



**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.

_____ (*insert name or organization*) wish to propose that the following is considered within the framework of International Mine Action Standards:

Theme or subject matter? (*Give brief description of the topic you wish the IMAS Review Board to consider*)

The topic to consider is the test and evaluation of mechanical assets used in technical survey. Since the objective of technical survey is not to detect and destroy all mines, the performance of a mechanical asset used in technical survey cannot be measured by its ability to destroy mines only as in CWA 15044. A new definition of performance and methods to measure it must be given.

Rationale as to why there is a need? (*Be as specific as possible. Include where this might improve such things as safety, productivity, be beneficial to a community or a host Government – include relevant data / calculations / research as back-up information.*)

Mechanical assets are frequently used in technical surveys but there is no consensus yet on the objectives of their use. This fact was recorded in "Land Release in Action" by Emanuela Elisa Cepolina, published in The Journal of Mine Action, issue 17.2.

CWA 15044 describes how to evaluate their performance at triggering or damaging mines. But a difference should be made between mechanical assets that destroy mines and mechanical assets that allow gathering some information about the mines: their types, their conditions, their exact locations, their depths, etc. All this information is a valuable output of the use of mechanical assets.

A protocol to measure the performance of mechanical assets based on this diversity of output would help potential users to select the mechanical assets that are more suited for what they want to do. It could also help mechanical assets manufacturers to provide their clients with equipment more adapted to their real needs.

State the current shortcoming and/or need for improvement of existing IMAS/TNMA that this new topic will seek to address? (max 200 words)

CWA 15044 describes how to evaluate the performance of mechanical assets in terms of triggering or damaging mines. But technical survey is also about gathering as much information as possible on the mine contamination. Information about the types of mines, their conditions (still working, rusted, etc.), their exact locations, their depths, etc. is a valuable output of the use of machines.

Moreover a second asset is usually used after the mechanical assets. The performance of this second asset is dependent on the output of the mechanical assets. Therefore the evaluation of mechanical assets should also include characteristics that affect the performance of metal detectors, mine detection dogs or any other asset, used afterward: they may include the conditions of the mines and the soil after the use of mechanical assets, the distance where mines can be ejected, etc.

Guidelines that take into account all useful output of mechanical assets and the effects on assets used after them when testing their performance are would be beneficial to the mine action community.

What is needed is a consensus on a list of criteria that are important when evaluating a mechanical asset used for technical survey and a protocol to measure these criteria.

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

The main negative impact on field operations of not having such a document is that organizations might not use the mechanical assets that are the most appropriate to the objectives that they have set for their technical survey activity, and to the follow-up methods that are used after the mechanical assets.

For instance since flails and tillers tend to detonate, damage and disperse mines they might not be the most appropriate assets to organizations that expect to collect additional information about mine contamination or that use manual follow-up afterwards.

Another main negative impact is that manufacturers might add improvements to their products that might not be the most appropriate to their intended use or the way they are used in practice. The proposed document when used in testing the performance of mechanical assets might provide manufacturers with inspiration for new improvements.

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

The main negative impact on the mine affected community is that by using assets that might not be the most appropriate the organizations performing clearance might take a longer time to release land and be more expensive in the long run.

Are there any existing publications already dealing with this topic? (max 100 words)

“Land Release in Action” by Emanuela Elisa Cepolina, published in The Journal of Mine Action, issue 17.2 show that several organizations working in six different countries have sometimes very different concepts for technical survey (TS), suggesting that there is a need for “a well-defined, systematic definition of what is expected from TS machines”.

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? (max 200 words)

The immediate objective of the TIRAMISU project is to seek advice from the Review Board on the topic for a new CWA, not to suggest a new or amended IMAS/TNMA.

The project TIRAMISU has secured budget from the European Commission for a new CWA on mine action with a topic which is left at the discretion of the TIRAMISU partners. Because of contractual commitment the TIRAMISU team will do its possible to draft this CWA.

The TIRAMISU team would like the topic to be as relevant as possible. During its consultations with various mine action actors it has collected a few proposals for a new CWA. When TIRAMISU asked for the point of view of the Review Board on the relevancy of some of these proposals, its secretary suggested filling in this form.

ANNEX A

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

Date received: 30 September 2013

Action: The proposal was not fully supported by the IMAS Review Board. TIRAMISU was asked to present the issue in the next meeting of the IMAS Review Board in March 2014 should it wishes to pursue the review board support.