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Reflections from an operational perspective / UNMAS expert-level

• What works / worked?
• What did not work / does not seem to work?
• What could be done?
ERW clearance: what works?

A broad picture:

• Mature industry
• Various cost-effective and safe tools
• Effective coordination in many countries
• Relatively efficient division of labor
• Local innovations
• Ability to work in most difficult access conditions
What works?

Specific examples:

• Afghanistan
• Palestine
• South Sudan
ERW clearance: what works?

**Afghanistan**

- Availability of well qualified field operators
- Availability of enough Large Loop technology for detection
- Availability of IMSMA database
- Quick response capacity
- System of hot line number recording and follow-up of requests locally asking for clearance
ERW clearance: what works?

Palestine

- ERW clearance proceeding with support of both parties to the conflict
- Agreement for ERW clearance and destruction with support by UNMAS
- Some strike information on air dropped munitions had been shared
ERW clearance: what works?

South Sudan

- Increase in recorded unknown hazards due to improved survey techniques
- Community Liaison Teams embedded with demining teams
ERW clearance: what does not quite work and needs improvement?

A broad picture

• Insufficient resources to meet actual requirements
• Inability to exercise control over all the territory
• Problems in information sharing
• Difficult operating environment for ERW clearance teams
  e.g. Bureaucracy, visa delivery, equipment importation etc.
What needs improvement?

Specific examples:

• Afghanistan
• Palestine
• South Sudan
What needs to be improved in support of ERW clearance?

Afghanistan

- Limited information about contamination in recent fighting areas
- Limited information about the type and scope of ERW contamination
- Limited knowledge on how to deal with new types of ERW
- Lack of Data Logger technology with humanitarian demining organizations
- Insufficient budget for ERW clearance
What needs to be improved in support of ERW clearance?

Palestine

• Lack of information shared by parties to the conflict regarding ground and sea launched ordnance
What needs to be improved in support of ERW clearance?

South Sudan

• Limited access due to volatile security situation and loss of information on previously cleared areas.

• Working during “hot” phase
What kind of information do clearance organizations need?

A broad picture

- Information about the use of explosive weapons systems in accordance with Article 4 of Protocol V
Specific examples

- Complete information about the areas where military operations took place (Afghanistan)
- Training on how to deal with ammunition left behind (Afghanistan)
- Technical information about types of ERW (Iraq)
- Need to avoid potential overlap of information with other agencies (who is doing clearance, MRE, etc.?) (Iraq)
Specific examples:

- Sharing of information about both air and ground munition in the aftermath of conflict to prioritize and clear (Palestine)
- Thorough survey reports with clearly delineated boundaries, improved coordination and information as to what is there (South Sudan)
Last Key Reflection:

All negotiated ceasefires led by the United Nations or any High Contracting Party should include provisions for the implementation of Article 3 and 4 of Protocol V.
“Mine Action is Humanitarian Action”

THANK YOU!
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