

## ICRC statement on the Draft Maputo Action Plan

### Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, Second Preparatory Meeting for the Third Review Conference, Geneva, 10 April 2014

Mr. President-designate,

The ICRC supports the direction of the draft Action Plan, which sets out the key challenges still facing the Convention and identifies appropriate means for addressing them. The current draft has, in our view, struck the right balance overall between aspiration and realism. The various time-bound commitments should serve to motivate and guide the States Parties over the next five years, as well as offering a means of measuring implementation of the Action Plan until the Fourth Review Conference.

We recognise that the preparation of this document has already involved a lot of work and wish to thank Mozambique, the ISU and all those involved in the drafting group for their efforts. We consider that all necessary actions have now been included and trust that the language can be further streamlined in some areas to maximise its readability and effectiveness.

The ICRC is honoured to have been engaged in a special partnership with States Parties, the United Nations and the ICBL since the inception of this Convention and we are pleased to see this partnership recognised in the **introduction** to the document.

Although we fully support the aspiration “to end the era of anti-personnel mines within a decade”, and would be truly delighted were this to occur, unfortunately we find this goal to be overly ambitious, given that some severely mine-affected countries are not yet party to the Convention. We would suggest amending this sentence to focus on aspects that are within the States Parties’ control.

In relation to **mine clearance**, the reference to achieving completion by States’ “respective clearance deadlines” in the introduction to section III might need to be re-considered, given that some States Parties have received extensions of time to complete surveys and better identify the extent of contamination rather than a specific deadline to complete clearance (though of course the obligation to complete as soon as possible continues to apply).

The ICRC agrees with the attention paid to developing and implementing national standards, policies and procedures in line with the IMAS and we also support the need to ensure high quality extension requests and their analyses, since both aspects have greatly assisted implementation of Article 5 over recent years.

We are very pleased to see an acknowledgment in the Plan of Action of the ongoing importance of **victim assistance** and the need to give this issue equal attention to other aims of the Convention.

In terms of **cooperation and assistance**, the ICRC is supportive of the idea of increasing “partnerships for completion”, and giving increased attention to South-South cooperation.

We note that the document also recognises the need for cooperation and assistance on national implementation measures under Article 9, and we hope that States will consider providing technical assistance in this regard, particularly given the close link between such national measures and ensuring compliance with the Convention's prohibitions. With the provision of such support where necessary, and a renewed commitment from all States Parties, it is feasible for States Parties to have fulfilled national implementation measures by the Fourth Review Conference in 2019 (para 28).

We also support the other proposed measures in the Action Plan to ensure **compliance**, which are based on transparency and cooperation.

In regards to **transparency and exchange of information**, the ICRC welcomes the ongoing attention to the issue of mines retained for permitted purposes, as we are sure that further reductions are possible in the coming five years.

Acknowledging the need to ensure the most efficient operation of the Convention and recognising the existing realities in the field, the ICRC also welcomes references to **synergies** with other relevant instruments of international humanitarian and human rights law. We stand ready to support processes that maximise these synergies, with a view to ensuring the best outcome for mine affected countries and victims. We do not see a risk of imposing any legal obligations on States not party to other relevant instruments (as suggested by some of the interventions here today), though perhaps further clarification of Action 30 could be provided in this regard.

Thank you.