

Minutes of the Meeting of the International Mine Action Standards Steering Group  
Wednesday, 12 February 2020  
UNOG, Geneva

Participants

Chair	Ms. Agnès Marcaillou, Director, UNMAS, assisted by Ms Cecile Grima, UNMAS New York (NY)
Secretary	Mr. Alan Macdonald, UNMAS
UNICEF	Ms. Meritxell Relaño Arana, Director, Office of Emergency Programmes-Geneva, assisted by Mr. Hugues Laurence, UNICEF, NY
UNOPS	Mr Amir Omeragic, representing Mr. James Provenzano, General Counsel & Director, UNOPS NY
UNDP	Mr Olaf Juergensen, Development and Mine Action Specialist Istanbul Regional Hub
GICHD	Ambassador Stefano Toscano, assisted by Mr. Rory Logan

Opening of the meeting

The Chair opened the meeting at 0900

The SG adopted the minutes of the previous Steering Group (SG) minutes 22 May 2019.

Discussion EY independent evaluation of IMAS Governance<sup>1</sup>

The Chair opened the discussion remarking that the EY report was well done; thorough and clear; proposing that the SG needed to look at the recommendations. The Chair proposed that the SG used the SG evaluation matrix<sup>2</sup> to guide the discussion. Ambassador Toscano remarked that the evaluation showed that in general the IMAS process functioned well, and were unique in guiding the work of the mine action sector.

For ease of understanding these minutes are presented against the tables of recommendations, findings and possible actions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Evaluation of the Governance of International Mine Action Standards (IMAS), Final Report vFRev, December 2019

<sup>2</sup> IMAS Steering Group (SG) matrix for the evaluation of the governance of international mine action standards (IMAS) EY report vF 23 Jan 2020

<b>Recommendation 1</b> (Pages 31 – 32)	<b>Operatorial Procedures: The Terms of Reference could be better elaborated for each governance body to integrate operational procedures</b>	Accepted as a valid recommendation by the SG
Associated finding (page 31)	<i><b>A number of specific procedural guidelines are not detailed in IMAS 01.10</b></i>	Accepted as valid finding by the SG
Possible actions (Page 32)	<i>i. Integrate Rules of Procedure for the Review Board and Steering Group in IMAS 01.10</i>	Accepted by the SG as “low hanging fruit” that could be actioned
Possible actions (Page 32)	<i>ii. Formalise the Terms of Reference for the role of technical sub-groups in IMAS 01.10</i>	Accepted by the SG
Possible actions (Page 32)	<i>iii. The ToR for the Chair of the RB should be updated to reflect neutrality, while the UNMAS observer on the RB should be given membership rights to represent the institutional expertise.</i>	Accepted by the SG. The Chair stated that UNMAS agreed that the UNMAS Chair should be neutral and the vote moved to the representative of UNMAS when converted from observer status to member on RB re-organisation)

<p><b>Recommendation 2</b> (Pages 33 – 35)</p>	<p><b>Transparency:</b> <b>Strengthen and adapt the mechanisms for transparency and accountability to allow for clearer and more robust decision-making processes</b></p>	<p>Accepted as a valid recommendation by the SG</p>
<p>Associated Finding (page 33)</p>	<p><b><i>Finding: Some decision-making processes are not well-established and understood</i></b></p>	<p>Accepted as valid finding by the SG</p>
<p>Possible actions (Page 33)</p>	<p><i>i. Put in place mechanisms to eliminate conflict of interest at the level of the technical sub-groups.</i></p>	<p>Accepted in principle. SG to highlight this issue to the RB and ask the RB to propose specific mechanisms to eliminate real or perceived conflict of interest.</p>
<p>Possible Actions (Page 34)</p>	<p><i>ii. The Secretariat role should be applied across the governance structure to further assure its neutrality</i></p>	<p>The Chair stated that UNMAS could give up its secretary role in the SG. GICHD stated that it ring fenced its work between being the secretariat to the RB and membership on the RB and would do the same if the SG decided to adopt the recommendation of the E&amp;Y for GICHD to be secretary to both the RB and SG. GICHD clarified it was not asking for this role. There followed a discussion about the meaning / understanding of the GICHD “ex-officio” status on the SG. GICHD recalled that it was a founding member of the SG and a full voting member in the SG, in accordance with the generally accepted definition of the term “<i>ex officio</i>”. GICHD mentioned that it would not consider serving as secretariat to both the RB and SG if that implied relinquishing SG voting membership of the SG. UNOPS remarked that there was some sense in having a common secretariat. The Chair added that a UN entity might be approached to take on the secretariat role, if so decided by the SG.</p> <p>The SG Secretary also explained that the role of the secretariat of the RB and SG were substantively different; in that the secretary to the RB played a significant role in encouraging and organising the work of various working groups (if such are formed by the RB in the preparation of an IMAS). He added that a non-mine action entity would likely face significant challenges fulfilling the role of the RB secretariat.</p> <p><b>No decision was taken at this meeting.</b></p>

<p><b>Recommendation 3</b> (Pages 35 – 39)</p>	<p><b>Steering Group:</b> <b>The Steering Group needs to be reimagined in terms of its purpose, goals, and composition</b></p>	<p>Accepted as a valid recommendation by the SG</p>
<p>Associated Finding (page 35)</p>	<p><b><i>Finding: The operations of the Steering Group are not well integrated into the IMAS governance structure</i></b></p>	<p>Accepted as valid finding by the SG, whilst noting that overall the governance structure did not need to be altered but rather improved</p>
<p>Possible actions (Page 35)</p>	<p><i>i. Give a rotating seat on the Steering Group to national authorities</i></p>	<p>The SG recognized that there was some merit in the recommendation; that increasing the use of virtual meetings technology, as well as timely distribution of notes on the exchanges for their comments, would facilitate their participation; The SG discussed evaluation report recommendation to open the SG to a mine action donor. GICHD suggested that a seat might be offered to the President of the Mine Action Support Group, a suggestion which was supported by UNDP. However, at the request of the Chair, it was decided that <u>further discussion would be needed</u> to define eligibility, diversity, engagement requirements, method of selection and length of service. <b>No decision was made at this meeting.</b></p>
<p>Possible actions (Pages 36 – 37)</p>	<p><i>ii. The operational portfolio of the members of the Steering Group should be re-examined to ensure the most relevant organisations are present.</i></p>	<p>The action was generally accepted but it was noted by the members of the current SG that it is quite unlikely that any member would relinquish its seat; the future discussion might then be about adding members. It was remarked by the Chair that the principle is good of adding national authorities, but the SG needed to ensure that it was useful. It was further noted by GICHD that national authorities and key MA donors had over time increased their engagement with conventions and that including them in the SG might perhaps be a natural step. UNDP suggested the Co-Chairs of the A5 Sub-Committee. The Chair added that if donors' participation were a criteria for participation, then it might be as observer. <b>The SG agreed to discuss this matter further. No decision was made at this meeting</b></p>
<p>Possible action (Pages 37 – 38)</p>	<p><i>iii. The policy oversight role of the Steering Group should be reinforced</i></p>	<p>Agreed in principle</p>

Possible action (Page 38)	iv. <i>Allow the Steering Group to comment on the composition of the Review Board every 5 years</i>	Agreed in principle, with the suggestion from the Chair that 3 years might be a better term duration than the 5 years outlined in the E&Y report due to the fact that participants tend to switch jobs from one mine action operator to another. No conclusion on the timeline was achieved.
------------------------------	---	--

<p><b>Recommendation 4</b> (Pages 39 – 40)</p>	<p><b>Review Board:</b> <b>Operational procedures to ensure and enforce adequate rotation and representation of stakeholders within the Review Board need to be formalised</b></p>	<p>Accepted as a valid recommendation by the SG</p>
<p>Associated finding (page 39)</p>	<p><b><i>Finding: While broadly incorporating the actors in the mine action community, the composition and representation modalities of the Review Board require revision and specification</i></b></p>	<p>Accepted as valid finding by the SG</p>
<p>Possible Actions (Page 39)</p>	<p><i>i. Organisations should be incentivised to nominate a male and female candidate to replace parting members</i></p>	<p>It was agreed that the greater participation of women should be reinforced. This might be better framed as a ‘requirement’ rather than an ‘incentive’.</p>
<p>Possible actions (Page 40)</p>	<p><i>ii. Provide a membership to a lawyer, potentially from one of the relevant conventions</i></p>	<p>There was some suggestion that the ICRC might be best placed to fulfil such a role. Alternatively, the GICHD suggested that the ISUs for the three main treaties (APMBC, CCM, CCW) might be offered rotating member and/or observer positions on the RB. <b>The SG decided that this action point required more discussion</b></p>
<p>Possible actions (Page 40)</p>	<p><i>iii. Use a rotational observer status to ensure participation of Review Board members</i></p>	<p>Accepted that this possible action should be further investigated</p>

Possible actions (Page 40)	iv. <i>Revise and strengthen the rotation of membership</i>	Accepted that this possible action should be further investigated
-------------------------------	---	---

<b>Recommendation 5</b> (Pages 41 – 42)	<b>Communication:</b>  Increase communication efforts to ensure involvement of outside stakeholders and to foster engagement from non-native English speakers	<b>Not discussed in any detail by the SG due to time constraints. To be discussed further.</b>
Associated finding (page 41)	<b>Finding:</b> <i>While communication among RB members works well, communication with other stakeholders could be improved further</i>	Not discussed
Possible actions (Page 41)	i. <i>Publish a newsletter informing summarizing on the work done in the previous year and that being proposed for upcoming year, in advance of ahead of the RB meetings</i>	Not discussed
Possible actions (Page 42)	ii. <i>Continue practice of regional meetings to ensure consistent terminology across national legislation and share learning between NMAAs</i>	<i>Not discussed, but some quick remarks made that this type of intervention was useful</i>

The SG was unable because of time constraints to fully discuss all matters presented in the evaluation. It was thus decided that further discussions would need to be had particularly around the structure and working procedures of the Steering Group. But it was also recognised that the recommendations for change associated with the procedures of the Review Board, and membership could be addressed. The SG and RB secretaries would be able to develop first draft documents if directed to do so. In terms of process, these minutes represent an initial management response on the governance evaluation. As a next step the SG will share this response with the RB along with a request for any feedback they might have on the evaluation or recommendations included.

#### RB Work Plan Update

The SG secretary (in extra time) updated the SG on the RB workplan progress. See the table and notes below at annex A

Annex A to Minutes of the Meeting of the International Mine Action Standards Steering Group, Wednesday, 12 February 2020, UNOG, Geneva

#### IMAS 2019/20 Workplan: Progress

<u>Title</u>	<u>IMAS Series</u>	<u>Mandate provided</u>	<u>Progress</u>
<b>New IMAS Chapters</b>			
IMAS Risk Management	7	Feb 2017	Completed 2019. IACG-MA approved 27 June 2019
IMAS IEDD	9	Feb 2018	Completed 2019. IACG-MA approved 27 June 2019
IMAS Building Clearance	9	Feb 2018	Completed 2019. IACG-MA approved 27 June 2019
IMAS Victim Assistance	13	Feb 2018	Approved by RB pending minor edits
IMAS Human Remains / Forensic Science	TBC	Feb 2019	In progress
<b>IMAS Chapters to be revised</b>			
IMAS Information Management	5	Feb 2016	Completed 2019. IACG-MA approved 27 June 2019
IMAS 10.40 Medical Support	10	Feb 2017	Electronic vote April 2020
IMAS 12.10 Risk Education	12	Feb 2018	Electronic vote April 2020
IMAS 09.41 ADS Accreditation and Testing (temporary)	9	July 2012	Completed 2019
IMAS ADS Series	7, 9	Nov 2018	Two standards approved by RB pending copy edit
IMAS 10.60 Accident Investigation	10	May 2019	In progress
IMAS 08.10 Non-Technical Survey	8	Feb 2019	WG recommend no changes
<b>New TNMA under development</b>			
07.10/01 Residual Risk Management	7	Feb 2016	Approved by RB
07.10/02 All Reasonable Effort	7	Feb 2018	In progress
TNMA KPIs	7	May 2019	In progress
<b>Other</b>			
Annex to 05.10 – Minimum data requirements	5	Feb 2016	Approved by RB

Annex C to IMAS 07.14 – Threat	7	Feb 2018	Completed 2019. IACG-MA approved 27 June 2019
IMAS Website update		NA	Completed, pilot underway
IMAS 01.10 (Governance Review of IMAS)	All	Dec 18	Completed 2019.

### **Ongoing work requiring SG approval**<sup>3</sup>

- The ADS working group has requested permission to continue working on supplementary technical documents:
  - Test and Evaluation Protocol: Establishment of ADS test areas
  - Test and Evaluation Protocol: ADS handler competencies
- The RB would like to incorporate findings from the first-year review of IEDD competencies. This would mean updates to T&EP 09.31 and T&EP 09.30.

### **New Proposals**

*The Chair of the Review Board has suspended all new IMAS/TNMA proposals until the Steering Group has met and deliberated on the external evaluation of IMAS governance.* The following proposals have been submitted and parked:

- Addressing the Environmental Impact of Mine Action Clearance Activities. Reducing the impact of soil and water contamination during HMA disposal activities.
- Encountering Chemical Contamination.
- Establishment of a technical working group to develop material on Explosive Detection Dogs.
- Establishment of a technical working group to update IMAS 09.44 *Guide to occupational health and general dog care.*

### **Other**

- The RB is awaiting feedback from the Chair of the SG, regarding updated terms and definitions submitted for consideration at the SG meeting in May 2019.
- There was a clear message from the donor representatives on the Review Board (MASG and PM/WRA) that IMAS should not seek to place responsibilities on them, responsibility at the country level rests with the NMAA.

### **Any other Business (AOB)**

There was no AOB

### **Closure of the meeting**

The meeting adjourned at 1045

---

<sup>3</sup> The RB propose to continue to work on matters on the current 2019/20 workplan. Newly approved IMAS will be electronically shared by the RB to the SG in one group with explanatory notes end of March 2020. No further works will be initiated by the RB prior to SG endorsement.

*First draft minutes*

*20 Feb 2020 prepared by Alan Macdonald Sec SG.*