

Afghanistan Mine Action Standards - AMAS 03.02

First Edition
July 2016
Version 1: July 2016

Mine Action Planning and Prioritization

Directorate for Mine Action Coordination (DMAC)
Post Box : 520 Kabul – Afghanistan
Website: www.dmac.gov.af

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. SCOPE	3
3. ANTI PERSONNEL MINE BAN TREATY (APMBT).....	3
4. AFGHANISTAN APMBT EXTENSION REQUEST AND WORK PLAN.....	3
4.1. Management of APMBT Work Plan	4
4.2. Changes in Impact Scoring of Recorded Mine/ERW Hazards	5
4.3. Impact Classification	5
4.4. Arrangement of the Projects within APMBT Work Plan	5
4.5. Prioritization of Projects within APMBT Work Plan	6
4.5.1 Mine/ERW Hazards Prioritization in the Field	7
4.6. Requirements of Hazards Amendment	7
5. PLANNING AND PRIORITIZATION OF MINE/ERW RISK EDUCATION AND VICTIM ASSISTANCE ..	8
5.1. Mine and ERW Risk Education:	8
5.2. Victim Assistance:	9
6. DEVELOPMENT OF ANNUAL OPERATIONAL PLAN.....	9
6.1. Hazard Reservation with Confirmed Fund:	11
6.2. Hazard Reservation without Confirmed Fund:	11
6.3. Hazard Reservation for Multiyear Donors:	11
6.4. Specific Requirements:	11

1. Introduction

Planning and prioritization in mine action are based on collection, assessing, analysis and processing of information. Planning also includes identification of the most suitable course of actions to proceed, and formulation of the detailed method through which mine actions tasks are to be carried out and appropriate response to be provided. Planning and prioritization in mine action requires accurate and timely information on the type, scale and impact of mine and ERW hazards, and the importance and urgency needed in provision of response. The sources of information for mine action planning and prioritization, include but not limited to non-technical survey, assessment missions, technical surveys, and ongoing mine action projects provided that the national strategies, obligations and stakeholders requirements are considered.

Information gathering is a continuous process through any relevant means, relating to mine or ERW accidents, incidents, impact and other mine and ERW related data. The planning and prioritization process effectively starts with analysis of up to date information recorded in IMSMA.

2. Scope

This AMAS covers the requirements and guidelines for planning and prioritization of mine action activities in Afghanistan in accordance with Anti Personnel Mine Ban Treaty (APMBT) obligations of the government of Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

3. Anti Personnel Mine Ban Treaty (APMBT)

The Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Treaty/Convention entered into force in March 1999 and has a clear humanitarian goal and seeks to put an end to the suffering caused by Anti-Personnel (AP) landmines. In order to achieve this goal, the Convention is comprehensive in prohibiting the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of AP landmines and calling for the destruction of all stockpiles, the clearance of all mined areas and assistance for landmine victims. Islamic Republic of Afghanistan has signed and became member state of this convention in March 2003, and is committed to clear all landmines and other Explosive Remnants of War (ERW) in 10 years, but due to many constrains, Afghanistan did not achieve the deadline, therefore, another 10 years extension request has been prepared and submitted to state parties.

4. Afghanistan APMBT Extension Request and Work Plan

Afghanistan signed and ratified APMBT in March 2003, obliged to clear all known AP contaminated areas in ten years. But multiple factors have impeded compliance with the treaty and the requirement of complete removal of all known AP landmines within given period of time from ratification. These factors including but not limited to; under funding, insecurity and ongoing conflicts, Anti-Vehicle landmines and ERW contaminated areas with high priority of clearance, limited technology, and lack of records and maps of contaminated areas, nuisance minefields especially AT contamination where land release is challenging and mostly require complete clearance, more time and resources. In addition, new minefields reporting continued despite several nationwide surveys undertaken; many contaminated areas remained hidden due to the lack of information, lack of urgent requirement for land use and insecurity increased the scope of mine and ERW problem in Afghanistan. In order to remove remaining mine and ERW contamination, Mine Action Programme of Afghanistan (MAPA) prepared and submitted a ten years extension request to the APMBT state parties in 2012 starting from 2013, which had been

approved. Part of extension request, all known mine and ERW hazards have been arranged and organized in projects considering their level of impact, priority and accessibility from the security point of view.

4.1. Management of APMBT Work Plan

In the context of this AMAS, Management of APMBT Work Plan means developing, updating and keeping track of Afghanistan's extension request work plan and communicating it to the relevant stakeholders. All known and recorded mine/ERW hazards shall be arranged in projects based on their impact and priority. The projects comprised of high impact hazardous areas should be planned for year one, medium and low impact for coming years respectively. As such, all known and recorded mine and ERW hazards shall be categorized based on their level of impact on communities, land users and beneficiaries.

Certain indicators are set for the type of impact that mine/ERW hazards have on the communities and other land users. Each indicator is scored based on the level of its impact and urgency for clearance. The allocated scores should be summed up and the ultimate level of impact of the individual hazards should be identified as; very high, high, medium and low. Refer to Annex A of this AMAS for further details.

Impact analysis is crucial in ensuring that all recorded mine/ERW hazards are defined as very high, high, medium and low, grouped in certain projects based on their impact level and priority, and planned for land release operations within the framework of national mine action strategies and Afghanistan APMBT obligations.

On behalf of the Mine Action Programme of Afghanistan (MAPA), planning committee comprised of UNMAS, DMAC and IPs; should ascertain criteria/indicators and apply impact scoring to the mine/ERW hazards and then arrange them in projects based on their impact level and priority for clearance. This process should take place in consultation with mine action stakeholders including donors of the programme and should be facilitated by DMAC Planning department. The APMBT work plan shall be reviewed by the assigned planning committee on yearly basis preferably during the middle of the year.

IMSMA provides up to date Non-Technical Survey (NTS) information as input for better management of the work plan. APMBT work plan shall be reviewed and updated on yearly basis, however, for its better tracking and updating, DMAC Planning department should conduct periodic review to ensure any new changes in terms of clearance, cancellation and NTS information are adopted and the work plan is updated. All the cleared, released and cancelled mine and or ERW hazards shall be removed from the work plan as soon as related information is updated in IMSMA and planning department has been notified. The up to date work plan shall always be communicated to the stakeholders. The following factors should be considered when conducting review:

- 1) Add newly surveyed and approved mine and ERW hazards into the nearest and compatible projects;
- 2) Remove closed and cancelled hazards from the projects.
- 3) Update the security situation in projects sites and accessibility of hazards with input from the RO and IPs.
- 4) Update the cost per team and average productivity rate, considering the recent year figures.

The Regional Offices shall conduct fresh visit of the upcoming year's APMBT projects' hazards and provide up to date information about the status of hazards and accessibility, this will help the planning and programme department to select projects/hazards for coming years planning and any potential funding during the year.

4.2. Changes in Impact Scoring of Recorded Mine/ERW Hazards

The APMBT work plan shall be maintained flexible to adopt necessary changes based on new priorities, new NTS information, donors and stakeholders requirements. Impact scores should be updated when an impact indicator require to be changed, new scores should be applied and the impact level of related mine and or ERW hazards shall be updated. The following factors be considered:

- a) Civilian Accident: Mine or ERW recent accident within recorded mine/ERW hazards and/or because of the recorded hazards, confirmed by DMAC Regional Office, should acquire three additional scores for each accident.
- b) Community Request: Community request for removal of mine and or ERW hazards, confirmed by DMAC RO and approved by district/provincial authority, should acquire two additional scores.
- c) IDPs Movement and Camping: Location of IDPs camps and also their movement within 5 km zone of the mine and or ERW hazards pose a direct risk to them, therefore, such hazards should be given two additional scores. Information about IDPs camps may be received from the Ministry of Refugees and Repatriation (MoRR), and UNHCR. DMAC Planning and Management Information System (MIS) departments should assess the location of IDPs and their proximity to hazards.
- d) Health Centre: Health Centres provide immediate first aid assistance and casualty stabilization services to the mine/ERW victims, therefore, their availability close to mine/ERW hazards reduce and prevent the complication of accidents on casualties. Inverse, far away location of health centres or lack of them increases the risk of more complications and threat to the life of victims. Based on this fact, a distance of 10 km is accepted the maximum. Hazards with more than 10 km distance from health facility should get additional one score. Update information about the location and capacity of health centres should be obtained from the Ministry of Public Health on yearly basis by DMAC Planning department.
- e) Resurvey: The recorded hazards are subject to resurvey to update their status, in case of any changes in terms of blockage, population and or other factors that affect the level of impact; the hazards should be up dated and scored in accordance with new changes.

4.3. Impact Classification

The impact scores from the assigned criteria are summed up making a total score for each mine and or ERW hazards. Based on total scores for each hazardous area, they should be classified to very high, high, medium and low impacts. See Annex B to this AMAS for further details.

4.4. Arrangement of the Projects within APMBT Work Plan

All recorded mine and ERW hazards should be organized and grouped into projects in a logical and practical manner and based on certain criteria, having unique name and ID. The projects should be

included in APMBT Work Plan and recorded in IMSMA to facilitate their inclusion in annual operational plan and be easily manageable. The following factors should be applied:

4.4.1 Geographical Considerations:

- 1) Hazards from the same province;
- 2) Hazards from the same or adjacent districts;
- 3) Side by side AP hazards;
- 4) Access way such as mountains, rivers and any other blockages should be considered in separation of projects;
- 5) Different hazards located on the same hillside and mountain should be sorted in one project to avoid possible wash down of mines/ERW and recontamination of cleared lower parts;
- 6) Hazards having walking distance of more than one hour and are low or medium impact should be sorted in one project/sub-project; and
- 7) Weather and climate conditions should be considered when grouping hazards into projects (winter/summer seasons considerations).

4.4.2 Impact/Ranks Consideration:

- 1) Hazards having the same or close by ranks such as (1 or 1 + 2, 2 or 2 + 3, 3 or 3 + 4) at the same geographical area should be sorted in one project.
- 2) Hazards with different ranks located in same geographical area with having total size of more than 1 sq km, should be sorted into more projects/sub-projects based on their rank and proximity. If the total size of hazards is less than 1 sq km and there is no more hazards in related district or nearby districts, should be grouped in one project, regardless of their ranks.

4.4.3 Type of Devices:

The Anti-Vehicle (AV) contaminated hazards (CHA & SHA) should be sorted in separate projects/sub-projects for further NTS and TS intervention.

4.4.4 Security consideration:

Considering above mentioned criteria, mine and ERW hazards with good security condition should be sorted in one project.

4.5. Prioritization of Projects within APMBT Work Plan

All the projects should be prioritized and arranged in a logical sequence within the work plan and this priority series should be based on the level of impact of mine and ERW hazards within the projects. The following should be applied:

- 1) Projects comprised of more high impact hazard areas than the total size of medium and low impact ones, should be classified as high priority projects within the work plan.
- 2) The same should apply with projects comprised of medium and low impact hazards.

- 3) Donor preference should also be considered as a factor in prioritization of the projects, this helps the programme not to lose funding opportunities. Such projects should be prioritized and planned for the year that donor confirmed to provide funds.
- 4) All projects located in secured areas should be sorted based on their importance, in the early years.
- 5) The projects located in insecure areas should be sorted based on their importance, in later years of the work plan.

4.5.1 Mine/ERW Hazards Prioritization in the Field

Implementing Partners (IPs) in close consultation with communities shall undertake the prioritization of individual hazards as part of their projects in the field level. The priorities of the communities should be considered as main factor in planning stage of land release operations. There may be situation where communities require certain hazards to be replaced with already planned ones, in this case, the IPs shall communicate the issue with DMAC Planning department and regional office, once all agreed, the "Requirements of Hazards Amendment" as describe in section below shall be applied and priority hazards included in the projects.

There may be situations where communities put certain conditions on IPs which can create constraints against land release operations. In order to avoid such situations, the IP shall convene comprehensive community liaison with the community elders and councils and inform them about the current situation, limitations and possibility of postponing demining operations there. If the community still insisting on their unnecessary conditions, all the hazards or some of them should be planned for later years of the work plan until the communities get agree with land release operations without any conditions or other arrangements are made to change the circumstances.

4.6. Requirements of Hazards Amendment

There may be situations where IPs may not be able to release certain hazards in their projects, due to changes in security situation, natural events, and changes in communities' priority to replace certain planned hazards with unplanned ones, in such cases mentioned hazards need to be replaced and the hazard list of related projects should be amended. In addition, the cancellation and or reduction in size of certain hazards and or early completion of the planned hazards within a project also require allocation of more hazards and amendment of related hazard list.

Once amendment is needed, the IPs shall request DMAC Planning department to amend their hazard list or add new hazards into their current projects. The following steps need to be considered in amendment of hazards:

- 1) The IP shall select open hazards and ensure that they are not reserved by other IPs as part of other project and donor.
- 2) The IP shall make sure that the selected hazards for replacement has the same scope of the mine or ERW problem.
- 3) In case the hazard is part of any other project or IP's plan as contingency or with un-confirmed fund, the issue should be communicated with related IP.

- 4) The IP shall make sure that the intended hazards for replacement do not have any problem, to avoid repeating amendment process.
- 5) Certain donors may require to be consulted and get their agreement about the replacement of hazards. Such donors should be consulted and their agreement is obtained.
- 6) The IP shall submit amendment request to UNMAS/DMAC planning department along with proper justification and evidence of steps taken as mentioned above.
- 7) Planning department shall check the proposed hazard status and then send it to the relevant regional office for their agreement.
- 8) Once the regional office agreed on amendment of hazards, the planning department provides an amendment letter to the IP and update the hazards list as agreed and approved. The IP is then authorized to proceed with land release operation on amended hazards.

5. Planning and Prioritization of Mine/ERW Risk Education and Victim Assistance

5.1. Mine and ERW Risk Education:

Planning and prioritization of M/ERW RE education require assessing the most suitable approaches that will be needed. RE delivery shall be assessed to ensure that the most at risk group of the people and then the entire population within impacted communities including men, women, boys and girls are covered. The RE approaches could be through delivering RE sessions to the at risk group, community based RE, encashment centres for returnees and through communities volunteers. Involvement of government related Ministries like education, public health, religious affairs and ministry of refugees and returnees in delivery of RE need to be assessed as well. RE through mass media, demining personnel and other humanitarian entities could also be effective options to be assessed for planning purpose.

The priority for RE through direct sessions shall be prioritized based on the impact of mine and ERW hazards on the communities on a logical sequence, the mine and ERW impact data should be obtained from IMSMA database, followed by a prioritization and planning exercise by UNMAS/DMAC planning, and M/ERW RE departments in consultation with RE IPs. The following sequence of prioritization should be applied:

- a) Communities with very high impact, with no RE record;
- b) Communities with high impact, with no RE record;
- c) Communities with medium impact, with no RE record;
- d) Communities with very high impact and less than 50% of population received RE;
- e) Communities with high impact and less than 50% of population received RE;
- f) Communities with medium impact and less than 50% of population received RE;
- g) Communities with low impact, with no RE record; and
- h) Communities with low impact with RE record.

Mine/ERW RE through encashment centres should be prioritized in consultation with the ministry of refugees and returnees, UNHCR and related IPs.

For effective planning and prioritization, the following criteria and scoring process should be applied:

1. Mine/ERW impacted communities with civilian incidents for the past two successive years are counted as killing zones, such communities shall be automatically classified as a high priority and get 3 scores.
2. Impacted communities where more than 75% of incidents cause by ERW, should be counted as ERW contaminated rather than only mines, and get 3 scores.
3. Communities with IDP settlements should be a priority for RE in order to avoid and prevent incidents to them and their children, such communities should get 3 scores.
4. Communities with recent conflicts seems to be contaminated with ERW and should get 3 scores.
5. Communities with recorded landmine hazards should get 2 scores, as the probability of incidents there is high.
6. Communities with recorded firing range hazard should get 2 scores, as the probability of incidents there is also high.
7. Communities with casualties of age under 18, should be prioritized due to the vulnerability of children, considering the fact that the majority of casualties in Afghanistan are children and should get 2 scores.
8. If the distance of community centre from a mine/ERW hazard is around 1 km, such communities should be prioritized for RE and get 2 scores.
9. The score 11 and above, shall be considered as very high impacted communities, 5 to 10 high impacted communities, 3 to 4 as medium and 0 and 2 as low impacted communities for prioritizing RE activities.

UNMAS Planning department in consultation with M/ERW RE department, should arrange the list of priority mine/ERW impacted communities for RE. See section 6 below for annual operational plan.

Implementing Partner may need to replace certain planned communities with unplanned ones where urgent need of RE is deemed necessary. The IPs should provide specific evidence and justification and follow amendment process with DMAC Planning department and related regional office.

5.2. Victim Assistance:

Planning and prioritization for Victim Assistance activities shall be started 3 months in advance to next operational year. This process should be started by DMAC Victim Assistance department in consultation with planning department and related ministries within government; Ministry of Public Health (MoPH), Ministry of Education (MoE) and Ministry of Labours, Social Affairs, Martyrs and Disabled (MoLSAMD). See Annex D to this AMAS for more details.

6. Development of Annual Operational Plan

After the completion of APMBT work plan review and updating, the planning process for the upcoming year should be started. DMAC Planning department shall share all the open projects

with the IPs to select the projects for demining, from the coming two years project list. Once the IP selected projects, they shall share the list with planning department to make sure that the priority projects are selected and to de-conflict the hazards and projects between IPs, if required.

The IPs should select open APMBT projects or part of them from the coming two years. They may also select high priority hazards from later years of the work plan. However, if medium and low priority hazards are selected from the later years, there should be sufficient justification. The IPs should not select multiple hazards from different projects without proper reason, otherwise, such selection may not be accepted as it creates problem in management of the projects.

Once the projects selection process completed and DMAC Planning department agreed upon, the IPs shall conduct field assessment and develop proposals and submit them to DMAC Planning department for review and approval. Planning department shall conduct a comprehensive review of the proposals through Proposal Review Team (PRT) and notify each IP about any concern and required revision. Planning department shall then provide endorsement letters in support of the proposals and share with the related IP and at the same time, link the proposed hazards and projects to related IPs in IMSMA database. Planning department should then reflect related projects in Annual Operational Plan. See Annex C to this AMAS for Annual Operational Planning Cycle.

For Mine/ERW Risk Education, DMAC Planning department shall share the update impacted communities' list with related IPs to plan and propose RE projects based on the priority as covered in section 5 of this AMAS. The IPs shall develop proposals and submit to the planning department to evaluate the priority of projects and suitability of the RE approaches. Once the proposals are accepted by UNMAS/DMAC PRT and planning department, the same process of planning like that of demining operations, should be applied.

For the VTF donors, once UNMAS receive funding opportunities from the donors, planning department in consideration of the amount of fund, shall come up with some projects as options from the MBT projects, considering their priorities and importance such as high number of beneficiaries, releasing province, districts and or communities and also available development intervention, and then should share the list with related regional office to assess the condition of hazards, possible changes and the accessibility of hazards. After feedback from the ROs, planning department shall present the options to the UNMAS and DMAC Project and Partner Selection Panel (PPSP) for further decision on the most important and suitable projects. This shall be applied to the mine/ERW Risk Education and Victim Assistance project as well, provided that the related departments shall be involved in providing the projects' options for PPSP. Once the required projects are identified and agreed, UNMAS shall inform the donor and then launch a Call for Proposal (CFP) for the interested IPs to apply.

The IPs in close coordination with DMAC regional office shall conduct a joint assessment of the hazards and prepare the report, then shall develop their proposals as per CFP requirement. UNMAS/DMAC should then review the proposals as per UNOPS evaluation process and notify the winner of grant, the planning department should then link related hazards and projects in IMSMA database with confirmed fund for the winner IPs.

The IPs should submit their proposals developed for mine action projects, to DMAC Planning department for review and endorsement prior submission to their intended donors.

Mine Action IPs can reserve mine and ERW priority hazards as part of the projects, considering the following requirements:

6.1. Hazard Reservation with Confirmed Fund:

- a) IPs with available/confirmed fund can select hazards from the current year's open APMBT work plan.
- b) IPs can block hazards from next year's APMBT work plan, provided that the hazards are high and medium impact.
- c) Justification is needed for other than the above.

6.2. Hazard Reservation without Confirmed Fund:

- a) Hazards may be allocated to the IPs, from the current or future years' of work plan without confirmed fund, but the possibility of funding is high or IP is in contact with a potential donor to fund the projects.
- b) Around 10 percent of the total planned projects may be reserved for the contingency plan of the IPs.
- c) The DMAC Planning department may reserve the hazards for the IPs with "no fund" until the fund is confirmed.
- d) The relevant IP shall provide update on funding situation of the project within 6 months of reservation of hazards, if the project not funded the DMAC Planning department shall remove reservation of hazards back to normal status, to be open for any other funding opportunity.

6.3. Hazard Reservation for Multiyear Donors:

- a) If IPs need to reserve certain hazards and projects for multiyear donors, the IPs work plan shall match with APMBT work plan in terms of the project year.

6.4. Specific Requirements:

- a) Hazards reported by IP to have confirmed fund, should be reserved in related project of the IP up to the end of the year or project duration. However, if at the end of the year or project duration, it is found that the hazard is not cleared, this should be counted in Balanced Scorecard and IP will lose scores.
- b) Reserved hazards with unconfirmed fund may be allocated to other IPs with evidence of available funds, but the first IP should be informed and agreed on allocation of the hazard to other IP with confirmed funds.
- c) The IPs shall not start operation on any hazards prior to completing the planning process (amendment letter or confirmation from DMAC Planning department).
- d) IPs shall not include their newly surveyed hazards in current projects, unless there is a proper justification and hazards amendment are approved by DMAC.