

13MSP for the Mine Ban Convention

Check against Delivery

Norway- Statement on compliance

Mr. President,

As we approach the 3rd Review Conference, Norway is concerned about various issues of compliance with the core legal obligations of the Convention. There is no doubt that the convention has been a huge success addressing the humanitarian problems caused by anti-personnel mines in its first years. But what seems like an emerging pattern of confirmed and possible non-compliance situations is a threat to the credibility of the Convention. These include confirmed use of antipersonnel mines by state party Yemen, and strongly substantiated allegations of use by states parties South Sudan, Sudan and Turkey. They also include the regrettable situation caused by the failure of States Parties Belarus, Greece and Ukraine to comply with the obligations to destroy stockpiles.

It is the responsibility of every State Party to ensure compliance with the Convention. Thus it is crucial, both how each individual state party respond to questions regarding their own compliance, and then how we states parties as a collective address these situations, in order to protect the integrity of the convention and to ensure the protection of civilians. We would like to take this opportunity to commend the efforts by the ICBL to provide relevant facts and continuously put these issues on the agenda.

Mr. President

We welcome the initial response from Yemen, acknowledging this breach of Article 1, and the actions taken as a response to this, as stated in Yemens statement just now. We look forward to their more detailed response. Among the questions we believe must be answered is; where did these anti personnel mines come from? According to their own reporting, the last stockpiled antipersonnel mines were destroyed in April 2002. These are issues that we expect Yemen to clarify, soon and at the least, well in time before the third review conference. From an active state parties' perspective, transparency and frankness on such situations is highly valued.

We believe that we also need to extend our discussion of compliance and non-compliance to cover what seems like a chronic lack of progress in implementing key operative provisions, such as protracted implementation of Article 5. While we have not concluded on this matter, the lack of progress of mine clearance indicates that we may need to look at this through the lens of compliance. This is particular relevant in situations where states parties have kept well known minefields in place for years, for various reasons.

Mr president

This convention has never had to make use of its formal procedures for compliance. It is a convention that is based on transparency, reporting and open discussions. However, we may have arrived at a point where we need to consider use of the procedures we have equipped this convention with, in article 8. If the emerging pattern of non-compliance continue, then the very foundations and the legitimacy of the convention will be threatened.

This is not a question of formalities. Compliance with the obligations is necessary to reduce and eventually end the harm caused by anti-personnel mines, and a precondition to reach the aim of a mine-free world.

Thank you