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Executive Summary

The following key observations may be considered as an ‘executive summary’ of the report.

Relative complexity of the SALW issue

The MRE message is comparatively simple when compared to the SALW message. Even in countries that have not signed the 1997 Mine Ban Treaty it is possible to say that all remaining minefields and all items of unexploded ordnance can be considered a hazard, and that anyone finding any mines or UXO should report them. The SALW issue is more complex, as SALW Awareness messages struggle with the problem that not all weapons are illegal and weapon ownership is – in general – not stigmatised. SALW Awareness projects must therefore struggle with the emphasis they place on either (a) attempting to stigmatise gun ownership with the long term aim of reducing the number of weapons in circulation or (b) concentrating on achieving the comparatively short term aim of preventing accidental injuries resulting from poor gun storage and handling. This problem of ‘selection and maintenance of the aim’ does not occur in MRE.

Mixed messages

SEESAC personnel recognise that there is a potential for mixed messages in countries that have both MRE and SALW Awareness programmes. It is recommended that work is undertaken to de-conflict this potential. However, it is impossible to say to what extent this mixed message poses a problem without further survey of the target communities. Under such circumstances, the understandable organisational divisions between mine action and SALW programmes in organisations such as UNDP may be counter-productive, and thoughts should be given to ensuring that programs do not conflict with each other (or allow issues to fall between the gaps).

Robustness

However although SALW Awareness faces these two significant issues as set out above, it may also be worth observing that the SALW literature is very advanced for a comparatively new sector, and the amount of scientific research presented at all levels – especially in the field of behaviour change communication as it relates to the SALW Awareness issue – is very high. MRE literature struggled with many years to escape an excessively technical paradigm that concentrated on listing and describing endless variations of types and mechanical features of mines. The scientific rigour implied in the literature encourages the belief that the two key problems described above can be addressed and conquered by the SALW community.

---

1 The full title is ‘Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction’. The full text of the treaty can be found at http://www.icbl.org/treaty/text/english.
## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>Behaviour Change Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD</td>
<td>Explosive Ordnance Disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERW</td>
<td>Explosive Remnants of War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAS</td>
<td>International Mine Action Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRE</td>
<td>Mine Risk Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMDS/G</td>
<td>Regional Micro-Disarmament Standards/Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALW</td>
<td>Small Arms and Light Weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASP</td>
<td>Small Arms and Light Weapons Awareness Support Pack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEESAC</td>
<td>South Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UXO</td>
<td>Unexploded Ordnance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions

Anti-Personnel Mines (APM)\(^2\)

a mine designed to be exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a person and that will incapacitate, injure or kill one or more persons.

Note: Mines designed to be detonated by the presence, proximity or contact of a vehicle as opposed to a person that are equipped with anti-handling devices, are not considered APM as a result of being so equipped. [MBT]

Behaviour Change Communication (BCC)\(^3\)

is part of an integrated, multilevel, interactive process with communities aimed at developing tailored messages and approaches using a variety of communication channels. It aims to foster positive behaviour; promote and sustain individual, community, and societal behavioural change; and maintain appropriate behaviour.

Mine Risk Education (MRE)\(^4\)

refers to activities which seek to reduce the risk of injury from mines/UXO by raising awareness and promoting behavioural change; including public information dissemination, education and training, and community mine action liaison.

Small Arms and Light Weapons (SALW)\(^5\)

all lethal conventional munitions that can be carried by an individual combatant or a light vehicle, that also do not require a substantial logistic and maintenance capability.

SALW Awareness

a programme of activities undertaken with the overall goal of minimising, and where possible eliminating, the negative consequences of inadequate SALW Control by undertaking an appropriate combination of SALW advocacy, SALW risk education and media operations/public information campaigns which together work to change behaviours and facilitate appropriate alternative solutions over the long term.

Note: Wherever it exists, the operational objectives of a national SALW Control initiative will dictate the appropriate type of SALW Awareness activities.

Note: SALW awareness is a mass mobilisation approach that delivers information on the SALW threat. It may take the form of formal or non-formal education and may use mass media techniques.

SALW Control

those activities, which, together, aim to reduce the social, economic and environmental impact of uncontrolled SALW proliferation and possession.

SALW Risk Education

a process that promotes the adoption of safer behaviours by at-risk groups and by SALW holders, and which provides the links between affected communities, other SALW components and other sectors.

\(^2\) IMAS 04.10 Glossary of mine action terms, definitions and abbreviations (Edition 2), http://www.mineactionstandards.org/imas.htm
\(^4\) IMAS 12.10 Planning for MRE (Edition 1), http://www.mineactionstandards.org/imas.htm
\(^5\) Unless otherwise stated, these definitions are taken from the Regional Micro-Disarmament Standards and Guidelines on SALW used by SEESAC.
Unexploded Ordnance (UXO)

explosive ordnance which has been primed, fuzed, armed or otherwise prepared for action, and which has been dropped, fired, launched, projected, or placed in such a manner as to constitute a hazard to operations, installations, personnel or material and remains unexploded either by malfunction or design or for any other cause (NATO definition).
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Assessing the Compatibility of SALW Awareness and MRE

Introduction

1 Background

One of SEESAC’s target activities is SALW Awareness, which constitutes a fundamental component of the small arms and light weapons (SALW) control process. It involves the use of professionally developed ‘core messages’ and dissemination strategies to impart knowledge, shape the perceptions and change the behaviour of the civilian community towards SALW. Although Mine Risk Education (MRE) does not fall within SEESAC’s mandate, there are organisations in South Eastern Europe which aim to combine MRE with SALW Awareness since the civilian population risks exposure to both landmines and SALW, meaning that educating the population on both are of vital importance. Yet not all actors are active in both issues. In some cases, this is because landmines pose less of a problem in some countries than others, so some organisations have focussed on the SALW issue; other organisations are primarily focussed on the mine action issue, but have included ammunition stockpiles as part of the unexploded ordnance/explosive remnants of war (UXO/ERW) problem.

Current resources available for practitioners in MRE and SALW Awareness are the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) on MRE, and the SEESAC SALW Awareness Support Pack (SASP 1), respectively. These both serve as comprehensive guidelines for the development and implementation of MRE and SALW Awareness initiatives, respectively. Yet, further research needs to be undertaken on how these approaches compare in terms of basic principles, developmental goals and methods of implementation; in particular identifying any dichotomies. Since one of SEESAC’s main concerns is to build the capacity of non-governmental organisations to conduct SALW Awareness as well as provide technical support to all SALW stakeholders, this study aims to be substantiated with the experiences, concerns and needs of those implementing such projects in the field. Consultation with practitioners currently focused on SALW Awareness and/or MRE in the region of South Eastern Europe is thus a crucial component of this research.

2 Purpose of the report

The chief objectives of this study are:

- to identify any possible areas of cooperation between SALW Awareness and MRE practitioners, in terms of sharing lessons learned;
- to identify any possible areas of conflict between the aims and messages of SALW Awareness and MRE, which might need to be taken into account when operating in a community or country which suffers from the dangers of mines as well as a high number of SALW in circulation.

3 Methodology

This report is based on a field mission to Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (hereafter Macedonia) in July 2005, followed by an extensive literature review. The consultant was also able to interview a number of specialists in behaviour change communication (BCC) and inspect other MRE interventions in Quang Tri Province, Vietnam, as a result of a fortuitous concurrence of other, otherwise unrelated research activity. Key documents relating to the Quang Tri MRE activity are included in the list of reference documents in Annex B.

---

6 Extracted from the Terms of Reference (09 June 2005) for the consultancy task.

7 SASP 2 will be issued in November 2005.
3.1 Format

The main text of this report consists of discussions of the main areas where MRE and SALW Awareness can either be compared or contrasted. The document then includes a number of Annexes:

- Annex A is a tabular summary of the findings, which may be useful for ease of reference.
- Annex B is a list of key reference documents, including those provided by SEESAC within the Terms of Reference (ToR), including some references to the latest literature in behaviour change communication. This list also includes some background documentation on social science surveying which may be of interest to readers new to survey issues.
Comparing and contrasting MRE and SALW Awareness

1 Summary

The main discussions in this part of the report are based on addressing a number of key questions. These are:

- What is the aim (i.e. why is the intervention taking place)?
- What is the core message?
- Who are the target groups?
- How is the message delivered?
- What are the normative standards?
- How is the effectiveness to be measured?

These questions are discussed in detail below. There then follows some discussion on the development of the MRE message and some notes on the latest developments in the field of behaviour change communication, which may be of bearing for the development of SALW Awareness (and indeed MRE) messages.

2 What is the aim?

Unlike mine action, there is also a legal dimension to the SALW issue. Since the formulation of the Ottawa Treaty in 1997, mines – and certainly minefields – are stigmatised and there is no legal justification for retaining them, especially by members of the public. This allows MRE to take a relatively simplistic attitude to the mine problem, as it allows MRE messages to consider that ‘all mines are bad’. This cannot be said for SALW as there are considerable numbers of legal weapons, either owned by the local security forces or by members of the public. Whilst many organisations active in SALW have differing views on the normative aspects of this situation this de facto and de jure permissive attitude to weapon ownership is a fact of life for the foreseeable future.

So the aim of MRE interventions can be summarised as ‘to carry out an educational process designed to assist in the reduction of casualties through the modification of behaviour’, and definitions to this effect are set out in the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) included in the references at Annex B. And likewise, the SEESAC SALW Awareness Support Pack (SASP 1) includes the aim of SALW Risk Education as ‘a process that promotes the adoption of safer behaviours by at-risk groups’, informing them about ‘the dangers and threats of SALW and educating them about alternative, safer behaviours.’

However, SALW Risk Education in SASP 1 also targets SALW-holders to adopt safe behaviours when handling and storing their weapons. In MRE, field interventions concentrate on a (comparatively) simpler message solely intended to promote safer behaviour against a threat over which the beneficiaries have no control – i.e. a ‘third person’ risk. SALW Awareness is faced with the more complex problem of including messages aimed at the individual to modify their own dangerous behaviour in terms of weapon storage and handling, which can also be described as a ‘first person’ risk.

Risk management literature suggests that subjective risk analysis shows that people are less afraid of first person risks than of third person risks (one common example is that many people are more afraid of flying than driving to the airport, even though statistics show that it is the latter that poses more risk. This disparity is put down to the fact that the individual has more control over the first person risk than the third person risk and so feels safer). This would suggest that SALW Awareness interventions are inevitably – all things being equal – going...
to be less effective than a ‘similar’ MRE intervention\textsuperscript{10} because the difference between perceived risks will allow the target audiences to discount the risk of something over which they have control.

Further, SALW Awareness as a whole, which has as just one of its components SALW Risk Education, also includes an Advocacy component defined as ‘a process that aims to raise SALW problems and issues with the general public, the authorities, the media, governments and their institutions to achieve changes at both institutional and/or individual levels’. In MRE the aim is very clear (although some the language used in the literature is perhaps rather jargonised) and, significantly, includes no reference to advocacy. The mine action sector has in fact identified advocacy as a separate pillar of mine action,\textsuperscript{11} whereas SALW Awareness includes advocacy messages aimed at the target population that attempt to persuade them to ‘give up’ gun ownership (in pursuit of a long term aim to reduce the number of guns in circulation).

This suggests that the SALW Awareness message is more complex than the MRE message, because SALW Awareness includes a mix of practical safety message and moral suasion. The existence of this complexity is supported in the SALW Awareness literature, including two particular themes:

- Focus group participants named tradition as the primary reason for possessing weapons,\textsuperscript{12} and there are also those who hunt with weapons or use them for recreational purposes;\textsuperscript{13} and

- If parents argue against the messages used in the awareness program this may neutralise positive lessons or even worsen pre-existing attitudes.\textsuperscript{14}

In other words, because there are \textit{de jure} legal grounds for some weapons ownership, SALW Awareness does not benefit from the clear ‘all mines are bad’ assumption that MRE enjoys.\textsuperscript{15} This suggests that, if the aim is to reduce casualties with safer behaviours adopted around weapons, SALW Awareness interventions could benefit from a clearer separation of advocacy from safe behaviour messages. But there needs to be coordination \textit{within} the SALW community when devising programme objectives as there may be confusion as to whether the aim is to advocate less gun ownership (potentially alienating those who lobby on behalf of responsible gun owners) or to advocate safer

\begin{itemize}
\item Focus group participants named tradition as the primary reason for possessing weapons,\textsuperscript{12} and there are also those who hunt with weapons or use them for recreational purposes;\textsuperscript{13} and
\item If parents argue against the messages used in the awareness program this may neutralise positive lessons or even worsen pre-existing attitudes.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{10} I.e. one prepared to the same quality.

\textsuperscript{11} The five pillars of mine action are mine and UXO clearance, MRE, mine victim assistance, stockpile destruction and advocacy. Whilst there is some dispute about these pillars (there is some question of the validity of singling out victim assistance from other health and disability interventions) there is little disagreement that advocacy stands aside from all of the ‘field oriented’ pillars as it is a government to government (or civil society to government) issue.

\textsuperscript{12} Drawn from the SALW Survey of Montenegro, 2004.

\textsuperscript{13} See SASP 1 for a tabulated list of the complex motivations behind weapons possession.

\textsuperscript{14} Drawn from the SEESAC Document ‘SALW Awareness in Schools – Towards a National Curriculum,’ 2005.

\textsuperscript{15} This was not always the case: the Consultant witnessed one mine risk education program in the Balkans in the mid 1990s that attempted to justify ‘good’ mines used by their ‘defending’ army and ‘bad’ mines used by the ‘attacking’ enemy. Luckily this attitude has faded with the end of hostilities.
gun ownership (and thus potentially alienating those organisations who seek to reduce the number of guns in the target countries). This divide does not exist in practice within the MRE community (although it does exist at a higher level in the advocacy pillar of mine action, i.e. in debates about accession to the Ottawa Treaty by the remaining mine producing/owning countries). In practice, MRE projects have tended to concentrate on safe behaviour messages rather than advocacy issues, and this suggests a requirement to develop an acceptable SALW message that achieves a similar pragmatic compromise. The risk is that if different organisations in the SALW sector send different messages about gun ownership to the same target groups, they will dilute the impact of their efforts.

Perhaps there are lessons to be learned from the ‘safer sex’ v ‘abstinence’ debate that continues in the HIV/AIDS sector (a key focus of current behaviour change communication research) in this regard. This problem can be represented diagrammatically as set out in Figure 3. Interestingly, this path is similar to that observed by psychotherapists using the ‘I’m ok – you’re ok’ technique for behavioural therapy.\(^{16}\) Psychotherapists also observe how individuals can ‘discount’ information that is too uncomfortable for their worldview – however dysfunctional or suboptimal it may be. Such ability may account for the difficulties of exhorting behaviour changes with benefits that may appear logical and self-evident from the outside.

This would suggest that SALW Awareness is at best going to modify behaviour of a percentage of a percentage of the overall population. However, this may still be worthwhile, even from a cold economic perspective. Other research\(^ {17} \) suggests that, using the value of a statistical life (VSL) commonly used in transport and health economics sectors it is possible to calculate the level of effectiveness of such interventions necessary to make them cost effective. The research also shows that MRE interventions can be relatively ineffective in terms of numbers of people whose behaviour is modified, and yet still beneficial in comparison with other mine action interventions due to their comparatively low costs. It should be possible to calculate such cost benefit analysis calculations for SALW interventions.

### 3 What is the core message?

In MRE, the core message can be summarised as a combination of the following three instructions:

- Don’t go (into contaminated areas);
- Don’t touch (suspected landmines or UXO); and
- Report (any findings of mines, UXO or suspected contaminated areas).

---


\(^{17}\) ‘The Economics of Landmine Clearance’, R Keeley, prepared for submission in March 2006, for a PhD in Applied Environmental Economics at Imperial College London.
The remaining content of MRE messages is how to recognise landmines and UXO, and more importantly, how to recognise contaminated areas. Nowadays, credible MRE interventions also include details about how to report findings to organisations responsible for marking, fencing and clearing contamination.

Full details of the MRE message are set out in IMAS, including IMAS 12.10 and IMAS 12.20.

In SALW Awareness (Risk Education), the messages are slightly different:

- Don’t touch (weapons or ammunition that you encounter);
- Report (weapons or ammunition that you encounter); and
- Secure (weapons or ammunition that you possess);

And in SALW Awareness (Advocacy):

- Hand in (weapons or ammunition that you possess).

SALW Awareness messages also include detail on recognition and reporting, and may include references to weapons collection programmes that facilitate safe disposal of items.

However, whilst the MRE message can be summarised as something that is essentially passive in terms of the relationship between the target audience and the hazard, SALW Awareness includes instructions for two active forms of behaviour, including an exhortation to safely secure weapons and, more significantly, to hand in weapons.

This leads to two problems that are not apparent in the MRE message. These are:

- accepting that there is a case for promoting safe storage of all weapons may not be attractive for those sections of the SALW sector whose primary aim is to reduce the number of weapons in circulation (this is discussed in detail in the preceding section). There is therefore much more of a risk of different political messages being circulated by different organisations with different agendas, a problem that is non-existent in the MRE sector (as the advocacy issue in mine action is a separate pillar that acts on a state level rather than at the level of the individual); and
- asking people to hand in weapons may lead to casualties caused by a lack of understanding of the differences between ‘guns bullets and bombs.’ This is recognised by SEESAC personnel (reference to it is included in SASP 1 on page 18). There are several reports of such accidents, including one (as yet undocumented) that took place in a weapons collection programme in Bosnia and Herzegovina during 1999. It is also easy for SALW Awareness and MRE practitioners to forget that target populations will not know as much about the differences between weapons, their ammunition and explosive ordnance (EO) as the specialists. This is a crucial consideration in terms of what ordnance and weapons can be handled and how, and what is safe to transport and what is not. Possible ways to minimise such incidents recommended by SASP 1 are as follows:
  
  a) use the terms ‘weapons’, ‘ammunition’ and ‘explosives’ to distinguish between the various types of SALW and allow clarification of the different behaviours that are appropriate for weapons and most types of ammunition on the one hand, AND UXO/mines on the other;
  
  b) issue ‘Safety Cards’ to the population to give citizens basic safety advice on what types of weapons, ammunition and explosives to hand-in and what is unsafe to handle; and

---

18 During the field trip at least one example of the result of such a mixed message was given by one of the respondents: he witnessed a man unloading significant numbers of landmines and explosive ordnance from the boot of his car during a recent weapons amnesty and SASP 1 refers to an example from Croatia in the 1990s where one man attempted to collect mines from minefields and hand them in at SALW collection point which was both hazardous and disrupted the pattern of known minefield areas. There are certainly instances of such activity resulting in casualties in other regions of the world.
c) establish contact with any organisation currently conducting or, that has recently conducted MRE work in the area.

Furthermore, given that the MRE sector has adopted a purely passive mode in describing safe behaviour, and that it has largely abandoned extensive technical descriptions of different types of UXO, there is clearly a potential for mixed messages in countries where both MRE and SALW Awareness programmes exist. MRE programmes that teach about all types of explosive ordnance will usually describe abandoned ordnance as a type of hazard, whilst also stressing the ‘don’t go, don’t touch, report’ message, whereas SALW Awareness interventions will often be telling the same people that they should touch these items and hand them in. Combine this instruction with a lack of ability to differentiate between categories of EO (possibly exacerbated by overly complicated advice that only serves to confuse) and there is clearly scope for accidents to occur. The separation of mine action and SALW responsibilities between different project staff cannot help matters. For example, it was noted that the mine action coordination agency in Bosnia (BHMAC) was not invited to join SALW coordination (even though it helped coordinate EOD teams called to assist in collection of ammunition) and that UNDP employed two different project officers to coordinate UNDP involvement in mine action and SALW activities.

It is possible to consider this issue as a Type I/Type II error problem as described in risk analysis literature. Type I/Type II error analysis considers the risk of proceeding with an activity as compared with the risk of not proceeding (readers familiar with the doctrines of the Catholic Church will recognise a similarity with the concepts of ‘sins of omission’ and ‘sins of commission’). In the case of SALW Awareness we can describe the options as set out in Table 1 thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ‘Hand-in’ Advocacy Message</th>
<th>Type of Error</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include</td>
<td>Type I</td>
<td>Increased risk of accidents caused by recipients attempting to hand in UXO in dangerous condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not include</td>
<td>Type II</td>
<td>Harder to achieve hand in of weapons as reduced transmission of message to comply with weapons collection projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, an extreme Type I or Type II situation could be a significant problem; however whilst the analysis in Table I describes the potential hazard it does not address the probability of occurrence.

Developing strategies to deal with this problem must also be further tempered by the fact that not all UXO are unsafe to move (though as one cannot of course expect the general population to identify which is safe or unsafe, this must be considered as an essential random occurrence). Earlier research in Bosnia and Herzegovina suggests that 25% of all UXO pose a significant hazard (based on the percentage of reported UXO that Bosnian civil protection EOD teams have to blow in situ).

Unfortunately, the data collected by the existing SALW Surveys does not describe how prevalent is the incidence of mixed messages resulting in people handling UXO. There is therefore a case to be made for a SALW Survey to study the incidence of confusion from mixed messages in countries where there are MRE and SALW Awareness programmes, in order to understand the actual risk posed by this potential problem.

However, if immediate safety concerns are the key aim, it might also be possible to resolve these two main potential issues (i.e. of confusion of the aim and of mixed messages) with the adoption of some simple, pragmatic messages that set aside the question of weapon ownership and concentrate on safe handling and storage. Some possible message themes are set out below in Table 3. These messages could also be adopted as a consensus

---


20 This issue does not apply in those countries in South Eastern Europe where there have not been recent conflicts (such as Bulgaria).

21 Conducted by the author in February 2005 as part of his PhD research. The percentage is based on an analysis of incident records from the Republican Srpska Civil Protection EOD teams.
position by the two wings of SALW Awareness practitioners (i.e. those seeking to reduce gun ownership and those seeking better control of existing guns).

**TABLE 2: SOME SIMPLE AND PRAGMATIC MESSAGES FOR SALW AWARENESS?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you discover weapons, report them without touching them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt safe handling of weapons that you own - regardless of how you came to own them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you have weapons, ask yourselves if you still need them – consider the consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you possess weapons and want to dispose of them, only handle weapons and ammunition that you are confident to do so safely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you are unsure, or if the ammunition looks old or unstable, exposed to heat or fire, ask for assistance. No one will mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under no circumstances should you handle landmines or other UXO that you discover.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Who are the target groups?

MRE and SALW Awareness literature both emphasise the need for different messages for different sectors of the target population. In MRE, this can be seen in sector overviews (such as the 2002 GICHD report ‘Communication in Mine Awareness Programmes’) and in documents that analyse specific programs (such as the 2002 KAP survey in Quang Tri, Vietnam). For example, the Quang Tri KAP survey identifies that ‘hobby deminers’ (a local term for those who search for UXO in order to extract scrap for sale) are increasingly the largest source of mine casualties and the hardest to influence, as a specific target group for MRE interventions, and many MRE communications in Quang Tri are targeted specifically at them. In the field of SALW Awareness the identification of target groups allows for more focussed project design and also facilitates evaluation of the impact of any SALW Awareness initiative. Coordination between SALW Awareness and MRE can ensure that there aren’t any target groups that are being ignored.

**TABLE 3: DIFFERENT KEY TARGET GROUPS FOR MRE AND SALW AWARENESS INTERVENTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MRE</th>
<th>SALW Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobby deminers</td>
<td>Weapon owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting aid workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. The journalist in this photograph had to be physically restrained after attempting to disinter a body in search for interesting artifacts. Kuwait 1991.
It may also be worth considering the need for SALW Awareness training for journalists for their own safety. Getting journalists to adopt safe behaviours in mined areas is a common problem: journalists who cover weapons collection may be tempted to handle some of the items that are collected, indeed may even be encouraged to (and there are some pictures in the SEESAC newsletters that show visiting dignitaries handling weapons!). It might be useful to include some ‘do’s and don’ts’ on safe handling issues with the SEESAC resource pack.

5 How is the message delivered?

Review of the MRE literature reveals four main vectors for the dissemination and delivery of the MRE message. These are:

- community-based presentations;
- school-based presentations;
- mass media; and/or
- add-ons to other issues.

These are also arenas in which SALW Awareness programmes take place.

5.1 Community-based presentations

Community-based presentations typically involve a specialised MRE team descending on a community with a travelling show to inform the community about the landmine and UXO issue. When they are done well, MRE community-based presentations may involve participatory methods adopted from rural development techniques that encourage the community to inform each other about the location of the nearest suspected hazard areas, and can also therefore provide feedback to the mine action community about the location of landmines and UXO for inclusion in the clearance plan.

Similarly, in SALW Awareness programmes, SASP 1 recognises the importance of a participatory approach at community-level and that the distribution of materials and/or lectures is not sufficient to change behaviours: communities must be engaged in the whole process with their specific circumstances and needs taken into account. This community-based activity is known as the Safer Community Plan.

There are a number of concerns that both MRE and SALW Awareness share, as programmes which seek to engage and influence individuals at the community-level:

- The danger of ‘one size fits all’ initiatives is that they are culturally insensitive and not community-specific. MRE material was used from Laos in Vietnam without changing the costumes of the characters in the material – so making the material appear less relevant to Vietnamese audiences.

- Information gathering ahead of a SALW Awareness programme and MRE initiatives is a key part of the project cycle. In South East Europe several National SALW Surveys have been carried out to identify which regions have greater incidence of weapon ownership, and which regions have greater incidence of violence involving SALW. This data also provides a means for more focussed project design and for evaluation. Programme managers designing future SALW Awareness interventions can also learn from social science specialists who have identified ‘tarmac bias’ as a problem in social science projects in developing countries where research and project implementation tends to cluster disproportionately around communities that have good road communications, and tend not to penetrate sufficiently into remote areas.


23 Worse still was an attempt by a NATO army team that intended to engage in MRE activities in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1996. The Consultant was asked for advice on the content of an MRE package that included an opening cartoon of a NATO soldier standing in a circle of people sitting on the ground in front of their mud huts with straw roofs – not a particularly relevant image for an MRE presentation aimed at a European audience! Fortunately this image was subsequently removed from the presentation pack before use.
A particular problem identified for community-based MRE in Cambodia was that MRE teams were employed to provide community-based MRE delivery over a standard working week – i.e. with working hours that coincided almost exactly with the working hours of their target audiences. This is a simple lesson to be learned for project managers designing future SALW Awareness interventions.

Teams employed to carry out presentations (MRE) or conduct meetings with community stakeholders (SALW Awareness), in standard working hours may only reach the non-working population.

The law of unintended consequences: MRE teams that are unconnected to clearance capacities and SALW Awareness project staff that are not coordinating with other SALW stakeholders on weapons registration and collection, may find their credibility damaged when the target communities immediately report the existence of landmines and UXO to the team as a result of their presentation or ask to whom they can hand in or register their weapon, respectively. Expectations are raised by MRE and SALW Awareness project staff and then dashed when they can’t provide a timely solution.

The SALW Awareness literature also recognises the role of community-based approaches in placing peer pressure on gun owners to give up their weapons. It is not clear from the literature how effective this persuading may be in practice.

5.2 School-based activities

School-based presentations can be considered as community-based presentations that have been optimised for interaction with children. They may include the same features as general community-based presentations but may include some specific features such as the use of child art (often through art competitions) and peer-to-peer communication to encourage the adoption of safe behaviour. Broadcasting the results of the art competitions also provide a focus for mass media efforts (see 5.3).

Since both SALW Awareness and MRE have in common children as a target group, it is in the interest of both fields to coordinate activities for a two-way sharing of lessons learned as well as to avoid any overlap and confusion. Lessons learned include:

Long descriptions of the differences between mortar rounds, rockets and recoilless rifle ammunition, whilst useful for those engaged in the disposal of such items, are inappropriate for target populations for both MRE and SALW messages, especially for children. Many MRE interventions have been guilty of such technical digressions, rather than focussing on behaviour change in the target audience, as the notes set out in Box 1 describe. Instructors may be tempted to fall into this ‘comfort zone’ concentrating on the technical

In 1994, staff working at the UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR) headquarters in Zagreb identified a problem with the dominant technical paradigm in mine awareness training for UN civilian and military personnel arriving in the mission area. The problem was first defined by Ms Belinda Goslin, who went on to work as the Mine Awareness Officer in the UN Mine Action Centre for Croatia UN MAC (C). Ms Vanja Sikaricia, hired to join the UN MAC (C) for her background in mass communication, helped her develop a message that was aimed at behaviour change, with assistance from a public health specialist, Dr (now professor) Branko Kopjar (now a member of the faculty of George Washington University) who had – coincidentally – studied the impact of the war on weapon ownership and gun-related violence in Croatia. Others of the UN MAC (C) team (including this Consultant) then worked to provide technical input to reinforce a message that concentrated on identifying safe and unsafe behaviour rather than simply listing the recognition features of different types of mines. There was subsequently a significant reduction in peacekeeper mine casualties, even with an increase in force size and change to a more proactive mandate with the accession of the NATO Implementation Force (IFOR) which adopted the new mine awareness message developed by UN MAC (C).

Unfortunately, this paradigm change has been slow to catch on, even though its need was evident to many other mine action specialists and has now been incorporated in the relevant IMAS. The GICHD study on Communication in Mine Awareness, published in 2002, reported the persistence of the technical paradigm in Cambodia, and in 2004 the Consultant witnessed a mine risk education briefing for new aid agency personnel in Afghanistan that simply recited – at length and in detail – the different recognition features and operating principles of every AP mine in Afghanistan, with very little advice given on safe behaviour.

Box 1. The persistence of the technical paradigm in MRE. SALW Awareness programmes should guard against similar digressions.
paradigm, especially when they are specialists in mines and/or SALW rather than educators. This may even lead to the ‘bubble-gum effect’ whereby when you show endless pictures of different kinds of weapons, you risk generating an interest amongst the children in being able to say that they have seen all these types of weapons.

- A common problem already documented in MRE is over-emphasis on school interventions and urban youth projects, where most casualties may be adults. Schools provide a captive audience and may well be spaces in which staff have experience (‘sticking to what they know’). Implementing organisations need to study the casualty data which may not be easily obtainable in new areas of operation;²⁴

- Ostensibly ‘community-based’ MRE interventions may morph into school-based activity as schoolchildren are easily accessed, especially during working hours;

- School-based approaches – which are inherently photogenic - may be a disguised form of propaganda for the implementing agent concerned, with a focus on producing high profile activity rather than ensuring that there are useful outcomes in terms of actual behaviour change;

- There are debates about how shocking the material should be; the literature tends to suggest that younger children should be protected from traumatic exposure to graphic images of wounds, whilst some practitioners feel that teenagers in particular need to be shocked. Peer-to-peer approaches involving young casualties are felt to provide a means by which children can be made to recognise that this is a real problem that might affect them, whilst also providing the casualty with a means to develop their own self esteem if they can contribute to helping others. Clearly the involvement of child casualties in such endeavours must be carefully handled in case they actually become more traumatic for the individuals concerned;

²⁴ One notable exception to the problem of casualty data is that of the Cambodian CMVIS database, details of which can be found at http://www.redcross.org.kh/services/cmvis.htm
In general, the MRE community now recognises there are particular problems with teenagers, who may be less receptive to school-based instruction.

There is a greater recognition of the need to compensate for this with out of school approaches more likely to be effective with teenagers. The UN Mine Action Centre in Croatia (forerunner of the current CROMAC) was an early adopter of youth-based mass media with the help of MTV Europe in 1996-97, using youth culture to replace standard authority figures against which teenagers habitually rebel. Mass media approaches are discussed in more detail below. However, it is important not to fall into the 'one size fits all' trap. For example, in rural provinces in Vietnam it appears to be possible to engage teenagers in organised activities to a much older age than might be expected in Europe, apparently because it gives teenagers an opportunity to 'hang out' that is otherwise unavailable. It may be possible that this potential exists in youth activities in South East Europe in some form (and the involvement of youth organisations in the SALW issue is an encouraging feature in this regard).

SALW Awareness in South East Europe is already well positioned to address school-based approaches; the SEESAC document ‘SALW Awareness in Schools – Towards a National Curriculum’ published in 2005 lays out the key issues involved in a school-based approach. The only detraction from this useful document is that in one section it poses a number of interesting and valid research questions, but it does not present many of the solutions in the same context (though many of them are answered by the document itself in other places). It would be useful if later versions of this document could set out these answers.

5.3 Mass and small media

Many mine action programmes now include a form of mass media communication within their activities. These can include:

- TV spots;
- radio broadcasts;
- billboards; and
- newspaper articles and advertisements.

TV spots can be used to highlight key issues and can be designed to concentrate on specific elements of the MRE or SALW Awareness message or tailored to specific segments of the target audience.
Small media (such as posters and leaflets) can be superficially attractive to donors and implementing agencies, not least because it sees the logos of these organisations quickly promulgated. However, in many cases the posters never leave the offices, and the MRE literature reports a common over emphasis on ‘small media’ when these have been reported to have limited effectiveness in the transmission of the message. Small media is often too complicated, with a recurrence of the technical paradigm – posters of lots of different types of mines – and sometimes relying on the use of the printed word in largely illiterate communities. This last problem is more unlikely in South Eastern Europe which has far higher literacy rates than most other mine and UXO affected regions, though it may come with attendant logistic problems of producing material in different languages and alphabets.

The MRE literature suggests that small media are more likely to be effective when they are simple, useful (such as t-shirts and children’s school exercise books) and, most importantly, delivered as part of a community-based approach.

SASP 1 already includes some useful advice on the use of small media:

![Figure 9](image.png) This Afghan poster, seen in 2004, shows the persistence of the technical paradigm. However, this example is printed on a tea-cloth, which means it is at least more likely to be seen than a conventional poster.

![Figure 10](image.png) Badges used in support of SALW Awareness programme in FYRoM – these were given to clothes shops and the Intercity Bus Station for distribution.

![Figure 11](image.png) T-shirt with the logo ‘For a life without weapons’ distributed during a SALW Awareness campaign in Serbia.
5.4 Additional possible vectors for SALW Awareness

The above discussions on vectors for the dissemination of messages have concentrated on those elements that are common to both MRE and SALW Awareness. However, SALW Awareness can also draw on two other activities linked with weapons collection that are not available to MRE interventions. These are:

- SALW Awareness incorporated with amnesties; and
- SALW Awareness linked to incentives.

SALW literature lists a number of mechanisms for encouraging weapons collection, such as 'Weapons for Development (WfD)’. This offers SALW Awareness project planners further opportunities to set out the SALW Awareness core messages; indeed SALW Awareness is important as a means to transmit instructions on how to hand in weapons safely. Nevertheless it can be argued that the actual vectors (community, schools, and mass communication) remain the same for SALW Awareness as for MRE.

6 What are the normative standards?

Both MRE and SALW Awareness have access to normative standards. MRE normative standards can be found in IMAS, specifically:

- IMAS 07.41 Monitoring of MRE (Edition 1);
- IMAS 12.10 Planning for MRE (Edition 1); and

SALW Awareness projects in South Eastern Europe are also guided by normative standards, as set out in RMDS/G 06.10 (Development and Implementation of SALW Awareness Programmes (2nd Edition)). SALW Awareness projects in South Eastern Europe are also provided with comprehensive guidelines for implementation in SASP 1. Both documents appear to cover almost all of the key issues, and indeed there is a good case to be made for promoting RMDS/G 06.10 to the status of a full 'international' standard. The only main observation to be made about SASP 1, is that there may be some benefit in re-organising its layout to be compatible with that of RMDS/G 06.10, in order to provide clearer guidance on how to comply with the requirements of RMDS/G 06.10.

However, there are other sources of advice on best practice in the science of behaviour change communication (BCC), which have been driven by public health research into limiting the spread of HIV/AIDS through behaviour modification. Useful resources include the ELDIS website25 and a series of BCC handbooks which are also available at the website of Family health International26. The text in Box 2 sets out how the ELDIS website summarises the principles of BCC.

Once references to HIV/AIDS are removed, the language shows the potential relevance to MRE and SALW Awareness project designers.

The principles of BCC are as follows:

- Before individuals can change their behaviour and reduce their level of risk, they must understand the basic facts...
- They must also adopt key attitudes, learn a set of skills and be given access to appropriate services.
- People must feel that their environment is supportive so that they are confident about maintaining their new behaviour and accessing information and services.

---

25 www.eldis.org
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7  How is effectiveness to be measured?

The final key question to be considered is how one might measure the effectiveness of MRE and SALW Awareness projects. IMAS 07.41 Monitoring of MRE (Edition 1) provides guidance on the qualitative evaluation of MRE activities. However this tends to emphasise evaluation of the activities of MRE. In the sense of the working definition of MRE as ‘to carry out an educational process designed to assist in the reduction of casualties through the modification of behaviour’ this qualitative evaluation focuses on the assessment of whether or not the project follows best educational practices.

However, there is less guidance in this IMAS on determining how effective the project is on modifying behaviour change. In the case of MRE, the GICHD document ‘Communication in Mine Awareness Programmes’ provides guidance on how to conduct knowledge, attitude and practices (KAP) surveys although perhaps its KAP methodology is a little impractical (it includes an eight page questionnaire purportedly suitable for Grade 1 children). SASP 1 also provides guidance on KAP methodology. Nevertheless, Public health professionals interviewed by the Consultant27 are unanimous in expressing their concern with the validity of KAP processes in evaluation processes, as there is strong suspicions that respondents have a habit of reporting what they think is the ‘right’ behaviour and under-representing their actual propensity for risky behaviour.

Conventionally, public health interventions are evaluated in terms of effectiveness through examination of their outcomes in terms of reduction of casualty numbers, though (as the GICHD study makes clear) it is very difficult to establish causality as there are a number of exogenous factors that can also impact significantly on casualty numbers. It may however be possible to control for interventions in some areas where there are comparable populations that have not been exposed to MRE (or SALW Awareness) messages.

27 The list includes: Professor Julia Fox-Rushby, Brunel University, Dr. Kara Hanson, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Dr Tom Jefferson, consultant, Professor Ann Netten, UKC; Professor David Parkin, City University; Dr Hazel Slavin, consultant, and Dr Catriona Waddington of the HLSPI Institute.
In order of desirability, therefore, the assessment of effectiveness might be:

1. Use of control groups to assess the effectiveness of MRE/SALW Awareness interventions in terms of casualty numbers controlled by their access to BCC messages. Requires significant casualty data plus existence of a suitable control group.

2. Use of a KAP survey, which may be reliable in terms of knowledge and attitude. Requires use of formal sampling techniques to achieve a statistically reliable result, but still might include an inaccuracy in terms of reporting of actual practices.

3. Use of qualitative techniques including soliciting of expert opinions and focus groups to estimate the effectiveness of various messages and minimise the incidence of unintended consequences.

The following table (Table 4) shows a possible qualitative means of grading MRE and SALW Awareness interventions in terms of what could be called a “Five I” scale:

- **Level 6**: Immobilising
- **Level 5**: Influential
- **Level 4**: Ineffectual
- **Level 3**: Impossible
- **Level 2**: Irrelevant
- **Level 1**: Incompetent

Level 5 is the desirable level of effect, where interventions are effective (‘influential’) without being so dramatic that they ‘immobilise’ the target audience with excessive fear.

### 8 Other issues and observations

There are two other observations that may be worth considering in the context of SALW Awareness.

Firstly, one of the most investigated areas in BCC is the question of smoking, and specifically how BCC interventions can be used to encourage people to stop smoking. People commonly talk about ‘giving up’ smoking, and it has been realised that this language encourages the subconscious impression that a smoker has something to lose (‘give up’) by stopping smoking, whereas one might equally describe the process as ‘saving’ money spent on smoking or ‘freeing’ oneself from the tyranny of nicotine. There may be something to be learned from this before talking about people ‘giving up’ or ‘surrendering’ their weapons – perhaps it might be possible to describe the handing in process as one of ridding oneself of a hazard.

Secondly, as part of the preparation for the pilot project for mine action in Quang Tri Province, an MRE specialist providing technical assistance to the project produced a list of the major errors in MRE projects.

---


29 These are available from the Consultant on request.
### TABLE 4: MRE AND SALW EFFECTIVENESS CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>MRE</th>
<th>SALW</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Immobilizing</td>
<td>Counter-productive level of fear</td>
<td>'Mines are everywhere'</td>
<td>'If everyone else has got one…I better get one too!'</td>
<td>Short-term effect likely to be regarded as irrelevant once local context is understood. In SALW context weakens focus on illegal or badly stored weapons. Could also conceivably generate ‘arms race’ if people think that everyone else is carrying a gun!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Influential</td>
<td>Behaviour modification achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ineffectual</td>
<td>Right message, right audience, but discounted by individual for personal reasons</td>
<td>'I don’t think that I’m at risk'</td>
<td>'I know how to look after my gun'</td>
<td>In SALW context could be perceived as irrelevant by owners of legal weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Impossible</td>
<td>Right message, right audience, no alternative livelihood strategy</td>
<td>'I have no choice'</td>
<td>'I must be sure of my security'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>Right message wrong audience</td>
<td>'Nothing to do with me'</td>
<td>'Nothing to do with me'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>Wrong message increases risk</td>
<td>May also include irrelevant presentation of the technical features without any behaviour change advice</td>
<td>Risky behaviour by handing in UXO</td>
<td>SALW problem of conflict with MRE message</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions and recommendations

In conclusion, the SALW Awareness literature shows that it has developed quickly and has already learned many of the lessons to be learned by the MRE sector. Many of the key questions faced by any designer of MRE interventions are faced by SALW Awareness project designers, with a few minor changes in the definition of target groups and opportunities for presenting the SALW Awareness message.

However, one of the main lessons to be learned from MRE – and indeed, from BCC activities in general - is that one size does not fit all. In particular, the comparatively sophisticated target audiences in the countries of South East Europe may not be receptive to some of the techniques developed for use in remote rural populations in developing countries. For example, it may be less effective to use some of the community-based or youth organisation methods that are used in countries without many opportunities for entertainment in populations used to having access to their own cars and TV.

There are also lessons to be learned from BCC literature on the subtlety needed in designing the format of the message. The difference made by either ‘giving up’ or ‘stopping’ smoking may have application in SALW Awareness intervention design.

There are three major issues faced by SALW Awareness project managers. These are:

- the fact that not all weapon ownership is illegal makes the SALW issue more complex than MRE;
- there is a potential for a mixed message in countries that also have a landmine and UXO problem, where people are advised not to touch items; and
- given the fact that not all weapons are illegal and many countries have a reported ‘gun culture’, the SALW Awareness message – especially if presented in a radical ‘anti-gun’ manner, may turn off some recipients against all elements of the SALW Awareness message, including practical advice on safe gun handling and storage. SALW Awareness interventions can therefore only be expected to influence a percentage of a percentage of the population. However, based on other research, the use of cost benefit analysis techniques is likely to show that SALW Awareness interventions may still be of net benefit.

The following recommended actions may be of use in optimising SALW Awareness interventions:

- revision of the SEESAC publication schools publication to include the answers to the questions posed in the document;
- inclusion of advice on safe behaviour for journalists in the journalist resource pack;
- careful monitoring of the SEESAC newsletters and other articles to avoid pictures of people handling guns out of curiosity;
- revision of SASP 1 to reflect the format of the RDMS/G and IMAS documentation, allowing easier read-across and allowing SASP 1 to provide clearer guidelines on how to meet RMDS/G requirements. The RMDS/G should also be promoted as the basis for international guidelines in SALW issues;
- continual use of focus groups to pre-test SALW Awareness interventions, to prevent incidences of ‘the law of unintended consequences’ and optimise the language used in each message;
- continued use of KAP surveys at appropriate stages in the project cycle to measure the effectiveness of interventions;
- a study to measure the actual incidences of mixed messages in countries that have MRE and SALW Awareness interventions;
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- use of cost benefit analysis techniques to measure the cost effectiveness of SALW Awareness interventions in a quantitative manner;

- adoption of pragmatic messages which are acceptable by all wings of the small arms issue, concentrating on safe handling and storage and encouraging weapons hand-in rather than inadvertently demonising weapon holders; and

- encourage closer coordination with mine action actors at all levels to ensure consistency of approach.
### Annex A - Tabular summary of the comparisons between MRE and SALW Awareness programmes

#### MRE AND SALW AWARENESS COMPARISON CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>MRE</th>
<th>SALW Awareness</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>Why?</td>
<td>Educational process intended to reduce casualties through [continual] modification of behaviour</td>
<td>Reduce incidence of injury and numbers of weapons through [presumably] a one off act to surrender weapons</td>
<td>Is overarching aim correct? How does BCC theory suggest that external imperatives will affect compliance with stated aims?</td>
<td>Complexity of including advocacy in SALWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Core Message</td>
<td>What?</td>
<td>Don’t go Don’t touch Report</td>
<td>Don’t touch Report Secure Hand in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Target Group(s)</td>
<td>Who?</td>
<td>Children Community Hobby deminers Visitors</td>
<td>Children Community-based Weapon owners</td>
<td>Do current vectors address target groups?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Geographic distribution</td>
<td>Where?</td>
<td>Mine contaminated areas</td>
<td>Population centres or areas of incidence</td>
<td>Where are SASP 1 projects?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Temporal distribution</td>
<td>When?</td>
<td>Community-based teams work when targets are at work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BCC Vectors</td>
<td>How?</td>
<td>Community-based School Mass media Add-ons to other issues</td>
<td>Community-based School Mass media Add-ons to other issues Amnesties Incentives</td>
<td>Make sure SALW legislation isn’t counter-productive Incentives that don’t encourage ‘harvesting’ UXO How to deal with UXO that are handed in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>IMAS</td>
<td>SASP 1 (SASP 2 from November 2005)</td>
<td>Why doesn’t SASP 1 look like IMAS?</td>
<td>Room to re-format SASP 1? Who owns and validates it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Measures of merit</td>
<td>Casualty numbers KAP surveys Control surveys Compliance with IMAS</td>
<td>Casualty numbers KAP surveys Control surveys Compliance with SASP 1 Hand-in rates</td>
<td>Causalities KAP validity Finding a control area Qualitative not quantitative Disaggregating ammunition items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex B – Key References

As identified in the TOR

- IMAS 07.41 Monitoring of MRE (Edition 1)
- IMAS 12.10 Planning for MRE (Edition 1)
- IMAS 12.20 Implementation of MRE (Edition 1)
- RMDS/G 06.10 Development and Implementation of SALW Awareness Programmes (2nd Edition)
- SALW Awareness Support Pack (SASP 1) 2003
- SEESAC ‘SASP Test in North East Serbia Evaluation Report’ 2005
- SEESAC ‘SALW Awareness in Schools – Towards a National Curriculum’ 2005

Additional references identified by the Consultant

SALW literature

- ‘Clearing Guns’ (the South Eastern Europe SALW Quarterly newsletter)
- UNDP information pack ‘Small Arms and Demobilisation’
- Small Arms and Light Weapons (Selected UN Documents), 14 August 2005
- SALW Survey Reports in:
  - Bosnia and Herzegovina
  - Bulgaria
  - FYR Macedonia
  - Republic of Montenegro
  - Republic of Serbia

MRE literature

- Project RENEW Knowledge Attitude and Practices (KAP) Report, 2002
- Project RENEW MRE instructors handbook, 2003
- Notes on using the MRE flipcharts, 2005
- Evaluation Report of the pilot phase of Project RENEW, 2004

---

31 Project RENEW is a comprehensive mine action project conducted in Quang Tri Province, Vietnam, with the assistance of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund (VVMF). More detail can be found at www.landmines-vietnam.org
**Behaviour change communication and transactional analysis**

See the following websites:

- www.eldis.org

**Risk analysis**

- ‘Acceptable Risks’ by CFL Heimann, published by the University of Michigan, 1997

**Background documentation on survey**

- ‘Finding Out Fast’ by A Thomas, J Chataway and Marc Wuyts, published by the Open University and Sage, 1998

See also the Survey Action Centre protocols at http://www.sac-na.org/resources_lisprotocols.html
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