared by chance after that the field study had been accomplished. Reports on the projects hardly exist, i.e. had to be collected step by step in the field. Some project proposals are still missing.

7. Recommendations for the future

1. Continue to support Mine Action in Mozambique

Mine Action is still needed in Mozambique. According to the Impact Survey, almost 125'000 people are still affected by landmines in the province of Sofala. The DESSOF project proved to be effective and adapted to the local needs. All the interviewed stakeholders would welcome a follow-up of the project. Accordingly, the team recommends the continuation of projects like DESSOF, based on the experiences of DESSOF, i.e. with a specific focus on the specific circumstances of the rural mine situation and a methodology based on the ideas of "proximity-demining"³. The strong involvement of the IND and local operators should be maintained.

2. Integrate Mine Action into the Austrian Development Programme

Considering the emphasis that Mozambique itself gives to the relationship between MA and development (as stated above, to integrate MA into the overall development strategy is an explicit policy of Mozambique, reflected in various MA reports and strategies), bearing in mind also the international standards on the socio-economic impact of MA, and taking into account the efforts Austria already made to combine its development goals with MA, it is recommended to establish an **overall strategy of all Austrian activities in Mozambique, including Mine Action**.

Mine Action can contribute and be part of both current sectors Decentralisation and Rural Development. It coincides with the IND's goals to invest in the establishment of regional IND branches in order to improve coordination and control of MA in the provinces. And it helps to address mine problems in rural areas, an increasing concern of IND.

3. Maintain Regional Concentration in Sofala

The regional concentration on the Sofala Province can help to build synergies between various programmes and partners and to increase both impact and visibility of the Austrian Cooperation in Mozambique. In addition it facilitates monitoring and control of projects. Accordingly, the regional concentration should be maintained.

4. Strengthen monitoring and control of Mine Action

The team assessed the lack of clearly defined roles and responsibilities. With an integration of Mine Action into the development programmes of Austria and an ongoing concentration of all activities on Sofala Province, the team recommends to give the responsibility for monitoring and control of Mine Action projects to the Austrian Cooperation Office in Beira. It has the context knowledge and is best placed to identify synergies between Mine Action and development; it has also accumulated considerable experiences in the field of Mine Action during the last years. As a matter of fact, the promotion of local ownership and capacity building of IND and other local partners appears to have resulted to a large extent from the influence of the Austrian Cooperation. Accordingly, the team recommends to use the facilities of the Cooperation rather than to rely on agencies like adc or UNDP, which both do not dispose of monitoring mechanisms in Sofala.

However, the Cooperation Office lacks of personal to accompany Mine Action project appropriately. The team recommends to provide assistance to the Austrian Cooperation in Mozambique, either by

- a local Mine Action programme officer or
 - a regular support coming from a specialised consultant
- to
- select projects (help to identify project and to establish project documents)
 - select partners (e.g. accompany demining authorities in defining criteria for selection)
 - set up projects (organisation and structuring of MA projects)
 - establish/support monitoring and control (setting up reporting mechanisms and field visits)

³ For further explanations, please see Annex VI.

Annexes

Annex I

ABBREVIATIONS

adc Austria	adc Development Corporation Projektmanagement G.M.B.H
ADP	Accelerated Demining Programme
ATS	Österreichische Schilling
BMaA	Bundesministerium für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
CND	National Demining Commission
DESSOF	Demining Sofala
EOD	Explosive Ordnance Disposal
EMD	Empresa Moçambicana de Desminagem
EU	European Union
FADM	Armed Forces of Mozambique
GoM	Government of Mozambique
HQ	Headquarters
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IMAS	International Mine Action Standards
IMSMA	Information Management System for Mine Action
IND	National Institute for Demining
LP	Landesprogramm (Country Programme for Mozambique)
MA	Mine Action
MBT	Mine Ban Treaty
MMAS	Mozambique Mine Action Standards
MRE	Mine Risk Education
NMAP	National Mine Action Plan
NPA	Norwegian People's Aid
NGO	Non Government Organisation
ÖEZA	Österreichische Entwicklungszusammenarbeit
PARPA	Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty
UCM	Universidade Catolica de Moçambique
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UP	Universidade Pedagogica
UXO	Unexploded Ordnance

Annex II

Programme of Field Visit and Interlocutors

Beira: 25-26 March 2003					
Day	Institution	Name	Function	Meeting place	Hour
25	Austrian Cooperation	Michael Butscheck	Financial Administrator	Austrian Coop.	8.00
25	IND	Juma Diniz dos Caniras	Head of Regional Office	IND	9.00
25	Afrovita	Felix Daude	Regional Coordinator	IND	11.30
25	Zaone	Joao Mave	Regional Collaborator	District of Dondo	14.00
26	Universidade Pedagogica	Joao Baptista Fenhane	Project Coordinator		9.00
26	Policia	Joao Agosto Mutaca	Commandante	Police Headquarter Beira	10.00
26	Cruz Vermelha	Adrian Massora	Regional Delegate	IND	14.00
26	Universidade Catolica	Aurelio Gomes Fernanda Jose	Project Coordinator	UCM	16.00
Maputo: 27-28 March 2003					
Day	Institution	Name	Function	Meeting place	Hour
27	Afrovita	Christiano Stein	President	Afrovita	9.00
27	UNDP	Carlos Mu-	Desk Officer for	UNDP	11.00

		capera	Mine Action		
27	EMD	Nico Bosman	Director	EMD	14.30
27	CCQ	Jorge Muchanga	Head of Programme	Swiss Cooperation	16.00
28	ZAONE	Ricardo Tapa	Director	Swiss Cooperation	9.00
28	IND	Gamiliel Mungambe	Director	IND	11.00
28	ARPAC	Fernando Dava	Director	Phone	14.30

Annex III

EMAIL TO UNDP

Maputo, 10th of April 2003

RE: Evaluation of the Austrian Mine Action Programme in Mozambique

Dear Carlos,

Thank you and Clarisse for having supported Markus Heiniger and myself in bringing some light into the spending of the funds that Austria allocated to the UN Trust Fund for Mine Action in Mozambique (as stated in the agreements between Austria and UNDP signed in 1995 and 1997).

After studying the information that came out of the interviews and the documentation made available, some questions still remain. As a matter of fact, we miss quite a lot of documents we would need to get to a clear picture about the use of the money and the circumstances in which it was used.

Given that UNDP has the overall responsibility for the correct funding of the means Austria contributed to Mine Action in Mozambique through the UN Trust Fund, we must bother you again.

So far we understand that out of the 1'665'602 USD, Austria transferred to the Trust Fund (according to your accounts and the agreements, according to the Austrian accounts it was only 1'314'715 USD),

- 1) 308'898 USD was spent for a survey in Sofala carried out by Minetech;
- 2) 905'817 USD for the clearing (incl. QA and extension project) of 11 minefields/targets, identified by the survey, carried out by EMD (demining) and Qualitas (Quality Assurance);
- 3) 100'000 USD for the set up and functioning of IND Beira during a year;
- 4) the rest of 350'887 USD probably went into the funding of the demining of the Mavuzi-Nhamantanda power-line (according to verbal statements); however, the project actually cost 396'000 USD and was, according to the contract, funded by the EU.
- 5) A follow-up project to finish or at least to continue works for the clearing of the power-line should initially also be funded by Austria with 200'000 USD, i.e. remaining money of the DESSOF project. Austria, according to your information, cancelled its commitment at short notice before signing the contract.

However, due to the lack of information, the list might be incorrect. Are we really looking at an Austrian contribution in every case? Reference to Austria was only made in the documents on project 3) and in EMD's final report regarding project 2).

In the following table please see the list of the information/documents we dispose of together with the information/documents we would need in addition in order to evaluate at least the basics:

Project	Existing informa-	Missing information / document	Comments
---------	-------------------	--------------------------------	----------

Evaluation of the Mine Action Projects in Mozambique, supported by Austria 1995-2002

	tion/document		
General aspects: Agreements between Austria and UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Signed agreements - Draft of Project document for 1997 contribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Copies of official project documents for the Austrian contribution - Accounts on the spending of the Austrian contribution - Have other donors contributed to mine clearance in Sofala through the Trust Fund? 	<p>The agreements basically earmark the money for mine action in Sofala; in line with your information we suppose that the item "Sofala Clearance" in your budget therefore correspond to the Austrian contribution.</p> <p>We received from you only accounts on spending between 1997 and 1999 and miss information about spending since 1999</p>
1) Survey Sofala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oral statements from IND that Minetech made a Survey with Austrian money in 1998 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project Document - Contract - Financial report - Survey - Tendering documents, if relevant - What is the story of this project? Who was involved in the selection of the project and the operator? - Relationship between this survey and the survey of Halo Trust? - Was the survey of Minetech integrated in the new impact survey? 	<p>We have no paper whatsoever about this project</p>
2) Demining Sofala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contracts between EMD-IND, Qualitas-IND for Phase I+II, between EMD-IND for Phase II, - EMD Proposals for Phase I+II - EMD Progress reports 1,2,3,5,6 Phase I, Progress report 1 for Phase II - EMD Final technical Reports Phase I+II - Qualitas Reports May, June, July, September 2000 - Qualitas Final Technical Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4th progress Reports of EMD - Qualitas Progress Report for August 2000 - All Qualitas Progress Reports for Phase II - Proposal of Qualitas for Phase I+II - Final Report of Qualitas for Phase II - Tendering Documents - Proposals of other bidders - What is the history of the project? - Does it correspond to national priorities? - Was UNDP or Austria involved in the selection of the operator? - What are the track records of EMD? Do you or IND dispose of their SOPs? - Was there any QA, monitoring, evaluation carried out by either IND or UNDP? - How do you explain that the costs for QA was over 26% resp. 23% (compared to the cost of the demining), i.e. a lot more than the usual 5% or 10%? - What would you conclude with respect to the socio-economic impact of the project? 	<p>The reports of EMD and Qualitas focus on technical aspects. They make hardly any reference to the socio-economic impact of their work. Since any other documents about the project are missing, we are not in a position to state anything about socio-economic results.</p>
3) Support of IND Beira	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UNDP Document on capacity-building for IND with project de- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial and narrative report about the use of the money - Was there any action plan of IND 	<p>The gap between the UNDP/Austrian contribution of last year and</p>

Evaluation of the Mine Action Projects in Mozambique, supported by Austria 1995-2002

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - description and budget for the Beira office - ToR of the IND Delegations in Nampula and Beira - Description of the Central Delegation of IND 	<p>Beira in 2001?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was the money used appropriately in your view? - Was there any audit? - According to the IND report on activities in 2002, Austria contributed to IND 1.... USD: How do you explain the difference between your report and IND's records? 	<p>the budget of this year for IND Beira is quite significant. We wonder how UNDP envisages sustainability of the Northern and Central offices of IND.</p>
4) Demining of Mavuzi-Nhamatanda Power-Line	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contract between IND-EMD over 396'000 USD - EMD Progress Reports 1-4 - EMD Final Report - Report of Hugh Lawrence, TA for IND, on the Project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tendering documents - Offers of other operators - Proposal of EMD - Was there any QA-operator? - If yes: All the QA-related proposals and reports - Was there any evaluation done by UNDP or IND? Hugh Lawrence announces in his report a contract evaluation to be carried out by IND. - How would you comment the outcome of the operation (e.g. regarding speed and the chosen methodology) - Has UNDP or IND reacted in any manner to the accident that happened to the operator? 	<p>No track of the Austrian funding to be found in the documents, but EU mentioned as a donor</p>
5) Continuation of demining of Mavuzi-Nhamatanda Power-Line	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft Cost-Sharing Agreement between Austria and UNDP - Draft Contract between IND and FADM (Moz. Armed Forces) - Letter of IND to Austrian Cooperation on the issue - Proposal of FADM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the lessons learnt of the first phase that had been taken into account for defining the second phase? - How was the election process of the operator conducted? - Does the FADM proposal, and if existing, its SOP, correspond to International and National Standards? - What is in your view the current and future role of FADM in demining? 	<p>This is more or the less the only project that could be fully documented by Austria, and it is also the one that hasn't been realised. Therefore no additional documents needed.</p>

Please don't feel too overwhelmed by all these questions and requests. We are aware of the fact that you haven't been in charge yet for most of the projects. We are also aware that IND had the overall responsibility for the operations and therefore probably stands in a better position to answer. However, towards Austria it is UNDP being responsible. Therefore, we have to bother you in the first place.

If there is the impossibility to meet our needs in some of the cases, just explain the reason in order for us to forward this information to our contractors.

Your collaboration is most appreciated – thank you in advance for your help.

Sincerely yours,
Anne Gloor

Annex IV

ANSWER OF UNDP by email on 10 June 2003

Dear Anne,

Please find the information sent to NY about the Austrian contribution to mine action activities in Mozambique. I hope it will help for your report.

thank you

Carlos Mucapera

Tried to build on the fax of 04 June and dig a little deeper on the Austrian money and its impact and expenditure. Please remember that the CA was signed in 1995 so the corporate memory is a bit scant -- actually 4 yrs before the IND was decreed. The value of the CA was \$1,356,703.

ADP

\$780,096 went to ADP between 1997 and 2000. Thing is, it was deposited in a pool account so it is hard to disaggregate its direct contribution. I have contacted ADP and asked them to fwd their yearly activity reports but so far have not received anything. They do regular monthly reports, but I was unable to find summaries or tallies to make sense of what was cleared/done. I have asked Paul Curray (CTA) to email them directly to you.

IND

In 2000 Mozambique was hit by floods and in 2001 a cyclone in the central part of the country. Austria approached the IND to see if some of its remaining funds in the original ADP ProDoc would help in the central region. \$576,607 of the original amount was then divided into two distinct activities, demining in the flooded areas in Sofala Province and helping the IND to establish its central regional office in the city of Beira. Stemming from this intervention the following was undertaken via IND:

i) Demining of the Mavuzi-Nhamatanda Power line was undertaken by Empresa Mozambicana de Desminagem. The power line was knocked over by a cyclone and there was an immediate need to get in and fix the line as it is the backup source of power for Beira which is the second largest city in Mozambique (pop 600,000) and the most important port for Zimbabwe, Malawi, and Zambia. 425,598 sq m were cleared and 5,113 mine and 17,616 UXOs destroyed. After the area around the pylons was cleared the line was rehabilitated and is now working. So, the impact was major.

ii) Demining of Tanga-Tanga was done by MMA Lda. 400,000 sq m were cleared and 22 mine and 17 UXOs destroyed. In 2001 there were dramatic floods in the Zambezi valley that displaced 100,000s of people. Along with funds from the European Union, money from Austria was used to clear a site where several thousand people had temporarily fled due to the catastrophic flooding. The site was actually an elevated cemetery and there had been a few accidents, which included people, but primarily animals in the area in the mid 1990s so authorities were worried with the movement of people in the area. The displaced remained in the area for an entire year as their homes/fields were destroyed and they needed the support of the international community.

iii) Support to the IND's Central Region Office: Austria funds exclusively in the central provinces of Sofala and Manica and as such supports the decentralization process in Mozambique. In 2000 IND was establishing a RO in Beira and Austria committed to helping the government's efforts in this area by contributing a one-off payment of \$100,000 to the IND for the following: i) general rehabilitation of office, ii) 1 x4 WD, iii) salaries for 4 IND staff, iv) basic computer equipment, v) general operational costs for the office. The money was to be spread over 18 months and has now expired. We are actually negotiating a further 2.5 yrs with Austria.

DESSOF Project

If there is anything that does not seem right with the Austrian contribution to mine action in the country it is between Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC) and a local entity called Demin-

ing Sofala (DESOFF). There was no relationship between UNDP and this activity which was ATS 9.3 million (not sure what that is in Euros!). Anyway, DESSOF was contracted by ADC to conduct socio-economic impact studies in the central provinces of Sofala and Manica and conduct some MRE there as well. The Director of DESSOF who was selected by ADC is a smooth operator who I have met; and a man about town in Beira. Turns out, he fleeced the project for about \$25k. ADC actually deposited the entire budget of the project in his personal bank account?! Last year he was found out -- he actually had opened a small lumber store in Beria...I kid you not. ADC did not go to the police and the whole thing is kind of a hush-hush job and the person in question has promised to repay the money. So far a total of \$2000 has been returned. So, if there is anything smelly it is this aspect of Austria's funding to mine action in Mozambique, but it has totally nothing to do with UNDP, IND, or ADP for that matter so I don't think we should raise it.

Ok Sayed, unfortunately, given the constraints of time I can't really get you more than this today. Hope it helps address the concerns raised by Judith.

Best for now, Olaf

Olaf Juergensen
UN Chief Technical Advisor
National Demining Institute
Maputo, Mozambique
Tel/Fax: +(258 1) 41 42 11
Email: ujuergensen@ind.gov.mz
Website: www.ind.gov.mz

Annex V

DOCUMENTATION OF EVALUATION

The following list contains a *selection of the consulted document*

Contribution to UNDP Trust Fund

- Agreement of 1995 between Austria and UNDP
- Project file BmaA contribution to Trust Fund, July 1997
- Agreement of 1997 between Austria and UNDP
- UNDP Proposal for 1997 contribution
- ProgrammeBudget for capacity building to National Institute for Demining, 2001

Demining Sofala with EMD

- Project Proposal August 1999
- Contract with EMD and Qualitas, December 1999
- Progress Reports 1, 2, 3, 4, 6
- Final technical report, November 2000
- Quality assurance, Progress reports May, June July, September;
- Final technical report, October 2000

Extension Project Demining Sofala

- Project Proposal, September 2000
- Contract with EMD and Qualitas, including statement of work, Dec. 2000
- Report I, September Final technical report, February 2001
- *No Qualitas report!*
- Request for internal transfer of funds from ADP to IND (letter Zeininger), April 2001.

Demining of Nhamatanda-Mavuzi Power line

- Contract IND-EMD, October 2001
- Progress Reports 1a, 1, 2, 3, 4
- Final report, May 2002

Demining of Nhamatanda-Mavuzi Power line, 2

- Project Proposal of FADM, August 2000
- Draft Contract IND-FADM, September 2002
- Third party cost sharing agreement between Austria and UNDP (draft)
- Activities report of IND on funded activities of EU, June 2002

DESSOF

- Project file by BmaA, II.8, December 2000
- Adc, Halbjahresbericht II/02
- Adc, Zusatzbericht, January 2003
- Adc, Missionsbericht, January 2003
- Terms of Reference for socio-economic impact study (english and portuguese version)
- Study of Universidade Catolica de Mozambique, Beira, about socio-economic and cultural impact of mines, February 2002
- Study of Universidade Pegagogica, Beira, about socio-economic and cultural impact of mines, December 2001
- Proposal Call (Power Point Presentation)
- Documentation of consultation workshop, including report, September 2001

Evaluation of the Mine Action Projects in Mozambique, supported by Austria 1995-2002

- Evaluation list of competitors for proposal call
- IND: Final report of evaluation commission
- Documentation of workshop between partners, April 2002
- Documentation of workshop between partners, September 2002
- Documentation of final evaluation workshop, December 2002
- Final Annual Report 2002

- Contracts between DESSOF and all Proposal Call partners (Afrovita, Cruz vermelha, Radio Mozambique, CEPLAGA, CCQ, Zaone Morrumbala)

- Afrovita: Proposal; Reports 1,2,3; final report; tape of a song for mine awareness
- Zaone: 3 reports
- Red Cross: Final report
- CEPLAGA: Avaliação de impacto dos programmes de sensibilização relativos à prevenção contra o perigo das minas nas escolas rurais, CEPLAGA, July 2002

- The Five-Year National Mine Action Plan, 2002-2006, IND, November 2001
- Delegação Regional Centro, Instituto Nacional de Desminagem

Annex VI

IDEAS ON „PROXIMITY DEMINING“

A methodology called "Proximity Demining" has been developed by Handicap International (HI) in the Inhambane Mine Clearance Project (IMCP) in Mozambique which seems to be interesting in view of a next project of Austrian Cooperation in Sofala: As indicated by the name, the idea is to work at proximity level rather than on large minefields. It is suggested that the approach and lessons learnt of HI are looked at by Austrian Cooperation whilst developing another bilateral project after DESSOF:

"Mine-clearance in Inhambane Province presented a number of difficulties related to the technical aspects of the mined sites. The level 1 impact survey has shown in particular that among 1.374 target suspected mined areas (SMAs), only 4.3% were areas larger than 1 million m² and 41.2% less than 1.000 m². This has confirmed the relevancy of proximity demining in the absence of large marked and formal minefields⁴. It was then difficult to efficiently use a large demining team (usually about 30-40 persons) as a safe distance could not be maintained. Also as these small areas were mainly surrounding social facilities used by many people, the ground was likely to contain a large amount of metal fragments (from rubbish), which would limit the possibility of using metal detectors, commonly used in manual clearance. Handicap International's approach focuses therefore on the need to clear land for socio-economic needs using appropriate methods.

Proximity demining also refers to the co-operation between the demining teams and the populations directly affected for locating sites and judging local priority. The demining teams work to gain the support of the community during operations and to assure that all information related to demining, in progress or accomplished, is understood by everyone.

⁴ *South African Institute of International Affairs, Issue VIII – October 2001*