

ICBL Statement on the Extension Request Process
MBT Intersessional Standing Committee on Mine Clearance
22 May 2012



Thanks to the President for the introduction to this subject. The ICBL believes that there are three areas that should be looked at by the Analysing Group to facilitate their work and to reinforce the whole process.

The first issue is how to get the best quality requests. The clearer the information provided, the easier it will be for the members of the Analysing Group to assess it. The current outline states follow provides space for all necessary information, though states use it to varying levels of effectiveness. But it often leads to quite lengthy and at times repetitive requests. Some of the key information called for is not clearly stated or is placed in various tables in multiple annexes, making it more time-consuming to find what is needed when it should be readily accessible. With this in mind, we would like to suggest that requesting states are asked to include in their executive summary in a table or other clear manner those key pieces of information that will help put the details of the request in context. Such information should include contamination at time of becoming a State Party; past land released on an annual basis; past national and international funding on an annual basis; remaining contamination; projected land to be released on an annual basis for the extension period (clearly disaggregated by cancellation by non-technical survey, release by technical survey, and full clearance); and annual resources required.

Another way to improve the quality of the requests, as well as to address the second point – increasing the capacity of the Analyzing Group to assess the reports – is to increase support to the Analyzing Group in terms of expert input, as agreed upon at the 7MSP. Thanks to the Analyzing Group for already making some improvements in this regard. We also support Norway's suggestion for the ISU and expert organizations to do a lot of the initial legwork to clarify and assess the requests before the Analyzing Group sits down to examine them. In this way, not only would the quality of the requests be improved, but also the key technical, legal, and policy issues would be laid out for Analyzing Group members to consider, allowing them to better understand and analyze the requests. The ICBL and our demining NGO members are ready to help in any way we can.

Finally, the point of the extension request process is not just to grant additional time to SPs in need, but to ensure that the duty to complete Article 5 as soon as possible is respected throughout the process. We therefore believe that there should be more follow up by the Analyzing Group and other SPs with the states that have received extensions to ensure that they fulfill the commitments they made and provide high quality reporting. We agree with proposals made by several speakers to include milestones and other commitments laid out in their requests are included in the analyses and decisions. Early awareness of any delays that may arise can help all parties try to address them so that a second extension period isn't needed.

We have more concrete ideas on how to do achieve these three goals, which we would be happy to discuss with the President in preparation for any needed changes to the practice of the Analyzing Group and/or any decisions that may be taken at the 12MSP.

Thank you.