

MINUTES OF THE IMAS REVIEW BOARD MEETING 2017

Date: Monday, February 06, 2017
Time: 09:00-16:00
Location: Conference Room, 6th Floor GICHD

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

1. Welcome and Introduction

Paul Heslop opened the IMAS Review Board meeting and welcomed all members and partakers. The current arrangements for the annual IMAS RB meeting adjacent to the National Directors Meeting (NDM) has its pros and cons. Paul Heslop introduced the idea of moving the RB meeting to perhaps another location and time of the year. The RB meeting could be hosted by one of the organisations representing the IMAS RB. Any suggestions and/or ideas could be put forward to Paul Heslop by the RB members.

2. Minutes IMAS RB Meeting 2016

Robert Keeley, DDG, asked for the removal of the sentence; “DDG for example, does not clear IEDs, as this would label the organisation a party to the conflict” on page 3 from the previous IMAS RB meeting minutes. There were no other comments and the meeting minutes could be archived after the change advised by DDG.

3. IMAS Review Board Members 2017

Mikael Bold was introduced as the new secretary of the IMAS RB replacing Faiz Paktian. Paul Heslop on behalf of the RB extended his sincere gratitude to Faiz Paktian and Phil Bean for their services on the RB for almost 10 years.

It was regrettably noted that none of the National Mine Action Authorities (NMAA) attended the IMAS RB meeting. They are important members of the RB and GICHD will always try to sponsor their attendance where possible. No requests for sponsorship had been received in advance for this meeting. Most of the NMAA Directors are attending the NDM hence their absence raised some concerns. It was suggested that a letter would be sent out to the NMAA

encouraging them to make every possible effort to attend IMAS RB meetings and IMAS sub-committee meetings that are planned for 2017/ 2018.

The current members and vacancies of the RB can be found in the annex. Paul Heslop encouraged the RB to suggest replacements and/ or additional members to the RB after the meeting. The IMAS RB is positive to invite more NMAAs to participate in meetings and as members of the IMAS RB.

4. IMAS Update

A new IMAS 07.12 on quality management in mine action was adopted by the IMAS Review Board last year and published on the IMAS website for public review as a “draft edition” pending the UN-IACG endorsement. The draft IMAS standard adopts language and structure similar to the newest version of ISO 9000:2015 and 9001:2015. It provides guidelines for the implementation of a quality management system (QMS) for mine action programmes and organisations. GICHD will recruit a QM Advisor in 2017 to support the implementation of IMAS 07.12 alongside 07.30 and 07.40.

5. IMAS Sub-committee meeting on IEDs, New York Oct 2016

Paul Heslop thanked all participants that attended the IMAS Sub-committee meeting on IEDs last autumn in New York. It was a very productive meeting even though the visa process restricted some participants to attend. These type of meetings could be a solution on specific and urgent topics to strengthen the annual IMAS RB meeting. The purpose of the sub-committee meeting was to develop recommendations for the IMAS Review Board about IEDs within IMAS. For further details the minutes of the meeting in New York is attached as an annex.

Risk Management - IED – IMAS

David Hewitson, GICHD Consultant, presented on recommendations where IMAS could be strengthened to address IEDs, which meet the CCW AP II definition of an anti-personnel mine. This stipulation covers most IEDs encountered, in particular for northern Iraq and Syria, when clearing IEDs in rural and/ or open terrain areas. It would clarify that such victim operated IEDs are to be considered as landmines, which is suggested through an updated 04.10 definition. This would better delineate boundaries between IMAS and IEDD standards. This is essentially a risk management decision issue comparable to existing aspects of EOD against more challenging targets. Consequently, this could be reflected in a revised IMAS on 07.10 or further expansion of detail in 01.10, which was David’s mandate and main focus when revising IMAS.

Key objectives:

1. To reassure national authorities about the applicability of IMAS to many/most aspects of their current operations, including those that are encountering improvised, artisanal or locally manufactured devices
2. To remind operators that principles, guidelines and requirements in IMAS remain applicable to the great majority of their operational and technical activities, including those where improvised, artisanal or locally manufactured devices are encountered

A risk management standard could be the key to address concepts and principles that have the capacity to meet new challenges presented by an environment that is significantly different from recent decades.

Mark Thompson, MAG, highlighted on key areas of MAG's success to deal with the challenging environment in Northern Iraq is training, mentoring and monitoring.

Arianna Calza Bini, GMAP, raised the question of how victim-activated IED and their victims are currently being recorded by operators, as it is believed that these items might affect people in different ways from legacy minefields. It would be interesting to analyse the statistics of victims of these ordnances by sex and age to identify the most affected groups. According to David Hewitson there is no consistency in how these are currently recorded.

Paul Heslop tasked the members of the IMAS RB to provide feedback on the matrix presented to the IMAS RB. Deadline for feedback 12 May 2017. The matrix is attached as an annex.

Information Management – IMSMA - IED

Mikael Bold informed the IMAS RB that GICHD has developed an IMSMA reporting form for IEDs that will be circulated among operators and NMAAs in March for feedback.

Risk Education IED

Robert Keeley, DDG, presented on DDG's development of a TNMA for Risk Education on IEDs. The draft TNMA will be circulated among the IMAS RB for feedback and attached as an annex.

UNMAS IED Disposal Standards

Paul Heslop presented on UNMAS work on IED with DPKO and other stake holders. DPKO is developing a general mission manual that contains minimum IED standards for military and police in peace keeping operations. An IED Threat Mitigation handbook is developed parallel with the mission manual for peace keeping operations. It will cover aspects from IED mitigation to Counter-IED (C-IED). The audience is UN field missions and direct partners such as police. Parallel with the development of the handbook a new EOD manual will also be drafted. UNMAS are a part of the DPKO and has delivered services for the missions that is based on IMAS since 2004. UNMAS has been asked to participate and contribute towards the IED and C-IED process as a result of the recent attack in Goma targeting UN. UNMAS will organise an UN IED workshop mid 2017. The main question is; where does IMAS end and where does UN IED/C-IED start.

6. IMAS Draft 07.13 Environmental Management in Mine Action

Martin Jebens, GICHD consultant and Gianluca Maspoli, GICHD, presented the new proposed IMAS draft on environment. In general, the IMAS RB expressed its concerns on general requirements and responsibilities outlined in the draft. The draft in its current form risks to be a burden on NMAA and mine action operators rather than a support to address environmental matters. The main issues according to the IMAS RB was chapter 4,5 and 6 that requires another review before circulated again to the IMAS RB.

7. IMAS Draft 09.40 and 09.41 Animal Detection Systems (ADS)

The new IMAS drafts on ADS, now including mine detection rats and more details on dogs for technical survey were presented by Håvard Bach, APOPO, and Mikael Bold. Håvard Bach's presentation included "free-running" dogs / "Special Detection Dogs¹ (SDD)" used for technical survey. Furthermore, the updated processes and procedures outlining the testing and use of dogs and rats in a more traditional manner (short lead/ long lead) that are similar to the previous chapters on MDD were accepted by the IMAS RB. However, the IMAS RB did not approve the proposed testing standards of dogs for technical survey. The acceptance standard for testing of 5m rather than the acceptance standard of 1m was not supported. Furthermore, the IMAS RB expressed concerns on the lack of data relating to dogs used for technical survey. NPA and HALO were asked to share testing data with the Chair and Secretary of the IMAS RB on operational tests conducted by the organisations.

As a result of the discussions the IMAS RB decided the following:

1. Remove all references to "free-running" dogs and re-submit to the IMAS RB; or
2. Present new data supporting the proposed changes and re-submit to the IMAS RB.

Paul Heslop pointed out that there are no problems, in principle once a suitable testing regime has been established, in using "free-running" dogs or any other method in technical survey subject to the approval of the NMAA. The use of "free-running" dogs for technical survey could also be outlined in a TNMA rather than IMAS as a starting point.

8. IMAS Residual

David Hewitson, Consultant GICHD, presented on the latest update on residual as per the IMAS RB requirements from previous meeting in 2016. The IMAS RB then voted on the issues where 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 adopted.

However, wider questions of reflecting risk management and cyclical management systems arise. It is difficult at the moment to bring residual into the framework. Thus, it's suggested to adopt a more explicitly cyclical approach to management, capturing issues of risk management, QM and operational management. It is also worth considering the relationship between 07.10 and a 'Risk Management IMAS'. Options could include:

- a. Effectively change 07.10 to the broad risk management IMAS; or
- b. Develop a wider risk management IMAS and then reflect its contents in 07.10, which could have a wider focus on technical operations, in the same way that it, and others, reflect the contents of 07.12

¹ Currently IMAS 04.10 only refers to a dog trained and employed to detect mines, ERW and other explosive devices as Mine Detection Dog(s) (MDD). MDD can be used in Clearance and Survey. Special Detection Dog(s) (SDD) is an NPA definition and IMAS 04.10 will be updated when 09.40 and 09.41 is approved if required.

Paul Heslop tasked the IMAS RB to take these comments into consideration and for GICHD to present a more detailed draft on their proposed suggestions.

9. IMAS 10.40 Medical Support

Mikael Bold brought forward the question to revise the IMAS on medical support. This has been suggested by many operators delivering mine action services in remote areas.

Justification:

Approaches to remote area medicine have changed drastically since the beginning of this century, primarily due to lessons learned regarding medical care during recent combat operations. Although the clear majority of mine action interventions are not delivered in a combat environment, injury mechanisms to deminers are similar to those suffered by soldiers in combat and typically caused by blast and penetrating injuries with resultant massive and complex trauma. It has been found that military trauma care training that had previously been based on the principles of the civilian Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) and Advanced Trauma Life Support (ATLS) is not entirely appropriate with certain principles that do not apply when care is delivered in a remote environment. Recent changes in the approach to delivery of remote area medicine an update in approach would not require significant modifications to implement but would significantly increase survivability of demining casualties in remote areas.

It was agreed by the IMAS RB that GICHD should explore the possibilities and draft an updated IMAS on medical support.

10. IMAS Website

Mikael Bold informed the IMAS RB, pending approved funding, that GICHD would move ahead and improve the existing IMAS website. The main purpose would be to make it more fit for purpose incorporating up-to-date technologies. This would allow the IMAS RB to better manage, discuss and decide on new drafts on IMAS/ TNMA. In addition it would also allow the mine action sector to be continuously updated on changes and allow them to propose changes/ share lessons learned.

11. Any other business/ Closing of the Meeting

GICHD was tasked to update IMAS 04.10 in line with new recent IMAS chapters.

Paul Heslop suggested that IMAS subgroups should be established to quicker address new topics such as residual, IED, risk management etc. Paul Heslop tasked the members of the IMAS RB to provide feedback on the matrix presented by David Hewitson to the IMAS RB. Deadline for feedback 12 May 2017. Sub-groups, if required, could be established after the received feedback. IMAS related meetings such as thematic sub-committees and/ or bi-annual meetings should be considered and could be hosted by NMAAs and other stake holders/ mine action organisations.

Nick Bray, HALO Trust, stressed on the importance to address accident reporting as outlined in IMAS 10.60. Many reports including BOI are incomplete. GICHD will coordinate this with HALO Trust and other organisations when revising and developing a new IMAS on information management in 2017. This will be conducted parallel with the development and launch of IMSMA Core.

IMAS RB members were asked to submit recommendations for the vacancies in the IMAS RB. This should not only include individuals but could also include national authorities and education institutes associated to the mine action sector.

IMAS RB meetings held before the NDM was a preferred option instead of holding them on the last day of the NDM.

Paul Heslop closed the meeting and thanked all members for their active participation.

Paul Heslop
Chair IMAS RB
UNMAS

Mikael Bold
Secretary IMAS RB
GICHD

PARTICIPANTS IMAS REVIEW BOARD MEETING, 06 FEBRUARY 2017

CATEGORY	#	NAME	COUNTRY/ ORG	ACTIVE	REPRESENTED YES/ NO
Chair	1	Paul Heslop	UNMAS	Jan-07	Yes
Secretary	2	Mikael Bold	GICHD	Oct-16	Yes
Donor	3	Gerald L. Guilbert	USA	Oct-14	Yes, represented by R. Robideau and G.Cox
Donor	4	Ian Mansfield	MASG	Jan-13	Yes
Commercial	5	Chris Pearce	Optima Group	Mar-14	Yes
Commercial	6	Dave McDonnell	Phase 3 Services Ltd	Apr-09	Yes
National	7	Ly Thuch	Cambodia	Jan-11	No
National	8	Davor Laura	Croatia	Jan-04	No
National	9	Aimal Safi	Afghanistan	Jan-09	No
National	10	Sr.Col Tuan	Vietnam	Apr-13	No
Nat./NGO/Operator	11	Mohammed Ismail	IKMAA/Iraq	Jan-11	No
Nat./NGO/Operator	12	Rafael Alfredo Colon Torres	DAICMA/ Colombia	Jan-16	No
INGO	13	Robert Keeley	DDG	Feb-15	Yes
INGO	14	Mark Thompson	MAG	Mar-12	Yes
INGO	15	Hans Risser	NPA	Jan-17	Yes
INGO	16	Gary Toombs	HI Federation	Jan-17	Yes
INGO	17	Calvin Ruysen	HALO	May-17	Yes, represented by N. Bray
UN	18	Sara Sekkenes	UNDP	Oct-13	Yes, represented by B. Larke and O. Leschenko

CATEGORY	#	NAME	COUNTRY/ ORG	ACTIVE	REPRESENTED YES/ NO
UN	19	Reuben McCarthy	UNICEF	Oct-13	Yes
UN	20	VACANT	UNOPS	Xxx-YY	Yes, represented by A. Omeragic and M.Siles
Military	21	Gunther Haustrate	Military- Belgium	Feb-14	Yes
Demining School	22	Bernard Thomas	CNDH	Jan-13	No
Demining School	23	Angel Belen	HDTC	Apr-13	No
Non-Affiliated	24	VACANT	Independent	Xxx-YY	
Non-Affiliated	25	Tim Horner	Independent	Oct-13	No
Observer	26	Erik Tollefsen	ICRC	Jun-14	Yes
Observer	27	Magnus Bengtsson	MSB	Jan-11	Yes
Observer	28	Richard Boulter	UNMAS	Sep-13	Yes
Observer	29	Guy Rhodes	GICHD	Apr-14	Yes
Observer	30	Juan Carlos Ruan	ISU APMBC	Jan-17	Yes
Observer	31	Arianna Calza Bini	GMAP	Jun-15	Yes
Observer	32	VACANT	NAOC (Commercial)	Xxx-YY	
Attendee		David Hewitson	Consultant GICHD		Yes
Attendee		Håvard Bach	APOPO		Yes