



To: IMAS Review Board

Date: 30 April 2009

MINUTES OF IMAS REVIEW BOARD MEETING 27 MARCH 2009

1. Introduction

The IMAS Review Board met at the GICHD on Friday, 27 March 2009, from 1000 until 1700 hrs.

2. Attendance

The following members attended the meeting:

Noel Mulliner (NM) – UNMAS, Chairman
Alistair Craib (AC) – UK
Erik Lauritzen (EL) – Denmark
Bill Walenius (BW) - RONCO
Mohammad Breikat (MB) – Jordan
Davour Laura (DL) – Croatia
Sediq Rashid (SR) – Afghanistan
Heng Ratana (HR) – CMAC
Radosav Zivkovic (RZ) – STOPMINES
Fredrik Pålsson (Fredrik) representing Don Macdonald – DDG
Christian Richmond (CR) and Richard Boulter (RB) representing Guy Willoughby - HALO
Mark Buswell (MB) – MAG
Reuben McCarthy (RM) representing Sara Sekkenes - UNDP
Paul Heslop (PH) - UNOPS
Sharif Baaser (SB) – UNICEF
Johan Sohlberg – SWEDEC
Havard Bach (HB) – GICHD
Andy Smith (AS) – Independent
Phil Bean - (PB) – Independent
Faiz Paktian (FP) - GICHD, Secretary

Marie Nilsson (MN) – SCBL, Speaker – Gender Review of IMAS
Michael Creighton - GICHD, Land Release Officer
Wilyam Lúcar – CONTRAMINS, Peru, Observer
Christopher Clark – UNMAS Geneva, Observer

Apologies:

Manfredo Capozza - Italy
Bill Howell HI (F)
Luc Moerman - Military
David Hewitson
Ben Lark – ICRC
Mark Adams - USA

3. Introduction and welcome

The Chairman welcomed those attending and thanked them for coming. He introduced new members; Mohamed Breiket from Jordan; Sediq Rashid from Afghanistan; and Radosav Zivkovic from Bosnia. NM looked forward to their continued involvement and contribution to IMAS.

In his opening remarks, NM reminded all members of the need to respond to the requests for comments. He suggested that members who do not have the time to read all the documents that are sent out for comment, or provide comments on time, could introduce another relevant staff member of their organization who could assist. NM said that original members will still be kept on the distribution list for information but the additional name could be used as an information addressee.

NM stated that he was impressed that the UK had submitted NMAS for the Falkland Islands for comment to UNMAS and GICHD. This was a real recognition that IMAS are still being used and that they are effective.

4. Minutes of the last meeting

No issues in relation to the minutes of the last meeting were raised. A number of outstanding issues that are requiring an action to be taken by a member will be carried over to 2009. See summary of action attached for details.

5. Composition of Review Board and new members

NM stated that a few more vacancies were available on the RB for potential candidates. He said that the gender review of IMAS recommended the inclusion of a female member, and that there was a vacancy in the Commercial Category. NM further said that there was a request from NPA for Mr. Steiner Essen, and a suggestion to invite Armour Group UK to the RB. The RB agreed to the nominations of both organizations. **Action:** NM to send letter of invitation to NPA and Armour Group UK. **After note:** Letters have been sent and both organisations have confirmed membership.

6. CEN Workshop Agreements (CWA)

NM briefly informed the meeting about the status of the seven CWA. He stated that the UNMAS, on behalf of the mine action community, will request the CEN Management Committee to handover exploitation rights of the CWA to UNMAS and GICHD in order to manage and review these CWA in the future as part of the IMAS review process. Under CEN, these CWA will expire if they are not being reviewed and validated after three years. He stated that 3 of 7 CWA are already expired and the CMC has no funding available to amend them. To this end, UNMAS will send a proposal to the CMC for handover of these CWA. **Action:** NM to send a proposal to CMC. **After action:** A proposal was sent, and CMC have agreed to hand all CWA over to UNMAS/GICHD.

7. Secretaries Report to the Review Board

FP briefed the meeting about key IMAS activities since the last meeting. For details of his presentation see IMAS News dated 26 January 2009.

8. Update on Land Release

Michael Creighton provided a presentation on land release IMAS to the meeting. He discussed the background and the objective of land release, and the contents of three proposed draft IMAS; an over-arching IMAS on land release, an IMAS on non-technical survey and an IMAS on technical survey. After some discussion, due to concern raised at the meeting as to whether the process should be called risk reduction or area cancellation compared to land release, the general consensus was that the term land release has already been used extensively, is accepted by donors and provides an overall phrase to capture the meaning for the entire process even if not perfect. It would appear that the opportunity to change the title had already been missed. NM stated that the drafts would be sent to the focus group and then to the RB for comments in two weeks time. **Action:** GICHD to send three draft IMAS to the land release focus

group in two weeks before they are circulated to the RB. **After action:** Comments of the focus group have been included and, following a meeting held in Glasgow between GICHD and the HALO Trust, where major differences were addressed, the IMAS were sent to the RB for comment with nearly every member accepting them.

9. Gender Review of IMAS

NM thanked Marie Nilsson (MN) and the SCBL for conducting a gender review of the IMAS and requested her to present her findings.

MN presented her findings to the meeting by stating that the SCBL had developed a checklist for those drafting future IMAS on how to ensure gender issues are considered within each set of standards, had reviewed all current standards (45) and had recommended minimum changes, from a gender perspective, based on selected criteria using track-changes. They had also undertaken an analysis of the IMAS Review Board with concrete recommendations on how it could be more gender balanced. Finally, they had drafted a report summarising the main findings.

A question was raised as to why the SCBL referred to some terms as being gender blind while in fact they are gender inclusive. It was explained that gender blind terms reflect a passive approach while gender inclusive terms may be more appropriate for use in mine action.

After some strong issues had been expressed, it was eventually agreed that the RB should progressively consider the comments of the SCBL, where relevant, during the regular revision of the IMAS. For instance, seven MRE standards will be reviewed in 2009, and recommendations made in relation to these IMAS will be considered in this process. NM stated that an official response to this end, will be sent to the SCBL, and the final report of the gender review will be posted on the IMAS website. **Action:** NM and FP are to consider all gender recommendations in the new/amended IMAS in the future. NM and FP will also prepare a RB response to the SCBL, and post the final report on the IMAS website.

10. New IMAS

10.1. Guidelines for support to victims:

FP stated that the work was in progress and a draft will be circulated as soon as available.

10.2. Guidelines for setting priorities in mine action:

FP stated that the GICHD was developing a guide on priority setting, and when a guide is produced, the need for an IMAS will be re-assessed.

10.3. Guidelines for post-clearance socio-economic assessments:

FP stated that the GICHD was developing a guide on post clearance socio-economic assessments, and when the guide is produced, the need for an IMAS will be re-assessed.

10.4. Ammunition management:

The need for an IMAS was discussed, and there was a suggestion that IMAS 10.50 storage and transportation of explosive was good enough for both handling of explosive and ammunition. Also, ammunition management was seen as a cross-cutting issue between mine action, small arms and disarmament standards. At the end, no decision was reached. However, NM stated that there was a need for further clarifications from CCW Protocol V on the issue and the involvement of other organisations and international initiatives in this area. **Action:** NM and FP to follow up.

10.5. Field Risk Assessment (FRA):

The need for an IMAS, or a TNMA on the process of assessing risk in a field environment was discussed in the meeting. AS had drafted a FRA IMAS and distributed that to HB, FP, EL and NM for consideration in July 2008. However, no general agreement was reached at the time, and the issue postponed for the RB meeting. In the interim, Annex C to IMAS 10.20, which discusses the FRA, was updated and published. The question to the RB was whether the industry needed an IMAS, or TNMA on the FRA. There was a general agreement that the FRA was useful, but since the RB had not seen the draft, it was suggested that AS's draft should be circulated to the RB for consideration. EL recommended that a TNMA should be developed to introduce principles of FRA, methodology for FRA, introduce a risk based approach, and standards and specification for control. He further stated that it will be a useful tool for land release as well. It was agreed that EL would then consider producing a technical note outlining his version of the FRA for review of the RB. **Action:** FP is first to circulate AS draft FRA as a technical note to the RB, and EL is to produce an outline of an TNMA on risk assessment at the more strategic level.

11. Review of MRE IMAS

SB stated that the revision of the MRE IMAS was on his plan for 2009, and that he had already discussed this with the GICHD MRE section. He further stated that amended MRE IMAS will be sent to the MRE Advisory Group for review, and when approved, will be sent out to the IMAS RB. FP suggested that the seven MRE IMAS could be reduced to one which could still effectively specify the entire MRE requirements.

12. IMAS 10.30 - Personal Protective Equipment

NM briefly discussed the issues related to the revision of the IMAS 10.30 on PPE. The subject matter was discussed and a final agreement was reached that, notwithstanding the primary determining factor, which is that the amount of PPE provided should be determined based on a field risk assessment and management decision, the IMAS would recommend that the use of full face protection is the preferred option but would allow the minimum standard to be eye protection only. If eye protection is selected it should be held over the eyes in a frame that prevents blast ingress from beneath and capable of retaining integrity against the blast effects the most common mine and shall be made of 5 mm of untreated polycarbonate. Commonly available industrial safety spectacles do not meet this requirement. **Action:** FP and NM are to circulate a revised version of IMAS 10.30 to the RB. **After action:** revised, circulated, approved and published. See actual text in the new IMAS 10.30.

13. Safety Distances

NM stated that the issues related to safety distances in the IMAS 10.20 have been agreed upon prior the RB meeting, and an amended IMAS had been published.

14. Removal of rubbles in BAC/EOD tasks

This was a discussion point proposal by EL. However, he had to leave the meeting earlier and the issue remains un-discussed.

15. Future work

FP, referring to the independent evaluation of the GICHD contribution to the IMAS in 2008, stated that the recommendations made in the evaluation will be considered in the IMAS/NMAS strategy in the future. He then highlighted the key conclusions of Dr. Russell Gasser:

- > GICHD is regarded as an impartial and authoritative centre
- > GICHD has made significant contribution to IMAS
- > Significant weakness in some parts of the project cycle (programmes strategies)
- > Focus on projects with greatest impact.
- > The need to define strategic guidance including possible reactivation of the IMAS Steering Group.

FP through a question to the RB, asked what could be done in order to improve the IMAS process, products and services. He explained that the plan for the next two to three years could include new IMAS and TNMA developed, approved and published (It was noted that the principle has always been to keep the number of IMAS to the minimum necessary but, if new IMAS were justified, they should be produced). The IMAS website will be maintained and kept up-to-date and a CD ROM and IMAS book will be published. IMAS training will be provided as requested. He asked whether this was enough or should more be done to improve IMAS. Some members considered that there should be no further work on the production of new IMAS but that existing IMAS should be improved and shortened etc. NM raised the question whether even this was required considering the work involved and the acceptance, already, of the IMAS as they are by so many national programmes. The question of an evaluation of IMAS, recording the strengths and weaknesses of the process as well as the application, was then raised - either internal or external. Additionally, FP enquired whether more TNMA should be developed, or a review of IMAS from the cluster munition perspective should be conducted.

There was little agreement on the way ahead but some did feel that an IMAS evaluation might be useful. TOR for possible evaluations should be developed and submitted to the RB for full comment. **Action:** NM and FP. It was suggested that a TNMA on non-technical survey and a TNMA on technical survey could be developed to make the subject matters and the IMAS very clear, through practical examples, for the national authorities. **Action:** NM and FP to further study this possibility once the IMAS on land release were accepted. Also, there were suggestions that lessons learnt should be distributed to the field through technology newsletters or other mine action related publications. **Action:** NM and FP. NM requested GICHD to make an outline for reviewing IMAS from a cluster munition treaty standpoint. **Action:** NM and FP.

16. AOB

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

The next RB meeting will probably be held in March 2010 at the GICHD.

Summary of action and decisions

- NM to send letter of invitation to NPA and Armour Group UK. **After note:** Letters have been sent and both organisations have confirmed membership. (Para 5).
- NM to send a proposal to CMC. **After action:** A proposal was sent, and CMC have agreed to hand all CWA over to UNMAS/GICHD (Para 6).
- GICHD to send three draft IMAS to the land release focus group in two weeks before they are circulated to the RB. **After action:** Comments of the focus group have been included and, following a meeting held in Glasgow between GICHD and the HALO Trust, where major differences were addressed, the IMAS were sent to the RB for comment with nearly every member accepting them (Para 8).
- NM and FP are to consider all gender recommendations in the new/amended IMAS in the future. NM and FP will also prepare a RB response to the SCBL, and post the final report on the IMAS website (Para 9).
- NM and FP to seek clarification from CCW – Protocol V, for the development of an IMAS on ammunition management if required (Para 10.4)
- FP is first to circulate AS draft FRA as a technical note to the RB, and EL is to produce an outline of an TNMA on risk assessment at the more strategic level (Para 10.5).
- **Action:** FP and NM are to circulate a revised version of IMAS 10.30 to the RB. **After action:** IMAS 10.30 revised, circulated, approved and published. See actual text in the new IMAS 10.30 (Para 12).
- NM and FP to develop and submit a TOR for possible evaluations to the RB for full comment (Para 15).
- NM and FP to consider developing a TNMA on non-technical survey and a TNMA on technical survey once the IMAS on land release were accepted (Para 15).
- FP and NM to make an outline for reviewing IMAS from a cluster munition treaty standpoint (Para 15).

Summary of action carried over from the minutes of 2008 meeting

- HB to review and propose changes to IMAS 09.20, and HALO is to provide details of their sampling procedures (Para. 4d).
- NM to locate a suitable medic to review IMAS 10.10 and 10.40 (Para. 4e).
- NM and FP to draft and circulate criteria for members of the RB, and the RB members are to suggest suitable candidates for membership (Para. 5).
- NM, FP and LM to review IMAS in 11 series to ensure compliance with protocol V of CCW (Para. 8).
- FP and the JMU to create a page on the website for documents circulated for comments (Para. 12.2).
- NM to raise the issue of IMAS steering committee not functioning.

Faiz Paktian
Secretary IMAS RB
30 April 2009