
Nairobi, 29 November – 3 December 2004
Item 18 of the agenda

FINAL REPORT

The Final Report of the First Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction consists of five parts and twelve annexes as follows:

- Part I Organization and Work of the First Review Conference
- A. Introduction
 - B. Organization of the First Review Conference
 - C. Participation in the First Review Conference
 - D. Work of the First Review Conference
 - E. Decisions and Recommendations
 - F. Documentation
 - G. Adoption of the Final Report and conclusion of the First Review Conference
- Part II Review of the operation and status of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction: 1999-2004
- Introduction
- I. Universalizing the Convention
 - II. Destroying stockpiled antipersonnel mines
 - III. Clearing mined areas
 - IV. Assisting landmine victims
 - V. Other matters essential for achieving the Convention's aims
- Annex I Ratification / accession and entry into force dates
- Annex II States that have not ratified or acceded to the Convention
- Annex III Deadlines for States Parties to destroy or ensure the destruction of antipersonnel mines in mined areas under their jurisdiction or control in accordance with Article 5
- Annex IV Summary of information provided by the States Parties on the fulfilment of Article 5 obligations
- Annex V Annual landmine casualty rates
- Annex VI Problems faced by States Parties in which there are significant number of landmine victims, and their plans to address these problems, progress and priorities for assistance

- Annex VII Reports submitted in accordance with Article 7
- Annex VIII Antipersonnel mine reported retained by the States Parties for reasons permitted under Article 3 of the Convention
- Annex IX Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs of the Standing Committees: 1999-2004
- Part III Ending the suffering caused by anti-personnel mines: Nairobi Action Plan 2005-2009
- Introduction
- I. Universalizing the Convention
- II. Destroying Stockpiled Anti-personnel mines
- III. Clearing Mined Areas
- IV. Assisting the Victims
- V. Other matters essential for achieving the Convention's aims
- Part IV Towards a mine-free world: The 2004 Nairobi Declaration
- Part V Programme of meetings and related matters to facilitate implementation 2005-2009
- Appendix I Agenda of the First Review Conference
As adopted at the first plenary meeting on 29 November 2004
- Appendix II Report on the Functioning of the Implementation Support Unit September 2003-
November 2004
As adopted at the sixth plenary meeting on 1 December 2004
- Appendix III List of documents

PART I

ORGANIZATION AND WORK OF THE FIRST REVIEW CONFERENCE

A. Introduction

1. The Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction states in article 12, paragraphs 1 and 2, that “a Review Conference shall be convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations five years after the entry into force of this Convention”, with the purpose of the Review Conference to be:

- (a) To review the operation and status of the Convention;
- (b) To consider the need for and the interval between further Meetings of the States Parties referred to in paragraph 2 of Article 11 of the Convention;
- (c) To take decisions on submissions of States Parties as provided for in Article 5 of the Convention; and,
- (d) To adopt, if necessary, in its final report conclusions related to the implementation of the Convention.

2. At the 15-19 September 2003 Fifth Meeting of the States Parties, the States Parties agreed to hold the Convention’s First Review Conference at the United Nations facilities in Nairobi from 29 November to 3 December 2004 and to hold preparatory meetings in Geneva on 13 February 2004 and 28-29 June 2004. In addition, the States Parties agreed to designate Ambassador Wolfgang Petritsch of Austria as the President of the First Review Conference, to request that Kenya designate a Secretary-General of the Review Conference, to accept the estimated costs prepared by the United Nations for convening the preparatory meetings, and to proceed with a preparatory process in a manner consistent with the elements contained in the report¹ of Ambassador Jean Lint of Belgium, the President of the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties. Finally, the States parties urged participation at the highest possible level in a high-level segment to be held at the end of the First Review Conference.

3. At its fifty-eighth session, the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 58/53 requested the Secretary-General, “in accordance with article 12, paragraph 1, of the Convention, to undertake the preparations necessary to convene the Convention’s First Review Conference, at Nairobi from 29 November to 3 December 2004.” In addition, in this resolution, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General, “on behalf of States Parties and in accordance with article 12, paragraph 3, of the Convention, to invite States not parties to the Convention, as well as the United Nations, other relevant international organizations or institutions, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross and relevant non-governmental organizations to attend the First Review Conference as observers,” and “urged participation at the highest possible level in a high-level segment to be held at the end of the Review Conference.”

4. To prepare for the First Review Conference, in accordance with the decisions of the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties, the First Preparatory Meeting was held on 13 February 2004 and

¹ APLC/MSP.5/2003/5, Annex II.

the Second Preparatory Meeting was held on 28-29 June 2004. The First Preparatory Meeting recommended for adoption at the First Review Conference a provisional agenda², a provisional programme of work³ and cost estimates⁴ for convening the First Review Conference with the exception of Section B in these estimates. The Meeting took note of the President-designate's commitment to consult with States Parties with respect to Section B of the cost estimates with a view to ensuring that the Second Preparatory Meeting would be provided with further clarifications and / or revisions. In addition, the Meeting took note of the President-designate's commitment to present to the Second Preparatory Meeting ideas on how to best operationalize the agenda and programme.

5. The Second Preparatory Meeting recommended for adoption at the First Review Conference a revised provisional agenda⁵, a revised provisional programme of work⁶, revised estimated costs⁷ and revised draft rules of procedure⁸, as orally amended to take into account the recommendation that there be nine vice-presidents elected at the First Review Conference. With respect to the matter of vice-presidents, the Meeting recommended that, in keeping with the practice that has served the States Parties well at their annual meetings, the Co-Chairs of the four Standing Committees should serve as vice-presidents for the First Review Conference, namely: Australia, Cambodia, Croatia, Guatemala, Italy, Japan, Mexico and the Netherlands. In addition, given that the Review Conference was to take place in Africa and that the 2003-2004 complement of co-chairs did not include an African State Party, it was recommended that one additional vice-president be nominated at the Review Conference. Finally, the Meeting took note of the President-designate's intentions regarding how to best operationalize the agenda and programme.

6. To seek views on matters of substance, the President-Designate convened informal meetings in Geneva on 1 December 2003 and 24 September 2004 to which all States Parties and interested organizations were invited to participate.

7. On 2-3 December 2003 the President-Designate publicly launched preparations for the Nairobi Summit and at a ceremony in Cyprus at which Cyprus commenced its programme of destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines. Subsequent to this event, eight regional conferences were held on a voluntary and informal basis in the context of preparing for the First Review Conference and for the purpose of advancing the Convention's aims. The following States Parties served as hosts: Burkina Faso (West Africa), Romania (South-Eastern Europe), Kenya (the Great Lakes and Horn of Africa), Tajikistan (Central Asia), Jordan (the Middle East), Lithuania (Northern and Eastern Europe), Ecuador (the Americas), and Thailand (South East Asia). In addition, other States Parties hosted conferences of a thematic nature, including France and Switzerland. As well, the African Union held the Second Continental Meeting of Experts on Landmines, at which the member States of the African Union, in a manner consistent with aims and obligations of the Convention, adopted the Common African Position on Landmines. Donor states, the United Nations, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), the

² APLC/CONF/2004/1

³ APLC/CONF/2004/2

⁴ APLC/CONF/2004/4

⁵ APLC/CONF/2004/PM.2/L.1

⁶ APLC/CONF/2004/PM.2/L.2

⁷ APLC/CONF/2004/PM.2/L.4

⁸ APLC/CONF/2004/PM.2/L.3

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) played an instrumental role in financing, otherwise supporting and / or participating in these regional events.

8. The opening of the First Review Conference was preceded on 28 November 2004 by a ceremony at which statements were delivered by His Excellency the President of the Republic of Kenya, the Honourable Mwai Kibaki, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Kenya, the Honourable Chirau Ali Mwakwere, the Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs of Thailand, His Excellency Dr. Sorajak Kasemsuvan, on behalf of the President of the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties, the President of the First Review Conference, Ambassador Wolfgang Petritsch of Austria, the Secretary-General of the First Review Conference, Ambassador Esther Tolle of Kenya, the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize co-recipient, Ms. Jody Williams and the Coordinator of the Kenyan Coalition to Ban Landmines, Ms. Mereso Agina. In addition, landmine survivors from around the globe presented their personal stories, reminding delegates of the need to fulfil the promise made by States Parties to provide for the care, rehabilitation and reintegration of survivors.

B. Organization of the First Review Conference

9. The First Review Conference was opened on 29 November 2004 by the Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs of Thailand, His Excellency Dr. Sorajak Kasemsuvan, who delivered a statement of the President of the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties, His Excellency Dr. Surakiart Sathirathai, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Thailand. In his statement, which was warmly received by all delegations, the President of the Fifth Meeting reported on progress made in achieving the Convention's aims over the past year and stated that Thailand would continue to provide leadership on universalization efforts.

10. The Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs of Thailand, His Excellency Dr. Sorajak Kasemsuvan, presided over the election of the President of the First Review Conference. The conference elected by acclamation Ambassador Wolfgang Petritsch of Austria as its President in accordance with rule 5 of the Rules of Procedure.

11. At its first plenary meeting on 29 November 2004, the First Review Conference adopted its agenda as contained in Appendix I to this report. On the same occasion, the First Review Conference adopted its rules of procedure as contained in document APLC/CONF/2004/3/Rev.1, the estimated costs for convening the First Review Conference as contained in document APLC/CONF/2004/4/Rev.1, and its programme of work as contained in document APLC/CONF/2004/2/Rev.1.

12. Also at its first plenary meeting, Australia, Cambodia, Croatia, Guatemala, Italy, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands and Senegal were elected by acclamation as Vice-Presidents of the First Review Conference.

13. The meeting unanimously confirmed the nomination of Ambassador Esther Tolle, Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Kenya, as Secretary-General of the conference. The conference also took note of the appointment by the United Nations Secretary-General of Mr. Enrique Roman-Morey, Director of the Geneva Branch of the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs, as Executive Secretary of the meeting, and the

appointment by the President of Mr. Kerry Brinkert, Manager of the Implementation Support Unit of the GICHD, as the President's Executive Coordinator.

14. The meeting took note of the support provided to the President by a group of Friends of the President comprised of the following: Ambassador Ross Hynes (Canada), Ambassador Friedrich Gröning (Germany), Mr. Raja Reza Raja Zaib Shah (Malaysia), Mr. Gamiliel Munguambe (Mozambique), Ms. Patricia Campbell (Nicaragua), and Ambassador Steffen Kongstad (Norway).

C. Participation in the First Review Conference

15. 109 States Parties participated in the meeting: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, France, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

16. One State that had ratified or acceded to the Convention, but for which the Convention had not yet entered into force, participated in the meeting as an observer, in accordance with article 12, paragraph 3, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure of the meeting: Ethiopia.

17. 5 signatories that have not ratified the Convention participated in the meeting as observers, in accordance with article 12, paragraph 3, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure of the meeting: Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Poland, Ukraine and Vanuatu.

18. A further 20 States not parties to the Convention participated in the meeting as observers, in accordance with article 12, paragraph 3, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure of the meeting: Bahrain, Bhutan, China, Cuba, Egypt, Finland, India, Iraq, Israel, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Somalia and Sri Lanka.

19. Delegation information submitted in accordance with rule 4 of the rules of procedure of the meeting was received from 135 States mentioned in paragraphs 15 to 18 above. The meeting took note of this.

20. In accordance with article 12, paragraph 3, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Rules of Procedure, the following international organizations and institutions, regional organizations, entities and non-governmental organizations attended the meeting as observers: African Development Bank Group, African Union, East African Development Bank, European Commission, European Parliament, Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining, International Campaign to Ban Landmines, International Committee of the Red Cross, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, International Monetary Fund, League of Arab States, Nairobi Secretariat on Small Arms and Light Weapons, North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, OCHA, Organization of American States, Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe, UNDP, UNEP, UNHCR, UNICEF, UNIDIR, United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs, United Nations Mine Action Service, UNON, UNOPS, WFP, WHO and the World Bank.

21. In accordance with article 12, paragraph 3, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraph 4, of the rules of procedure, the following other organizations attended the meeting as observers: APOPO, AISP, British Peace Support Team, Cleared Ground Demining Ltd, Institute for Applied International Studies, International Development Research Centre, International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance, Mine Action Information Center James Madison University, Mine Awareness Trust, Muslim Youth Development, Swiss Foundation for Mine Action, and World Association Desk and Emergency Medicine.

22. A list of all delegations to the First Review Conference is contained in documents APLC/CONF/2004/INF.2 and APLC/CONF/2004/INF.2/Add.1

D. Work of the First Review Conference

23. The First Review Conference held ten plenary meetings from 29 November to 3 December 2004. At its first, second and third plenary meetings, the conference reviewed the general status and operation of the Convention. The conference concluded that since it was adopted in Oslo on 18 September 1997, the Convention's unique spirit of cooperation has been sustained, ensuring the Convention's rapid entry into force and over five successful years of implementation. As recorded in documents APLC/CONF/2004/L.3/Rev.1, APLC/CONF/2004/L.3/Rev.1/Corr.1 and APLC/CONF/2004/L.3/Rev.1/Amend.1, the conference took stock of accomplishments to date and the essential work that lies before the States Parties in ensuring that the Convention indeed lives up to its promise.

24. At its third and fourth plenary meetings, the conference considered the matter of future meetings of the States Parties and related matters. The conference drew various conclusions on these matters, as contained in documents APLC/CONF/2004/L.2, APLC/CONF/2004/L.2/Corr.1, and APLC/CONF/2004/L.2/Amend.1. These conclusions included that based upon the experience to date, both regular formal Meetings of the States Parties and informal meetings of the Standing Committees will be indispensable for the future functioning of the Convention and the realization of its aims. It was further concluded that the full and active participation of States Parties, international and non-governmental organizations, and States not parties that share the aims of the States Parties but which have not yet joined the Convention will be equally indispensable.

25. At its fourth and fifth plenary meetings, the conference considered a plan of action, APLC/CONF/2004/L.4/Rev.1, to overcome challenges that remain in ending for all people for all time, the suffering caused by anti-personnel mines. The States Parties concluded *inter alia* for the period 2005-2009:

- (1) that the pursuit of universal adherence to the Convention will remain an important object of cooperation among States Parties;
- (2) that they would ensure the expeditious and timely destruction of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines under their or jurisdiction or control;
- (3) that successfully meeting deadlines for clearing mined areas will be the most significant challenge to be addressed during this period and will require intensive efforts by mine-affected States Parties and those in a position to assist them;
- (4) that consistent with the Convention's vital promise to mine victims, the States parties will enhance care, rehabilitation and reintegration efforts;
- (5) that fulfilling their obligations will require substantial political, financial and material commitments;
- (6) that transparency and the effective information exchange will be crucial to fulfilling their obligations;
- (7) that they will continue to be guided by the knowledge that individually and collectively they are responsible for ensuring compliance with the Convention; and,
- (8) that their implementation mechanisms will remain important, particularly as key means to implement the Nairobi Action Plan.

26. At the fourth plenary meeting, the meeting considered the submission of requests under article 5 of the Convention. The President notified the meeting that he had not been informed that any state wished to make such a request at the First Review Conference. The meeting took note of this.

27. At its sixth plenary meeting, the conference noted the Director of the GICHD's report on the activities of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU), contained in annex II. States Parties expressed their appreciation to the GICHD for the manner in which the ISU is making a positive contribution in support of the States Parties' efforts to implement the Convention.

28. The seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth plenary meetings featured the conference high level segment. 103 representatives, at the highest possible level, of States Parties, observer States and observer organizations addressed the conference during this high level segment.

E. Decisions and Recommendations

29. At its final plenary meeting, the conference adopted the document *Review of the operation and status of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction: 1999-2004*, which is contained as Part II of this report, emphasizing that while great progress has been made in ending the suffering caused by anti-personnel mines, much more needs to be done.

30. Also at its final plenary meeting, the conference adopted the document *Ending the suffering caused by anti-personnel mines: Nairobi Action Plan 2005-2009*, which is contained as Part III of this report, and urged all States Parties and all others who share the States Parties'

aims to undertake all necessary actions at the national, regional and international levels to implement this action plan.

31. Also at its final plenary meeting, the conference adopted the document *Towards a mine-free world: the 2004 Nairobi Declaration*, which is contained as Part IV of this report, emphasizing that this declaration contains the States Parties' renewed commitment to achieving the goal of a world free of anti-personnel mine, in which there are no more new victims.

32. Also at its final plenary meeting, the conference adopted the document *Programme of meetings and related matters to facilitate implementation 2005-2009*, which is contained as Part V of this report. In doing so, the conference took the following decisions:

(a) To hold annually, until the Second Review Conference, a Meeting of the States Parties which will regularly take place in the second half of the year, in Geneva or, when possible or appropriate, in a mine-affected country.

(b) To convene annually, until 2009, informal intersessional meetings of the Standing Committees to be held in Geneva in the first half of the year, for a duration of up to five days.

(c) As a general rule, however not excluding exceptions for specific reasons, intersessional meetings of the Standing Committees would take place in February / March and the annual Meetings of the States Parties in September.

(d) The Second Review Conference will take place in the second half of the year 2009.

(e) In keeping with the States Parties' practice of being flexible and pragmatic in addressing changing circumstances, the States Parties may review decisions regarding their 2005-2009 programme of meetings at each Meeting of the States Parties prior to the Second Review Conference.

33. In addition at its final plenary meeting, with regard to the next meeting of the States Parties, States Parties took the following decisions:

(a) The next Meeting of the States Parties will be held in Croatia from 28 November to 2 December 2005.

(b) Meetings of the Standing Committees will take place during the week of 13-17 June 2005 with the length of individual meetings and their sequencing, and duration of the entire period meetings to be established by the Coordinating Committee.

(c) Consistent with the practice of past Meetings of the States Parties, the Coordinating Committee shall be chaired by the President elected by the Review Conference until the States Parties elect a subsequent President. The chair of the Coordinating Committee will continue the practice of keeping the States Parties apprised of the Coordinating Committee's functioning.

(d) The following States Parties shall serve as the Standing Committee Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs until the end of the next Meeting of the States Parties:

- Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies: Algeria and Sweden (Co-Chairs), Jordan and Slovenia (Co-Rapporteurs);
- Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration: Nicaragua and Norway (Co-Chairs), Afghanistan and Switzerland (Co-Rapporteurs);
- Stockpile Destruction: Bangladesh and Canada (Co-Chairs), Japan and the United Republic of Tanzania (Co-Rapporteurs);
- The General Status and Operation of the Convention: New Zealand and South Africa (Co-Chairs), Belgium and Guatemala (Co-Rapporteurs).

F. Documentation

34. A list of documents submitted to the First Review Conference is contained in Appendix III to this report. These documents are available in all official languages through the United Nations Official Documents System (<http://documents.un.org>).

G. Adoption of the Final Report and conclusion of the First Review Conference

35. At its tenth and final plenary meeting, on 3 December 2004, the meeting adopted its draft report, contained in document APLC/CONF/2004/CRP.1, as orally amended, which is being issued as document APLC/CONF/2004/5. At the close of the conference, the conference expressed its heartfelt thanks to the Government and people of Kenya for their outstanding efforts in hosting the First Review Conference – the Nairobi Summit on a Mine-Free World.

PART II

REVIEW OF THE OPERATION AND STATUS OF THE CONVENTION ON THE PROHIBITION OF THE USE, STOCKPILING, PRODUCTION AND TRANSFER OF ANTIPERSONNEL MINES AND ON THEIR DESTRUCTION: 1999-2004

Introduction

1. The very purpose of the Convention is to put an end to the suffering and casualties caused by antipersonnel mines. The preamble to the Convention emphasises that the path towards fulfilment of this humanitarian promise is undertaken through the pursuit of both humanitarian and disarmament actions, particularly: ensuring universal adherence to the Convention's comprehensive prohibitions; destroying existing stockpiled antipersonnel mines; clearing mined areas; and, assisting the victims. The Convention also foresees that certain matters are essential for achieving progress in these areas, including: cooperation and assistance; transparency and the exchange of information; and, measures to prevent and suppress prohibited activities, and to facilitate compliance.

2. The Convention came into being as a result of unprecedented partnership and determination. The Brussels Declaration of June 1997 affirmed the key elements of the future Convention. Since it was adopted in Oslo on 18 September 1997, the Convention's unique spirit of cooperation has been sustained, ensuring the Convention's rapid entry into force and over five successful years of implementation. A great deal of progress has been made. However, considerable challenges remain. This review is intended to document what has been accomplished and to take stock of the essential work that lies before the States Parties in ensuring that the Convention indeed lives up to its promise.

I. Universalizing the Convention

3. Article 15 indicates that the Convention was to be open for signature at Ottawa, Canada, by all States, from 3 December 1997 until 4 December 1997, and at the United Nations headquarters in New York from 5 December 1997 until its entry into force. Between 3 December 1997 and the Convention's entry into force on 1 March 1999, 133 States signed the Convention, thereby indicating their agreement with the Convention's object and purpose and an intention to ratify the Convention.

4. Article 16 states that the Convention is subject to ratification, acceptance or approval of the Signatories and that it shall be open for accession by any State that did not sign the Convention. This article also states that the instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession shall be deposited with the Depository – which Article 21 notes is the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Between 3 December 1997 and 3 December 2004, a total of 144 States – almost 75 percent of all States – had deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with the Secretary-General, including 124 of the States that signed the Convention in accordance with Article 15. (See Annex I.)

5. Article 17 states that the Convention shall enter into force on the first day of the sixth month after the month in which the 40th instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession had been deposited. On 16 September 1998, Burkina Faso became the 40th State to deposit such an instrument, thereby assuring the Convention's entry into force on 1 March 1999.¹ In accordance with Article 17, paragraph 2, the Convention has since entered into force for 143 States which have deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with the Secretary-General. Eight of the Convention's 133 signatories have not yet ratified, accepted or approved the Convention: Brunei Darussalam, the Cook Islands, Haiti, Indonesia, the Marshall Islands, Poland, Ukraine and Vanuatu. However, in accordance with Article 18 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, these signatories are obliged to refrain from acts which would defeat the object and purpose of the Convention.

6. In addition to the impressive quantitative progress in universalising the Convention, important qualitative gains have been made. The **production** of antipersonnel mines has decreased significantly. According to the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), at one time more than 50 States produced anti-personnel mines. Thirty-three (33) of these States are now parties to the Convention, thereby having agreeing to be bound by the Convention's prohibition of the production of anti-personnel mines: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Zimbabwe.² Hence the majority of countries that at one time produced anti-personnel mines will never again do so. In addition, according to the ICBL at least three States not parties – Finland, Israel and Poland – have ceased production and, according to the ICBL, others have not produced antipersonnel mines for several years including Egypt, the Republic of Korea and the United States of America.

7. The global **trade** in anti-personnel mines has effectively ceased. By having joined the Convention, 144 of the world's States have accepted a legally-binding prohibition on transfers of anti-personnel mines. Even for most States not parties this has become the accepted norm, with many of these States having put in place moratoria or bans on transfers of the weapon, including, according to the ICBL, China, Cuba, Egypt, the Republic of Korea, India, Israel, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Poland, the Russian Federation, Singapore, Ukraine, the United States of America and Vietnam. It is significant that from 1999 to 2004 there has been no acknowledged legal trade in anti-personnel mines with any trade likely limited to a very low level of illicit trafficking.

8. The **use** of anti-personnel mines has decreased dramatically. Use of antipersonnel mines was widespread, and increased exponentially throughout the last decades of the twentieth century. The campaign for and the establishment of the Convention changed this. Not only does the Convention's prohibition on the use of anti-personnel mines bind its 144 members, but the

¹ Joining Burkina Faso in assuring a 1 March 1999 entry into force of the Convention were the following other 39 States: Andorra, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Denmark, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, France, Germany, Grenada, Holy See, Hungary, Ireland, Jamaica, Malawi, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mozambique, Niue, Norway, Peru, Samoa, San Marino, South Africa, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, United Kingdom, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

² The current versions of the names of States are used even though production of antipersonnel mines took place while some States possessed different names.

Convention's norm of non-use also has enjoyed widespread acceptance by States not parties. Since the Convention entered into force, the ICBL's annual *Landmine Monitor* has reported a sharp decline in the use of the weapon. The use of anti-personnel mines has been stigmatized – as evidenced both by this decline in use and by statements made by many States not parties attesting to their agreement with the goals of the Convention, and their intentions to eventually join.

9. The States Parties have deplored any use of anti-personnel mines. Thus, in addition to demanding that all States cease use, the States Parties have affirmed that progress to free the world from anti-personnel mines will be enhanced if **armed non-State actors** embraced the international norm established by the Convention. The States Parties have urged all such actors to cease and renounce the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines according to the principles and norms of international humanitarian law, and to allow actions to eliminate the effects of mines to take place. The States Parties have welcomed the efforts of the United Nations, regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and non-governmental organisations in engaging armed non-State actors on a ban on anti-personnel mines. The States Parties have expressed their appreciation for the work of these organizations and as well as their desire that individual States Parties that are in a position to do so facilitate this work. Impressive progress has been made with armed non-State actors within the following States having adhered to the Geneva Call's *Deed of Commitment for Adherence to a Total Ban on Anti Personnel Mines and for Cooperation in Mine Action*: Burundi, India, Iraq, Myanmar, the Philippines, Somalia and Sudan.

10. Efforts to universalise adherence to the Convention have been important manifestations of the Convention's spirit of **partnership and cooperation**. States Parties, and international, regional and non-governmental organizations have undertaken countless activities, individually and in cooperation and coordination with each other, to promote universalization of the Convention in all types of fora. Such efforts have contributed greatly to further adherence to the Convention.

11. The preamble to the Convention highlights “the role of **public conscience** in furthering the principles of humanity as evidenced by the call for a total ban on anti-personnel mines (...).” The ICRC and the ICBL in particular have perpetuated the voice of public conscience since the Convention's entry into force, playing a central role in promoting universal adherence to the Convention. The United Nations has contributed to this effort. The United Nations General Assembly annually has voted to “(invite) all States that have not signed the Convention (...) to accede to it without delay” and to “(urge) all States that have signed but not ratified the Convention to ratify it without delay.”³ The United Nations system has had as one of its objectives in its mine action strategy to see that “all States regularly (are) encouraged to ratify, accede to and comply with, existing international instruments on landmines.”⁴ In addition, the United Nations Secretary-General – the Convention's depository – has called for universal adherence to the Convention. The General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS) has annually since 1996 called for a mine-free Western Hemisphere and has called on its

³ See for example Resolution 58/53, *Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Antipersonnel Mines and on Their Destruction*, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 8 December 2003. (A/RES/58/53).

⁴ See for example: *United Nations Mine Action Strategy 2001-2005* (A/58/260/Add.1) and the *UNICEF Mine Action Strategy 2002-2005*.

member States to join the Convention. Other regional organizations, such as the European Union (EU), the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), MERCOSUR, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) have also played roles in promoting adherence to the Convention, where appropriate.

12. Despite great progress towards universal adherence, 50 States have not yet ratified or acceded to the Convention. (See Annex II.) Among these States are several which could have a significant impact on the global disarmament, as well as humanitarian, goals of the Convention, for example because they still produce, stockpile or have anti-personnel mines laid on their territory. These States not parties include 11 States which, according to the ICBL, have used anti-personnel mines since the Convention entered into force: Georgia, India, Israel, Kyrgyzstan, Nepal, Myanmar, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan, as well as Iraq under its former regime. Moreover, according to the ICBL 15 States not parties continue to produce anti-personnel mines or have not produced mines for some time but retain the capacity to produce anti-personnel mines: China, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, India, Iran, Iraq, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, Singapore, the United States of America and Vietnam. According to the ICBL, a small number of States not parties hold vast stockpiles of anti-personnel mines, including the three permanent members of the United Nations Security Council that remain outside of the Convention.⁵ In addition, while some States not parties accept the Convention's norms, others still consider the 1996 Amended Protocol II to the 1980 Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) to be their point of reference.

13. Whereas almost every State in the Western Hemisphere, Africa and Europe has become a party to the Convention, the rate of adherence remains low in Asia, the Middle East and amongst the members of the Commonwealth of Independent States – this despite vigorous bilateral and regional efforts to promote the Convention in these regions.

14. A compelling case has been made regarding how the terrible humanitarian consequences that result from antipersonnel mine use greatly outweigh their limited military utility. This case has been made, inter alia, by senior active and retired military officers from many States Parties and States not parties – and by virtue of close to three-quarters of the world's States having accepted the Convention. Some States not parties, however, continue to claim that antipersonnel mines are necessary. Others have linked the possibility of accession to the Convention to the resolution of a territorial, regional or internal dispute or conflict. Such States have not joined the Convention despite the evidence of the indiscriminate nature of antipersonnel mines, the devastating socio-economic consequences of these *hidden killers*, and that removing anti-personnel mines from border areas constitutes a crucial means of promoting security and building confidence.

15. The States Parties repeatedly have stated that assistance and cooperation for mine action will flow primarily to those that have sworn the use of anti-personnel mines forever through adherence to, implementation of, and compliance with the Convention.⁶ One of the most severely mine-affected States Parties, Angola, for example, has stated that its ratification of the

⁵ See paragraph 26.

⁶ See for example the Declaration of the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties (APLC/MSP.5/2003/5).

Convention facilitated a 100 percent increase in the mine action contributions it received.⁷ However, one State not party, Ukraine, has indicated that assistance for the destruction of its large stockpile of anti-personnel mines must be in place before it would be in a position to join the Convention.

16. Some States have joined the Convention notwithstanding the fact that armed non-State actors engage in acts prohibited by the Convention in the sovereign territory of these States Parties. One State not party, Sri Lanka, however, has suggested that accession to the Convention may be linked to a commitment to an end to the use of anti-personnel mines by an armed non-State actor in its sovereign territory.

17. Some States with no objections to the Convention remain outside it simply because ratification or accession to it is one of many competing priorities for scarce administrative resources. In addition, accession to the Convention is not possible on the part of at least one State – Somalia – given that it currently does not have a functioning or recognized government in place.

18. Finally, while universalization of the Convention itself means adherence to it by all States, universal acceptance of the Convention's norms is impeded by armed non-State actors that continue to use, stockpile, and produce anti-personnel mines.

II. Destroying stockpiled antipersonnel mines

19. The preamble to the Convention indicates that the States Parties believe it necessary to do their utmost to assure the destruction of anti-personnel mines. This indication is translated into action in Article 4, which states that “except as provided for in Article 3, each State Party undertakes to destroy or ensure the destruction of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines it owns or possesses, or that are under its jurisdiction or control, as soon as possible but not later than four years after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party.”

20. Moreover, with respect to fulfilling Article 4 obligations, Article 7.1 requires that each State Party report:

- “the total of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines owned or possessed by it, or under its jurisdiction or control, to include a breakdown of the type, quantity and, if possible, lot numbers of each type of anti-personnel mine stockpiled;
- “the status of programs for the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with (Articles 4 ...) including details of the methods which will be used in destruction, the location of all destruction sites and the applicable safety and environmental standards to be observed;” and,
- “the types and quantities of all anti-personnel mines destroyed after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party, to include a breakdown of the quantity of each type of anti-personnel mine destroyed, in accordance with (Article 4...), along with, if possible, the lot numbers of each type of antipersonnel mine (...).”

⁷ See the report of the 4858th meeting of the United Nations Security Council, 13 November 2003, (S/PV.4858), page 22.

21. The destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 4 is an obligation that has been, would have been or is relevant for 78 States Parties: Sixty-nine (69) States Parties reported, in accordance with Article 7, that they held stockpiled antipersonnel mines when the Convention entered into force for them: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, the Niger, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen and Zimbabwe. Nine (9) States Parties reported that they had destroyed their stockpiled antipersonnel mines prior to entry into force: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Luxembourg, Mali, Namibia, Norway and South Africa. One (1) of the States Parties that has not yet provided an initial report in accordance with Article 7 holds or may hold stockpiled antipersonnel mines based on statements made elsewhere: Guyana.

22. Sixty-seven (67) States Parties reported, in accordance with Article 7, that they did not hold stockpiles when the Convention entered into force for them.⁸ These States Parties are: Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, the Central African Republic, the Comoros, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Fiji, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, the Holy See, Iceland, Ireland, Jamaica, Kiribati, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Namibia, Nauru, New Zealand, Nigeria, Niue, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, the Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Timor Leste and Zambia. Six (6) of the States Parties that have not yet provided an initial report in accordance with Article 7 are presumed not to hold stockpiled antipersonnel mines based on statements made elsewhere: Cape Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia and Sao Tome and Principe.

23. States Parties' fulfilment of their Article 4 obligations has been one of the Convention's great success stories. All States Parties whose deadlines for destruction have occurred have now reported completion of their stockpile destruction programmes. Today, 126 States Parties no longer have stockpiled anti-personnel mines. Together the States Parties have destroyed more than 37 million landmines. The Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction has contributed significantly to this success by providing a forum for States Parties to provide updates on efforts to destroy stockpiled mines and for others to indicate what assistance is available to support these efforts. Furthermore, through this forum, a general understanding has developed that, with the exception of PFM mines⁹, stockpile destruction is relatively simple and does not pose significant environmental problems.

⁸ This includes those 9 States Parties mentioned above that reported that they had destroyed their stockpiled antipersonnel mines prior to entry into force.

⁹ See paragraph 27.

24. Destroying anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 4 has produced improvements in planning, understanding destruction methods, destruction technologies, economic efficiencies and safety and environmental aspects. As an example at least one State Party, Albania, established a demilitarization facility to destroy its mines and now has taken on other important demilitarization projects. Additionally many State Parties have improved their technical and safety skills based on lessons learned in open detonation of their mines.

25. The International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) have been developed.¹⁰ With respect to Article 4 obligations, the IMAS inform national authorities of the technical and logistical issues involved in stockpile destruction, explain systems and procedures that can be used at the national level to plan the destruction of a State's stockpile, establish the principles and procedures for the safe conduct of large-scale destruction operations using open burning or open detonation techniques, and provide a consistent framework for a monitoring system as part of the destruction process.

26. The number of parties for which the obligation to destroy stockpiled antipersonnel mines remains relevant has been narrowed considerably to include 16 States: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Belarus, Burundi, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Mauritania, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Turkey and Uruguay. Many of these States Parties have commenced their stockpile destruction programmes. By 1 April 2008 the last of these States Parties is obliged to have completed its destruction programme. It is estimated that together these States Parties hold more than 10.2 million antipersonnel mines. While the number of States Parties for which stockpile destruction is relevant is now small, a challenge exists in the fact that the numbers of mines held by a few individual States Parties is high. This challenge would be increased should additional stockpile-holding States join the Convention in the period following the First Review Conference. For example, the ICBL has estimated that six States not parties combined – China, India, the Republic of Korea, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and the United States of America – may hold more than 180 million stockpiled antipersonnel mines.

27. From a technical perspective, the remaining main challenges include the destruction of a unique type of mine, the PFM1 mine. This mine is particularly difficult to destroy as it cannot be disarmed once armed and it contains a liquid explosive that gives off toxic fumes once detonated. This is a matter that is relevant for one State Party, Belarus, that holds millions of these mines. In addition, some States not parties including one signatory, Ukraine, have large stockpiles of them and thus the destruction of those stockpiles would be an important challenge should they join the Convention. Appropriate destruction technologies have now been identified

¹⁰ The IMAS were developed to improve safety and efficiency in mine action by providing guidance, by establishing principles and, in some cases, by defining international requirements and specifications. They provide a frame of reference which encourages the sponsors and managers of mine action programmes and projects to achieve and demonstrate agreed levels of effectiveness and safety. They provide a common language, and recommend the formats and rules for handling data which enable the accurate and timely exchange of important information. The preparation and application of IMAS are shaped by five guiding principles: first, the right of national governments to apply national standards to national programmes; second, standards should protect those most at risk; third, emphasis on building a national capacity to develop, maintain and apply appropriate standards for mine action; fourth, to maintain consistency with other international norms and standards; and fifth, compliance with international conventions and treaties. The Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) manages the development and updating of the IMAS on behalf of the UN.

and it is hoped that solutions will be of immediate application soon after the First Review Conference. Another technical challenge relates to a lack of expertise by some States Parties to develop and implement national stockpile destruction plans.

28. From a financial perspective, it must be recalled that some States Parties, particularly developing countries, do not possess the financial means to destroy their stockpiles of anti-personnel mines given pressing needs in other areas. Similarly it should be recognised that while an investment of typically less than US\$ 1 per mine will destroy a stockpile of mines, the costs to clear emplaced mines are hundreds or thousands of times higher.

29. In some post-conflict or otherwise complex situations it may be challenging to find and account for all stockpiled anti-personnel mines that are under the jurisdiction or control of a State Party. Ammunition depots may have been decentralized, and / or may have been in the hands of more than one entity, possibly rendering the accounting and collection process more difficult and complex and slowing this process. In the future, such situations conceivably could lead to a State Party discovering previously unknown stockpiles after destruction was complete, and perhaps following the deadline by which they were to have completed destruction.

30. A small number of the 16 States Parties that must still complete the implementation of Article 4 do not or may not have control over their entire sovereign territories. In areas that are beyond their control, stockpiles of anti-personnel mines may be present. However, it is important to recall that Article 4 obliges States Parties to destroy stockpiles under their jurisdiction or control. Hence, nothing stands in the way of States Parties fulfilling their obligations in areas under their control, and henceforth proceeding promptly with destruction in other areas when conditions permit.

III. Clearing mined areas

31. The preamble to the Convention indicates that the States Parties, in acting upon their determination to end the suffering and casualties caused by anti-personnel mines, “(believe) it necessary to do their utmost to contribute in a coordinated and efficient manner to face the challenge of removing anti-personnel mines placed throughout the world.” The obligation to remove anti-personnel mines ultimately rests with each mine-affected State Party to the Convention in accordance with the provisions of Article 5. These States Parties must:

- “make every effort to identify all areas under (their) jurisdiction or control in which antipersonnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced;”
- “ensure as soon as possible that all antipersonnel mines in mined areas under (their) jurisdiction or control are perimeter-marked, monitored and protected by fencing or other means, to ensure the effective exclusion of civilians, until all anti-personnel mines contained therein have been destroyed;” and,
- undertake “to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under (their) jurisdiction or control, as soon as possible but not later than ten years after the entry into force of (the) Convention for (a particular) State Party.”

32. Under Article 7, each State Party must report annually to the Secretary General of the United Nations:

- “to the extent possible, the location of all mined areas that contain, or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines under its jurisdiction or control;”
- “the status of programs for the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with (Article 5);”
- “the types and quantities of all anti-personnel mines destroyed after the entry into force of (the) Convention;” and,
- “the measures taken to provide an immediate and effective warning to the population in relation to all areas identified under paragraph 2 of Article 5.”

33. In reports submitted in accordance with Article 7, the following 49 States Parties have reported areas under their jurisdiction or control that contain, or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines and hence must fulfil the obligations contained in Article 5 and the relevant reporting requirements: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Eritrea, France, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Jordan, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, the Niger, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. Of these, 3 States Parties – Costa Rica, Djibouti and Honduras – have indicated that they have completed implementation of Article 5.

34. While each mine-affected State Party holds ultimate responsibility for fulfilling the obligations contained in Article 5, Article 6 contains provisions related to cooperation and assistance. Under this Article, each State Party in fulfilling its obligations “has the right to seek and receive assistance, where feasible, from other States Parties to the extent possible.” With particular regard to fulfilling Article 5 obligations, Article 6 states that each State Party “shall have the right to participate in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information concerning the implementation of this Convention.” And, “States Parties may request the United Nations, regional organizations, other States Parties or other competent intergovernmental or non-governmental fora to assist its authorities in the elaboration of a national demining program.”

35. Article 6 also contains various responsibilities related to facilitating assistance and cooperation. This Article states “the States Parties shall not impose undue restrictions on the provision of mine clearance equipment and related technological information for humanitarian purposes.” It requires “each State Party in a position to do so” to provide assistance “for mine clearance and related activities” and “for mine awareness programs.” Finally, “each State Party undertakes to provide information to the database on mine clearance established within the United Nations system, especially information concerning various means and technologies of mine clearance, and lists of experts, expert agencies or national points of contact on mine clearance.”

36. Based upon what is contained in Articles 5, 6 and 7 of the Convention, it is possible to discern that the following actions are required in order to implement Article 5:

- the identification of mined areas;
- the development and implementation of a mine action plan and programme;
- the reduction of risk by verifying and marking suspected areas and protecting civilians from mined areas awaiting clearance, and through mine risk education;
- the clearance of mined areas;
- an effective exchange of technologies;
- reporting and sharing information; and,
- cooperation and assistance.

This section of the review of the general status of the Convention will cover all of these areas with the exception of reporting and sharing information, and cooperation and assistance, which will be covered elsewhere in the review.

Identifying mined areas

37. Whereas when the Convention entered into force little in precise terms was known about the global landmine problem or the problem faced by most affected States, since the Convention was established, significant methodological, organization and operational advances have been made in identifying areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced. These advances are not limited to identifying areas containing antipersonnel mines only but include areas containing mines and UXO. Moreover, advances have pointed towards greater understanding of not only the extent of mine and UXO contamination but also the impact of such contamination. This has helped the prioritisation process for mine clearance, freed-up land for economic and social activity and contributed to decreases in the number of new mine victims.

38. Assessment missions have emerged as a means to help define the scope and nature of a landmine / UXO problem, identify constraints and opportunities related to the development of mine action initiatives and recommend comprehensive responses. Since the Convention was established, UN Inter-Agency Assessment Missions have been conducted in the following 13 States Parties which have reported areas containing antipersonnel mines or which have not yet provided an initial transparency report but which evidence suggests are mine-affected: Ecuador, Jordan, Malawi, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Sudan, Tunisia, Uganda, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

39. The establishment of the Convention was the impetus for the development of the Global Survey Initiative to better understand the global landmine problem. The Landmine Impact Survey (LIS) methodology defines the problem in terms of location and socio-economic impacts experienced by affected communities. Landmine Impact Surveys have helped improve national planning efforts, and have provided baseline data for measuring performance. LIS have been completed in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Mozambique, Thailand and Yemen as well as in some States not parties. In addition, LIS are under way or nearing completion in the following States Parties: Afghanistan, Angola and Eritrea. The LIS has proven useful to States Parties while at the same time lessons learned have shed light on its limitations, which are being taken into account in future survey efforts. Challenges ahead include developing survey methodology to address countries with more limited levels of contamination or those of vast size

and ensuring that data remain updated, relevant and operationally useful for mine clearance tasking, including years after the surveys have been conducted.

40. Other forms of assessments and surveys have been carried out in other States Parties and in some States Parties such efforts have proven unnecessary given the degree of existing information already available on the extent and impact of mined areas. However, States Parties that have not yet done so need to act with urgency to ensure that every effort is made to identify all areas under their jurisdiction or control in which antipersonnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced. This is especially relevant for those States Parties with Article 5 clearance deadlines that occur in 2009. (See Annex III for an overview of the clearance deadlines of the States Parties mentioned in paragraphs 33 and 34.)

41. In the context of reporting in accordance with Article 7.1(c) and through other means, relevant States Parties have provided information related to identifying areas under their jurisdiction or control in which antipersonnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced. This information is summarised in Column A in the table contained in Annex IV.

National planning and programme development

42. Many States Parties have proceeded in the development and implementation of national programmes to fulfil Article 5 obligations through the establishment of effective and transparent mine action structures. In many cases this has involved establishing bodies separating the policy-making function from the operational implementation of the programme. Legislation has proven to be important in setting out roles and responsibilities, providing legal authorisation for various actors to act in certain areas, and governing legal issues such as insurance and responsibilities to victims. States Parties' experience in national planning and programme development has shown that coordination is best achieved when simple and manageable solutions are found through cooperative efforts involving national and sub-national governments, mine action operators, affected communities and other development actors.

43. The evolving role of information management in supporting national planning and programme implementation and hence in supporting fulfilment of Article 5 obligations has been discussed extensively within the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies. Since 1999, mine action information needs have been increasingly addressed through the development of the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA), which was developed by the GICHD. The IMSMA to some extent has contributed to standardised mine action information. By 2004, the following States Parties were receiving IMSMA support: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Eritrea, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Rwanda, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Yemen and Zambia. Challenges ahead include ensuring that information management is simplified in order to be of benefit to national authorities in meeting their obligations under Article 5 in the Convention, continuing to improve the system while maintaining it as a user-friendly system, and ensuring that information is made available to all relevant stakeholders.

44. As noted, the States Parties are required in accordance with Article 7.1(f) to report on “the status of programmes for the destruction of antipersonnel mines in accordance with (Article 5).” In the context of reports submitted and through other means, relevant States Parties have provided information related to their plans and programmes to implement Article 5. This information is summarised in Column B in the table contained in Annex IV.

Marking and protecting mined areas

45. States Parties are obliged to ensure that all antipersonnel mines in mined areas under (their) jurisdiction or control are perimeter-marked, monitored and protected by fencing or other means until these mines have been cleared. This is part of the larger effort undertaken by States Parties to reduce risk to civilians and thus prevent further suffering caused by antipersonnel mines. The effective implementation of this obligation has been aided by the development of the IMAS on marking mine and UXO hazards. These standards articulate that marking systems should take account of local materials freely available in the contaminated region and that these materials should have little, if any, value or practical use for other purpose in order to prevent them from being removed. In addition, these standards emphasize that marking systems need to be maintained and systems to mark, monitor and protect mined areas should be integrated into mine risk education programmes if clearance is not to be undertaken rapidly.

46. In the context of reporting in accordance with Article 7.1(i) on “the measures taken to provide an immediate and effective warning to the population in relation to all areas identified under paragraph 2 of Article 5,” the following 25 States Parties have provided information regarding the steps they have taken to fulfil their obligations to ensure that all antipersonnel mines in mined areas under (their) jurisdiction or control are perimeter-marked, monitored and protected by fencing or other means: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chile, the Congo, Cyprus, Denmark, Honduras, Jordan, Malawi, Nicaragua, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

47. One of the biggest challenges associated with reducing risks to communities through marking, monitoring and protecting of mined areas awaiting clearance relates to the broader challenge faced by many States Parties in simply gaining a more comprehensive understanding of the extent and impact of mined areas under their jurisdiction or control. Other challenges include that fencing off large swathes of territory and maintaining fencing and markings are expensive propositions, that monitoring requires precious human resources, and that communities in resource-deprived areas have often procured the fencing used for their own day-to-day purposes. Experience has shown that engaging affected communities in the marking process significantly reduces the chances of markings being damaged or removed; however, clearing mines is the only 100 percent safeguard against more incidents. Finally, other challenges to marking, monitoring and protecting of mined areas awaiting clearance relate to ongoing instability in areas suspected of being mined and the absence of operational mine action structures.

Mine risk education

48. While Article 6.3 obliges States Parties in a position to do so to provide assistance for mine awareness programmes, the term “mine awareness” is not defined by the Convention. Since 2001 the States Parties generally have used the term “mine risk education” rather than “mine awareness.”¹¹

49. Since the Convention was established, the field of mine risk education (MRE) has evolved to become more standardised and professional. It is now accepted that MRE should be incorporated into broader mine action programmes, ensuring an effective two-way information exchange both to ensure the effectiveness of MRE programmes and to obtain information from affected communities to support mine clearance priority-setting. It has been stressed that MRE programmes should include a clear communications strategy, targeting a variety of different audiences in a manner that takes age and gender into consideration, as well as social, economic, political and geographical factors. It has been emphasised that a careful assessment of needs should be carried out. For example, needs assessments may overcome a tendency to focus on MRE activities on children, which are not necessarily the category most at-risk, and challenge the assumption that, simply because a State Party is affected by landmines, an MRE programme is necessary or appropriate. In addition, it has been emphasised that effective monitoring and evaluation systems need to be developed to continuously measure mine risks and the impact of programmes on reducing risk.

50. As noted, States Parties are required to report on “the measures taken to provide an immediate and effective warning to the population in relation to all areas identified under paragraph 2 of Article 5.” In reports submitted in accordance with Article 7, the following 34 States Parties provided information related to such measures having been taken: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Chad, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Ecuador, Eritrea, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Jordan, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, the Niger, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

51. MRE programmes are intended to see at-risk individuals adopt safe behaviours. However, changes in annual casualty rates do not necessarily mean that these programmes or other measures to provide an immediate and effective warning to the population in relation to mined areas have been effective. Many other factors contribute to fluctuations in casualty rates including, for example, the movement of refugees, internally displaced persons and nomadic groups, the economic situation, the need to access food, water or firewood, ongoing hostilities and the presence or absence of mine clearance activities. Effective monitoring systems should measure the contribution of MRE to achieving this end. With these points in mind, annual casualty rates of States Parties in which such information is available do contribute to an overall assessment of progress that has been made and challenges that remain in ending the suffering caused by antipersonnel mines. (See Annex V.)

¹¹ The term “mine risk education” is defined by the IMAS as “educational activities which seek to reduce the risk of injury from mines / UXO by raising awareness and promoting behavioural change including public information dissemination, education and training, and community mine action liaison.”

52. The fact that many States Parties do not have the means to obtain accurate data on casualties or even a general sense of the extent to which populations are at risk underscores the need for assessments in order to determine what needs to be done to initiate or advance MRE activities. Another challenge confronting efforts to reduce risk is the fact that in some States Parties, where annual casualty rates have declined and where MRE programmes are being carried out, the number of new casualties remains at an alarmingly high rate. In addition, an increasing challenge faced by many States Parties is the need to integrate MRE programmes into broader relief and development activities and education systems, both to take advantage of synergies and to rationalise activities in environments where resources are scarce. In addition, at least one State Party has indicated that additional challenges include ongoing instability in areas suspected of being mined and the absence of operational mine action structures.

Clearing mined areas

53. As noted in paragraphs 33 and 34, 3 States Parties have cleared mined areas in accordance with their Article 5 obligations and 46 are still in the progress of doing so. The operational experience of and lessons learned by these States Parties have substantially advanced the clearance of mined areas. It is now widely recognized that a variety of clearance assets based on the prevailing conditions is necessary – assets that generally fall into one of three broad categories: manual deminers, mine detection dogs (MDD) and mechanical systems. Many States Parties have learned that the key to success is to employ a combination of systems based on the capabilities and effectiveness of each type of asset and to correctly sequence their employment. In addition, many States Parties have demonstrated that Technical Survey operations – rapidly verifying that parts of suspected hazardous areas are clear in order to focus manual deminers on areas actually containing mines – will be important in assuring the fulfilment of Article 5 obligations.

54. The IMAS concerning clearing mined areas and related activities have been developed in part to assist States Parties in fulfilling Article 5 obligations. These standards aim to reflect mine action norms and practices. Efforts to fulfil obligations under Article 5, particular clearance obligations, have been greatly aided by the extensive work, contribution and sacrifices of thousands of deminers in mine-affected countries. Without their dedication significant progress in clearing mined areas would not have been achieved. These women and men – some of whom are landmine survivors – include nationals of mine-affected States Parties, as well as international mine action operators.

55. As noted, the States Parties are required to report on progress made in clearing and destroying antipersonnel mines in accordance with Article 5 obligations. The exact wording of the reporting obligation contained in Article 7.1(g) incorporates disarmament terminology. When this reporting provision is narrowly applied States Parties may forgo an opportunity to communicate progress in a richer manner, particularly by providing additional quantitative and qualitative information related to how their efforts are contributing to the humanitarian aims of the Convention. This point was recognized at the Fourth Meeting of the States Parties in 2002, which encouraged States Parties to maximize the potential of the Article 7 reporting format as an important tool to measure progress and expressed their appreciation for and agreed to act upon suggestions made in a President's Paper – suggestions which included taking full advantage of Article 7 reporting as a State Party's official voice in communicating with other States parties on broader implementation matters. In addition, the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies has provided a valuable forum for States Parties

that must fulfil Article 5 obligations to communicate their problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance.

56. In the context of reports submitted in accordance with Article 7 and through other means, relevant States Parties have provided information related to their progress in clearing mined areas in accordance with Article 5. This information is summarised in Column C in the table contained in Annex IV.

Exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information

57. A variety of means have emerged for States Parties to exercise their “right to participate in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information concerning the implementation of (the) Convention”, and to fulfil their responsibility to facilitate such an exchange. In addition to bilateral exchanges and exchanges between authorities and field operators, the UN, the OAS, other regional organizations and organizations like the GICHD have served to produce and disseminate relevant information. The International Test and Evaluation Programme (ITEP) has emerged as a forum for technology-developing countries to cooperate in the testing and evaluation of equipment, systems and methods as well as to avoid duplication in testing and evaluation. As well, Meetings of the States Parties – which are mandated in Article 11 of the Convention to consider inter alia “the development of technologies to clear antipersonnel mines” – and meetings of the Standing Committees have served as fora for actors to present needs and views and provide updates on developments. In addition, a variety of countries and organizations have held or sponsored meetings and workshops specifically dedicated to the exchange of information relating to the development and testing of technology suitable for possible use in mine action. Some of these meetings have become regular annual events and have consecutively contributed to the greater knowledge of technologies available.

58. While the Convention does not limit exchanges of equipment, material and scientific and technological information to matters concerning Article 5 and while some progress has been made in matters pertaining to the care and rehabilitation of landmine victims, for the most part such exchanges indeed have focused on matters pertaining to the fulfilment of Article 5 obligations. Within the context of Article 5 obligations, exchanges can be said to relate to either those pertaining to existing equipment and technologies or those pertaining to future prospects. While there have been advances in both areas since the Convention entered into force, for the most part progress has been mixed.

59. Technologies which were the mainstays of clearance efforts when the Convention was established continue to be some of the most significant elements of the demining *toolbox*. While basic manual techniques have essentially remained unchanged, other mine clearance technologies have evolved and new operational procedures have been developed. Progress is now being made in studying various tools in the existing toolbox in order to increase efficiency and safety. The sensitivity of metal detectors has been increased but in so doing the susceptibility of metal detectors to false alarms from small metal fragments or metallic compounds in certain soils, including those soils commonly found in South-East Asia and Africa has also increased. Dogs can be used more reliably today and are in more wide-spread use. In addition, the quality and applicability of machines have improved. Mechanical mine clearance systems are being employed on an ever widening scale. Moreover, the availability of different machines on the

international market continues to expand. Finally, advances have been made in personal protective equipment, binary explosives and in information technology.

60. Tests have been conducted on combined ground penetrating radar / metal detectors and on infrared detectors. The use of animals other than dogs to detect antipersonnel mines is being investigated, with certain types of rats showing some promising results in operational use. In addition, advances have been made in remote explosive scent tracing (i.e., REST – a technique involving taking air samples from suspected mined areas to detection dogs). As well, the potential of using trained honeybees has also been explored and may offer a very quick and low cost sustainable solution. The use of genetically modified plants is an additional area of potential low cost, low risk, detection capability and more research is currently under way on this possibility.

61. A significant injection of funding into research and development of new technologies has been made. Additional investments will be needed to overcome remaining challenges, including those pertaining to close-in detection and area reduction. The small size of the market for mine action technologies affects development efforts and market size is further complicated by the fact that often potential solutions are not universally applicable but rather are country or region-specific. There is a need to maintain an appropriate level of technology in mine-affected States Parties, ensuring that it is affordable, sustainable and adaptable to local conditions. That is, an emphasis developing new technologies must not overshadow productivity increases, which could be achieved by supplying existing technology, particularly mechanical clearance assets and mine detection dogs. Finally, while there have been recent examples of improvements in information and idea exchange between end users of technology and those developing it, this relationship needs to be further strengthened through workshops, field demonstrations and visits to mine-affected countries.

62. According to Article 6.6 “each State Party undertakes to provide information to the database on mine clearance established within the United Nations system, especially information concerning various means and technologies of mine clearance, and lists of experts, expert agencies or national points of contact on mine clearance”. Since the Convention entered into force, the United Nations’ electronic information network *E-mine* – a central repository of mine-related information – has replaced the database on mine clearance established by the United Nations Department for Humanitarian Affairs in 1995.

IV. Assisting landmine victims¹²

63. The preamble to the Convention expresses the wish of the States Parties “to do their utmost in providing assistance for the care and rehabilitation, including the social and economic reintegration of mine victims.” This wish is translated into an obligation in Article 6.3 in that “each State Party in a position to do so shall provide assistance for the care in and rehabilitation of, and social and economic reintegration, of mine victims (...)” Article 6.3 continues by indicating that such assistance may be provided through a variety of means, including “the United Nations system, international, regional or national organizations or institutions, the

¹² Notwithstanding the fact that the term “mine victim” has a negative connotation relative to the term “mine survivor”, the former is used predominately in this document as it is a term used in the Convention.

International Committee of the Red Cross, and national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies and their International Federation, non-governmental organizations, or on a bilateral basis.”

64. One of the early steps taken by the States Parties, particularly through the work of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, was to clarify terms that are central to fulfilment of the aim of providing assistance to landmine victims, particularly the terms *victim* and *victim assistance*. It is now generally accepted that *victims* include those who either individually or collectively have suffered physical or psychological injury, economic loss or substantial impairment of their fundamental rights through acts or omissions related to mine utilization. A broad approach to what is considered a landmine victim has served a purpose in drawing attention to the full breadth of victimisation caused by landmines and unexploded ordnance. However, quite naturally the majority of attention has been focused on providing assistance to those individuals directly impacted by mines. These individuals have specific needs for emergency and ongoing medical care, rehabilitation and reintegration, and require legal and policy frameworks to be implemented in such manner that their rights are protected.

65. In addition to increasing their awareness of the specific rights and needs of landmine victims, the States Parties, particularly through the work of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, have also developed a clear sense of the place of assistance to mine victims in broader contexts. Those individuals directly impacted by mines are a sub-group of larger communities of persons with injuries and disabilities. While victim assistance has been referred to as an integral component of mine action, there are important contextual differences between humanitarian demining and activities related to assisting in the care, rehabilitation and reintegration of landmine victims. The challenges associated with clearing mine / UXO-contaminated areas are relatively distinct from other humanitarian, development or disarmament challenges. Consequently humanitarian demining has developed as a relatively new and specialized discipline. However, the problems faced by landmine victims are similar to the challenges faced by other persons with injuries and disabilities. Victim assistance does not require the development of new fields or disciplines but rather calls for ensuring that existing health care and social service systems, rehabilitation programmes and legislative and policy frameworks are adequate to meet the needs of all citizens — including landmine victims. However, it does require that a certain priority be accorded to health and rehabilitation systems in areas where landmine victims are prevalent.

66. The work to implement the Convention has resulted in the commonly held view that the call to assist landmine victims should not lead to victim assistance efforts being undertaken in such a manner as to exclude any person injured or disabled in another manner. Furthermore, the impetus provided by the Convention to assist mine victims has provided an opportunity to enhance the well-being of not only landmine victims but also all other persons with war-related injuries and persons with disabilities. Assistance to landmine victims should be viewed as a part of a country's overall public health and social services systems and human rights frameworks. However, within those general systems, deliberate care must be taken to ensure that landmine victims and other persons with disability receive the same opportunities in life — for health care, social services, a life-sustaining income, education and participation in the community — as every other sector of a society. Health and social services must be open to all sectors of society, including landmine victims and other persons with disabilities.

67. Another commonly held view that has emerged from the work of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration is that providing adequate assistance to landmine survivors must be seen in a broader context of development and underdevelopment. The mine-affected States Parties have different capacities. Many are not in a position to offer an adequate level of care and social assistance to their populations and to mine victims in particular. Many of the mine-affected States Parties, particularly those in Africa, have a low Human Development Index score – a measure established by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to assess the level of well-being of a country's population. Moreover, many of these States Parties have some of the world's lowest rankings of overall health system performance. A political commitment within these countries to assist landmine survivors is essential but ensuring that a real difference can be made may require addressing broader development concerns. It is now widely recognized that victim assistance should be integrated into development plans and strategies. By doing so, development efforts that assist mine victims will benefit from these victims' contributions to their country's development through their full participation in social and economic spheres.

68. The States Parties have come to recognize that victim assistance is more than just a medical or rehabilitation issue – it is also a human rights issue. In this vein, it has been stressed that victim assistance should be guided by principles including: national ownership; the non-discrimination of victims; the empowerment of victims; an integrated and comprehensive approach, including a gender perspective; the participation of all relevant government agencies, service providers, non-governmental organizations and donors; transparency and efficiency; and, sustainability.¹³

69. One of the major advances made by the States Parties, particularly through the work of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, has been to better understand the elements that comprise *victim assistance*. This effort was particularly assisted by a consultative process led by the United Nations Mine Action Service, which led to the generally accepted view that the priorities in this area include:

- understanding the extent of the challenge faced;
- emergency and continuing medical care;
- physical rehabilitation, including physiotherapy, prosthetics and assistive devices;
- psychological support and social reintegration;
- economic reintegration; and,
- the establishment, enforcement and implementation of relevant laws and public policies.

Progress has been made but challenges remain in each of these areas.

¹³ An initial description of these principles was contained in a document entitled *Victim Assistance: A Comprehensive Integrated Approach*, which was distributed by Switzerland at the 1999 First Meeting of the States Parties.

Understanding the extent of the challenges faced

70. The States Parties have come to recognize the value and necessity of accurate and up-to-date data on the number of new landmine casualties, the total number of survivors and their specific needs, and the extent / lack of and quality of services that exist to address their needs in order to use limited resources most effectively. This matter was acted upon by the World Health Assembly even before the Convention entered into force when in 1998 it requested the Director-General of the World Health Organization “to strengthen the capacity of affected States for the planning and execution of programmes for (inter alia) better assessment of the effects of anti-personnel mine injuries on health through the establishment or reinforcement of surveillance systems.”¹⁴ In response, in 2000 the World Health Organization published *Guidance for surveillance of injuries due to landmines and unexploded ordnance* as a standardized tool for information gathering on mine / unexploded ordnance victims as well as guidance on how to use this tool. This tool subsequently served as the model for the design of elements of the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) related to data on victims – a system that is supported in 26 States Parties: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, Eritrea, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Rwanda, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Yemen and Zambia.

71. Despite advances made in data collection tools and methodology, and in information systems, many mine-affected States Parties still know little about the prevalence of new victims, the numbers of survivors or their specific needs. Even in many countries with functioning data collection and information management systems like the IMSMA it is believed that not all mine casualties are reported or recorded. This is particularly the case in countries experiencing ongoing conflict, or with minefields in remote areas, or with limited resources to monitor public health services. In addition, some of the best data collection exercises are performed by actors other than States Parties themselves, with national ownership over this matter not yet achieved. The challenge for many States Parties during the period 2005 to 2009 will be to enhance their mine victim data collection capacities, integrating such systems into existing health information systems and ensuring full access to information in order to support the needs of programme planners and resource mobilization.

Emergency and continuing medical care

72. The States Parties have come to see emergency and continuing medical care as being emergency first-aid and adequate medical care including competent surgical management. It is acknowledged that the provision of appropriate emergency and continuing medical care, or the lack of it, has a profound impact on the immediate and long-term recovery of mine victims. While some progress has been made in the training of trauma surgeons and those providing emergency first-aid, many mine-affected countries continue to report a lack of trained staff, medicines, equipment and infrastructure to adequately respond to mine and other trauma injuries.

¹⁴ Fifty-First World Health Assembly, *Concerted public health action on anti-personnel mines*, (16 May 1998, A51/VR/10).

Moreover, while guidelines¹⁵ have been developed to assist States Parties, a challenge remains in applying these guidelines.

73. In addition, a profound challenge that many States Parties need to overcome is to ensure that healthcare workers in mine-affected areas are trained in emergency first-aid to respond effectively to landmine and other traumatic injuries. The training of lay-people in mine-affected communities in some States Parties has proven to be effective in lowering mortality rates by providing care as soon as possible after accidents. Lessons from such experiences should be applied. Training is also a challenge for many States Parties with respect to trauma surgeons and nurses in order that they receive appropriate training as an integral component of studies in medical schools and continuing education. As well, many States Parties face the ongoing challenge of ensuring that medical facilities can provide an adequate level of care and that they have the staff, equipment, supplies and medicines necessary to meet basic standards. Moreover, some States Parties face problems related to the proximity of services to mined areas and difficulties in transporting to these facilities those who require care.

Physical rehabilitation and prosthetics

74. Physical rehabilitation is a crucial means to landmine victims' ultimate aim: full reintegration. The States Parties have come to see this aspect of meeting the needs of landmine victims as involving the provision of services in rehabilitation and physiotherapy and the supply of prosthetic appliances and assistive devices, such as wheelchairs and crutches, to promote the physical well-being of mine survivors with limb loss, abdominal, chest and spinal injuries, loss of eyesight, or deafness. Progress has been made in the development of guidelines¹⁶, in the training of technical staff in prosthetics / orthotics in mine-affected countries and by virtue of the fact that the Convention has increased attention on physical rehabilitation and prosthetics. However, needs in this area continue to exceed the level of resources applied to it. Moreover, as the number of landmine survivors continues to increase, so too will resource needs. Physical rehabilitation and prosthetic services are preconditions to the full recovery and reintegration of landmine survivors.

75. Thus, major challenges for many States Parties during the period 2005-2009 will be to: increase, expand access to and ensure the sustainability of national physical rehabilitation capacities; increase the number of trained rehabilitation specialists including doctors, nurses, physiotherapists and orthopaedic technicians; provide rehabilitation services in mine-affected communities, ensuring that landmine victims have access to transportation to these services; and, engage all relevant ministries as well as national, regional and international health and rehabilitation organizations to ensure effective coordination in advancing the quality of care and increasing the numbers of individuals assisted. Coordination among all actors in this field will be

¹⁵ Relevant guidance documents include the ICRC's *Assistance for Victims of Anti-personnel Mines: Needs, Constraints and Strategy* and *Care in the Field for Victims of Weapons of War* and the Trauma Care Foundation's *Save Lives, Save Limbs*.

¹⁶ Relevant guidance documents include the World Health Organization's *Prosthetics and Orthotics Services in Developing Countries – a discussion document*; the Landmine Survivors' Network's *Surviving Limb Loss, Life after Injury: A rehabilitation manual for the injured and their helpers*, by Liz Hobbs, Sue McDonough and Ann O'Callaghan), and, *Implementing Prosthetics & Orthotics Projects in Low-Income Countries: A framework for a common approach among international organizations* (forthcoming), by Anders Eklund, et al; and Handicap International's *A review of assistance programs for war wound and other persons with disabilities living in mine-affected countries: May 2004 lessons learned workshop report*.

key to improving results and thus the States Parties should look favourably upon processes that encourage cooperation, collaboration and efficiency.

Psychological support and social reintegration

76. The States Parties have come to see psychological support and social reintegration as being activities that assist mine victims to overcome the psychological trauma of a landmine explosion and promote social well-being. The causal relationship between psychological and social factors has also been recognized. These activities include community-based peer support groups, associations for the disabled, sporting and related activities, and where necessary, professional counselling. Appropriate psycho-social support has the potential to make a significant difference in the lives of mine victims. While progress has been made in some mine-affected communities, this is an area that has not received the attention or resources necessary to adequately address the needs of mine victims. The challenge for States Parties during the period 2005 to 2009 will be to increase national and local capacity in these areas with efforts to do so involving the engagement of all relevant actors including relevant ministries, trauma recovery experts, academics, relevant international and regional organizations, and non-governmental organizations and agencies working with other vulnerable groups. In addition, efforts to provide psychological and social support should take full advantage of the fact that mine victims themselves are resources who can act as constructive partners in programmes.

Economic reintegration

77. The States Parties have come to see economic reintegration as being assistance programs that improve the economic status of mine victims in mine-affected communities through education, economic development of the community infrastructure and the creation of employment opportunities. Those landmine survivors who have participated in the work of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration have indicated that their highest priority is economic reintegration. While progress has been made in developing guidelines¹⁷ and in implementing programs in some mine-affected communities – including, for example, training in agriculture, bee-keeping, handcrafts, literacy, livestock breeding and trades, and in micro-credit initiatives, in many continues there continues to be few opportunities for mine victims to receive vocational training or to access employment and other income generation activities. The economic status of mine victims depends largely upon the political stability and economic situation of the communities in which they live. However, enhancing opportunities for economic reintegration contributes to self-reliance of mine victims and community development. The challenge for many States Parties during the period 2005 to 2009 will be to build and develop sustainable economic activities in mine-affected areas that would benefit not only those individuals directly impacted by mines and UXO but their communities. This is a profound challenge to overcome given that economic reintegration of landmine victims must be seen in the broader context of economic development.

Laws and public policies

78. The States Parties have come to see laws and policies as being legislation and actions that promote effective treatment, care and protection for all disabled citizens, including landmine

¹⁷ See for example, the World Rehabilitation Fund's *Guidelines for Socio-Economic Integration of Landmine Survivors*.

victims. Many mine-affected States Parties have legislation to protect the rights of persons with disabilities, and to provide social assistance, for example, in the form of pensions. However, it remains a challenge for many of these States Parties to fully implement the provisions of the legislation, to provide pensions that are adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of living and to ensure accessibility to public and private infrastructure.

79. Progress has been made by many mine-affected States Parties in the development of plans of action to address the needs of mine victims, or more generally to improve rehabilitation services for all persons with disabilities. Moreover, some of these States Parties have integrated such plans into broader development or poverty reduction plans, such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers. The challenge for those States Parties for which the responsibility to ensure the well-being of landmine victims is most pertinent during the period 2005 to 2009 will be to further develop and implement plans to address the needs and rights of mine victims, and more generally to improve rehabilitation and socio-economic reintegration services for all persons with disabilities.

80. The States Parties have recognized the importance and the benefits of the inclusion of landmine survivors in a substantive way in the work of the Convention – at the international level – including in Meetings of the States Parties and in the Intersessional Work Programme, but particularly within landmine survivors' home countries where decisions affecting their well-being ultimately are taken. A challenge for the States Parties during the period 2005 to 2009 will be to ensure that efforts to ensure such substantive participation do not subside but rather are enhanced.

81. In addition to outlining the priority elements of *victim assistance*, the work of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration has underscored that the ultimate responsibility for victim assistance rests with each State Party within which there are landmine survivors and other mine victims. This is logical given that it is the basic responsibility of each State to ensure the well-being of its citizens, notwithstanding the fundamental importance of the international donor community supporting the integration and implementation of the policies and programmes articulated by States Parties in need. As noted, the Convention articulates the responsibility of all States Parties to provide for the well being of mine victims in general terms, indicating that assistance shall be provided “for the care and rehabilitation, and social and economic reintegration of mine victims.” However, the work of the Standing Committee has brought to the attention of the States Parties existing and widely accepted instruments and declarations which provide further guidance in fulfilling this responsibility to mine victims, which as noted, are a sub-group of all persons with disabilities.

82. The declaration of the 1993 World Conference on Human Rights¹⁸, adopted by consensus by 171 States, reaffirmed “that all human rights and fundamental freedoms are universal and thus unreservedly include persons with disabilities” and that “any direct discrimination or other negative discriminatory treatment of a disabled person is therefore a violation of his or her rights.” This declaration also stated that “persons with disabilities should be guaranteed equal opportunity through the elimination of all socially determined barriers, be they physical, financial, social or psychological, which exclude or restrict full participation in society” and

¹⁸ World Conference on Human Rights. *Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action*, (United Nations document A/CONF.157/23, 12 July 1993).

called upon the United Nations General Assembly to adopt standard rules on the equalization of opportunities for persons with disabilities.

83. In 1993, the United Nations General Assembly, without a vote, subsequently adopted the United Nations Standard Rules for Persons with Disabilities¹⁹ – a document whose importance was highlighted at various meetings of the Standing Committee and widely distributed to the States Parties. The purpose of the Standard Rules is to ensure that all persons with disabilities, as members of their societies, may exercise the same rights and obligations as others. While not compulsory, the Standard Rules imply a strong moral and political commitment on the part of the UN General Assembly, and hence on the part of all States Parties to the Convention, to take action for equalization of opportunities for persons with disabilities.

84. The success and lessons learned from the work to implement the Convention have helped inspire further efforts at the international level to protect and promote the rights of persons with disabilities. In this regard, the States Parties have been apprised of, and have discussed during meetings of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, ongoing negotiations on a draft United Nations convention on the rights of people with disabilities.

85. The work of the States Parties, particularly through discussions in Meetings of the States Parties and in the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, has led to an accepted view that all States Parties in a position to do so have a responsibility to support mine victims – regardless of the number of landmine victims within a particular State Party. In addition, the Standing Committee has highlighted that this responsibility is most pertinent for – and hence the challenges faced in fulfilling it most profound in 23 States Parties in which these States Parties themselves have indicated there likely are hundreds, thousands or tens-of-thousands of landmine survivors: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Eritrea, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda and Yemen.

86. While not forgetting the responsibilities to landmine victims wherever they may be, a greater emphasis must be placed on the fulfilment of the responsibilities to landmine victims by the above-mentioned States Parties and on providing assistance where necessary to these States. This becomes a more focused challenge for the Convention during the period 2005 to 2009. In Annex VI this challenge is illustrated in more precise terms through summaries of the extent of the problem faced by these States Parties, their plans to address these problems and their priorities for assistance.

¹⁹ See United Nations General Assembly document A/RES/48/96 of 20 December 1993.

V. Other matters essential for achieving the Convention's aims

Cooperation and assistance

87. Article 6 states that “in fulfilling its obligations under this Convention each State Party has the right to seek and receive assistance, where feasible, from other States Parties to the extent possible.” It outlines that “each State Party in a position to do so” shall provide assistance for the care and rehabilitation, and social and economic reintegration, of mine victims and for mine awareness programs, for mine clearance and related activities, and for the destruction of stockpiled antipersonnel mines. Furthermore, it obliges each State Party giving and receiving assistance under the provisions of the Article “to cooperate with a view to ensuring the full and prompt implementation of agreed assistance programs.”

88. The Convention is clear that fulfilling obligations to destroy stockpiled antipersonnel mines and to clear mined areas is the responsibility of each individual State Party, just as ensuring the well-being of a country's citizens – including mine victims – is a national responsibility. Nevertheless, Article 6 emphasizes that cooperation and assistance are important elements available to those States Parties that may require support in fulfilling their obligations.

89. It is possible to account for over US\$ 2.2 billion having been generated since the Convention was established in the context of efforts to assist States in pursuing the aims of the Convention. Almost 40 States Parties have been donors to mine action, along with several States not Parties as well as international organisations. Global funding levels have remained relatively constant for the past several years – a remarkable fact given that public awareness of the landmine problem was at its peak in 1997.

90. Some States Parties that are not considered to be traditional donors also have made meaningful contributions in the context of efforts to assist others in implementing the Convention. Examples include peace keepers assisting in clearing mined areas, defence cooperation programmes used to train staff from developing countries in humanitarian demining, in-kind contributions of expert advisors, and participation in victim assistance initiatives.

91. The challenge for both traditional and non-traditional “States Parties in a position to do so” will be to ensure a renewed commitment to assist others during the period 2005-2009, through means such as dedicated funds to assist in the implementation of the Convention and by mainstreaming support to mine action through broader humanitarian, development, peace-building and peace support programmes. In addition, States Parties in a position to do so face the ongoing challenge of bridging the gap between humanitarian relief efforts and development programmes.

92. The States Parties have affirmed that assistance in implementing the Convention is a collective matter. It is important that financial resources continue to be provided by States Parties in a position to do so. However, it is equally important that affected States Parties themselves take full ownership for this responsibility by making national resource commitments. Evidence suggests that this indeed is occurring. Of the mine-affected States Parties, a total of 24 have voluntarily reported a combined total of over US\$ 200 million having been dedicated to mine action from national sources since the Convention entered into force.

93. States Parties can advance measures to take full ownership over their responsibilities by integrating mine action in their national development plans. This is logical given that the presence or suspected presence of mined areas in most affected countries obstructs economic development and reconstruction and inhibits the repatriation of refugees and internally displaced persons. It is equally logical that over time fulfilling the Convention's obligations will contribute to development, thus increasing the capacity of mine-affected States Parties and lessening their need for outside assistance. The development situation faced by each mine-affected State Party naturally is different and therefore each individual party itself must discern the place of mine action within overall development priorities, taking into consideration the need to meet its obligations under Article 5.

94. The presence or suspected presence of mined areas can exacerbate poverty and efforts to clear these mines can help reduce poverty. The following 3 States Parties have taken action on this front by incorporating into their Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) efforts to clear mined areas and to enhance the opportunities of persons with disabilities: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia and Chad. In doing so, these States Parties have demonstrated to others how this important basis for assistance from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund can be used in the context of fulfilling Convention obligations. In addition, other States Parties have used other methods to incorporate obligations under the Convention into overall poverty reduction plans.

95. The role of the World Bank and of regional development banks more generally has been highlighted as a potential source of funding for those States Parties requiring assistance. Some States Parties already have accessed loans whereas others have benefited from grants having been awarded by the World Bank's Post Conflict Fund. An ongoing challenge, however, rests in ensuring that mine-affected States Parties are made well aware of the availability of loans and grants in the context of fulfilling Convention obligations.

96. The Convention makes it clear that assistance may be provided through a variety of means, including, inter alia, the United Nations system, international, regional or national organizations or institutions, the International Committee of the Red Cross, national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies and their international federation, non-governmental organizations, or on a bilateral basis, or by contributing to the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Action²⁰, or other regional funds.

97. The United Nations system has played a leading role in assisting over 20 mine-affected States Parties in implementing the Convention and in supporting mine action in States not parties and in mine affected regions. Since 1999, UNMAS has managed over US\$ 150 million in contributions made to the Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Action. The OAS has been instrumental in supporting the implementation of the Convention in the Americas, supporting more than 10 States Parties in the Western Hemisphere and having established a political, financial and technical commitment to assist its member States in mine action. In addition, the International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance has served as an important funding channel in South Eastern Europe, NATO has filled a significant niche in supporting the destruction of stockpiled mines in Europe and Central Asia and the European Union has been one of the largest contributors to mine action, including stockpile destruction.

²⁰ The Convention refers to the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in Mine Clearance. Since the Convention was adopted, the name of this fund has changed.

Most recently, the OSCE has begun supporting the implementation of the Convention in Central Asia.

98. The ICRC has generated and applied almost US\$ 100 million since the Convention entered into force to assist in the care and rehabilitation of landmine victims and to deliver mine risk education programmes. Other organizations, particularly member organizations of the ICBL, have also made important contributions in these areas, in addition to support provided by them for mine clearance and related efforts. Moreover, since the Convention was established the GICHD has become an important source of assistance, through operational support, research, and support for the general operations of the Convention.

99. A challenge facing all these actors is to ensure that they remain as committed to the aims of the Convention in the future as they have in the past. Their efforts have been instrumental to ensuring that progress is made in implementing the Convention, but much more needs to be done. In particular, while great progress has been made in building national capacity, challenges remain in ensuring that national authorities acquire full ownership over efforts to implement the Convention. As demonstrated by the advances made in integrating mine action into the United Nations Consolidated Appeals Process, efforts should be made to ensure the sustainability of support and, where relevant, to integrate mine action into relevant ongoing activities. In addition, many organizations have been successful in acquiring the financial and in-kind support of private organizations and individuals. It will be a challenge over the next period of implementation to ensure that this level of commitment continues.

100. While a great deal of funding will be required to fulfil obligations over the next five years, the States Parties have learned that cooperation and assistance in the context of fulfilling the Convention's aims is about more than simply money. Of equal importance is the matter of how well finite resources are spent and on what. It will be an increasing challenge for the States Parties to ensure greater cost-effectiveness in implementation, applying lessons such as those related to effective coordination and advancing national ownership.

101. Another challenge for States Parties in a position to do so will be to ensure that necessary support for some of the first mine-affected States to have joined the Convention does not disappear before Article 5 has been fully implemented. For their part, these mine-affected States Parties face the challenge of increasing their own national contributions to finish the effort while at the same time effectively communicating ongoing needs for external resources.

102. Providing for the care, rehabilitation and reintegration of landmine victims often requires that attention be given during the entire lifetime of these individuals. Addressing this challenge will not be easy for the States Parties in which there are large numbers of landmine victims. In many cases this challenge can only be overcome with the assistance of States Parties in a position to do so in contributing a necessary amount of resources and energy to victim assistance.

103. While assistance in destroying stockpiled mines is required by only a small number of States Parties, very few States Parties in a position to do so have provided such support. With some of the newest States Parties possessing larger numbers of mines awaiting destruction, collectively the States Parties must overcome the challenge of ensuring cooperation in this area of implementation.

Transparency and the exchange of information

104. Through Article 7, the Convention contains an important mechanism to assure transparency in implementation. This Article requires that each State Party openly and regularly shares information on the following:

- The national implementation measures referred to in Article 9;
- The total of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines owned or possessed by it, or under its jurisdiction or control, including a breakdown of the type, quantity and, if possible, lot numbers of each type of anti-personnel mine stockpiled;
- To the extent possible, the location of all mined areas that contain, or are suspected to contain, antipersonnel mines under its jurisdiction or control, including as much detail as possible regarding the type and quantity of each type of anti-personnel mine in each mined area and when they were emplaced;
- The types, quantities and, if possible, lot numbers of all anti-personnel mines retained or transferred for the development of and training in mine detection, mine clearance or mine destruction techniques, or transferred for the purpose of destruction, as well as the institutions authorized by a State Party to retain or transfer anti-personnel mines, in accordance with Article 3;
- The status of programs for the conversion or de-commissioning of anti-personnel mine production facilities;
- The status of programs for the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with Articles 4 and 5, including details of the methods which will be used in destruction, the location of all destruction sites and the applicable safety and environmental standards to be observed;
- The types and quantities of all antipersonnel mines destroyed after the entry into force of the Convention for that State Party, including a breakdown of the quantity of each type of anti personnel mine destroyed, in accordance with Articles 4 and 5, respectively, along with, if possible, the lot numbers of each type of antipersonnel mine in the case of destruction in accordance with Article 4;
- The technical characteristics of each type of antipersonnel mine produced, to the extent known, and those currently owned or possessed by a State Party, giving, where reasonably possible, such categories of information as may facilitate identification and clearance of anti-personnel mines, at a minimum including the dimensions, fusing, explosive content, metallic content, color photographs and other information which may facilitate mine clearance; and
- The measures taken to provide an immediate and effective warning to the population in relation to all areas identified under paragraph 2 of Article 5.

105. In accordance with Article 7, paragraph 1, each State Party must provide an initial report in accordance with Article 7 to the depository “as soon as practicable, and in any event not later than 180 days after the entry into force of this Convention for that State Party.” A total of 141 of the 144 States, which have ratified or acceded to the Convention have been required to submit such an initial report. All have done so with the exception of the following 5 States Parties: Cape Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Guyana, Saint Lucia, and Sao Tome and Principe. (See Annex VII.)

106. In accordance with Article 7, paragraph 2, each State Party must provide updated information to the depository annually, covering the last calendar year and reported not later than 30 April of each year. Each State Party obliged to provide such a report in 2004 has done so with the exception of the following 24 States Parties: Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Cameroon, the Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Lesotho, Madagascar, Maldives, Niue, Panama, Paraguay, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Seychelles, Swaziland, Venezuela and Zimbabwe. (See Annex VII.)

107. Article 7, paragraph 3, indicates that Secretary-General of the United Nations shall transmit reports received in accordance with Article 7 to the States Parties. At the 1999 First Meeting of the States Parties, the States Parties agreed on the ways and means to ensure the distribution of these reports. In particular, they agreed that it would be practical and cost-effective to make the reports available on the Internet, to encourage States Parties to submit their reports electronically and to be pragmatic regarding the matter of translations of reports. Moreover, it was agreed to provide all interested actors with access to the reports submitted given that such access is consistent with the Convention's humanitarian purpose. As well, the First Meeting of the States Parties adopted a common reporting format. Together these ways and means have proven to serve the States Parties well during the first five years in which they have been used. In addition, the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs on behalf of the United Nations Secretary-General has done a commendable job in receiving reports and making them available – without additional costs borne by the States Parties.

108. Most types of information contained in reports submitted in accordance with Article 7 have been referred to elsewhere in this review. Three areas not previously covered include information related to mines retained or transferred for purposes described in Article 3, the conversion or decommissioning of antipersonnel mine production facilities, and, the technical characteristics of mines at one time produced or currently held by States Parties.

109. The following 74 States Parties have reported antipersonnel mines retained or transferred for the development of and training in mine detection, mine clearance or mine destruction techniques in accordance with Article 3: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Luxembourg, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Moldova, Mozambique, Namibia, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The tables in Annex VIII provide an overview of the number of mines reported retained and transferred in various years in accordance with this Article. Some of these States Parties on a voluntary basis have provided information on the intended purpose and actual use of these mines.

110. The following 22 States Parties have reported on the conversion or decommissioning of antipersonnel mine production facilities: Albania, Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Hungary, Italy,

Japan, Peru, Portugal, Romania, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Uganda and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

111. The following 66 States Parties have provided technical characteristics of antipersonnel mines produced or currently held, giving information as may facilitate identification and clearance of antipersonnel mines: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Eritrea, France, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Moldova, Mozambique, Nicaragua, the Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

112. At the 2000 Second Meeting of the States Parties, the States Parties reviewed the technical ways and means of circulating reports, adopting *Form J* to provide States Parties with an opportunity to report voluntarily on matters pertaining to compliance and implementation not covered by the formal reporting requirements contained in Article 7. The States Parties further recommended the use of this form to report on activities undertaken with respect to Article 6, in particular to report on assistance provided for the care and rehabilitation, and social and economic reintegration, of mine victims. Since the adoption of *Form J*, the following 62 States Parties have made use of this voluntary means of reporting: Albania, Angola, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Congo, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Germany, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, the Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Tajikistan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

113. At the 2002 Fourth Meeting of the States Parties, the States Parties again reviewed the technical ways and means of circulating reports. On the basis of suggestions contained in a President's Paper, States Parties were encouraged to maximize the potential of the reporting format as an important tool to measure progress and communicate needs and agreed to act upon, as appropriate, particular suggestions made in this paper. As noted, these suggestions included encouraging States Parties to use the opportunity to provide "supplementary information", in such a way that it could help facilitate cooperation and assistance efforts.

114. The Intersessional Work Programme, established by the States Parties in 1999, has complemented the official and legally-required exchange of information through Article 7. By employing principles such as coherence, flexibility, partnership, informality, continuity and effective preparation, this Programme has been successful in particular in the following areas:

- raising awareness;
- reaching common understanding on diverse issues;
- identifying best practices;

- sharing experiences and information on means available to address the landmine problem; and
- providing the opportunity for different actors involved in mine action issues to meet and discuss ideas.

Most importantly, the Intersessional Work Programme has provided a forum both for mine-affected States Parties and those in the process of destroying stockpiled mines to share information on their problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance, and for those in a position to do so to share information on the support that they can provide. In this sense, the informal information exchange made possible through the Intersessional Work Programme has significantly supported the operationalization of the Convention's cooperation and assistance measures.

115. Since the Convention's entry into force, the States Parties at their annual Meetings of the States Parties and at meetings of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention have shared information and exchanged views on the application of many of the Articles of the Convention. In particular, the following matters have been subject to discussion:

- With respect to Article 1, States Parties have discussed paragraph 1, sub-paragraph c of the Article (i.e., that each State Party undertakes never to assist, encourage or induce, in any way, anyone to engage in any activity prohibited to a State Party under this Convention), - and how they understand its application when engaged in military operations with States not party to the Convention. In addition, States Parties have discussed whether the transit of antipersonnel mines by a State not party to the Convention relates to this provision.
- With respect to Article 2, the States Parties have discussed whether the Convention's definition of an antipersonnel mine as "a mine designed to be exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a person and that will incapacitate, injure or kill one or more persons" relates to mines that are fitted with sensitive fuses or sensitive anti-handling devices.
- With respect to Article 3, the States Parties have discussed what constitutes "the minimum number (of antipersonnel mines) absolutely necessary" which may be retained in accordance with Article 3 "for the development of and training in mine detection, mine clearance, or mine destruction techniques."

116. Non-governmental organizations have played an important role in the exchange of information related to the implementation of the Convention. In particular, the ICBL's *Landmine Monitor* initiative has provided the States Parties and others with a detailed independent information source on the actions of all States regarding the pursuit of the Convention's aims.

117. An important challenge in the period following the First Review Conference will be to ensure that the remaining 5 States Parties that have not yet submitted an initial transparency report in accordance with Article 7, paragraph 1, do so as soon as possible. Moreover, while the overall reporting rate has exceeded 78 percent in the year of the Review Conference, it will be a challenge to ensure that the States Parties continue to comply with their annual reporting obligations following the Review Conference. This continues to be particularly important for

States Parties that are in the process of destroying stockpiled mines in accordance with Article 4, those that have decided to retain antipersonnel mines in accordance with Article 3 and those undertaking measures in accordance with Article 9. Moreover, annual reporting by mine-affected States Parties will become increasingly important to confirm that Article 5 obligations have been fulfilled or to communicate, at the earliest possible stage, challenges that must be overcome in order to ensure that these obligations can be fulfilled.

118. It will also be important for States Parties to ensure the vibrancy not only of Meetings of the States Parties but also of informal means to share information (e.g., the Intersessional Work Programme and regional conferences and seminars) and non-legally-binding ways to be transparent (e.g., openness in the destruction of antipersonnel mines and in clearing mined areas).

Preventing and suppressing prohibited activities, and facilitating compliance

119. States Parties are individually and collectively responsible for ensuring compliance with the Convention.

120. The primary responsibility for ensuring compliance with the Convention rests with each individual State Party establishing and applying, as necessary, measures outlined in Article 9. This Article obliges each State Party to take all appropriate legal, administrative and other measures, including the imposition of penal sanctions, to prevent and suppress any activity prohibited to a State Party under the Convention undertaken by persons or territory under its jurisdiction or control.

121. Under Article 7, paragraph 1(a), each State Party must report to the Secretary General of the United Nations on “national implementation measures referred to in Article 9” and annually update this report. The following 37 States Parties have reported that they have adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Belize, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Monaco, Mauritius, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad & Tobago, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zambia and Zimbabwe. In addition, the following 18 States Parties have reported that they consider existing laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention: Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Guinea-Bissau, the Holy See, Ireland, Lesotho, Mexico, the Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Tunisia.

122. Thirty-two (32) States Parties have reported that they are in the process of adopting legislation to implement the Convention: Albania, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Cameroon, Chad, the Congo, Chile, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, El Salvador, Jamaica, Kenya, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, the Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, and Yemen. Fifty-seven (57) States Parties have not yet reported that they have taken any legislative measures in accordance with Article 9. The challenge for the period 2005 to 2009 is for all States Parties that have not yet done so to ensure

that they have in place the legislative measures required by Article 9 and to report on such measures in accordance with Article 7.

123. In addition to reporting legal measures, some States Parties have reported other measures mentioned in Article 9 to prevent and suppress prohibited activities. These measures include the systematic dissemination of information regarding the Convention's prohibitions to their armed forces, the development of armed forces training bulletins, the distribution of the text of the Convention in military academies and directives issued to police forces. However, few States Parties have reported taking measures as these or otherwise harmonising military doctrine with the Convention's obligations. Thus, it will be an ongoing challenge for most States Parties to ensure that such measures to prevent and suppress prohibited activities - in addition to legal measures - are taken and reported upon.

124. Article 8 provides the States Parties with a variety of means to facilitate and clarify questions related to compliance. During the period covered by this review, one State Party, Canada, has facilitated an informal dialogue on these means. Outcomes of this dialogue included the generally accepted sense that compliance with the provisions of the Convention must be seen in the context of cooperation to facilitate implementation. Moreover, the States Parties, in recognizing the need to secure full compliance with all obligations of the Convention, have affirmed their commitment to effectively implement the Convention and to comply fully with its provisions. They have made this affirmation in the spirit of cooperation and collaboration that has characterized the Ottawa process. In this regard, States Parties have acknowledged their responsibility to seek clarification of these concerns in this cooperative spirit in the event of serious concerns of non-compliance with any of the obligations of the Convention.

125. No State Party has submitted a request for clarification to a Meeting of the States Parties in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 2, or has proposed that a Special Meeting of the States Parties be convened in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 5. This fact, combined with the overall exceptional level of compliance with the Convention, underscores the States Parties' commitment to the aims of the Convention and is a testament to their agreement, as stated in Article 8, paragraph 1, "to work together in a spirit of cooperation to facilitate compliance by States Parties with their obligations under this Convention."

126. In accordance with Article 8, paragraph 9, the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs has fulfilled the UN Secretary-General's responsibility to prepare and update a list of names, nationalities and other relevant data of qualified experts designated for fact finding missions authorized in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 8. The Department for Disarmament Affairs has regularly communicated this information to all States Parties. Since the Convention entered into force, the following States Parties have provided the names of qualified experts: Bulgaria, Croatia, Fiji, France, Germany, Hungary, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Thailand.

127. One State Party, Colombia, has indicated that it faces the challenge of armed non-state actors carrying out prohibited activities on its sovereign territory. Such actors are required to comply with the Convention in that their activities are subject to the jurisdiction of the State in question and they may be called to account for violations of the Convention in accordance with the national implementation measures established by the State Party under Article 9.

Implementation Support

128. As noted, the First Meeting of the States Parties in 1999 established the Intersessional Work Programme “to ensure the systematic, effective implementation of the Convention through a more regularized programme of work.” In establishing this Programme, the States Parties recognized the importance of having intersessional Standing Committees on issues related to the operation of the Convention to “engage a broad international community for the purpose of advancing the achievement of the humanitarian objectives of the Convention.” The aim of the exercise was “to organize the work within the framework of the Convention in a way which promotes continuity, openness, transparency, inclusiveness and a cooperative spirit.”

129. Originally five “Standing Committees of Experts” were established. At the Second Meeting of the States Parties in 2000, the States Parties reduced this to four “Standing Committees” as “technologies for mine action” became a subject matter incorporated into the work of the Standing Committee responsible for mine clearance. In addition, the Intersessional Work Programme was made more efficient through the agreement to hold all Standing Committee meetings consecutively during two sessions a year, each of one-week duration. As well, the States Parties recommended that those in a position to do so “consider making voluntary contributions to have additional languages made available for the intersessional meetings.” The European Commission subsequently responded to this call and has since ensured that interpretation has been provided in English, French and Spanish at meetings of the Standing Committees without any cost to the States Parties.

130. The Third Meeting of the States Parties in 2001 made a minor adjustment to the committee structure, shifting responsibility for mine awareness from the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance to the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance. The Fourth Meeting of the States Parties in 2002 saw the States Parties agree that the Intersessional Work Programme in the lead-up to the First Review Conference should focus with even greater clarity on those areas most directly related to the core objectives of the Convention: to destroy anti-personnel mines that remain in stockpiles; to clear areas containing anti-personnel mines; to provide assistance to landmine victims; and, to ensure universal acceptance of the ban on anti-personnel mines. The Fifth Meeting of the States Parties in 2003 reaffirmed the need to continue to focus with great clarity on the areas most directly related to these core aims.

131. At each of the Meetings of the States Parties, Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs of the Standing Committees have been elected, with the practice being that one year’s Co-Rapporteurs are elected as the subsequent year’s Co-Chairs. A table containing the names of those States Parties which have served as Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs is contained in Annex IX.

132. The States Parties have recognized the value and importance of the Coordinating Committee, established at the Second Meeting of the States Parties in 2000, in the effective functioning and implementation of the Convention. In fulfilling its mandate, the Coordinating Committee has been practical-minded and has applied the principle of flexibility with respect to its coordination of the Intersessional Work Programme. In addition, the Coordinating Committee has operated in an open and transparent manner, having made available summary reports of its meetings on the web site of the GICHD and through updates provided by the Chair of the Coordinating Committee to the States Parties.

133. The States Parties have noted the work undertaken by these interested States Parties through the establishment of the Sponsorship Programme in 2000, which has ensured widespread representation at meetings of the Convention. In addition, the States Parties have expressed their appreciation to the GICHD for efficiently administering the Sponsorship Programme and at no additional cost to the programme's donors. Since its establishment, the following States Parties have made voluntary contributions to the Sponsorship Programme: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. The challenge in coming years will be to sustain the necessary level of funding for the Sponsorship Programme following the First Review Conference. In addition, those who have benefited from the programme will need to review their required level of assistance in order to ensure necessary support for others.

134. The States Parties have expressed their appreciation for the manner in which the Implementation Support Unit (ISU), established as part of the GICHD pursuant to a mandate agreed to at the Third Meeting of the States Parties in 2001, is making a positive contribution in support of the States Parties' efforts to implement the Convention. The ISU has met the States Parties' expectations in supporting the Convention's Presidents, the Coordinating Committee, Standing Committees, the Sponsorship Programme, in its work related to communications and liaison, and, budgeting and planning, and through the establishment of the Convention's documentation centre.

135. Many States Parties have heeded the call to provide on a voluntary basis the necessary financial resources for the operation of the ISU, with the following States Parties having made contributions to the ISU Voluntary Trust Fund since it was established in 2001: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Malaysia, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The challenge in coming years will be for past donors to make ongoing contributions and for additional States Parties to contribute, on a regular basis, to this valuable implementation mechanism.

Annex I

Ratification / accession and entry into force dates

| State | Ratification / accession date | Entry-into-force date |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Afghanistan | 11 September 2002 | 1 March 2003 |
| Albania* | 29 February 2000 | 1 August 2000 |
| Algeria* | 9 October 2001 | 1 April 2002 |
| Andorra* | 29 June 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Angola* | 5 July 2002 | 1 January 2003 |
| Antigua and Barbuda* | 3 May 1999 | 1 November 1999 |
| Argentina* | 14 September 1999 | 1 March 2000 |
| Australia* | 14 January 1999 | 1 July 1999 |
| Austria* | 29 June 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Bahamas* | 31 July 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Bangladesh* | 6 September 2000 | 1 March 2001 |
| Barbados* | 26 January 1999 | 1 July 1999 |
| Belarus | 3 September 2003 | 1 March 2004 |
| Belgium* | 4 September 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Belize* | 23 April 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Benin* | 25 September 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Bolivia* | 9 June 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina* | 8 September 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Botswana* | 1 March 2000 | 1 September 2000 |
| Brazil* | 30 April 1999 | 1 October 1999 |
| Bulgaria* | 4 September 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Burkina Faso* | 16 September 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Burundi* | 22 October 2003 | 1 April 2004 |
| Cambodia* | 28 July 1999 | 1 January 2000 |
| Cameroon* | 19 September 2002 | 1 March 2003 |
| Canada* | 3 December 1997 | 1 March 1999 |
| Cape Verde* | 14 May 2001 | 1 November 2001 |
| Central African Republic | 8 November 2002 | 1 May 2003 |
| Chad* | 6 May 1999 | 1 November 1999 |
| Chile* | 10 September 2001 | 1 March 2002 |
| Colombia* | 6 September 2000 | 1 March 2001 |
| Comoros | 19 September 2002 | 1 March 2003 |
| Congo | 4 May 2001 | 1 November 2001 |
| Costa Rica* | 17 March 1999 | 1 September 1999 |
| Côte d' Ivoire* | 30 June 2000 | 1 December 2000 |
| Croatia* | 20 May 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Cyprus* | 17 January 2003 | 1 July 2003 |
| Czech Republic* | 26 October 1999 | 1 April 2000 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 2 May 2002 | 1 November 2002 |
| Denmark* | 8 June 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Djibouti* | 18 May 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Dominica* | 26 March 1999 | 1 September 1999 |
| Dominican Republic* | 30 June 2000 | 1 December 2000 |
| Ecuador* | 29 April 1999 | 1 October 1999 |
| El Salvador* | 27 January 1999 | 1 July 1999 |
| Equatorial Guinea | 16 September 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Eritrea | 27 August 2001 | 1 February 2002 |

| State | Ratification / accession date | Entry-into-force date |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Estonia | 12 May 2004 | 1 November 2004 |
| Ethiopia* ¹ | 17 December 2004 | 1 June 2005 |
| Fiji* | 10 June 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| France* | 23 July 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Gabon* | 8 September 2000 | 1 March 2001 |
| Gambia* | 23 September 2002 | 1 March 2003 |
| Germany* | 23 July 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Ghana* | 30 June 2000 | 1 December 2000 |
| Greece* | 25 September 2003 | 1 March 2004 |
| Grenada* | 19 August 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Guatemala* | 26 March 1999 | 1 September 1999 |
| Guinea* | 8 October 1998 | 1 April 1999 |
| Guinea-Bissau* | 22 May 2001 | 1 November 2001 |
| Guyana* | 5 August 2003 | 1 February 2004 |
| Holy See* | 17 February 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Honduras* | 24 September 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Hungary* | 6 April 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Iceland* | 5 May 1999 | 1 November 1999 |
| Ireland* | 3 December 1997 | 1 March 1999 |
| Italy* | 23 April 1999 | 1 October 1999 |
| Jamaica* | 17 July 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Japan* | 30 September 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Jordan* | 13 November 1998 | 1 May 1999 |
| Kenya* | 23 January 2001 | 1 July 2001 |
| Kiribati | 7 September 2000 | 1 March 2001 |
| Lesotho* | 2 December 1998 | 1 June 1999 |
| Liberia | 23 December 1999 | 1 June 2000 |
| Liechtenstein* | 5 October 1999 | 1 April 2000 |
| Lithuania* | 12 May 2003 | 1 November 2003 |
| Luxembourg* | 14 June 1999 | 1 December 1999 |
| Madagascar* | 16 September 1999 | 1 March 2000 |
| Malawi* | 13 August 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Malaysia* | 22 April 1999 | 1 October 1999 |
| Maldives* | 7 September 2000 | 1 March 2001 |
| Mali* | 2 June 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Malta* | 7 May 2001 | 1 November 2001 |
| Mauritania* | 21 July 2000 | 1 January 2001 |
| Mauritius* | 3 December 1997 | 1 March 1999 |
| Mexico* | 9 June 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Monaco* | 17 November 1998 | 1 May 1999 |
| Mozambique* | 25 August 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Namibia* | 21 September 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Nauru | 7 August 2000 | 1 February 2001 |
| Netherlands* | 12 April 1999 | 1 October 1999 |
| New Zealand* | 27 January 1999 | 1 July 1999 |
| Nicaragua* | 30 November 1998 | 1 May 1999 |
| Niger* | 23 March 1999 | 1 September 1999 |
| Nigeria | 27 September 2001 | 1 March 2002 |
| Niue* | 15 April 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Norway* | 9 July 1998 | 1 March 1999 |

¹ On 29 November 2004 Ethiopia announced that it had ratified the Convention. However, the date when Ethiopia provided the depository with its instrument of ratification did not occur until after the close of the First Review Conference.

| State | Ratification / accession date | Entry-into-force date |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Panama* | 7 October 1998 | 1 April 1999 |
| Papua New Guinea | 28 June 2004 | 1 December 2004 |
| Paraguay* | 13 November 1998 | 1 May 1999 |
| Peru* | 17 June 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Philippines* | 15 February 2000 | 1 August 2000 |
| Portugal* | 19 February 1999 | 1 August 1999 |
| Qatar* | 13 October 1998 | 1 April 1999 |
| Republic of Moldova* | 8 September 2000 | 1 March 2001 |
| Romania* | 30 November 2000 | 1 May 2001 |
| Rwanda* | 8 June 2000 | 1 December 2000 |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis* | 2 December 1998 | 1 June 1999 |
| Saint Lucia* | 13 April 1999 | 1 October 1999 |
| Saint Vincent and the Grenadines* | 1 August 2001 | 1 February 2002 |
| Samoa* | 23 July 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| San Marino* | 18 March 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Sao Tome and Principe* | 31 March 2003 | 1 September 2003 |
| Senegal* | 24 September 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Serbia and Montenegro | 18 September 2003 | 1 March 2004 |
| Seychelles* | 2 June 2000 | 1 December 2000 |
| Sierra Leone* | 25 April 2001 | 1 October 2001 |
| Slovakia* | 25 February 1999 | 1 August 1999 |
| Slovenia* | 27 October 1998 | 1 April 1999 |
| Solomon Islands* | 26 January 1999 | 1 July 1999 |
| South Africa* | 26 June 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Spain* | 19 January 1999 | 1 July 1999 |
| Sudan* | 13 October 2003 | 1 April 2004 |
| Suriname* | 23 May 2002 | 1 November 2002 |
| Swaziland* | 22 December 1998 | 1 June 1999 |
| Sweden* | 30 November 1998 | 1 May 1999 |
| Switzerland* | 24 March 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Tajikistan | 12 October 1999 | 1 April 2000 |
| Thailand* | 27 November 1998 | 1 May 1999 |
| The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia | 9 September 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Timor Leste | 7 May 2003 | 1 November 2003 |
| Togo* | 9 March 2000 | 1 September 2000 |
| Trinidad and Tobago* | 27 April 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Tunisia* | 9 July 1999 | 1 January 2000 |
| Turkey | 25 September 2003 | 1 March 2004 |
| Turkmenistan* | 19 January 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Uganda* | 25 February 1999 | 1 August 1999 |
| United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland* | 31 July 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| United Republic of Tanzania* | 13 November 2000 | 1 May 2001 |
| Uruguay* | 7 June 2001 | 1 December 2001 |
| Venezuela* | 14 April 1999 | 1 October 1999 |
| Yemen* | 1 September 1998 | 1 March 1999 |
| Zambia* | 23 February 2001 | 1 August 2001 |
| Zimbabwe* | 18 June 1998 | 1 March 1999 |

* = signatory State

Annex II

States that have not ratified or acceded to the Convention

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Armenia | Marshall Islands* |
| Azerbaijan | Micronesia (Federated States of) |
| Bahrain | Mongolia |
| Bhutan | Morocco |
| Brunei Darussalam* | Myanmar (Burma) |
| China | Nepal |
| Cook Islands* | Oman |
| Cuba | Pakistan |
| Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea | Palau |
| Egypt | Poland* |
| Finland | Republic of Korea |
| Georgia | Russian Federation |
| Haiti* | Saudi Arabia |
| India | Singapore |
| Indonesia* | Somalia |
| Iran | Sri Lanka |
| Iraq | Syrian Arab Republic |
| Israel | Tonga |
| Kazakhstan | Tuvalu |
| Kuwait | Ukraine* |
| Kyrgyzstan | United Arab Emirates |
| Lao People's Democratic Republic | United States of America |
| Latvia | Uzbekistan |
| Lebanon | Vanuatu* |
| Libyan Arab Jamahiriya | Viet Nam |

* = signatory State

Annex IV

Summary of information provided by the States Parties on the fulfilment of Article 5 obligations

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|-------------|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | The known mine and UXO contaminated area is estimated to total approximately 788.7 square kilometers in 206 districts of 31 provinces. Of this total, 157.7 square kilometers is considered “high impact” areas which include important agricultural land, irrigation systems, residential areas, grazing land and roads. | The Mine Action Programme for Afghanistan (MAPA) has been operating since 1989. A 10-year mine action strategy was endorsed by the government in 2003. It aims between 2003 and 2007 to clear high impact areas and to mark medium and low impact areas, and, between 2008-2012 to clear medium and low impact areas. Afghanistan’s objectives during the period 2005-2009 include: achieving safer, more efficient and more effective implementation of its strategy; gathering information on the impact of hazards at the community level and gathering precise technical and geographical information on contaminated areas; ensuring that priority areas are made mine and UXO-free; and, reducing injuries and casualties by promoting safer behaviour. | Nearly 300 square kilometres of minefields and 522 square kilometres of battle area have been cleared since 1989 with 250,000 anti-personnel mines and 3.3 million items of UXO destroyed. In addition 10.6 million Afghans have received mine risk education training. |
| Albania | A 120 kilometre long stretch of Albanian territory along the border with Serbia and Montenegro is suspected to contain anti-personnel mines. In 1999, a landmine impact survey identified 102 contaminated areas in the Tropoje, Has and Kukes | The Albanian Mine Action Programme has been established and has been mainstreamed into the regional development strategy of the Kukes prefecture. Albania’s objectives during the period 2005-2009 include: completing all impact and technical surveys by | Between 2000 and 2003, around 10 million square metres of formerly contaminated land were released through survey and clearance activities with 6,804 anti-personnel mines destroyed. Of the original 15.25 million square metres of |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|---------|--|---|--|
| | districts covering 15.25 million square metres. | December 2005, prioritizing all high and medium impact areas for clearance; clearing all high and medium impact areas by December 2006; clearing all low impact areas by December 2008; and, reducing life-threatening activities through mine risk reduction education among vulnerable groups within 39 affected villages. | suspected mined areas, less than 6 million square metres remain today. |
| Algeria | Algeria's areas mined by the colonial Army are located on Algeria's eastern border with Tunisia and western border with Morocco. These areas cover 5,676 hectares and contain 3,064,180 anti-personnel mines. Additionally, some areas in the North are suspected to be mined by terrorist groups. | Algeria is in the process of drafting its national demining programme. | Over 25 years of demining activities, 7,819,120 mines laid over 1,482 kilometres were destroyed and 50,006 hectares were cleared, which represents 58 percent of all mined areas in Algeria. Mine-affected areas have been marked. |
| Angola | All 18 Angolan provinces are thought to be affected by mines. A landmine impact survey was commenced in 2003 in order to determine the nature and scope of the problem in Angola. | The Landmine Impact Survey, which will be completed in 2005, will be critical for the elaboration of a strategic plan for the period 2006-2010. In the interim, Angola's objectives include: completing the landmine impact survey; extending the coordination activities of the National Inter-Sectoral Commission for Demining and Humanitarian Assistance (CNIDAH) to the provinces; developing the capacity of the National Demining Institute (INAD); and, improving operational output without compromising quality and | Prior to the commencement of the landmine impact survey demining activities had taken place in Angola for several years and institutional structures (i.e., CNIDAH and INAD) had been established. Currently 32 organizations – including 22 Angolan non-governmental organizations – and 12 commercial enterprises are active in mine clearance and mine risk education. In 2002 and the first quarter of 2003, non-governmental organisations working in mine action |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | safety. | reported clearing of about 2.8 million square metres of land, surveying of about 7.8 million square metres and destroying more than 5,000 mines and 13,000 pieces of UXO. |
| Argentina | The Falklands / Malvinas are affected with 20,000 mines. | Following an agreement concluded on 11 October 2001, Argentina and the United Kingdom are working together to assess the cost and feasibility of mine clearance options in the Falklands / Malvinas. | On 26-27 October 2004, a meeting of the Joint Argentine-British Working Group took place in London to carry out the feasibility study for demining the Malvinas Islands. |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | It is estimated that there are over 18,000 suspected minefields located mostly between the former lines of confrontation. A landmine impact survey completed in December 2003 identified 1,366 mine-impacted communities of which 11 percent were categorised as “high impact” and 51 percent “medium impact. Approximately 2,000 square kilometres are suspected of containing mines. | In 2002 a variety of structures were integrated into the Bosnia and Herzegovina Mine Action Centre (BH MAC) and the national demining strategy was introduced. The landmine impact survey allowed for improved priority setting and led to a revised strategy. During the 2005-2008 period Bosnia and Herzegovina plans to reduce suspected mined areas by 716.39 square kilometres using systematic survey, clear 21 square kilometres, permanently mark 140 square kilometres and urgently mark 510 square kilometres. Other objectives includes: further reducing risks to populations through an integrated mine risk education programme, building mine clearance and mine risk education capacities and working with others to create conditions for the development of new technologies and more effective mine action. | From 1997 to the end of 2003, approximately 50 square kilometres were cleared and 180 square kilometres of suspected areas were reduced further through general and technical surveys. |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|----------|--|---|--|
| Burundi | Fourteen (14) areas have been identified as mined or suspected to be mined in 5 different provinces. | Burundi does not yet have a national mine action programme yet. With the help of UNICEF, a mine risk education programme has been functioning since July 2003. | |
| Cambodia | A landmine impact survey completed in April 2002 identified 4,466 square kilometres of areas suspected to contain mines or UXO. Almost half of Cambodia's 13,908 villages in all 24 provinces are affected by mines with approximately 12 percent of these facing high levels of contamination. Approximately 5 million people are at risk. Approximately 10 percent – or 424.7 square kilometres – of suspected mined areas are considered high priorities. | The Cambodian Mine Action Authority was established in September 2000 to coordinate, manage and plan mine clearance. It prepared a national mine action strategy in 2003 which aims to integrate mine action into the national development policy and eradicate mine casualties and clear suspected mined areas by 2012. Cambodia's objectives for the period 2005-2009 include: reducing the number and size of suspected mined areas; permanently marking low impact suspected areas; update the landmine impact survey; prioritise high impact areas, clearing all of them by 2009; strengthening the deliver of mine risk education; and ensuring the effectiveness of national coordination. | Between 1992 and 2003, approximately 251.72 square kilometres were cleared with 419,794 anti-personnel mines, 12,633 antitank mines and 949,922 UXO destroyed. |
| Chad | A landmine impact survey completed in May 2001 identified 249 affected communities in 23 of Chad's 28 departments, 417 areas suspected of containing mines and 1,081 square kilometres of suspected affected areas. | Chad has developed a national strategic mine action plan which is taken into account in Chad's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP). Chad aims to free the country from mines and UXO by 2015. Its objectives for the period 2005-2009 include: carrying out technical survey efforts by 2006, clearing all | Between September 2000 and December 2003 over 2.2 million square metres were cleared with 11,931 mines, 65,551 UXO and 94 bombs destroyed. |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|----------|--|---|--|
| | | remaining mined areas along the Sudan border; marking and fencing all low and medium impact areas by 2005; clearing minefields in the Wadi Doum area; and, further developing, building the capacity of and integrating mine risk education. | |
| Chile | Chile has indicated that 114,830 mines are laid in 26 areas of Regions I and II (northern Chile), 123 mines are laid in Region V (central Chile) and 8,490 mines are laid in 10 different areas of Region XII (southern Chile). There are a total of 308 minefields in Chile. | The National Demining Plan was completed in January 2003 and demining activities started that same year. For the 2004-2005 period, Chile plans to clear 16 minefields contaminated with 13,582 AP mines in Regions I, II and XII. | In 2003-2004, Chile cleared the 123 mines of Region V and it is currently conducting demining activities in 5 minefields of Region I, where so far, 765 AP mines have been found and destroyed. |
| Colombia | IMSMA in Colombia has registered between 1990 until 1 October 2004, 3,697 suspected mined areas of which 1,371 have been geo-referenced. Some of the minefields identified are situated around water points, schools, access routes and public infrastructure. Illegal armed groups over the last few years have continued to utilize antipersonnel mines (mostly IEDs) in a massive and indiscriminate way. To date, 30 of the 32 departments in Colombia are affected, principally in rural areas. | In February of 2004, a process was initiated with all the different stakeholders in mine action in the country to develop a national policy on mine action. The policy integrated lessons learned and paid particular attention to regional characteristics. The National Mine Action Plan was formulated with the specific objectives of strengthening four components of mine action in Colombia: 1) Institutional strengthening at different territorial levels, 2) Integral assistance to the population, 3) Compliance with the Convention and 4) Communications strategy. The National Mine Action Plan was approved by the National Inter-Sectorial Commission on 10 August. Under integral assistance to population | To comply with Article 5 of the Ottawa Treaty, the Colombian Government is making progress in the following areas: 1. Identification of the mined areas of the armed forces of Colombia that were previously laid to protect communications post or military bases. These minefields are under the jurisdiction of the government of Colombia and in accordance with the national plan, will be cleared in compliance with the Convention. 2. Training in the clearance of minefields and humanitarian demining with an emphasis on developing national standards for the clearance of antipersonnel mines. 3. Adoption of |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|--------------------|---|---|---|
| | | component of the plan, it is detailed the elaboration, design and formulation of a National Mine Risk Education Strategy in which with the collaboration of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Communications, there will be developed publications and materials that will assist the process of prevention. The Observatory has been supported technically and financially in MRE work by UNICEF, UNDP, GICHD and national NGOs working in 10 departments of the country. | appropriate standards for clearance, which reflect the Colombian context. 4. The formation of 7 divisionary groups of the Engineering School of the National Army with the specific role of attending to humanitarian emergencies by the presence of anti-personnel mines and UXO and the associated threat to life, personal integrity and the right of movement of communities. |
| Congo, Republic of | Areas in the South-west of Congo, on the border with Angola, might be mined. | Further investigations will be conducted to determine whether the suspected mined areas are indeed mined and what kind of demining programme needs to be put in place. | |
| Costa Rica | Areas close to Costa Rica's northern border were reported contaminated with mines. | The contaminated area was divided in 4 operational modules. Demining was carried out by the Zapadores Unit. | Costa Rica destroyed 338 mines and some explosive artefacts located on a 178 kilometres stretch of border. At a ceremony on 10 December 2002 Costa Rica became the first State Party to announce that it had completed its mine clearance obligations in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention. |
| Croatia | In 2004, an estimated 1350 square kilometres were suspected to be mined, with mines found in 14 of the 21 counties of the Republic of | Croatia has a National Mine Action Programme containing annual targets for survey and clearance activities for the period 2000-2010. | Through clearance activities and the conduct of general and technical surveys, Croatia has reduced the size of its suspected mined areas to 1,350 |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|----------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | Croatia. | | square kilometres from approximately 4,500 square kilometres since 2000. Between 1998 and January 2003, 173.62 square kilometres were demined and handed over to the community. There are approximately 300,000 explosive remnants of war still laid in minefields. |
| Cyprus | There are 23 minefields containing 5,000 anti-personnel mines that are under the control of the Republic of Cyprus. Cyprus has records for all its minefields. | A programme for the destruction of mines in mined areas is currently under consideration. | From 1983 to January 2002, Cyprus cleared 10 minefields adjacent to the buffer zone and more than 11,000 mines were destroyed between January 2000 and January 2002. All remaining minefields under the control of the Republic of Cyprus are fenced and marked in accordance with Article 5 obligations. |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | Suspected mined areas affect 165 villages in 11 provinces. | Some demining activities have taken place but a demining programme is not yet in place. | |
| Denmark | Mines from the Second World War are located on the 10-kilometre long peninsula of Skallingen. This area contained approximately 8,300 antipersonnel mines and 1,600 antitank mines but parts of the minefields have been engulfed into the North Sea. The remaining minefields are located in a long narrow area stretching from north to south and at the southern end of Skallingen. | Once the new mapping of the area is completed, a plan for handling the remaining mines will be worked out. | |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|----------|--|---|---|
| Djibouti | Three (3) areas suspected of containing mines were reported. | Djibouti had a 3-year demining programme. | Djibouti cleared a total of 40,080.7 square metres and destroyed 509 mines and 40 UXO. The demining programme was completed at the end of 2003 with Djibouti announcing on 29 January 2004 that it had fulfilled its Article 5 clearance obligations. |
| Ecuador | Ecuador has reported 5 mine-affected areas and 2 suspected mined areas, all located on the border with Peru, with 6,682 mines emplaced over an estimated area of 426,481 square metres. Four (4) provinces and 7 cantons are affected or suspected to be affected. | In 1998, Ecuador and Peru agreed to clear landmines from their bordering territories. In March 2001, Ecuador signed an agreement to implement the OAS Assistance Programme for Mine Action. Demining operations are projected to be completed by 2010. Ecuador's objectives include: for 2004: clearing 15 dangerous areas; completing demining activities in Loja and Piura; destroying 665 antipersonnel mines and clearing 17,017 m ² . For 2005: clearing 12 dangerous areas; destroying 331 antipersonnel mines and clearing 33,340 m ² in the Morona Santiago province. | |
| Eritrea | A landmine impact survey identified 481 mine-affected communities and approximately 129 square kilometres of suspected mined area. There are a total of 132 mined areas under the control of Eritrea, with 87 of these considered high or medium impact. | Eritrea's objectives for the period 2005-2009 include: completing technical surveys, marking, clearance and the deliver of mine risk education to enable 65,000 internally displaced persons to return by the end of 2006; clear the remaining 116 high and medium impacted communities by the end of 2009, clearing | From 2000 to June 2004, Eritrea cleared 52,484,762 square metres, destroying 4,781 antipersonnel mines and 50,399 UXO. |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|---------------|--|---|---|
| | | approximately 48 square kilometres of land; and, reducing casualties through mine risk education and by carrying out marking in the 344 low impact communities. | |
| France | La Doudah military depot, under French control in Djibouti, is suspected to contain mines. | The suspected area in Djibouti was partially surveyed in 1989 and is now marked and fenced. Another survey was recently conducted and the details of the clearance that has to be carried out should be announced shortly. | |
| Greece | A total of 24,751 anti-personnel mines are emplaced in minefields close to Greece's borders. Additionally there are old minefields from the Second World War throughout Hellenic territory, especially in North-western Greece. | The Hellenic Army established a Land Minefield Clearance Battalion (LMCB) in 1954. Greece indicated that it will fulfil its Article 5 obligations within the timeframe laid by the Convention. | Greece has cleared its border with Bulgaria, destroying 25,000 mines and hundreds of UXO. Demining is currently taking place on the Albanian border. The minefields on Greece's border with Turkey are fenced. Between 1954 and 28 May 2002, more than 150,000 square kilometres have been cleared. |
| Guatemala | Guatemala has no defined mined areas, but mines and explosive devices are scattered over its territory in 13 districts. | In August 1997, the first demining plan was approved and the programme began operations in December of 1997. Guatemala aims to complete its demining programme in June 2005. | During demining operations conducted between January 2001 and March 2004, Guatemala destroyed 169 explosive artefacts, some of which were antipersonnel mines. |
| Guinea Bissau | In order to measure the extent of the problem, a general impact survey of Bissau's suspected areas was launched in 2004. Seventeen (17) suspected minefields have been identified in areas in Bissau and its surroundings. Other suspected areas | Guinea-Bissau's objectives during the period 2005-2009 include the following: marking all suspected areas in Bissau by 2005; addressing the mine and UXO problem in Bissau by 2006; identifying and marking all other suspected areas by 2008; and, addressing the mine and UXO | Between November 2000 and April 2004, close to 610,000 square metres of land in the Bissau capital were cleared with 2,509 mines and 15,000 UXO destroyed. |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| | exist in the east and the northern region bordering Senegal. | problem in these areas outside of Bissau by 2009. | |
| Honduras | Mined areas have been reported on the border with Nicaragua in the districts of Cortes, Paraiso, Choluteca and Olancho. | Completion of Honduras' mine clearance programme was scheduled for the end of July 2004. | Since September 1995, Honduras has cleared 446,798.7 square metres, destroying 2,189 mines. |
| Jordan | Jordan's original mine clearance challenge going back to 1993 included 60 million square metres of mined area, 496 minefields and approximately 309,000 emplaced mines. | The Royal Engineering Corps of Jordan started a demining programme in 1993. Jordan's strategic plan is to be a mine-free country by 2009. The plan consists of three phases: 1999-2005: demining in the Jordan Valley and the Eastern Heights, 2005-2007: demining in the Security zone, 2007-2009: demining of the remaining suspected areas in the West. It aims to clear approximately 10 million square metres of land per year in coming years thereby fulfilling its clearance requirements by 2009. | Between 1993 and 2003, 25.5 million square metres and 183 minefields were cleared with 101,356 mines and 10,000 UXO destroyed. All minefields in Jordan are marked and fenced. |
| Macedonia, the FYR of | The North-western areas of the FYR of Macedonia are Areas contaminated by mines and UXO have been reported in the north-western part of the country in addition to 4 to 5 UXO contaminated areas in the south-east which are remnants of the First and the Second World Wars. | A demining plan was adopted in 2003 with the government acquired full responsibility for mine action. It is envisaged that the entire country will be cleared by 2007. | Approximately 6 million square metres have been cleared with 22 mines and 776 UXO destroyed. |
| Malawi | Suspected mined areas exist along the 1,000 kilometre border with Mozambique, particularly in | A United Nations assessment mission conducted in August 2003 has provided the initial basis for national planning with | |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|------------|---|--|---|
| | 16 areas that served as refugee or combatants' camps and 33 areas that served as Malawi Young Pioneers camps. | a view to being free of mines by 2009. Malawi's objectives during the period 2005-2009 include: identifying all mined areas by 2005; prioritizing clearance tasks by 2005; conducting mine risk education programmes in affected areas; and, clearing all high impact areas by the end of 2006, all medium impact areas by the end of 2008 and all low impact areas by the middle of 2009. | |
| Mauritania | The northern part of Mauritania is mine-affected, particularly areas of enormous mineral exploitation potential. | The objective of Mauritania is to be mine free by 2011. In 2000 Mauritania received assistance to set up a humanitarian demining programme and a National Bureau for Demining. For 2004, 6 demining operations were planned with it anticipated that they would cover 30,000 square metres. | Between June 2002 and 30 April 2004, Mauritania destroyed 5,505 mines. In the first half of 2004, demining operations cleared 10,000 square metres. |
| Mozambique | A landmine impact survey completed in 2001 indicated that all 10 provinces were affected by mines, but particularly the provinces of Cabo Delgado, Nampula, Zambezia, Inhambane and Maputo which represent 70 percent of the suspected contaminated areas. As of January 2004 583 villages and a population of approximately 1,022,501 were still affected by mines. Suspected mined areas of high and medium impact total 130,801,989 square metres. | The Mozambican national coordination mechanism (IND) oversees the executive of Mozambique's national mine action plan, which during the period from 2002 to 2006 aims to: clear all high and medium impact sites; destroy all UXO; survey and mark remaining low impact areas; and, put in place a national mine risk education programme. Specific objectives include: conducting technical surveys of all suspected mined areas that are greater than 1 square kilometre (i.e., in aggregate terms approximately 20.6 percent of the all suspected areas); | Between 2000 and 2003, 45,743,119 square metres of land have been cleared and 45,017 mines and 16,310 UXO destroyed. |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| | | conducting technical surveys on all high and medium impact areas between 10 square metres and 1 square kilometre (i.e., in aggregate terms 27 percent of all suspected areas); reassessing three low impact areas that comprise a disproportionately large portion (34 percent) of all suspected areas; develop and maintain a marking system; launch a comprehensive national mine risk education programme; safely and cost-effectively clear all high and medium impact suspected areas. | |
| Nicaragua | The records of the Nicaraguan Army initially indicated that 135,643 mines had been emplaced and that there were 991 targets to clear. An additional 10,054 mines were recently added to the records of the army. | The Humanitarian Demining Programme of Nicaragua aims for the destruction of all emplaced mines within the 10-year timeframe set by the Convention. To fulfil this objective, a term of 5 years (2000-2004) was initially estimated but it is likely that the programme could be extended until 2006. The programme is implemented with the support of the OAS Programme of Assistance for Integral Mine Action. Demining is carried out by the Nicaraguan Army through the small demining units of the body of engineers. Nicaragua plans to clear some 70 remaining minefields by the end of 2006. | As of March 2004, 827 mined areas had been cleared and 77.14% of the initial quantity of reported mines had been destroyed. As of July 2004, 838 mined areas, representing an area of 7,685,494 square metres had been cleared and 109,921 mines had been destroyed. |
| Niger | The areas of Air, Manguèni, Plateau du Djado and Plaine du Talak are mined. Four additional areas are | Niger has a draft mine action plan for the 2004-2006 period, which does not include demining objectives yet but focuses on | |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|---------|---|---|---|
| | suspected to be mined. Niger has very limited knowledge on its mined areas. | identifying and marking the mined areas. | |
| Peru | Peru's mined areas are located at the border with Ecuador, with an original estimate of 120,000 made. Some mines have also been emplaced around key infrastructure, especially high-tension electrical towers. | In May 2001, the OAS and the Government of Peru signed an agreement to coordinate international support for Peru through the OAS Mine Action Programme. The OAS Programme seeks to ensure the following: define exact locations of minefields along the border with Ecuador by conducting impact studies of the areas and clear the mines according to annual objectives set by the National Demining Plan. | As of March 2004, Peru had destroyed 103,490 mines. In December 2003, Peru completed clearance activities in the districts of Tumbes and Piura, at the border with Ecuador. In the last trimester of 2003, the Peruvian and Ecuadorian Armed Forces started a joint demining operation in the area of Los Limos and Pueblo Nuevo. |
| Rwanda | Rwanda's original mine clearance challenge included 35 suspected mined areas totalling 1,437,387 square metres. In addition, the UXO problem is more widespread than the problems posed by mines. A landmine impact survey completed in January 2003 identified that 54 percent of the original suspected areas still needed to be cleared. As of April 2004, there were 639,770.2 square metres that remained to be cleared. | Rwanda created its National Demining Office in 1995 to address issues related to antipersonnel mines. Rwanda is currently thinking of setting up an accelerated demining programme to fulfil its Article 5 obligations. | A total of 46 percent of suspected mined areas have been cleared with 1,265 mines and 29,843 UXO destroyed. |
| Senegal | In Senegal, 3 areas are considered to be mine-affected: along the border with Guinea Bissau, the Ziguinchor region and the Kolda region. Exact locations of mined areas and quantity of mines are not known. | In 2004, Senegal drafted a national mine action strategy, proposals for mine action legislation and for the creation of a mine action coordination centre. The documents have been sent to the relevant authorities and approval by the prime minister is pending. | Between 1996 and June 2004, 1,759 mines were destroyed during demining operations of the national army. |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| Serbia and Montenegro | Mined areas in Serbia and Montenegro are located at the border with Croatia in the area of the village of Jamena and at the border with Albania, in the municipalities of Plav and Rozaje. It has been assessed that the mined area near Jamena could cover 6,000,000 square metres and also contain anti-vehicle mines and UXO. | The 2005 Demining Plan anticipates the clearance of an area of 2,000,000 square meters, which represents 50 percent of the mined area remaining along the border of the Republic of Serbia with the Republic of Croatia. With bilateral and regional cooperation in the border zone clearance and with the assistance of the International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance (ITF) in Ljubljana, as the major source of funding for clearance operations in the region of Southeastern Europe, it is expected that Serbia and Montenegro will fulfill its obligations under the Ottawa Convention even before the deadline of 2014. That will be in line with the joint initiative of the countries of Southeastern Europe for a mine free region by 2009. | In 2003, 485,500 square metres, approximately 8 percent of the mined areas in Jamena was demined and 1,441 mines were destroyed. In the same area, between March and September 2004, Serbia and Montenegro cleared 674,400 square metres and destroyed 1,060 anti-personnel mines and 215 anti-vehicle mines. In 2003, 19 locations in the municipalities of Plav and Rozaje in the border area with Albania were demined, reducing the number of mined locations to 46. An area of 192,400 square metres is currently being demined at the Albanian border. |
| Sudan | It is estimated that mines or other explosive remnants of war may affect 30 percent of Sudan. Suspected areas are in Western Equatoria, Eastern Equatoria, Bahr Al-Ghazal, Jonglei, Blue Nile, Upper Nile, Nuba Mountains, Lakes and Kassala. Sudan's borders with Eritrea, Chad, Libya and Egypt are also mine affected. The presence or suspected presence of mines had both a humanitarian and development | The lack of information on mine and UXO contamination and its impact remains the most important obstacle to mine action progress in Sudan. The United Nations, the Government of Sudan and the Sudan Peoples Liberation Movement (SPLM) have agreed on a policy framework for mine action in Sudan prescribing a "one-country" approach. Sudan is currently working to develop structures that can address mine action needs adequately. The next step | In 2003-2004, Sudan released 3,068,066 square metres by clearance, while destroying 215 anti-personnel mines. |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|------------|--|--|--|
| | impact. The World Food Programme has estimated that the food security of 2 million people is affected by mines. | will be to address immediate to medium term mine action needs and to prepare for a post-conflict long-term mine action plan. Objectives for the period 2005-2009 include: building national capacity to manage the national mine action programme; identifying mined areas through a modified landmine impact survey; clearing all high impact areas before 2009; establishing a mine risk education programme; and, developing a sound resource mobilization strategy. | |
| Suriname | Suriname has one mined area containing 13 mines. It is marked and under surveillance. | The Inter-Departmental Commission on Antipersonnel Mines is currently preparing a programme for clearing Suriname's mined area. Demining activities should be conducted in collaboration with the OAS. | |
| Swaziland | Mined areas are located along the Swaziland-Mozambique borderline. | Demining was expected to commence in 2000. | |
| Tajikistan | Mined and suspected areas can be found in the Central Region as a result of the 1995-97 civil war, along the Afghan border in areas under the control of Russian which contain Soviet-laid and Russian-maintained minefields and along the border with Uzbekistan as a result of mines laid by Uzbekistan. | In 2004, the Government of Tajikistan approved a 5-year Strategic Plan (2004-2008) which aims to eliminate all mine incidents and ensure that economic activity and development projects are not impeded by landmines or UXO. Specific objectives include: conducting a general mine action assessment of affected communities located along the border with Uzbekistan and in the Sugd Region; progressively assessing the extent of mine-contaminated areas along the border | From 1997 to 2004 Tajikistan neutralised and destroyed more than 3,250 pieces of mines and explosives. A general mine action assessment has been completed in the Central Region, reducing the amount of suspected area of 29 square kilometres and 124 linear kilometres of read/rail. In September and October of 2004, general research on frontier sites of Tajik-Uzbek border in the Sughd region, two areas of Hatlon region (in |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|----------|--|---|--|
| | | with Afghanistan as responsibility for the border is handed over by the Russian border troops; continuing technical surveys in the Central Region; marking areas along the border with Uzbekistan; carrying out mine risk education programmes in concert with technical survey and mine clearance efforts; and, by 2006, expanding survey and clearance capacity to six survey teams, four manual clearance teams and four mine detection dog teams. | the south) and three areas of the Autonomous Region of Badakhshan (in the east) was completed. While in the central region there is a work going on actualization of technical surveys and mine clearance of the minefields. Additionally three areas were demined and handed over to the local governmental authorities for long run use. |
| Thailand | A landmine impact survey completed in 2001 indicated that mine-affected provinces are located at the country's borders with Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia and Myanmar and 934 suspected areas representing 2,556.7 square kilometres. | The Thailand Mine Action Centre has been established with four Humanitarian Mine Action Units which are deployed along the Cambodian border. | Demining officially started in 2000. As of May 2004, 1,641,126 square metres in 6 provinces had been cleared and 1,397,986 square metres were handed over for community use. A total of 721 mines were destroyed during demining operations. |
| Tunisia | Tunisia has 9 mined areas containing 3,526 antipersonnel mines and 1,530 antitank mines. There are also some areas suspected to be contaminated with unexploded ordnance from the Second World War. | A January 2003 United Nations interagency assessment mission assessed the extent of the landmine problem. | Over the last five years, the units of military engineers of the Tunisian army recovered and destroyed around 4,500 mines and other devices. |
| Turkey | Turkey's original mine clearance challenge included 936,663 anti-personnel mines laid between 1957 and 1998, with 615,419 of these mines laid along Turkey's border with Syria. | Mine clearance coordination centres, mine clearance teams and a working group on mine clearance and detection methods have been established. In 2004 clearance priorities include areas in Diyarbakir, Batman, Mardin, Bitlis, Bingöl, Tunceli | Mined areas have been marked and fenced in accordance with international norms. In 1998 Turkey commenced mine clearance operations and by the end of 2003 14,840 mines had been removed and destroyed and |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|----------------|--|---|---|
| | | and Göle provinces. Objectives for 2005 including clearance in Hakkari, Van and Sirnak provinces. Mine clearance along the border with Syria is another priority for Turkey. To this end Turkey has allocated US\$ 17 million to clear an estimated 306 million square metres, which will be used for agricultural purposes. | 48,120 square metres cleared. |
| Uganda | Mine contamination in Uganda is limited to the northern, western and North eastern regions. There are 3 affected districts in the North, 3 in the West and 2 in the Northeast. | No survey has been carried out to map exact locations of mined areas. In the West, where peace has returned, the government is ready to commence mapping and eventually clearance but is waiting for assistance. The North on the other hand is still affected by an ongoing conflict and survey and clearance cannot take place. | Limited demining by the Uganda Peoples Defence Forces (UPDF) has already been carried out in the West to remove mines that were obvious and those on roads and access trucks. Similarly in the North the UPDF have provided responsive clearance as to when need arises. In 2002-2003, 231 mines were removed. |
| United Kingdom | Around 16,600 mines remain in the Falklands / Malvinas. | In October 2001 a Memorandum of Understanding was agreed between the UK and Argentine governments to enable a feasibility study of mine clearance options in the Falklands. As of April 2003, work towards a UK-led study funded by Argentina was still under way. | Some clearance of anti-personnel mines was conducted immediately after the 1982 conflict, lifting about 1,400 mines but was stopped after several injuries to those involved. A total of 149 mines were destroyed between 1997 and 2001. A further 50 were destroyed as they were exposed to the surface. The 101 minefields are marked and fenced. |
| Venezuela | It has been reported that there are 6 areas contaminated by mines containing a total of 1,073 anti- | All minefields will be cleared by April 2009. Three (3) will be cleared by the end of 2007, 4 by the end of 2008 and the | As of August 2004, there were 13 minefields containing 1,073 mines, all of them are fenced. |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|-------|--|---|--|
| | personnel mines. | remaining 4 by April 2009. | |
| Yemen | A landmine impact survey completed in 2000 identified 14 high impact communities, 86 medium impact communities and 494 low impact communities. A total of 1,078 suspected areas were identified. | Based on the findings of the landmine impact survey, a strategic plan was developed. The Yemen National Mine Action Committee was established in 1998 as to hold overall responsibility and ensure accountability for demining activities and the Yemen Mine Action was established as the implementing agency. Yemen envisages that it will be in full compliance with its clearance obligations by the end of March 2009. Specific objectives between 2004 and 2009 include: clearing all high impact communities, 47 medium impact communities and 22 low impact communities within 2004; clearing remaining medium impact and 27 percent of low impact communities by 2008; and, ensuring that all at-risk individuals are exposed to mine risk education using YEMAC and Yemen Mine Awareness Association capacities. Specific clearance goals are: 64 square kilometres in 2004, 83 square kilometres in 2005; 93 square kilometres in 2006; 95 square kilometres in 2008; and, 98 square kilometres in 2009. | Since clearance began in 1999, 224 square kilometres of suspected and mined areas have been returned to communities. |

| | <u>Column A:</u> Areas in which antipersonnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced | <u>Column B:</u> Plans and programmes | <u>Column C:</u> Progress in clearing mined areas |
|----------|--|--|--|
| Zambia | Zambia has suspected mined areas along its border with Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Namibia and Angola and also around former Freedom Fighters' Camps. A national survey completed in May 2004 indicated 41 mined areas, most of which are low impact. | The national demining plan is currently being refined based on the conclusions of the national survey. Zambia estimates that it can complete its clearance obligations by 2007. Its specific objectives between now and then include: implementing a marking operation by 2005; expanding mine risk education programmes to cover approximately 250,000 at-risk Zambians and approximately 130,000 refugees; and, clearing the 41 mined areas by 2007. | National demining clearance capacity has been established and 650 kilometres of clearance has been conducted on the Gwembe-Tonga road. |
| Zimbabwe | Zimbabwe's original mine clearance challenge included over 210 square kilometres of suspected mined areas in four border provinces in addition to UXOs found in all nine provinces. In the affected provinces, mines restrict socio-economic development, including development of the tourist industry. | Zimbabwe has formed the National Mine Action Authority (NAMAZ) to regulate mine action activities and the Zimbabwe Mine Action Centre to coordinate demining and the National Demining Office to carry out demining. Zimbabwe envisages clearing all minefields by its 2009 deadline to do so. Its objectives during the period 2005-2009 include: identifying and surveying all mined areas; carrying out mine risk education campaigns in all affected provinces; and, clearing all mined areas by 2009 with the sequencing of clearance based upon socio-economic priorities. | To date 40 percent of the original 210 square kilometres of suspected area has been cleared. Around 221,773 mines have been destroyed. |

Annex V
Annual landmine casualty rates¹

| | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 |
|------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|
| Afghanistan | no data | 1,800* | 1,200* |
| Albania | no data | no data | no data | 191 | 35 | 8 | 7 | |
| Angola | no data | 270 |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | 632 | 290 | 149 | 95 | 100 | 87 | 72 | 54 |
| Cambodia | 4,301 | 2,293 | 2,148 | 1,155 | 862 | 828 | 833 | 755 |
| Colombia | 122 | 94 | 59 | 50 | 143 | 268 | 627 | 666 |
| Croatia | 124 | 121 | 94 | 58 | 22 | 32 | 24 | 9 |
| Mozambique | 211 | 130 | 134 | 60 | 29 | 80 | 47 | 14 |
| Nicaragua | 13 | 18 | 27 | 11 | 9 | 17 | 9 | 3 |
| Senegal | 5 | 167 | 198 | 78 | 65 | 56 | 48 | 20 |
| Yemen | no data | 9 |

Note:

* Estimate

¹ May include UXO casualties as well. As was noted previously in this document, most States Parties that have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control do not yet have the capacity to collect and report data on annual numbers of new victims. Hence, this table includes only data from those States Parties for which relevant data are available.

Annex VI**Problems faced by States Parties in which there are significant number of landmine victims, and their plans to address these problems, progress and priorities for assistance**

| | Problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance |
|-------------|---|
| Afghanistan | <p>Problems faced: In 2003, landmines and unexploded ordnance killed approximately 370 Afghans and left more than 1,000 survivors and it is estimated that in total there are more than 100,000 survivors in Afghanistan. At least one-third under the age of 18 and as many as 10 percent being women and girls.</p> <p>Plans and progress and priorities: The Afghan Ministry of Martyrs and Disabled coordinates assistance and empowerment efforts for the disabled, including mine survivors. Afghanistan plans to mainstream the policy for disabled into schools, regular vocation training courses and employment. It aims to fight discrimination against the disabled through mass media campaigns and related awareness raising activities in schools, the development of disability awareness training materials in national languages and the training of national language trainers, and, advocacy to promote national legislation related to the rights of people with disabilities.</p> |
| Albania | <p>Problems faced: Since the 1998 Kosovo crisis, 34 people have been killed and 236 injured from mines and UXO in the Northeast of Albania.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: Albania is implementing an integrated mine action plan adopted in 2004, which includes the physical, social and economic reintegration of mine/ UXO survivors. The National Trauma Centre, with ICRC support, has been providing lower limb and partial foot prosthesis to mine amputees since 2000. Upper limb amputees and difficult cases have been treated at the Slovenia Institute of Rehabilitation since 2001 with ITF support. In 2004, 18 victims will receive prostheses and rehabilitation in Slovenia. A prosthesis support centre will be established in Kukes regional hospital by December 2004 with UNDP support. In 2004-2005, 2 prosthesis technicians will receive advanced training in India with ICRC-SFD support. A revolving fund for socio-economic reintegration of mine and UXO victims has been established by local NGO-VMA, with American State Department and ITF support, and has assisted 39 mine survivors and their families in 2003-2004 with cows and beehives for generating income. In 2004-2005, a community based rehabilitation network will be established in the mine affected villages of Northeast Albania by VMA with UNDP and ITF support.</p> |
| Angola | <p>Problems faced: A Landmine Impact Survey will be completed in mid-2005 which will help assess the extent of the problem. Therefore there is a need for funds to be able to implement a nationwide evaluation project to know how many mine victims there are, where they are, and what assistance facilities are available for health, physical and psychological rehabilitation, education, professional training, and social and economic reintegration. Also there is a need for funds to be able to recruit for 12 months, one international technical assistant to assist the sub-commission for support and social reintegration of landmine victims.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: Support and assistance to mine victims is part of the national framework to support persons with disabilities, directed by the National Programme for Physical and Sensorial Rehabilitation within the</p> |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| | <p>Operational Plan 2001-2005 of the Health Ministry. There are 9 orthopaedic centres in Angola. The national NGO, ANDA, in partnership with Fund Lwini is implementing small projects for socio-economic reintegration for disabled people who want to return to their areas of origin. These include vocational training and microcredit financed by the Angolan Government. LARDEF is implementing small projects for training and socio-economic reintegration for disabled people including mine victims. Handicap International provides technical support to the S.Paulo Social Centre for training and social reintegration. German Technical Cooperation GTZ also provides technical support to the S.Paulo Centre and capacity building for the Ministry of Social Affairs. The Angolan government is working on indicators for evaluation. The National and Intersectorial Commission for Demining and Humanitarian Assistance (CNIDAH) was established by Presidential decree in September 2001 to plan, co-ordinate and control the National Mine Action Programme. It has two sub-commissions: one for demining and mine risk education and one for support and social reintegration. Under existing legislation war veterans – many of whom are landmine victims – have a right to a personal monthly allowance.</p> |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina | <p>Problems faced: Up until the end of 2003, 4,825 persons were injured or killed by mines or UXO with males aged 19-39 making up to 40 percent of the victims, and children younger than 18 years making up to 20 percent of all victims. Economic reintegration remains the greatest problem.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: A working group exists to prepare a landmine victim assistance strategy on the basis of Handicap International and UNICEF's analysis of the existing assistance services. There are 7 rehabilitation centres, 7 health resorts and 60 community centres, which deal with physical therapy. There are 3 psychiatric hospitals, established together with the community centres, and 27 orthopaedic-prosthetic workshops. Victim assistance programmes include financial support for the purchase of prosthetic devices, material assistance, rehabilitation, psycho-social support and socio-economic reintegration. Under existing legislation civilians and war veterans have rights to personal disability allowance, allowance for care and assistance by a third person, orthopaedic allowance, family disability allowance, and, child allowance. International assistance is still needed to fill the gaps in the provision of assistance to landmine victims.</p> |
| Burundi | <p>Problems faced: Burundi has a considerable number of victims. Medical emergency services are non-existent, as well as transportation to medical centres. There are five hospitals in Burundi with four of these in the capital. The most difficult cases are treated abroad, mainly in Kenya and South Africa. There are four centres providing physiotherapy and equipment in Burundi. The four centres are not able to meet the needs of the patients. A workshop for orthopaedic equipment called Centre National d'Appareillage et de Rééducation functions well. The two other workshops are dependent on private support. There are four centres for socio-economic reintegration, mostly for war victims.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: Some associations for psychological and social support are being put in place slowly: L'Association Burundaise pour l'Assistance des Handicapés Physiques, and L'Union des Personnes Handicapées. Burundi needs financial support to strengthen the four centres for</p> |

| | |
|----------|--|
| | <p>physiotherapy and equipment, in the areas of rehabilitation of the hospital buildings, new equipment and training of personnel.</p> |
| Cambodia | <p>Problems faced: It is estimated that there are approximately 40,000 landmine survivors in Cambodia.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: The Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority (CMAA) is assisting the Disability Action Council (DAC) in developing a long-term strategic plan. The plan will identify inter-sectorial programmes and resources to support them. The CMAA is a regulatory authority that has the responsibility for co-ordination and monitoring of mine action. It is both a regulator and the government's focal point for designing policies, plans and programmes and for establishing a necessary legal framework governing mine related issues. Over the next five years, Cambodia's priorities are to: 1) Initiate, enable and if needed, co-ordinate all relevant agencies so that they are capable of delivering integrated and sustainable services, 2) develop information networks on victim assistance, 3) promote the development of effective and appropriate rehabilitation services and programs, 4) support and promote the inclusion of victims in all development projects / programmes and activities, 5) develop quarterly and annually progress forms for relevant organisations and agencies to send regular reports to the national authority, 6) conduct field monitoring of organisations and agencies to check that all government policies and guidelines on disability rehabilitation, socio-economic integration and anti-discrimination are implemented, and 7) call an annual meeting of victim assistance for all relevant organisations / agencies, key ministries and stakeholders. The Ministry of Social Affairs, Youth Rehabilitation and Veterans is finalising the draft law "Rights of People with Disabilities". The law has been submitted to the Council of Ministers' Legal Council for review with the hope that the Royal Government will endorse it and will pass on to the National Assembly in due course. Mine victims are included within the contents of the bill.</p> <p>Ongoing victim assistance funding is required.</p> |
| Chad | <p>Problems faced: The 2001 Landmine Impact Survey 2001 indicated that 1,688 people had been injured or killed in mine incidents in Chad.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: Chad does not have a national mine victim assistance plan. Nevertheless, Chad's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) sets out targets vulnerable groups including persons with disabilities.</p> |

| | |
|----------|---|
| Colombia | <p>Problems faced: Both the military and civilian population are affected by violence in Colombia, alarmingly with the number of mine victims increasing to a point where there are on average two victims registered on IMSMA every day. Forty percent of these victims are civilians who mostly are rural poor, living below the poverty line. Colombian legislation addresses policies and programmes aimed to assist vulnerable and displaced populations affected by political violence (including victims of anti-personnel mines and UXO). It is clear that these legislative measures need to be articulated and revised to fully guarantee the rights of Colombian victims.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: In February 2004, a process was initiated with different actors working in the area of mine action where a government policy was constructed. This policy integrated lessons learnt and incorporated specifics at regional and national levels which was translated into the National Mine Action Plan. The National Mine Action Plan developed priorities, strategies and means to cover the four pillars of the plan, notably: 1) Institutional strengthening at different territorial levels, 2) Integral assistance to the population, 3) Compliance with the Ottawa Treaty and 4) Communications strategy. The National Mine Action Plan was approved at a session of the national inter-sectorial Commission on 10 August 2004. Under the pillar of integral assistance to the population, a programming was formulated to address the issue of strengthening assistance to victims, specifically over first aid, rehabilitation and socio-economic reintegration of victims. For this reason, it is necessary to formulate standards regarding attention to mine victims adopted by the country. Pilot programmes in the departments of Antioquia and Cauca have been developed with the aim of following the route of a victim through all the stages from accident to recuperation, in conformity with the procedures established by the Colombian Government.</p> |
|----------|---|

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Croatia | <p>Problems faced: According to the Croatian Mine Victims Association (CMVA) 1,890 individuals have suffered from mine incidents during the period 1991 to June 2004, 420 of whom suffered fatal injuries. The largest numbers of victims were in Karlovac, Sisak, Osijek and Zadar counties. The majority of landmine victims are adult male farmers, while women make up about 5.26 percent of victims. Of the total number of landmine victims in Croatia, 104 were under the age of 18. Deminers accounted for 6.24 percent of all mine victims. Unemployment remains the main problem along with the large differentials in rights and entitlements following mine injury.</p> <p>Plans and progress and priorities: The DUGA centre for psycho-social rehabilitation, established in 2004, will host 500-600 mine victims a year in Rovinj, where workshops have been held every summer since 2001. The centre will be open to all mine victims from South Eastern Europe, with 10-15 percent of the places reserved for mine victims from other regions of the world. All levels of emergency care are highly developed in Croatia. There are four specialised hospitals for treatment of amputees, although 75 percent of the cases are treated in Zagreb. Pre- and post-prosthetic care is available, although the availability of wheelchairs is insufficient. All public institutions and government owned companies in Croatia are obliged by law to employ disabled people when possible, although this is difficult to enforce, especially in times of high unemployment. Laws covering mine victims' medical needs and rights have been passed, but some mine victims are not fully aware of their rights or how to obtain them. The CMVA has published an information brochure on this issue and is strengthening its regional capacities by educating special representatives in each of Croatia's 14 mine-affected counties, who are themselves mine victims. With respect to external funding, Croatia puts priority on capacity building. More needs to be done when it comes to education and mine awareness in general, as well as monitoring and enforcing the laws.</p> |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | <p>Problems faced: It is assumed that years of war have led to many mine victims.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: Qualified medical personnel are only available in the capital. The DRC aims to care for survivors by fitting prostheses but suffers from a lack of adequately qualified staff. To care for the socio-economic needs of victims, a social fund for victims was set up in February 2002 by the President. A National Vocational Training Committee also exists. There is an absence of national legislation to assist mine victims; legal assistance is required from other countries.</p> |
| El Salvador | <p>Problems faced: There are approximately 7,000 mine victims, mostly from rural areas. There is a need for mine victims to be fitted with prosthetics suitable for the Salvadoran climate.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: A physical rehabilitation and psychological reintegration program is being implemented to benefit civilians and military personnel affected by mines. Another important initiative was the establishment of the Centre for Prosthetics and Orthotics. The government continues to make efforts to protect survivors through legal means, such as the "law for the protection of injured and disabled persons as consequence of the armed conflicted" and the "law for equal opportunity for disabled people". These laws</p> |

| | |
|---------|--|
| | guarantee health care and productive reintegration of disabled people, as well as equal opportunities in society. |
| Eritrea | <p>Problems faced: The magnitude of the mine victim problem is not yet fully known, but, at present, data on 100,000 persons with disability are being analysed for a National Survey for People with Disability, which will mature into a socio-economic database to monitor the reintegration process. The Landmine Impact Survey has identified landmine survivors in mine-affected communities and has found that the most affected group is young male herders and that there are 5,385 mine victims in mine affected communities. This number is expected to increase with the return of displaced persons and with improved data collection.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: The Mine Action Strategic Planning Process was scheduled for July and August 2004. The completion of the National Survey for People with Disability is scheduled for March 2005. In 2003, the Ministry of Labour and Human Welfare endorsed a strategic plan for 2002-2006 – “Direction to Establish a Model of Victim Support Utilising Community Based Rehabilitation in Eritrea”. This provides a plan for victim support in Eritrea and the participatory priority setting process involved over 800 persons, many of whom have their own disability. The victim support programme in Eritrea seeks to: change attitudes of the communities where landmine survivors and other people with disability live for improved social reintegration; use community based rehabilitation to realise priorities within the national development plans with regard to people with disability; and, build access to other services such as the orthopaedic workshops, enabling child landmine survivors to attend school and providing seed money loans to set up small businesses for poverty reduction. The Ministry of Labour and Human Welfare is working to develop plans in collaboration with the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education. The Ministry has prepared “the emergency care proposal” to train communities to respond to the golden hour of emergency. Continuing medical care is an area where partnership is being built to respond to traumatic injuries, surgery and additional medical care. A project was funded in 2004 to assist landmine survivors and other persons with disability to access the Ministry of Labour and Human Welfare’s orthopaedic workshops. Social support and changing attitudes are areas of focus in Eritrea. Community-based rehabilitation committees exist. Concerning economic reintegration, a pilot seed loan money scheme has been extremely successful and the continuation of this project is the top priority within victim support. As the work on the international Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities persons with disabilities proceeds, Eritrea will use this information to open a participatory dialogue with respective ministries to develop a framework for victim support that complies with the Convention. There is a need for capacity building at the orthopaedic workshops and to continue to build good relations with the community to find solutions. There is a need for raw materials, training in management of upper limbs, developing simple aids and equipment production. (Wheelchair manufacturing is anticipated to begin in 2005 or 2006.)</p> |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Guinea-Bissau | <p>Problems faced: According to a countrywide survey of mine casualties launched in 2002, 616 landmine survivors were identified: Almost 35 percent are children, 20 percent are women and 45 percent are men. Only 9 percent of the victims have been treated by the national physical rehabilitation capacity. Landmine survivors are prevalent in northern region (35 %), in the capital area (25 %), in the southern part of the country (19 %) and in eastern region (21 %). Treatments available for victims are scarce. The specialised Centre for Surgery and Rehabilitation of Disabled was destroyed during the 1998-99 conflict. The cost of treatment is a major hurdle for many victims, even when they have access to a public hospital. The hospital itself frequently suffers from inadequate resources. There are no special service providers in psychological and social support. The main problem is to provide work for the landmine survivors and persons with disabilities.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: The objective is to improve access for persons with physical disabilities through the rehabilitation of the specialised centre for surgery and to increase national capacity in physical rehabilitation. The objective is to offer victims physical rehabilitation, psychological support and assistance to reintegrate into Guinean society. The objective is to promote the reintegration of mine victims and disabled persons into society by promoting sports activities and facilitating relevant income-generating projects. There is a need to reinforce the article 5 of the National Constitution in order to include the landmine / UXO victim assistance concept. A complete and comprehensive national plan is needed which includes awareness campaigns on the needs of persons with disabilities. Other challenges include the inclusion of mine / UXO victims in category of “war victims” so they can access the same rights for compensation, the non-discrimination between the victims of the Liberation War and the victims of the 1998-99 conflict, and, the non-discrimination between mine / UXO victims and other disabled or injured people. Guinea-Bissau requests assistance to further improve the national organisations, care services and workshops. It requests assistance to develop a first response unit, including training in first aid and follow up activities, and, assistance in other areas.</p> |
| Mozambique | <p>Problems faced: There is limited information about mine victims. Since mine action started in 1992, about 2,300 victims have been registered. Of those, only a minority have benefited from victim assistance programming.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: It was reported that there are 60 physiotherapy services, 10 orthopedic centres, and 10 transit centres specifically designated to host those handicapped undergoing treatment. The current programme of victim assistance (conducted by Landmines Survivors Network – LSN) covers areas such as physical rehabilitation, vocational training and provision of tools for mine victims to conduct their own business, as well as moral support between the mine victims themselves. Out of the 321 assisted mine victims, only 12 have been declared as no longer in need of assistance as they were considered fully rehabilitated and able to conduct a normal life. Mozambique has raised with LSN the question of expanding its activities to other provinces and work is under way to meet this end. If more financial support was provided more organisations would be in a position to support landmine survivors. Such support would be geared towards socio-economic reintegration as well as to ensure maintenance work and / or distribution of prosthetics.</p> |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Nicaragua | <p>Problems: According to the International Red Cross estimates Nicaragua has more than 2000 landmine survivors or unexploded ordnance victims. However officially there are 781 registered survivors. Ninety-five (95) percent of victims are of limited economic resources and live in remote zones of difficult access. Centres of specialized attention are located only in the capital and in two cities in the north of the country. Therefore for each treatment session, transportation, accommodation and nourishment must be provided for the victim and a companion which results in the high maintenance cost of this program. The State has only one center for the production of prosthesis which covers only 10 percent of the demand at the national level based on United Nations statistics on Nicaragua which reflects that more than 500,000 persons suffer some kind of disability. Private centers provide prosthetics and orthotics services but at a higher cost.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: In 2002 a program on socio economic reintegration program was initiated through which 106 landmine survivors or unexploded ordnance victims have been trained, with the result being a coverage of 10 percent of the victims eligible for training. Since 1995 the victim assistance program has attended to 90 percent of the officially registered victims (approximately 690 persons), which have been provided specialized medical and psychological treatment, prosthetics and / or orthotics services, physical rehabilitation, as well as the possibility to be included in a program of socio economic reintegration. The National Commission on Demining (CND) plans to maintain the current Integral Attention Program to Landmine Survivor Program (PAICMA) at least until 2010, when the State may have had the opportunity to develop its own programs and physical capacities of the national centers for health and rehabilitation attention.</p> |
| Peru | <p>Problems faced: The National Commission for Action Against Mines continues to develop a comprehensive registry of landmine victims. While this effort continues, it relies on information available from the ICRC. According to the ICRC, between 1992 and 2003, there have been 238 new mine victims. Most of the mine victims are poor people in rural areas. To be able to develop an adequate policy for survivors, it is necessary to find out who the victims are.</p> <p>Plans and progress and priorities: All public health establishments in the country are able to give emergency aid. The state hospitals are able to provide trauma care and can give attention to patients affected by mines. Health insurance exists, but does not include rehabilitation. The National Rehabilitation Institute offers a program for physical and psychological care, and training. The services are not free. The institute is situated in Lima, meaning that the access is difficult for people in the rural areas. The CEFODI Centre trains persons with disability in diverse trades. Peru has received support from the Red Cross to set up a pilot vocational training programme. National victim assistance policies are contained within general policies on disabled persons. The legal basis for this policy is in the General Law for Disabled Persons, which guarantees the rights of disabled persons to health and welfare services, access to public housing and equal opportunities for employment. The Government of Peru is promoting the “Plan of Equal Opportunities” in which the state assumes commitments to reduce poverty and promote equal opportunities, as well as prioritizing assistance to vulnerable</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| | groups and those in extreme poverty. There is a need to strengthen reintegration activities. |
| Senegal | <p>Problems faced: Handicap International (HI) reports every year on the number of victims, with 643 survivors registered since 1996.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: Victim assistance is conducted through: individual assistance, socio-economic reintegration and follow-up of victims individually. The hospitals have limited resources, but were recently offered new equipment. Orthopaedic centres exist in the most affected regions. The government sends specialists to these hospitals. There has been success in the reintegration of the survivors. Training courses have been conducted for different vocations. In 2002, kits of medical equipment were distributed to disabled people, including survivors. HI has conducted micro finance projects. Vocational training of disabled people is in place. A vast programme of reconstruction of socio-economic structures is being implemented. The World Bank is carrying out an overall survey with respect to demining and economic rehabilitation of the region. There are plans for setting up demining centre, putting in place an income generating mechanism. The mine victims have constituted associations, joining with organisations that work in the area of rehabilitation.</p> |
| Serbia and Montenegro | <p>Problems faced: The greatest numbers of victims are among persons more recently displaced from Kosovo and Metohija, and refugees from earlier hostilities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. No organised response to injuries was in place at the outbreak of hostilities, and injuries were dealt with as best as possible within the existing civilian health care system. Consequently, consolidating data remains a great challenge. It is estimated that between 1992 and 2000 there were 1,500 new mine victims, with approximately 1,450 surviving. In the field of psychological and social support, no comprehensive database has been compiled. There is no targeted education of health professionals concerning post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) among landmine victims. The international community is expected to help implement mine victims assistance projects, plans and programmes by working with donors and professional organizations and associations on providing material, technical and educational support to the achievement of these humane goals.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: On 11 August 2004, the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Montenegro established a Commission for Anti-Personnel Mine Victims Rehabilitation, consisting of eight prominent experts from the field of physical therapy, rehabilitation and psycho-social reintegration, the work of which is coordinated by an expert designated by the Ministry. The Commission also includes representatives of other Ministries of the Republic of Montenegro, representatives of union-level Ministries and experts from the Republic of Serbia, dealing with the same problems. The main objectives of the Commission's work plan is: assistance to mine victims (establishment of databases, social care and medical and material assistance, international cooperation and realization of donors' assistance projects in equipment and other material supplies needs by victims); assistance to medical institutions and personnel providing therapy and rehabilitation to mine victims (coordination of medical personnel education programmes, procurement of equipment and orthopaedic aids, improvement of technical and material conditions for the treatment of, and work with, mine</p> |

| | |
|-------|---|
| | <p>victims); creation of material conditions for economic reintegration of mine through cooperation with domestic and international economic institutions in the implementation of programmes of work training and employment; raising the level of social awareness of the problems of APMs and the need to provide assistance to victims (media publicity and education). A Council of Health Workers will be established in the Republic of Serbia to implement physical rehabilitation and social reintegration programmes. To coordinate the activities, the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Serbia has designated its representative, who presented a detailed update to the State Parties in June 2004. The main objectives to be achieved by the project, subject to the receipt of international assistance, include: elaborating a programme for the establishment of a central mine victim database, aimed at providing concrete assistance to individual mine victims; and establishment of a continuous process of work with mine victims from physical therapy and rehabilitation over psychological recovery to full personal social reintegration. A phased programme of activities has been devised, which includes: establishing regional centres in Serbia and Montenegro to organize full-scale activities of medical and psycho-social rehabilitation; establishing a mine victims database on the regional principle to provide data for a central register (numerical, classification, including description of mine victims' needs); establishing mobile expert teams to tour institutions and visit parent, educate and organize therapy and report on priority needs; training regional expert teams and local personnel; and, elaborating re-training and gainful employment programmes for mine victims (with international assistance and cooperation with economic entities). Since the establishment of the institutions and the launch of activities, the first concrete results have been achieved in the area of: elaboration of part of the database for mine victims in Montenegro (260 persons registered and processed so far), initially treated, rehabilitated or reported in the territory of Montenegro; and conceptualization of a seminar to be held in Serbia on the "Development of an Assistance Programme for Mine Victims within the Mechanisms of the Ottawa Convention", to take place in Belgrade by the end of 2004, targeting medical and other professional working with mine victims from regional health and social care centres in Serbia and Montenegro.</p> |
| Sudan | <p>Problems faced: The mine / UXO problem has yet to be ascertained but it is estimated that there are 10,000 victims in Sudan, with 1,090 victims registered at the National Mine Action Office (NMAO). Fifty (50) percent of registered victims are male and one out of four is a child. Approximately 70 percent of registered victims survived. Approximately 29 percent who did not die while on the way to the health facilities or upon arrival at them. In Kassala, 84 percent of the registered victims were transported more than 50 km to reach the nearest health facility and 14 percent were carried on foot. Survivors are vulnerable and one of the most neglected groups. Health services are inadequately equipped to deal with injuries. The Preliminary Health Care Units / Centres are unable to deal with internal injuries caused by fragmentation.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: The Ministry of Welfare and Social Development is the focal point for persons with disabilities. A National Orthopaedic Centre in Khartoum, and satellite centres in six states, is managed by</p> |

| | |
|------------|--|
| | <p>the National Authority for Prostheses and Orthopaedics, supported by the Government of Sudan and the ICRC. The Sudan Landmine Information and Response Initiative (SLIRI) has been implementing needs assessment surveys. SLIRI data is currently sensitive because most of the victims are combatants and were injured during conflict. The WHO has training programmes in first aid. The majority of Sudanese Red Crescent volunteers are well-trained in first aid, however, hospitals are not sufficiently prepared or equipped. There are plans for a prosthetics centre in Rumbek (South Sudan), with smaller operations in other counties of Bahr el Ghazal. ABRAR has peer to peer programs for mine victims, and has organised two camps with athletic and psychological programmes. The National Vocational Training Institute in Khartoum has the capacity to train 40 to 200 people in a variety of skills. Ten landmine victims have graduated in computer maintenance from the Elamam Elmahadi University. The University of Sudan agreed to provide five mine victims per year access to free courses. Legislation obliges organisations to reserve five percent of their occupational positions for persons with disabilities.</p> <p>Priorities for assistance include: victim assistance capacity development to effectively implement and coordinate victim assistance throughout Sudan; support for a country-wide survey to determine the actual extent of mine / UXO victims' problems and needs; the development of psycho-social counselling services; the strengthening of decentralised Preliminary Health Care Units / Centres to deal with trauma injuries; support for and expanded physical rehabilitation centres; and, support for socio-economic reintegration programmes linked to peace-building, poverty reduction and repatriation of displaced persons.</p> |
| Tajikistan | <p>Problems faced: During the last five to six years over 100 people have been injured by landmines.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: An agreement between the Ministry of Labour and Social Security, National Red Crescent Society and ICRC has been signed for a prosthetic plant and rehabilitation centre. A boarding school for disabled persons offers professional rehabilitation. Pensions for disabled persons including mine victims is part of a law on the provision of pensions. In addition the rights of disabled persons are protected by the law on social security.</p> |
| Thailand | <p>Plans and progress: The Thai Government has an initiative to develop national programmes on victim assistance, particularly regarding physical rehabilitation and economic reintegration in mine affected areas along the Thai-Cambodia border. Victim assistance has been integrated into the work of the various government departments. The Ministry of Public Health is responsible for providing emergency medical care, the Ministry of the Interior for rehabilitation activities, Ministry of Labour for vocational training and job opportunities, and the Ministry of Education for providing proper education.</p> |
| Uganda | <p>Problems faced: Some parts of northern and eastern Uganda suffer from insecurity caused by the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA). This armed conflict has created increased congestion in internally displaced persons camps and unsafe road network in the northern Uganda. Consequently, social, relief, development, and health services have been severely disrupted. There are not enough ambulances. Victims are mostly transported by military vehicles. Hospitals exist, but are long distances from affected areas and have been devastated by the armed</p> |

| | |
|-------|--|
| | <p>conflict. Between July 1998 and May 2003 there were 1,183 amputees identified. Out of these 385 (27.3 percent) were due to landmines and 629 were fitted with prosthesis, with 221 (35 percent) being landmine victims. The most affected group is men between 18-40 years old. The demands of other pressing problems (e.g., HIV / AIDS) further complicates the ability to meet the needs of mine victims.</p> <p>Plans, progress and priorities: Uganda has carried out victim support programmes which involve community-based psychological and social support, sustainable livelihood opportunities, improved access to sanitation, facilities, and strengthening of local health care services. A spin-off effect of a mine awareness campaign has been a much higher degree of reporting of mine incidents. Latrines in schools have been designed to accommodate persons with disabilities. The Ministry of Health is currently leading and guiding the co-ordination of relevant activities. Priorities include placing surgeons in the hospitals in Acholi, physiotherapy / prosthetics services.</p> |
| Yemen | <p>Plans and progress: Yemen is continuing its victim assistance programme with a second survey under way. Yemen Mine Association Disabilities (YMAD), which is run by survivors, is in the process of reintegrating 100 survivors (20 women, 80 men). The goal is to open a file for each victim, thereafter to transfer the victims to specialists around Yemen and finally to provide equipment for the victims. There is need for some victims to undergo further surgery. The most difficult cases are sent to Italy for medical help.</p> |

Annex VII
Reports submitted in accordance with Article 7

| State Party | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Afghanistan | | | | | Y | Y |
| Albania | | | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Algeria | | | | N | Y | Y |
| Andorra | N | Y | N | N | N | N |
| Angola | | | | | N | Y |
| Antigua and Barbuda | | Y | N | N | N | N |
| Argentina | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Australia | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Austria | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Bahamas | N | N | N | Y | N | Y |
| Bangladesh | | | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Barbados | N | N | N | N | Y | N |
| Belarus | | | | | | Y |
| Belgium | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Belize | Y | N | N | N | N | Y |
| Benin | Y | Y | N | Y | N | Y |
| Bolivia | Y | N | N | N | N | N |
| Bosnia Herzegovina | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Botswana | | | Y | N | N | N |
| Brazil | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Bulgaria | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Burkina Faso | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Burundi | | | | | | Y |
| Cambodia | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Cameroon ¹ | | | | | N | N |
| Canada | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Cape Verde | | | | N | N | N |
| CAR | | | | | N | Y |
| Chad | | N | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Chile | | | | Y | Y | Y |
| Colombia | | | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Comoros | | | | | Y | Y |
| Congo (Brazzaville) | | | | Y | N | Y |
| Costa Rica | | N | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Cote d'Ivoire | | | N | N | N | Y |
| Croatia | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Cyprus | | | | | N | Y |
| Czech Republic | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| DRC | | | | | Y | Y |
| Denmark | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Djibouti | N | N | N | N | Y | Y |
| Dominica | | N | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Dominican Republic | | | Y | Y | Y | N |

¹ On 14 March 2001, prior to ratifying the Convention, Cameroon submitted a voluntary Article 7 report.

| State Party | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Ecuador | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| El Salvador | N | N | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Equatorial Guinea | N | N | N | N | N | N |
| Eritrea | | | | N | Y | N |
| Estonia | | | | | | |
| Fiji | Y | N | N | Y | N | N |
| France | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Gabon | | | N | Y | N | N |
| Gambia ² | | | | | N | N |
| Germany | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Ghana | | | N | Y | N | N |
| Greece | | | | | | Y |
| Grenada | N | N | Y | N | N | Y |
| Guatemala | | N | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Guinea | N | N | N | N | N | Y |
| Guinea-Bissau | | | | Y | Y | Y |
| Guyana | | | | | | N |
| Holy See | Y | N | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Honduras | Y | N | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Hungary | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Iceland | | N | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Ireland | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Italy | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Jamaica | N | Y | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Japan | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Jordan | Y | Y | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Kenya | | | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Kiribati | | | Y | N | N | Y |
| Lesotho | N | Y | N | N | Y | N |
| Liberia | | N | N | N | N | Y |
| Liechtenstein | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Lithuania ³ | | | | | | Y |
| Luxembourg | | N | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Macedonia, FYR of | | N | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Madagascar | | N | Y | N | N | N |
| Malawi | N | N | N | N | Y | Y |
| Malaysia | | Y | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Maldives | | | N | Y | N | N |
| Mali | N | N | Y | N | Y | Y |
| Malta | | | | Y | Y | Y |
| Mauritania | | | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Mauritius | N | N | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Mexico | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Moldova | | | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Monaco | N | N | Y | Y | Y | Y |

² On 28 August 2002, prior to ratifying the Convention, Gambia submitted a voluntary Article 7 report.

³ On 2 July 2002, prior to ratifying the Convention, Lithuania submitted a voluntary Article 7 report.

| State Party | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Mozambique | N | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Namibia | N | N | N | N | N | Y |
| Nauru | | | N | N | N | Y |
| Netherlands | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| New Zealand | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Nicaragua | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Niger | | N | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Nigeria | | | | N | N | Y |
| Niue | Y | N | N | Y | N | N |
| Norway | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Panama | N | N | N | Y | Y | N |
| Papua New Guinea | | | | | | |
| Paraguay | N | N | Y | Y | N | N |
| Peru | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Philippines ⁴ | | | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Portugal | | Y | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Qatar | N | N | N | N | Y | Y |
| Romania | | | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Rwanda | | | Y | N | Y | Y |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis | Y | N | N | N | N | N |
| Saint Lucia | | N | N | N | N | N |
| St Vinc. & Grenadines | | | | N | N | Y |
| Samoa | N | N | N | Y | N | N |
| San Marino | N | N | Y | Y | N | Y |
| Sao Tome & Principe | | | | | | N |
| Senegal | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Serbia & Montenegro | | | | | | Y |
| Seychelles | | | N | N | Y | N |
| Sierra Leone | | | | N | N | Y |
| Slovakia ⁵ | | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Slovenia ⁶ | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Solomon Islands | N | N | N | N | N | Y |
| South Africa | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Spain ⁷ | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Sudan | | | | | | Y |
| Suriname | | | | | Y | Y |
| Swaziland | N | Y | N | N | N | N |
| Sweden | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Switzerland | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Tajikistan | | N | N | N | Y | Y |
| Tanzania | | | N | N | Y | Y |
| Thailand | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |

⁴ Philippines submitted its initial Article 7 report on 12 September 2000, before it was due.

⁵ Slovakia submitted its initial Article 7 report on 9 December 1999, before it was due.

⁶ While Slovenia did not submit an Article 7 report in 2000, it submitted 2 reports in 2001, one of which covers the period from October 1999 to 30 April 2001.

⁷ While Spain did not submit an Article 7 report in 2000, the report it submitted in 2001 covered calendar year 2000.

| State Party | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Timor-Leste | | | | | | Y |
| Togo | | | N | N | Y | Y |
| Trinidad and Tobago | N | N | N | Y | N | Y |
| Tunisia | | Y | N | Y | Y | Y |
| Turkey | | | | | | Y |
| Turkmenistan | N | N | Y | N | N | Y |
| Uganda | | N | N | Y | Y | Y |
| United Kingdom | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Uruguay | | | | Y | N | Y |
| Venezuela | | N | N | Y | Y | N |
| Yemen | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| Zambia ⁸ | | | | N | N | Y |
| Zimbabwe ⁹ | N | Y | Y | N | Y | N |

⁸ Zambia submitted its initial report on 31 August 2001, before it was due.

⁹ While Zimbabwe did not submit an Article 7 report in 2004, it submitted 2 reports in 2003, one of which covers calendar year 2003.

Annex VIII
**Antipersonnel mine reported retained by the States Parties for reasons permitted under
Article 3 of the Convention**

Table 1: Antipersonnel mines reported retained in accordance with Article 3

| State | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Afghanistan ¹ | | | | | | |
| Albania | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Algeria | | | | | 15030 | |
| Andorra | | 0 | | | | |
| Angola | | | | | | 1390 |
| Antigua and Barbuda | | 0 | | | | |
| Argentina ² | | 3049 | 13025 | 2160 | 1000 | 1772 |
| Australia | ~10000 | ~10000 | 7845 | 7726 | 7513 | 7465 |
| Austria | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bahamas | | | | 0 | | 0 |
| Bangladesh | | | | 15000 | 15000 | 15000 |
| Barbados | | | | | 0 | |
| Belarus | | | | | | 7530 |
| Belgium | 5980 | 5816 | 5433 | 5099 | 4806 | 4443 |
| Belize | 0 | | | | | 0 |
| Benin | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 |
| Bolivia | 0 | | | | | |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina ³ | | 2165 | 2405 | 2405 | 2525 | 2652 |
| Botswana ⁴ | | | | | | |
| Brazil ⁵ | | 17000 | 16550 | 16545 | 16545 | 16545 |
| Bulgaria | 10446 | 4000 | 4000 | 3963 | 3963 | 3688 |
| Burkina Faso ⁶ | | 0 | | | | |
| Burundi ⁷ | | | | | | |
| Cambodia | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cameroon ⁸ | | | 500 | | | |
| Canada | 1781 | 1668 | 1712 | 1683 | 1935 | 1928 |
| Cape Verde | | | | | | |
| Central African Republic | | | | | | 0 |
| Chad ⁹ | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |

¹ In its reports submitted in 2003 and 2004, Afghanistan indicated that a decision on the number of mines to retained was pending. In its Article 7 report submitted in 2004, Afghanistan indicated that it currently retains 370 inert mines.

² In its report submitted in 2000, Argentina indicated that an additional number of mines to be retained by the Army was under consideration at that time. In its report submitted in 2002, Argentina indicated that 1160 mines were retained to be used as fuses for antitank mines FMK-5 and that 1000 will be consumed during training activities until 1 April 2010. Additionally, in Form F, Argentina indicated that 12025 mines would be emptied of their explosive content in order to have inert mines for training.

³ In its reports submitted in 2001 and 2002, Bosnia and Herzegovina indicated that 222 of the mines reported under Article 3 were fuse-less. In 2003, it indicated that 293 of the mines reported under Article 3 were fuse-less and in 2004, it indicated that 439 if the mines reported under Article 3 were fuse-less.

⁴ In its report submitted in 2001, Botswana indicated that a "small quantity" of mines would be retained.

⁵ In its report submitted in 2001, Brazil indicated that all mines retained would be destroyed in training activities during a period of 10 years after the entry into force of the Convention for Brazil, that is by October 2009.

⁶ In its reports submitted in 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004 Burkina Faso indicated that "nothing yet" was retained.

⁷ In its report submitted in 2004, Burundi indicated that the decision concerning mines retained is pending.

⁸ In a report submitted prior to ratifying the Convention in 2001, Cameroon reported the same 500 mines under Article 4 and Article 3.

| State | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|
| Chile | | | | 28647 | 6245 | 6245 |
| Colombia | | | | 0 | 986 | 986 |
| Comoros | | | | | 0 | 0 |
| Congo | | | | 372 | | 372 |
| Costa Rica | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Cote d'Ivoire | | | | | | 0 |
| Croatia | 17500 | | 7000 | 7000 | 6546 | 6478 |
| Cyprus | | | | | | 1000 |
| Czech Republic | | 4859 | 4859 | 4849 | 4849 | 4849 |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo ¹⁰ | | | | | | |
| Denmark | 4991 | 4934 | 2106 | 2091 | 2058 | 2058 |
| Djibouti | | | | | 2996 | 2996 |
| Dominica | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dominican Republic | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Ecuador | | 16000 | 16000 | 4000 | 3970 | 3970 |
| El Salvador | | | 0 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Equatorial Guinea | | | | | | |
| Eritrea | | | | | 222 | |
| Estonia | | | | | | |
| Fiji | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| France | 4361 | 4539 | 4476 | 4479 | 4462 | 4466 |
| Gabon | | | | 0 | | |
| Gambia | | | | 0 | | |
| Germany | 3006 | 2983 | 2753 | 2574 | 2555 | 2537 |
| Ghana | | | | 0 | | |
| Greece | | | | | | 7224 |
| Grenada | | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Guatemala | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Guinea | | | | | | 0 |
| Guinea Bissau ¹¹ | | | | 0 | 0 | |
| Guyana | | | | | | |
| Holy See | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Honduras | 1050 | | 826 | | | 826 |
| Hungary | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 1500 |
| Iceland | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ireland | 130 | 129 | 127 | 125 | 116 | 103 |
| Italy | | 8000 | 8000 | 7992 | 803 | 803 |
| Jamaica | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Japan | 15000 | 13852 | 12513 | 11223 | 9613 | 8359 |
| Jordan | 1000 | 1000 | | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 |
| Kenya | | | 3000 | 3000 | | 3000 |
| Kiribati | | | 0 | | | 0 |
| Lesotho | | 0 | | | 0 | |

⁹ In its report submitted in 2002, Chad reported that the quantity of mines retained for training purposes would be indicated in the next report.

¹⁰ In its reports submitted in 2003 and 2004, the Democratic Republic of the Congo indicated that the decision concerning mines retained is pending.

¹¹ In its report submitted in 2004, Guinea-Bissau indicated that it would retain a very limited number of AP mines.

| State | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--------------------------|------|-------|-------|------|------|------|
| Liberia | | | | | | 0 |
| Liechtenstein | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lithuania ¹² | | | | 8091 | | 3987 |
| Luxembourg | | | 998 | 998 | 988 | 976 |
| Macedonia, FYR of | 50 | | | 0 | 4000 | 4000 |
| Madagascar | | | 0 | | | |
| Malawi ¹³ | | | | | 21 | 21 |
| Malaysia ¹⁴ | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maldives | | | | 0 | | |
| Mali | | | 3000 | | 900 | 900 |
| Malta | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mauritania ¹⁵ | | | 5728 | 5728 | 843 | 728 |
| Mauritius ¹⁶ | | | | 93 | 93 | 0 |
| Mexico | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 |
| Moldova, Republic of | | | | 849 | | 736 |
| Monaco | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mozambique | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1427 | 1470 |
| Namibia | | | | | | 9999 |
| Nauru | | | | | | 0 |
| Netherlands | | 4076 | 3532 | 4280 | 3866 | 3553 |
| New Zealand | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nicaragua | 1971 | | 1971 | 1971 | 1971 | 1810 |
| Niger ¹⁷ | | | | 0 | 146 | 0 |
| Nigeria | | | | | | 3364 |
| Niue | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| Norway | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Panama | | | | 0 | 0 | |
| Papua New Guinea | | | | | | |
| Paraguay | | | 0 | | | |
| Peru | | 9526 | 5578 | 4024 | 4024 | 4024 |
| Philippines | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Portugal ¹⁸ | | ~3523 | ~3523 | 1115 | | 1115 |
| Qatar | | | | | 0 | 0 |
| Romania | | | | 4000 | 4000 | 2500 |
| Rwanda ¹⁹ | | | 0 | | 101 | 101 |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis | 0 | | | | | |
| Saint Lucia | | | | | | |

¹² In its report submitted in 2004, Lithuania indicated that fuses of MON-100 and OZM-72 mines had been changed to remotely controlled and that they no longer fall under the Convention's definition of APMs. These mines will not appear in next year's exchange of information.

¹³ In its reports submitted in 2003 and 2004, Malawi indicated that mines declared under Article 3 were dummy mines.

¹⁴ In its report submitted in 2004, Malaysia indicated that, for the purpose of training, the Malaysian Armed Forces is using practice antipersonnel mines.

¹⁵ In its reports submitted in 2001 and 2002, the mines reported by Mauritania under Article 3 were also reported under Article 4.

¹⁶ In its reports submitted in 2002 and 2003, the mines reported by Mauritius under Article 3 were also reported under Article 4.

¹⁷ In its report submitted in 2003, the mines reported by Niger under Article 3 were also reported under Article 4.

¹⁸ In its report submitted in 2000, Portugal indicated that only 3000 of the retained mines were active, the rest was inert.

¹⁹ In its report submitted in 2003, Rwanda indicated that the 101 mines declared under Article 3 had been uprooted from minefields to be retained for training purposes.

| State | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | | | | | | 0 |
| Samoa | | | | 0 | | |
| San Marino | | | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Sao Tome and Principe | | | | | | |
| Senegal | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Serbia and Montenegro | | | | | | 5000 |
| Seychelles | | | | | 0 | |
| Sierra Leone | | | | | | 0 |
| Slovakia | 7000 | | 1500 | 1500 | 1486 | 1481 |
| Slovenia | 7000 | | 7000 | 3000 | 3000 | 2999 |
| Solomon Islands | | | | | | 0 |
| South Africa ²⁰ | 11247 | 11247 | 4505 | 4455 | 4400 | 4414 |
| Spain ²¹ | 10000 | | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 3815 |
| Sudan | | | | | | 5000 |
| Suriname ²² | | | | | 296 | 296 |
| Swaziland | | 0 | | | | |
| Sweden ²³ | 0 | 0 | 11120 | 13948 | 16015 | 15706 |
| Switzerland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tajikistan | | | | | 255 | 255 |
| Tanzania, United Republic of | | | | | 1146 | 1146 |
| Thailand ²⁴ | 15604 | 15604 | 5000 | 4970 | 4970 | 4970 |
| Timor-Leste | | | | | | 0 |
| Togo | | | | | 436 | 436 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | | | | 0 | | |
| Tunisia | | 5000 | | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 |
| Turkey | | | | | | 16000 |
| Turkmenistan ²⁵ | | | | | 69200 | |
| Uganda | | | | 2400 | | |
| United Kingdom ²⁶ | 4437 | 4519 | 4919 | 4949 | 4899 | 1930 |

²⁰ In its report submitted in 1999, South Africa indicated that 10992 of the 11247 mines declared under Article 3 were empty casings retained for training of members of the SNDF.

²¹ While Spain did not submit an Article 7 report in 2000, the report it submitted in 2001 covered calendar year 2000.

²² In its report submitted in 2004, although Suriname reports these 296 mines as retained under Article 3, it mentions that from 1995 there were no mines retained for training in mine detection or clearance.

²³ In its report submitted in 2001, Sweden indicated that 11120 mines declared under Article 3 were complete mines or mines without fuses. In its report submitted in 2002, it indicated that 2840 of the declared mines were without fuses and could be connected to fuses kept for dummies. In its report submitted in 2003, it indicated that 2782 mines were without fuses and could be connected to fuses kept for dummies. In its report submitted in 2004, it indicated that 2840 mines were without fuses and could be connected to fuses kept for dummies.

²⁴ In its report submitted in 1999, Thailand indicated that the 15604 retained mines included 6117 Claymore mines.

²⁵ In its report submitted in 2004, Turkmenistan indicated that it started the process of destruction of 60000 antipersonnel mines in February 2004. Later the same year it indicated that the remaining 9200 mines would be destroyed during the year.

²⁶ In its report submitted in 1999, the United Kingdom reported 2088 mines with a shelf life expiring on 1 August 2002, 1056 mines with a shelf life expiring on 1 August 2010, 434 inert training shapes and 859 mines of foreign manufacture. In its report submitted in 2000, it reported 2088 mines with a shelf life expiring on 1 August 2002, 1056 mines with a shelf life expiring on 1 August 2010, the inert shapes have been taken off the total since they don't fall under the Convention's definition of a mine and 1375 mines of foreign manufacture. In its report submitted in 2001, it reported 2088 mines with a shelf life expiring on 1 August 2002, 1056 mines with a shelf life expiring on 1 August 2010 and 1775 mines of foreign manufacture. In its report submitted in 2002, it reported 2088 mines with a shelf life expiring on 1 August 2002, 1056 mines with a shelf life expiring on 1 August 2010 and 1805 mines of foreign manufacture. In its report submitted in 2003, it reported 2088 mines with a shelf life expiring on 1 August 2002, (the UK is currently working towards their destruction), 1028 mines with a shelf life expiring on 1 August 2010 and 1783 mines of foreign manufacture.

| State | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Uruguay | | | | 500 | | 500 |
| Venezuela | | | | 2214 | 5000 | |
| Yemen | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 |
| Zambia | | | 6691 | | | 3346 |
| Zimbabwe | | 946 | 700 | | 700 | |

Key:

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Number of mines reported retained in a particular year: | Numeric value |
| No report was submitted as required or a report was submitted but no number was entered in the relevant reporting form: | |
| No report was required: | |

Table 2: Antipersonnel mines reported transferred in accordance with Article 3¹

| State | Reporting year | AP Mines transferred | Additional information |
|----------------|----------------|----------------------|--|
| Afghanistan | 2004 | 370 | Transferred from MoD ammunition depots to UNMACA and MAPA implementing partners |
| Belgium | 1999 | 11 | Inert mines |
| | 2000 | 11 | Inert mines |
| Cambodia | 2000 | 1454 | Transferred for training from 1993 to 2000 |
| | 2001 | 1454 | Transferred for training from 1993 to 2000 |
| | 2002 | 1877 | Amongst newly discovered mines, another 423 mines were transferred for training. Total number of mines transferred for training since 1993 is 1877 |
| | 2003 | 2117 | 240 mines transferred for training in 2002 |
| | 2004 | 2483 | 366 mines transferred for training in 2003 |
| Canada | 2000 | 67 | Transferred from Georgia |
| | 2001 | 4 | Transferred from the UN Mine Action Coordination Centre in Kosovo |
| | 2002 | 180 | (154 remaining) transferred from the USA |
| | | 110 | Transferred from the Former Yugoslavia |
| Denmark | 1999 | 92 | Transferred to Engineer Regiment Denmark |
| | 2000 | 57 | Transferred to Engineer Regiment Denmark |
| | 2001 | 92 | Transferred from Denmark to Sweden on 12/10/99 |
| | | 189 | Transferred from Denmark to Sweden on 12/10/99 |
| | | 864 | Transferred from Denmark to the Netherlands on 08/12/99 |
| | 2003 | 33 | Transferred for demonstration in Denmark |
| | 2004 | 30 | Used for demonstration and training purposes |
| Ecuador | 2002 | 1644 | 4 of which were transferred to the US Navy |
| | 2003 | 1664 | 4 of which were transferred to the US Navy |
| Italy | 2003 | 8 | No transfer outside of Italian territory |
| | 2004 | 8 | No transfer outside of Italian territory |
| Netherlands | 2001 | 864 | Transferred from Denmark on 8 December 1999 |
| Nicaragua | 1999 | 286 | Transferred by the Nicaraguan Army to the OAS/Inter-American Defence Board Demining Assistance Programme |
| | 2001 | 286 | Transferred by the Nicaraguan Army to MARMINCA |
| | 2002 | 286 | Transferred by the Nicaraguan Army to MARMINCA |
| | 2003 | 124 | Transferred by the Army to UTC for mine detecting dogs |
| | 2004 | 124 | Transferred by the Army to UTC for mine detecting dogs |
| Romania | 2004 | 3265 | Transferred from the Romanian MoD to the Department of the US Navy |
| South Africa | 1999 | 4830 | 5000 mines were transferred to MECHEM by the SANDF and retained for research and training purposes by MECHEM on Inventory 100732 dated 10 October 1997. 170 mines were used for demonstration and training purposes. 4830 mines remain |
| | 2000 | 4830 | Same information as reported previously |
| United Kingdom | 2000 | 516 | Various non-UK type mines |
| | 2001 | 490 | Mines of foreign manufacture |
| | 2002 | 30 | Mines of foreign manufacture transferred to the UK |
| Yemen | 1999 | 4000 | Transferred from military central storage facilities in Sana'a and Aden to Military Engineering Department Training facility in Sana'a |
| | 2000 | 4000 | Same information as reported previously |
| | 2001 | 4000 | Same information as reported previously |

¹ This table includes only those States Parties that reported mines transferred in accordance with Article 3.

| State | Reporting year | AP Mines transferred | Additional information |
|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| | 2002 | 4000 | Same information as reported previously |
| | 2003 | 4000 | Same information as reported previously |
| | 2004 | 4000 | Same information as reported previously |

Annex IX
Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs of the Standing Committees¹: 1999-2004

| | General Status and Operation of the Convention | Stockpile Destruction | Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration² | Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies³ | Technologies for Mine Action⁴ |
|--------------------|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1999 - 2000 | Co-Chairs: - Canada & South Africa Co-Rapporteurs: - Belgium & Zimbabwe | Co-Chairs: - Hungary & Mali Co-Rapporteurs: - Malaysia & Slovakia | Co-Chairs: - Mexico & Switzerland Co-Rapporteurs: - Japan & Nicaragua | Co-Chairs: - Mozambique & UK Co-Rapporteurs: - the Netherlands & Peru | Co-Chairs: - Cambodia & France Co-Rapporteurs: - Germany & Yemen |
| 2000 - 2001 | Co-Chairs: - Belgium & Zimbabwe Co-Rapporteurs: - Norway & Thailand | Co-Chairs: - Malaysia & Slovakia Co-Rapporteurs: - Australia & Croatia | Co-Chairs: - Japan & Nicaragua Co-Rapporteurs: - Canada & Honduras | Co-Chairs: - the Netherlands & Peru Co-Rapporteurs: - Germany & Yemen | |
| 2001 - 2002 | Co-Chairs: - Norway & Thailand Co-Rapporteurs: - Austria & Peru | Co-Chairs: - Australia & Croatia Co-Rapporteurs: - Romania and Switzerland | Co-Chairs: - Canada & Honduras Co-Rapporteurs: - Colombia & France | Co-Chairs: - Germany & Yemen Co-Rapporteurs: - Belgium & Kenya | |
| 2002 - 2003 | Co-Chairs: - Austria & Peru Co-Rapporteurs: - Mexico & the Netherlands | Co-Chairs: - Romania and Switzerland Co-Rapporteurs: - Guatemala & Italy | Co-Chairs: - Colombia & France Co-Rapporteurs: - Australia & Croatia | Co-Chairs: - Belgium & Kenya Co-Rapporteurs: - Cambodia & Japan | |
| 2003 - 2004 | Co-Chairs: - Mexico & the Netherlands Co-Rapporteurs: - New Zealand & South Africa | Co-Chairs: - Guatemala & Italy Co-Rapporteurs: - Bangladesh & Canada | Co-Chairs: - Australia & Croatia Co-Rapporteurs: - Nicaragua & Norway | Co-Chairs: - Cambodia & Japan Co-Rapporteurs: - Algeria and Sweden | |

¹ Until the end of the 1999-2000 Intersessional Work Programme, the Standing Committees were called "Standing Committees of Experts."

² Until the end of the 2000-2001 Intersessional Work Programme, this Standing Committee was called the "Standing Committee on Victim Assistance, Socio-Economic Reintegration and Mine Awareness".

³ Until the end of the 1999-2000 Intersessional Work Programme, this Standing Committee was called "the Standing Committee of Experts on Mine Clearance" when it was merged with the "Standing Committee of Experts on Mine Action Technologies" to become the "Standing Committee on Mine Clearance and Related Technologies." Following the end of the 2000-2001 Intersessional Work Programme, it became the "Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Awareness and Mine Action Technologies", with the name again changing following the 2001-2002 Intersessional Work Programme to become the "Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies".

⁴ At the Second Meeting of the States Parties, the decision was taken to merge "the Standing Committee of Experts on Mine Clearance" and the "Standing Committee of Experts on Mine Action Technologies" into the "Standing Committee on Mine Clearance and Related Technologies."

PART III

ENDING THE SUFFERING CAUSED BY ANTI-PERSONNEL MINES: NAIROBI ACTION PLAN 2005-2009

Introduction:

1. Having reaffirmed their unqualified commitment to the full and effective promotion and implementation of the Convention, the States Parties are determined, in full cooperation with all concerned partners:

- (i) to secure the achievements to date;**
- (ii) to sustain and strengthen the effectiveness of their cooperation under the Convention; and**
- (iii) to spare no effort to meet our challenges ahead in universalizing the Convention, destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines, clearing mined areas and assisting victims.**

To these ends they will over the next five years pursue a plan of action guided by the strategies set out below. In so doing, they intend to achieve major progress towards ending, for all people and for all time, the suffering caused by anti-personnel mines.

I. Universalizing the Convention

2. Committed by the Convention “to work strenuously towards the promotion of its universalization in all relevant fora,” the States Parties have made this a core task of their collective endeavours these past five years. In that short time, almost 75 per cent of the world’s States have joined, proving their commitment and capacity to fulfil national security responsibilities without anti-personnel mines, establishing a global framework for effective mine action assistance and cooperation, and demonstrating the significant benefits of joining this common effort. But the only guarantee that the significant disarmament and humanitarian advances to date will endure, and that a world free of anti-personnel mines will be ultimately realized, will lie in the achievement of universal adherence to the Convention and implementation of its comprehensive ban.

Consequently, for the period 2005 to 2009, universal adherence will remain an important object of cooperation among States Parties. To this end:

All States Parties will:

- Action #1:** Call on those States that have not yet done so, to accede to the Convention as soon as possible.
- Action #2:** Persistently encourage those signatories of the Convention that have not yet done so to ratify it as soon as possible.
- Action #3:** Attach priority to effectively addressing universalization challenges presented by States not parties, and in particular those that continue to use, produce, or possess large stockpiles of anti-personnel mines, or otherwise warrant special concern for humanitarian reasons, or by virtue of their military or political attention or other reason.
- Action #4:** Accord particular importance to promoting adherence in regions where the level of acceptance of the Convention remains low, strengthening universalization efforts in the Middle East and Asia, and amongst the members of the Commonwealth of Independent States, with States Parties within these regions playing a key role in such efforts.
- Action #5:** Seize every appropriate opportunity to promote adherence to the Convention in bilateral contacts, military-to-military dialogue, peace processes, national parliaments, and the media, including by encouraging States not parties to abide by its provisions pending their adherence to the Convention.
- Action #6:** Actively promote adherence to the Convention in all relevant multilateral fora, including the UN Security Council, UN General Assembly, assemblies of regional organizations and relevant disarmament bodies.
- Action #7:** Continue promoting universal observance of the Convention's norms, by condemning, and taking appropriate steps to end the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines by armed non-state actors.
- Action #8:** Encourage and support involvement and active cooperation in these universalization efforts by all relevant partners, including the United Nations and the UN Secretary General, other international institutions and regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) and other non-governmental organizations, parliamentarians and interested citizens.

II. Destroying Stockpiled Anti-personnel mines

3. Article 4 of the Convention requires all States Parties to destroy stockpiled anti-personnel mines as soon as possible, but not later than four years after assuming their Convention obligations. With more than 37 million mines destroyed and the destruction process completed for all whose deadline has passed, the Convention's record of compliance to date has been impressive. **The States Parties are resolved to sustain such progress in meeting the Convention's humanitarian aims and disarmament goal during the 2005-2009 period, ensuring the expeditious and timely destruction of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines under their or jurisdiction or control.** To this end:

The 16 State Parties yet to complete their destruction programmes will:

- Action #9:** Establish the type, quantity and, if possible, lot numbers of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines owned or possessed, and report this information as required by Article 7.
- Action #10:** Establish appropriate national and local capacities to meet their Article 4 obligations.
- Action #11:** Strive to complete their destruction programmes if possible in advance of their four-year deadlines.
- Action #12:** Make their problems, plans progress and priorities for assistance known in a timely manner to States Parties and relevant organisations and disclose their own contributions to their programmes in situations where financial, technical or other assistance is required to meet stockpile destruction obligations.

States Parties in a position to do so will:

- Action #13:** Act upon their obligations under Article 6 (5) to promptly assist States Parties with clearly demonstrated needs for external support for stockpile destruction, responding to priorities for assistance as articulated by those States Parties in need.
- Action #14:** Support the investigation and further development of technical solutions to overcome the particular challenges associated with **destroying PFM mines.**

All States Parties will:

- Action #15:** When **previously unknown stockpiles** are discovered after stockpile destruction deadlines have passed, report such discoveries in accordance with their obligations under Article 7, take advantage of other informal means to share such information and destroy these mines as a matter of urgent priority.

Action #16: Enhance or develop effective responses, including regional and sub regional responses, to meet requirements for technical, material and financial assistance for stockpile destruction and invite the cooperation of relevant regional and technical organizations in this regard.

III. Clearing Mined Areas

4. Article 5 of the Convention requires each State Party to ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control as soon as possible but not later than 10 years after the entry into force of the Convention for that State Party. 2004 is the midpoint between the Convention's entry into force and the first mine-clearance deadlines. **Successfully meeting these deadlines will be the most significant challenge to be addressed in the coming five years and will require intensive efforts by mine-affected States Parties and those in a position to assist them.** The speed and manner with which it is pursued will have crucial implications for human security - the safety and well-being of affected individuals and communities.

The States Parties will therefore:

Action #17: Intensify and accelerate efforts to ensure the most effective and most expeditious possible fulfilment of Article 5 (1) mine clearance obligations in the period 2005-2009.

The 49 States Parties that have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control, where they have not yet done so, will do their utmost to:

Action #18: Urgently identify all areas under their jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced, as required by Article 5 (2) and report this information as required by Article 7.

Action #19: Urgently develop and implement national plans, using a process that involves, where relevant, local actors and mine-affected communities, emphasizing the clearance of high and medium impact areas as a matter of priority, and ensuring that task selection, prioritisation and planning of mine clearance where relevant are undertaken in mine-affected communities.

Action #20: Significantly reduce risks to populations and hence reduce the number of new mine victims, hence leading us closer to the aim of zero new victims, including by prioritising clearance of areas with highest human impact, providing mine risk education and by increasing efforts to perimeter-mark, monitor and protect mined areas awaiting clearance in order to ensure the effective exclusion by civilians, as required by Article 5 (2).

Action #21: Ensure that mine risk education programmes are made available in all communities at risk to prevent mine incidents and save lives, promote mutual understanding and reconciliation, and improve mine action planning, integrating such programmes into education systems and broader relief and development activities, taking into consideration age, gender, social, economic, political and geographical factors, and ensuring consistency with relevant International Mine Action Standards, as well as national mine action standards.

Action #22: Make their problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance known to other States Parties, the United Nations, regional organizations, the ICRC and specialized non-governmental organisations, the Implementation Support Unit at the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) and other organizations, while specifying what resources they themselves have contributed to fulfil their Article 5 obligations.

States Parties in a position to do so will:

Action #23: Act upon their obligations under Article 6 (3) and 6 (4) to promptly assist States Parties with clearly demonstrated needs for external support for mine clearance and mine risk education, responding to the priorities for assistance as articulated by the mine-affected States Parties themselves and ensuring the continuity and sustainability of resource commitments.

All States Parties will:

Action #24: Ensure and increase the effectiveness and efficiency of their efforts in all of the above-mentioned areas, involving all relevant actors in mine action coordination, ensuring that coordination exists at the local level and involves mine clearance operators and affected communities, making the best possible use of and adapting to national circumstances information management tools, such as the Information Management System for Mine Action, and using the International Mine Action Standards as a frame of reference to establish national standards and operational procedures in order to be of benefit to national authorities in meeting their obligations under Article 5.

Action #25: Strengthen efforts to enable mine-affected States Parties to participate in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information concerning the implementation of the Convention, in accordance with Article 6 (2) and to further close the gap between end users of technology and those developing it.

Action #26: Share information on – and further develop and advance – mine clearance techniques, technologies and procedures, and, while work proceeds on developing new technologies, seek to ensure an adequate supply and most efficient use of existing technologies, particularly mechanical clearance assets and

biosensors, including mine detection dogs.

Action #27: Strive to ensure that few, if any, States Parties will feel compelled to request an **extension** in accordance with the procedure set out in Article 5, paragraphs 3-6 of the Convention.

Action #28: Monitor and actively promote the achievement of mine clearance goals and the identification of assistance needs, continuing to make full use of Article 7 reporting, Meetings of the States Parties, the Intersessional Work Programme and regional meetings as fora for mine-affected States Parties to present their problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance.

IV. Assisting the Victims

5. Article 6 (3) of the Convention calls for States Parties to provide assistance for the care rehabilitation and reintegration of mine victims. This constitutes a vital promise for hundreds of thousands of mine victims around the world, as well as for their families and communities. Keeping this promise is a crucial responsibility of all States Parties, though first and foremost of those whose citizens suffer the tragedy of mine incidents. This is especially the case for those 23 States Parties where there are vast numbers of victims. These States Parties have the greatest responsibility to act, but also the greatest needs and expectations for assistance. Recognizing the obligation of all States Parties to assist mine victims and the crucial role played by international and regional organisations, the ICRC, non-governmental and other organisations, **the States Parties will enhance the care, rehabilitation and reintegration efforts during the period 2005-2009 by undertaking the following actions:**

States Parties, particularly those 23 with the greatest numbers of mine victims, will do their utmost to:

Action #29: Establish and enhance health-care services needed to respond to immediate and ongoing medical needs of mine victims, increasing the number of healthcare workers and other service providers in mine-affected areas trained for emergency response to landmine and other traumatic injuries, ensuring an adequate number of trained trauma surgeons and nurses to meet the need, improving health-care infrastructure and ensuring that facilities have the equipment, supplies and medicines necessary to meet basic standards.

Action #30: Increase national physical rehabilitation capacity to ensure effective provision of physical rehabilitation services that are preconditions to full recovery and reintegration of mine victims by: developing and pursuing the goals of a multi-sector rehabilitation plan; providing access to services in mine-affected communities; increasing the number of trained rehabilitation specialists most needed by mine victims and victims of other traumatic injuries engaging all relevant actors to ensure effective coordination in advancing the quality of care

and increasing the numbers of individuals assisted; and, further encouraging specialized organizations to continue to develop guidelines for the implementation of prosthetics and orthopaedic programmes.

- Action #31:** **Develop capacities to meet the psychological and social support needs of mine victims**, sharing best practices with a view to achieving high standards of treatment and support on a par with those for physical rehabilitation, and engaging and empowering all relevant actors – including mine victims and their families and communities.
- Action #32:** **Actively support the socio-economic reintegration of mine victims**, including providing education and vocational training and developing sustainable economic activities and employment opportunities in mine-affected communities, integrating such efforts in the broader context of economic development, and striving to ensure significant increases of economically reintegrated mine victims.
- Action #33:** **Ensure that national legal and policy frameworks effectively address the needs and fundamental human rights of mine victims**, establishing as soon as possible, such legislation and policies and assuring effective rehabilitation and socio-economic reintegration services for all persons with disabilities.
- Action #34:** **Develop or enhance national mine victim data collection capacities** to ensure better understanding of the breadth of the victim assistance challenge they face and progress in overcoming it, seeking as soon as possible to integrate such capacities into existing health information systems and ensuring full access to information to support the needs of programme planners and resource mobilisation.
- Action #35:** **Ensure that, in all victim assistance efforts, emphasis is given to age and gender considerations** and to mine victims who are subject to multiple forms of discrimination in all victim assistance efforts.

States Parties in a position to do so will:

- Action #36:** **Act upon their obligation under Article 6 (3) to promptly assist those States Parties with clearly demonstrated needs for external support** for care, rehabilitation and reintegration of mine victims, responding to priorities for assistance as articulated by those States Parties in need and ensuring continuity and sustainability of resource commitments.

All States Parties, working together in the framework of the Convention's Intersessional Work Programme, relevant regional meetings and national contexts will:

- Action #37:** **Monitor and promote progress in the achievement of victim assistance goals** in the 2005-2009 period, affording concerned States Parties the opportunity to present their problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance and encouraging States

Parties in a position to do so to report through existing data collection systems on how they are responding to such needs.

Action #38: Ensure effective integration of mine victims in the work of the Convention, inter alia, by encouraging States Parties and organizations to include victims on their delegations.

Action #39: Ensure an effective contribution in all relevant deliberations by health, rehabilitation and social services professionals and officials inter alia by encouraging States Parties -- particularly those with the greatest number of mine victims -- and relevant organizations to include such individuals on their delegations.

V. Other matters essential for achieving the Convention's aims

A. Cooperation and Assistance

6. While individual States Parties are responsible for implementing the Convention's obligations in areas within their jurisdiction or control, its cooperation and assistance provisions afford the essential framework within which those responsibilities can be fulfilled and shared goals can be advanced. In this context between 1997 and 2004, more than US\$2.2 billion was generated for activities consistent with the Convention's aims. **The States Parties recognize that fulfilling their obligations during the period 2005-2009 and effectively pursuing the actions and strategies set out herein will require substantial political, financial and material commitments.** To this end:

The States Parties that have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control and those with the greatest numbers of mine victims will:

Action #40: Ensure that clearing mined areas and assisting victims are identified as priorities, wherever this is relevant, in national, sub-national and sector development plans and programmes, Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), UN Development Assistance Frameworks, and other appropriate mechanisms, thus reinforcing national commitment and increasing ownership in fulfilling Convention obligations.

Action #41: Ensure that the activities of the UN, national and international non-governmental organizations and other actors, where relevant, **are incorporated into national mine action planning frameworks and are consistent with national priorities.**

Action #42: Call on relevant actors for cooperation to improve national and international policies and development strategies, enhance effectiveness in mine action, reduce the need to rely on international personnel and ensure that assistance in mine action is based on adequate surveys, needs analysis and cost effective approaches.

Action #43: Promote technical cooperation, information exchange and other mutual assistance to take advantage of the rich resource of knowledge and expertise acquired in the course of fulfilling their obligations.

States Parties in a position to do so will:

Action #44: Fulfil their obligations under Article 6 by promptly responding to calls for support from those States Parties in need and with a particular view to the first mine clearance deadlines occurring in 2009.

Action #45: Ensure the sustainability of their commitments through means such as integrating as appropriate mine action into broader humanitarian and / or development assistance programmes, providing where possible multi-year funding to facilitate long-term planning of mine action and victim assistance programmes, paying particular attention to the specific needs and circumstances of the least developed States Parties, and ensuring that mine action remains a high priority.

Action #46: Continue to support, as appropriate, mine action to assist affected populations in areas under the control of armed non-state actors, particularly in areas under the control of actors which have agreed to abide by the Convention's norms.

All States Parties will:

Action #47: Encourage the international development community – including national development cooperation agencies where possible and as appropriate – **to play a significantly expanded role in mine action**, recognising that mine action for many States Parties is fundamental to the advancement of the UN Millennium Development Goals.

Action #48: Use, where relevant, their participation in decision making bodies of relevant organizations to urge the UN and regional organizations and the World Bank and regional development banks and financial institutions to support States Parties requiring assistance in fulfilling the Convention's obligations, inter alia by calling for the integration of mine action into the UN Consolidated Appeals Process and for the World Bank and regional development banks and financial institutions to make States Parties aware of opportunities for loans and grants.

Action #49: Develop and strengthen means to enhance cooperation at the regional level to implement the Convention and to effectively use and share resources, technology and expertise, engage the cooperation of regional organizations, and promote synergies between different regions.

Action #50: Pursue efforts to identify new and non-traditional sources of support, be they technical, material or financial, for activities to implement the Convention.

B. Transparency and Exchange of Information

7. Transparency and the open exchange of information have been essential pillars on which the Convention's practices, procedures and tradition of partnership have been built, through both formal means and informal means. These qualities and arrangements have in turn constituted an essential part of the foundation on which the Convention's significant disarmament and humanitarian gains have been achieved. **The States Parties recognize that transparency and effective information exchange will be equally crucial to fulfilling their obligations during the period 2005-2009 and to effectively pursuing the actions and strategies set out herein.** To this end:

All States Parties will:

- Action #51:** Urge the 5 States Parties that have not yet done so to fulfil their obligation to provide initial transparency reports under Article 7 without further delay, and request that the UN Secretary-General, as the recipient of these reports, call upon these States Parties to provide their reports.
- Action #52:** Fulfil their obligations to annually update Article 7 transparency reports and maximise reporting as a tool to assist in implementation, particularly in cases where States Parties must still destroy stockpiled mines, clear mined areas, assist mine victims or take legal or other measures referred to in Article 9.
- Action #53:** Take full advantage of the flexibility of the Article 7 reporting process, including through the reporting format's "Form J" to provide information on matters not specifically required but which may assist in the implementation process and in resource mobilization, such as information on mine victim assistance efforts and needs.
- Action #54:** In situations where States Parties have retained mines in accordance with the exceptions in Article 3, provide information on the plans requiring the retention of mines for the development of and training in mine detection, mine clearance, or mine destruction techniques and report on the actual use of retained mines and the results of such use.
- Action #55:** Exchange views and share their experiences in a cooperative and informal manner on the practical implementation of the various provisions of the Convention, including Articles 1, 2 and 3, to continue to promote effective and consistent application of these provisions.
- Action #56:** Continue to encourage the invaluable contribution to the work of the Convention by the ICBL, the ICRC, the United Nations, the GICHD, and regional and other organizations.

Action #57: **Encourage States not parties**, particularly those that have professed support for the object and purpose of the Convention, to provide voluntary transparency reports and to participate in the work of the Convention.

Action #58: **Encourage individual States Parties, regional or other organizations to arrange on a voluntary basis regional and thematic conferences** and workshops to advance the implementation of the Convention.

C. Preventing and Suppressing Prohibited Activities, and Facilitating Compliance

8. Primary responsibility for ensuring compliance with the Convention rests with each State Party and Article 9 of the Convention accordingly requires each party to take all appropriate legal, administrative and other measures, including the imposition of penal sanctions, to prevent and suppress prohibited activities by persons or on territory under its jurisdiction and control. In addition, the States Parties are aware that the Convention contains a variety of collective means to facilitate and clarify questions related to compliance in accordance with Article 8. During the period 2005-2009, **the States Parties will continue to be guided by the knowledge that individually and collectively they are responsible for ensuring compliance with the Convention.** To this end:

States Parties that have not yet done so will:

Action #59: **Develop and adopt legislative, administrative and other measures in accordance with Article 9** as soon as possible to fulfil their obligations under this Article thereby contributing to full compliance with the Convention report annually on progress as required by Article 7.

Action #60: **Make their needs known to the ICRC or other relevant actors** in instances when assistance is required to develop implementing legislation.

Action #61: **Integrate the Convention's prohibitions and requirements into their military doctrine** as soon as possible.

States Parties that have applied their legislation, through the prosecution and punishment of individuals engaged in activities prohibited by the Convention, will:

Action #62: **Share information on the application of implementing legislation** through means such as Article 7 reports and the Intersessional Work Programme.

All States Parties will:

Action #63: In instances when serious concerns about non-compliance cannot be resolved through measures adopted pursuant to Article 9, **seek clarification in a cooperative spirit in accordance with Article 8**, and call upon the UN Secretary-General to undertake the tasks foreseen in Article 8 as required.

Action #64: In instances when armed non-state actors are operating in areas under States Parties' jurisdiction or control, **make it clear that armed non-state actors are required to comply with the provisions of the Convention** and that they will be called to account for violations of the Convention in accordance with measures taken under Article 9.

D. Implementation Support

9. The effective functioning and full implementation of the Convention has been enhanced through the structures and mechanisms that exist in the Convention, that have been established pursuant to the decisions of the States Parties or that have emerged on an informal basis. **The States Parties' implementation mechanisms will remain important during the period 2005-2009, particularly as key means to implement the Nairobi Action Plan, and in this regard the States Parties are committed to supporting them.** To this end:

All States Parties will:

Action #65: **Support the efforts of the Coordinating Committee** to ensure effective and transparent preparation of meetings.

Action #66: **Continue to make use of the valuable support provided for by the GICHD** in hosting the meetings of the Standing Committees, through the Implementation Support Unit, and by administering the Sponsorship Programme.

Action #67: **Continue to provide** on a voluntary basis, in accordance with their agreement with the GICHD, **the necessary financial resources for the operation of the Implementation Support Unit.**

Action #68: **Continue to reaffirm the valuable role of the United Nations** for providing support to Meetings of the States Parties.

Action #69: **Continue to utilize informal mechanisms such as the Contact Groups**, which have emerged to meet specific needs.

States Parties in a position to do so will:

Action #70: **On a voluntary basis contribute to the Sponsorship Programme** thereby permitting widespread representation at meetings of the Convention, particularly by mine-affected developing States Parties, with the latter maximising this important investment by actively participating and sharing information on their problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance.

PART IV

Towards a Mine-Free World: The 2004 Nairobi Declaration

1. Seven years ago today, representatives of states – joined by international organizations and civil society – gathered in Ottawa to sign the Convention banning anti-personnel mines. In its short history the Convention has become the framework to pursue a conclusive end to the suffering caused by those mines. Today, we, the high representatives of States Parties to the Convention again have gathered in the presence of the global public conscience here at the Nairobi Summit on a Mine-Free World. We do so to mark our accomplishments, to take stock of our remaining challenges and to recommit ourselves to ending the scourge of anti-personnel mines.

We celebrate the tremendous advances made towards our common goal of forever ending the suffering caused by anti-personnel mines:

2. One-hundred-forty-four states have joined this endeavour and have established a powerful international norm that is recognized, in words and actions, well beyond the Convention's membership. Whereas anti-personnel mines were until recently in widespread use, their production has decreased dramatically, trade in this weapon has virtually ceased and their deployment is now rare. The number of new victims has fallen significantly and more of those who have survived are receiving assistance. Major strides have been made in clearing mined areas. And together we have destroyed more than 37 million stockpiled mines. These achievements have been fuelled by a unique spirit of cooperation between states, international organizations and civil society – a partnership that has become an example and inspiration for addressing other humanitarian, development and disarmament challenges.

While great progress has been made, we are prepared to address the remaining challenges:

3. We remain gravely troubled that anti-personnel mines continue to kill or maim, adding new victims to the hundreds of thousands of landmine survivors requiring life-long care. The presence of mines still blocks the return of displaced persons, hinders the achievement of the UN Millennium Development Goals that we have pledged to meet, and impedes states and peoples from building confidence between one another. Much more is required to ensure that mined areas are cleared by the Convention's deadlines, that mine victims receive the needed care, and that all other promises of this Convention are fulfilled. And we call upon those states that have not joined our efforts, and in particular those that possess vast stocks of anti-personnel mines or continue to use this insidious weapon, to adhere to the Convention without delay.

We renew our unwavering commitment to achieving the goal of a world free of anti-personnel mines, in which there will be zero new victims:

4. We will strengthen our efforts to clear mined areas and destroy stockpiled anti-personnel mines in accordance with our time-bound obligations. We will assist mine victims and we will vigorously promote the universal acceptance of the Convention. Together as representatives of both mine-affected states and those spared this scourge, we pledge to work in partnership, fulfilling our shared responsibility to provide the required human, technical and financial resources. We will condemn any use of anti-personnel mines by any actor. And we shall persevere until this unique Convention has been universally applied and its aims fully achieved.

PART V

Programme of meetings and related matters to facilitate implementation, 2005-2009

Conclusions on Principles:

1. Based on discussions held in advance of the First Review Conference, the States Parties conclude that the following principles shall guide their programme of meetings and related matters during the period 2005-2009:

- (a) Both formal Meetings of the States Parties, as well as informal meetings of the Standing Committees, on a regular basis, and with the full and active participation of States Parties, interested international organizations and of non-governmental organizations, as well as States not parties that share our aims but have not yet joined our common effort, will be indispensable for the future functioning of the Convention and the realisation of its aims,
- (b) The considerable experience gained in the years since the entering into force of the Convention will be taken into account, including the existing organizational structure and characteristics of meetings with their focus on the Convention's core aims, partnership and cooperation, flexibility and informality, continuity, and effective preparations.
- (c) The work and structure of the Standing Committees, the Coordination Committee and Implementation Support Unit of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining have been appreciated and will continue to be important elements for the implementation of the Convention,
- (d) Voluntary regional initiatives, including conferences and workshops, have been appreciated and will continue to help enhance efforts to implement the Convention and assist in preparing States Parties for Meetings of the States Parties and meetings of the Standing Committees,
- (e) Transparency and the exchange of information will remain crucial to assuring confidence and the proper functioning of the Convention's cooperation mechanisms,

Decisions on Future Meetings:

2. States Parties therefore decide the following:

- (a) To hold annually, until the Second Review Conference, a Meeting of the States Parties which will regularly take place in the second half of the year, in Geneva or – when possible or appropriate – in a mine-affected country.

- (b) To convene annually, until 2009, informal intersessional meetings of the Standing Committees—to be held in Geneva in the first half of the year — for a duration of up to five days.
- (c) As a general rule, however not excluding exceptions for specific reasons, intersessional meetings of the Standing Committees would take place in February/March and the annual Meetings of the States Parties in September.
- (d) The Second Review Conference will take place in the second half of the year 2009.
- (e) In keeping with the States Parties' practice of being flexible and pragmatic in addressing changing circumstances, the States Parties may review decisions regarding their 2005 – 2009 programme of meetings at each Meeting of the States Parties prior to the Second Review Conference.
3. With regard to the next meeting of the States Parties, States Parties decide the following:
- (a) The next Meeting of States Parties will be held in Croatia and take place from 28 November to 2 December 2005.
- (b) Meetings of the Standing Committees will take place during the week of 13-17 June 2005 with the length of individual meetings and their sequencing, and duration of the entire period meetings to be established by the Coordinating Committee.
- (c) Consistent with the practice of past Meetings of the States Parties, the Coordinating Committee shall be chaired by the President elected by the Review Conference until the States Parties elect a subsequent President. The chair of the Coordinating Committee will continue the practice of keeping the States Parties apprised of the Coordinating Committee's functioning.
- (d) The following States Parties shall serve as the Standing Committee Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs until the end of the next Meeting of the States Parties:
- Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies: Algeria and Sweden (Co-Chairs), Jordan and Slovenia (Co-Rapporteurs);
 - Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration: Nicaragua and Norway (Co-Chairs), Afghanistan and Switzerland (Co-Rapporteurs);
 - Stockpile Destruction: Bangladesh and Canada (Co-Chairs), Japan and United Republic of Tanzania (Co-Rapporteurs);
 - The General Status and Operation of the Convention: New Zealand and South Africa (Co-Chairs), Belgium and Guatemala (Co-Rapporteurs).

Background:

4. At the First Preparatory Meeting held on 13 February 2004, Germany and Malaysia prepared and submitted a document entitled “Nature, Timing and Sequencing of Post-2004 Meetings of the States Parties and Related Matters” contained in Document APLC/CONF/2004/PM.1/WP.2 dated 26 January 2004 (hereinafter referred to as “the Discussion Paper”) for consideration of the meeting.

5. Views were expressed by many States Parties, international and non-governmental organizations on their preferred options as contained in the annex to the Discussion Paper.

6. In the effort to obtain a clearer and comprehensive picture of the issue and in order to solicit further views on the matter, Germany and Malaysia developed a questionnaire, providing several possible options. The questionnaire was later circulated to the States Parties, international and non-governmental organizations in late April this year. Subsequently, encouraging responses were received from various respondents by the 14 May 2004 deadline.

7. However, both Germany and Malaysia felt that more time and opportunity should be given to interested parties to submit their views. As a result, the questionnaire was redistributed to the States Parties, international and non-governmental organizations and the deadline for submission was extended to 2 June 2004. Subsequently, additional views and comments were received which were very valuable and useful.

8. The findings of the responses received were carefully analyzed and reflected in a document (Document APLC/CONF/2004/PM.2/L.7/Amend.1) dated 28 June 2004, submitted at the Second Preparatory Meeting held from 28-29 June 2004 in Geneva.

9. At the Second Preparatory Meeting, a large number of States Parties, international and non-governmental organizations expressed their views on the four options contained in the questionnaire.

10. Based on the responses received from the questionnaire and also the views expressed during the Second Preparatory Meeting, following are some of the key conclusions:

(a) Organizational Structure

In general, a large number of delegations favor retaining the existing organizational structure and nature of meetings.

(b) Annual Meetings of States Parties

(i) Many delegations had expressed the need to maintain a balance between the formal and informal meetings of the Convention. Meetings of States Parties which are

considered as formal meetings should continue to be convened as some decisions can only be taken at a Meeting of the States Parties or a Review Conference.

(ii) On the other hand, the meetings of the Standing Committees which are essentially regarded as informal meetings continues to provide a very effective mechanism for States Parties, States not Parties, international governmental and non-governmental organizations to exchange views and experiences as proven over the years.

(iii) It is equally important to consider the views of several delegations on the need to overall reduce the number of meetings in a year so that the cost involved in organizing many meetings can be better utilised for other beneficial purposes to promote the implementation of the Convention.

(iv) Since the convening of annual Meetings of the States Parties seems necessary for the reasons mentioned in paragraph 10 (b) (i), possible options would be (A) to hold one set of meetings of the Standing Committees and one Meeting of the States Parties in a year or (B) to convene in a year one set of meetings of the Standing Committees and one meeting combining (I) three days of meetings of the Standing Committees with (II) a two-day abridged Meeting of the States Parties.

(c) Duration of meetings

(i) Holding the Meetings of the States Parties and meetings of the Standing Committees for a period between 3 and 5 days is the period considered adequate and reasonable to many States Parties. Any period shorter or longer than this may not be acceptable to them.

(d) Venue of meetings

(i) There seems to be a wide support for meetings of the Standing Committees to continue be held in Geneva primarily to minimize the cost – in part through the generous offer of the GICHD to continue hosting these meetings – and that there is a likelihood that more countries would participate if these meetings are convened in Geneva.

(ii) For the same reasons, many think that, as a general rule, Meetings of the States Parties should also be held in Geneva. However, a considerable number of countries felt, that holding these Meetings in mine-affected countries would be the preferred option.

11. Views were also expressed on other related matters pertaining to the nature of meetings as follows:

(a) Regional meetings

(i) While many delegations have underscored the usefulness and importance of convening regional meetings, the general preference is that these meetings should not be institutionalized under the framework of the Convention. Instead, regional meetings could be organized on voluntary basis, as and whenever necessary.

(b) Nature of discussions at meetings of the Convention

(i) It can be concluded that many supported the continuance of thematic discussions as the preferred mode of discussion especially at the meetings of the Standing Committees.

(c) Participation at meetings of the Convention

(i) Many agreed that the informal setting and flexibility of the meetings of the Standing Committees encourages the widest possible participation among States Parties, States not parties, international organizations and non-governmental organizations and civil society.

(d) Coordinating Committee and Implementation Support Unit

(i) The existing structures of the Coordinating Committee and the Implementation Support Unit of the GICHD are equally considered by a clear majority of the answers as being adequate for serving the purposes of the Convention.

(e) Transparency

(i) Many agreed that both Meetings of the States Parties and the informal meetings of the Standing Committees provide sufficient opportunity for States Parties to exchange information pursuant to Article 7 of the Convention.

Appendix I

AGENDA OF THE FIRST REVIEW CONFERENCE
As adopted at the first plenary meeting on 29 November 2004

1. Opening of the Review Conference
2. Election of the President
3. Adoption of the agenda
4. Adoption of the rules of procedure
5. Adoption of the budget
6. Election of the Vice-Presidents
7. Confirmation of the Secretary-General
8. Organization of work
9. Exchange of views on the review of the operation and status of the Convention
10. Exchange of views on conclusions related to the implementation of the Convention
11. Exchange of views on future Meetings of the States Parties and related matters
12. Consideration of submissions of States Parties as provided for in Article 5
13. Exchange of views on a 2005-2009 action plan
14. Recommendation for adoption of the final documents
15. High level segment
16. Address by distinguished guests
17. Any other business
18. Adoption of the final documents
19. Closure of the Review Conference

Appendix II

Report on the Functioning of the Implementation Support Unit September 2003 – November 2004

Prepared by the Director of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining
As adopted at the sixth plenary meeting on 1 December 2004

Background

1. At the September 2001 Third Meeting of the States Parties (3MSP) the States Parties endorsed the President's Paper on the Establishment of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) and mandated the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD) to establish the ISU. The 3MSP also encouraged States Parties in a position to do so to make voluntary contributions in support of the ISU. In addition, the States Parties mandated the President of the 3MSP, in consultation with the Coordination Committee, to finalise an agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD on the functioning of the ISU.
2. The Council of Foundation of the GICHD accepted this mandate on 28 September 2001.
3. In accordance with the above-mentioned actions taken by the States Parties at the 3MSP, on 7 November 2001 an agreement on the functioning of the ISU was finalised between the States Parties and the GICHD by the President of the 3MSP and the Director of the GICHD. This agreement indicates i.a. that the Director of the GICHD shall submit a written report on the functioning of the ISU to the States Parties and that this report shall cover the period between two Meetings of the States Parties. As the First Review Conference is a formal meeting of the States Parties, this report has been prepared to cover the period between the Fifth Meeting of the States Parties (5MSP) and the First Review Conference.

Activities

4. During the reporting period, the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) worked closely with the 5MSP Presidency and the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committees in supporting their efforts to fulfil their responsibilities. The ISU assisted the 5MSP President in achieving the aims of the President's Action Programme and in facilitating the work of the Coordinating Committee.
5. A particular focus during the reporting period was for the ISU to support the active participation of mine-affected States Parties in the February and June 2004 Standing Committee meetings, and to ensure that opportunities for exchanging information in advance of the Review Conference were maximized by all States Parties. Enhanced efforts were made to ensure that pertinent information reached those who needed to receive it.

6. The workload of the ISU increased dramatically in response to the States Parties' robust preparations for the First Review Conference. The ISU responded to an increasing number of requests for assistance in meeting both the additional information needs of the States Parties and the support needs of the President-Designate and Secretary-General Designate of the First Review Conference. At the 13 February 2004 First Preparatory Meeting, the President-Designate announced that he had asked the GICHD to have the Manager of the Implementation Support Unit serve as his Executive Coordinator. In this capacity, the ISU enhanced its strong cooperative relationship with the United Nations secretariat of the First Review Conference, working in close partnership with the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs to assure sound preparations for the First Review Conference.
7. The ISU responded to the priority expressed by the President-Designate and States Parties concerning communications aspects of the First Review Conference. A dedicated web site¹ was established and various communications tools were produced by the GICHD, and efforts were made to coordinate with key actors and wide-ranging communications activities were supported.
8. The ISU, in providing assistance to the States Parties and information on the Convention in accordance with its mandate, also provided support to and participated in numerous regional events organised in advance of the First Review Conference. The ISU provided advice and input on planning and preparations to regional conference hosts, developed background documents and information tools, and made various presentations on the Convention, its implementation mechanisms and its status.
9. The GICHD continued to administer the Sponsorship Programme established by some States Parties to the Convention.² This Programme aims to support widespread participation in meetings related to the Convention. During each of the two periods of Standing Committee meetings taking place in February and June 2004, the GICHD administered sponsorship to over 80 delegates. In accordance with the mandate to provide assistance in administering the Sponsorship Programme, the ISU provided advice to the Programme's donors' group and information to sponsored delegates on how to maximise their participation in the Intersessional Work Programme.
10. To enhance the Convention's Documentation Centre, the ISU continued to collect a large number of pertinent documents. The number of documents obtained increased dramatically in 2003-2004 given the volume of Convention-related activity that took place during the reporting period. The Documentation Centre currently contains over 4,000 records and increasingly is being used by States Parties and other interested actors as an important source of information on the Convention. While the physical collection of documents is an important part of the work associated with the Documentation Centre, the ISU has also worked to ensure that access to documents related to the work of the Convention is facilitated in making as many documents as possible available on-line.

¹ www.reviewconference.org or www.nairobisummit.org

² The Sponsorship Programme's donors group retains the responsibility for making all decisions related to sponsorship. The Programme is funded on a voluntary basis by these donors through contributions made to a separate trust fund.

Financial Arrangements

11. The 2004 budget for the ISU affirmed that the ISU should remain small in number of staff. In view of the additional workload as a result of the First Review Conference, the budget foresaw a temporary reinforcement of the ISU staff. In responding to priority needs, a communications officer was hired for the period June-December 2004. In 2005, the staff complement of the ISU will revert to a full-time ISU Manager, a full-time Implementation Support Officer, and a half-time Administrative Assistant.

12. In accordance with the 3MSP's President's Paper on the Establishment of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) and the agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD, the GICHD created a voluntary trust fund for activities of the ISU in late 2001. The purpose of this fund is to finance the on-going activities of the ISU, with the States Parties endeavouring to assure the necessary financial resources.

Contributions to the ISU Voluntary Trust Fund³ 1 January 2003 to 31 October 2004

| | Contributions received in 2003 | Contributions received in 2004 ⁴ |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Australia | 45,045 | 29,011 |
| Austria | | 70,380 |
| Belgium | 14,470 | |
| Canada | 46,553 | 47,789 |
| Croatia | 1,357 | 2,580 |
| Czech Republic | 39,375 | |
| Germany | 38,250 | |
| Hungary | | 12,400 |
| Iceland | 6,550 | |
| Italy | 120,218 | |
| Malaysia | | 1,833 |
| Mexico | | 7,500 |
| Netherlands | | 63,000 |
| New Zealand | 19,064 | |
| Norway | 91,750 | 101,667 |
| Sweden | 34,068 | |
| Thailand | 6,950 | |
| UK | | 11,168 |
| Total | 463,650 | 347,328 |

³ All amounts in CHF.

⁴ As of 31 October 2004.

13. In accordance with the agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD, in November 2003 the Coordinating Committee was consulted on a 2004 ISU budget⁵, covering the period from 1 January to 31 December 2004 and totalling CHF 498,000. The 5MSP Presidency subsequently distributed this budget to all States Parties and appealed to the States Parties to provide voluntary contributions to the ISU Trust Fund.

14. In accordance with the agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD, the Voluntary Trust Fund's 2003 financial statements were independently audited (by PriceWaterhouseCoopers). The audit indicated that the financial statement of the Voluntary Trust Fund had been properly prepared in accordance with the accounting policies of the Foundation of the GICHD and complies with the relevant Swiss legislation. The audited financial statement, which indicated that the 2003 expenditures of the ISU totalled CHF 419,278, was forwarded to the Presidency, the Coordinating Committee and donors.

⁵ Basic infrastructure costs (e.g. general services, human resources, accounting, conference management) for the ISU are covered by the GICHD and therefore not included in the ISU budget.

Appendix III

List of documents of the First Review Conference

| SYMBOL | TITLE |
|---|--|
| APLC/CONF/2004/1/ Rev.1 | Revised Provisional Agenda for the First Review Conference |
| APLC/CONF/2004/2/ Rev.1 | Revised Provisional Programme of Work for the First Review Conference |
| APLC/CONF/2004/3/ Rev.1 | Revised Draft Rules of Procedure for the First Review Conference |
| APLC/CONF/2004/4/ Rev.1 | Revised Estimated Costs for Convening the First Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction |
| APLC/CONF/2004/L.1/ Rev.1 | Towards a Mine-Free World: Revised Draft of the 2004 Nairobi Declaration |
| APLC/CONF/2004/L.2 APLC/CONF/2004/L.2/Corr.1 (ENGLISH ONLY) APLC/CONF/2004/L.2/Amend.1 | Draft Programme of Meetings and Related Matters to Facilitate Implementation, 2005-2009 |
| APLC/CONF/2004/L.3/Rev.1 APLC/CONF/2004/L.3/Rev.1/Corr.1 (ENGLISH and RUSSIAN ONLY) APLC/CONF/2004/L.3/Rev.1/Amend.1 | Revised Draft Review of the Operation and Status of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction: 1999-2004 |
| APLC/CONF/2004/L.4/Rev.1 | Ending the Suffering Caused by Anti-Personnel Mines: Revised Draft Nairobi Action Plan 2005-2009 |
| APLC/CONF/2004/L.5 | Nature, Timing and Sequencing of Post-2004 Meetings of the States Parties and Related Matters |
| APLC/CONF/2004/L.6 APLC/CONF/2004/L.6/Corr.1 (ENGLISH ONLY) | Report on the Functioning of the Implementation Support Unit September 2003-November 2004 |
| APLC/CONF/2004/MISC.1 (ENGLISH/ FRENCH/ SPANISH ONLY) | Provisional List of Participants |
| APLC/CONF/2004/MISC.2 (ENGLISH ONLY) | ICRC Proposals for Amendments to Action #54 and Action #55 of the Document "Ending the Suffering Caused by Anti-Personnel Mines: the Draft Nairobi Action Plan 2005-2009" |

| | |
|--|---|
| APLC/CONF/2004/MISC.3 (ENGLISH AND SPANISH ONLY) | Information of the Argentine Republic and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on the Implementation of the Ottawa Convention |
| APLC/CONF/2004/MISC.4 (ENGLISH AND SPANISH ONLY) | Propuesta de la República Argentina y la República de Chile sobre la Interpretación Artículo 3 de la Convención |
| APLC/CONF/2004/MISC.5/Rev.1 (ENGLISH ONLY) | Mine-Free Regions Initiative: The Example of Mine Free South Eastern Europe by 2009 (Slovenia) |
| APLC/CONF/2004/MISC.6 (ENGLISH AND FRENCH ONLY) | Common African Position On Anti-Personnel Landmines |
| APLC/CONF/2004/MISC.7 (ENGLISH ONLY) | Proposed text for the “Draft Nairobi Action Plan 2005-2009” (South Africa) |
| APLC/CONF/2004/MISC.8 (ENGLISH ONLY) | Amendments Action Plan (Algeria) |
| APLC/CONF/2004/MISC.9 ((ENGLISH AND SPANISH ONLY) | Nota informativa de la República del Ecuador y de la República del Perú sobre la implementación de la Convención de Ottawa |
| APLC/CONF/2004/MISC.10 (ENGLISH ONLY) | Updating the OSCE Questionnaire on Anti-Personnel Mines and Explosive Remnants of War (Austria) |
| APLC/CONF/2004/INF.1 (ENGLISH ONLY) | List of the Reports on Transparency Measures |
| APLC/CONF/2004/INF.2 (ENGLISH/ FRENCH/ SPANISH ONLY) APLC/CONF/2004/INF.2/Add.1 (ENGLISH/ FRENCH/ SPANISH ONLY) | List of Participants |
| APLC/CONF/2004/CRP.1 (ENGLISH ONLY) | Draft Report |