

# **MINUTES OF THE IMAS REVIEW BOARD MEETING 2018**

Date: Monday, February 12, 2018  
Time: 08:30-16:30  
Location: Conference Room, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor GICHD

Meeting Chair: Mr Paul Heslop, UNMAS  
Meeting Sec: Mr Mikael Bold, GICHD

## **1. Welcome and Introduction**

The Chair of the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) Review Board (RB), Mr Paul Heslop, opened the meeting and welcomed all members, observers and guests. During the last year the importance and relevance for the IMAS continues to be proven. In particular Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs) have caused an increasing number of victims, and have presented challenges to the sector in recent months. In this context, the Chair noted that IMAS provide an important reference point, although there is a growing need for revision of IMAS to reflect the current reality on the ground.

## **2. Minutes IMAS RB Meeting 2017.**

The minutes from the IMAS review board meeting in February 2017 were formally accepted and archived. They can be found on the link below:

[https://www.mineactionstandards.org/fileadmin/MAS/documents/review-board/minutes/Minutes\\_IMAS\\_Review\\_Board\\_Meeting\\_Feb\\_2017\\_IMAS\\_Website.pdf](https://www.mineactionstandards.org/fileadmin/MAS/documents/review-board/minutes/Minutes_IMAS_Review_Board_Meeting_Feb_2017_IMAS_Website.pdf)

## **3. IMAS Review Board Members 2018**

It was noted with regret that out of the four National Mine Action Authority (NMAA) members, only two attended the RB meeting. Representatives of affected states are important representatives on the RB and, given that most of the NMAA were present in Geneva for the UN-organised National Directors Meeting during the same week as the RB meeting, their absence raised some concerns. It was suggested that a letter would be sent out by the Chair of the RB to NMAA members encouraging them to make every possible effort to attend IMAS RB meetings and IMAS sub-committee meetings that are planned for 2018/2019. A previous decision to sanction members of the RB that were sponsored to attend the RB Meeting and did not attend was raised during the discussion. It was decided that the issue of sponsorship should

be verified, to determine if any NMAA representatives that did not attend were sponsored for the purpose of RB participation.

Four new representatives were voted onto the IMAS Review Board:

- Member (Independent): Ms Suzanne Fiederlein [Center for International Stabilization and Recovery](#), James Madison University
- Member (National): China represented by Mr Yang Li on behalf of the Arms Control Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Observer (Independent): Mr Gareth Beck
- Observer (NGO): APOPO (represented by Mr Håvard Bach)

#### **4. Update on UN IEDD Standards and WebEX Meetings**

Mr Richard Boulter from UNMAS informed the Board that the UN IEDD Standards have been submitted to the Executive Senior Management Team (ESMT) of UN DPKO/DFS for approval. He noted that the scope and application of these standards will be clarified in the final version, which will be published by UNMAS in due course. It was clarified that these standards will apply to relevant UN agencies and their contractors. Mr Olaf Juergensen from UNDP noted that there is still internal discussion within the UN system regarding which UN agencies the standards will apply to. In addition, where a NMAA and adequate National Standards are already in place, these National Standards will be used for contractors. It was also noted that other actors, such as donors and/or NMAAs, can decide to adopt the UN IEDD standards and apply them to the mine action sector in a given context. Further, since it was highlighted by mine action stakeholders that IMAS must be revised to incorporate better guidance on dealing with IEDs, the RB Chair noted that during the recent WebEX in January it was determined that UN IEDD standards in whole, or in part, could be used as reference material during this process.

The Chair also suggested to the Board that the consultative process for the UNIEDD standards over WebEX has proven to be a very effective forum allowing people to attend without travel costs and lengthy visa processes. The Chair offered to support sub-committee meetings on IMAS with the option to conduct these via WebEX coordinated by UNMAS. It was further suggested that an additional RB meeting should be held in June, which was supported by the RB Chair. Work on IMAS amendments for IEDs could therefore be considered at this additional meeting.

The GICHD's Ms Tammy Hall and Mr Nick Bray, presented on the incorporation of IED guidance within IMAS, based on a roadmap that had been shared in advance of the meeting -- Improvised Explosive Devices: A roadmap for the IMAS Guidance (see Annex A attached to this document). During the discussions, Board members agreed on the need for a clarification of definitions, a requirement to look at competencies, risk management, urban contexts, as well as survey and search. Although there was no consensus regarding what should be included in the Terms of Reference for each thematic group, it was agreed that these issues should be explored further within smaller, dedicated discussion fora that can develop recommendations. In this regard, the importance of timely participation by RB members to ensure that additional work on IEDs is carried out in a timely manner, was emphasized. The Chair advised that whilst the Board would take the final vote on approving any new IMAS text, non-members who are

subject-matter experts should be involved in thematic work -- opening the process for more widespread consultation. It was agreed that the proposal to create parallel sub-groups should be established rapidly to quickly focus on IED-related thematic issues. Whilst the RB did not enter into very detailed discussion regarding the format of the working sub-groups there was an initial agreement on the key thematic focus areas that would be addressed. The members were asked to state their interest in participating in and/or serving as Focal Points for specific groups. It was decided that these groups would report back to the Board ahead of the next meeting in June 2018 (see Annex B – IED Thematic Working Groups, attached to this document).

## **5. Review IMAS 01.10 Guide for the application of IMAS**

HALO Trust, Ms Camille Wallen, presented proposed amendments to IMAS 01.10, that were developed in collaboration with MAG. The amended IMAS 01.10 was adopted by consensus with the caveat that it include the following further amendments:

- Paragraph 6.2, humanitarian principles “should” will be replaced with “shall”.
- IEDs shall be included in list of bullets (“explosive ordnance including all different items”).
- A footnote will be included to include a reference to “underwater explosive ordnance”.
- Include reference to limit with regards to the littoral zone (in line with IMAS 09.60 on Underwater Survey and Clearance of Explosive Ordnance)
- “Chairman” will be replaced with “Chair”
- References to “commercial demining companies/contractors” will be replaced with “commercial companies/contractors”
- References to “capacity building” will be replaced by “capacity development”

The Secretary will implement the changes above and submit to the Chair, for final verification prior to replacing the existing version.

## **6. New IMAS 07.13 Environmental Management in Mine Action**

The new IMAS 07.13 standard on Environmental Management in Mine Action was adopted by consensus and will be uploaded shortly on the IMAS website. This chapter will replace IMAS 10.70 Safety & occupational health - Protection of the environment, as well as any references to it.

## **7. New IMAS 09.40 Animal detection systems – Principles, Requirements and Guidelines**

The new standard for animal detection systems (ADS) was discussed. The intention of the revision was to link the ADS chapter to IMAS 07.12 (Quality Management) and combine current 09.40 and 09.41 with the inclusion of mine detection rats, however, concerns were raised regarding some of the language included in the document, which some members felt was ‘aspirational’. The following steps were agreed:

- Removal of any references to the REST system
- Remove any conflicting statements referencing the number of MDD/ADS to be used in survey and clearance and directly insert existing paragraph 9.3 found in IMAS 09.41, which is already approved.

- First review of amendments by UNOPS and UNMAS.

The Secretary will implement the changes above and submit to UNOPS (Mr Joakim Berlin) and UNMAS (Mr Richard Boulter) for verification prior to re-circulation.

There will be a need to revise the other existing chapters on MDD to include other ADS. In particular a revision work plan to revise testing and accreditation of ADS should be drafted as soon as possible for approval by the IMAS RB. GICHD volunteered to take a lead establishing a consultative process on this issue among specialists that can be presented to the RB for consideration.

## **8. New TNMA on Explosive Hazard Risk Assessment and Debris Management**

The TNMA was adopted by consensus assuming that the following amendments would be included:

- “Explosive Ordnance” will replace “explosive hazard” throughout the document
- Spelling, grammar and formatting need to be improved throughout the document
- The Gaza case study should be included as an annex rather than in the main text
- IEDs should eventually be included within the framework of the note, once appropriate new guidance is developed.

UNMAS (Mr Richard Boulter) will implement the immediate proposed corrections and submit to the Chair, via the Secretary, for final review prior to making it available on the IMAS website. New content will be incorporated once it is available. Deadline for the completion of this work is before the meeting in June 2018.

## **9. New TNMA for IED Risk Education**

The Secretary proposed that the TNMA for IED Risk Education is accepted as an informative document rather than normative document. The RB also agreed that:

- The document will be updated once the IMAS 04.10 Glossary of mine action terms, definitions and abbreviations has been revised.
- The document may be revised or superseded by revisions to IMAS 12.10 Mine/ERW Risk Education

The Secretary will implement these changes to the TNMA once IMAS 4.10 is updated.

## **10. Residual Contamination:**

### **a. IMAS 07.10**

The GICHD’s Mr Rory Logan presented proposed amendments to IMAS 07.10 and the changes were adopted by consensus assuming that the following conditions are met:

- Review of the definition of Explosive Ordnance to be in line with changes in IMAS 01.10 and the revision of IMAS 04.10

- Replace the term ‘Survey and Clearance’ with ‘Land Release’ throughout
- Change MDD to ADS throughout
- Confirmation of review (including any minor amendments) by the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) of the AP Mine Ban Convention (APMBC).

The Secretary will implement the changes above in coordination with ISU APMBC and submit to the Chair for final verification prior making it available on the IMAS website.

#### **b. Update on TNMA ‘Residual Contamination’**

The GICHD’s Mr Rob White presented an outline of the TNMA on Residual Contamination as an initial step to inform the Board on progress while the document text is being developed. It will be circulated for comment ahead of the next RB Meeting.

#### **c. TNMA ‘All Reasonable Effort’**

The GICHD’s Mr Rory Logan presented a request, formally submitted in late 2017, to develop a TNMA on “All Reasonable Effort”. The TNMA would be designed to complement the revised IMAS 07.10 and TNMA Residual Contamination. A mandate was given by RB Members to develop a TNMA for consideration by the RB.

### **11. Update IMAS 05.10 Information management for mine action and TNMA on Minimum Reporting Requirements**

The GICHD’s Mr Henrik Rydberg provided the Board with an update on progress towards a revision of IMAS 05.10 and the TNMA on Minimum Reporting Requirements. Both documents are in the process of being written, based on extensive consultations with mine action actors. The Board will be invited to participate in an IM survey together with external actors such as IM departments from mine action organisations and NMAA. The Board had no comments and looks forward to reviewing the IMAS 05.10 revision and TNMA when it is completed.

### **12. Update IMAS 10.40 Medical support to demining operations and TNMA on Medical Support**

NPA’s Mr Tony Belgrave presented an update on work on a TNMA on Medical Support and a planned revision of IMAS 10.40. This was well received by the Board and support was expressed for a working group to be established to suggest amendments to IMAS 10.40 and participate in the development of a TNMA on medical support to operations. See Annex B- Thematic Working Groups, which is attached to this document.

### **13. Revision of EOD Competencies to IMAS**

The GICHD’s Mr Roly Evans presented a proposal for updating competency requirements in IMAS. Currently IMAS guidance is limited to the competencies outlined for EOD in the T&E Protocol for IMAS 09.30. Included in the GICHD’s presentation was the proposal to add competencies for additional mine action activities rather than just for EOD. A potential list of mine action competencies included Risk Education, Clearance, Non-technical Survey, Medical Support, and others. The existing EOD competencies are vague and open to interpretation. In the case of the over 500 EOD competencies currently listed, a revision would likely involve

significant streamlining of the training objectives and a clarification of the content, in addition to addressing gaps.

The initiative to properly map competencies was generally supported by RB, however UNMAS questioned whether these competencies should be enshrined in IMAS. There was some discussion as to whether a comprehensive competency framework would be more suited to a GICHD guide, or perhaps a JMU publication. How such competencies would be certified was also raised as a concern, though it was agreed that operators would always be responsible for the deployment of appropriately trained and competent staff in all roles.

It was agreed that:

- IED competencies are a priority for IMAS and would be looked at by one of the working groups identified under the IED discussion recorded above (Annex B- Thematic Working Groups)
- The GICHD will assess the next steps and keep the RB informed with regards to any future initiatives related to an overall mine action competency framework.

#### **14. IMAS Website Update**

The GICHD's Ms Sandra Bialystok presented an update on the IMAS website, which is currently being developed with funds from the US State Department (PM/WRA) and Switzerland. The website has an improved functionality, which will allow RB members to review documents on and off line. The website will provide a more efficient platform to address the review of proposed standards and proposals and should therefore increase the efficiency of the consultative process. A new logo was also presented for the IMAS as part of the visual presentation of the website. Feedback on the initiative was positive, though some further clarification is required on specific functions and potential limitations. RB members emphasized that members also requested a delegation function to be in place for the review of documents. It was affirmed that training would be required for RB members, in order to use the website platform effectively, once it goes online in May 2018. The GICHD stated that such training could be available on the margins of the next RB meeting.

GICHD will look into the delegation functionality and other questions raised, as well as send the new proposed IMAS logo to UNMAS for approval.

#### **15. Any other business/ Closing of the Meeting**

- On behalf of Humanity and Inclusion (HI - formerly Handicap International), the GICHD presented a proposal received to develop an IMAS related to Support to Victims of Explosive Ordnance. The intention of this document would not be to replace technical guidance in areas related to the Health Sector, but instead to provide guidance on what elements of support to victims should be implemented by mine action programmes. A short proposal was developed and submitted to the RB Board (see Annex C). The RB reacted favourably to the HI proposal and provided a mandate for HI to move forward with drafting text on Support to Victims for submission to the RB.
- The secretary informed the IMAS RB that IMAS translations in Arabic, French and Russian are available on the IMAS website. It was highlighted that these translations were funded by UNMAS.

- The Chair informed the Board that Mikael Bold will be leaving GICHD in February 2018, which will end his role as the RB Secretary. It has been proposed that Rory Logan will replace Mikael Bold as the Secretary on behalf of GICHD.
- The Chair also informed the Board that Chris Pearce would be standing down as the representative for Optima Group. The Chair thanked Chirs for his considerable contribution and dedication to the IMAS RB, over many years. Optima have nominated Richard Holmes as their new representative.
- The Chair reiterated the need for members to remain engaged in IMAS updates throughout the year. This will avoid issues where there are no comments for months and where unproductive discussions take place during formal RB Meetings.
- The Chair noted particularly that those signing up to working groups should be committed to allocating time/staff to work in those groups.

The Chair thanked RB members for their time and participation and added that members will be informed regarding when and where the next meeting will take place in June 2018.

Paul Heslop  
Chair IMAS RB  
UNMAS

Mikael Bold  
Secretary IMAS RB  
GICHD

## Annex A - Improvised Explosive Devices: A roadmap for the IMAS Guidance

### **Improvised Explosive Devices: A Roadmap for the IMAS Guidance**

Consultations beginning as early as 2015 within the IMAS Review Board (RB) have focused on the fact that improvised explosive devices (IEDs) are increasingly present in contexts affected by mines and explosive remnants of war (ERW) and are ever more challenging to deal with due to the scale of their use. The IED issue was again raised at the 2016 RB Meeting, at a special sub-committee meeting later that year, and at the 2017 RB Meeting. At this most recent gathering, David Hewitson presented his review of the entirety of the IMAS and this feedback was considered by RB members in the months following the RB Meeting. A Summary of comments was circulated in September 2017, which highlighted the main points of consensus among members regarding work to be done, including:

- IMAS 01.10 *Application of IMAS* and IMAS 04.10 *Glossary* should be updated immediately.
- Training requirements and equipment specifications (including mechanical clearance assets) need to be updated.
- A Technical Note on MRE related to IEDs is required
- A new IMAS chapter on Risk Management should be added for framing more detailed risk assessment guidance on IEDD and other relevant topics.
- Other technical notes should be considered in order to provide more detailed guidance to operators on issues such as IED clearance in urban areas.

Discussions have continued among RB members in the context of both IMAS meetings and the development of UN Standards for IED Disposal by Member States under the coordination of UNMAS. During this process, additional areas of work were suggested by some RB members, including: Survey/search, Land Release, Mechanical Demining, EOD, Clearance Requirements, and Worksite Safety.

#### **Where added guidance is necessary:**

Despite the long history of success and progress in clearing explosive devices of an improvised nature, the past two decades have most often seen mine action implementing organisations defer treatment of complex devices to the security sector when they have been encountered. The focus for mine action organisations has instead been on simpler victim operated devices – principally those laid as landmines and initiated with pressure or tension release mechanisms. More complex victim operated devices (using methods such as infrared, light and acoustics for initiation), as well as time or command devices, were generally only addressed as component parts or abandoned ordnance in a legacy context. This continues to be the case for most mine action scenarios, however, the boundary line between on-going and post-conflict environments is increasingly blurry. Implementing organisations working in contexts such as Iraq are more and more being exposed to sensitive security environments and coming in contact with more complex IEDs (both laid as landmines and in urban environments). In such environments, the requirements for operational planning, survey/search, as well as clearance and disposal operations require more sophistication and better guidance, including the integration of knowledge and expertise from specialist technicians, as well as from operators using new methodologies developed on the ground in these environments.

**The road ahead:**

Given the time that has passed since discussions on IEDs began, Review Board members, and mine action stakeholders, have overwhelmingly expressed the need to move forward as quickly as possible with revisions to the contents of IMAS. This is counterbalanced by the requirement to ensure that IMAS guidance is of high quality and fit for purpose. Given current time constraints a sequenced approach that would deal with the most urgent requirements first, and then move on to less urgent revisions to IMAS chapters in a second stage, would seem to be the most efficient approach.

Building on this feedback, the following timelines map out a suggested plan for achieving progress related to IED guidance (a more detailed work plan will follow).

**Short-term objectives (Feb-May, 2018)**

- Approve a revised text for **IMAS 1.10** that explicitly integrates IEDs
- Outline new terms and definitions to be added to **IMAS 4.10** (establishing “working definitions” for terms that are needed for IMAS revisions, if the consensus cannot be initially reached).
- Establish **IED competencies** (based on training needs assessment (TNA) consultations with operators)
- Develop a **Risk Management Chapter** and accompanying related technical notes

*The above will be accomplished through individual consultations with all implementing organisations and national authorities represented on the Review Board and other relevant operating organisations and national authorities. In addition, a series of subject matter working groups and Review Board meetings (using Webex and at least one additional physical meeting of RB Members) should be held.*

**Mid-term objectives (June-Dec, 2018)**

- Assess the applicability of the Land Release model to urban environments and discuss the possibility of developing a separate structure for urban contexts.
- Approval of IED competencies
- Approve series of terminology for new/revised terminology for IMAS

**Longer-term objectives (Jan-Feb, 2019)**

- Review the entire structure of IMAS to ensure that new and revised terminology is integrated appropriately in all chapters, and that appropriate linkages have been made with new content.

**Conclusion:**

It is clear that in order to meet the objectives of this overall plan, the IMAS Review Board members and other relevant stakeholders in the mine action sector will need to commit the relevant time and resources to this process. Under the leadership of the Chair of the IMAS Review Board, the process must be coordinated and monitored to ensure that there is no slippage with regard to time frames, or it will have an impact on the credibility of the process and will have failed in terms of bringing timely and needed guidance to the sector.

Annex B - IED Thematic Working Group sign up sheets

## 1) Terminology - IMAS 4.10 Working Group

Name	Organisation	Contact email
Calvin Ruysen (Focal Point)	HALO	<a href="mailto:Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org">Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org</a>
Suzanne Fiederlein	CISR	<a href="mailto:fiedersl@jmu.edu">fiedersl@jmu.edu</a>
Gary Toombs	HI	<a href="mailto:g.toombs@hi.org">g.toombs@hi.org</a>
Mark Thompson	MAG	<a href="mailto:Mark.thompson@maginternational.org">Mark.thompson@maginternational.org</a>
Hans Risser	NPA	<a href="mailto:Hansr@npaid.org">Hansr@npaid.org</a>
Bryan Sand	UNMAS	<a href="mailto:sandb@un.org">sandb@un.org</a>
Robert Keeley	DDG	<a href="mailto:Bob.keeley@drc.dk">Bob.keeley@drc.dk</a>
Tammy Hall	GICHD	<a href="mailto:t.hall@gichd.org">t.hall@gichd.org</a>
Juan Carlos Ruan	ISU APMBC	<a href="mailto:j.ruan@apminebanconvention.org">j.ruan@apminebanconvention.org</a>
Olaf Juergensen	UNDP	<a href="mailto:Olaf.juergensen@undp.org">Olaf.juergensen@undp.org</a>
Ian Mansfield	MASG	<a href="mailto:ian.w.mansfield@gmail.com">ian.w.mansfield@gmail.com</a>

## 2) Competencies Working Group

Name	Organisation	Contact email
Roly Evans (Focal Point)	GICHD	<a href="mailto:r.evans@gichd.org">r.evans@gichd.org</a>
Gunther Haustrate	Belgium Military	<a href="mailto:Gunther.haustrate@mil.be">Gunther.haustrate@mil.be</a>

Gareth Bex	UK	<a href="mailto:garethbex@live.co.uk">garethbex@live.co.uk</a>
Richard Holmes	Optima	<a href="mailto:Richard.holmes@optimagroup.co">Richard.holmes@optimagroup.co</a>
Dave McDonnell	Phase 3 Services Ltd	<a href="mailto:dmcdonnell@phase3services.com">dmcdonnell@phase3services.com</a>
Calvin Ruysen	HALO	<a href="mailto:Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org">Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org</a>
Mark Thompson	MAG	<a href="mailto:Mark.thompson@maginternational.org">Mark.thompson@maginternational.org</a>
Hans Risser	NPA	<a href="mailto:Hansr@npaid.org">Hansr@npaid.org</a>
Bryan Sand	UNMAS	<a href="mailto:sandb@un.org">sandb@un.org</a>
Tammy Hall	GICHD	<a href="mailto:t.hall@gichd.org">t.hall@gichd.org</a>

### 3) Survey and Land Release<sup>1</sup> Working Group

Name	Organisation	Contact email
Calvin Ruysen (Focal Point)	HALO	<a href="mailto:Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org">Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org</a>
Richard Holmes	Optima	<a href="mailto:Richard.holmes@optimagroup.co">Richard.holmes@optimagroup.co</a>
Dave McDonnell	Phase 3 Services Ltd	<a href="mailto:dmcdonnell@phase3services.com">dmcdonnell@phase3services.com</a>
Havard Bach	APOPO	<a href="mailto:Havard.bach@apopo.org">Havard.bach@apopo.org</a>
Mark Thompson	MAG	<a href="mailto:Mark.thompson@maginternational.org">Mark.thompson@maginternational.org</a>
Bryan Sand	UNMAS	<a href="mailto:sandb@un.org">sandb@un.org</a>
Hans Risser	NPA	<a href="mailto:hansr@npaid.org">hansr@npaid.org</a>

<sup>1</sup> Including Search.

Laura Davor	Croatia	<a href="mailto:Devor.laura@hcr.hr">Devor.laura@hcr.hr</a>
Stanislav Damjanovic	GICHD	<a href="mailto:s.damjanovic@gichd.org">s.damjanovic@gichd.org</a>
Tammy Hall	GICHD	<a href="mailto:t.hall@gichd.org">t.hall@gichd.org</a>
Aimal Safi	DMAC/UNMAS	<a href="mailto:AIMAL@unops.org">AIMAL@unops.org</a>

#### 4) Urban IED<sup>2</sup> Working Group

Name	Organisation	Contact email
Nick Bray (Focal Point)	GICHD	<a href="mailto:n.bray@gichd.org">n.bray@gichd.org</a>
Richard Holmes	Optima	<a href="mailto:Richard.holmes@optimagroup.co">Richard.holmes@optimagroup.co</a>
Dave McDonnell	Phase 3 Services Ltd	<a href="mailto:dmcdonnell@phase3services.com">dmcdonnell@phase3services.com</a>
Gary Toombs	HI	<a href="mailto:gtoombs@hi.org">gtoombs@hi.org</a>
Calvin Ruysen	HALO	<a href="mailto:Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org">Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org</a>
Mark Thompson	MAG	<a href="mailto:Mark.thompson@maginternational.org">Mark.thompson@maginternational.org</a>
Hans Risser	NPA	<a href="mailto:hansr@npaid.org">hansr@npaid.org</a>
Bryan Sand	UNMAS	<a href="mailto:sandb@un.org">sandb@un.org</a>
Tammy Hall	GICHD	<a href="mailto:t.hall@gichd.org">t.hall@gichd.org</a>

---

<sup>2</sup> Including Urban Search.

## 5) MRE WG

Name	Organisation	Contact email
Hugues Laurence	UNICEF	<a href="mailto:hlaurence@unicef.org">hlaurence@unicef.org</a>
Gary Toombs	HI	<a href="mailto:gtoombs@hi.org">gtoombs@hi.org</a>
Calvin Ruysen	HALO	<a href="mailto:Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org">Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org</a>
Robert Keeley	DDG	<a href="mailto:Bob.keeley@drc.dk">Bob.keeley@drc.dk</a>
Sebastian Kasack	MAG	<a href="mailto:Sebastian.kasack@maginternational.org">Sebastian.kasack@maginternational.org</a>
Tammy Hall	GICHD	<a href="mailto:t.hall@gichd.org">t.hall@gichd.org</a>

## 6) Risk/Threat Assessment Working Group

Name	Organisation	Contact email
Rob White (Focal Point)	GICHD	<a href="mailto:r.white@gichd.org">r.white@gichd.org</a>
Havard Bach	APOPO	<a href="mailto:Havard.bach@apopo.org">Havard.bach@apopo.org</a>
Gary Toombs	HI	<a href="mailto:g.toombs@hi.org">g.toombs@hi.org</a>
Calvin Ruysen	HALO	<a href="mailto:Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org">Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org</a>
Mark Thompson	MAG	<a href="mailto:Mark.thompson@maginternational.org">Mark.thompson@maginternational.org</a>
Hans Risser	NPA	<a href="mailto:hansr@npaid.org">hansr@npaid.org</a>
Bryan Sand	UNMAS	<a href="mailto:sandb@un.org">sandb@un.org</a>
Tammy Hall	GICHD	<a href="mailto:t.hall@gichd.org">t.hall@gichd.org</a>

## Other Groups:

### 7) Medical Working Group

Name	Organisation	Contact email
Tony Belgrave (Focal Point)	NPA	<a href="mailto:tonyb@npaid.org">tonyb@npaid.org</a>
Magnus Bengtsson	MSB	<a href="mailto:Magnus.bengtsson@msb.se">Magnus.bengtsson@msb.se</a>
Calvin Ruysen	HALO	<a href="mailto:Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org">Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org</a>
Mark Thompson	MAG	<a href="mailto:Mark.thompson@maginternational.org">Mark.thompson@maginternational.org</a>
Stanislav Damjanovic	GICHD	<a href="mailto:s.damjanovic@gichd.org">s.damjanovic@gichd.org</a>
Trent O'Brien	UNMAS	<a href="mailto:Trento@unops.org">Trento@unops.org</a>
Jen Amrhein	UNMAS	<a href="mailto:amrhein@un.org">amrhein@un.org</a>
Alexander Bongartz <sup>3</sup>	DCA	<a href="mailto:abon@dca.dk">abon@dca.dk</a>
Aimal Safi	DMAC/UNMAS	<a href="mailto:AIMAL@unops.org">AIMAL@unops.org</a>

---

<sup>3</sup> Non-member, not present at RB but has asked to be included in this group

## Annex C – HI Proposal on Victim Assistance

### International Mine Action Standard 13.10 on Victim Assistance Brief description of proposed items Humanity & Inclusion, formerly Handicap International, February 2018

#### **1. Introduction**

Assisting the victims of explosive weapons, or victim assistance, is a relatively new concept, first introduced in a multilateral disarmament treaty in the 1997 Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC). Following its entry into force, the concept has evolved considerably. With victim assistance provisions having appeared in Protocol V to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) in 2008 and in the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM) in 2010, there is now a collective understanding that assisting victims is an obligation and an integral part of humanitarian mine action.

The international community understands in very broad terms that victim assistance involves a wide range of activities. Whilst the clearance of explosive hazards and victim assistance are both pillars of humanitarian mine action, the former is also part of broader long-established domains, such as development, humanitarian action, disability and human rights. Through the provision of information, advocacy and coordination, as well as identification, referral, resource mobilisation and planning, the role of mine action actors is to ensure that these domains are responding to the needs of the victims.

#### **2. Scope**

This standard describes the victim assistance obligations and the ways in which these can be operationalized by mine action authorities, mine action operators, line ministries in affected states and donor states, as well as the United Nations, not-for-profit non-governmental and international organizations.

#### **3. Normative references**

A list of normative references is given in Annex A. Normative references are important documents to which reference is made in this standard and which form part of the provisions of this standard.

#### **4. Terms, definitions & abbreviations**

- Victims: direct & indirect
- Survivors
- Casualties

#### **5. Victim assistance – general**

- What is victim assistance
  - Data collection to understand the needs and challenges faced
  - Medical care
  - Psycho-social support
  - Rehabilitation
  - Socio - economic inclusion
  - Laws and policies
- International legal obligations to provide assistance to victims (including explanation of fact that it bridges IHL and HR law)
- The role of victim assistance in mine action:
  - Victim assistance support for non-technical survey

- Victim assistance support for clearance and explosive ordnance disposal
- Victim assistance support for explosive hazard risk education
- Victim assistance support for advocacy
- The role of mine action in victim assistance
  - Non – technical survey support for victim assistance
  - Demining and explosive ordnance disposal support for victim assistance
  - Explosive hazard risk education support for victim assistance
  - Advocacy support for victim assistance
- Victim participation
- Non-discrimination
- Accessibility
- Sustainability
- Coherence with other instruments of international humanitarian and human rights law
- Gender and diversity

## **6. Operationalizing victim assistance: an integrated approach**

- Victim assistance as an integral part of mine action: specific efforts
  - Implications for affected states
  - Implications for donor states
- Victim assistance as a part of broader contexts: broader efforts
  - Implications for affected states
  - Implications for donor states

## **7. Roles and responsibilities**

- Affected countries
  - National Mine Action Authorities/Ministry responsible for coordinating victim assistance
  - Mine Action Centres
  - Relevant ministries, agencies and other actors
- Mine action operators
- Associations of survivors and other persons with disabilities
- Delegations in Geneva or New York and their counterparts in capitals with responsibilities for conventional weapons instruments
- Development agencies and programme implementers
- International and non – governmental organisations
- The United Nations

## **Annex A – Normative references**

- ✓ *United Nations Policy on Victim Assistance* (2016)
- ✓ *Guidance on an integrated approach to victim assistance* (2016)
- ✓ *Sustainable Development Goals* (2016)
- ✓ *Guidance on Victim Assistance Reporting* (2016)
- ✓ *Victim Assistance Fact Sheets: How to implement Victim Assistance Obligations under the Mine Ban Treaty or the Convention on Cluster Munitions*. Handicap International (2013)
- ✓ *Assisting mine and other ERW survivors in the context of disarmament, disability and development* (2011)
- ✓ *A Guide to Understanding Victim Assistance in the Context of the AP Mine Ban Convention* (2008)

- ✓ *Victim Assistance in the Context of the AP Mine Ban Convention – Checklist* (2008)
- ✓ *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* (2008)
- ✓ IMAS 01.10 Guide for application of IMAS
- ✓ IMAS 04.10 Glossary of terms definitions and abbreviations;
- ✓ Anti-personnel Mine Ban Convention
- ✓ Protocol V of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons
- ✓ Convention on Cluster Munitions