

## **Updated on the Article 5 extensions process**

**Ambassador Susan Eckey of Norway, President of the Second Review Conference**

**Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies**

**22 June 2010**

It is my pleasure to provide you with an update on the Article 5 extension process which was agreed to at the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties.

I wish to remind you of the main features of this process.

- First: Requesting States Parties are encouraged to submit their request to the President no fewer than nine months before the Meeting of the States Parties or the Review Conference at which the request would be considered. The President is subsequently charged with informing the States Parties of the receipt of requests, which I will do through the course of this report.
- Second: The President, Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs are mandated to jointly prepare an analysis of each request, with this analysis being submitted in advance of the relevant Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conference.
- And third: This process is intended to be a cooperative, collaborative one, with requesting States Parties and the States Parties mandated to prepare analyses working together to produce outcomes that are good from Convention as a whole.

This is the third year of the application of this process. During the first year, in 2008, the States Parties established working methods. These working methods were recorded in a report presented to the 9MSP and in the documents adopted at the Second Review Conference.

With respect to the extension process this year, please allow me to inform you of the following:

- On 11 March, the States Parties mandated to analyse Article 5 requests met for the first time this year to review our working methods and take stock of our work load.
- On 31 March of this year, I received a request submitted by Colombia. On 10 April I received a request submitted by Mauritania. And, on 18 June I received a request submitted by Denmark. Each of these requests has been made available on the Convention's website.
- I have also written to all other States Parties with deadlines in 2011 to request that they clarify when or whether they will submit requests.

Chad has responded to provide reasons why it was unable to submit a request approximately nine months prior to the 10MSP.

In addition, Guinea Bissau has recently indicated to me that it will submit a request soon.

And, I am aware that Zimbabwe is in the process of preparing a request.

- Following the receipt of the requests submitted by Colombia and Mauritania and in keeping with the agreed working methods, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, with the support of their Co-Rapporteurs, sought to obtain additional information that may be necessary for a complete analysis.

They generated questions, which I forwarded to both States Parties on 18 May. Both Colombia and Mauritania have provided responses to these questions and I thank them for their efforts in doing so.

- On 19 May, the analysing group met to have an initial discussion the requests submitted by Colombia and Mauritania. In addition, in keeping with the agreed understanding that expertise to assist in the analysis process could be obtained from a variety of sources and a variety of forms, the analysing group received the valuable input of the ICBL and ICRC.
- It should be noted that with respect to conflicts of interest, the agreed working methods indicate that the President would ask members of the analysing group to excuse themselves from the analysis of their own requests or the analysis of a request with which they have a

conflict of interest, such as a territorial or sovereignty dispute with the requesting State Party. In this regard, I wish to note that Colombia excused itself from any discussions on the request submitted by Colombia.

- This week, the analysing group is taking advantage of the presence of experts from capitals to engage in informal discussions with requesting States Parties. This morning we met with experts from Colombia and Mauritania and later this week we hope to meet with Chad, Congo, Denmark, Guinea Bissau and Zimbabwe.

In terms of next steps, my aim is to conclude our work by the end of September in order that analyses can be made available well before the 10MSP.

Completing our work by the end of September may be ambitious with respect to some cases because requests have not yet been submitted by some States Parties.

That some States Parties are late in submitting is largely due the fact that after more than ten years since entry into force many States Parties are still unable to account for what has been accomplished and what remains to be done.

This is regrettable. For years we have received reports from the humanitarian demining industry about developments in survey activities and information management. It is perplexing, therefore, that a decade of activity in many cases has not resulted in the clarity necessary to specify, locate and quantify various States Parties' implementation challenges.

The lesson for States Parties that may have to request an extension next year or in future years – and more generally the lesson for any Article 5 implementing State Party that wishes to prepare a meaningful demining plan and a compelling case for resources – is to take corrective action now, if necessary, to be able to report, as required, on the location of areas known or suspected to contain anti-personnel mines.

In closing, let me thank those States Parties that have prepared requests this year as well as the members of the analysing group who have already invested a great deal of time in examining these requests.