

CCM intersessional meetings June 2011

Norwegian statement on Article 4

Check against delivery

Thank you Mr. Chair,

The rapid and effective implementation of Article 4 is our opportunity to demonstrate to the world that disarmament instruments like the CCM are relevant and result in concrete improvement in the lives of people living with unexploded dangers. We have been looking forward to hearing updates from states on their implementation of Actions 10 – 19 in the Vientiane Action plan we agreed to last year.

At the First Meeting of States Parties in Vientiane, Norway reported a small and limited cluster munition remnants problem at the former test firing range at Hjerkins. We provided further details in our transparency report submitted in January this year, and will continue to report on the progress of this work. The plan is to turn Hjerkins into a national park and army engineers are underway in their operations to clear the area for all kinds of UXOs, including cluster bomblets.

Mr. Chair

With a few significant exceptions, contamination by cluster munition remnants is a fairly limited problem, very different from the global landmine problem a decade ago. Our responsibility as States Parties is to ensure that the cluster munition contamination problem is addressed within years and not decades in the areas where that is possible, while making all possible efforts to reduce and finally solve the problem in those states that are most affected, and where clearance will take longer time.

The key to this is the application of the right methods to identify and delineate the perimeters of the areas actually affected by cluster munitions as precisely as possible. Thus we must move away from the idea that there is “a global cluster munition contamination problem” to recognise the specific characteristics in each of the affected states and areas.

We must also appreciate that surveys do not provide us with a complete and final picture of the problem that can then be the basis for operations and prioritisations in years to come. Rather, surveys are tools that provide the best available information of the problem at a certain time, but which need to be continuously updated as more information is generated through on-going operations. This updated information must then in turn inform allocation of resources and choice of methods.

At this point, we would like to commend Australia for the excellent discussion paper you/they have prepared for this meeting on the application of all available methods for implementation of Article 4. In our view the paper effectively and accurately presents current knowledge of how best to address the Article 4 challenges. We fully support the approach in the paper as well as the draft recommendations for the Second Meeting of States Parties. We look forward to hearing other states' views on the paper and hope that we can agree on relevant recommendations already in September.

Mr. Chair,

One of the features of this issue is the vast difference in the actual problems in affected states and areas. We in this community should promote and facilitate for the application of tailored rather than blueprint approaches. One issue is the question of how to address situations of very limited contamination, where building a national capacities, develop and adopt standards and other features associated with a national mine action program might be completely out of proportions to the actual problem. Another issue is to ensure coherence in in all our actions, ensuring that recommendations such as those identified in the Australian paper are implemented in the full decision-making chain in both affected states and among states and agencies supporting cluster clearance.

We have the opportunity now to address this problem in a rational and cost-effective way – lets make good use of that.

Thank you.