

**Tenth Meeting of the States Parties to the  
Convention on the Prohibition of Anti-Personnel Mines  
Geneva, 29 November – 3 December 2010**

**ICRC notes on the extension request process 2010**

We would like to reflect briefly on the 6 extension requests presented this year and the extension request process.

First, we would like to pay tribute to the excellent work of the analyzing group. Most States Parties which are members of the analyzing group, have worked tirelessly to forge a constructive dialogue with requested States and really got to the bottom of each extension request. They have helped States present a clear and precise plan for the implementation of their article 5 obligations. The work of the analyzing group has become an indispensable tool in the life of the Convention and its credibility.

In the past three years, and again this week, the analyzing group conveyed in particular two important messages. These are relevant not only to the 6 requesting states this year but also to any States Parties that wish to request an extension. The first crucial message is that States, which still do not have a precise picture of the extent of the contaminated land or do not have a concrete plan to fulfill their obligation, should only request the period of time necessary to assess relevant facts and develop a meaningful forward looking plan based on these facts. The second aspect is the importance of benchmarks or targets that each carefully planned demining program should set. It is crucial that States Parties report on these targets providing clarity as to the progress made or any setbacks at every meeting of the Mine Ban Convention.

Thirdly, one aspect which is common to almost every request under scrutiny this week, and to previous extension requests, is the need to secure necessary funds from national or international donors. The ICRC calls on affected States to prioritize this work and on all States Parties in a position to do so to provide technical, material or financial support to these requesting States. It is clear from the explanations of Zimbabwe or Chad this week that we will be facing similar requests in 2 or 3 years from now unless sufficient international support is forthcoming.

Finally, we would like to associate ourselves with the comments just made by Canada regarding the crucial importance of the words ‘as soon as possible’ in the implementation of clearance obligations under this Convention. We also support Canada’s proposal to grant a one year extension to those State party that submit their request too late, i.e. later than 9 months before the meeting of States Parties that will study the request.