

**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**

APLC/MSP.6/2005/L.1*
25 November 2005

ENGLISH ONLY

Sixth Meeting

Zagreb, 28 November – 2 December 2005

Item 11 of the provisional agenda

**Consideration of the general status and
operation of the Convention**

**ACHIEVING THE AIMS OF THE NAIROBI ACTION PLAN:
THE ZAGREB PROGRESS REPORT**

Presented by Austria and Croatia

Introduction

1. On December 3, 2004 at the First Review Conference of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (hereinafter “the Convention”) the States Parties adopted the *Nairobi Action Plan 2005-2009*. In doing so, the States Parties “reaffirmed their unqualified commitment to the full and effective promotion and implementation of the Convention,” and their determination “to secure achievements to date, to sustain and strengthen the effectiveness of cooperation under the Convention, and to spare no effort to meet (their) challenges in universalizing the Convention, destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines, clearing mined areas and assisting the victims.”¹

2. The *Nairobi Action Plan*, with its 70 specific action points, lays out a comprehensive framework for the period 2005-2009 for achieving major progress towards ending, for all people for all time, the suffering caused by anti-personnel mines. In doing so, it underscores the supremacy of the Convention and provides the States Parties with guidance in fulfilling their Convention obligations. To ensure the effectiveness of the *Nairobi Action Plan* as a means of guidance, the States Parties acknowledge the need to regularly monitor progress in the pursuit of the aims of the *Nairobi Action Plan* and to identify challenges that remain. Hence, pursuant to ideas proposed by the Austrian President of the First Review Conference and Croatia in its capacity as designated presidency of the Sixth Meeting of the States Parties, the States Parties –

* / Re-issued for technical reasons.

¹ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Introduction.

in their customarily inclusive and transparent manner – have developed the *Zagreb Progress Report*.

3. The purpose of the *Zagreb Progress Report* is to support the application of the *Nairobi Action Plan* by measuring progress made during the period 3 December 2004 to 2 December 2005. While all 70 points in the *Nairobi Action Plan* remain equally important and should be acted upon, the *Zagreb Progress Report* aims to highlight priority areas of work for the States Parties, the Co-Chairs and the Convention's President in the period between the Sixth and the Seventh Meetings of the States Parties. It could be considered as the first in a series of annual progress reports prepared by the States Parties in advance of the 2009 Second Review Conference.

I. Universalizing the Convention

Status at the close of the First Review Conference

4. At the close of the First Review Conference, 143 States were parties to the Convention.² Moreover, according to the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL), two-thirds of the States that had **produced** anti-personnel mines prior to the opening for signature of the Convention had become parties to the Convention, accepting to never again produce anti-personnel mines.

5. An additional three States not parties – Finland, Israel and Poland – had ceased production, and several others had not produced anti-personnel mines for several years, including Egypt, the Republic of Korea and the United States of America. In addition, the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) had indicated that the legal global trade in anti-personnel mines had effectively come to a halt and that the use of anti-personnel mines was limited to very few States not parties, indicating a widespread acceptance of the Convention's norm of non-use. However, the First Review Conference also recorded that, according to the ICBL, since the Convention entered into force, 11 States not parties had used anti-personnel mines and that 15 States not parties continued to produce anti-personnel mines or have not produced mines for some time but retained the capacity to do so.³

6. Despite great progress towards universal adherence, as of 3 December 2004, 51 States had not yet ratified or acceded to the Convention, including 8 of the Convention's signatories: Brunei Darussalam, the Cook Islands, Haiti, Indonesia, the Marshall Islands, Poland, Ukraine and Vanuatu. The rate of adherence was particularly low in Asia, the Middle East and amongst the members of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS).

² The First Review Conference recorded 144 States as having ratified, accepted, approved or acceded to the Convention, with the 144th State being Ethiopia. After the First Review Conference it was noted that technical procedures regarding the deposit of Ethiopia's instrument of ratification were not completed until 17 December 2004.

³ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraphs 6-8 and 12.

7. The First Review Conference recorded that challenges to universalization included: that while a compelling case has been made regarding how the terrible humanitarian consequences that result from anti-personnel mine use greatly outweigh their limited military utility, some States not parties continue to claim that anti-personnel mines are necessary; that others have linked the possibility of accession to the Convention to the resolution of a territorial, regional or internal dispute or conflict; that one State not party, Ukraine, had indicated that assistance for the destruction of its large stockpile of anti-personnel mines must be in place before it would be in a position to join the Convention; that while some States have joined the Convention notwithstanding the fact that armed non-State actors engage in acts prohibited by the Convention in their sovereign territory, one State not party, Sri Lanka, has suggested that accession to the Convention may be linked to an end to the use of anti-personnel mines by an armed non-State actor in its sovereign territory; that some States with no objections to the Convention remain outside it simply because ratification or accession to it is one of many competing priorities for scarce administrative resources; and, that accession to the Convention may not be possible on the part of States that do not have functioning or recognized government in place. The First Review Conference also noted that “while universalization of the Convention itself means adherence to it by all States, universal acceptance of the Convention’s norms is impeded by armed non-State actors that continue to use, stockpile, and produce anti-personnel mines.”⁴

Nairobi Action Plan

8. To assure progress in overcoming these challenges, in the *Nairobi Action Plan* the States Parties decided to: call on those States that have not yet done so to accede to the Convention as soon as possible; persistently encourage those signatories of the Convention that have not yet done so to ratify it as soon as possible; attach particular priority to States not parties that continue to use, produce, or possess large stockpiles of anti-personnel mines, or otherwise warrant special concern; accord particular importance to promoting adherence in regions where the level of acceptance of the Convention remains low; seize every appropriate opportunity to promote adherence to the Convention in bilateral contacts, military-to-military dialogue, peace processes, national parliaments, and the media; and, actively promote adherence to the Convention in all relevant multilateral fora, including the UN Security Council, UN General Assembly, assemblies of regional organizations and relevant disarmament bodies.⁵ As well, the States Parties accepted that they will “continue promoting universal observance of the Convention’s norms, by condemning, and taking appropriate steps to end the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines by armed non-State actors.”⁶

Actions taken and progress made

9. Since the First Review Conference, a number of universalization initiatives have been undertaken by States Parties, regional organizations, the United Nations, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the ICBL and others in a manner that is consistent with the States Parties’ commitment to “encourage and support involvement and active cooperation in

⁴ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraphs 14-18.

⁵ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Actions #1 to #6.

⁶ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #7.

these universalization efforts by all relevant partners.”⁷ On 1 March 2005, the President of the First Review Conference wrote to all States not parties, urging them to ratify or accede to the Convention. He reiterated this appeal in his 3 March 2005 statement to the Conference on Disarmament and in doing so he was joined by the representatives of 10 other States Parties. On 5-6 May 2005 Canada, the Coordinator of the Universalization Contact Group, co-sponsored the *Seminar on Removing Landmines* in Tripoli with a view to raising understanding of the Convention by Libya. On 7 June 2005 the Organization of American States (OAS) adopted a resolution which reaffirmed “the goals of the global elimination of anti-personnel mines and the conversion of the Americas into an anti-personnel-mine-free zone” and which urged member States of the OAS which have not yet done so to ratify or consider acceding to the Convention as soon as possible.⁸ On 16 June 2005, the European Parliament convened a *Landmines Information Day* to promote progress towards a mine-free world and on 7 July it adopted a resolution which in part called on all States that have not yet done so to ratify or accede to the Convention without delay.⁹ On 5-6 October 2005, the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) co-hosted, in Georgia, the regional workshop *Confidence Building and Regional Cooperation through Mine Action*. The workshop was organized by the International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance (ITF) and sponsored by Canada, the Netherlands and Slovenia.

10. A number of States Parties have acted in accordance with their commitment to “seize every appropriate opportunity to promote adherence to the Convention,” thus indicating that universalization is a matter that is relevant for all States Parties.¹⁰ In addition, the ICBL continued vigorous promotion of the Convention, which included visits to Azerbaijan, Bahrain, China, Georgia, Indonesia, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mongolia and Singapore. As well, the ICRC continued to encourage adherence by States not parties in the context of its bilateral contacts with those States, national and regional meetings aimed at promoting adherence to and implementation of international humanitarian law treaties, and in other international fora. [Moreover, in October 2005 all components of the International Movement of the Red Cross and Red Crescent were called upon to encourage all States to adhere to the Convention.]¹¹ As well, the United Nations engaged a high-level advisor to discuss the provisions of the Convention with a number of States not parties. The United Nations also hosted a treaty event in New York in September 2005 at which States were encouraged to deposit instruments of ratification of or accession to the Convention. Vanuatu availed itself of this opportunity.

11. In keeping with the Nairobi Action Plan’s emphasis on regions where the level of adherence to the Convention remains low,¹² the Coordinator of the Universalization Contact Group sought to identify regional facilitators in Asia, the Middle East and amongst the member States of the CIS. These facilitators engage States Parties from their respective regions on the margins of Convention meetings to discuss ways in which they will promote universalization among States not parties within their regions.

⁷ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) action #8.

⁸ Organization of American States General Assembly resolution # AG/RES. 2142 (XXXV-O/05), *The Americas as an Anti-Personnel-Land-Mine-Free Zone*.

⁹ European Parliament resolution # P6_TA-PROV(2005)0298, *A world without landmines*.

¹⁰ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #5.

¹¹ [Council of Delegates Resolution on Weapons and International Humanitarian Law, CD 2005 – DR 6/2 (Seoul, 16-18 November 2005), paragraph 1.

¹² *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #4.

12. Important progress has been made in increasing adherence to the Convention since the First Review Conference. Instruments of ratification were deposited by **Ethiopia** on 17 December 2004 and by **Vanuatu** on 16 September 2005, and, instruments of accession were deposited by **Latvia** on 1 July 2005 and by **Bhutan** on 18 August 2005. There are now [147] States which have deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with the Convention having entered into force for 144 of these States.¹³ A list of these States can be found in Annex I.

13. Several other States not parties have completed or have made significant progress in their internal processes towards ratification or accession: **Ukraine's** concerns about requiring resources for stockpile destruction appear to have been addressed thanks to the European Union and thus it has announced that in May 2005 it completed its internal procedures for the ratification of the Convention. In June 2005, the Deputy Prime Minister of the Transitional Federal Government of **Somalia** reiterated that Somalia will accede to the Convention as soon as possible. In October 2005, **Haiti** completed its internal ratification of the Ottawa Convention and **Palau** stated its intent to accede to the Convention at the Sixth Meeting of the States Parties. In addition, **Indonesia** submitted the Convention for Presidential approval, which will involve the Ministry of Foreign Affairs drafting legislation for approval by the Ministry of Defence and onward transmission to the First Commission of the Indonesian Parliament. As well, the Executive Branch of the **Federated States of Micronesia** completed its review of the Convention and intends to submit it to its national congress for internal ratification in 2005.

14. The *Nairobi Action Plan* makes mention of encouraging States not parties to abide by the Convention's provisions pending their adherence to it.¹⁴ Accordingly, while some States not parties are considering acceptance of the Convention, they have been encouraged to adopt interim measures that promote broader acceptance of the norm of the Convention, or demonstrate their commitment to humanitarian principles of it. Such interim measures can include: moratoria on the use, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines; voluntary destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines; mine clearance operations; the submission of voluntary transparency reports, according to Article 7 of the Convention; voluntary compliance with other Articles of the Convention; and, mine action projects jointly undertaken as confidence-building measures. Since the First Review Conference, **Poland** adopted such an interim measure by again submitting a voluntary transparency report on anti-personnel mines in accordance with the provisions of Article 7 of the Convention. **Sri Lanka** provided, on a voluntary basis, some of the information required in Article 7, although it did not submit information on stockpiled anti-personnel mines. While voluntary compliance with provisions of the Convention may be recognized as first steps towards ratification of or accession to it, such steps should not be used to postpone formal adherence.

15. According to the ICBL, since the First Review Conference three States not parties (Myanmar, Nepal and Russia) have used anti-personnel mines. In addition, the ICBL indicated that the United States, which has not produced anti-personnel mines since 1997, is due to make a decision in December 2005 on the production of a new weapon system that reportedly could function as an anti-personnel mine.

¹³ The Convention enters into force for Latvia on 1 January 2006 and for Bhutan on 1 February 2006.

¹⁴ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #5.

16. On 7 June 2005, the General Assembly of the Organization of American States condemned the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines by armed non-State actors and reaffirmed that progress toward a mine-free world will be facilitated if these actors observe the international norm established by the Convention.¹⁵ On 7 July 2005, the European Parliament called on armed non-State actors to sign the Geneva Call's *Deed of Commitment for Adherence to a Total Ban on Anti Personnel Mines and for Cooperation in Mine Action*.¹⁶ With respect to the *Deed of Commitment*, since the First Review Conference, one additional armed non-State actor – in Somalia – renounced the use of anti-personnel mines by signing the document. In addition, former armed non-State actors that signed the *Deed of Commitment* and which are now part of governments have played a leading role in the acceptance and implementation of the Convention by Burundi and Sudan, and are doing the same in Somalia. Challenges remain, however, in that some key armed non-State actors have been reluctant to renounce the use of anti-personnel mines and difficulties persist in monitoring compliance with the *Deed of Commitment* and in mobilisation the resources necessary to implement the *Deed of Commitment*.

17. Also in this context, as rights and obligations enshrined in the Convention and commitments in the Nairobi Action Plan apply to States Parties, some States Parties are 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.

Priorities for the period leading to the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties

18. Given the progress made in 2005, in the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties priorities should be as follows:

- (i) **All States Parties should direct specific efforts towards encouraging progress by those States not parties which have indicated that they could ratify or accede to the Convention in the near-term. As discussed by the Universalization Contact Group, these include: Bahrain, Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Iraq, Kuwait, the Federated States of Micronesia, Oman, Poland, Somalia and the United Arab Emirates.**
- (ii) **In keeping with Action #3 of the Nairobi Action Plan, all States Parties and those that share their aims should continue and increase universalization efforts that place a priority on those States not parties that produce, use, transfer and maintain large stockpiles of anti-personnel mines, including those developing new kinds of anti-personnel mines.**
- (iii) **In accordance with Action #7 of the Nairobi Action Plan, efforts should continue to promote universal observance of the Convention's norms by condemning, and taking appropriate steps to end the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines by armed non-State actors.**

¹⁵ Organization of American States General Assembly resolution # AG/RES. 2142 (XXXV-O/05), *The Americas as an Anti-Personnel-Land-Mine-Free Zone*.

¹⁶ European Parliament resolution # P6_TA-PROV(2005)0298, *A world without landmines*.

II. Destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines

Status at the close of the First Review Conference

19. At the close of the First Review Conference 16 States Parties had still to achieve their obligation to destroy their stockpiled mines. While the number of States Parties for which stockpile destruction was relevant had been reduced to a small number, it was noted that several challenges remained, including that: the numbers of mines held by a few individual States Parties were high; the destruction of the PFM1 mine remained technically challenging; some States Parties did not possess the financial means to destroy their stockpiles of anti-personnel mines; in some post-conflict or otherwise complex situations it might have been difficult to find and account for all stockpiled anti-personnel mines that were under the jurisdiction or control of a State Party; and, a small number of the States Parties with Article 4 obligations did not or might not have had control over their entire sovereign territories.¹⁷

Nairobi Action Plan

20. According to the *Nairobi Action Plan*, States Parties that have yet to complete their destruction programmes will: establish the type, quantity and, if possible, lot numbers of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines owned or possessed, and report this information as required; establish appropriate national and local capacities; strive to complete their destruction programmes if possible in advance of their four-year deadlines; and, make their problems, plans progress and priorities for assistance known in a timely manner.¹⁸

21. Also in the *Nairobi Action Plan*, States Parties in a position to do so committed to act upon their obligations to promptly assist States Parties with clearly demonstrated needs for support, and, support the investigation and further development of technical solutions to overcome the particular challenges associated with destroying PFM1 mines. As well, it was resolved 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, take advantage of other informal means to share such information and destroy these mines as a matter of urgent priority; and, enhance or develop effective responses, including regional and sub regional responses, to meet requirements for technical, material and financial assistance for stockpile destruction and invite the cooperation of relevant regional and technical organizations in this regard.¹⁹

¹⁷ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraphs 26-30.

¹⁸ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Actions #9 - #12.

¹⁹ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Actions #13 - #16.

Actions taken and progress made

22. At the June 2005 meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction, the Co-Chairs announced a goal that, by the Sixth Meeting of the States Parties, stockpile destruction would remain an obligation for at most seven States Parties (Afghanistan, Belarus, Ethiopia, Greece, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan and Turkey) and challenged seven States Parties (Algeria, Angola, Burundi, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana) to complete destruction before the Sixth Meeting of States Parties. Algeria accepted this challenge, completing its destruction program on 21 November 2005 more than five months ahead of its deadline. In addition, Guinea-Bissau completed its destruction programme on 17 October 2005.

23. Of the 16 States Parties which at the close of the Review Conference had not yet completed the destruction of mines, 5 have since reported that their stockpile destruction programs are complete: Algeria, Bangladesh, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania, and Uruguay. Since the First Review Conference, four additional States – Bhutan, Ethiopia, Latvia and Vanuatu – joined the Convention and have accepted the obligation to destroy their stockpiles. Two of these – Bhutan and Vanuatu – have informally advised the Co-Chairs that they hold no stockpiles. Hence, the number of States Parties for which the obligation to destroy stockpiled anti-personnel mines remains relevant has been narrowed to include 13 States: Afghanistan, Angola, Belarus, Burundi, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Greece, Guyana, Latvia, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan and Turkey.²⁰ Timelines for these States Parties to complete stockpile destruction in accordance with Article 4 is contained in Annex II.

24. As noted above, the *Nairobi Action Plan* calls upon States Parties in the process of destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines to report, as required by Article 7, on the type, quantity and, if possible, lot numbers of all stockpiled anti-personnel mines owned or possessed.²¹ Of the remaining 13 States Parties with the obligation to destroy their stockpiles, all have reported such information since the First Review Conference with the exception of Afghanistan, [Ethiopia], and Guyana. With respect to Afghanistan, it should be noted that it complied in 2005 with its obligation to provide a transparency report, noting, with respect to stockpiled anti-personnel mines, that it may need assistance in determining quantities and types of mines held.

25. In accordance with Action Item 15 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, one State Party - Cambodia – reported, in 2005, on anti-personnel mines discovered after its deadline had passed and on the destruction of these 15,466 anti-personnel mines.

26. In accordance with the commitment made by States Parties to establish capacities to destroy their stocks,²² of the 13 remaining States Parties at least 7 (Afghanistan, Angola, Belarus, Cyprus, Greece, Serbia and Montenegro and Turkey) have indicated that they have

²⁰ It should be noted that while it is understood that these 13 States Parties are the only States Parties which must still fulfill Article 4 obligations, an additional 6 States Parties not mentioned in this paragraph have never provided an initial Article 7 report as required to confirm informal indications that no stocks are held. These States Parties are: Cameroon, Cape Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Guyana and Sao Tome and Principe. In addition, in coming months, Bhutan and Vanuatu will be required to submit initial Article 7 reports to confirm informal indications that no stocks are held.

²¹ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #9.

²² *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #10.

Cyprus, Greece, Serbia and Montenegro and Turkey) have indicated that they have made available or are acquiring the necessary resources and plans to destroy their stockpiles.

27. Pursuant to the commitment made to support the investigation and further development of technical solutions to overcome the particular challenges associated with destroying PFM1 mines,²³ much more is now known about this type of mine and solutions to its destruction are at hand.

28. At the June 2005 meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction, the Co-Chairs recognized technical issues associated with the destruction of artillery delivered anti-personnel mines (ADAM) which contain or may contain depleted uranium. This issue is of interest to at least two States Parties.

29. Additionally during the June 2005 meeting of the Standing Committee, it was highlighted that the States Parties must consider the subject of multi-function fuses and how inventories of this particular fuse could possibly be used to convert command detonated munitions to victim activated mines. At least one State Party holds this type of fuse in its inventory.

Priorities for the period leading to the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties

30. Given the progress made in 2005, in the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties priorities should be as follows:

- (i) **Efforts should continue, in accordance with Action #11 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, to ensure that States Parties continue to strive to complete their destruction programmes if possible in advance of their five year deadlines.**
- (ii) **Given that some of the 13 States Parties for which stockpile destruction remains relevant lack necessary capacities, due attention must be given to continuing to overcome challenges identified by the First Review Conference, including that some States Parties do not possess the financial means to destroy their stockpiles of anti-personnel mines and that in some post-conflict or otherwise complex situations it may be difficult to find and account for all stockpiled anti-personnel mines that are under the jurisdiction or control of a State Party.²⁴**
- (iii) **Success and / or progress in pursuing the aims of the *Nairobi Action Plan* as they pertain to stockpile destruction should continue to be monitored, measured and discussed, particularly during the Intersessional Work Programme, in part to raise awareness in relevant States Parties of the need to establish and implement stockpile destruction programmes that are consistent with good safety and environmental practices, such as those outlined in International Mine Action Standards.**

²³ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #14.

²⁴ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraphs 28-29.

- (iv) **Just as the *Nairobi Action Plan* highlighted the need to overcome technical challenges related to PFM mines,²⁵ so too should steps be taken to understand and resolve the issues associated with ADAM and multi-function fuses.**
- (v) **Appropriate actions should be taken to ensure that those States Parties that have not reported their stockpile status in their Article 7 Transparency Reports do so in a timely manner.**
- (vi) **Efforts should be made to raise awareness of the need to establish and implement stockpile destruction of mines belonging to armed non-State actors that have made a commitment to ban the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines.**

III. Clearing mined areas

Status at the close of the First Review Conference

31. In accordance with Article 5 of the Convention, States Parties must “make every effort to identify all areas under (their) jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced” and undertake “to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under (their) jurisdiction or control, as soon as possible but not later than ten years after the entry into force of (the) Convention for (a particular) State Party.” The term “mined area” is defined in Article 2 of the Convention as “an area which is dangerous due to the presence or suspected presence of mines.” The Convention does not contain language that would require each State Party to search every square metre of its territory to find mines. The Convention requires, however, the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas which a State Party has made every effort to identify. It should be noted that while terms like “mine-free,” “impact-free,” and “mine-safe” are sometimes used, such terms do not exist in the text of the Convention and are not synonymous with Convention obligations.

32. Clearance of all mined areas in accordance with Article 5 is part of the Convention’s overall comprehensive approach to ending the suffering and casualties caused by anti-personnel mines – “for all people, for all time.”²⁶ Anti-personnel mines, and the clearance of them, have and / or could have a humanitarian impact, an impact on development, an impact on the disarmament goal of the Convention and an impact on solidifying peace and building confidence. The totality of the impacts caused by anti-personnel mines should be addressed in the context of the Convention. As of 3 December 2004, 50 States Parties had reported areas under their jurisdiction or control that contain, or are suspected to contain, anti-personnel mines.

²⁵ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #14.

²⁶ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III), Introduction.

Four of these States Parties – Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Djibouti and Honduras – had indicated that they have completed implementation of Article 5.²⁷

33. With respect to the **identification of mined areas**, the First Review Conference both recorded significant methodological, organizational and operational advances, and, emphasized that “States Parties that have not yet done so need to act with urgency to ensure that every effort is made to identify all areas under their jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced” as required by Article 5.²⁸

34. With respect to **national planning and programme development**, on the one hand the First Review Conference noted that “many States Parties have proceeded in the development and implementation of national programmes to fulfil Article 5 obligations,” assisted in part by the development of the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA) and the International Mine Action Standards (IMAS).²⁹ On the other hand, the First Review Conference was not able to record progress with respect to the national plans and demining programmes of several States Parties.³⁰

35. With respect to **marking and protecting mined areas**, the First Review Conference recorded that implementation of relevant obligations had been aided by relevant International Mine Action Standards. However, challenges noted included that fencing off large swathes of territory and maintaining fencing and markings are expensive propositions, that monitoring requires precious human resources, that communities in resource-deprived areas have often procured the fencing for their own day-to-day purposes and that ongoing instability in areas suspected of being mined and the absence of operational mine action structures affects implementation.³¹

36. With respect to **mine risk education (MRE)**, the First Review Conference noted that this field has become more standardized and professional. However, challenges were also recorded, including that many States Parties do not have accurate data on populations at risk and that many States Parties need to integrate MRE programmes into broader relief and development activities and education systems.³²

37. With respect to **mine action technologies**, the First Review Conference recorded that a variety of means have emerged for States Parties to exercise their right, under Article 6(2), “to participate in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information concerning the implementation of (the) Convention”, and to fulfil their responsibility to facilitate such an exchange. In addition, the following challenges were recorded: the need for additional investments for close-in detection and area reduction; the need to focus on country or region-specific solutions; the need to maintain an appropriate level of technology

²⁷ The Final Report of the First Review Conference omitted to mention that Bulgaria had reported that it had areas under its jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines were known or suspected to be emplaced and that it had subsequently reported that it had cleared these areas.

²⁸ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraphs 37-40.

²⁹ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraphs 42, 43 and 54. The IMSMA has been developed by the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD). The GICHD also manages the development and updating of the IMAS on behalf of the UN.

³⁰ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), Annex IV.

³¹ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraphs 45 and 47.

³² *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraphs 49 and 52.

in mine-affected States Parties, ensuring that it is affordable, sustainable and adaptable to local conditions; the need to ensure that developing new technologies does not overshadow productivity increases, which could be achieved with supplying existing technology; and, the need to further strengthen the relationship between end users of technology and those developing it.³³

Nairobi Action Plan

38. The *Nairobi Action Plan* emphasizes that successfully meeting the deadlines for clearing mined areas according to Article 5 of the Convention “will be the most significant challenge to be addressed in the coming five years and will require intensive efforts by mine-affected States Parties and those in a position to assist them.”³⁴

39. To address this challenge, in the *Nairobi Action Plan*, the States Parties decided to “intensify and accelerate efforts to ensure the most effective and most expeditious possible fulfilment of Article 5 (1) mine clearance obligations in the period 2005-2009” and to “strive to ensure that few, if any, States Parties will feel compelled to request an extension in accordance with the procedure set out in Article 5, paragraphs 3-6 of the Convention.”³⁵ In addition, the States Parties that have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control, where they have not yet done so, committed to do their utmost to urgently identify all areas containing anti-personnel mines, urgently develop and implement national plans, and make their problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance known.³⁶ As well, the States Parties resolved to “monitor and actively promote the achievement of mine clearance goals and the identification of assistance needs.”³⁷

40. In the *Nairobi Action Plan* States Parties that have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control, where they have not yet done so, accepted that they will do their utmost to: prioritize clearance of areas with highest human impact, provide mine risk education and increase efforts to perimeter-mark, monitor and protect mined areas awaiting clearance in order to ensure the effective exclusion of civilians, as required by Article 5 (2); and, ensure that mine risk education programmes are made available in all communities at risk, integrating such programmes into education systems and broader relief and development activities, taking into consideration age, gender, social, economic, political and geographical factors, and ensuring consistency with relevant International Mine Action Standards, as well as national mine action standards.³⁸

41. The States Parties resolved in the *Nairobi Action Plan* to strengthen efforts to enable mine-affected States Parties to participate in the fullest possible exchange of equipment, material and scientific and technological information, in part to further close the gap between end users of technology and those developing it; to share information on – and further develop and advance – mine clearance techniques, technologies and procedures; and, while work proceeds on

³³ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraphs 57 and 61.

³⁴ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III), paragraph 4.

³⁵ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III), Actions #17 and #27.

³⁶ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III), Actions #18, #19 and #22.

³⁷ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III), Action #28.

³⁸ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III), Actions #20 and 21.

developing new technologies, to seek to ensure an adequate supply and most efficient use of existing technologies.³⁹

42. The *Nairobi Action Plan* also contains a commitment on the part of the States Parties to “ensure and increase the effectiveness and efficiency of their efforts” in clearing mined areas.⁴⁰

Actions taken and progress made

43. Since the First Review Conference, Ethiopia – a State with areas under its jurisdiction or control that contain anti-personnel mines – ratified the Convention and Suriname indicated informally that it had fulfilled its obligations under Article 5. Hence, fulfilling obligations under Article 5 remains relevant for 46 States Parties. Timelines for these States Parties to complete clearance in accordance with Article 5 is contained in Annex III.

44. Regarding “(monitoring) and actively (promoting) the achievement of mine clearance goals and the identification of assistance needs,”⁴¹ the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies set as their main objective for the Standing Committee to serve as a catalyst to “intensify and accelerate efforts” to fulfil Article 5 obligations. Each of the States Parties which has reported areas containing anti-personnel mines was invited to share information at the June meeting of the Standing Committee with 36 of these States Parties doing so. Based on presentations made by States Parties, reports submitted by them in accordance with Article 7, and other information that has been made available, it is possible to record progress and remaining challenges.

45. Since the First Review Conference, *landmine impact surveys* – a means of defining the landmine problem in terms of location and socio-economic impacts experienced by affected communities – have been completed in Afghanistan and have been underway in Angola and Ethiopia. It should be noted that as landmine impact surveys record areas according to the social and economic impacts experienced by affected communities, the total area recorded will be greater than the actual area in which anti-personnel mines are emplaced.

46. Reporting on identified mined areas should be facilitated by the IMSMA having been made available by the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining to mine action programmes in 29 relevant States Parties. However, more must be done by several States Parties to identify mined areas under their jurisdiction or control and to report this information as required. For instance, the First Review Conference recorded that “many States Parties have demonstrated that technical survey operations – rapidly verifying that parts of suspected hazardous areas are clear in order to focus manual deminers on areas actually containing mines – will be important in assuring the fulfilment of Article 5 obligations.”⁴² To help advance technical survey efforts, the GICHD announced that it will proceed with a technical survey and risk management study. This study aims to enable mine action programmes to streamline their area reduction processes and thus implement more effective use of scarce resources for demining.

³⁹ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III), Actions #25 and #26.

⁴⁰ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III), Action #24.

⁴¹ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III), Action #28.

⁴² *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 53.

47. Of the 46 States Parties which must still fulfil obligations under Article 5 of the Convention, 19 have provided details on national demining plans / programmes which are consistent with Article 5 obligations and the 10-year deadline set by the Convention.⁴³ Five (5) have provided details on national demining plans / programmes which are not consistent with Article 5 obligations and / or the 10-year deadline set by the Convention. Seven (7) States Parties have provided details on national demining plans / programmes which are unclear regarding consistency with Article 5 obligations and / or the 10-year deadline set by the Convention. Eight (8) States Parties have indicated that efforts are underway to establish a national demining plan / programme or to acquire the necessary information to do so. Seven (7) States Parties have not provided details on a national demining plan / programme. Immediate action must be taken by several States Parties to develop and implement national demining programmes with a view to meeting their deadlines. In terms of the development and implementation of national plans and demining programmes, a summary of the status of progress reported over the past year can be found in Annex IV.

48. The United Nations has assisted a number of States Parties in establishing national plans and in making these plans publicly available on its E-Mine web site.⁴⁴ In addition, the Organization of American States has provided assistance in national planning to almost every State Party in the Americas which has reported anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its control or jurisdiction.

49. Since the First Review Conference, the following [18] States Parties have reported, as required, on measures taken to “ensure as soon as possible that all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under (their) jurisdiction or control are perimeter-marked, monitored and protected by fencing or other means, to ensure the effective exclusion of civilians, until all anti-personnel mines contained therein have been destroyed:” [Afghanistan, Cambodia, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Greece, Guinea Bissau, Jordan, Malawi, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Turkey, United Kingdom, Yemen, and Zimbabwe]. According to the ICBL, the same challenges noted by the First Review Conference concerning the fulfilment of this obligation have persisted since the Conference.⁴⁵

50. In addition, the following [26] States Parties have reported, as required, on “the measures taken to provide an immediate and effective warning to the population in relation to all areas identified under paragraph 2 of Article 5:” [Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Guatemala, Guinea Bissau, Jordan, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Thailand, Uganda, United Kingdom, Yemen and Zimbabwe].

51. According to the ICBL, important quantitative and qualitative gains have been made in risk reduction activities with more individuals receiving mine risk education (MRE), with 11 States Parties (Afghanistan, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Croatia, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Sudan and Uganda) having increased the integration of MRE

⁴³ It should be noted that some of the States Parties which have provided details on national demining plans / programmes which are consistent with Article 5 obligations and the 10-year deadline set by the Convention have made it clear that successfully implementing their plans will depend upon obtaining a reasonable amount of external support.

⁴⁴ www.mineaction.org

⁴⁵ See paragraph 34.

into broader mine action activities, and with 7 States Parties (Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Eritrea, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, and Uganda) now having integrated MRE into school curricula. In addition, UNICEF led a consultative process with other key stakeholders to create International Mine Action Standards (IMAS) for MRE. UNICEF, with the support of the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD), has commenced work on comprehensive guidelines to support the implementation of these IMAS.

52. In follow-up to the relevant actions agreed to at the First Review Conference, Belgium continued in 2005 to convene an informal group of mine action technologies experts. This group of experts highlighted that a great deal of testing of existing equipment has been undertaken, particularly by the International Test and Evaluation Programme (ITEP). This has included tests on more than 20 vegetation cutters and flails, 30 metal detectors, 2 dual-sensor mine detectors, protective equipment, ground penetrating radar and vapour detectors. In addition, on the basis of presentations made by Japan and the GICHD, on 5 July 2005 the New York-based Mine Action Support Group held detailed discussions on advances in the field of mine action technologies.

53. With respect to “(ensuring) and (increasing) the effectiveness and efficiency of their efforts”⁴⁶ in clearing mined areas, since the First Review Conference, the IMAS Review Board, which is chaired by the GICHD, met, making amendments to 32 International Mine Action Standards. In addition, the United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) has indicated it will analyse IMAS training needs in order to ensure that the IMAS are applied effectively. Furthermore, the Russian translation of all IMAS commenced in August 2005 and, with the support of the Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie (OIF), 12 IMAS have been translated into French.

54. While it is mentioned elsewhere in the Nairobi Action Plan, an emphasis on gender considerations is also important in the fulfilment of Article 5 obligations.⁴⁷ In this regard, since the First Review Conference, the United Nations has produced *Gender Guidelines for Mine Action Programmes* to help ensure that gender perspectives are incorporated into United Nations mine action programmes.

Priorities for the period leading to the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties

55. Given the progress made in 2005, in the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties priorities should be as follows:

- (i) **In keeping with action #18 of the Nairobi Action Plan, each State Party which has not yet identified all areas under its jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines are known or are suspected to be emplaced should identify such areas as soon as possible and report this information as required.**
- (ii) **In keeping with action #19 of the Nairobi Action Plan, each State Party which has reported areas containing anti-personnel mines but which has not yet established a plan to clear these areas by its deadline should establish**

⁴⁶ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III), Action #24.

⁴⁷ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III), Action #35.

such a plan as soon as possible and share information on its plan and progress in implementing it, using mechanisms such as Article 7 reporting and the Intersessional Work Programme.

- (iii) Each actor which has professed its support for the Convention and which is assisting States Parties in developing a national plan to implement Article 5 should ensure that advice and assistance provided is consistent with and does not contradict or fall short of the obligations that States Parties have accepted under Article 5 of the Convention.**
- (iv) With a view to striving to ensure, as specified by action #27 of the Nairobi Action Plan, that few, if any, States Parties will feel compelled to request an extension in accordance with the procedure set out in Article 5, paragraphs 3-6 of the Convention, each State Party which has reported areas containing anti-personnel mines should make or acquire the financial and technical means available to clear mined areas, identify ways to address any circumstances which may impede its ability to conduct clearance, and share information on these matters using mechanisms such as Article 7 reporting and the Intersessional Work Programme.**
- (v) In cases where mine action is largely managed and conducted by foreign non-governmental organizations and / or international organizations, national ownership and local capacity development – which are more cost-effective and sustainable – should be accelerated through means such as the use of national demining experts and staff and the use, if appropriate in local contexts, of regular army units or demobilized combatants in demining.⁴⁸ In addition, in keeping with Action #24 of the Nairobi Action Plan, States Parties should continue using the International Mine Action Standards as a frame of reference to establish national standards and operating procedures.**
- (vi) Given the advances made in the field of mine risk education, a priority should be placed on applying the relevant International Mine Action Standards in keeping with Action #21 of the Nairobi Action Plan, particularly by ensuring that all clearance operations have a community liaison component as stipulated by these standards.**
- (vii) In accordance with actions #26 and #27 of the Nairobi Action Plan, States Parties should ensure an adequate supply and most efficient use of existing technologies to further integrate available technologies into clearance operations.**

⁴⁸ This point has been underscored in the United Nations Inter-Agency Policy, *Mine Action and Effective Coordination*, which was endorsed on 6 June 2005, in which it is stated that “the primary responsibility lies with the government of the mine-affected State.”

IV. Assisting the victims

Status at the close of the First Review Conference

56. The First Review Conference recorded that significant conceptual gains had been made during the period 1999-2004 with respect to the fulfilment of the States Parties' obligation to provide assistance for the care and rehabilitation, and social and economic reintegration of mine victims. One of the major advances made by the States Parties was to better understand the elements that comprise victim assistance.⁴⁹ While progress had been made in each area, significant challenges remained.

57. With respect to **understanding the extent of the challenge faced**, it was noted that many mine-affected States Parties still knew little about the prevalence of new victims, the numbers of survivors or their specific needs and that in many cases where data collection did occur national ownership over this matter had not yet been achieved. Hence it was recorded that many States Parties faced the challenge of enhancing their mine victim data collection capacities, integrating such systems into existing health information systems and ensuring full access to information.⁵⁰

58. With respect to **emergency and continuing medical care**, it was noted that for many mine-affected countries: there was a lack of trained staff, medicines, equipment and infrastructure to adequately respond to mine and other trauma injuries; the application of existing guidelines remained a challenge; there was a need to ensure that healthcare workers and lay-people in mine-affected areas were trained in emergency first-aid and that trauma surgeons and nurses received appropriate training; there was a need to enhance medical facilities, at a minimum, to meet basic standards; and, problems were posed by the proximity of services to mined areas and difficulties in transporting to these facilities those who require care.⁵¹

59. With respect to **physical rehabilitation**, it was noted that major challenges for many States Parties were to: increase, expand access to and ensure the sustainability of national capacities; increase the number of trained specialists; provide rehabilitation services in mine-affected communities, ensuring that landmine victims have access to transportation to these services; and, engage all relevant actors to ensure effective coordination in advancing the quality of care and increasing the numbers of individuals assisted.⁵²

60. With respect to **psychological support and social reintegration**, it was noted that a challenge for many States Parties was to increase national and local capacity, engaging all relevant actors and taking full advantage of the fact that landmine survivors themselves are resources who can act as constructive partners in programmes.⁵³

61. Concerning **economic reintegration**, it was noted that a challenge for many States Parties was to build and develop sustainable economic activities in mine-affected areas that

⁴⁹ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 69.

⁵⁰ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 71.

⁵¹ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraphs 72 and 73.

⁵² *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 75.

⁵³ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 76.

would benefit not only those individuals directly impacted by mines and UXO but their communities. It was also noted that this challenge was profound given that economic reintegration of survivors must be seen in the broader context of economic development.⁵⁴

62. Concerning the **establishment, enforcement and implementation of relevant laws and public policies**, it was noted that it remained challenging for many States Parties: to fully implement the provisions of existing legislation; to provide pensions that are adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of living; to ensure accessibility to public and private infrastructure; and, to further develop and implement plans to address the needs and rights of mine victims, and more generally to improve rehabilitation and socio-economic reintegration services for all persons with disabilities.⁵⁵

63. The First Review Conference highlighted that the problems faced by landmine victims are similar to the challenges faced by other persons with injuries and disabilities. Victim assistance does not require the development of new fields or disciplines but rather calls for ensuring that existing health care and social service systems, rehabilitation programmes and legislative and policy frameworks are adequate to meet the needs of all citizens – including landmine victims. However, it does require that a certain priority be accorded to health and rehabilitation systems in areas where landmine victims are prevalent.⁵⁶

64. The First Review Conference also highlighted that victim assistance responsibilities are most pertinent for – and hence these challenges are most profound in – 23 States Parties in which these States Parties themselves have indicated there likely are hundreds, thousands or tens-of-thousands of landmine survivors: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Eritrea, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda and Yemen.⁵⁷ With the ratification of the Convention by Ethiopia on 17 December 2004, this number now stands at 24.

Nairobi Action Plan

65. The *Nairobi Action Plan* provides that States Parties, particularly those with the greatest numbers of mine victims, will do their utmost to: develop or enhance national mine victim data collection capacities; establish and enhance health-care services needed to respond to the needs of mine victims; increase national physical rehabilitation capacity; actively support the socio-economic reintegration of mine victims; ensure that national legal and policy frameworks effectively address the needs and fundamental human rights of mine victims; and, ensure that, in all victim assistance efforts, emphasis is given to age and gender considerations and to mine victims who are subject to multiple forms of discrimination.⁵⁸ These actions constitute the basis for the States Parties' response in a concrete, measurable and meaningful way to the "vital

⁵⁴ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 77.

⁵⁵ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraphs 78 and 79.

⁵⁶ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 65.

⁵⁷ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 85.

⁵⁸ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5) Actions #29 to #35.

promise for hundreds of thousand of mine victims around the world, as well as for their families and communities.”⁵⁹

66. Ensuring that the 24 States Parties that have reported the responsibility for significant numbers of landmine survivors will be in a position to meet their objectives by 2009 will, in many cases, require outside assistance. This was recognized in the *Nairobi Action Plan*, which recorded the commitment that “States Parties in a position to do so will act upon their obligation under Article 6(3) to promptly assist those States Parties with clearly demonstrated needs for external support for care, rehabilitation and reintegration of mine victims, responding to priorities for assistance as articulated by those States Parties in need and ensuring continuity and sustainability of resource commitments.”⁶⁰

67. In the *Nairobi Action Plan*, the States Parties also resolved to “ensure effective integration of mine victims in the work of the Convention” and to “ensure an effective contribution in all relevant deliberations by health, rehabilitation and social services professionals,” inter alia by including such individuals on their delegations.⁶¹

Actions taken and progress made

68. At the First Review Conference, it was noted that “while not forgetting the responsibilities to landmine victims wherever they may be, a greater emphasis must be placed on the fulfilment of the responsibilities to landmine victims by (the now 24 State Parties of the Convention which have indicated that they hold the responsibility to provide for the well-being of significant numbers of landmine survivors).”⁶² However, maximizing the *Nairobi Action Plan* as a basis for action on victim assistance requires a better understanding of what can or should be achieved by December 2009 by / in these 24 States.

69. It should be noted that what can or should be achieved by when and how will be different for each of these 24 States Parties with respect to each of the areas of victim assistance, given diversities in terms of numbers / characteristics of survivors, capacity, geography, etc. As the ultimate responsibility of meeting the needs of survivors rests with each of these States, they themselves must define what can or should be achieved (in concrete and measurable terms) and how.

70. Assisting these States Parties in establishing objectives was a major priority of the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration in 2005. The Co-Chairs distributed a comprehensive questionnaire to the 24 pertinent States Parties to support these States Parties in their articulation of (a) specific, measurable and realistic victim assistance objectives by 2009; (b) plans to achieve these objectives; and (c) means to implement these plans. This questionnaire was inspired by the *Strategic Framework for Planning Integrated Victim Assistance Programmes*, which was developed by Switzerland in 1999, and it was based upon the *Guidelines for the Socio-economic Reintegration of Landmine Survivors*, which was

⁵⁹ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5) paragraph 5.

⁶⁰ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5) Action #36.

⁶¹ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5) Actions #38 and #39.

⁶² *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 86.

produced by the World Rehabilitation Fund and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 2003.

71. To further support the efforts of these 24 States Parties in developing concrete and measurable objectives for victim assistance, the Co-Chairs convened workshops in Managua, in which all four pertinent Latin American States Parties participated, and in Nairobi, in which 10 of the 11 pertinent African States Parties participated.⁶³ The Co-Chairs also pursued a number of country-specific assistance strategies and provided a forum for States Parties to present their initial responses to the questionnaire at the June 2005 meeting of the Standing Committee. In addition, a number of States Parties were assisted by the United Nations and by the Implementation Support Unit of the GICHD in preparing responses to the questionnaire.

72. The questionnaire, which is not an end-product but rather an initial step in long-term planning and implementation as it concerns victim assistance, has been welcomed and used by most of the 24 States Parties in question. Many of these States Parties have now developed victim assistance objectives for 2009, which are summarized in Annex V. Hence, there is now a much more solid basis for developing a clearer road map regarding what needs to be done between 2005 and the Second Review Conference and how success pertaining to victim assistance will be measured in 2009.

73. The questionnaires that have been submitted by several States Parties suggest that challenges remain in applying certain lessons that were recorded by the First Review Conference. For example, it was noted that “assistance to landmine victims should be viewed as a part of a country’s overall public health and social services systems and human rights frameworks.”⁶⁴ However, in many instances the effort to develop victim assistance objectives has been led by demining officials with little interaction with those responsible for health and social services. In addition, the First Review Conference recorded that “providing adequate assistance to landmine survivors must be seen in a broader context of development and underdevelopment.”⁶⁵ Many States Parties have prepared Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers or national development plans to overcome broader development challenges, with most such documents containing objectives that are relevant to advancing the care, rehabilitation and reintegration of landmine survivors. However, in many instances the preparation of victim assistance objectives has not taken these broader national plans into consideration.

74. With specific regard to understanding the status of the challenge faced by many States Parties, actions taken since the First Review Conference include UNICEF, with the Centres for Disease Control and Prevention, having supported the implementation of a field epidemiology for mine action course, which is designed to strengthen and standardise mine victim data collection in affected countries. In addition, the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA), which has the capacity to manage information on mine victims, has been

⁶³ Colombia, El Salvador, Nicaragua and Peru participated in the workshop in Managua. Angola, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Senegal, Sudan and Uganda participated in the workshop in Nairobi.

⁶⁴ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 66.

⁶⁵ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 67.

provided to 20 of the 24 States Parties that have reported significant numbers of landmine survivors.⁶⁶

75. Providing support that will benefit landmine survivors can take many forms. Important assistance can be and is provided by or through specialized organizations in which assistance specifically targets landmine survivors and other war wounded. Tracking and measuring such assistance is relatively easy. However, it has proven difficult to track and measure benefits that flow specifically to landmine survivors through integrated approaches in which development cooperation aims to guarantee the rights of all persons with disabilities, including landmine survivors.

76. With respect to ensuring “effective integration of mine victims in the work of the Convention” and “an effective contribution in all relevant deliberations by health, rehabilitation and social services professionals,”⁶⁷ the President of the First Review Conference and the Director of the GICHD undertook to remind the States Parties and all other relevant actors of these commitments through their letter of invitation to the June 2005 meetings of the Standing Committees. In addition, the Secretary General of the Sixth Meeting of the States Parties informed the States Parties that have reported the responsibility for significant numbers of survivors that Croatia was providing some assistance to support the participation of survivors on delegations at the Sixth Meeting. Many States Parties and relevant organizations responded by including survivors and / or health, rehabilitation and social services professionals on their delegations to key meetings in 2005.

77. Since the First Review Conference, efforts have been made to strengthen the normative framework that protects and ensures respect for the rights of persons with disabilities including landmine survivors through the participation by many States and interested organizations in the ongoing drafting of an international convention on the rights of persons with disabilities.

78. The thematic areas that make up what the States Parties understand *victim assistance* to be are complex. With a view to advancing understanding of some of these complexities, since the First Review Conference, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance placed priority on exploring two areas in particular – emergency medical care and socio-economic reintegration. It was noted that in subsequent years, future Co-Chairs may wish to highlight other thematic areas of victim assistance. For instance, this may be particularly important with respect to physical rehabilitation given that in many cases the provision of services remains dependent upon external actors for resources and expertise.

79. For its part, the ICBL and its member organizations assisted in advancing understanding of various matters concerning victim assistance by producing, since the First Review Conference, the compilation, *101 Great Ideas for the Socio- Economic Reintegration of Mine Survivors*, the study, *National Legal Frameworks Relating to Persons with Disabilities in Heavily Mine-Affected Countries*, and, the report *Victim Assistance in 2004: Overview of the Situation in 24 States Parties*.

⁶⁶ Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand and Yemen.

⁶⁷ See *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5) Actions #38 and #39.

Priorities for the period leading to the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties

80. Given the progress made in 2005, in the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties priorities should be as follows:

- (i) **While objectives may have been established by many of the 24 States Parties that have reported the responsibility for significant numbers of survivors, it is essential that these States Parties proceed with the more complex task of developing comprehensive national plans to guide the fulfilment of these objectives, ensuring that these plans integrate mine victim assistance into broader health care and social service systems, rehabilitation programmes and legislative and policy frameworks.**
- (ii) **In keeping with the commitment made in the *Nairobi Action Plan* to “monitor and promote progress in the achievement of victim assistance goals,” a priority must be, to place a focus on what steps are being taken to achieve the national objectives set by the 24 most affected States Parties and what progress is being made.⁶⁸**
- (iii) **Given that the objectives established by the 24 most affected States Parties provide a clearer picture of their priorities for assistance, an emphasis could be placed on an enriched exchange of information on ways in which States Parties in a position to do so are fulfilling their obligations under Article 6(3) as called for in action #36 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*.**
- (iv) **In 2006 and beyond, a priority should be placed by the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance on exploring in greater detail those areas of victim assistance which were not covered in great detail in 2005 such as physical rehabilitation, psychological support and / or establishment, enforcement and implementation of relevant laws and public policies.**
- (v) **As called for in actions #38 and #39 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, States Parties and relevant organizations should continue to ensure effective integration of mine victims in the work of the Convention and an effective contribution in all relevant deliberations by health, rehabilitation and social services professionals.**

⁶⁸ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5) Action #37.

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

A. Cooperation and assistance

Status at the close of the First Review Conference

81. The First Review Conference highlighted that “the Convention is clear that fulfilling obligations to destroy stockpiled anti-personnel mines and to clear mined areas is the responsibility of each individual State Party, just as ensuring the well-being of a country’s citizens – including mine victims – is a national responsibility.” The First Review Conference, nevertheless, emphasized “that cooperation and assistance are important elements available to those States Parties that may require support in fulfilling their obligations.”⁶⁹

82. While the First Review Conference noted that an impressive volume of funding and other support had been generated since 1997 in the context of the pursuit of aims of the Convention, it also recorded that “the challenge for both traditional and non-traditional States Parties in a position to do so will be to ensure a renewed commitment to assist others during the period 2005-2009, through means such as dedicated funds to assist in the implementation of the Convention and by mainstreaming support to mine action through broader humanitarian, development, peace-building and peace support programmes.” As well, the First Review Conference noted the importance of affected States Parties themselves taking full ownership over implementation by making national mine action resources available, including by integrating mine action in national development plans and Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers.⁷⁰

83. The First Review Conference noted that additional challenges that pertain to cooperation assistance included: ensuring that States Parties are made well aware of available assistance from the World Bank and regional development banks; the need for international, regional, non-governmental and other organizations to remain as committed to the Convention in the future as they have in the past; and, recognizing that cooperation and assistance concerns not only the volume of money generated but also ensuring cost-effectiveness.⁷¹ As well, the States Parties recorded: the need to ensure that necessary support for clearing mined areas does not disappear before Article 5 has been fully implemented; the fact that assisting landmine survivors often requires that attention be given during the entire lifetime of these individuals; and, that very few States Parties in a position to do so have provided assistance in destroying stockpiled mines.⁷²

Nairobi Action Plan

84. The actions in the *Nairobi Action Plan* that concern cooperation and assistance provide guidance to the States Parties in a manner consistent with the Convention's principles of national responsibility and cooperation in implementation. For instance, it was accepted that the States Parties that have reported mined areas under their jurisdiction or control and those with the

⁶⁹ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 88.

⁷⁰ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraphs 89-94.

⁷¹ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraphs 95, 99-100.

⁷² *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraphs 101-103.

greatest numbers of mine victims will: ensure that clearing mined areas and assisting victims are identified as priorities in development plans and programmes, Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), UN Development Assistance Frameworks, and other appropriate mechanisms; ensure that the activities of the UN and other actors, where relevant, are incorporated into national mine action planning frameworks and are consistent with national priorities; call on relevant actors for cooperation to improve national and international policies and development strategies, enhance effectiveness in mine action, reduce the need to rely on international personnel and ensure that assistance in mine action is based on adequate surveys, needs analysis and cost effective approaches; and, promote technical cooperation, information exchange and other mutual assistance.⁷³

85. In the *Nairobi Action Plan* emphasises that States Parties in a position to do so will fulfil their obligations contained in Article 6 of the Convention by: promptly assisting States Parties with clearly demonstrated needs for external support for stockpile destruction, for mine clearance and mine risk education, and for the care, rehabilitation and reintegration of mine victims;⁷⁴ ensuring the sustainability of their commitments through a variety of means;⁷⁵ and, continuing to support, as appropriate, mine action to assist affected populations in areas under the control of armed non-State actors, particularly in areas under the control of actors which have agreed to abide by the Convention's norms.⁷⁶

86. In addition, the *Nairobi Action Plan* indicated that all States Parties will: encourage the international development community to play a significantly expanded role in mine action; use their participation in decision making bodies of relevant organizations to urge the UN and regional organizations and development banks and financial institutions to support States Parties requiring assistance in fulfilling the Convention's obligations; develop and strengthen means to enhance cooperation at the regional level to implement the Convention; and, pursue efforts to identify new and non-traditional sources of support.⁷⁷

Actions taken and progress made

87. A number of States Parties and organizations have heeded the calls made at the First Review Conference to ensure renewed commitments to implement the Convention, to ensure the sustainability of these commitments and to remain as dedicated in the future as in the past.⁷⁸ For example, Australia, announced, on 29 July 2000, a five-year renewal of its efforts by committing AUS\$ 75 million to mine action in addition to funds it has spent over the past ten years. The European Commission has renewed its commitment, establishing a mine action strategy for the period 2005 to 2007 in which it is projected that total EC assistance for mine action during this period will amount to at least €140 million. In addition, the level of funding that has passed through significant funding channels such as the UN Voluntary Trust Fund for Assistance in

⁷³ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Actions #40 to #43.

⁷⁴ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Actions #13, #23, #36 and #44.

⁷⁵ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #45.

⁷⁶ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #46.

⁷⁷ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Actions #47 to #50.

⁷⁸ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraphs 91 and 99, *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #45.

Mine Action and the International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance (ITF) has been maintained at consistently high levels.

88. In general since the First Review Conference, the volume of funding generated for activities consistent with the Convention's aims appears to have been sustained at a very high and constant level. As this tells little about where the funding is going, how well it is spent and the impact of investments, the Coordinator of the Resource Mobilisation Contact Group, Norway, requested that the Implementation Support Unit of the GICHD research this matter. Some initial findings from this research suggest: that while great sums of money continue to be generated, much of the funding in any particular year is directed to a few beneficiary countries; that better understanding the flow of mine action resources requires transparency on the part of all actors handling scarce mine action resources, and, that it is difficult for many actors to articulate the impact of mine action efforts, suggesting that further research in this area is required.

89. While there have been renewals of commitments to provide resources to implement the Convention, in some instances when States Parties have been close to having fulfilled their obligations under Article 5, funding appears to be drying up. For example, funding received by the Organization of American States for mine action programmes in Central and South America declined dramatically in 2005. This despite the fact that some States Parties have indicated that they could complete clearance of mined areas before their 10-year deadlines in accordance with Article 5 of the Convention if funding is provided until the job is done. That said, the primary responsibility for mine clearance lies with the mine-affected State Party, and the contributions of the international community can only be a supplement to their efforts. National ownership and coordination of mine action operations, at both the local and national levels, are essential if the efforts of mine-affected States Parties are to be effective and efficient.

90. The First Review Conference highlighted various means to ensure the sustainability of commitments, including by integrating support to mine action "through broader humanitarian, development, peace-building and peace support programmes."⁷⁹ Some progress has been made in understanding the integration of mine action into development programming. On 13 June 2005, Canada and the GICHD convened a dialogue on this matter in which 14 donor States, the European Commission and various international agencies participated. At this dialogue, it was concluded that while linking mine action to development is a valid approach for furthering assistance to mine-affected countries, the matter needs to be better understood and defined by development practitioners and mine action professionals. In addition, it was noted that the value in pursuing this approach is that mine action integrated into development offers possibilities that complement stand-alone efforts and those funded under humanitarian programmes. The UNDP has contributed to the matter of integrating mine action into development by providing advice and support to country programmes in developing and enhancing integration strategies and plans.

91. While the matter of integrating mine action into donors' development programming was discussed to some detail in 2005, it should be noted that integrating the removal of anti-personnel mines into broader efforts must also be explored in the context of peace and confidence-building programmes and peace-support initiatives. This will be particularly important with respect to assisting States Parties in clearing mined areas, as required, which do

⁷⁹ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 91.

not fall into the context of development but have a closer relationship to the humanitarian and disarmament goals of the Convention, and, to the opportunity presented by the Convention to build confidence between States.

92. In the lead-up to the First Review Conference, significant advances were made in understanding how States Parties which are in the process of fulfilling obligations can themselves integrate mine action into broader domains. This point was emphasized in the Nairobi Action Plan in which it was resolved that such States Parties “will ensure that clearing mined areas and assisting victims are identified as priorities, wherever this is relevant, in national, sub-national and sector development plans and programmes, Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), UN Development Assistance Frameworks, and other appropriate mechanisms.”⁸⁰ It is not, known, however, to what extent this matter has been acted upon since the First Review Conference, although the UNDP has indicated that it is willing to facilitate integration and provide follow-on assistance.

93. Moreover, no assessment has been made regarding the commitment of States Parties to “use, where relevant, their participation in decision making bodies of relevant organizations to urge the UN and regional organizations and the World Bank and regional development banks and financial institutions to support States Parties requiring assistance in fulfilling the Convention’s obligations.”⁸¹

94. With respect to the commitment in the Nairobi Action Plan to “continue to support, as appropriate, mine action to assist affected populations in areas under the control of armed non-State actors, particularly in areas under the control of actors which have agreed to abide by the Convention’s norms,”⁸² on 15 June 2005 Switzerland organised an event entitled *the role of States in moving forward with the implementation of Action 46 of the Nairobi Action Plan*. At this event, Switzerland presented a paper that it had commissioned to stimulate discussion regarding engaging armed groups with a view to implementing *Action 46*. In addition with respect to *Action 46*, the Geneva Call reported that progress has been made by armed non-State actors within India, the Philippines, Somalia and Sudan in their application of the mine action responsibilities contained in the Geneva Call’s *Deed of Commitment for Adherence to a Total Ban on Anti Personnel Mines and for Cooperation in Mine Action*.

Priorities for the period leading to the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties

95. Given the progress made in 2005, in the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties priorities should be as follows:

- (i) **In accordance with Actions #13, #23, #36, #44 and #45 of the Nairobi Action Plan, States Parties in a position to do so should act with greater urgency to fulfil their obligations under Article 6 of the Convention, taking into account the importance of providing necessary support until the implementation of Article 5 obligations has been completed, the long-term needs of landmine survivors, and the value of expanding the number of States Parties providing**

⁸⁰ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #40.

⁸¹ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #48.

⁸² *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III), Action #46.

increased assistance for mine action.

- (ii) The Resource Mobilisation Contact Group should continue to explore ways that resources can be made use of in the most efficient and effective way, particularly by drawing upon the experiences of field-based mine action actors.**
- (iii) In line with Action #45 of the Nairobi Action Plan, efforts should continue concerning, as appropriate, the integration of mine action into broader humanitarian and / or development assistance programmes, taking into account that this should complement, not replace, stand-alone mine action efforts and those funded under humanitarian programs.**
- (iv) In support of the application of Action #42 of the Nairobi Action Plan, increased support should be provided to mine-affected States Parties in their use of local resources and competence.**
- (v) Efforts should be undertaken to explore other areas where integrating support to mine action may be relevant, including in the context of integrating mine action into peace and confidence-building programmes and peace-support initiatives.**
- (vi) Pursuant to Action #40 of the Nairobi Action Plan, an assessment should be made of the extent to which relevant States Parties have identified the fulfilment of Convention obligations in development plans, Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and UN Development Assistance Frameworks.**
- (vii) Pursuant to Action #48 of the Nairobi Action Plan, an assessment should be made of the extent to which States Parties have used, where relevant, their participation in decision making bodies to urge the UN, regional organizations, the World Bank and other development banks and financial institutions to support States Parties requiring assistance in fulfilling Convention obligations.**

B. Transparency and the exchange of information

Status at the close of the First Review Conference

96. At the First Review Conference, the States Parties noted 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,” and, “(recognized) that transparency and effective information exchange will be equally crucial to fulfilling their obligations during the period 2005-2009.”⁸³

⁸³ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) paragraph 7.

97. At the close of the First Review Conference, of the then 141 States Parties that were required to submit an initial transparency report in accordance with Article 7.1, all but 6 had done so.⁸⁴ In addition, of the States Parties that were obliged to furnish updated information in 2004 in accordance with Article 7.2, all had done so with the exception of 24 States Parties. The overall reporting rate in the year of the First Review Conference exceeded 78 percent.

98. Notwithstanding a high rate of compliance, the States Parties noted at the First Review Conference that it will be a challenge to ensure that the States Parties continue to comply with their annual reporting obligations. They underlined that compliance will be particularly important for States Parties that are in the process of destroying stockpiled mines in accordance with Article 4, those that are in the process of clearing mined areas in accordance with Article 5, those that have decided to retain anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 3, and those undertaking measures in accordance with Article 9.⁸⁵

Nairobi Action Plan

99. In the *Nairobi Action Plan*, the States Parties stated that they will “fulfil their obligations to annually update Article 7 transparency reports.” In addition, they resolved to “maximise reporting as a tool to assist in implementation, particularly in cases where States Parties must still destroy stockpiled mines, clear mined areas, assist mine victims or take legal or other measures referred to in Article 9.” As well, with respect to those States Parties which have not yet complied with Article 7.1 of the Convention, the States Parties decided to “urge (these States Parties) to fulfil their obligation to provide initial transparency reports under Article 7 without further delay and request that the UN Secretary-General, as the recipient of these reports, call upon these States Parties to provide their reports.”⁸⁶

100. With respect to mines retained under Article 3, the First Review Conference noted that some States Parties on a voluntary basis have provided information on the intended purpose and actual use of mines retained under Article 3.⁸⁷ In the *Nairobi Action Plan*, this level of transparency was further encouraged. That is, it was accepted that all States Parties will “in situations where States Parties have retained mines in accordance with the exceptions in Article 3, provide information on the plans requiring the retention of mines for the development of and training in mine detection, mine clearance, or mine destruction techniques and report on the actual use of retained mines and the results of such use.”⁸⁸

101. The First Review Conference recalled that in 2000 the States Parties adopted *Form J* to provide States Parties with an opportunity to report voluntarily on other relevant matters, including matters pertaining to compliance and implementation not covered by the formal reporting requirements contained in Article 7, particularly information on assistance for the care

⁸⁴ The Final Report of the First Review Conference indicates that Saint Lucia had not submitted an initial report by the close of the Conference. This was an error as Saint Lucia submitted its initial report on 16 November 2004. The Final Report also omitted to mention that Cameroon and Gambia, each of which submitted a voluntary transparency report prior to joining the Convention, have not submitted an initial report since becoming States Parties.

⁸⁵ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 117.

⁸⁶ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Actions #51 and #52.

⁸⁷ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 109.

⁸⁸ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5) Action #54.

and rehabilitation, and social and economic reintegration, of mine victims.⁸⁹ The Nairobi Action Plan encouraged the use of this information sharing mechanism in that it was decided that “all States Parties will take full advantage of the flexibility of the Article 7 reporting process, including through the reporting format's *Form J*.”⁹⁰

102. At the First Review Conference, the States Parties noted that since the Convention's entry into force they have shared information and exchanged views on the application of many of the Articles of the Convention and that they concurred in the *Nairobi Action Plan* that they will, during the period 2005 to 2009, “exchange views and share their experiences in a cooperative and informal manner on the practical implementation of the various provisions of the Convention, including Articles 1, 2 and 3, to continue to promote effective and consistent application of these provisions.”⁹¹

103. At the First Review Conference, the States Parties recognized the value of extending to States not parties the concept of volunteering pertinent information. In the *Nairobi Action Plan*, it was accepted that “all States Parties will encourage States not parties, particularly those that have professed support for the object and purpose of the Convention, to provide voluntary transparency reports and to participate in the work of the Convention.”⁹²

104. The Nairobi Action Plan also recognized the value of other informal means to exchange information in that the States Parties expressed a willingness to “encourage individual States Parties, regional or other organizations to arrange on a voluntary basis regional and thematic conferences and workshops to advance the implementation of the Convention.”⁹³

Actions taken and progress made

105. As of 2 December 2005, a total of 144 of the [147] States which have ratified or acceded to the Convention were required to submit an initial report in accordance with Article 7.1. Since the First Review Conference, initial reports were submitted by [Estonia and Papua New Guinea]. Hence, all States Parties have now complied with their Article 7.1 obligations with the exception of [six] States Parties which had not yet provided an initial report: [Cameroon, Cape Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Guyana, and Sao Tome and Principe].⁹⁴

106. In terms of compliance with Article 7.2 of the Convention, of the States Parties which were required in 2005 to provide updated information covering the preceding calendar year, each has done so with the exception of the following [46] States Parties: [Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea,

⁸⁹ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 112.

⁹⁰ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5) Action #53.

⁹¹ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 115; *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5) Action #55.

⁹² *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #57.

⁹³ See *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5) Action #58.

⁹⁴ Ethiopia's initial report is due no later than 28 November 2005. Latvia is required to submit an initial transparency report as soon as practicable and in any event not later than 30 June 2006. Bhutan is required to submit an initial transparency report as soon as practicable and in any event not later than 31 July 2006. Vanuatu is required to submit an initial transparency report as soon as practicable and in any event not later than 28 August 2006.

Honduras, Kenya, Kiribati, Lesotho, Liberia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Madagascar, Maldives, Nauru, Niue, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, St. Kitts and Nevis, Sudan, Swaziland, Timor Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, and Uruguay]. As of 2 December 2005, the overall reporting rate in 2005 stood at [65] percent.

107. As noted, the First Review Conference emphasised that reporting in accordance with Article 7 is particularly important for States Parties which are in the process of fulfilling key obligations or which have retained anti-personnel mines for reasons permitted under Article 3 of the Convention. In this regard, the following was the status as of 2 December 2005:

- (i) Of the 16 States Parties which, as of the close of the First Review Conference, still had to destroy stockpiled mines in accordance with Article 4, each provided a transparency report in 2005 covering the previous calendar year with the exception of the following: [Algeria, Ethiopia, Guyana, Serbia and Montenegro and Sudan].
- (ii) Of the 46 States Parties which, as of the close of the First Review Conference, still had to clear mined areas in accordance with Article 5, each provided a transparency report in 2005 covering the previous calendar year with the exception of the following: [Algeria, Ecuador, Ethiopia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, and Swaziland.]
- (iii) Of the 89 States Parties which, as of the close of the First Review Conference, had not yet reported either that they had adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations or that they considered existing laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention, each provided a transparency report in 2005 covering the previous calendar year with the exception of the following: [Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Benin, Botswana, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Kenya, Kiribati, Liberia, Madagascar, Maldives, Nauru, Niue, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Swaziland, Timor-Leste, Togo and Uruguay].
- (iv) Of the 74 States Parties which, as of the close of the First Review Conference, had reported that they had retained mines for reasons permitted under Article 3, each provided updated information on this matter with the exception of the following: [Algeria, Botswana, Cameroon, Ecuador, Honduras, Kenya, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro, Sudan, Togo, and Uruguay]. An update on the numbers of mines retained and transferred for permitted reasons by all States Parties is contained in Annex VI.

108. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention took an active interest in promoting the pursuit of the aims of Action #54 of the Nairobi Action Plan. At the 13 / 17 June 2005 meeting of the Standing Committee, the Co-Chairs provided a forum for States Parties to volunteer relevant information and, in advance of

this meeting, they invited States Parties that have retained mines under Article 3 to make use of this forum.⁹⁵ A total of 12 States Parties took advantage of this opportunity to share information at the Standing Committee's meeting. Some States Parties also used their annual transparency reports as vehicles to volunteer information. An overview of additional information provided is contained in Annex VI. In addition, two States Parties – Argentina and Chile – proposed that the transparency reporting format be amended to better enable States Parties to provide information.

109. Since the First Review Conference, the following [42] States Parties have made use of Form J as a voluntary means of reporting: [Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Guinea Bissau, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Malawi, Malta, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Rwanda, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey and Zimbabwe.]

110. To facilitate an exchange of views and sharing of experiences pursuant to Action #55 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention incorporated this matter into the agenda for the Standing Committee's 13 / 17 June 2005 meeting, noting that the implementation of Articles 1, 2 and 3 would reflect on the robustness of the international norm against the use of anti-personnel mines and that it was important that all States Parties expressed their views on these issues.

111. Since the First Review Conference, Latvia and Poland provided voluntary transparency reports, sharing information on all pertinent matters mentioned in Article 7.⁹⁶ Sri Lanka also provided some information referred to in Article 7, although significantly it refrained from offering transparency on matters such as stockpiled anti-personnel mines.

112. Most types of information contained in reports submitted in accordance with Article 7 have been referred to elsewhere in this review. Two areas not covered include information on the conversion or decommissioning of anti-personnel mine production facilities, and, on the technical characteristics of mines at one time produced or currently held by States Parties. Since the First Review Conference, the following [1] additional State Party reported on the conversion or decommissioning of anti-personnel mine production facilities [Zimbabwe]. With respect to the technical characteristics of anti-personnel mines produced or currently held, the following [2] additional States Parties have reported on this matter since the First Review Conference [Latvia and Venezuela].⁹⁷

⁹⁵ The Co-Chairs suggested that States Parties may wish to volunteer three main pieces of information: (i) The purposes for which retained mines have been used and the results of this use, including for example: the mine detection, clearance or destruction techniques that have been / are being developed; the mine detection, clearance or destruction training that has been carried out; and, the number of personnel trained and to what standard. (ii) Plans for the further development of mine detection, clearance or detection techniques and further training which would result in the use of mines retained under Article 3. (iii) The number and types of mines that a State Party anticipates using in coming years for the development of and training in mine detection, mine clearance, or mine destruction techniques.

⁹⁶ Since submitting a report on a voluntary basis, Latvia acceded to the Convention.

⁹⁷ The information provided by Latvia was in the context of a voluntary report submitted before it had acceded to the Convention.

113. The informal Article 7 Contact Group, Coordinated by Belgium, has played a major role in raising the profile of transparency reporting obligations and in serving as a point of contact for requests for assistance. On 1 March 2005 – on the sixth anniversary of the Convention’s entry into force – the Coordinator of the Contact Group and the President of the First Review Conference wrote to all States Parties to remind the States Parties of their obligations, particularly the 30 April deadline to provide updated information covering the previous calendar year. In addition, the Contact Group met to discuss cooperative strategies and exchange of information on a regular basis. As well, the Contact Group Coordinator has suggested placing an emphasis on quality reporting. The United Nations also has helped States Parties comply with their reporting obligations. In 2005.

Priorities for the period leading to the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties

114. Given the progress made in 2005, in the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties priorities should be as follows:

- (i) **All States Parties should continue to be reminded of, and comply with, their annual reporting obligations in accordance with Article 7, and in particular, those States Parties that are in the process of destroying stockpiled mines in accordance with Article 4, those that are in the process of clearing mined areas in accordance with Article 5, those that have decided to retain anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 3, those undertaking measures in accordance with Article 9.**
- (ii) **All States Parties that have not yet provided an initial transparency report in accordance with Article 7, particularly given the need for these States Parties to confirm the presence or absence of stockpiled anti-personnel mines and mined areas, should be urged to comply with their transparency obligations.**
- (iii) **Voluntary means to share information, including other relevant information through the use of Form J, should continue to be encouraged and used. In addition, States Parties should continue to cooperate with and provide information to the mechanisms created to facilitate the general operations of the Convention.**
- (iv) **Those States Parties that have retained or transferred anti-personnel mines for reasons permitted under Article 3 of the Convention should continue to share information, as called for by Action #54 of the Nairobi Action Plan.**

C. Preventing and suppressing prohibited activities, and facilitating compliance

Status at the close of the First Review Conference

115. Regarding the prevention and suppression of prohibited activities and facilitating compliance, the States Parties noted at the First Review Conference that the primary responsibility for ensuring compliance with the Convention rests with each individual State Party establishing and applying, as necessary, measures outlined in Article 9.⁹⁸ This Article obliges each State Party to take all appropriate legal, administrative and other measures, including the imposition of penal sanctions, to prevent and suppress any activity prohibited to a State Party under the Convention undertaken by persons or on territory under its jurisdiction or control.

116. As of 3 December 2004, 38 States Parties had reported that they had adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations.⁹⁹ In addition, 18 States Parties had reported that they consider existing laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention.¹⁰⁰ A further 32 States Parties had reported that they were in the process of adopting legislation to implement the Convention.¹⁰¹

117. On the basis of this status, particularly given that 56 States Parties had not yet reported that they had taken any legislative measures in accordance with Article 9, it was noted that a challenge for the period 2005 to 2009 is for all States Parties that have not yet done so to ensure that they have in place the legislative measures required by Article 9 and to report on such measures in accordance with Article 7.¹⁰²

118. In addition to noting that they are individually responsible for ensuring compliance with the Convention, at the First Review Conference the States Parties noted that they are also collectively responsible for doing the same when a States Party has engaged in a prohibited activity, using the means available to them in Article 8 of the Convention.¹⁰³

⁹⁸ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 120.

⁹⁹ Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Monaco, Mauritius, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad & Tobago, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The Final Report of the First Review Conference omitted to mention that Belarus had indeed reported that it had adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations.

¹⁰⁰ Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Guinea-Bissau, the Holy See, Ireland, Lesotho, Mexico, the Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Tunisia.

¹⁰¹ Albania, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Cameroon, Chad, the Congo, Chile, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, El Salvador, Jamaica, Kenya, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, the Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Seychelles, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, and Yemen.

¹⁰² *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 122.

¹⁰³ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 119.

Nairobi Action Plan

119. According to the *Nairobi Action Plan*, all States Parties that had not yet done so will: develop and adopt legislative, administrative and other measures in accordance with Article 9 as soon as possible to fulfil their obligations under this Article thereby contributing to full compliance with the Convention and report annually on progress as required by Article 7; and, make their needs known to other States Parties and the ICRC or other relevant actors in instances when assistance is required to develop implementing legislation.¹⁰⁴ In addition, it was agreed that States Parties that have applied their legislation will share information on the application of implementing legislation.¹⁰⁵

120. Also with respect to measures outlined in Article 9, at the First Review Conference the States Parties acknowledged that it will be a challenge during the period 2005-2009 for most States Parties to ensure that measures to prevent and suppress prohibited activities – including the systematic dissemination of information regarding the Convention’s prohibitions to their armed forces, the development of armed forces training bulletins, the distribution of the text of the Convention in military academies and directives issued to police forces – are taken and reported upon.¹⁰⁶ To address this challenge in part it was accepted that all States Parties that had not yet done so will integrate the Convention’s prohibitions and requirements into their military doctrine as soon as possible.¹⁰⁷

121. In the *Nairobi Action Plan*, the States Parties also resolved, in instances when serious concerns about non-compliance cannot be resolved through measures adopted pursuant to Article 9, to seek clarification in a cooperative spirit in accordance with Article 8, and to call upon the UN Secretary-General to undertake the tasks foreseen in Article 8 as required.¹⁰⁸ As well, the States Parties accepted, in instances when armed non-State actors are operating in areas under the States Parties’ jurisdiction or control, to “make it clear that armed non-State actors are required to comply with the provisions of the Convention and that they will be called to account for violations of the Convention in accordance with measures taken under Article 9.”¹⁰⁹

Actions taken and progress made

122. To advance progress in the pursuit of these aims, several States Parties have taken actions at the national level and reported on steps taken, as required, in reports submitted in accordance with Article 7 of the Convention. In addition, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention invited States Parties to volunteer information at the Standing Committee’s 17 June 2005 meeting on their progress in developing and adopting legislative, administrative and other measures in accordance with Article 9, and, if relevant, to make their needs known if assistance is required. Moreover, a number of States Parties, the ICRC and the Implementation Support Unit of the GICHD continued to make it clear that they were ready to provide technical assistance should States Parties need it. The ICRC has reported

¹⁰⁴ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Actions #59 and #60.

¹⁰⁵ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #62.

¹⁰⁶ *Review of the operation and status of the Convention* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II), paragraph 123.

¹⁰⁷ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #61.

¹⁰⁸ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #63.

¹⁰⁹ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #64.

that, since the First Review Conference, it has been providing assistance for the development of national implementing legislation to [16] States Parties.

123. As a result of steps taken, since the First Review Conference: the following States Parties reported that they have adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations: [Bosnia and Herzegovina, El Salvador, Estonia, Niger, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Seychelles, Turkey and Yemen]; the following States Parties reported that they consider existing laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention: [Algeria, Andorra, Central African Republic, Jordan, Kiribati, Lithuania, Moldova and Papua New Guinea]; and, the following States Parties reported that they are in the process of adopting legislation to implement the Convention [Afghanistan, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Guinea, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone and Uruguay]. There are now 46 States Parties that have adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations and 26 States Parties now consider existing laws to be sufficient. Consequently, 75 States Parties have not yet adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations or reported that existing laws are sufficient, although 35 of these have indicated that they are in the process of adopting legislation to implement the Convention.

124. Since 3 December 2004, the States Parties remained committed to their agreement, as stated in Article 8, paragraph 1, "to work together in a spirit of cooperation to facilitate compliance by States Parties with their obligations under this Convention." In addition, it should be noted that since the First Review Conference, no State Party has submitted a request for clarification to a Meeting of the States Parties in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 2, or has proposed that a Special Meeting of the States Parties be convened in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 5.

125. Since the First Review Conference, the UN Department for Disarmament Affairs has 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 authorized in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 8. Since the First Review Conference, one State Party – Germany – has provided updated information for the list of experts.

Priorities for the period leading to the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties

126. Given the progress made in 2005, in the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties priorities should be as follows:

- (i) **While progress has been made by States Parties in fulfilling their Article 9 obligations, it remains a priority that the necessary appropriate legislative, administrative and other measures are taken by the [75] States Parties that have not yet done so. These States Parties are also encouraged to report once such measures are adopted.**
- (ii) **States Parties and relevant organizations in a position to do so should assist other States Parties that have indicated, consistent with Action #60 of the Nairobi Action Plan, that they would require legal assistance in drafting implementing legislation.**

- (iii) **States Parties that have not yet integrated the Convention's prohibitions and requirements into their military doctrine, in keeping with Action #61 of the Nairobi Action Plan, should do so as soon possible.**

D. Implementation Support

Status at the close of the First Review Conference

127. The First Review Conference recorded that “the effective functioning and full implementation of the Convention has been enhanced through the structures and mechanisms that exist in the Convention, that have been established pursuant to the decisions of the States Parties or that have emerged on an informal basis” and that the States Parties’ implementation mechanisms “will remain important during the period 2005-2009.”¹¹⁰

Nairobi Action Plan

128. In the *Nairobi Action Plan*, it was accepted that States Parties will: support the efforts of the Coordinating Committee; continue to make use of the support provided by the GICHD in hosting the meetings of the Standing Committees, through the Implementation Support Unit (ISU), and by administering the Sponsorship Programme; continue to provide on a voluntary basis, in accordance with their agreement with the GICHD, the necessary financial resources for the operation of the ISU; continue to reaffirm the valuable role of the United Nations for providing support to Meetings of the States Parties; and, continue to utilize informal mechanisms such as the Contact Groups, which have emerged to meet specific needs.¹¹¹

129. Also with respect to implementation support, the *Nairobi Action Plan* provides that “States Parties in a position to do so will on a voluntary basis contribute to the Sponsorship Programme thereby permitting widespread representation at meetings of the Convention, particularly by mine-affected developing States Parties, with the latter maximising this important investment by actively participating and sharing information on their problems, plans, progress and priorities for assistance.”¹¹²

Actions taken and progress made

130. Since the First Review Conference, the Coordinating Committee met 7 times to prepare for and assess the outcome of the Intersessional Work Programme and to coordinate matters relating to and flowing from the work of the Standing Committees with the work of the Meeting of the States Parties. The Coordinating Committee continued to operate in an open and transparent manner with summary reports of each meeting made available to all interested parties

¹¹⁰ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) paragraph 9.

¹¹¹ *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Actions #65 to #69.

¹¹² *Nairobi Action Plan* (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part III) Action #70.

on the web site of the GICHD.

131. The June 2005 meetings of the Standing Committees featured the largest ever number of registered representatives of States Parties, States not parties and interested organizations. In addition, these meetings featured a continued trend towards more focused discussions on the implementation, by individual States Parties, of key provisions of the Convention and on assuring that cooperation and assistance in the context of the Convention would continue to function well. These meetings were again supported by the GICHD and active participation was enhanced by interpretation services which were provided courtesy of voluntary contributions made by the European Commission and Canada.

132. The Implementation Support Unit of the GICHD continued to assist States Parties in all possible aspects of implementing the Convention's obligations and objectives. With the adoption of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, clear direction was provided to the ISU regarding the States Parties' priorities. Since the First Review Conference, the President, the President-Designate, the Co-Chairs, the Contact Group Coordinators, the Sponsorship Programme donors group and individual States Parties proceeded with initiatives to pursue the aims of the *Nairobi Action Plan*. The ISU responded accordingly, providing necessary support. The ongoing operations of the ISU were assured by voluntary contributions which were made by the following States Parties since the First Review Conference: [Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Chile, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway and Turkey].

133. The United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs and Croatia, with the assistance of the Implementation Support Unit of the GICHD, proceeded in 2005 in making arrangements for the Sixth Meeting of the States Parties. In addition, the States Parties continued to make use of Contact Groups concerning universalization, Article 7 reporting and resource mobilization.

134. Since the First Review Conference, there has been no increase in the number of donor States Parties contributing to the Sponsorship Programme. The group of donors includes: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. The Sponsorship Programme remains an important instrument in ensuring States Parties' and States not parties' participation in the Convention's meetings. It also remains important in enhancing universalization. Renewed effort is needed, from all States Parties in a position to do so, to contribute to this Programme and ensure its continuing success.

Annex I**States which have ratified or acceded to the Convention**

State	Date of Formal Acceptance	Date of Entry-into-force
Afghanistan	11 September 2002	1 March 2003
Albania	29 February 2000	1 August 2000
Algeria	9 October 2001	1 April 2002
Andorra	29 June 1998	1 March 1999
Angola	5 July 2002	1 January 2003
Antigua and Barbuda	3 May 1999	1 November 1999
Argentina	14 September 1999	1 March 2000
Australia	14 January 1999	1 July 1999
Austria	29 June 1998	1 March 1999
Bahamas	31 July 1998	1 March 1999
Bangladesh	6 September 2000	1 March 2001
Barbados	26 January 1999	1 July 1999
Belarus	3 September 2003	1 March 2004
Belgium	4 September 1998	1 March 1999
Belize	23 April 1998	1 March 1999
Benin	25 September 1998	1 March 1999
Bhutan	18 August 2005	1 February 2006
Bolivia	9 June 1998	1 March 1999
Bosnia and Herzegovina	8 September 1998	1 March 1999
Botswana	1 March 2000	1 September 2000
Brazil	30 April 1999	1 October 1999
Bulgaria	4 September 1998	1 March 1999
Burkina Faso	16 September 1998	1 March 1999
Burundi	22 October 2003	1 April 2004
Cambodia	28 July 1999	1 January 2000
Cameroon	19 September 2002	1 March 2003
Canada	3 December 1997	1 March 1999
Cape Verde	14 May 2001	1 November 2001
Central African Republic	8 November 2002	1 May 2003
Chad	6 May 1999	1 November 1999
Chile	10 September 2001	1 March 2002
Colombia	6 September 2000	1 March 2001
Comoros	19 September 2002	1 March 2003
Congo, Republic of	4 May 2001	1 November 2001
Costa Rica	17 March 1999	1 September 1999
Côte d'Ivoire	30 June 2000	1 December 2000
Croatia	20 May 1998	1 March 1999
Cyprus	17 January 2003	1 July 2003
Czech Republic	26 October 1999	1 April 2000
Democratic Republic of the Congo	2 May 2002	1 November 2002
Denmark	8 June 1998	1 March 1999
Djibouti	18 May 1998	1 March 1999
Dominica	26 March 1999	1 September 1999
Dominican Republic	30 June 2000	1 December 2000
Ecuador	29 April 1999	1 October 1999

State	Date of Formal Acceptance	Date of Entry-into-force
El Salvador	27 January 1999	1 July 1999
Equatorial Guinea	16 September 1998	1 March 1999
Eritrea	27 August 2001	1 February 2002
Estonia	12 May 2004	1 November 2004
Ethiopia	17 December 2004	1 June 2005
Fiji	10 June 1998	1 March 1999
France	23 July 1998	1 March 1999
Gabon	8 September 2000	1 March 2001
Gambia	23 September 2002	1 March 2003
Germany	23 July 1998	1 March 1999
Ghana	30 June 2000	1 December 2000
Greece	25 September 2003	1 March 2004
Grenada	19 August 1998	1 March 1999
Guatemala	26 March 1999	1 September 1999
Guinea	8 October 1998	1 April 1999
Guinea Bissau	22 May 2001	1 November 2001
Guyana	5 August 2003	1 February 2004
Holy See	17 February 1998	1 March 1999
Honduras	24 September 1998	1 March 1999
Hungary	6 April 1998	1 March 1999
Iceland	5 May 1999	1 November 1999
Ireland	3 December 1997	1 March 1999
Italy	23 April 1999	1 October 1999
Jamaica	17 July 1998	1 March 1999
Japan	30 September 1998	1 March 1999
Jordan	13 November 1998	1 May 1999
Kenya	23 January 2001	1 July 2001
Kiribati	7 September 2000	1 March 2001
Latvia	1 July 2005	1 January 2006
Lesotho	2 December 1998	1 June 1999
Liberia	23 December 1999	1 June 2000
Liechtenstein	5 October 1999	1 April 2000
Lithuania	12 May 2003	1 November 2003
Luxembourg	14 June 1999	1 December 1999
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	9 September 1998	1 March 1999
Madagascar	16 September 1999	1 March 2000
Malawi	13 August 1998	1 March 1999
Malaysia	22 April 1999	1 October 1999
Maldives	7 September 2000	1 March 2001
Mali	2 June 1998	1 March 1999
Malta	7 May 2001	1 November 2001
Mauritania	21 July 2000	1 January 2001
Mauritius	3 December 1997	1 March 1999
Mexico	9 June 1998	1 March 1999
Moldova, Republic of	8 September 2000	1 March 2001
Monaco	17 November 1998	1 May 1999
Mozambique	25 August 1998	1 March 1999
Namibia	21 September 1998	1 March 1999

State	Date of Formal Acceptance	Date of Entry-into-force
Nauru	7 August 2000	1 February 2001
Netherlands	12 April 1999	1 October 1999
New Zealand	27 January 1999	1 July 1999
Nicaragua	30 November 1998	1 May 1999
Niger	23 March 1999	1 September 1999
Nigeria	27 September 2001	1 March 2002
Niue	15 April 1998	1 March 1999
Norway	9 July 1998	1 March 1999
Panama	7 October 1998	1 April 1999
Papua New Guinea	28 June 2004	1 December 2004
Paraguay	13 November 1998	1 May 1999
Peru	17 June 1998	1 March 1999
Philippines	15 February 2000	1 August 2000
Portugal	19 February 1999	1 August 1999
Qatar	13 October 1998	1 April 1999
Romania	30 November 2000	1 May 2001
Rwanda	8 June 2000	1 December 2000
Saint Kitts and Nevis	2 December 1998	1 June 1999
Saint Lucia	13 April 1999	1 October 1999
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1 August 2001	1 February 2002
Samoa	23 July 1998	1 March 1999
San Marino	18 March 1998	1 March 1999
Sao Tome and Principe	31 March 2003	1 September 2003
Senegal	24 September 1998	1 March 1999
Serbia and Montenegro	18 September 2003	1 March 2004
Seychelles	2 June 2000	1 December 2000
Sierra Leone	25 April 2001	1 October 2001
Slovakia	25 February 1999	1 August 1999
Slovenia	27 October 1998	1 April 1999
Solomon Islands	26 January 1999	1 July 1999
South Africa	26 June 1998	1 March 1999
Spain	19 January 1999	1 July 1999
Sudan	13 October 2003	1 April 2004
Suriname	23 May 2002	1 November 2002
Swaziland	22 December 1998	1 June 1999
Sweden	30 November 1998	1 May 1999
Switzerland	24 March 1998	1 March 1999
Tajikistan	12 October 1999	1 April 2000
Tanzania, United Republic of	13 November 2000	1 May 2001
Thailand	27 November 1998	1 May 1999
Timor-Leste	7 May 2003	1 November 2003
Togo	9 March 2000	1 September 2000
Trinidad and Tobago	27 April 1998	1 March 1999
Tunisia	9 July 1999	1 January 2000
Turkey	25 September 2003	1 March 2004
Turkmenistan	19 January 1998	1 March 1999
Uganda	25 February 1999	1 August 1999
United Kingdom	31 July 1998	1 March 1999
Uruguay	7 June 2001	1 December 2001

State	Date of Formal Acceptance	Date of Entry-into-force
Vanuatu	16 September 2005	1 March 2006
Venezuela	14 April 1999	1 October 1999
Yemen	1 September 1998	1 March 1999
Zambia	23 February 2001	1 August 2001
Zimbabwe	18 June 1998	1 March 1999

Annex III

Deadlines for States Parties to destroy or ensure the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas under their jurisdiction or control in accordance with Article 5

	2009					2010					2011					2012					2013					2014					2015																												
	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N
Deadlines for States Parties to destroy or ensure the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas under their jurisdiction or control in accordance with Article 5																																																											
Afghanistan																																																											
Albania																																																											
Algeria																																																											
Angola																																																											
Argentina																																																											
Bosnia and Herzegovina																																																											
Burundi																																																											
Cambodia																																																											
Chad																																																											
Chile																																																											
Colombia																																																											
Congo, Republic of the																																																											
Croatia																																																											
Cyprus																																																											
DRC																																																											
Denmark																																																											
Ecuador																																																											
Eritrea																																																											
Ethiopia																																																											
France																																																											
Greece																																																											
Guatemala																																																											
Guinea Bissau																																																											
Jordan																																																											
Macedonia, the FYR of																																																											
Malawi																																																											
Mauritania																																																											
Mozambique																																																											
Nicaragua																																																											
Niger																																																											
Peru																																																											
Rwanda																																																											
Senegal																																																											
Serbia and Montenegro																																																											
Sudan																																																											
Swaziland																																																											
Tajikistan																																																											
Thailand																																																											
Tunisia																																																											
Turkey																																																											
Uganda																																																											
United Kingdom																																																											
Venezuela																																																											
Yemen																																																											
Zambia																																																											
Zimbabwe																																																											

Table 2: Progress in implementation

Afghanistan		
Status recorded at the First Review Conference:	Progress reported since the First Review Conference:	National demining plan / programme:
<p>The known mine and UXO contaminated area was estimated to total approximately 788.7 square kilometres in 206 districts of 31 provinces. Of this total, 157.7 square kilometres was considered “high impact” areas which included important agricultural land, irrigation systems, residential areas, grazing land and roads. Nearly 300 square kilometres of minefields and 522 square kilometres of battle area had been cleared since 1989 with 250,000 anti-personnel mines and 3.3 million items of UXO destroyed. In addition 10.6 million Afghans had received mine risk education training.</p>	<p>A Landmine Impact Survey (LIS) was recently completed and identified that some 2,368 Afghan communities are impacted by mines or UXO. Of those Afghans living with mines and UXO, 17 percent live in high impact communities, 21 percent in medium impacted communities and 62 percent in low impacted communities. The survey identified 4,514 separate suspect hazardous areas and estimated that 716 million square metres are contaminated by mines. From March 2004 to March 2005, the Mine Action Programme for Afghanistan cleared over 100 million square metres, destroying over a million devices, including some 11,000 anti-personnel mines. Based on LIS results and on Afghanistan’s rural development and national infrastructure rehabilitation plans, Afghanistan is working to develop a strategy to address the worst of the contamination by 2009. It expects to present a detailed plan at the 6MSP. Afghanistan also added a mine action goal to its Millennium Development Goal report,</p>	<p>Afghanistan has directed that the UN Mine Action Centre for Afghanistan (UNMACA) be recognised as the interim coordination body for Afghanistan for Mine Action. It has worked with UNMACA to convert Convention obligations and deadlines into national strategic and operational plans.</p> <p>Afghanistan has included mine action considerations in broader strategic planning, for example, listing Convention deadlines for clearing all emplaced anti-personnel mines as an indicator for Afghanistan’s achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.</p>

	document which was made public in September 2005.	
Albania		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>A 120 kilometre long stretch of Albanian territory along the border with Serbia and Montenegro was suspected to contain anti-personnel mines. In 1999, a landmine impact survey identified 102 contaminated areas in the Tropoje, Has and Kukes districts covering 15.25 million square metres. Between 2000 and 2003, around 10 million square metres of formerly contaminated land were released through survey and clearance activities with 6,804 anti-personnel mines destroyed. Of the original 15.25 million square metres of suspected mined areas, less than 6 million square metres remained.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Albania reported 182,792 square metres cleared, 423,852.22 square metres released through clearance and surveys and 2,265 anti-personnel mines destroyed in 2004. Demining progress was limited and the clearance objectives set out in the National Demining Plan could not be fully achieved. For this reason, a revision of the National Mine Action Strategy was deemed necessary. The mission of the Albanian Mine Action Programme is now to render Albania free from the impact of mines and UXO by December 2006 and free from mines and UXO by 2009.</p> <p>About 1 million square metres of contaminated land is planned to be released as mine free during 2005. To this purpose one survey and clearance project funded by the EC and implemented by UNDP through Danish Church Aid and another humanitarian demining project funded by Germany, EU and Danish private sources, implemented also</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>The mission of the Albanian Mine Action Programme now is to make Albania free from the impact of mines and UXO by December 2006 and free from mines and UXO by 2009.</p> <p>A National Mine Action Plan for Completion has been formulated. The plan identifies the national strategic objectives for the main pillars of mine action during 2005-2009 as well as a comprehensive implementation plan. In addition, the plan sets out the implementation mechanisms for 1) planning and coordination of mine action in Albania which includes also the monitoring and quality assurance of the mine action activities and 2) the delivery of the programme.</p>

	<p>by DCA are currently ongoing in Northeast Albania. As at the end of August 2005, 361,698.4 square metres had been released while 852 mines and UXO had been found and destroyed.</p>	
Algeria		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Algeria's areas mined by the colonial Army were reported located on Algeria's eastern border with Tunisia and western border with Morocco. These areas were reported covering 5,676 hectares and containing 3,064,180 anti-personnel mines. Additionally, some areas in the North were suspected to be mined by terrorist groups. Over 25 years of demining activities, 7,819,120 mines laid over 1,482 kilometres were destroyed and 50,006 hectares were cleared, representing 58 percent of all mined areas in Algeria. Mine-affected areas had been marked.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Since 27 November 2004, the National Popular Army has carried out clearance in the affected areas and as a result destroyed 76,978 mines over a 5 month-period (until 19 April 2005).</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>A long term demining programme for the whole of Algeria is currently being drawn up on the basis of the information held on areas mined by the colonial army and areas newly contaminated by the terrorist groups.</p>
Angola		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>All 18 Angolan provinces were thought to be affected by mines. Demining activities had taken place in Angola for several years and</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>In 2004, 7,351 mines were removed by several demining operators. The total cleared area amounted to 10,669,335 square metres.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>On 6 May 2004, Angola signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Survey Action Centre to undertake a</p>

<p>institutional structures had been established. Thirty-two (32) organizations – including 22 Angolan non-governmental organizations – and 12 commercial enterprises were active in mine clearance and mine risk education. In 2002 and the first quarter of 2003, non-governmental organisations working in mine action reported clearing of about 2.8 million square metres of land, surveying of about 7.8 million square metres and destroying more than 5,000 mines and 13,000 pieces of UXO.</p>		<p>Landmine Impact Survey. Information from the survey will be used by Angola’s national demining commission (CNIDAH) in the development of the five-year mine action strategic plan, and by all implementing partners at the operational level. CNIDAH intends to develop a medium term strategy for 2006-2010 which would cover the whole of the national territory.</p>
<p>Argentina</p>		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>The Falklands / Malvinas were affected with 20,000 mines. Following an agreement concluded on 11 October 2001, Argentina and the United Kingdom began working together to assess the cost and feasibility of mine clearance options in the Falklands / Malvinas. On 26-27 October 2004, a meeting of the Joint Argentine-British Working Group took place in London to carry out the demining feasibility study.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>The joint Argentine-British Working Group met in Buenos Aires on 27-28 April 2005 and in London on 7-8 July 2005. During these meetings, a first draft of the Preliminary Study was considered and some progress was registered with the definition of the technical and financial aspects as well as with administrative and contractual questions. These questions will continue to be analyzed until the next meeting of the Working Group, scheduled to take place in October 2005.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>See previous column.</p>

Bosnia and Herzegovina		
Status recorded at the First Review Conference:	Progress reported since the First Review Conference:	National demining plan / programme:
<p>It was estimated that there are over 18,000 suspected minefields located mostly between the former lines of confrontation. A landmine impact survey completed in December 2003 identified 1,366 mine-impacted communities of which 11 percent were categorised as “high impact” and 51 percent “medium impact. Approximately 2,000 square kilometres were suspected of containing mines. From 1997 to the end of 2003, approximately 50 square kilometres were cleared and 180 square kilometres of suspected areas were reduced further through general and technical surveys.</p>	<p>In 2004, Bosnia and Herzegovina cleared 6,612,716 square metres and destroyed 3,106 anti-personnel mines. Additionally, 465.72 square kilometres were reduced by further analysis and assessment of suspected areas within the systematic survey. In 2005, Bosnia and Herzegovina’s plan was to clear 4,500,000 square metres and free up 6,400,000 square metres through technical survey. As of June 2005, Bosnia and Herzegovina had cleared around 2,000,000 square metres of suspected contaminated area and destroyed 143 anti-personnel mines, 20 Anti-vehicle mines and 243 UXO.</p>	<p>Bosnia and Herzegovina’s vision is that it will be a country not contaminated with mines and UXO, where communities and individuals can live a safe, peaceful and normal life, where development can take place unimpeded, and where victims of mines are integrated into society. During the period from 2005 to 2009, Bosnia and Herzegovina shall ensure the re-establishment of a safe environment for the citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina thereby allowing a safe return to the conditions of normal life and development. Bosnia and Herzegovina’s operational objectives include, by 2009, through reduction during general and technical survey and risk area clearance, eliminating the first category of suspected area in high impacted communities, undertaking necessary mine action interventions on risk areas regardless of priority categorization in order to significantly reduce the threat from identified mine fields, significantly increasing the proportion of technical survey in the overall scope of operations, and conducting permanent marking of</p>

		suspected locations that are not going to be subject of reduction or clearance in the period 2005-2009.
Burundi		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Fourteen (14) areas had been identified as mined or suspected to be mined in 5 provinces. Burundi did not yet have a national mine action programme but reported that, with the help of UNICEF, a mine risk education programme had been functioning since July 2003.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>A landmine impact survey was due to commence in July 2005.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Burundi's key priorities for 2005 were to develop a comprehensive mine-information database upon which to establish a sound national strategy; to establish national standards and a quality assurance capacity to enable mine action operations to be implemented in a safe and cost-effective manner; to reduce the impact of the landmine and UXO threat through proactive and comprehensive mine action operations, especially to the most vulnerable; and, to enhance governmental capacity for mine action coordination and policy making.</p>
Cambodia		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>A landmine impact survey completed in April 2002 identified 4,466 square kilometres of areas suspected to contain mines or UXO. Almost half of Cambodia's 13,908 villages in all 24 provinces were affected by mines with approximately 12 percent of these facing high levels of contamination.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>In 2004, 13,129 square kilometres were cleared and 71,534 anti-personnel mines were destroyed.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Cambodia's vision for mine action is to carry out the compliance with Convention obligations and to keep on moving towards zero impact from mines by clearing contaminated areas and by developing intensive mine risk education with the increasing support of a national capacity.</p>

<p>Approximately 5 million people were at risk. Approximately 10 percent – or 424.7 square kilometres – of suspected mined areas were considered high priorities. Between 1992 and 2003, approximately 251.72 square kilometres were cleared with 419,794 anti-personnel mines, 12,633 antitank mines and 949,922 UXO destroyed.</p>		<p>The medium-term vision is to move towards zero impact from landmines and UXO by 2012, in order to enhance security, alleviate poverty and to sustain development, as ensured by clearing all severe/high risk suspected mined areas and developing intensive mine risk education for the medium and low suspected areas. The long-term vision is to have a Cambodia free from the negative humanitarian and socio-economic impacts of landmines / UXO by 2020 by sustaining a national capability to address the problem in non-cleared and remote areas from 2012.</p>
<p>Chad</p>		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>A landmine impact survey completed in May 2001 identified 249 affected communities in 23 of Chad’s 28 departments, 417 areas suspected of containing mines and 1,081 square kilometres of suspected affected areas. Between September 2000 and December 2003 over 2.2 million square metres were cleared with 11,931 mines, 65,551 UXO and 94 bombs destroyed.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>MRE activities directed at the Sudanese refugees and local villages were organised in the Chad-Sudan border. The priority areas for 2004-2005 were Wadi Doum and the border area with Sudan. Between May 2004 and April 2005, 244,227 square metres were demined; 3,630 anti-personnel mines and 67,507 UXO were destroyed. In the second half of 2005, a technical survey is planned in the region of Fada.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Chad has developed a national strategic mine action plan which is taken into account in Chad’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP). The plan’s vision is a Chad free from the impact of mines and unexploded ordnance by the end of year 2009. Free from the impact of mines meaning a country in which: mines blocking access to infrastructure (roads, houses), water, fields and pasture will be removed or in which marked access channels will be created; every contaminated area which prevents the</p>

		<p>implementation of a development project or which prevents access by a community to a vital area, will be cleared. All areas that remain uncleared will be marked; a mine awareness programme for communities living by the affected marked areas will be maintained; demining capabilities will be maintained to deal with newly identified contaminated areas, and upon request, to clear areas that have a socio-economic impact on populations and to maintain markings around uncleared areas.</p>
<p>Chile</p>		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>A total of 114,830 mines had been laid in 26 areas of Regions I and II (northern Chile), 123 mines in Region V (central Chile) and 8,490 mines in 10 different areas of Region XII (southern Chile). There were a total of 308 minefields in Chile. In 2003-2004, Chile cleared the 123 mines of Region V and at the time it was conducting demining activities in 5 minefields of Region I, where to that point, 765 anti-personnel mines had been found and destroyed.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>As of May 2005, the work conducted in 5 minefields of Region I – which started on 3 August 2004 – resulted in the detection and destruction of 4,943 anti-personnel mines and 2,032 anti-tank mines.</p> <p>All minefields are marked and registered in IMSMA and 70 percent of them have been reviewed with the EOD IS-Survey system.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>The National Demining Plan was completed in January 2003. It describes a set of activities that will be carried out to fulfill the obligations that arose from the ratification of the Convention.</p>

Colombia		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>There were 3,697 suspected mined areas of which 1,371 had been geo-referenced. Some of the minefields identified were situated around water points, schools, access routes and public infrastructure. Illegal armed groups had continued to utilize anti-personnel mines (mostly improvised explosive devices) in a massive and indiscriminate way. Thirty (30) of the 32 departments in Colombia were affected, principally in rural areas.</p> <p>Colombia was in the process of identifying the areas mined by the armed forces, which were areas under the jurisdiction of the government of Colombia and in accordance with the national plan, will be cleared in compliance with the Convention. It was also in the process of: training in humanitarian demining with an emphasis on developing national standards; adopting appropriate national standards for clearance; and, training 7 divisionary groups of the Engineering School of the National Army to attend to humanitarian emergencies caused by anti-personnel mines and UXO and the associated</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Achievements in 2005 included the design of a destruction plan for the military forces' minefields, the elaboration of a protocol for the clearance of minefields, technical cooperation agreements with the OAS for the training of FFMM in clearance work and financial cooperation agreements with the OAS for the destruction of 3 minefields.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Colombia has a 4-year national mine action plan <i>Plan Estratégico Nacional de Acción Integral contra MAP Y MUSE 2004-2009</i>.</p>

<p>threat to life, personal integrity and the right of movement of communities.</p>		
<p>Congo</p>		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Congo had reported that areas in the South-west of its territory, on the border with Angola, might be mined. Further investigations were going to be conducted to determine whether the suspected mined areas were indeed mined and what kind of demining programme needs to be put in place.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p>
<p>Croatia</p>		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>In 2004, an estimated 1,350 square kilometres were suspected to be mined, with mines found in 14 of the 21 counties of Croatia. Through clearance activities and the conduct of general and technical surveys, Croatia had reduced the size of its suspected mined areas to 1,350 square kilometres from approximately 4,500 square kilometres since 2000. Between 1998 and January 2003, 173.62 square kilometres had been demined and handed over to the community. Approximately 300,000 explosive remnants</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>In 2004, 33,684,932 square metres were given back to the communities – 10,601,198 square metres by demining and 23,083,734 square metres by surveying. Twenty-four (24) commercial companies and the NGO Norwegian Peoples Aid conducted demining and surveying. A total of 595 pyrotechnics, 45 demining machines and 123 mine detection dogs were involved in these activities. The total mine suspected area is marked with 7,818 warning signs. All counties, municipalities and towns are familiar with the situation of</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Croatia has a national mine action programme containing annual targets for survey and clearance activities for the period 2000-2010.</p>

of war still required clearance.	mine suspected areas, their borders, position and the number of warning signs. They were given maps and provided with a presentation on the issue.	
Cyprus		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>There were 23 minefields reported containing 5,000 anti-personnel mines under the control of the Republic of Cyprus. Cyprus had records for all its minefields. From 1983 to January 2002, Cyprus had cleared 10 minefields adjacent to the UN-controlled buffer zone and more than 11,000 mines had been destroyed between January 2000 and January 2002. All remaining minefields under the control of Cyprus had been fenced and marked in accordance with Article 5 obligations.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>The demining process in the buffer zone, which contains 7 Cypriot National Guard minefields and 1 suspected area representing approximately 254,743 square metres with 1,024 anti-personnel mines, commenced on 16 November 2004 and was expected to be completed in November 2005. At the end of January 2005, one National Guard minefield had been cleared. With regards to the 23 minefields located outside the buffer zone in areas under the control of Cyprus, as of June 2005, 505 anti-personnel mines had been removed and destroyed from 6 minefields. While demining activities were going on, a public information campaign was conducted to ensure awareness.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Cyprus undertakes the responsibility to destroy all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under its jurisdiction or control, within the time limits specified in the Ottawa Convention but not later than June 2013. A detailed timetable has been drafted and annexed to the <i>Cyprus National Plan for the Implementation of the Ottawa Convention</i>. Furthermore, the provisions of Article 5 are being applied for minefields laid by the National Guard within the buffer zone with the objective of clearing the buffer zone of all the minefields.</p>
Democratic Republic of the Congo		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Suspected mined areas affected 165 villages in 11 provinces.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>From December 2004 to September 2005, the Democratic Republic of the Congo worked</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Some demining activities have taken place but a demining programme is not yet in</p>

	<p>with the UN Mine Action Centre in cooperation with demining operators to identify new mined areas in the Provinces of Katanga, Sud-Kivu and Equateur. In Katanga and South Kivu, the survey conducted by Dan Church Aid in the district of Tanganyika identified 96 new dangerous areas. Other surveys are going on South Kivu. A survey is also planned for the district of Thuapa in Equateur.</p>	<p>place.</p>
<p>Denmark</p>		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Mines from the Second World War were reported located on the 10-kilometre long peninsula of Skallingen. This area contained approximately 8,300 anti-personnel mines and 1,600 anti-tank mines but parts of the minefields had been engulfed into the North Sea. The remaining minefields were reported located in a long narrow area stretching from north to south and at the southern end of Skallingen.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Denmark reported that the affected peninsula of Skallingen is public property and has been placed under a conservation order according to an EU Council directive of May 1992 under the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora. Skallingen is also protected by the Ramsar Convention of 2 February 1996. The Danish authorities continue to keep the area, which is open to the public, under tight surveillance, and Denmark is convinced that in the near future it will be possible to find ways and means to officially declare Skallingen a mine safe area.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>See previous column.</p>

Ecuador		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Ecuador had reported 5 mine-affected areas and 2 suspected mined areas, all located on the border with Peru, with 6,682 mines emplaced over an estimated area of 426,481 square metres. Four (4) provinces and 7 cantons were affected or suspected to be affected.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>In 1998, Ecuador and Peru agreed to clear landmines from their bordering territories. In March 2001, Ecuador signed an agreement to implement the OAS Assistance Programme for Mine Action. Demining operations are projected to be completed by 2010.</p>
Eritrea		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>A landmine impact survey had identified 481 mine-affected communities and approximately 129 square kilometres of suspected mined area. There were a total of 132 mined areas under the control of Eritrea, with 87 of these considered high or medium impact. From 2000 to June 2004, Eritrea cleared 52,484,762 square metres, destroying 4,781 anti-personnel mines and 50,399 UXO.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>From the beginning of operations in 2000 to 30 April 2005, 4,793 anti-personnel mines have been destroyed. A technical survey is planned to commence in 2006. MRE has been conducted by 6 teams of Eritrean Demining Operations and 2 teams of UNMEE Mine Action Coordination Centre in Zoba Gash Barka, Debub and Southern Red Sea with a total of 212,000 beneficiaries. MRE will be integrated in the elementary school curriculum and 229 teachers will be trained in Zoba Gash Barka and Debub as a result of an agreement between the Ministry of Education and UNICEF.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Eritrea's vision is that it will be a country with a physical environment that will permit free movement, uninhibited development and poverty reduction initiatives; where victims are assisted and integrated into society, and no new victims are occurring due to mines and UXO. Strategic objectives 2005-2009 include: completing technical survey and task assessment planning, clearance (area to be cleared is about 48 square kilometres), marking, integrated MRE and victim assistance to eliminate the impact in the remaining 116 high and medium impact communities by the end of 2009; supporting</p>

		<p>development and rehabilitation initiatives as necessary; conducting national, regional and local MRE activities to reduce new casualties, assist clearance of UXO through identification of contaminated locations, and carry out marking in 344 low impact communities through the conduct of community-based MRE relations and dedicated marking teams. There are a total of 132 mined areas located inside the border area (temporary security zone) with 87 of these scheduled for clearance during 2005-2009. The remaining, 45 low impact areas will be addressed in the following five-year period.</p>
<p>Ethiopia</p>		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:¹</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>An impact survey was completed 2004 with 1,492 communities identified as impacted by anti-personnel mines and UXO. Three regions in northern and eastern Ethiopia account for over 80 percent of the landmine impact in the country. Areas surveyed by the Ethiopian Mine Action Office (EMAO) and waiting clearance are marked and danger signs are erected around them in order to warn local</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>EMAO has devised a strategic plan for the period 2004-2007, with the main objectives being: the removal of mines and UXO's socio-economic impact on communities within Ethiopia; the reduction and clearance of mined and UXO impacted land in accordance with regional and national rehabilitation and development plans; the provision of mine risk education, victim</p>

¹ As of the close of the First Review Conference, the Convention had not yet entered into force for Ethiopia and thus no information on status of efforts to fulfil Article 5 obligations by Ethiopia had been recorded.

	<p>residents of the dangers. The EMAO has deployed four clearance companies in Afar and Tigray regions. Each company comprises 54 deminers, 13 medics and one MRE and community liaison officer. In order to enhance the ongoing mine clearance, two more companies have started training and one international NGO is at the initial process to engage in mine clearing activities. Since the deployment of EMAO MRE personnel in the field, 77,482 male and 56,274 female have received MRE training in and around minefields. More than 10 square kilometres of land were cleared in 2004, 1,102 anti-personnel mines, 105 anti-tank mines and 11,846 UXO cleared and destroyed. Up to May 2005, more than 17 square kilometres were cleared and 88 anti-personnel mines, 48 anti-tank mines and 3,911 UXO cleared and destroyed.</p>	<p>assistance and integration with the society; and, providing support to the government in conducting stockpile destruction.</p>
<p>France</p>		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference:</p> <p>La Doudah military depot, under French control in Djibouti, was suspected to contain mines. It was partially surveyed in 1989 and was subsequently marked and fenced. Another survey had recently been conducted and the details of the clearance that had to be</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>At the beginning of 2005, military experts were sent to Djibouti to decide on a schedule and on organizational matters related to clearance work. Their conclusions indicated that clearance activities could begin in 2006 and should be completed at the latest in 2008.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>See previous column.</p>

<p>carried out were going to be announced shortly.</p>		
Greece		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>A total of 24,751 anti-personnel mines were emplaced in minefields close to Greece's borders. Additionally there were minefields from the Second World War throughout Hellenic territory, especially in North-western Greece. Greece had cleared its border with Bulgaria, destroying 25,000 mines and hundreds of UXO. Demining was taking place on the Albanian border. The minefields on Greece's border with Turkey were fenced. Between 1954 and 28 May 2002. More than 150,000 square kilometres had been cleared.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Of the minefields reported at the beginning of 2004 (in the frontiers in the region of Evros river), 30 percent were eliminated and of the 24,751 anti-personnel mines emplaced in these minefields, 4,372 were cleared.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Mine clearance is expected to be completed by 2011, 3 years ahead of Greece's deadline.</p>
Guatemala		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Guatemala had no defined mined areas, but mines and explosive devices scattered over its territory in 13 districts. During demining operations conducted between January 2001 and March 2004, Guatemala had destroyed 169 explosive artefacts, some of which were anti-personnel mines.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Between March 2004 and March 2005 Guatemala destroyed 40 explosive artefacts, some of which were anti-personnel mines.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Guatemala has a national demining plan, <i>Plan Nacional de Desminado</i>, according to which demining operations are due to be completed in 2005.</p>

Guinea Bissau		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>In order to measure the extent of the problem, a general impact survey of Bissau's suspected areas was launched in 2004. Seventeen (17) suspected minefields had been identified in areas in Bissau and its surroundings. Other suspected areas existed in the east and the northern region bordering Senegal. Between November 2000 and April 2004, close to 610,000 square metres of land in the Bissau capital were cleared with 2,509 mines and 15,000 UXO destroyed.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Guinea Bissau cleared 215,871.85 square metres and destroyed 25 anti-personnel mines, 8 anti-tank mines and 25,787 UXO in 2004. Between January and April 2005, a further 22,143.72 square metres had been cleared and 17 anti-personnel mines and 4,831 UXO destroyed. Most high impact areas in Bissau have been cleared. Of the 17 areas which were initially defined in and around Bissau, four have been cleared, with two awaiting quality assurance. A survey project outside the capital is planned for 2005-2006. Between 30 April 2004 and 30 April 2005, 89 MRE activists were trained in Bissau and 22 in the regions. They in turn trained 160 community liaison agents in Bissau and 150 in the regions, who in turn educated 7,000 people in the regions and 4,000 in Bissau.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>The National Humanitarian Mine Action Programme (PAAMI) aims to eliminate the impact of landmines and UXO in Bissau, the national capital, two years from the period where the requested funds will be available, and the following three years after Bissau ended, for the rest of the country. In line with the priorities established in the National Poverty Reduction Strategy Plan (PRSPs) the end-state of this plan is for people from the most highly / moderately impacted communities to live free from the impacts of landmines and UXO. Those impacts will be reduced by a combination of clearance operations, of UXO / MRE activities, of assistance to survivors and their dependents.</p> <p>Guinea-Bissau envisions itself in full compliance with its Convention obligations by 2009, safe from landmines and unexploded ordnance from battlefields, where people and communities live in an environment conducive to development, and where mine survivors are fully integrated into their communities.</p>

Jordan		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Jordan's original mine clearance challenge going back to 1993 included 60 million square metres of mined area, 496 minefields and approximately 309,000 emplaced mines. Between 1993 and 2003, 25.5 million square metres and 183 minefields had been cleared with 101,356 mines and 10,000 UXO destroyed. All minefields in Jordan were reported marked and fenced.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>From January to September 2005 the Royal Engineering Corps reported that it had cleared 22 minefields totalling 2.9 million square metres in Aqaba and the Jordan Valley.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Working together with the Government, the Jordanian Armed Forces, mine-affected communities, civil society, and the international community, the National Mine Action Plan's vision is to make Jordan free of landmines and provide comprehensive support for survivors of landmine incidents in accordance with the Convention.</p>
Macedonia, the Former Yugoslav Rep. of		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Areas contaminated by mines and UXO had been reported in the north-western part of the country in addition to 4 to 5 UXO contaminated areas in the south-east which contained remnants of the First and the Second World Wars. Approximately 6 million square metres had been cleared with 22 mines and 776 UXO destroyed.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia envisages that the entire country will be cleared by 2007.</p>

Malawi		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Suspected mined areas existed along the 1,000 kilometre border with Mozambique, particularly in 16 areas that served as refugee or combatants' camps and 33 areas that served as Malawi Young Pioneers camps.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Malawi continued to conduct surveys in suspected areas, starting with former bases of the Malawi Young Pioneers (MYP). Some of the MYP camps, particularly in the townships and cities of Lilongwe, Blantyre and Mzuzu were cleared by local engineers while detailed surveys were being conducted. Construction of houses has already started on these cleared areas. In 2005 Malawi planned to survey the border areas, which have good land for agriculture, and mark all dangerous areas.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Malawi's vision is to be free of the threat of landmines and unexploded ordnance, where individuals and communities live in a safe environment conducive to development, and where mine victims are fully integrated into society. If donor support is forthcoming, then it is feasible to have achieved this vision by 2009. If donor support is not forthcoming, then achieving this vision will take substantially longer.</p>
Mauritania		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>The northern part of Mauritania was mine-affected, particularly areas of enormous mineral exploitation potential. Between June 2002 and 30 April 2004, Mauritania destroyed 5,505 mines. In the first half of 2004, demining operations cleared 10,000 square metres.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>The National Bureau for Demining launched a technical survey to give more precise information on the mined areas and serve as the basis for planning future demining operations. The survey will also be used in the revised action plan and national strategy. The MRE programme, which started in 2004 in affected areas, continued in 2005. Between 30 April 2004 and 30 April 2005, Mauritania destroyed 397 anti-personnel mines and 177</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Mauritania aims to demine all priority areas in relevant regions by 2008 and demine all minefields identified by the technical surveys by 2011.</p>

	UXO in mined areas.	
Mozambique		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>A landmine impact survey completed in 2001 had indicated that all 10 provinces were affected by mines, but particularly the provinces of Cabo Delgado, Nampula, Zambezia, Inhambane and Maputo, which represented 70 percent of the suspected contaminated areas. As of January 2004, 583 villages and approximately 1,022,501 people were still affected by mines. Suspected mined areas of high and medium impact totalled 130,801,989 square metres. Between 2000 and 2003, 45,743,119 square metres of land had been cleared and 45,017 mines and 16,310 UXO destroyed.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>In 2004 Mozambique attained high levels of area reduction and mine clearance. A total of 379 villages with a population of 217,000 people were freed of the danger of landmines, following the cancellation of 84 suspected mined areas, the demarcation of 14 others and the clearance of 11.8 million square metres, thus surpassing the 10 million target set forth in the 2002-2006 five-year plan. The mine action programme in Mozambique has moved into a new phase with its inclusion in the five-year Government Programme as a cross-cutting issue. As a result, demining is now also included in Mozambique's annual economic and social programme. The next step is to reflect mine action into the Poverty Reduction Strategy, the PARPA II, whose consultation process has started.</p> <p>As of 31 December 2004, 204 villages and a population of approximately 805,716 were still affected by mines. Suspected areas totalled 171,571,071 square metres as opposed to 528,000,000 square metres at the end of 2003. In 2004 43,284 anti-personnel mines</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Mozambique envisions full compliance with its convention obligations, safe from the impact of landmines and UXO, where people and communities live in an environment conducive to development sustainable.</p>

	were destroyed during clearance activities.	
Nicaragua		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>The records of the Nicaraguan Army had initially indicated that 135,643 mines had been emplaced and that there were 991 targets to clear. An additional 10,054 mines had been added to the records. As of March 2004, 827 mined areas had been cleared and 77.14 percent of the initial quantity of reported mines had been destroyed. As of July 2004, 838 mined areas, representing an area of 7,685,494 square metres had been cleared and 109,921 mines had been destroyed.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>The National Demining Commission, through the Army of Nicaragua, continued the execution of its demining programme and as of April 2005, 873 mined areas, representing an area of 8,293,842 square metres, had been cleared. A total of 84.18 percent of the initial reported mines had been destroyed. There are still 118 areas to be cleared and 23,209 mines to be destroyed. In the south, the border with Costa Rica is considered to be free of mines, with 96 kilometres, of a 330 kilometre-border, demined. In the north, 239 kilometres have been cleared at the border between Honduras and Nicaragua.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>The national demining programme, introduced in April 1999, reflects the total number of mines to be destroyed – 135,643. To fulfil the proposed objective of declaring a country free of mines, 2005 was initially estimated as the deadline. However Nicaragua indicated in its Article 7 report submitted on 19 May 2005, that it had to revise this objective and that it has planned that the programme could be extended until 2006.</p>
Niger		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>The areas of Air, Manguèni, Plateau du Djado and Plaine du Talak were mined. Four additional areas were suspected to be mined. Niger had very limited knowledge on its mined areas.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>No practical measure has been taken with regards to defining the areas suspected to be mined. The defence and security forces advise travellers on their itineraries. However, an awareness campaign for the population of affected areas will be necessary.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Niger has a draft mine action plan for the 2004-2006 period which does not include demining objectives yet but focuses on identifying and marking the mined areas.</p>

Peru		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Peru's mined areas were reported located at the border with Ecuador, with an original estimate of 120,000 made. Some mines had also been emplaced around key infrastructure, especially high-tension electrical towers. As of March 2004, Peru had destroyed 103,490 mines. In December 2003, Peru completed clearance activities in the districts of Tumbes and Piura, at the border with Ecuador. In the last trimester of 2003, the Peruvian and Ecuadorian Armed Forces started a joint demining operation in the area of Los Limos and Pueblo Nuevo.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>In April 2005, Peru and Ecuador, with the support of the OAS, agreed on the continuation of joint work in the vicinity of Rio Chira. In 2005, in the area of Cordillera del Cóndor, along the border with Ecuador, a mission was planned to the source of Rio Santiago, to assess the conditions that are specific to the place as well as the procedures and necessary equipment. A plan to demine the high tension electrical towers, being executed by the Security Division Contraminas of the Peruvian National Police was initiated in November 2004, and as of June 2005 work to remove mines had been conducted around approximately 60 towers.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>In May 2001, the OAS and the Government of Peru signed an agreement to coordinate international support for Peru through the OAS Mine Action Programme. The OAS Programme seeks to ensure the following: define exact locations of minefields along the border with Ecuador by conducting impact studies of the areas and clear the mines according to annual objectives set by the National Demining Plan.</p>
Rwanda		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Rwanda's original mine clearance challenge included 35 suspected mined areas totalling 1,437,387 square metres. In addition, the UXO problem was more widespread than the problems posed by mines. A landmine impact survey completed in January 2003 identified</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>In 2004, about 800 explosive remnants of war were destroyed and about 20,000 square metres of land were cleared. Since January 2005, the National Demining Office (NDO) has managed to clear about 4,000 square metres of land manually. There are 16 remaining known</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>At the First Review Conference, Rwanda indicated intentions to set up an accelerated demining programme to fulfil its Article 5 obligations. Since then the Rwanda has reported that its demining programme is handicapped by lack of</p>

<p>that 54 percent of the original suspected areas still needed to be cleared. As of April 2004, there were 639,770.2 square metres that remained to be cleared. A total of 46 percent of suspected mined areas had been cleared with 1,265 mines and 29,843 UXO destroyed.</p>	<p>medium and small minefields accounting for about 900,000 square metres of land.</p> <p>Rwanda's demining capacity has deteriorated as external financial support has ended. The NDO now has no option but to react to hasty reports while big mine fields remain untouched. All the mine detection dogs have been retired due to age. Absence of MRE has resulted in a renewed rise of casualty figures.</p>	<p>support and, if not assisted, Rwanda may not attain its clearance deadline.</p>
<p>Senegal</p>		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Three (3) areas were considered to be mine-affected: along the border with Guinea Bissau, the Ziguinchor region, and the Kolda region. Exact locations of mined areas and quantity of mines were not known. Between 1996 and June 2004, 1,759 mines had been destroyed by the national army.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>In Ziguinchor and Kolda the Senegalese armed forces periodically destroy mines laid by armed groups.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>In 2004, Senegal drafted a mine action strategy, proposals for mine action legislation and for the creation of a mine action coordination centre. The documents were sent to the relevant authorities to be approved.</p>
<p>Serbia and Montenegro</p>		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Mined areas in Serbia and Montenegro were reported located at the border with Croatia in the area of the village of Jamena and at the border with Albania, in the municipalities of Plav and Rozaje. It had been assessed that the</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>It is expected that Serbia and Montenegro will fulfil its obligations under the Ottawa Convention even before the deadline of 2014. That will be in line with the joint initiative of the countries of South-Eastern</p>

<p>mined area near Jamena could cover 6,000,000 square metres and also contain anti-vehicle mines and UXO. In 2003, 485,500 square metres, approximately 8 percent of the mined areas in Jamena, had been demined with 1,441 mines destroyed. In the same area, between March and September 2004, Serbia and Montenegro had cleared 674,400 square metres and destroyed 1,060 anti-personnel mines and 215 anti-vehicle mines. In 2003, 19 locations in the municipalities of Plav and Rozaje in the border area with Albania had demined, reducing the number of mined locations to 46. An area of 192,400 square metres was being demined at the Albanian border.</p>		<p>Europe for a mine free region by 2009.</p>
<p>Sudan</p>		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>It was estimated that mines or other explosive remnants of war might affect 30 percent of Sudan. Suspected areas were reported located in Western Equatoria, Eastern Equatoria, Bahr Al-Ghazal, Jonglei, Blue Nile, Upper Nile, Nuba Mountains, Lakes and Kassala. Sudan's borders with Eritrea, Chad, Libya and Egypt were also mine affected. The presence or suspected presence of mines had both a humanitarian and development impact.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>The Ceasefire Agreement endorsed by the Government of Sudan and SPLM on 31 December 2004 has impacted the national mine action structure in Sudan. It states that the Parties shall conduct demining activities as soon as possible to create the conditions necessary for the return of displaced populations and that they shall establish two demining authorities (Northern and Southern) that shall work together and coordinate their</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>The <i>National Mine Action Strategy</i> was developed and endorsed by the Government of Sudan and the SPLM on 27 August 2004. The signing of the comprehensive peace agreement in January 2005 had implications on the implementation of the strategy and the institutional mine action structure in Sudan. The <i>National Mine Action Strategy</i> was to be revised to reflect these</p>

<p>The World Food Programme estimated that the food security of 2 million people was affected by mines. In 2003-2004, Sudan released 3,068,066 square metres by clearance, while destroying 215 anti-personnel mines.</p>	<p>demining activities.</p> <p>From 2004 to April 2005, a total of 276,501 metres of road were cleared or verified. A total of 98 dangerous areas were cleared, 31 in the Bahr El Ghazal state, 18 in Equatoria state, 42 in Kordofan state and 7 in the Upper Nile state. A total of 616 areas identified as dangerous are awaiting clearance.</p>	<p>implications and national mine action work plans were to be finalized following the establishment of the Government of National Unity on 9 July 2005.</p> <p>With respect to the Convention's obligation to clear mined areas within a ten-year time-frame, the <i>National Mine Action Strategy</i> indicates that Sudan will: facilitate the emergency clearance of routes for humanitarian aid, returnee routes and resettlement areas by the end of 2006; complete technical surveys of all medium and high priority mine and ERW contaminated areas by December 2008; clear medium and high priority minefields and battle areas with a cost effective mix of capabilities by December 2011; recorded and permanently mark, by December 2008, all low priority minefields and battle areas; mobilize resources for demining on an annual basis; and, ensure that demining is at all times conducted according to international and national humanitarian standards.</p>
<p>Swaziland</p>		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Mined areas were reported located along the</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p>

<p>Swaziland-Mozambique borderline. Demining was expected to commence in 2000.</p>		
<p>Tajikistan</p>		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Mined and suspected mined areas were reported found in the Central Region as a result of the 1995-97 civil war, along the Afghan border in areas under the control of Russian which contained Soviet-laid and Russian-maintained minefields and along the border with Uzbekistan as a result of mines laid by Uzbekistan. From 1997 to 2004 Tajikistan had neutralised and destroyed more than 3,250 pieces of mines and explosives. A general mine action assessment had been completed in the Central Region, reducing the amount of suspected area of 29 square kilometres and 124 linear kilometres of road / rail. In September and October of 2004, general research on frontier sites of Tajik-Uzbek border in the Sughd region, two areas of Hatlon region (in the south) and three areas of the Autonomous Region of Badakhshan (in the east) was completed. In the Central Region there was work going on to actualize technical surveys and clearance of the minefields. Additionally three areas were</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>In 2004, area reduction and technical survey were conducted in 5 areas: Sagirdasht, Shull, Lulikharvi, Margak and Chorcharog – locations where mine accidents / incidents have been reported. In 2004 and area of 61,826 square metres was cleared. Manual mine clearance activities were conducted by two teams during only four months. Achievements in 2004 included: general mine action assessments conducted in 205 villages with the identification of 84 mined areas affecting the inhabitants of 80 villages; 250 mines and UXO cleared and destroyed; and, ongoing technical survey of 3 suspect areas and ongoing clearance of 2 mined areas.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Tajikistan’s vision is that it will be a country safe from the negative humanitarian and economic impact of landmines: at the community level, to eliminate mine accidents; at the national level, to ensure that economic activity and development projects are not impeded by the presence of landmines or UXO; and, at the community and national level, to assist relevant authorities to provide physical, psychological and social support to survivors of mine accidents</p> <p>Tajikistan’s list of priorities includes to comply with obligations under the Convention. With sufficient donor support to enable the expansion of the operational capacity it should be possible to clear all mines and UXO which pose a threat to nearby communities by the end of 2008.</p>

demined and handed over to the local governmental authorities for long run use.		
Thailand		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>A landmine impact survey was completed in 2001, indicating that mine-affected provinces were located at the country's borders with Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia and Myanmar and 934 suspected areas representing 2,556.7 square kilometres. Demining officially started in 2000. As of May 2004, 1,641,126 square metres in 6 provinces had been cleared and 1,397,986 square metres had been handed over for community use. A total of 721 mines had been destroyed during demining operations.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>As of April 2005, Thailand had cleared 3,548,808 square metres, of which 2,697,690 square metres were handed over to the communities.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Thailand's vision is that it will be a country in which the people can use all land with safety and socio-economic development will improve tremendously. During 2005-2009, Thailand aims to conduct a technical survey and mark and fence all landmine contaminated areas. In terms of clearing mined areas, it aims to establish integrated annual plans by including national socio-economic plan and integrated provincial development plan, in order to designate prioritization and direct execution plan to coincide with the most requirement of the area.</p>
Tunisia		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Tunisia had 9 mined areas containing 3,526 anti-personnel mines and 1,530 anti-tank mines. There were also some areas suspected to be contaminated with unexploded ordnance from the Second World War. Over the five years preceding the First Review Conference,</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Tunisia has set up a unit specialized in demining and in the handling of explosives. This unit started working in November 2004 in a minefield in Ras Jedir. As of June 2005, 75 percent of the minefield had been cleared and 3,307 mines found and destroyed.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>See previous column.</p>

<p>the units of military engineers of the Tunisian army had recovered and destroyed around 4,500 mines and other devices.</p>		
<p>Turkey</p>		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Turkey’s original mine clearance challenge included 936,663 anti-personnel mines laid between 1957 and 1998, with 615,419 of these mines laid along Turkey’s border with Syria. Mined areas had been marked and fenced in accordance with international norms. In 1998 Turkey commenced mine clearance operations and by the end of 2003 14,840 mines had been removed and destroyed and 48,120 square metres cleared.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>In 2004, 1,225 anti-personnel mines were removed, 15,500 square metres cleared.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>The objective of Turkey’s demining programme is to clear the emplaced anti-personnel mines by 2014 and destroy the stockpiled ones by 2008.</p>
<p>Uganda</p>		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Mine contamination in Uganda was limited to the northern, western and North eastern regions. There were 3 affected districts in the North, 3 in the West and 2 in the Northeast. Limited demining by the Uganda Peoples Defence Forces (UPDF) had already been carried out in the West to remove mines that were obvious and those on roads and access trucks. Similarly in the North the UPDF had provided responsive clearance as to when</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>A mine action assessment completed in January 2005 in western Uganda identified 57 dangerous areas, 170,000 square metres contaminated or suspected to be contaminated. Twenty-two (22) UPDF engineers were involved in clearance activities.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>A national plan has not been developed yet but it is in progress. A list of possible strategic objectives has been provided by Uganda.</p>

<p>need arises. In 2002-2003, 231 mines were removed.</p>		
United Kingdom		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Around 16,600 mines remained in the Falklands / Malvinas. Some clearance of anti-personnel mines was conducted immediately after the 1982 conflict, lifting about 1,400 mines but was stopped after several injuries to those involved. A total of 149 mines were destroyed between 1997 and 2001. A further 50 were destroyed as they were exposed to the surface. The 101 minefields were marked and fenced.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>The Joint Working Party (JWP) held its third and fourth meetings in Buenos Aires on 27-28 April 2005 and in London on 7-8 July 2005, respectively. During those meetings a draft report of a preliminary study was considered and both parties moved forward in defining technical and financial aspects as well as administrative and contractual issues. These issues will continue, including at the next Meeting of the JWP, which has been scheduled for October 2005.</p> <p>In 2004, 50 anti-personnel mines were cleared as they were exposed to the surface.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>In order to fulfil its obligations under Article 5, the United Kingdom continues to work closely with the Argentine government towards finding a solution.</p>
Venezuela		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>There were 6 areas reported containing a total of 1,073 anti-personnel mines. As of August 2004, there were 13 minefields containing 1,073 mines, all of them were fenced.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas will commence in February 2007 and will finish in April 2009.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>See previous column.</p>

Yemen		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>A landmine impact survey completed in 2000 identified 14 high impact communities, 86 medium impact communities and 494 low impact communities. A total of 1,078 suspected areas were identified. Since clearance began in 1999, 224 square kilometres of suspected and mined areas were returned to communities.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>Between 30 March 2004 and 30 March 2005, 1,286 mines and 103,402 UXO were destroyed.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Yemen envisions that it will be a country in full compliance with its Convention obligations, which will put an end to the suffering of the people, and the casualties, caused by landmines in mine-affected areas by the end of March 2009. This accomplishment will result in the remaining 52 medium impacted communities plus 147 square kilometres of low impacted areas, being surveyed, cleared and returned to the affected communities by December 2008.</p>
Zambia		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Zambia had suspected mined areas along its borders with Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Namibia and Angola, and also around former Freedom Fighters' Camps. A national survey completed in May 2004 indicated 41 mined areas, most of which are low impact. National demining clearance capacity had been established and 650 kilometres of clearance had been conducted on the Gwembe-Tonga road.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>In 2004, the Zambia Anti-Personnel Mine Action Centre cleared 7,780.01 square metres in Mwapula – Munyeta area, Chongwe District, Lusaka Province.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Zambia has a three year comprehensive strategic plan on landmines called the <i>Humanitarian Demining Programme</i> which not only seeks to clear mined areas, but also promote awareness, mine risk education and support mine victims and social integration among the population living in mine-affected areas.</p> <p>The vision for Zambia is to be “mine free”</p>

		by the end of 2007. To achieve this will require national will, mobilization of Zambian resources and international donor assistance. The first two are in place through the passing and implementation of the Act of Parliament in August 2003, and, the establishment of a mine action capability. Zambia now requires the support of the international community with the goal of securing donor funding to implement the mine action programme to make Zambia mine free by the end of 2007.
Zimbabwe		
<p>Status recorded at the First Review Conference</p> <p>Zimbabwe's original mine clearance challenge included over 210 square kilometres of suspected mined areas in four border provinces in addition to UXOs found in all nine provinces. In the affected provinces, mines restricted socio-economic development, including development of the tourist industry.</p> <p>40 percent of the original 210 square kilometres of suspected area had been cleared and around 221,773 mines had been destroyed.</p>	<p>Progress reported since the First Review Conference:</p> <p>In 2004, 3,000 anti-personnel mines were destroyed in the Victoria Falls to Mlibizi minefield. Operations and quality assurance along this on this 240 kilometre-long minefield are almost complete. Of the 6 original minefields, there are 5 minefields, totalling 350 kilometres, left to be cleared.</p>	<p>National demining plan / programme:</p> <p>Zimbabwe has developed a national plan that includes clearing mined areas as well as mine risk education campaigns in the affected areas and communities.</p> <p>Zimbabwe envisages that it will be in full compliance with its Convention obligations by 2009 to be safe from landmines where people and communities live in an environment conducive to development and where mine survivors are rehabilitated and fully integrated into their communities. However, this will depend upon adequate funding by both the state and other willing</p>

		<p>donor communities and other partners to enable us to remove all minefields by the 2009 deadline. Failure to fulfil this vision means our Zimbabwe's poverty reduction strategy will be affected since resettlement of displaced people will remain a pipe dream since some communities cannot be self-sufficient in terms of food protection.</p> <p>Objectives during the period 2005-2009 are: to clear all mined areas by 2009 based on the humanitarian and socio-economic priorities set by the Government of Zimbabwe; to carry out national MRE campaign to all communities affected by mines and UXO in all 9 provinces; and, to provide basic assistance to victims / survivors as part of rehabilitation and reintegration into society.</p>
--	--	---

Annex V

Victim assistance objectives of the States Parties that have reported the responsibility for significant numbers of landmine survivors

Will be issued as an addendum to the present document.

Annex VI

Anti-personnel mines reported retained or transferred by the States Parties for reasons permitted under Article 3, and, a summary of additional information provided by these States Parties

Table 1: Anti-personnel mines reported retained in accordance with Article 3¹

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2004	2005	
Afghanistan ²		1,076	
Algeria ³			
Angola	1,390	1,390	

¹ This table contains only those States Parties which have not, in 2005 or previously, reported zero as the number of anti-personnel mines retained in accordance with Article 3. States Parties not included in this table are: Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, the Holy See, Iceland, Jamaica, Kiribati, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, the Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, Switzerland, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, and Turkmenistan.

² In 2004 Afghanistan indicated that it retained 370 inert mines. In 2005 Afghanistan indicated that it has yet to develop a formal policy on the number of mines retained for development and training purposes and that on a case-by-case basis it approves the number and type of anti-personnel mines retained by UNMACA on behalf of the MAPA.

³ In 2003 Algeria reported that it had retained 15,030 mines. No additional information has been provided since 2003.

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2004	2005	
Argentina	1,772	1,680	Argentina reported that 92 Type SB 33 mines were used on 15-16 November 2004 to train army engineers in explosive ordnance disposal (EOD). It also reported on development and training projects which are underway and which include the development of a remote-controlled vehicle for the detection and destruction of mines and the use of mines for destroying unexploded ordnance. In addition, Argentina reported that it estimates that mines will be used as follows in coming years: between 2005 and 2011, approximately 90 to 100 Type SB 33 and Type FMK-1 mines per year will be used to train Argentine army engineers; in 2005 and 2006, approximately 150 Type Expal P4B, 50 Type MFK1 and 50 Libyan anti-personnel mines will be used for the development and testing of the remote-controlled detection / destruction vehicle; in 2005 approximately 150 Type FMK1 and 150 Type Expal P4B mines will be used for the destruction of unexploded ordnance; and, between 2005 and 2010 approximately 40 Type Expal P4B, Type MFK1 and Libyan anti-personnel mines per year will be used in basic and advanced humanitarian demining courses, and, for EOD and demining training and for peace keeping forces.
Australia	7,465	7,395	Australia reported that stock levels will be regularly reviewed and assessed, that only a realistic training quantity is held, and that stocks in excess of this figure will be destroyed on an ongoing basis. In addition, Australia stated that training is conducted by the School of Military Engineers.
Bangladesh	15,000	15,000	Bangladesh informed the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention that mines were retained for training purposes, especially for officers and soldiers preparing for UN peacekeeping missions.
Belarus	7,530	6,030	
Belgium	4,443	4,176	Belgium reported that in 2004, at the Engineering School, 88 mines were used to educate Officers, NCOs and privates as EOD personnel and that 179 mines were used for the training of Engineer Combat Units in demining and mine awareness.

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2004	2005	
Bosnia and Herzegovina ⁴	2,652	2,755	
Botswana ⁵			
Brazil ⁶	16,545	16,125	Brazil reported that retained mines are for training to allow the Brazilian Armed Forces to participate adequately in international demining activities. It also indicated that, in 2004, 866 Type NM M409 mines and 9 Type NM T-AB-1 mines had been used for training purposes.
Bulgaria	3,688	3,676	
Burkina Faso ⁷			
Burundi ⁸			
Cameroon ⁹			

⁴ In 2004, Bosnia and Herzegovina indicated that 439 of the mines reported under Article 3 were fuse-less. In 2005, it indicated that 433 of the mines reported under Article 3 were fuse-less and that the total of Article 3 mines was higher than previously reported because the number included the mines kept by demining companies which had not been previously reported.

⁵ In its report submitted in 2001, Botswana indicated that a “small quantity” of mines would be retained. No updated information has since been provided.

⁶ In its report submitted in 2001, Brazil indicated that all mines retained would be destroyed in training activities during a period of 10 years after the entry into force of the Convention for Brazil, that is by October 2009.

⁷ In its reports submitted in 2004 and 2005 Burkina Faso indicated that “nothing yet” was retained.

⁸ In its reports submitted in 2004 and 2005, Burundi indicated that the decision concerning mines retained is pending.

⁹ In a report submitted prior to ratifying the Convention in 2001, Cameroon reported the same 500 mines under Article 4 and Article 3. No report has since been provided.

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2004	2005	
Canada	1928	1907	Canada informed the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention that since entry into force it had used 180 Type M-14 mines for research and training, noting the value of this mine for these purposes being its low metal content and that it is found in many mine-affected countries. In addition, Canada informed the Standing Committee that 8 Type PMR-2A mines were used to test and evaluate personal protective equipment given that the fragment velocity and size of this mine is quite different from other mines and because it too is found in many mine-affected countries. As well, Canada indicated that 102 Type PMA-2 mines were used to test and evaluate metal detectors and instrumented prodders as this mine represents a difficult target for detection and to test and evaluate protective equipment. Furthermore, Canada indicated that since the First Review Conference it had used 6 Type PMA-2, 3 Type PP-M1-NA1, 6 Type PMN-2, 3 Type PMR 2A and 3 Type M14 mines in support of the Canadian portion of the International Test and Evaluation Programme (ITEP) project to test mine detectors and mechanical demining vehicles and for research on the blast effects of the human body.
Cape Verde ¹⁰			
Chile	6245	5895	Chile reported that in 2004 348 mines were used by the Chilean army and 2 by the Chilean navy. In 2004 retained mines were used for EOD training and evaluation of deminers.
Colombia	986	886	
Congo, Republic of	372	372	

¹⁰ Cape Verde has not yet submitted a transparency report in accordance with Article 7 of the Convention.

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2004	2005	
Croatia	6478	6400	Croatia informed the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention that the main purpose in retaining mines was to test demining machines, that 78 mines (i.e., 20 Type PMA-1, 20 Type PMA-2, 20 Type PMA-3, 8 Type PMR-2A and 10 Type PROM-1) were used in 2004 for this purpose. In addition, it indicated that in 2004, the Centre for Testing, Development and Training was established with its primary task being to test demining machines, mine detection dogs and metal detectors, and, to undertake research and development of other demining techniques and technologies. Croatia estimated that 189 mines would be needed in 2005.
Cyprus	1000	1000	
Czech Republic	4849	4829	The Czech Republic reported that 20 mines were used for EOD specialist training in 2004.
Democratic Republic of the Congo ¹¹			
Denmark	2,058	1,989	Denmark reported that its retained mines are used as follows: a demonstration of the effects of anti-personnel mines is given to all recruits during training; during training of engineer units for international tasks, instructors in mine awareness are trained to handle anti-personnel mines; and, during training of ammunition clearing units, anti-personnel mines are used for training in ammunition dismantling.
Djibouti	2,996	2,996	
Ecuador ¹²	3,970		
El Salvador	96	96	
Equatorial Guinea ¹³			
Eritrea ¹⁴	222	9	

¹¹ In its report submitted in 2004, the Democratic Republic of the Congo indicated that the decision concerning mines retained is pending.

¹² No updated information was provided by Ecuador in 2005.

¹³ Equatorial Guinea has not yet submitted a transparency report in accordance with Article 7 of the Convention.

¹⁴ In its report submitted in 2005, Eritrea indicated that the mines retained under Article 3 were inert.

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2004	2005	
France	4,466	4,455	
Germany	2,537	2,496	Germany reported that 41 mines were used in 2004 by the Federal Armed Forces for neutralization of fuses and for the “Wolf” Light Truck mine protection programme. In addition, Germany reported that mines are retained for demining research and development, dog training and for testing the “Rhino” demining machine.
Greece	7,224	7,224	
Guinea Bissau ¹⁵			
Guyana ¹⁶			
Honduras ¹⁷	826		
Hungary ¹⁸	1,500	See note	
Ireland	103	85	
Italy	803	806	
Japan	8,359	6,946	Japan informed the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention that in 2005 it plans to implement educational training on mine detection and clearance by special units which will involve live demolition training and that Japan will conduct tests pertaining to the development of mine detection technologies in 2005 and 2006. Japan further informed the Standing Committee that for these activities it will use Type 63, Type 67, Type 80, Type 87 helicopter-carried scatterable, and Type M3 anti-personnel mines.
Jordan	1,000	1,000	
Kenya ¹⁹	3,000		
Latvia ²⁰	N/A	21	

¹⁵ In its reports submitted in 2004 and 2005, Guinea Bissau indicated that it would retain a very limited number of AP mines.

¹⁶ Guyana has not yet submitted a transparency report in accordance with Article 7 of the Convention.

¹⁷ No updated information was provided by Honduras in 2005.

¹⁸ Hungary indicated that on 14 October 2005, it destroyed its 1,500 anti-personnel mines previously retained under Article 3.

¹⁹ No updated information was provided by Kenya in 2005.

²⁰ Information provided by Latvia was volunteered in a report submitted by Latvia prior to it acceding to the Convention.

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2004	2005	
Luxembourg	976	956	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	4,000	4,000	The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia informed the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention that it is a priority to proceed efficiently with the use of retained mines for training purposes and that it will report progress regarding the status of these retained mines.
Malawi ²¹	21	21	
Mali ²²	600	600	
Mauritania ²³	728	See note	
Moldova, Rep. of	736	249	
Mozambique	1,470	1,470	
Namibia	9,999	6,151	
Netherlands	3,553	3,176	The Netherlands informed the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention that, in 2004, 366 Type 22 and 11 Type DM31 anti-personnel mines were used for the training of 7,000 military personnel in base mine awareness, 400 army engineers in basic mine clearance techniques and 70 army engineers as mine detection and reconnaissance specialists. It also indicated that mines were used to test new mine detection and neutralisation equipment. In addition, the Netherlands indicated that in the future retained mines would be used for the same purposes, and the number and types of mines used for countermine training would not change substantially compared with the number and types used in preceding years.
Nicaragua	1,810	1,040	
Niger ²⁴	0	146	

²¹ In its reports submitted in 2004 and 2005, Malawi indicated that mines reported as retained under Article 3 are in fact “dummy” mines.

²² Although the number reported in the Final Report of the First Review Conference for 2004 was 900, it included 300 anti-tank mines. Hence, the actual number of anti-personnel mines retained by Mali is 600.

²³ In its report submitted in 2005, the mines reported by Mauritania under Article 3 were also reported under Article 4.

²⁴ Although Niger did not indicate that it retained any mines under Article 3 in 2004, it reported 146 mines in 2003, mines which are again reported as retained in 2005.

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2004	2005	
Peru	4,024	4,024	
Portugal	1,115	1,115	
Romania	2,500	2,500	
Rwanda ²⁵	101	101	
Sao Tome and Principe ²⁶			
Serbia and Montenegro ²⁷	5,000		
Slovakia	1,481	1,427	
Slovenia	2,999	2,994	
South Africa ²⁸	4,414	4,388	South Africa reported that in 2004 33 mines were used for development and training techniques.
Spain	3,815	2,712	Spain reported that 4,000 anti-personnel mines retained were used for research and training Demining techniques at the International Cenjter for Demining.
Sudan ²⁹	5,000		
Suriname	296	150	
Sweden	15,706	14,798	Sweden reported that in 2004, 180 Type Truppmina 10 mines, 652 Type Trampmina 49 B mines, and 65 foreign produced mines were used for the training of personnel, and, that 11 Type Truppmina 10 mines were used for the development of mine clearance techniques. In addition, Sweden reported that in 2004, 1500 fuses from Type Trampmina 49 B mines were used in dummy mines for the development of mine clearance techniques.

²⁵ Rwanda has indicated that the 101 mines declared under Article 3 had been uprooted from minefields to be retained for training purposes.

²⁶ Sao Tome has not yet submitted a transparency report in accordance with Article 7 of the Convention.

²⁷ No updated information was provided by Serbia and Montenegro in 2005.

²⁸ In its report submitted in 1999, South Africa indicated that 10992 of the 11247 mines declared under Article 3 were empty casings retained for training of members of the SNDF.

²⁹ No updated information was provided by Sudan in 2005.

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2004	2005	
Tajikistan	255	255	
Tanzania, United Republic of	1,146	1,146	
Thailand	4,970	4,970	
Togo ³⁰	436		
Tunisia	5,000	5,000	
Turkey	16,000	16,000	
Uganda			
United Kingdom	1,930	1,937	
Uruguay ³¹	500		
Venezuela	5,000	4,960	
Yemen	4,000	4,000	
Zambia	3,346	3,346	
Zimbabwe	700	700	Zimbabwe reported that retained mines will be used during training of Zimbabwe's troops and deminers in order to enable them to identify and learn how to detect, handle, neutralise and destroy the mines in Zimbabwean minefields.

³⁰ No updated information was provided by Togo in 2005.

³¹ No updated information was provided by Uruguay in 2005.

Table 2: Anti-personnel mines reported transferred in accordance with Article 3³²

State	Mines reported transferred	Additional information
Cambodia	3079	596 mines transferred for training in 2004
Chile	350	Mines reported transferred were those destroyed in the course of their use for reasons permitted under Article 3 of the Convention
Denmark	8	No transfer outside of Italian territory
Nicaragua	46	Transferred by the Army to UTC for mine detecting dogs
Tanzania, United Republic of ³³		

³² This table includes only those States Parties that reported mines transferred in accordance with Article 3 since the First Review Conference.

³³ The United Republic of Tanzania reported that it intends to import 1,000 deactivated anti-personnel mines from Mozambique to be used in the APOPO project at Sokoine University of Agriculture in Morogoro for research purposes.