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CLEARANCE SEGMENT

Chair,

The International Mine Action Standards provide a comprehensive reference for setting up and running mine action programmes – promoting appropriate architecture and outlining operational and management systems to be established - but IMAS are less specific on how to downscale and adjust programmes as the level of contamination diminishes towards the tail end of a mine action programme.

For instance:

- How to dismantle or adapt the mine action architectures when the time comes,
- How to move from a proactive to a reactive response, as required for the management of long-term residual contamination - beyond mines and cluster munitions
- How to promote national sustainable solutions

Perhaps the IMAS are not the right vehicle to provide guidance and instruction on all these points but we believe they have a significant role to play.

Land release approaches that promote survey above clearance have progressively focused attention on the issue of residual contamination and corresponding risk management considerations.

The GICHD welcomes discussions in the IMAS Review Board on the topic of Residual Contamination which may result in greater clarity in the IMAS themselves, or a strengthening of Technical Notes that exist to support the IMAS.

Better guidance for the tail end of mine action programmes will do much to help accelerate progress towards the goal of the Maputo Declaration. Achieving ‘completion’ under Article 5 should go hand in hand with the implementation of appropriate plans to respond to any remaining risks from broader ERW in a post-completion setting.

As such, many countries - most recently Mozambique - will join others like Germany, France and Japan in respect of being free from landmines but which continue to manage longer term ERW contamination.

Thank you