

IMA - COMMISSION ON GEM MATERIALS
First Meeting, Ochil 1 Room, Edinburgh Convention Centre,
3rd September, 2002 at 14.20

1. Margherita Superchi, Chairperson, welcomed the attending persons:
Lin Sutherland, Secretary
Rodger Harding for United Kingdom
Elena Gambini for Italy
Erik Jonsson for Sweden
Nemad Tomasic representing Croatia
Bertrand Devourd representing France
Gayle Webb representing Australia
Lee Groat representing Canada
Mary Johnson representing United States of America
Alan Jobbins, observer

The following apologies were received:

Peter Zwaan, Vice Chairperson
Bill Birch, Australia
Emmanuel Fritsch, France
Jayshree Panjekar, India
Peter Oliver, New Zealand
Henry Haenni, Switzerland
James Shigley, United States of America

2. Minutes of the Madrid meeting were approved.
3. The chairperson outlined the processes related to members of the Commission. Unless the country is a member of IMA, then the nominated person cannot represent the country. The country decides the representative so that members of the commission cannot provide persons. Another problem stems from people who retire, but replacements have not yet been nominated by the IMA country. A further problem is that some countries, usually small, have a delegate with multiple representation and when IMA meetings are held in conjunction, then attendance by the representative gets split. The chairperson then went through all the countries in turn outlining the position in each case.
4. Relationships with other organisations.
It is important that the CGM be linked with other groups, academic or trade. We have chance to do something together with working groups on inclusion studies, probably somewhere in Europe. Possibilities can include meetings already arranged, or independently, or linked to a gemtrade show. Effective meetings need to allow time to talk. Often a specific theme can focus the meeting. The joint theme of gemmology and inclusion will help bring gem studies into new fields of mineral studies. This raises the possibility of linking in with fluid inclusion meeting studies.

Rodger Harding proposed that the International Gemmological Conference (IGC) be approached to consider the IMA Gem Commission representatives in their invitation

list, where not already included. The chairperson will provide the IMA-CGM list to Alan Jobbins, who as a committee member of IGC will take up the proposal.

5. Projects of the Commission

Atlas - This needs a person or group to take up the task. This can either be done bit by bit, or perhaps even as an updated web site.

Raman database - this has not proceeded far at this stage.

Nomenclature - This has been waiting in the wings and could be renewed as a future activity of this Commission. This is a real problem. The IMA mineral nomenclature commission has a fixed position, that the mineral species name must be used in the name, which differs from the trade. The Mineral Nomenclature Commission also considers gem nomenclature to be the domain of the Gem Materials Commission. The naming of gems includes cultural differences, commercial differences etc., making names very complicated. However, the Gem Materials Commission should provide a scientific basis for simplified nomenclature.

6. Future activities of the Commission:

To give advice to the gem trade, the Commission on Gem Materials needs to have a prepared position - some reference point. First the Commission needs to decide whether they want to tackle the nomenclature problem. The Chairperson asked how would we spell mineral names? It was decided to use the IMA approved mineral names. It was also suggested a working group in the commission be set up to look at nomenclature limits.

A Glossary is also needed to set out gem materials, which get little mention in IMA mineral nomenclature. The Glossary would need a simple introduction in the four official IMA languages, English, French, German, Russian. This would list material, name, formula, abbreviation. The meeting approved a project for a Glossary and for circulation of the draft glossary, to be sent by email to all members.

7. A campaign against misnomers is needed. This could involve other groups. The Gem Commission could put simple definitions of gem materials, perhaps with an example, on the IMA web site. The fact that IMA establish mineral names, put onus on the Gem Materials Commission and is a reason for the GMC existence.

8. Other business raised attendance at the IMA First General Meeting to hear report on the CGM.

9. The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday 5th September, at the poster session hall at 14.00 to discuss the outcome of the First General Meeting.

Meeting closed at 16.35.

F.L. Sutherland,

Secretary.

IMA - COMMISSION ON GEM MATERIALS
Second Meeting, Poster Hall, Edinburgh Convention Centre
5th September 2002 at 14.00

Margherita Superchi, Chairperson, welcomed the attending persons:

Lin Sutherland, Secretary

Rui Galopin de Carvalho for Portugal

Rodger Harding for United Kingdom

Elena Gambini for Italy

Alan Jobbins, observer

The Chairman outlined the situation concerning the proposed vote to dismantle the Commission of Gem Materials, which was announced at the First General IMA business meeting. The reasons given by the IMA executive at that meeting were due to inactivity of the CGM. This did not accord with the CGM understanding. Accordingly the Secretary wrote a note in support of CGM activities for the IMA executive to consider and the Chairman made a personal case for continuation at an IMA reception the evening of the 4th September. The CGM requested a stay to continue the Glossary project. The group now awaits a decision on the outcome of the IMA Council deliberations and General Meeting voting.

The group went through names of listed delegates and countries that are in IMA, but have no nominated representative countries. Those without representations are to be followed up.

The group intends to aim towards presenting a Symposium on Gem Materials at the IMA-IGC Florence meeting, August 2004, and also to present a preliminary glossary. CGM members should make an effort to come to Florence, because of the pressure on continuation of the Gem Commission. Some discussions on the form of the glossary followed. Responses will be requested by end of October, after being sent out in mid-September. The glossary will need to be compiled in the four official languages of IMA (English, French, German, Russian). A working group of 4 persons (Superchi, Gambini, Jobbins and probably Arps) will consider responses and decide on which comments will be implemented. Groups, species and varieties will use different fonts to separate them.

The meeting closed at 13.00.

F.L. Sutherland,

Secretary.