MINUTES OF THE

IMAS REVIEW BOARD MEETING JULY 2018

Date: Thursday 19th and Friday 20th July, 2018
Time: 08:30-16:30, 08.30-12.00
Location: Conference Room, 6th Floor GICHD

Meeting Chair[1]: Mr Paul Heslop, UNMAS (outgoing)
            Mr Alan MacDonald (incoming)
Meeting Secr: Mr Rory Logan, GICHD

Action points (workplan)

Action	Responsble	Suggested deadline
Develop (new)		
Definitions for 'permissive' and 'non permissive'	Term WG	31 Oct
Threat Asst section for RM IMAS	Threat WG	31 Nov
Building Search/Clearance IMAS/TNMA	Building WG	31 Nov
Building Search competencies	Building WG	31 Nov
IMAS IEDD	Building WG	31 Nov
Amend/Update		
Remove references to IMAS 09.20 throughout series	Secretary	15 Aug
IMAS 09.40 (post on website)	Secretary	15 Aug
TNMA 12.10/01 (post on website)	Secretary	31 Aug
IMAS 12.10	MRE WG	31 Oct
TNMA 05.10	GICHD	31 Oct
TNMA 10.40/02	Medical WG	31 Oct
IMAS 10.40	ICRC	Feb '19
IMAS 04.10 as per vote	Secretary	Actioned
IMAS 07.11, 08.10 and 08.20 as per vote	Secretary	Actioned
Review		
Draft TNMA 07.10/01 (distribute for review)	Secretary	15 Aug
Draft IMAS 05.10 (distribute for review)	Secretary	15 Aug
Draft IMAS 09.41	All	31 Oct
Provide		
Confirmation if support needed for VA IMAS	HI	31 Sep
Additional recomendations on Land Release	LR WG	31 Sep
Response to underwater request	Secretary	Actioned
Response to GMAP request	Secretary	Actioned
Brief Tetra Tech on roles and responsibilities	Secretary	Actioned
Commission		
Consultant to develop TNMA 07.10/02	Secretary	15 Aug
Request		
Formally request a meeting of the IMAS Steering Group	Chair	31 Aug

---

[1] Mr MacDonald assumed the role of Chair of the IMAS Review Board when Mr Heslop stepped down at the end of the meeting.

Detailed meeting minutes

Day 1 Thursday 19th July

1. Welcome and Introduction

The outgoing Chair of the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) Review Board, Mr Paul Heslop, opened the meeting and welcomed all members, observers and guests. He noted the tremendous volume of work that had been carried out since the last RB Meeting and thanked members, observers and other stakeholders for their active engagement with the various IED working groups over recent months, particularly the volunteer focal points who have taken on additional duties despite not being funded to do so.

2. Minutes IMAS RB Meeting February 2018

The minutes from the IMAS RB meeting in February 2018 were formally accepted and archived. They can be found on the link below:

https://mineactionstandards.org/fileadmin/MAS/documents/review-board/minutes/20180412_Minutes_IMAS_Review_Board_Meeting_Feb_2018.pdf

One point of clarification was requested by the incoming RB Chair; this was related to poor attendance at the last meeting by members from affected countries. It was explained that National Members have been contacted and offered sponsorship and visa support by the GICHD, which has led to improved attendance at the July meeting.

The Chair highlighted the potential use of WebEx or similar systems as a means of facilitating active engagement moving forward.

3. Overview of IMAS voting system

The Chair provided a short clarification on membership, voting procedures and voting rights. He reiterated the point made at the last meeting in February that working groups have been actively deliberating on the recommendations Board (about to be proposed) for months; as a result, those wishing to engage with the process have been given every opportunity to do so. In the past IMAS revisions have been frustrated by 'naysayers' failing to engage in standards development but then raising objections during annual meetings. It is hoped that current members can refrain from such a counter-productive approach.

4. Terminology Working Group (IMAS 04.10)

The GICHD's Ms Tammy Hall presented on behalf of the group's focal point[2]. An overview of the groups terms of reference, as well as the process through which recommendations were reached, was provided.

Optima asked for information regarding the technical qualifications of working group members, and raised concerns that an 'NGO heavy' process might lead to 'watering down' of terminology. It was confirmed that the terminology group consisted of close to 50% of the RB membership and that participants at meetings had included IED trained personnel. It was also made clear

---

[2] The HALO Trust's Mr Calvin Ruysen was delayed flying in from UK, but arrived near the end of the session

that the glossary is intended as a reference for all users of IMAS, not just field staff operating in technical roles. The list of recommendations was worked through with the following results (full list included as annex A):

- An updated scope of the Glossary was adopted by consensus
- Seven (7) glossary terms were included or updated by consensus (including an update to the definition of 'clearance')
- One (1) term was updated by majority vote
- Six (6) terms were removed from the glossary by consensus
- Four (4) terms recommended by the working group were not included (to be considered when and if they appear in IMAS)

The terminology working group was tasked to develop definitions for 'permissive and 'non permissive' environments. The definitions included in the UNIEDD standards for peacekeeping operations should be used as a starting point. **(Action Point)**

5. IEDD Competencies Working Group

The focal point Mr Roly Evans (GICHD) presented the IEDD competency framework that has been developed since February. Whilst a great deal of progress has been made, there is still some final work to do. It was confirmed that IED qualified personnel were well represented within this group. The framework presented includes 298 competencies divided across levels which get progressively more advanced; L1, L2, L3 and L3+. 'Level 3+' is effectively a repository for those higher level competencies which may be needed in specific circumstances and contexts, allowing operators to pick and choose as required.

The framework is designed to run parallel with existing IMAS EOD competency levels[3] and for the existing levels to be a prerequisite for IMAS IEDD training/certification. There was consensus that the framework works well, though some members advocated that names rather than numbers be associated with the different levels. The requirement for IMAS to be fit for purpose globally ws reiterated, so that the framework should not be looked at in terms of specific operating contexts.

The Board commended the working group for the excellent progress made in such a short time, and it was finally determined that activities should 'pause' while the new draft IMAS on IEDD is developed (see section 8.2 below). The current framework will be used as a reference document during this process and revisited once the new standard is approved (the version presented is included as annex B).

6. Survey and Land Release Working Group

The group focal point, Mr Calvin Ruysen (HALO Trust), provided an overview of the group's work, which was principally related to IMAS 07.11 (Land Release), IMAS 08.10 (Non-Technical Survey) and 08.20 (Technical Survey). They concluded that the overarching principles of these IMAS are appropriate for IEDs and so do not need fundamental change – though urban survey and clearance is under-represented and as such requires a separate standard or TNMA.

---

[3] See T&EP 09.30/01/2014

The Board was presented with a list of recommendations (see annex C) which included;

- Four (4) minor changes to IMAS 07.11 (adopted by consensus)
- Six (6) minor changes to IMAS 08.10 (5 adopted by consensus, 1 rejected)
- One (1) minor change to IMAS 08.20 (adopted by consensus)
- Eight (8) changes that the group still needed to debate
- Eight (8) observations to be submitted to other groups.

The Secretary will make the adopted changes. The working group was asked to meet again to debate and agree on any further recommendations to be made before disbanding. **(Action Point)**

7. MRE Working Group

Humanity and Inclusion's Mr Gary Toombs presented progress on behalf of the group's co-focal points[4]. The TNMA (TNMA 12.10/01) on IED RE that was presented and approved in February, has been updated and formatted. It is currently under final review by the author (Bob Keeley) and should be posted on the IMAS website by the end of July. The document will be posted with a disclaimer that highlights the need for further review as new terminology is adopted by the Board.

The group has also conducted a review of IMAS 12.10 (Mine/ERW Risk Education). There is consensus within the group that updates are needed to make the current edition fit for purpose for IEDs. There is also some debate within the group regarding the need for a wholesale revision of the standard, but agreement that these two activities should be sequenced was achieved in an effort to provide much needed additional guidance to the sector as soon as possible. UNICEF will provide an updated draft IMAS 12.10 to the Board by the end of September. It can then be deliberated and potentially voted on ahead of the next meeting. **(Action Point)**

8. Urban IED and Threat Assessment Working Groups

The GICHD's Ian Robb[5] and Nick Bray provided presentations on Threat Assessment and Urban Operations respectively. The session was subject to intense debate.

8.1 Threat Assessment
The session covered a number of issues including the recommendation that a section on the topic of Threat Assessment be included in the Risk Management IMAS (currently under development). The HALO Trust questioned whether the issue should mainstreamed throughout IMAS as a cross cutting theme. The general view of the group was that it should be separate and explicit, at least in the first instance. **(Action Point)** Use of the term 'threat' rather than 'risk' or 'hazard' (both of which are more in line with ISO terminology) was questioned by ICRC and debated. Mr Robb made the distinction that 'threat' was used in this context to denote a human intent to cause harm. After some discussion it was agreed that the topic is not contested and how it is referenced in the document can be a subject for the working group to debate. One of the most notable points made revolved around the fact that in an IED context the level of assurance - and therefore what is defined as 'clearance' - is determined on a case by case basis, depending on the assessed threat. This is in line with the definition approved in the

---

[4] Neither Hugues Laurenge (UNICEF) or Bob Keeley (Independent Specialist) was able to attend.

[5] On behalf of the groups focal point Rob White (GICHD) who was unable to attend.

morning session but the Board agreed that this issue must be dealt with carefully within the standards to ensure that the highest level of confidence in mine action outputs is maintained.

8.2 Urban IED operations

The working group recommended that IMAS guidance should make the distinction between building/area clearance rather than urban/rural. As area clearance is already covered by the updates to 07.11, 08.10 and 08.20 a mandate is required to develop guidance on 'Building Search/Clearance'. It was agreed by consensus that an IMAS chapter or TNMA should be developed and supplimented with a set of Building Search Competencies. **(Action Point)** The case was also made for a new IMAS on IED Disposal/Defeat[6] (IEDD), with the main focus being on the actual disposal of the item. Aspects of such a document may be adapted from the UNIEDD standard for peacekeeping (approved in May 2018). The Board reacted favourably and provided a mandate for the working group to proceed. **(Action Point)**

Day 2 Friday 20th July

9. Next Steps IMAS IED

Those mandates that were approved on Day 1 were re-iterated and sign-up sheets were provided for those working groups that will remain active; Terminology, Risk Management, Building/IEDD (see annex D). Other groups will complete final meetings or actions and pause activity or disband.

10. IMAS 10.40 and associated TNMA

NPA's Mr Hans Risser presented on behalf of the focal point[7] with support from DCA's Alexander Bongartz who attended the meeting as an observer/subject matter specialist. The group was mandated to make recommendations regarding IMAS 10.40 "*Medical support to demining operations*" and work on a TNMA. The group presented key findings, referenced changes in the medical sector and then finally framed its recommendations as questions regarding what should be the next steps for both IMAS 10.40 and the draft TNMA.

Members were asked by the Chair to provide accident data going as far back as possible, and it was suggested that this could be taken from insurance claims. The concept of a permanent medical advisory board for the mine action sector was debated. Whilst this was seen as a good idea, this is not necessarily an IMAS-specific issue, and there were concerns over how to resource such an initiative. There may be scope for a session at the annual National Directors Meeting to review accident data; however this would need to be based on accurate information. There is also a link to the TNMA being developed on minimum data requirements (see section 13 below).

Mr Erik Tollefsen (ICRC) presented a proposal to take the lead in updating IMAS 10.40; the incoming Chair supported the ICRC initiative, but did not support a long medical research project. The updated standard, it was suggested, should focus on the main principles, such as organisations' medical advisory boards, medical management systems and processes. The Board voted unanimously in favour of an ICRC-led revision. A target deadline for the production of a new draft standard was set as the next meeting in February 2019. **(Action Point)** The

---

[6] Precise determination on terminology used will need to be determined during working group/drafting process
[7] Tony Belgrave (NPA) was unable to attend

Board agreed that a TNMA could be issued as an interim step; the draft that was provided prior to the meeting requires minor amendments but will provided to the Secretary for distribution before 31 October. **(Action Point)**

11. New IMAS 09.40 Animal detection systems – Principles, Requirements and Guidelines

An updated version of IMAS 09.40 "*Animal Detection Systems – Principles Requirements and Guidelines*" was circulated for comment in April. The update, which was completed by Mikael Bold (MAG), replaced contentious sections in the previous draft with existing IMAS text. A number of comments and minor track changes were returned and some were debated, however the Board did not elect to go through each comment individually. In the absence of specific objections the issue was put to a vote and the updated IMAS 09.40 was adopted (with track changes accepted but no further action or comments). Secretary to implement final updates and forward to the Chair to table at the next Steering Group meeting. **(Action Point)**

An updated version of IMAS 09.41 "*Accreditation testing of animal detection systems and handlers*" was circulated in July at member's request. The two ADS standards have been drafted as a package. No comments on this draft have been received as members have not had time to complete a formal review. The Chair set a deadline of 31 October, if no significant comments have been submitted the standards will be adopted on 01 November[8]. **(Action Point)**

At the RB meeting in February the GICHD had committed to establishing a working group on ADS, and a draft ToR had been developed and shared. It was agreed that further work on this would depend on the Boards final response to draft IMAS 09.41.

12. IMAS 07.10 and associated TNMA

The Secretary updated the Board on the process through which IMAS 07.10 "*Management of Land Release and Residual Contamination Operations*" Ed1. Am.9 had been adopted following consultation with the ISU APMBC (see February 2018 minutes). The standard is now available on the IMAS website and will be complemented by two new TNMA;

- TNMA 07.10/01 "Residual Risk Management" has been drafted and submitted to the Secretary, this will be reviewed and distributed for comment before the end of July. **(Action Point)**
- TNMA 07.10/02 "All Reasonable Effort" was mandated in February. A potential conflict of interest was highlighted by the ISU APMBC (the proposal to develop this document was tabled by the current Secretary before taking the position on the RB). As such an external consultant will be commissioned to work on this TNMA and present it to the Board for consideration. **(Action Point)**

13. IMAS 05.10 and Associated TNMA

The Secretary updated the Board on the status of IMAS 05.10 "*Information management for mine action*" Ed1. Am.2. An updated standard has been provided and will be formatted and distributed to the Board before the end of July. **(Action Point)** An

---

[8] The five (5) existing MDD chapters will then be archived

associated TNMA on minimum data requirements has also been drafted; this document will require updates based on the decisions made on both IED and Medical IMAS. **(Action Point)**

The Board discussed the neccesity to store victim data on the IMSMA database, this is based on the needs of an individual national authority and should therefore be determined on a case by case basis.

14. IMAS Website

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 presentation focussed on the process though which IMAS/TNMA will be reviewed edited and voted on. The GICHD team is keen that the new site be as intuitive and user friendly as possible; initial testing by the Secretary led to minor changes in the background architecture, which is currently being updated (see annex E). It was again confirmed that training would be provided once the new site goes on line. A short demonstration was also provided.

15. Any other business/ Closing of the Meeting

- The Secretary advised the Board that a proposal had been received in March to amend IMAS 09.60 "Underwater Competency Standards" (see annex F). This request was submitted to the previous IMAS Secretary Mr Mikael Bold who confirmed that it had come from stakeholders involved in underwater operations. The Board raised no objection to those stakeholders taking the matter forward. **(Action Point)**
- A proposal was sent in by GMAP in July to Review gender related terminology and introduce new diversity related terminology in IMAS 04.10 (see annex G). The Board reacted favourably and a mandate was provided. **(Action Point)**
- Humanity and Inclusion (HI) were asked to provide an update on the Victim Assistance IMAS mandated during the meeting in February. The document is still under draft and HI's member will ask Ms Elke Hottentot to present an update at the next Board meeting. The Chair and Secretary asked HI to confirm whether any support on this issue was needed. **(Action Point)**
- Mr Dave McDonnell (Phase3 Services) stepped down from the Board in March. The Chair conveyed the Boards thanks to Mr McDonnell for his involvement over many years.
- Mr Murf McCloy (PM/WRA) nominated TetraTech Inc. to the vacant commercial member position on the Board. The nomination was put to a vote and passed. The Secretary will update the list of members and make contact with Tetra Tech to update them on their new role and responsibilities. **(Action Point)**
- Mr Gunther Hastrade (Military-Belgium) noted that he will be stepping down form the Board as he rotates out to a new position within the Belgian military. His successor will be nominated to take his place in September.
- Mr Mikael Bold (MAG) noted a number of out of date references within current IMAS chapters, and asked that these be removed or updated by the Secretary. **(Action Point)**
- There are currently five (5) new IMAS or substantive updates (01.10, 07.10, 07.12, 07.13, and 09.40) that will require approval by the IMAS Steering Group and submission to the IACG-MA for final endorsement. The Board voted unanimously in favour of sending a request to the Steering Group to meet and clear the backlog. The incoming Chair was asked to submit a formal request to the Steering Group within 14 days of the acceptance of the meeting minutes. **(Action Point)**

- The Chair thanked the US, Swiss and UNMAS for their generous funding of the IMAS review process, he also recognized the considerable in-kind contribution provided by other members and stakeholders.
- The Chair thanked the Board for all the hard work that had been undertaken during his tenure over the past five years. He noted the considerable improvements that had been made to the IMAS during this time and commended particularly the working groups and members for their recent commitment to what he views as one of the best years in the history of IMAS.

Ambassador Stefano Toscano closed the meeting with a short intervention during which he officially thanked Mr Paul Heslop for his Chairmanship. Amb Toscano noted that Mr Heslop has steered the review board process capably since he was appointed as Chair in 2011, and has left the IMAS framework in a considerably better place than he found it.

1) Terminology - IMAS 4.10 Working Group

Name	Organization	Contact email
Calvin Ruysen (Focal Point)	HALO	Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org
Suzanne Fiederlein	CISR	fiedersl@jmu.edu
Gareth Bex	Independent	Garethbex@live.co.uk
Mark Thompson	MAG	Mark.thompson@maginternatinal.org
Hans Risser	NPA	Hansr@npaid.org
Bryan Sand	UNMAS	sandb@un.org
Duncan Young	Optima	Duncan.young@optimagroup.co
Tammy Hall	GICHD	t.hall@gichd.org
Gregory Cathcart	ISU APMBC	g.cathcart@apminebanconvention.org
Olaf Juergensen	UNDP	Olaf.juergensen@undp.org
Ian Mansfield	MASG	ian.w.mansfield@gmail.com
Chris Loughran	MAG	Chris.loughran@maginternational.org

2) **Building/IEDD Working Group**

Name	Organization	Contact email
Nick Bray (Focal Point)	GICHD	n.bray@gichd.org
Richard Holmes	Optima	Richard.holmes@optimagroup.co
Gareth Bex	Independent	Garethbex@live.co.uk
Gary Toombs	HI	gtoombs@hi.org
Calvin Ruysen	HALO	Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org
Mikael Bold	MAG	Mikael.bold@maginternational.org
Gus Guthrie	NPA	johnathong@npaid.org
Bryan Sand	UNMAS	sandb@un.org
Criaig McInley	NPA	craigmci@npaid.org
Tammy Hall	GICHD	t.hall@gichd.org
Duncan Young	Optima	Duncan.young@optimagroup.co
Gregory Cathcart	ISU APMBC	g.cathcart@apminebanconvention.org

3) **Risk/Threat Assessment Working Group**

Name	Organization	Contact email
Rob White (Focal Point)	GICHD	r.white@gichd.org
Havard Bach	APOPO	Havard.bach@apopo.org

Juan Carlos Ruan	ISU APMBC	j.ruan@apminebanconvention.org
Calvin Ruysen	HALO	Calvin.ruysen@halotrust.org
Mikael Bold	MAG	Mikael.bold@maginternational.org
Hans Risser	NPA	hansr@npaid.org
Bryan Sand	UNMAS	sandb@un.org
Tammy Hall	GICHD	t.hall@gichd.org
Duncan Young	Optima	Duncan.young@optimagroup.co
Richard Holmes	Optima	Richard.holmes@optimagroup.co
Richard Boulter	UNMAS	richardbo@unops.org

Annex E – IMAS Website Process Map

Annex F – Proposal for updates to IMAS 09.60 Underwater

Annex G – Proposal for updates to IMAS 04.10 Gender and Diversity