Last year, at the TMSp, we recalled the importance of the timely submission of extension requests for the overall effective functioning of the Article 5 process and, in this context, recommended that requesting States take the process established at the TMSp, we agreed to encourage the President no fewer than nine months before the meeting of the States Parties, to submit their requests to the States Parties seeking Article 5 extensions and to encourage the States Parties to act on behalf of the Co-Chairs and Co-Chairs and Co-Chairs' support.

In addition, in preparing each analysis, the analyzing group is close cooperation fully to clarify issues and identity needs. The standing committees annually preparing an analysis of each request, this group is tasked, along with requesting States Parties, with the President and the Co-Chairs and Co-Chairs and Co-Chairs, "Article 5 deadlines."

You will recall that at the TMSp, the States Parties established "a process for the preparation, submission and consideration of requests for extension to the preambles and consideration of requests for extensions for the standing committees."

It is my pleasure to report on the process of analyzing Article 5 extensions.
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Parties submit requests no later than 31 March of the year when the request would be considered.

I am pleased to report that on 31 March 2011, I received requests submitted by Algeria, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Eritrea. And, on 14 April 2011, I received a request submitted by Chile.

In accordance with the decisions of the 7MSP, these requests were made available on the Convention’s website.

On 7 March 2011, I convened a workshop for the representatives of States Parties mandated to analyse requests.

The aims were to increase our knowledge of the subject related to Article 5 and to ensure that we were fully aware of the analysing group’s working methods.

In accordance with the agreed working methods, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, with the support of their Co-Rapporteurs, made an initial determination of the completeness of each request and generated questions to obtain additional information from each requesting State Party.

I then forwarded these questions to the concerned State Parties with each providing a detailed response.

On 20 May 2011, the analysing group met to share initial views on the four requests that had been received by that date.

In addition, in keeping with past practice, the ICBL and the ICRC were invited to share their views on the requests.

The analysing group also noted that four States Parties with 2012 deadlines did not submit requests: Denmark, Guinea Bissau, Jordan and Uganda.

In addition, the analysing group noted that one State Party with a 2011 deadline, Congo, had not provided clarity on whether it would be in a position to fulfil its Article 5 obligations by its 1 November 2011 deadline.
Regarding observations and recommendations from the analysis process this discussion on its request.

I will return to the matter of Congo in more detail once we get to the

that the agreed analysis process could not take place.

Moreover, the fact that it submitted a request less than two weeks ago means

with Article 5 of the Convention.

As it stands, as of November 1st of this year, Congo has been non-compliant

31 March of last year for consideration at the IOMSP. In keeping with our agreed process, Congo should have submitted a request by

On 22 November, I received a request submitted by Congo.

The Congo was submitted on 21 October 2011. The analysis on the request submitted by the Democratic Republic of 2011 and the analysis on the request submitted by Eritrea was forwarded on 3 October

The IOMSP Executive Secretary on 27 September 2011. Analyses on the requests submitted by Algeria and Chile were forwarded to

delegations were held electronically.

Analyses in addition, throughout September and October additional

The analyzing group met for a final time on 5 September 2011 to consider draft

2011 and Eritrea on 11 August 2011.

On 11 August 2011, the Democratic Republic of the Congo on 11 September Parties reviewed their requests and submitted these revisions as follows: Algeria

As a result of a cooperative dialogue with the analyzing group, three States

Algeria, Chile and the Democratic Republic of the Congo each accepted the

analyzing group’s invitation to take part in such discussions.

In informal discussions with representatives of requesting States Parties, the

The analyzing group met again on June 21st, 22nd and 24th, primarily to engage
all mined areas that contain or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines under (their) jurisdiction or control”.

This is a matter that States Parties are obliged to report on in accordance with their obligations under Article 7 of the Convention.

It is recommended, therefore, once again, that all States Parties in the process of implementing Article 5, particularly those that may believe it will be necessary at a future date to submit an extension request, intensify and accelerate efforts to locate and report on all mined areas that contain, or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines under (their) jurisdiction or control.

A second observation is that the analysis in 2011 underscored the importance, as has been recorded by States Parties in the past, of States Parties that lack clarity regarding their Article 5 challenge “requesting only the period necessary to assess relevant facts and develop a meaningful forward looking plan based on these facts”.

A third observation is that the analysis process in 2011 underscored the importance, as has been recorded by the States Parties in the past, of the States Parties agreeing that those that have been granted extensions be asked to report regularly on time-bound commitments made in requests and on the decisions taken on requests.

A fourth observation is, notwithstanding the situation with respect to the Republic of the Congo, there was improved performance on the part of requesting States Parties in 2011 in terms of the timely submission of requests.

Fifth: At the 10MSP, the President of the Second Review Conference noted that the Article 5 extension request process places a heavy burden on the representatives of those States Parties that are mandated to analyse the requests.

The President of the Second Review Conference recommended that the President, with the support of the ISU, should consider ways and means to increase the knowledge and expertise of the analyzing group with respect to the technical subject matter contained within Article 5 requests.
Thank you.

Responsibilities involve actively contributing to the analysis process.
Serving as a Co-Chair or Co-Rapporteur recall that a central aspect of their role would recommend that States Parties consider taking time on the task of

and Co-Rapporteurs.

2011 that the analysis process requires a renewed commitment from Co-Chairs while there was widespread appreciation for this workshop. It was observed in

mandated to analyze requests.

knowledge and build the capacity of representatives of States Parties accepted upon this recommendation by convening a workshop to increase the