

## **INTERNATIONAL MINE ACTION STANDARDS (IMAS)**

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

HELD AT GICHD ON 15 FEBRUARY 2016

#### **Members attended**

1. Armen Harutyunyan, UNOPS
2. Bernard Thomas, CNDH
3. Chris Pearce, Optima Group
4. Dave McDonnell, Phase 3 Services Ltd
5. Erik Tollefsen, ICRC
6. Faiz Paktian, Secretary (GICHD)
7. Goran Tomasevic, HALO Trust
8. Gunther Haustrate, Military, Belgium
9. Guy Rhodes, GICHD
10. Ian Mansfield, MASG
11. Juan Carlos Ruan, ISU APMBC
12. Magnus Bengtsson, MSB
13. Mark Thompson, MAG
14. Paul Heslop, Chair (UNMAS)
15. Phil Bean, Independent
16. Prum Sophamonkol, Cambodia
17. Reuben McCarthy, UNICEF
18. Richard Boulter, UNMAS
19. Havard Bach, NPA
20. Hans Risser UNDP
21. Miljenko Vahtaric, Croatia
22. Arianna Calza Bini, GMAP
23. Robert Keeley, DDG
24. Rodney Robideau, USA, PM/WRA
25. Rafael Alfredo Colon Torres, Colombia

#### **Guest speakers/participants**

26. Duncan Young, Optima Group
27. Gianluca Maspoli, GICHD
28. Jürg Hug, GICHD
29. John Rawson, GICHD
30. Yana Sofovich, Geomine
31. Jeannette von Däniken, note taker (GICHD)

#### **Members excused**

32. Philippe Houliat, HI Federation
33. Mohammad Sediq Rashid, Afghanistan
34. Tim Horner, Independent

\* \* \* \* \*

#### **1. Welcome and introduction**

Mr Paul Heslop (Chair) opened the meeting by welcoming the participants and asking all present to introduce her/himself. He requested that the agenda item on IEDs is to be discussed last before “any other business” as he anticipated lengthy discussion on the topic.

#### **2. Minutes of the last meeting**

Mr. Faiz Paktian (Secretary) asked if there were any comments regarding the last year’s minutes. Neither comments nor objections were raised. The minutes of the last meeting were adopted without changes.

#### **3. Composition of the Review Board**

The Chair asked the Review Board (RB) whether the RB composition was appropriate and if not, what could be done to improve it. It was stated some members are labelled “Independent”, it was not clear who these members represent. As important global players increasingly interested in mine action, Russia or China was mentioned as the potential future members. The various Language Outreach Programmes of the GICHD could be useful platforms to look at the IMAS from a regional or linguistic viewpoint. Language specific or regional review boards were also suggested. Another suggestion was that certain decisions, particularly those relating to the scope of IMAS, could be elevated to the Steering Group (SG). As the 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the IMAS is approaching, it may be useful to convene a special meeting of the RB to look at, among other topics, the future composition and function of the RB and SG.

The issue of responding to Secretary's requests was also raised. It was stated that members will respond when they have specific expertise or strong opinion about the subject matter.

#### **4. Secretary's report**

The Secretary presented an update on IMAS activities since the board's last meeting. His full report is attached to these minutes – see Annex I.

#### **5. IMAS and Residual Contamination**

Mr Guy Rhodes, Director of Operations of the GICHD, presented recommendation of a sub-group that met in Geneva in November 2015 on Residual Contamination (RC). See a summary of the recommendation in Annex II. The sub-group meeting concluded that guidelines on RC should be included in the IMAS by either drafting a new IMAS dedicated to RC, or to re-write IMAS 07.10 "management of mine action programmes" to include specific sections on RC. In the case of the latter proposal, a Technical Note would also be needed to document best practice on the subject matter. He said that the term "RC" has not been defined in the IMAS but a definition of "Residual Risk" existed. As such, the sub-group proposed two definitions taking into consideration the existing Residual Risk definition:

- 1) RC refers to contamination which gives rise to **residual risk**
- 2) RC refers to contamination remaining following the application of all reasonable effort to identify, define and remove all presence and suspicion of mines/ERW through non-technical survey, technical survey and/or clearance.

The RB voted on the issues, a clear majority was in favour of re-writing IMAS 07.10 and producing a Technical Note (TN) to document best practice. In addition, the shorter form of definition "**RC refers to contamination which gives rise to residual risk**" was preferred. However, it was decided to keep the definition open to modification in the course of working on the IMAS and TN.

The Chair underlined the importance of the subject matter and how the various aspects of it to be clarified in the IMAS and TN. He urged members of the board to actively participate when these documents are circulated for review and comment.

#### **6. IMAS and Information Management**

Mr Jürg Hug, Information Management Advisor at the GICHD, presented on the need to review and amended IMAS 05.10 Management of Information. Referring to the importance of information management in mine action, he pointed out that it is important to keep the IMAS up-to-date as the current version was over three years old and that there were developments in information technology. He focused on four topics; data fit for purpose, processes, organisation, and resources. He suggested inclusion of the minimum requirements for information collection as well as for information dissemination through the appropriate reporting templates in the IMAS 05.10. He concluded that the GICHD would amend the IMAS in the second quarter of 2016 and will circulate it to the RB for adoption.

The RB agreed on amendments to IMAS 05.10. However, some members indicated that the IMAS should stay short, communicate minimum requirements and be tested with the NMAA before sending it out to the RB for approval. It was also suggested that details on good Information Management practice should be captured in guide book.

#### **7. IMAS and Protection of the Environment**

Mr Gianluca Maspoli, Policy and External Relations Advisor at the GICHD, presented on possible improvements to IMAS 10.70 "protection of the environment". He stated that the quality of the environment is crucial when returning a land back to the local populations for productive use. The new ISO 14001 standard and the sustainable development goals are giving high consideration to the protection of the environment. After studying practices with regard to protection of environment in some mine action programmes in 2015, he said he was in a position to make some concrete suggestion and amendments to the IMAS 10.70, in track changes. The revisions will be submitted to the IMAS to RB in the second half of 2016. For more details see his note to the RB in Annex III.

The RB agreed with Mr Maspoli's proposal for reviewing and updating the IMAS 10.70. Mr. Rafael Alfredo Colon Torres, National Director of the Colombian Programme, emphasised the importance of cooperation with the national authorities on this topic. He said that, in Colombia, many contaminated areas are located in national parks and they are cautious about causing environmental harm.

## **8. IMAS App for Smart Phones and other Electronic Devices**

Based upon a request of the RB in 2015, the Secretary circulated a note on cost associated with the development of an application to make IMAS and their translations available on smart phones and other electronic devices. The Secretary said that the application would cost CHF 27000. However, this would also require the IMAS website to be restructured with an additional cost of around CHF 30000. The application would replace the existing IMAS USB sticks that are expensive to produce and get outdated as soon as an IMAS are amended or new translations are available. The application would put an end to cost associated with the production and dissemination of IMAS through USB sticks (previously through CDs). With the new application, users will have access to up-to-date IMAS automatically at all times, but it comes with a high cost.

The RB concluded that it is too expensive to proceed with the development of the application at this point and asked the Secretary to reconsider, where possible, the development of the application at a lower cost. It was pointed out that the current "what is new" alert, sent to all subscribers on the IMAS homepage was effective and that there was no immediate needs for the application to be developed. The Chair said that we should also look into the possibility of turning the IMAS into e-books.

## **9. IMAS and Improvised Explosive Devices (IED)**

Mr Duncan Young, Principle Consultant at Optima Group, presented his view on the IEDs and humanitarian mine action. See a note on Optima Group's opinion on IEDs in Annex IV. He underlined that EOD is no longer only a military responsibility as traditional warfare is not taking place very often anymore. He said that in traditional warfare, the IEDs are neutralised but today we are talking about clearance of the IEDs. The military should be in charge when there is an immediate threat to lives, or if clearance of the IEDs supports a military mission. Therefore, he said that liaison between the military and humanitarian operators is crucial.

The consensus among the RB was that the Technical Note (TN) 09.30-07 on IED disposal circulated to the RB earlier was not mature for publication and that it contained too much information for a single document. More discussion on the definition of IEDs and a clearer delineation of the TN was needed to ensure it is being used safely and effectively by all users.

Other opinions expressed at the meeting were:

- › humanitarian demining operators have already been clearing IEDs for a long time but under different names.
- › it is important to define humanitarian demining and the humanitarian aspects of clearing IEDs in order to decide what mine action operators should deal with and what not.
- › many IEDs are very similar to mines as they often are victim activated pressure plates.
- › the question that must first be answered is whether IEDs are used as active weapons in a conflict by a party to the conflict, or they are legacy weapons that are left behind after a conflict is over.
- › historically, mine action has been operating in post-conflict environments, but when mine action is delivered in complex security situations, it is complicated to answer such questions.
- › there is also a criminal investigation aspect that one needs to be aware of. By destroying an IED we are destroying evidence. It cannot however, be the responsibility of humanitarian operators to gather evidence.
- › IEDs are a matter of counter insurgency and not humanitarian mine action. DDG for example, does not clear IEDs, as this would label the organisation a party to the conflict.

Mr. John Rawson, Ammunition Safety Management Advisor at the GICHD briefed the board on the GICHD position with regard to IEDs. He stated that each individual IED scenario should be subject to a

threat assessment before making a decision on whether mine action actors should deal with it. The humanitarian demining actors may only deal with victim activated pressure plates as they are very similar to mines, although, not all pressure initiated IEDs are the same. Lives can be saved without dealing with the IEDs by clearing the crowd and controlling movement to the affected areas. The military should cover all threat levels, while humanitarian operators should only cover low threat level. The question always one has to ask oneself is whether there is an active campaign going on or not. During an active campaign, humanitarian actors should not get involved. Commercial actors are not tied down by humanitarian aspects. However, operators should realise that the costs of necessary equipment and manpower to become an IEDD organisation are huge. He concluded that the Technical Note on IED-D was not mature enough to be adopted.

The Chair concluded that the issues require more time. He said that UNMAS therefore, plans to call a working group of volunteers to meet in New York in September or early October 2016 to debate and agree on the position of the IMAS and the sector with regard to IEDs. He asked members that, if any related issues come up in the meantime, they should refer them to the Chair.

## **10. Any other business**

### **10.1 Next RB meeting**

The change of date of the IMAS RB meeting from Friday to Monday was welcomed by all members. It was suggested that future meetings should be held at the start of the week of the annual meeting of the National Programme Directors and UN Advisors.

### **10.2 Animal Detection Standards**

Mr Havard Bach updated the RB about review and revision of the mine detection dogs' standards. These standards are going to change to animal detection standards. The number of IMAS will be reduced from five to three chapters by moving some sections to the annexes. Also, guidance on the use animals in land release process will be provided. The revision will be finished in a few months and will be submitted to the RB for approval.

The Chair and the Secretary thanked all members for their active participation.

### **Faiz Paktian**

Secretary, IMAS Review Board

## **ANNEX I**

12 February 2016

### **Secretary's Report**

The following is an update on IMAS activities in 2015 and projections for 2016.

#### **1. IMAS Review Board Meeting**

The next IMAS Review Board (RB) meeting is scheduled to be held at the GICHD on the 15<sup>th</sup> of February 2016 from 09:00 to approx. 13:00 hours. Unlike past years, this year's meeting will take place ahead of the annual International Meeting of National Directors and UN Advisors that is scheduled from 16 to 19 February 2016.

#### **2. IMAS Steering Group Meeting**

No IMAS Steering Group (SG) meeting is scheduled in 2016. The last SG meeting was held in March 2012.

#### **3. Review Board Membership**

There are 33 RB members - 25 full members and eight observers. For details see RB members list as of January 2016 attached.

In 2015, following the RB decision to invite the Gender and Mine Action Programme (GMAP), Ms. Arianna Calza Bini, Director of GMAP, was invited and she accepted membership of the RB. The IKMAA representative Mr. Siraj Barzani was replaced by Mr. Mohammad Ismail, its new Director. The Olive Group was replaced by Phase 3 Services Ltd (an organisation in the commercial category) represented by Mr. Dave McDonnell. Mr. Rafael Alfredo Colon Torres, Director of DAICMA, replaces Mr. Pablo Parra who has left DAICMA. Mr. Mark Albe left NOAC and he has not been replaced so far.

#### **4. Overview of IMAS, Technical Notes and T&EP**

- a) IMAS - there are 42 IMAS endorsed and published on the IMAS website. For details see IMAS framework as of January 2016 attached. The following IMAS were reviewed and approved by the RB in 2015:
  - > A new Annex on land release symbology was introduced to IMAS 07.11 land release and approved;
  - > A new edition of IMAS 07.30 accreditation of mine action organisations was approved; and
  - > A new edition of IMAS 07.40 monitoring of mine action organisations was approved.
  - > IMAS 9.20 post-clearance inspection has been removed.
- b) Technical Notes (TN) - there are 16 TN published. The following TN were circulated and approved by the RB in 2015:
  - > A new version of TN 09.30/02 clearance of depleted uranium; and
  - > The new Technical Note 07.11/01-2015 land release symbology.

- c) T&EP - there are seven T&EP (CWA) in relation to humanitarian mine action published. A new version of the T&EP 09.30/01/2014 EOD competency standards was approved in early 2015.

## **5. Projections for 2016**

The following is the IMAS/TN review plan for 2016. The topics and subsequent new/amended IMAS/TN are subject to approval of the RB.

### a) IMAS

- › A new IMAS 07.12 on quality management system in mine action;
- › A new Edition of IMAS 07.10 on management of mine action to include guidance on management of residual contamination;
- › A new Edition of IMAS 10.70 on the protection of the environment in mine action;
- › A new Edition of IMAS 05.10 on the Information Management in mine action; and
- › A new edition of IMAS 04.10 glossary of terms and definition.

Upon approval of the above IMAS, a review of the entire IMAS series will be conducted to ensure changes in relation to residual contamination, quality management and information management are reflected in all the remaining IMAS.

### b) Technical Notes

- › TN 09.30/- IEDD
- › TN 09.30/ - Guided Missiles
- › TN 09.30/- Chemical EOD
- › TN 09.30/- Alternative demolition techniques

## **6. IMAS Outreach**

In 2015, four regional IMAS trainings were conducted:

- › In Beirut, Lebanon, in Arabic, for participants of the MENA region;
- › In Buenos Aires, Argentina, in Spanish for participants from the South American region;
- › In CPADD, Benin, in French, for participants from francophone countries; and
- › In Spiez, Switzerland, in English, for national standards focal points from the mine affected states.

In addition, IMAS presentations were given at many other international events throughout 2015.

## **7. National Standards**

In 2015, upon request, the GICHD supported a number of national mine action programmes in the development and/or revision of their national mine action standards (NMAS). Countries supported include: Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cambodia, DRC and Sri Lanka.

In addition, focal points from 20 countries have been trained to kick-off development/review and revision of the NMAS in their own programme. A follow up workshop is scheduled in September 2016 in Switzerland to measure progress and exchange ideas and experiences in the development/review and revision of the NMAS.

Moreover, the GICHD has established a “global national standards baseline” in consultation with the national authorities of over 35 countries. The baseline will help to measure progress made in review and development of NMAS by the national authorities. The GICHD plans to proactively engage with

the national authorities and other stakeholders in the development and review of the NMAS in the coming years. As such, in 2016 it plans to:

- › Recruit an NMAS Advisor;
- › Produce a guide to NMAS;
- › Produce templates for the various NMAS;
- › Support Egypt, Iraq, Turkey, Sri Lanka and Ukraine in the development and/or review and revision of their NMAS; and
- › Follow up with some other countries through a follow on international NMAS workshop.

## 8. IMAS website

The IMAS website [www.mineactionstandards.org](http://www.mineactionstandards.org) is maintained and updated on a regular basis. Amended and translated IMAS, TN as well as other relevant documents were published when they became available throughout 2015. E-mail updates of “What’s New” were sent regularly to all registered individuals. There are currently 653 registered individuals. IMAS-related questions and queries were responded to within one business day. Information about the IMAS RB, such as the IMAS framework, membership list, meeting minutes, work plans and other relevant documents, were made available.

The functionality to download IMAS in word format has been used frequently. In total, word documents have been downloaded 1059 times in 2015. The most downloaded IMAS was the Glossary 04.10 in Persian. IMAS in PDF format have been downloaded 24’474 times in 2015.

The table below provides a brief overview of the number of visits to the IMAS website in 2015. More details on statistics are available and can be provided upon request. You will note that there is a 25% increase in the number of visitors to the website in 2015.

Visits	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
<b>2015</b>	1836	2051	2088	1787	1763	1691	1670	2125	1911	2331	2229	1580	23062
<b>2014</b>	1657	1580	1710	1433	1485	1657	1315	1374	1426	1774	1499	1496	18406
<b>2013</b>	1712	1490	1764	1729	1594	1394	1545	1514	1467	1740	1663	1455	19067

## 9. Translation of IMAS

Efforts continued to translate the IMAS into other languages. The following table indicates number of up-to-date IMAS translated into other languages, including those translated in 2015:

IMAS	<i>English</i>	<b>Arabic</b>	<b>Farsi</b>	<b>French</b>	<b>Russian</b>	<b>Spanish</b>
Translated in 2015	4	21	9	0	0	0
All translations	42	36	11	39	25	5

Note1: GICHD plans to translate all the IMAS and the IATG into Russian in 2016. Translation of the IATG has also been well-coordinated with the UNODA. Funding has been provided by the DDPS (Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sports of Switzerland)

Note 2: There are many outdated IMAS translations that are being achieved in the archive page of the website.

## **10. IMAS publications**

In 2015, over 300 IMAS USB cards were distributed during workshops and international events. The cards have been progressively updated with new/amended IMAS, their translations and IATG each time they were distributed.

In 2016, subject to approval of the IMAS RB, IMAS will be made available on smartphones and tablets. To develop an IMAS app, the current IMAS website ([www.mineactionstandards.org](http://www.mineactionstandards.org)) will have to be redesigned. The app will replace the current practice of distributing IMAS on USB cards. The cards proved to be expensive and ineffective as the information/standards on them will get outdated after sometime. While distribution of the up-to-date IMAS and the associated documents on USB will only be confined to workshops and training events, the IMAS app seems a good investment with a long term solution to make up-to-date IMAS available to the mine action community. The topic will be discussed at the next RB meeting.

## **11. RAPID**

The database of demining accidents, (Reporting, Analysis and Prevention of Incidents in Demining (RAPID) has been maintained and upgraded throughout the year 2015. RAPID is integrated into IMSMA V6 and linked to the Mine Action Intelligence Tool (MINT). In 2015, collective and individual follow-up emails were sent to national focal points of 56 countries on a quarterly basis. Data for 9 accidents and 12 victims were received from three countries. 14 countries reported no accidents in 2015. The database includes 1544 accident records with 1928 victims involved. Collecting demining accident data from national programmes remains a challenge. Another challenge is incomplete data, as some programmes do not collect certain standard data concerning accidents. These programmes are encouraged to upgrade their SOPs and data collection forms in accordance with IMAS 10.60. Moreover, the GICHD has contacted major demining organisations for data and information. Those who responded provided some historical data from the past years only.

## **12. Review Board Feedback Form**

Feedback forms completed at the end of the last Review Board meeting indicated that the majority of the members were satisfied with the meeting and that it was a good investment of their time. Improvements were suggested in the area of allocating more time to the different agenda points and circulating background notes ahead of the meeting.

Best regards,

Faiz Paktian  
Secretary, IMAS Review Board

**ANNEX II****Residual Contamination Sub-group:  
Recommendations Executive Summary****INTRODUCTION**

Guidance on Residual Contamination is critical to address the realities of evolving Mine Action Programmes. These need to adjust their posture, orientation and strategies as they approach completion of their Article 5 obligations of the APMBC in order to address the longer term ERW contamination. Though no guidance is currently in place within IMAS on Residual Contamination, IMAS should serve as the primary reference to guide mine action programmes in the establishment of necessary human and institutional capacity needed to effectively manage and respond to the remaining risk.

Recognizing the essential need for work on the very important subject, particularly for the national authorities, the IMAS Review Board (RB) discussed the matter in its last meeting in March 2015 and concluded that the GICHD should establish a focus group to discuss the matter and provide its recommendation to the RB. While acknowledging the broad nature of the topic, a focus group gathered in Geneva on 2-3 November to discuss possible courses of action. The following recommendations are distilled from the report of the proceedings (refer to the attachment). The focus group and GICHD submit the recommendations below to the RB for consideration.

**DEFINITION**

Two definitions are proposed based on the term “Residual Risk” which already exists within IMAS 04.10.

Residual Risk is ‘the risk remaining following the application of all reasonable effort to identify, define and remove all presence and suspicion of mines/ERW through non-technical survey, technical survey and/or clearance’. (IMAS 04.10: 3.249)

It is important to ensure that ‘residual’ is not an ambiguous term, that it does not create any grey areas relating to what needs to be done, and that it does not lead to any conflict with the requirements of Article V of the APMBC, the Convention on Cluster Munitions, or Protocol V on Explosive Remnants of War to the CCW. It must still remain broad enough to be applicable globally.

As such, the following are proposed:

1. Residual contamination: that contamination which gives rise to residual risk.
2. Residual contamination is the contamination remaining following the application of all reasonable effort to identify, define and remove all presence and suspicion of mines/ERW through non-technical survey, technical survey and/or clearance.

**CHAPTER REVISION**

Incorporation of Residual Contamination in the IMAS, specifically 7.10, received broad support. The chapter, which needs to be reviewed and updated anyway, already discusses management of mine action programmes and could be developed further to consider guidance on the long-term nature of residual contamination. The full set of IMAS will be reviewed to identify if any other appropriate minor adjustments are required to reinforce the substantive entry in 7.10

**and/or**

**New Chapter**

Creating a separate IMAS chapter on Risk Management of Residual Contamination would serve to highlight the importance of the Residual Contamination issue, and was also supported as a separate idea during discussions in November.

**TECHNICAL NOTES**

GICHD has compiled a library of established risk management practices as they pertain to residual contamination. A series of technical notes drawing on existing knowledge and practices will make current risk-management procedures and policies a readily accessible resource for National Authorities and Mine Action planner.

**ANNEX III**

# Note for the IMAS Review Board on Protection of Environment

*12 January 2016*

## Introduction

In March 2015, the GICHD presented to the IMAS Review Board a project proposal aiming at reviewing the IMAS 10.70 in order to strengthen and mainstream the protection of the environment in mine action.

Subsequently, in 2015 the GICHD undertook desk and field research on the topic and hired a consultant to recommend issues which should be addressed in IMAS 10.70.

This note summarises the proposal for reviewing the IMAS 10.70 by providing reasons for its revision and recommendations for its improvement. This note gives also a plan for developing a reviewed version of IMAS 10.70.

## Justification

Five main reasons explain why it is important and timely to review and strengthen the IMAS 10.70 on the protection of the environment.

**1) Environment is an important aspect in mine action** since its goal is to return the land in a condition that it can be used by the local population. This goal is rooted in the definition of mine action as a set of “activities which aim to reduce the social, economic and environmental impact of **mines**, and **ERW** including **unexploded sub-munitions**.” (IMAS 4.10, para 3.176) At the same time, by its very nature, mine action involves direct interaction with the environment, hence it potentially affects the environment.

However, the awareness of the environmental impact is still weak and needs to be reinforced. This is demonstrated by the fact that, according to the Implementation Support Unit of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, only Denmark, Great Britain and Colombian as State Parties have so far mentioned environmental concerns in relationship with their treaty obligations. A reviewed IMAS 10.70 is instrumental to increase such awareness by providing concrete guidance.

**2) The current IMAS 10.70 presents some weaknesses** in the guidance for protection of the environment. Mine action has evolved and progresses need to be reflected in the IMAS.

For instance, the current IMAS 10.70 has the following weaknesses:

- Lack of focus on the environment and what should be protected (i.e. wildlife, fauna, water and soil as well as the population).
- Requirements on how to assess the anticipated environmental impact of operations and identify appropriate mitigation processes are lacunar.
- The IMAS 10.70 was based on the ISO 14001:2004. In 2015 the ISO published a new ISO 14001 that now features as the new reference point of IMAS.

**3) Other sectors do have integrated protection of the environment.** Mine action cannot disregard this evolution and may actually find useful lessons learned from other sectors.

First, the humanitarian sector in general takes into account environmental impact mitigation, which has become an integral part humanitarian preparedness, response and recovery including the cluster system and in any vulnerability assessment.

Secondly, the private industry - namely mining, oil and gas - has developed significant measures on the protection of the environment. The experience gathered by these industries is relevant because they have to address environmental impacts that are similar to those generated by mine action.

**4) The environment is on the top of the international agenda** as demonstrated by the Sustainable Development Goals that give a significant attention to environmental issues. Mine action is not disconnected from this agenda and a reviewed IMAS 10.70 would better reflect the sector's responsibilities and contribution in that regard. A focus on the protection of the environment might become an increasingly important requirement (or a comparative advantage) of mine action in future resource mobilisation.

**5) Increasing importance of clearing protected areas.** As mine-affected countries progress in releasing contaminated land, natural protected areas (e.g. natural parks), which might not have been prioritised during the first phases of a national mine action strategy, will become increasingly important clearance sites in the future (e.g. Croatia, Tajikistan).

## Recommendations

The work conducted in 2015 identified five areas calling for a strengthening of the current IMAS 10.70.

1. **Environmental impact assessment (EIA)** shall be made prior to any mine and ERW clearance operation due to the potential damages to the environment. As the impact varies, every area needs different mitigation measures and they can be identified only through an assessment that can be done as a part of any other mine action survey activity.

2. **Improvement of management** on all levels by incorporating environmental policies at an organizational level, strengthening the importance of the environment in the tender process (statement of works) and standard operating procedures, as well as by monitoring and training.
3. **Increase coordination** among environmental stakeholders and use existing capacities, frameworks, international conventions and national legal acts. Stakeholders include international, regional and national environmental organizations and treaties, governmental bodies, NGO's and academia.
4. **Stronger focus on environment** should be done by a better distinction between environment and health/safety issues. In addition, the language in IMAS 10.70 shall be strengthened based on ISO 14001 and IMAS 10.70 title may be changed by putting more emphasis on environment (e.g. reverse order "Protection of the environment – Safety & occupational health").
5. **Appendix** providing questions and points to be addressed in order to protect the environment.

## Plan

The review of IMAS 10.70 does not require extensive research as significant findings were gathered in 2015. If the above proposal is acceptable to the review board, a revised version of the IMAS 10.70 will be circulated to the review board approximately in July 2016.



## ANNEX IV

### OPTIMA GROUP REVIEW OF IMAS TECHNICAL NOTE 09.31/01

#### Background

Optima Group were requested to review IMAS Technical Note 09.31/01 and provide technical comment.

#### Approach

A panel was convened from the most suitably qualified and experienced personnel within Optima Group. The panel consisted of:

- Chris Pearce: Associate Director
- Duncan Young: Principle Consultant
- Mark Dawson: Counter-IED Consultant Trainer

The aim of the panel was to review the content of the Technical Note and provide comments where necessary. A number of issues were identified:

#### Technical Comment

The panels' opinion was that the Draft Technical Note 09.31/01 is technically accurate.

#### Contextual Comment

The panel believed that a number of areas, relating to the Technical Note and IMAS Framework, should be addressed. These are as follows:

- The document contradicts its own AIM (see Introduction Para. 2). The Technical note targets Mine Action Managers (Operational Level) and Field Staff (Tactical Level). It contains excessive information that spans across too many levels of command/management for the stated target groups. In order to ensure clear and specific direction individual documents need to target individual levels of need. A suggested approach is as follows:
  - **Policy.** At the Strategic (Programme Manager) level.
  - **Guidance.** At the Operational (Project Manager) level.
  - **Standard Operating Procedures (SOP).** At the Tactical (field implementation) level.
- **Policy (Strategic).** The document does not state policy - it is an advisory document. Policy is, however, critical in providing direction, from which all-else flows. Until a clear IEDD policy is created there will be confusion and overlaps. This needs to be addressed as a matter of urgency. Consideration should be given to a single policy that embraces Explosive Ordnance Threat Reduction in its totality.



- **Guidance (Operational).** The document contains some guidance information. Work should be done to expand on the guidance, principles and philosophies of IEDD operations. This would provide Project Managers with suitable guidance for successful IEDD operations in support of UNMAS.
- **SOP (Tactical).** Work needs to be done to create a field level IEDD manual containing core, generic SOPs, specified by the controlling authority (UNMAS). These should be in a framework format allowing Project Managers of contracted organisations (including both commercial operators and NGOs) latitude to develop country-specific SOPs. The content of annexes C/D/E are “tactical” and the information contained would be better represented within the aforementioned generic series of SOPs.
- A suggested start point for change is the creation of an IMAS **Series 15:IEDD** with at least two initial IMAS:
  - 15.10: Guidance for the conduct of IEDD operations
  - 15.11: IEDD Operational Procedures (core SOPs)

### Recommendations

- Do not publish the technical note until a review of policy and IEDD within the IMAS Framework is complete.
- Create a Series 15: IEDD specific within the existing IMAS Framework.
- Create two series 15 documents:
  - 15.10: Guidance for the conduct of IEDD operations
  - 15.11: IEDD Operational Procedures (core SOPs)
- Explore the efficacy of an Explosive Ordnance Threat Reduction Policy

### Conclusions

Implementing the above recommendations will establish IEDD within the IMAS framework. An overall policy should be explored that unifies the whole of the IMAS framework and recognises that terminology referring to “Mines” no longer describes the totality of the explosive ordnance threat.

The panel considered suggesting that a stand-alone set of IEDD standards could be created, similar to IATG. However, it was realised that the existing IMAS Framework complements explosive ordnance threat that can easily be unified through the proposed policy. This, as indicated above, is a longer-term objective. For the present a UN/UNMAS IEDD series should be quickly developed. This would allow clear direction to flow and avoid a looming situation where organisations are developing their own IEDD policies and documentation, which will confuse rather than assist.