

MATTERS TO CONSIDER IN DEVELOPING THE SIEM-REAP – ANGKOR ACTION PLAN

SUBMITTED BY THE PRESIDENT

1. The action plans adopted at the First, Second, Third and Fourth Review Conferences amounted to an important innovation, Review Conferences became not simply instances to review the operation and status of the Convention for the sake of reviewing. Rather, the States Parties looked back to identify what needed to be done to overcome challenges of the day in order to make commitments to ensure further progress in the pursuit of the Convention's aims. The commitments, contained in the Nairobi, Cartagena, Maputo, and Oslo Action Plans focused the States Parties' efforts and became important reference points to guide their work. The Oslo Action Plan further innovated by including indicators against which the implementation of the actions can be assessed on an annual basis.
2. After 25 years of efforts to implement the Convention, the States Parties may wish to consider the following questions in order to inform the political commitments that they would want to make in the Siem Reap – Angkor Action Plan.
 - a. What kind of action plan will best support the pursuit of the Convention's aims following the Fifth Review Conference?
 - b. The Oslo Action Plan contains 50 actions, including 10 on best practices, 2 on universalization, 5 on stockpile destruction and retention of anti-personnel mines, 10 on survey and clearance, 5 on mine risk education and reduction, 9 on victim assistance 6 on international cooperation and assistance, 3 on measures to ensuring compliance. Should the Siem Reap Action Plan be similar, more focused, overall and with respect to individual sections? Should the Siem Reap Action Plan contain a similar number of actions or be more condensed?
 - c. Previous Action Plans have been highly ambitious, presenting in some sections an ideal outcome which may in fact have been difficult for States Parties, particularly mine-affected States Parties, to fully implement. Should the Siem Reap Action Plan be aspirational or more realistic?
 - d. As the Oslo Action Plan contains indicators against which to assess the implementation of the plan, should the States Parties once again aim for an Action Plan that enables its implementation to be measured, thereby ensuring that its application can be monitored in a more concrete and specific manner?

Best Practices

3. The Oslo Action Plan included a section on best practices which include national ownership, national strategies and work plans, matter related to gender and diversity, national mine action standards, partnerships, article 7 reporting, national information management, assessed contribution and matters related to the Implementation Support Unit. Should such a section be considered for the Siem Reap – Angkor – Action Plan which contains all cross cutting elements? If yes, should it make reference to the same issues? Should additional cross-cutting issues be mentioned?
4. The States Parties are obliged to provide updated information annually on efforts to comply with the Convention and have committed to voluntarily provide additional information. In any particular year, large numbers of States Parties are not submitting updated information. Many of these States Parties, however, do not have new information to provide (e.g. because they do not

have mined areas or stockpiled mines, because they have retained mines for permitted purposes, et cetera). Following the Fifth Review Conference, should the focus as concerns transparency be less on these States Parties and more ensuring that those which are in the process of implementing key provisions of the Convention provide clarity on what has been accomplished during the past calendar year and what remains to be done and by when? Should a state that has indicated it has nothing to report be obliged to report?

5. The States Parties have taken a number of decisions to establish implementation mechanisms (i.e., Intersessional Meetings, Coordinating Committee, Implementation Support Unit, Article 5 extensions analysis process). Following the Fifth Review Conference, what commitments will the States Parties make to support the implementation machinery that they have created (e.g. funding to the Convention's Implementation Support Unit)?
6. The Oslo Action Plan contains a number of actions concerning gender and diversity. What measures should the Siem Reap – Angkor – Action Plan consider to ensure that the gender and diversity commitments of the Oslo Action Plan continue to be strengthened?
7. New issues have been raised that have not been included in the Oslo Action Plan, primarily concerning environmental issues. Should the Siem Reap – Angkor Action Plan mention environmental issues and if yes, how should these issues be referred to?

Universalizing the Convention

8. There are now few States not party to the Convention that have indicated an openness to accession to the Convention in the near-term. What could be done to ensure that universalization efforts are strengthened following the Fifth Review Conference? What actions should be considered by the States Parties?
9. Universalization efforts are not only geared toward ensuring accession by States Parties but also to most closely align States Parties with the goals and objectives of the Convention. If necessary, what could be included to better reflect this effort in the upcoming action plan?

Stockpile destruction and retention of anti-personnel mines

10. The Oslo Action Plan includes a number of actions on stockpile destruction, including for States Parties that have missed their respective deadline. What commitments should be contained in the Siem Reap-Angkor Action Plan to ensure that the challenges that were identified in the Oslo Action Plan can finally be overcome during the period of this upcoming action plan.

Survey and clearance of mined areas

11. Article 5 of the Convention obliges States Parties to clear all mined areas as soon as possible. By the time the Fifth Review Conference takes place, more than 25 years will have passed since entry into force of the Convention and yet more than 33 States Parties still not have completed implementation of Article 5. In addition, despite many years efforts, millions of dollars having been invested in mine action, and the development of sophisticated methods and means for addressing mined areas and for the management of information , many States Parties either do not have, or are not providing, clarity regarding the size, location and nature of their remaining Article 5 challenge.
12. What do the States Parties wish to commit to do in order to overcome such persistent challenges in the implementation of Article 5?

Mine risk education and reduction

13. Article 5 of the Convention obliges States Parties to ensure the effective exclusion of civilians from mined areas until all anti-personnel mines contained therein have been destroyed. In this regard, the States Parties have recognized the critical role of mine risk education and reduction efforts.
14. The Oslo Action Plan contained key commitments that State Parties would undertake to deliver on mine risk education and reduction efforts to ensure the safety of the civilian population. In this regard, what do the States Parties wish to commit to do in order to strengthen the delivery of mine risk education and reduction in affected communities?

Victim assistance

15. Since entry into force, the States Parties have done much to build up victim assistance, taking what was then a ground-breaking but tentative commitment and spelling out what it means in an extremely rich and precedent-setting manner. The States Parties have understood *victim* in broad terms, they have made a solemn promise to these victims, and they have understood that this promise will be fulfilled through broader national policies, plans and legal frameworks related to disability, health, education, employment, development and poverty reduction.
16. With so much having been done to build up victim assistance, now is not the time to dismantle it. What will the States Parties commit to do to take victim assistance to the next level? If it is agreed that the Siem Reap Action Plan should be measurable, how will this be accomplished with respect to victim assistance commitments, particularly given that all that is required to live up the ultimate promise to victims – participation in all spheres of one's society on a basis equal with others – cannot be accomplished by the efforts of this Convention alone?

International cooperation and assistance

17. The obligations for States Parties to cooperate and assist one another do not expire nor have deadlines. Many States Parties in the process of implementing the Convention have expressed that they will continue to require assistance in implementation following the Fifth Review Conference. What can be done to ensure that they receive the required assistance? What can those that require assistance do to better facilitate cooperation, particular in light of Third Review Conference's commitment to 2025 or any new deadline that may be presented by the States Parties in the Siem Reap – Angkor – Action Plan? What commitments should be made in the Siem Reap – Angkor – Action Plan to ensure that the cooperation and assistance mechanisms of the Convention continue to support implementation efforts?

Measures to ensure compliance

18. While progress has been made in this regard, a large number of States Parties have not yet reported having taken necessary legal measures in accordance with Article 9 to prevent and suppress any activity prohibited under the Convention. Such measures are essential when it comes to preventing and addressing concerns with compliance with the Convention. What commitments can be made and reflected in the Siem Reap-Angkor Action Plan to see that necessary legal measures are taken by all concerned States Parties by 2029? In addition, how, following the Fifth Review Conference, will the States Parties work together to expeditiously address concerns about compliance?