

ICBL Statement on the Extension Request Process  
12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of States Parties of the Mine Ban Treaty  
Geneva, 3 December 2012



Thank you Mr. President.

The ICBL welcomes this opportunity to reflect on the extension request process as well as the paper the President submitted to the 12MSP. While we find that the existing process generally works well, we have learned some valuable lessons since it was put into place in 2008, lessons that are well reflected in the President's paper. By following the recommendations set out in this paper, we believe the extension request process will serve the goals of Article 5 even better in the coming years.

The paper proposes improvements to the extension request process in three areas - the quality of the requests, the capacity of the Analyzing Group to assess the requests, and follow-up with States Parties once they receive extensions. On the first point, the recommendations encourage requesting states to be clearer about past progress, the remaining challenge and plans for the extension period - key data that is sometimes vague or even missing from requests. The suggestion to submit detailed plans for only 3-5 years at a time should avoid the problem we now see with states falling far behind long-term plans that quickly become out of date.

Second, the paper seeks a way to better support the Analyzing Group with its tasks, which take a lot of time and may go beyond the expertise of the group's members. The paper suggests enhancing the interaction with the requesting states to ensure any missing or unclear information is provided early in the process. In addition, the paper suggests that the Analyzing Group reach out more systematically to a broad group of experts in order to better assess the often long and complex requests. The ICBL appreciates the changes already made in this regard this year and stands ready to support the work of the analyzing group in whatever way we can.

Finally, we strongly support the paper's recommendations for ensuring follow-up after requests are granted, including holding states to the benchmarks they lay out in their requests, conducting mid-term assessments, and encouraging the submission of revised plans every few years. Such ongoing engagement with mine-affected states is the best way to ensure that states keep to their proposed plans and complete Article 5 obligations as soon as possible. It would also allow for early warning about delays or unexpected challenges that might help a state avoid the need for an additional extension. We hope the recommendations can also apply, if appropriate, to states that have already received extensions.

We would like to end by thanking the Analyzing Group and the President for a thorough reflection on this fundamental treaty process, and we encourage all States Parties to support the President's paper.

Thank you.