

Workshop Number 3:

Essential Differences in Clearance
and QA/QC of mine suspected and
ERW suspected areas

Workshop Number 3:

Essential Differences in Clearance and QA/QC of mine suspected and ERW suspected areas

Discussion points and conclusions:

Discussion one:

Mechanical Demining and QA/QC – Presentation

Main discussion – the requirements for follow-on clearance should be based on:

- **Tests the machine has passed – CEN and acceptance tests (accreditation)**
- **The track record of the machine**
- **QA during the ongoing operation and reports from such**
- **Documentation during the clearance operation supporting decisions**
- **Audible and visual detonation during the operation**

Often follow-on clearance is undertaken when the real requirement for such is questionable.

Workshop Number 3:

Essential Differences in Clearance and QA/QC of mine suspected and ERW suspected areas

Discussion points and conclusions:

Discussion two:

Lessons learnt and feed back to improve standards

“Methods for feed-back from field operators can and should be improved to allow for existing standards to include new methods and techniques.”

Workshop Number 3:

Essential Differences in Clearance and QA/QC of mine suspected and ERW suspected areas

Discussion points and conclusions:

Discussion three:

Efficiency and effectiveness for Land Release methodologies are not as developed as for other methodologies. Especially when doing the risk assessment and reviewing previous impact assessments.

More attention should be paid to the effectiveness of Land Release concepts.