



REVIEW AND REVISION OF MINE CLEARANCE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

In July 1996, international standards for humanitarian mine clearance programmes were proposed by working groups at a conference in Denmark. These draft standards were subsequently developed by a UN-led working group into *International Standards for Humanitarian Mine Clearance Operations*. The document was formally issued and circulated by the UN Mine Action Service (UNMAS) in March 1997.

At the time the document was issued it was acknowledged that the standards should be reviewed every two years to reflect developing mine action practices and procedures.

The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) has been invited by UNMAS to co-ordinate a review and revision of the standards. The first phase of this process involves the collection and collation of information from people and organizations who use the current mine clearance standards, and learning from those who use standards, guidelines and codes of practice in other related areas of work

This questionnaire is being issued to all mine action centres, major demining NGOs and commercial contractors, and to other organisations who apply mine clearance standards. We are fully conscious that you will need to devote much time to complete this questionnaire, and we are most grateful for your help. But as I am sure you will recognise, the information which we will gather from the completed forms once analysed will establish the baseline for the revision. **Your** views and suggestions are therefore crucial to the success of the process.

Some of the sections in the questionnaire may not apply directly to you or your organisation; in such circumstances just leave that part of the form blank. But as a minimum, please complete the first section (giving information about yourself, the organisation you represent and your experience in the application of standards) and the final section (giving general comments and observations on the availability, utility, layout and ease of use of the document).

The results of the analysis of the completed questionnaires will be published by 15 March 2000 on the project website: www.mineclearancestandards.org. All detailed records will then be destroyed.

HOW TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire asks for your views on the document: *'International Standards for Humanitarian Mine Clearance Operations'*. Depending on the way the question is framed you should either place a number in a box, select an option presented to you, or provide comments.

- Where you are asked to **make a choice** from a number of options, you should choose the option which comes closest to your view. For example if you agree or disagree with a particular statement and the option 'Disagree strongly = 4' is closest to your view then you should write the number 4 in the box.
- For other questions you are asked to **check boxes** for options or selections that may apply or which you prefer.
- In some cases you may be asked to **write your own comments** or suggestions, and you should do this in the space provided.

If you have any questions about the questionnaire please contact Alastair McAslan at the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD): +41 22 906 1682; a.mcaslan@gichd.ch.

WHAT TO DO WHEN YOU HAVE COMPLETED THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

The Mine Action Information Center (MAIC) at James Madison University will be collecting and collating the information from the questionnaires. This information will be held in a database with restricted access, and all detailed records will be destroyed by 15 March 2000.

The questionnaire can be completed **on line** via the internet, or **off-line**. If you complete the questionnaire **on line** your details, selections and comments will be sent directly to the MAIC at James Madison University. This is the easiest option.

If you complete the questionnaire **off-line** you should forward it by fax or post/mail/courier as follows:

- by fax (+1 540 568 8176).
- by post or courier to Mine Action Information Center, MSC 4003, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA 22807, United States.

If you have any difficulty forwarding the questionnaire to James Madison University please contact Suzanne Fiederlein or Amanda Reeder at the MAIC (tel: +1 540 568 2718) or (e-mail: fiedersl@jmu.edu or whetstap@jmu.edu)

Your completed questionnaire should reach James Madison University by no later than Monday 14 February 2000.

Thank you for your assistance.

DEFINITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The terms *standard(s)*, *guidelines*, *SOPs* and *standardization* are applied in different ways by different people and organisations involved in mine action. For the purposes of the review of '*International Standards for Humanitarian Mine Clearance Operations*' the following definitions have been adopted.

In completing this questionnaire, please relate your comments and suggestions to these definitions. This will assist us greatly in our analysis.

Standard(s)

A standard is a measure, or quality or object serving as a basis or example or principle to which others conform, or should conform, or by which the accuracy or quality of others is judged.' It is something which is agreed and fixed, and it enables tasks and activities to be conducted in a constant and consistent way '... and thus ensure that products, processes and services are fit for their purpose.' A standard provides a 'benchmark' against which progress and performance can be measured.

Guidelines

Guidelines are '.... general rules, principles or pieces of advice'. The use of guidelines may confer advantages or benefits, but there is usually no requirement or obligation for them to be accepted or adopted (c.f. standards).

SOPs

Standing operating procedures (SOPs), sometimes referred to as *standard* operating procedures, are instructions which define the preferred method of conducting an operational task or activity. Their purpose is to establish recognizable and measurable degrees of uniformity, consistency and commonality within an organization, with the aim of improving operational effectiveness and safety. SOPs should reflect local requirements and circumstances.

Standardization

Standardization is a continuing process to establish measurable and recognizable degrees of uniformity, accuracy and excellence. It applies to policy, codes, practices, procedures, specifications and time. It aims to achieve and maintain the most appropriate and most effective levels of compatibility, interoperability interchangeability and commonality in humanitarian mine clearance programmes.

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Your organization:

- a. Name of organization:
- b. Category of organization (please check appropriate box):
- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (1) Government | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (2) Mine action centre | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (3) NGO (engaged in mine clearance) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (4) NGO (other) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (5) Commercial demining organization | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (6) Consultant | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (7) Other (please specify): | |
- c. Your position / appointment in organization (please check appropriate box):
- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| (1) Director / head of unit | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (2) Senior technical advisor | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (3) Deputy or assistant technical advisor | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (4) Operations officer (or equivalent) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (5) Other (please specify): | |

2. Your involvement with standards:

- a. Does your position / appointment within your organisation require you to use / apply international standards for mine clearance?

Yes No

- b. Does your position / appointment within your organization require you to prepare local mine clearance SOPs and / or codes of practice?

Yes No

- c. Have you used *International Standards for Humanitarian Mine Clearance Operations* to prepare local mine clearance SOPs and / or codes of practice?

Yes No

- d. Over the past 12 months, how often have you referred to *International Standards for Humanitarian Mine Clearance Operations*?

Frequently Occasionally

Never (apart from completing this questionnaire)

3. In completing this questionnaire, is your response:

- a. the official view of your organisation, or
- b. a representative view based on broad consultation, or
- c. your individual views and comments.

SECTION 1 - SAFETY

4. Scope.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements. Use the following grading:

1 = agree strongly; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree;
4 = disagree strongly; 5 = don't know / no opinion

- a. International standards and/or guidelines for safety in mine clearance operations are essential.
- b. The section needs to be more complete and/or appropriate to assist with the preparation of national/local SOPs.
- c. The section needs to differentiate more clearly between safety-critical standards and general safety guidelines.

5. Suitability (i.e. necessity and accuracy) of content.

Indicate your views on the necessity and accuracy of the detail given in Section 1 and its annexes. Necessity: check the *yes* or *no* box. Accuracy: use the following grading:

1 = entirely accurate; 2 = some errors or omissions; 3 = many errors or omissions;
4 = dangerously inaccurate; 5 = don't know / no opinion

	Necessity		Accuracy
	Yes	No	
a. Personal protection levels and equipment (Paras 1.6 and 1.7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Safety distances (Para 1.8 and Annex A)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Probing procedures (Para 1.9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Site standards and procedures (Paras 1.11 to 1.17 and Annex B)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Storage of explosives (Para 1.18 and Annex C)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Explosive storage construction (Para 1.19 and Annex D)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Transportation of explosives (Para 1.20 and Annex E)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Visitors (Paras 1.21 and 1.22)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Are there any additional functions and activities which, in your opinion, require international safety standards and/or guidelines:			

.....
.....
.....
.....

6. **Comments and recommendations.**

Do you have any additional comments and recommendations (on safety standards and guidelines):

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

SECTION 2 - TRAINING AND QUALIFICATIONS

7. **Scope.**

To what extent do you agree with the following statements. Use the following grading:

1 = agree strongly; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree;
4 = disagree strongly; 5 = don't know / no opinion

- a. International standards and/or guidelines for training and qualifications are essential.
- b. The section needs to be more complete and/or appropriate to assist with the preparation of training courses.
- c. The section needs to differentiate more clearly between training standards and guidelines.
- d. There is a need for centralised accreditation of courses and a table of equivalence for accredited courses and qualifications.
- e. Too much emphasis is given to formal training and too little credit is given to field experience.

8. **Suitability (i.e. necessity and accuracy) of content.**

Indicate your views on the necessity and accuracy of the detail given in Section 2. Necessity: check the *yes* or *no* box. Accuracy: use the following grading:

1 = entirely accurate; 2 = some errors or omissions; 3 = many errors or omissions;
4 = dangerously inaccurate; 5 = don't know / no opinion

	Necessity		Accuracy
	Yes	No	
a. Qualifications and experience (Paras 2.6 to 2.9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Training courses (Paras 2.10 to 2.22)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Are there any additional training functions and activities which, in your opinion, require international standards and/or guidelines:			
.....			
.....			
.....			

9. Comments and recommendations.

Do you have any additional comments and recommendations (on training standards and guidelines):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

SECTION 3 - SURVEY

10. Scope.

This section will be completely re-written in conjunction with Section 9 (Information Management) to reflect the introduction of the UN's Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA).

To what extent do you agree with the following statements. Use the following grading:

1 = agree strongly; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree;
4 = disagree strongly; 5 = don't know / no opinion

- a. International standards and guidelines of survey are essential.
- b. The section needs to be more complete and/or appropriate to assist with the preparation of national/local SOPs.
- c. The section needs to differentiate more clearly between standards and guidelines.
- d. Survey should include a comprehensive assessment of the socio-economic impact of mines.
- e. Survey should include comprehensive risk assessments.

f. Survey should include comprehensive environmental assessments.

11. Suitability (i.e. necessity and accuracy) of content.

Indicate your views on the necessity and accuracy of the detail given in Section 3. Necessity: check the *yes* or *no* box. Accuracy: use the following grading:

1 = entirely accurate; 2 = some errors or omissions; 3 = many errors or omissions; 4 = dangerously inaccurate; 5 = don't know / no opinion

		Necessity		Accuracy
		Yes	No	
a.	Definition of Level 1 (Paras 3.5 and 3.6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Definition of Level 2 (Paras 3.7 and 3.8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Definition of Level 3 (Paras 3.9 and 3.10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Information sources and classification (Paras 3.12 to 3.17)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Team composition, training and qualifications (Para 3.18)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	Coordinate systems and GPS (Paras 3.19 and 3.20)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g.	Minefield marking and area reduction (Paras 3.21 to 3.25)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h.	Minefield information systems (Paras 3.28 to 3.30)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

i. Are there any additional survey functions and activities which, in your opinion, require new or revised international standards and/or guidelines:

.....

.....

.....

.....

12. Comments and recommendations.

Do you have any additional comments and recommendations (on survey standards and guidelines):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

SECTION 4 - MNEFELD MARKING

13. Scope.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements. Use the following grading:

1 = agree strongly; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree;
4 = disagree strongly; 5 = don't know / no opinion

- a. International standards and/or guidelines for the marking of mined areas is essential.
- b. The section needs to be more complete and/or appropriate to assist with the preparation of national/local SOPs.
- c. The section needs to differentiate more clearly between standards and guidelines for the marking of mined areas.
- d. Greater effort should be made to develop and use long-term marking (and fencing) for high-risk areas. Such marking (and fencing) should be mandatory

14. Suitability (i.e. necessity and accuracy) of content.

Indicate your views on the necessity and accuracy of the detail given in Section 4. Necessity: tick the yes or no box. Accuracy: use the following grading:

1 = entirely accurate; 2 = some errors or omissions; 3 = many errors or omissions;
4 = dangerously inaccurate; 5 = don't know / no opinion

- | | Necessity | | Accuracy |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Yes | No | |
| a. Mine clearance marking (Paras 4.5 to 4.7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Minefield/UXO marking levels (Paras 4.8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Marking specifications (Paras 4.9 to 4.12) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Are there any additional marking functions and activities which, in your opinion, require international standards and/or guidelines: | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

15. Comments and recommendations.

Do you have any additional comments and recommendations (on marking standards and guidelines):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

SECTION 5 - MNEFELD CLEARANCE OPERATIONS

16. Scope.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements. Use the following grading:

1 = agree strongly; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree;
4 = disagree strongly; 5 = don't know / no opinion

- a. International standards and/or guidelines for mine clearance procedures are essential.
- b. This section needs to be more complete and/or appropriate to assist with the preparation of national/local clearance standards and SOPs.
- c. This section needs to differentiate more clearly between standards and guidelines
- d. The current definition of 'clearance' is being applied to the majority of clearance programmes.
- e. The current definition of 'clearance' is being achieved in the majority of clearance programmes.
- f. An alternative to the current definition of 'clearance' should be developed as part of the review process.
- g. The definition of an 'appropriate' level of clearance is not fully understood. There is a need to provide guidance on how to determine 'appropriate' clearance levels by developing, for example, look-up tables based on an assessment of risk.

17. Suitability (i.e. necessity and accuracy) of content.

Indicate your views on the necessity and accuracy of the detail given in Section 5. Necessity: tick the *yes* or *no* box. Accuracy: use the following grading:

1 = entirely accurate; 2 = some errors or omissions; 3 = many errors or omissions;
4 = dangerously inaccurate; 5 = don't know / no opinion

		Necessity		Accuracy
		Yes	No	
a.	Qualifications (Paras 5.4 to 5.6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Clearance standards and levels (Paras 5.9 to 5.10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Site layout and mapping (Paras 5.11 to 5.12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Clearance equipment, tools, methods and techniques (Paras 5.13 to 5.22)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Marking (Paras 5.23 and 5.24)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	Location and destruction of mines and munitions (Paras 5.25 to 5.38)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g.	Medical (Para 5.39)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i.	Are there any additional clearance functions and activities which, in your opinion, require new or revised international standards and/or guidelines:			
			
			
			
			

18. Comments and recommendations.

Do you have any additional comments and recommendations (on clearance standards and guidelines):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

SECTION 6 - EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL

19. Scope.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements. Use the following grading:

- 1 = agree strongly; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree;
- 4 = disagree strongly; 5 = don't know / no opinion

a. International standards and/or guidelines for EOD are essential.

b. The section needs to be more complete and/or appropriate to assist with the preparation of national/local SOPs for EOD.

c. The section needs to differentiate more clearly between EOD standards and guidelines.

20. Suitability (i.e. necessity and accuracy) of content.

Indicate your views on the necessity and accuracy of the detail given in Section 6. Necessity: tick the yes or no box. Accuracy: use the following grading:

1 = entirely accurate; 2 = some errors or omissions; 3 = many errors or omissions; 4 = dangerously inaccurate; 5 = don't know / no opinion

		Necessity		Accuracy
		Yes	No	
a.	General disposal methods (Para 6.6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Disposal options (Para 6.8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Destruction levels (Para 6.9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Training, qualifications and authorization (Paras 6.10 - 6.11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Render safe procedures (Paras 6.14 - 6.15)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	Coordination and control (Paras 6.17 - 6.18)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g.	Safety procedures (Para 6.16)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h.	Medical support (Para 6.19)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

i. Are there any additional EOD functions and activities which, in your opinion, require new or revised international standards and/or guidelines:

.....

.....

.....

.....

21. Comments and recommendations.

Do you have any additional comments and recommendations (on EOD standards and guidelines):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

SECTION 7 - MEDICAL

22. Scope.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements. Use the following grading:

1 = agree strongly; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree;
4 = disagree strongly; 5 = don't know / no opinion

- a. International medical standards and/or guidelines for mine clearance are essential.
- b. The section needs to be more complete and/or appropriate to assist with the preparation of national/local medical SOPs.
- c. The section needs to differentiate more clearly between medical standards and guidelines.
- d. International medical standards for mine clearance should be based on the standards prescribed in the *Medical Support Manual for United Nations Field Operations*.
- e. International medical standards for mine clearance should be based on the local needs and circumstances and not necessarily on the standards prescribed in the *Medical Support Manual for United Nations Field Operations*.

23. Suitability (i.e. necessity and accuracy) of content.

Indicate your views on the necessity and accuracy of the detail given in Section 7. Necessity: tick the *yes* or *no* box. Accuracy: use the following grading:

1 = entirely accurate; 2 = some errors or omissions; 3 = many errors or omissions;
4 = dangerously inaccurate; 5 = don't know / no opinion

- | | Necessity | | Accuracy |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Yes | No | |
| a. Levels of medical support (Para 7.5) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Medical training standards (Paras 7.6 - 7.8 and Annexes A and B) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Medical equipment (Paras 7.9 - 9.10 and Annex C) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Primary health care (Paras 7.11 - 7.12) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Deployment of medical resources (Paras 7.13 - 7.14) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- f. CASEVAC and MEDIVAC (Paras 7.15 - 7.18)
- g. Rehabilitation surgery (Para 7.19)
- h. Communications and reporting (Paras 7.20 - 7.21)
- i. Are there any additional medical support functions and activities which, in your opinion, require new or revised international standards and/or guidelines:

24. Comments and recommendations.

Do you have any additional comments and recommendations (on medical standards and guidelines):

SECTION 8 - COMMUNICATIONS

25. Scope.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements. Use the following grading:

1 = agree strongly; 2 = agree; 3 = disagree;
 4 = disagree strongly; 5 = don't know / no opinion

- a. International standards and/or guidelines for communications are essential.
- b. The section needs to be more complete and/or appropriate to assist with the preparation of national/local SOPs.
- c. The section needs to differentiate more clearly between communications standards and guidelines.
- d. International standards and guidelines for communications should reflect the increasing availability of satellite phones, mobile phone networks, internet access and e-mail in some mine affected countries.

26. Suitability (i.e. necessity and accuracy) of content.

Indicate your views on the necessity and accuracy of the detail given in Section 7.
 Necessity: tick the *yes* or *no* box. Accuracy: use the following grading:

1 = entirely accurate; 2 = some errors or omissions; 3 = many errors or omissions;
 4 = dangerously inaccurate; 5 = don't know / no opinion

		Necessity		Accuracy
		Yes	No	
a.	Frequency allocation (Para 8.5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Medical frequency (Para 8.6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Base stations (Paras 8.7 - 8.8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Vehicle and hand-held radios (Para 8.9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Call signs (Para 8.10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	Are there any additional medical support functions and activities which, in your opinion, require new or revised international standards and/or guidelines:			
			
			
			

27. Comments and recommendations.

Do you have any additional comments and recommendations (on communications standards and guidelines):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

SECTION 9 - INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

28. Scope.

This section will be completely re-written in conjunction with Section 3 (Survey) to reflect the introduction of the UN's Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA).

29. Comments and recommendations.

Do you have any additional comments and recommendations (on standards and guidelines for the application of management information systems to mine clearance):

.....

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

GENERAL COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

30. **Availability of *International Standards* document** Yes No
- a. Do you have a paper copy of the document in or close to your office or place of work?
- b. Do you make use of the electronic edition published on the UNMAS website: www.un.org/Depts/Landmine/Standard/s-index.htm?

Comments (on the availability of the document):

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

31. **Utility and usefulness.**

Grade the document for general utility and usefulness to you and your organization. Use the following grading:

1 = essential; 2 = very useful; 3 = useful; 4 = limited use; 5 = no use

- | | | | |
|----|-----------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. | Section 1 | Safety | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. | Section 2 | Training and qualifications | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. | Section 3 | Survey | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. | Section 4 | Minefield marking | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. | Section 5 | Clearance operations | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. | Section 6 | EOD | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. | Section 7 | Medical | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h. | Section 8 | Communications | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i. | Section 9 | Information management | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments (on the utility and usefulness of the document):

.....

.....

.....

.....

32. Layout and structure.

Grade the document for its layout, structure and general ease of use as follows:

- 1 = clear, logically structured and easy to use;
- 2 = moderately clear; adequately structured and useable;
- 3 = unclear, illogically structured and unusable

a.	Section 1	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Section 2	Training and qualifications	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Section 3	Survey	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Section 4	Minefield marking	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Section 5	Clearance operations	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	Section 6	EOD	<input type="checkbox"/>
g.	Section 7	Medical	<input type="checkbox"/>
h.	Section 8	Communications	<input type="checkbox"/>
i.	Section 9	Information management	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments (on the layout and ease of use of the document):

.....

.....

.....

.....

33. Completeness.

You have been asked to comment on the nine sections of the standards document. Ideally, these sections should have addressed all facets of the mine clearance process. Are there any significant omissions?

Please give suggestions on mine clearance functions (planning, operational or support activities) which are not addressed in the current document and which, in your opinion, should be included in the revised document.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

HAVNG COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE

34. Please provide your contact details

- a. Name:
- b. Telephone:
- c. Fax:
- e. E-mail:

(Please note that this information will be destroyed on 15 March 2000.)

35. You should forward your completed questionnaire by fax or post/mail/courier as follows:

- by fax (+1 540 568 8176).
- by post or courier to Mine Action Information Center, MSC 4003, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA 22807, United States.