



To: IMAS Review Board

13 April 2007

MINUTES OF REVIEW BOARD MEETING 23 MARCH 2007

1. Introduction

The IMAS Review Board met at the GICHD on Friday 23 March from 09.00 until 1630 hours.

2. Attendance

The following attended the meeting:

Noel Mulliner – UNMAS Chairman
Alistair Craib – UK
Manfredo Capozza- Donor-Italy
Fredrik Palsson- RONCO standing in for Merlin Clark
Christian Richmond- HALO standing in for Guy Willoughby
Davour Laura – Croatia
Bob Doheny - ITEP
Paul Heslop - UNOPS
Julie Myers – UNICEF standing in for Reuben McCarthy
Johan Sohlberg – SWEDEC
Harvard Bach – GICHD
Andy Smith – Independent (He also stood in for the UNDP representative)
Luc Moerman - Military/NATO
Faiz Paktian- GICHD, Secretary

Observer:
Ben Lark – ICRC

Apologies:

Erik Lauritzen – Denmark
Murph McCloy – USA
David Hewitson – ELS
Fazel Kareem – OMAR
Geir Bjorsvik – NPA
Jan-Ole Robertz – independent

3. Agenda discussion points

3.1. Introduction and welcome

The Chairman, Mr. Noel Mulliner (NM) welcomed those attending and thanked them all for coming. He thanked those who had actively participated in the IMAS review process since the last meeting. In his opening remarks NM emphasized that there was a great deal the members can and should be doing in regard to keeping IMAS up-to-date and relevant. He stated that the Review Board (RB) was the main forum from which to get feedback and members were selected as relevant points of contact or gauges of the community. He reminded everyone that their role was a responsible one and that it involved some additional and voluntary work. He stated that when members were asked for

comments, it is important to respond because, if comments were not received, the RB would end up with the views of one or two individuals and no balancing argument. This would not be representative. He mentioned that if any member cannot afford the time to contribute to the RB process they should ask to be removed from the RB before being requested to leave. Finally, NM requested that all members should try to present their case as simple as possible, respecting the intelligence and experience of others and they should refrain from insults and non-constructive criticism in responses.

The Chairman briefly mentioned some IMAS website statistics saying that there were approximately 25000 visitors to the IMAS website last year with an average number of 110 per day. The statistics are evidence that IMAS are visited very frequently and this should be an encouragement to the RB members to continue to contribute to their standing. It was of interest to note that most visitors were in the commercial category

3.2 Minutes of the last meeting

Two points were raised by Andy Smith (AS) from the last minutes 1) the issue of safety distance in IMAS 10.20 and 2) the decision as to whether IMAS should endorse eye protection or full face protection. Both issues were discussed towards the end of the meeting and are covered under item No 4.3 and 4.4 in these minutes.

3.3. Composition of Review Board and new members

The Chairman informed the board that since the last meeting, Germany had been replaced by Italy as a donor representative having completing more than three years. In their place, he welcomed Rear Adm Manfredo Capozza representing Italy. He informed that the previous RONCO representative had been replaced with Mr. Merlin Clark but we had not heard anything from him. RONCO would therefore be reminded of their obligation and expectations. He further remarked that we had gained Mr. Fazel Kareem, OMAR Afghanistan and Mr. Heng Ratana, CMAC-Cambodia who had joined as National members. NPA membership had been extended and the UNDP representative Chip Bowness had retired. UNDP had yet to provide a replacement and Paul Heslop had joined the RB replacing JJ Van der Merve from UNOPS. The old category of Specialist member is now shown as Independent and he welcomed the new Secretary as well. **[Afternote: RONCO have since nominated Mr. Bill Walenius as a replacement for Mr. Merlin Clark.]**

Finally, he proposed that Phil Bean, former Secretary to the RB be accepted as an Independent member because of his previous experience and role as Secretary and his valuable contribution to IMAS. The attending members unanimously agreed and **accepted Phil Bean as an Independent member** in the RB.

3.4. Review Board roles and TOR

The Chairman apologised for the lateness of the presentation of the draft TOR and voting procedures which had been discussed at the previous meeting. He reminded the RB that the future of the IMAS Steering Group (SG) remained unclear and that he had produced the draft TOR based on the assumption that the SG existed. He hoped that the SG will meet, or comment electronically, following this meeting to discuss its functions or possible dissolution. He further said that he had attempted to address the issues that were raised in the last RB meeting and hoped that the document reflected the views of the RB. He then offered a chance for the members to review and comment.

Comments included a query on the logic of how the total number of 30 members was divided over several categories such as donor, national, NGO and independent. The logic of the breadth of interest was explained and Mr. Bob Doheny suggested a bracketed breakdown i.e. "Donors: 4-5". This could also be defined as either minimum or maximum numbers.

With regard to Tenure- it was suggested that “appreciated” should read “constructive” and that “electronic voting” should read “simple voting”. It was also suggested that the language be reviewed and revised to reflect the voting procedure more clearer.

Action: NM to revise the TOR and circulate them to the full RB for comment and approval before submitting to the SG along with the minutes of this meeting also that future decisions/action could be directed by these TOR.. [**Afternote:** TOR circulated for comment on 3 Apr 07]

3.5. Secretaries report to the Review Board.

Faiz Paktian (FP) briefly discussed the ongoing IMAS activities. He circulated the IMAS news and RB Work Plan 2007. He said that there were 38 IMAS approved and two awaiting endorsement of the IACG at the Principal level. Those were: IMAS 07.20 guide for drafting mine action contracts and IMAS 09.50 mechanical demining.

FP reminded members that the following IMAS were revised based on comments received and most would now be posted on the website as amended versions.

- 07.30 Accreditation of demining organizations and operations
- 07.40 Monitoring of mine action organizations
- 09.10 Clearance requirement
- 09.20 Post clearance inspection and sampling (See below for further discussion)

Furthermore he said that the following IMAS were awaiting specialist review. Havard Bach (HB) was coordinating the input from the mine dog focus group.

- 09.40 Guide for the use of MDD
- 09.41 Operational procedures for MDD
- 09.42 Operational accreditation of MDD
- 09.44 Guide to occupational health and general dog care

[**Afternote:** It was agreed with HB that the completion of this review should be expected by the end of May 07]

FP mentioned that the following IMAS were in the final stage of drafting

IMAS14.10 evaluation of mine action interventions and IMAS 02.10 guide to the establishment of mine action programmes. They had been circulated to the RB and will be revised and shortened in view of comments received. The revised versions will be re-circulated for information.

IMAS 05.10 information management and IMAS 06.10 management of training have been under revision and will be circulated to the RB soon.

On new IMAS and TNMA under consideration/development FP listed the following:

- 01.20 Guide for the development of national mine action standards
- 07.12 Guide for the management of victim assistance
- 07.13 Guide for the management of the environment
- 07.14 Guide to quality management in mine action
- 07.15 Guide to risk management in mine action
- 09.11 Battle area clearance
- 09.51 Demining machine operator’s safety
- 09.52 Mechanical area reduction

TNMA under consideration

- Action on finding human remains
- Landmine injuries and surveillance
- EOD clearance of ammunition storage area explosions
- Clearance of cluster munitions

FP mentioned that one third of existing IMAS would be reviewed in 2007 to ensure they are relevant and up-to-date. Also all IMAS would be reviewed by Mr. Gustavo Laurie, the Geneva based UNMAS Liaison Officer, to ensure they are in compliance with the Protocol V of CCW.

FP pointed out that all the above represented a considerable amount of work for 2007. In order to achieve it all it would be necessary to shorten some response deadlines and to chase for replies if not forthcoming.

FP informed the meeting that a new IMAS web page was under redesigning and would soon be up and running. The new website not only includes the most up to date version of IMAS in English but some unofficial translations of IMAS in Arabic-Chinese-French-Spanish and Russian. The translations will be posted on separate pages for each language. In addition, there will be some NMAS of countries that had agreed to post them on the IMAS website for information and reference. FP added that the new design would include the ability to register for updates. Once registered email information will be sent as soon as a new or an amended IMAS is posted on the IMAS website.

Finally, FP mentioned that there was a significant workload this year if we were to address all IMAS that needed to be looked at. However, if tackled sensibly, the RB should not be overloaded.

3. 6 Summary of CEN workshops

The Chairman briefly explained the four CEN workshops that were in progress. He emphasised that these workshops may result in amendments to some IMAS and/or a CEN Workshop Agreement (CWA) which could be officially recognised as a normative reference. Before this happens, however, the RB will be consulted. He then briefly discussed the intentions of the following:

- CEN Workshop 7 – Test and evaluation of metal detectors – Part 2: Soil characterization for metal detector and ground penetrating radar performance. The final product is due in Nov 2007.
- CEN Workshop 26 – PPE Test and Evaluation. Final product is expected in 2007.
- CEN Workshop 28 and 29 – Quality Control and follow on processes after the use of mechanical demining machines. Final product is expected in Nov 2007.

There was some discussion about how the CEN system had chosen the subjects for CWAs and it was explained that it had been a result of discussions between UNMAS, GICHD and CEN Members. The original idea was to produce work in support of mine action needs and not to duplicate work. CWAs are not automatically accepted as normative references to IMAS.

3.7 Post clearance sampling

Having received, electronically, some detailed comments from 3 members of the RB, the Chairman asked the RB for more comment in relation to the IMAS 09.20, Inspection of cleared land and guidelines for the use of sampling procedures. HB questioned the statistical validity of the sampling tool within the IMAS and agreed to find out more to substantiate this doubt.

Action: HB to provide more information to the RB.

It was generally agreed that the content of the main body of the IMAS was still valid i.e. the concept of conducting post clearance sampling to confirm quality, but that it may not be as clearly stated as intended. The Chair and HB agreed to look at the IMAS with a view to improving the language used. It was also suggested that additional examples of ways of conducting post clearance sampling could be included to be helpful. It was noted that post clearance sampling covers both sampling immediately after clearance as it is conducted as well as sampling when a whole area has been completed. HALO Trust strongly suggested that post clearance sampling should be conducted within a week of clearance or not at all. This will be considered in the above mentioned review.

The Chairman asked HALO to provide details of their sampling work for consideration as an additional example and had asked if other members could present other cases that are statistically valid.

Action: HALO to provide details of their sampling procedures. NM and HB to review IMAS 09.20 with a view to making it much simpler. All to consider additional examples of how to sample such that the aim is achieved.

3.8 New and possible IMAS and TNMA

a. IMAS on management of environment

The RB agreed and approved the need for an IMAS on this as this would provide awareness and useful guidelines when conducting mine action operations.

Action: NM will follow this up with **Eric Lauritzen** (EL) to finalize the current draft version. A more mature draft version would then be sent to the RB for comment

b. IMAS on Quality Management

NM raised EL's proposal on the need for a Quality Management (QM) IMAS. He asked the RB for guidance as previous comments had indicated a pretty even split on this issue. He briefly explained the background discussion from the last RB meeting by adding that EL's concern was that there was a problem with the definition and understanding of QM, QA and QC. The previous definition was taken from ISO 9000:2000 and EL believed that IMAS should change this definition with a view to mine action. EL also argued that the duplication of the section in IMAS 07.30, IMAS 07.40 and 09.20 on the demining QM indicated that there was a need for crosscutting definitions of demining QM, QA and QC.

NM asked the RB that if there is a need for such an IMAS and would anyone volunteer to work on this with EL. Most members indicated that they did not see enough justification to approve the development of such an IMAS. They also indicated that the IMAS at present was about quality management and that the RB should not complicate IMAS by producing more IMAS that were not really needed

NM added that Cranfield University has produced a good paper on QM in mine action that the board may consider to use as a normative reference to IMAS. He offered to get a copy and circulate it for comment.

Action: NM to circulate the Cranfield papers to the RB once obtained. EL to continue to work on a draft proposal I additional volunteers identified.

c. IMAS on battle area clearance

NM informed the RB that Phil Bean (PB) had drafted an IMAS on battle area clearance on request. A hard copy was provided to all members for review and comments. The RB agreed and approved the need for this IMAS. The document was sent to all members for review and comments.

Action: All members to review and comment on IMAS-BAC before 20 April.

d. IMAS on underwater demining

The Chairman updated the meeting on discussions related to under water standards. He said that response from some countries such as Somalia and Sudan indicated no problem, however, Iraq indicated a real problem in the area of the Marsh Arabs, Laos indicated a real problem and Croatia indicated that 0.8% of their problem was in or around water.

The need to clarify whether the subject was about underwater demining or EOD clearance was raised but, like last year, the RB did not find justification or need for a general standard for underwater demining at this time. More information may be available following the Croatian Symposium in Apr 07.

e. IMAS on guide to victim assistance

Leonie Barnes (LB) briefly discussed the need for an IMAS related to victim assistance. She said it was not an attempt to discriminate disability caused by mine accidents/ERW with other forms of disability. However, it was a reflection of the need for National Mine Action Authorities (NMAA) to ensure some involvement through oversight and monitoring, accreditation of mine victim assistance related activities and surveillance of mine/ERW accidents. LB indicated that Victim Assistance requires an overview of the various elements of survivor support including access and advocacy for the disabled, primary and secondary medical treatment, prosthetic and physiotherapy, psychosocial support and socio-economic reintegration. It is not an attempt to control, rather, through advocacy, awareness raising and resource mobilization, to support the general situation of disabled in a country. She then explained the possible various levels of accreditation for NGOs conducting support to mine/ERW.

LB mentioned the need for reporting and the need for the NMAA to establish a national surveillance monitoring mechanism. She said that the NMAA should act as a referral centre for disability related queries rather than take on a role as implementer. Accreditation agreements, information sharing, monitoring and surveillance are essential.

LB informed that the following were the key principles in writing an IMAS for VA:

- Mine victims should not be treated differently to PWD.
- Monitoring, accreditation and surveillance are vital.
- NMAA involvement as a referral centre and in resource mobilisation and advocacy for the disabled.
- Potential partnership with Ministries of Health.
- The term mine victim/survivor also relates to families impacted by death or injury of victim.

The RB agreed with the proposal and approved work on a draft IMAS that provides guidelines on the above.

Action: LB, FP and the ISU should work on an IMAS for VA.

f. TNMA on landmine injuries and surveillance

The Chairman said that UNICEF had previously agreed to write a TNMA on landmine injuries and surveillance. But they did not secure resources to write this. Both UNMAS and UNICEF believed that this TNMA is useful. UNMAS will try to find people to assist with writing this TNMA. There is a need to ensure coordination with the work on producing an IMAS on Victim Assistance.

Action: NM will follow up this issue with UNMAS and James Madison University considering their involvement in this subject.

g. TNMA on clearance of cluster Ammunitions

LB briefed the RB that this TNMA would provide guidelines for those engaged in addressing the threat, and impact, of unexploded cluster munitions including States and their armed forces and the International NGOs involved in demining cluster munitions or providing assistance to the victims. She said the guide should address the following issues:

- The impact of cluster munitions
- Information on the types of cluster munitions
- Marking and fencing of affected areas
- Risk education and warning.
- Clearance and disposal of cluster munitions and
- Assistance to survivors

LB said that she had visited EOD schools in UK and in France and that she had sent out questionnaires to some experts for initial information gathering. She would be visiting Lebanon to interview some key players and visit clearance of cluster munitions sites. LB intends to produce a draft TNMA by July 2007.

The RB agreed the need for and approved the development of a TNMA to guide the mine action community in dealing with cluster munitions.

Action: LB to develop a draft TNMA and submit to the RB for comment.

h. TNMA on mapping accuracy;

The Chairman discussed an issue raised from the field about mapping accuracy. The solution to the stated problem can be provided by a simple amendment to the current IMAS.

Action: NM agreed to present a draft amendment for IMAS 08.40 based on experience in Cyprus.

3.9. Update on developing national mine action standards

LB, in her capacity as the GICHD National Standard Specialist, updated the RB of the activities concerning the development of NMAS. She said that Sri Lanka, Moçambique, Laos, Croatia and , BiH indicated that they had developed NMAS and would provide copies to the website. Afghanistan, Tajikistan, Jordan and Yemen have agreed in principle, but have yet to provide their NMAS in electronic versions. LB said that GICHD had other requests from mine affected countries, and that she was supporting Albania and Uganda at present. She suggested that there is a need for a guide for the development of national standard.

The Chairman asked the RB what would be the appropriate product: an IMAS, a TNMA or a booklet to support mine affected countries in their efforts to develop national standards. The RB agreed that GICHD could produce a Guide Book in the same way as the Guide to IMAS.

Action: FP and LB to work on a guide for the development of national standards.

3.10. Protocol V and Review of IMAS

The Chairman informed the board that the UNMAS Liaison Officer in Geneva, Mr. Gustavo LAURIE (GL), has voluntarily agreed to review all IMAS and make recommendations for amendments to ensure that the IMAS are in compliance with Protocol V (ERW) of the UN Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. He thanked GL for his commitment and assistance in this regard.

Action: NM and FP to follow up with GL

3.11. IMAS and Gender

The Chairman raised the subject of how IMAS deals with the gender issues within the UN Mine Action Gender Guidelines. While they have been reviewed once in this respect it is possible that a gender specialist may have more proactive suggestions for improvements. Since there was not a gender Specialist among the RB members, it was agreed that a specialist should be sought to review IMAS in the same way as GL was about to do with Protocol V.

Action: NM and FP to find a suitable reviewer.

3.12. IMAS and medical requirement

NM informed the RB that he had received suggestions that IMAS 10.40 on Safety & occupational health and medical support to demining (Edition 1) should be amended to provide more guidance on the qualifications required of medics, and on their equipment, and for Supervisors to know how to evaluate capabilities. He explained that he had received an offer from Cranfield University to amend IMAS 10.40. The RB, however, did not see enough evidence to support this request at this time and felt that it was not the medics that was the problem in an accident situation. Many were cautious of any additionally imposed criteria at this time.

Action: NM to follow up with Cranfield University and will discuss the proposals with The HALO Trust before making a further recommendation to the RB.

4. Any other business

4.1. TNMA on Task Order (Dossier)

Mr. Paul Heslop (PH) suggested that there was a need for a TNMA on task orders within the mine action community to provide guidelines on the management and procedures of mine action tasks to be carried out at various stages of implementation. The RB agreed and accepted the proposal.

Action: PH to contact one of the TAs in Sudan to request a draft TNMA on Task Orders for consideration by the RB.

4.2. Road verification and survey

PH also argued a need for a TNMA for road verification and survey. However, the RB was not convinced at this time. A general agreement was that we should not create IMAS and TNMA simply to address a specific problem in one country. It was agreed that such issues should be addressed and covered in national standards.

4.3. Full face protection or eye protection.

Mr. Andy Smith (AS) pointed out the unfinished discussion from the previous meeting on whether the IMAS should be revised to change the recommended minimum protection to eye protection instead of full face protection. The Chair suggested that this issue should be put to the whole RB for electronic general voting as a first trial of the new voting procedures once the voting procedures were accepted by the RB and the Steering Group.

Action: NM to finalise the TOR for the RB and submit to the Steering Group for approval. Once approved, to provide the facts to the RBG for a vote. NM promised to ensure the subject was factually balanced when presented to the RB.

4.4. Safety Distance

AS referred to the unfinished discussions from the last meeting on the issue of default safety distance. He had suggested that IMAS 10.20 should be amended so that users were able to make a more

informed choice about safety distances under various situations in the field rather than stick to the default distance. The counter discussion claimed that the IMAS was already quite clear in its present wording, and in its intention, and, if read correctly, the default distance is there as a suggested alternative to no other information and not as a recommendation for normal circumstances.

After some discussion, the RB agreed to change clause No 5.3. in the IMAS 10.20 to read as follows:

“Demining organisations shall establish safe working distances between individual deminers, machines or MDD and other staff on a demining worksite. Safety distances shall be established based on a detailed and documented risk assessment taking into account the hazards associated with the site, the topography of the site and the protection provided to staff by equipment. In the absence of such a detailed risk assessment the default safety distance shown in Annex C are provided as guidance.”

This subtle change was considered adequate to highlight the basic intention of this clause, which is that demining organisations “shall” establish safe procedures that safety distances “shall” be based on a detailed and documented risk assessment taking into account the hazards particular to the specific area of operations.

4.5. Remarks by Luc Moerman

Mr. Luc Moerman stated that IMAS had been very beneficial for the Belgian troops, as part of the NATO forces in Lebanon, in terms of risk reduction and quality management. He had used IMAS to affect decisions on the procurement of equipment and PPE and SOPs. He informed the RB that MAC- South Lebanon had agreed that all peacekeeping troops involved in mine/ERW clearance should be accredited by the MAC – South Lebanon with effect from 22 Feb 2007. He also stated that he had found a very useful document concerning cluster munitions that he would share with UNMAS and GICHD to assist with the development of a TNMA on cluster munitions.

Action: LM to provide details of this document to UNMAS and GICHD.

4.6. Next meeting

FP suggested that it would be more effective to hold the next RB meeting at the beginning of the week of the UNMAS Programme Directors meeting next year. All agreed to this suggestion.

The Chairman thanked all members for their valuable contribution and for a stimulant meeting. He wished them a safe return to their homes. There being no further business, he declared the meeting closed.