

Thanks Chileshe,

The Mine Ban Convention art. 5 requires states parties to make “every effort” to identify areas under their jurisdiction or control where mines are known or suspected to be emplaced, and to destroy these mines.

In practice that is taken to mean making all *reasonable* effort. Article 5 does not require the affected States to search every square meter of their country looking for every last mine. There will be some residual risk, and it should be planned for.

At the 7MSP the States Parties adopted a model declaration of completion that recognised this, and the 12MSP adopted a decision on what to do in such situations. As we saw this morning, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania and Nigeria are applying these decisions.

Following a State’s declaration of completion, it may in other words discover previously unknown mined areas. At depths lower than the cleared depth. In areas previously unknown. The odd mine that was missed. New contamination. This is nothing new under the sun.

What *is* new is the emphasis that the Oslo Action Plan puts on the issue. In Action 26, States Parties committed to ensure that “national strategies and work plans for completion make provisions for a sustainable national capacity to address previously unknown mined areas” and in Action 31 to “build national capacity to deliver mine risk education to affected

communities in the case that previously unknown mined areas are discovered". Two actions out of 50, no less!

Inasmuch as we accept a residual risk – that the States Parties may identify previously unknown mine areas – we must ensure that there is a sustainable national capacity in place to deal with that risk. And, as the OAP points out: the planning does not start upon declaration of completion. Just as residual risks should be part of the planning from the get-go, so should the planning for a capacity to deal with that risk. Conversely, completion is not the end-point for mine risk education. It just needs to be adapted so that the affected populations remain vigilant and safe vis-à-vis this threat.

--- --- ---

Actions 26 and 31 are the fruit of the extensive dialogue that the presidency had with affected states parties and civil society in the run-up to the 4<sup>th</sup> Review Conference. Recurring themes were the need for affected states to create a conducive environment to ensure sustainability, including standards, a sustainable national information management system and national investment and ownership. Another recurring topic was the need for the international operators to not just up and leave when the job's done, but to plan for the end, assist with transfer of knowledge and development of sustainable capacity.

We will likely hear from representatives of many of those same interlocutors today, so I will not go into more detail. I just want

to take the opportunity to underscore again the connection between the issue of sustainable national capacities, long planning horizons, the all-important national ownership – without which there can hardly be a residual sustainable capacity, and the importance of the mine operators assisting in the endeavour to establish a sustainable residual capacity before they leave.

--- --- ---

Finally, one last point in relation to Action 26 that the article 5 committee (to which Norway belongs) has made a habit to remind the states parties of: If states parties discover previously unknown mined areas after completion Action 26 calls on them to use the procedure that was agreed at the 12<sup>th</sup> meeting of states parties in order to receive a new deadline for the clearance. This is very important, as the extension request is the basis for the Convention's cooperative reengagement with that state.