



Panel on Article 5 -- Response
Intersessional Meeting of the Mine Ban Treaty
8 June 2018

I think we can broadly support pretty much everything that has been said by the excellent panel. The decisions taken by States Parties over time have been very well thought through, and have created this coherent ensemble that allows us all to ensure the integrity and strength of the convention. The Implementation Support Unit, in particular, has played an important role in ensuring that the convention evolves in this coherent manner.

With regards to what has been said this morning, we would like to highlight three points.

- Improvised explosive devices that can be activated by the victim are antipersonnel mines. They fall under the scope of the Mine Ban Treaty. They need to be cleared in accordance with Article 5, their presence needs to be reported under Article 7, and victim assistance obligations also apply.
- We also want to highlight the importance of having sustainable national capacity to deal with contamination found after mine clearance programmes are completed. There must be a mechanism for communities to be able to report the presence of mines and there must be trained personnel to deal with any residual contamination.
- And finally, the importance of transparency, openness, and cooperation. Whenever contamination is found, it must be reported and cleared. Whether it is after your deadline, after the completion of the national clearance programme, on territory that you control or not, new mines or old mines... There are mechanisms within the convention to deal with every situation.

We draw your attention to this paper by MAG and the HALO Trust that tackles many of the important issues raised here today.