

**Statement of the Government of Canada  
8th Meeting of States Parties**

**Clearing Mined Areas**

Thank You Mr. President

As this year marks the 10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the negotiation and signing of the Ottawa Convention, it is important that we all reaffirm our commitment to "finishing the job," particularly in the area of mine clearance. We understand that the goal of a mine free world is certainly a challenge, but it is achievable with continued dedication and perseverance.

Mine clearance obligations under Article 5 are very clear, and each State Party has agreed to destroy *all* mines in *all* known areas. Priority setting in each mine affected states is crucial, as those high and medium impact areas that pose significant risk to populations must be addressed first. However, an interim phase of reaching a "mine-safe" or "mine threat free" status is important, and commendable, but is only a step along the road to meeting all of our Article 5 obligations.

We recognize the daunting task that is ahead for many States Parties, and despite their best efforts, will require an extension to meet the obligation of destroying all of the mines in mined areas. We thank all those involved in establishing a process on how the States Parties may chose to handle extension requests. We encourage States Parties to adopt the voluntary template and to use it when requesting an extension. We also encourage States to make use of the valuable resources from the GICHD ISU.

Before commenting on our assistance in the area of mine clearance and mine risk education, we would like to take the opportunity to encourage those States Parties that have yet to begin a mine clearance program to do so as soon as possible. We remind all States Parties that we have made a clear, legal commitment to renounce the use of mines immediately and completely, with no exceptions. States Parties should not be purposefully utilizing existing minefields to derive military benefit such as areas around military installations, prisons, and in border areas. We thus urge all States Parties to begin clearing known areas without unnecessary delay.

Mr President,

In response to your questions, I will quickly outline some of our support for the clearance of mined areas and in mine risk education. Our funding in 2006-2007 increased from previous years totally at more than CDN \$34 million. Through our dedicated Canadian Landmine Fund and our humanitarian, development, peace and security programmes, we provided more than \$23

million for integrated mine action programs, mine clearance and mine risk education.

As we have integrated mine action into a number of programmes we are able to provide funds for clearance and mine risk education in a number of circumstances: For example, we have provided emergency mine clearance funds to allow humanitarian access in countries such as Sudan; clearance and mine risk education to support the repatriation process of internally displaced persons and refugees in Uganda; and clearance in Afghanistan to complement the ongoing peace and security operations. Further, as a strong supporter of mainstreaming mine action into development, Canada has integrated mine action into a number of its bilateral aid programs to encourage land release for sustainable development in countries such as Cambodia and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

~~Madame/Mister President/Vice President~~ <sup>MR</sup> President, with 22 countries facing deadlines for clearance in 2009, it is critical that we redouble our collective efforts to meet these deadlines. This Convention has – and can continue to be – a remarkable achievement of which we can all be proud.



KING HUSSEIN BIN TALAL  
CONVENTION CENTER

~~Votre~~ Altesse ~~royale~~, Excellences, Mesdames et Messieurs,

~~Votre~~ Altesse ~~royale~~, permettez-moi tout d'abord de vous féliciter pour votre élection et vous remercier ainsi que le Gouvernement jordanien et l'entente des personnes travaillant à l'organisation de cette Conférence de votre hospitalité et de la chaleur de l'accueil que nous avons reçu -

La Convention d'Ottawa est entrée en vigueur pour la Principauté de Monaco en mai 1999.

Avant toute chose, il est important de préciser que la P<sup>te</sup> est un État qui n'utilise pas, ne stocke pas et ne produit pas de mines antipersonnel mais qui, en revanche, a décidé d'intégrer les actions de déminage ~~et de réhabilitation~~ d'aide <sup>aux</sup> victimes à sa politique de coopération internationale -

Ainsi, depuis 2003, le Monaco finance des actions de déminage en Croatie, au travers de Norwegian People's Aid et surtout du Centre croate d'action contre les mines -

Un deuxième volet de cette action en Croatie est engagé depuis 2006 avec la construction, en collaboration avec le Min. des Aff. étrangères croate et l'ONG DUGA, d'un <sup>un</sup> centre d'accueil et de réhabilitation pour enfants -



KING HUSSEIN BIN TALAL  
CONVENTION CENTER

Le Centre devrait être achevé début 2008 et recevoir environ 600 enfants par an.

Monsieur le Président,

Je suis particulièrement heureuse, à l'occasion de cette 8ème Assemblée des Etats Parties à la Convention d'Oslo, d'annoncer la décision prise par le Gouvernement Princier d'initier une coopération en matière de déminage ici, en Jordanie.

Le projet concerné se situe sur les flancs du Mont Hebo, zone à la fois florissante mais également à vocation agricole et pastorale (malheureusement non exploitable en raison de la présence de mines sur une superficie de 300 000 m<sup>2</sup> au relief particulièrement accidenté).

A cette occasion, je tenais à saluer le courage et le dévouement des personnels militaires dans ce travail extrêmement dangereux.

Le projet que le Gouvernement Princier a décidé de cofinancer, en partenariat avec le Comité national jordanien pour le déminage et la réhabilitation, succédait, à l'origine, 708 mines. C'est avec un grand plaisir que j'ai appris il y a deux jours, sur le site même du Mont Hebo, que seule une centaine de mines devaient encore être trouvées et



KING HUSSEIN BIN TALAL  
CONVENTION CENTER

définies, et ce probablement avant la fin de  
cette année, ce que nous souhaitons pour l'ensemble  
des populations concernées.

~~Je vous~~ ~~assure~~ Je vous remercie de votre attention.

Mine Ban Convention

8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the States Parties in Jordan, 18 – 22 November 2007

Norwegian statement under Item 11 c Clearing mined areas

Ambassador Steffen Kongstad

Thank you, Your Royal Highness, Mr. President,

The Mine Ban Convention is about to enter what is probably its most important and interesting phase since its adoption ten years ago as the first deadlines for meeting obligations under Article V come up in 15 months' time. This is an opportunity to demonstrate the success of the Convention, and the value of a model where states, non-governmental organisations and international organisations work together sharing a common humanitarian goal. Several States Parties have already completed their mine clearance obligations, and we congratulate them. In the coming few years, our achievements will be measured, discussed and commented upon. Our commitment to the Convention, our commitment to compliance with the various obligations, and particularly our commitment to landmine survivors must remain at the highest level to maintain the credibility of the Convention.

One lesson we have learned during the eight years the Convention has been in force, is the importance of national ownership. National ownership has in many respects become a clichée, but true national ownership is decisive to effective and sustainable mine action and implementation of the Convention. Being assembled here at the shores of the Dead Sea, it is natural to point to how Jordan has addressed its landmines problem. Through an effective, well organised, civilian national authority Jordan has during the last years produced major achievements in clearing land. Jordan serves as a model of how effective national ownership and responsibility can be assumed.

Mr. President,

(Implementation of Article V obligations)

The obligation under Article V is to clear all known mined areas as soon as possible and no later than 10 years after the entry into force of the Convention for a particular State Party. It is essential that the utmost is done to implement the obligations as soon as possible. We have focused on accelerated implementation in our period as first Co-Rapporteur and then Co-Chair of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies. Over the last few years, we have also seen the development of alternative and more efficient approaches to the safe release of suspected mined areas.

Despite efforts made, challenges are of such a magnitude that not all countries will be able to fulfil their obligations within the deadlines. The Convention opens up for extension requests. In spite of tremendous efforts by States Parties, NGOs and mine clearers, there are still large mined areas to be cleared. In order to fulfil the Convention's obligations, all known mined areas must be cleared, even areas where mines at the moment do not present a pressing humanitarian problem.

One of our priorities during the Norwegian and Chilean term as Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance has been to ensure that further steps are taken to identify efficient, effective and practical ways to fulfil Article V obligations. One part of this was a

seminar on the Implementation of Article V in Latin America in August 2007, held by Chile and Norway in Santiago.

The seminar demonstrated that affected countries face very diverse situations, as regards both the background for the problem, the nature of the contamination, and with regard to what efforts are necessary to overcome challenges. The discussions were good, open and fruitful, and have been summarised in the publication introduced by Chile in the Co-Chairs' opening remarks and which is available outside this room.

In October this year, Norway and Mozambique held a seminar in Maputo with the objective of presenting and discussing some of the challenges facing the national mine action authorities of Mozambique – as a country with very demanding Article V obligations and approaching its Article V deadlines, in a situation with changing funding modalities. The outcome of the seminar will be presented at the meeting of the Resource Mobilisation Contact Group during lunch time today and in the Norwegian intervention under the Cooperation and Assistance session.

When discussing practical implementation of Article V obligations, we have over the last years seen interesting concepts being developed. Rapid land release through other means than mine clearance has been advocated by many as one way to increase the cost-effectiveness of mine action. Cancellation and area reduction are two concepts of land release that could greatly reduce the time and resources needed to allow people to resume their lives and activities safely in an area previously suspected to be mine-affected. Of course, resources are needed to develop these concepts further, and to identify, plan and implement specific tasks that will facilitate efficient release of suspected mined areas. But it is important to underline that security standards and quality must not be compromised as new methods are being developed.

Integrating a gender perspective when discussing mine clearance is essential, as, for example, women and men, girls and boys use their land and environment in different ways, and different methods of mine clearance and land release will affect them differently.

Mr. President,

(Article 5 extensions process)

Last year, the 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the States Parties agreed on a process for submitting, receiving, assessing and deciding extension requests. The process sets certain timelines, and provides guidance to States Parties on how to handle extension requests. A voluntary template has been developed to assist States Parties in developing their requests. The process will be open and transparent, and will be the responsibility of the President working together with the Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs. The Implementation Support Unit will be – and indeed already is – playing a crucial role in assisting States Parties in preparing the submission of extension requests. We strongly recommend all States Parties with Article V obligations that see the need for an extension, to make the fullest use of the invaluable support that the ISU can provide. We also urge States Parties in a position to do so, to provide additional funding to enable the ISU to take on this responsibility in a satisfactory way.

The agreed process for extension requests must be followed and fully utilised. It is an opportunity for affected states to demonstrate their commitment, their political will, the

resources they are willing to put into meeting the Convention's obligations. Requests must be accompanied by a realistic and concrete national plan clearly demonstrating such political will to act and full national ownership of the process, in accordance with Article V, paragraphs 3, 4, 5, and 6. Compliance with the Convention remains the responsibility of the individual State Party.

A realistic case for an extension based on identified criteria and assumptions must be made. The Convention opens up for the possibility of further extensions. There is therefore no need to immediately request a full 10 year extension unless it is documented that the magnitude of the problem clearly is such that 10 years is needed. This is to be clarified in the extension request and national plan.

(Cooperation and assistance for mine clearance activities)

Cooperation and assistance related to Article V and the process for extension requests should be seen as an opportunity for mine-affected countries to accelerate a state party's fulfilment of Article V obligations; an opportunity to improve or develop national plans, and – last but not least – to make a case for resources needed from the international donor community. States Parties in a position to do so have an obligation under Article VI to provide cooperation and assistance to States Parties with mine clearance obligations. However, donors will base their funding decisions on the quality of national plans that should accompany a request for extension. This is an issue that we will discuss further this afternoon.

Specific support for efforts to meet Article V commitments is needed to ensure compliance with the Convention, its humanitarian goals and, ultimately, the credibility of the Convention. Modalities in mine action funding are changing, and we need to respond and adapt to that. Even if funding for mine action again has increased since the dip last year, it is not likely that there will be an increase in overall funding for mine action in coming years. It is a challenge to make better use of existing resources. National resources should be identified to supplement existing resources. The land release concept that I referred to earlier, is one way that we are certain will contribute to a better overall resource utilisation.

Your Royal Highness,

(The way forward)

We look forward to cooperating closely with you as President, with the Coordinating Committee, with mine-affected countries, and with the ISU as we enter the first year of processing extension requests. The Convention's credibility is at stake, as is the lives and livelihoods of thousands of potential landmine victims. We must all rise to the occasion and do our utmost to take the opportunity that exists to improve, accelerate and reinforce our efforts to clear all mines and to reach our ultimate goal of a world free of mines and no new victims.

Finally, I wish to invite all interested parties to the lunch event of the Resource Mobilisation Contact Group. We will further elaborate on the plans for the work of the group over the next two years. Deputy Foreign Minister Henrique Banze of Mozambique will reflect on the resource situation in his country. We will also discuss other issues related to resource utilisation. The event is taking place in the Moutah Room.



**Thank you.**

**International Campaign to Ban Landmines**  
**Statement during the Informal Discussions on Implementing Article 5**  
**Eighth Meeting of States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty**  
**Dead Sea, Jordan**  
**20 November 2007**  
**Delivered by Tamar Gabelnick, ICBL**

Mr. President,

The ICBL has been following the practice of mainstreaming of mine action into development budgets out of our desire to see mine action funding remain at high levels for years to come. We see some promise in this practice because of the potential for longer-term, multi-year funding allocations and the recognition that landmines stifle economic opportunities for individuals, communities, and nations. But we also see some risks associated with this trend that we have mentioned in past meetings and want to highlight again here.

One of our key concerns about mainstreaming is that it appears to take away the guarantee of a minimum amount of spending on mine action through a specific budget line and replaces it with a system that has two potential weak links. The first weak link is on the recipient side. It appears that mainstreaming will create the necessity for new actors to be involved – those people developing national priorities for development assistance. Such persons may have little or no knowledge of mine action and may not understand its connection with development. Given a long list of priorities pressing for their attention, they may overlook mine action. But if a mine-affected state does not let donors know that mine action is part of their priorities for development aid, the donor state may no longer fund mine action for that state, jeopardizing mine action programs and treaty compliance.

The other weak link is on the donor side. If an actor in a donor state involved in bilateral development assistance also does not appreciate the urgency of mine action and the connection with economic development, it would not push the recipient to include it in its request. It might even actively discourage the inclusion of mine action.

This is why the ICBL strongly suggests keeping a point person or office in charge of mine action on the donor side to supervise the process on both sides, educate all new actors about how mine action affects development, and also actively encourage mine-affected states to include mine action in their development funding priorities. A central point of contact could keep track of funding dispersed among many bilateral desks so that the state or organization can evaluate whether its mine-related policy goals are being met.

Many of our concerns stem from observing how the changes to the European Commission system unfolded. We have been straightforward with the EC on our concerns, and they have been equally straightforward in their responses. We thank the EC for their presentation today, which we hope will make it clearer to states here about how mine action funding in the EC has changed. As we told the EC, its leadership position on mine action is on the line, and only a strong centralized

management of landmine funding will help them maintain that status and their capacity to shape mine action around the world. The same applies to other major donors.

As we said yesterday during the linking mine action and development contact group meeting, the ICBL also thinks it is important for donor states to continue to consider states' treaty obligations that are not directly related to development. While it is true that areas with humanitarian and development impact should be given a high priority in the selection of clearance tasks, the treaty requires that all mined areas must be ultimately be cleared. So while this is of course the affected states' primary responsibility, donor states should also help mine-affected states to develop the national capacity to perform such operations and sustain them after international operators have left.

We would also like to encourage donors to keep additional specific or mainstreamed budgets for non-development related mine action or for states that are mine-affected but not part of a sometimes limited list of priority states for receiving development aid from a that state. Finally, Mr. President, donors must also give a clear political message that their movement of funds to development does not signal that other demining tasks are less important and stress that treaty obligations will not be fulfilled until all mined areas are cleared.

Thank you.

International Campaign to Ban Landmines  
Statement on Clearing Mined Areas  
Eighth Meeting of States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty  
Dead Sea, Jordan  
Delivered by Nick Cummings-Bruce, Landmine Monitor  
20 November 2007

Mr. President,

It's a source of satisfaction that 10 years after the signing of the Mine Ban Treaty, the mine action community continues to report a significant acceleration in clearance. In 2006, countries reported clearing a total of 450 square kilometers of land, representing an increase of more than one-third over the previous year. Although clearance of mined areas remained at about the same level as the previous year, battle area clearance rose by over 60 per cent. And the amount of land released through area reduction and cancellation almost tripled to 860 square kilometers.

The increases testify in part to improvements in the productivity achieved by certain countries, acting on the experience of recent years to refine and improve clearance methodologies. In Afghanistan and Laos, we have the example of two countries where major reviews of management and implementation of operations are yielding big gains in productivity.

However, Mr. President, beneath these alluring headline numbers, we observe wide disparities in the results from different countries and mine action programmes that raise a number of major concerns.

First, the progress is extremely narrowly distributed. More than half of the mined area clearance in 2006 occurred in just two countries, Cambodia and Afghanistan. Similarly much of the advance in battle area clearance occurred in two countries, Afghanistan again and, perhaps surprisingly, in Iraq, where operators claimed to have cleared almost 100 square kilometers in this way, compared with less than 15 square kilometers the previous year. Nearly 90 per cent of the land released occurred in just three countries, Cambodia, Bosnia & Herzegovina and Yemen.

Secondly, the corollary to this phenomenon is that too many other countries are making at best modest progress in landmine clearance. Too much effort goes into clearing land that is not actually contaminated. Many states still do not have strategic plans in place, and some that do are oriented towards achieving a "mine-safe" status. This does not meet treaty requirements. Some states are delaying mine clearance operations because of the strategic value of the mined areas, which contradicts the treaty's obligations not to use mined areas and to demine as quickly as possible. It's unacceptable that eight years after they signed the treaty, four countries, France, Niger, the UK and Venezuela, had yet to initiate formal clearance operations, though we welcome the fact that France has now begun clearance operations and aims to meet its deadline.

A third major concern is the disappointingly high proportion of countries which are now almost certain to miss the clearance deadlines to which they committed when they acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty. The treaty allows for extensions but intended these to be granted only for states with severe contamination. In Nairobi, states reiterated that "few if any" should need to ask for extensions. It is therefore disappointing that of 29 countries with clearance deadlines in 2009 or 2010, over half will not finish in time. Some of these states have valid reasons, but others have simply not demonstrated sufficient will to meet their obligations.

Mr. President, the mine ban treaty also requires states parties to make every effort to identify all mined areas. A decade into the life of the treaty, it is therefore regrettable that many states have yet to accurately define the extent of their mined areas and rely on inflated estimates of the extent of the contamination, resulting in poor task selection and poorly focused clearance, wastage of precious resources and delays in fulfilling their clearance obligations under the treaty.

Clearly, with the approach of Article 5 clearance deadlines, states parties will feel growing pressure to accelerate the clearance and release of land through area reduction and cancellation. It is therefore a good moment to emphasize the importance that it is done without jeopardizing safety. ICBL has drawn up guiding principles on area reduction and we are pleased the issue will be discussed in detail this afternoon. We hope that the debate will reinforce the urgent need for all mine action stakeholders --operators, national authorities and international institutions-- to develop international guidelines for area reduction and cancellation of suspected areas.

With the approach of Article 5 deadlines, Mr. President, we would like to take a minute to consider the extension process that you elaborated earlier. We would like to express our support for the template tabled at this meeting as a way to encourage states parties to provide the comprehensive information required by the mine ban treaty.

We realize this requires considerable detailed information from countries requesting extensions but much of this information should have already been gathered by mine action authorities in the course of their existing planning and operations. And it is therefore the ICBL's view that the process should not distract states parties from the work of clearing.

Regarding the evaluation of extension requests by other states parties, we are also pleased to hear that the process is to be transparent and that documents will be made quickly available to the public, ensuring the widest possible scrutiny among stakeholders.

The extension process allows ample time for the evaluation of requests. But the ICBL strongly believes that the process will only be meaningful if the end result is more than a yes or no from the other states parties. It is our view that the decisions states parties render should include four elements. In addition to approval or rejection, they should include the number of years granted, which may be different from the number requested, performance benchmarks on the road to completion for those states that have made the least progress, and the rationale behind the decision. There would be little point to having a nine month evaluation including outside experts' advice if the outcome is reduced to a yes-or-no decision.

The ICBL has prepared criteria for judging extension requests that we hope will help states parties in the task of evaluating extension requests. We made them available to the intersessional in Geneva in April and they are available outside.

Finally Mr. President, we would also like to recommend adding the following bullet point under Article 41: "When requesting extensions to Article 5 deadlines, States Parties should observe the convention requirement that all antipersonnel mines in mined areas be destroyed as soon as possible. States Parties should therefore request extensions for the minimum practical time required, supported by the information provided in the voluntary template."

Thank you.

20/11/2007 AM

**THE DELEGATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA**

Check against delivery

**EIGHT MEETING OF THE STATE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON THE  
PROHIBITION OF THE USE, STOCKPILING, PRODUCTION AND TRANSFER OF  
ANTI-PEROSONAL MINES AND ON THEIR DESTRUCTION**

ITEM 11 c): Mine Clearance

**STATEMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA**

Mr. Dusko Uzunovski  
Head of Delegation

*AMMAN, November 19, 2007*

Your Royal Highness,  
Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Since, that I am taking the floor for the first time, please allow me to join all previous speakers who have congratulated you on your election for President of the 8th MSP. We also share the conviction that your able leadership will bring us to the envisaged results of the 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting.

I would like to state that the Republic of Macedonia fully associates itself with the statement distributed yesterday by the Delegation of Portugal on behalf of the EU.

In addition I would to make few comments and to provide some information in our experience regarding the mine clearance process.

8MSP is very important milestone in the history of the Convention. It is a turning point; it is a point of acceleration in overall implementation of the Ottawa Convention. With the fact that we have convened this meeting in Jordan, for the first time in Middle East is another sign of determination of all state parties to succeed in achieving the goals of the Convention.

I have the pleasure to commence my statement by reiterating that the Republic of Macedonia is a part of the group of State Parties that have already fulfilled its obligations under the article 4 and the article 5 of the MBT. I truly believe that the results accomplished serve as an encouragement not only to the state parties in our Region. Your Royal Highness, in this context, I would like to extend our support to the principle mentioned in your Statement at the Opening Ceremony: that the most important goal of the Convention is to achieve results, no matter of the size of the country. We also commend the intention of Jordan to fulfill the obligation under the Article 5 until the end of 2008. ~~That will be practical evidence that the progress of implementation is increased not only by number of states, but also by enlarged number of Regions where a state party has fulfilled article 5.~~

In regard to the case of the Republic of Macedonia, I would like to stress that our accomplishments are contributing directly to Confidence building amongst the countries in the Region, Implementation of the regional initiative: SEE zone free of anti-personal mines by 2009; Improvement of the safety in the border zones, Strengthening the stability in the Region, Normalization of the life in the previously contaminated zones and in addition producing preconditions for the local economic development.

**In our view, Mine Clearance under the Article 5 is essential for full success of the Convention. Requests that will come for an extension of the deadlines should be completely elaborated by the respective states parties, as per the template provided in this Conference documents.**

**In order to ease the decision process about extension, the MofSP has to be provided with a precise plan and program by the respective country**



with deadline for final fulfillment of the obligations under the Article 5. Beside other things, this kind of approach certainly will be useful for the donor countries. On the other hand, in this fragment we have to also be fair to those countries that have already fulfilled its obligation and to avoid endless continuation of this process.

Your Royal Highness,

The Republic of Macedonia with generous assistance of the country partners, have made maximum efforts to fulfill its obligations even before the deadlines set out in the Convention. The assistance by the donor countries was essential to reach this goal. Jointly we have developed and trained our demining teams and later we have achieved the results that we are proud of.

In our case and we hope in many other to follow, the genuine cooperation in the framework of the Ottawa Convention will stay as unique hallmark and mechanism destined to success. This attitude is making the Convention an excellent fore in the domain of Disarmament in which we are practically demonstrating **successful cross regional cooperation fully dedicated to the security, protection and care for citizens.**

**In the year that we are celebrating the 10th anniversary, we have to make all necessary efforts to turn the actual stage of "success in progress" into the next phase that will not last too long – to make the Convention "a complete success story".**

**The Republic of Macedonia truly believes that this goal is possible and achievable.**

Your Royal Highness,

In concluding, allow me to again express our gratitude for the Jordanian hospitality that we are enjoying on the 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the State Parties of the Ottawa Convention.

Thank you.

**Eight Meeting of the States Parties to the  
Convention on the Prohibition of Anti-Personnel Mines  
Dead Sea, 18-22 November 2007**

**ICRC Statement on clearance- Article 5**

Thank you Mr. President,

Let me begin by thanking all States Parties that have taken the floor in the last two days to provide updates on their progress and plans.

The ICRC wish to congratulate the Kingdom of Swaziland for having completed the clearance of all known mines in areas under its jurisdiction or control before the end of its deadline and for having used the declaration of completion template adopted at the 7<sup>th</sup> MSP. We also commend the few states, such as Jordan, France, Serbia or Albania, that have stated that they expect to meet their clearance deadlines.

However, we regret that 3 States Parties which have deadlines falling in 2009 and 2010 did not take the floor to share with us their plans on the implementation of article 5 of the Convention.

We also note with concern that, while all States which have taken the floor have reported on past progress, many, which have a deadline in 2009 and 2010, have not indicated whether they expect to achieve clearance of all mined areas within their respective deadline, how they will do so and if not, whether they will request an extension of time in the coming months.

The ICRC witnesses with deep concern that more than half of the States which have a deadline falling in 2009 or 2010 have indicated that they will request an extension of time to meet their obligation under Article 5 of the Convention.

While the number of requests for extension of time is not a problem in itself, the extent to which States, which have a problem of limited scale, have relied on this possibility contained in the Convention, is unfortunate and undermines the humanitarian purposes of the Convention and its credibility.

Importantly, we must understand that every day during which the Convention's deadline is not met is a day in which civilians are put at risk. Extensions will most likely be measured in lost limbs, lost lives and lost livelihoods.

A number of extension requests will be submitted in the next few months. It is essential that these requests are managed in a way which maintains the credibility of the Convention and promote completion within a realistic, well planned and adequately funded extension period.

We must recognize that an extension request reflects problems by a State Party in meeting its commitments under the Convention. It is essential that the process of making and examining an extension request identifies the problems which have been encountered and ensures that they are adequately addressed by the requesting State with collective support from States in a position to provide assistance.

We believe that extension periods should only be granted for the minimum period necessary to carry out a well prepared and financially viable clearance plan. The 9MSP should have the option to grant an extension which is less than the actual time requested by the State Party, if the request is received late or if the Conference believes that demining activities could and should be undertaken more rapidly.

Furthermore, we would like to stress that no extension request should be made or, if made, approved if the delay in clearance would constitute a *de facto* use of anti-personnel mines through a failure to clear them. For the ICRC, a *de facto* use means leaving mines in the ground in order to obtain a military advantage from them.

Finally, we hope that the pace of demining activities between now and the occurrence of deadlines for States Parties will be increased. States should take advantage of this time to diligently implement their obligations under article 5 of the Convention

I thank you, Mr. President.

Mine Ban Convention

8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the States Parties, 18-22 November 2007, Jordan

Item 11 (c) Clearing mined areas

Co-Chairs' summary remarks

Ingunn Vatne

Thank you.

Your Royal Highness, Mr. President,

On behalf of Norway and Chile, outgoing Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, I would like to offer a few concluding remarks on what we have learned during the last days in our discussions under Item 11 (c) Clearing mined areas, and on the way forward before handing over to the incoming Co-Chairs, Canada and Peru.

During our discussions, we have heard a number of mine-affected States Parties provide an update as to the status of the implementation of Article V obligations. We have also heard a number of other States Parties provide an update on international cooperation and assistance for mine clearance, and comments on the extension process. Additionally, we have heard NGOs and international organisations present their views.

Let me first, again, congratulate Swaziland with its achievement, and thank Swaziland for setting such a good example as to reporting on its fulfillment of Article V obligations. What Swaziland has done and presented to us shows the importance of focusing on the possibilities that the land release concept provides. Also other mine-affected States Parties and other States Parties have discussed land release in their statements and presentations, and we hope to see this issue further developed in the time to come.

The debate has been rich and interesting, with many detailed presentations, and we are pleased that many are focusing their statements according to the questionnaire provided. Many States Parties have provided us with good updates clarifying where they are in the process of fulfilling Article V obligations, and what factors are influencing progress, ranging from vegetation, climate, lack of funding, political difficulties, to armed internal conflict. We

have learned about the variety of challenges that States Parties face. Several States Parties have ensured us that they intend to fulfill their Article V obligations within set deadlines, and we commend their efforts to reach this goal. Many have indicated that they will need to ask for an extension of the deadline to fulfill Article V obligations. We are glad to see that many States Parties are already relating to and making full use of the opportunities that the agreed process for extension requests provide. We are particularly pleased that some States Parties have indicated that even though they will have to ask for an extension, they will ask for a shorter extension than the Convention provides for, based on realistic and ambitious assumptions. We are also glad to learn that many, as we are approaching the first deadlines, are redoubling their efforts and reinvigorating their work so as to come as far as possible before the deadline passes.

We would like to commend States Parties for their openness and transparency in this regard. This contributes to preserving the credibility of the Convention. A good understanding of the problems States Parties face is essential when donors make their priorities. As we heard from many States Parties during this debate, resource needs are still great.

On the other hand, some States Parties are still unclear as to whether they will be able to complete their obligations within the set deadlines, or whether they would need to request an extension. In addition, we have also heard the use of words that are not contained in the Convention, such as mine-free, impact-free or mine-safe, even if to a lesser degree than before. We would like to urge States Parties to do their utmost to ensure a speedy implementation of the Convention's obligations, and to ensure that the agreed procedures for applying for an extension – if needed – are followed, within the set timeframes.

I believe there is widespread agreement that in the coming years, the handling of extension requests will be most important. The credibility of the Convention is at stake, and the way we collectively meet this challenge, will be crucial for the way the Convention is perceived by the world. We need to be practical, flexible, open and transparent. We must preserve the cooperative atmosphere of the Convention; between mine-affected and other countries; between states and civil society. And we must keep our focus clear to reach our final goal: A world free of the scourge of anti-personnel mines.

Finally, Mr. President, let me on behalf of Norway and Chile again thank all colleagues for the good cooperation we have had, with both the previous and the current President, and in the Coordinating Committee.

On behalf of Norway and Chile, we wish Canada and Peru all the best as they take on the co-chairmanship of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, and would like to ensure you that we will be available for discussing anything that might come up. Thank you for your efforts and cooperation as co-rapporteurs.

On our own behalf, Norway would like to thank Chile for an excellent cooperation during these two years as co-rapporteurs and co-chairs, and to wish Chile good luck when you take on yet another office under the Convention, clearly demonstrating the strength of Chile's commitment to the humanitarian goal of our work.

Thank you.

**Declaración de Canadá y del Perú**  
**En la asunción de los Cargos de Copresidentes del**  
**Comité Permanente de Desminado, Educación sobre el Riesgo de las Minas, y**  
**Tecnologías de Acción contra las Minas.**

**Prioridades para el 2008**

Gracias señor Presidente

En primer lugar, quiero expresar nuestra gratitud por la confianza depositada en Canadá y el Perú, como los nuevos Co-Presidentes del Comité Permanente de Desminado, Educación sobre el Riesgo de las Minas y Tecnologías de Acción contra las Minas, durante lo que promete ser un año muy importante y atareado.

Es nuestra opinión que para el año 2008 debe haber cuatro prioridades. La primera es continuar trabajando diligentemente para apoyar a todos los Estados Parte, en el cumplimiento de sus obligaciones en el marco del Artículo 5°. Esperamos conseguirlo prosiguiendo con las actividades de los anteriores Co-Presidentes, en proporcionar claridad sobre el estado de implementación del Artículo 5° en todos los Estados Parte afectados por minas antipersonal. El trabajo realizado anteriormente tuvo ese propósito. Esta acción no sólo nos ayudará a todos a comprender dónde estamos en términos de implementación de la Convención, sino también a que los Estados Parte afectados por minas antipersonal concentren su atención en ello y avancen en este proceso.

La segunda prioridad es trabajar estrechamente con nuestro Presidente, nuestros Co-Relatores y los Copresidentes y Co-Relatores de los distintos Comités Permanentes, con el objeto de dirigir el proceso de solicitud de prórroga. La Séptima Reunión de Estados Parte aprobó el proceso de solicitud de prórroga y corresponde ahora a nuestro Presidente ocuparse de su implementación. Los Copresidentes de este Comité Permanente nos comprometemos a llevar a cabo todo lo posible para apoyarlo en sus esfuerzos.

Nuestra tercera prioridad es continuar apoyando a los Estados Parte a comprender el denominado "Land Release Process". De existir acuerdo en el Comité Permanente, esperamos recomendar a la Novena Reunión de Estados Parte, que este proceso sea refrendado por todos, a condición que cuente con el aseguramiento de calidad necesario asociado con todas nuestras actividades de acción contra las minas antipersonal. En la actualidad, al menos tres Estados Parte utilizan dicho proceso y consideramos de gran importancia que sus esfuerzos sean reconocidos y que a través de ellos podamos decir que el proceso está casi "institucionalizado", ampliando su uso y asegurando que cuente con los altos estándares necesarios para ello.

Por último, debemos mantener nuestros esfuerzos en asegurar la difusión de la Educación sobre el Riesgo de Minas Antipersonal, así como la Tecnología para la Acción contra las Minas Antipersonal, en primer lugar para limitar el riesgo de nuevas víctimas y en segundo lugar para, finalmente, eliminar ese riesgo.

Gracias señor Presidente



حضرة صاحب السمو الأمير مرعد بن عبد الله الحسين المحترم رئيس المؤتمر الثامن للاطراف  
والسادة اعضاء الوفود المحترمين  
ليابه عنا العهد العراقي المثار ، اود أن اعبر عن اجل التقاضي  
والتبرعات لسوكم بمناسبة توليكم رئاسة اعمال هذا المؤتمر وبجاءكم  
في المؤتمر في ادارته واقامته خصوصاً انه يقام لأول مرة في منطقة الشرق  
الارسط مما يُعد بادره خير ونقطة تحول ايجابية في مسار الجهود  
الرامية لتطبيق بنود اتفاقية اوتاوا الدولية.

من المعروف ان العراق قد انضم الى اتفاقية اوتاوا في منتصف الشهر الثامن عام  
ووفقاً للفقرة الثانية من المادة السابعة من الاتفاقية ستلويون العلام  
منزماً بتنفيذ بنودها في الاول من الشهر الثاني من عام ٢٠٠٨.

لقد مانت الهيئة الوطنية لتوون الانغام في بداية تأسيسها في آب من عام ٢٠٠٣  
صعوبات عديدة حالت اعاقل على تطوير قابليتها الفنية والتشريعية ماها ادى  
اكن سباط في العمل في هذا القطاع رافقه بعض الصعوبات الناجمة من عدم استقرار  
الاممنا ولكننا وخلال السنوات المقبلة سنعمل بجهد واجتهاد لتطهير الاراضي الملوثة  
بالانغام والمقدمات غير المنفصلة المنتشرة في أنحاء العراق جراء ثلاث حروب متتالية  
هذا الثلاثي عام المنصرم.

ان الهيئة الوطنية لتوون الانغام اصبحت الآن احدى تشفيلات وزارة البيئة  
العراقية التي بدورها اولت اهتماماً عالياً في اتباع برنامج العلام لتوون الانغام  
والتي تقم في اولوياته الاعتراف بالكارثة الانسانية وهو وصمة الانسان  
الذي يتل احدى اهم فقرات اهتمامات وزارة البيئة من برنامجها العام لتوون  
البيئة والحيه.

ومع صعوبة البرنامج العراقي لتوون الانغام في انجاز محابه بسبب الظروف المحيطة بالبلد الا ان  
ذلك لم يمنع من التقدم في تنفيذ بنود الاتفاقية خصوصاً المادة الخامسة منه  
المعنية بازالة الانغام المزروعة في بعض المناطق في العراق والتي تشهد وضعا  
امنياً مستقرآ. اذا استمرت فروس العمل التابعة للكويسر العام لتوون  
الانغام في اقليم كردستان العراق في تنفيذ برامج التطهير وقد تجت نجاحاً جدياً



حالة تقرير زملانا في مقفه ICBL

وبهذه المناسبة نقدم للمحاضرين نموذجاً دراسياً (case study) يوضح  
الوضع الحاصل في البنين المحتية لتلك المناطق التي كانت ملوثة بعد انجاز  
عمليات تطهيرها، وسوف يتم تطبيقه في برنامج على باقي المناطق الملوثة في  
المرحلة .

ونشرح لهذا النموذج الحصى المور لليد سراج بزازاني عضو لوفده لوفين  
المشاركه درسيه بؤسه العامه لسفوف الانعام فيهم

Power Point

20 min.

کردستان : ←