

EIGHTH 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

2 October 2007

---

Dead Sea, 18-22 November 2007  
Item 11 of the provisional agenda

**ACHIEVING THE AIMS OF THE NAIROBI ACTION PLAN:  
THE DEAD SEA PROGRESS REPORT 2006-2007**

**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.”<sup>1</sup>
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.
3. The purpose of the *Dead Sea Progress Report* is to support the application of the *Nairobi Action Plan* by measuring progress made during the period 22 September 2006 to 22 November 2007. While all 70 points in the *Nairobi Action Plan* remain equally important and should be acted upon, the *Dead Sea 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 Eighth and the Ninth Meetings of the States Parties (9MSP). It is the third in a series of annual progress reports prepared by Presidents of Meetings of the States Parties in advance of the 2009 Second Review Conference.

**I. Universalizing the Convention**

4. At the close of the 18-22 September 2006 Seventh Meeting of the States Parties (7MSP), 151 States had deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession and the Convention had entered into force for 150 of these States. Since that time, the Convention entered into force for **Brunei Darussalam** (on 1 October 2006). On 23 October 2006 **Montenegro** deposited its instrument of succession and the Convention

---

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

entered into force for it on 1 April 2007 and on 16 February 2007 **Indonesia** deposited its instrument of ratification and the Convention entered into force for it on 1 August 2007. In addition, instruments of accession were deposited by **Kuwait** on 30 July 2007 and by **Iraq** on 15 August 2007. There are now 155 States which have deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession. The Convention has entered into force for 153 of these States. (See Annex I.)

5. Progress towards accession was made by some other States. At the 23 April 2007 meeting of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention, **Mongolia** announced that it had taken a significant step towards accession by passing a law declassifying information on landmines. At the same meeting **Palau** reiterated that it will soon accede to the Convention. In addition, **Nepal** indicated that it would consider submitting a voluntary Article 7 transparency report and **Laos**, in May 2007, indicated that it may consider accession in the near future. As well, on 12 June 2007 **Bahrain** announced that it would soon accede to the Convention.

6. Since the 7MSP, States Parties promoted adherence to the Convention by States not parties in accordance with Actions #1-#6 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*. The President of the 7MSP issued the *Action Plan to Universalise and Implement the Mine Ban Convention*, setting out commitments to promote the Convention bilaterally, regionally and multilaterally. In accordance with her plan, the President wrote to States not parties encouraging ratification or accession to the Convention without delay. The President promoted the *Action Plan to Universalise and Implement the Mine Ban Convention* at the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in October 2006 including by presenting the work of the Convention and the outcomes of the 7MSP to New York-based disarmament delegations, which was an event attended by a number of States not parties. The 7MSP Presidency conducted bilateral outreach to each remaining signatory State, including through a visit by Australia's Special Representative for Mine Action to Warsaw in September 2006, urging these States to proceed swiftly to ratification. In addition, the 7MSP Presidency and Vanuatu convened a workshop in May 2007 intended to advance universalisation and implementation of the Convention in the Pacific.

7. Canada, along with coordinating the Universalization Contact Group, undertook missions to Nepal, Laos and Kazakhstan to promote acceptance of the Convention. In addition, in March 2007 Canada and Cambodia organized a regional workshop in Phnom Penh, and, Canada, Slovenia, and the International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance (ITF) supported a similar activity in Almaty with both events intended in part to advance universalization in South East Asia and Central Asia respectively. On the margins of the April 2007 meetings of the Standing Committees, New Zealand and Jordan again convened regional universalization discussions for the Asia-Pacific and the Middle East, respectively.

8. States Parties undertook a variety of efforts, in accordance with Action #6 of the *Nairobi Action Plan* to "actively promote adherence to the Convention in all relevant multilateral fora." On 6 December 2006, the international community again expressed its support for the Convention in the UNGA with 161 States, including 20 States not parties, voting in favour of an annual resolution on the implementation and universalization of the Convention. On 27 February 2007 in the Conference on Disarmament, some States Parties marked the eighth anniversary of the entry into force of the Convention by calling on States not parties to accede to the Convention without delay. On 5 June 2007, the Organization of

American States' General Assembly adopted a resolution urging its member States that have not yet done so to consider acceding to the Convention.

9. Pursuant to Action #8 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, the United Nations (UN), other institutions and regional organizations, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) and other non-governmental organizations, parliamentarians and interested citizens continued their involvement and active cooperation in universalization efforts. Prominent examples included an appeal made by the United Nations Secretary General on 4 April 2007 to all States which have not yet done so to accede to the Convention and to other international instruments, a workshop for national mine action programme directors convened by the UN in March 2007 to promote adherence to the Convention, visits by the ICBL to Bahrain, India, Kuwait, Nepal, Poland and Vietnam and regional workshops convened by the ICRC in June 2007 in Kuwait City for the States of the Gulf Cooperation Council and in September 2007 in Tunis for the States of the Maghreb.

10. Forty (40) States have not yet ratified or acceded to the Convention. Among these are two States – the **Marshall Islands** and **Poland** – which signed the Convention but which have not yet ratified it. While “the desirability of attracting adherence of all States to this Convention”<sup>2</sup> remains a matter of emphasis for the States Parties, these two signatory States remain of special interest with respect to universalization given that through their signature of the Convention they have accepted that they shall “refrain from acts which would defeat the object and purpose”<sup>3</sup> of the Convention. In addition, while the European Union (EU) was again commended for its support for the destruction of Ukraine’s stockpiled anti-personnel mines as being critical in facilitating Ukraine’s ratification of the Convention, **Finland** and **Poland**, the only EU member States that have not ratified or acceded to the Convention, were urged to join the Convention.

11. Also among the 40 States that have not expressed their consent to be bound by the Convention are some that produce, use, transfer and / or maintain large stockpiles of anti-personnel mines. According to the ICBL, two States not parties – **Myanmar** and the **Russian Federation** – made new use of anti-personnel mines since the 7MSP. Also since the 7MSP, one such State not party, **Pakistan**, announced its intention to make new use of anti-personnel mines. In response, Canada’s Minister of Foreign Affairs, who was in Pakistan on an official visit at the time of the announcement, and the President of Afghanistan expressed their States’ concerns. In addition the President of the 7MSP wrote to Pakistan to urge it to find other means to secure its borders and a United Nations Security Council mission expressed its concern to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Pakistan regarding the possible employment of mines along Pakistan’s borders.<sup>4</sup> As a result of these initiatives, Pakistan agreed to reconsider its possible actions with respect to mining the border.

12. According to the ICBL, armed non-State actors in eight (8) States (Afghanistan, Colombia, India, Iraq, Lebanon, Myanmar, Pakistan and Russia) made new use of anti-personnel mines since the 7MSP.

---

<sup>2</sup> Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction. Preamble.

<sup>3</sup> Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. Article 18.

<sup>4</sup> United Nations Security Council. *Report of the Security Council mission to Afghanistan, 11 to 16 November 2006*. Document # S/2006/935.

13. States Parties and other actors continued to advocate for the end to use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines by armed non-State actors. Switzerland further pursued its efforts to promote a discussion on the role of States Parties in a position to do so in implementing Nairobi Action Plan Action #46. Several States Parties and the UN expressed their support and / or made financial commitments to the Geneva Call for its work to engage armed non-State actors and promote their adherence to the Convention's norms. The Geneva Call obtained further signings of its *Deed of Commitment for Adherence to a Total Ban on Anti Personnel Mines and for Cooperation in Mine Action* since the 7MSP. With respect to one previous signing, one State Party again noted with concern that the Geneva Call proceeded in a manner not consistent with paragraph 17 of the Zagreb Progress Report which states:

“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 Ninth Meeting of the States Parties:*

14. States Parties must turn their commitment to universalization into action in accordance with Actions #1 to #8 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, particularly given the extent of the challenges that remain. States not parties should continue to be approached on a case specific basis. And pending their adherence to the Convention, they should be encouraged to participate as observers in Convention meetings and to implement voluntarily the Convention's provisions. 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. Given the progress made since the 7MSP and the challenges that remain, 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 quick 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, Laos, Lebanon, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nepal, Oman, Palau, Poland, Tonga, Tuvalu 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 to 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) Further to Actions #5 and #6 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, States Parties should make renewed efforts to use bilateral, regional and multilateral meetings and events to promote the Convention including in the United Nations General Assembly and its committees.**

## **II. Destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines**

16. At the close of the 7MSP, it was reported that the obligation, contained in Article 4 of the Convention, to destroy or ensure the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines, may remain relevant for 12 States Parties. Since that time, **Angola, Cyprus and Serbia** reported that they had fulfilled their Article 4 obligation, information was made available indicating that **Montenegro** transferred its entire stock of anti-personnel mines to Serbia for destruction, **Guyana** submitted its initial transparency report clarifying that it does not possess stockpiled anti-personnel mines, and **Indonesia** – a State which had previously indicated that it possessed stockpiled anti-personnel mines – ratified the Convention. In addition, information was made available which indicated that one State Party, **Cape Verde**, which was presumed not to have held stockpiled anti-personnel mines, indeed did hold them and ensured their destruction in 2006. Hence, the obligation to destroy stockpiled anti-personnel mines remains relevant for nine States Parties: **Afghanistan, Belarus, Burundi, Ethiopia, Greece, Indonesia, Sudan, Turkey and Ukraine**. Timelines for States Parties to complete stockpile destruction in accordance with Article 4 are in Annex II.

17. One-hundred-forty-four (144) States that have ratified or acceded to the Convention now no longer hold stocks of anti-personnel mines, either because they never did or because they have completed their destruction programmes. Together the States Parties have reported the destruction of approximately 40 million stockpiled mines.

18. While the number of States Parties which must fulfill Article 4 obligations is small, serious challenges remain. At the 23 April 2007 meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction **Afghanistan** reported that, while it had destroyed almost 500,000 stockpiled anti-personnel mines, two depots of anti-personnel mines remained north of the Afghan capital, Kabul. Afghanistan, therefore, failed to fulfill its Article 4 obligation within the proscribed four year time period after entry into force. Afghanistan did however indicate that it had secured agreement that these mines would soon be turned over to Government control and expected that destruction would be completed soon.

19. At the 23 April 2007 meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction, **Belarus** expressed concern with regard to its PFM-1 type mine destruction programme, indicating that in November 2006 the tendering process necessary to choose an operator to proceed with destruction failed due to a lack of bids meeting the technical and procedural conditions of tender. Belarus indicated that it therefore is unlikely to meet its 1 March 2008 deadline. The gravity of this situation was underscored by the fact that Belarus has reported that over three million anti-personnel mines await destruction. Belarus and the European Commission nonetheless remain committed to continue cooperation with the goal of destroying all PFM-1 mines in Belarus.

20. The complications with efforts associated with the destruction of stockpiled mines by Belarus illustrates that, in addition to technical challenges with the destruction of PFM-1 mines, a challenge remains in arriving at a fruitful conclusion on matters concerning cooperation and assistance. With respect to this and other related matters, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction recalled that Article 6, paragraph 9 states “each State Party giving and receiving assistance under the provisions of this Article shall cooperate with a view to ensuring the full and prompt implementation of agreed assistance programs.” It was noted that arriving at a fruitful conclusion on matters concerning cooperation and assistance in the destruction of PFM-1 mines also remained relevant for

**Ukraine.** The gravity of this situation was underscored by the fact that Ukraine has reported that more than six million anti-personnel mines await destruction.

21. One State Party, **Ethiopia**, for which it is assumed possesses, and hence must destroy, stockpiled anti-personnel mines, remains overdue in providing an initial transparency report as required. The information in such a report would provide clarity on all stockpiled anti-personnel mines owned or possessed by this State Party, on the status of programmes for destroying these mines and on the types and quantities of mines destroyed after entry into force. In addition, five States Parties – **Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Haiti, Montenegro and Sao Tome and Principe** – for which it is assumed do not possess stockpiled anti-personnel mines, are overdue in providing an initial transparency report. The information in such reports could confirm or correct the record with respect to the assumption that stocks are not held. As well, one State Party, **Cape Verde**, for which information has emerged indicating that it indeed held stocks and that these have been destroyed, is overdue in providing an initial transparency report to clarify the types and quantities of mines destroyed after entry into force.

22. States Parties continued to discuss the commitment they made in Action #15 of the *Nairobi Action Plan* to report previously unknown stockpiles discovered after stockpile destruction deadlines have passed in accordance with their obligations under Article 7, to take advantage of other informal means to share such information and to destroy these mines as a matter of urgent priority. Two States Parties, **Bosnia and Herzegovina** and **Yemen**, provided clarity on such matters at the 23-24 April 2007 meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction and Bosnia and Herzegovina provided an update on such matters in the transparency report it submitted in 2007. With a view to facilitating better reporting on stockpiled anti-personnel mines discovered after stockpile destruction deadlines have passed or completion of destruction has been officially reported, the Co-Chairs proposed amendments to Forms B and G of the Article 7 reporting format.

23. The need to give due regard to the destruction of stockpiled mines belonging to armed non-State actors that have committed to ban the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines was again raised. The UN reported that since the 7MSP it had assisted one signatory of the Geneva Call's *Deed of Commitment* in the destruction of more than 3,000 stockpiled anti-personnel mines. It was noted that in other instances assistance may also be required and that the prompt destruction of such mines was important to prevent them from being stolen or abandoned.

*Priorities for the period leading to the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties:*

24. While the list is short in terms of the number of States Parties for which Article 4 remains relevant, the list is long in terms of the number of outstanding challenges related to implementation. All States Parties must act to comply with their deadlines, placing a priority in the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties on the following:

- (i) **States Parties with deadlines for the destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines which occur prior to the 9MSP should, in accordance with their Convention obligations and as emphasized in Action #11 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, ensure that they complete their destruction programmes on time and others should aim to do so, if possible, in advance of their four year deadlines.**

(ii) States Parties in a position to do so should, in accordance with their Convention obligations and as emphasized Action #13 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, promptly assist States Parties with clearly demonstrated needs for external support for stockpile destruction, responding promptly to appeals for assistance by States Parties in danger of not meeting deadlines under Article 4.

(iii) All States Parties should place an increased emphasis on the obligation, as it concerns stockpile destruction, of each State Party giving and receiving assistance under the provisions of Article 6 to cooperate with a view to ensuring the full and prompt implementation of agreed assistance programs.

(iv) States Parties should continue to report previously unknown stockpiles discovered after stockpile destruction deadlines have passed or completion of destruction has been officially reported in accordance with their obligations under Article 7, making use of new means to facilitate such reporting and taking advantage of other informal means to share such information, and, destroy these mines as a matter of urgent priority.

### III. Clearing mined areas

25. At the close of the 7MSP, it was reported that the obligation, contained in Article 5 of the Convention, to destroy or ensure the destruction of emplaced anti-personnel mines remained relevant for 45 States Parties. Since that time, **Vanuatu** clarified that this obligation indeed is not relevant for it and **Bhutan** submitted its initial transparency report indicating that there are anti-personnel mines in mined areas under Bhutan's jurisdiction or control. Hence, the obligation to destroy or ensure the destruction of emplaced anti-personnel mines remains relevant for 45 States Parties: **Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, Colombia, the Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Jordan, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Peru, Rwanda, Senegal, Serbia, Sudan, Swaziland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.** Timelines for these States Parties to destroy or ensure the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas in accordance with Article 5 are contained in Annex III.

26. It was recalled that, 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." It was again noted that the Convention does not contain language requiring each State party to search every square metre of its territory to find mines. But the Convention does require the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas which a State Party has made every effort to identify. Moreover, it was noted that oft-used terms like "mine-free", "impact-free", and "mine-safe" do not exist in the Convention text and are not synonymous with Convention obligations.

27. States Parties in the process of fulfilling Article 5 obligations were again encouraged to provide clarity on national demining plans, progress made, work that remains, and factors

that may impede the fulfillment of their obligations in a 10 year period. To facilitate preparations and to assist in the dissemination of information provided by States Parties, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies encouraged relevant States Parties to make use of a questionnaire when preparing their interventions, and held bilateral preparatory meetings with a number of States Parties. At the April 2007 meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, more relevant States Parties than ever before – 40 – provided information, some with more clarity than ever before. However few of these States Parties indicated that they have a plan to fulfill their obligations by their deadlines. In addition, it was noted that some States Parties reporting mined areas have not yet reported the destruction of a single mine in such areas.

28. Some States Parties continued to provide little information with respect to the obligation contained in Article 5, paragraph 2, for each State Party to “make every effort to identify all areas under (their) jurisdiction or control in which anti-personnel mines are known or suspected to be emplaced” or otherwise report, as required by Article 7, paragraph 1(c) on such areas. In other instances States Parties reported that progress had been made. For example, **Angola, Mauritania and Senegal** indicated that they had completed Landmine Impact Surveys. **Malawi** started implementing a survey of all areas suspected to contain anti-personnel mines. **Zambia** indicated that it is on the verge of starting survey activities and **Guinea Bissau** indicated the same with respect to areas outside of its capital.

29. In many instances States Parties reported that impressive progress has been made either since the 7MSP or since entry into force in fulfilling the obligation to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under a State Party’s jurisdiction or control. **Afghanistan** reported that approximately 60 percent of all contaminated land has now been released. **Albania** reported that over 85 percent of all contaminated areas has been released. **Algeria** reported that as of 31 March 2007 its demining efforts had resulted in the destruction of over 218,000 anti-personnel mines. **Bosnia and Herzegovina** indicated that in 2006 approximately 239 square kilometres of areas known or suspected to contain mines were released. **Cambodia** reported that in 2006 it had cleared more than 51 square kilometres and destroyed more than 76,000 emplaced anti-personnel mines. **Chad** indicated that approximately 57 percent of mined areas had been released. **Croatia** reported that all areas suspected to contain anti-personnel mines have been marked with over 12,000 warning signs and that maps containing these areas had been distributed to all administrative units in Croatia and other organizations. **Sudan** reported that as of March 2007 almost 40 percent of known dangerous areas had been cleared. **Yemen** indicated that over 53 percent of all areas known or suspected to contain anti-personnel mines have now been cleared. In addition, **Burundi, Greece, Serbia and Tunisia** indicated that they will be able to fulfil their obligations well in advance of their 10 year deadlines. As well, **Ethiopia** indicated that it does not anticipate that it will need to request an extension on the fulfilment of its obligations, and **Rwanda** expressed confidence that it could comply with its obligations by its deadline if it obtains necessary resources.

30. While significant progress has been achieved by many States Parties in fulfilling their Article 5 obligations, many challenges remain. At the 25-26 April 2007 meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, the following States Parties noted that obtaining external resources was a challenge: **Afghanistan, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, Colombia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Guinea Bissau, Jordan, Malawi,**

**Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Rwanda, Sudan, Tajikistan, Tunisia, Uganda, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.**

31. It was highlighted that at the 7MSP the States Parties adopted the 7MSP President's proposal concerning a procedure for handling requests for extensions of deadlines for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas.<sup>5</sup> This procedure was further elaborated through Canada's preparation of a template to assist requesting States Parties in preparing their extension requests.<sup>6</sup> Since the 7MSP, States Parties began to act upon the decisions taken at the 7MSP. It was noted that the focus of the States Parties must not drift from the imperative to ultimately implement Article 5 and that, if the process agreed to at the 7MSP is applied effectively, it should become a new means to achieve this aim. That is, a prepared, submitted, analysed and considered request is not an end in itself. Rather, it is a means to chart a course forward towards fulfilling important obligations contained in Article 5.

32. Of the 20 States Parties with deadlines in 2009 for the fulfilment of obligations under Article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention, 11 indicated that they will submit a request for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas under their jurisdiction or control: **Bosnia and Herzegovina** indicated that despite its best efforts, it will not be in a position to completely fulfill obligations stated under Article 5 of the Convention by its 1 March 2009 deadline. **Chad** indicated that various circumstances mean it will need to submit a request for an extension. **Croatia** indicated that it has begun to prepare a request for an extension and that it would need to increase efforts to release mined areas by 50 percent in order to fulfill Article 5 obligations within a 10 year extension period. **Ecuador** indicated that it hoped in the course of 2007 to formalize its extension request. **Mozambique** indicated that it is proceeding in achieving an interim milestone by the time of its 1 March 2009 deadline – the clearance of what it considers high and medium impact sites. **Peru** indicated that it is in the process of preparing its request for an extension and shared its experiences from this process. **Senegal** sought advice on the preparation of its request. **Thailand** indicated that despite its best efforts, it appears that an extension request for mine clearance may be inevitable. **Venezuela** indicated that the delay in finding substitutes for anti-personnel mines to protect military installations would make it necessary to ask for an extension. **Yemen** indicated that its prospective goal is to clear all areas by 2011 or 2012, if it has enough resources. **Zimbabwe** indicated that it will take many years to clear all its mined areas.

33. Of the 20 States Parties with deadlines in 2009 for the fulfilment of obligations under Article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention, two (2) – **France** and **Swaziland** – indicated that they will destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under their jurisdiction or control no later than 10 years after entry into force of the Convention for each State Party. In addition, **Jordan** indicated that it will do so as well if no unforeseen administrative or technical circumstances emerge to delay the clearance of remaining mined areas. **Uganda** indicated that it will fulfill its obligations no later than 10 years after entry

---

<sup>5</sup> See *Towards the full implementation of Article 5*. Annex II to the Final Report of the Seventh 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.7/2006/5).

<sup>6</sup> See *Proposed voluntary template for assisting States Parties in requesting an extension under Article 5*. Annex IV to the Final Report of the Seventh 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.7/2006/5).

into force of the Convention for it subject to the successful outcome of peace negotiations, the eventual end to conflict and support from like-minded States Parties. As well, **Nicaragua** indicated that new mined areas have been discovered and that the fulfilment of its obligations no later than 10 years after entry into force was dependent upon acquiring external funding.

34. Of the 20 States Parties with deadlines in 2009 for the fulfilment of obligations under Article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention, four (4) – **Denmark, Malawi, Niger** and the **United Kingdom** – have not yet indicated whether they will submit a request for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas under their jurisdiction or control. The status as it concerns all 20 States Parties with deadlines in 2009 with respect to requests for extensions can be found in Annex IV. In accordance with Article 5, paragraph 3 of the Convention and in line with the decisions of the 7MSP, States Parties with deadlines in 2009 which are preparing requests will need to have their requests considered at the 9MSP and they are encouraged to submit their requests to the President in March 2008. An overview of timelines for the extensions process as it concerns these and other relevant States Parties can be found in Annex V.

35. It was observed that the matter of preparing and considering requests for extensions will now be a regular feature of work to implement the Convention and that as with all other aspects of implementation, principles such as clarity, transparency and predictability should be emphasised.

36. States Parties were reminded that they may seek assistance from the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) when preparing such requests. As well, it was recalled that the 7MSP decisions concerning the extensions process imply additional costs. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies indicated that these costs should be shared between States Parties. It was further noted that this may be done so on a voluntary basis through the ISU Trust Fund.

37. The issue of how to increase efficiency in mine action through greater use of effective land release mechanisms was subject to increasing interest during the period since the 7MSP. At the 25-26 April 2007 meeting of the Standing Committee on Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies, Croatia, the GICHD and Norwegian People's Aid provided experts' views on how this can be done in a manner that is responsible and safe. In addition, in June 2007 the GICHD convened a practitioners' workshop on this matter. When done according to strict criteria and with the knowledge and approval of local actors, land release through means other than clearance can speed up implementation of Article 5 in a way that is consistent with and supports implementation of the Convention. The need for standards to ensure the safe and efficient release of suspected mined areas was underlined.

38. The Standing Committee in Mine Clearance, Mine Risk Education and Mine Action Technologies was again kept apprised of progress and challenges concerning mine risk education (MRE). It was highlighted that MRE is required in at-risk communities even during conflict and that to be sustainable MRE must include local participation. The importance of creatively addressing risk taking behaviour was pointed out, as was the need for data collection, survey and marking and fencing. It was underlined that affected States Parties should be prepared for emergency MRE. The need to increase resources provided for MRE by affected States Parties was highlighted.

39. The importance of including gender considerations in all stages of mine clearance and MRE was further highlighted. Lessons from mine-related activities that are adapted to the different needs and situations of women and men were shared, notably by the UNDP.

40. With respect to mine action technologies, Croatia convened a fourth annual symposium on mechanical demining in April 2007. A number of pertinent conclusions were drawn which may assist relevant States Parties in making the most efficient and effective use of machines in the fulfillment of Article 5 obligations.

*Priorities for the period leading to the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties*

41. In recalling that the First Review Conference emphasized that Article 5 implementation will be the most significant challenge to be addressed in the period leading to the Second Review Conference, States Parties should place a priority in the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties on the following:

**(i) States Parties in the process of implementing Article 5 which have not yet done so should act in accordance with their Convention obligations and as emphasized by Actions #17 to #22 of the *Nairobi Action Plan* to identify mined areas under their jurisdiction or control, develop national plans consistent with Convention obligations and achieve progress in implementing such a plan.**

**(ii) States Parties implementing Article 5 should provide clarity on their status regarding Article 5 implementation.**

**(iii) States Parties should implement the agreed process concerning requests for extensions to Article 5 deadlines, doing so in a cooperative and practical-minded manner.**

**(iv) States Parties that need to prepare an extension request should, in accordance with the decisions of the 7MSP, as necessary, seek assistance from the ISU in the preparation of their requests and States Parties in a position to do so should provide additional ear-marked funds to the ISU Trust Fund to cover costs related to supporting the Article 5 extensions process.**

**(v) States Parties in a position to do so should, in accordance with their Convention obligations and as emphasized Action #23 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, provide assistance for mine clearance and mine risk reduction education.**

**(vi) Noting that approaches to releasing areas suspected to contain anti-personnel mines through means other than clearance can speed up implementation of Article 5, States Parties should encourage the development or enhancement of standards for the release of suspected mined areas.**

**IV. Assisting the victims**

42. Since the 7MSP, greater emphasis continued to be placed on fulfilling responsibilities to landmine victims by the 24 States Parties that have indicated that they hold ultimate responsibility for significant numbers of landmine survivors. These States Parties are: **Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burundi, Cambodia, Chad,**

**Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Senegal, Serbia, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, Uganda, and Yemen.** As noted in the *Nairobi Action Plan*, “these States Parties have the greatest responsibility to act, but also the greatest needs and expectations for assistance.”<sup>7</sup> Since the 7MSP, the efforts of these 24 States Parties, with the support of others, continued to be guided by the clear framework regarding victim assistance in the context of the Convention which was agreed to at the First Review Conference which includes the following core principles:

(i) that “the call to assist landmine victims should not lead to victim assistance efforts being undertaken in such a manner as to exclude any person injured or disabled in another manner;”

(ii) that 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;”

(iii) 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;” and,

(iv) that “providing adequate assistance to landmine survivors must be seen in a broader context of development and underdevelopment.”<sup>8</sup>

43. Guided by the conclusions drawn at the First Review Conference and Actions #29 to #39 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration provided support and encouragement to the 24 relevant States Parties to set specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART) objectives and a plan of action to fulfil their victim assistance responsibilities in the period leading up to the Second Review Conference in 2009. Particular effort was made to overcome the fact that as of the end of the 7MSP few of the 24 relevant States Parties had responded with SMART objectives and that some had failed to spell out what is known or not known about the status of victim assistance. In addition, in some instances preparation of victim assistance objectives had not taken broader national plans into consideration, some States Parties lacked the capacity and resources to develop and implement objectives and national plans and in some there was limited collaboration between mine action centres and relevant ministries and other key actors in the disability sector.

44. Since 2005, Co-Chairs have recognized that overcoming these challenges requires intensive work on a national basis in the 24 relevant States Parties. In this regard, with assistance provided by Australia, Austria, Norway and Switzerland, the ISU continued to support national inter-ministerial processes to enable those States Parties with good objectives to develop and implement good plans, to help those with unclear objectives develop more concrete objectives, and to assist those least engaged in developing objectives and plans in 2005 and 2006, to get engaged. The ISU provided or offered some degree of support to each of the 24 relevant States Parties and undertook specialized support visits to

---

<sup>7</sup> Review of the operation and status of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II).

<sup>8</sup> Review of the operation and status of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction (APLC/CONF/2004/5, Part II).

Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Colombia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Peru, Sudan, Thailand, and Uganda in 2007. Many relevant States Parties' inter-ministerial processes involved national victim assistance-focused workshops with such workshops taking place in the following States Parties since the 7MSP: Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Sudan and Uganda.

45. At the April 2007 meeting of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, 19 of the 24 relevant States Parties provided updates on the application of relevant provisions of the *Nairobi Action Plan*. Through these updates and from information otherwise provided by the States Parties, progress in strengthening objectives and / or developing, revising or implementing plans was reported by Afghanistan, Albania, Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, El Salvador, Sudan, Tajikistan, Thailand, and Uganda. In addition, relevant ministries are developing and implementing plans of action for the disability sector as a whole in Mozambique.

46. The potential for progress in some States Parties has been hindered by a lack of financial resources. For example, in 2006 Tajikistan reported significant progress in the development of a national plan through a process of consultation and collaboration with relevant ministries and other key actors. However, it has been unable to secure the resources needed to implement key elements of its plan. In this regard, it was recalled that States Parties in a position to do so have an obligation to provide assistance for the care, rehabilitation and reintegration of mine victims and have made commitments in this regard in the *Nairobi Action Plan*.

47. Also in the context of Action #29 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, the Sixtieth World Health Assembly in May 2007 urged its Member States, which include all 24 States Parties reporting responsibility for significant numbers of landmine survivors, "to assess comprehensively the pre-hospital and emergency-care context including, where necessary, identifying unmet needs," and requested the Director-General of the World Health Organization "to devise standardized tools and techniques for assessing need for prehospital and facility-based capacity in trauma and emergency care" and "to collaborate with Member States, non governmental organizations and other stakeholders in order to help ensure that the necessary capacity is in place effectively to plan, organize, administer, finance and monitor provision of trauma and emergency care."<sup>9</sup> Such actions by the World Health Assembly provide valuable guidance to the States Parties to the Convention in the fulfilment of their responsibilities to landmine survivors.

48. The World Health Assembly also took action on a matter that concerns Action #34 of the *Nairobi Action Plan* when in May 2007 it urged its Member States "to develop, implement, consolidate and assess plans to strengthen their health information systems," and requested the Director-General of the World Health Organization "to increase WHO's activities in health statistics at the global, regional and country levels and provide harmonized support to Member States to build capacities for development of health information systems and generation, analysis, dissemination and use of data."<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> *Health systems: emergency-care systems*. Sixtieth World Health Assembly, Agenda Item 12.14 (WHA 60.22).

<sup>10</sup> *Strengthening of health information systems*. Sixtieth World Health Assembly, Agenda Item 12.15 (WHA 60.27).

49. On matters that relate to Action #33 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, efforts continued since the 7MSP to strengthen the normative framework that protects and ensures respect for the rights of persons with disabilities including landmine survivors. In particular, on 13 December 2006 the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and its Optional Protocol were adopted. On 30 March 2007 the CRPD was opened for signature. Thirteen (13) of the 24 States Parties reporting responsibility for significant numbers of landmine survivors have signed the CRPD as have 71 other States Parties to the Convention. Five States have ratified the CRPD, including Croatia, which is one of the 24 States Parties reporting responsibility for significant numbers of landmine survivors. At the 24 / 27 April 2007 meeting of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, it was highlighted that the CRPD has the potential to promote a more systematic and sustainable approach to victim assistance in the context of the Convention by bringing *victim assistance* into the broader context of policy and planning for persons with disabilities more generally.

50. Pursuant to Action #37 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, Australia supported the ICBL through its member organization, Standing Tall Australia, in monitoring progress in the achievement of victim assistance goals through the report *Landmine Victim Assistance in 2006: Overview of the Situation in 24 States Parties* – the third such annual report. In addition, the ICBL released its *10 Guiding Principles for Victim Assistance* to provide a framework for all concerned actors to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate victim assistance activities.

51. In keeping with Action #38 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, at least 11 landmine survivors participated in the April 2007 meetings of the Standing Committees, including one who was a member of the delegation of a State Party.

52. In keeping with Action #39 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, at least 17 States Parties included relevant health, rehabilitation, social services or disability professionals in their delegations to the April 2007 meetings of the Standing Committees. In order to make the best possible use of the time dedicated by such experts in the work of the Convention, the Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration organized an ambitious parallel programme during the 23-27 April 2007 meetings of the Standing Committees. This programme increased the knowledge of the expert participants on victim assistance in the context of the Convention, emphasized the place of victim assistance in the broader contexts of disability, health care, social services, and development, reaffirmed the importance of key principles adopted by the States Parties in 2004, and reaffirmed key challenges. In addition, in response to the request of the victim assistance experts participating in the programme, the ISU began to significantly enhance the quantity of victim assistance resources available in the Convention's Documentation Centre.

#### *Priorities for the period leading to the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties*

53. Despite advances since the 7MSP, States Parties should continue to deepen their understanding of principles accepted and commitments made through the Convention and at the First Review Conference and the work undertaken since by the Standing Committee on Victim Assistance and Socio-Economic Reintegration, in particular by placing a priority in the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties on the following:

- (i) As progress in victim assistance should be specific, measurable and time-bound, with specific measures logically needing to be determined by individual States Parties based on their very diverse circumstances, relevant States Parties that have not yet done so should provide an unambiguous assessment of how progress with respect to victim assistance as concerns their States could be measured by the time of the Second Review Conference in 2009.
- (ii) In fulfilling their responsibilities to landmine survivors, relevant States Parties and those assisting them should apply the understandings adopted at the First Review Conference, particularly by understanding victim assistance in the broader contexts of development and seeing its place as a part of existing State responsibilities in the areas of health care, social services, rehabilitation and human rights frameworks.
- (iii) In fulfilling their responsibilities to landmine survivors, relevant States Parties and those assisting them should recall the need to reinforce existing State structures and that the role of mine action centres should largely relate to data collection and dissemination and advocacy.<sup>11</sup>
- (iv) States Parties should strengthen the involvement in the work of the Convention by health care, rehabilitation and disability rights experts and do more to ensure that landmine survivors are effectively involved in national planning and contribute to deliberations that affect them.
- (v) In fulfilling their responsibilities to landmine survivors, States Parties should be guided by the principles of non-discrimination, inclusion, equality of opportunity, and accessibility, and should ensure all efforts consider the age and gender of the victims, the development of national and local capacities, the delivery and accessibility of a comprehensive range of services, and the involvement of all concerned actors and stakeholders.

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

### **A. Cooperation and assistance**

54. Norway continued to coordinate the work of the Resource Mobilisation Contact Group, placing an emphasis since the 7MSP on information sources available to enable States Parties to make efficient and effective use of mine action resources.

55. At the 7MSP, the establishment of the Linking Mine Action and Development (LMAD) Contact Group, coordinated by Canada, was noted with the Contact Group's immediate aim being to develop practical guidelines and tools to facilitate integration of mine action and development in complementing existing dedicated mechanisms. It was also noted that Canada, the United Kingdom, the GICHD and the UNDP were promoting the link between mine action and development in the programme of work of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and

---

<sup>11</sup> See for instance *The scope of mine action centres and organizations in victim assistance*. United Nations Mine Action Service, 2003.

Development (OECD) with the aim of enhancing policy and practical guidelines for DAC members on the inclusion of mine action in security and development policies.

56. Since the 7MSP, the GICHD established the LMAD Practitioners Network involving over 100 practitioners with extensive knowledge of linking mine action with development at the community, sectoral, national, and international levels. LMAD practitioners' workshops were held in Geneva in April 2007, Cambodia in June 2007, and Yemen in November 2007, with the aim of sharing experiences, lessons and good practices. Based on these workshops, guidelines are being drafted for national authorities, donors, mine action officials and practitioners, NGOs and UN agencies on how to more effectively link mine action with development. Guidelines aimed specifically at donor agencies will feed into the OECD DAC's guidelines on integrating armed violence into development programming.

57. While the First Review Conference had highlighted the importance of mainstreaming support to mine action through broader programmes, various Standing Committees raised potential concerns about how mainstreaming can put at risk accessibility to and the allocation of mine action funding. It was noted that donors concerned should be clear in communicating procedural changes which could affect funding levels and that donors should maintain a central focal point for assistance requests.

58. As noted, pursuant to the right of each State Party, as contained in Article 6, paragraph 1 of the Convention, "to seek and receive assistance, where feasible, from other States Parties to the extent possible," a large number of States Parties indicated a need for external resources in order to fulfill Convention obligations. In some instances it was noted that the failure to obtain external resources may affect the timely implementation of Article 5 of the Convention.

59. A variety of means through which States Parties may provide and obtain assistance, including relatively new means, were highlighted, particularly by the UN system. In addition to funds obtained through the UN Trust Fund for Mine Action and the Trust Fund for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, the UN reported that it had accessed funds through the UN Trust Fund for Human Security (including more than US\$ 1.7 million to assist **Sudan** in the development and implementation of a strategic action plan on victim assistance and for MRE activities) and the UN Central Emergency Revolving Fund (from which funds were obtained to assist **Guinea Bissau** in mine clearance). As well, the UNDP reported that it had refocused its *Completion Initiative* on accelerating assistance to States Parties with relatively modest Article 5 challenges to develop strategies which could be implemented in accordance with Convention deadlines. To date through this programme, **Albania** has developed a plan of action for completion of its obligations by its deadline and the UNDP has begun providing support to **Malawi**, **Mauritania** and **Zambia**.

60. The importance of a two-track approach to cooperation on victim assistance was again noted. Such an approach involves assistance provided by or through specialized organizations in which assistance specifically targets landmines survivors and other war wounded, and assistance in the form of integrated approaches in which development cooperation aims to guarantee the rights of all individuals, including persons with disabilities. As in past years, while some States Parties provided information on efforts regarding the former, very little information was provided regarding efforts that will ultimately benefit landmine survivors through integrated development cooperation.

61. It was again noted that stockpile destruction is a cost efficient and effective way of ensuring that no more mines are placed in the ground and that even with an ever-decreasing number of mines remaining in stocks there exists a risk until such time as all stocks are destroyed. In this context and as it relates to Action #13 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, States Parties in a position to do so were again encouraged to promptly assist other States Parties with clearly demonstrated needs concerning the fulfillment of Article 4 obligations. Two (2) States Parties provided an updated on their assistance activities in this area during the April 2007 meeting of the Standing Committee on Stockpile Destruction.

62. Also with respect to cooperation and assistance as it concerns stockpile destruction, as previously noted, the importance of Article 6, paragraph 9, which states “each State Party giving and receiving assistance under the provisions of this Article shall cooperate with a view to ensuring the full and prompt implementation of agreed assistance programs,” was recalled.

*Priorities for the period leading to the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties*

63. In recalling their obligations and the commitments they made in the *Nairobi Action Plan* to cooperate with and assist each other, States Parties should place a priority in the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties on the following:

**(i) Given the large number of States Parties which continue to indicate a need for external resources in order to fulfill Convention obligations, States Parties in a position to do so should continue to act upon their obligations under Article 6 of the Convention.**

**(ii) In accordance with Action #45 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, States Parties should ensure that when mine action is mainstreamed into development budgets, the changes are geared towards enhancing the sustainability of such assistance and done in a way that ensures that the implementation of the Convention remains a high priority.**

**(iii) States Parties requiring assistance should include mine action in their development plans and programmes as indicated in Action #40 of the *Nairobi Action Plan* in order to benefit from mainstreamed international assistance.**

**(iv) States Parties should continue to support efforts to establish and promote guidelines on how to more effectively link mine action with development.**

**B. Transparency and the exchange of information**

64. At the close of the 7MSP, initial transparency reports had been submitted as required by Article 7, paragraph 1 by all States Parties except Bhutan, Cape Verde, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guyana, and Sao Tome and Principe. Since that time, **Bhutan** and **Guyana** submitted initial reports. In addition since the 7MSP, the initial reporting deadlines for **Brunei Darussalam**, the **Cook Islands**, **Haiti**, **Montenegro** and **Ukraine** have occurred with each of these States Parties except **Haiti** and **Montenegro** having submitted its initial report. Hence, there are seven (7) States Parties – **Cape Verde**, **Equatorial Guinea**,

**Ethiopia, Gambia, Haiti, Montenegro and Sao Tome and Principe** – which have not yet complied with their obligations under Article 7, paragraph 1.<sup>12</sup>

65. In terms of compliance with Article 7 paragraph 2, at the close of the 7MSP all States Parties which at the time were required to provide an updated transparency report covering calendar year 2005 had done so with the exception of 43 States Parties. In addition, at the close of the 7MSP, the overall reporting rate in 2006 stood at 66 percent. In 2007, all States Parties required to provide an updated transparency report covering calendar year 2006 had done so with the exception of the following 62 States Parties: Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Guyana, Iceland, Kenya, Kiribati, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Monaco, Namibia, Nauru, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Swaziland, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Uruguay and Vanuatu. As of 22 November 2007 the overall reporting rate in 2007 stood at [54] percent.

66. The 7MSP re-emphasized that States Parties should continue to comply or improve their compliance with Article 7 reporting obligations, especially those States Parties that are destroying stockpiled anti-personnel mines, clearing mined areas, retaining anti-personnel mines for reasons permitted under Article 3 and / or taking measures in accordance with Article 9. As of 22 November 2007:

(i) Of the 12 States Parties, which as of the close of the 7MSP, still had to destroy stockpiled anti-personnel mines in accordance with Article 4, each provided transparency information covering the previous calendar year on this matter as required in 2007 with the exception of the following: **Burundi, Ethiopia and Serbia.**

(ii) Of the 45 States which, as of the close of the 7MSP, still had to clear mined areas in accordance with Article 5, each provided transparency information covering the previous calendar year on this matter as required in 2007 with the exception of the following: **Burundi, Cambodia, Guinea Bissau, Malawi, Niger, Rwanda, Serbia and Uganda.**

(iii) Of the 77 States which, as of the close of the 7MSP, had reported that they had retained anti-personnel mines for reasons permitted under Article 3, each provided transparency information covering the previous calendar year on this matter as required in 2007 with the exception of the following: **Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, El Salvador, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Guinea Bissau, Malawi, Mali, Namibia, Niger, Serbia, South Africa, Togo, Uganda and Uruguay.** One State Party: the **Democratic Republic of the Congo** stated that a decision concerning anti-personnel mines retained under Article 3 is pending.<sup>13</sup> Two States Parties, **Moldova and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia** reported that in 2006 they destroyed all their anti-personnel mines retained under Article 3. In

<sup>12</sup> Indonesia is required to submit an initial transparency report as soon as practicable and, in any event, not later than 27 January 2008; Iraq not later than 30 July 2008; and Kuwait not later than 29 June 2008.

<sup>13</sup> Two additional States Parties – **Botswana and Burundi** – which did not submit transparency reports in 2007 previously had indicated that a decision concerning anti-personnel mines retained under Article 3 is pending.

addition since the 7MSP, two States Parties – **Brunei Darussalam** and **Guyana** – reported for the first time that they have not retained mines for purposes permitted under Article 3. An update on the numbers of anti-personnel mines retained and transferred for permitted reasons is contained in Annex VI.

(iv) Of the 74 States Parties which, as of the close of the 7MSP, had not reported in the context of Article 9, either that they had adopted legislation or that they considered their existing laws to be sufficient to give effect to the Convention, each provided transparency information covering the previous calendar year on this matter as required in 2007 with the exception of the following: **Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bolivia, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Comoros, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Cyprus, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Kenya, Latvia, Liberia, Malawi, Maldives, Mauritania, Namibia, Nauru, Nigeria, Niue, Panama, Paraguay, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Swaziland, Timor-Leste, Togo, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uganda, Uruguay, Vanuatu and Venezuela.**

67. At the 6MSP, the States Parties amended the transparency reporting format to provide, in Form D, the opportunity to volunteer information in addition to what is minimally required on anti-personnel mines retained for reasons permitted under Article 3 pursuant to Action #54 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*. In 2007, 12 States Parties used the amended reporting format to provide such information. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation invited States Parties to volunteer relevant information on anti-personnel mines retained under Article 3 and to make use of the 23-27 April 2007 meeting of the Standing Committee. Nine (9) States Parties took advantage of this opportunity and provided updated information in this forum. An overview of information volunteered is contained in Annex VI.

68. States Parties may share information beyond what is minimally required through the Article 7 reporting format’s Form J. Since the 7MSP, the following 36 States Parties have made use of Form J as a voluntary means of reporting: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Japan, Lithuania, Mauritania, Mozambique, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Turkey, Yemen and Zambia. Of these, the following 21 States Parties used Form J to report on assistance for the care and rehabilitation, and social and economic reintegration, of mine victims: Afghanistan, Albania, Australia, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Chad, Colombia, Croatia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Germany, Japan, Mauritania, Mozambique, New Zealand, Peru, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Turkey, Yemen and Zambia.

69. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention provided an opportunity on 27 April 2007, pursuant to Action #55 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, to exchange of views and share experiences on the practical implementation of the various provisions of the Convention, including Articles 1, 2 and 3. One State Party spoke on Articles 1, 2 and / or 3. Three States Parties shared views on other aspects of implementation.

70. Since the 7MSP, one State not party, Poland, provided a voluntary transparency report sharing information on all pertinent matters mentioned in Article 7.

71. Consistent with Action #58 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, some States Parties and regional or other organizations arranged voluntarily regional and thematic conferences and workshops to advance implementation of the Convention or otherwise worked to disseminate information on the Convention. Many of these activities have been referred to elsewhere in this progress report. Other efforts included bilateral meetings in New York held by the 7MSP President with States Parties not represented in Geneva to promote, in particular, fulfilment of transparency reporting obligations. This work resulted in at least one State Party submitting its initial Article 7 report. In addition, the ICBL convened workshops in Senegal, Yemen, Tajikistan and Colombia and the UN in collaboration with the ISU organized a workshop on the obligations of the Convention for national mine action directors and UN advisors.

72. Several States Parties took the initiative to organize events to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the adoption and signing of the Convention:

(i) On 12 February 2007 in Vienna, Austria held a symposium marking the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Vienna Meeting on the Convention for the Prohibition of Anti-Personnel Mines that took place exactly ten years before in February 1997. The symposium, *Assisting Landmine Survivors – A Decade of Efforts*, concentrated on progress achieved over the past ten years and challenges that still remain in fully implementing the Convention in relation to mine victim assistance.

(ii). On 9 May 2007 in Brussels, Belgium convened the special event, *New Perspectives for a World Without Mines*, which marked the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the June 1997 Brussels International Conference for a Global Ban on Anti-Personnel Mines.

(iii). On 18 September 2007 in Oslo, Norway organized *Clearing the Path for a Better Future*, an event commemorating the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Oslo Diplomatic Conference on an International Total Ban on Anti-Personnel Mines and the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the adoption of the Convention.

(iv). Canada announced that it will organize events in Ottawa in December 2007 to mark the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Convention's signing ceremony.

73. The informal Article 7 Contact Group, coordinated by Belgium, continued to work to raise awareness on transparency reporting obligations and played an important role in serving as a point of contact for requests for assistance. On 1 March 2007 – the eighth anniversary of the Convention's entry into force – the Coordinator of the Contact Group wrote to all States Parties to remind them of their obligations, particularly the 30 April deadline by which updated information covering the last calendar year should be submitted. In addition, the Contact Group met to discuss strategies and exchange of information on a regular basis and re-emphasized the importance of quality reporting. The UN also helped States Parties complying with their Article 7 reporting obligations by facilitating access to Article 7 reporting formats on its website and with in-country support provided by UN technical

advisors. A new database containing Article 7 reports submitted since 2005 was also created by the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA).

*Priorities for the period leading to the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties*

74. Further to the recognition made by the States Parties that transparency and the effective exchange of information will be crucial to fulfilling their obligations during the period 2005-2009, States Parties should place a priority in the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties on the following:

**(i) Those States Parties which are late in submitting initial transparency reports and those that did not provide updated information in 2007 covering the previous calendar year should submit their reports as a matter of urgency. Prompt submission of 2007 reports.**

**(ii) States Parties should consider making use of the variety of informal information mechanisms and forums which exist to provide information on matters not specifically required but which may assist in the implementation process and in resource mobilisation.**

**C. Preventing and suppressing prohibited activities, and facilitating compliance**

75. Since the 7MSP, two additional States Parties Brunei Darussalam and Cook Islands reported that they were in the process of adopting legislation to implement the Convention. There are now 51 States Parties that have reported that they have adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations. An additional 26 reported that they consider existing laws to be sufficient. Seventy-six (76) States Parties have not yet reported having adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations or that they consider existing laws to be sufficient. An overview of implementation of Article 9 is contained in Annex VII.

76. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention invited States Parties to volunteer information at the 27 April 2007 meeting of the Standing Committee on their progress in adopting legislative, administrative and other measures in accordance with Article 9 and if relevant, to make their priorities for assistance known. Seven States Parties took advantage of this opportunity and provided updated information in this forum.

77. The Co-Chairs of the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention highlighted that while almost 80 States Parties have reported on “legal” measures taken in accordance with Article 9, very few have reported on “administrative and other measures.” The Co-Chairs encouraged updates on administrative and other measures taken at the April meeting of the Standing Committee. One State Party, Argentina, provided updates on such measures that it had taken.

78. Since the 7MSP, the States Parties remained committed to work together to facilitate compliance under the Convention. In addition, since the 7MSP, no State Party submitted a request for clarification to a Meeting of the States Parties in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 2, nor has any proposed that a Special Meeting of the States Parties be convened in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 5. As well, the UNODA continued fulfilling the UN Secretary General’s responsibility to prepare and update a list of names, nationalities and

other relevant data of qualified experts designated for fact finding missions authorized in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 8. Since the 7MSP, 19 States Parties – Austria, Bolivia, Croatia, Czech Republic, El Salvador, Germany, Jordan, Luxembourg, Moldova, Nicaragua, Serbia, Spain, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine and Yemen – provided new or updated information for the list of experts.

79. Since the 7MSP, concern was expressed about a UN Monitoring Group's report on Somalia referring to the alleged transfer of landmines into Somalia by three States Parties to the Convention and by one State not party. The President of the 7MSP wrote to the Chair of the Monitoring Group to seek further information, particularly as some of the terminology in the report was unclear as to which types of mines were allegedly transferred. The President did not receive a response. It was noted that the States Parties concerned rejected claims made in the report.

*Priorities for the period leading to the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties*

80. In recalling that the commitment made in the Nairobi Action Plan to continue to be guided by the knowledge that individually and collectively they are responsible for ensuring compliance with the Convention, States Parties should place a priority in the period leading to the next Meeting of the States Parties on the following

- (i) Given that approximately 50 percent of the States Parties have not yet reported having implemented Article 9, State Parties should place a renewed emphasis on the obligation 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 by the Convention.**
- (ii) The President will continue to follow up to seek clarity with respect to reports, such as those of UN Monitoring Groups, which allege violations of the Convention.**

#### **D. Implementation Support**

81. The Coordinating Committee met six times to prepare for and assess the outcome of the Intersessional Work Programme and to coordinate the work of the Standing Committees with the work of the Meeting of the States Parties since the 7MSP. The Coordinating Committee continued to operate in an open and transparent manner with summary reports of meetings made available to all interested parties on the Convention's web site.<sup>14</sup>

82. With respect to the Intersessional Work Programme, at the April 2007 meetings of the Standing Committees there were over 500 registered delegates representing 100 States Parties, 21 States not parties and numerous international and non-governmental organizations. These meetings featured discussions on the implementation of key provisions of the Convention and on assuring that cooperation and assistance would continue to function well. The meetings were again supported by GICHD. Interpretation services were provided through voluntary contributions by the European Commission and Canada.

---

<sup>14</sup> [www.apminebanconvention.org](http://www.apminebanconvention.org)

83. In 2007, the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) of the GICHD continued to assist States Parties to implement the Convention's obligations and objectives. The ISU supported the President, the President-Designate, the Co-Chairs, the Contact Group Coordinators, the Sponsorship Programme donors group and individual States Parties with initiatives to pursue the aims of the *Nairobi Action Plan*. In addition, through the provision of professional advice, support and information services, the ISU assisted individual States Parties in addressing various implementation challenges.

84. The continuing operations of ISU were assured by voluntary contributions by the following States Parties since the 7MSP: [LIST TO BE INSERTED]. In 2007, ISU continued to provide victim assistance *process support* to the inter-ministerial coordination efforts of States Parties that have reported the responsibility for significant numbers of mine victims through project funding provided by Australia, Austria, Norway and Switzerland.

85. The ISU obtained additional staff resources to support individual States Parties in the preparation of requests for extensions on the implementation of Article 5. In addition, pursuant to the decision of the 7MSP "to encourage all States Parties in a position to do so to provide additional earmarked funds to the ISU Trust Fund to cover costs related to support the Article 5 extensions process," the 2007 ISU budget provided a means for such earmarking. The following States Parties provided earmarked funding [LIST TO BE INSERTED].

86. The UNODA and Jordan, with the assistance of ISU, made arrangements for the 8MSP. The States Parties continued to use Contact Groups on universalization, Article 7 reporting, resource mobilization and linking mine action and development.

87. The Sponsorship Programme continued to ensure participation in the Convention's meetings by States Parties normally not able to be represented at these meetings by relevant experts or officials. In advance of the April 2007 meetings of the Standing Committees, the programme's Donors' Group invited 39 States Parties to request sponsorship for up to 62 delegates to provide updates on Convention implementation. Thirty-two (32) States Parties accepted this offer with 48 representatives of States Parties sponsored to attend the April meetings. The programme's Donors' Group invited 45 States Parties to request sponsorship for up to 69 delegates to attend the 8MSP. [NUMBER TO BE INSERTED] States Parties accepted this offer with [NUMBER TO BE INSERTED] representatives of States Parties sponsored to attend the 8MSP.

88. Sponsorship of States Parties' delegates was again instrumental in the application of Action #39 of the *Nairobi Action Plan*, to include health and social service professionals in deliberations. Sixteen (16) relevant States Parties accepted the Donors' Group offer of support at the April 2007 meetings. And [NUMBER TO BE INSERTED] relevant States Parties took advantage of the Donors' Group offer of support for participation by such a professional in the 8MSP.

89. The Sponsorship Programme also contributed to the aims of universalization, with the Donors' Group having offered sponsorship to eight (8) States not parties for the April 2007 meetings of the Standing Committees and seven (7) States not parties for the 8MSP. Four (4) States not parties accepted this offer in April 2007, with most providing an update on their views on the Convention at the 23 April meeting of the Standing Committee on the General

Status and Operation of the Convention. [NUMBER TO BE INSERTED] States not parties accepted this offer for the 8MSP.

90. The continuing operations of the Sponsorship Programme were assured in 2007 by contributions to the Sponsorship Programme from the following States Parties since the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties: [LIST TO BE INSERTED].

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

<b>State</b>	<b>Date of Formal Acceptance</b>	<b>Date of Entry-into-force</b>
<b>Afghanistan</b>	11 September 2002	1 March 2003
<b>Albania</b>	29 February 2000	1 August 2000
<b>Algeria</b>	9 October 2001	1 April 2002
<b>Andorra</b>	29 June 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Angola</b>	5 July 2002	1 January 2003
<b>Antigua and Barbuda</b>	3 May 1999	1 November 1999
<b>Argentina</b>	14 September 1999	1 March 2000
<b>Australia</b>	14 January 1999	1 July 1999
<b>Austria</b>	29 June 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Bahamas</b>	31 July 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Bangladesh</b>	6 September 2000	1 March 2001
<b>Barbados</b>	26 January 1999	1 July 1999
<b>Belarus</b>	3 September 2003	1 March 2004
<b>Belgium</b>	4 September 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Belize</b>	23 April 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Benin</b>	25 September 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Bhutan</b>	18 August 2005	1 February 2006
<b>Bolivia</b>	9 June 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>	8 September 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Botswana</b>	1 March 2000	1 September 2000
<b>Brazil</b>	30 April 1999	1 October 1999
<b>Brunei Darussalam</b>	24 April 2006	1 October 2006
<b>Bulgaria</b>	4 September 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Burkina Faso</b>	16 September 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Burundi</b>	22 October 2003	1 April 2004
<b>Cambodia</b>	28 July 1999	1 January 2000
<b>Cameroon</b>	19 September 2002	1 March 2003
<b>Canada</b>	3 December 1997	1 March 1999
<b>Cape Verde</b>	14 May 2001	1 November 2001
<b>Central African Republic</b>	8 November 2002	1 May 2003
<b>Chad</b>	6 May 1999	1 November 1999
<b>Chile</b>	10 September 2001	1 March 2002
<b>Colombia</b>	6 September 2000	1 March 2001
<b>Comoros</b>	19 September 2002	1 March 2003
<b>Congo (Brazzaville)</b>	4 May 2001	1 November 2001
<b>Cook Islands</b>	15 March 2006	1 September 2006
<b>Costa Rica</b>	17 March 1999	1 September 1999
<b>Côte d' Ivoire</b>	30 June 2000	1 December 2000
<b>Croatia</b>	20 May 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Cyprus</b>	17 January 2003	1 July 2003
<b>Czech Republic</b>	26 October 1999	1 April 2000
<b>Democratic Republic of the Congo</b>	2 May 2002	1 November 2002
<b>Denmark</b>	8 June 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Djibouti</b>	18 May 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Dominica</b>	26 March 1999	1 September 1999
<b>Dominican Republic</b>	30 June 2000	1 December 2000
<b>Ecuador</b>	29 April 1999	1 October 1999

<b>State</b>	<b>Date of Formal Acceptance</b>	<b>Date of Entry-into-force</b>
<b>El Salvador</b>	27 January 1999	1 July 1999
<b>Equatorial Guinea</b>	16 September 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Eritrea</b>	27 August 2001	1 February 2002
<b>Estonia</b>	12 May 2004	1 November 2004
<b>Ethiopia</b>	17 December 2004	1 June 2005
<b>Fiji</b>	10 June 1998	1 March 1999
<b>France</b>	23 July 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Gabon</b>	8 September 2000	1 March 2001
<b>Gambia</b>	23 September 2002	1 March 2003
<b>Germany</b>	23 July 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Ghana</b>	30 June 2000	1 December 2000
<b>Greece</b>	25 September 2003	1 March 2004
<b>Grenada</b>	19 August 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Guatemala</b>	26 March 1999	1 September 1999
<b>Guinea</b>	8 October 1998	1 April 1999
<b>Guinea Bissau</b>	22 May 2001	1 November 2001
<b>Guyana</b>	5 August 2003	1 February 2004
<b>Haiti</b>	15 February 2006	1 August 2006
<b>Holy See</b>	17 February 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Honduras</b>	24 September 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Hungary</b>	6 April 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Iceland</b>	5 May 1999	1 November 1999
<b>Indonesia</b>	16 February 2007	1 August 2007
<b>Iraq</b>	15 August 2007	1 February 2008
<b>Ireland</b>	3 December 1997	1 March 1999
<b>Italy</b>	23 April 1999	1 October 1999
<b>Jamaica</b>	17 July 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Japan</b>	30 September 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Jordan</b>	13 November 1998	1 May 1999
<b>Kenya</b>	23 January 2001	1 July 2001
<b>Kiribati</b>	7 September 2000	1 March 2001
<b>Kuwait</b>	30 July 2007	1 January 2008
<b>Latvia</b>	1 July 2005	1 January 2006
<b>Lesotho</b>	2 December 1998	1 June 1999
<b>Liberia</b>	23 December 1999	1 June 2000
<b>Liechtenstein</b>	5 October 1999	1 April 2000
<b>Lithuania</b>	12 May 2003	1 November 2003
<b>Luxembourg</b>	14 June 1999	1 December 1999
<b>Madagascar</b>	16 September 1999	1 March 2000
<b>Malawi</b>	13 August 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Malaysia</b>	22 April 1999	1 October 1999
<b>Maldives</b>	7 September 2000	1 March 2001
<b>Mali</b>	2 June 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Malta</b>	7 May 2001	1 November 2001
<b>Mauritania</b>	21 July 2000	1 January 2001
<b>Mauritius</b>	3 December 1997	1 March 1999
<b>Mexico</b>	9 June 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Moldova, Republic of</b>	8 September 2000	1 March 2001
<b>Monaco</b>	17 November 1998	1 May 1999
<b>Montenegro</b>	23 October 2006	1 April 2007
<b>Mozambique</b>	25 August 1998	1 March 1999

<b>State</b>	<b>Date of Formal Acceptance</b>	<b>Date of Entry-into-force</b>
<b>Namibia</b>	21 September 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Nauru</b>	7 August 2000	1 February 2001
<b>Netherlands</b>	12 April 1999	1 October 1999
<b>New Zealand</b>	27 January 1999	1 July 1999
<b>Nicaragua</b>	30 November 1998	1 May 1999
<b>Niger</b>	23 March 1999	1 September 1999
<b>Nigeria</b>	27 September 2001	1 March 2002
<b>Niue</b>	15 April 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Norway</b>	9 July 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Panama</b>	7 October 1998	1 April 1999
<b>Papua New Guinea</b>	28 June 2004	1 December 2004
<b>Paraguay</b>	13 November 1998	1 May 1999
<b>Peru</b>	17 June 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Philippines</b>	15 February 2000	1 August 2000
<b>Portugal</b>	19 February 1999	1 August 1999
<b>Qatar</b>	13 October 1998	1 April 1999
<b>Romania</b>	30 November 2000	1 May 2001
<b>Rwanda</b>	8 June 2000	1 December 2000
<b>Saint Kitts and Nevis</b>	2 December 1998	1 June 1999
<b>Saint Lucia</b>	13 April 1999	1 October 1999
<b>Saint Vincent and the Grenadines</b>	1 August 2001	1 February 2002
<b>Samoa</b>	23 July 1998	1 March 1999
<b>San Marino</b>	18 March 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Sao Tome and Principe</b>	31 March 2003	1 September 2003
<b>Senegal</b>	24 September 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Serbia</b>	18 September 2003	1 March 2004
<b>Seychelles</b>	2 June 2000	1 December 2000
<b>Sierra Leone</b>	25 April 2001	1 October 2001
<b>Slovakia</b>	25 February 1999	1 August 1999
<b>Slovenia</b>	27 October 1998	1 April 1999
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	26 January 1999	1 July 1999
<b>South Africa</b>	26 June 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Spain</b>	19 January 1999	1 July 1999
<b>Sudan</b>	13 October 2003	1 April 2004
<b>Suriname</b>	23 May 2002	1 November 2002
<b>Swaziland</b>	22 December 1998	1 June 1999
<b>Sweden</b>	30 November 1998	1 May 1999
<b>Switzerland</b>	24 March 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Tajikistan</b>	12 October 1999	1 April 2000
<b>Tanzania, United Republic of</b>	13 November 2000	1 May 2001
<b>Thailand</b>	27 November 1998	1 May 1999
<b>The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</b>	9 September 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Timor-Leste</b>	7 May 2003	1 November 2003
<b>Togo</b>	9 March 2000	1 September 2000
<b>Trinidad and Tobago</b>	27 April 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Tunisia</b>	9 July 1999	1 January 2000
<b>Turkey</b>	25 September 2003	1 March 2004
<b>Turkmenistan</b>	19 January 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Uganda</b>	25 February 1999	1 August 1999
<b>Ukraine</b>	27 December 2005	1 June 2006

<b>State</b>	<b>Date of Formal Acceptance</b>	<b>Date of Entry-into-force</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>	31 July 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Uruguay</b>	7 June 2001	1 December 2001
<b>Vanuatu</b>	16 September 2005	1 March 2006
<b>Venezuela</b>	14 April 1999	1 October 1999
<b>Yemen</b>	1 September 1998	1 March 1999
<b>Zambia</b>	23 February 2001	1 August 2001
<b>Zimbabwe</b>	18 June 1998	1 March 1999





## Annex IV

**States Parties in the process of implementing Article 5 and which have a deadline in 2009: Status with respect to the submission of extension requests**

States Parties with deadlines for the fulfillment of obligations under Article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention which have indicated that they will submit a request for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas under their jurisdiction or control:	States Parties with deadlines for the fulfillment of obligations under Article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention which have not yet indicated whether they will submit a request for an extension of the deadline for completing the destruction of anti-personnel mines in mined areas under their jurisdiction or control:	States Parties with deadlines for the fulfillment of obligations under Article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention which have indicated that they will destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under their jurisdiction or control no later than 10 years after entry into force of the Convention for each State Party, subject to certain conditions being met:	States Parties with deadlines for the fulfillment of obligations under Article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention which have indicated that they will destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in mined areas under their jurisdiction or control no later than 10 years after entry into force of the Convention for each State Party:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Bosnia and Herzegovina</li> <li>▪ Chad</li> <li>▪ Croatia</li> <li>▪ Ecuador</li> <li>▪ Mozambique</li> <li>▪ Peru</li> <li>▪ Senegal</li> <li>▪ Thailand</li> <li>▪ Yemen</li> <li>▪ Venezuela</li> <li>▪ Zimbabwe</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Denmark</li> <li>▪ Malawi</li> <li>▪ Níger</li> <li>▪ United Kingdom</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Jordan</li> <li>▪ Nicaragua</li> <li>▪ Uganda</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ France</li> <li>▪ Swaziland</li> </ul>
<p>These States Parties will need to have their requests considered at the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties (9MSP) at the end of 2008.</p> <p>In accordance with the decisions of the 7MSP, these States Parties are encouraged to submit their requests for fewer than nine months before the 9MSP (i.e., approximately March 2008).</p>	<p>Should these States Parties indicate that they will submit a request for an extension, they will need to have their requests considered at the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties (9MSP) at the end of 2008.</p> <p>In accordance with the decisions of the 7MSP, these States Parties are encouraged to submit their requests for fewer than nine months before the 9MSP (i.e., approximately March 2008).</p>	<p>Should these States Parties indicate that they will submit a request for an extension, they will need to have their requests considered at the Ninth Meeting of the States Parties (9MSP) at the end of 2008.</p> <p>In accordance with the decisions of the 7MSP, these States Parties are encouraged to submit their requests for fewer than nine months before the 9MSP (i.e., approximately March 2008).</p>	<p>In accordance with the decisions of the 7MSP, these States Parties, when they have completed implementation of Article 5, paragraph 1, may wish to use the model declaration as a voluntary means to report completion of Article 5 obligations.</p>



**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 3<sup>15</sup>**

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2006	2007	
Afghanistan	1,887	2,692	
Algeria	15,030	15,030	
Angola	1,460	2,512	
Argentina	1,596	1,471	<p>Argentina indicated that in 2006 the navy destroyed 111 mines (104 SB-33 and 7 FMK-1) during training activities conducted by the Company of Amphibious Engineers on destruction techniques. The army retains mines to develop an unmanned vehicle for the detection and handling of mines and explosives. Development of this vehicle started on 1 March 2004 and is half complete. The vehicle is currently at the stage of assembling. During 2006 no mines were destroyed for this project.</p> <p>Mines are also retained by the Institute of Scientific and Technical Research of the Armed Forces to test charges for the destruction of UXO/mines. In 2006, 14 mines were destroyed in the testing grounds.</p>
Australia	7,266	7133	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	14,999	12,500	
Belarus	6,030	6,030	

<sup>15</sup> This table contains only those States Parties which have not, in 2007 or previously, reported in accordance with Article 7 zero (0) as the number of anti-personnel mines retained in accordance with Article 3.

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2006	2007	
Belgium	3,820	3,569	Belgium reported that in 2006, 251 mines were used during different sessions of courses organised by the Belgian Armed Forces with the aim of educating and training EOD specialists and deminers with live ammunition and training militaries in mine risk education.
Benin	30	16	
Bhutan		4,491	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	17,471	1,708	<p>In 2006, joint EUFOR and Bosnia and Herzegovina Armed Forces inspection teams discovered 15,269 stockpiled MRU mines on several Armed Forces storages in Republika Srpska. The MRUD mines are directional fragmentation mines made in the former Yugoslavia and are designed to be used with an electrical initiation system. For this reason, such types of mines are not considered as a “mine” as defined under the terms of the Convention.</p> <p>However, since they are not adapted to ensure command detonation only, MRUD mines can be technically considered as having the potential to be used as antipersonnel mines. For this reason, the Ministry of Defence of Bosnia and Herzegovina made the decision to destroy the majority of them. The decision was that: 14,071 MRUD mines will be destroyed, 150 will be retained for training and education purposes by the Armed Forces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 396 will be transferred to EUFOR for their training purposes, 20 will be donated to the Ministry of Defence of Germany and 2 MRUD mines, which are incomplete, will be destroyed immediately.</p> <p>After the decision was made, all 14,701 pieces were transported to a workshop in Doboj, by mid-April 2007, approximately 5,000 MRUD mines had been destroyed and it is expected that the remaining 9,701 mines will be destroyed by mid-May 2007. The whole process of destruction has been controlled by representatives of the UNDP, NATO and the OSCE.</p>
Botswana <sup>16</sup>			

<sup>16</sup> In its report submitted in 2001, Botswana indicated that a “small quantity” of mines would be retained. No updated information has since been provided.

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2006	2007	
Brazil	15,038	13,550	Brazil reported that all mines retained for training shall be destroyed in training activities. The retention of these mines will allow the Brazilian Armed Forces to participate adequately in international demining activities.
Bulgaria	3,676	3,670	
Burundi <sup>17</sup>			
Cameroon <sup>18</sup>			

<sup>17</sup> In its report submitted in 2006, Burundi indicated that the decision concerning mines retained is pending.

<sup>18</sup> In its report submitted in 2005, Cameroon reported the same 3,154 mines under Article 4 and Article 3.

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2006	2007	
Canada	1,992	1,963	<p>Canada reported that it retains live anti-personnel mines to study the effect of blast on equipment, to train soldiers on procedures to defuse live anti-personnel mines and to demonstrate the effect of landmines. For example, live mines help determine whether suits, boots and shields will adequately protect personnel who clear mines. The live mines are used by the Defence department's research establishment located at Suffield, Alberta and by various military training establishments across Canada. The Department of National Defence represents the only source of anti-personnel mines which can be used by Canadian industry to test equipment.</p> <p>A variety of anti-personnel mines are necessary for training soldiers in mine detection and clearance. Counter-mine procedures and equipment developed by Canada's research establishment must also be tested on different types of mines member of the Canadian Forces or other organisations might encounter during demining operations. The Department of National Defence retains a maximum of 2,000. Canada will continue to conduct trials, testing and evaluation as new technologies are developed. There will be a continuing requirement for provision of real mine targets and simulated minefields for research and development of detection technologies.</p> <p>In 2006, 22 anti-personnel mines were transferred from Afghanistan to train Canadian soldiers with anti-personnel mines they are currently facing in Afghanistan and 51 anti-personnel mines were destroyed for research and development and training purposes.</p>
Cape Verde <sup>19</sup>			

<sup>19</sup> 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
	2006	2007	
Chile	4,574	4,484	<p>Chile reported that its retained anti-personnel mines were under the control of the army and the navy. In 2006, 39 mines were destroyed in anti-personnel mines detection, disposal, and destruction training courses organized for deminers at the School of Military Engineers of the Army. 1,357 mines were destroyed in anti-personnel mines detection, disposal, and destruction training courses organized for the Army's Demining Training Unit in Regions I, II and XII. 15 mines were destroyed to prepare the Partida de Operaciones de Minas Terrestres (Chilean Navy's demining unit) in humanitarian demining.</p> <p>Chile plans to use another 300 mines in 2007 in the course of its training activities. These activities include courses in detection, disposal, and destruction of anti-personnel mines for the Azapa, Atacama and Punta Arenas Engineering Battalions and the Navy demining units and regular courses for Engineer Officers and Sub-Officers at the School of Military Engineers.</p>
Colombia	886	586	
Congo	372	372	
Croatia	6,236	6,179	<p>Croatia informed the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention that in 2006, 57 anti-personnel mines were used for testing of demining machines, which left the total number of mines in stock for training purposes at 6,179 pieces. The main purpose for which retained mines were used up to date is testing demining machines Božena 5 and Mini "MINE-WOLF" and RM-KA 02. Only after comprehensive testing the machines would receive appropriate certification which would enable them to operate in Croatia and beyond. On the basis of current estimates regarding requirements for testing of demining machines, Croatia believes that 175 anti-personnel mines will be needed in 2007.</p> <p>In 2003, CROMAC established the Centre for Testing, Development and Training (CTDT), whose prime task is to conduct testing on demining machines, mine detection dogs and metal detectors, as well as research and development of other demining techniques and technologies. CTDT is the only organisation in the Republic of Croatia authorised to use live anti-personnel mines in controlled areas and under the supervision of highly qualified personnel. In 2004, for that purpose, CTDT established a test site "Cerovec" near the city of Karlovac.</p>

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2006	2007	
Cyprus	1,000	1,000	
Czech Republic	4,829	4,699	130 anti-personnel mines were disposed of in 2006. The Czech Republic reported that there is no specific action plan on how to use the retained mines, the principle is to use them for EOD/engineer units training to detect and destroy anti-personnel mines.
Democratic Republic of the Congo <sup>20</sup>			
Denmark	60	2,008	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. Anti-personnel mines are not used for the purpose of training in mine laying.
Djibouti <sup>21</sup>			
Ecuador	2,001	1,000	On 12 September 2007 Ecuador issued a statement indicating that it destroyed on 14 August 2007 a total of 1,001 anti-personnel mines previously retained for training.
El Salvador	96		
Equatorial Guinea <sup>22</sup>			
Eritrea <sup>23</sup>		109	
Ethiopia <sup>24</sup>			

<sup>20</sup> In its report submitted in 2006, the Democratic Republic of the Congo indicated that the decision concerning mines retained is pending.

<sup>21</sup> In its report submitted in 2005, Djibouti indicated that 2,996 mines were retained under Article 3.

<sup>22</sup> Equatorial Guinea has not yet submitted a transparency report in accordance with Article 7 of the Convention.

<sup>23</sup> In its report submitted in 2005, Eritrea indicated that the mines retained under Article 3 were inert.

<sup>24</sup> Ethiopia 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
	2006	2007	
France	4,216	4,170	France reported that its retained mines were used to: 1) test mine detection devices, including the "Mine Picker", a mine detection robot developed by Pegase Instrumentation and the MMSR-SYDERA system. 2) to assess the anti-personnel mine threat, 3) to test protective anti-personnel boots.
Germany	2,525	2,526	Germany reported that it retained anti-personnel mines under Article 3 with the following objectives 1) detection and demining equipment research and testing, 2) vehicle mine protection programme, 3) mine detection dogs, and 4) accident research, for the following projects/activities: 1) Mobile Minesearch and Clearing system, 2) Modular Fragment Protection, 3) Regular dog training at the Dog Handling Centre where the anti-personnel mines are placed in permanent search fields with fusing mechanisms partly or entirely removed. In 2006 at the Federal Armed Forces Technical Centre 91, 14 anti-personnel mines were used for the vehicle mine protection programme and accident research, 5 anti-personnel mines were destroyed, 20 anti-personnel mines type MRUD were delivered from the Balkans and 19 anti-personnel mines were transferred to Rheinmetall Unterlüss.
Greece	7,224	7,224	
Guinea Bissau	109		
Haiti <sup>25</sup>			
Honduras	815	826	
Indonesia <sup>26</sup>			
Ireland	77	75	
Italy	806	750	
Japan	5,350	4,277	Japan reported that it consumed 1,073 mines in 2006 for education and training in mine detection and mine clearance, and for the development of mine detectors and mine clearance equipment.

<sup>25</sup> Haiti has not yet submitted a transparency report in accordance with Article 7 of the Convention.

<sup>26</sup> Indonesia's report is not due until 28 January 2008 but Indonesia reported at the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention that it had stockpiled anti-personnel mines, some of which will be retained under Article 3 of the Convention.

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2006	2007	
Jordan	1,000	1,000	
Kenya	3,000	2,460	Kenya informed the Standing Committee on the General Status and Operation of the Convention that 540 anti-personnel mines had been used for the purposes described under Article 3. These mines were consumed during humanitarian demining and EODs training, demolition/destruction practical exercises and mine awareness training to peacekeeping contingents deployed to various missions.
Latvia	1,301	902	
Luxembourg	956	900	
Malawi <sup>27</sup>			
Mali <sup>28</sup>			
Mauritania	728	728	
Montenegro <sup>29</sup>			
Mozambique	1,319		
Namibia	3,899		
Netherlands	2,878		
Nicaragua	1,021	1,004	Nicaragua reported that a total of 17 mines were destroyed in training during 2006. 5 PPMI-SR11 mines were destroyed in May 2006 during a humanitarian demining training course. In addition, 12 PMN mines were deactivated, their explosive parts being removed (charge and detonator), with the aim of using them for retraining and verification of detectors used in the front lines of operations. These mines can be considered destroyed or unusable, since the removed parts were destroyed and can no longer be restored in their technical capacity to function as anti-personnel mines.
Niger	146		
Peru	4,012	4,012	

<sup>27</sup> In its report submitted in 2005, Malawi indicated that mines reported as retained under Article 3 are in fact “dummy” mines.

<sup>28</sup> In its report submitted in 2005, Mali indicated that 600 mines were retained under Article 3.

<sup>29</sup> Montenegro’s initial Article 7 report has not been submitted yet. [NOTE TO DRAFTERS: MONTENEGRO’S DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION IS 28 SEPTEMBER 2007]

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2006	2007	
Portugal	1,115	1,115	
Romania	2,500	2,500	
Rwanda <sup>30</sup>	101		
Sao Tome and Principe <sup>31</sup>			
Serbia <sup>32</sup>	5,507		
Slovakia	1,427	1,427	
Slovenia	2,993	2,993	
South Africa	4,433		
Spain	2,712	2,034	
Sudan	10,000	10,000	
Suriname	150	150	
Sweden	14,402	10,578	
Tajikistan	225	105	During 2006, Tajikistan destroyed 150 mines in the course of training activities. Mines retained are used for demining training and research activities. For 2007, Tajikistan plans to train 150 servicemen and 12 mine detection dogs.
Thailand	4,761	4,713	
Togo <sup>33</sup>			
Tunisia	5,000	5,000	
Turkey	15,150	15,150	
Ukraine	1,950	1,950	
Uganda <sup>34</sup>			

<sup>30</sup> Rwanda has indicated that the 101 mines declared under Article 3 had been uprooted from minefields to be retained for training purposes.

<sup>31</sup> Sao Tome has not yet submitted a transparency report in accordance with Article 7 of the Convention.

<sup>32</sup> In its report submitted in 2006, Serbia indicated that 5,507 mines were retained for training purposes and that 5,000 were transferred for training purposes.

<sup>33</sup> No updated information was provided by Togo in 2006-2007. In 2004, Togo reported retaining 436 mines.

<sup>34</sup> No updated information was provided by Uganda in 2006-2007. In 2005, Uganda reported retaining 1,764 mines.

State Party	Mines reported retained		Additional information volunteered by the State Party
	2006	2007	
United Kingdom	1,795	650	The United Kingdom indicated that anti-personnel mines are retained with the objective of identifying APM threat to UK forces and maintaining and improving detection, protection, clearance and destruction techniques. In 2006 1,248 anti-personnel mines were destroyed because they were unsafe.
United Republic of Tanzania	1,146	1,102	The United Republic of Tanzania reported that the Great Lake Region countries plan to utilise mine detection rats in their humanitarian demining efforts, so the Government of Tanzania requested 1,000 deactivated anti-personnel mines from the Government of Mozambique with the aim of training more MDR to respond to the demand of these countries.
Uruguay <sup>35</sup>			
Venezuela	4,960	4,960	
Yemen	4,000		Yemen indicated that the 4,000 mines were transferred from the military central storage facilities in Sana'a and Aden to the military engineering department training facility and MDDU.
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.

<sup>35</sup> No updated information was provided by Uruguay in 2006-2007. In 2004, Uruguay reported retaining 500 mines.

**Table 2. Anti-personnel mines reported transferred in accordance with Article 3<sup>a</sup>**

<b>State Party</b>	<b>Mines reported transferred</b>	<b>Additional information</b>
Canada	22	Transferred from Afghanistan to train Canadian soldiers with anti-personnel mines they are currently facing in Afghanistan.
Eritrea	100	The mines are demined by the teams of EDA from shilalo and transferred to NTC for the purpose of training. [UPDATE REQUIRED]
Moldova	249	Within the period of 19 May-8 June 2006, all 249 remotely controlled anti-personnel mines previously retained by the National Army for the purpose of training were transferred for the purpose of destruction and subsequently destroyed.
Mozambique	120	Mines transferred from Handicap International to APOPO and INTEGRA, two demining operators.
Nicaragua	72	26 PMN mines were transferred from the Nicaraguan Army to the Corps of Engineers and 46 mines were transferred to the army's dogs unit.
Tajikistan	5	Transferred from the storage facilities of the law enforcement units of the Republic of Tajikistan to the engineering units of the Ministry of Defence in 2006 for the purpose of destruction. These mines were confiscated by the law enforcement units as a result of crime control operations.
Thailand	48	
Yemen	4,000	Transferred from the military central storage facilities in Sana'a and Aden to the military engineering department training facility and MDDU.

<sup>a</sup> This table includes only those States Parties that reported mines transferred in accordance with Article 3 since the 7MSP.

## Annex VII: The status of legal measures taken in accordance with Article 9

### *A. States Parties which have reported that they have adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 obligations*

Albania	Colombia	Japan	St Vincent & the Gren.
Australia	Costa Rica	Liechtenstein	Senegal
Austria	Croatia	Luxembourg	Seychelles
Belarus	Czech Republic	Malaysia	South Africa
Belgium	El Salvador	Mali	Spain
Belize	Estonia	Malta	Sweden
Bosnia and Herzegovina	France	Mauritius	Switzerland
Brazil	Germany	Monaco	Trinidad and Tobago
Burkina Faso	Guatemala	New Zealand	Turkey
Cambodia	Honduras	Nicaragua	United Kingdom
Canada	Hungary	Niger	Yemen
Chad	Iceland	Norway	Zambia
	Italy	Peru	Zimbabwe

### *B. States Parties which have reported that they consider existing laws to be sufficient in the context of Article 9 obligations*

Algeria	Guinea Bissau	Mexico	Slovakia
Andorra	Holy See	Moldova	Slovenia
Bulgaria	Ireland	Netherlands	Tajikistan
Central African Republic	Jordan	Papua New Guinea	Tanzania
Denmark	Kiribati	Portugal	The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Greece	Lesotho	Romania	Tunisia
	Lithuania	Samoa	

### *C. States Parties which have not yet reported having either adopted legislation in the context of Article 9 legislation or that they consider existing laws are sufficient*

Afghanistan	Côte d'Ivoire	Jamaica	Saint Kitts and Nevis
Angola	Cyprus	Kenya	Saint Lucia
Antigua and Barbuda	Dem Rep. of the Congo	Latvia	San Marino
Argentina	Djibouti	Liberia	Sao Tome and Principe
Bahamas	Dominica	Madagascar	Serbia
Bangladesh	Dominican Rep.	Malawi	Sierra Leone
Barbados	Ecuador	Maldives	Solomon Islands
Benin	Equatorial Guinea	Mauritania	Sudan
Bhutan	Eritrea	Montenegro	Suriname
Bolivia	Ethiopia	Mozambique	Swaziland
Botswana	Fiji	Namibia	Thailand
Brunei Darussalam	Gabon	Nauru	Timor-Leste
Burundi	Gambia	Nigeria	Togo
Cameroon	Ghana	Niue	Turkmenistan
Cape Verde	Grenada	Panama	Uganda
Chile	Guinea	Paraguay	Ukraine
Comoros	Guyana	Philippines	Uruguay
Congo	Indonesia	Qatar	Vanuatu
Cook Islands	Haiti	Rwanda	Venezuela