Journal of Conventional Weapons Destruction

Volume 10
Issue 2 The Journal of Mine Action

November 2006

Issue 10.2 Endnotes

CISR JOURNAL
Center for International Stabilization and Recovery at JMU (CISR)

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cisr-journal

Part of the Defense and Security Studies Commons, Emergency and Disaster Management Commons,
Other Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons, and the Peace and Conflict
Studies Commons

Recommended Citation
Available at: https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cisr-journal/vol10/iss2/50

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for International Stabilization and Recovery at
JMU Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Conventional Weapons Destruction by an
authorized editor of JMU Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact dc_admin@jmu.edu.
The Mine Action Express, [Blog page 8-8]


3. Editor’s Note: Some organizations consider mines and ERW to be two separate issues, since they are regulated by different legal documents. The former by the Ottawa Convention and Amended Protocol V and the latter by the Mine Ban Treaty. However, some mine and explosive remnants of war detainees have also cleared ERW, whereas some reports use “mines” and “ERW” in a similar context to describe those who have cleared mines and ERW in their communities or countries.

4. Explosive Remnants of War in Afghanistan, Tanzania and Bosnia [from page 20].

5. Although most countries have signed the CCW, mine-clearing strategies are not regulated by different legal documents. For instance, the Swiss and the French conventions are the only legal documents that regulate the clearance of mines and UXO. However, since mine organizations do not have the same strategy to deal with ERW and it is often impossible to separate the two for in situ decontamination, some in the community have adapted the term “working definition” of ERW (as opposed to a legal or technical definition) which is a blanket that includes all types of explosive remnants.

6. Connections on Prevention or the Use of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (The Hague) [from page 21].

7. Protection of Inert Vehicles Against ERW, Battlefield [from page 22].

8. Editor’s Note: Some organizations consider mines and ERW to be two separate issues, since they are regulated by different legal documents. The former by the Ottawa Convention and Amended Protocol V and the latter by the Mine Ban Treaty. However, some mine and explosive remnants of war detainees have also cleared ERW, whereas some reports use “mines” and “ERW” in a similar context to describe those who have cleared mines and ERW in their communities or countries.

9. Some organizations are urging the use of the term “mine safe” or “impact free.” “Mine free” connotes a condition in which landmines, UXO, abandoned explosive ordnance and other explosive devices.

10. Explosive Remnants of War and Their Consequences, Briefing 24 [from page 24].


15. See PAX’s Workplan 2010 on “Progress towards halving and, beyond the year 2010, on ‘creating a mine-risk free’ world.”


22. Some organizations are urging the use of the term “mine safe” or “impact free.” “Mine free” connotes a condition in which landmines, UXO, abandoned explosive ordnance and other explosive devices.


25. An examination of the processes of demining and decontamination in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and southern Sudan. These results confirmed that the new concept is the basis for developing the demining process from ground preparation to mine clearance and shows improvement over other methods and systems with regards to effectiveness, quality and cost.
Min-risk Education and the Amateur Scrap-metal Hunter, Yossef [from page 31]


Fact Sheet: Recent Use of Cluster Bombs in Lebanon

Background

• "Multilateral" war in Lebanon and northern Israel, occurring from July 12 to August 14, 2006.

• Israel government vs. Hezbollah (Lebanon-based Islamic militant group).

• Ended with a U.N. mediated ceasefire on August 14, 2006.

How cluster munitions work

• Small bomblets called submunitions released from larger cluster munitions; these submunitions are designed to explode, rain and kill to they scatter across a target area.

• Developed by the Germans in World War II to increase efficiency of aerial attacks against "soft" targets (personnel), first one called the "butterfly bomb.”

• Unwanted munitions deployed by aircraft, rocket launcher or artillery and containing—depending on type—anywhere from two to over 2,000 submunitions.

• Wide area of effect (about that of two football fields).

• Almost always leave behind unexploded submunitions, 2–40 percent failure rates (range and variations due to factors such as type and age of munition, environmental conditions, deployment technique and testing conditions).

• Different kinds of cluster munitions are produced today by over 50 countries.

Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS)

• Multiple Launch Rocket Systems were used in the 2006 Israel-Hezbollah conflict.

• The MLRS is one of the most lethal missile launch systems; can deploy high numbers of cluster munitions very quickly, spreading submunitions over a large area.

• Track-trailer-mounted mobile rocket-launching platforms with 12 rockets.

• Can send rockets up to 25 miles away.

• In one minute 1,206 MDS can be deployed, containing 644 M77 submunitions (U.S. Navy 2004).

• Total = 7,728 submunitions in one minute.

• Reported failure rates for M77 submunitions range from 2.5–5 percent, which means hundreds or thousands of potential duds left after every MLRS launch.

Cluster munitions and their effects in Lebanon

• Most of the submunitions were dropped in first 72 hours of conflict "when we knew there would be an end" (source: Jan Egeland, U.N. Under-Secretary-General of Humanitarian Affairs and Interim M77, M42, M69, M81 and RSU-51 (U.S.) submunitions).

• It is estimated that up to 1,000 cluster munitions may have been dropped and scattered (source: Handicap International).

• Over 850 cluster munition strike sites with up to one million unexploded submunitions are estimated, covering over 32 million square meters (7,000 acres) as of November 12, 2006 (source: Mine Action Coordination Centre–South Lebanon).

• In total 280,000 displaced civilians cannot return due to hazard from UXO as of November 1, 2006 (source: United Nations Humanitarian Commission for Refugees).

• Between August 14 and December 14, 2006, 26 people died (6 of them under the age of 18) and 160 others were wounded (57 under 18) by unexploded submunitions.

• Clean-up of unexploded ordnance and submunitions is estimated by the UNMACC to take anywhere between 12 and 15 months.

Action against cluster munitions and what’s happening since August 14, 2006

• Current action in Carry on Committing War Crimes (COWC), Protocol V.

• International humanitarian law regarding post-conflict clean-up of unexploded ordnance and abandoned explosive ordnance (ores: EFP other than landmines and booby traps, which are covered by Amendement Protocol II), ignores voluntary preventive measures.

• Discussion continues on further steps to take in order to receive cluster munitions and decrease failure (dud) rates. Third CCW Review Conference was held November 7–17, 2006, and during that time efforts were made to address cluster munitions and the threat unexploded submunitions hold for civilians. The confer-

• The conference failed to take a deal to remove the use of cluster munitions, instead agreeing only to keep talking about the issue.

• After failing to reach such an agreement within the CCW, civil society actors and countries (led by Norway) have called for a new international treaty separate from the CCW that would control ban cluster munitions.

• Two U.S. congressmen, Diane Rehm (D-CA) and Patrick Leahy (D-VT), tried to stop U.S. production of cluster bombs, but the measure was defeated on September 6, 2006, by a vote of 70–30.

• Lebanon’s National Demining Office in partnership with the Mine Action Coordination Centre of South Lebanon is collecting information and coordinating the clean-up efforts.

• Continued clean-up by many individuals and organizations including the Lebanese Army, United Nations Interim Forces in Lebanon, and groups contracted under the United Nations Mine Action Service: MAG, Swedish Red Cross Service Agency and BACTEC.

• UNICIC is supporting the National Demining Office to implement mine risk education.

• Along with many other donors, USAID humanitarian assistance to Lebanon is being provided: http://www.usaid.gov/locations/asia/near_east-middle_east/.

For an overview of cluster munitions and their use in Iraq, go to http://www.un.org/treaty/prepcon/cluster/

Interactive, due-by-day-map of 34-day-war are available at http://unmap.net/2006/