GMAP Overview

- Removing the risk of harm by clearing land and reducing SHA
- Reducing the risk of harm through MRE
- Building the capacity of national and provincial authorities
Phase 1: Sri Lanka, Vietnam, Laos, Mozambique, Cambodia

Phase 2: Burma, South Sudan, Somalia, Zimbabwe

Capacity Development: Cambodia, Laos, Sri Lanka, Mozambique, Vietnam & Somalia

Outputs:

34,861,495 m² of land put into productive use

115,615,441 m² of land cancelled

444,995 beneficiaries of MRE

National capacity to manage mine action enhanced
GMAP Theory of Change

Inputs
- UK funding channelled through mine action partners
- HRG diplomacy advice and programme staff time
- International obligations, UK Govt policies, information and lessons learned

Activities
- Landmine & ERW survey and clearance that targets vulnerable groups
- Delivery of mine risk education to target beneficiaries
- Coordination on the ground between national authorities, mine action implementers, donor community and development actors
- Capacity building of local staff and national mine action authorities

Outputs
- Priority land declared safe through survey or clearance
- Mine action employment created for local people
- Affected communities aware of the risks of landmines and ERW
- Mine action more closely linked with wider development planning & implementation
- Capacities and trained staff in national mine action authorities

Outcomes
- Target communities feel safer, leading to increased well-being
- Formerly contaminated land used productively by target communities, leading to improved livelihoods
- Target communities have increased access to basic services provided by national governments or NGOs
- Effective mine action programmes increasingly managed by national authorities with minimal outside technical or financial input
- Measurable progress towards Ottawa Treaty compliance reducing life suffering caused by AP mines

Impact
- Poverty reduction and improved physical security leading to better livelihoods and progress against the MDGs
Itad’s M&E Contract

Three interconnected elements to the Itad contract:

- Monitor delivery against agreed targets
- Review performance with focus on lessons learned
- Conduct an evaluation through two phases: *Formative & Summative*
Evaluation Questions

- The design and relevance of GMAP
- The efficiency and VfM of GMAP
- Contributions to risk reduction and community security
- Contributions to capacity development
- Contributions to poverty reduction and livelihoods
Evaluation Findings and Conclusions

GMAP design & relevance

GMAP efficiency and VfM

GMAP risk reduction and community security

GMAP capacity development

GMAP poverty reduction and livelihoods
GMAP design & relevance

Key Findings:
DFID and the consortium model was flexible and adaptive to context
Better co-ordination and integration with other development actors and strategies would benefit outcomes
Contractors had good awareness of conflict dynamics but lacked robust analysis and systems to ensure conflict sensitivity

Conclusions:
The design of GMAP enabled it to respond to development and stabilisation contexts, ensuring its relevance as a global fund.
At the country level, GMAP and its implementers do not have sufficient systems in place to regularly analyse data and use that data to inform programme adaptation undermining guarantees of relevance.
GMAP efficiency and VfM

**Key Findings:**
GMAP has demonstrated good VfM; improvements could be made
Data collected by contractors has not been fully utilised
The level of development return from mine action varies considerably across countries
Benefits of ‘soft power’ associated with UK investments in mine action were valuable but not reported.

**Conclusions:**
GMAP’s encouragement of innovation has increased VfM
GMAP outcomes should be expanded to fully capture the programme’s benefits
Particular causal pathways within the ToC should be emphasised depending on the context
GMAP risk reduction and community security

**Key Findings:**
GMAP contributed to safer communities, except in Burma

Socio-economic pressures can lead people to continue to engage in risky behaviour

GMAP countries have not necessarily led to *feelings* of safety and MRE could be improved

**Conclusions:**
To really deliver behavioural change, better analysis is needed that leads to nuanced delivery of MRE

To really understand if behaviour change is being achieved, better indicators and assessment methodologies are needed

---

10.
GMAP capacity development

Key Findings:
GMAP has led to improved NMAA and advancements towards treaty obligations of signatory countries.
Investments in local partners have been positive but the consortium’s approach to this is mixed.
Gender mainstreaming does not always translate into practice.

Conclusions:
CD is most effective where there is full-time presence of contractors supported from HMG in-country.
CD needs to be seen as a long-term accompaniment process but alongside this there needs to be an exit strategy which commits contractors to phasing out external support.
GMAP poverty reduction and livelihoods

Key Findings:
- Clearance can jumpstart a process of development but often high levels of existing poverty limit development gains from mine action.
- Improvements to livelihoods have benefited men and women.
- Contractors working in mine-affected communities can benefit local economies and challenge gender norms through employment of women.

Conclusions:
- In some countries people are unable to fully exploit the benefits of clearance and greater integration with other development efforts is needed.
- Not enough evidence is available to fully understand and demonstrate the links between mine action and GMAP outcomes and the sector as a whole needs to do more to contribute to this.
Key Lessons

1. There continues to be insufficient attention paid to outcome level change, leading to an absence of evidence that links mine action to wider stabilisation and development goals.

2. Global funds for mine action require flexible funding mechanisms that can adapt to various contexts, as delivered by GMAP.

3. MRE needs to be better informed by context analysis to maximise effectiveness; measurements of success need to consider social norm change and not just knowledge retention.

4. Capacity development can be more effective where implementers have greatest in-country presence and where donors in-country provide political support.

5. Local partners are effective at increasing the reach and sustainability of mine action and a more consistent commitment by implementers to this approach would be advantageous.

6. Implementers run the risk of causing harm unless they improve the capability of their staff to conduct conflict analysis and introduce systems that enable their programmes to be adaptive rather than reactive to conflict dynamics.
Capacity development issues

- **Need**: To respond to issues raised and lessons learned from GMAP 1; capacity development needs engagement from all stakeholders.
- **Context**: Dependent on many outside factors like political will and national resources and timeframes.
- **Challenge**: Not as tangible to measure and monitor as land release.
- **Key aim**: To work with each national authority on areas that can be supported and improved, in the areas of agreed priority for GMAP 2 (and complement other initiatives).

Capacity development lessons learned

- Recognise that capacity development is a long-term intervention; incremental progress requires long-term engagement.
- Current approach is based on best practice in the sector, but can be developed – GMAP 2 offers this opportunity to refine.
  - Standard approach for all countries important.
- Specifically, M&E Matrix is delivering, but can be restructured/refined.
- Standardised measuring of outputs and outcomes can be reviewed over GMAP 2 to inform discussions on ‘impact’.
- We could adopt a more simplified Theory of Change for CD.