

BACKGROUND NOTE
“NATIONAL DIRECTORS DAY” ON TUESDAY 30 APRIL 2024

Date and time Tuesday, 30 April 2024, 9:30 – 10:00 in plenary

Introduction to “National Directors Day”

Presenter/Chair: Ms. Ilene Cohn, Director, UNMAS

*** **

Date and time Tuesday, 30 April 2024, 10:15 – 12:00 in designated rooms

Breakout Group French in Room B

Chair: Gen. Bechelany, Director, LMAC, Lebanon

Rapporteur: Mr. Emmanuel, Lokinu Omanga, CCLAM Coordinator

Facilitators: Mr. Jeremy Repond, GICHD and Mr. Jean-Denis Nsoki Larsen, UNMAS

Proposed to include representatives from: Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cote d’Ivoire, Lebanon, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger

Breakout Group English I in Room C

Chair: Mr. Muhabbat Ibrohimzoda, Director, TNMAC, Tajikistan

Rapporteur: Ms. Philathong Venephet Lao PDR

Facilitators: Mr. Rupert Leighton, UNDP, Ms. Naomi Konza, UNDP

Proposed to include representatives from: Afghanistan, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Israel, Republic of Korea, Lao PDR, Mexico, Myanmar, Palau, Philippines, Serbia, Solomon Islands, Tajikistan, Thailand, Türkiye, Ukraine, Viet Nam

Breakout Group Arabic in Room D

Chair: Mr. Ahmed Alshybani, Director, LMAC

Rapporteur: Mr. Mounir Litim, Algeria

Facilitators: Ms. Lubna Allam, GICHD and Ms. Fatma Zourrig, UNMAS

Proposed to include representatives from: Algeria, Djibouti, Iraq, Jordan, Libya, Somalia, State of Palestine, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen

Breakout Group English II in Room E

Chair: Mr. Sathyananda Wijesekara Subasinghe, National Director, NMAC, Sri Lanka

Rapporteur: Mr. Velauthapillai Premachanthiran, Deputy Director, NMAC, Sri Lanka

Facilitators: Mr. Stephen Robinson, UNDP and Ms. Francesca Chiaudani, UNMAS

Proposed to include representatives from: Albania, Angola, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Ghana, Iran, Mozambique, Nigeria, Peru, Russian Federation, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, South Sudan, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*** **

NDM-UN27 Background Note for “National Directors Day”

Date and time Tuesday, 30 April 2024, 15:00 – 16:15 in plenary

Plenary Session 3: Report Back by National Directors

Chair & Presenters/Rapporteurs:

- Mr. Steinar Essén, Global Advisor, UNDP
- Representatives from each of the four breakout groups

Aim of “National Directors Day”

The second day of the NDM-UN 27 is dedicated to an exchange and discussion between National Directors on topics of interest, challenges, concerns, and best practices.

After a brief introduction in plenary of the objectives, format for the day and the topics for discussion, National Directors will join one of four pre-assigned Breakout discussion groups organized by language preferences – English, Arabic and French.

The Breakout Groups will be Chaired by a National Director who will moderate a discussion amongst fellow National Directors based on topics and questions shared ahead of the NDM-UN27 meeting – ***See the Annex for a full list of proposed topics and guiding questions.***

These topics and questions are based on issues raised by National Directors either during past NDM-UN meetings or in the survey disseminated as part of consultations in preparation for the 30 April session at the NDM-UN27 meeting.

The aim of smaller group discussions (i.e. Breakout Groups) is to encourage peer-to-peer exchanges on challenges, best practices and to decide on proposals or recommendations for better targeting support and assistance to critical needs. Each group, under the Chair's guidance, will decide how to prioritize topics for discussion from the list shared before the meeting. There will be no presentations (i.e. PowerPoints) during the Breakout Groups and participants are asked to make **short interventions of no more than four minutes.**

For larger national delegations, you are kindly asked that no more than two representatives per delegation take the floor to speak during discussions in Breakout Groups.

Delegations are strongly encouraged to consider gender, diversity and inclusion considerations when deciding their representation.

A Rapporteur for each group will report back during Plenary 3 at 15:00 on their group's discussions. The National Director designated to be Rapporteur is responsible for preparing a presentation that will include one PowerPoint slide per topic discussed by the group.

Facilitators from the UN and GICHD will be present throughout the day to support the Chair and Rapporteur of each group when convening and managing breakout group discussions. Facilitators are responsible for supporting the Rapporteur in finalizing the presentation.

******Other conference participants may join the breakout group discussion as observers.***

NDM-UN27 Background Note for “National Directors Day”

Format for the Introductory session from 9:30 to 10:00: (30 minutes)

The introductory session will outline the objectives, format for the day and the topics for discussions. After introductory remarks by the Chair, the topics for discussion will be briefly introduced. There will also be time for any questions. The plenary will end when National Directors will be asked to go to their designated Breakout Groups.

Welcome by Chair	5 minutes
Introduction to the format and content of the day	10 minutes
Q & A from the audience, if any	10 minutes
Last instructions from the Chair, if needed before participants quickly move to their respective breakout rooms.	5 minutes

Format for Breakout Groups from 10:15 to 12:00: (105 minutes)

The Breakout Group discussion will be structured along a list of topics and guiding questions. The Chairs will make introductory remarks, present an agenda, and get agreement on expectations and a prioritized list of topics to be covered. On their first intervention, the participants will be asked to introduce themselves briefly. Interventions should not be longer than four minutes. Larger delegations are asked to designate only two people to make interventions.

The discussion will follow a set of questions. Each topic will be guided by at least 3 questions. The breakout groups prioritize the topics to address and their time individually, but preferably a minimum of 4 (out of the 5) topics should be covered.

Each group is also expected to make a summary of the main discussion points and include any proposals or recommendations for follow-up, and by whom in a PowerPoint that will be used during the report back to the plenary

The Breakout Groups will follow the Chatham house rules.

Introductory remarks by the Chair and an agreement on the agenda and topics to be covered	10 minutes
Discussion by topic (approx. 20 minutes per topic)	85 minutes
Summary and conclusive remarks by the Chair and Rapporteur	10 minutes

Format for Plenary 3: Report back on Breakout Groups from 15:00 to 16:15 (75 minutes)

The Chair of the plenary (UNDP) will make introductory remarks and introduce briefly the Presenters/Rapporteurs from each of the Breakout Groups. The Chair will introduce each topic and ask each Rapporteur to give a 2-3 min summary of the group discussion and conclusion on that topic. After all four Rapporteurs have given their reflection on the specific topic raised a general discussion will follow.

The session ends when all five topics have been discussed and the chair has made final remarks.

Introductory remarks by the Chair	2 minutes
Presentation of topic 1 Regional coordination and cooperation Presentations by the four breakout groups (2-3 minutes per topic) Q & A from the audience	14 minutes
Presentation of topic 2 Resource Mobilisation Presentations by the four breakout groups (2-3 minutes per topic) Q & A from the audience	14 minutes
Presentation of topic 3 Information management Presentations by the four breakout groups (2-3 minutes per topic) Q & A from the audience	14 minutes
Presentation of topic 4 Victim assistance Presentations by the four breakout groups (2-3 minutes per topic) Q & A from the audience	14 minutes
Presentation of topic 5 Prog. Man./creating an enabling environment Presentations by the four breakout groups (2-3 minutes per topic) Q & A from the audience	14 minutes
Closing remarks by the Chair	3 minutes

Annex: Proposed list of topics and questions for the breakout sessions

NOTE: Topics covered in the plenary sessions will not be addressed in-depth during the breakout sessions (EORE, Innovation, mine action and broader agendas and food security).

1. Regional coordination and cooperation

The mine action sector recognizes the importance of knowledge exchange and collaboration. Innovation and the introduction of new tools and methods are first and foremost driven by needs at country level (by operators and/or NMAC). It is evident that organisations and individuals possess skills and lessons learned that could greatly improve the quality and cost efficiency of other organisations. How can we ensure that best practices from within the mine action sector are shared among programmes and countries, particularly regionally when working in similar contexts or facing a comparable threat?

Guiding questions

- Do you have an example of a successful regional or cross border cooperation/exchange of information?
- Who are the key stakeholders responsible or best placed to cater for cross border/regional cooperation? Do these stakeholders require any support or additional resource to ensure that coordination and cooperation is gender responsive and representative of diverse groups within the region?
- What are concrete examples of areas of work where regional cooperation would improve quality and/or cost efficiency of your programme?
- What are comparable threats that can be addressed (more successfully) through regional cooperation?
- Are you aware of any regional needs assessments that have been completed? Does the assessment highlight the differential needs of women, men, girls and boys, people of different ethnic origin or physical capabilities? If not, how can this information gap be filled and by who?
- How can we strengthen regional coordination and cooperation (suggest an action plan)?
- What efforts will be made to ensure that women are appropriately engaged, both lead and deliver this coordination and cooperation
- How can regional cooperation be funded?

2. Resource Mobilisation

The world is faced with more armed conflict now than seen for decades. International cooperation and assistance are more important than ever, but the competition for funding is immense and most explosive ordnance-contaminated countries are experiencing a decline in international support. How do we, as a sector, address these gaps and challenges?

Guiding questions

- How can we as a sector ensure that international cooperation and assistance are sustainable in the long-term to assist a country until “the job is done” (e.g. mine/explosive ordnance free; a diverse, sustainable national capacity is developed; mine action is sustainable through national budget allocations; support for gender-responsive mine action integrated into recovery/development plans)?
- What should be the top three key criteria donors should consider when selecting a national mine action authority to partner with and/or which country to fund?
- Which other funding streams exist and how can the mine action sector tap into these? (e.g. area-based approaches or holistic/cross-sectorial programming)
- What can be done to promote mine action better and lead to more sustainable support (e.g. draw/retain media and donor interest)?
- How do you plan to mobilise resources that will fund initiatives to promote gender and diversity, environmental considerations or other innovations?

3. Information management

It is well-known that reliable, up-to-date, gender and diversity disaggregated, and accurate data is critical for sound planning/strategy development, priority setting, efficient programme implementation, reporting and ultimately, for successful resource mobilisation. Despite this fact, many explosive ordnance-affected countries still lack a comprehensive understanding of their explosive ordnance contamination, and some do not have data that shows how women, men, girls, boys and people from disadvantaged groups, may be specifically affected. This may be due to a combination of factors such as: limited funds available, a weak or limited nationwide non-technical survey undertaken; a weak or incomplete national database (IMSMA); and/or a lack of tools or skills to manage data and produce maps and basic statistics.

Guiding questions

- Is IMSMA core a suitable tool for information management in all contexts? If not, why and what are the alternative approach/tools?
- What are the resources and skills (incl. Partnerships) required to maintain a good national database?
- The survey takes money and resources away from urgent needs for clearance/VA/EORE, how should these priorities be balanced?
- How can we ensure that collected information is thoroughly analysed and validated to avoid registering large areas that are years later cancelled via desktop exercise?
- Is there a need to better integrate information-management systems with operational cells and units responsible for deploying mine-action teams on the ground?
- Are there enough QA and QC elements in the quality management of data and information?

4. Victim assistance

Many countries grapple with developing effective strategies to support individuals affected by mines and explosive ordnance over the extended period of their recovery. The challenge of providing sustained, long-term assistance to victims of mine action poses a significant hurdle for national authorities worldwide.

Guiding questions

- What should be the responsibility of NMAA/NMAC in this regard?
- Why is it important to ensure that data is disaggregated by gender, age, physical ability and what other disaggregation do you consider to be critical?
- Can we learn from the approaches adopted by other sectors?
- Do we have any best practices to address this pressing issue?
- Can we use the CRPD and the 2030 Agenda to strengthen resource mobilisation for VA? If so, how?

5. Programme Management/creating an enabling environment

A successful mine action programme depends on strong national ownership and commitment, and a well-functioning NMAA/NMAC whose composition represents the diverse population they seek to serve. The NMAA and NMAC have the responsibility to create optimal working conditions and legal frameworks for operators, and thereby ensure that programmes are designed implemented as efficiently as possible with the appropriate quality to ensure that benefits are delivered to women, men, girls, boys and disadvantaged groups.

Guiding questions

- What are the key factors for creating an enabling environment for successful mine action implementation?
- Do women currently participate equally in the design, management and implementation of mine action programmes and projects. If not, what are the barriers and how might they be addressed?
- Liability is a reoccurring concern for NMAC and operators alike and often an obstacle for establishing sound land release principles. How can we address this challenge? Are there any best practices?
- Implementation of national mine action standards (NMAS) (and/or revision of NMAS) are often resource-demanding and lengthy processes that significantly impact programme efficiency and the quality of operations. What can be done to help NMAA which struggles to implement sector best practices?
- Are there good examples of a whole government approach to MA to promote efficiency and effectiveness of MA?
- What are some good practices in MA governance, including integrating Mine Action activities into broader development frameworks, such as poverty reduction and infrastructure development programs, to help maximize impact and ensure that mine clearance contributes to long-term sustainable development?

NDM-UN27 Background Note for “National Directors Day”

- What are some of the examples of good collaboration among governments, international organizations, NGOs, and local communities is essential for Mine Action governance to help leverage resources, share expertise, and coordinate efforts more effectively.