



To: IMAS Review Board

25 July 2006

IMAS REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES OF REVIEW BOARD MEETING 7 JULY 2006

1. Introduction

The IMAS Review Board met at the GICHD on Friday 7 July from 09.30 until 16.00 hrs.

2. Attendance

The following attended the meeting:

Noel Mulliner – UNMAS, chairman
Eric Lauritzen- Denmark
Bob Doheny – ITEP
Davor Laura – CROMAC
Chip Bowness - UNDP
Geir Bjorsvik – NPA
Vincent Muylkens – NATO EOD WG
Luc Moerman – Belgium military representative
Jan-Ole Robertz – Specialist
Havard Bach – Specialist
Andy Smith – Specialist
Johan Sohlberg – Specialist
Phil Bean – GICHD, secretary

Observer:

Faiz Mohammad – Review Board Secretary designate

Apologies:

Alistair Craib – UK
Murf McCloy – USA
Johannes Dirscherl – Germany
David Hewitson – ELS
Bill Howell – HI
Reuben McCarthy – UNICEF
Mohammed Younus - UNDP

3. Agenda discussion points

3.1 Item 1 - Introduction and welcome

Noel Mulliner welcomed those attending. He then opened the meeting and confirmed the agenda.

3.2 Item 2 – Minutes of the last meeting, Item 3 Secretaries Report

Phil Bean(PB) combined the agenda points 2 & 3 and started with the Secretaries report. For the benefit of new members PB asked the Review Board(RB) to introduce themselves, and noted that Chip Bowness was acting as a representative for UNDP and that Luc Moerman was in the process of taking over from Vincent Muylkens. Eric Lauritzen reminded the meeting that it had been almost exactly ten years ago that the mine action community met in Copenhagen to kick off the process of IMAS.

PB informed the meeting that he would be replaced by Faiz Mohammed in September as the GICHD Head of Standards, and by Leonie Barnes (during August) who would have responsibilities for IMAS outreach and support to national mine action standards.

PB reminded the RB of the minutes of meetings process; a first draft was sent to the Chairman, a second draft to all RB members and, once agreed, a final version was sent to all members and published on the www.mineactionstandards.org website. The minutes of the last meeting had been approved in this way and follow up actions from the last meeting would be discussed under this agenda point.

From the last meeting, amendment to IMAS 10.20 (Demining worksite safety) and the issue of default safety distances was still progressing. In the draft amendment, and as agreed at the last meeting, the formulae for calculation of safety distances will be removed from this IMAS. The provision of a different table illustrating distances that should be considered for different mine types was proving harder to obtain from credible proof data than had been originally anticipated. However, the principle of providing advisory detailed information was still valid, rather than leaving programmes to make decisions without any clear or practical guidance.

Action: GICHD. The action remained on-going, albeit the current IMAS was still technically appropriate as an advisory document, and all clauses under debate were written as advisory ‘should’ activities, i.e. as a preferred option for consideration. The intention remained to replace the current default 25m safety distance with a table of alternative options for different mine types and to provide a simple explanation of how to achieve appropriate distances.

IMAS 10.30, PPE, the actions carried forward from the previous meeting, relating to whether the IMAS should be revised to contain advice on eye protection, instead of full face protection, were ongoing. Some of the RB members argued for an amendment to IMAS to reflect that, as a minimum, eye protection should be worn, rather than the current recommended minimum of a full face visor. Others argued that the grounds for change should be validated and that the current IMAS already provided flexibility if people applied it correctly.

Geir Bjorsvik briefed the RB on a visit that he had made the previous week to ROFI where he was following the progress of a new design of a light face mask which incorporated eye protection. The design was comfortable, close fitting to the face without visual distortion and did not affect breathing. He thought that the protection levels were as good as those provided by 5cm polycarbonate and that they would be suitable for demining environments. The eye protection was rated at V50/270 m/sec and the opaque face protection at V50/450m/sec. The mask weighs only 500gm (half the weight of a full face visor) and felt very comfortable, it overlapped well with the ROFI vest and examples would be distributed for comment within NPA during August 2006.

The topic was discussed and referred to throughout the meeting, with the following conclusion:

Action: That Andy Smith would resubmit his proposal for an amendment for Review Board comment. **After note:** this has now been done.

That GICHD should broaden the outreach of this debate and should consider the preparation of a TNMA to explain the issue.

That GICHD would progress and monitor the CEN CWA on PPE which would help define the protection requirements. (A TNMA would compliment this activity).

That GICHD should consider the preparation of a Statement of User Requirement from the Mine Action sector for PPE.

IMAS 09.20, revised wording to explain the application of this IMAS had been added as an 'amendment 3' and would be distributed to the Review Board for consideration.

Action: GICHD

PB went on to discuss the IMAS frame work as it related to new and existing IMAS.

IMAS 02.10 Management of Mine Action Programmes, had been circulated once as a draft and would be amended before a second circulation.

IMAS 05.10 Information Management, was awaiting an IMSMA Annex before circulation of the draft.

IMAS 06.10 Management of Training, had been drafted for circulation.

IMAS 07.31 Accreditation of MRE Organisations, previously UNICEF had considered producing an edition 2, but subsequently opted to focus on national standards rather than seek change to the IMAS.

IMAS 07.12 Environmental Management, an IMAS had been drafted, and would provide a basis for discussion through a specialist workshop to be organized in conjunction with Eric Lauritzen.

IMAS 08.40 Marking of mine and ERW hazards, an Edition 2 had been drafted for circulation.

IMAS 09.40 series MDD IMAS had been published as draft edition 2, GICHD Havard Bach undertook to have completed the MDD UFG review and representation of the IMAS to the Review Board by the end of December 2006.

IMAS 09.50 Mechanical Demining, had been circulated once and would have minor amendments before recirculation.

IMAS 09.51 Demining Machine operator's safety, was in development by GICHD and would refer to the current CEN CWA on mechanical applications.

IMAS 09.52 Mechanical area reduction, was in development by GICHD and would refer to risk and survey studies.

IMAS 14.10 Evaluation, had been circulated once as a draft and would be re-circulated with amendments.

Some 22 existing IMAS would be published to incorporate an Amendment 3, (in the main incorporating the terminology of ERW).

Four IMAS would need to be approved by the IMAS Review Board for inclusion of revised Amendment 3, as substantive changes had resulted, these being:

IMAS 07.30 Accreditation of demining organisations and operations.

IMAS 07.40 Monitoring of demining organisations.

IMAS 09.10 Clearance requirements.

IMAS 09.20 Guidelines for the use of sampling procedures.

A TNMA dealing with advice on how to deal with Human Remains would also be circulated for information.

The need for a specific IMAS on quality management was discussed, and discounted as QM was integral to IMAS. However, an expansion of the general QM introduction in IMAS 01.10 the guide to the application, of IMAS was recommended. Notwithstanding the above review of IMAS 01.10 and with reference to earlier discussions on Quality Management Eric Lauritzen suggested the RB should review the opportunity of a new IMAS on Quality Management. Eric recommended a specific IMAS for UNMAS on this topic. Eric offered to send a report on Quality Management and Quality Assurance to the RB members. ***after note, and has done this.***

Action: GICHD

PB stated that UNICEF is considering drafting an IMAS on landmine injuries and surveillance.

PB outlined the process of circulation of drafts and revisions to the RB for comment, and it was confirmed that one month was a reasonable time frame for comment. After one month if no comment had been received then agreement would be assumed. RB members could request an extension of the comment period if they needed more time for consultation.

For co-ordination, the Secretary would be the focal point for all RB information circulation and not individual RB members.

The general concern was again raised that understanding of the application of IMAS was weak within the mine action sector, and that the Review Board should be wary about changing an IMAS, when the solution was more one of ensuring that people read and understand IMAS correctly.

Action: GICHD / UNMAS to work together to provide IMAS training.

After note; a new revision of the current www.mineactionstandards.org website layout is underway to improve ease of access and use. This will change the

look of the website opening page and the way IMAS are viewed but will have no substantial changes.

Agenda Item 4. CEN WG 126

Jan-Ole Robertz, briefed the RB on the current work and plans of CEN WG126.

So far CEN had produced three CEN Workshops (CW); CW 7 – Testing and evaluation of metal detectors, CW 12 Standards for the test and evaluation of Demining Machines, and CW 13 EOD Competency standards.

Four projects were in process:

Project 2 , is a continuation of the work connected to T&E of metal detectors, looking at the characterization of soils for electromagnetic sensors. This is aimed to:

- Identify any gaps in knowledge about the influence of soil properties to metal detectors and GPRs.
- Determine relevant physical properties of soils.
- If possible provide numerical thresholds to classify soil difficulties.
- Describe protocols to measure relevant soil properties.

The output will be the addition of a Part 2 to CWA14147.

Project 4, is the production of a CWA to provide a standard methodology for users to test their PPE. This process will involve:

- Defining the threat.
- Defining the test situation.
- Developing test procedures.

The first workshop is scheduled to take place in Geneva at GICHD 4/6 September 2006. The work is anticipated to be finalized by August 2007. The 'driving force' / co-chair is GICHD.

Projects 11 & 12 will run concurrently. Project 11 covers Post Mechanical Clearance Requirements and Project 12 covers evaluation of methods of Quality Control after mechanical demining. The kick off meeting is scheduled for November, and the first workshop is expected to take place around the Croatian conference in Sibenik in April 2007. The 'driving force' and chairman of the CWA is GICHD.

Note: Where appropriate, the products of the CEN standards process are referenced within IMAS.

Agenda Item 5 NATO Cooperation

Vincent Muylkens briefed the Review Board on the NATO EOD Working Group, which is part of the NATO Standardisation Agency. The aim of standardization within NATO is to enhance their interoperability. The EOD Working Group links with other related groups covering a range of activities dealing with such topics as underwater and land operations and defence against terrorism. The EOD Working Group is divided in to four panels covering:

- EOD Doctrine, policy and philosophy.
- EOD Tactics, techniques and procedures.
- EOD Information.
- EOD Standardisation.

Vincent had been briefing the NATO working group on IMAS and Mine Action.

He informed the Review Board that Spain was to become the NATO Centre for Excellence for Humanitarian Demining, and that once that had been established military representation to the IMAS RB could come from Spain. Until then Belgium will continue in the liaison role. The topic of EOD was being taken as a case study within NATO to look at NATO cooperation with civilian standards bodies and processes.

Vincent illustrated his presentation with examples of NATO EOD operations in Afghanistan and concluded by stating that the military should not just focus on military standardization and that military experts should be involved in the development of mine action standards, and that the current IMAS standards relating to EOD should be improved.

Vincent will leave the IMAS Review Board in August 2006 on posting, his successor Major Luc Moerman was present at the meeting.

After note: The IMAS Review Board would like to thank Vincent for his support to IMAS in general, for his advocacy work with NATO and the assistance that he provided through the CEN CWA 13 EOD Competency standards process.

Agenda Item 6 Underwater standards

The Chairman briefed on the current discussions related to underwater standards. Requests had been received from the commercial sector for underwater standards and from some mine action programmes. The GICHD has commissioned a scoping study for the topic which has been presented to UNMAS for consideration. The Regional Centre for Underwater Demining in Montenegro and Russian organization EMERCOM were also drafting standards for consideration. The Review Board would be briefed on progress, but at this time the RB did not find justification and need for a general standard for underwater demining.

Action: UNMAS/ GICHD research into the 'need' and the scope of such standards was on-going. **After note:** A letter from UNMAS has now been sent to all national programmes requesting information on underwater demining requirements.

Agenda Item 7 Composition of the Review Board

The Chairman introduced discussion that included Review Board membership, Terms of Reference and rules and procedures for the Review Board and specifically voting rights and processes.

He informed the meeting that the need for an IMAS Steering Group had been discussed within UNMAS with a recommendation that it might be disbanded. This would position the IMAS RB as the technical briefing group to the UN Inter Agency Coordination Group, (IACG-MA).

In terms of membership, following the principle of a three year normal term:

- Donor category, Germany having been a member for more than 3 years would rotate off the Board and the MASG had been requested to nominate a replacement.
- Commercial Category, RONCO, having been a member for more than 3 years, would be rotated off the Board and either MineTech or Mechem would be invited to join.
- National NGO / organization category, two new members were required, Afghanistan would be invited to supply one and one other is required. CMAC was suggested.
- International NGO category, even though NPA had served for more than 3 years, and has been very actively involved. Some Review Board members proposed that NPA should continue on the Board. NPA confirmed that they would be willing to do this if requested. They would therefore be requested to remain on the Board.
- That the role of the Specialist Members category should be redefined and that consideration be given to introduce another category of Independent Members. This category would cover individuals who were invited for their contribution as full members compared to specialists who would be requested to contribute in a specialist area and on an 'as required' basis.

In terms of voting rights, the chairman wanted members of the Review Board to be able to call for a vote on such matters as membership and on topics that could not be resolved by consensus. Discussion ranged over topics such as, what constituted a quorum and what majority would be appropriate for issues affecting safety or membership. Generally those present were in favour of a minimum two thirds majority vote for decisions, and that normally votes would be electronically gathered or, exceptionally, would be at physical meetings where notification of a need to vote on a topic had been pre-announced.

Action: The Chair and Secretary to prepare TOR and rules of procedure to address the issues of membership, rotation of members, voting procedures, approvals etc. and then distribute them for RB comment.

Agenda Item 6- Work-plan

The secretary briefed that the current work plan for 2006 was in progress but not complete and that a new plan for 2007 would be issued at a later date.

Agenda Item 7 – Any Other business

The secretary had wished to tender two topics for discussion:

- The formation of a formal UFG to look at IMAS implications from activities and studies on risk management and survey.
- Victim Assistance and reference to this pillar within IMAS.

Time pressure prevented discussing either topic and the meeting closed at 1600 hrs.

Date of next meeting

To be advised, but to be planned around the UNMAS PM/CTA meeting which was anticipated to take place in March/April 2007.

Phil Bean
Secretary to the IMAS Review Board

Afternote:

Considering that this meeting was the last that Phil Bean would attend as Secretary of the Review Board, the Chairman would like to formally acknowledge the energy and attention to detail that Phil has contributed to IMAS and the Review Board process. His contribution, both while in the offices of the GICHD and in the field, in regard to the promotion of IMAS and the assistance he has given to many during his time as Secretary to the RB, has been most appreciated. The Chairman is sure this will not be the last we hear from Phil Bean but at the same time welcomes Faiz Mohammad and Leonie Barnes to the world of IMAS.