

INTERNATIONAL MINE ACTION STANDARDS (IMAS)

MINUTES OF IMAS REVIEW BOARD MEETING GICHD | FRIDAY, 18 MARCH 2011

1. Introduction

The IMAS Review Board (RB) met at the margins of the 14th Meeting of National Programme Directors and UN Advisors at the GICHD on Friday, 18th March 2011, from 13:00 to 17:00.

2. Attendance

Members who attended:

- 1. Barzani Siraj IKMAA/Iraq
- 2. Bean Phil Independent
- 3. Bengtsson Magnus MSB
- 4. Beriard Jean-Francois CNDH
- 5. Bowen Dan RONCO
- 6. Clark Christopher- UNMAS (The Chair)
- 7. De Decker Guy Military
- 8. Dingley John UNDP (representing Sara Sekkenes)
- 9. Giha Abd Almonem Sudan
- 10. Houliat Philippe HI Federation
- 11. James Jesse MAG
- 12. Lark Ben ICRC
- 13. Lauritzen Erik Denmark
- 14. Laura Davor Croatia
- 15. Paktian Faiz GICHD (The Secretary)
- 16. Pålsson Fredrik DDG
- 17. Parra Pablo PPMA / Colombia
- 18. Rashid Sediq Afghanistan
- 19. Smith Andy Independent
- 20. Sophakmonkol Prum, NMAA/Cambodia
- 21. Spignesi Nick USA
- 22. Hemi Morete UNMAS Consultant (Observer)

Members excused:

- 1. Baaser Sharif UNICEF
- 2. McDonnell Dave G4S Ordnance Management

3. Introduction and welcome

The Chair, Mr Chris Clark, welcomed all members. He introduced Mr Hemi Morete who attended the meeting as an observer, and said that Mr Morete was the consultant who had been working on the UNMAS Strategy, and the person conducting the IMAS evaluation later this year. The agenda was presented and agreed. The Chair asked if there were any additional points for inclusion in the agenda. Mr Erik Lauritzen suggested discussing the issues raised by Mr Robert

Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining | Centre International de Déminage Humanitaire | Genève 7 bis, av. de la Paix | P.O. Box 1300 | 1211 Geneva 1 | Switzerland | t. + 41 (0)22 906 16 60 | f. + 41 (0)22 906 16 90 info@gichd.org | www.gichd.org



Keeley on land release IMAS. The Chair responded that it was agreed by the majority of the members that it was too early to review the land release chapters this year and that his points will be considered when the revision of the land release IMAS is due in 2012.

4. Composition of Review Board

The Chair said that as agreed last year, the IMAS 01.10 was reviewed, the review process updated within the IMAS, and the membership of the RB restructured. As a result, some members have stepped down, and some new members were invited. For retired members, "certificates of appreciation" had been arranged, which the Chair presented to the former members present - Mr Mohammad Breikat and Mr Havard Back. Other members had either collected their certificates earlier or had asked for them to be sent by post. The following new members were then introduced: Mr Magnus Bengtsson representing MSB, Mr James Jesse representing MAG, Mr Siraj Barzani representing IKMAA/Iraq, Mr Philippe Houliat representing HI Federation, Mr Pablo Parra representing PPMA/Colombia, Mr Prum Sophakmonkol representing NMAA Cambodia and Mr Nick Spignesi representing USA.

5. Minutes of the last meeting

Mr Erik Lauritzen asked why the terms of reference (TOR) for the IMAS evaluation was not circulated to the IMAS RB. The Chair explained that the evaluation was postponed from 2010 to 2011 due to a funding shortfall. He informed that UNMAS has now confirmed funding for the evaluation and it will be conducted in June 2011. The TOR was distributed to all RB members.

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

6. Secretaries report to the Review Board

The Secretary, Mr Faiz Paktian, stated that he had circulated IMAS News 2011 to the RB earlier and that it represents his report to the board in brief. A copy of it was available in the participants' folder. He then briefly discussed key activities undertaken since the last RB meeting. For more details on his report, please refer to the attached IMAS News 2011.

Mr Andy Smith asked for the amendments of the IMAS 09.50 mechanical demining. The Secretary responded that the amended IMAS will be sent out to the RB in a couple of weeks. Mr Dan Bowen asked about translating IMAS into Arabic. The Chair said that UNMAS is looking into the issue, and if the UN cannot translate it, then the option of seeking a grant from UNMAS should be explored.

Mr Siraj Barzani asked what the outcome of the Arabic-speaking programmes meeting held at the GICHD at the margin of the National Directors meeting was. The Secretary responded that the National Directors from the Arabic Speaking Programmes had unanimously supported the initiative to establish an Arabic Speaking Programme at the GICHD. He further stated that, to move forward, the GICHD is now searching for potential donors and mine action partners within the Arab region.

7. IMAS/TNMA vs. articles and publications

The Chair stated that the background to this discussion is to determine the differences between the IMAS, TNMA, JMU articles, and GICHD publications. The Secretary said that he had circulated a proposal for a new TNMA on well clearance, based on experience in Sri Lanka. Many members responded that it was not fit for the IMAS or TNMA, others responded that it



should be published as an article in the JMU Journal of Mine Action. The Secretary said that people refer to the IMAS/TNMA as the mine action community-approved documents. The JMU article is a personal viewpoint, and people do not search for answers to their questions in the Journal of Mine Action. He then said that if we, as the RB, reject a proposal of such a nature, lessons learnt and experiences gained will be wasted. He asked the RB to be more flexible regarding the TNMA.

Mr John Dingley (UNDP) mentioned that JMA publications are good but not accessible to all – many refer first to IMAS/TNMA. Some members requested the proposal for a TNMA on well clearance to be re-circulated. The Secretary said that TNMA 01.10, a guide to TNMA, needs to be updated and one of the amendments can be the establishment of criteria regarding what type of subject matters can be included in a TNMA and also in the IMAS. After a long debate on the issue, the Chair asked Mr John Dingley to look at TNMA 01.10, and to suggest amendments, in order to resolve the issue and reflect the discussion. Action by John Dingley.

8. Update on International Ammunition Technical Guidelines

The Chair stated that two years ago, the General Assembly mandated the production of International Ammunition Technical Guidelines (IATG), and the work was delegated to UNODA. The guidelines are drafted, but the date for completion is not yet known. The IATG will cover, among other issues, the demilitarisation/destruction of the stockpiles of ammunitions and ammunition storage. These guidelines will be high level documents which countries can refer to in order to implement stockpile destruction.

9. IMAS Evaluation

The Chair informed that the independent evaluation of IMAS was postponed last year due to absence of funds. The funds are currently available and the evaluation will be conducted during the Intercessional Meeting of the Standing Committees of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (APMBC) from 20th to 23rd June, 2011. A final report and findings of the evaluation will be presented to the Director of UNMAS and GICHD not later than 30th August. A formal presentation of the evaluation's findings to the IMAS Steering Group and IMAS RB will be made later. He said that Mr Hemi Morete, who was present at the meeting, will be conducting this evaluation. Mr Morete briefly introduced himself. The TOR for the evaluation was reviewed by all the members. Mr Phil Bean said that the TOR is the most important document and members should ensure that it was comprehensive and that all issues were covered.

Mr Erik Lauritzen said that the first ever meeting of mine clearance standards was held in Copenhagen in 1996. He said that it would be useful to have a special meeting of the IMAS RB in Copenhagen later this year when the evaluation is completed, to discuss findings and recommendations of the evaluation. His suggestion was welcomed by the participants. He stated that he will look into it and will get back to the Chair and Secretary with a proposal. <u>Action by Erik Lauritzen.</u>

10. Update on CEN Workshop Agreement

The Secretary gave an update on the CEN workshop agreements. He said that there are seven CEN workshop agreements published in relation to humanitarian mine action. Among them, CWA 15044:2009 test and evaluation of demining machines was reviewed and amended by the original workshop members in 2009. The new version, along with lessons learned, was published in 2010. The CWA 15756:2007 test and evaluation of Personal Protective Equipment remains withdrawn. Other CWAs remain valid.



In January 2011, CEN formally transferred ownership rights for these CWA to UNMAS/GICHD on behalf of the mine action community. As such, these documents will now be relabelled as Test and Evaluation Protocols for Mine Action, while the origin of the document will be kept. They will be reviewed and amended, when needed, as part of the IMAS/TNMA through the IMAS RB in the future. The CWA page on the website will also be renamed as Test and Evaluation Protocols in 2011.

Mr Guy De Decker asked how people could propose amendments. In addition he mentioned that mine detectors satisfying the CWA tests and evaluation of metal detectors could be perturbed by radio transmitters (EMR). It was verified and confirmed during tests conducted by the Belgian Defense. He said there is probably a need to amend the CWA tests and evaluation of metal detectors. The Secretary responded that this would be done through filling out a proposal/justification form for amendments available on the website and contained in IMAS 01.10. Mr Andy Smith said that some of the CWA are outdated and cannot be used. He referred to the one on test and evaluation of PPE CWA 15756:2007. Mr Erik Lauritzen said it is not wise to throw them away, but rather necessary to update them. The Secretary said that the CWA on test and evaluation of PPE has been withdrawn and is no longer available on the website. Mr Andy Smith and Mr Erik Lauritzen have agreed to discuss the CWA for testing and evaluating PPE, and propose a course of action. Action by Andy Smith and Erik Lauritzen.

11. IMAS Review Board Work Plan 2011

The Secretary presented a list of the IMAS with their current edition, indicating what standards were reviewed in the year 2008, 2009 and 2010. He said that in the past, IMAS were reviewed based on requests from the field or the RB. He further stated that the IMAS series were reviewed as a whole a number of times since 2007. Each time was with an attempt to ensure that issues in relation to CCW Protocol V (2008), gender and diversity (2009), land release (2009) and cluster munitions (2010) were included. Therefore, most of the IMAS have been reviewed and updated. He asked the RB about whether to follow the same trend or else to agree on a more systematic approach in regard to reviewing certain numbers this year and others one a year later. The general agreement was that all the IMAS should be reviewed and updated at least once every three years. Those that require major amendments will go to the RB for proposal and justification. Mr Erik Lauritzen emphasised the revision of the land release IMAS 08.20, 08.21 and 08.22 in 2012.

12. Any Other Business

Mr Guy De Decker informed the board that the NATO EOD Working Group was reviewing some specific terminology related to EOD operations. He proposed to give an update of those that are also used in the glossary of terms and definition IMAS 04.10. Action by Guy De Decker.

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

23 March 2011 Faiz Paktian