
**Meeting 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**

8 June 2011

Original: English

Geneva, 29 November – 3 December 2010

Final Report

The Final Report of the Tenth Meeting 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 two parts and six annexes as follows:

Part I Organization and work of the Tenth Meeting

- A. Introduction
- B. Organization of the Meeting
- C. Participation in the Meeting
- D. Work of the Meeting
- E. Decisions and Recommendations
- F. Documentation
- G. Adoption of the Final Report

Part II Achieving the aims of the Cartagena Action Plan: The Geneva Progress Report, 2009-2010

Introduction

- I. Universalisation
- II. Stockpile destruction
- III. Mine clearance
- IV. Victim assistance
- V. Other matters essential for achieving the Convention's aims

Appendices

- I. Stockpiled anti-personnel mines
- II. Progress in meeting commitments made in article 5 extension requests and decisions taken on these requests
- III. Overview of States Parties' reporting on the location of all mined areas that contain, or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines

- IV. Support provided since the Cartagena Summit by the UNDP, UNICEF, UNMAS and the OAS to States Parties that are in the process of implementing article 5 or that have reported the responsibility for significant number of landmine survivors
- V. Mines reported retained for purposes permitted under article 3 of the Convention
- VI. The status of legal measures taken in accordance with article 9

Annexes

- I. Agenda of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties
- II. Report on the process for the preparation, submission and consideration of requests for extensions to article 5 deadlines, 2009-2010
- III. Strengthening international cooperation and assistance in support of mine action and the implementation of the Convention
- IV. Proposal to establish a Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance
- V. Transparency and the exchange of information in the context of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention
- VI. Review of the Intersessional Work Programme
- VII. Report on the Functioning of the Implementation Support Unit, November 2009-November 2010
- VIII. ISU Task Force: Final Report and Recommendations
- IX. President's Statement on the Endorsement of the ISU Task Force Report
- X. List of documents of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties

Part I

Organization and work of the Tenth Meeting

A. Introduction

1. The Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction provides in article 11, paragraphs 1 and 2, that the States Parties shall meet regularly in order to consider any matter with regard to the application or implementation of this Convention. At the 30 November to 4 December 2009 Second Review Conference, the States Parties agreed to hold annually, until a Third Review Conference in 2014, a Meeting of the States Parties. In addition, at the Second Review Conference, the States Parties agreed to hold the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties in Geneva the week of 29 November to 3 December 2010.

2. To prepare for the Tenth Meeting, in keeping with past practice, at the June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, a provisional agenda and provisional programme of work were presented. Based upon discussions at that meeting, it was the sense of the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention that these documents were generally acceptable to the States Parties to be put before the Tenth Meeting for adoption. To seek views on matters of substance, the President-Designate convened an informal meeting in Geneva on 7 September 2010 to which all States Parties, States not parties and interested organizations were invited to participate.

3. The opening of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties was preceded on 29 November 2010 by a ceremony at which statements were delivered by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Micheline Calmy-Rey, the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of Albania, Selim Belortaja, and the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Jakob Kellenberger.

B. Organization of the Meeting

4. The Tenth Meeting of the States Parties was opened on 29 November 2010 by Ambassador Susan Eckey of Norway, President of the Second Review Conference. Ambassador Eckey presided over the election of the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties. The Meeting elected, by acclamation, His Excellency Gazmend Turdiu, Secretary General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Albania, as its President in accordance with rule 5 of the rules of procedure.

5. At the opening session, a message was delivered by Sergei Ordzhonikidze, Director-General of the United Nations Office in Geneva, on behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. In addition, a message was delivered by Per Nergaard on behalf of the Nobel Peace Prize co-laureates the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and Jody Williams. As well, a message was delivered by Dr. Barbara Haering, President of the Council of Foundation of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining.

6. At its first plenary meeting on 29 November 2010, the Tenth Meeting adopted its agenda as contained in annex I to this report. On the same occasion, the meeting adopted its programme of work as contained in document APLC/MSP.10/2010/2.

7. Also at its first plenary meeting, Bulgaria, Ecuador, Greece, Indonesia, Nigeria, Peru, Slovenia and Turkey were elected by acclamation as Vice-Presidents of the Tenth Meeting. The Meeting unanimously confirmed the nomination of His Excellency Jürg

Lauber of Switzerland as Secretary-General of the Meeting. The Meeting also took note of the appointment, by the United Nations Secretary-General, of Peter Kolarov of the Geneva Branch of the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs as Executive Secretary of the Meeting, and the appointment, by the President, of Kerry Brinkert, Director of the Implementation Support Unit, as the President's Executive Coordinator.

C. Participation in the Meeting

8. The following 103 States Parties participated in the Meeting: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Holy See, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

9. The following signatory that has not ratified the Convention participated in the Meeting as an observer in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure of the Meeting: Poland. In addition, the following 17 other States not parties to the Convention participated in the Meeting as observers, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraph 1, of the rules of procedure of the Meeting: Azerbaijan, Bahrain, China, Egypt, Finland, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, United Arab Emirates, and United States of America.

10. In accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, 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 Union, European Union, Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, International Organization for Migration (IOM), Organization of American States (OAS), Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), United Nations Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS), and United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA).

11. In accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, of the Convention and rule 1, paragraph 4, of the rules of procedure, the following other organizations attended the Meeting as observers: APOPO, Association Internationale des Soldats de la Paix (AISP), Center for International Stabilization and Recovery (James Madison University), Cleared Ground Demining, HALO Trust, International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance (ITF), and Swiss Foundation for Mine Action (FSD).

12. A list of all delegations and delegates to the Tenth Meeting is contained in document APLC/MSP.10/2010/INF.1 and APLC/MSP.10/2010/INF.1/Add.1.

D. Work of the Meeting

13. The Tenth Meeting of the States Parties held ten plenary sessions from 29 November to 3 December 2010. During the first two plenary sessions, several States Parties and observer delegations delivered general statements or otherwise made written statements of a general nature available.

14. At its second plenary session, the President of the Second Review Conference presented a report on the process for the preparation, submission and consideration of requests for extensions to article 5 deadlines, as contained in annex II to this report. In addition, during its second and third plenary sessions, the States Parties that had submitted requests for extensions in accordance with article 5.4 of the Convention, Chad, Colombia, Denmark, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania and Zimbabwe, presented their requests, the executive summaries of which are contained in documents APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.1, APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.3, APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.4, APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.6/Rev.1, APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.9 and APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.10. In addition, the President of the Second Review Conference presented an analysis of each request as contained in documents APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.2, APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.5, APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.7, APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.11, APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.13, and APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.14.

15. During its third and fourth plenary sessions, the Meeting discussed enhancing international cooperation in the context of the Convention, thereby building upon a 25 June 2010 special session on this matter which had been convened by the President of the Second Review Conference. This discussion included consideration by the Meeting of (a) a paper presented by the President of the Second Review Conference on the strengthening international cooperation and assistance in support of mine action and the implementation of the Convention, as contained in annex III to this report, and, (b) a proposal presented by Zambia, as contained in annex IV to this report, to establish a new Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance.

16. During its third through ninth plenary sessions, the Meeting considered the general status and operation of the Convention, reviewing progress made and challenges that remain in the pursuit of the Convention's aims and in the application of the Cartagena Action Plan 2010-2014. In this regard, the Meeting warmly welcomed the Geneva Progress Report 2009-2010, as contained in part II of this report, as an important means to support the application of the Cartagena Action Plan by measuring progress made since the Cartagena Summit and highlighting priority areas of work for the States Parties in the period between the Tenth Meeting and the 2011 Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties.

17. Also in the context of its consideration of the general status and operation of the Convention, the Meeting considered a paper presented by Belgium, as contained in annex V to this report, which highlighted the importance of further discussions on a number of matters concerning the Convention's transparency provisions and the reporting process.

18. Also in the context of its consideration of the general status and operation of the Convention, the Meeting considered a report and recommendations on the Intersessional Work Programme, as contained in annex VI to this report.

19. Also in the context of its consideration of the general status and operation of the Convention, the Meeting noted the Director of the GICHD report on the activities of the Implementation Support Unit (ISU), contained in annex VII to this report. 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.

20. During its ninth and tenth plenary sessions, the Meeting recalled that the Second Review Conference had agreed to establish an open ended Task Force with a mandate to develop terms of reference for an evaluation of the Implementation Support Unit and, in this context, considered the final report and recommendations of the ISU Task Force, as contained in annex VIII to this report.

21. At its tenth plenary session, the Meeting, in accordance with article 11 of the Convention, was provided with the opportunity to consider matters arising from/in the context of reports submitted under article 7 and requests submitted under article 8.

E. Decisions and Recommendations

22. At its ninth plenary session, taking into account the analyses presented by the President of the Second Review Conference of the requests submitted under article 5 of the Convention and the requests themselves, the Meeting took the following decisions:

(i) The Meeting assessed the request submitted by Chad for an extension of Chad's deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas in accordance with article 5, paragraph 1, agreeing to grant the request for an extension until 1 January 2014;

(ii) In granting the request, the Meeting noted that, as Chad had not complied with the commitment it had made, as recorded by the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties, to garner an understanding of the true remaining extent of the challenge and to develop plans accordingly that precisely project the amount of time that will be required to complete article 5 implementation, it would appear that Chad does not possess much more knowledge now than it did in 2008 to develop a plan to meet its article 5 obligations;

(iii) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that, as Chad has made it clear that the provision of external support is necessary to fully implement the plan contained within its request, Chad could inspire greater confidence on the part of those in a position to provide assistance by providing as soon as possible clarity regarding the remaining scope of the problem and give consideration to the transformation of its national demining authority towards a more civilian organization;

(iv) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that while it may be unfortunate that after almost twelve years since entry into force a State Party is unable to specify how much work remains and how it will be carried out, it is positive that Chad intends to renew efforts to garner an understanding of the true remaining extent of the challenge and develop plans accordingly. In this context, the Meeting noted the importance of Chad requesting only the period of time necessary to assess relevant facts and develop a meaningful forward looking plan based on these facts. The Meeting further noted that, by requesting a three year extension, Chad was projecting that it would need approximately three years from the date of submission of its request to obtain clarity regarding the remaining challenge, produce a detailed plan and submit a third extension request;

(v) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that the commitments made in Chad's 2010-2012 work plan would greatly assist Chad and all States Parties in assessing progress in implementation during the extension period. The Meeting noted in particular the commitments made by Chad to review its strategic plan at the beginning of 2012 on the basis of an analysis of the final results of survey efforts. In this regard the Meeting noted that it would be beneficial if Chad presented to the Twelfth Meeting of the States Parties, in 2012, a revised strategic plan as a precursor to Chad submitting, no later

than 31 March 2013, a third extension request that would be comprehensive in clarifying the remaining challenge and that would contain a detailed annual implementation plan leading to completion. In this regard, the Meeting requested Chad, in accordance with Action 13 of the Cartagena Action Plan, to provide updates relative to these and other commitments at meetings of the Standing Committees and at Meetings of the States Parties;

(vi) The Meeting assessed the request submitted by Colombia for an extension of Colombia's deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas in accordance with article 5, paragraph 1, agreeing to grant the request for an extension until 1 March 2021;

(vii) In granting the request, the Meeting noted that, while it is understandable that Colombia has asked for the maximum time available given the extent of the known or suspected contamination problem, Colombia is doing so based on an incomplete picture. In order to attain a better picture of the situation, the Meeting requested Colombia to provide additional clarity to the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties, in 2011, regarding what areas are in the process of "Democratic Consolidation" and what areas currently provide the necessary security conditions to carry out humanitarian demining tasks, as well as the provision of more information concerning these areas;

(viii) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that, after almost ten years since entry into force, Colombia does not have the information in place to report in a more precise manner on the location of areas known or suspected to contain anti-personnel mines and hence to develop an implementation plan based on concrete information. In this context, the Meeting requested Colombia to provide an update to the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties on steps that are being taken to develop and implement more effective methods to determine the actual location and size of suspected hazardous area in municipalities where this may be possible;

(ix) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that, given the extremely ambitious resource mobilisation projections and given the importance of a sustained high level of external support, Colombia could benefit from developing as soon as possible a resource mobilisation strategy which included clarity regarding its national commitment during the extension period;

(x) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that, given the activities Colombia is undertaking initially in fourteen municipalities during the period 2011 to 2013 as well as other efforts to more closely define the level of contamination, and, given that Colombia has defined specific objectives for the development of methodologies to support mine clearance operations by its armed forces and civilian organizations, Colombia should have a much clearer understanding of the location and nature of contamination by the end of that period as well as on steps that can be taken to address this contamination. The Meeting also noted that Colombia has provided a clearance plan only for the period 2011 to 2013. In this context, the Meeting requested Colombia to present to the Thirteenth Meeting of the States Parties, in 2013, a revised implementation plan that contains and takes into account a clearer and more substantiated understanding of the location and nature of contamination and that includes revised annual projections of which areas would be addressed when and how. In addition, the Meeting requested Colombia, in accordance with Action 13 of the Cartagena Action Plan, to provide updates relative to these and other commitments at meetings of the Standing Committees, at Meetings of the States Parties and at Review Conferences;

(xi) The Meeting assessed the request submitted by Denmark for an extension of Denmark's deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas in accordance with article 5, paragraph 1, agreeing to grant the request for an extension until 1 July 2012;

(xii) In granting the request, the Meeting noted that Denmark had complied with the commitments it had made, as recorded in the decisions of the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties, to obtain clarity regarding the remaining challenge, produce a detailed plan and submit a second extension request, thus affirming the importance of a State Party, should it find itself in a situation similar to that of Denmark in 2008, requesting only the period of time necessary to assess relevant facts and develop a meaningful forward looking plan based on these facts;

(xiii) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that the timeline contained in the request would greatly assist Denmark and all States Parties in assessing progress in implementation during the extension period. In this regard, the Meeting requested Denmark, in accordance with Action 13 of the Cartagena Action Plan, to provide updates relative to these and other commitments at meetings of the Standing Committees and at Meetings of the States Parties;

(xiv) The Meeting assessed the request submitted by Guinea-Bissau for an extension of Guinea-Bissau's deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas in accordance with article 5, paragraph 1, agreeing to grant the request for an extension until 1 January 2012;

(xv) In granting the request, the Meeting noted that Guinea-Bissau had found itself in a situation wherein less than 14 months before its deadline it was still unclear whether it would be able to complete implementation of article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention by its deadline. The Meeting further noted that, while it may be unfortunate that after almost ten years since entry into force a State Party is unable to account for what remains to be done, it is positive that Guinea-Bissau intends to take the steps to garner an understanding of the true remaining extent of the challenge and to act accordingly. In addition, the Meeting noted that Guinea-Bissau will have obtained clarity regarding the remaining challenge following the conclusion of general survey at the end of April 2011. As well, the Meeting noted that Guinea-Bissau had acted in a prudent manner by requesting only the amount of time necessary to ensure that it would not become non-compliant;

(xvi) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that, while Guinea-Bissau has been slow to adopt efficient land release practices and that while its progress to date has been modest, Guinea-Bissau was making a commitment through its extension request to more efficiently and expediently proceed with article 5 implementation. The Meeting further noted that the plan presented by Guinea-Bissau is workable, but subject to the acquisition of funds to keep all relevant non-governmental organizations in operation. In this regard, the Meeting noted that Guinea-Bissau's resource mobilisation efforts could benefit from communicating in more detail its cost projections for each organization listed in its request and from Guinea-Bissau itself making a national contribution to the implementation of article 5;

(xvii) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that the plan presented by Guinea-Bissau provides for the use of the full range of technical and non-technical means to release suspected hazardous areas in keeping with the recommendations adopted by the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties. In this regard, the Meeting requested Guinea-Bissau to report on its progress in a manner consistent with commitments the States Parties had made through the adoption of the Cartagena Action Plan by providing information disaggregated by release through clearance, technical survey and non-technical survey;

(xviii) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that the timeline contained in the request would greatly assist Guinea-Bissau and all States Parties in assessing progress between now and the requested extended deadline. In this regard, the Meeting requested Guinea-Bissau to provide updates relative to these timelines at meetings of the Standing Committees and at Meetings of the State Parties;

(xix) The Meeting assessed the request submitted by Mauritania for an extension of Mauritania's deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas in accordance with article 5, paragraph 1, agreeing to grant the request for an extension until 1 January 2016;

(xx) In granting the request, the Meeting noted that, while progress in implementing article 5 was limited until 2006, Mauritania's efforts had improved considerably after that time with the establishment of Mauritania's National Humanitarian Demining Programme Development;

(xxi) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that the plan presented by Mauritania is workable and ambitious, but subject to the acquisition of equipment and the receipt of funds at levels that greatly exceed recent experience. In this context, the Meeting noted that given the importance of external support to ensure implementation, Mauritania's resource mobilization efforts could benefit from communicating in more detail its cost projections for acquisition of transport and mine clearance equipment and for land release;

(xxii) In granting the request, the Meeting noted that the plan presented by Mauritania provides for the use of the full range of technical and non-technical means to release suspected hazardous areas in keeping with the recommendations adopted by the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties. In this context, the Meeting requested Mauritania to continue to report on its progress in a manner consistent with commitments the States Parties had made through the adoption of the Cartagena Action Plan by providing information disaggregated by release through clearance, technical survey and non-technical survey;

(xxiii) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that the accounting of annual milestones of progress to be achieved, which Mauritania provided in its request, would greatly assist both Mauritania and all States Parties in assessing progress during the extension period. In this regard, the Meeting requested Mauritania, in accordance with Action 13 of the Cartagena Action Plan, to provide updates relative to these and other commitments at meetings of the Standing Committees, at Meetings of the States Parties and at the Third Review Conference;

(xxiv) The Meeting assessed the request submitted by Zimbabwe for an extension of Zimbabwe's deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas in accordance with article 5, paragraph 1, agreeing to grant the request for an extension until 1 January 2013;

(xxv) In granting the request, the Meeting noted that, while Zimbabwe had not complied with the commitment it had made, as recorded by the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties, to garner an understanding of the true remaining extent of the challenge and to develop plans accordingly that precisely project the amount of time that will be required to complete article 5 implementation, it is positive that Zimbabwe has committed, by 1 January 2013, to have built its capacity, improved its efficiency, carried out surveys and engaged those in a position to provide assistance;

(xxvi) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that, as Zimbabwe has made it clear that the provision of external support is necessary to fully implement the plan contained within its request, Zimbabwe could inspire greater confidence on the part of those in a position to provide assistance by increasing national ownership and enhancing its humanitarian demining effort in ways that would cost little, including by adopting IMAS-compliant national standards and strengthening civilian demining authorities;

(xxvii) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that while it may be unfortunate that after almost twelve years since entry into force a State Party is unable to specify how much work remains and how it will be carried out, it is positive that Zimbabwe

intends to reinvigorate efforts to garner an understanding of the true remaining extent of the challenge. In this context, the Meeting noted the importance of Zimbabwe requesting only the period of time necessary to assess relevant facts and develop a meaningful forward looking plan based on these facts. The Meeting further noted that, by requesting an additional 24 month extension, Zimbabwe was projecting that it would need approximately two years from the date of submission of its request to obtain clarity regarding the remaining challenge, produce a detailed plan and submit a third extension request;

(xxviii) Also in granting the request, the Meeting noted that the timeline contained in the request would greatly assist Zimbabwe and all States Parties in assessing progress in implementation during the extension period. The Meeting noted in particular the commitments made by Zimbabwe to undertake, within 12 months, non-technical survey of the four “unknown areas” (Rushinga, Lusulu, Mukumbura and Kariba) and technical survey of parts of the five “known minefields”, to relocate, within 12 months, ZIMAC “out of military cantonment area”, and, to develop, within 24 months, Zimbabwean mine action standards that are based on the IMAS. In this regard, the Meeting requested Zimbabwe, in accordance with Action 13 of the Cartagena Action Plan, to provide updates relative to these and other commitments at meetings of the Standing Committees and at Meetings of the States Parties.

23. Also in the context of considering the submission of requests under article 5 of the Convention, the Meeting warmly welcomed the report presented by the President of the Second Review Conference on the process for the preparation, submission and consideration of requests for extensions to article 5 deadlines, as contained in annex II to this report, and, in considering this report, the Meeting took the following actions:

(a) The Meeting recommended that all States Parties in the process of implementing article 5, particularly those that may believe it will be necessary at a future date to submit an extension request, intensify and accelerate efforts to locate and report on all mined areas that contain, or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines under their jurisdiction or control;

(b) The Meeting recalled the importance of the timely submission of extension requests to the overall effective functioning of the article 5 extension process and, in this context recommended that all States Parties that wish to submit requests do so no later than 31 March of the year when the request would be considered (i.e., the year prior to the State Party’s deadline);

(c) The Meeting, in noting that the Republic of the Congo has an article 5 deadline on 1 November 2011 and has not yet indicated that it will be able to comply by its deadline, noted the importance of the Republic of the Congo providing clarity on this matter as soon as possible.

24. Also at its tenth plenary session, the Meeting endorsed the final report of the ISU Task Force, as contained in annex VIII to this report. In doing so, the States Parties (a) mandated the President, in consultation with the States Parties, to conclude an amended agreement with the GICHD regarding the ISU, (b) adopted the “Directive from the States Parties to the ISU” as annexed to the ISU Task Force report, ensuring that the ISU is directly responsible to the States Parties while it continues to be hosted by the GICHD, and, (c) tasked the President to establish an informal open-ended working group to examine new models for the financing of the ISU and present recommendations and draft decisions on the most feasible comprehensive financing model for adoption by the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties, so it may be effective from the financial year 2012. In addition, the States Parties endorsed the President’s Statement on the Endorsement of the ISU Task Force Report, as contained in annex IX to this report.

25. Also at its ninth plenary session, the Meeting warmly welcomed the Review of the Intersessional Work Programme, presented by the President of the Second Review Conference on behalf of the Coordinating Committee and as contained in annex VI to this report, and, expressed appreciation for the proposal to establish a new Standing Committee, proposed by Zambia and as contained in annex IV to this report. In this context, the Meeting took the following action:

(a) The Meeting reaffirmed the ongoing importance of the principles that have been central to the success of the Intersessional Work Programme to date, namely: coherence, flexibility, partnership, informality, continuity, effective preparation, transparency and inclusion;

(b) The Meeting established a Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance, to be supported like other mechanisms established by the States Parties by the Implementation Support Unit, and, to be presided over in 2011 by the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties, with the leadership of this Standing Committee being regularised as of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties;

(c) The Meeting agreed to examine the possibility of rationalising the number of States Parties in leadership positions on Standing Committees, and, in this regard, requested that the President, on behalf of the Coordinating Committee, submit to the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, ideas regarding how many Co-Chairs/Co-Rapporteurs may be required to ensure the effective functioning of the mechanisms established by the States Parties, with a view to a decision to be taken on this matter at the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties;

(d) The Meeting requested the Coordinating Committee to organise the week of meetings of the Standing Committees in 2011 in such a way that time is allocated for Co-Chairs, individual States Parties and others to experiment with the new ways of using the Intersessional Work Programme to more intensively focus on national contexts or to otherwise creatively support progress in the application of the Cartagena Action Plan. The Meeting further agreed that, on the basis of experimentation carried out during various Intersessional Work Programmes, the States Parties should keep an open mind regarding the structure of the week of meetings of the Standing Committees to ensure the ongoing effectiveness of the Intersessional Work Programme;

(e) The Meeting acknowledged the ongoing importance of a Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction as long as profound challenges remain in the implementation of article 4;

(f) The Meeting noted that States Parties, and in particular States Parties that are party to more than one related instrument, should pursue coherence in the scheduling of meetings of relevant instruments, particularly those meetings that deal with the clearance of explosive hazards and assistance to the victims of conventional weapons, and, that the States Parties should regularly evaluate the potential for synergy in the work of various related instruments, while acknowledging the distinct legal obligations of each.

26. At its final plenary session, pursuant to consultations undertaken by the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the Meeting agreed to set the dates of 2011 meetings of the Standing Committees from 20 to 24 June 2011 and identified the following States Parties as the Standing Committee Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs until the end of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties:

(a) Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration: Australia and Uganda (Co-Chairs); Algeria and Croatia (Co-Rapporteurs);

(b) Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies: Colombia and Switzerland (Co-Chairs); Indonesia and Zambia (Co-Rapporteurs);

(c) Stockpile Destruction: Lithuania and the Philippines (Co-Chairs); Germany and Romania (Co-Rapporteurs);

(d) The General Status and Operation of the Convention: Canada and Thailand (Co-Chairs); Norway and Peru (Co-Rapporteurs).

27. Also at its final session, the Meeting agreed to designate His Excellency Prak Sokhonn, Minister Attached to the Prime Minister and Vice-President of the Cambodian Mine Action and Victim Assistance Authority, President of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties and decided to hold the Eleventh Meeting in Phnom Penh the week of 28 November to 2 December 2011. In addition, the Meeting adopted costs estimates for the Eleventh Meeting of the States parties as contained in document APLC/MSP.10/2010/6.

F. Documentation

28. A list of documents of the Tenth Meeting is contained in annex X to this report.

G. Adoption of the Final Report

29. At its final plenary session, on 3 December 2010, the Meeting adopted its draft report, as contained in document APLC/MSP.10/2010/CRP.1 as orally amended, which is being issued as document APLC/MSP.10/2010/7.

Part II

Achieving the aims of the Cartagena Action Plan: The Geneva Progress Report, 2009-2010

Introduction

1. From 30 November to 4 December 2009, the international community gathered at a high level in Cartagena, Colombia to reaffirm the commitment of States, international organisations and civil society to ending the suffering caused by anti-personnel mines and to achieving a world free of mines. At this historic event – the Cartagena Summit on a Mine-Free World – the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, while inspired by their collective achievements, expressed their will to strengthen their efforts to overcome remaining challenges.

2. With the aim of supporting enhanced implementation and promotion of the Convention in the five year period following the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties adopted the Cartagena Action Plan 2010-2014 and pledged to translate this action plan into sustainable progress while acknowledging their respective local, national and regional circumstances with regard to its practical implementation.

3. To ensure the effectiveness of the Cartagena Action Plan, the States Parties appreciate the need to regularly monitor progress of the application of the actions contained within. The purpose of the Geneva Progress Report 2009-2010 is to support the application of the Cartagena Action Plan by measuring progress made during the period 5 December 2009 to 3 December 2010 and, in doing so, to highlight priority areas of work for the States Parties in the period between the 2010 Tenth Meeting of the States Parties (10MSP) and the 2011 Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties (11MSP). It could be considered the first in a series of annual progress reports prepared by the States Parties in advance of the 2014 Third Review Conference.

I. Universalisation

4. At the close of the Cartagena Summit, there were 156 States Parties to the Convention. Moreover, most States not parties were adhering to the Convention's norms, with new use and production of anti-personnel mines rare and with transfers virtually non-existent. However, at the Cartagena Summit it was noted that while advancement toward universalisation has been impressive, challenges remain. It was further noted that several States not parties may still perceive that they derive utility from previously emplaced anti-personnel mines, that new use of anti-personnel mines had been recorded between the First and the Second Review Conferences on the part of three States not parties, and, that as long as States not parties possess stockpiled anti-personnel mines and have not indicated an intention to destroy them, the probability that they remain ready to make new use of these mines cannot be ruled out.

5. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties expressed the view that attracting further adherents to the Convention has grown more difficult in recent years and that future efforts to promote acceptance of the Convention and its norms will require intensive effort at as high a level as possible. They noted in particular that there is a dire need for States Parties, at the ministerial level or higher, to engage States not parties in order to complement the universalisation activities at the officials' level and advocacy by non-governmental and international organisations. It was further noted that the most prevalent

barrier to universalisation remains a persistent view on the part of many States not parties that a perceived marginal military utility derived from anti-personnel mines is not outweighed by the grave humanitarian consequences of their use and that intensive efforts likely are needed, with new tools, to overcome outdated thinking about the utility of anti-personnel mines.

6. Since the Cartagena Summit, progress toward universalisation continued to be stalled. There remain 156 States Parties and no State has deposited an instrument of ratification or accession to the Convention since November 2007. In addition, two (2) of the Convention's 133 signatories have not yet ratified, accepted or approved the Convention: the Marshall Islands and Poland, notwithstanding that, 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. On the other hand there are signs that the situation will not remain stalled for long:

(a) At the Cartagena Summit the **United States of America** announced that it was carrying out the first comprehensive review of US landmine policy since 2003. In 2010, the USA continued its policy review, consulting many States Parties and international and non-governmental organisations;

(b) In its May 2010 reply to the Organization for Security Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) "Questionnaire on Anti-Personnel Landmines and Explosive Remnants of War", **Finland** reiterated its decision to accede to the Convention in 2012. On 29 November 2010, at the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties, Finland indicated that the national constitutional measures required for accession to the Convention were under way and that an inter-agency working group was finalizing the Government Bill to Parliament;

(c) At the June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, **Poland** reiterated its intention to ratify the Convention in 2012 and that "the relevant documents are being prepared and will be submitted to the Parliament";

(d) Also at the June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee, the **Lao People's Democratic Republic** recalled that in 2004 it announced that it would accede to the Convention and that there is now a process in place of consultations with all concerned ministries to verify the Lao PDR's readiness to meet the Convention's obligations;

(e) In addition at the June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee, **Nepal** repeated its commitment to the Convention and indicated that it is fulfilling most of the Convention's obligations;

(f) On 28 September 2010, the Prime Ministers of Canada and Mongolia issued a joint statement in which Canada welcomed Mongolia's commitment to accede to the Convention.

7. Given their resolve to achieve universal adherence to the Convention and its norms, the States Parties agreed at the Cartagena Summit to seize every opportunity to promote ratification of and accession to the Convention, in particular in regions with low adherence to the Convention and to promote and encourage adherence to the norms of the Convention¹. In light of the universalisation challenges noted in Cartagena and commitments we made to overcome these challenges, the President of the Second Review Conference appointed His Royal Highness Prince Mired Raad Al-Hussein of Jordan to serve as the President's Special Envoy on the Universalisation of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention. In his capacity as Special Envoy, Prince Mired visited the capitals of

¹ Cartagena Action Plan, Actions #1 and #3.

Bahrain, Lao People's Democratic Republic (with a representative of Japan), Mongolia (with a representative of Canada) and United States of America. In addition, in Geneva he met with the Permanent Representatives of Finland, Georgia, Nepal and Sri Lanka.

8. In reporting in June 2010 to the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, the Special Envoy on the Universalisation of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention observed that, while the effort of having a Special Envoy is working, high level engagement of States not parties must continue past 2010 and that sustained, strategic efforts are required until the Third Review Conference. The Special Envoy also observed that maintaining a cooperative spirit in the work of this Convention is important to promoting universalisation, noting that States not parties closely observe the work of the Convention and that they want to be part of movement that features States and other actors collaborating with one another and working together to overcome the complexities of implementation.

9. In addition to the effort undertaken through a Special Envoy, thanks to enhanced support provided by Norway through the Implementation Support Unit (ISU), other States Parties continued their efforts to promote acceptance of the Convention. Canada, for instance, continued to advance universalisation efforts through its coordination of the informal Universalisation Contact Group. It was noted, however, that the number of universalisation actors continues to be small and could be considerably reinforced if more States Parties became active.

10. The States Parties continued to use the annual United Nations General Assembly resolution on the universalisation and implementation of the Convention as one measure of States' acceptance of the Convention's norms². On 2 December 2009, this resolution was adopted by 160 votes to none, with 18 abstentions and with two additional States subsequently advising the UN secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour. The following 19 States not parties voted in favour of this resolution: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, China, Finland, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Oman, Poland, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Tonga and United Arab Emirates.

11. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed to encourage and support the universalisation efforts of all relevant partners, including international, regional and non-governmental organizations³. The International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) continued their involvement and active cooperation in universalisation efforts. ICBL member organisations in over 60 countries participated in an effort to promote accession to the Convention by the USA. In addition, the ICBL continued to promote the acceptance of the Convention by other States not parties, in particular by Georgia, Israel, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nepal and Sri Lanka. The ICRC continued to play a central role in universalisation efforts in every region of the world. The United Nations Secretary General and United Nations departments and agencies continued to appeal for all States to ratify or accede to the Convention. As well, the United Nations Mine Action Team in Nepal, the United Nations Develop Programme (UNDP) in the Lao People's Democratic Republic and the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) in Geneva provided valuable support to the efforts of the Special Envoy on the Universalisation of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention.

² United Nations General Assembly Resolution 64/56.

³ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #2.

12. On 4 April 2010, the President of the European Parliament urged the international community “to create a new momentum” in efforts to eliminate anti-personnel mines and welcomed Finland and Poland's intention to ratify the Convention by 2012, remarking that “Europe's credibility in the fight against (anti-personnel mines) will be further strengthened.” In addition, on 27 July 2010, the Council of Europe's Commissioner of Human Rights expressed that “it is high time that all European states ratify the (Convention) and respect its provisions.”

13. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed to condemn and continue to discourage in every possible way any production, transfer and use of anti-personnel mines by any actor⁴. Since the Cartagena Summit, the ICBL has reported that one State not party – Myanmar – has made new use of anti-personnel mines and that armed non-State actors in the following six countries have done the same: Afghanistan, Colombia, India, Myanmar, Pakistan and Yemen. Also at the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed to encourage States not parties, particularly those that have professed support for the humanitarian objectives of the Convention, to participate in the work of the Convention⁵. In 2010, in keeping with the States Parties' tradition of openness, all States not parties were invited to participate in the Intersessional Work Programme and the 10MSP and its preparations. Seventeen States not parties registered to take part in the June 2010 meetings of the Standing Committees and eighteenth States not parties were recorded as observers of the 10MSP.

14. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed to continue promoting universal observance of the Conventions' norms, by condemning, and taking appropriate steps to end the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines by armed non-state actors⁶. Since the Cartagena Summit, two additional armed non-State actors signed the Geneva Call's “Deed of Commitment for Adherence to a Total Ban on Anti-Personnel Mines and for Cooperation in Mine Action” bringing to 41 the number of armed non-State actors that have made this commitment. Nevertheless, the view was expressed that when engagement by non-governmental organizations of armed non-State actors is considered, vigilance is required to prevent terrorist organizations from exploiting the Ottawa Process for their own goals. Some States Parties continue to be of the view that when engagement with armed non-state actors is contemplated, States Parties concerned should be informed and their consent would be necessary in order for such an engagement to take place. One State Party reiterated its concern regarding the engagement on the basis of one previous signing of the “Deed of Commitment” of Geneva Call as inconsistent with the above view.

II. Stockpile destruction

15. At the close of the Cartagena Summit, there were four States Parties for which the obligation to destroy stockpiled anti-personnel mines remained relevant – Belarus, Greece, Turkey and Ukraine – with three of these States Parties having been non-compliant with respect to their stockpile destruction obligation since 1 March 2008. In addition, one additional State Party – Equatorial Guinea – had not yet formally confirmed the presence or absence of stockpiled anti-personnel mines, although information from other sources indicates that this State Party does not hold stocks. Hence, 152 States Parties no longer held stocks of anti-personnel mines other than those mines States Parties are permitted to retain under article 3, either because they never did or because they had completed their

⁴ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #5.

⁵ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #6.

⁶ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #4.

destruction programmes. At the close of the Cartagena Summit, together the States Parties had reported the destruction of more than 43 million mines⁷.

16. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties expressed the view that the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines, while largely a great success story, persists as one of the Convention's most complex remaining challenges, noting that since 1 March 2008, Belarus, Greece and Turkey had not concluded implementation of their article 4 obligations within the time frame prescribed by the Convention and that Ukraine had indicated that it would be unable to comply with its obligation to destroy its stockpiled anti-personnel mines by its 1 June 2010 deadline. Serious concern was expressed with respect to the failure by three States Parties to comply with their obligations by their deadlines as well as to provide a clear timeline for completion and concern was expressed with respect to the looming matter of non-compliance on the part of one State Party.

17. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties acknowledged that the complexity of destruction of PFM-1-type anti-personnel mines combined with the limited number of entities capable of destroying these mines, the vast numbers of these mines held by Belarus and Ukraine, the inadvisability of transferring these mines for destruction and the high cost of destruction had resulted in a compelling implementation challenge for both States Parties. The States Parties recognised that the destruction of PFM mines is significantly more challenging and complex, technically and financially, than the destruction of other anti-personnel mines. The States Parties also recorded that both Belarus and Ukraine have sought assistance in accordance with article 6 of the Convention and expressed the view that the matter of ensuring compliance on the part of Belarus and Ukraine is the business of all States Parties.

18. Since the Cartagena Summit, Belarus, Greece, Turkey and Ukraine have continued their efforts to ensure the destruction of their stockpiles. In addition, on 1 June 2010 Ukraine, as had been foreshadowed at the Cartagena Summit, missed its four year destruction deadline. Hence, there remain 152 States Parties that now no longer hold stocks of anti-personnel mines, either because they never did or because they have completed their destruction programmes. Given progress in stockpile destruction reported by these States Parties since the Cartagena Summit, States Parties have now reported the destruction of almost 44 million mines.

19. Given their resolve to ensure the expeditious and timely destruction of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines, the States Parties agreed at the Cartagena Summit that States Parties that have missed their deadlines for article 4 implementation will comply without delay by destroying all stockpiles and provide a plan to ensure compliance as soon as possible and in strict conformity with relevant safety and environmental standards, including for this purpose relevant legislative measures taken, structures established, committed national resources, assistance needed and committed, and an expected completion date⁸. They further agreed that all States Parties yet to complete their obligations under article 4 will report on the progress of implementation, including steps taken at national level, anticipated particular technical and operational challenges, resources allocated and number of anti-personnel mines destroyed, to other States Parties through annual transparency reports, at every meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction and at every Meeting of

⁷ The total number of stockpiled anti-personnel reported destroyed in the final report of the Second Review Conference was 42,369,334 but, further to an amendment in the figures for the Turkish stockpile, the actual total at the close of the Second Review Conference/Cartagena Summit was 43,021,437.

⁸ Cartagena Action Plan, Actions #7 and #9.

the States Parties or Review Conference⁹. Since the Cartagena Summit, a variety of actions have been undertaken by Belarus, Greece, Turkey and Ukraine concerning the above mentioned commitments.

20. At the Cartagena Summit, it was recorded that the terms and conditions of the implementation of the PFM-1 mine destruction joint programme were identified and a schedule for the preparatory stage of the phase of the project had been agreed upon between **Belarus** and the European Commission (EC). It was further recorded that an EC assessment visit to the proposed destruction site was successful, that a tender was launched in July 2009 and that the EC was planning to sign a contract with the winner of the tender in January 2010.

21. On 30 April 2010, Belarus provided updated information in accordance with article 7, paragraphs 1(b) and 2 of the Convention reporting that 3,370,172 stockpiled anti-personnel mines remained as of 31 December 2009.

22. On 21 June 2010, Belarus informed the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction that while cooperation between the Republic of Belarus and the EC was ongoing, there had been setbacks since the Cartagena Summit which had delayed the commencement of the project. Belarus indicated that the Evaluation Committee of the EC had met during 8-10 December 2009 but had been unable to select an appropriate company to engage as a contractor to implement the project. Belarus further indicated that between December 2009 and May 2010 the EC had entered into negotiations with a potential contractor but that on 21 May 2010, the EC informed Belarus that the procedure had not been successful. As well, Belarus indicated that the EC had confirmed its willingness to continue its support to the project and to re-launch a tender “in the very near future”. Belarus further informed the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction on 21 June 2010 that, in parallel to its efforts to acquire international assistance, a private Belarusian company called Stroyenergo had destroyed a limited number of PFM -1 type mines. Belarus also confirmed that 3,370,172 stockpiled anti-personnel mines remained to be destroyed (i.e., the same number as reported in its transparency report submitted in 2010).

23. In June 2010, the EC proposed that Belarus sign the Addendum to the Financing Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Belarus and the European Commission on the implementation of the project “Destruction of PFM-1 Series Ammunition in Belarus”, dated 22 January 2008. The Addendum to the Financing Agreement was signed by Belarus and it entered into force on 24 August 2010. On 30 June 2010, the EC announced a new tender to select a contractor to implement the project “Destruction of PFM-1 Series Ammunition in Belarus”.

24. At the Cartagena Summit, it was recalled that on 25 May 2009 **Greece** had informed the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction that the total number of mines to be destroyed was 1,586,159, that 225,962 mines had been transferred to Bulgaria and were destroyed and that the transfer and destruction of all stockpiled mines “will be completed by the end of 2009.” Also at the Cartagena Summit, Greece indicated that while the transfer of mines to Bulgaria for the purposes of destruction had been delayed, all stockpiles had been gathered in specific locations to facilitate the quickest possible transportation and that between 24 October 2008 (when the first shipment was made) and 30 October 2009 the shipment of mines had “been constant” and that a total of 615,457 mines or 39.24 percent of the total stockpile had been transferred.

25. In April 2010, Greece provided updated information in accordance with article 7, paragraphs 1(b), 1(d) and 2 of the Convention reporting that as of 31 December 2009 a total

⁹ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #11.

1,566,532 anti-personnel mines remained to be destroyed and that as of 1 February 2010 a total of 615,362 mines had been transferred to Bulgaria for the purposes of destruction, including 599,052 that had been transferred in 2009. In April 2010, Bulgaria provided updated information in accordance with article 7 paragraphs 1(d) and 2 of the Convention reporting that between 31 March 2009 and 31 March 2010 it had received transfers of 443,832 stockpiled anti-personnel mines from Greece. The discrepancy between the numbers reported by Bulgaria and Greece was brought to the attention of the June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction.

26. On 21 June 2010, Greece informed the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction that the agreement between the Greek Ministry of Defence and the company selected to ensure the destruction of Greece's stockpiled anti-personnel mines had been cancelled on 16 June 2010 due to non-fulfilment of the agreement as a result of an industrial accident which had taken place on 3 February 2010 and as a consequence Greece would be unable to complete destruction of its stockpiles of anti-personnel mines by the end of 2010. Greece further informed the Standing Committee that despite this setback, the Greek Ministry of Defence was proceeding rapidly to engage another company to undertake the work and thus enable Greece to meet its obligations. Greece also indicated that a new contract will specify that the destruction of all remaining mines must be concluded within six months of signing the agreement. Given this, Greece expressed that a realistic timeline for completion of article 4 implementation would be early 2011. Greece also indicated that, in close collaboration with competent Bulgarian authorities, Greece had taken the necessary steps to ensure the destruction of the mines.

27. In October 2010 Greece indicated that 615,362 mines have been shipped to Bulgaria overall. Bulgarian authorities reported that between 15 December 2008 and 14 May 2010 a total of 614 882 Greek anti-personnel mines have been delivered and destroyed in Bulgaria. The issue of the difference between the Greek and the Bulgarian data relating to the quantity of delivered mines is a matter of an ongoing examination by the Greek authorities in close cooperation with the Bulgarian authorities." The aforementioned number of 614,882 destroyed mines was subsequently confirmed by the Bulgarian Permanent Mission in Geneva by note verbale dated 28 October 2010. In addition, Greece indicated that, with regard to the destruction of the remaining stockpile (60 percent) after the termination of the contract with EAS/ VIDEX, EAS filed an appeal against the Greek State, which is now under consideration by the competent Greek courts. This, however, has not prohibited the Greek authorities from preparing the preliminary groundwork for a new contract, pending the completion of the legal proceedings. The prospective new contractor will have the obligation to destroy the remaining anti-personnel mines within six months of the awarding of the contract.

28. At the Cartagena Summit, **Turkey** indicated that as of the end of October 2009, 956,761 mines remained to be destroyed. In April 2010, Turkey provided updated information in accordance with article 7, paragraphs 1(b) and 2 of the Convention reporting that 730,458 stockpiled anti-personnel mines remained as of 31 December 2009. On 21 June 2010, Turkey informed the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction that destruction of Turkey's remaining anti-personnel mines is being carried out at "full speed" at the Turkish Munitions Disposal Facility with the facility running 24 hours a day on the basis of 3 shifts per day. Turkey further indicated that the destruction process is being carried out with national resources only. Turkey also indicated that as of June 2010 a total of 266,143 stockpiled anti-personnel mines (including 22,788 ADAM mines) remained to be destroyed, that all DM-11 and M-16 mines have been destroyed and that remaining stockpile consists of M2, M14, and ADAM mines. On 10 August 2010, Turkey indicated that the number of stockpiled anti-personnel mines had been further reduced to 161,191 mines (including 5,416 M2, 132,987 M14 and 22,788 ADAM mines) and that 95 percent of Turkey's original stockpile has now been destroyed.

29. Turkey further informed the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction on 21 June 2010 that its stockpile destruction process is predicted to be completed this year. With respect to ADAM mines, which contain depleted uranium, Turkey indicated that destruction could not be done at the Turkish Munitions Disposal Facility as it would contravene national environmental regulations. Therefore the Ministry of National Defence is currently collaborating with the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA) to ensure the destruction of the 22,788 ADAM type mines.

30. Turkey informed the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties on 2 December 2010 that, with the exception of 22,788 “Area Denial Anti-Personnel Mines” (ADAM) which require special handling, all the stockpiled anti-personnel mines in Turkey have been completely destroyed as of mid-October 2010. The number of mines destroyed is close to three million (2,938,060 of four different types). For the destruction of the 22,788 remaining mines which contain depleted uranium, and thus require special handling, a contract has been signed on 16 November 2010 with NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA). These mines, which have already been rendered unusable, now await shipment to a third country with the proper facilities. Turkey also stated that, with the opening of a modern munitions disposal facility in 2007, destruction of a great number of anti-personnel mines was made possible within a very short period of time and that this facility was built and equipped entirely with national financial resources.

31. At the Cartagena Summit, it was recorded that on 25 May 2009 **Ukraine** informed the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction that it possessed 149,096 POM-2 mines and 5,950,372 PFM-1 mines. It was further recorded that, while Ukraine planned to destroy 1,500,000 mines in 2009 and 600,000 in 2010, a lack of financial resources was undermining the plan. The Cartagena Summit also recorded that in June 2009, the EC launched an experts’ mission to assess available destruction facilities and to determine the type of assistance with this mission confirming that Ukraine has the technical know-how to destroy its stockpiled PFM type mines, albeit with significant investment in technology and equipment required. As well, it was noted that the destruction of anti-personnel mines had been identified as one of the Ukrainian priorities that could be financed under the European Union’s European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI), with further needs to be identified in the course of the negotiation between Ukraine and the EC in the framework of the Ukrainian National Programme (UNP) for 2011-2013. Finally, it was recorded that on 16 June 2009, the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) received a request for assistance from Ukraine related to the destruction of Ukraine’s stockpiled anti-personnel mines and that the two were discussing modalities for the provision of expert support.

32. In September 2010, Ukraine expressed its appreciation for the efforts of the President of the Second Review Conference in facilitating a decision of the Norwegian Government to provide up to US\$ 1 million in 2010-2011 for Ukraine’s stockpile destruction efforts. Ukraine further noted that the modalities related to this financial assistance remain a matter of consultations between Ukraine and Norway.

33. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties that have missed their deadlines for completion of obligations under article 4 will immediately communicate, to all States Parties, the reasons, which should be cases of force majeure, for failing to comply¹⁰. On 18 May, Ukraine requested that the ISU distribute a note verbale to all States Parties informing them that Ukraine would be unable to comply with its article 4 obligation to destroy all its stockpiled anti-personnel mines by its 1 June 2010 deadline. Through this note verbale and through a non-paper distributed by Ukraine at the 21 June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction, Ukraine expressed that a “lack of

¹⁰ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #8.

practical international assistance” did not allow Ukraine to implement its obligations under article 4, particularly as a result of Ukraine’s “European partners” unilaterally suspending a joint destruction project with the EC.

34. Through its May 2010 note verbale and at the June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction, Ukraine elaborated on its plans to acquire the resources necessary to complete implementation of article 4, noting that it will work to accumulate national resources, resume cooperation with the EC in the framework of the ENPI (with the new National Indicative Programme for 2011-2013, which will include a sub-priority on the implementation of the Convention, to be finalised through a Memorandum of Understanding between Ukraine and the EC “in the nearest future”), and use, where appropriate, bilateral and multilateral mechanisms to encourage and facilitate the destruction of its stockpiles. Ukraine noted in particular that it has made a proposal to initiate stockpile destruction in the framework of a NATO/PfP Trust Fund project, which is being considered by the USA. Ukraine further indicated that, given the current absence of international support and the economic situation in Ukraine, the destruction process is “on hold.”

35. In April 2010, Ukraine provided updated information in accordance with article 7, paragraphs 1(b) and 2 of the Convention reporting that 5,951,785 stockpiled anti-personnel mines remained as of 1 April 2010. Taking into account the Cartagena Summit commitment to provide an expected completion date for destruction of these mines, Ukraine informed the June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction that it is estimated that the one rotary kiln at the Pavlograd Chemical Plant could destroy 1 million PFM mines per year, implying that without international assistance to expand capacity it would take “six years at the soonest” for Ukraine to complete implementation of article 4. Ukraine further indicated that with “proper financing”, the installation and operation of a second incinerator could see destruction completed within three years. Ukraine also indicated that the USA had recently agreed to purchase another incinerator for the Pavlograd Chemical Plant that could be used for the destruction of anti-personnel mines.

36. States Parties continued to express concern that four States Parties have failed to comply with the four-year deadline to destroy or ensure the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines owned, possessed or under their jurisdiction or control, encouraged the early completion of stockpile destruction programmes and recalled that the Cartagena Action Plan provides guidelines for getting back into the status of compliance. It was also noted that all States Parties have a role in being vigilant in ensuring that those with stockpile destruction programmes are on track to meet their obligations, including through the provision of international cooperation and assistance. In addition, it was noted that Belarus, Greece, Turkey and Ukraine each have expressed a deep commitment to the Convention and the fulfilment of their obligations.

37. It was noted that there is ambiguity with respect to Iraq’s stockpile status and that, should Iraq have stockpiled anti-personnel mines, Iraq would need to destroy or ensure the destruction of all stockpiled mines under its jurisdiction or control by 1 February 2012. In its initial article 7 report submission made in July 2008, Iraq stated that it did not hold stockpiles of antipersonnel mines, but states that “this matter will be further investigated and if required, corrected in the next report.” In its May 2009 article 7 submission, Iraq did not include any information on stockpiles or programmes related to their destruction. In its 15 June 2010 article 7 submission, Iraq appeared to indicate that 690 stockpiled anti-personnel mines are held.

38. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties will, when previously unknown stockpiles are discovered after stockpile destruction deadlines have passed, report such discoveries in accordance with their obligations under article 7, and in addition take

advantage of other informal means to share such information as soon as possible and destroy these anti-personnel mines as a matter of urgent priority¹¹. (“Informal means” could, for example, take the form of sharing information during the Intersessional Work Programme.) At the 21 June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction, Burundi reported that it had discovered 76 anti-personnel mines that were previously unknown. Burundi further reported that these mines have now been destroyed.

III. Mine clearance

39. There are 54 States Parties that originally had reported that they had to fulfil the obligation contained in article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention. Of these, by the close of the Cartagena Summit, 15 had reported that they had fulfilled their obligation to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under their jurisdiction or control. Therefore, at the close of the Cartagena Summit, there were 39 that had to still fulfil this obligation.

40. Since the Cartagena Summit, **Nicaragua** – at the 22 June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies – informed the States Parties that it had completed implementation of article 5. It was noted that article 5 implementation by Nicaragua was a major milestone as it ensured that an entire region – Central America – previously riddled with anti-personnel mines is safe again. It was also expressed that other States Parties still in the process of addressing their mine clearance challenges should be inspired by Nicaragua, a country that had overcome great obstacles to do what some had thought was impossible – the full implementation of article 5.

41. There are now 38 States Parties that must still fulfil the obligation contained in article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nigeria, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, and Zimbabwe.

42. The Cartagena Summit recorded that compliance with the obligation to destroy all emplaced anti-personnel mines had been of heightened importance for the States Parties in recent years. While progress in implementing article 5 on the part of many individual States Parties was also recorded at the Cartagena Summit, the Summit expressed the view that the large numbers of States Parties that have requested extensions on their deadlines suggests that there has been only minimal success in overcoming the challenge of clearing or otherwise releasing all mined areas.

43. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties that have been granted an extension to their initial article 5 deadline will complete implementation of article 5 as soon as possible but not later than their extended deadlines, ensure progress toward completion proceeds in accordance with the commitments made in their extension requests and the decisions taken on their requests, and report regularly on such progress¹². A summary of progress made relative to the commitments made in extension requests and the decisions taken on these requests is contained in annex II. Since the Cartagena Summit, it was noted that several of the States Parties with extended deadlines have fallen short of the annual

¹¹ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #12.

¹² Cartagena Action Plan, Action #13.

benchmarks or other commitments made in their extension requests. It was also noted that increased funding had been identified as a requirement in order for several of the State Parties with extended deadlines to meet their commitments and that this funding had not materialised, from either national or external sources.

44. Of the States Parties that have been granted extensions on their article 5 deadlines, one – **Nicaragua** – has had its deadline occur since the Cartagena Summit. As noted above, this State Party reported compliance with article 5 obligations by its extended deadline. Of the States Parties that have been granted extensions on their article 5 deadlines, three – **Chad, Denmark** and **Zimbabwe** – had been granted extensions for a period of time necessary to assess relevant facts and develop a meaningful forward looking plan based on these facts. Since the Cartagena Summit Denmark has indicated that it has now developed a meaningful plan forward and Chad and Zimbabwe have indicated that, due to various circumstances, they have not.

45. In the decisions taken on article 5 extension requests, it was agreed that for one State Party – **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** – there would be a dated commitment with the date for meeting this commitment occurring since the Cartagena Summit. The States Parties noted that United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland agreed at the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties (9MSP) to provide as soon as possible, and not later than 30 June 2010, a detailed explanation of how demining is proceeding and the implications for future demining in order to meet the United Kingdom's obligations, including the preparation and status of work conducted under national demining programmes and financial and technical means available.

46. At the 22 June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland reported that a four site pilot project started on 4 December 2009 and was completed on 4 June with 568 anti-vehicle mines, 678 anti-personnel mines, 2 sub-munitions and 9 additional unexploded ordnance destroyed. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland provided dates when mines were either emplaced or discovered in each area, the numbers and types of munitions found and destroyed, the amount of area released, the methods used to do so and steps taken to assure quality. In addition, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland indicated that it will now analyse the data gathered from this project, make recommendations for future work based on this analysis and report the findings of this analysis and agreed next steps to the 10MSP.

47. At the Cartagena Summit, it was recorded that one of the first challenges faced by many States Parties that must still complete implementation of article 5 is to undertake or complete the task of making every effort to identify all areas under a State Party's jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced. It was further recorded that several States Parties, including some for which the Convention entered into force several years ago, had not yet provided clarity pursuant to their obligation to report on the location of all mined areas that contain or are suspect to contain, anti-personnel mines. To address this challenge, it was agreed that States Parties that have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control will do their utmost to identify, if they have not yet done so, the precise perimeters and locations, to the extent possible, of all areas under their jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced, and report this information, as required by article 7, no later than the 10MSP¹³. A summary of information reported by States Parties in accordance with this commitment and the obligations contained in article 7 is contained in annex III.

¹³ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #14.

48. It was noted that many States Parties in the process of implementing article 5 have still not provided information, as is called for in article 7, paragraphs 1(c) and 1 (f), on “the location of all mined areas that contain, or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines under (a State Party’s) jurisdiction or control” and on “status of programs for the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with (article 5).” It was further noted that while many States Parties in their extension requests had provided a detailed accounting of the size, location and nature of remaining mined areas, they had not since submitting their extension requests reported relative to the benchmark information contained in their requests.

49. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties expressed the view that Landmine Impact Surveys and other efforts have resulted in an imprecise identification and significant overestimation of the size of mined areas and have led to inappropriate allocations of time and resources. The States Parties also recorded that they are now greatly aided by understanding the limitations of Landmine Impact Surveys and by applying the recommendations that they have embraced on applying all available methods to achieve the full, efficient and expedient implementation of article 5, including by releasing land through non-technical means, technical survey and clearance. In this context, at the Cartagena Summit the States Parties agreed that States Parties that have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control will do their utmost to ensure that all available methods are applied where and as relevant, by developing and implementing applicable national standards, policies and procedures for releasing land through technical and nontechnical means that are accountable and acceptable to local communities, including through the involvement of women and men in the acceptance process¹⁴. It was also agreed that such States Parties would provide information on the areas already released, disaggregated by release through clearance, technical survey and nontechnical survey¹⁵.

50. Since the Cartagena Summit, **Bosnia and Herzegovina** reported that since the beginning of mine action in the country, 95 percent of the suspected mined areas have been reduced by non technical land release methods which include systematic and general survey and that these methods were defined in Bosnia and Herzegovina’s standing operating procedures which were adopted in 2003. **Cambodia** reported that since 1992, all operators have been using all available means, including clearance, technical and nontechnical survey to release land and that the Cambodian has developed standards that include chapters on clearance, baseline survey and land release. **Chile** reported that it prepared a demining field manual and a handbook on the application of land release procedures. **Colombia** reported that it has adopted the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) and is adapting methodologies and procedures for land release. Colombia has also made available lists of areas where nontechnical survey is taking place and of areas that have been released through technical survey and clearance. **Croatia** reported that it has developed national mine action standards that are in accordance with the IMAS, that all Croatian standing operating procedures are publicly available on the Croatian Mine Action Centre (CROMAC) website, and that non-technical survey and the combination of non-technical survey and clearance are used in Croatia. Croatia also reported on the amount of area released through demining and the amount released through general survey.

51. **Democratic Republic of the Congo** reported that operators under the coordination of the United Nations Mine Action Coordination Centre (UNMACC) are using demining and technical and non-technical means to release lands and that the Democratic Republic of the Congo does not yet have national standards. **Ethiopia** reported that standard operational

¹⁴ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #15.

¹⁵ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #17.

procedures are used to secure the standard of released land by non-technical means, technical survey and clearance. **Jordan** reported that it utilises the latest methods and standards for demining, technical survey, quality assurance and quality control, and, that these methods are governed by national technical standards and guidelines which are based on IMAS Version 4 and were modified to reflect the reality of Jordan. **Mozambique** reported that it has developed national land release standards to ensure that suspected hazardous areas will be released in a more efficient and cost effective manner, that these standards require demining organisations to apply non-technical means to release land in addition to applying full clearance method, and, that Mozambique's National Demining Institute (IND) will ensure that decisions to release land are made through a consultative process involving communities and by applying appropriate quality assurance procedures. Mozambique further reported that all the existing standards have been reviewed to ensure the land release concept is integrated throughout Mozambique's national standards in compliance with the IMAS, that it is expected that through proper non-technical and technical survey there will be a significant reduction to the estimated suspect hazardous area, and, that this reduction will ensure a more efficient use of time and resources for demining operators, which could reduce the estimated completion timelines of in various provinces and districts.

52. **Senegal** indicated that since 2009 it has implemented its own standards, which include standards for land release by non-technical means and technical survey. **Tajikistan** reported that it uses non-technical means, technical survey, and clearance to release land, that it has national standards for non-technical land release and for technical survey operations and that mechanical mine clearance standards are under development. **Thailand** reported that it is in the process of revising its national standards on mine clearance with this process expected to be completed in 2011. Thailand has also reported on the amount of area released using its "Locating Minefield Procedure" and the amount released through manual clearance methods. **Uganda** reported that national standards were approved in February 2009, that these standards spell out procedures for non-technical and technical surveys, and, that non-technical and technical surveys are being used in the field. **Yemen** reported that land is released through technical survey and clearance in accordance with international and national mine action standards. **Zimbabwe** reported that all land release that has been done so far has been through technical survey and clearance only and that it is working on a project to establish national standards for land release based on the IMAS.

53. At the Cartagena Summit the States Parties agreed that States Parties that have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control will do their utmost to take full national ownership of their article 5 obligations by developing, implementing and regularly reviewing national mine action strategies and associated policies, plans, budget policies and legal frameworks, and inform the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies on their implementation¹⁶. It was also agreed that these States Parties would provide annually, in accordance with article 7, precise information on the number, location and size of mined areas, anticipated particular technical or operational challenges, plans to clear or otherwise release these areas¹⁷. With respect to these commitments, **Bosnia and Herzegovina** reported that Bosnia and Herzegovina's Council of Ministers adopted Bosnia and Herzegovina's Mine Action Strategy 2009-2019, based on which annual operational mine action plans are developed. **Cambodia** reiterated that it has developed a national mine action strategy, which will soon be made available on the website of the Cambodian Mine Action Authority (CMAA). **Chile** reported that it has a national demining plan and that annual directives bring the programme

¹⁶ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #16.

¹⁷ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #17.

up to date. **Colombia** indicated that its request for an extension of this article 5 deadline contains its prospective plan of action to implement article 5.

54. **Croatia** reported that, on 16 September 2009, the Croatian Parliament adopted a 2009-2019 mine action strategy, that an abstract of this is publicly available on the CROMAC website, and that annual plans containing projections of areas to be cleared are also prepared and made available on this website. **Democratic Republic of the Congo** reported that while no national demining strategy has yet been developed, a United Nations Mine Action Coordination Centre (UNMACC) 2010-2012 strategy outlines UNMACC objectives for this period. **Ethiopia** reported that the yearly plan of action and the national demining strategic plan (2006/7-2010/11) came to effect through participatory priority settings involving local authorities, beneficiaries, and project stakeholders. **Jordan** reported that it has a National Mine Action Plan for 2010-2015. **Mozambique** reported that, in accordance with its extension request, it developed a national mine action plan (2008-2014), which includes an annual action plan per province and district, including financial implications for both operations and coordination.

55. **Senegal** reported that its mine action strategy was revised in 2007 and that an action plan for 2007-2015 and a demining action plan were also developed. **Tajikistan** reported that demining is taking place with accordance to its article 5 extension request, which was granted in 2009, and that annual work plans are developed containing tasks for the year. **Thailand** reported that it has developed a national mine action strategy 2010-2014. **Uganda** reported that it has a demining plan, which is part of the Integrated Mine Action Programme document 2010-2012, and, that the plan highlights how Uganda can be in a position to reach its August 2012 article 5 deadline. **Yemen** reported that it has a strategic mine action plan for six years, 2009-2014. **Zimbabwe** reported that, since its article 5 extension request was granted in 2008, it failed to get the assistance necessary to carry out surveys that would enable it to develop plans for dealing with the remaining contamination.

56. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties recalled that article 5 implementation, particularly along borders, has an important relationship to the obligation contained in article 1 of the Convention and noted the need to proceed with article 5 implementation along borders and in other areas to avoid the semblance of violating article 1. The States Parties also noted the importance, where a border dispute exists over land that is considered a “mined area”, to do the maximum to coordinate work with the relevant State, be it a State Party or a State not party, in such a way that clearance can proceed even where the border is not delineated or demarcated. Given these understandings, it was agreed at the Cartagena Summit that States Parties that have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control will do their utmost to provide access to all mined border areas where access may be difficult or contested, without prejudice to potential border delineation, to ensure that clearance can proceed as soon as possible, making use of the good offices of Presidents of Meetings of the States Parties or Review Conferences or other third parties as appropriate¹⁸.

57. Since the Cartagena Summit, **Cambodia** reported that, while it still faces some challenges due to the slow process of demarcation along its border with Thailand, where land is not contested clearance is taking place in accordance with community priorities. It further reported that areas which are being contested will be subject to clearance upon request by the Joint Border Committee. **Chile** has reported that one of its priorities is to clear the mined areas close to border crossings, thus allowing better integration and exchanges between Chile and neighbouring States. Chile further highlighted that demining operations have allowed for a safe passing across its borders with Peru, Bolivia and Argentina and that on 30 July 2010 the Ministers of Defence of Chile and Bolivia met to

¹⁸ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #18.

declare two areas along their common border free of mines and that this effort will allow for the construction of a new border crossing.

58. **Thailand** has reported that most of its mine clearance work takes place in border provinces but that there are contaminated areas along borders that have not yet been accessed as the demarcation process is ongoing between Thailand and its neighbouring countries and that Thailand looks forward to collaborating with its neighbouring countries on the work on the border area. **Tajikistan** has reported that mine action personnel are permitted to enter to the mined Tajik-Afghan border areas to conduct any type of operation relating with land release and survey but that the national demining programme still does not have official permission to conduct operations along the Tajik-Uzbek border. **Zimbabwe** has reported that it has mined areas that straddle its border with Mozambique, that issues of access and responsibility for clearance of these mined areas have been discussed at the technical level between the two countries' respective national mine action authorities, that these issues will be subject to discussion in due course at bilateral high level government forums that already exist between the two countries and that no problems in dealing with these issues are anticipated and therefore the involvement of third parties is not warranted at this stage.

59. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties updated their understandings related to mine risk education (MRE) and agreed that States Parties that have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control will do their utmost to provide mine risk reduction and education programmes, as part of broader risk assessment and reduction activities targeting the most at-risk populations, which are age-appropriate and gender-sensitive, coherent with applicable national and international standards, tailored to the needs of mine-affected communities and integrated into ongoing mine action activities, in particular data gathering, clearance and victim assistance as appropriate¹⁹. Since the Cartagena Summit, **Bosnia and Herzegovina** reported that MRE is conducted according to its standards adopted in 2004 and its standing operating procedures adopted in 2006, that annual MRE plans are made based upon its 2009-2019 MRE Substrategy, that there are 15 accredited MRE organisations, and that MRE programmes and activities are planned and carried out according to the needs of affected groups in mine impacted communities based on age. **Cambodia** has reported that MRE remains an important component to achieve the goals of Cambodia's National Mine Action Strategy, that messages and activities tailored to the needs of the remaining male and female high-risk groups as well as children and that steps have been taken to improve coordination in the delivery of MRE.

60. **Ethiopia** reported that the Ethiopian Mine Action Office is providing gender and culturally sensitive MRE and that efforts are undertaken in accordance with the IMAS, customised to local and national requirements. Ethiopia further reported that MRE efforts have led to populations demonstrating behavioural changes, reporting explosive hazards and providing other pertinent information regarding mine action. **Mozambique** reported that MRE activities focus on communities affected by landmines, that it is implemented by all humanitarian operators during their clearance tasks, that focal points are instructed to communicate information on the risk caused by mines, and that MRE has resulted in information on suspected areas, accidents and victims. **Uganda** reported that MRE is conducted by two accredited international non-governmental organisations, that their activities are coordinated by Uganda's Mine Action Centre and that these activities include direct presentations by MRE teams in affected communities, teaching schools, training drama groups for mobile live performances and the use of small and mass media to communicate messages.

¹⁹ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #19.

61. Since the Cartagena Summit, the International Mine Action Standards on Mine Risk Education (IMAS-MRE) were revised and updated with support from UNICEF and GICHD and within the framework of International MRE Advisory Group and the IMAS Review Board. The revised standards will assist states and mine action organizations develop and implement more effective mine risk education interventions. UNICEF in collaboration with GICHD has also developed a Training Manual on implementation of IMAS-MRE that will facilitate easy application of the revised standards at national and local levels.

62. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties recalled the decisions taken at the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties (7MSP) establishing a process for the preparation, submission and consideration of requests for extensions of article 5 deadlines, noted the suggested outline provided by the ISU to assist requesting States Parties in organising the content of their requests and expressed the view that the article 5 extensions process has led to the establishment of an orderly and predictable calendar for submitting, analysing and considering extension requests. With respect to such requests, at the Cartagena Summit it was agreed that States Parties that have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control but due to exceptional circumstances need to request an extension to their 10-year deadline will inform the States Parties of these exceptional circumstances in due time, develop the extension request in line with the recommendations made by the 7MSP and utilise the opportunity for informal dialogue with the group mandated to analyse the extension request²⁰.

63. The article 5 extensions process implies that if a State Party with a 2011 deadline believes it will be unable to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas that it has reported by its deadline, it should have submitted a request in March of 2010. At the Cartagena Summit, it was noted that in 2008 and 2009 many requesting States did not adhere to such a timeline and that States Parties should adhere to the March submission date or otherwise inform the President of circumstances that may prevent timely submission. Since the Cartagena Summit, requests were received by the President from **Colombia** (on 31 March 2010), **Mauritania** (on 10 April 2010), **Denmark** (on 18 June 2010), **Zimbabwe** (on 3 August 2010), **Guinea Bissau** (on 8 September 2010), and **Chad** (on 20 September 2010). In keeping with the decisions of the Cartagena Summit, Chad, Denmark, Guinea-Bissau and Zimbabwe all informed the President of the circumstances that prevented timely submission. In keeping with the decisions of the 7MSP, the President informed the States Parties of the receipt of these requests and instructed the ISU to make these requests available to all interested actors on the Convention's web site.

64. Further to the commitments made at the Cartagena Summit, representatives of each requesting State Party and the group mandated to analyse the extension requests engaged in informal dialogue with a view to the analysing group to seek a better understanding of the requests and to offer advice and suggestions to requesting States Parties. This cooperative process resulted in requesting States Parties clarifying many questions about their requests and with some (**Colombia**, on 13 August 2010 and **Mauritania**, on 6 September 2010 and **Zimbabwe**, on 28 September 2010), submitting revised, improved requests.

65. It was noted that one State Party with an article 5 deadline in 2011, **Congo**, neither submitted a request for an extension of its deadline nor confirmed that it would comply with its obligation by its deadline.

66. It was noted that the following States Parties with article 5 deadlines that occur in 2012 believe that they will be unable to comply with their obligations in a ten year period and hence will submit extension requests in 2011: **Chile**, **Democratic Republic of the**

²⁰ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #21.

Congo and Eritrea. It was further noted that there are four additional States Parties – **Algeria, Jordan, Nigeria and Uganda** – that have deadlines that occur in 2012.

67. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties will, when previously unknown mined areas are discovered after reporting compliance with article 5 (1), report such discoveries in accordance with their obligations under article 7, take advantage of other informal means to share such information and destroy the anti-personnel mines in these areas as a matter of urgent priority²¹. Since the Cartagena Summit, no State Party has reported such discoveries.

IV. Victim assistance

68. At the Cartagena Summit, it was recorded that in the preceding five years, for the first time clear objectives had been established and national plans developed by States Parties that are ultimately responsible for the well-being of significant numbers of landmines survivors and that the aim of assisting landmine survivors had been taken into account in broader disability and human rights approaches. Between the 2004 Nairobi Summit and the 2009 Cartagena Summit, 13 of these States Parties had revised their objectives to be more specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound – SMARTer: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Cambodia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Serbia, Sudan, Tajikistan, and Uganda. In addition, between these two summits, 13 of these States Parties had developed, or had initiated an interministerial process to develop and/or implement, a comprehensive plan of action to meet their objectives: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, El Salvador, Jordan, Senegal, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Uganda. As well, 23 of the States Parties that are ultimately responsible for the well-being of significant numbers of landmines survivors had reported progress in the achievement of specific objectives: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Jordan, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda and Yemen.

69. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties reaffirmed their understandings on victim assistance which have evolved through ten years of implementation of the Convention and the evolution of international human rights law. They reiterated their understanding of the paramount importance of the principles of national ownership, equality, non-discrimination, full inclusion and participation, an integrated and comprehensive approach, a gender perspective, transparency, efficiency and accountability in all victim assistance efforts. In addition, they recalled that victim assistance should be part of public health, rehabilitation, social services and human rights frameworks and that efforts should be integrated into broader national policies, plans and legal frameworks related to disability, health, education, employment, development and poverty reduction, noting again that victim assistance efforts should not exclude any person injured or disabled in another manner while ensuring that services are provided where they are needed.

70. At the Cartagena Summit, while noting the progress that has been made in achieving the victim assistance aim of the Convention, the States Parties recognised that the most identifiable gains had been process-related and that the real promise of the Convention is to make a difference on the ground, in the lives of survivors, the families of those killed or injured, and their communities. The States Parties expressed the view that a persistent

²¹ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #22.

challenge remains in translating increased understanding on victim assistance into tangible improvements in the quality of daily life of mine victims.

71. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties expressed their resolve to provide adequate age- and gender-sensitive assistance to mine victims, through a holistic and integrated approach that includes emergency and continuing medical care, physical rehabilitation, psychological support, and social and economic inclusion in accordance with applicable international humanitarian and human rights law, with the aim of ensuring their full and effective participation and inclusion in the social, cultural, economic and political life of their communities. To this end, the States Parties, particularly those accountable to and responsible for the well-being of significant numbers of mine victims, agreed to reinforce their efforts and do their utmost to facilitate measurable progress by applying 11 specific actions relating to assisting the victims²². To promote the application of these actions, the then-Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration (Belgium and Thailand) presented specific recommendations on national implementation of relevant aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan²³. To enhance their usefulness at the national level, these recommendations have been made available in the following languages: Albanian, Arabic, Dari, English, French, Khmer, Pashtu, Portuguese, Spanish and Tajik. In addition, at the Cartagena Summit the States Parties were presented with the “Survivors’ Call to Action”, which spells out landmine survivors’ expectations of States Parties during the period 2010-2014 and the commitments that survivors themselves have made to advance the aims of the Convention.

72. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties, particularly those accountable to and responsible for the well-being of significant numbers of mine victims, will reinforce their efforts and will do their utmost to ensure the inclusion and full and active participation of mine victims and their representative organisations as well as other relevant stakeholders in victim assistance related activities, in particular as regards the national action plan, legal frameworks and policies, implementation mechanisms, monitoring and evaluation²⁴. Since the Cartagena Summit, 21 States Parties reported the inclusion of mine survivors and other persons with disabilities in national workshops and/or implementation, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand and Uganda.

73. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties, particularly those accountable to and responsible for the well-being of significant numbers of mine victims, will establish, if they have not yet done so, an inter-ministerial/inter-sectoral coordination mechanism for the development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of relevant national policies, plans and legal frameworks, and ensure that this focal entity has the authority and resources to carry out its task²⁵. There are now 21 States Parties that have established such a coordination mechanism: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Uganda. Examples include: Afghanistan’s Disability Sector

²² Cartagena Action Plan, Actions #23 through #33. In addition to these 11 actions listed under the heading “assisting the victims”, several actions under the “international cooperation and assistance” and “transparency” headings relate to victim assistance.

²³ Assisting the Victims: Recommendations on Implementing the Cartagena Action Plan 2010-2014. APLC/CONF/2009/MISC.6

²⁴ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #23.

²⁵ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #24.

Coordination Group; Cambodia's National Disability Coordination Committee; Jordan's Higher Council for the Affairs of Persons with Disabilities; and, Sudan's High Disability Council. However, in many instances coordination is weak or remains under the domain of a mine action authority or centre rather than being a part of broader coordination frameworks in accordance with the understandings adopted by the States Parties in Nairobi and reaffirmed in Cartagena. In addition, there are now 18 States Parties have designated a focal entity to strengthen victim assistance-related activities: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Peru, Senegal, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Uganda.

74. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties, particularly those accountable to and responsible for the well-being of significant numbers of mine victims, will collect all necessary data, disaggregated by sex and age, in order to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate adequate national policies, plans and legal frameworks including by assessing the needs and priorities of mine victims and the availability and quality of relevant services, make such data available to all relevant stakeholders and ensure that such efforts contribute to national injury surveillance and other relevant data collection systems for use in programme planning²⁶. There are now 18 States Parties that collect data in accordance with this agreed commitment: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, El Salvador, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Uganda. Examples of progress include: Angola launched a project to collect mine/ERW casualty data and establish a database; Colombia launched a pilot project to include the category of mine/ERW casualty in the national injury surveillance mechanism; in Croatia, a new database is being developed under the Croatian National Institute of Public Health; El Salvador is undergoing a process of data cleaning to identify the cause of injury among victims of the armed conflict; Guinea-Bissau is developing a comprehensive survey of persons with disabilities after the population census; and, Senegal conducted a needs assessment of survivors. States Parties have also expressed that the following challenges remain in being able to collect and make available all necessary data: lack of a unified system; and, lack of human, technical and financial resources to collect and maintain data.

75. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties, particularly those accountable to and responsible for the well-being of significant numbers of mine victims, will develop (or review and modify if necessary) and implement national policies, plans and legal frameworks with a view to meet the needs and human rights of mine victims, and, develop a budget related to carrying out these tasks²⁷. It was further agreed that plans should contain objectives that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time bound and that these plans should be integrated into broader relevant national policies, plans, and legal frameworks²⁸. Since the Cartagena Summit, 21 States Parties have reported on the development, review or modification of policies, plans and legal frameworks: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Uganda. Of these States Parties, 6 have reported on the integration of victim assistance plans into broader relevant national policies, plans, and legal frameworks: Afghanistan, Cambodia, El Salvador, Guinea-Bissau, Jordan and Uganda. Examples include in Afghanistan, a new law on the rights of persons with disabilities has been signed by the President; in Albania, the

²⁶ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #25.

²⁷ Cartagena Action Plan, Actions #26 and #27.

²⁸ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #27.

Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities has been signed and a new Anti-Discrimination Law adopted; in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, a work plan for victim assistance was adopted at the national workshop; in Iraq, a draft law on the establishment of a Disability Council has been submitted to the Parliament; in Mozambique, the 2006-2010 National Plan for Persons with Disabilities is under review; Senegal, ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities; in Tajikistan, a new Law on Social Protection of Persons with Disabilities was approved; in Thailand, the Master Plan for Victim Assistance is being revised to comply with the Cartagena Action Plan; and in Uganda, the Comprehensive Plan for Victim Assistance was reviewed and revised to incorporate the Cartagena Action Plan and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. States Parties have also expressed that the following challenges remain in being able to live up their commitment to develop (or review and modify if necessary) and implement national policies, plans and legal frameworks: limited or lack of human, technical and financial resources to develop, implement and monitor national policies, plans and legal frameworks.

76. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties, particularly those accountable to and responsible for the well-being of significant numbers of mine victims, will monitor and evaluate progress regarding victim assistance within broader national policies, plans and legal frameworks on an ongoing basis²⁹. There are now 15 States Parties that have developed such a monitoring and evaluation mechanism: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, El Salvador, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Tajikistan, and Uganda. Examples include: in Cambodia, the National Disability Coordination Committee has the mandate to monitor and evaluate the National Plan of Action; and, in El Salvador the interagency coordination committee is responsible. States Parties have also expressed that the following challenges remain in being able to monitor and evaluate progress: limited capacity to implement monitoring mechanisms.

77. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties, particularly those accountable to and responsible for the well-being of significant numbers of mine victims, will ensure the continued expert involvement and effective contribution in all relevant convention related activities by health, rehabilitation, social services, education, employment, gender and disability rights experts, including mine survivors, inter alia by supporting the inclusion of such expertise in their delegations³⁰. At the June 2010 meetings of the Standing Committees, 16 States Parties included such an expert in their delegation: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Guinea-Bissau, Jordan, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Uganda. At least nine landmine survivors and other persons with disabilities participated in these meetings. At the 10MSP, 21 States Parties included an expert, as defined above, in their delegation: Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Uganda. At least 11 landmine survivors and other persons with disabilities participated in the 10MSP. It was noted again that the informal Sponsorship Programme plays an indispensable role in ensuring the participation of States Parties' health, rehabilitation, social services, education, employment, gender and disability rights experts.

²⁹ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #28.

³⁰ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #29.

78. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties, particularly those accountable to and responsible for the well-being of significant numbers of mine victims, will strengthen national ownership³¹. At the June 2010 meetings of the Standing Committees, during a special session held to discuss international cooperation and assistance, it was proposed that national ownership in relation to victim assistance could comprise the following six elements: (a) a high level commitment to addressing the rights and needs of mine victims and other persons with disabilities, (b) a national coordination mechanism empowered and provided with the human, financial and material capacity to carry out its responsibilities, (c) a comprehensive plan, and, legislation to address the rights and needs of persons with disabilities including mine victims, (d) a regular, significant commitment to implement the policy, plan and legislation and to provide services, (e) capacity to implement the policy, plan and legislation or steps taken to acquire the resources necessary to build this capacity, and, (f) a national focal entity for disability-related issues. It was noted that such an expression of what might be expected from States Parties in terms of “national ownership” may provide a more specific means of evaluating progress in this area in the future.

79. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties, particularly those accountable to and responsible for the well-being of significant numbers of mine victims, will develop and implement capacity building and training plans to promote and enhance the capacity of the women, men and associations of victims, other organisations and national institutions charged with delivering services and implementing relevant national policies, plans and legal frameworks³². Since the Cartagena Summit, 15 States Parties have reported on activities to develop and/or implement capacity building and training plans: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Colombia, Croatia, Iraq, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Sudan, Tajikistan, and Thailand. Examples of initiatives undertaken include in Burundi, the training of prosthetic technicians in cooperation with Thailand; in Colombia, capacity building of surgeons and rehabilitation specialists in two affected regions; and, in Senegal, the capacity building of an association of survivors to improve management. States Parties have also expressed that the following challenges remain in being able to live up their commitment to develop and implement capacity building and training plans: lack of training facilities at the national level; limited financial and technical resources; and, migration of trained personnel.

80. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties, particularly those accountable to and responsible for the well-being of significant numbers of mine victims, will increase availability of and accessibility to appropriate services and ensure that appropriate services are accessible³³. Since the Cartagena Summit, 18 States Parties have reported on activities to increase the availability of and accessibility to appropriate services: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Colombia, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Uganda. Examples of initiatives undertaken include: in Afghanistan, a Physical Accessibility committee was established under Disability Sector Coordination Group; in Bosnia and Herzegovina, a new orthopaedic centre opened in Mostar; in Guinea-Bissau, the Janeiro Physical Rehabilitation Centre in Bissau has been re-equipped and will soon reopen; in Jordan, national accreditation standards for institutions and programmes were launched; in Nicaragua, the number of physicians in remote areas has been increased; in Peru, the decentralisation of rehabilitation services is underway; in Tajikistan, a “Guideline on psycho-social support for landmine survivors” and a “Medical and Social

³¹ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #30.

³² Cartagena Action Plan, Action #30.

³³ Cartagena Action Plan, Actions #31 and #32.

Diagnostic Guideline” for staff of relevant ministries and agencies were published; in Thailand, a comprehensive guide for practitioners is being developed; and, in Uganda, accessibility standards were developed, launched and disseminated. States Parties have also expressed that the following challenges remain in being able to live up their commitment to increase availability of and accessibility to appropriate services and ensure that appropriate services are accessible: lack of appropriate services with qualified personnel in remote areas; limited implementation of accessibility guidelines; and limited financial, technical and material resources.

81. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties, particularly those accountable to and responsible for the well-being of significant numbers of mine victims, will raise awareness among mine victims about their rights and available services, as well as within government authorities, service providers and the general public to foster respect for the rights and dignity of persons with disabilities including mine survivors³⁴. Since the Cartagena Summit, 15 States Parties have reported on awareness raising activities to promote understanding of and progress in achieving the aims of this commitment: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Iraq, Peru, Senegal, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Uganda. Examples of initiatives undertaken include: national workshops in Albania, Angola, Cambodia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Peru and Uganda; in Bosnia and Herzegovina a website created to foster exchange of information on victim assistance; and, the publication and dissemination of a booklet entitled “Rights and Privileges of Persons with Disabilities – answers for all questions” in Tajikistan. States Parties have also expressed that the following challenges remain in being able to live up their commitment to raise awareness among mine victims about their rights and available services, as well as within government authorities, service providers and the general public to foster respect for the rights and dignity of persons with disabilities including mine survivors: the lack of financial and technical resources. It was also noted that in addition to States Parties’ efforts to raise aware to promote understanding of and progress in achieving the aims of the Cartagena Action Plan, non-governmental organizations, such as Handicap International and Survivor Corps, have taken the initiative to do the same, for example through regional workshops in Amman, Nairobi and Sarajevo.”

82. Since the Cartagena Summit, the primary focus of the work of the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration has been to continue the work of their predecessors and assist national authorities responsible for healthcare, rehabilitation, social services, employment, or disability issues more generally in the process of setting their own specific and measurable objectives and developing, implementing and monitoring plans of action. When plans for the disability sector already exist, the focus has been on ensuring that mine survivors have access to the services and benefits enshrined within those plans and that the relevant ministries are aware of their States’ obligations under the Convention. The ISU has continued to support the work of the Co-Chairs through the provision of advice to all relevant States Parties and through process support visits. Ten (10) States Parties – Albania, Burundi, Cambodia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iraq, Jordan, Mozambique, Peru, Tajikistan and Uganda – have benefited from such visits since the Cartagena Summit.

83. With financial support provided by Australia through the ISU, the Co-Chairs continued to facilitate a parallel programme for victim assistance experts on the margins of the meetings of the Standing Committee and the 10MSP. The programmes are intended as a forum in which health, rehabilitation, social services, disability rights and other experts can

³⁴ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #33.

share experiences, priorities and challenges in addressing the rights and needs of landmine victims and other persons with disabilities and provide a clearer picture of the reality on the ground in many affected States Parties. In 2010, particular emphasis has been given to resource mobilisation and utilisation, capacity building of survivors and their organisations, community based rehabilitation, and challenges and opportunities in implementing the Cartagena Action Plan. On 29 November 2010, the Geneva launch of the new CBR Guidelines by the World Health Organisation, the International Labour Organisation and the International Disability and Development Consortium took place in the parallel programme for victim assistance experts.

84. The Co-Chairs have also taken steps to strengthen linkages between the work of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration and implementation mechanisms developed under the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). Seventy-nine States Parties to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention are also parties to the CRPD, including 13 of the States Parties reporting responsibility for significant numbers of mine survivors – Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Jordan, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Sudan, Thailand, Uganda and Yemen. At the June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, the Co-Chairs invited Professor Ron McCallum AO, Chair of the CRPD's Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. He attended through support provided by Australia and spoke on the work of the Committee and its relevance for the application of the victim assistance aspects of the Cartagena Action Plan, including on matters related to reporting and monitoring. At the October 2010 meeting of the CRPD's Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the Implementation Support Unit was invited to share experiences in implementing the AP Mine Ban Convention's provision to assist the victims.

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

(a) Cooperation and assistance

85. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties recognised that the need for partnerships to achieve the aims of the Convention had become more important than ever. They expressed the view that strong national ownership is essential for ensuring that cooperation can flourish and developed a clear understanding of what national ownership means. In addition, at the Cartagena Summit the States Parties recorded that ensuring sufficient resources exist and seeing that available resources meet well expressed needs by States Parties demonstrating strong ownership over their implementation efforts may be the most significant challenge facing the States Parties during the period 2010 to 2014.

86. To address this and related challenges, over one-quarter of the commitments agreed to in the Cartagena Action Plan concern international cooperation and assistance³⁵. In acting upon this clear expression of interest in reinvigorating international cooperation and assistance in the life of the Convention, and, paying particular regard to the commitment made at the Cartagena to ensure that the Convention and its informal mechanisms include and provide a specific and effective framework for identifying needs and mobilising national and international resources to meet these needs, the President of the Second Review Conference placed a high priority on this matter in 2010³⁶. With the cooperation of the Co-Chairs, the President convened a special session on international cooperation and

³⁵ Cartagena Action Plan, Actions #34 through #52. In addition, part of Action #28 concerns cooperation and assistance.

³⁶ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #48.

assistance during the week of meetings of the Standing Committees in June 2010 as well as an experts' workshop on this matter in May 2010. Numerous important points were raised at this special session which provided the States Parties with a rich agenda on cooperation and assistance for possible follow up.

87. The June 2010 special session on international cooperation and assistance highlighted the need for two distinct discussions – one that concerns article 5 implementation and one that concerns victim assistance. It was noted that while both matters belong to the larger family of mine action, mine clearance and victim assistance have different timelines, involve distinct national and international actors and relate to different national institutional and regulatory frameworks and budget lines. It was further noted that the whole notion of mine action as an integrated field of practice may have hampered attempts to utilise available resources in the most effective manner. In addition, it was noted that there is a need for an increased focus on results in addition to demands for increased efficiency and effectiveness.

88. With respect to enhancing international cooperation and assistance as concerns victim assistance, it was recalled that victim assistance is the most complex and challenging issue for the States Parties and it is fundamentally distinct from the collection of activities referred to as humanitarian demining. It was also recalled that at the Cartagena Summit the States Parties recognised that guaranteeing the rights and addressing the needs of mine victims requires a long term commitment and that this involves sustained political, financial and material commitments, both made by affected States themselves and through international cooperation and assistance, in accordance with article 6 obligations. It was further recalled that three actions in the Cartagena Action Plan's cooperation and assistance section relate specifically to assisting the victims³⁷.

89. The June 2010 special session on international cooperation and assistance highlighted a number of issues and opportunities concerning victim assistance:

(a) It was recalled that the ultimate responsibility of guaranteeing the rights and meeting the needs of landmine victims within a particular state rests with that state. Within a particular affected State, we must appreciate that victim assistance-related activities concern a wide range of ministries and agencies responsible for health, social affairs, labour, education, transport, justice, planning, finance, and possibly others. In States in a position to assist, the main actors are usually development agencies and ministries that engage in international cooperation efforts. However, within these agencies, there could be multiple relevant sub actors, including those responsible for bilateral development assistance or for providing assistance through multilateral entities; it was noted that States Parties in a position to assist include any State Party that has any form of assistance that it could offer to another to help in improving its response to landmine survivors and other persons with disabilities. It was highlighted that cooperation and assistance is not only about financial resources, with the provision of technical support, support for national capacity building and contributions of equipment and supplies all considered important;

(b) It was noted that in addition to there being potentially 156 States Parties in a position to fulfil article 6.3 obligations, other actors such as international organisations play a key role in generating resources or implementing programmes and that, like States, these organisations can be complex with several aspects of the work of any particular organisation being relevant to what the States Parties consider "assisting the victims". It was also noted that associations of landmine survivors and disabled persons organisations are important stakeholders in victim assistance-related activities, as are other non-

³⁷ Cartagena Action Plan, Actions #39, #41 and #46.

governmental organizations. It was further noted that while some of these organisations are well known members of the Convention community, others that are actively involved at the national level working on disability and/or development issues may not see themselves as working on what the States Parties define as “victim assistance”. It was suggested that in order to better understand the scope of services available in affected States, a comprehensive mapping of all actors involved in services relevant to “assisting the victims” is needed;

(c) It was highlighted that with respect to victim assistance there is no clarity on the true magnitude of what is provided by States Parties in a position to assist because the bulk of what is made available for activities considered consistent with “assisting the victims” is not captured in any assessment of mine action funding. It was noted that the bulk of what is provided is through bilateral cooperation between States to enhance healthcare systems, physical rehabilitation programmes, mental health services, the exercise of rights by persons with disabilities, et cetera. In this regard, it was suggested that a dialogue on enhanced cooperation and assistance on victim assistance could itself be enhanced if those giving and receiving development assistance, including core budget support, could provide greater clarity regarding the true magnitude of the effort being made to assist States in developing the responses necessary to meet the rights and needs of all individuals who are injured or who live with disabilities;

(d) It was noted that while the vast majority of resources to support activities considered consistent with “assisting the victims” undoubtedly flows through development cooperation, the States Parties had previously recorded that more than US\$ 232 million had been reported invested between 2004 and 2009 in support of emergency medical care, physical rehabilitation and other assistance carried out by international service providers such as the ICRC including in some instances with national Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, Handicap International, other NGOs and relevant UN agencies. It was suggested that a dialogue on cooperation and assistance and the further mobilisation of resources could benefit from knowing how effectively these resources have been used, how such efforts could be part of national CRPD implementation and what lessons have been learned;

(e) It was noted that while some have called for a specific percentage of mine action funding to be dedicated to victim assistance, others have pointed out that doing so may be counterproductive, in particular because this may result in diverting funds from humanitarian demining, which is one of the main activities to address the victimisation of communities in war-torn societies and to prevent additional victims. It was suggested that what is required is to gain a better understanding of the true level of need and then to fund accordingly, rather than robbing from one aspect of Convention implementation to support another;

(f) It was recalled that while the States Parties, at the Cartagena Summit, adopted an understanding regarding “national ownership” as concerns article 5 implementation, there was an opportunity to do the same in defining what the Convention community expects from affected States in terms of “national ownership” as concerns victim assistance. As noted above, at the June 2010 special session on international cooperation and assistance, elements for national ownership in relation to victim assistance were proposed.

90. The June 2010 special session on international cooperation and assistance highlighted a number of issues and opportunities concerning article 5 implementation:

(a) It was recalled that 32 of the 38 States Parties that must still complete implementation of article 5 obligations have indicated a need for assistance in fulfilling their obligations and that the gap between projected needs and anticipated contributions poses several challenges in for the effort to ensure compliance by these States Parties;

(b) It was acknowledged that States Parties and mine clearance operators have come far in their understanding of the challenges posed by the obligation to clear all mined areas, that impressive progress has been made in making mine clearance more efficient and effective, and that the amount of area cleared or otherwise released in recent years has increased substantially. It was noted that, while many States Parties have not yet defined the precise locations of mined areas despite massive investments made in surveys, there is a great potential for increasing productivity by employing the full range of methods previously recognised by the States Parties to release suspected hazardous areas. It was also noted that there is scope to increase efficiency across the breadth of the humanitarian demining sector;

(c) It was suggested that the definition of national ownership as concerns article 5 implementation which was adopted at the Cartagena Summit, along with the relevant commitments made in the Cartagena Action Plan, provide the States Parties with a roadmap for the practical implementation of article 6 in support of mine clearance, with this roadmap including the following components:

- (i) claiming national ownership;
- (ii) identifying the task³⁸;
- (iii) mapping the resources needed to address the task³⁹;
- (iv) communicating the needs for international cooperation and assistance⁴⁰;
- (v) making the case for assistance⁴¹;
- (vi) responding to the needs⁴²; and
- (vii) seeking peer support⁴³;

(d) It was noted that while mapping financial requests for and contributions to mine clearance may draw attention to a problem in a manner that is easy to communicate, it does not provide information that can help determine how needs in affected States Parties can be matched with relevant resources. It was suggested that meaningful discussions on article 6 as concerns article 5 implementation must have a broader scope than just money and move towards a better understanding of what effective and efficient international cooperation entails.

91. While time did not permit a discussion on stockpile destruction during the June 2010 special session on cooperation and assistance, it remained clear in 2010 that addressing questions related to cooperation and assistance were central to ensuring that two States Parties could fulfil their article 4 obligations. It was recalled that as these two States Parties had sought assistance in accordance with article 6, paragraph 1, the matter of ensuring compliance on the part of both is the business of all States Parties.

92. At the Cartagena Summit, Zambia, with the support of other actors, proposed that a new Standing Committee be established to address the challenges related to international cooperation and assistance in the context of the Convention. Support for this proposal was expressed by several delegations at the June 2010 special session on cooperation and assistance.

³⁸ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #14.

³⁹ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #34.

⁴⁰ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #35.

⁴¹ Cartagena Action Plan, Actions #35 and #50.

⁴² Cartagena Action Plan, Actions #37 and #38.

⁴³ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #36.

93. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties with obligations to destroy stockpiled anti-personnel mines, identify and clear mined areas, and assist mine victims will make their needs known to other States Parties and relevant organisations if they require financial, technical or other forms of international cooperation and assistance to meet obligations under the Convention, and identify these activities as a priority in relevant development goals and strategies⁴⁴. Since the Cartagena Summit, the United Nations Mine Action Team, and in particular the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and UNICEF, have continued to apply the UN Inter-Agency Mine Action Strategy 2006-2010 with a view to promoting achievement of the UN's Millennium Development Goals and full adherence to and compliance with the Convention and other relevant instruments. Since the Cartagena Summit, the UNDP, UNICEF and UNMAS have provided support to 25 States Parties that are in the process of implementing article 5 of the Convention. The Organisation of American States (OAS) has indicated that it has standing agreements with Colombia, Ecuador and Peru for financial and technical support for mine clearance and related activities. The details of support are planned and agreed upon on an annual basis.

94. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties adopted commitments to ensure the continuity and sustainability of resource commitments, to provide where possible multi-year funding, and to provide where possible multi-year financial, material or technical assistance⁴⁵. Since the Cartagena Summit, **Australia** began to implement its Mine Action Strategy 2010-2014 including by providing multi-year financial commitments. **Switzerland** expressed that it is maintaining its firm commitment to Convention implementation through its 2008-2011 mine action strategy. **Norway** highlighted its strategic partnership with Mozambique as an example of a long-term partnership between States Parties. **Germany** both expressed that it will stay committed to mine action based on the Cartagena Action Plan with its strong preference to contribute to States Parties to the Convention and signalled a possible global decline in mine action budgets. In addition, **Austria** indicated that it is currently elaborating a new mine action strategy to take effect in 2011.

95. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties in a position to do so will, in the spirit of the Convention's aims, endeavour to continue supporting States Parties that have completed their article 5 obligations in their efforts to address the humanitarian consequences resulting from mine and explosive remnants of war contamination⁴⁶. With respect to this commitment, **Zambia**, which reported completion of its mine clearance obligations at the Cartagena Summit, received support from **Norway** for Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) to follow up on each UXO report obtained through the course of executing Zambia's 2009 landmines survey.

96. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties in a position to do so will ensure that international cooperation and assistance, including development cooperation, is age-appropriate and gender-sensitive and inclusive of, and accessible to, persons with disabilities, including mine survivors⁴⁷. At the June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, a special session raised awareness on Inclusive Development as an appropriate mechanism to ensure that landmine victims and other persons with disabilities have access to the same opportunities in life as every other sector of a society. At the Cartagena Summit, it was also agreed that all States Parties will ensure that assistance in mine action is based on appropriate surveys, needs analysis, age-appropriate and gender-sensitive strategies and cost-effective

⁴⁴ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #35.

⁴⁵ Cartagena Action Plan, Actions #37, #38 and #39.

⁴⁶ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #40.

⁴⁷ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #41.

approaches⁴⁸. Since the Cartagena Summit, States Parties have continued to support the Swiss Campaign to Ban Landmines' Gender and Mine Action Programme which in turn has continued to promote the necessity of a gender perspective in executing mine action projects in an equal way. Non-governmental organizations such as the Mines Advisory Group (MAG) have used gender balanced interview teams to better reach out to all community members communities regarding the process of clearance and handover of land. In addition, the United Nations Mine Action Service has continued to support gender sensitive strategies through inter-departmental and inter-agency collaborations. In addition, in March 2010, the United Nations developed new "Gender Guidelines for Mine Action Programmes to help mine-action policymakers and field personnel incorporate gender perspectives into all operations of mine action.

97. Most recently, UNMAS contributed in drafting the DPKO/DFS Guidelines for Integrating Gender Perspective in early 2010. In addition, a new Gender Guidelines for Mine Action was published representing an agreed strategy to further promote gender mainstreaming in mine action. In conjunction with UNICEF and UNDP, UNMAS is planning the Middle East Gender in Mine Action Workshop in early 2011 to have country specific gender sensitive actions plans, learn good practices and lessons, and review the new Gender Guidelines for Mine Action Programmes.

98. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties will contribute to further development of the International Mine Action Standards to be used as a frame of reference to establish national standards and operational procedures for addressing all aspects of mine and other explosive ordnance contamination⁴⁹. Since the Cartagena Summit, the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining has continued to manage, on behalf of the United Nations, the International Mine Action Standards project. This consists of a review of existing standards, the development of new ones and outreach to assist in the design of national mine action standards. Since the Cartagena Summit, Afghanistan, Guinea-Bissau and Iraq received GICHD support for the development of their national standards. There now are 11 examples of national standards posted on the IMAS website.

(b) Transparency and the exchange of information

99. At the close of the Cartagena Summit, one State Party – Equatorial Guinea – had not yet complied with the obligation to report as soon as practicable, and in any event not later than 180 days after the entry into force of the Convention for that State Party, on the matters for which transparency information is required in accordance with article 7. In addition, 94 States Parties had and 61 States Parties had not in 2009 provided updated information, as required, covering the previous calendar year. At the close of the Cartagena Summit, the overall reporting annual rate in 2009 stood at just under 60 percent.

100. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties expressed the view that while it is an obligation for all States Parties to provide updated information on implementation, this is particularly important for States Parties in the process of destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 4, those that are in the process of clearing mined areas in accordance with article 5, those that are retaining anti-personnel mines for purposes permitted by article 3 and those undertaking measures in accordance with article 9. The States Parties noted that several States Parties that are in the process of implementing article 5, that have retained anti-personnel mines for permitted purposes and/or that have

⁴⁸ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #52.

⁴⁹ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #49.

not yet reported having taken legal or other measures in accordance with article 9 are not up to date in providing transparency information as required.

101. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties expressed the view that while it is an obligation for all States Parties to provide updated information on implementation, this is particularly important for States Parties in the process of destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 4, those that are in the process of clearing mined areas in accordance with article 5, those that are retaining anti-personnel mines for purposes permitted by article 3 and those undertaking measures in accordance with article 9. The States Parties noted that several States Parties that are in the process of implementing article 5, that have retained anti-personnel mines for permitted purposes and/or that have not yet reported having taken legal or other measures in accordance with article 9 are not up to date in providing transparency information as required.

102. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties that have not submitted their initial article 7 report will immediately fulfil their obligation to initially submit and annually update article 7 transparency reports⁵⁰. Since the Cartagena Summit, **Equatorial Guinea** has remained non-compliant with its obligation to report as soon as practicable, and in any event not later than 180 days after the entry into force of the Convention for that State Party, on the matters for which transparency information is required in accordance with article 7. In addition in 2010, the following 63 States Parties did not provide updated information covering calendar year 2009 in accordance with article 7.2 as required: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Comoros, Republic of the Congo, Cook Islands, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Jamaica, Kenya, Kiribati, Lesotho, Liberia, , Madagascar, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Nauru, Niger, Niue, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Tanzania, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia Timor-Leste, Togo, Uruguay, Vanuatu and Zimbabwe. As of 3 December 2010, the annual reporting rate for 2010 stood just over 59 percent.

103. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties will maximise and take full advantage of the flexibility of the article 7 reporting process as a tool to assist in implementation, including through the reporting format "Form J" to provide information on matters which may assist in the implementation process and in resource mobilization, such as information on international cooperation and assistance, victim assistance efforts and needs and information on measures being taken to ensure gender sensitization in all aspects of mine action⁵¹. In addition, it was agreed that relevant States Parties would be encouraged to report on the progress made, including resources allocated to implementation, and challenges in achieving their victim assistance objectives, and that States Parties in a position to assist would be encouraged to report on how they are responding to efforts to address the rights and needs of mine victims⁵².

104. Since the Cartagena Summit, the following States Parties made use of "Form J" to provide information on matters which may assist in the implementation process and in resource mobilization: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Japan, Latvia,

⁵⁰ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #54.

⁵¹ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #55.

⁵² Cartagena Action Plan, Action #28.

Lithuania, Malawi, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, and Uganda. Of these States Parties, the following provided information in mine victims, efforts to address the rights and needs of mine victims and/or international cooperation and assistance in this sphere: Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Croatia, Guinea-Bissau, Japan, Mozambique, Norway, Senegal, Switzerland, Thailand, and Turkey.

105. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties will regularly review the number of anti-personnel mines retained for purposes permitted under article 3 to ensure that it constitutes the minimum number absolutely necessary for these purposes and destroy all those exceeding that number⁵³. Since the Cartagena Summit, **Cyprus**, on 29 April 2010, wrote to the President of the Second Review Conference to inform her that “in demonstrating its commitment to the implementation of the Cartagena Action Plan”, Cyprus has reviewed the number of mines retained under article 3 of the Convention and, as a result, has taken the decision to proceed with the destruction of 494 of the mines retained. On 8 October 2010, Cyprus held a ceremony marking the destruction of these mines. **Indonesia** reported that 2,524 anti-personnel mines that it had reported retained for permitted purposes were destroyed on 15 December 2009 and the remaining anti-personnel mines that it retains are used as instructional materials to enhance the ability of officers to identify, detect and destroy mines for the purpose of preparing for Indonesia’s participation in UN peacekeeping operations. **Thailand** reported that, as the number of mines retained is high compared with the number of mines used for permitted purposes, it will review the plans for mines that have been retained to comply with its commitment of total mine eradication by 2018.

106. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties will annually report, on a voluntary basis, on the plans for and actual use of antipersonnel mines retained, explain any increase or decrease in the number of retained antipersonnel mines. Since the Cartagena Summit, **Algeria** reported that on 20-21 October 2009, 30 anti-personnel mines were used for permitted purposes. **Argentina** reported that 126 mines had been used for training (116 mines) and for field testing (10 mines) and provided information on the plans for the use of 485 anti-personnel mines during the period 2011 to 2015. **Australia**, in 2010, reported 40 fewer M16 type mines than it had reported in 2009 and that stock levels are regularly reviewed and assessed. **Belgium** reported that 41 mines had been used in 2009 for educating and training explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) experts and deminers. **Bosnia and Herzegovina**, in 2010, reported 145 fewer mines than it had reported in 2009. **Brazil**, in 2010, reported 935 fewer mines retained than it had reported in 2009 and that it retains mines for training to allow the Brazilian Army to participate adequately in international demining activities. **Bulgaria**, in 2010, reported 10 fewer mines than it had reported in 2009. **Canada** reported that anti-personnel mines are retained to study the effect of blast on equipment, to train soldiers on procedures to defuse live anti-personnel mines and to demonstrate the effect of landmines and that during the period 19 April 2009 to 20 April 2010 Canada used three (3) anti-personnel mines for research and development and for training purposes.

107. **Chile** reported that 725 mines had been used in 2009 in training courses for deminers. **Croatia** reported that 84 anti-personnel mines had been used in 2009 for testing and evaluating demining machines and that it anticipates using 175 anti-personnel mines in 2010 for the same purposes. **Cyprus**, in addition to having reported that it destroyed 494 anti-personnel mines that had been retained, reported that it transferred six (6) mines for permitted purposes. The **Czech Republic** reported that 24 mines were used in 2009 to

⁵³ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #56.

train and educate current and new EOD personnel. **Denmark**, in 2010, reported 40 fewer mines retained than it had reported in 2009 and that it retains mines for educating and training army recruits and engineering units. **Eritrea**, in 2010, reported 63 more mines than it had reported in 2009. **France**, in 2010, reported 27 fewer mines retained than it had reported in 2009. **Germany** reported that 176 anti-personnel mines had been used in 2009 for training of personnel and dogs and for testing and evaluating mine action equipment, systems and technologies, including testing multiple sensor mine detection and search technology. **Greece**, in 2010, reported 1,066 fewer mines than it had reported in 2009 and that mines are retained to train soldiers in mine detection and clearance and canine detection. **Indonesia**, in 2010, reported 2,524 fewer mines than it had reported in 2009 and that mines have been used as instructional/teaching materials to further enhance officers in identifying, detecting and destroying landmines in genera and particularly for the purpose of preparing for Indonesia's participation in peace keeping operations.

108. **Ireland** reported that it had used one (1) anti-personnel mine for permitted purposes in 2009 and that the Irish Defence Forces use anti-personnel mines in the development and validation of mine render safe procedures and in training personnel in these procedures, and, as part of the testing and validation of mechanical mine clearance equipment and in the training of personnel in the use of such equipments. **Italy**, in 2010, reported 15 fewer mines than it had reported in 2009 and that mines are used for bomb disposal and pioneers training courses (4 every year) to give to the attendees (35 per course) the know-how and the chance to live the experience as in a real action. **Japan** reported that 297 anti-personnel mines had been used for permitted purposes in 2009 and that it retains anti-personnel mines for education and training in mine detection and mine clearance. **Jordan** reported that 50 anti-personnel mines had been used in 2009 for the purpose of mine detection training for new deminers and mine detection dog teams that are working on Jordan's northern border demining project. **Latvia** reported that 781 anti-personnel mines had been destroyed in 2009 as part of training and demilitarisation. **Mozambique**, in 2010, reported 20 fewer mines than it had reported in 2009 and that 520 of the 1,943 mines that remained would be destroyed in the course of 2010. **Namibia**, in 2010, reported 1,000 fewer mines than it had reported in 2009. The **Netherlands**, in 2010, reported 199 fewer mines retained than it had reported in 2009.

109. **Nicaragua** reported that 41 anti-personnel mines had been used for to train deminers in 2009. **Peru**, in 2010, reported 1,987 fewer mines retained than it had reported in 2009. **Portugal**, in 2010, reported 63 fewer mines retained than it had reported in 2009 and that it retains anti-personnel mines for EOD training purposes. Serbia reported that in 2009, of the mines that the Ministry of Defence was authorised to retain, 10 were used to test demining protective equipment and 25 were destroyed due to damage caused in training. Serbia did not provide new information with respect to the mines (395) that, in 2008, it reported the Ministry of Interior was authorised to retain. **Spain**, in 2010, reported 62 fewer mines retained than it had reported in 2009. **Thailand**, in addition to committing to review the number of anti-personnel mines retained, reported that 12 anti-personnel mines had been used for training in 2009 by the Royal Thai Police and that the Royal Thai Air Force has a plan to use landmines for training once every three years. **Turkey** reported that 25 anti-personnel mines were used in 2009 for mine detection and clearance and techniques and for training and research purposes. **Ukraine** reported that 24 anti-personnel mines were used in 2009 to continue training and testing activities and that mines have been used to test personnel protective clothing and devices and to train military engineers and deminers. The **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**, in 2010, reported 70 fewer mines retained than it had reported in 2009 and that it retains anti-personnel mines for EOD/demining training. **Yemen** reported that 240 anti-personnel mines were used in 2009 for training dogs.

110. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that States Parties that have maintained, under the provisions of article 3, the same number of anti-personnel mines over periods of years, and have not reported on the use of such mines for permitted purposes or on concrete plans for their use, would be encouraged to report on such use and such plans and to review whether these anti-personnel mines are needed and constitute the minimum number absolutely necessary for permitted purposes and to destroy those that are in excess of this number⁵⁴. Since the Cartagena Summit, **Afghanistan** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (2,618) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Angola** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (2,512) that, since 2007, it has reported retained. **Bangladesh** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (12,500) that, since 2007, it has reported retained. **Belarus** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (6,030) that, since 2005, it has reported retained and that the Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Belarus intends to use retained anti-personnel mines for the purpose of training of a Byelorussian demining unit to prepare for participation in international humanitarian demining operations. **Benin** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (16) that, since 2007, it has reported retained. **Bhutan** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (4,491) that, since 2007, it has reported retained.

111. **Burundi** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (4) that, since 2008, it has reported retained. **Cameroon** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (1,885) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Colombia** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (586) that, since 2007, it has reported retained. **Congo** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (322) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Ecuador** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (1,000) that, since 2008, it has reported retained. **Ethiopia** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (303) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Guinea-Bissau** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (9) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Honduras** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (826) that, since 2007, it has reported retained. **Kenya** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (3,000) that, since 2001, it has reported retained. **Luxembourg** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (855) that, since 2008, it has reported retained. **Mauritania** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (728) that, since 2004, it has reported retained. **Niger** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (146) that, since 2003, it has reported retained. **Nigeria** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (3,364) that, since 2009, it has reported retained.

112. **Romania** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (2,500) that, since 2004, it has reported retained. **Rwanda** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (65) that, since 2008, it has reported retained. **Senegal** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (28) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Slovakia** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (1,422) that, since 2008, it has reported retained. **South Africa** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (4,356) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Sweden** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (7,364) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Tanzania** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (3,638) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Tunisia** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (4,980) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Uganda** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (1,764) that,

⁵⁴ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #58.

since 2005, it has reported retained. **Uruguay** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (1,764) that, since 2008, it has reported retained. **Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (2,120) that, since 2005, it has reported retained. **Zambia** reported no change in the number of anti-personnel mines (2,120) that, since 2009, it has reported retained. **Zimbabwe** did not provide new information to update the number of anti-personnel mines (550) that, since 2009, it has reported retained.

(c) **Measures to ensure compliance**

113. At the close of the Cartagena Summit, there were 59 States Parties that had reported that they had adopted legislation in the context of article 9 obligations and that there were 33 States Parties that had reported that they considered existing national laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention. The remaining 64 States Parties had not yet reported having either adopted legislation in the context of article 9 obligations or that they considered existing laws were sufficient to give effect to the Convention.

114. At the close of the Cartagena Summit, there were 59 States Parties that had reported that they had adopted legislation in the context of article 9 obligations and that there were 33 States Parties that had reported that they considered existing national laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention. The remaining 64 States Parties had not yet reported having either adopted legislation in the context of article 9 obligations or that they considered existing laws were sufficient to give effect to the Convention.

115. The States Parties had previously acknowledged that the primary responsibility for ensuring compliance rests with each individual State Party and that article 9 of the Convention accordingly requires each State 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 or control. With this in mind and with over 40 percent of States Parties not having yet reported on legislative measures to prevent and suppress prohibited activities, at the Cartagena Summit the States Parties expressed the view that it remains an important challenge for the States Parties to act with greater urgency to take necessary legal measures in accordance with article 9.

116. To overcome challenges concerning the application of article 9 of the Convention, it was agreed at the Cartagena Summit that States Parties that have not developed national implementation measures will, as a matter of urgency, develop and adopt legislative, administrative and other measures in accordance with article 9 to fulfil their obligations under this article and thereby contributing to full compliance with the Convention⁵⁵. It was also agreed that all States Parties will share information on implementing legislation and its application through reports made in accordance with article 7 and the Intersessional Work Programme⁵⁶.

117. Since the Cartagena Summit, no additional State Party has reported that it has established legislation in accordance with article 9 or that existing laws were sufficient to give effect to the Convention. (See annex VI) However, some States Parties reported either through article 7 reports or through the Intersessional Work Programme that they were in the process of establishing legislation or have taken other measures. **Afghanistan** reported that its constitution requires the country to respect all international treaties it has signed and that the Ministry of Defence has instructed that all military forces to respect the

⁵⁵ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #59.

⁵⁶ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #60.

comprehensive ban on anti-personnel mines by militaries or individuals. **Algeria** reiterated that its legislation fulfils the requirements of article 9. Algeria further indicated that since 2006, there have been eight cases involving illegal possession of anti-personnel mines that have been brought to the attention of relevant legal authorities in Algeria and that in accordance with the relevant procedures, these anti-personnel mines had been seized and destroyed by the national police. **Malawi** reported that it has drafted a “Land Mine Prohibition Bill” that is consistent with the definitions under article 2 of the Convention, includes all acts prohibited by article 1 of the Convention, makes mention of the article 3 exceptions, provides a framework for information gathering in the context of article 7 obligations and provides for means to facilitate the application of article 8.

118. **Mozambique** reported that a proposed law was submitted to Parliament for further analysis, that the subject has been discussed by the Council of Ministers and that the law likely will be approved by the end of 2010. The **Netherlands** reported that the Council of State has advised on a bill providing for the implementation arms control and disarmament treaties, that this advice has led to a reconsideration of a proposed bill and that at present the Convention is implemented on the basis of existing legislation, such as the Import and Export Act, the Military Penal Code and the Weapons and Munitions Act. The **Philippines** reported that, in March 2009, the Philippines Congress held public hearings on the Philippine Landmine Bill (House Bill No 1595) and that the bill remained at the Technical Working Group level.

119. Since the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties were informed about an allegation that may relate to compliance with the Convention’s prohibitions within the territory of **Turkey**. Turkey indicated that it was investigating this matter and would subsequently inform the States Parties of the outcome of its investigation. Concern was expressed about this allegation, the commitment to investigate was welcomed and a high level of transparency was encouraged. At the Cartagena Summit, it was agreed that all States Parties will, in case of alleged or known non-compliance with the Convention, work together with the States Parties concerned to resolve the matter expeditiously in a manner consistent with article 8 (1)⁵⁷. Concerning this commitment, the President of the Second Review Conference informed the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention that, in keeping with the practices employed by her predecessors, she had engaged those concerned in accordance with article 8.1 on the above mentioned compliance question.

120. Since the Cartagena Summit, the UNODA continued fulfilling 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 authorised in accordance with article 8.8. Since the Cartagena Summit, 14 States Parties – Albania, Bulgaria, Ecuador, Iraq, Jordan, Latvia, Netherlands, Serbia, Switzerland, Tajikistan, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, and Ukraine – provided new or updated information for the list of experts.

121. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed that all States Parties will recognize that when armed non-State actors operate under State Parties’ jurisdiction or control, such non-State actors will be held responsible for acts prohibited to States Parties under the Convention, in accordance with national measures taken under article 9⁵⁸. Since the Cartagena Summit, Colombia again advised the States Parties that armed non-State actors are carrying out acts in a contravention of the Convention’s prohibitions on Colombian territory.

⁵⁷ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #53.

⁵⁸ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #61.

(d) Implementation support

122. At the Cartagena Summit, the increasing appreciation on the part of the States Parties for the work of the ISU was recorded as was the evolution in terms of the support provided by the ISU. The Cartagena Summit also recalled that the States Parties have agreed to assure that, on a voluntary basis, they would provide the resources necessary for the operations of the unit. In addition, the Cartagena Summit highlighted that a challenge for the States Parties remains to ensure the sustainability of funding of the operations of the ISU, through either the existing method or another manner. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties also highlighted that without a sustainable means of financing, the ISU will have to drastically reduce its service offerings, which no doubt would adversely affect the implementation process.

123. Also at the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties endorsed a President's Paper on the establishment of an open ended task force with a mandate to develop terms of reference for an evaluation of the Implementation Support Unit. It was agreed that an independent consultant would be hired to execute the evaluation, and, that the evaluation should address issues related to (a) the tasks and responsibilities of the ISU, (b) the financing of the ISU, and, (c) the institutional framework for the ISU.

124. The "ISU Task Force" met for the first time on 10 February 2010 at which time the Task Force agreed on its working methods and terms of reference of an independent consultant, approved the proposal that Mr. Tim Caughley serve as the independent consultant and was presented with cost estimates for the evaluation which totalled US\$ 83,000. The ISU Task Force met for a second time on 10 March 2010 at which time the independent consultant presented his work plan and the Chair of the Task Force indicated that she would write to all States Parties to solicit voluntary contributions to cover the costs of the evaluation. On 15 April 2010, the independent consultant delivered his preliminary report to the Task Force and on 2 June 2010, at the Task Force's third meeting, the independent consultant presented this preliminary report. On 21 June 2010, the Chair of the Task Force presented a preliminary status report to the meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention.

125. On 1 September 2010, the independent consultant delivered his final report to the Task force and on 8 September, at the Task Force's fourth meeting, the independent consultant presented this final report. This final report contained options reflecting "a range of views expressed to the consultant" which the consultant recommended "should be considered against the overall finding that there are high levels of satisfaction with the ISU and with the manner in which its staff carry out their work to support the States Parties in implementing the Convention." Also at the 8 September 2010 meeting, the Task Force received comments on the report presented by the Director of the GICHD, the ICBL, the ICRC, the United Nations Mine Action Team and the Director of the ISU. In addition at this meeting, the Task Force focused on the options identified in the consultant's final report and on how to take these further in order to arrive at a report and recommendations for the 10MSP. At its fifth meeting on 3 November 2010, the Task Force discussed its final report.

126. The evaluation of the ISU was funded on a voluntary basis with contributions having been provided by Albania, Canada, Germany, New Zealand, and Norway.

127. With respect to its substantive efforts, in 2010 the ISU carried out its activities in accordance with its 2010 work plan and budget, which was adopted by the Coordinating Committee in November 2009. This included providing advice to State Parties on matters related to implementation and compliance (including in-country support to States Parties regarding article 5 implementation and applying the understandings adopted by the States Parties on victim assistance), assisting States Parties in maximising participation in the

Convention's implementation processes, providing strategic direction to Co-Chairs and the Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme, supporting the States Parties mandated to analyse article 5 extension requests, supporting States Parties in preparing transparency reports, leading seminars and providing training on understanding the Convention and its operations, supporting the President and individual States Parties in undertaking universalisation efforts, providing advice on applying the lessons learned from implementing the Convention, supporting the 10MSP President-Designate and the presumed 11MSP President-Designate and host, continuing to serve as the authoritative source of information on the Convention and maintaining the Convention's Documentation Centre.

128. In addition to carrying out its core work plan, the ISU executed other activities, in a manner consistent with its mandate, when additional funds are made available to fully fund these efforts. These activities included providing enhanced support to the President of the Second Review Conference and her Special Envoy on the Universalisation of the Convention (funded by Norway) and providing enhanced victim assistance support including by organizing parallel programmes for victim assistance experts (funded by Australia). In addition, funds were received from Australia to provide enhanced support to universalisation and implementation in the Pacific. The Director of the ISU regularly reported to the Coordinating Committee on these enhanced activities. As well, the ISU administered the financing of the ISU evaluation.

129. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties recorded that voluntary contributions to the ISU in 2009 were no longer keeping pace with the costs of services demanded by the States Parties. In response, the President of the Second Review Conference placed a high priority on monitoring the ISU's financial situation in 2010. The President of the Second Review Conference wrote twice to all States Parties to encourage them to contribute to the ISU's core work plan in 2010 and raised the matter of the ISU's finances at every meeting of the Coordinating Committee.

130. At the 7 September 2010 meeting of the Coordinating Committee, the Director of the ISU reported that, while the ISU should have the resources necessary to complete most of its intended work plan in 2010, cuts would have to be made. The Director of the ISU further noted that planning for the remainder of the year cannot be divorced from planning for 2011. In this context the Director indicated that a structural change would need to be made that will result in a significant cut in support that the States Parties have come to expect and appreciate – in-country victim assistance advisory services and a dedicated expert advisory service in Geneva. The Director further indicated that as of 1 December 2010, the position of "victim assistance specialist" will no longer be staffed and it will remain vacant until such a time as States Parties provide the necessary resources to cover the costs of this position and related services. In addition, he indicated that in 2011, the ISU will be able to provide intensive in-country victim assistance support to only 3-4 affected States Parties, down from the normal level of approximately 9-12.

131. Also at the 7 September 2010 meeting of the Coordinating Committee, the Director of the ISU remarked that, while there will be a dramatic diminishment in the services that affected States Parties have come to greatly appreciate, the ISU, thanks largely to one State Party having made a multi-year commitment, will still do what it can to support States Parties in applying the victim assistance understandings that they have adopted. In addition, he expressed the hope that the ISU could return to a staffing and service level that States Parties have come to expect as the norm in recent years.

132. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed that those in a position to do so would provide necessary financial resources for the effective operation of the Implementation Support Unit⁵⁹. Contributions in support of the ISU's 2010 core work plan were received from the following States Parties: Albania, Australia, Austria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Indonesia, Italy, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, Thailand, and Turkey.

133. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties recorded that the Intersessional Work Programme had continued to provide a valuable forum for the informal exchange of information, thus complementing the official exchange of information under article 7. The States Parties also remarked that, while the Intersessional Work Programme had continued to play an important role in supporting implementation of the Convention, there had been no thorough assessment of the Intersessional Work Programme since 2002. In this context, at the Cartagena Summit the States Parties agreed to call upon the Coordinating Committee to review the operation and status of Intersessional Work Programme, with the Chair of the Coordinating Committee consulting widely on this matter and, if necessary, recommendations to the 10MSP.

134. The Coordinating Committee assessed the Intersessional Work Programme to some degree at each of its meetings in 2010. At the 25 June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention and at the 7 September 2010 informal meeting convened to prepare for the 10MSP, the Chair of the Coordinating Committee provided updates on this assessment. It was concluded that the States Parties consider that the Intersessional Work Programme has functioned well since it was last reviewed in 2002. It was noted that the 2002 recalibration of the Intersessional Work Programme had succeeded in providing the space for States Parties in the process of fulfilling key obligations to share their problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance and, consequently, in provide greater clarity on and more precise knowledge of the status of the implementation of the Convention. It was also concluded that the principles on which it was founded in 1999 continue to be important. That have contributed to an effective work programme to date – namely coherence, flexibility, partnership informality, continuity and effective preparation – remain valid as do additional principles, namely, transparency and inclusion.

135. While it was concluded that there is general satisfaction with the operation of the Intersessional Work programme, it was also noted that the implementation process has evolved in recent years. Given this evolution, the Coordinating Committee sought to develop recommendations for consideration by the 10MSP that would relate to: (a) the importance of continuing to addressing pressing implementation concerns in an effective manner; (b) the strong desire expressed by States Parties that a more intensive focus be placed on international cooperation and assistance; (c) the value of providing space to explore new ways to carry out intersessional work; and, (d) the potential of maximising synergy between related instruments. In developing recommendations, the Coordinating Committee considered the heavy burden associated with being a Co-Chair or Co-Rapporteur and hence member of both the Coordinating Committee and article 5 analysing group, and, the proliferation of demands on States to assume roles of responsibility related to conventional weapons more generally.

136. As noted, Zambia, with the support of other actors, proposed that a new Standing Committee be established to address the challenges related to international cooperation and assistance in the context of the Convention. Support for this proposal was expressed by several delegations at the June 2010 special session on cooperation and assistance.

⁵⁹ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #66.

137. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed to support the efforts of the President and Coordinating to ensure effective preparations and conduct of meetings of the Convention⁶⁰. Since the Cartagena Summit, the Coordinating Committee met six times to fulfil its mandate to coordinate matters relating to and flowing from the work of the Standing Committees with the work of the 10MSP. Summaries of these meetings were made available to all interested actors on the Convention's web site.

138. At the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties agreed that those in a position to do so would contribute to the Sponsorship Programme thereby permitting widespread representation at meetings of the Convention, particularly by mine-affected developing States Parties. In 2010, the following States Parties contributed to the Sponsorship Programme: Australia, Canada, Denmark, Ireland, Italy and Norway. At the June 2010 meetings of the Standing Committees, 39 representatives of 26 States Parties were sponsored as were 4 representatives of 3 States not parties. At the 10MSP, 44 representatives of 29 States Parties were sponsored as were 4 representatives of 3 States not parties. In 2010, the Sponsorship Programme helped enable States Parties live up to the commitment they made at the Cartagena Summit to ensure the ensure the continued involvement and effective contribution in all relevant Convention related activities by health, rehabilitation, social services, education, employment, gender and disability rights experts⁶¹.

139. Since the Cartagena Summit, the States Parties, in keeping with their Cartagena Summit commitment, continued to recognise and further encourage the full participation in and contribution to the implementation of the Convention by the ICBL, ICRC, national Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies and their International Federation, the UN, the GICHD, international and regional organisations, mine survivors and their organisations, and other civil society organisations⁶².

⁶⁰ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #63.

⁶¹ Cartagena Action Plan, Action #29.

⁶² Cartagena Action Plan, Action #62.

Appendix I

Stockpiled anti-personnel mines

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Number of stockpiled anti-personnel mines reported at the close of the Cartagena Summit</i>	<i>Number of stockpiled anti-personnel mines reported destroyed since the close of the Cartagena Summit</i>	<i>Number of stockpiled anti-personnel mines remaining</i>
Belarus	3,371,984	1,812	3,370,172
Greece	1,340,570	389,424	951,146
Turkey	956,761	933,973	22,788
Ukraine	6,099,468	147,683	5,951,785
Burundi	0	76	0
Totals	11,768,783	1,472,968	10,295,891

<i>Number of stockpiled anti-personnel mines reported destroyed by all States Parties as of the close of the Cartagena Summit</i>	<i>Number of stockpiled anti-personnel mines reported destroyed by all States Parties since the close of the Cartagena Summit</i>	<i>Number of stockpiled anti-personnel mines reported destroyed by all States Parties as of 3 December 2010</i>
43,021,437 ¹	1,472,968	44,494,405

¹ The total number of stockpiled anti-personnel reported destroyed at the Cartagena Summit was recorded as 42,369,334 but further to an amendment in the figures for the Turkish stockpile, this number increased to 43,021,437.

Appendix II

Progress in meeting commitments made in article 5 extension requests and decisions taken on these requests

Argentina

The request indicates that, as Argentina “does not exercise territorial control over the land to be demined,” the plan submitted as part of the request is a “schematic plan”. Argentina has pointed out that this plan will be developed in detail and will be implemented as soon as Argentina does exercise control over the areas in question or when both Argentina and the United Kingdom “reach agreement over making progress in such planning.”

Since the request was granted in 2009, there has been no change regarding the exercise of control over the areas in question.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

In its extension request, Bosnia and Herzegovina committed to in 2009 release 151.65 square kilometres of land (5 square kilometres by survey of priority III areas, 9.27 square kilometres by clearance, 21.63 square kilometres by technical survey, 115.75 square kilometres by general survey) and in 2010 release 162.65 square kilometres of land (16 square kilometres by survey of priority III areas, 9.27 square kilometre by clearance, 21.63 square kilometres by technical survey, 115.75 square kilometres by general survey).

Since its extension request was granted in 2008, Bosnia and Herzegovina reported that in 2009 the suspected area was reduced by 128.10 square kilometres or 110.66 percent of what had been planned (10.8 square kilometres by technical survey, 1.9 square kilometres by clearance) and in 2010 the suspected area was reduced by 59 square kilometres (55 square kilometres by general and systematic survey, 3 square kilometre by technical survey, 1 square kilometre by clearance).

Additionally, in its extension request, Bosnia and Herzegovina committed to develop a survey method for releasing “priority risk category III areas”, to be reviewed during the first revision of the strategic plan in 2012; distribute a list of locations for humanitarian demining by administrative units in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the size of the suspected area; distribute plans for technical survey and clearance which include the size and location of the areas to be addressed (i.e. cantons/counties and Brcko District) and the organizations that will carry out the activities in accordance with annual mine action plans, and; adopt a new mine action law to create conditions for stable and continuous funding of mine action from local government budgets stimulating maintenance and improvement of donor support, and, see that the Bosnia and Herzegovina Ministry of Finance and Treasury will ensure shortfall of funds.

Cambodia

In its extension request, Cambodia committed to in 2009 full clearance of 38,627,620 square metres and in 2010 full clearance of 39, 400,173 square metres.

Since its request was granted in 2009, Cambodia reported that in 2009 the suspected area was reduced by 59,242,450 square meters and by September 2010 the suspected area was reduced by 74,806,009 square metres.

Additionally, in its extension request, Cambodia committed to in 2009 finalize National Mine Action Standards, accredit the Royal Cambodian Armed Forces, complete Cambodian Mine Action Standards on Land Release and complete CMAS Planning and Prioritization and in 2010 complete Phase 1 of the Baseline Survey (21 Districts), develop the annual clearance plan for 2011 and provide an update on the BLS progress to the States Parties.

Since its request was granted in 2009, Cambodia reported that in 2009 the Royal Cambodian Armed Forces received accreditation from the Cambodian Mine Action Authority, that the National Mine Action Standards are in the process of approval and that the plans will be aligned with the NMAS. In 2010 Cambodia reported that field work in 27 Districts had been completed and captured 9,259 polygons with 692,285,270 square metres.

Chad

In its extension request, Chad committed to the following: create a multi-purpose survey group using the best operational assets of the Haut Commissariat National de Déminage who will be trained to apply the new land release standards, conduct technical survey, conduct demining operations and mark dangerous areas; visit all areas identified as potentially dangerous during and after the impact survey and conduct technical survey with a view to determining precisely the extent of the remaining contamination; define and apply national land release standards; develop a plan for mine risk education and victim assistance; elaborate a plan of action based on reliable data; deploy available demining sections to deal with areas where the presence of mines is known and where demining often started, in particular the base of Ouaddi doum surrounded by a 43 kilometres-long mixed minefield; clearance of the area East of Chad, not known to contain mines to this day, by the clearance/demining section of EUFOR and MINURCAT; restart of demining operations in the region of Fada (Ennedi); start an 8-month demining operation in the region of Ounianga Kebbir (Ennedi); assign two demining sections for 5 years in Wadi Doum (6 demining groups, covering 3000 square metres per week and working 45 weeks a year); at the beginning of 2010, depending on the first results of the survey mission, the section deployed in Fada will be redeployed to address priority areas containing anti-personnel mines identified by the survey group in the remaining parts of Chad (excluding Tibisti), and; prepare a second extension request, the duration of which will be based on the results of the technical survey, containing a detailed plan of action taking into account the remaining anti-personnel mine contamination in the national territory under the control of the Chadian Government, which excludes most parts of the Tibesti.

Since its request was granted in 2008, Chad reported that the technical survey planned to be conducted could not start until September 2010 because the availability of the Japanese funds was delayed for administrative reasons internal to the United Nations system. Since its request was granted Chad has submitted a second request for extension in September 2010.

Croatia

In its extension request, Croatia committed to in 2009 clearance of 73 square kilometres and in 2010 clearance of 100 square kilometres. Since its extension request was granted in 2008, Croatia reported that in 2009, through 213 mine clearance and mine search projects, the mine threat had been removed from a total area of 37,869,420 square metres while an additional 24,708,774 square metres had been cancelled through general survey activities.

Additionally, in its extension request, Croatia committed to develop methodologies enabling better quality analysis of the mine contamination situation in forested areas; completely remove the danger from areas for reconstruction of houses and infrastructure by the end of 2010 and from areas allocated for agricultural production and cattle breeding by 2013, and; completely demine around houses planned for reconstruction and return of displaced person (5 square kilometres) by 2010.

Denmark

In its extension request, Denmark committed to in 2009 carry out an Environmental Impact Assessment, including a public consultation exercise of relevant interested parties and drawing up a task description and definition of release criteria; seek permission from the Environmental Authorities in order to carry out technical survey; carry out technical survey of Area III, and; submit a new request on this basis.

Since the request was granted in 2008, Denmark reported that a number of technical surveys were conducted in order to establish a proper understanding of the suspected area including a terrain analysis comparing terrain surveys made just after the war and surveys of the terrain today; an Environmental Impact Assessment was carried out and clearance standards and methods were revised to address the issues raised in this assessment, and; Denmark submitted a second extension request in June 2010.

Ecuador

In its extension request, Ecuador committed to in the period of October 2009 – September 2010 the clearance of 21,365 square metres and in the period of October 2010 – September 2011 the clearance of 10,150 square metres.

Since its extension request was granted in 2008, Ecuador reported that in 2009 a total of 8,191.38 square metres had been released and that in 2010 Ecuador cleared 140,376.85 square metres.

Additionally, in its extension request, Ecuador committed to complete the impact survey in the Province of Zamora Chinchipe and increase the number of deminers from 60 to 100.

Since its extension request was granted in 2008, Ecuador reported that in 2009 the General Deming Command has deployed personnel to carry out impact studies in the sectors of Huasaga Nuevo (where a new mine area was identified and added to the national plan), Coangos and the square kilometre of Tiwintza (area where new information on 39 areas had been collected but needs to be refined), all in the Province of Morona Santiago, and the number of deminers has been increased from 60 to 100

Jordan

In its extension request, Jordan committed to complete in 2009 and 2010 the clearance of 27 tasks in a total of 5,634,962 square metres in the East Sector and 11 tasks in a total of 2,960,322 square metres in the North-East Sector.

Since its extension request was granted in 2008, Jordan reported that in 2009 manual clearance was implemented on over 250,000 square metres of land, while almost 2 million square metres of land was verified by utilizing manual, mechanical and mine detection dog methods. Jordan reported that in 2010 manual clearance was implemented on over 136,000 square metres of land, while more than 1 million square metres of land was verified by utilizing manual, mechanical and mine detection dog methods.

Mozambique

In its extension request, Mozambique committed to the conclusion of all HALO Trust activities in Maputo Province by the first half of 2009, HI concluding all tasks in 13 Districts in the provinces of Inhambane, Sofala and Manica in 2008, HALO Trust completing in 2008 previous mechanical clearance attempts by other organizations of the line of pylons, stretching from Maputo City to Ressano Garcia on the South African border, continuation of general survey in areas not covered earlier during the baseline assessment in 2007 and continuation of survey along the border with Zimbabwe, Malawi and Zambia.

Since the extension was granted in 2008, Mozambique reported that the power-lines between Maputo in Mozambique and Kmatiport in RSA were under clearance and survey since April 2009 and that by June 2009, 20 towers of 170 reported as mined were addressed.

In addition, Mozambique committed to the following for 2009: clear an estimated area planned of 2,239,402 square metres, a 16 percent increase from 2008, conclude the province of Maputo by mid 2009 at the latest, continue work in Gaza by APOPO and HALO, concentrate operations in the province of Inhambane on the Vilanculos district by HI, subject to availability of funds resume demining in the province of TETE during the course of 2009-2010 and a small IND delegation will be set up for QA and liaison with government authorities, HALO will start covering the province of Manica, the clearly-defined task of the 11 kilometres stretch of mine belt near the Cahorra Bassa Dam will be carried out as part of the plan for 2009, and more survey will be carried out in the

minefields on the border between Mozambique and Zimbabwe before accurate clearance estimates can be provided.

Since the request was granted in 2008, Mozambique reported that the borderline between Mozambique and Zimbabwe was surveyed by the end of 2009 and findings were finalized by IND. The total confirmed hazard areas are 22 with estimated 6.2 million square metres, which 2.9 million square metres in Mozambique territory and 3.7 million square metres in both Mozambique and Zimbabwe; however its impact affects communities living in both Mozambique and Zimbabwe.

Mozambique also committed to the following for 2010: Handicap International will gradually cease operations in Manica Province to concentrate its capacity in the provinces of Sofala and Inhambane, this process will occur simultaneously with allocating a new capacity to address the Manica problem, giving priority to infrastructure such as the Railway Beira-Machimbanda and Chicamba Dam, the IND and partners should, in the beginning of 2010, conduct an evaluation of the two previous year of work to analyze the course of the operations and forecast forthcoming period and make all necessary adjustments in terms of priorities and required resources.

Since the request was granted in 2008, Mozambique reported that 4 million square metres had been reduced leaving around 8 million square metres, which represent 67 percent of tasks yet to be cleared; four of Mozambique's Northern provinces were surveyed and the 146 sites reported in 2007, 77 were confirmed, 43 mined areas and 34 EOD tasks. Of the 43 mined areas 5 are being cleared in Zambezia province, with government funds, using national capacity, and; the northern region was classified as free of landmines, 11 districts of 65 existent in the region.

Nicaragua

In its extension request, Nicaragua committed to in 2008 clearance of 29 mined areas with a total of 9,889 mines, in 2009 clearance of the remaining 19 mined areas with at total of 7,726 mines.

Since the request was granted in 2008, Nicaragua reported in 2009 that to December 2009 a total of 1,018 objectives have been addressed certifying the destruction of 178,478 mines and a total of 11 objectives pending in the municipality of Mozonte, San Fernando, Wiwili de Jinotega, as well as the certification of 4 objectives previously addressed in the departments of Managua, Matagalpa, Esteli and Madriz. In 2010 Nicaragua indicated that the work pending had been completed and Nicaragua has fulfilled its obligations under article 5 of the Convention.

Peru

In its extension request, Peru committed to in 2008 complete the clearance of 153,600 square metres remaining in the ETECEN-Huancayo high tension towers, complete clearance of 7,800 square metres remaining around retransmission antennas and electric substations (Antena Cuto Cuto – Junin, Antena Yahuaspuquio – Junin, Antena Huamurca – Huarochiri and Estacion Zapallal – Lima) and complete clearance of 2,265.52 square metres in 1 objective on the border with Ecuador. In 2009 Peru committed to complete the clearance of two police bases (Anti Drug Base – Santa Lucia, and Anti Terrorist Base – Tulumayo) and the clearance of 8,700 square metres in 2 objectives on the border with Ecuador. And, in 2010, Peru committed to complete the clearance of 11,167 square metres in three high security prisons (Castro Castro – Lima, Yanamayo-Puno and Huacariz – Cajamarca) and clearance of 19,000 square metres in 4 objectives on the border of Ecuador.

Since its extension request was granted in 2008, Peru reported that in 2009 a total of 813.20 square metres had been cleared from the high security prisons of Castro Castro and a total of 1,622 square metres had been cleared on the border with Ecuador and that in 2010, a total of 2,591.49 square metres had been cleared from the high security prison of Castro Castro and a total of 5,073.93 square metres was cleared on the border of Ecuador.

Senegal

In its extension request, Senegal committed to develop its own land release method through impact or technical surveys, to define the status of the unvisited – but highly suspect places – and to identify the possible presence of suspect areas; to promote the implementation of the traditional range of land clearance techniques (general and technical surveys, reduction of areas, decontamination of battlefields, etc) in the 41 localities suspected of being lightly contaminated in order to confirm contamination or to delete them from the list of suspect areas.

Since the request was granted in 2008, Senegal reported that a general survey of 11 localities resulted in 8 areas being proposed for cancellation and 3 for technical survey, a general survey took place on the trail Djifanghor – Boulome where suspicion has been removed, in Gouraf a technical survey took place, a second demining project was opened in the district of Nyassia and demining was completed in the following locations: Bacounoume, Etafoune, Darsalame and Kaguitte. A total of 34,417 square metres were reported cleared with a total of 97,668 square metres remaining to be addressed.

Tajikistan

In its extension request, Tajikistan committed to in 2009 release 98 areas totalling 4.9 million square metres in the Tajikistan-Afghanistan border (82 areas will be released totalling 3.4 million square metres) and the Central Region (16 areas will be released totalling 1.5 million square metres) and in 2010 releasing 16 areas totalling 1.7 million square metres in the Tajikistan- Afghanistan border (12 areas will be released totalling 1.4 million square metres) and the Central Region (4 areas will be released totalling 300,000 square metres).

Since the request was granted in 2009, Tajikistan reported in 2009 the release of 5,735,000 square metres and in 2010 the release of 77,519 square metres.

Additionally, in its extension request, Tajikistan committed to complete the re-survey operations in the 6 left over districts in the Tajikistan-Afghanistan border and 5 left over districts in the Central Region by December 2009 and start wide-range technical survey operations in April 2009.

Since the request was granted in 2009, Tajikistan reported in 2009 the completion of re-survey operation in the Tajikistan-Afghanistan border and Central Region.

Thailand

In its extension request, Thailand committed to in 2009 release a total of 43,066,849 square metres and in 2010 release a total of 43,280,768 square metres.

Since its extension request was granted in 2008, Thailand has reported that as of October 2009, Thailand has already identified a safe area of around 2,000 square kilometres, which amounts to 78 percent of the total mine-affected area and that a total of approximately 500 square kilometres remain to be demined with QC procedures having been completed in around half of the 2,000 square kilometres. Thailand also reported that the total area in 2009 located mine fields is 60,098,393 square metres, cleared is 1,789,686 square metres and the reduced area is 235,887,421 square metres waiting to be handed over. Thailand reported that in 2010, since the Second Review Conference, Thailand was able to reduce the total by 4.3 square kilometres, employing both the Locating Minefield Procedure and the manual clearance method.

Additionally, in its extension request, Thailand committed to develop Standard of Procedures for Area Reduction and implement a new national annual demining plan.

Uganda

In its extension request, Uganda committed to in 2009 complete the release of a total of 27,500 square metres (15,000 square metres in Ngomoromo and 12,500 square metres in Agoro Mountains) and in 2010 complete the clearance of 137,500 square metres

(52,500 square metres in Ngomoromo and 85,000 square metres in Agoro Mountains).

Since its extension request was granted in 2009, Uganda reported that in 2009 a total of 30,828 square metres was released (17,433 square metres in Agoro and 13,395 square metres in Ngomoromo) and that in 2010 a total of 142,942 square metres was released (6,644 square metres in Agoro and 136,298 square metres in Ngomoromo).

Additionally, in its extension request, Uganda committed to increase the current demining capacity by 40 additional deminers to improve the pace of clearance with the increased capacity ready to deploy in December 2009 as well as acquire additional demining team equipment and vehicles.

Since its extension request was granted in 2009, Uganda reported that a mine wolf machine was secured from Norwegian People's Aid (NPA) Sudan and has successfully cleared the mined area at Ngomoromo with clearance operations completed in March 2010 with a total of 134,673 square metres of land having been cleared. Uganda further reported that clearance operations at the Agoro hills minefield has continued to register good progress, one out of the five identified suspected minefields named "Lote", measuring 12,469 square metres, is cleared and the handover process of this area is underway and work in the second minefield of "Ajalikeych" has started and is showing great progress with a total of 09 anti personnel T72 mines having so far been demolished and the total area cleared so far being 6,644 square metres.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

In its extension request, the United Kingdom committed to initiate the clearance of three mined areas (Fox Bay 8 (West), Goose Green 11 and Stanley Area 3, M25); develop a Statement of Requirement and tender; establish a Mine Action Co-ordinating Committee based in the Falkland Islands; develop appropriate national mine action standards, and; provide as soon as possible, but not later than 30 June 2010, a detailed explanation of how demining is proceeding and the implications for future demining in order to meet the UK's obligations in accordance with articles 5.4. b) and c) of the Convention, including the preparation and status of work conducted under national demining programs and financial and technical means available.

Since the request was granted in 2008, the United Kingdom reported that the project was underway and that, following two rigorous tender exercises, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office appointed BACTEC International Limited to carry out the clearance work and C. King Associates to carry out quality control and quality assurance work and to monitor progress. The United Kingdom also reported completion of a 4-site pilot project with a total of 1,246 mines located and destroyed, of which 568 were anti-vehicle mines and 678 were anti-personnel mines, as well as 2 sub-munitions and 9 unexploded ordnance; clearance of Sapper Hill SA-025 with all 190 P4B anti-personnel mines recovered and clearance by Battle Area Clearance Experts of 65,000 square metres of land outside the main mine site recovering and destroying 2 unexploded sub-munitions; excavation works inside the Fox Bay FB-008W Suspect Hazardous Area and across the adjacent headland, to ensure no mines were present, and clearance by Battle Area Clearance Experts of 222,705 square metres searching for unexploded ordnance within the Suspect Hazardous Area and the headland with none found; excavation of the Goose Green GG-011 area recorded to have contained mines, with no mines found and clearance by Battle Area Clearance Experts of an area of 24,175 square metres, with no mines or unexploded ordnance found; clearance of Surf Bay SA -008 minefields with deminers locating and destroying 488 SB 33 mines and 568 SB 81 mines and search by Battle Area Clearance Experts of 34,00 square metres of land with 5 M67 grenades and 4 small arms rounds (7.62mm) cleared.

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

In its extension request, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) committed to in 2008 restructure the Operative Procedures Manual for Demining in order to adapt it to the objectives, assign resources in cooperation with the budgetary entities of the states and

create a national demining structure and possible purchase of mechanical equipment, in 2009 selection of specialized personnel to carry out demining, training for deminers in the use of equipment and the techniques to be employed, inspection and reconnaissance of border Naval Bases in order to plan and organize logistic issues, and in 2010 initiate operations with a total of 5 mined areas (6 hectares) cleared by the end of 2010.

Since the request was granted in 2008, (Bolivarian Republic of) reported that in the period of April 2008 – April 2009 it carried out inspections of six mined areas (Guafitas, Isla Vapor, Cararabo, Atabapo, Puerto Paez, Rio Arauca), selected specialized personnel to carry out demining operations and provided personnel with practical theoretical training by specialized personnel of Venezuela's Combat Engineers and coordinated and consulted on prices for mechanized system for detection and destruction of anti-personnel mines. Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) also reported that in the period of April 2009-April 2010 the Demining Committee was created through a resolution of the Ministry of Popular Defence on 21 September 2009. In 2010, (Bolivarian Republic of) reported modification to its original plan and reported having destroyed 77 mines in 1 area of 2 hectares (Puesto Naval de Rio Arauca) originally scheduled for 2012.

Yemen

In its extension request, Yemen committed to in 2009 technical survey of one affected community in Shabwah governorate with 45,438,386 square metres of suspected hazardous area, it is expected that approximately 1,540,361 square metres of this will be marked as requiring clearance, and of a total of 7,658,734 square metres marked from pervious years for clearance, a total of 1,370,388 square metres will be cleared in Lahij, Ibb, Hadhramoot, Al Dhalee, Shabwah and Amran. In 2010 Yemen committed to the clearance of a total of 2,055,582 square metres from the total area marked in Ibb, Hadhramoot, Al Dhalee, Saada, Al-Jawf, Mareb and Shabowah.

Since the request was granted in 2008, Yemen reported that in the period of March 2008 – March 2009 51 anti-personnel mines, 24 antitank mines and 61,482 unexploded ordnance were cleared in Lahej Abain Abb, Al Dale, Hadhramut, Taiz, Dhamar, Shabwoah, and Sana'a and that during the period of March 2009 – March 2010 95 anti-personnel mines, 27 antitank mines and 36,989 unexploded ordnance were cleared in Lahej Abain Abb, Al Dale, Hadhramut and Taiz.

Zimbabwe

In its extension request, Zimbabwe committed to seek and receive international technical assistance in order to acquire up to date survey and demining techniques, beginning in the second quarter of 2009 resurvey areas and survey areas where the exact locations of mined areas are unknown, develop a plan that takes into account advanced techniques, continue demining by the military in Sango Border Post to Crooks Corner Minefield with another squadron trained and deployed to boost the capacity and submit a subsequent request for a period of time to implement the plan including a time schedule and budget for implementing article 5, including a projection of funds that may be required from the international community.

Since the request was granted in 2008, Zimbabwe reported that during the initial extension period, ZIMAC with support provided through the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) undertook a more detailed analysis using core data from sources that included the 1994 MineTech Survey Report, 2000 Koch – MineSafe Completion Report, 2010 HALO Trust Border Minefield Survey Report done for the Government of Mozambique and significant experience and knowledge gained by Zimbabwe's National Mine Clearance Squadron from more than 12 years of clearance. Zimbabwe submitted a second extension request in August 2010.

Appendix III

Overview of States Parties' reporting on the location of all mined areas that contain, or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines

<p>Afghanistan</p> <p>In its article 7 report submitted in 2010, Afghanistan reported that areas suspected to contain anti-personnel mines were identified during the conduct of the Landmine Impact Survey certified in September 2005 and updated by Landmine Impact Assessment Teams. Some of these areas have also undergone follow-up polygon survey activities, in which more accurate technical and geographical information on mines and UXO-contaminated land was gathered. The total surface area is reported to be 673.4 square kilometres.</p>	<p>Algeria</p> <p>In its article 7 Report submitted in 2010, Algeria reported 2 areas on its Eastern border with Tunisia and on its Western border with Morocco, in which anti-personnel mines are known to be planted by the French colonial army. These areas are linear minefields with a reported mine density ranging from 0.8 to 3,5 mines per linear meter. The length of the two areas is reported to be 1,012.6 kilometres (133.6 kilometres on the eastern border and 879 kilometres on the western border). Between November 2004 and October 2010 a total of 508,544 anti-personal mines were destroyed. Furthermore 286 anti-personal mines and 1 shell were destroyed, between 6 and 18 October 2010 in a newly discovered minefield in the Bir El Ater region. In addition, Algeria declared one area under its jurisdiction in which anti-personal mines were planted by the Algerian army and where 116 anti-personnel mines remain to be destroyed.</p>
<p>Angola</p> <p>During the June 2008 meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Angola reported areas suspected to contain anti-personnel mines were identified during a Landmine Impact Survey completed in 2007. Angola further reported that the total surface area remaining to be addressed was 895.5 square kilometres (895,586,695 square metres).</p>	<p>Argentina</p> <p>In its article 5 extension request submitted on 27 April 2009 and granted on 4 December 2009, Argentina indicated that there is 113 areas under its jurisdiction in which anti-personnel mines are known to be emplaced and 4 areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced. These areas were identified during the conduct of a feasibility study concluded in October 2007. The total surface area is reported to be 13.15 square kilometres (1,315 hectares), including 5.775 square kilometres (577.5 hectares) for the suspected areas. The feasibility study report that has been made available to the States Parties contains a table listing each area and its size, relating each area to a locality and indicating if known the date of emplacement of mines and the number of mines emplaced. The feasibility study report further indicates that all 117 areas in</p>

Bhutan

In its initial article 7 report submitted in 2007, Bhutan identified 2 areas in which anti-personnel mines are known to be emplaced. The initial report contains information on the types and quantities of mines emplaced. The 2 areas are reported to contain 103 anti-personnel mines emplaced on 6 tracks. The report also indicates that the tracks are located in the Manas Wildlife Sanctuary near the Indian border.

Burundi

In a statement delivered at the May 2009 meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Burundi indicated that there were still 2 areas in which anti-personnel mines were known to be emplaced. These areas were identified during a Landmine Impact Survey completed in May 2006. In addition, Burundi identified 58 areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced. A General Community Survey was scheduled to start in July 2010 in the 58 areas in question.

Chad

In its extension request submitted on 20 September 2010, Chad reported that the total surface area where the presence of anti-personnel mines is suspected is reported to be 440 square kilometres. These areas were identified during a Landmine Impact Survey completed in 2001. In addition, the LIS identified 135 areas under Chad's jurisdiction or control in which

question are perimeter marked and are regularly monitored and protected by fencing.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

During the June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Bosnia and Herzegovina reported 11,443 areas (locations) in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced. The total surface area remaining to be addressed is reported to be 1,555 square kilometres.

Cambodia

In its extension request submitted on 24 August 2009 and granted on 4 December 2009 Cambodia reported that it was working towards defining more precisely how many areas in which anti-personnel mines were suspected to be emplaced. The total surface area is reported to be estimated at 648.8 square kilometres. The extension request indicated that the provision of precise and accurate information on the size, location and nature of the remaining challenge remained a challenge for Cambodia and thus only an estimate could be provided. The estimate is based on the results of the Landmine Impact Survey completed in April 2002 but also on the knowledge and experience of all operators active in Cambodia. A Baseline Survey (BLS) started in August 2009 and is due to be completed in December 2012. It aims to supersede previous LIS contamination and to define remaining contamination through a national land classification system. In information provided on the application of the Cartagena Action Plan on 11 August 2010, Cambodia reported that the first phase of the BLS would be complete in October 2010 and the work plan would be reviewed accordingly.

Chile

In its article 7 report submitted in 2010, Chile reported 40 sectors located in 12 different communes containing 158 areas in which anti-personnel mines are known to be emplaced. The 158 areas are reported to contain 97,313 anti-personnel mines. The article 7 report contains a table listing the number of areas per sector, relating them to a commune and indicating the date of

anti-personnel mines were suspected to be emplaced but which could not be linked to a particular community. Further to the LIS, during the course of demining operations, Chad reported that additional areas in which anti-personnel mines were suspected to be emplaced were identified. The total surface area is reported to be 96.3 square kilometres (96,297,542 square metres). A technical survey covering two regions in the North of Chad started in September 2010 to establish the extent of the remaining contamination and include a technical appreciation of all remaining tasks.

Colombia

In its extension request submitted on 13 August 2010, Colombia reported 13 areas in which anti-personnel mines are known to be emplaced and 10,191 areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced. The total surface area is reported to be 0.087 square kilometres (87,490 square metres) for the areas known to contain antipersonnel mines and 50.955 square kilometres (50,955,000 square metres) for the areas suspected to contain antipersonnel mines. The extension request indicates that the surface area provided for the areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced is an estimate obtained by multiplying the number of registered incidents involving anti-personnel mines by 0.005 square kilometres.

Croatia

In its extension request submitted on 2 June 2008 and granted on 28 November 2008, Croatia reported 7,247 areas (minefield records) in which anti-personnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced. The total surface area remaining to be addressed was reported to be 997 square kilometres. All areas in which anti-personnel were suspected to be emplaced are marked. In information provided on the application of the Cartagena Action Plan on 19 August 2010, Croatia reported that the total surface area remaining to be addressed is 845.5 square kilometres, including 271.5 square kilometres of areas known to contain anti-personnel mines and 574 square kilometres of areas suspected to contain anti-personnel mines.

emplacement, the number and types of mines emplaced in each sector. The article 7 report further indicates that the mined areas are perimeter-marked and protected by fencing.

Congo

In its initial article 7 report submitted on 12 September 2002, Congo reported 1 area in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced. The area is located at the border with Angola and the total surface area is reported to be [INSERT SIZE]. Congo reported that it has been unable to determine so far if the area indeed contains anti-personnel mines.

Cyprus

In a statement delivered during the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties, Cyprus reported 3 localities in the areas of its jurisdiction that are under the government's effective control, containing areas in which anti-personnel mines are known to be emplaced. The areas are reported to contain 2,183 anti-personnel mines.

Democratic Republic of the Congo

In information on the application of the Cartagena Action Plan provided on 6 August 2010, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, indicated that the total surface area where anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced is reported to be 13.77 square kilometres (13,777,222 square metres). The areas are linked to geographical coordinates.

Ecuador

In its extension request submitted on 31 March 2008 and granted on 28 November 2008, Ecuador reported 75 areas in which anti-personnel mines are known to be emplaced. The total surface area reported is 0.49 square kilometres (498,632.89 square metres). The areas are estimated to contain 5,923 antipersonnel mines. The extension request contains a table listing all areas, their geographical coordinates, their sizes, and the estimated number of mines.

Ethiopia

In information provided on the application of the Cartagena Action Plan on 13 September 2010, Ethiopia reported 13 areas in which anti-personnel mines are known to be emplaced and 44 areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced. The total surface area reported is 1683.677 square kilometres (22,518,632 square metres for the areas known to contain anti-personnel mines and 1,661,158,738 square metres for the areas suspected to contain anti-personnel mines). The areas were identified during the Landmine Impact Survey completed in 2004.

Guinea-Bissau

In its extension request submitted on 8 September 2010, Guinea-Bissau reported 9 areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced. These areas were identified by a Landmine Impact Survey completed in May 2008. The total surface area is reported to be 1.378 square kilometres (1,378,814.28 square metres). In addition 52 areas were also reported as

Denmark

In its extension request submitted on 18 June 2010, Denmark reported 1 area in which anti-personnel mines are known to be emplaced. The total surface area is estimated to be 1.212 square kilometres (121.2 hectares). The request also contains information on the types of mines and an estimated number of mines contained in the area based on the number of mines originally laid, the experience from the clearance carried out in 2006-2008 and the technical survey of 2008. The area is fenced off and marked.

Eritrea

In its article 7 report submitted in 2010, Eritrea reported 677 areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced. The areas were identified during the Landmine Impact Survey completed in June 2004. A nationwide technical survey was planned to be completed by 2009 but was suspended due to lack of funds.

Gambia

In its initial article 7 report submitted in 2009, Gambia reported 1 area in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced. Gambia indicated that the area is located in the outskirts of the village of Gillanfari, in the Foni Bintang District, close to the border with Casamance, Senegal.

Iraq

In information provided to the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance in May 2009, Iraq indicated that the total area of contamination was still unknown and reported 3,673 areas in which anti-personnel mines were suspected to be emplaced or which were suspected to be hazardous. In information provided on the application of the Cartagena Action Plan, Iraq reported that

areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced (they include 7 areas not surveyed by the LIS, 29 areas unknown, not included in the LIS, and 16 areas not covered by the LIS for accessibility reasons). A general survey is scheduled to take place between mid September 2010 and the end of April 2011 and a technical survey is scheduled to take place from September 2010 to May 2011.

Jordan

In its extension request submitted on 31 March 2008 and granted on 28 November 2008, Jordan reported 93 areas in which anti-personnel mines are known to be emplaced. The total surface area is reported to be 10.36 square kilometres (10,355,967 square metres) and the areas in question stretch over 104 kilometres. The areas were reported to contain 92,569 anti-personnel mines.

Mozambique

In its extension request submitted on 26 August 2008 and granted on 28 November 2008, Mozambique reported 541 areas in which anti-personnel mines are known to be emplaced. The total surface area remaining to be addressed was reported to be 12.166 square kilometres (12,166,401 square metres). The areas in question were confirmed during a "Baseline Assessment" completed in 2008 and included 181 areas originally identified by the Landmine Impact Survey. The extension request further indicated that survey activities would need to be undertaken in areas along Mozambique's border with Zimbabwe. In June 2010 during the meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mozambique reported that the total surface area remaining to be addressed was reported to be around 8 square kilometres (8,000,000 square metres). Mozambique also indicated that new hazards continued to be reported and

it does not have accurate information on the exact locations in which anti-personnel mines were emplaced because no inclusive locating procedure has been yet undertaken. Iraq further indicated that the only source of information it currently has available is the survey that was carried out in 13 of the 18 districts during the period 2004-2006.

Mauritania

In its extension request submitted on 10 April 2010, Mauritania reported 21 areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced. The total surface area is reported to be 64.81974 square kilometres (64,819,740 square metres). The request indicates that the information gathered by the Landmine Impact Survey carried out in 2006 did not provide detailed knowledge on the precise locations and perimeters of the affected areas. Of the remaining 21 areas, 5 areas covering 2.521 square kilometres (2,521,000 square metres) will undergo technical survey over the course of 2011. An additional 2 areas covering 2.03 square kilometres (2,030,000 square metres) will be subject to survey resumption. The request further indicates that approximately 15 square kilometres (15,000,000 square metres) have been marked.

Nigeria

In its article 7 report submitted in 2010, Nigeria reported 38 (locations) areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced. The total surface area is estimated to be 241,250 square kilometres.

known hazards were becoming more precisely defined. Mozambique further indicated that the border between Mozambique and Zimbabwe was surveyed by the end of 2009 and identified 22 areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be contained and with a total surface area estimated to be 6.2 square kilometres (6,200,000 square metres).

Peru

In its extension request submitted on 20 August 2008 and granted on 28 November 2008, Peru reported 846 areas (around national infrastructure) in which anti-personnel were known to be emplaced. The total surface area remaining to be addressed was reported to be 0.334 square kilometres (334,667 square metres). In addition Peru reported 35 areas (along the border with Ecuador) in which anti-personnel were suspected to be emplaced. The total surface area remaining to be addressed was reported to be 0.192 square kilometres (192,061 square metres).

Serbia

In a statement delivered at the meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance in June 2010, Serbia reported two areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced. The total surface area remaining to be addressed was reported to be approximately 1.589 square kilometres (1,589,900 square metres). Serbia further reported that surveys in the area were scheduled to be completed by the end of 2010.

Tajikistan

In information provided on the application of the Cartagena Action Plan on 13 August 2010, Tajikistan reported 242 areas in which anti-personnel are known to be emplaced. The total surface area remaining to be addressed is reported to be 10.743 square kilometres

Senegal

In its extension request submitted on 8 July 2008 and granted on 28 November 2008, Senegal reported 149 areas in which anti-personnel mines were suspected to be emplaced. These areas were identified during the conduct of an emergency study on the impact of mines in Casamance from October 2005 to April 2006. The total surface area is estimated to be 11 square kilometres of land and 73 kilometres of tracks and/or paths. The extension request also indicated that not all areas suspected to contain anti-personnel mines could be visited during the impact study, and that as a result additional areas may be identified in the future. In information provided by Senegal on the application of application of Action 14 of the Cartagena Action Plan on 11 August 2010, Senegal indicated that the size and location of identified contaminated areas cannot be determined clearly and that this information will be available when the ongoing general surveys are completed.

Sudan

In its article 7 report submitted in 2009, Sudan reported areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced, including 1,615 “dangerous areas” and 363 “active suspected hazard areas”. Sudan further reported that as no nationwide assessment/survey has been conducted in Sudan, the full extent of the landmine problem in the country remains unknown. The available information is derived from ad hoc assessments carried out in various parts of the country.

Thailand

In its extension request submitted on 2 October 2008 and granted on 28 November 2008, Thailand reported that areas where the presence of anti-personnel is suspected were identified during a Landmine Impact Survey completed in June 2001. In information provided on the

(10,743,243 square metres). Each area is geographically referenced. In addition, Tajikistan reported 58 areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced.

Turkey

In its initial article 7 report submitted on 1 October 2004, Turkey reported 15 areas in which anti-personnel mines were known to be emplaced and 7 areas in which anti-personnel were suspected to be emplaced.

The report contained a table listing each area linked to a province, the types and quantity of mines it contained as well as the date of emplacement when known. The total number of emplaced mines in the known areas was reported to be 921,080. In a statement to the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance in June 2010, Turkey indicated that all areas are marked. At the 10th Meeting of the States Parties, Turkey reported that out of the total number of emplaced anti-personnel mines, 814,951,450 had been cleared, leaving 814,501 still to clear. Turkey also indicated that the western borders with Greece, Bulgaria and Georgia were mine-free. Turkey further indicated that at present mine clearing activities along the southern border, in particular the borderline with Syria, constituted a priority and that around two thirds of the mines were laid along this border. Turkey stated that the project to clear the borderline with Syria, 870 kilometres long and on average 350 metres wide, also entails the simultaneous establishment of a new physical border security system and Turkey will keep the States Parties informed of further developments regarding article 5 obligations.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

In its article 5 extension request submitted on 27 April 2009 and granted on 4 December 2009, the United Kingdom reported 113 areas in which anti-personnel mines are known to be emplaced and 4 areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced. These areas were identified during the conduct of a feasibility study concluded in October 2007. The total surface area was reported to be 13.15 square kilometres (1,315 hectares), including 57.75 square kilometres

application of the Cartagena Action, Thailand reported that the total surface area remaining to be addressed is reported to be 551.3 square kilometres (551,335,991 square metres).

Uganda

In information provided on the application of the Cartagena Action Plan on 24 September 2010, Uganda reported 2 areas in which anti-personnel mines are known to be emplaced. The total surface area is reported to be 0.03 square kilometres (30,000 square metres). Uganda also reported 12 areas in which anti-personnel are suspected to be emplaced for which the total surface area is estimated to be 0.716 square kilometres (716,000 square metres). Uganda provided a table listing each suspected area and its size, relating each area to a district, and indicating the type of survey that each area had been subjected to.

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

In its extension request submitted on 31 March 2008 and granted on 28 November 2008, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) reported 13 areas in which anti-personnel mines were known to be emplaced. The total surface area is reported to be 0.18 square kilometres (18 hectares). The extension request contains a table listing each area and its size, relating each area to a location and referring to relevant maps and indicating the date of emplacement of mines, the number of mines emplaced and their types. The 13 areas in question are

(577.5 hectares) for the suspected areas. The feasibility study report that has been made available to the States Parties contains a table listing each area and its size, relating each area to a locality and indicating if known the date of emplacement of mines and the number of mines emplaced. The feasibility study report further indicates that all areas in question are perimeter marked and are regularly monitored and protected by fencing. At the June 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, the United Kingdom reported the release of 4 areas, 1 classified as suspected to contain anti-personnel mines and 3 where the presence of anti-personnel mines was known. There remains, 106 areas under the United Kingdom's jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines are known to be emplaced and 3 areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced.

Yemen

In its extension request submitted on 6 November 2008 and granted on 28 November 2008, Yemen reported 457 areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced. The total surface area was reported to be 213.23 square kilometres (213,228,369 square metres). These areas were identified by a nationwide Landmine Impact Survey (LIS) which was completed in July 2000. The request also indicated that 10 areas were identified after the conduct of the LIS. In information provided on the application of the Cartagena Action Plan on 21 September 2010, Yemen reported 237 areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced with a total surface area of 140 square kilometres (140,968,405 square metres) remaining to be addressed. Yemen provided a table listing each area, with its name, its size and related to a locality.

reported to be fenced off and to contain 1,073 anti-personnel mines. In information provided on the application of the Cartagena Action Plan on 25 October 2010, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) indicated that by the end of 2010, there should be 12 areas in which anti-personnel mines are known to be emplaced.

Zimbabwe

In its extension request submitted on 3 August 2010, Zimbabwe reported 9 areas in which anti-personnel mines are suspected to be emplaced. The total surface area is reported to be 201.32 square kilometres. The extension request indicated that 5 areas would require limited general survey to confirm the accuracy of available information and 4 areas would require more detailed technical survey. The areas are marked.

Appendix IV

Support provided since the Cartagena Summit by the UNDP, UNICEF, UNMAS and the OAS to States Parties that are in the process of implementing article 5 or that have reported the responsibility for significant number of landmine survivors

	<i>OAS</i>	<i>UNDP</i>	<i>UNICEF</i>	<i>UNMAS</i>
Afghanistan			X	X
Albania		X	X	
Algeria		X		
Angola		X	X	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		X	X	
Burundi		X		
Cambodia		X	X	X
Chad		X		X
Colombia	X	X	X	X
Cyprus		X		X
Democratic Republic of the Congo			X	X
Ecuador	X			
Eritrea		X	X	
Ethiopia		X		X
Guinea-Bissau		X		
Iraq		X	X	
Jordan		X		
Mauritania		X	X	X
Mozambique		X		X
Peru	X			
Senegal		X	X	X
Sudan		X	X	X
Tajikistan		X	X	
Thailand		X	X	
Uganda		X		
Yemen		X	X	
Zimbabwe		X		

Appendix V

Mines reported retained for purposes permitted under article 3 of the Convention

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>
Afghanistan ^a	1076	1887	2692	2680	2618	2618
Albania	0		0	0	0	0
Algeria	15030	15030	15030	15030	6000	5970
Andorra	0	0	0		0	
Angola	1390	1460	2512			2512
Antigua and Barbuda						
Argentina ^b	1680	1596	1471	1380	1268	1142
Australia	7395	7266	7133	6998	6785	6947
Austria	0		0	0	0	0
Bahamas	0				0	
Bangladesh	15000	14999	12500	12500	12500	12500
Barbados						
Belarus	6030	6030	6030	6030	6030	6030
Belgium	4176	3820	3569	3287	3245	3204
Belize						
Benin		30	16	16		
Bhutan			4491			
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	0					
Bosnia and Herzegovina ^c	2755	17471	1708	1920	2390	2255
Botswana ^d						
Brazil ^e	16125	15038	13550	12381	10986	10051
Brunei Darussalam ^f			0			0

^a In its article 7 report submitted in 2005, Afghanistan indicated that the Government had yet to develop a formal policy on the number of mines retained for development and training purposes. The Government on a case-by-case basis approves the number and type of APMs retained by UNMACA on behalf of the MAPA.

^b 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.

^c In its article 7 report submitted in 2010, BiH indicated that 2,255 mines were without fuses.

^d In its report submitted in 2001, Botswana indicated that a “small quantity” of mines would be retained.

^e In its reports submitted in 2006 and 2009, Brazil indicated that it intends to keep its article 3 mines up to 2019.

^f In its report submitted in 2007, Brunei Darussalam indicated that there were no live anti-personnel mines prohibited by the Convention retained for the development and training in Brunei Darussalam. For these purposes, the Royal Brunei Armed Forces is using anti-personnel mines that are not prohibited by the Convention.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>
Bulgaria	3676	3676	3670	3682	3682	3672
Burkina Faso ^g						
Burundi				4	4	4
Cambodia	0		0	0	0	0
Cameroon ^h	3154				1885	
Canada ⁱ	1907	1992	1963	1963	1939	1937
Cape Verde					120	
Central African Republic						
Chad	0	0	0		0	0
Chile	5895	4574	4484	4153	4083	3346
Colombia	886	886	586	586	586	586
Comoros						
Congo	372	372	372		322	
Cook Islands			0			
Costa Rica	0					0
Cote d'Ivoire	0	0	0		0	0
Croatia	6400	6236	6179	6103	6038	5954
Cyprus	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	500
Czech Republic	4829	4829	4699	4699	2543	2497
Democratic Republic of the Congo ^j						
Denmark	1989	60	2008	2008	1990	1950
Djibouti	2996					
Dominica	0					
Dominican Republic					0	
Ecuador	2001	2001	2001	1000	1000	1000
El Salvador	96	72			0	
Equatorial Guinea						
Eritrea ^k	9		109	109	109	172
Estonia	0		0	0	0	0
Ethiopia				1114	303	303

^g In its reports submitted in 2005, 2007 and 2008, Burkina Faso indicated that “nothing yet” was retained.

^h In its report submitted in 2009, Cameroon indicated in Form B that 1,885 mines were held and in Form D that some thousands of mines were held for training purposes.

ⁱ 84 of the 1941 mines reported in 2007 are without fuses.

^j In its reports submitted in 2008, 2009 and 2010, the Democratic Republic of the Congo indicated that the decision concerning mines retained was pending.

^k In its report submitted in 2005, Eritrea indicated that the mines retained were inert. In its report submitted in 2007, Eritrea indicated that 9 of the 109 mines retained were inert. In its report submitted in 2008, Eritrea indicated that 8 of the 109 retained mines were inert. In its report submitted in 2010, Eritrea indicated that 71 of the 172 mines retained for training were inert.

<i>State Party</i>	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Fiji						
France	4455	4216	4170	4152	4144	4017
Gabon						
Gambia					0	100
Germany	2496	2525	2526	2388	2437	2261
Ghana						
Greece	7224	7224	7224	7224	7224	6158
Grenada						
Guatemala	0				0	0
Guinea						
Guinea-Bissau ¹		109		109	9	9
Guyana		0				0
Haiti					0	
Holy See	0	0	0		0	0
Honduras		815	826			
Hungary	1500		0		0	0
Iceland	0	0	0	0		
Indonesia				4978	4978	2454
Iraq				9	TBC	TBC
Ireland	85	77	75	70	67	66
Italy	806	806	750	721	689	674
Jamaica	0		0			
Japan	6946	5350	4277	3712	3320	2976
Jordan	1000	1000	1000	950	950	900
Kenya		3000		3000		
Kiribati						
Kuwait				0	0	0
Latvia		1301	902	899	899	118
Lesotho						
Liberia						
Liechtenstein	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lithuania	0	0	0	0	0	0
Luxembourg	956	956	900	855		800
Madagascar						
Malawi	21				0	0
Malaysia	0				0	0

¹ In its reports submitted in 2006 and 2008, Guinea-Bissau indicated that amongst the 109 retained mines, 50 POMZ2 and 50 PMD6 did not contain detonators or explosive. In its report submitted in 2009, Guinea-Bissau indicated that the 50 POMZ2 were transferred for metal use and the 50 PMD6 were eliminated and used as wood.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>
Maldives		0				
Mali	600					
Malta	0	0		0	0	
Mauritania	728	728	728	728	728	728
Mauritius	0	0	0	0		
Mexico	0	0	0	0	0	0
Monaco	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montenegro			0	0	0	0
Mozambique ^m	1470	1319	1265		1963	1943
Namibia	6151	3899			1734	1634
Nauru						
Netherlands	3176	2878	2735	2516	2413	2214
New Zealand ⁿ	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nicaragua	1040	1021	1004	1004	1004	963
Niger	146	146			146	
Nigeria	0	0			3364	3364
Niue						
Norway	0	0	0	0	0	0
Palau				0	0	
Panama					0	
Papua New Guinea ^o						
Paraguay		0	0			0
Peru	4024	4012	4012	4000	4047	2060
Philippines	0	0	0			0
Portugal	1115	1115	1115		760	697
Qatar						
Romania	2500	2500	2500	2500	2500	2500
Republic of Moldova	249	249	0	0	0	0
Rwanda	101	101		65		
Saint Kitts and Nevis						
Saint Lucia						
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines						

^m In its report submitted in 2009, Mozambique indicated that 520 of the retained mines were inherited from an NPA mine detection training camp. This camp is not used as training falls outside of the IND scope of work so the mines will be destroyed in June 2009.

ⁿ In its report submitted in 2007, New Zealand indicated that it retains operational stocks of M18A1 Claymores which are operated in the command-detonated mode only. Other than the M18A1 Claymores, the New Zealand Defence Force holds a very limited quantity of inert practice mines, used solely in the training of personnel in mine clearance operations, in accordance with article 3 of the Convention.

^o In its report submitted in 2004, Papua New Guinea indicated that it had a small stock of command-detonated Claymore mines for training purposes only by the Papua New Guinea Defence Force.

<i>State Party</i>	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Samoa			0			
San Marino	0		0	0	0	0
Sao Tome and Principe				0		
Senegal ^p	0		24	24	28	28
Serbia ^q	5000	5507		5565	3589	3159
Seychelles	0					
Sierra Leone						
Slovakia	1427	1427	1427	1422	1422	1422
Slovenia	2994	2993	2993	2992	2991	
Solomon Islands						
South Africa	4388	4433	4406	4380	4356	4356
Spain	2712	2712	2034	1994	1797	1735
Sudan	5000	10000	10000	4997	1938	
Suriname	150	150	150	0		
Swaziland		0				
Sweden ^r	14798	14402	10578	7531	7364	7364
Switzerland	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tajikistan	255	225	105	0	0	0
Thailand ^s	4970	4761	4713	3650	3638	3626
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	4000	0	0	0	0	
Timor-Leste						
Togo						
Trinidad and Tobago		0			0	0
Tunisia	5000	5000	5000	4995	4980	4980
Turkey	16000	15150	15150	15150	15125	15100
Turkmenistan	0	0				0
Ukraine		1950	1950	223	211	187
Uganda	1764			1764	1764	1764
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1937	1795	650	609	903	833
United Republic of Tanzania	1146	1146	1102	950	1780	

^p In its reports submitted in 2007 and 2008, Senegal indicated that the 24 mines it retains under article 3 were found during demining operations or in rebels stocks held before they were destroyed in August-September 2006. These mines have been defused and are used to train deminers. In its report submitted in 2010, Senegal indicated that 4 of the mines retained for training had been defused.

^q In its report submitted in 2009, Serbia indicated that all fuses for 510 PMA-1 type and 560 PMA-3 type had been removed and destroyed.

^r In its reports submitted in 2004 and 2005, Sweden indicated that 2840 mines were without fuses and could be connected to fuses kept for dummies. In its report submitted in 2009, Sweden indicated that 2780 mines were without fuses and could be connected to fuses kept for dummies.

^s In its article 7 report submitted in 2010, Thailand reported the transfer of all its mines for training and destruction.

<i>State Party</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>	<i>2010</i>
Uruguay				260		
Vanuatu		0		0		
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	4960	4960	4960	4960	4960	4960
Yemen	4000	4000				3760
Zambia	3346	3346	3346	2232	2120	2120
Zimbabwe ^t	700	700	700	600	550	

Key:

<i>Number of mines reported retained in a particular year:</i>	<i>Numeric value</i>
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:	

^t In its report submitted in 2008, Zimbabwe reported 700 mines retained for training in Form D and indicated that 100 had been destroyed during training in 2007 in Form B.

Appendix VI

The status of legal measures taken in accordance with article 9

(a) States Parties that have reported that they have adopted legislation in the context of article 9 obligations

Albania	Australia	Austria
Belarus	Belgium	Belize
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Brazil	Burkina Faso
Burundi	Cambodia	Canada
Chad	Colombia	Cook Islands
Costa Rica	Croatia	Cyprus
Czech Republic	Djibouti	El Salvador
France	Germany	Guatemala
Honduras	Hungary	Iceland
Ireland	Italy	Japan
Jordan	Kiribati	Latvia
Liechtenstein	Luxembourg	Malaysia
Mali	Malta	Mauritania
Mauritius	Monaco	New Zealand
Nicaragua	Niger	Norway
Peru	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Senegal
Seychelles	South Africa	Spain
Sweden	Switzerland	Trinidad and Tobago
Turkey	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Yemen
Zambia	Zimbabwe	

(b) **States Parties that have reported that they consider existing laws to be sufficient in the context of article 9 obligations**

Algeria	Andorra
Argentina	Bulgaria
Central African Republic	Chile
Denmark	Estonia
Ethiopia	Greece
Guinea-Bissau	Holy See
Indonesia	Kuwait
Lesotho	Lithuania
Mexico	Montenegro
Namibia	Netherlands
Papua New Guinea	Portugal
Republic of Moldova	Romania
Samoa	Slovakia
Slovenia	Tajikistan
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Tunisia
Ukraine	United Republic of Tanzania
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	

(c) **States Parties that have not yet reported having either adopted legislation in the context of article I legislation or that they consider existing laws are sufficient**

Afghanistan	Angola	Antigua and Barbuda
Bahamas	Bangladesh	Barbados
Benin	Bhutan	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)
Botswana	Brunei Darussalam	Cameroon
Cape Verde	Comoros	Congo
Côte d'Ivoire	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Dominica
Dominican Republic	Ecuador	Equatorial Guinea
Eritrea	Fiji	Gabon
Gambia	Ghana	Grenada
Guinea	Guyana	Haiti
Iraq	Jamaica	Kenya
Liberia	Madagascar	Malawi
Maldives	Mozambique	Nauru
Nigeria	Niue	Palau
Panama	Paraguay	Philippines
Qatar	Rwanda	Saint Kitts and Nevis
Saint Lucia	San Marino	Sao Tome and Principe
Serbia	Sierra Leone	Solomon Islands
Sudan	Suriname	Swaziland
Thailand	Timor-Leste	Togo
Turkmenistan	Uganda	Uruguay
Vanuatu		

Annex I

Agenda of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties (as adopted at the first plenary meeting on 29 November 2010)

1. Official opening of the meeting
2. Election of the President
3. Brief messages delivered by or on behalf of Nobel Peace Prize laureate Jody Williams, the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross, the President of the Council of Foundation of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining and the Secretary General of the United Nations
4. Adoption of the agenda
5. Election of the Vice-Presidents of the meeting and of other officers
6. Confirmation of the Secretary-General of the meeting
7. Organization of work
8. General exchange of views
9. Informal presentation of requests submitted under article 5 and of the analysis of these requests
10. Enhancing international cooperation and assistance in the context of the Convention
11. Consideration of the general status and operation of the Convention
 - (a) Universalizing the Convention
 - (b) Destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines
 - (c) Clearing mined areas
 - (d) Assisting the victims
 - (e) Other matters essential for achieving the Convention's aims
 - (i) Transparency and the exchange of information
 - (ii) Preventing and suppressing prohibited activities and facilitating compliance.
 - (iii) Implementation support
12. Evaluation of the Implementation Support Unit
13. Consideration of requests submitted under article 5
14. Consideration of matters arising from/in the context of reports submitted under article 7
15. Consideration of requests submitted under article 8
16. Date, duration and location of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties, and matters pertaining to the preparations for the Eleventh Meeting.
17. Any other business
18. Consideration and adoption of the final document
19. Closure of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties

Annex II

Report on the process for the preparation, submission and consideration of requests for extensions to article 5 deadlines, 2009-2010 (as warmly welcomed at the ninth plenary meeting on 3 December 2010)

1. At the 2006 Seventh Meeting of the States Parties (7MSP), the States Parties established “a process for the preparation, submission and consideration of requests for extension to article 5 deadlines.” This process includes the President and the Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs of the Standing Committees jointly preparing an analysis of each request. In doing so this group of 17 States Parties (hereafter referred to as the “analysing group”) is tasked, along with requesting States Parties, with cooperating fully to clarify issues and identify needs. In addition, in preparing each analysis, the analysing group in close consultation with the requesting State, should, where appropriate, draw on expert mine clearance, legal and diplomatic advice, using the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) to provide support. Ultimately, the President, acting on behalf of the Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs, is charged with submitting the analyses to the States Parties well before the Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conference preceding the requesting State’s deadline.
2. At the 7MSP, the States Parties agreed “to encourage States Parties seeking article 5 extensions to submit their request to the President no fewer than nine months before the Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conference at which the decision on the request would need to be taken.” On 11 March 2010 the analysing group met to take stock of its workload for 2010, noting that potentially seven States Parties with 2011 deadlines – Chad, Colombia, Congo, Denmark, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania and Zimbabwe – would request extensions. The analysing group noted that three of these States Parties – Chad, Denmark and Zimbabwe – would be submitting a second request as they have previously been granted extensions until 2011.
3. Also at its 11 March 2010 meeting, the analysing group agreed to carry out its work in accordance with the working methods adopted by the analysing group in 2008, as recorded by the President of the Eighth Meeting of the States Parties (8MSP) in document APLC/MSP.9/2008/WP.35.
4. In accordance with the decisions of the 8MSP, requests to be considered at the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties (10MSP) should normally have been submitted no later than the end of March 2010. On 31 March 2010, the President received a request submitted by Colombia. On 10 April 2010, the President received a request submitted by Mauritania. On 18 June 2010, the President received a request submitted by Denmark. On 23 June, the President informed the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance that she had written to all other States Parties with deadlines in 2011 to request that they clarify when or whether they will submit requests.
5. On 3 August 2010, the President received a request submitted by Zimbabwe. On 2 September 2010, the President received a request submitted by Chad. On 8 September 2010, the President received a request submitted by Guinea-Bissau. As a result of a cooperative dialogue with the analysing group, three States Parties revised their requests and submitted these revisions as follows: Colombia on 6 August, Mauritania on 6 September and Zimbabwe on 28 September 2010.
6. In accordance with the decisions of the 8MSP, each request and each revised request received by the President was made available on the Convention’s website.

7. The analysing group met on 19 May 2010, each day from 21 to 24 June 2010, on 7 September 2010, on 2 November and on 24 November 2010 to carry out its work. During the week of 21 to 25 June 2010, the analysing group held informal discussions with representatives of each of the requesting States Parties. As well, expert input was obtained at various instances in the process from the ICBL and ICRC. While much of the work of the analysis group was completed by the end of September – which is the approximate deadline for ensuring that documents can be processed for Meetings of the States Parties in a timely manner – the late submission of some requests and/or complexities related to some requests meant that some analyses could not be submitted until the week prior to the 10MSP.

Observations and recommendations

8. For the third year in a row, the analysis process highlighted that some requesting States Parties, almost ten years after entry into force, still lacked clarity regarding “the location of all mined areas that contain, or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines under (their) jurisdiction or control”, a matter which States Parties are obliged to report on in accordance with their obligations under article 7 of the Convention. It is recommended, therefore, once again, that all States Parties in the process of implementing article 5, particularly those that may believe it will be necessary at a future date to submit an extension request, intensify and accelerate efforts to locate and report on all mined areas that contain, or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines under (their) jurisdiction or control.

9. The analysis of requests in 2010 underscored the importance, as has been recorded by the States Parties in the past, of States Parties that lack clarity regarding their article 5 challenge “requesting only the period of time necessary to assess relevant facts and develop a meaningful forward looking plan based on these facts.

10. The analysis of requests in 2010 underscored the importance, as has been recorded by the States Parties in the past, of the States Parties agreeing that those that have been granted extensions be asked to report regularly on time-bound commitments made in requests and on the decisions taken on requests.

11. Normally requests should be submitted no later than 31 March of the year when the request would be considered. In 2010, only one of the six requests submitted was received by the President by 31 March 2010. Three of the requests were not submitted until well after the June meetings of the Standing Committees. This impeded the efforts of the analysing group and resulted in some analyses being completed much later than they normally should have. It is recommended that the 10MSP recall the importance of the timely submission of extension requests to the overall effective functioning of the article 5 extension process.

12. The article 5 extension request process places a heavy burden on the representatives of those States Parties that are mandated to analyse the requests. It remains important that the analysis process is State Party-driven. To further assist the States Parties in continuing to effectively lead this process, the President, with the support of the ISU, should consider ways and means (e.g., seminars, workshops, etc.) to increase the knowledge and expertise of the analysing group with respect to the technical subject matter contained within article 5 requests.

13. The Republic of Congo has an article 5 deadline on 1 November 2011. It has not yet indicated that it will be able to comply by its deadline. If it now believes that it will not be able to meet its deadline, it will be non-compliant with the Convention as of 1 November 2011.

Annex III

Strengthening international cooperation and assistance in support of mine action and the implementation of the Convention (as considered at the third and fourth plenary meetings on 30 November 2010)

Background

1. One of the most significant outcomes of the 2009 Cartagena Summit on a Mine-Free World was the strong interest expressed by States Parties and others in strengthening international cooperation and assistance and the implementation of article 6. Lack of resources has been identified by implementation stakeholders as a key obstacle for States Parties in meeting their obligations within victim assistance, mine clearance and in some instances, stockpile destruction.
2. With the Cartagena Action Plan, States Parties "...recognize that fulfilling their obligations will require sustained substantial political, financial and material commitments, provided both through national commitments and international, regional and bilateral cooperation and assistance, in accordance with the obligations under article 6."
3. The nineteen actions in the section on international cooperation and assistance describe steps all States Parties and other relevant implementation actors should take to support implementation of the Convention in affected areas. The actions in particular emphasise the importance of mapping and identifying needs, of making the needs known and of supporting States Parties with such needs, as preconditions for effective implementation of article 6.
4. Two discussion papers on international cooperation and assistance for mine clearance and victim assistance respectively were prepared for a special session held on 25 June during the week of the Intersessional Work Programme. This separation was done as mine clearance and victim assistance have different timelines, involve distinct national and international actors and relate to different national institutional and regulatory frameworks and budget lines. Attempts to address two so distinct subject matters under a common heading of "Mine Action" may confuse rather than clarify the core issues and true needs. The decision to separate the discussions was well received, as it was agreed that this enabled more relevant and substantive discussions on the respective themes.
5. The special session demonstrated the strong commitment and interest States Parties and other key actors have in addressing article 6 issues in a focused and systematic manner. While international cooperation and assistance has been on the agenda of all formal and informal meetings of the Convention, it has often been discussed in a fragmented manner and it has been difficult to explore core issues in a comprehensive manner.
6. Two informal contact groups on Resource Mobilization/Utilization and on Linking Mine Action to Development have for some years addressed different aspects of cooperation and assistance. Discussions in both contact groups have yielded significant input to the States Parties on resource issues. However, their informal status and the fact that the meetings have taken place outside the plenary have led to limited attendance, in particular from small delegations, often from mine affected countries.

7. The discussions on international cooperation and assistance during and after the Cartagena Summit indicate that there is a strong case to be made for locating the debates at the centre of the implementation work, i.e. both at Meetings of the States Parties and at the intersessional work. There is also a need to ensure a certain continuity in the discussions as well as some degree of institutional ownership and responsibility for moving the discussion forward.

8. Both contact group coordinators, Canada and Norway, have indicated that they may discontinue the informal Contact Groups as a way to support a new plenary structure for addressing resource issues. This could help to focus States Parties' efforts in their consultations on how to match needs with resources. Since both Contact Groups are informal, this will not require any decisions by the States Parties.

Issues to address

9. The discussions prior to and during the Cartagena Summit; at the 25 June special session; in the Contact Groups and at various workshops and other occasions have helped to focus on some key issues that States Parties and other implementation actors should address in a concerted and systematic manner. The section on international cooperation and assistance in the Cartagena Action Plan provides States Parties with a comprehensive list of issues that would gain from being discussed in a systematic manner at both the informal and formal meetings of the Convention.

10. The Mine Ban Convention is the main framework for identifying and mobilising resources for mine action. The meetings of the Convention go beyond traditional pledging sessions, as they provide all implementation actors with ample opportunities for formal and informal direct interaction, comprehensive updates and frank discussions on needs, strategies and effective approaches in mine action. As such, the formal and informal meetings help to keep the risk of developing an implementation gap – understood as the increasing discrepancy between intentions and actions addressing the problem – in mine action low.

11. To reinforce the strong emphasis on implementation that has been the trademark of Convention meetings, discussions on resources, cooperation and assistance should focus on the concrete steps all States Parties and other key implementation actors could take to improve the systems and procedures for identifying, mobilising and providing both fiscal and non-fiscal resources to meet identified needs. Furthermore, discussions should focus on how these systems may be geared towards ensuring efficient and effective resource utilization with a view to maximising the humanitarian and development impact of the work.

12. Discussions on resources over the past years, and in particular during the 25 June special session, have identified a number of issues which, if they are addressed in a systematic and constructive manner by the implementation community, may be crucial to the success of ongoing and future mine action programs. Such issues include:

- (a) Improving efficiency of all aspects of the transfer of financial resources from providers to receivers, with a view to reducing delays and extra costs;
- (b) Identifying obstacles and opportunities for more efficient South/South cooperation, triangular cooperation and cooperation among affected States;
- (c) Clarifying the roles and responsibilities of the different implementation actors, including national authorities, the UN, the ICRC, Mine Action NGOs and private sector actors;

- (d) Taking steps to strengthen national ownership and the mobilization of domestic mine action resources;
- (e) Taking steps to map the full magnitude of the problems and the resources needed to address them, and to communicate this in a meaningful manner;
- (f) Taking steps to ensure predictable and sustainable dedicated mine action funding;
- (g) Improving integration of mine action into long-term development programmes;
- (h) Identifying new models for cooperation between affected States and resource providers from all sectors;
- (i) Identifying innovative ways of mobilising resources for mine action in and outside affected States and areas;
- (j) Engaging non-traditional providers and sources of mine action support, such as factoring mine clearance as investment cost into infrastructure projects;
- (k) Developing models to project the economic, developmental and social costs of continued mine contamination and continued exclusion of survivors from society and the economic sector;
- (l) Improving transparency in reporting on support for victim assistance;
- (m) Broadening the understanding of what it takes to be a State Party "...in a position to provide support";
- (n) Building relationships with other relevant international instruments and developing the potential for optimalization of resource mobilization.

Considerations and conclusions

13. There is agreement among States Parties and within the broader implementation community that discussions on article 6 and resources need to be formalized and that they need to take place in the plenary sessions of both formal and informal meetings. This can be done in a variety of ways, and the final decision on this should be seen in the broader context of the review of the intersessional work programme.

14. Any decision on a new structure should take into consideration the capacity of States Parties to take on roles as Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs in the coming years.

15. Experience over the years demonstrates the practical and substantive importance of ISU support to the Standing Committees and the informal contact groups.

Recommendation

16. Effective cooperation and assistance will be key to implementation of the Convention over the coming years. States Parties should reflect this importance in their efforts to implement the Cartagena Action Plan up until 2014, by moving the issue towards the centre of their discussions. The Intersessional Work Programme including meetings of the Standing Committees has proved to be an effective way to engage States Parties and the rest of the implementation community in focused discussions on key issues. Establishing a new Standing Committee on article 6 in 2011 and discontinuing the two informal Contact Groups therefore seems to be the best way to ensure progress on the issue of matching needs with resources.

Annex IV

Proposal to establish a Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance (as considered at the third and fourth plenary meetings on 30 November 2010)

Introduction

1. The purpose of this paper is to further elaborate a proposal made by Zambia during the Second Review Conference of the Mine Ban Convention in Cartagena, Colombia in December 2009; a proposal that was raised initially during the preparatory committee meeting for the Review Conference in September 2009 and addressed again during the Special Session on International Cooperation and Assistance at the Intersessional Meeting of Standing Committees in Geneva, in June 2010.

Proposal

2. Zambia has proposed that the Tenth Meeting of States Parties to the Mine Ban Treaty establish a new Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance in order to exchange information and develop plans and strategies to ensure:

- (a) adequate and predictable levels of human, technical and financial support for mine action from affected States and the donor community (resource mobilization); and
- (b) the efficient and effective use of resources (resource utilization).

3. It is further proposed that:

- (a) the Tenth MSP agree that the first meeting of the new Standing Committee shall be held during the Intersessional Meetings in 2011;
- (b) that this first meeting focus on the further development of the general terms of reference for the new Standing Committee; work that can be carried forward as necessary by the Co-Chair(s) and Co-Rapporteur(s) who would be elected at the 11th Meeting of States Parties.

Background

4. The “action” in ‘Mine Action’ is made possible only through the provision of adequate human, technical and financial resources to support the implementation of all elements of the Mine Ban Convention, particularly: mine clearance, stockpile destruction and victim assistance.

5. Although affected States and donors have been reasonably successful in generating funds and other resources over the 11 years that the Convention has been in force, there have never been sufficient resources to meet many of the priority needs of affected States. Moreover, there is reason to believe that, unless concerted action is taken, even current levels of support from affected and donor States may be difficult to maintain over the longer term.

Rationale

6. The introduction of a Standing Committee would be a way of ensuring that adequate time and attention is devoted to this critically important issue in the wider meeting so that all delegations can participate and benefit.

7. In addition to promoting greater investment in mine action by affected States and traditional donors, it will be an effective venue to advance greater south-south cooperation as well.

8. Considerations:

(a) *Landmine Monitor* reports that, although global funding levels have held steady over the past few years, last year this was due to unusually strong support from a small number of donors, which off-set a dramatic drop in mine action funding by several other States;

(b) There is increasing competition for limited resources, particularly in light of the recent global recession and the myriad priorities of the international community;

(c) Many Mine Ban Convention States Parties have or are planning to assume similar legal obligations with respect to the *Convention on Cluster Munitions*. Several donor States have advised that this will not necessarily result in any increase in funding;

(d) The resources issue is not new. Indeed, it has been a matter of great interest within the mine action community for many years. In addition to *ad hoc* discussion in plenary during Meetings of States Parties and Meetings of Standing Committees, Norway has for many years coordinated a Contact Group focussed initially on resource mobilization and more recently on resource utilization. In 2006, Canada established a Contact Group on Linking Mine Action and Development (LMAD) which, among other things, has explored ways to create greater cooperation between the mine action and development communities and better access funding from traditional development donors in order to advance mine action and development. Although there have been many excellent presentations and discussions in both Contact Groups, because meetings are held during lunch breaks, usually at the same time as several other events attendance has been poor. Coverage has been a particular problem for small delegations, often from mine affected countries;

(e) Canada has indicated that it would be pleased to fold the work of LMAD into a Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance in order that all States can engage on this issue.

Caveat

9. Meetings of this Standing Committee would not be 'pledging sessions'. Nor would this be the venue where affected States inform the community of their resource requirements. There are many other formal and informal opportunities to do this. Rather, the focus will clearly be on the generation of resources by both affected and donor States and the efficient and effective utilization of resources, with a view to maximizing the humanitarian and development impact of our work.

Conclusion

10. Ultimately, it is not our words, but our collective actions that will eliminate the threat to life and limbs posed by landmines and explosive remnants of war.

11. Zambia would be most grateful for the strong support of this proposal by all States Parties, UN agencies, international organizations and civil society.

Annex V

Transparency and the exchange of information in the context of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention (as considered by the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties)

Background

1. In accordance with article 7 of the Convention, each State party is under an obligation to submit to the Secretary-General of the United Nations an initial report, and thereafter an annual update of the information initially submitted, on the issues covered by article 7: national implementation measures referred to in article 9, stockpiled anti-personnel mines and status of programmes for the destruction of these mines, location of all mined areas under its jurisdiction or control and status of programmes for the destruction of the anti-personnel mines contained in these areas, anti-personnel mines retained or transferred for training, status of programmes for the conversion of anti-personnel mine production facilities, technical characteristics of each type of anti-personnel landmine produced and of those owned or possessed by the State party, and measures taken to provide a warning to the population in relation to all mined areas.

2. Article 7 reporting is an obligation that is incumbent on all States parties. Reporting is important as it demonstrates that States parties are taking the Convention and their obligations thereunder seriously. When submitting its initial report, a State party makes a formal declaration of the obligations that are relevant in its case. The annual reporting process enables the State party subsequently to submit updated information on the status of its efforts and progress made towards fulfilling the obligations that the State party has itself identified. The submission of annual reports containing this information is not only beneficial to the implementation process but may also provide support for resource mobilization efforts.

3. Although the reporting questions are relevant to all States parties, they are particularly relevant in the case of States parties that have stockpiled mines to be destroyed, that are clearing mined areas, that are retaining anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 3 or that are undertaking measures in application of article 9.

4. At the Nairobi Summit in 2004, the States parties declared that “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”. At the Cartagena Summit in 2009, the States parties noted that, since the first Summit, “transparency in all forms has indeed been essential for achieving the Convention’s core aims”.

5. In addition to submitting reports in accordance with article 7, States parties are urged to provide information through more informal channels, on a regular basis each year, on the progress they have made towards fulfilling their obligations. States parties are encouraged to share their advances in the statements they make at informal meetings of the standing committees and at meetings of the States parties, as well as to provide information on the implementation of the five-year Cartagena action plan adopted in 2009.

Observations

6. At the Cartagena Summit, the States parties noted that “since the Nairobi Summit the exchange of information between States parties has been vibrant, particularly on the part of States parties in the process of implementing key provisions of the Convention”, and that “new tools have been developed to assist in the formal and informal exchange of information”, although “the rate of adherence to the Convention’s reporting obligations has waned since the Nairobi Summit”.
7. Given this situation, and on the strength of the review conducted in Cartagena and the undertakings assumed in the Cartagena action plan, Belgium, which has coordinated an informal article 7 contact group since 2001, wishes to accord greater attention to the ongoing fulfilment of article 7 obligations and place the emphasis on producing high-quality transparency reports.
8. To this end, the following observations may be made.

Annual reporting rate

9. The annual article 7 reporting rate has fallen steadily and has never again reached the level attained during the year of the Nairobi Summit. Some States parties have not updated the information required under article 7 for several years.

Reporting in relation to article 5

10. Many States parties submit reports that do not contain all the relevant information requested under article 7. For example, a particular point highlighted at the Cartagena Summit with regard to reporting by States parties that are fulfilling their mine clearing obligations was that a certain number of States parties, including some for which the Convention entered into force several years ago, have not yet provided a clear indication, in accordance with their obligations under article 7, paragraph 1 (c), of “the location of all mined areas that contain, or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines”.
11. The wealth of information contained in the extension requests submitted by certain States parties in accordance with article 5 has highlighted the lack of precise, detailed information in the article 7 reports submitted by the same States parties. Accordingly, these State parties must make a particular effort to ensure that the information they provide on each area that contains mines or is suspected to contain mines is as comprehensive as possible, i.e. that it includes the name of each area identified, its precise geographical location, its size, the estimated quantity of anti-personnel mines emplaced in the area, the area of land released, the methods used to make the area non-hazardous, the quantity of anti-personnel mines destroyed, the date of land release and lastly the size of the area still to be cleared, if applicable.
12. A “suggested outline for preparing article 5 extension requests” was adopted at the Cartagena Summit and included in the final document. This outline may be used by all States parties which are clearing mined areas in accordance with article 5 to submit information on their progress. This outline, if used, is a tool that can significantly enhance the quality and precision of the information submitted.
13. Precise, regular, good-quality article 7 reporting can help States parties in the implementation process and in resource mobilization. It can also serve as a basis for all other reports that States parties are required to submit in relation to the Convention.

Reporting on other key issues: articles 9, 3 and 4

14. In addition to reporting in relation to article 5, the following issues — national implementation measures, anti-personnel mines retained in accordance with article 3 and stockpiled anti-personnel mines — should be accorded particular attention in States parties' article 7 reports.

15. A total of 64 States parties have not yet indicated either that they have adopted the legislative measures referred to in article 9 or that their existing legislation is sufficient to cover the provisions of this article. These States parties need to accord greater attention to submitting transparency reports “on the national implementation measures referred to in article 9” and exchanging information within the framework of the Intersessional Work Programme.

16. A number of the 75 States parties that have indicated that they have retained anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 3 of the Convention have not yet provided information about the use of these mines. As established in actions #56–58 of the Cartagena action plan 2010–2014, the States parties concerned must submit information on “the plans for and actual use of anti-personnel mines retained” and “explain any increase or decrease in the number of retained anti-personnel mines”. Similarly, States parties that have maintained the same number of anti-personnel mines over periods of years are encouraged to report “on the use of such mines ... or on concrete plans for their use”.

17. The four States parties that have not yet fulfilled their obligations under article 4 are encouraged to continue to report on the progress of implementation of article 4 to other States parties not only through annual article 7 reports but also at every meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction and at every meeting of the States parties, as established in the Cartagena action plan.

18. States parties that discover previously unknown stockpiles after destruction deadlines have passed may use the forms provided for this purpose to submit information on the status of these stocks and the plans established for their destruction in their transparency reports.

Other important issues

19. The Cartagena action plan 2010–2014 gives particular prominence to the exchange of detailed information on the key obligations established in the Convention, not only through formal channels such as the article 7 reporting procedure but also through informal channels.

20. Some States parties that have key obligations on which they are required to report not only do not submit their reports on a regular basis but also fail to take advantage of the official information exchange mechanisms that exist for the purpose of such reporting.

21. States parties that have never had stockpiled anti-personnel mines or mined areas, that do not retain mines in accordance with article 3, that have never produced anti-personnel mines and that have either taken the necessary measures in accordance with article 9 or indicated that their existing domestic legislation is sufficient to cover the provisions of this article, can facilitate their task by completing only the simplified version of the standard forms that exist for reporting purposes.

Next steps

22. In the light of the observations made in this document, between now and the next meetings of the standing committees scheduled for June 2011, Belgium would like to engage all States parties and stakeholder organizations in a discussion to explore possible means of revitalizing the article 7 reporting process, with an equal focus on the problems of report regularity, precision and quality. A document setting out the outcome of these discussions will be presented by Belgium at the meetings of the standing committees in June 2011 and may serve as a basis for any future action taken in relation to reporting.

Annex VI

Review of the Intersessional Work Programme (as warmly welcomed at the ninth plenary meeting on 3 December 2010)

Background

1. At the Second Review Conference, the States Parties called upon the Coordinating Committee to review the operation of the Intersessional Work Programme, with the Chair of the Coordinating Committee consulting widely on this matter and presenting a report and, if necessary, recommendations to the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties.

Report

2. The Coordinating Committee recalled that the last time that the Intersessional Work Programme had been reviewed was in 2002 and that the ensuing recalibration resulted in the work of the Convention being focused with greater precision on the pursuit of the Convention's core aims. Moreover, since 2002, States Parties in the process of fulfilling key obligations have been given centre-stage to share their problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance. The result has been greater clarity on and more precise knowledge of the status of the implementation of the Convention and the identification of weaknesses, gaps and opportunities.

3. The Coordinating Committee noted that with a clear focus on the pursuit of objectives that flow from the provisions of the Convention itself, successive Co-Chairs have truly ensured continuity in their efforts. Since 2002, meetings of the Standing Committees have not been stand-alone episodes but rather have served as milestones in a process ultimately leading to the realisation of the Convention's promise. Moreover, Co-Chairs have seen that their responsibilities to facilitate progress in implementation are not limited to simply chairing a single meeting but rather span the entire year of their respective terms and set the ground for a continuation of efforts by their Co-Rapporteurs.

4. The Coordinating Committee concluded that the Intersessional Work Programme has functioned well since its recalibration in 2002 but equally remarked that the implementation process has evolved in recent years:

(a) In advance of, during and since the Second Review Conference, several delegations emphasised the ongoing importance of cooperation and assistance in ensuring that the promise of the Convention is realised;

(b) While the States Parties have gained a lot since 2002 by seeing that meetings primarily focus on national contexts, there is a potential to deepen this focus;

(c) The article 5 extensions process, agreed to in 2007, has significantly added to the workload for the Presidency, Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs. Moreover, there has been an increase in demands for States to fill a proliferation of tasks related to conventional weapons instruments;

(d) While there are some serious concerns regarding the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines, this remains a matter of national implementation for only four States Parties;

(e) There has been increased awareness of the potential for synergy in the work of various conventional weapons instruments.

Considerations and recommendations:

5. The Coordinating Committee noted the ongoing importance of the principles, first agreed to in 1999, which have contributed to an effective work programme, in particular: coherence, flexibility, partnership, informality, continuity and effective preparation. The Coordinating Committee also remarked that two other principles should be recognised as being central to the ongoing success of the Intersessional Work Programme, namely transparency and inclusion.

Recommendation #1: The States Parties should reaffirm the ongoing importance of the principles that have been central to the success of the Intersessional Work Programme to date, namely: coherence, flexibility, partnership, informality, continuity, effective preparation, transparency and inclusion.

6. The Coordinating Committee recognised the clear expression of the States Parties and others that steps be taken to intensify consideration of international cooperation and assistance in the context of the Convention, noting the support expressed by many for the establishment of a new Standing Committee on cooperation and assistance. The Coordinating Committee also expressed satisfaction with the manner in which the 25 June 2010 Special Session on International Cooperation and Assistance had provided for a meaningful, forward looking discussion on this matter and helped chart an agenda on cooperation and assistance to be dealt with over the near term.

7. Given the successful manner in which cooperation and assistance was dealt with during the 2010 Intersessional Work Programme, the Coordinating Committee noted the value of intensifying a focus on cooperation and assistance. The Coordinating Committee in particular considered favourably a proposal made by Zambia to establish a new Standing Committee. It was noted that the purpose of such a Standing Committee would be to serve as a forum to exchange information and views, and share ideas, on (a) ensuring adequate and predictable levels of human, technical and financial support for the implementation of the Convention on the part of both States Parties implementing the Convention and from other States Parties and other sources, and, (b) the efficient and effective use of resources. It was further noted that such a Standing Committee, like other mechanisms established by the States Parties, would be supported by the ISU.

Recommendation #2: The States Parties should establish a new “Standing Committee on Cooperation and Assistance”.

8. The Coordinating Committee also noted that it has become increasingly challenging for States Parties to fulfil responsibilities related to being a Co-Chair/Co-Rapporteur (given the increased volume and complexity of work) and increasingly difficult to identify a geographically representative group to take on all roles (given an increase in demands for States to take on tasks related to conventional weapons). In this regard, the Coordinating Committee considered that moving to a leadership team of two States Parties for each Standing Committee, rather than four, would be an effective means to rationalise the numbers of States in leadership positions. A structure could be devised that maintained the coherence and continuity of the leadership team. The Coordinating Committee noted that discussions should continue in 2011 on considering options regarding the effective functioning of the mechanisms established by States Parties. The Coordinating Committee, noted, however, that this consideration need not delay the establishment of a new Standing Committee on cooperation and assistance and that a creative way could be found to lead such a Standing Committee in 2011.

Recommendation #3: A new Standing Committee on Cooperation and Assistance should be presided over in 2011 by the President of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties with the leadership of this Standing Committee being regularised as of the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties.

Recommendation #4: The States Parties should examine the possibility of rationalising the numbers of States Parties in leadership positions on Standing Committees, and, in this regard, request that the President, on behalf of the Coordinating Committee, submit to the June 2011 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, ideas regarding how many Co-Chairs/Co-Rapporteurs may be required to ensure the effective functioning of the mechanisms established by the States Parties, with a view to a decision to be taken on this matter at the Eleventh Meeting of the States Parties.

9. The Coordinating Committee discussed a proposal made by the ICRC to significantly change how the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration carries out its work, reducing the amount of time for plenary work with a view to moving toward smaller group discussions that more intensively focus on national contexts.

10. There was widespread appreciation for investigating ways and means to intensify a national focus, although it was noted that this likely is best done within affected countries themselves. It was also noted that it is important that the States Parties do not deviate from principles that have made the Intersessional Work Programme special and productive to date. It was highlighted in particular that the Intersessional Work Programme must remain an inclusive process with all interested actors permitted to have the opportunity to take part in discussions on the pursuit of the Convention's core aims and that the Intersessional Work Programme must remain a uniquely cooperative and collegial process with any adjustments to the work programme not diminishing this cooperative spirit.

11. Reservations notwithstanding, appreciation was expressed for the ICRC having taken the initiative to propose creative new ways for work to be carried out in the context of the Convention. In addition, it was noted that proposals to more intensively focus on national contexts were not limited in their applicability to victim assistance but rather had relevance for mine clearance, stockpile destruction and possibly other areas of implementation (e.g., article 9). The Coordinating Committee expressed the view that space could be provided for experimentation with new ideas, perhaps focusing on States Parties that have indicated that they may volunteer for such experiments, albeit with such experiments being undertaken in a prudent manner as to not detract from the cooperative, inclusive nature of the Intersessional Work Programme.

Recommendation #5: The Coordinating Committee in 2011 should organise the week of meetings of the Standing Committees in such a way that time is allocated for Co-Chairs, individual States Parties and others to experiment with new ways of using the Intersessional Work Programme to more intensively focus on national contexts or to otherwise creatively support progress in the application of the Cartagena Action Plan.

Recommendation #6: On the basis of experimentation carried out during various Intersessional Work Programmes, the States Parties should keep an open mind to how to restructure the week of meetings of the Standing Committees to ensure its ongoing effectiveness.

12. The Coordinating Committee noted that the work of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction concerned the implementation of article 4 by only four States Parties and that the Standing Committee meeting in 2010 consumed less than two hours. Equally, though, the Coordinating Committee recognised that the small number of country cases was not indicative of the great complexity associated with remaining stockpile destruction

challenges and that the amount of meeting time consumed by any particular Standing Committee was not indicative of its relative importance.

13. The Coordinating Committee also noted that the challenges associated with the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines will persist for several years and that there is value in having two States Parties (i.e., the Co-Chairs) with responsibility for the subject of stockpile destruction and hence possessing the authority to pursue cooperative ways and means to overcome these challenges. In this regard, the Coordinating Committee recalled the value of the efforts of successive Co-Chairs of this Standing Committee to engage in convene workshops and engage in bilateral consultations. It was also noted that five of the States not parties most likely to accede to the Convention in coming years possess or may possess stockpiled anti-personnel mines.

Recommendation #7: The States Parties should acknowledge the ongoing importance of a Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction as long as profound challenges remain in the implementation of article 4.

14. The Coordinating Committee recalled that the same subject matter (e.g., clearance of explosive hazards, assistance to the victims of conventional weapons) is dealt with by various international instruments with often the same States being parties to two or more relevant instruments. The Coordinating noted, however, that to date little has been done to take advantage of the potential for synergy in the work of related instruments.

Recommendation #8: The States Parties, and in particular States Parties that are party to more than one related instrument, should pursue coherence in the scheduling of meetings of relevant instruments, particularly those meetings that deal with the clearance of explosive hazards and assistance to the victims of conventional weapons.

Recommendation #9: The States Parties should regularly evaluate the potential for synergy in the work of various related instruments, while acknowledging the distinct legal obligations of each.

Annex VII

Report on the Functioning of the Implementation Support Unit, November 2009-November 2010 (as noted by the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties)

Background

1. At the Third Meeting of the States Parties (3MSP) in September 2001, 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 Coordinating Committee, to finalise an agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD on the functioning of the ISU. The GICHD's Foundation Council accepted this mandate on 28 September 2001.
2. An agreement on the functioning of the ISU was finalised between the States Parties and the GICHD on 7 November 2001. This agreement indicates 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. This report has been prepared to cover the period between the Second Review Conference and the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties (10MSP).

Report

General support and publications

3. On the basis of the direction received from the Coordinating Committee, in 2010 the ISU provided the support consistent with that provided in 2009. This included advising States Parties on matters related to implementation and compliance and furnishing information or assistance in maximising participation in the Convention's implementation processes. The ISU received hundreds of requests in 2010 from State Parties on matters related to implementation and compliance. In particular, immediately in advance of the June 2010 meetings of the Standing Committees and the 10MSP, the ISU responded to dozens of requests to furnish information or to provide advice or assistance.
4. The ISU provided strategic direction to Co-Chairs, the Coordinating Committee and the Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme. The ISU supported six meetings of the Coordinating Committee and dozens of small group planning meetings. A proposed strategic plan for the Coordinator of the Sponsorship Programme was developed twice – once in the lead up to the meetings of the Standing Committees and once in the lead up to the 10MSP.
5. The ISU continued its efforts in supporting States Parties in preparing transparency reports, responding to dozens of requests for assistance. As well, the ISU supported the Coordinator of the article 7 Contact Group by providing information and assisting in developing strategies.
6. The ISU was called upon on numerous occasions to lead seminars and provide training on understanding the Convention, or aspects of it, and its operations. Highlights included participation in the United Nations' annual meeting of national mine action

directors, in the United Nations' Disarmament Fellowship Training Programme, in international training courses for senior mine action managers which were organised by Jordan and by James Madison University's Mine Action Information Centre, in regional or special seminars organised by the GICHD, NATO and the Croatian-based Centre for Security Cooperation, and in seminars for new diplomats which were organized by the GICHD and the Geneva Forum.

7. The ISU supported the President and individual States Parties in undertaking universalisation efforts, including by providing information and strategic advice to the Coordinator of the Universalization Contact Group, assisting the President's "Special Envoy on the Universalisation of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention", and liaising with the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) and its member organisations, the International Committee of the Red Cross, the United Nations and individual States Parties.

8. The ISU supported preparations for both the Tenth and Eleventh Meetings of the States Parties, including by providing advice and support to the President-Designate of the 10MSP and carrying out a joint 11MSP planning mission to Phnom Penh with the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs.

9. Pursuant to its communications and liaison mandate, the ISU continued to serve as the main source of information on the Convention, maintaining the Convention's Documentation Centre, receiving and making available hundreds of new documents in 2010 related to the implementation process. In addition, the ISU produced publications containing the programmes and information on the Intersessional Work Programme and on the 10MSP and updated its background brochure on the Convention.

10. In terms of liaison, the ISU placed a heavy emphasis on enhancing partnerships with organisations whose activities are supportive of the pursuit of the States Parties aims including by carrying out two liaison visits to deepen collaboration with the United Nations and various non-governmental organisations. In addition, the ISU sought to broaden collaboration on victim assistance to include a number of actors that do not regularly participate in the work of the Convention, including the World Health Organisation, the International Labour Organisation, the International Disability and Development Consortium and the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.

11. The ISU again was called upon extensively to advise on applying, in other areas, the lessons learned from implementing the Convention. The ISU responded to several requests from States and others, particularly in the context of efforts to implement the Convention on Cluster Munitions, the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD).

12. At the Second Review Conference, the States Parties agreed to proceed with an evaluation of the ISU. While the ISU was not involved in the evaluation, the evaluation had a significant impact on ISU staff resources in terms of the demands placed upon the ISU to furnish information to the independent evaluator and to individual States Parties, to distribute and otherwise make available information related to the evaluation and to administer the contract for the independent evaluator.

Article 5 implementation support

13. A specific area of support that the ISU continued to provide in 2010 concerns article 5 extension requests. In 2006, the States Parties agreed to encourage States Parties requesting extensions in accordance with article 5 of the Convention "as necessary, to seek assistance from the Implementation Support Unit in the preparation of their requests." In 2010, the ISU provided advice to each of the six States Parties that submitted an article 5 extension request this year and four States Parties that are likely to submit requests in 2010,

including by carrying out six advisory missions. In addition the ISU provided advice to one State Party in the preparation of a declaration of completion of article 5 implementation, supported a State Party at a national “mine action summit”, provided in-country advice to one State Party on the application of the Cartagena Action Plan and responded to numerous requests for individual States Parties seeking information or support in the implementation of article 5.

Support to the article 5 extensions process

14. Another specific area of support provided by the ISU in 2010 concerns the process agreed to by the States Parties in 2006 that sees the President, Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs mandated to analyse article 5 extension requests. The ISU supported five meetings or sets of meetings of the article 5 analysing group and undertook follow up actions at the request of the group and the President.

Victim assistance implementation support

15. An additional area of specific support that the ISU continued to provide in 2010 concerns victim assistance. At the 2004 First Review Conference, the States Parties adopted understandings on victim assistance that provided a basis for the States Parties to act strategically in this area. Successive Co-Chairs have responded by requesting the support of the ISU to assist those States Parties responsible for significant numbers of landmine survivors in applying the 2004 understandings. This work began in 2005 on a project basis (i.e., a fixed time period during which clear-cut objectives would be achieved), funded outside of the ISU Trust Fund by a small number of interested States Parties. As support to States Parties on victim assistance has become a core programmatic area of work for the ISU, in 2010 advisory services on victim assistance were incorporated into the 2010 ISU budget for the first time.

16. The ISU carried out 11 advisory visits in response to requests by States Parties that are responsible for significant numbers of landmine survivors and which wish to meet one of the following objectives: (a) for those with good victim assistance objectives, to develop good plans; (b) for those with underdeveloped objectives, to develop more concrete objectives; (c) for those with good plans, to advance implementation of these plans, (d) for those that have engaged little to date in applying the understandings agreed to by the States Parties, to achieve a higher level of engagement, and, (e) for all, to develop monitoring mechanisms. In addition, the ISU visited one other State Party to discuss the application of the Cartagena Action Plan’s victim assistance commitments.

17. ISU support concerning victim assistance also involved ISU participation in thematic conferences, workshops and seminars in Vienna, Sarajevo and London. In addition the ISU was invited to deliver a presentation to the CRPD’s Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Geneva. As well, the ISU supported the Co-Chair of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance in organisation an experts’ visit to Turkey’s leading physical rehabilitation facility.

Enhanced activities in addition to the ISU’s core work plan

18. In keeping with past practice, the ISU executed other activities, in a manner consistent with its mandate, when additional funds were made available to fully fund these efforts (including funding any additional human resource costs). With funds made available by Australia, the ISU began carrying out enhanced victim assistance efforts in support of national efforts by two States Parties, organised victim assistance experts’ programmes parallel to the meetings of the Standing Committees and the 10MSP and began work on a guide to understanding the Convention’s victim assistance provision in the broader context of disability.

19. In 2010, the ISU was able to provide enhanced support to the Presidency with funds made available by Norway. This support in part enabled the ISU to support the activities of the President's Special Envoy on the Universalization of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention.

20. During the first four months of 2010, with funds provided by the European Union (EU), the ISU completed implementation of the EU Joint Action in support of the universalisation and implementation of the Convention. Resources provided enabled the ISU to extend the reach of its support to individual States Parties in addressing pressing implementation challenges.

Staffing

21. The staffing of the ISU in 2010 included a director, a mine action implementation specialist, a victim assistance implementation specialist, an implementation support specialist, an implementation support officer and an administrative assistant. At peak periods, the ISU engaged part-time staff on a short term basis, including to support communications efforts related to the 10MSP. In addition, the ISU continued to engage interns, both to acquire additional no/low cost support and as part of broader outreach efforts.

ISU Staffing 2010

<i>Staff position</i>	<i>Full-time equivalent</i>
Director	1.0
Mine Action Implementation Specialist	1.0
Implementation Support Specialist	0.8
Victim Assistance Specialist	1.0
Implementation Support Officer	1.0
Administrative Assistant	0.5
Total	5.3

Financing

Financing of the ISU's core work plan

22. As indicated in the President's Paper on the Establishment of the Implementation Support Unit 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. In accordance with the agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD, the ISU Trust Fund's 2009 financial statement was independently audited by PriceWaterhouseCoopers. The audit indicated that the financial statement of the Trust Fund had been properly prepared in accordance with relevant accounting policies and the applicable Swiss legislation. The audited financial statement, which indicated that the 2009 expenditures of the ISU totalled CHF 981,768.49 and that the ISU Trust Fund had a balance of CHF 258,176 as of 31 December 2009, was forwarded to the President, the Coordinating Committee and contributors to the ISU Trust Fund.

23. Given the financial challenges faced by the ISU in 2009, the President, in 2010, placed a priority on monitoring the ISU's finances. Updates were provided at each meeting of the Coordinating Committee. In addition, the President wrote twice to all States Parties

to encourage them to provide contributions to the ISU. On 7 September 2010, the Director of the ISU informed the Coordinating Committee that, while the ISU should have the resources necessary to complete most of its intended work plan in 2010, cuts would have to be made. The Director indicated that a structural change would need to be made that would result in a significant cut in support that the States Parties have come to expect and appreciate – in-country victim assistance advisory services and a dedicated expert advisory service in Geneva. The Coordinating Committee was informed in particular that as of 1 December 2010, the position of “victim assistance specialist” would no longer be staffed and it would remain vacant until such a time as States Parties provide the necessary resources to cover the costs of this position and related services.

24. Also on 7 September 2010, the Director of the ISU expressed to the Coordinating Committee his hope that the ISU could return to a staffing and service level that States Parties have come to expect as the norm, noting that even this level of staffing leaves the ISU far short of meeting demands from individual States Parties for victim assistance advisory services and far short of fulfilling the potential to provide advisory services to article 5 implementing States Parties well before article 5 deadlines.

25. It is projected that expenses related to the ISU’s 2010 core work plan will total approximately CHF 1,100,000 (i.e., approximately CHF 100,000 under budget). As of 23 November, contributions had been received in 2010 from the following States Parties: Albania, Australia, Austria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Denmark, Indonesia, Italy, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, Thailand and Turkey. In addition, contributions are expected from Belgium and Sweden on the basis of agreements that are in place. When these contributions are added to the carry-over from 2009 to 2010, total revenue in 2010 is projected to be approximately CHF 1,200,000. Hence, the carry-over from 2010 to 2011 is projected to be approximately CHF 100,000.

Financing of enhanced activities carried out by the ISU

26. With respect to the enhanced activities mentioned above, CHF 248,888.89 was received from Norway to provide enhanced support to the Presidency, the enhanced victim assistance activities supported by Australia span a period 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2011 and are valued at approximately CHF 225,000, and, with respect to the EU Joint Action, the ISU incurred costs in 2010 totalling approximately €125,000.

Financing of the ISU evaluation

27. As noted, the ISU was asked to administer the contract with independent evaluator of the ISU. To date contributions totalling approximately CHF 55,000 have been received from Albania, Canada, Germany, New Zealand, Norway and Switzerland. These contributions have resulted in the ISU evaluation having been fully funded.

GICHD support to the ISU, to the Intersessional Work Programme and to the Sponsorship Programme

28. Costs for basic infrastructure and services in support of the ISU (office space, information technology, telecommunications, postage, publications coordination, travel support, human resources management, accounting, audit and other administrative support, etc.) are covered by the GICHD general budget, on the basis of funds provided by Switzerland, and were estimated at approximately CHF 380,000 in 2010.

29. While costs associated with providing substantive support to the Presidency and Co-Chairs in preparing the Intersessional Work Programme are covered by the ISU budget, costs totalling CHF 150,000 related to facility, interpretation and organisational matters

concerning the Intersessional Work Programme were covered by the GICHD budget, again on the basis of funds provided by Switzerland.

30. While costs associated with providing strategic direction to the Sponsorship Programme are covered by the ISU budget, costs related to the administration of the Sponsorship Programme are covered by the GICHD budget, again on the basis of funds provided by Switzerland. The value of these costs was estimated at approximately CHF 40,000 in 2010.

Contributions to the ISU's core work plan received in 2010 (as of 25 November)

<i>County</i>	<i>In CHF</i>
Albania	1,042
Australia	180,000
Austria	43,089
Canada	98,919
Chile	5,727
Croatia	24,400
Cyprus	3,300
Denmark	53,190
Estonia	1,330
Indonesia	1,300
Italy	65,907
Malaysia	1,702
Netherlands	120,664
Norway	142,653
Switzerland	70,000
Thailand	3,500
Turkey	4,245
Total	820,968

Annex VIII

ISU Task Force: Final Report and Recommendations (as endorsed at the tenth plenary meeting on 3 December 2010)

Background

1. At the 2009 Second Review Conference, the States Parties endorsed the President's paper on the establishment of an open ended Task Force with a mandate to develop terms of reference for an evaluation of the Implementation Support Unit. It was agreed that this task force would present a preliminary status report to the Meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention in June 2010 and present its final report and recommendations concerning: (a) the tasks and responsibilities of the ISU; (b) the financing of the ISU; (c) the institutional framework for the ISU; in time for adoption at the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties (10 MSP).

The Task Force

2. The Task Force has been open to all States Parties and chaired by the President of the Second Review Conference. It met for the first time on 10 February 2010, and agreed on working methods and terms of reference for an independent evaluation report of the ISU. The Task Force met again on 10 March, 2 June, 8 September and informally on 20 September. The final meeting of the Task Force was held on 3 November 2010. All States Parties have been invited to these meetings and all documents have been published on the Convention's website.

The Evaluation

3. The Task Force adopted its working methods as well as terms of reference for the evaluation of the ISU at its 10 February meeting and commissioned Mr Tim Caughley to undertake the evaluation. Mr Caughley presented a Preliminary Report to the Task Force on 15 April and a Final Report on 1 September 2010. The evaluation included interviews and consultations with States Parties and key stakeholders, including the UN, the ICRC and the ICBL as well as the GICHD and the ISU. These stakeholders also provided the Task Force with their views on the Final Report with oral and written submissions to the 8 September meeting. In line with the terms of reference, the Final Report presented several options on the three core questions, but no recommendations.

4. At the 8 September meeting, members of the Task Force expressed their satisfaction with and gratitude for the work of the independent consultant and the high quality of his report, as it provided an excellent basis for discussions. At the same meeting, Task Force members expressed their appreciation for the support by the GICHD as host of the ISU and also reiterated their strong appreciation for the ISU, its Director and other staff. The options presented in the Final Report were used as a basis for consultations in the Task Force with the aim of developing concrete recommendations for decisions to be made at the 10 MSP.

Options and recommendations

The institutional framework for the ISU

5. The Final Report presented five options for the institutional framework, ranging from continuing with status quo to a fully independent status for the ISU. Consultations in the Task Force indicated an emerging consensus around continuing the current institutional set-up with some key adjustments. These adjustments include more clarity regarding the formal division of roles and responsibilities between the GICHD and the ISU, the need for direct reporting and budgetary responsibilities from the ISU to the States Parties, and the need to reinforce the identity and visibility of the Convention and thus its Implementation Support Unit. Such changes necessitate an amendment of the 2001 Agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD on the hosting of the ISU, and a new Directive from the States Parties for the ISU regarding its tasks and responsibilities.

6. Recommendations:

(a) The ISU will continue to be hosted by the GICHD, based on an amended Agreement between States Parties and the GICHD and on a new Directive from the States Parties to the ISU annexed to this Agreement;

(b) In order to reinforce the identity and visibility of the Convention the ISU will be identified by a distinct profile that emphasizes its role as supporting entity for the Convention, including identifiable bank account, identifiable logo, email-addresses and similar features;

(c) The GICHD Director will report to the States Parties on the functioning of the agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD.

The financing of the ISU

7. The Final Report presented five options for the financing of the ISU, ranging from continuing with the current arrangement to a system of mandatory assessed scale of contributions that would finance all activities of the ISU. There is general agreement among Task Force members of the need to review the financial model for the ISU, and on the need to establish a model that is sustainable and predictable. Consultations in the Task Force have showed a variety of views reflecting all the options presented in the report. It seems that it is possible, in time for the 11 MSP, to gather broad support for moving to a new financial model for the ISU.

8. Consultations in the Task Force indicate that the remaining time available before the 10MSP may not be sufficient to identify and gain the support of all States Parties for a financing model for ISU. Therefore, the 10 MSP President could be tasked to carry out consultations during 2011, and present recommendations on a financing model for adoption at the 11 MSP.

9. Recommendation: The 10 MSP asks the President to establish an open-ended working group to examine new models for the financing of the ISU, and to present recommendations on the most feasible comprehensive model, as well as a draft decision, for adoption at the 11 MSP, so it may be effective from the financial year 2012.

The tasks and responsibilities of the ISU

10. The Final Report presents six options for defining the tasks and responsibilities of the ISU. The general view of the Task Force is that the ISU has developed and evolved according to the wishes of the States Parties, and there is broad support for the activities conducted by the ISU. The Task Force also noted the value of the ISU's ability to provide

meeting support and substantive advice to the Presidency, the Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs.

11. Delineating the tasks and responsibilities of the ISU has direct consequences for the financial needs of the ISU. Consultations in the Task Force indicate that there is scope for more involvement by the States Parties in the prioritisation of ISU activities and the ensuing budget.

12. The Task Force recommends a model whereby the Director of the ISU annually presents a comprehensive work plan with an accompanying budget to the Meetings of the States Parties or Review Conferences, and that the States Parties discuss and approve the work plan and budget. To guide the overall work of the ISU, the States Parties define tasks and responsibilities of the ISU in a new Directive to be annexed to the amended Agreement between the States Parties to the Convention and the GICHD. The Directive should be reviewed and amended as needed at Review Conferences of the Convention. Such a Directive could read as follows:

Directive by the States Parties to the Implementation Support Unit

Mandate of the ISU

13. The ISU shall, in support of the States Parties:

(a) Prepare, support and carry out follow-up activities from formal and informal meetings under the Convention including Meetings of the States Parties, Review Conferences, Amendment Conferences, inter-sessional meetings, Standing Committees, the Co-ordinating Committee and the article 5 Extension Request Analysing Group;

(b) Provide substantive and other support to the President, President-Designate Co-Chairs and Co-Rapporteurs in their work related to all such meetings;

(c) Provide advice and technical support to States Parties on the implementation and universalisation, including on the Sponsorship Program, of the Convention;

(d) Facilitate communication among the States Parties, and promote communication and information regarding the Convention towards States not Party and the public;

(e) Keep records of formal and informal meetings under the Convention, and communicate, as appropriate, the decisions and priorities resulting from such meetings to States Parties and other stakeholders;

(f) Liaise, and coordinate as appropriate, with relevant international organisations that participate in the work of the Convention, including the ICBL, the ICRC, the UN and the GICHD;

(g) Propose and present a work plan and a budget for the activities of the ISU for the following year to the Co-ordinating Committee for endorsement and subsequently to each Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conferences for approval;

(h) Report in written form as well as orally on the activities, functioning and finances of the ISU to each Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conference, and to informal meetings under the Convention as appropriate.

Finances of the ISU

14. The financing of the ISU shall be subject to decisions by Meetings of the States Parties and Review Conferences. The ISU will assist in this effort.

15. An audited Annual Financial Report (cf. Agreement GICHD - States Parties para 8) for the previous year and a preliminary Annual Financial Report for the present year shall be submitted by the ISU to the Co-ordinating Committee and subsequently to each Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conferences for approval.
16. The Financial reports shall be published on the Convention's web site after having been approved by the Meetings of the States Parties.

Recommendations

17. The tasks and responsibilities of the ISU will be defined by the States Parties according to the above draft Directive that will be annexed to the amended Agreement between the States Parties and the GICHD, and reviewed and amended as needed at Review Conferences of the Convention.
18. The ISU Director will be directly responsible to the States Parties. The ISU Director will propose and present a work plan and a budget for the activities of the ISU for the following year to the Co-ordinating Committee for endorsement and subsequently to each Meeting of the States Parties or Review Conferences for approval. The ISU Director will provide the States Parties with annual financial and activity reports.
19. The Task Force recommends that the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties adopt the following decisions:
 - (a) Endorse this report;
 - (b) Mandate the President, in consultation with the States Parties, to conclude an amended Agreement with the GICHD regarding the ISU;
 - (c) Adopt the annexed Directive from the States Parties to the ISU, ensuring that the ISU is directly responsible to the States Parties while it continues to be hosted by the GICHD;
 - (d) Task the President to establish an informal open-ended working group to examine new models for the financing of the ISU, and present recommendations and draft decisions on the most feasible comprehensive financing model for adoption by the 11MSP, so it may be effective from the financial year 2012.

Annex IX

President's Statement on the Endorsement of the ISU Task Force Report (as endorsed at the tenth plenary meeting on 3 December 2010)

“In connection with the endorsement of the report of the ISU Task Force I would like to spell out the following understanding:

1. The decision that we are taking involves three issues: the task and the responsibilities of the ISU, the financing of the ISU and the institutional framework for the ISU. These three issues are interlinked. Alternative models for the financing of the ISU will be discussed in an informal open-ended working group chaired by me as President in the course of the next year in order to gather broad support for an appropriate financial model;

2. The 10MSP has mandated me as President, in consultation with the States Parties, to negotiate an amended agreement with the GICHD regarding the ISU. Following the discussion with the GICHD, the draft amended agreement will be circulated to all States Parties, an informal meeting will be called and the draft amended Agreement will be submitted to all States Parties for approval at the intersessional meeting in June 2011. The new directive from the States Parties to the ISU, will ensure that the ISU will conduct their work as directed by the States Parties and according to their needs and priorities. It will be annexed to the amended Agreement;

3. The present Statement will be included in the final Report of the 10MSP.”

Annex X**List of documents of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties**

APLC/MSP.10/2010/1 and Corr.1	Provisional agenda. Submitted by the by the President-Designate of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties
APLC/MSP.10/2010/2	Provisional programme of work. Submitted by the President-Designate of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties
APLC/MSP.10/2010/3	ISU Task Force. Final report and recommendations. Presented by the President of the Second Review Conference and Chair of the ISU Task Force
APLC/MSP.10/2010/4	Report. Functioning of the Implementation Support Unit, November 2009 to November 2010. Submitted by the Director of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining
APLC/MSP.10/2010/5	Review of the intersessional work programme. Presented by the President-designate of the Second Review Conference on behalf of the Coordinating Committee
APLC/MSP.10/2010/6	Estimated costs for convening the Eleventh Meeting 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. Note by the Secretariat
APLC/MSP.10/2010/7	Final report
APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.1	Request for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Executive summary. Submitted by Denmark
APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.2	Analysis of the request submitted by Denmark for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Submitted by the President of the Second Review Conference on behalf of the States Parties mandated to analyse requests for extensions
APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.3	Request for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Executive summary. Submitted by Zimbabwe

APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.4	Request for an extension of the time limit set in article 5 to complete the destruction of anti-personnel mines. Summary. Submitted by Mauritania
APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.5	Analysis of the request submitted by Guinea-Bissau for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Submitted by the President of the Second Review Conference on behalf of the States Parties mandated to analyse requests for extensions
APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.6 and Rev.1	Request for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Executive summary. Submitted by Guinea-Bissau
APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.7	Analysis of the request submitted by Mauritania for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Submitted by the President of the Second Review Conference on behalf of the States Parties mandated to analyse requests for extensions
APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.8*	Draft. Achieving the aims of the Cartagena action plan: The Geneva progress report 2009-2010. Submitted by the President-Designate of the Tenth Meeting of the States Parties
APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.9	Request for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Executive summary. Submitted by Chad
APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.10	Request for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Executive summary. Submitted by Colombia
APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.11	Analysis of the request submitted by Chad for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Submitted by the President of the Second Review Conference on behalf of the States Parties mandated to analyse requests for extensions
APLC/MSP.10/2010/ WP.12	Transparency measures and the exchange of information in the framework of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention: points for discussion. Submitted by Belgium

APLC/MSP.10/2010/ WP.13	Analysis of the request submitted by Colombia for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Submitted by the President of the Second Review Conference on behalf of the States Parties mandated to analyse requests for extensions
APLC/MSP.10/2010/ WP.14	Analysis of the request submitted by Zimbabwe for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in accordance with article 5 of the Convention. Submitted by the President of the Second Review Conference on behalf of the States Parties mandated to analyse requests for extensions
APLC/MSP.10/2010/ WP.15	Strengthening international cooperation and assistance in support of mine action and implementation of the Convention. Presented by the President of the Second Review Conference
APLC/MSP.10/2010/ WP.16	Report on the consideration of requests for extensions to article 5 deadlines, 2009-2010. Submitted by the President of the Second review Conference
APLC/MSP.10/2010/WP.17	Proposal. Establishment of a Standing Committee on Resources, Cooperation and Assistance. Submitted by Zambia
APLC/MSP.10/2010/INF.1 and Add.1 [English/French/Spanish only]	List of participants. Submitted by the Secretariat
APLC/MSP.10/2010/CRP.1	Draft final report
APLC/MSP.10/2010/MISC.1 [English/French/Spanish only]	Provisional list of participants. Submitted by the Secretariat
