

**Kerry Brinkert**  
**Manager, Implementation Support Unit**  
**Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining**

**Standing Committee on Mine Clearance – 10 May 2006**

At the request of the Co-Chairs, the Implementation Support Unit of the GICHD has reviewed the transparency information provided by six States Parties that have indicated that they have fulfilled their obligations under Article 5 of the Convention. The purpose of this request has been to draw out observations regarding the important experiences of these States Parties which may be of interest to others:

Some observations are as follows:

- First: States Parties that have reported that they have fulfilled their Article 5 obligations indicated that they took seriously their obligation to destroy or ensure the destruction of anti-personnel mines “as soon as possible” by establishing a national demining programme and implementing a national demining plan soon after entry into force – and – in some instances by doing so even before entry into force.
- Second: In operational terms, a national demining programme logically proceeds with the clearance of both anti-personnel mines and other explosive remnants of war. Some States Parties that have reported that they have fulfilled their Article 5 obligations have reported on the destruction of a range of mines and other explosive remnants of war in areas containing such mines / remnants. Given that such information was provided in the context of a reporting requirement intended to contain information specifically on anti-personnel mines, there may be some ambiguity regarding what it means to have fulfilled Article 5 obligations.

This is suggested by one State Party which did not report until relatively recently that it had fulfilled Article 5 obligations even though in its most recent report it indicated that all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control had been destroyed even before entry into force.

The lesson perhaps is that a State Party may have fulfilled its Article 5 obligations notwithstanding the fact that it must continue work in the context of a national demining programme to fulfill legal obligations contained other instruments concerning other explosive remnants of war, or otherwise address the problems caused by other explosive remnants of war.

- Third: One State Party has indicated in Form C of its Article 7 reports that at one time it had areas that contain mines and that it now does not. However, in the latter report, ambiguity was introduced in another part of its Article 7 submission because it defined its state of completion in terms not contained in the Convention, that is, indicating that it is “sans mines” or without mines or mine free. Further ambiguity resulted from the use of similar terminology in a statement it made at the Sixth Meeting of the States Parties.
- Fourth: Two States Parties that have indicated explicitly how they had confidence in understanding that they had indeed fulfilled their Article 5 obligations, referring to a certification process and that demining had been undertaken in accordance with highest existing international standards.
- Fifth: The same two States Parties have provided information on the financial and technical means both made available from national sources and acquired externally to implement Article 5.

Thank you.