

MINUTES

IMAS RB MEETING

Date:	Tuesday, 8 September 2026
Time:	14.00 (Central European Time)
Duration:	2 hours
Format:	Online
Location:	Microsoft Teams
Chair:	Richard Boulter, UNMAS
Secretary:	Sasha Logie, GICHD

1. Call to order, welcome of new members, and adoption of the agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order and welcomed new member representatives Ole Feurer from the Swiss EOD Centre.

The agenda was adopted without changes.

2. TNMA 07.11/04 Guidance for the implementation of land release (first edition)

The Review Board (RB) considered the new land-release TNMA 07.11/04 *Guidance on the implementation of land release*. The draft had been circulated to RB members for comment on 3 July 2026 with an updated version incorporating RB amendments on 24 August ahead of the meeting.

Drafting process: GICHD, which coordinated the Technical Working Group (TWG) responsible for developing the document, outlined the drafting process. The document was developed following the withdrawal of IMAS 07.10 and the revision of IMAS 07.11 and was given a defined scope covering planning, standards, criteria and evidence. Fourteen representatives participated in the TWG, which held 10 main meetings, in addition to bilateral discussions and subgroup meetings. The draft was subsequently circulated to national authorities.

NPA concerns: NPA considered that the document was not yet sufficiently integrated or ready for publication. Its concerns included unresolved wording, provisions that NPA understood would be removed but which remained in the draft, and the risk that some elements of the guidance could lead national authorities to adopt approaches that would make land-release operations more costly and less efficient. NPA confirmed that it could provide specific alternative wording to address its concerns within two weeks.

Roles of the TWG and RB: Participants discussed the respective roles of the TWG and the RB in developing and approving IMAS documents. The Chair raised the respective roles of the RB and TWG, noting that while many RB members lacked the capacity to participate in every TWG they still had wisdom to impart at the final review process, and that if full authority were to be ceded to the TWG then the RB would in some ways become redundant. The Secretary explained that TWGs provide the specialist technical capacity required to develop documents, while RB members retain the right to review and comment on drafts before approval. He also noted that RB members wishing to influence the overall scope, structure or technical direction of a document are encouraged to participate actively in the relevant TWG from the outset.

Agreed next steps: The RB agreed that NPA would submit its proposed amendments as tracked changes to the draft, rather than as comments, by 23 September 2026. The TWG would then convene one final session to consider the proposed changes, taking decisions by vote where

necessary. Following this review, the revised draft would be returned to the RB for a decision on approval.

3. IMAS RB workplan 2027-28

The RB considered approving six new proposed workplan activities that had been submitted by RB members. The Chair had written to the RB on 15 July 2026, inviting the RB to propose activities for the RB workplan by 22 August 2026.

The Secretary first presented an overview of the status of the existing workplan activities before new proposals were considered, reporting eight completed activities, eleven nearly complete, six ongoing and five not started or paused. The Chair asked participants to consider the substantial work already in progress before adding activities. Later discussion highlighted that organisations have limited specialist capacity and that adding too much work could delay completion or reduce the ability to address existing commitments.

Approved Workplan Additions: The RB approved four additions in principle; an HI-led victim-assistance reporting update, terminology revisions to IMAS 04.10, a remote-sensing test and evaluation protocol (T&EP), and a review of underwater survey and clearance guidance, subject to IMAS Steering Group approval.

1. **IMAS 05.10 Victim Assistance Reporting:** HI presented Humanity and Inclusion's proposal to review IMAS 05.10 Annex B, so that its beneficiary-reporting requirements align with IMAS 13.10 and TNMA 05.10/01. The aim is to resolve inconsistencies between what operators are required to do in victim assistance and what data they are expected to record, without expanding operators' responsibilities to provide victim assistance services. The RB accepted the targeted review, with HI leading it.
2. **IMAS 04.10 Glossary Terminology:** GICHD proposed reviewing IMAS 04.10 to reconcile definitions with current standards, remove definitions linked to withdrawn documents and consider terms such as "mine action". NPA supported the review, noting that the current explosive ordnance definition is linked to the response to a list of munitions and is causing inconsistent interpretations. The RB accepted the targeted review, with GICHD leading it.
3. **Remote Sensing Protocol:** GICHD presented a proposal from the Innovation Working Group for a new Test and Evaluation Protocol (T&EP) covering remote sensing. The objective is to establish common testing methods and performance expectations. Discussion expanded the proposed scope beyond UAV-mounted RGB sensors to other detection systems and potentially surface and subsurface applications, while recognising that the initial wording was intended to keep the work manageable.

HI asked whether the remote-sensing protocol would address pilot qualifications. GICHD said competence is usually handled in a separate document but could be included in an annex if the group considers it necessary. Participants also discussed overlap with existing detection protocols; the agreed direction was to clarify that RGB sensors are an initial focus rather than an exclusive scope. The RB accepted the targeted review, with GICHD leading it.
4. **IMAS 09.60 Underwater Survey Review:** TetraTech proposed reviewing IMAS 09.60, which has not been updated since approximately 2014. They cited changes in operational demand, training requirements, technology, funding and experience, particularly in Ukraine and other programmes. The board accepted the proposal, with TetraTech leading it.

The four approved activities would be submitted to the IMAS Steering Group before being added formally to the RB workplan.

The RB did not approve proposed technical notes on gender, diversity, equality and inclusion or conflict sensitivity to the IMAS workplan. It was noted that the content fell outside the scope of the technical mine action content of an IMAS technical note.

4. Any other business

Technical Working Group Participation: GICHD raised recurring absenteeism in TWGs, and participants discussed the resulting workload, late objections and the need for organisations to nominate active members and maintain internal communication.

GICHD reported approximately 40% absenteeism in three of the technical working groups GICHD chairs, noting that repeated late participation causes previously discussed scope, wording and technical decisions to be reopened, increasing the workload for the chair and the whole group and delaying dependent activities. GICHD asked organizations to review their nominations and appoint members who can participate consistently. While it was acknowledged that leave and operational demands make some absences unavoidable, it was noted that persistent non-attendance is not sustainable for GICHD and may force it to reduce the number of groups it chairs. The Secretary reminded members that organisations may send substitutes when nominated members cannot attend. In response to an ICRC request for RB representatives to remain informed, the Secretary recommended that RB members maintain direct links with their technical-group representatives and share meeting documents through those channels.

The Chair emphasised the issue is not simply the number of meetings missed but the lack of continuity that can lead to late objections and rework.

- End -