
**Meeting of the States Parties to the Convention
on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling,
Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel
Mines and on Their Destruction**

30 September 2010

Original: English

Tenth Meeting

Geneva, 29 November – 3 December 2010

Item 9 of the provisional agenda

**Informal presentation of requests submitted under
article 5 and of the analysis of these requests**

**Analysis of the request submitted by Denmark for an
extension of the deadline for completing the destruction
of anti-personnel mines in accordance with
article 5 of the Convention**

**Submitted by the President of the Second Review Conference on behalf
of the States Parties mandated to analyse requests for extensions**

1. Denmark ratified the Convention on 8 October 1998. The Convention entered into force for Denmark on 1 March 1999. In its initial transparency report submitted on 27 August 1999, Denmark reported areas under its jurisdiction or control containing, or suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines. Denmark was obliged to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control by 1 March 2009. Denmark, believing that it would be unable to do so by that date, submitted a request to the 2008 Ninth Meeting of the States Parties for a 22 month extension of its deadline, until 1 January 2011. The Ninth Meeting agreed unanimously to grant the request.

2. In granting Denmark's request in 2008, the Ninth Meeting, while noting that the delay in proceeding with implementation as soon as possible after entry into force had hampered Denmark in fulfilling its obligations under article 5 of the Convention by its deadline, welcomed demining efforts conducted since 2005. The Ninth Meeting further noted that, while it may be unfortunate that after almost ten years since entry into force a State Party is unable to specify how remaining work will be carried out, it is positive that Denmark would, within the extension period of 22 months, garner an understanding of the true remaining extent of the challenge and develop plans accordingly that precisely project the amount of time that will be required to complete article 5 implementation. In this context, the Ninth Meeting noted the importance of Denmark requesting only the period of time necessary to assess relevant facts and develop a meaningful forward looking plan based on these facts. The Ninth Meeting also noted that by requesting a 22 month extension, Denmark was projecting that it would need approximately two years from the date of submission of its request to obtain clarity regarding the remaining challenge, produce a detailed plan and submit a second extension request.

3. On 18 June 2010 Denmark submitted to the President of the Second Review Conference a request for an extension of its 1 January 2011 deadline. Denmark requests an 18 month extension, until 1 July 2012.
4. The request indicates, as did the original request granted in 2008, that 1.4 million mines were deployed mostly along the coasts as well as in the southern part of western Jutland on the North Sea Coast, on a 10 kilometre long peninsula named Skallingen. During 1945-47 approximately 99 percent of the estimated 1.4 million landmines deployed in Denmark were removed with the balance left located on Skallingen. The request indicates that the mined areas were identified through 1944 German mine reports, combined with reports from clearance operations which took place in the area just after the Second World War as well as old marking poles and fix points that could be identified in the terrain. The request further indicates that the compiled information was then compared with modern maps to identify the remaining affected area.
5. The request recalls that when Denmark signed the Convention, the area which remained suspected of being mined was approximately 3.0 million square metres covering beach, dunes and marshland on the peninsula of Skallingen. Once the modern map was compared to old marking poles and fix points as well as minefield records, the suspected area was reduced to 1.86 million square metres. The request further recalls that for operational purposes the suspected mined area at Skallingen was divided into three sub areas – Area 1 (190,000 square metres), Area 2 (470,000 square metres) and Area 3 (1,200,000 square metres).
6. The request recalls that Area 1 was addressed in 2006 by the British contractor European Land Solutions, releasing 190,000 square metres of beach and dunes and resulting in the destruction of 14 anti-personnel mines, 21 anti-tank mines, 21 mine parts (such as detonators or explosives) and 11 unexploded ordnance (UXO). The request further recalls that Area 2 was addressed by the Danish consortium Minegruppen from May 2007 to April 2008, releasing another 470,000 square metres of beach and dunes and resulting in the destruction of 13 anti-personnel mines, 5 anti-tank mines, 129 mine parts and 2 UXO.
7. The States Parties mandated to analyse requests submitted under Article 5 of the Convention (hereafter referred to as the “analysing group”) recalled that, in Denmark’s original request granted in 2008, Denmark committed to undertake the following activities between the submission of its original request and June 2010: (a) technical survey, (b) an environmental impact assessment, including a public consultation exercise, (c) a description of the task that would need to be undertaken, and, (d) the definition of release criteria. The present request: (a) indicates that during 2008-2009, Denmark completed a technical survey of the area in question; (b) lists the elements of the survey; (c) contains a threat assessment (including detail on mine types, quantity, distribution, depth and functionality); and, (d) provides a description of the clearance requirements and methods. The request further indicates that environmental authorities have approved the mine clearance project provided that a number of restrictions and recommendations are followed concerning the reestablishment of dunes, precautions to prevent sand loss from the beach, measures to keep dune and beach sand separated, restriction in use of access roads, amongst others. The analysing group noted that Denmark had indicated that it had complied with the commitments that it had made in its original request.
8. The request indicates that since Denmark was granted its original request, a process to identify a company that meets the criteria to carry out the clearance of Area 3 had been carried out and that a Danish consortium, the Damasec J. Jensen Group, consisting of the two companies Damasec and J. Jensen, was selected.
9. As noted, Denmark’s request is for 18 months (until 1 July 2012). The request indicates that the Damasec J. Jensen Group has in its initial time schedule planned to

complete the clearance in April 2011, which is 8 months before the deadline given by the Danish Coastal Authority in the tender. The request further indicates that if mine clearance is completed before the deadline of December 2011, the area will be released earlier than July 2012. The request also indicates that the most serious challenge to operational planning consists of a ban on vehicles and use of explosives in the southern part of the area of operations, from 1 April to 1 August each year. As well, the request indicates that if the contractor experiences delays in areas which are under this restriction this can significantly impact the completion date with a few weeks behind schedule potentially meaning a six month delay in completion of the work. The analysing group noted that, even though Denmark was projecting the possibility of releasing the area in question six months prior to the requested extended deadline, Denmark's requested date appeared prudent in light of such risk factors.

10. The request indicates that the remaining area of approximately 1,200,000 square metres is composed of five different terrain types: 92,000 square metres of dune or dyke, 66,000 square metres of marshland covered with dunes, 683,000 square metres of low marshland, 291,000 square metres of high marshland and 80,000 square metres of beach. The request further indicates that: the dike/dunes and marshland covered with dune will be treated by sifting; the low marsh and beach will be treated through metal detection with geo-mapping and data-logging; and, the high marshland will be treated through metal detection. The request contains tables indicating the activities to take place over the extension period: (a) mobilisation of the operational setup will take place between May 2010 and July 2010; (b) over the period of July 2010 to December 2010 Denmark will carry out surface probing of areas which need vehicle access, sifting of dikes and dunes, clearance of the beach, and clearance of low marshland; and, (c) in 2011 Denmark will carry out activities related to sifting of dikes and dunes, clearance of low marshland and clearance of high marshland. The request also indicates that during the period of January 2012 to June 2012 Denmark intends to carry out quality control and will use this time, if necessary, as a buffer time to make up for delays.

11. The request indicates that Denmark has developed standards for clearance in Skallingen based on the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) and that the mine clearance standards for the two first areas were adapted to the environment in which the clearance took place. The request further indicates that based on the experience from Area 1, the standards were altered slightly for Area 2 and that, likewise, the standards for Area 3 have been reviewed and reformulated so they address the situation in the new area of operation while remaining IMAS compliant.

12. The request indicates that mine clearance is subjected to an extensive quality management system which assures that the work is conducted within the framework of IMAS, the project specific technical guidelines and in accordance with the Danish legislation (especially restrictions on handling and storage of explosives as well as the specific Danish health and safety regulations). The request also indicates that the contractor was accredited after an evaluation of its prequalification application, proposal and standard operating procedures, and, that the Danish Coastal Authority outlines in the tender documents the demand for quality management which is required from the contractor. The request further indicates that the Danish Coastal Authority (KDI) has contracted an external quality auditor (Bureau Veritas) and that KDI and the external auditor will monitor the mine clearance and check recorded data.

13. The request indicates, as did the original request granted in 2008, that Denmark granted DKK 86 million (approximately US\$ 14.325 million) in 2005 and a further DKK 32 million (approximately US\$ 5.381 million) to clear Area 1 and Area 2. The analysing group recalled that the original request also indicated that DKK 2.4 million (approximately US\$ 455,000) had been allocated for the technical survey of Area 3. The present request

further indicates that for clearance of Area 3, the Danish Government has granted DKK 98 million (approximately US\$ 16.9 million). The analysing group noted the significant original financial investment and additional financial commitment made by Denmark to complete implementation of article 5.

14. The request recalls the circumstances that impeded implementation during Denmark's original ten year period following entry into force, as recorded in Denmark's original request granted in 2008.

15. The request indicates that there are no humanitarian implications associated with the remaining mined area. The request further notes that the release of Area 1 and Area 2 has made those areas accessible to the population.

16. The request includes other relevant information that may be of use to the States Parties in assessing and considering the request, including a detailed assessment of the remaining threat, a map of the area in question and photographs of the condition of mines that are found within this area. In response to an informal discussion between Danish experts and the analysing group, Denmark provided a detailed version of the contractor's preliminary work plan.

17. The analysing group noted that Denmark had complied with the commitment it had made, as recorded in the decisions of the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties, to obtain clarity regarding the remaining challenge, produce a detailed plan and submit a second extension request, thus affirming the importance of a State Party, should it find itself in a situation similar to that of Denmark in 2008, requesting only the period of time necessary to assess relevant facts and develop a meaningful forward looking plan based on these facts.

18. The analysing group noted that the plan presented by Denmark is workable, comprehensive and complete.

19. The analysing group noted that the timeline contained in the request as well as the timeline contained in the contractor's preliminary work plan would greatly assist Denmark and all States Parties in assessing progress in implementation during the extension period. In this regard, the analysing group noted that both could benefit if Denmark provided updates relative to these timelines at meetings of the Standing Committees and at Meetings of the State Parties.
