

**Statement on Nigeria's Article 5 Extension Request, delivered by Mine Action Review
Intersessional Meetings, 22–24 June 2021**

In the interests of time, Mine Action Review will focus our statement on key topics for attention and clarification.

- Nigeria should be commended for rightly addressing the new mine contamination under Article 5. This serves as a positive example to other States Parties in the Lake Chad Basin and Sahel region, as well as elsewhere, which are also facing the challenge of ongoing conflict and new contamination from anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature.
- In determining the baseline of contamination, and recording survey and clearance outputs, Nigeria must take care to disaggregate data by type of device. Areas that contain anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature (or mixed anti-personnel mine and UXO/ERW contamination), must be disaggregated from those areas that only contain UXO and ERW.
- Nigeria should also take care to disaggregate victim-activated IEDs (i.e. anti-personnel mines of an improvised nature) which are covered under the Convention, from person-borne IEDs or command-detonated or time-delay IEDs which are not.
- Nigeria should set out clearer plans for national capacity building and the role it foresees for international implementing partners in the mine action programme due to be developed in this extension period.
- Understandably, the ongoing security situation prevents Nigeria from being able to undertake required evidence-based survey of all contaminated areas. However, Nigeria should seek to begin survey as and when conditions allow.
- Nigeria last submitted an Article 7 report in 2012. Nigeria must submit timely, annual transparency reports to keep States Parties informed during the deadline extension period.
- We welcome the plans to establish a national platform for regular dialogue and coordination with partners in 2021. Such a platform will help to coordinate efforts, including for elaboration of the required mine action strategy and national mine action standards.
- Nigeria says that depending on the number of implementing partners available, “it will be desirable to release about 10,000km² per annum”. This seems to be an error in the number. Given Nigeria’s current limited survey and clearance capacity, and the fact that a baseline of anti-personnel mine contamination has yet to be established, a realistic envisaged annual land release target should be provided.
- Nigeria plans to release land through a) survey (non-technical and technical), b) clearance, and c) cancellation.

Category c (by cancellation) is confusing and potentially problematic, as cancellation is the land release output of non-technical survey and should therefore already be included in category a (survey).

Reports of contamination that have not been verified should not be recorded as a suspected mined area in the database in the first place. Removal of unverified areas should not be classed as cancellation.

- Nigeria should provide more details of the survey, clearance, and explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) capacity and levels of training that are available now, particularly in relation to capacity for tackling improvised mines.
- Lastly, Mine Action Review encourages Nigeria to provide more information on how it plans to mainstream gender and diversity within its mine action programme.

Thank you.