

Presentation of the analysis of Angola's extension request

President of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties

Agenda Item 9a

The analysing group was grateful for the effort made by Angola in preparing its request and for engaging with us in a cooperative manner.

However, the analysing group had a number of concerns with the request.

Angola's request is based on its expressed need to acquire, through survey and database update, a real picture of landmine contamination in the country.

We regretted that because mine action information had not been effectively collected, maintained and managed, implementation was impeded and that Angola felt compelled to request more time to gain a clearer picture of its challenge.

While we welcomed the efforts of Angola to obtain increased clarity regarding its implementation challenge through measures such as database cleanup, we noted that these efforts could have been undertaken earlier and that achieving the desired outcomes should not take as long as they have been projected to take.

Most significantly we noted that a more accurate estimate of the amount of time required to complete implementation of Article 5 should be available once survey efforts have been carried out and that the request makes it clear that these efforts would be complete in 2013.

Therefore, it is our understanding that two to three years would be sufficient to garner a necessary deeper understanding of contamination and to plan accordingly, rather than the five years requested by Angola.

As gaining a clearer understanding of the remaining challenge in Angola largely means carrying out surveys, we were concerned that the survey methodology described by Angola suggests that the methods to be employed differ little from methods previously used which had led to an overestimation of contamination.

We engaged Angola on numerous instances to obtain more information or clarity on data provided. Concerns persist, however:

- There remain discrepancies between figures used by Angola in the body of its request and figures contained in tables in the request or annexed to them.
- Angola did not specify operators or specific time frames nor include milestones that would indicate which and how many municipalities will be subjected to non-technical survey activities during each phase of the extension period or how these municipalities were prioritized.
- While Angola indicates the amount of area which will be cleared by operators over the course of 2013-2017, Angola does not indicate how this amount of area relates to the number of remaining suspected hazardous areas or how this relates to Angola's non-technical survey project.
- As well, Angola projects that "national public operators" will demine what appears to be an illogically large amount of area totalling more than one-quarter of the total of Angola's territorial land.

We concluded in noting that it is unfortunate that, after almost ten years after entry into force, Angola is unable to account for what remains to be done, particularly given the significant investment in humanitarian demining in Angola over the past decade, including the investment already made in conducting surveys and information management.

We further noted that, while Angola was projecting that it would need approximately five years to obtain clarity regarding the remaining challenge, produce a detailed plan and submit a second extension request, Angola's indication that the non-technical survey process will take only two years would make it seem that two to three years would be sufficient to garner a necessary deeper understanding of contamination and to plan accordingly.

We also noted that, given the importance of external support to ensure timely implementation, Angola could benefit from enhancing its resource mobilisation strategy, in part by providing additional clarity regarding estimated costs for implementation.

Angola could also benefit from clarifying the costs that Angola's State budget would cover as part of the overall costs of implementation and addressing extremely large figures in the request which are attributed to expected demining progress by public institutions.

Given a number of concerns about the request, including the discrepancy between the amount of time requested and the length of time projected to carry out activities consistent with the expressed purpose of the request, we noted the importance, should the request be accepted, of Angola reporting to the 13MSP on a variety of precise matters, which are outlined in our analysis.

Finally, we noted the importance, in addition to Angola reporting to the 13MSP in a detailed manner as noted in the analysis, reporting annually on progress made and challenge remaining to fulfil Angola's Article 5 obligation.