
Mr. President,

Thank you for the paper on elements for the Lausanne Action Plan. I would like to express Norway’s general support for the direction you have outlined. We are pleased to see that you are aiming for an action plan that is actionable, clear and measurable. Our goal should be to draft an action plan that promotes the greatest possible degree of accountability for its implementation among all States Parties. We encourage drafting the plan in clear and concise language. We believe this will help States Parties feel ownership of the actions and will support effective implementation.

We fully support the idea of having a cross-cutting section and we believe it should take the form of actions with associated indicators. Although it may be challenging, there is value in trying to operationalize our principles in clear and action-oriented language. We are pleased to see gender and diversity included as important points. We should aim to integrate these important considerations in all parts of our work in a practical way that recognizes and responds to the different needs and experiences of women, men, girls and boys.

We welcome a broader focus on universalization to cover both the norm and the number of States Parties. Actions in this section should be as concrete as possible and seek to give us practical tools to advance in this field. Compliance is a very important topic and one that we believe should be addressed in the Lausanne Action Plan. It may, however, possibly be better placed as a separate section rather than as a sub-section of universalization. Nevertheless, we remain flexible on this point.

We support your elements on stockpile destruction. We should focus on keeping stockpile destruction on track and avoid further requests for extension as far as possible.
We support to split the section on **survey, clearance and risk education** into two separate sections. We are glad to see the field of **risk education** evolving and believe it deserves separate attention and recognition as an important way of protecting people from explosive risks. The elements on risk education are good and we fully support them. In line with our general comment on going with clear language, the first bullet point on taking a comprehensive approach to risk education will need to be carefully formulated into an easy to understand action.

We support the approach you outline for the section on **survey and clearance**, but encourage taking an **even more ambitious approach** in this section. The Lausanne Action Plan needs to help us make a collective push to speed up survey and clearance worldwide. We should work hard to avoid unnecessary requests for extension under Article 4 and need to use the full range of our toolbox - including cooperation and assistance - to this effect.

We know the importance of having a national baseline of contamination. Would it for example be possible to commit all States Parties to carrying out such a baseline within a given date? We are glad to see the elements paper make the case for using the latest, **evidence-based and most efficient methodologies for survey and clearance**, in line with the International Mine Action Standards. This is important, as it helps us get the most results out of limited resources.

Finally, we fully support the idea to anchor the **country coalition concept** in the Lausanne Action Plan. We are strong supporters of the country coalition and believe such regular in-country dialogue involving all stakeholders should be encouraged for all affected States Parties. We would like to recall that the value of the country coalition is to promote technical and policy dialogue between donors, the affected country and operators to jointly address challenges in survey and clearance not. It may additionally help increase donor support and donor coordination in country.

We look forward to supporting you and working with States Parties on the road to a successful Lausanne Review Conference.

Thank you.