

Mine Action Review Criteria to Assess National Programme Performance of States Parties to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention

CRITERION	KEY FACTORS AFFECTING SCORING
<p>1. UNDERSTANDING OF ANTI-PERSONNEL MINE CONTAMINATION</p> <p>(20% of overall score)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has a national baseline of anti-personnel mine contamination been established and is it up to date and accurate? 2. If no national baseline, or only a partial or inaccurate baseline, exists, is survey and/or re-survey being conducted or is it planned? 3. Are anti-personnel mined areas disaggregated from areas with other types of explosive ordnance (e.g. anti-vehicle mines or explosive remnants of war (ERW))? 4. Is contamination from anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature included in the national baseline of anti-personnel mine contamination? 5. Is anti-personnel mine contamination classified into suspected hazardous areas (SHAs) and confirmed hazardous areas (CHAs), based on whether there is indirect or direct evidence of emplaced anti-personnel mines respectively? 6. Is there a high ratio of CHAs to SHAs?
<p>2. NATIONAL OWNERSHIP AND PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT</p> <p>(10% of overall score)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there a national entity, such as a national mine action authority, overseeing mine action? 2. Is there a national mine action centre coordinating operations? 3. Are the roles and responsibilities in mine action clear and coherent within the national programme? 4. Is the mine action centre adequately staffed and skilled? 5. Are clearance operators involved in key decision-making processes? 6. Does national legislation, or other suitable administrative measures, effectively underpin the mine action programme? 7. Have the authorities created an enabling environment for mine action? 8. Has the government facilitated the receipt and efficient use of international assistance? 9. Is there political will for timely and efficient implementation of Article 5 of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC)? 10. Does the affected state contribute national resources to support the cost of the mine action centre and/or survey and clearance of anti-personnel mined areas? 11. Does the affected state have a resource mobilisation strategy in place for Article 5 implementation?
<p>3. GENDER AND DIVERSITY</p> <p>(10% of overall score)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the national mine action programme have a gender policy and implementation plan? Do the main mine action operators have one? 2. Is gender mainstreamed in the national mine action strategy and national mine action standards?

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Are women and children in communities affected by mined areas consulted during survey and community liaison activities? 4. Are survey and community liaison teams inclusive and gender balanced, to facilitate access and participation by all groups, including women and children? 5. Are the needs of women and children in communities affected by mined areas taken into account in the prioritisation, planning, and tasking of survey and clearance activities? 6. Are ethnic or minority groups in communities affected by mined areas consulted during survey and community liaison activities? 7. Do survey, clearance, and community liaison teams include representatives from different ethnic or minority groups, to facilitate access and participation by all groups? 8. Are the needs of ethnic or minority groups in communities affected by mined areas taken into account in the prioritisation, planning, and tasking of survey and clearance activities? 9. Is relevant mine action data disaggregated by gender and age? 10. Is there equal access to employment for qualified women and men in survey and clearance teams, including for managerial level/supervisory positions?
<p>4. ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES AND ACTION</p> <p>(10% of overall score)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the national mine action programme have an environmental management policy? 2. Does the affected State have a national mine action standard (NMAS) on environmental management in mine action? If yes, is it in line with International Mine Action Standard (IMAS) 07.13? 3. Are environmental assessments conducted to support informed decision-making on the planning and delivery of survey and clearance tasks? 4. Where required, are measures implemented to prevent or minimise environmental harm, including to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, during demining operations, at demining camps, at mine action centres, and during travel? 5. When planning and prioritising survey and clearance tasks, is the affected State taking into account climate-related or extreme weather risks (such as increased risk of flooding that may cause operations to be stood down or potentially displace landmines or even displace people into contaminated areas)?
<p>5. INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING</p> <p>(10% of overall score)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there a national information management system in place (e.g. IMSMA), and is the data accurate and reliable? 2. Are data collection forms consistent and do they enable collection of the necessary data? 3. Is data in the information management system disaggregated by type of contamination and method of land release? 4. Is the data in the information management system accessible to all operators? 5. Are ongoing efforts being made to ensure or improve the quality of data in the mine action database?

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Does the affected state party to the APMBC submit accurate and timely annual Article 7 reports on Article 5 progress? 7. Are Article 5 extension requests of a high-quality and submitted in a timely manner? 8. Is the survey and clearance data reported by the affected state party (e.g. in Article 7 reporting) accurate and disaggregated by type of contamination (i.e. anti-personnel from anti-vehicle mines) and method of land release? 9. Does the affected state party report on progress in Article 5 implementation at the intersessional meetings and Meetings of States Parties, and is reporting accurate and consistent between reporting periods?
<p>6. PLANNING AND TASKING (10% of overall score)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there a national mine action strategy in place and does it include realistic goals for land release? 2. Is there a realistic annual workplan in place for land release? 3. Are there agreed and specified criteria for prioritisation of tasks? 4. Are key stakeholders meaningfully consulted in planning and prioritisation? 5. Is clearance of anti-personnel mines tasked in accordance with agreed prioritisation? 6. Are task dossiers issued in a timely and effective manner? 7. Where relevant, is there a plan for dealing with residual risk and liability? Is it realistic and sustainable?
<p>7. LAND RELEASE SYSTEM (10% of overall score)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the affected state have national mine action standards in place for land release? 2. Do the standards enable or impede efficient evidence-based survey and clearance? 3. Are national standards reflected in SOPs? 4. Are standards and SOPs periodically reviewed against IMAS and international best practice, in consultation with clearance operators? 5. Is there an effective and efficient: i) non-technical survey capacity, ii) technical survey capacity, iii) clearance capacity in the programme? Does this include national capacity? 6. Are areas being cleared that prove to have no anti-personnel mine contamination? 7. Where relevant, is there national survey and clearance capacity in place to address anti-personnel mine contamination discovered after the release of mined areas or post completion? 8. Is there an appropriate range of demining assets (manual, mechanical, and animal detection systems) integrated into land release operations? 9. Is there an effective quality management system in place for survey and clearance operations? 10. Where an accident has occurred within a mine action programme was there an effective investigation? Were lessons learned shared between operators?

<p>8. LAND RELEASE OUTPUTS AND ARTICLE 5 COMPLIANCE</p> <p>(20% of overall score)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Is the affected state seeking to clear all anti-personnel mine contamination from territory under its jurisdiction or control, including anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature, border minefields, anti-personnel mine contamination in and around military installations, hard to access minefields etc.?2. Have national mine action authorities set a target date for the completion of anti-personnel mine clearance and is this within the state party's Article 5 deadline?3. Is the target date for completion realistic based on existing capacity?4. Is the target date sufficiently ambitious?5. What were the outputs of survey and clearance of anti-personnel mined area in 2023, and were they greater or lesser than the previous year and why?6. Are survey and clearance outputs in line with plans and Article 5 obligations?7. Are anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature, if present, included in the clearance plans and operations?8. Is the affected state on track to meet the target completion date and/or Article 5 deadline?
--	---