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A Study of Manual Mine Clearance

Manual mine clearance is the fundamental tenet of mine action and yet it has never been considered sufficiently. To that end, the GICHD, at the request of the United Nations Mine Action Service, commenced a detailed study into manual mine clearance in late 2003. The Study of Manual Mine Clearance sought to define a set of parameters that affect the efficiency of manual mine clearance and use it to develop benchmarks or planning figures for manual mine clearance (clearance rates, costs, etc.). The study also examined in detail the drills, techniques, equipment and procedures used for manual mine clearance, and considered the risk-management approach to the process of manual mine clearance. The study was developed in five specific areas and each section forms a stand-alone publication that complements the others.

- Historical summary and conclusions
- Management of manual mine clearance
- Operational systems in manual mine clearance: case studies and experimental trials
- Risk assessment and risk management of mined areas
- Costs of manual mine clearance

The study found today’s “humanitarian demining” is much safer than the major military-supervised operations and miles away from World War II. While the rate of manual mine clearance is affected by many factors, the study found that worldwide an individual deminer clears on average 15 to 20 square metres (18–24 square yards) per day. The estimated cost of manual mine clearance varies widely from $60 to $87.30 U.S. per square metre, although every programme uses a different methodology to calculate costs. The study proposed a number of new drills and techniques that could help improve the efficiency of manual demining. However, it found the greatest productivity gains could be made with improvement at the middle management level, through better training and empowerment of middle managers to make on-site decisions. Finally, it recommends consideration of a risk-reduction approach when setting priorities in situations where clearance resources are limited.

The study was released in September 2005 to coincide with the UNMAS National Directors’ meeting. A series of briefings and workshops will widely disseminate the findings of the study. Copies of the study can be obtained via the GICHD Web site (see contact information, left).

Ongoing Work at the GICHD

The GICHD continues to undertake a wide range of work on the use of dogs for mine detection. The International Mine Action Standards on mine-detecting dogs have been reviewed and the new draft document of dogs for mine detection, case studies and experimental trials are available on the Standards Web site (www.mineactionstandards.org). A study of MDD operations, consisting of four case studies, is available on the GICHD Web site, along with three new videos on the training of MDDs. Guidebooks on the training of dogs and on the use of Remote Explosive Scent Tracking have also been published.

The development of the IMAS is undertaken by the GICHD on behalf of UNMAS. In 2005, 32 of the existing 38 IMAS were reviewed and endorsed by the IMAS Review Board, which met in September. The latest IMAS are always posted on the Standards Web site; however, the GICHD has issued a new compact disc (IMAS 2005) and also a revised edition of the easy-to-use Guide to IMAS. The publications can be ordered for free through the GICHD Web site (see contact information).

See “References and Endnotes,” page 108.
Geneva Diary: Report From the GICH, Mansfield [ from page 82 ]

Endnote


2. "One-square metre is approximately equivalent to 1.2 square yards.

Endnote


Mines Action Support Group Update, October 2005 M&SSG Newsletter [ from page 85 ]

Endnote


2. Editor's Note: Some countries and mine action organizations are using the term "mine free," while others are exposing the term "mine safe" or "impact free." "Mine free" connotes a condition where all landmines have been cleaned; whereas the terms "mine safe" and "impact free" order to the condition in which landmines no longer pose a credible threat to a community or country.

LBC System Allows Remote Disposal, Barhold [ from page 89 ]
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1. S. Barhold, "How Deminer Position Contributes to Injury," Jetté, Dionne, Maach, Makris, Ceh and Bergeron [ from page 93 ].

Endnote


6. 10 centimeters equals approximately 4 inches.

7. Fractured sand is sand that has been pulverized by explosive force, with silica dust as the main by-product of this process.

8. SAE J211 refers to the SAE Recommended Practice J211. Instrumentation for Impact Tests (MAR95). It provides standards for the performance of equipment in impact tests.


13. 1 g = 9.8 m/s².

QR Hits a Homerun: Landmine-Detection Systems Based on Quadrupole Resonance Technology Show Progress, Turner and Williams [ from page 95 ]
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Rats to the Rescue: Results of the First Tests on a Real Minefield, Verhagen, F. Weetjens, Cox, B. Weetjens and Billeter [ from page 100 ]

Endnote


2. The Tuberculosis Project is a study hoping to change the way Tuberculosis is diagnosed using the exceptional sniffing abilities of rats. For more information, please see http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/health/5485595.stm. Accessed 11 Nov. 2005.

Blast Protection For UXO Operations Including Demining, Miles [ from page 103 ]
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3. In collaboration with INSYS Ltd. in the United Kingdom.


Endnote

1. The editorial staff of the Journal goes to great effort to make sure that what is printed in our magazine is accurate, properly documented and unbiased. However, in Issue 9.1 there were two errors for which we feel we must apologize. In the staff-written profile of Afghanistan (pages 66-67), our writer misinterpreted something that was written in an earlier article by Patrick Fruchet (http://maic.jmu.edu/journal/8.1/features/fruchet/fruchet.htm) and we alluded to a conflict, which apparently does not exist. Mr. Fruchet wrote to us to clarify, saying, “Our deminers are NOT in ‘conflict’ with ISAF…” We humbly apologize for this accidental error, and thank Mr. Fruchet for calling it to our attention. We mistakenly attributed the article, “Mine Action in Yemen An Example of Success” (pages 10-11, 17), to Mansour Al Azi. It was actually written by Faiz Mohammad, UNDP Mine Action Specialist for the Yemen Mine Action Programme. We apologize to Faiz Mohammad for this error and thank him for letting us know about it.

2. Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining. Geneva (http://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cisr-journal/vol9/iss2/36) and we alluded to a conflict, which apparently does not exist. Mr. Fruchet wrote to us to clarify, saying, “Our deminers are NOT in ‘conflict’ with ISAF…” We humbly apologize for this accidental error, and thank Mr. Fruchet for calling it to our attention. We mistakenly attributed the article, “Mine Action in Yemen An Example of Success” (pages 10-11, 17), to Mansour Al Azi. It was actually written by Faiz Mohammad, UNDP Mine Action Specialist for the Yemen Mine Action Programme. We apologize to Faiz Mohammad for this error and thank him for letting us know about it.