

**Mine Action Review comments on:
Vientiane Capital Action Plan 2027-2031
(agenda item 5(b))
(delivered by NPA on behalf of Mine Action Review)**

CCM Second Preparatory Meeting for the Third Review Conference, 1 July 2026

Thank you, Mr President. We would also like to take the opportunity to extend our sincere condolences to Colombia on the passing of the Colombian Ambassador.

Mine Action Review has already submitted detailed written comments on the draft Vientiane Capital Action Plan (VCAP). We would, however, also like to highlight a few key reflections today.

Firstly, we very much welcome the stronger integration of **environmental and climate-related considerations** in the revised action plan, including the introduction of Action #5. It is both important and appropriate that environmental and climate considerations will, through the inclusion of this new cross-cutting action, receive the same prominence in the CCM action plan as they do under its sister convention, the APMBC, where a comparable action is included in the best practices section of the Siem Reap–Angkor Action Plan (SRAAP).

We would also like to thank the Coordinators on Survey and Clearance, France and Mexico, for their work and leadership on this issue and for the informative and timely hybrid workshop held last month on "Integrating Climate and Environmental Considerations into the CCM Vientiane Capital Action Plan." In this context, we once again encourage States Parties to consider establishing one or more **focal points on environment and climate** within the CCM Coordination Committee. The Coordinators on Survey and Clearance could be made the environment focal points. Unless environmental and climate considerations are embedded within the Convention's institutional machinery, Mine Action Review is concerned that States Parties will not take sufficient ownership of these issues and that, despite their importance, they will remain largely absent from plenary discussions and implementation updates.

We also welcome the inclusion of the **Voluntary Trust Fund** for Article 4 implementation in **Action 36**. The positive feedback on the feasibility of establishing a comparable trust fund at the APMBC intersessional meeting last month suggest that this proposal is likely to be taken forward under the APMBC. Should this occur, a comparable mechanism should also be explored and advanced under the CCM to ensure that CMR-affected States Parties are not placed at a disadvantage in accessing funding for survey and clearance compared with States Parties affected by anti-personnel mines.

Our remaining comments, submitted in writing, primarily relate to clarifying the wording and intent of several proposed indicators, tightening the drafting of a number of actions and indicators, and recommending that certain actions that have been merged be separated once again.

Notably, with respect to **Action 20**, Mine Action Review separating sustainable national capacity for residual contamination into a standalone action and indicator, as in the Lausanne Action Plan (LAP).

We advocate that **Action 24** specifies reporting that is disaggregated by suspected hazardous areas and confirmed hazardous areas, and specifies land cancelled through non-technical survey, reduced through technical survey, and cleared through clearance, as in both the Lausanne Action Plan and the APMBC SRAAP. In this respect, we also propose that indicator (a) be split into two, so that one indicator measures that the national information management system records disaggregated contamination data and a separate indicator measures that it records disaggregated survey and clearance data. Lastly, this action should refer simply to "in line with IMAS", rather than specifically citing IMAS 08.20/2, which is a Technical Note on Mine Action (TNMA) rather than an IMAS.

With respect to **Action 25**, the CCM text is 'every effort', therefore any declaration of compliance should reflect this wording.

With respect to **Action 35**, Mine Action Review suggests separating the action point and indicators relating to the provision of support for implementation, from the action point and indicators relating to coordination mechanisms; as in the LAP.

Action 38 refers to both CCM Article 3 and Article 4, but the indicator only refers to Article 3.6 (retention). There needs to be an indicator relating to Article 4, to help ensure that affected States Parties submit Article 7 reports containing updated information on implementation. This was previously the case in the LAP and there is an equivalent indicator in the APMBC SRAAP on this. The approach should remain consistent across the two conventions.

Lastly, we align with the Statement of the GDWG, of which we are a member.

I thank you.