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Mine-action Challenges and Responses in Georgia

Following an international conflict in 2008, Georgia faces a greater threat from landmines and explosive remnants of war than that posed by previous violence. In response to this threat, Georgia, with assistance provided by the Office of Weapons Removal and Abatement in the U.S. Department of State’s Bureau of Political-Military Affairs (PM/WRA) and the Government of Canada, created national bodies to coordinate and implement landmine and ERW clearance. This article documents Georgia’s past ERW, landmine and cluster-munitions contamination, as well as efforts to remove these threats.

by Emil M. Hasanov [iMMAP/ERWCC] and Petri Nevalainen [iMMAP]

Georgia is party to the Convention on the Prohibition on the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and their Destruction (also known at the Anti-personnel Mine Ban Convention or APMBCC), and acceded to Protocol V on ERW on 22 December 2008 and to Amended Protocol II on Landmines on 8 June 2009. According to Article 6 of the Georgia Law on International Treaties, international treaties are an integral part of Georgian legislation, and the provisions of these treaties establish specific rights and obligations that are enacted directly without requiring adoption of additional laws or regulations.

Landmines and ERW in Georgia

The landmine problem in Georgia is primarily a result of landmine use around former Soviet/Russian military bases along international borders and from conflicts with the breakaway republics of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. Georgia had neither the authority nor the responsibility to clear these bases while they remained under Russian control. However, Russia transferred the last of the military bases located in Georgia to Georgian authority in November 2007, allowing authorities to begin clearance operations.

In addition to landmines, Georgia is faced with unexploded cluster submunitions as a result of the conflict between Russia and Georgia in August 2008. This conflict created a serious threat of ERW and cluster-munition injuries to the Georgian population at large. The impact of this contamination was most noticeable from the Shida Kartli region north of Gori to Tskhinvali in South Ossetia. Additionally, aerial-delivered bombs and missiles that targeted areas in Poti harbor, Kopitinari, Batumi (Black Sea coast) and around Tbilisi contributed to an increased ERW threat and impact. The increased ERW contamination added to prior problems that Georgia faced from legacy Soviet/Russian minefields, as well as the existing ERW threat in the Abkhazia region.

Georgia has not acceded to the Convention on Cluster Munitions. Georgian officials stated in a letter to the Landmine and Cluster Munitions Monitor in April 2010, “The Georgian government has expressed its support to the spirit of the Mine Ban Treaty and the Cluster Munitions Convention, but the bitter reality on the ground with reference to the security situation in the region didn’t allow us to adjoin the mentioned conventions. Unfortunately the situation has not changed much and has even worsened security-wise that does not leave us any option other than to stay reluctant to join the conventions until the credible changes occur in the security environment of the region.”

Russia used cluster munitions near towns and villages in the Gori-Tskhinvali corridor near the South Ossetia administrative border of Georgia during the August 2008 conflict. According to a Human Rights Watch report, Russian cluster-munition strikes on populated areas killed 12 civilians and injured 46 during this period. As a result, unexploded submunitions affected populated and agricultural areas, posing a threat to the civilian population. Russia produced and stockpiled the cluster-munition types used in the August 2008 conflict (AO-2.5 RTM and 9N210 submunitions, RBK series bombs, Uragan rockets and Iskander missiles). Georgia reports possessing RBK-500 bombs, but they are no longer active and are slated for destruction.

Georgia also used cluster munitions, including M85 submunitions in Mk 4 160mm rockets (Georgia procured these weapons as packages from Israel) during the August 2008 conflict. Regarding the Human Rights Watch report, the Ministry of Defence stated Georgia launched 24 volleys of GRADLAR Mk 4 rockets, each volley containing 13 of the weapons. While these rockets can have unitary warheads as well, assuming all 13 contained cluster munitions would result in a total of 32,448 M85 submunitions.
Currently the threat of ERW, cluster munitions and landmines around former military facilities and in some border areas outside the South Ossetia borders continues to endanger the civilian population. Furthermore, potentially produc-
tive land is unusable due to the contamination, preventing the government from undertaking necessary socioeconomic development projects. These projects include agricultural develop-
ment in the Shida Kartli region and tourism expansion on the Black Sea and at important religious sites, such as Mtskheta.

On the other hand, The HALO Trust completed clearance of Abkhazia and a ceremony was held on 4 November 2011 to acknowledge completion of this project.

“…that does not leave us any option other than to stay re-
luctant to join the conventions until the credible results occur in the security environment of the region.”

Norwegian People’s Aid conducted a General Mine Ac-
tion Assessment funded by the International Trust Fund
for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance. Between October 2009 and January 2010 the governments of Hungary and the Czech Republic funded this assessment through IFTF. The GMAA identified eight suspected hazardous areas and seven confirmed hazardous areas in 13 districts, the latter of which totaled more than an estimated 4.5 square kilometers (1.73 square miles).

Mine-action Coordination in Georgia

Immediately following the August 2008 conflict many international humanitarian-aid agencies rallied to provide emergency response support. Several international organiza-
tions, including the European Union Monitoring Mission, the
International Committee of the Red Cross, IFTF and the In-
ternational Campaign to Ban Landmines - Georgia, engaged in humanitarian mine-action activities in Georgia, but these activities lacked coordination. The Georgian Government had discussed for several years how to best address the legacy landmine issue, but had not until the recent conflict, realized the importance of coordinating HMA activities. Two primary

demining operators were identified: HALO and NPA. HALO
already operated in Abkhazia, the breakaway autonomous re-
gion of Georgia, and established the Abkhazia Mine Action Of-
fice there in 1999; NPA deployed demining teams in Georgia through the end of June 2010.

At the national level, demining capacity was represented by Georgia's Ministry of Defence Brigade of Engineers and by the Ministry of Internal Affairs Explosive Ordnance Response Teams. On 9 October 2008 a Memorandum of Understanding was signed between the Georgian Ministry of Defence and the international nongovernmental organization, the Infor-
mation Management & Mine Action Programs (IMAP) to support the Georgian Government in es-
tablishing the Explosive Remnants of War Coordination Cen-
ter to address the ERW problem resulting from the conflict and to assist in coordinating clearance of the legacy mine-
fields. Although ERWCC began operations in October 2008, the official opening was held on 25 February 2009 in Tbilisi. According to Deputy Defence Minister Giorgi Muchaidze

who spoke at the launch, “It is more important to reorganize the above mentioned office as a national mine action center, which would be a step forward for struggling with this prob-
lem.” IMAP and other stakeholders determined through an assessment that there was an urgent need to develop local capacity for HMA activities, as well as for Georgia to establish national HMA standards and technical safety guidelines de-

erived from the International Mine Action Standards.

On 23 October 2008, the Georgian Ministry of Defence and the Slovenia-based IFTF signed a two-year Memorandum of Understanding on HMA assistance. IFTF initiated a nation-

al capacity building program in January 2009 that followed ERWCC’s general goals. Among other things, the program fo-
cused on providing assistance to national authorities in HMA capacity building.

ERWCC Operations

IMAP engaged the Ministries of Defence and Internal Affairs through Memorandum of Understandings and worked closely with other Georgian authorities. ERWCC be-
came the Georgian entity tasked to coordinate and execute ERW mitigation and is responsible for external quality assurance/quality control of HMA activities (Canada’s Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade initially funded QA/QC activities). Through IMAP’s guidance, the ERWCC

continued to coordinate HMA activities in Georgia, as well as coordinate QA/QC and act as the national HMA authority. These activities and responsibilities were transferred to the Georgian Government in early 2011. During the lifespan of the ERWCC, the tasks and responsibilities that were identified included the following:

- QA/QC of demining/clearance activities
- QA/QC of unexploded ordnance and explosive hazard clearance and disposal
- Battle-area clearance
- Mine-risk education
- ERW information management from any conflict or source
- Community liaison
- Stockpile reduction
- Advocacy

The ERWCC hosted regularly scheduled coordination meetings with all major HMA stakeholders in Georgia. These stakeholders included international NGOs, the Georgian Red Cross, the Georgian Ministries of Defence and Interior, and the Georgian Army Brigade of Engineers. These meetings were held biweekly or as requested by the parties involved for the purpose of synchronizing and monitoring HMA ac-
tivities. ERWCC also established mechanisms to assist other NGOs and international institutions (United Nations agen-
cies, EU Monitoring Mission, etc.). When suspected con-
tamination is reported and rapid assessments are required, clearance plans are made jointly with the appropriate stake-
holders. ERWCC conducted several risk-assessment missions during 2010 to survey potential new hazardous areas. An ex-
ample is Perevi village, which was the Ministries of Defence and Interior requested that the ERWCC conduct an ERW hazard assessment after Russian troops withdrew from the village at the western border with South Ossetia on 18 October 2010. Russian forces in the Perevi area controlled the main road in Perevi village, which links nearby South Ossetia villages to the rest of the breakaway region. ERWCC found evidence of the use of cluster-munitions and other ERW and provided this in-
formation for further action, such as mine risk education, vic-
tim assistance and clearance.

Transition and Georgian Ownership

On 30 December 2010 the Georgian Ministry of Defence issued a decree instructing that HMA be included as part of a Ministry body known as the State Military Scientific Tech-
nical Center, or DELTA. DELTA has now assumed the
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In Conflict Resolution in the Twenty-first Century: Principles, Methods, and Approaches, Bercovitch and Jackson create an accessible and well-organized analysis of the best approaches to resolving conflicts in the world today. Emphasizing fundamental changes in the nature of conflict following the Cold War, the authors present the argument that conflict resolution must also change. Their analysis characterizes pre-1991 conflicts as primarily interstate conflicts or power struggles between states and insurgents, overseen and manipulated by the major powers. According to the authors, the collapse of the Soviet Union saw “the proliferation of ethnic, religious, cultural, and resource-driven conflicts as major threats to international peace.” This shift rendered traditional methods of resolving conflicts practically obsolete, forcing innovative thinking to produce a new understanding of peace building.

Bercovitch and Jackson, both from the University of Canterbury, New Zealand, describe traditional approaches—international negotiation, conflict mediation, arbitration and adjudication, U.N. conflict resolution and peacekeeping—and explain how these methods must evolve to meet the needs of the modern world. They analyze new methods—preventive diplomacy, humanitarian intervention, regional task-sharing, nonofficial justice, and reconciliation—as approaches arising from a philosophy of participatory social interaction, which views peace as the result of positive cultural transformation rather than a state imposed by a paternalistic superstructure. Additionally, they view nongovernmental organizations as crucial actors in implementing this new methodology because of their moral credibility and independence from power politics. Concise, well-referenced and eloquent, this book outdistances other weightier tomes in demonstrating a new understanding of peace building.
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