



INTERNATIONAL MINE ACTION STANDARDS (IMAS)

MINIUTS OF IMAS REVIEW BOARD MEETING

GICHD | FRIDAY, 19 MARCH 2010

1. Introduction

The IMAS Review Board (RB) met at the margins of the 13th Meeting of National Programme Directors and UN Advisors at the GICHD on Friday, 19 March 2010, from 11:00 to 15:00.

2. Attendance

Members attended:

Baaser Sharif – UNICEF
Bach Havard – GICHD
Beriard Jean-Francois - CNDH
Breikat Mohammad – Jordan
Capozza Manfredo - Italy
Clark Christopher– UNMAS (The Chair)
Craib Alistair - UK
De Decker Guy – Military
Essen Steinar – NPA
Gannon Robert – RONCO
Heslop Paul – UNOPS
Lauritzen Erik – Denmark
Laura Davur – Croatia
Macdonald Alan– Afghanistan (Representing Mr Sediq Rashid)
McCarthy Reuben– UNDP (Representing Ms Sara Sekkenes)
McDonnell Dave – G4S Ordnance Management
Paktian Faiz – GICHD (The Secretary)
Pålsson Fredrik – DDG
Richmond Christian - HALO Trust (Representing Mr Guy Willoughby)
Smith Andy – Independent
Zivkovic Radoslav – STOPMINES
Wheatly Andrew– ICRC (Representing Ben Lark)

Prum Sophakmonkol – CMAC (Observer)

Members excused:

Bean Phil - Independent
Guest Nick - MAG
Howell Bill - HI(F)
Sohlberg Johan (SWDEC)

3. Introduction and welcome

Chris Clark (CC) welcomed all members and thanked them for coming. Whilst noting that this was his first time as the Chair, he had attended several RB meetings in the past and thus was not new to the process. The Chair presented the agenda for the meeting which was agreed by all members.

4. Minutes of the last meeting

No issues in relation to the minutes of the last meeting were raised. The minutes were adopted.

5. Composition of Review Board

The Chair stated that the current membership of the RB does not match that outlined in Clause 12.1 of the IMAS 01.10 - guide for the application of IMAS. He suggested to members that either IMAS 01.10 should be amended to reflect the current membership or current membership be revised to comply with the IMAS. Most members agreed that IMAS 01.10 should be revised. The Chair stated that an assessment of the individuals and organisations represented on the current structure of the RB will be made and members will be informed in due time. **Action by CC.**

5. Secretaries report to the Review Board

Faiz Paktian (FP), the Secretary, presented brief information on gender and cluster munitions reviews of the IMAS conducted in 2009 and the subsequent amendments made to IMAS, as well as provided an update on the CEN Workshop Agreements. For full details, see IMAS News dated 6 March 2010, circulated to the RB.

He pointed out a recommendation of the gender review team that the RB should consider inclusion of women or a gender specialist in the RB structure. Nonetheless, the RB was of the opinion that it was not required due to the fact that some members of the board are well-aware of the gender issues (eg UNDP) and that the checklist prepared by the review team will assist when drafting new IMAS to ensure gender issues. The Chair further stated that this issue would be considered as part of the wider review of current RB membership.

6. Formalisation of the process for potential new IMAS

The Chair stated that there was no formal process for initiating a new IMAS. He proposed to develop a mechanism which will help to coordinate and validate this process through a form or a template. He suggested that the template will include questions, such as: description of the subject matter; explain the shortcoming or gap in the current IMAS and how the proposed IMAS will fill this gap; articulate the negative impact caused by the gap; identify what other documents address the subject matter (eg GICHD guides, technical notes, other documents). To process a new IMAS, the template should be completed and sent to the Chair and Secretary and will then be presented to the members of RB. When the need for an IMAS is supported by 50% of the RB members, it will formally be submitted to the IMAS Steering Group for approval to proceed. He further said that any body could initiate a request for a new IMAS by submitting the template which will be available on the IMAS website. The same procedures will apply to IMAS that are currently in various stages of drafting to ensure their requirement and validity.

The suggestion of the Chair was supported by the RB. It was agreed that the Chair will draft the template for proposed new IMAS and will send it out for review/comments and acceptance of the board members. **Action by CC. After Action:** a draft was circulated on 25 March and members were asked to send feedback by 16 April.

7. Presentation of MRE IMAS

Sharif Baaser stated that the revised version of MRE IMAS was submitted to the RB Chair and Secretary on 15 March. He mentioned that the new draft MRE IMAS contains all seven MRE in one, and has been approved by the MRE Advisory Group made up of several MRE Specialists.

Faiz Paktian (FP) stated that the new draft will be re-formatted into IMAS/ISO format and will be reviewed and amended by the Chair and Secretary, and will be sent out to the RB for approval.
Action by FP and CC

8. IMAS Evaluation

The Chairman stated that the evaluation of IMAS was on the agenda of the IMAS Steering Group meeting that morning. UNMAS and GICHD Directors agreed to conduct an independent evaluation of IMAS. To this end, a draft ToR will be produced and will be circulated to the RB members for input and comment. **Action by CC.**

9. Purpose and application of TNMA

The Chair stated that the TNMA were initially produced to provide safety information and were subject to the approval of the UN agencies and GICHD. However, TNMA have since been moved away from their original intention and currently include issues like clearance of cluster munitions and field risk assessment. Further, he questioned if technical detail for an activity is placed in a TNMA, what will be the legal consequences if an organisation applies the requirements and an accident happens as a result. Some members pointed out that TNMA should not be considered as IMAS, they are examples, for information, of how an activity could be conducted. National authorities should decide what is best for their programme or apply a different method. As far as new TNMA are concerned, the general opinion of the board was that the same procedures discussed in section 6 for initiating new IMAS should also apply for new TNMA.

10. AOB / Civilian vs. Humanitarian Demining

Mr Barzani, Director of IKMAA, Irbil - Iraq was invited to speak to the RB about his paper that he had submitted to the RB earlier. He stated that some terminologies used in the IMAS question impartiality of the standards. He said that the definition of “donor” includes all sources of funding including funding from the national government. FP said that the latest amendment of IMAS 04.10 defines “donor” as all sources of funding, and no longer includes State’s funding. Mr Barzani further said that the term “humanitarian” ahead of demining biases IMAS towards humanitarian demining while demining in many countries takes place in support of development. He suggested that the term “humanitarian” should be removed from all IMAS. The Chair said the RB will consider his recommendation and thanked him for his presentation.

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting closed. He thanked all members for their valuable contribution.

The next RB meeting will be held in March 2011 following UNMAS National Directors meeting.

16 April 2010
Faiz Paktian