

Meeting of the States Parties mandated to analyse requests submitted under Article 5 of the Convention (“analysing group”)

15-16 May 2008

Chair’s Summary

1. Welcome and introductions

The Chair (HRH Prince Mired Raad Al-Hussein, President of the Eighth Meeting of the States Parties) opened the meeting by thanking the States Parties mandated to analyse requests for dedicating so much time to continuing to fulfil our task of analysing the Article 5 extension requests. In addition, he noted that on the basis of the interest expressed at that meeting, he had prepared an agenda for the 15-16 May meeting that involved a split between additional discussions of requests and expert input.

2. Update on requests received / being prepared

The Chair reported that on 6 May 2008 Mozambique submitted its request. He further reported that the United Kingdom had responded to the letter that he wrote to indicate that a request should be submitted by the end of May, and, that with respect to Chad and Niger there was no news to share and that he still expected communications from both indicating that as a result of extraordinary circumstances both will be unable to submit until July. The Chair also reported that with respect to Croatia he had been informed that an internal complication emerged at a very late stage and it was now unsure regarding when Croatia’s request would be submitted. Finally, the Chair indicated that he would write to Croatia to express that it would greatly help the group’s efforts if Croatia were to submit its request as soon as possible.

3. Update on funds earmarked to support the Article 5 extensions process

The Director of the ISU reported that a small additional amount had been spent on translations since the last meeting and that there remained approximately CHF 26,500 in earmarked funds to support the Article 5 extensions process.

4. Expert input on demining techniques

The Chair, in recalling that at the last meeting the group had expressed interest in receiving expert input on manual and mechanical demining techniques, in particular, to understand what productivity could be expected given differing conditions and factors, introduced Erik Tollefsen of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) who made a brief presentation and answered questions.

5. Expert input – UNDP

The Chair, in recalling that at the last meeting the group had expressed interest in receiving the general views of the United Nations on requests received, introduced Sara Sekkenes of the UNDP who shared some initial thoughts. In addition, Ms. Sekkenes offered to provide to the group more detailed input.

6. Expert input on land release

The Chair recalled that at the last meeting he had noted that the task of implementing Article 5 essentially comes down to releasing land that a State Party has identified as being dangerous due to the presence or suspected presence of mines, and, that he had indicated that the group needs to be as knowledgeable as possible about the range of methods used to release land. In this context, the Chair welcomed the Resource Utilization Contact Group Coordinator (Norway), given the Contact Group's focus on advances being made in the area of land release, and, Havard Bach of the GICHD, who made a presentation and answered questions.

7. Expert input – ICBL and ICRC

The Chair, in recalling that at the last meeting the group had expressed interest in receiving views of the ICBL and ICRC on additional requests received, welcomed representatives of both organizations who shared some initial thoughts.

8. Informal question and answer sessions with representatives of requesting States Parties

The Chair recalled the conclusion drawn at the last meeting that representatives of requesting States Parties be invited for informal question and answer sessions in order to seek clarity on requests submitted in a collegial and informal manner. In this context, the group proceeded to have informal question and answer sessions with representatives of Mozambique, Nicaragua and Thailand. It was further noted that representatives of other requesting States Parties would be invited to informal sessions during morning meetings prior to meetings of the Standing Committees the week of 2-6 June.

9. Analysis of requests submitted

The group began discussions on the requests submitted by three States Parties – Bosnia and Herzegovina, Denmark, and Senegal – whose requests were not discussed at the previous meeting. The Chair concluded that it was the sense of the group that he should write to each suggesting that revisions be made in order that their requests would be more complete.

10. Next steps

The Chair expressed some frustration with the degree to which the totality of the group is engaging in the analysis process and noted that it is fundamentally important that all States Parties that have accepted the responsibility to be part of the group take the process seriously and contribute to it.

To chart our course forward between May and August, the Chair presented a critical path:

- By 1 June, all analyzing group members will have familiarized themselves with all extension requests and will be in a position to ask informed questions of requesting States Parties.
- From June 2nd to 6th, analysing group members will participate in question and answer sessions with representatives of requesting States Parties each day from 08:15 to 09:30, arriving on-time to ensure the necessary efficiency of each meeting. Efficiency would be required because up to two request States would be dealt with each morning. It would be

expected that each analyzing group member would be in a position to ask informed questions of the requesting State Party's representatives.

- By June 20, it is expected that all analyzing group members will have submitted to the ISU more advanced comments and views on each request, organized in accordance with the right-hand column of the checklist used by the analyzing group to date. (See attached.)

(In response to this point, some analyzing group members suggested that it should be assumed that if no comments are provided on a particular request by a particular analysing group member, that State Party had chosen to excuse itself from participating in the analysis of that particular request.)

- By July 4 the Chair will distribute to the analysing group advanced syntheses of remarks submitted by all analyzing group members. These advanced syntheses would serve as the basis for discussions on 9-10 July.
- On 9-10 July, the analyzing group would conclude in precise terms what suggestions it has for requesting States Parties to improve requests and what issues or concerns it has. Also at this meeting the analyzing group would receive the expert input of the ICRC with respect to understanding Article 5.5 of the Convention.
- August 1 would be the deadline for requesting States Parties to respond to the analyzing group's questions and concerns.
- On 28-29 August the analyzing group would meet to conclude analysis on as many requests as possible, and, finally in mid-September, the group would need to conclude analysis on remaining requests.

11. Any other business

The group reflected upon how many requests had projected a significant need for external assistance in order to implement Article 5 during extension periods. The group remarked that perhaps the Resource Utilization Contact Group with the support of the ISU could prepare data on assistance generated in recent years and what demands may be in coming years. In addition, it was noted that there needs to be meaningful action on the part of States Parties in a position to provide assistance in response to those States Parties that have demonstrated national ownership and put forward strong plans for their extension periods. In this regard, it was suggested that the Resource Utilization Contact Group again could play an important role.

12. Next meetings

The Chair reiterated that he will convene meetings each day from 2 to 6 June from 08:15 to 09:30 to continue informal question and answer sessions with requesting States Parties, and that he intends that subsequent meetings of the group would be held on 9 and 10 July from 13:00 to 15:00 at a minimum and longer if the agenda of CCW meetings is such that it does not pose scheduling conflicts for analysing group participants.

Article 5 Analysing Group Extension Request Checklist*

Requesting State Party: _____

	Relevant Facts in Request	Remarks/Views
<p>Total land needing to be addressed at entry into force, as defined in Article 2, paragraph 5</p>		
<p>Estimated land remaining to be addressed, in accordance with Article 5 paragraph 4.b.i</p>		
<p>Amount of time requested, in accordance with Article 5, paragraph 4.a</p>		
<p>Circumstances which impeded the ability of the requesting state party to fulfil its obligations, in accordance with Article 5 paragraph 4.b.iii</p>		

	Relevant Facts in Request	Remarks/Views
Annual projections of mined areas to be released, in accordance with Article 5 paragraph 4.b.i		
Methods to be used to render mined areas no longer dangerous, in accordance with Article 5, paragraph 4.b.i and Article 5, paragraph 4.b.ii		
National financial resources required, in accordance with Article 5, paragraph 4.b.ii		
International financial resources required, in accordance with Article 5, paragraph 4.b.ii		

	Relevant Facts in Request	Remarks/Views
Humanitarian, social, economic and environmental implications of the extension, in accordance with Article 5, paragraph 4.c		
Any other information relevant to the request, in accordance with Article 5, paragraph 4.d		

Conclusions:

* Each member of the analysing group should complete a checklist for each request submitted (with the exception of instances when an analyst indicates it has a conflict of interest).
Analysers should feel free to use this checklist in a flexible manner, for instance, providing initial observations and views in a narrative format rather than in a tabular format.