

## UPDATED ON THE ARTICLE 5 EXTENSIONS PROCESS

H.E. GAZMEND TURDIU,  
PRESIDENT OF THE TENTH MEETING OF THE STATES PARTIES

STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
MINE CLEARANCE, MINE RISK EDUCATION AND MINE ACTION TECHNOLOGIES

21 JUNE 2011

It is my pleasure to provide you with an update on the Article 5 extension process which was agreed to at the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties.

Before doing so, however, let us recall the process.

First: Requesting States Parties are encouraged to submit their request to the President no fewer than nine months before the Meeting of the States Parties or the Review Conference at which the request would be considered.

The President is charged with informing the States Parties of the receipt of requests and making requests available on the Convention's website.

The President, Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs are mandated to jointly prepare an analysis of each request, with this analysis being submitted in advance of the relevant Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conference.

Finally, this process is intended to be a cooperative, collaborative one, with requesting States Parties and the States Parties mandated to prepare analyses working together to produce outcomes that are good from Convention as a whole.

Let us also recall that at the 10MSP, we agreed to the following conclusions and recommendations regarding the Article 5 extensions process:

First: the 10MSP recommended that all States Parties in the process of implementing Article 5, particularly those that may believe it will be necessary at a future date to submit an extension request, intensify and accelerate efforts to locate and report on all mined areas that contain,

or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines under their jurisdiction or control.

Second: The 10MSP recalled the importance of the timely submission of extension requests to the overall effective functioning of the Article 5 extension process, and, in this context, recommended that all States Parties that wish to submit requests do so no later than 31 March of the year when the request would be considered.

And third: The 10MSP, in noting that the Republic of Congo has an Article 5 deadline on 1 November 2011 and has not yet indicated that it will be able to comply by its deadline, noted the importance of the Republic of the Congo providing clarity on this matter as soon as possible.

Following the 10MSP, I wrote to States Parties with deadlines in 2012 to ensure that they were well informed of the extensions process and to encourage timely submission this year.

I am extremely grateful that Algeria, Chile, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Eritrea all submitted their requests on, or very soon after, March 31<sup>st</sup> of this year.

However, even before these requests were received, I took steps to ensure that the analyzing group would be ready to carry out its work. In particular, I sought to follow up on the report submitted to the 10MSP by my predecessor.

At the 10MSP, Ambassador Eckey reported that “the Article 5 extension request process places a heavy burden on the representatives of those States Parties that are mandated to analyse the requests.”

Ambassador Eckey continued by reporting that “it remains important that the analysis process is State Party-driven” and therefore, “to further assist the States Parties in continuing to effectively lead this process, the President, with the support of the ISU, should consider ways and means to increase the knowledge and expertise of the analysing group with respect to the technical subject matter contained within Article 5 requests”.

In follow-up to Ambassador Eckey’s suggestion, on March 8 I convened a full-day training for the States Parties mandated to analyse Article 5 requests.

I was grateful, not only for Susan's suggestion, but also for having provided me with the financial resources to make such a training session possible.

I was also grateful for the ISU for making arrangements for this training and for the expert input and participation of the HALO Trust, Norwegian People's Aid and the GICHD.

With the analyzing group well trained, we began our activities in early May with the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance carrying out pre-analysis work.

In keeping with the agreed working methods, this involved the Co-Chairs generating questions for each requesting State Party in order to obtain additional information to assist our analysis process.

I wish to note that each of the requesting States Parties responded promptly to the questions that were submitted to them. If these States agree, we will post their responses on the Convention's website.

On 20 May, the analyzing group met as a whole for the first time to share initial views on the requests.

In addition at this meeting, in keeping with past practice, the analysing group received the valuable input of the ICBL and ICRC.

This week, the analysing group is taking advantage of the presence of experts from capitals to engage in informal discussions with Algeria, Chile and the DRC.

In addition, the analyzing group will seek the expert input of demining organizations that are active in the DRC. This too is in keeping with practices employed by the group in the past.

In terms of next steps, my aim is to conclude our work by the end of September so that analyses can be made available well before the 11MSP.

In closing, let me thank those States Parties that have prepared requests this year as well as the members of the analysing group who have already invested a great deal of time in examining these requests.