



**PROPOSAL AND JUSTIFICATION
FOR
AMMENDING AN EXISTING INTERNATIONAL MINE ACTION STANDARD,
DEVELOPING A NEW STANDARD,
OR
A NEW TECHNICAL NOTE FOR MINE ACTION**

This form is intended to provide the start point in a process that identifies both shortcomings and improvements needed in International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) and their accompanying Technical Notes on Mine Action (TNMA).

After it has been properly completed and submitted, the proposal will be reviewed by the Chairman and the Secretary of the IMAS Review Board who will then include their comments, if any, and circulate it to the Review Board. If there is support for the proposal from at least 25% of the Review Board's members the process will continue.

Note 1: When the Review Board supports the subject matter, the proposal for a new IMAS will be submitted to the IMAS Steering Group for approval.

Note 2: In the event of amendments to an existing IMAS, this form will only be used when the amendments are substantial (e.g. NMAA and Mine Action Organizations may need to amend their National Standards and/or SOPs).

Note 3: When the Review Board cannot agree on a proposal, the issue will be put to the IMAS Steering Group for a final decision.

The Geneva International Centre for humanitarian Demining (GICHD) wish to propose that the following is considered within the framework of International Mine Action Standards:

Theme or subject matter? Complete review of IMAS 09:20 - *the inspection of cleared land*. The GICHD has recently completed a study on the application of post-clearance inspection in mine action programmes. Based on the conclusions and recommendations of the study, briefly presented in this justification form, it is suggested that IMAS 09.20 is amended.

Rationale as to why there is a need? Post-clearance inspection (external quality control) was introduced in the IMAS in 2000, and since then, much time, money and effort has been spent conducting this process. However, only a very small number of (missed) mines/ERW have been found.

The GICHD report "*A review of external post-clearance inspection in mine action*" (see attached) indicates that although the associated costs of external post-clearance inspection are considerable, the added confidence that the land is in fact free of explosive hazards post-clearance is negligible. According to the GICHD study that there is a reasonable expectation that existing standards of clearance in most mine action programmes, already exceed those laid down in IMAS.

Based on data for 2010 from five countries included as case studies in the report, a total of 7.05 million m² was sampled to a cost of 7.59 million USD and approximately four mines or critical non-conformities were located.

Given the accumulated data, knowledge and experience gained over the past decade, as well as the fact that the method for sampling in the IMAS 09.20 has not undergone a revision since its inception, it is suggested that now would be an appropriate time to conduct a full review the standard.

State the current shortcoming and/or need for improvement of existing IMAS/TNMA that this new topic will seek to address?

- IMAS 09.20 is based on ISO 2859, which was developed to sample industrial production processes, rather than for the sampling of land cleared during demining operations. ISO 2859 may not be the optimal reference standard for mine action
- Experience gained over the last decade of mine action operations have showed that, in general, the quality of the final product, the cleared land, is typically very high. In such instances, the question of costs versus the added value of external post-clearance inspection should be considered – especially in programmes with limited funding.
- Greater focus on quality assurance of the Land Release process as a whole including increased focus on the quality management of the survey and decision making.
- Quality of cleared land should remain a responsibility of demining organization. As such, programmes should focus more on internal quality control and external quality assurance.
- It is suggested the external post-clearance inspection remains an option in IMAS. It is however recommended that a more selected application is used where by the focus lays on operators with no or poor track records and the added value in each situation is carefully considered.

Explain the negative impact on field operations that this shortcoming will or has caused and/ or the improvement that is expected? (max 200 words)

- External post-clearance inspection often comes with a high costs for a negligible increase in confidence that an area is free of explosive hazards.
- The current IMAS have a strong focus on clearance and provides very limited guidance on how to ensure quality of the often challenging survey process. By changing the approach the overall quality of the land release process has the potential to improve.
- The study indicates that none of the countries included in the case study where actually preformed sampling in accordance with IMAS 09.20. Many programmes have found that the formula for calculating sample size is too complicated to use.

State why this issue is best addressed through IMAS/TNMA and may not be adequately covered by support and/or endorsement of an existing or under draft publication?

The focus of the IMAS should be to promote safe, simple, and efficient practices. In the case IMAS 09.20, the concept and the method are not applicable in today's mine action. In order to send a strong message to the mine action community it is suggested that IMAS 09.20 is removed as a whole and that a revised and simplified version is incorporated into an existing IMAS (e.g. 07:40 Monitoring of demining organizations).

ANNEX A

Summary and recommendations resulting of above proposal: *(To be prepared by the Secretary or the Chair of the IMAS Review Board)*

Proposal Received: 9 July 2012

Action: The proposal has been supported by the Review Board, and the IMAS are under review and revision currently.