

Thank you very much Mr. President for offering me the floor.

The expansion of the Committee's mandate by the Fourth Review Conference to: encourage States Parties to submit annual Article 7 Reports, to address all matters under Article 1.2 in cases where a State Party has not submitted an Article 7 Report detailing progress in implementing relevant obligations each year and support States Parties in their efforts to implement and report on matters contained in Article 9 was very welcome.

The Convention is a humanitarian disarmament instrument that has at its foundation cooperative implementation and transparency.

The urgent humanitarian character of the Convention makes us all stakeholders in ensuring its implementation by mine affected States Parties where landmines continue to claim lives and limbs and have a socioeconomic impact.

At the Third Review Conference we adopted the Maputo Action Plan and established the Conventions four Committees, in their

current format, with mandates that obliged them to look more closely into the individual context of States Parties and the challenges they face in implementation of the Convention.

The Committees cannot implement their respective mandates should States not provide high-quality information, primarily, but not only, in annual Article 7 Reports. As you could appreciate from the Committee's observations, the reporting rate is simply too low. Therefore, an accurate picture of where we are with implementation, is difficult to acquire.

Our reporting efforts have evolved since the implementation of the Convention. We have learned more about what it takes to ensure that we achieve the objective of "putting an end to the suffering and casualties caused by anti-personnel mines" for all people, for all times.

Decisions made by the States Parties concerning reporting in the first 16 years of implementation of the Convention culminated in the adoption of the Guide to Reporting at the Fourteenth Meeting of the States Parties which collated all the decision made by States Parties on reporting into one Guide. Since this

time States Parties have made additional commitments to report on different aspects of implementation. In particular, in the context of the adoption of the Oslo Action Plan.

The Oslo Action Plan is more demanding than the Maputo Action Plan given the fact that it contains 50 actions with approximately 80 indicators that must be tracked and reported on.

In this regard, in 2019 the Coordinating Committee lead by Sudan carried out some technical updates to the Guide to Reporting in line with the Oslo Action Plan. As mentioned, these updates are of a purely technical nature and stem from reporting commitments we as States Parties agreed upon in Oslo.

The updated document is on the intersessional website and the aim is to put it forward for adoption at the Nineteenth Meeting of the States Parties.

It is important to point out that many of the reporting commitments we adopted in Oslo, were not new. The few that are new have been included in the updated guide to reporting.

For example, the Oslo Action Plan commits States Parties to report on efforts to replace live anti-personnel mines with alternative measures for training and research purposes. In this regard, this has been included in the updated Guide to reporting.

To close Ambassador, as a member of the Committee on Cooperative Compliance, I am looking forward to working with colleagues to implementing our mandate of following up with States that have not reported on their implementation efforts this year. And eventually, through the updated Guide to Reporting, ensuring improved reporting in line with Article 8 of the Oslo Action Plan which Requests States Parties to:

*Provide quality information on progress and challenges in implementing the Convention, including on cooperation and assistance, by 30 April each year in line with Article 7, employing the Guide to Reporting , and during formal and informal meetings.*

Thank you very much.