Annex A to SNMAS 03.01 Planning and Prioritization Hazardous Areas Impact Indicators and Scoring

Hazardous Areas Impact Indicators and Scoring

The impact scoring shall be determined based on certain impact criteria and hazard blockages such as detailed and listed in below table. Other important factor to be considered is; the size of mine/ERW hazardous areas and their distance from the communities, IDP camps and health centres.

Small hazardous areas and spot ERW should also be considered as a factor in selection of impact indicator, removal of such hazards require less resource and effort, but will have higher impact including quicker removal of blockages, quicker release of communities from known mine and ERW, tangible outputs and achievements for communication and reduction in number of hazardous areas from IMSMA database. Types of devices are also impact indicator with certain scores. For each type of blockages, based on its value and importance, a specific scoring weight should be assigned. The impact indicators shall be reviewed on annual basis to ensure their continual suitability within the mine action context in Sudan. Table below shows the impact indicators and scorings:

| S- No. | Impact Indicators | Scores | Descriptions |
|-----------|--|--------|---|
| 1 | Hazardous area with known victims in recent two years. | 3 | Any mine/ERW detonation within a known hazard which resulted in human loss or casualty |
| 2 | Water blockage. | 3 | Drinking water, irrigation systems |
| 3 | Critical infrastructure blockage. | 3 | Religious, education, cultural and health facilities, houses and markets. |
| 4 | Request from humanitarian, development sectors, approved by government, and agreed by communities. | 3 | The requested area assessed and confirmed by NMAC sub- office. |
| 5 | Agriculture blockage | 3 | Crop land, fruit farms and forest |
| 6 | Routes and roads blocking access of humanitarian aid and development interventions. | 3 | Routes, roads and, Bridges |
| 7 | Small hazards | 2 | Quick release of communities, localities and states from hazards; changes in contamination map, important for communicating achievement and progress in line with APMBC extension request, resource mobilization. |
| 8 | Community Centre | 2 | Hazard located in one km from the centre of the nearest community, cause high levels of psychological stress to the people and increase the likelihood of incidents happening. |
| 9 | AP mine and ERW affecting high number of | 2 | The possibility and likelihood of accidents become high, when the area is going to be used by high |

Annex A to SNMAS 03.01 Planning and Prioritization Impact Indicators and Scoring

| | people, including IDPs, returnees, nomads and | | number of people. |
|----|---|---|--|
| | refugees. | | |
| 10 | IDPs, returnees and refugees near to | 2 | If IDPs, returnees and refugees are settled within 2 km distance from the hazards, the likelihood of |
| | hazardous Areas | | incidents increases. |
| 11 | Known victims beyond two years. | 1 | Any mine/ERW detonation within a known hazard area which resulted in human loss or casualty. |
| 12 | Non-agriculture blockage. | 3 | Grazing/pastureland. |
| 13 | Size of contaminated area located near to | 1 | May increases the likelihood of incidents. |
| | community; 50,000 Sqm and above. | | |
| 14 | Distance from health centre | 2 | Hazards located in more than 10 km distance from the health centres, can complicate the status of |
| | | | casualty during evacuation. |