

MINUTES

IMAS REVIEW BOARD MEETING

Date of meeting:	19 August 2024
Start time (duration):	14:00 Central European Time (1½ hours)
Location:	Online (Microsoft Teams)
Meeting chair:	Mr. Pehr Lodhammar, UNMAS
Meeting secretary:	Mr. Sasha Logie, GICHD

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

Mr. Pehr Lodhammar, called the meeting to order.

The chair welcomed Ms. Victoria Grant, UNMAS's new representative, and Ms. Radwa Rabie, who returned as GICHD's representative. He also noted that Ms. Tammy Hall was now attending the meeting as an independent non-affiliated member.

The agenda was adopted without changes.

2. Overview of current workplan results and IMAS framework

The secretary, Mr. Sasha Logie gave an overview of the current 2023-24 workplan which consists of 18 new or revised IMAS documents, including technical notes for mine action (TNMA) and test and evaluation protocols (T&EP). 12 of these were completed and three were still in process. A further three had not been started. The presentation acknowledged the contribution of RB member organizations in undertaking this work, with 127 people, primarily from RB organizations, participating in technical working groups (TWG).

The secretary then gave a presentation about the IMAS framework which currently includes 47 IMAS, 24 TNMAs, and eight T&EPs. The presentation highlighted the challenges of reviewing IMAS in a timely manner, noting that 22 of 47 IMAS will not have been reviewed within five years, by the end of 2024, of which 15 IMAS will have not been reviewed for more than 10 years.

3. Open discussion on next workplan priorities

The chair invited RB members to discuss what the priorities should be for the RB 2025-26 workplan.

There was an extensive discussion on how the RB should assess whether IMAS chapters require updating, and the extent of such updates, for the next workplan.

For IMAS that need to be updated, it was noted that there should be a clearer distinction between IMAS that require maintenance, e.g., updating of terminology or references, and IMAS that require a more significant revision.

For IMAS that require maintenance only, it was suggested that this be managed as a separate workstream from IMAS that require a revision and the setup of specialized TWGs. Doing so could speed up the review of IMAS ensuring that they remain up to date.

The Secretary presented four categories applied by ISO when reviewing standards, adapted to IMAS, as one way to determine what action an IMAS requires. The four categories included:

1. **Confirm:** IMAS is still relevant and fit for purpose, and it can be revalidated for five years without change.
2. **Amend:** IMAS is still relevant and generally fit for purpose but requires some maintenance, e.g., minor editorial or technical corrections.

3. **Revise:** IMAS is still relevant, but the content is outdated, and the document requires significant revision.
4. **Withdraw:** IMAS subject matter is no longer relevant to mine action, and the IMAS should be removed from the standards.

It was noted that it would also be necessary to prioritize which IMAS should be included in the workplan taking into consideration such factors as the capacity of the RB, the number of users accessing a standard through the website, and the timeline since previous review.

Seeking input from national authorities was highlighted. The idea of an annual survey was suggested, although it was noted that it was too late to do so for the 2025-26 workplan.

It was noted that once the Siem Reap Action Plan is finalized, any elements not covered by IMAS should be looked at.

Different ways for undertaking such a pre-screening process were proposed, with the RB voting that all RB members should be given the opportunity to review each standard that has not been reviewed for more than five years, and to advise on how to categorize standards, and level of priority.

Action point 1: IMAS Secretary create a survey to facilitate RB members to pre-screen IMAS.

Action point 2: RB members complete the survey and review IMAS and recommend whether a document should be confirmed, amended, revised, or withdrawn. Complete survey by 30 September 2024.

Action point 3: IMAS Secretary develop the concept of an annual national authority consultation on standards.

4. Timeline and process for workplan development

The secretary presented the different steps and timeline of developing the RB workplan 2025-2026. RB members will have until 30 September to submit proposals for new IMAS documents to be included in the workplan. Proposals can include suggestions for amendments to existing IMAS documents, or new IMAS documents. IMAS documents include IMAS themselves, TNMAs and T&EPs.

On 7 October, a consolidated list of proposals, and the results of the survey will be shared with RB members, which will be reviewed and considered for approval at an online RB meeting on 23 October.

Action point 4: RB member submit specific proposals for new or revised IMAS by 30 September 2024, through the proposal form on www.mineactionstandards.org

5. Any other business

- Ms. Radwa Rabie advised that GICHD is finalizing a summary report on the results of a survey GICHD had conducted on land release and would share it with the RB by early September.
- The secretary advised that the TWG working on IMAS 07.13 and TNMA 07.13.01, had recommended that a number of terms and definitions from IMAS 07.13 be added to IMAS 04.10.

End