

# Risk Education under the Mine Ban Treaty

## Immediate and Effective Warning

### Target Areas

 <p><b>In both rural and urban areas</b></p> <p>Afghanistan Angola Bosnia and Herzegovina Colombia</p> <p>Croatia Democratic Republic of Congo Iraq Mali</p> <p>Nigeria Palestine Somalia South Sudan Ukraine</p>	 <p><b>In rural areas</b></p> <p>Cambodia Chad Ethiopia Mauritania</p> <p>Niger Senegal Sri Lanka Sudan</p> <p>Thailand Zimbabwe</p>	 <p><b>In refugee and IDP camps</b></p> <p>Afghanistan Angola Democratic Republic of Congo</p> <p>Iraq Mali Nigeria Palestine</p> <p>Somalia South Sudan Thailand Yemen</p>	 <p><b>Across borders</b></p> <p>Afghanistan–Tajikistan Ecuador–Peru Thailand–Myanmar Turkey–Syria</p>	 <p><b>In indigenous reserves</b></p> <p>Colombia</p>
--	---	--	---	--

### Risk Groups



**Children**

- Growing up in contaminated areas.
- Lack of knowledge of the war and its legacy.
- Roles that take them into contaminated areas.
- Prone to picking up and playing with items.



**Men**

- Primary risk group with regard to antipersonnel mines.
- Livelihood roles and responsibilities put them at risk, such as: animal herding, farming, fishing, or hunting.



**Women and girls**

- Less likely to engage in unsafe behaviors or to travel as far from the home as men.
- Can promote safer behavior among men, children, and peers.
- In some contexts women are harder to reach for risk education.



**IDPs, refugees, and returnees**

- Lack of familiarity with the areas they move through.
- Returning to familiar areas that have been contaminated.
- Job scarcity and livelihood insecurity may force them to engage in intentional risk-taking activities.



**Migrants and itinerant workers**

- Entering and working in unfamiliar areas.
- Crossing borders, often at informal crossing points.
- Drivers are particularly at risk due to the contamination on roads and use of short-cuts.



**Pastoral and nomadic communities**

- Transit across large areas of land, including contaminated areas, looking for grazing and water for their cattle.



**People living in poverty and lacking viable livelihoods alternatives**

- Poverty forces people to knowingly access contaminated areas.
- Increased demand for land may push poorer households into contaminated areas.

**Other risk groups in 2019**

- People living in humanitarian and emergency settings: provision of risk education in response to landmine/ERW accidents, flash floods, or armed conflict.
- Provision of risk education to humanitarian aid staff.
- Person with disabilities: risk education integrated with victim assistance projects; risk education materials using braille, sign language or subtitles.

### Delivery Methods



**Interpersonal**

- Often provided by specialized liaison teams.
- Distribution of small and printed materials, such as leaflets and posters.
- Mixed gender teams to ensure that all age and gender groups in the population are adequately reached.
- Provision through interactive means, such as mobile cinema, puppet shows, and theatre.

**Challenges in face-to-face delivery include:** *poor road infrastructure, lack of trust, insecurity and ongoing conflict, and wide range of languages and dialects spoken.*



**Mass and digital media**

- Delivery of risk education using mass media, such as billboards, radio, and TV.
- Increasing interest in the use of digital media and mobile applications, particularly in remote and challenging contexts.

**Challenges in the use of mass and digital media include:** *limited communication infrastructure, lack of mobile networks, and limited access to and use of social media.*



**Community volunteers or networks**  
Maintains risk education in hard-to-reach areas and is provided by trusted community members.



**Integrated into the humanitarian and protection sectors**  
Combines risk education with other humanitarian and stabilization activities.



**Integrated into survey and clearance activities**  
Supports community understanding of clearance activities and reporting of ordnance.



**Partnership with the national police or emergency services**  
Supports national police and emergency services to provide safety messages and advice.



**School-based**  
Implemented into or outside of the formal curriculum.

Notes: ERW=explosive remnants of war; and IDP=internally displaced people. States not party to the Mine Ban Treaty are indicated in *italics*.

## Risk Education, the Mine Ban Treaty, and the Oslo Action Plan

The Mine Ban Treaty requires States Parties to “provide an immediate and effective warning to the population” in relation to all areas under its jurisdiction or control in which antipersonnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced. However, despite being a core pillar of mine action, risk education has often been considered as one element of broader clearance activities, and as a result has often not received adequate attention or resources.

In 2019 there was an increased focus on risk education due to the dramatic rise in casualties, particularly in the Middle East. Recognizing the importance of this mine action pillar, the Oslo Action Plan, adopted in November 2019, includes a dedicated section with five concrete action points on risk education and risk reduction.

### Other Risk Education Developments in 2019-2020

- The establishment of the Explosive Ordnance Risk Education (EORE) Advisory Group to provide overall guidance to the sector and to identify ways to improve the integration, effectiveness, efficiency, and relevance of risk education.
- The update of the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) 12.10 on risk education. The standards were approved by the IMAS review board during the final quarter of 2020.
- The conduct of a number of studies to provide models and methodological guidance to the sector. This included a study on the new technologies and methodologies for EORE.
- The instigation of in-depth discussions and information sharing on COVID-19 and risk education messaging through the International Mine Risk Education Working Group (iMREWG) hosted by the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF).
- The thematic reporting on risk education by the Landmine Monitor for the first time since 2008.

## 2019 Facts and Figures

- ✘ 🗺️ 🇦🇫 Afghanistan
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇦🇳 Angola
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇸🇦 Bosnia and Herzegovina
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇰🇲 Cambodia
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇸🇩 Chad
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇨🇴 Colombia
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇦🇷 Croatia
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇨🇩 Democratic Republic of Congo
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇪🇨 Ecuador
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇪🇹 Ethiopia
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇮🇶 Iraq
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇲🇱 Mali
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇲🇷 Mauritania
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇳🇮 Niger
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇳🇬 Nigeria
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇵🇸 Palestine
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇵🇪 Peru
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇸🇳 Senegal
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇸🇴 Somalia
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇸🇩 South Sudan
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇱🇰 Sri Lanka
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇸🇩 Sudan
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇹🇯 Tajikistan
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇹🇭 Thailand
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇹🇷 Turkey
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇺🇦 Ukraine
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇾🇪 Yemen
- ✘ 🗺️ 🇿🇼 Zimbabwe

- 28 States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty were known to have provided risk education to populations affected by antipersonnel mine contamination and other explosive remnants of war (ERW).
- 15 States Parties reported having risk education included within their mine action strategy or as a separate strategy or workplan.
- 18 States Parties had or were developing a national standard on risk education.
- 22 States Parties had national institutions or mechanisms in place for coordinating risk education.
- 20 of the 28 mine-affected States Parties that submitted an Article 7 transparency report for 2019 reported on risk education. However, the extent of detail was varied.
- Cambodia, Chad, Ethiopia, Tajikistan, and Yemen all included risk education within their Article 5 clearance deadline extension requests. Only Eritrea and Argentina did not.
- 17 donors reported specific risk education funding in 2019 and contributed US\$13.3 million. This represents an increase from 2018 when 12 donors contributed a combined total of \$9.3 million.

#### KEY

- ✘ Risk education coordination mechanisms in place at national level.
- 🗺️ Risk education national standard in place or in development.
- 🗺️ Risk education strategy or workplan in place or in development.

## Cross-Border Risk Education

In certain contexts, risk education needs to work across countries to ensure that populations living in or transiting through mine-contaminated border areas are informed of the risks.

Danish Refugee Council (DRC)/Danish Demining Group (DDG) provided risk education to Syrian refugees in Turkey to ensure awareness of contamination and safer behavior in Turkey and also for those returning to Syria.

Ecuador and Peru work together to provide risk education activities on their shared border.



The Swiss Foundation for Mine Action (FSD) provides risk education to communities in the Panji valley in Afghanistan, accessing the area from across the border in Tajikistan.

On the Thailand-Myanmar border, Humanity & Inclusion (HI) is the sole risk education operator in the nine camps in Thailand for refugees from Myanmar.