1. **Open and welcome**

The Chair opened the meeting by welcoming all members, observers, and guests. A new member organization and new member representatives were also welcomed:

New member organization:
- The Development Initiative (TDI), which will be represented by Mr. Stephen Saffin

New member representatives:
- Mr. Alex van Roy (FSD)
- Ms. Eva Veble (NPA)
- Ms. Lene Rasmussen (DanChurchAid)
- Ms. Radwa Rabie (GICHD)
- Mr. Mark Buswell (UNDP)

The Chair confirmed there were no outstanding action points from the last meeting.

2. **Guide for the management of terminology in IMAS**

At the RB meeting in March 2022, the IMAS 04.10 technical working group (TWG) recommended creating a guide for the development and maintenance of terms and definitions in IMAS. The RB agreed an action point that such guidance should be developed.

On 15 September 2022, RB members received the draft guide and an accompanying TWG report for review. The IMAS Secretary circulated on 1 November 2022 a revised draft incorporating RB feedback.

The ‘guide for the management of terminology in IMAS’ was approved by consensus by the IMAS Review Board. The RB also approved annexing the guide to IMAS 04.10.

TWG coordinator, Mr. Lionel Pechera, advised that the TWG will begin to review terms and definitions in IMAS 04.10 in accordance with the guide.

3. **IMAS 07.50: Management of human remains in mine action**

Following the RB meeting in May 2021, a TWG was formed to review a new IMAS on the management of human remains in mine action. Upon completion of their work, RB members received the draft IMAS with an accompanying TWG report on 15 September 2022 for review. The IMAS Secretary circulated on 1 November 2022 a revised draft incorporating RB inputs.

Following discussion, IMAS 07.50 (first edition) was approved by consensus by the IMAS RB.

TWG coordinator, Mr. Lionel Pechera, advised that the TWG will commence review of the pre-existing TNMA 10.10.01 “Guidance on the management of human remains located during mine
action operations”. The review will ascertain whether a TNMA is require, and if so, if it an amendment is necessary.

**Action point:** IMAS 07.50 TWG to review TNMA 10.10.01.

**Action point:** Remove TNMA 10.10.01 from the IMAS website until the RB approves the TWG-reviewed TNMA, to avoid confusion with the new IMAS 07.50.

4. **T&EP 07.31.02.2022: Competencies required for ADS handlers, team leaders and instructors**

The animal detection system (ADS) TWG has since 2018 reviewed IMAS and T&EPs related to ADS. The TWG drafted a new T&EP on competencies for working with ADS, which the RB received on 21 October 2022.

**T&EP 07.31.02.2022 (first edition) was approved** by consensus by the IMAS Review Board.

It was noted that IMAS 09.44 “Guide to occupational health and dog welfare”, is the only IMAS to have not been reviewed by the TWG. It was proposed that the review of IMAS 09.44 be considered as an activity for the IMAS RB workplan 2023-24.

5. **IMAS 13.10: Victim assistance in mine action**

In advance of the meeting, the RB Secretary circulated the draft standard and an accompanying TWG report to RB members on 2 November 2022. Following a late submission of inputs from the Harvard Law School Project on Disability, which was reviewed by OHCHR, a revised version of the standard was circulated to the RB on 16 November 2022.

Given that the IMAS was shared with the RB less than a week before the meeting, and while the importance of finalizing the IMAS was noted, it was decided that the RB should have more time to review the IMAS to approve it. It was decided that the virtual voting mechanism, as set out in IMAS 01.10, will be applied, affording RB members 21 days to review and approve the IMAS.

**Action point:** RB secretary to administer a virtual vote to approve IMAS 13.10 (edition 1, amendment 1).

6. **IMAS 08.40: Marking EO hazards**

RB members received the draft IMAS and TWG report on 19 October 2022.

It was clarified that the IMAS did not create a requirement for mine action organizations (MAO) to obtain specific accreditation for marking. Rather, accreditation related to land release activities should consider an MAO’s capacity for marking as part of a broader accreditation.

It was also explained that the TWG reviewed existing terminology in IMAS 04.10 and recommend amending terms and definitions related to marking, as outlined in the TWG report submitted to the RB with the IMAS. Once the IMAS is endorsed, the terms related to marking in section 3 of IMAS 08.40 will replace those currently used in IMAS 04.10.

Text changes agreed upon during the meeting are as below:

- Section 1. Amend the Scope to clarify that the standard does not apply to marking underwater contamination.
- Section 4. Change two occurrences of “be safe” to “not be contaminated by EO”
- Normative reference. Add normative references used in the main body of the document to Annex A.
- Minor changes to annexes (to be submitted by PM/WRA in writing)

It was decided to recirculate the IMAS incorporating the proposed text changes giving the RB 21 days to review and approve the IMAS through the virtual voting mechanism.
Action Point:  RB secretary to administer a virtual vote to approve IMAS 08.40 (edition 3).

7. IMAS 06.10: Management of training
RB members received the draft IMAS and TWG report on 31 October 2022.
It was clarified that the reference to ‘basic care’ in section 6.2 is addressed in IMAS 10.40.
If was further clarified that the scope of the IMAS is broad and does not address specific competencies, which should fall within the scope of relevant T&EPs. Should the RB wish to develop further competencies, such as the competencies required for EOD trainers, this should be considered as part of the development of the next workplan.
Action point: Competencies for EOD and IEDD trainers to be considered for the next workplan.
It was noted that the words ‘competence’ and ‘competency’ are defined as synonyms in common language and may both be used within IMAS.
IMAS 06.10 was approved by consensus by the IMAS Review Board.

8. TNMA 12.10.01: Risk education for improvised explosive devices
RB members received the draft IMAS and TWG report on 31 October 2022.
A number of editorial errors were noted, including incorrectly numbered references, reference to an annex that does not exist, as well as clarification of references to technical details, which will be corrected prior to publication.
Action point: Correct text errors and clarify language on technical details.
It was recognized that competencies for EORE require further guidance, but this was not considered within the scope of the TNMA.
TNMA 12.10.01 (first edition) was approved by consensus by the IMAS Review Board, subject to editorial fixes.

9. IMAS 10.10 Safety and occupational health – general requirements & IMAS 10.20 Demining worksite safety
Mr. Adam Jasinski provided an update on the work of the two TWGs working on IMAS 10.10 and IMAS 10.20, which the TWGs expect to complete both IMAS in the first quarter of 2023.
It was noted that Annex B of IMAS 10.20, which addresses manual demining site safety and safe working distances between deminers and other personnel on-site, does not cover safe working distances pertaining to IEDs, machines, and ADS. The question remains whether Annex B should be expanded to cover safe working distances for all types of interventions in a hazardous area. It was also noted that the reference to normal and increased risk is not consistently applied, and the TWG questioned whether this should remain in the IMAS.
Lastly, it was noted the TWGs suggested that the two related technical notes, TNMA 10.20.01 and TNMA 10.20.02 require review.
Action point: Review of TNMA 10.20.01 and TNMA 10.20.02 to be considered for next workplan.

10. IMAS 10.30: Personal Protective Equipment (PPE)
RB members received the draft IMAS on 1 November 2022.
Text change agreed upon during the meeting:
- Correct typo in reference to “TNMA 10.20.02”.
It was noted that the IMAS does not include the information on environmental impact, including that of UV, on visors, because there is currently no guidance of how to address this issue in a systematic way.

**IMAS 10.30 (second edition, amendment 5) was approved** by consensus by the IMAS Review Board.

11. **IMAS 07.13: Environmental management in mine action**

Mr. Robert White provided an update on the initial work of the IMAS 07.13 TWG, and discussions related to the scope of the IMAS. In particular, the TWG addressed the question of how to include aspects of climate change in the standard, while ensuring that this remains within the remit of environmental management within mine action. The TWG concluded that the scope of the IMAS should include minimum requirements for environmental management in planning, prevention, and mitigation; opportunities to improve organizations’ environmental management and the relevance to climate change and resilience; and supporting the notion of ‘build back better’ to support the sustainable use of land and alignment with the SDGs. The TWG recommends that the IMAS not include guidance for supply chain, monitoring, or verification which falls outside the scope of the standard.

The TWG clarified that it will conclude the revision of the IMAS before assessing whether a supporting TNMA is required.

It was noted that in some contexts, anecdotal evidence suggests that climate change is leading to a rise in EO accidents, as the pressures on communities to use EO-contaminated land increases.

The **IMAS 07.13 TWG TOR was circulated on 10 November 2022 and was approved** by consensus.

12. **TNMA: Cluster munition remnant survey**

Mr. Timothy Horner updated the RB on the work of the cluster munition remnant survey (CMRS) TWG which met for the first time on 1 November 2022. The new TNMA will provide guidance on addressing cluster munitions through the application of technical survey and non-technical survey. The CMRS method is already used in different contexts, for example in Southeast Asia. The scope of the TNMA will define CMRS, where and when it should be applied, as well as setting out CMRS methodology, and the output of a CMRS. It was clarified that monitoring of casualty data and victims of CMRS falls outside the scope of the TNMA.

The TWG expects to complete the TNMA for RB review by the end of March 2023.

The **CMRS TNMA TWG TOR was circulated on the 10 November 2022 and approved** by consensus.

13. **T&EP Additional Operational Competencies**

Mr. Jonathan ‘Gus’ Guthrie updated the RB on the work of the TWG drafting new T&EPs for competencies for demining, mechanical and non-technical survey. The first demining T&EP is expected to be completed by the end of the first quarter of 2023. A decision on where to place the T&EP within the IMAS framework was deferred until the document is finalized.

It was recommended that the TWG TOR be split into three separate TORs, one for each of the three T&EPs.

**Action point:** Revise TWG TORs to three TORs for the three separate T&EPs. The TOR for the demining T&EP will remain in the 2021-2022 RB workplan. The TORs for mechanical and non-technical survey will be included in the 2023-24 RB workplan.

14. **Development of the RB workplan 2023-2024**

The RB workplan sets out the general direction and specific activities that the IMAS RB will undertake over a two-year period. It establishes a timeline for each activity as well as which RB
members take the lead on a workplan activity. In addition to planning the work of the RB, the workplan is the principal tool used by the IMAS Steering Group to direct and monitor the RB. Any proposals for new or revisions to IMAS, once approved by the RB and SG are entered into the workplan.

While the current IMAS RB two-year workplan for the period 2021-2022 ends on 31 Dec 2022, a number of activities will be completed in the first six months of 2023. (See Annex B)

The process and timeline for developing the 2023-2024 workplan was presented. (See Annex C). Workplan activities can include revisions and new IMAS, T&EPs, and TNMAs.

Members provided initial comments and observations on the focus and content of the next workplan.

Ms. Radwa Rabie proposed that the next workplan continue to prioritize reviewing and revising existing IMAS. She advised the GICHD is considering proposing a review of IMAS that address land release, quality management, and risk management. She noted that while a number of the land release IMAS were revised in 2018, updates at that time were minor, and a full review may be due. She also supported a revision of IMAS 09.44 (see agenda item 4). Ms. Rabie also highlighted the lack of a structured process for archiving and removing outdated standards. She proposed that such a process could be devised followed by an assessment of old and less-used IMAS. GICHD will undertake further consultations before finalizing its proposals for workplan activities.

Mr. Adam Jasinski observed that there is an increasing gap between developments in IMAS and the ability of national authorities to keep pace with managing national mine action standards (NMAS). This is having practical implications in the way operators work.

Ms. Eva Veble recognised the comments made by HALO but maintained that the RB should continue to drive the development of IMAS, and that further efforts should be made to support NMAAs with NMAS. She also highlighted that it may be timely to review the IMAS related to quality management. Lastly, she proposed reviewing the least used IMAS, some of which have not been reviewed since 2003, to allow for a decision on whether to either archive the IMAS that are no longer required, or to update old IMAS that remain relevant to the sector.

Ms. Katherine Baker noted that PM/WRA have an expectation that operations funded by the U.S. are consistent with IMAS, and for that to happen SOPs, NMAAs and IMAS should be aligned. She highlighted the IMAS on investigating and reporting of accidents may require review. She also recommended that an initial quick assessment, by the IMAS secretariat, to determine whether an IMAS is still useful and does not require an update, or if it is no longer useful and can be put aside, or whether it requires a review, would help the RB to prioritize its work.

The Chair asked for RB members to consider which IMAS documents they would propose to be included for the next workplan and send these to the Secretary by 23 December 2022. These will be consolidated and by 15 January 2023, a draft workplan will be shared with RB members, who will then have a month, until 15 February 2023, to review and finalize the workplan.

**Action point:** RB members to propose activities for the 2023-24 workplan by 23 December 2022.

**15. Review requirement to review IMAS every three years**

The RB discussed whether the current requirement in IMAS 01.10 to review IMAS on a three-yearly basis remained feasible and fit for purpose. It was recommended to increase the review period to once every five years, without precluding essential amendments from being made within that period. It was further proposed to add language to IMAS 01.10 allowing the IMAS Secretary to recommend extensions to the five-year review period.
Action point: Secretary draft amendment to IMAS 01.10 section 12.1 ‘IMAS Review’ including 1) increasing the review timeframe to once every five years, and 2) new language to allow the Secretariat to propose an extension of the five-year period.

16. Any other business

Mr. Mikael Bold noted a significant decline in the participation of NMAAs both within TWGs and the IMAS RB.

Ms. Radwa Rabie informed members the GICHD has identified small amendments to T&EP 09.30.01.2022 on EOD competencies, for RB consideration – to be shared by email?

Mr. Lionel Pechera updated the RB that the TWG will soon complete IMAS 05.10 Annex B, Minimum data requirements, ready for IMAS RB review and approval by email.

The Chair closed the meeting by announcing that the next RB meeting will take place in person during the next NDM-UN meeting in Geneva, which is tentatively scheduled to take place in late June.

- END -