

Statement on Transparency

5th Review Conference of the Mine Ban Treaty, Siem Reap, Cambodia 25-29 November 2024

Thank you, Mr. President,

The draft Siem Reap-Angkor Action Plan states at its outset that “*The information submitted by States Parties in their annual Article 7 reports serves as the main data source to assess progress for the President and members of the Coordinating Committee to measure progress within their mandate.*”

The ICBL welcomes inclusion of transparency reporting among the “best practices in implementation” and as a dedicated Action#8 in the Action Plan, with several additional actions across the plan that specifically require action in annual Art. 7 reports.

More attention and efforts in this area are indeed needed, as unfortunately the rate of fulfilling this obligation remains alarmingly low. As of this month, only 80 States Parties (less than a half) had submitted their annual Article 7 reports that covered the previous calendar year. A total of 84 States Parties have NOT submitted such transparency report, of which most have failed to provide an annual transparency report for two or more years. Tuvalu remains the only State Party that has not provided an initial transparency report that was due 12 years ago.

The ICBL greatly appreciates the timely submission of Article 7 reports by those states which did so, and the work of the Committee on Cooperative Compliance, in this regard. We continue to encourage states to not only submit their transparency reports by the deadline but also to provide complete and correct information. Comprehensive and quality information sharing is a key tool for States Parties to track progress, fulfill their obligations under the treaty, to highlight existing gaps and needs, as well as to achieve the goals set by the the Siem Reap – Angkor Action Plan.

Article 7 transparency reports are important tools for showing how well victim assistance is working. These reports should give a full and honest picture of the situation where the gaps are, and how states can better fulfill their obligations to address the rights and needs of mine survivors – something that remains a challenge for most states responsible for victims, including my own – Chile.

The ICBL is also dismayed that few states report on actions undertaken to promote universalization of the treaty or strengthening of the the norm of non-use of antipersonnel landmines, which may be an indicator that few states undertake such actions.

In closing, we invite States Parties to read further the Transparency section of the this year’s Landmine Monitor report presented on the first day of this meeting. Article 7 reports are essential tools for the Landmine Monitor and for all of us to demonstrate that we are committed to and on track to achieving a world free of landmines.

Thank you.