

## **Article 5 Extension Process**

**H.E. Prak Sokhonn, President of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties**

### **Standing Committee on Mine Clearance**

**22 May 2012**

As noted by the Co-Chairs, the 11MSP recognised that the analysis process places a heavy burden on the representatives of those States Parties that are mandated to analyse Article 5 requests.

The 2012 analysing group was thus mandated to reflect on the process to date.

The 11MSP decisions emphasised that we should focus on two matters in particular – efficiency and quality.

At this stage, we have little to report to you given that the analysing group met for the first time only last week.

Nevertheless, we did receive views from the ICBL on this matter, which might prompt some discussion both by the analysing group and by this Standing Committee.

As well, I have already proceeded with a measure intended to increase the efficiency of the analysing group.

That is, I sought expert input on this year's requests prior to the first meeting of the analysing group.

This was well appreciated by the analysing group last week and has put the group in a much better position to ask informed questions about the requests.

While we have little to report at this stage, it is safe to say that some key questions we will have to consider are as follows:

- First: A good request arguably should be one that provides clarity and detail with respect to what has been done to implement Article 5 since entry into

force, what remains to be done, why a particular extension length is required and what the plan is to complete implementation.

Requests received to date, however, are of varying quality when it comes to providing such clarity and detail. What can be done to ensure that all requests are of high quality?

- Second: The States Parties made a decision in 2006 that they would take full ownership for the process of preparing analyses of requests.

Given that this is a difficult and time-consuming task, what can be done to make the process as efficient as possible, while still retaining full ownership of the States Parties?

- And third: Many States Parties have used the Article 5 extension process to compile the best ever detailed overview of their demining programmes.

What can be done in the years after these requests have been submitted to ensure that States Parties continue to provide detail and clarity regarding their implementation of Article 5?

My colleagues and I no doubt would value your input with respect to these questions in order for us to fulfil our mandate to develop recommendations for the 12MSP.

Thank you.