

Priority Setting in Afghanistan

Sub-Regional Workshop on Priority Setting and
Pre/Post Clearance Assessments; **Vientiane 11**
March 2009

Presented by:

Mohammad Shafiq Yosufi
Senior OPS Manager Mine Action Coordination
Centre of Afghanistan (MACCA)

Mine Action Coordination Centre of Afghanistan



Objective of this presentation:

To share some information about the mine action priority setting system in Afghanistan from 1990 to date

Priority System 1990-2004 (Emergency Responses):

□ High/Low Priority

- High: Priority 1 and/or 2
- Low: Priority 3, 4 & 5

□ Priority One:

- Immediate Rehabilitation and Development Projects
- Confirmed Repatriation of Refugees and Internal Displaced People
- Civilian Causality Rate @ 1 accident per month in specific community
- Other requests vital to population, life saving, life sustaining

Mine Action Coordination Centre of Afghanistan



Priority System 1990-2004.....

□ Priority Two:

- Rehabilitation and Development Projects planned but fund yet not available
- Where repatriation of refugees & IDP likely to occur within 12 months
- 1 – 2 civilian accidents within 12 months
- Local requests significant but not vital

Priority System 1990-2004

□ Priority Three:

- Rehabilitation/Development Project requests approved but yet no plan & funds
- Repatriation of Refugees likely to occur within 1-2 years
- Only one civilian accident in the past 12 months
- Requests for clearance contribute to the ongoing economic development and well being of the population

Priority System 1990-2004

□ Priority Four:

- All requests not covered in priorities 1-3
- No civilian casualties but the mine areas within one Km of population zones
- Request not addressed in priorities 1-3
- Where clearance improves local conditions, improve economy

Priority System 1990-2004

□ Priority Five:

- Hilltops, mountainous areas where the presence of mine does not affect normal life of the people.

Priority System 1990-2004

Decision Making Approach:

- Geographical Priority Setting by (RMAC),
- Distribution of tasks (MCPA & HALO Trust)

□ Strengths:

- Decision making decentralized
- Implementing Partners more involved in Planning
- Coordination Centre mostly focus to strategic planning, fund raising
- Easy for locals requests reach the nearest demining team

Priority System 1990-2004

Weaknesses:

- No systematic priority evaluation, rely much to requests

- Little chance for those who were not able to send requests to RMAC

- Routine, monotonous, X Sqm area cleared, Y number of mines destroyed – less tangible

- Limited indicators (Sqm & Number of mines) against which the successes measured

- Multiple demining teams movements from one side to another

Mine Action Coordination Centre of Afghanistan



Priority System (2005 - 2007):

Landmine Impact Survey (Scoring Method):

- High Impact
- Medium Impact
- Low Impact

Some Cases, Medium and Low Impact having high priority

Decision Making Approach (Priority System 2005 - 2007):

- Priority Setting Decentralized; by UNMACA Area Offices:
- Priorities set based on both either computer oriented facts or physical field assessments
- UNMACA HQ set priorities nationwide based on Area Office Submissions
- Quite flexible (if new priorities appeared, AMACs simply change the plan)
- Confirmation Assessments prerequisite prior to planning

Priority System 2005 – 2007 (Cont..)

Strengths:

- Being more objective
- Systematic Priority Setting applicable
- Computer based priority setting applicable
- Easy tracking the progress
- Long term priorities available
- Local Requests could be cross checked with IMSMA/GIS

Mine Action Coordination Centre of Afghanistan



Priority System 2005 – 2007.....

Weaknesses:

- Implementing Partners not involved in priority setting
- Implementing Partners gradually losing initiatives
- Implementing Partners much relying to MACA Area Offices
- Scoring system, in some cases, unable give us the real picture

Decision Making Approach (Priority System 2007 - date):

- ❑ MACCA allocate certain number of hazards to different Implementing Partners
- ❑ Implementing Partners make their Plan accordingly
- ❑ MACCA Reviews & Approves the Plans submitted by Implementing Partners

Priority System 2007 to date

Priority Criteria:

- ❑ Killing Zone
- ❑ 500m Proximity
- ❑ High Impacted Communities
- ❑ Medium Impacted Communities
- ❑ Highly Impacted districts
- ❑ Removing Small hazards
- ❑ Completing the “doable” FAST (Districts with 1 or 2 hazards)
- ❑ Areas with cultural benefits

Priority System 2007 to date

Strengths:

- Outputs more tangible
- Implementing Partners take the ownership
- Progress are effectively tracked
- Number of red dots reduce on the map
- Well measureable in terms of completing villages, districts etc
- Gaps easy identifiable
- Districts with few number of hazards completed (following the concept of “doing the easiest questions first in written exams”)

Mine Action Coordination Centre of Afghanistan



Priority System 2007 to date.....

Weaknesses:

- ❑ Cannot be 100% high priorities
- ❑ More computer oriented
- ❑ Implementing Partners argue “this is doable that is not”

In Summary:

- ❑ Priority System in Afghanistan Mine Action witnessed gradual positive changes since 1990.
- ❑ Priority Setting is being shifted from emergency phase to development.
- ❑ Priority Setting in Afghanistan effective all times as the requirements of each period taken into consideration
- ❑ Still the priority system in Afghanistan needs to be further developed.