



To: IMAS Review Board

Date: 22 April 2008

MINUTES OF IMAS REVIEW BOARD MEETING 18 MARCH 2008

1. Introduction

The IMAS Review Board met at the GICHD on Tuesday, 18 March 2008, from 1000 until 1730 hrs.

2. Attendance

The following members attended the meeting:

Noel Mulliner (NM) – UNMAS, Chairman
Alistair Craib (AC) – UK
Erik Lauritzen (EL) – Denmark
Manfredo Capozza (MC) - Italy
Bill Walenius (BW) - RONCO
Davour Laura (DL) – Croatia
Danniel Fernandez (DL) – DDG
Bill Howell (BH) – HI(F)
Bob Doheny (BD)– ITEP
Sara Sekkenes (SS) - UNDP
Sharif Baaser (SB)– UNICEF
Havard Bach (HB) – GICHD
Luc Moerman (LM) - Military/NATO
Faiz Paktian (FP) - GICHD, Secretary

Sandra Velasco (SV) – NMAS GICHD, Observer
Russel Gasser (RG)– HTC Ltd., Observer
Marc Antoine Morel (MA) – UNDP Geneva , Observer
Gustavo Laurie (GL) – UNMAS Geneva, Speaker on IMAS and P-V of CCW

Apologies:

Mark Adams - USA
Paul Heslop - UNOPS
Johan Sohlberg – SWEDEC
Andy Smith – Independent
Phil Bean - Independent
Ben Lark – ICRC

3. Introduction and welcome

The Chairman welcomed those attending and thanked them for coming. He introduced new members, Mr. Bill Walenius from RONCO, Mr Danniel Fernandez from DDG, Mr. Sharif Baaser from UNICEF, and Mr. Mark Adams from US, who had arrived in Geneva but had been immediately re-directed to Albania. He looked forward to their continued involvement and contribution to IMAS. NM also introduced a number of Observers; Mr. Russel Gasser, Evaluator from HTC Ltd, who has been asked to conduct an independent evaluation of the GICHD contribution to standards, Mr. Marc Antoine Morel from UNDP small arms team in Geneva, who was attending the meeting to learn from IMAS experiences as he was to develop standards for small arms, and Ms Sandra Velasco, the new GICHD Specialist on NMAS. NM stated that he had also invited Mr. Gustavo Laurie, UNMAS Liaison Officer in Geneva, who had reviewed IMAS to

ensure compliance with Protocol V of CCW, to attend and speak about his recommendations for IMAS.

In his opening remarks, NM re-stated his remarks of the last year regarding the role and responsibility of the RB to keep IMAS up-to-date and relevant.

He then briefly discussed IMAS website statistics. In 2007, the use of the website saw a substantial increase from 2006 and the years before. He stated that the average number of unique visitors had increased by 17.4%, the number of visits by 24.3%, pages visited by 32.9% while the monthly average visit was 3512 where it was 2824 per month in 2006 and 2795 per month in 2005. NM stated that the statistics were evidence that IMAS are being visited very frequently and this should be an encouragement to the meeting to continue to contribute to their relevance.

4. Minutes of the last meeting

FP stated that the minutes of the last RB meeting were circulated for comments and were approved in 2007. He asked the RB if there were any issues.

- a) LM referred to the clause 4.5 and stated that UNIFIL should be replaced by MAC-South Lebanon. **Action note:** the minutes have been amended.
- b) HB referred to the full face protection or eye protection issue and stated that electronic voting had not taken place. He suggested the RB needed to decide how to deal with this, as it was a safety issue. The issue dominated the agenda and was discussed in length both in the morning and in the afternoon. Finally, it was decided to review IMAS 10.30 in order to try to ease PPE requirements where possible. **Action:** NM, FP and HB should review IMAS 10.30 PPE and propose changes to ease PPE requirements as and where necessary.
- c) SS referred to the clause 3.11 “IMAS and gender”, and asked if any action had been taken. NM stated that he was unable to find a gender specialist to review IMAS to ensure gender compliance. He asked SS if she could propose a name. **Action:** NM and SS will look for a specialist on gender issues to conduct a gender review of IMAS.
- d) HB referring to the clause 3.7 “post clearance sampling”, stated that IMAS 09.20 was still on his list for review. He stated that he would review and propose changes in consultation with NM and FP by the next RB meeting. NM stated that HALO was also meant to provide input. **Action:** HB is to review IMAS 09.20 and propose changes, and HALO to provide details of their sampling procedures.
- e) NM referred to the clause 3.12 “IMAS and medical requirement” and stated that no progress was made since the last meeting. He will continue to review IMAS 10.10 and 10.40. **Action:** NM.

5. Composition of Review Board and new members

NM stated that in 2007, the German representative was replaced by a representative from Italy; RONCO, UNOPS and UNDP introduced new representatives; an Afghan national NGO was included; and the former Secretary to the RB was accepted as an independent member. He stated that the following members left for different reasons: Geir Bjorsvik, Murph McCloy, Sam Sotha, Jan-Ole Robertz and Reuben McCathy, and the UNDP position remained vacant. He further stated that some positions had already been replaced while the RB was still looking for nominees in the category of independent, national and national NGO representative. NM said that there were 23 members and that more can be added up to the limit of 30 members. He also stated that if the RB know of any suitable candidates in these categories they should nominate

them. SS suggested that the vacant memberships should be filled according to the needs. She suggested Arben Braha, National Director of Albania MAC as a good candidate. HB suggested a national representative, Gral Mosania, from Tanzania. BH suggested Col. Gills Canin from the humanitarian demining school (CPADD) in Benin. NM stated that nominees names should be circulated, and criteria for new members such as categories, gender, experience etc. would be issued. **Action:** NM and FP.

6. Secretaries report to the Review Board

FP invited the meeting to look at the IMAS News dated 11 Feb 2008, and the brief report on the work plan 2007 that were circulated in Feb 2008 and included in the members folder. He briefly discussed the Secretary's report while referring to the IMAS re-designed website which was put on display. He stated that the new website had been running since 1st of June 2007. FP referred to the IMAS directory page and stated that there were 44 IMAS, of which 40 were approved. The remaining four, developed in 2007, are waiting for endorsement by the IACG. These are:

- IMAS 02.10 establishment of mine action programme;
- IMAS 09.11 battle area clearance;
- IMAS 10.70 protection of environment; and
- IMAS 14.10 evaluation of mine action interventions.

He stated that the following two IMAS were in the final stage of drafting and will be circulated for approval in due course:

- IMAS 05.10 information management; and
- IMAS 06.10 management of training.

In addition, FP stated that all IMAS were reviewed and amended in 2007 to ensure compliance with Protocol V of CCW as recommended by GL. As part of the regular review the following were reviewed/amended in 2007:

- IMAS 04.10 glossary of terms and definition
- IMAS 07.30 accreditation of demining organizations and operations
- IMAS 07.40 monitoring of demining organizations
- IMAS 09.10 clearance requirement
- IMAS 09.20 post clearance inspection and sampling (some action still outstanding)
- IMAS 10.20 demining worksite safety.

FP stated that the second edition of the following IMAS were endorsed by MDD user group, and circulated to the RB in 2007:

- IMAS 09.40 guide for the use of MDD;
- IMAS 09.41 operational procedures for MDD;
- IMAS 09.42 operational accreditation of MDD;
- IMAS 09.43 REST; and
- IMAS 09.44 guide to occupational health and general dog care.

He stated that two TNMA were drafted in 2007 and approved by the RB. He said that with these two, the total number of TNMA published was 14. The new TNMA were:

- TN 10.10.01 - 2007 guidelines on the management of human remains; and
- TN 09.30.06 - 2008 clearance of cluster munitions based on experience in Lebanon.

He then moved on to IMAS translation pages, pointing out that a separate page for translated IMAS in Arabic (9 IMAS), Chinese (9 IMAS), French (21 IMAS), Spanish (9 IMAS) and Russian (full set of IMAS as of Dec 2006) was available. He stated that the military school in Nanjing,

China, and the school in Angers, France, and CPADD in Benin agreed to translate and maintain translation of IMAS in Chinese and French respectively in 2008.

He further stated that a page on NMAS with the national standards of several countries had been created, as well as a page on Training Services. Soon a page on CEN Workshop Agreements will be posted. FP stated that the new features of the website included the ability to register for IMAS updates, and registered visitors were receiving email information when new documents were posted.

Lastly, he asked the meeting to review his brief report on the 2007 work plan for further information.

LM stated that ESP has a military centre for humanitarian demining and that he would contact them in order to get their translation support for GICHD. He said that he was convinced that they already had some translations in their archives. **Action:** FP and LM to contact ESP POC for IMAS translation in Spanish.

7. Update on WG 126 and CEN WA

The Chairman stated that Johan Sohlberg, the Chairman of the CEN WG 126 was supposed to speak to the meeting on this topic but could not attend the meeting. He stated that in 2007, both the Chairman and the Secretary of the WG 126 had been replaced. He said that under the new management, SWEDEC would run the Chair and the SIS would provide the Secretariat for this group. He briefly updated the meeting about the CEN Workshop Agreements, stated that the following four CWAs published:

- CEN Workshop 7 – Test and Evaluation – Metal Detectors. This Workshop started in December 2001 and has produced the CEN Workshop Agreement CWA 14747:2003.
- CEN Workshop 12 – Test and Evaluation – Demining Machines. This Workshop started in June 2003 and by mid 2004 has produced CEN Workshop Agreement CWA 15044:2004.
- CEN Workshop 13 – Competency standards, This Workshop started in November 2003 and by mid 2005 produced CWA 15464:2005.
- CEN Workshop 26 – Personal Protective Equipment - Test and Evaluation, This workshop started in September 2006 and by October 2007, produced CWA 15756:2007.

In addition, he stated that the following three Workshops were in progress:

- CEN Workshop 7 reactivated – Test and Evaluation - Metal Detectors - Part 2: Soil Characterisation for Metal Detector and Ground Penetrating Radar Performance.
- CEN Workshop 28 Post Mechanical Clearance Requirements.
- CEN Workshop 29 Evaluation methods for Quality Control (Sampling) after Mechanical Demining.

After note: CWA 28 and 29 are now being approved and will be published soon.

He asked the RB about the process of a CWA being accepted as a normative reference in IMAS. The RB agreed that a CWA should be circulated to the IMAS RB for review and acceptance as normative reference. LM suggested that it would be useful to publish the status of the CWA on the IMAS website.

8. Update on IMAS and Protocol V of CCW

NM introduced GL, UNMAS Liaison Officer in Geneva, who had volunteered to conduct a review of all IMAS and to recommend changes to ensure that IMAS comply with Protocol V of CCW. Thanking him for this great contribution, NM requested GL to speak to the RB about his recommendations. GL briefly discussed the main recommendations in his report. He then referred to recommendation “b” for the creation of a new IMAS about “ammunition management.” He stated that IMAS 10.50 provided guidance on storage, transportation and handling of explosive, but did not cover safety and management of ammunition. GL stated that section 3b of the technical annex of Protocol V was specifically discussing preventive measures for ERW. This is why he strongly suggested further guidance in the form of an IMAS about munitions management, one similar to IMAS 10.50. SS stated that a meeting was planned under the chair of Germany, in New York, which would discuss ammunition management and safety. She stated that the meeting would provide guidance as to where the issue of ammunitions should be placed. NM asked SS that UNMAS and GICHD should get an invitation to this meeting. **Action:** SS will provide information on the meeting in NY.

Referring to recommendation “c” of GL’s report regarding the development of a new IMAS for stockpile destruction of ERW or AXO, the Chairman asked the meeting whether to develop a new IMAS or amend the existing IMAS 7.42, 11.10, 11.20 and 12.30 to address the destruction of ERW. It was agreed that the above-mentioned IMAS should be reviewed to accommodate ERW destruction as well. **Action:** NM and FP in consultation with LM will review these IMAS and recommend changes.

FP referred to the recent ammunition depot explosion in Albania and stated that the current IMAS and TNMA do not provide guidance on the related issues. He asked the RB if SEESA RMDS/6 – “EOD clearance of ammunition storage area explosions” could be adopted as a TNMA. NM stated that the document should be accepted and referred to as a normative reference. LM suggested the IMAS website should present all normative references where possible. **Action:** NM, FP and the JMU are to discuss if normative reference could be made available on the website. LM also suggested that if ERW excluded mines then, it should be stated in the terms and definition of IMAS as well. **Action:** FP is to amend the definitions of ERW.

9. Update on land release and amendment of IMAS 08.10 & 08.20

NM stated that a number of initiatives had been started to address land release in mine action. The GICHD had conducted a study in five countries and the study report was published last year. UNMAS had discussed land release and its implication on IMAS at the UN Programme Manager’s meeting in Nairobi in Nov 2007. SAC had also conducted a study of 5 countries. He further stated that a workshop was planned in Ljubljana on 10 and 11 April to discuss the way forward. He said that all these would result in the revision of the 8 series of IMAS in particular, IMAS 08.10 and IMAS 08.20. HB stated that his team had been working on a number of IMAS to address land release in mine action.

10. Update on NMAS

Sandra Velasco (SV) presented herself and informed the meeting that she started working as the NMAS specialist in February 2008. She briefly explained her responsibilities and the process of supporting NMAS development. SV stated that Uganda, Vietnam and Albania were supported in 2007, and Vietnam and Uganda would require further support in 2008. She further stated that Angola, Chad, DRC, and Lebanon were among the countries which would be supported in 2008 and beyond. She also informed the meeting that an interactive guide on the development of national standards would be drafted in 2008.

11. Work Plan 2008 and New IMAS

11.1. IMAS guide for management of victim assistance

FP stated that he was unable to move forward with the development of a generic IMAS on the “management of Victim Assistance (VA)” as agreed in the last meeting. He stated that the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) of AP MBC and many others engaged in VA were not supporting the development of this IMAS. He stated that the ISU believed that an IMAS would create confusion as VA was not the responsibility of any MAC, but the responsibility of the Ministry of Health or other ministries dealing with issues related to people with disabilities. FP asked the meeting to review their previous decision whether to proceed in developing an IMAS on VA. BH stated that HI considered an IMAS on VA **was** necessary to establish the scope of responsibilities for MA and other sectors as well as clarifying responsibilities. LM stated that at least a document is needed to explain the relationship between MA and VA. SB suggested that there was a need for a document to discuss roles and responsibilities of MAC in regard to VA, it did not matter if it was an IMAS or a guide. The Chairman stated that we should re-engage with ISU on this issues. **Action:** FP is to re-discuss the issue with the ISU. **After note:** FP met with the Director of ISU, the ISU this time agreed to support the development of an IMAS “guidelines for support to VA”, and work on a draft is now in progress.

11.2. IMAS - guide for setting priority in mine action

FP stated that the network of linking mine action and development increasingly suggested that an IMAS on priority setting should be developed as this was a critical process in mine-action. He stated that the GICHD would study priority setting in a number of countries and develop a guide based on the current best practices. He said that a guide for priority setting would assist mine action managers to better allocate resources in order to achieve better results. He asked the RB whether to proceed in drafting an IMAS. SS stated that she would only support this if the IMAS discussed the process and transparency issues and not a broad guide to explain priority setting in mine action. HB stated that it would be best if we could develop a concept paper outlining issues which would be covered in this IMAS. All agreed that further research was needed before the RB agree on an IMAS. FP stated that GICHD would work on a draft and present it to the RB.

11.3. IMAS - guide for Post-clearance survey and assessment

FP stated that the same network strongly suggested an IMAS on the post clearance socio-economic survey and assessment in mine action. He explained that post clearance assessment was an important component of quality management in mine action, and it would be useful if an IMAS provided guidance. He stated that more and more NMAA and donors were interested in conducting such an assessment to ensure that they achieved the results they expected. He said that, in the absence of such an assessment, mine action managers would not be able to provide a full account on the results achieved with the resources entrusted to them by donors, national authorities, etc. FP asked the RB whether to proceed in developing an IMAS along this line. The meeting agreed that more information was needed in order to understand the requirement for an IMAS. Some suggested that the issue was connected to priority setting and should be addressed in priority setting IMAS. FP stated that GICHD would work on a draft and present it to the RB.

11.4. RB Work Plan 2008

FP stated that the draft RB Work Plan for 2008, circulated to the RB, would be revised and updated based on the results agreed in the meeting. He said a final version will be posted on the website for information.

12. Review Board Methodology

12.1. Output of documents:

Referring to the RB responses in 2007, NM stated that the level of response was 45% - too low. He stated that we should strive for a better response, for constructive comments or a simple response if the issue was not applicable. He asked the RB if there was any other methodology that could be used to improve the situation. Some suggested that reminders should be sent in advance of the deadline for comments, and members who did not respond should be reminded and given more time to respond. Then if no response received after reminders, the RB should assume the silence as an agreement.

12.2. Web issues

NM asked the RB if there was anything required to improve the website and information provided on it. LM suggested that all normative references in the IMAS should be placed on the website. BD suggested a page could be opened on the website, where documents circulated for comment could be posted. Members could be provided with a login and password to access, and could place comments and view comments of others as well. PD further stated that the ITEP had a page like this on its website. **Action:** FP will discuss this with JMU to post normative references, and create a page where documents are placed for review and comment of the RB.

13. Discussion points

13.1. Annex B:

NM asked the RB whether to keep Annex B “Terms and Definitions” in each of the IMAS or remove them. He stated that the advantage of removing Annex B was that an IMAS would be reduced by a page or two, and the effort required to update the definitions would no longer be required. However, he said the disadvantage of doing this was that other Annexes in the IMAS would be re-named and this would create confusion in other documents when a reference had previously been made to any of the Annexes. He suggested that the best way to deal with this was to keep Annex B in place, but remove all terms and definitions, and instead, put a note referring readers to IMAS 04.10. The RB concurred NM's suggestion. **Action:** FP.

13.2. Shall vs. Should:

NM stated that the issue had been resolved and there was no need for the RB to discuss this further. He said that both shall and should - should remain in the IMAS. AC emphasized that there must be some shall(s), but we should be careful using them!

13.3. IMAS training certificates:

FP asked the RB whether the GICHD was allowed to issue IMAS training completion certificate. NM stated that when IMAS training was part a training curriculum, e.g. the JMU Senior Management training, the JMU certificate would cover training on IMAS, and, when a special training was conducted by the GICHD staff, the GICHD could issue a certificate stating that s/he completed a GICHD IMAS training. It was also mentioned that the UN Security Council expect that countries contributing military personnel to UN peacekeeping missions should conduct humanitarian demining in accordance with IMAS. NM stated that UNMAS had also been receiving requests from demining organizations for IMAS Certification, but UNMAS did not provide any certification as this was very much depending on the national authority or organization acting on its behalf in the country in which an organization intended to operate. He stated these organizations should meet the national standards and the accreditation requirement in that country.

13.4. IMAS network:

FP asked the RB whether a network of IMAS/NMAS practitioners would be a good idea to debate IMAS. He stated that in the past IMAS had been criticized for not being field- tested. He said that it would be useful to create, alongside the RB, a network of practitioners already engaged in the development of NMAS to review draft IMAS, debate them in the field and provide suggestions where those could then be discussed, approved/disapproved by the RB. He also raised the issue that the IMAS Steering Committee, which was responsible for policy and strategic directions to the IMAS RB, was not-functioning. He stated that efforts were needed to improve both fronts, the Steering Committee to function and to provide policy and strategic directions, and the field to provide feedback. The creation of a network may be a solution to the later. NM stated that the Steering Committee was not delivering policy directions, and that he would raise the issue with them. No decision was made as other business diverted the meeting.

14. Any other business

14.1. IMAS 06.10

SS stated that UNDP had some reservation on IMAS 06.10 management of training. She stated that the proposed draft was too rigid, too prescriptive, didn't take into account broader training and was very much clearance concentrated. She stated UNDP would provide comments but the IMAS should be held for the time being. SB confirming SS points and stated that the draft was too clearance orientated and didn't include other training. **Action** FP to hold this IMAS and SS to provide comments.

14.2. Review of MRE IMAS

SB stated that there was an MRE Technical Committee (TC) under formation in 2008. He stated that UNICEF would prefer that MRE IMAS were reviewed by this committee, when established, and asked the RB to move the review and amendment of MRE IMAS from the work plan 2008 to the work plan 2009. **Action:** MRE IMAS will be reviewed in 2009 by the MRE TC, and SB is to advise when the TC starts to work.

14.3. Process of developing new IMAS

Most of the afternoon was spent discussing this topic. HB stated that the process of initiating an IMAS was not clear. He asked the RB whether anyone was allowed to develop an IMAS or there should be a clear process in place to guide the development of new IMAS. NM stated that the principle was that anyone could suggest changes or even draft an IMAS, and we should not stop people from doing this. MC suggested that there should be a hierarchical process clearly stated in a document. HB stated that he understood that the process to initiate an IMAS was to consult the RB, and once authorization was provided, someone should be asked to draft it. The result should be circulated to the RB through the Secretary. NM stated that there was not, and should not be, any formal process of initiating an IMAS. He said that the intended subject should be discussed with the IMAS RB management but, even if the Chair and Secretary did not agree with a topic proposed, this should not really stop an individual from producing a draft IMAS and presenting it to the RB as a whole. After a lengthy discussion on the subject, the RB did not reach a conclusion. However, it was agreed to publish a note on this subject on the IMAS Website. **Action:** FP and NM to draft a note for the website on the process of initiating new IMAS.

15. Next meeting

The next RB meeting will be held in March 2009 at the GICHD.

The Chairman thanked all members for their valuable contribution and for a stimulating meeting. There being no further business, he declared the meeting closed.

Summary of actions and decisions:

a. Minutes of the last meeting:

- FP is to amend clause 4.5 changing UNIFIL to MAC South Lebanon (Para. 4a).
- NM, FP and HB are to revise IMAS 10.30 to ease the requirement for PPE (Para. 4b).
- NM and SS are to find a suitable gender specialist to review IMAS from a gender perspective (Para. 4c).
- HB is to review and propose changes to IMAS 09.20, and HALO is to provide details of their sampling procedures (Para. 4d).
- NM is to locate a suitable medic to review IMAS 10.10 and 10.40 (Para. 4e).

b. Composition of RB and new members:

- NM and FP are to draft and circulate criteria for members of the RB, and the RB members are to suggest suitable candidates for membership (Para. 5).

c. Secretaries report to the RB:

- FP and LM to contact ESP POC for IMAS translation in Spanish.

d. CEN WG 126 and CEN WA:

- NM and FP are to circulate new CWA to the RB for acceptance as normative references (Para. 7).

e. IMAS and Protocol V of CCW:

- SS is to provide information about the upcoming meeting on munitions management in New York, and that UNMAS and GICHD should receive an invitation to this meeting (Para. 8).
- NM and FP are to consider developing an IMAS or an alternative document to address ammunition management (Para. 8).
- NM, FP and LM are to review IMAS in 11 series to ensure compliance with protocol V of CCW(Para. 8).
- FP and JMU to post IMAS normative references on the website (Para. 8).
- FP is to amend the definition of ERW in IMAS 04.10 to add “excluding mines” (Para. 8).

f. Work plan 2008 and new IMAS

- FP is to re-engage with ISU and draft an IMAS – guidelines for support to VA (Para. 11.1)
- FP is to provide an outline of a draft IMAS on priority setting (Para. 11.2).
- FP is to provide an outline of a draft IMAS for the post clearance survey and assessment (Para. 11.3).
- FP is to revise the RB work plan 2008 in the light of RB meeting and post the revised one on the website (Para. 11.4).

g. Review Board methodology:

- FP is to send reminder for comments once a document is circulated (Para. 12.1).
- FP and the JMU are to create a page on the website for documents circulated for comments (Para. 12.2).

h. Discussion points:

- FP is to keep Annex B in all IMAS, but remove definitions and place a note referring readers to IMAS 04.10 (Para. 13.1).
- IMAS should keep “shall” and “should” as appropriate (Para. 13.2).

- GICHD can issue IMAS training certificate (Para. 13.3).
- Creating a network of IMAS field practitioners for the sake of IMAS being debated in the field will raise awareness and improve IMAS relevance (Para. 13.4).
- NM is to raise the issue of IMAS steering committee not functioning.

i. Any other business:

- SS is to provide UNDP comments on IMAS 06.10 management of training.
- MRE IMAS will be reviewed in 2009; SB is to provide information when the MRE TC is established.
- NM and FP are to draft a note for the website on the process of initiating new IMAS.

Faiz Paktian
Secretary IMAS RB
22 April 2008