New-Zealand supports further discussion of article 8 in the context of the Standing Committee on General Status and Operation of the Convention, as BRAZIL does. Like the ICBL, we think that continued work on elaborating and operationalising Article 8 should build upon the work previously carried out by the Standing Committee, and should not have to begin again from scratch. The useful work, for instance, already undertaken by CANADA and FRANCE froms art of the basis of this, and we commend it.

BRAZIL has proposed that an open-ended working group be set-up to explore Article 8 issues in more depth. AUSTRIA has suggested that this discussion instead takes place in the context of the Standing Committees. We would support AUSTRIA’s suggestion. There are already a number of organs within the rubric of the Mine Ban Convention’s intersessional process. We do not see a need to duplicate functions of these. New-Zealand is of the view that the intersessional process’s Standing Committees are the best for a for discussion, in order to ensure wide participation. However, we fully support the notion that the Coordinating Committee allocate the Standing Committee on General Status and Operation of the Convention additional time in future intersessional rounds to ensure a full discussion of Article 8, as well as other important questions.

I thank you.