
**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**

12 October 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 Guinea-Bissau 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. Guinea-Bissau ratified the Convention on 22 May 2001. The Convention entered into force for Guinea-Bissau on 1 November 2001. In its initial transparency report submitted on 19 June 2002, Guinea-Bissau reported areas under its jurisdiction or control containing, or suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines. Guinea-Bissau is obliged to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control by 1 November 2011. Guinea-Bissau, believing that ongoing survey work may produce new information that may suggest that compliance by that date would not be possible, submitted, on 8 September 2010, to the President of the Second Review Conference, a request for an extension of its deadline. On 16 September 2010, the President of the Second Review Conference wrote to Guinea-Bissau to request additional information. Guinea-Bissau provided a response on 22 September 2010. Guinea-Bissau's request is for two months (until 1 January 2012).

2. The request indicates that a Preliminary Opinion Collection (POC) for a Landmine Impact Survey (LIS) was executed by the National Mine Action Coordination Centre (CAAMI) at the end of 2006 resulting in 278 communities being identified as contaminated by mines and other explosive remnants of war (ERW). The request indicates that a targeted LIS was subsequently carried out during the period of October 2007 to May 2008 and resulted in the identification of 12 affected areas covering an area of 2,236,560 square metres and five battle area clearance tasks with an estimated area of 930,000 square metres. The request indicates that this is the size of the impacted areas and not the specific mined areas. The request further indicates that the LIS covered all but seven of the 278 areas covered by the POC and that the LIS was unable to visit 16 communities due to inaccessibility (roads bad conditions) and flooded access due to heavy rains. The request also indicates that an additional 29 affected communities have been identified through reports from non-governmental organisations and communities.

3. The request indicates that initial clearance efforts focused on the capital, Bissau, and that a total area of 2,193,020 square metres was cleared in and around Bissau with 2,654 anti-personnel mines, 63 anti-tank mines, and 37,303 unexploded ordnance (UXO) destroyed. The request indicates that, once these areas were completed, the focus shifted towards addressing mines and other ERW throughout the country. The request indicates that since the initiation of operations, the minefields of Buruntuma, Binta, and Suar have been addressed with 1,033,839 square metres having been cleared and 397 anti-personnel mines, 92 anti-tank mines and 104 UXO destroyed. The request further indicates that clearance of Barraca Mandioca (which has been suspended for need of survey) and Bissabur (which is an ongoing operation) has resulted in the clearance of 83,125.72 metres and the destruction of 176 mines and 34 UXO. The States Parties mandated to analyse requests submitted under article 5 of the Convention (hereafter referred to as the “analysing group”) noted that progress since entry into force had been modest and that a lack of detail on annual rates of progress made it difficult to analyse the degree to which the effort had been constant or sporadic.

4. The request indicates that the remaining challenge includes nine (9) known affected areas measuring approximately 1,378,814 square meters. The request indicates that these areas do not represent the size of the mined areas but the socio-economic impacted area and non-technical and technical survey activities are still necessary to determine the actual size of the mined areas and clearance needs. The request further indicates that there are also 52 areas which are suspected to contain mines and require survey activities to determine the extent of the contamination in these areas. In addition, the request indicates that there are five (5) major battle area clearance (BAC) tasks with an estimated area of 930,000 square metres.

5. The request indicates that the LIS was unable to visit parts of the country. The President of the Second Review Conference asked Guinea-Bissau if it is now able to access these areas. Guinea-Bissau responded by indicating that it believes Norwegian People’s Aid (NPA) will get access to those areas that were reported unreachable during the LIS as most of the roads in the region are now in use and that NPA intends to visit the areas in question during the dry season (November to May). Guinea-Bissau also indicated that NPA will take into consideration alternative means, such as motorbikes and bicycles, to get to remote areas. Guinea-Bissau also responded by indicating that the security situation “is considered calm”.

6. As noted, Guinea-Bissau’s request is for 2 months (until 1 January 2012). The request indicates that although Guinea-Bissau is still positive that it can complete implementation of article 5 by its 1 November 2011 deadline, it is unknown what will be discovered by an upcoming survey that will begin in September 2010. The request indicates that the logic behind a two-month extension request is based on the fact that the results of this survey will not be available until the first quarter of 2011 (i.e., after the last Meeting of the States Parties before Guinea-Bissau’s deadline). The request further explains that if this survey indicates that more time will be needed to complete implementation of article 5, Guinea-Bissau would then submit a second extension request to the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties. The request also explains that this approach would avoid the possibility of Guinea-Bissau becoming non-compliant.

7. The request indicates the following as impeding circumstance: (a) the clearance capacity has been insufficient and the methods used have been inappropriate (i.e., the fact that all mine clearance in Guinea-Bissau is undertaken manually); (b) operations in the rainy season have been subject to delays due to the fact that manual clearance teams have been unable to operate in the rain; (c) the remaining tasks have not yet been subject to technical survey and there is the possibility that areas may be identified that may not have been identified during the LIS process; and, (d) inefficient methods have been used

(e.g., clearance undertaken in a manner inconsistent with national standards) and methods that could have increased efficiency (e.g., technical survey to reduce and cancel suspected land) have not been used. The analysing group noted that Guinea-Bissau was now acting to address the deficiencies it acknowledged in its past demining efforts.

8. The request indicates that in order to gain a clear picture of the remaining landmine/UXO problem in Guinea-Bissau, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and CAAMI requested NPA to conduct a general and technical survey in order to verify the degree of landmine/UXO contamination and to increase clearance capacity for Guinea-Bissau to achieve its Article 5 deadline of 1 November 2011 as planned. The request indicates that the plan consists of three main activities: general survey activities, technical survey activities, and mine/ERW clearance activities. The request further indicates that all survey activities will be conducted by NPA split into four teams – two for non-technical surveys and two for technical surveys – and that mine clearance will be conducted by three non-governmental organisations: HUMAID, LUTCAM and NPA. The amount of area to be addressed by each organisation and when is contained in the “Guinea-Bissau Demining Work Plan 2010-2012”, which is annexed to the request.

9. The analysing group noted that, while battle area clearance of areas not containing or suspected to contain anti-personnel mines fell outside the scope of the Convention, addressing such areas would need to be taken into account in an overall humanitarian demining plan. In this regard, the analysing group noted that the request did not mention how Guinea-Bissau would proceed in addressing its five major BAC tasks.

10. The request indicates that the general survey will take place between mid September 2010 and end of April 2011, while the technical survey will take place from September 2010 to May 2011. The President of the Second Review Conference asked Guinea-Bissau, given that it is already mid-September 2010, (a) if these survey activities have begun, (b) if not, when they will begin, and, (c) if the prospective end dates would be affected. Guinea-Bissau responded by indicating that the general survey was initiated on 20 September 2010 and that the start of the technical survey is expected for 27 September 2010. Guinea-Bissau indicated that this slight delay will not affect the normal course of action and that Guinea-Bissau still finds itself within the time allotted for unforeseen delays.

11. The President of the Second Review Conference requested clarity from Guinea-Bissau concerning a contradiction between Guinea-Bissau expressing that “it is still positive that it will be able to complete its implementation of article 5 in known areas by its deadline of 1 November 2011” and a separate indication that the “clearance of all LIS reported areas... will take place until January 2012.” Guinea-Bissau responded by indicating that completion by 1 November 2011 is based on (a) technical survey proceeding as planned with a considerable amount of land released, (b) NPA’s efforts contributing to increased clearance rates, and (c) the availability of funds to support operations, particularly the operations of the organisation “LUTCAM”. Guinea-Bissau further responded to indicate that if these conditions are not satisfied, the release all LIS-identified areas could be extended to January 2012.

12. The request indicates that, while since 2000 all clearance activities had been conducted without technical survey making the clearance process long and inefficient, clearance will now be conducted following technical survey which will result in a precise definition of areas to be demined. The request further indicates that all clearance work is conducted in accordance with the International Mine Action Standards. In addition the request indicates that a land cancellation policy has been developed to ensure that non-technical surveys would also be used (along with technical surveys and clearance) to release suspected hazardous areas. The analysing group noted that Guinea-Bissau’s more efficient approach meant that past clearance rates were not indicative of the rate that could be expected between now and the requested extended deadline date.

13. The request indicates that approximately US\$ 6.5 million was invested into mine action in Guinea-Bissau between 2001 and 2004 and that US\$ 7.5 million was invested between 2005 and 2009. The President of the Second Review Conference asked Guinea-Bissau if it could confirm, as is indicated in the table in Section II of the request, that Guinea-Bissau itself has not invested any of its own resources into the implementation of Article 5 and has relied solely on external sources. Guinea-Bissau responded by confirming that Guinea-Bissau has not invested any of its own resources into the implementation of article 5, that it has relied solely on external resources, and, that the only contribution from Guinea-Bissau itself has been the premises where CAAMI is located and the appointment of a national director.

14. The request further indicates that available resources for September 2010 to November 2011 total US\$ 2,883,974 divided among the organizations (NPA – US\$1.2 million, HUMAID – US\$ 682,000, Cleared Ground – US\$ 318,000, LUTCAM – US\$ 146,600, and, CAAMI – US\$ 537,374). The President of the Second Review Conference asked Guinea-Bissau if all funds are in place or if more funds are required for the work that remains to be conducted and if Guinea Bissau could provide a budget. Guinea-Bissau answered by indicating that there are funds in place for NPA survey and clearance activities, and for HUMAID clearance activities for 2011. Beyond 2011, NPA has funds assured for two years, and no further information is available on funds for HUMAID past 2011. Cleared Ground Demining has been funded for 2011, and there is no further information about their support after 2011. CAAMI is still supported on a regular basis by the UNDP and would need US\$ 500,000.00 for the next year for planning and coordination. LUTCAM has no funds for the next year. Therefore, the shortfall is related to LUTCAM and CAAMI for 2011 and it totals US\$1,050,000.

15. The President of the Second Review Conference requested additional information from Guinea-Bissau on what each organization is intended to do or accomplish. Guinea-Bissau responded by reiterating that NPA would carry out general and technical surveys and provide additional mine clearance capacity, HUMAID would carry out mine/ERW clearance, LUTCAM would carry out mine/ERW clearance, CAAMI would plan and coordinate mine action activities and Cleared Ground Demining would be involved in the destruction of obsolete ammunitions and small-scaled demolition tasks.

16. The President of the Second Review Conference asked if Guinea-Bissau itself was going to contribute resources to the remaining work. Guinea-Bissau responded by indicating that it is not providing financial resources, apart from the premises where CAAMI is located. The analysing group noted that, given that the financial shortfall could affect the realisation of Guinea-Bissau's plan, resource mobilisation could be greatly aided if Guinea-Bissau demonstrated greater national ownership by making a national financial investment into article 5 implementation, in keeping with the understandings adopted by the States Parties at the Second Review Conference. The analysing group further noted resource mobilisation could be enhanced by providing more detailed budgetary information regarding unfunded costs.

17. The request indicates that 1,140 women, girls, boys or men were injured or killed by mines or UXO between 1963 and 2004. The analysing group noted that Guinea Bissau had provided in its request data on mine victims disaggregated by age and sex in keeping with commitments the States Parties had made through the adoption of the Cartagena Action Plan. The request further indicates that clearance has reduced the risk to civilians, increased the movement of people and the availability of agricultural land, permitted internally displaced persons to relocate and provided for the installation of communications infrastructure. The request also indicates that the presence of mines continues to significantly limit the possibilities for further development of agricultural areas and the impact that those areas can have on economic growth, the creation of employment

opportunities and improvement of the country's external competitiveness as well as improving the quality of life of the local population.

18. The request includes other relevant tables that may be of use to the States Parties in assessing and considering the request, including tables listing areas known or suspected to contain mines, complete with geographic coordinates, a table reporting on deaths and injuries over time, and a timeline for the activities to be undertaken.

19. The analysing group noted that Guinea-Bissau had found itself in a situation wherein less than 14 months before its deadline it was still unclear whether it would be able to complete implementation of article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention by its deadline. The analysing group further noted that while it may be unfortunate that after almost ten years since entry into force a State Party is unable to account for what remains to be done, it is positive that such a State Party, as is the case of Guinea-Bissau, intends to take the steps to garner an understanding of the true remaining extent of the challenge and to act accordingly. In addition, the analysing group noted that Guinea-Bissau will have obtained clarity regarding the remaining challenge following the conclusion of general survey at the end of April 2011. As well, the analysing group noted that Guinea-Bissau had acted in a prudent manner by requesting only the amount of time necessary to ensure that it would not become non-compliant.

20. The analysing group noted that while Guinea Bissau has been slow to adopt efficient land release practices and that while its progress to date has been modest, Guinea Bissau was making a commitment through its extension request to more efficiently and expediently proceed with article 5 implementation. The analysing group further noted that the plan presented by Guinea Bissau is workable, but subject to the acquisition of funds to keep all non-governmental organisations in operation. In this regard, the analysing group noted that Guinea-Bissau's resource mobilisation efforts could benefit from communicating in more detail its cost projections for each organisation listed in its request and from Guinea Bissau itself making a national contribution to the implementation of article 5.

21. The analysing group noted that the plan presented by Guinea-Bissau provides for the use of the full range of technical and non-technical means to release suspected hazardous areas in keeping with the recommendations adopted by the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties. In this regard, the analysing group noted the importance of Guinea-Bissau reporting on its progress in a manner consistent with commitments the States Parties had made through the adoption of the Cartagena Action Plan by providing information disaggregated by release through clearance, technical survey and non-technical survey.

22. The analysing group noted that the timeline contained in the request would greatly assist Guinea-Bissau and all States Parties in assessing progress between now and the requested extended deadline. In this regard, the analysing group noted that both could benefit if Guinea-Bissau provided updates relative to these timelines at meetings of the Standing Committees and at Meetings of the State Parties.
