

ICBL Statement on Article 3: Mines retained for training  
Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the  
Convention

Friday 24 June 2011



Thank you Mr/Ms Co-Chair, and thanks to all States Parties that provided updates.

A Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor factsheet on Article 3 is available outside this room. As noted by the Monitor, a total of 76 States Parties have reported that they retain antipersonnel mines for training and research purposes. Seventy-eight States Parties have declared that they do not retain any antipersonnel mines. This includes 25 states that stockpiled antipersonnel mines in the past and have chosen not to retain any mines. The status of two States Parties is uncertain.<sup>1</sup>

Disturbingly, as of mid-June, over 40% of the States Parties that retain mines under Article 3 had yet to submit a transparency report for calendar year 2010, which makes it difficult to provide a full, up-to-date analysis. We encourage states to comply with this treaty obligation as soon as possible.

It is also regrettable that so few states are using expanded Form D to report on how the retained mines are being used, as called for in Action #57 of the Cartagena Action Plan. States may be using new Form D, but few are providing information on past and planned use.

On a positive note, we commend **Latvia** for recently completing the destruction of all its retained mines. We are also encouraged that **Cyprus** chose to re-evaluate its need to retain mines in accordance with the Cartagena Action Plan Action #56, and destroyed 494 mines—which represent almost half of its stock of retained mines.

Also, **Venezuela**, for the first time since 1999, has reported that it has consumed retained mines in training activities, a total of 80 mines in 2010.

On the other hand, a total of 12 states have *not* reported consuming any mines for permitted purposes since the treaty entered into force for them. These are **Angola, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bhutan, Burundi, Cape Verde, Cyprus, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Senegal, and Togo**. And many others have not reported consumption for multiple years. This is a key concern for the ICBL, and we encourage those states to clarify what is being done with these mines. Is there really a requirement to keep them? If retained mines are not being utilized at all for the permitted purposes, it would appear to constitute ongoing stockpiling that should be treated as a compliance issue.

A regrettable trend involves changes in the number of retained mines—either increases or decreases—that are left without any explanation in transparency reports. Among the reports submitted so far, this is the case for **Australia, Cambodia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Italy, Netherlands, Peru, Portugal, Spain, and the United Kingdom**. We urge States Parties to provide explanations for the increase or decrease in the number of retained mines, as they committed to do under the Cartagena Action Plan Action #57. This will help establish the

---

<sup>1</sup> Botswana has indicated its intention to retain some mines for training but has never made a formal declaration. Equatorial Guinea has never submitted an initial transparency report, so its status is uncertain, but it is not thought to retain any mines.

necessary level of confidence that the exception permitted by Article 3 is being implemented in a consistent and transparent manner.

Thank you.