

## **The Status of Implementation of Article 5**

### **Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies**

**(Greece and Nigeria)**

**22 June 2010**

In Cartagena we took stock of more than a decade of implementation of the Convention, including more than a decade of implementing Article 5. Here's where matters stood on 4 December 2010:

- At the close of the Cartagena Summit, 54 States Parties had reported that they had been or were still required to fulfil their Article 5 obligations.
- Of these, 15 States Parties had reported that they had fulfilled their obligation to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas, with four of these States Parties – Albania, Greece, Rwanda and Zambia – reporting completion in Cartagena.
- And, at the close of the Cartagena Summit, there were 39 that still needed to complete implementation of Article 5.

These numbers are the benchmarks against which will measure our progress this year and in every subsequent year leading to our Third Review Conference in 2014.

We already know that these numbers will change today, with one State Party set to officially inform us of completion. However, as we saw in Cartagena, the ongoing pace of action toward a mine free world depends upon our ability to overcome a number of challenges.

Two of the challenges identified in Cartagena are particularly important and the Co-Chairs wish to join others in placing an emphasis on these matters this year.

The first challenge is recorded in paragraph 79 of the Review document that we adopted in Cartagena. This paragraph reads as follows:

One of the first challenges faced by many States Parties that must still complete implementation of Article 5 is to undertake or

complete the task, described in Article 5, paragraph 2, and as reiterated in the Nairobi Action Plan to make every effort to identify all areas under a State Party's jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced.

Paragraph 79 continues by stating:

Several States Parties, including some for which the Convention entered into force several years ago, have not yet provided clarity pursuant to their obligation under Article 7, paragraph 1.c, to report on the location of all mined areas that contain or are suspect to contain, anti-personnel mines. It is reasonable to expect that all relevant States Parties could overcome this challenge prior to a Tenth Meeting of the States Parties.

Again, we agreed that "it is reasonable to expect that all relevant States Parties could overcome this challenge prior to a Tenth Meeting of the States Parties." This Standing Committee meeting is the first opportunity to assess whether we are indeed on track to overcoming this challenge.

The second key challenge highlighted in Cartagena concerns national ownership.

That is, on the one hand, we recorded that 33 States Parties, as of the close of the Cartagena Summit, had indicated that they are seeking or have sought assistance from other States Parties. On the other hand, we also recorded our recognition that "strong national ownership is essential for ensuring that cooperation can flourish."

In paragraph 169 of the Review that we adopted in Cartagena, we went on to define "national ownership".

Moreover, we noted that while the existence of the components that we consider part of the definition of national ownership will not guarantee that resources will flow in response to needs, "demonstrating national ownership makes it significantly more likely that cooperation will flourish between those with needs and those in a position to provide assistance".

Both Greece and Nigeria know firsthand the complexities of implementing Article 5 of the Convention. However, we also know that it is possible and we encourage all States Parties to work together this year to overcome the two main challenges that we have highlighted.