

**Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Awareness and Mine Action
Technologies of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling,
Production and Transfer of
Anti-personnel Mines and on their Destruction.**
Geneva, 14 May 2003.

Opening intervention on a Global overview, Review of progress made and an
Outlook on future action, by Sara Sekkenes – NPA,
on behalf of the Mine Action Working Group of the ICBL

Co - Chairs, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Allow me to give you an update of the Landmine Monitor Fact Sheet on matters relating to Art. 5.

- ❖ 37 State Parties have reported mined areas in their Art. 7 reporting. This is an increase since the last meeting in February and is due to the actual increase of submitted Art. 7 reports that include statements on mined areas, among them UK, France, Argentina and Venezuela.
- ❖ Eight additional countries Party to the Convention are late or not yet due in submitting their Art. 7 report and are considered to be mine affected according to Landmine Monitor findings, namely; Eritrea, Liberia, Malawi, Namibia, Sierra Leone, Angola, Afghanistan and Cyprus. The latter three not yet due to submit their initial Art. 7 report.
- ❖ Four State Parties report they are not affected by mined areas but are however considered to be so according to findings of the *Landmine Monitor Report*. These State Parties are Bangladesh, El Salvador, Hungary and the Philippines.
- ❖ Worldwide, some 89 countries, State Parties and States not Party to the Convention, are from a limited to severe degree affected by the contamination of landmines and other explosive remnants of war - ERW.
- ❖ According to Landmine Monitor findings, 44 States not Party are affected by landmines and /or UXO.

It is encouraging to note the increase of countries effectively utilising the opportunity to report on the status in matters pertaining to Art. 5 of the Convention in this Standing Committee and I will be brief in order to let even more countries have the floor. The ICBL strongly urges you to continue to do so and encourages mine affected State Parties to make use of the excellent suggested framework for preparing updates to the intersessional working week meetings, also known as the “4P” approach. Let me just reflect a few moments on one of the “P’s”- the “P” for Plans.

More and more countries report on the establishment of mine action plans, not seldom referring to other development plans, poverty reduction strategies and planning documents. It is highly relevant and of utmost importance to also make practical use of these planning instruments in the day to day work on national as well as lower administrative and bureaucratic levels. Furthermore, to practically integrate the plans and important milestones in the collaboration in operational planning and tasking with implementing mine action partners on the ground.

In handing over to hear a few words also from my colleague Stan Brabant from the Working Group on Mine Risk Education, I'd like to end by encouraging the reporting in plans and needs also for mine risk education - MRE.

Thank You.