

**REPORT ON THE ANALYSIS OF REQUESTS FOR EXTENSIONS TO ARTICLE 5
DEADLINES, 2012-2013 – AGENDA #9**

PRESIDENT OF THE TWELFTH MEETING OF THE STATES PARTIES

2 DECEMBER 2013

In 2013, for the sixth year in the row, the group of States Parties mandated to analyse requests submitted under Article 5 of the Convention carried out its work.

In 2013, this group, which I chaired, included the following States Parties: Austria, Bulgaria, Colombia, Ecuador, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, and Thailand.

In 2013, requests for extended mine clearance deadlines were submitted by seven States Parties: Chad, Germany, Mozambique, Niger, Serbia, Sudan and Turkey.

Two of these States Parties – Germany and Niger – submitted requests in accordance with the political commitments adopted at the 12MSP concerning States Parties that discover mined under their jurisdiction or control after an original or extended deadline to implement Article 5 has expired.

One of these States Parties – Germany – subsequently withdrew its request.

In carrying out its efforts in 2013, the States Parties mandated to analyse requests sought to apply, as relevant, the recommendations adopted at the 12MSP concerning ensuring that high quality requests continue to be submitted, that high quality analyses continue to be prepared, and that a cooperative engagement of Article 5 implementing States Parties continues after requests have been granted.

For instance, the analysing group sought clarity when requesting States Parties referred to mined areas using terms other than those in the Convention.

In addition, the analysing group drew attention to the fact that the UN's mine action standards' definitions of "suspected hazardous area" and "confirmed hazardous area," noting, in some instances, that it is still not clear whether

what some States Parties report such areas in a manner consistent with the UN's standards.

The analysing group also sought to act upon recommendations #6, #12 and #13, which were adopted at the 12MSP:

- Recommendation #6 states that “the States Parties should consider taking decisions on requests that call for both mid-term assessments of requesting State Parties’ efforts to implement Article 5 and revised plans to be submitted three to five years after requests have been granted.”
- Recommendation #12 states that “at both meetings of the Standing Committees and formal meetings/conferences, States Parties that have been granted extensions should be requested to provide updates on efforts to implement the plans contained in their requests,” and that “such reports should clearly document progress and challenges relative to what it committed to achieve.”
- Recommendation #13 states that “to assist States Parties that have been granted extensions in updating States Parties on their efforts, the analyses of requests and decisions taken on them should contain annual benchmarks on projected survey and clearance activities, planned allocation of financial and other resources, plus other actions such as development of new standards.”

As concerns these recommendations, the analysing group proposed in each analysis that States Parties, once requests have been granted, be formally requested to report to the States Parties with respect specific, time-bound benchmarks for progress.

Particularly in instances when the time requested was more than a few years, the analysing group recommended specific instances when States Parties concerned should provide an updated detailed work plan for the remaining period covered by the extension.

Many of the recommendations adopted at the 12MSP concern making the analysis process as efficient and effective as possible for the States Parties mandated to prepare analyses

With respect to these recommendations, the ISU held two briefings for analysing group members to ensure that we were ready to carry out our responsibilities.

The ISU and the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance sought additional information from requesting States Parties to assist the analysis process.

In addition, expert organizations were invited to provide input.

We were grateful that many organizations did provide input and were particularly thankful for the comprehensive manner in which the ICBL and the ICRC contributed their expertise to this process.

In keeping with past practice, the analysing group informally met with representatives of requesting States Parties on the margins of the May 2013 meetings of the Standing Committees.

These informal meetings continue to be of great importance in terms of enabling the analysing group to better understand requests and fostering a cooperative environment between the analysing group and requesting States Parties.

It should be noted that, while the implementation of the recommendations of the 12MSP made the process more efficient for the analysing group, the ISU did shoulder an additional burden.

While the ISU can assist the analysing group in many ways, it should be recalled that the States Parties explicitly chose at the 7MSP to create a process for which they would ultimately be responsible.

To continue to act in a manner consistent with the nature of the process established, the States Parties should continue to demonstrate real ownership over the process.

Finally, it should be noted that complying with measures to ensure that the analysis process could be as efficient as possible with the process completed in a timely manner as made difficult for the analysing group because some States Parties submitted requests or revised requests extremely late.

The short period between the Thirteenth Meeting of the States Parties and the Third Review Conference will make it even more challenging to complete the analysis process in a timely manner.

States Parties which have indicated that they will need to have requests considered at the Third Review Conference have been asked to submit their requests by 15 December 2013. Some have indicated that this will be difficult for them to do.