
**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**

5 October 2020

Original: English

Eighteenth Meeting

Geneva, 16-20 November 2020

Item 11 of the provisional agenda

Consideration of requests submitted under Article 5

**Analysis of the request submitted by Senegal 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 Committee on Article 5 Implementation
(Austria, Canada, Norway and Zambia)**

1. Senegal ratified the Convention on 24 September 1998 and the Convention entered into force for Senegal on 1 March 1999. In its initial transparency report Senegal indicated that there were areas under its jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced. Senegal was obliged to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines under its jurisdiction or control by 1 March 2009. Senegal, believing that it would be unable to do so by that date, submitted a request to the 2008 Ninth Meeting of the States Parties (9MSP) for a seven-year extension of its deadline, until 1 March 2016. The 9MSP agreed unanimously to grant the request.
2. In granting Senegal's request in 2008, the 9MSP noted that while it may be unfortunate that after almost ten years since entry into force, Senegal was only beginning to obtain clarity regarding the challenge it faced and had demined very little, there were some compelling circumstances that impeded any work from progressing until 2005. The Meeting further noted that it was encouraging that Senegal had used the extension request process to signal that it was now acting with greater urgency. The Meeting further noted the commitment made by Senegal to undertake technical survey activities and to develop a cancellation procedure that may result in implementation that proceeds much faster than that suggested by the amount of time requested and in a more cost-effective manner.
3. On 20 June 2015, Senegal submitted to the Fourteenth Meeting of the States Parties, (14MSP) a request for extension of its 1 March 2016 deadline. Senegal's request was for five years, until 1 March 2021. The 14MSP agreed unanimously to grant the request.
4. In granting the request in 2015, the 14MSP noted that, while Senegal had largely sought to comply with the commitments it had made in 2008, to obtain clearer knowledge of size and location of areas that will still warrant clearance including by technical surveys and develop a cancellation procedure, the full extent of the remaining challenge remains to be

* This document was scheduled for publication after the standard publication date owing to circumstances beyond the submitter's control.



clarified and a detailed annual work plan for survey and clearance leading to completion and based on accurate and coherent data is still missing.

5. On 15 June 2020, Senegal submitted to the Chair of the Committee on Article 5 Implementation (hereafter referred to as “the Committee”), a request for extension of its 1 March 2021 deadline. Senegal’s request is for five years, until 1 March 2026. On 29 July 2020, the Committee wrote to Senegal to request additional clarification and information. On 22 September 2020, Senegal submitted to the Committee on Article 5 Implementation additional information in response to the Committee’s questions.

6. The request indicates that at the time of submission of the previous request, Senegal reported a remaining challenge of 64 areas, including 52 confirmed hazardous areas measuring 478,328 square metres and 12 suspected hazardous areas whose estimated size is unknown. The previous request also indicated that 111 suspected localities are still inaccessible and remain to be surveyed and 25 of the 60 abandoned localities remain abandoned. In addition, the request indicates that non-technical surveys are planned to be conducted in 216 localities, including in the remaining 111 suspected localities which are still inaccessible in the Ziguinchor region.

7. The request indicates that during the requesting period Senegal completed non-technical survey in 98 of 216 localities identified, resulting in the identification of 5 confirmed dangerous areas and 93 areas declassified, with 118 localities remaining to be visited. The request further indicates that technical survey and clearance were completed on 20 of a total 52 confirmed dangerous areas in 6 departments of Ziguinchor and Goudomp. The request indicates one confirmed dangerous area was addressed by Norwegian People’s Aid (NPA) in 2013, with 32 confirmed dangerous areas remaining to be addressed.

8. The request indicates that an estimated 176,278 square metres were released during the extension period. The Committee welcomes the information on progress provided by Senegal and noted the importance of Senegal continuing to report on progress in accordance with the land release methodology employed (i.e. cancelled through non-technical survey, reduced through technical survey, or cleared through clearance).

9. The request indicates that over the course of the previous extension period a total of 6 mine victims were reported. The Committee noted that Senegal had provided in its request data on mine victims. In response to the Committee’s request, this data was disaggregated data by age, sex and location. The request indicates that progress has allowed for agricultural, pastoral and tourist activities to resume, giving access to more than 200,000,000 square metres of land, including the re-opening of fruit processing plant and reconstruction of 120 houses in Gouraf with the support of ICRC, as part of the “Programme National Plateformes Multifonctionnelles” (Dar Salam, Mpack, Gouraf, Sindone). In addition, the population’s mobility was improved by an additional 50 kilometres of tracks. The Committee noted that progress in the implementation of Article 5 during the requested extension period had the potential of making a significant contribution to improving human safety and socioeconomic conditions in Senegal.

10. The request also indicates that since 2014, Senegal implemented four mine risk education projects in Bignona, Ziguinchor, Oussouye and Goudromp. The Committee noted the importance of Senegal continuing to provide context-specific mine risk education and reduction programmes to all affected populations and groups at risk and to ensure that such programmes are developed on the basis of a needs assessment, that they are tailored to the threat encountered by the population, and that they are sensitive to gender, age, disability and take the diverse needs and experiences of people in affected communities into account.

11. The request indicates that Senegal updated its national mine action standards (NMAS) in 2013 which led to the adoption of two new standards on demining and to revisions to the national standards on accreditation, non-technical and technical survey. The Committee highlighted the importance of Senegal ensuring that its national mine action standards remain up to date in accordance with the latest International Mine Action Standards (IMAS), adapt them to new challenges and employ best practices to ensure efficient and effective implementation.

12. The Committee wrote to Senegal to request information on measures taken by Senegal to integrate and mainstream gender considerations and take the diverse needs and experiences of people in affected communities into account in mine action programming. Senegal responded by indicating that gender is mainstreamed in all aspects of national life, including in the work of the CNAMS¹ and the mine action operator working in Senegal. In addition, community liaison teams are always mixed teams to ensure inclusive surveys.

13. The request indicates the following, which in Senegal's view, acted as impeding circumstances: a) Senegal experienced a reduction in operational capacity due to the departure of UNDP and NPA in 2014 and MECHEM in 2016 due to lack of funding and security issues, b) difficulty in safely accessing suspected hazardous areas, with demining teams becoming the target of robberies and exactions, with the abduction of 12 MECHEM deminers in Kailou, Ziguinchor department in 2013 and in the kidnapping of 12 deminers in Bafata, Goudomp department in 2019, resulting in a 10 month halt to demining activities and c) lack of financing.

14. The request indicates a remaining challenge of 1,593,487 square metres, including 37 confirmed hazardous areas (CHAs) measuring 491,086 square metres, 9 suspect hazardous areas (SHAs) of unknown size, and 118 localities measuring an estimated 1,278,679 square metres, (101 in Bignona, 13 in Ziguinchor, and 4 in Oussouye). The Committee wrote to Senegal requesting that the information on the remaining challenge be disaggregated by 'suspected hazardous areas' and 'confirmed hazardous areas' and their relative size, as well as by the type of contamination in a manner consistent with IMAS. Senegal responded by providing a list of remaining areas by department, disaggregated as per IMAS, their size when known and indicated that the type of contamination was difficult to assess before clearance but previous activities indicated a prevalence of anti-personnel mines and anti-tank mines. The Committee welcomed the information provided by Senegal and noted the importance of Senegal continuing to report in a manner consistent with IMAS.

15. As noted, Senegal's request is for 5 years (until 1 March 2026). The Committee enquired whether Senegal could consider requesting only the time necessary over the next two years to complete clearance of the 37 CHAs and to determine the extent of the remaining contamination. Senegal responded that, while non-technical surveys can take 4-6 months, negotiations with factions of the Movement of Democratic Forces of Casamance (MDFC) can take 10 months or longer and the situation would be the same when deploying operators in CHAs. As well, Senegal indicated that these areas will be the focus of the first three years of the extension, and that if resources are available, clearance and non-technical surveys could be led in parallel, which would accelerate the pace of work.

16. The request indicates that during the extension period Senegal intends to a) carry out non-technical survey in 118 localities and 9 suspected hazardous areas, b) address 37 mined areas. The request indicates that in 2018 updated its national strategy with the participation of members of the national commission, international donors and implementing partners. The request indicates that Senegal intends to address 40 locations through non-technical survey in 2020, 78 locations and 9 SHA as well as 12 CHA measuring 113,975.21 square metres in 2021, 16 CHA measuring 299,871.45 square metres in 2022, 9 CHA measuring 77,240.02 square metres in 2023 and 9 SHA in 2024. The committee noted the importance of Senegal continue to update its work plan based on new evidence and report on adjusted milestones on an annual basis and how priorities have been established.

17. The request indicates that for all activities to be undertaken during the extension period will cost a total of US \$12,186,185. The request indicates that the Government of Senegal will finance US \$3,333,333 of the total and would require US \$8,852,852 to be mobilised from donors. The Committee recognises Senegal's efforts to ensure a national financial commitment to implementation. The Committee welcomes the commitment from Senegal and noted the importance of Senegal developing a resource mobilisation plans and use all mechanisms within the Convention to disseminate information on challenges and requirements for assistance, including by taking advantage of the individualised approach. The Committee wrote to Senegal to request information on the current availability of national

¹ Centre d'Action Antimines au Sénégal

resources and on efforts by Senegal to secure additional national resources. Senegal responded by indicating that the only resources currently available are used to pay salaries, that requests have been sent through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to a number of partners and their feedback is yet to be received.

18. The request indicates that several circumstance may impact positively or negatively on the milestones given in the plan, including, a) the support of two international partners to provide necessary capacity to carry out planned demining activities, b) precarious security conditions, which require the collaboration of MFDC for access to target areas, implying long negotiations and unstable agreements, and c) overcoming the drop of financial resources that has occurred since 2014.

19. The Committee wrote to Senegal requesting information on efforts undertaken to ensure support from partners. Senegal responded by indicating that Senegal has had contacts with the Mines Advisory Group (MAG) in addition to Humanity and Inclusion (HI) and is waiting for a formal response from these organisations before initiating contacts with other partners. In addition, Senegal indicated that resource mobilisation meetings were going to be held in March 2020 but were cancelled because of COVID-19.

20. The Committee noted the importance of Senegal providing additional information on efforts undertaken to reach an agreement with armed groups to secure access to mined areas as well as providing clear milestones related to future discussions in the context of the adoption of an engagement strategy for the continuation of operations in Casamance. The Committee wrote to Senegal to request that Senegal specify which mined areas are located in safe areas and can continue to be surveyed and cleared. Senegal responded by indicating that all areas are impacted by insecurity and that access to target areas is obtained after long negotiations with the MFDC. In this context, it is currently impossible to indicate areas where survey and demining teams can be deployed without the MFDC factions' agreement which makes it difficult to communicate future milestones for securing access to mined areas. However, Senegal indicated that after 10 months of negotiations, non-technical surveys could resume in Bignona in February 2020 but were interrupted because of COVID-19.

21. The Committee also enquired about the status of survey and demining activities around the military bases. Senegal responded by indicating that in this regard, only the village of Djirack at the border with Guinea Bissau has mined areas located as a buffer between the Senegalese armed forces and headquarters of one of the MFDC factions. While it is still unclear who laid these mined areas, they will be demined like those of the village of Mpack.

22. The Committee noted that the request includes other relevant information that may be of use to the States Parties in assessing and considering the request, including further details on national demining structures, information on security risks, together with annexes with details of the remaining challenge, mine risk education and victim assistance efforts.

23. In recalling that the implementation of Senegal's national demining plan may be affected by the precarious security conditions and the need for collaboration of the MFDC for access to target areas, amongst other matters, and that following the first years of implementation circumstances may change, the Committee noted that the Convention would benefit from Senegal submitting to the Committee an updated detailed work plan by 30 April 2023, for the remaining period covered by the extension. The Committee noted that the work plan should contain an updated list of all areas known or suspected to contain anti-personnel mines using terminology consistent with IMAS, annual projections of which areas and what area would be dealt with during the remaining period covered by the request and by which organisation, matched to a revised detailed budget.

24. The Committee wrote to Senegal to request information on provisions for a sustainable national capacity to address previously unknown mined areas, including newly mined areas discovered following completion. Senegal responded by indicating that the coordination of an exit strategy will be ensured by l'Agence Nationale de Reconstruction de la Casamance (ANRAC). There will be a need to have a rapid-response capacity to deal with isolated mines or ERW. The Military Engineering Units in Casamance will be responsible for residual contamination. The Ministries of the Interior, armed forces, customs, water and forests are responsible for the implementation of the law relating to anti-personnel mines on

the national territory and at borders. Ministries in charge of health, social action, family and education will continue activities relating victim assistance.

25. The Committee noted with satisfaction the plan presented by Senegal is workable, lends itself to be monitored, and states clearly which factors could affect the pace of implementation. The Committee also noted that the plan is based on allocations from State budgets and contingent upon stable international funding. In this regard, the Committee noted that the Convention would benefit from Senegal reporting annually to the States Parties on the following:

- (a) Progress in implementation of Senegal's work plan, including annual survey and clearance plan during the extension period disaggregated in a manner consistent with IMAS in accordance with the land release methodology employed, (i.e. cancelled through non-technical survey, reduced through technical survey, and clearance through clearance);
- (b) The impact of annual progress on annual targets as given in Senegal's work plan, including updates to Senegal's national work plan, based on new evidence and report on adjusted milestones, including on the number of areas and amount of area to be addressed annually, and on how priorities have been established;
- (c) Progress on security related access matters and potential positive or negative impacts regarding re-survey and clearance of mined areas;
- (d) Information on how implementation efforts take into consideration the different needs and perspectives of women, girls, boys and men and the diverse needs and experiences of people in affected communities;
- (e) Updates regarding detailed, costed and multi-year plans for context-specific mine risk education and reduction in affected communities;
- (f) Updates regarding resource mobilisation efforts, including efforts in approaching potential donors and organisations in order to fund and assist in the implementation of clearance operations and the result of these efforts, including an expected timeline for recruitment, training and management of new or additional capacities;
- (g) Update on efforts by Senegal to strengthen national coordination including by ensuring regular dialogue with national and international stakeholders on progress, challenges and support for implementation of their obligations under the Convention (e.g. establishing an appropriate national platform for regular dialogue among all stakeholders) and the results of these efforts, and;
- (h) Progress on efforts to establish a sustainable national capacity to address previously unknown mined areas, including newly mined areas discovered following completion.

26. The Committee noted the importance, in addition to Senegal reporting to the States Parties as noted above, of keeping the States Parties regularly apprised of other pertinent developments regarding the implementation of Article 5 during the period covered by the request and other commitments made in the request at intersessional meetings, Meetings of the States Parties and Review Conferences as well as through its Article 7 reports using the Guide to Reporting.