

**Mine Action Review comments on Ethiopia's Article 5 Extension Request
(delivered by NPA on behalf of Mine Action Review)**

**Agenda Item 4: Matters related to the mandate of the Committee on Article 5 Implementation
APMBC Intersessional Meetings, 17–20 June 2025**

Thank you, Madam Chair.

In the interests of time we will deliver a few short observations and will submit full comments in writing.

We thank Ethiopia for the submission and presentation of its extension request, and have the following comments:

- Firstly, do security conditions now allow for full access to all areas of Ethiopia's territory which are suspected or known to contain AP mined area and which require survey or clearance?
- Secondly, to what extent does Ethiopia expect to find anti-personnel (AP) mined areas in the planned non-technical survey (NTS) of explosive ordnance (EO) in Tigray and Afar? During the survey, it will be essential that the nature of the EO contamination is accurately recorded and disaggregated by EO type.
- Lastly, Mine Action Review commends Ethiopia's efforts in collaboration and regular dialogue with partners, such as through the Mine Action Area of Responsibility (MA AoR) and working groups. In light of the multiple stakeholders and operators now accredited and which will be operating in country, we encourage Ethiopia to further strengthen national level coordination by establishing an appropriate National Mine Action Platform, in line with Siem Reap-Angkor Action Plan (SRAAP) Action #42.

Additional points, provided in the written submission of the statement:

- Does Ethiopia aim to complete fulfilment of its Article 5 commitments within the 5 years requested or is this intended as an interim request on its path to completion?
- Ethiopia should provide additional clarification on how the calculations for the projection of clearance of CHAs in Somali region over two years are calculated.
- Mine Action Review encourages Ethiopia to specify throughout its extension request the type of survey planned (i.e. non-technical survey (NTS), technical survey (TS), or both) and also to use terminology which is consistent with International Mine Action standards (IMAS) for the land released through survey (i.e. cancelled through non-technical survey or reduced through technical survey).
- Mine Action Review welcomes Ethiopia's commitment to develop a Gender and Disability mainstreaming policy and its exploration of a potential technical working group. This is important, as Ethiopia looks set to undergo a rapid upscaling of its mine action programme, including international operators. We encourage Ethiopia to extend its policy to all aspects of diversity, including ethnicity. Meaningful consideration and inclusion of women and minority groups early in the process of upscaling the programme will be essential.
- Ethiopia should be encouraged to provide information on how it plans to take into consideration—and where possible strive to mitigate—the environmental impact of its mine action programme, including clearance operations.

- We encourage Ethiopia to set out its requirements for assistance (technical /material support) for implementation of Article 5 in slightly more detail, if possible, breaking down the quantity of teams, equipment etc.
- Mine Action Review commends Ethiopia for budgeting 10% of required funding to be sourced from national/government funding. What will these funds (USD3,900,000 over two years) be allocated to? Has the Ethiopian government already committed to spend this in its 2026 and 2026 budget?
- We note that the survey in the Tigray region will be undertaken by EMAO. Does the government have sufficient funding and national capacity for the survey? It will be essential that the EMAO's survey capacity follows IMAS-compliant land release methodology; that data is accurately recorded and sufficiently disaggregated; and that EMAO is confident in cancellation of mined areas in which there is no evidence of AP mines.

====