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Thank you Mr. President,

It is a requirement for every state party that has been affected by cluster munitions to report on the scope of contamination and the efforts invested to mitigate that. Thorough and efficient implementation of information management practices will enable that reporting meets the criteria on transparency, accuracy and reliability.

The current strategy of the GICHD focuses on two objectives: first, to improve the Global clarity on explosive hazards and second, to promote national ownership and high performance by national authorities. On the first objective, the Sector still lacks a complete and accurate picture of the extent of Cluster Munitions Remnants in some countries.

Frequently we see a lack of focus on surveys - and failure to accurately disaggregate different types of contamination. Often survey teams cannot actually determine the type of contamination. In such cases, the teams should record contamination as ‘unknown’ and both survey questionnaires and database records should have this field available. This is not always the case and survey staff guess - or worse still - use a default ‘mine’ category when the true nature of contamination is unknown.

In other cases, contaminated areas may include a combination of mines, Cluster Munitions Remnants and other ERW. For reporting purposes under different Conventions, areas must then be separated, tagged and carefully managed to avoid duplications in estimates of national contamination by munitions type - or in subsequent clearance statistics.

There must also be greater focus on distinguishing areas based on the reliability of information into sites that are ‘suspected’ of contamination – as opposed to those which have ‘confirmed’ contamination. This is vital to better target clearance activities. The current LR IMAS is under review and, while there are on-going discussions on the actual terms to be used, the greater promotion of a two tier land classification system will be a key element in the revision of the current series.

The cornerstone of good reporting is to understand that reporting starts on the field. It is the recording and analysis of daily field activities that will serve as a basis for the yearly summary report. Thereby, it is important that sufficient efforts are laid at early stages to define the right level of data disaggregation.
and information management quality routines. These efforts will prevent issues of data discrepancy, data duplication, confusion on which forms are used in the country, lack of standardization, etc.

A joint pragmatic approach from information management and operational staff is pivotal when defining level of data details to be collected (e.g. types of sqm, device types, clearance methods, assets deployment, duration of activities, accuracy of GIS data), definition of key operational terms (e.g. suspected area, cluster strike, evidence point, cleared area, released land, victim) and information management quality standards (e.g. standardization of forms, standardization of reports, operational workflow, information workflow, approval routines, information exchange routines).

The GICHD has a strong track record in information management and is continuing to support affected countries, particularly in the following way:

- The Information Management System for Mine Action, IMSMA NG, is implemented in most of the affected countries.
- The recent version allows full flexibility on adjusting the system to specific country requirements.
- Regular regional workshops are organized to train the national staff in utilizing their information management capacities in support of operational activities.
- A final draft of IM IMAS has been developed and sent to the IMAS Review Board for approval.
- In support of the CCM reporting, the GICHD is developing the IMSMA NG CCM Reporting Guide. The guide will address CCM reporting issues in a pragmatic way, from field-level data collection to the final compilation of the transparency report.