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New Mine Usage Confirmed (and Denied) as of 2011

• ICBL quotes UNAMA & the Taliban responding to UNAMA
  
  “[E]ach pressure plate IED serves as a massive anti-personnel landmine with the capability of destroying a tank. Civilians who step or drive on these IEDS have no defense against them and little chance of survival.” UNAMA, “Afghanistan: Mid Year Report 2011, Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict,” Kabul, July 2011.

  “UNAMA accuses Mujahideen of the Islamic Emirate of having caused casualties to the common people by planting land mines. However, all the country men know that Mujahideen use landmines which are controlled remotely, i.e. they are not detonated by heavy pressure. So Mujahideen’s mines aim only at a specific targets.” Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan, “Statement of the Islamic Emirate Regarding the Repeatedly Baseless Accusations of UNAMA,” 19 July 2011.
Scope of legacy and new Mine/ERW contaminations in Afghanistan

Legacy & New Contamination Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazards Types</th>
<th>Number of Hazards</th>
<th>Area (KM Sq)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Contamination</td>
<td>3,411</td>
<td>835.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Contamination</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>474.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>1,110.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: 8th Jan 2018
Taliban presence in Afghanistan by district

Labelled cities have also experienced deadly suicide attacks, car bombs and targeted killings

How the districts break down:
Open Taliban presence in government-held areas
- High - attacked at least twice a week, 15% of districts
- Medium - attacked at least three times a month, 20%
- Low - attacked once in three months, 31%

Full government control, 30%
Full Taliban control, 4%

Source: BBC research, 23 August - 21 November 2017
Taliban presence in Afghanistan by district

Labelled cities have also experienced deadly suicide attacks, car bombs and targeted killings.

[Map showing Taliban presence in Afghanistan by district]

[Map showing Scope of legacy and new Mine/ERW contaminations in Afghanistan]

Legend:
- New Contamination
- Legacy Contamination
- Mines with legacy contaminations (Mine 2002)
- Mines with new contaminations (Mine 2002)
- District Boundary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazards Types</th>
<th>Number of Hazards</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Contamination</td>
<td>2,443</td>
<td>325.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Contamination</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>47.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,742</td>
<td>372.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projected Source: Integrated Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA)

Casualties and Mine Action Funding

*Projected

Source: Integrated Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA)
‘Abandoned’ & ‘Not Abandoned’?

Abandoned & Not Abandoned

International Mine Action Standards (IMAS)

Military/Security Context

Humanitarian Space

Humanitarian Objectives

Explosive ordnance ‘out of play’ and ‘cold’

Military/Security Objectives

Explosive ordnance ‘in-play’ and ‘hot’

Abandoned

Not Abandoned
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Discussion. Please!

• Abandonment: Is this a new challenge or have we always done this as part of humanitarian mine action? As part of community liaison? Speaking to the parties to a conflict?

• Abandonment: Is it a process rather than an event?

• Abandonment: Role of Humanitarian Diplomacy?

• Abandonment: Needs to be ‘certified’ or ‘verified’?

• Abandonment: A pre-condition to establishing durable consent to clear.